



Support Pool of Experts
Programme

The connected gaze. Video recording, surveillance and administering evidence in the age of smart glasses

by Dr. Yann BRUNA

Associate Professor, sociologist, University of Paris-Nanterre

As part of the SPE programme, the EDPB may commission contractors to provide reports and tools on specific topics.

The views expressed in the deliverables are those of their authors and they do not reflect the official position of the EDPB. The EDPB does not guarantee the accuracy of the information included in the deliverables. Neither the EDPB nor any person acting on the EDPB's behalf may be held responsible for any use that may be made of the information kept in the deliverables.

Some excerpts may be redacted or removed from the deliverables as their publication would undermine the protection of legitimate interests, including, inter alia, the privacy and integrity of an individual regarding the protection of personal data in accordance with Regulation (EU) 2018/1725 and/or the commercial interests of a natural or legal person.

Short summary

If connected glasses were first presented by manufacturers as tools of productivity or hands-free entertainment, the concrete uses that are made of them reveal much more complex dynamics. Based on a qualitative interview methodology, this report proposes to analyse the social reception of these devices and to understand to what extent they function as both ethical revealers and markers of social differentiation. This sociological research shows that, on the one hand, connected glasses reactivate the panoptic imagination, becoming instruments of interpersonal surveillances, anticipation of deviance and the daily administration of evidence. On the other hand, their cognitive and practical mastery is profoundly unequal, illustrating socio-digital discrepancies and highlighting power relations between the 'observer' and the 'observed', even though we observe that the two positions increasingly tend to be linked.

Table of Contents

1	Executive summary	5
2	Introduction	11
3	Methodology and field of investigation.....	14
4	Connected glasses ‘for what’? A panorama of uses	16
4.1	Spontaneity, authenticity and immersion: glasses to capture the field of vision	16
4.2	The economy of "satisfactory" digital content and "optimized" device	17
4.3	Closer to the body but less intrusive as well?	18
5	A contrasting acceptability of these day-to-day capture devices.....	18
5.1	The professional world to the test of illegal catches.....	19
5.2	The institutions of control and education in the face of the asymmetry of the gaze.....	21
5.3	Acceptable capture: the intentionality and locations of “implicit consent”	23
6	Connected glasses feed and materialize a judicialization of everyday life.....	24
6.1	Filming to administer evidence	24
6.2	‘If I had those...’. Non-users between resistance and regret	25
7	Identifying and verbalising the ethical issues surrounding glasses	27
7.1	A widely discussed catch signage	27
7.2	Keeping control and making use of ‘a lead time’: Who talks about privacy?	29
7.3	Social-digital inequalities in the receptions and uses of tools	31
8	Conclusion.....	33
9	References	34
10	Annexes.....	36

1 Executive summary

Contextual elements

Sociological literature has largely demonstrated that the use of technological objects is never dictated unilaterally by their designers, but results from social negotiation and appropriation work. In the case of connected glasses, although initially presented by manufacturers as "hands-free" productivity or entertainment tools, **this survey shows that their *large-scale marketing* reveals complex dynamics, closely linked to their audiovisual capture capacity.** Unlike the smartphone that requires ostensible manipulation, or the connected watch focused on self-measurement, connected glasses (notably the hegemonic Meta Ray-Ban model) are indeed based on a well-known design, aligning the technology with the individual's **very gaze, which rekindles concerns about the forms of interpersonal surveillance that they might amplify.**

In the early 2010s, the first studies on Google Glass had already highlighted the **tensions between innovation and perceived surveillance**, generating discomfort among non-users in the face of difficult-to-detect devices. This research focused on a binary opposition between "adopters" (who see it as a utilitarian or identity tool) and "non-adopters" (some focused on privacy risks). In this context and more broadly, **this report aims to explain to what extent the contrasting acceptability of these glasses reflects socially situated relationships to surveillance technologies, privacy and data management.** To explore these questions, the results presented are based on a qualitative methodology based on semi-structured interviews, commissioned and funded by the EDPB on the basis of a proposal by the CNIL. The survey was conducted between March and August 2026 with a diverse sample of 22 individuals. This panel is divided into 7 users (recruited mainly *via* groups dedicated to connected glasses on social networks) and 15 non-users (recruited by networks from close to close to diversify socio-demographic profiles, including rural people and individuals less endowed with cultural capital).

Immersion and spontaneity at the service of online sharing

The expression "connected glasses" refers almost exclusively to the Meta Ray-Ban models in the minds of the respondents. The analysis of the interviews reveals several major reasons for use. First, the main attraction of the device lies in its **ability to film as close as possible to the human eye**, offering an unprecedented immersion and this 'feeling of being in the bearer's place' when viewing video content. For many respondents, the tool makes it possible **to capture moments of life** (landscapes, concerts) with a certain authenticity, without the break induced by the manipulation of a smartphone (take out your phone, frame, etc.). An interviewee, for example, expresses frustration after forgetting his connected glasses during a walk at the beach, considering the smartphone as a disappointing substitute for sharing exactly what he sees. **This reveals an interesting break, since the smartphone, the main video capture tool for everyday**

use, is here relegated to the background by Meta glasses. In addition, the function of describing the field of vision by artificial intelligence is particularly **useful for people with visual disabilities**, as pointed out by a former podiatrist in our survey. However, some users temper this enthusiasm by pointing out the **technical limits of the framing** (impossibility to zoom – concerning current models in any case, partial field of view).

