

The Scoping Observations Of Interface Design, Persuasive Technologies, And Digital Well-Being For User Experience, Ethics, And Regulation

Darshan M. Patel¹ & Yash B. Naik²

1. Student Scholar, Department of Computer Science and Engineering, GSFC University, Vadodara (Gujarat), INDIA.
2. Teaching Assistant, Department of Psychology, The M.S. University of Baroda, Vadodara (Gujarat), INDIA.

Abstract

The rapid evolution of digital interfaces, algorithmic personalization, and persuasive design techniques has significantly reshaped user experiences across platforms such as streaming services, social media, e-commerce, and mobile applications. While these systems offer efficiency, personalization, and engagement, emerging evidence highlights risks related to cognitive overload, manipulative design practices, diminished digital well-being, and increased anxiety. This scoping review synthesizes empirical, conceptual, and design-based research published between 2023 and 2026 to map key themes, methodologies, and findings related to interface persuasion, dark patterns, digital detox, and user well-being. This review identifies dominant research clusters, methodological trends, gaps in current knowledge, and implications for designers, policymakers, and researchers. The findings reveal a tension between engagement-driven design and user autonomy, underscoring the need for ethical interface practices, transparent regulation, and user-centered design frameworks.

Keywords: digital well-being, dark patterns, persuasive design, user interfaces, algorithmic persuasion

1. Introduction

Digital platforms increasingly rely on persuasive interface elements such as urgency cues, personalization, gamification, and algorithmic recommendations to influence user behavior. While such mechanisms enhance engagement and commercial outcomes, they also raise concerns about user autonomy, cognitive overload, anxiety, and manipulative practices. Prior research has examined these issues across domains including live-stream commerce, music streaming platforms, political advertising, conversational agents, and digital detox applications.

Given the diversity of contexts and methods, a scoping review is appropriate to systematically map existing evidence, clarify conceptual boundaries, and identify research gaps.

This review addresses the following questions:

1. What types of persuasive and interface design strategies are examined in recent literature?
2. How do these strategies affect user behavior, cognition, and well-being?
3. What methodological approaches dominate this research area?
4. What implications emerge for design practice, regulation, and future research?

2. Methodology

2.1 Scoping Review Approach

This review follows established scoping review principles, aiming to map the breadth and characteristics of existing research rather than evaluate effect sizes or causal strength. Studies were included based on relevance to digital interfaces, persuasive design, user behavior, and well-being.

2.2 Data Source and Selection

The dataset consisted of 24 peer-reviewed and preprint studies summarized in the user-provided Review of Literature document. Included studies span quantitative experiments, surveys, mixed-methods research, system design papers, and conceptual frameworks.

2.3 Data Charting and Synthesis

Key attributes extracted included objectives, research design, data methods, variables, samples, findings, and limitations. A thematic synthesis approach was applied to identify recurring patterns and research clusters.

3. Results: Scoping and Findings

3.1 Persuasive Interface Cues and Behavioral Influence

Several studies demonstrate how subtle interface cues such as urgency language, vocal features, visual signals, or haptic feedback significantly influence user behavior. Live-stream commerce research shows that vocal tone, speech rate, and promotional language directly increase sales, while VR navigation studies indicate that sensory cues improve task performance without breaking immersion. These findings highlight the behavioral power of interface-level design decisions.

3.2 Dark Patterns, Manipulative Friction, and Consumer Harm

A substantial body of research examines dark patterns, including forced continuity, confirmed shaming, privacy manipulation, and deceptive friction. Framework-based audits and heuristic evaluations reveal systematic biases that make opting out more difficult than opting in. Empirical studies show mismatches between consumer awareness and designer intentions, suggesting that manipulative practices often remain unnoticed yet impactful.

3.3 Cognitive Overload and Interface Complexity

Research on music streaming platforms and political advertising transparency highlights the limits of information-based interventions. Overly complex interfaces, excessive categorization, and dense disclosures often increase cognitive load rather than empower users. Simplified, thematic organization consistently outperforms taxonomic or cluttered designs in usability and satisfaction.

3.4 Digital Well-Being, Anxiety, and Detox Mechanisms

Multiple studies address digital well-being through digital detox apps, algorithmic burnout, and exposure to ads or news. Findings suggest that time-outs and usage breaks reduce attention to ads and mitigate overload, whereas constant exposure to personalized or emotionally charged content may increase anxiety. However, well-being outcomes are context-dependent and vary by user motivation and design implementation.

3.5 Automation, AI Interfaces, and Emerging Risks

Recent system-oriented studies explore AI agents, conversational search, and embodied smartphone automation. While these systems improve accessibility and efficiency, speculative and empirical work warns that conversational interfaces may intensify persuasion due to heightened trust and reduced transparency, creating new ethical risks.

4. Research Gaps Identified

Despite growing interest, the literature reveals several gaps:

- Overreliance on short-term, cross-sectional designs, limiting causal inference.
- Underrepresentation of non-Western contexts, despite global platform use.
- Limited longitudinal evidence on anxiety, well-being, and behavioral adaptation.
- Few studies directly compare ethical vs. manipulative design alternatives.
- Insufficient integration between technical system design and user well-being outcomes.

5. Implications

5.1 Implications for Designers

Designers should adopt ethical-by-design principles, minimizing manipulative friction and cognitive overload. Transparent defaults, balanced friction, and meaningful choice architectures can preserve engagement without compromising autonomy or well-being.

5.2 Implications for Policymakers and Regulators

Findings suggest that transparency alone is insufficient. Regulatory frameworks should address interface asymmetries, deceptive defaults, and dark pattern enforcement, particularly in subscription management, data privacy, and political advertising.