Then, connected glasses are part of **the attention economy of social networks and proves to be a tool particularly suitable for communication platforms**. The youngest interviewees in particular praise their ability to produce videos called "satisfactory" and "immersion" on Instagram and TikTok, which will then parade in the feed of Internet users. According to the interviewees, **glasses are not exclusively dedicated to content creators and increase the possibilities for sharing**: a funny moment in everyday life, a trip, an exceptional panorama or even a professional activity that is perceived as unpleasant (the example given is that of storing shelves in a hypermarket) can thus be captured and shared, and make sense because of the point of view that differs from the traditional framing of a more worked but above all less authentic video. Beyond the creation of content, respondents insisted on 'optimising' everyday life: the device becomes multitasking (audio, camera, voice assistant) and saves time even if friction persists due to a strong dependence of the glasses on the smartphone.

Finally, in some contexts, **having your hands free is perceived as a major safety and professional advantage**. Among the interviewees, an optician sees it as an asset for filming complex technical manipulations that require both hands, while a cyclist uses voice commands to send messages or call without endangering himself at the side of the road and a cook films the training of his plates without breaking his professional gesture, which, according to him, allows the authenticity of his creative work to be captured there again.

At work, with the family and on the street: Highly contrasted acceptability

While the initial ambition of connected glasses is mainly entertainment and sports practices (Meta Oakley) or assistance with productivity and disability situations (Meta Ray-Ban), they are quickly perceived as **potentially intrusive inter-individual surveillance devices**, generating strong tensions depending on social contexts.

To this end, **the professional environment appears to be the most acute area of conflict**. For example, a public service executive reports the misuse of glasses by a colleague to clandestinely record strategic meetings. Faced with this device, which is difficult to detect since it is similar to conventional eyeglasses, his staff develop a sense of vulnerability and self-censorship. In a completely different environment, a payroll manager shares this fear about leaking confidential information. Conversely, for workers exposed to the public, glasses can become a tool of necessity. A bus driver in our investigation explains that he was equipped specifically to photograph the license plates of vehicles that rub his mirrors, when a precarious deliveryman

films his deliveries to prove his good faith in the face of customer complaints and preserve his rating on the platforms.

Also in the professional context, several non-users express regret that they did not possess these glasses to prove, respectively, a racist assault by a superior and a violent altercation. But capturing everything without restriction can protect as well as expose: a craftsman and a doctor warn that this visibility exposes professionals to the risk of immediate lynching in case of error, through socio-digital networks.

The intrusion of the device into the private sphere is severely criticised by several individuals in the sample. One of them described a family experience as ‘traumatic’, where a relative recorded a debate without everyone’s knowledge, then using it to overwhelm the participants. For the interviewee, it seems that the recording perverts the domestic space, the place of free speech, and affects a “contract of interindividual trust”. However, some captures remain acceptable according to respondents, provided that the intention is transparent (e.g. filming his sports performance in a park). The more tech-savvy profiles accept the ‘implicit consent’ to be in the background of the videos of others in the public space, pointing out that this does not change ‘much’ of what could be done with a smartphone. However, **the most critical recall that, by its very design (the aiming set on the gaze), the bezel poses the unambiguous intention of filming, which leaves no room for misunderstanding.**

The role of the captured image and the taking of evidence

The survey reveals a serious sociological trend: **the transformation of connected glasses into a ‘legal shield’, which reflects a desire for permanent self-defence.** Connected glasses are thus envisaged as a protection against devaluation of speech, in particular by a victim of a road accident who has been unable to obtain compensation for lack of visual evidence and who concludes that there is a contemporary obligation to record everything in order to be heard by insurance companies or authorities. **This horizontal surveillance is a defensive necessity,** including by a farrier, non-user, but who imagines continuous recording as an effective remedy against conflicts of use of the road with hikers or cyclists when riding.

This is where a particularly interesting tension emerges between reflexive discourse and projected uses: **whereas almost all non-users are rather critical of the possible excesses in terms of interpersonal surveillance, these same people switch, for the most part and by themselves, later in the interview, in a logic of preventive capture when they imagine themselves faced with conflict scenarios.** In this context, remaining unarmed (to be understood as unequipped) in the face of those who register the ordinary seems to be perceived, on several occasions in our investigation, as a systemic vulnerability. For many interviewees, connected glasses act as a palliative to judicial or managerial systems deemed to be failing.

Non-recreational uses are thus transformed into **the reappropriation of urban security for the purpose of monitoring the offences of others**. A restaurant manager, who bought the glasses to listen to music by bike without fear of a ticket (this practice is prohibited), also uses them to film dangerous crossroads and to objectivize the offenses of others. Other respondents call themselves "archivists" of reality, such as a pensioner who films a fight from his window and explains that he needs the image to describe it more accurately, or a young man looking for a job who compares glasses connected to a dashcam or the sentinel mode of Tesla vehicles: According to him, thus equipped, citizens also become "mobile **sentinels**". **Some of the most critical respondents deplore this ambient paranoia that postulates danger as permanent and substitutes technical evidence for human trust.**

Inequalities in the practices and understandings of these devices

The ability to understand, circumvent or denounce the ethical stakes of these devices is socially located and indexed on the cultural capital of individuals and more specifically on the digital capital that derives from it; The debate on capture signage (a flashing diode on Meta Ray Bans) is an explicit illustration **of this**. The context is simple: because the disappearance of gestural friction makes capture insidious, Meta has integrated a light diode that must be lit during recordings. Several respondents rely on this LED to prove their "good faith" and to abstain from any voyeurism: **If the other does not react to the diode, it is because he consents "by default"**. Individuals who are more critical and reflexive about privacy issues, who are also among the most qualified in our sample, denounce a '**sham of transparency**' and highlight the weaknesses of such signage. They recall that the LED is invisible in full sun, that it does not indicate the destination of the data, and especially that it is easily bypassable, by accessories or software modifications.

In the survey, non-users with strong cultural capital therefore require a radical change in design. Some call for a red light flashing 'violently', and above all 'impossible to hide', while others politicise the debate by comparing public space with academic research standards: in the name of what private companies, and by slipping individuals who use their products, could they free themselves from the informed consent imposed on researchers in terms of audio/video capture? A former professor believes that if there is to be capture in public space, it should be a state monopoly rather than left to the discretion of citizens. In addition to practices, **the acceptability of the tool is also socially divided. Individuals highly endowed with cultural capital manage to conceptualize the ethical dilemmas of the object, pointing to the risks associated with the processing of personal or medical data.** On the other hand, for precarious categories or, in any case, more strongly subject to hierarchical authority in a professional context, **the tool is not discussed from the point of view of privacy but adopted (or desired) out of a strict practical need for self-defence by the taking of evidence.**

Finally, the digital capital of equipped people can also grant a decisive "lead time" to the dominants of the "supervisory game". Accustomed to wearing them daily, a restorer now knows how to analyze the body gestures of users of connected glasses, which allows her to spot a capture, when a tech-savvy adopter explains for his part how to disable the LED in a software way. **On the other hand, more secular profiles confess to being totally destitute, unable to know whether they are filmed or how the object works,** which may have the effect, in the speeches of two of them, of transforming the social space into an anxiety-provoking environment.

This research work develops that behind the industrial promise of entertainment, connected **glasses are transformed into interpersonal monitoring instruments that directly serve the administration of evidence. In doing so, they join other technologies that have followed a similar path** – such as collecting and sharing geolocation with peers and loved ones, which today takes place largely via platforms (Snapchat, Instagram, etc.). **In a society marked by a legalisation of everyday life, not possessing these tools would create, in the words of some respondents, a vulnerability to the supposed infallibility of the image on speech.** The imminent arrival of augmented reality and, less certainly, facial recognition will only harden this asymmetry between an "augmented observer" and a "dispossessed observed", and by slipping between the knowledge or not of the signage and / or gestures of capture, suggesting intense political struggles around consent in the public space.

*‘A good photograph consists precisely in capturing a person not when he or she is aware of it,
but when it is as natural as possible.’*

Lee Miller, American photographer (1907-1977)

2 Introduction

In recent decades, sociological literature has extensively documented the fact that technological objects never unilaterally dictate their uses (Akrich, 1998; Akrich, 1993; Jauréguiberry, 2003). The social reception of an innovation is always the product of negotiation, appropriation work, but also resistance rooted in pre-existing social structures, including information and communication technologies (Jauréguiberry and Proulx, 2011). While connected glasses were first presented by manufacturers as tools of productivity or hands-free entertainment, their confrontation with the social body reveals in practice much more complex dynamics and - most often - closely linked to the possibility of capturing photographs and videos. Moreover, these objects confirm that the connected tools attached to the contemporary individual are now becoming increasingly intimate, discreet and close to the body (Licoppe, 2012; Pharabod et al., 2013; Lupton, 2013a). Unlike a smartphone that requires slow and ostensible manipulation (i.e. taking it out of the pocket and then unlocking it and accessing the requested functionality, framing to take a photo, etc.), or a connected watch geared towards self-measurement (Pharabod, 2019) or access to smartphone notifications, connected glasses are now, and above all else, glasses. This is a strength of the partnership between Meta and Ray Ban, intended to make us forget the failure of the pioneering Google Glass but the widely discussed form factor. Meta glasses instead embellish with a connected shutter an already established and accepted design, on which the big name of optics has forged its reputation. As discreet as traditional glasses, therefore, the Ray Ban Meta, which are practically hegemonic at the time when these lines are written, adjust on the face, aligning the technological capture with the very gaze of the individual. By integrating an AI conversational assistant and audio-visual recording functions,¹ they give rise to a promise of informational fluidity and ‘instant’ image capture at the same time as they raise serious concerns about the latent monitoring that they allow to be carried out on the social environment, in particular after successive revelations of certain problematic uses of content captured by on-board cameras.²³ Indeed, by the design choices they inherit and the discretion that characterises them, connected glasses embody these ordinary so-called ‘interveillances’ (Aïm, 2020): they outsource visual memory and make it possible to constitute, at any time, an *archive* of everyday life (Keviani et al., 2014).

Initial work on these devices focused on the difficult ‘domestication’ of *Google Glass*, pointing to tensions between innovation, perceived surveillance and social marking – or even stigmatisation

¹ Augmented reality features are being rolled out and will only be available to the general public in the coming months, with the first announced model scheduled for autumn 2026.