5.3 Implications for Researchers

Future research should prioritize longitudinal and mixed-method approaches, explore cross-cultural variations, and bridge system-level innovation with psychological and behavioral outcomes. Scalable auditing tools and standardized taxonomies would enhance comparability across studies.

6. Recommendations

1. Integrate well-being metrics (e.g., stress, anxiety, fatigue) into interface evaluation.
2. Design for bounded persuasion, limiting excessive urgency and emotional manipulation.
3. Adopt standardized dark pattern auditing frameworks in both research and practice.
4. Expand longitudinal studies to capture cumulative exposure effects.
5. Encourage interdisciplinary collaboration between HCI, psychology, law, and design.

7. Conclusion

This scoping review demonstrates that persuasive interface design is a double-edged sword capable of enhancing usability and engagement while simultaneously undermining autonomy and well-being. The mapped evidence underscores the urgency of ethical design practices, stronger regulation, and theoretically grounded research. By shifting focus from maximizing engagement to supporting sustainable and humane digital experiences, future systems can better align technological innovation with societal well-being.

References

1. Andersen, K., Djerf-Pierre, M., & Shehata, A. (2024). The scary world syndrome: News orientations, negativity bias, and the cultivation of anxiety. *Mass Communication and Society*, 27(3), 502–524.
2. Anneser, E., Levine, P., Lane, K. J., & Corlin, L. (2024). Climate stress and anxiety, environmental context, and civic engagement: A nationally representative study. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 93, 102220.
3. Balaskas, S., Konstantakopoulou, M., Yfantidou, I., & Komis, K. (2025). Algorithmic burnout and digital well-being: Modelling young adults' resistance to personalized digital persuasion. *Societies*, 15(8), 232.
4. Caparas, J. M., Pulgar, J. R., Abrenica, Y., Gomez, J. D., Chan, J. R., & Serrano, E. (2025). Nirvana: A meditation mobile-based application specializing in stress-relief of academic workload for college students. *International Journal of Education Science*, 2(1), 91–103.

5. Chaimalas, I., Vyšniauskas, A., & Brostow, G. (2025). Explorer: Robust collection of interactive GUI elements. arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.09352.
6. Dobber, T., Kruikemeier, S., Helberger, N., & Goodman, E. (2024). Shielding citizens? Understanding the impact of political advertisement transparency information. *New Media & Society*, 26(11), 6715–6735.
7. Duan, J., Fan, C., Yan, H., & Wu, C. (2026). “Our special price is only once, and then there will be no more”: The language magic in live streams—How vocal and semantic features of influencers dynamically trigger purchases.
8. Erickson, J. (2025). Fake friends and sponsored ads: The risks of advertising in conversational search. arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.06447.
9. Goebel, S. R. (2025). Analysing customer contact sequences during the pre-purchase phase for consumer durables in Germany (Doctoral dissertation, International School of Management, Dortmund, Germany).
10. Guldmond, P. C., Van Remoortere, A., Vermeer, S. A., Boerman, S. C., & Kruikemeier, S. (2025). How ads get in our head: Studying processing of political (mis)targeting using a thought-listing approach. *Mass Communication and Society*, 1–19.
11. Kopka, J. F., Borgmann, L., & Langner, T. (2025). (Not) the right time for social media ads? Exploring the impact of social media detox on attention to the ad. *International Journal of Advertising*, 44(1), 87–108.
12. Lewis, B. W. (2025). Staring into the darkness: The heuristic evaluation of manipulative interfaces (Doctoral dissertation, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon).
13. Lu, T., Krauter, C., Liu, R., Schulte, M., Achberger, A., Blascheck, T., Sedlmair, M., & Gowda, M. (2025). VisRing: A display-extended smartring for nano visualizations. In *Proceedings of the 38th Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology* (pp. 1–18).
14. Mills, S., Whittle, R., Ahmed, R., Walsh, T., & Wessel, M. (2023). Dark patterns and sludge audits: An integrated approach. *Behavioural Public Policy*, 1–27.
15. Noetzel, S., Stubenvoll, M., Binder, A., & Matthes, J. (2025). Four shades of avoidance: Conceptualising and predicting reactive and preventive dimensions of online political microtargeting avoidance. *Behaviour & Information Technology*, 1–23.
16. Onkarnath, S. B., & Srinivasan, L. (2025). Dark patterns and consumer decision-making: Determining the economic impact of manipulative interface design.
17. Roongta, R., Jose, J., Habib, H., & Greenstadt, R. (2025). Sheep’s clothing, wolfish intent: Automated detection and evaluation of problematic “allowed” advertisements. *Proceedings on Privacy Enhancing Technologies*.
18. Skogberg, A. (2025). Playlist overload: Optimizing playlist discovery in Spotify’s Browse page.
19. Tunc, B. (2025). User-centred development of the VitaBeat app for linking smartwatch sensor data with Spotify songs.
20. Wittenberg, C., Epstein, Z., Péloquin-Skulski, G., Berinsky, A. J., & Rand, D. G. (2025). Labeling AI-generated media online. *PNAS Nexus*, 4(6), 170.
21. Yom-Tov, E., & Levontin, L. (2025). The in-situ effect of offensive ads on search engine users. *ACM Transactions on Information Systems*, 43(3), 1–22.
22. You, Y., & Karlsen, F. (2025). Affordances of digital detox applications: Exploring gamification and undesign as design principles. *International Journal of Human–Computer Interaction*, 41(16), 10178–10189.

23. Zhao, H., Ding, W., Yang, Y., Tian, Z., Yang, L., Shao, K., & Wang, J. (2025). See-Control: A multimodal agent framework for smartphone interaction with a robotic arm. arXiv preprint arXiv:2512.08629.
24. Zwoliński, G., Dubiel, A., & Kamińska, D. (2026). Subtle cues for navigation in virtual reality: How to effectively guide users in VR?