² <https://www.bbc.com/news/articles/c0q33nvj0qpo>

³ <https://www.wired.com/story/meta-smart-glasses-face-recognition-nametag-connections/>

of carriers⁴ (Lupton, 2013b; Zekany, 2015). In the continuity of the cameras worn, these glasses generate discomfort and tension, particularly among non-users who do not know whether they are filmed and who consider the visual indicators (such as flashing diodes) to be insufficient (Koelle and Boll, 2019). Connected glasses also appear as an extension of the practices of permanent connection initiated by the smartphone. They would normalise behaviour deemed dangerous or prohibited and help to rationalise normative transgressions and ambiguities in public space (Kaviani *et al.*, 2024). The Australian quantitative study conducted by Kaviani and his team (*ibid.*) distinguishes users from non-users. Owners see it as a utilitarian object, an identity marker that assigns them to a social group that is rather 'connected' or tech-savvy and has little interest in possible abuses, when the unequipped above all raise concerns for privacy in the face of a consumer capture device that is particularly difficult to detect (*ibid.*). Building on previous work, an experiment conducted by Regenbrecht and his team (2024) symmetrically contrasts between 'have' and 'have nots', with wearers having access to additional information (including vocal information, once the glasses have 'read' and interpreted the visual information), which may have created a feeling of privilege in some, exclusion and 'missing something' in others (*ibid.*).

Apart from the research presented above, the scientific literature on these still emerging technologies among the public remains superficial and incomplete. At this stage, the main question arising from these different readings is how the social acceptability of connected glasses is constructed in the interactions between 'informed' or even 'augmented' wearers and non-wearers who 'subject' them. By implicitly presenting adopters as potential 'spies' to be spotted in order to protect themselves from them, because of isolated reprehensible practices,⁵ developers 'resisting against any form of technological surveillance' are also part of that duality.⁶ But turning back these social groups is not without risk of essentialisation, whereas it is necessary to think of them in their complexity and heterogeneity. In addition to the sociology of uses, a second theoretical section is therefore essential to address this connected object; it concerns the social conditions of technological appropriation. Against the myth of a homogeneous 'digital democratisation', the sociology of digital inequalities (Granjon, 2011; Pasquier, 2018; Brotcorne and Valenduc, 2009) has demonstrated that access to a tool does not guarantee control of its issues. Uses remain largely overdetermined by the volume and structure of digital capital (Granjon, 2022), thought of as a sub-component of cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1979). The critical ability to understand, evaluate and manipulate digital environments or reflexivity in the face of algorithmic collection and management of personal data remains unevenly distributed. Sociology thus shows that social classes with high cultural and school capital have a greater capacity to put

⁴ As a result of inappropriate video capture behaviour by some Google Glass users, the wearers of these connected devices were sometimes referred to as "Glassholes".

⁵ <https://www.404media.co/metax-ray-ban-glasses-users-film-and-harass-massage-parlor-workers/>

⁶ <https://www.404media.co/this-app-warns-you-if-someone-is-wearing-smart-glasses-nearby/>

into words the paradoxes of these devices (Granjon, 2022; Boyadjian, 2026; Balleys et al., 2018), to anticipate its excesses and to rationalize their own practices of self-limitation, disconnection (Jauréguiberry, 2014) or temporal optimization (Jauréguiberry, 2003). Conversely, the adoption or rejection of the object by less endowed fractions can take place in more intuitive modes, driven by heterogeneous professional imperatives (Granjon, 2009, Pasquier, 2018) or by fear of marginalisation (Déage, 2018).

Therefore, our general problem aims to overcome the distinction, not necessarily obsolete but somewhat simplifying, between adopters and others. We seek to understand to what extent the contrasting acceptability of connected glasses reflects socially situated relationships to surveillance technologies, the exploitation of the data they generate and the protection of privacy. To restore the richness of our empirical material, the analysis of the results will be structured in four parts. We will first present, from the varied but rarely dissonant speeches of the respondents, a panorama of the uses of connected glasses and will emphasise the disruptive dimension of the device, which would allow, among other features, a spontaneous and authentic capture. We will then investigate the social reception of these devices, through the presentation of various situations to which respondents were invited to react. We will then explore how, far from being a simple entertainment and productivity tool, the device is invested with a function of watchfulness and, in doing so, integrates into rational action strategies aimed at anticipating social hazard and administering evidence in case of conflict (aggression, road dispute, abuse of power, etc.). Finally, beyond the user/non-user antagonism, we will highlight that the ability to decode risks, to verbalise the ethical dilemmas of the tool and to develop complex and reflexive uses constitute a statutory privilege correlated with a strong digital capital, which endows the individuals who are rewarded with a supervisory agency that can worry those who are dispossessed of it.

3 Methodology and field of investigation

To test this questioning and in addition to a quantitative approach recently commissioned by the CNIL from Harris Interactive – Toluna,⁷ we propose a qualitative methodology by in-depth semi-structured interviews in order to access, on the one hand, the meaning that the actors give to their practices (Demazière and Dubar, 1997) and their justifications for the use and non-use of these connected devices, and, on the other hand, their reflexivity on what they represent, particularly in terms of surveillance and privacy.

Our survey, commissioned and funded by the *Support Pool of Experts of the European Data Protection Board* (EDPB) on the basis of a proposal by the CNIL⁸, was carried out between March and August 2026 among a diverse sample of 22 individuals, divided between owners and users of connected glasses (N=7) and non-users (N=15) who share the common characteristic of having a more or less diffuse knowledge of these devices, without being owners of them.

The interviewees were recruited through two main channels: on the one hand and mainly through specialised online spaces such as the groups 'Meta Ray Ban France' and 'Meta Ray Ban Gen 2' (more international) on social networks in order to identify users and, on the other hand, through a close-to-close network in order to diversify socio-demographic profiles, in particular those of non-users for whom we also went to look for profiles with less cultural capital and living in rural municipalities. The corpus of respondents was constructed in such a way as to saturate two major variables: the actual practice of the object (user/non-user, in order to observe possible discrepancies and position ourselves vis-à-vis existing literature) and the degree/profession level of the individual and that of his/her parents – elements that we will use as indicators of cultural capital. The maintenance guide, which is partly common but of course adapted to the situation of the interviewee (user or not), is structured around four main axes:

1. The general relationship with the technique and the equipment trajectories: place of digital in everyday life, habits of material renewal, etc.
2. Representations of the object: imaginary associated with connected glasses, functionalities and lack of functionalities, first links envisaged with surveillance, etc. Particular attention is paid to the lexicon used to describe the object (technical terms, metaphors of vision or danger) in order to bring out potential variations related to cultural capital.
3. Concrete practices (for users) and planned practices (for all individuals): contexts of use (mobility, professional space, domestic space), situations (connected glasses used by an employer, a family member, a teacher, a health professional, etc.), management of the

⁷ See <https://linc.cnil.fr/survey-les-francais-et-les-lunettes-connectés>

⁸ This research has been followed by the CNIL and more specifically its Digital Innovation Laboratory (LINC), with Vincent Toubiana, Mehdi Arfaoui and Martin Bieri being the main correspondents. We thank them here for the proposal made in February 2026 to carry out this survey and for their support in carrying it out.

gaze of others, types of content captured.

4. Ethical and political reflexivity: expression of fears, envisaged links with private life, perception of regulations (necessary or not), links between the 'object' Ray Ban and the partnership with Meta, projection into the socio-technical future (what glasses in five years?), etc.

The interviews, lasting an average of fifty minutes, were recorded, transcribed and then subjected to an essentially manual (Word) cross-cutting thematic content analysis and partly automated by Tailwind, AI assistant of the MaxQDA qualitative analysis software.

4 Connected glasses ‘for what’? A panorama of uses

The expression "connected glasses" spontaneously refers in the minds of the respondents to the models marketed by Meta, in partnership with Ray-Ban. For most respondents and apart from two of the most tech-savvy, however, it is the Ray Ban brand that is most frequently cited for these glasses. Several main types of use, whether actual, projected or observed, emerge from the corpus. We propose in this section to classify them according to the reasons they cover.

4.1 Spontaneity, authenticity and immersion: glasses to capture the field of vision

Mathieu, an optician, underlines the importance of ‘POV’⁹ capture, which made it possible to film things as close as possible to the human eye, offering an unprecedented immersion that was impossible to reproduce with a smartphone or a traditional camera: *It's so much closer to the gaze that it feels like you're in the place of the person who's filming. I think the usefulness is really to get as close as possible to the vision of the wearer.* Pauline, payroll manager, also sees it as an advantage to immortalize landscapes while hiking or live concerts without having to raise her arms with a screen, thus avoiding breaking the authenticity of the moment. Jacques adds, in the same vein, that they are *‘practical to capture a nice landscape, his dog on his knees, nice moments, no need to take out such, to frame, we find a spontaneity, an authenticity because the person does not seek ‘to pose’, we take the raw movement, etc. We capture a slice of life’.*

Farid, a cook, follows on from previous speeches, while stressing the disruptive nature of the system: Having only his smartphone left during a walk at the beach, he regrets the impossibility of capturing his field of vision as he would have done with his glasses:

I had gone to a different beach and I had a landscape, it was really beautiful. And lack of bowl, that day, I had left my glasses at my friend's house, so I could not enjoy it. So I took it with my phone, but I was a little disgusted because I thought: “I could have enjoyed it, taken the video directly on my nose, showed everyone what I see live”. It could have been great, but lack of bowl, I forgot. (...) Glasses are a bit of an extension of what you actually see, it's about giving people the benefit of what I've seen, or showing people what I've seen, or proving it if it's something extraordinary.

According to Jacques and Geoffrey, connected glasses do not just capture the field of vision, they are presented as particularly clever when it comes to describing it, which is very useful to Geoffrey, a former podiatrist now with a disability: *‘It is true that I often ask my glasses what is in the field of vision. The description is phenomenal’.* Jacques and Mathieu also point out that these devices are very useful to visually impaired people, particularly when they are used in

⁹ Point Of View, which conveys the idea, particularly in high-level sports, of being ‘as close as possible’ to what the subject actually observes during a race, descent or free fall.

conjunction with the *BeMyEyes* application,¹⁰ which allows humans to take over the AI description and describe an image captured by someone who can hardly see it. However, the description of the field of vision does not escape some criticism. For example, being limited to the 'wide angle' of the field of vision also appears to be a constraint, particularly for Baptiste:

When I went to see it I was like, 'If I'm watching something and I just have to press a little button to film what I'm seeing, it's going to be great to make short videos and share them.' And unfortunately, the fact of not being able to control what you are filming, since it is not projected on your eye, and not being able to zoom in to have the things like I do with my smartphone, I thought to myself that finally, this connected bezel, it will be of no use to me.

Enthusiastic in the first place, Jacques also tempers his first testimony: "Well, *it is true that it is also not entirely possible to capture the field of vision, it does not film at 180 degrees either, we cannot rest on it and say that this is exactly what we saw*".

4.2 The economy of "satisfactory" digital content and "optimized" device

Continuing from the previous point, we observe that satisfaction and optimization are two terms that come up regularly in interviews. Pauline notes the prevalence of these devices on social networks to produce immersive videos (such as supermarket employees filming the linear storage of first-person shelves) aimed at capturing users' attention and monetising these flows: "People who store the shelves [...] do this with the glasses to be able to generate money afterwards on, on TikTok, etc. And people like it because they say it is, it is satisfactory content". In the same way, Farid occasionally films his dishes, from their preparation to the final rendering. However, he concedes that he only very rarely hosts such content on social networks, preferring a more restricted sharing with his relatives.

For their part, Farid, Lydia, Claire and Marion emphasised the 'optimisation' aspect, which could be understood by the 'multitasking' aspect of the system: 'These are sunglasses but they are also headphones in a way, and cameras, I can even talk to them, in fact that's what I mean, I really optimised my glasses, they are no longer just glasses,' Farid explains. Lydia and Claire integrate into this definitional effort the saving of time and the practical ease of the device, which frees the user 'to have to take the phone out of his pocket, one day it will replace the phone, when we have augmented reality for example, notifications that appear, but already it is a tool for optimising everyday life' for Lydia. Like many other informed participants, this increased gaze represents a major expectation horizon and the next key step in the development and dissemination of connected glasses.

¹⁰ Become My Eyes. For more information: <https://www.bemyeyes.com>

4.3 Closer to the body but less intrusive as well?

As an optician, Mathieu identifies a use value in training and sharing complex manual skills. The glasses make it possible to film a delicate technical manipulation while keeping ‘*both hands free*’ – a commercial argument widely deployed by Meta, offering greater feedback than a video taken by one hand via a smartphone. In continuity and beyond the image, participants are interested in audio and the use of the AI conversational assistant. While the ability to listen to her music without headphones was decisive in her acquisition, Lydia also sees hands-free as a major safety argument as a cyclist:

They allow me to communicate, to send messages in, I don't know how to say, by talking to them, to glasses. I give them orders: Hey Meta, please, can you send a message by that name? And so I can send a message directly like that, which is very convenient when riding a bike. Because it's already happened to me, to stop by the side of the road, take out my phone to type my message. Sometimes it's not safe to stop at the side of the road. While here, it's very convenient. I can just run a command and it sends a message or I can even call and roll and call at the same time with the glasses.

According to Farid, an asset of connected glasses lies in the perfect coincidence between the axis of his vision and the axis of capture. Unlike the smartphone that partially extracts the individual from the action, the bezel allows to document while remaining fully physically engaged. The chef thus records the training of his plates without breaking the thread of his professional or creative gesture and sees it as a quest for raw authenticity: film the world exactly as it unfolds before his eyes, without the distorting filter of staging proper to the outstretched arm and framing of the smartphone.

5 A contrasting acceptability of these day-to-day capture devices

According to most respondents – and not only among the unequipped – connected glasses are originally an entertainment tool and in any case remain presented as such, but this initial ambition fades behind a device of inter-individual surveillance and facilitated intrusion into the intimacy of others. The issue of sharing the content thus captured is, moreover, central. Pauline evokes, for example, the risks of accidental or malicious capture in the public space that can break anonymities or expose entire sections of privacy on social networks regardless of the relational consequences. Several social situations, presented by us to make users and non-users react or directly evoked by respondents in the form of anecdotes, reflect a strong heterogeneity in the social acceptance of these tools.

5.1 The professional world to the test of illegal catches

Particularly recurrent in interviews, the professional world undoubtedly emerges as the most acute space of conflict concerning the use of connected glasses. The introduction of these devices in meetings or office spaces reactivates coping anxieties and directly threatens the confidentiality of information. Inès, a civil service official, gives a precise account of what she describes as ‘the ravages’ of misuse within her administration: A colleague uses her connected eyeglasses to clandestinely record strategic meetings, capturing sensitive data that can be transferred outside or using it as a means of pressure. Faced with this, she feels powerless, in particular because of the material ambiguity of the object and the difficulty in detecting a recording:

Unfortunately, the administration has not foreseen these cases, since connected glasses, it is very recent, there is no charter, there is nothing. This person uses these connected glasses to film and record meetings where there may be issues for my institution [...]. When it is asked to remove the connected glasses, it is eyeglasses. You are not allowed to ask someone to remove eyeglasses or when they are asked not to record, the answer is: Prove I'm recording!

According to the interviewee, this situation creates a sense of vulnerability among agents, who prefer to silence sensitive information rather than risk a leak. Pauline, payroll manager, shared this concern about business secrecy and the risks of hacking:

In the office, you often deal with confidential information. I don't see the point in filming them and taking the risk of it escaping. You never know about piracy. Unknowing recording destroys the spontaneity of labour relations. Inès confides to be "very, very careful with everything she says" since she suspects that she was recorded via a smartphone discreetly returned to a table during a service conflict: In fact, we have lost the, spontaneity [...] we no longer have confidence.

Also in the professional sector, Patrick, a bus driver, expresses, like other user participants – including Christophe mentioned above – his conviction of a profound singularity of use: I took them for a very specific reason. And that's not what you think, I think you're ten thousand leagues away from knowing. Do you think it's to listen to music? No, I don't listen to music. I'm having fun putting it on, but after five minutes, it gives me, I take it off. And if I tell you why I bought them, you'll tell me: “fucking, it's not stupid.” However, Patrick's practices are hardly surprising compared to those of other adopters:

It's been three times since I've been at a stop to pick up passengers and I've had the retro ripped off by a truck or a car, which passes and runs away. Well, now it won't happen anymore. I'm taking a picture. That's why I actually have them. I will be able to film or take a picture if I have a problem on the road. Me, I get ripped off a retro when I'm

stationary, I'm not wrong, well now I can prove it. And on a bus, it's not easy to look behind to take the license plate. So now, what am I doing? Yesterday, I had the same case, a truck that walked in front of me, not very wide road, I saw the truck arrive, well when it was within sight, I took a photo for safety. So if he ever breaks, hop, I have his license plate.

Because he welcomes the public, Patrick explains that he equipped himself after negotiating the wearing of connected glasses with his employer, by explicitly presenting him with the intentional uses and those they forbade themselves, such as filming passengers, which is ‘in any case useless since I have cameras inside’. In any case, these are uses of necessity, dictated by the feeling of growing legal uncertainty and by the obligation for each citizen to become the legal archivist of his own existence in order to counter an imaginary failure of traditional regulations or to justify himself to an employer. Similarly, Moussa, a courier who works with two platforms, explains that he uses video capture of his deliveries in order to preserve his precarious employment, which again reflects surveillance by necessity:

‘If my score goes down too much, it’s simple, I’m struck off the platform, I know it’s not very useful, but I happen to film deliveries, people today are ..., there’s always something wrong, there’s a sauce missing, I can’t help it, they say it happened cold, there’s a lot of things I can’t prove that I’m going to play on my note, but at least if there’s a problem I can show that the delivery went well’.

Xavier, a non-user, regrets not having had connected glasses available after an altercation in his company, in which he was an interim: ‘The glasses would have been useful to me, but the smartphone would have been good too if I had launched the dictaphone, you see, but all that I think about afterwards when the glasses I would have caught direct that I had to film is also the difference with the iPhone. And there the guy who attacked me was on permanent contracts, so the choice was made quickly, I let you guess who was unemployed.’ Finally, Marc would have liked to have had tangible elements against a hierarchical superior in the face of a situation which he considers unacceptable:

My boss is hyper-racist, a real xenophobic. And he humiliated, uh, really humiliated the housekeeper who was almost black in front of me. And that day, I left before the hour because I couldn't stand him humiliating her anymore. I told my HR about it but it didn't change anything, and I regretted not filming it, because it was really cruel and really there, I regretted.

If you had those connected glasses, would you have filmed the scene?

Undoubtedly, because I hesitated with my mobile phone to film, I did not have time, it had already passed. And it's true that ... connected glasses are a tool that can be useful, in such

situations it would be foolish not to use them. But it must not become a goal in itself to film others. »

As in Xavier's case, he recalls the spontaneity of the capture. When the employee's speech is disqualified by a hierarchical authority, embedded video capture therefore appears to be an effective way to achieve factual justice and to rebalance an asymmetry in speech inherent in a position in the company. For his part, Jacques, security manager, wants to be much more cautious and, joining here the iron marshal Christophe who mentioned some difficulties and the unexpected share relating to his job, explains how an unexpected video capture can jeopardise a professional career and result in a "trial" via digital platforms:

"I am at the end of my career, so yes, privacy ... images and videos can be watched by people in Africa who are paid by the slingshot, I don't care, but for the youngest ... the problem is all the crazy people who can't eat a pinito without putting it on social networks, mainly Gen Z, they have no limit, no distance, their life is networks. And ... glasses will give them the opportunity to look at each other to take pictures and film themselves (...) of course it will reinforce street harassment, we already see it on networks, and it will be even worse with facial reco coming up. And even at work, look at ..., my son is a doctor, imagine he makes a misdiagnosis or something, you can rot his life in three minutes with these glasses.

After having precisely identified, without worrying about it, the risks behind the collection and off-site processing of content, and then devalued the exposure of the youngest on social networks, Jacques refocuses his discourse on a major and this time quite concrete concern, namely the visibility of human error for the purposes of procedure by a generalised person who is not authorised or legitimate to make a judgment.

5.2 The institutions of control and education in the face of the asymmetry of the gaze

Beyond the professional sector, other scenarios or lived situations challenge respondents who highlight the power asymmetry and relational disruptions introduced by the device. Several cases stand out here, starting with the school setting we interviewed respondents about. The hypothesis of a teacher wearing connected glasses gives rise to mixed reactions. Lydia immediately validates the idea in terms of discipline: *'It could encourage children to behave better'*, joining Inès, who justifies the teacher's use of defensive tactics in the face of accusations from students. For his part, Mathieu warns against the deleterious effects on students' development and learning: *Having a look at what's going on, uh, what's going on in class [...] I don't think it's a good thing to know you're spied on, uh, and possibly flicked, in quotation marks [...]. I think it would not be ... at last, it would not allow an environment conducive to the relaxation*

of the child and therefore it would give poor learning conditions. Pauline took a more radical stance, pointing out that education is based on the right to error, groping and a relationship of asymmetrical but human trust between the teacher and the pupil. Introducing permanent capture at school would destroy "the *psychological safety space necessary for learning*".

Close to the school context, another situation is mentioned twice: people recording in front of schools. Marc and Pauline shared their concerns: *Today, I see a shady guy with his cell phone filming her, filming me, filming school leaving. I'm asking myself a question. The same guy, the same guy with glasses, well I'm not even careful because here, for me, especially from afar, it's just a guy with glasses*, explains the first, when Pauline adds: *Tomorrow, there is someone who, who has paedophile or other intentions, who goes in front of a school or who goes to a park to walk around, in itself, he films what he wants and he does what he wants from the images behind. And yet, parents, they will never know that their children were filmed and all that.* Among the other contexts of use presented, the use of cameras by law enforcement is better accepted, as it is perceived as an extension of already existing control devices (carried cameras) aimed at regulating institutional and citizen violence, setting limits and protecting both parties in a symmetrical manner. Mathieu notes that this "makes it possible to establish a certain limit", while Inès believes that it allows agents to protect themselves from biased judgments.

The family sphere, on the other hand, is the subject of more pronounced concerns among most of our respondents, particularly in situations of marital supervision, but not only. Olivier describes a specific family event that illustrates what he describes as a 'technological *perversion of the intimate*':

I've had an experience that I call odious, intrusive and deeply dishonest. A member of my own family came to an extended family reunion, where we were debating rather lively political and personal issues, equipped with these connected glasses. No one realized they were recording. A few days later, during a minor disagreement, this person sent us back to the face of perfect verbatims, textual quotes of what had been said, almost threatening to use the recording to prove that this or that had been contradictory. It was a rape of family intimacy, a hijacking of a moment of trust to turn it into a court. The object turned a table discussion into a chargeable data collection.

This excerpt also shows that the use of connected glasses seems to affect the ethical nature of the spaces they enter. By introducing the possibility of systematic and clandestine archiving within the domestic sphere, traditionally preserved as the place of free, imperfect and ephemeral speech, the object affects a 'contract of *interindividual trust*', Olivier adds later in the interview.

5.3 Acceptable capture: the intentionality and locations of “implicit consent”

However, not all image captures are necessarily unacceptable. Several respondents identify public places and activities where registration is not a *priori* problematic. According to Claire, it is more the intention behind the capture that is to be investigated and not the capture itself:

It can be dangerous if, for example, the person is filming a park with children. It becomes immediately unhealthy, a guy who films girls, who follows them. Yes, then, in this case, it would be very problematic. And to not know it, to hide it because it discreetly films anyway, it proves that the person has bad intentions. Because if it's something she's not hiding from, it could be more legitimate. If, for example, she is doing sports, she is filming, I miss it, I see that she is filming, there is no problem, she is filming her race or her session, it is ok, I see videos on Instagram where people are going to film their performance with glasses, because it is much simpler necessarily with free hands, and in this case, I think it is legitimate. We know the goal, well it's a performance goal to display on networks, but it's understandable.

The most tech-savvy profiles in the corpus also tend to minimise the scope of this video recording, which moves away from a desire for voyeurism, as Xavier evokes with a certain detachment his own passive exposure within content produced by third parties in contemporary spaces of sociability: *Today, I'm going to the Capitol, I'm going to the gym, I know for a fact that I'm in the background of ten Instagram Reels of guys filming their performances. It's like that, it's the life of an artist, you can't do anything about it (laughs).* Here we find the idea of ‘implicit consent’ to capture images located in certain public places.

More critical participants, however, ignore the question of intent. According to Olivier, this device is, by its *nature* and unlike the smartphone, designed to record: *The difference is that the smartphone is a multifunctional tool. There are a multitude of functions on a smartphone, when in fact, the connected bezel resembles a camera that immediately, sets the intention to film. So it's a tool to capture the gaze you have on others and to fix that gaze, there can be no misunderstanding.* Before adding, paraphrasing the metaphor of Deleuze’s sniper who has access to the public space through his overhanging position but wishes to reach only one target, that ‘there is the idea of a sight in the bezel, and when it is associated with an increase in reality, the sight will be all the more precise, it corresponds to what is seen with facial recognition’.

6 Connected glasses feed and materialize a judicialization of everyday life

The corpus reveals a heavy sociological trend: the increasing use of capture technologies as a legal and administrative shield in a social world perceived as uncertain, violent or even anxious.

6.1 Filming to administer evidence

Connected glasses and on-board cameras become essential instruments for the administration of evidence. Inès illustrates this drift by a personal experience linked to a road accident: verbally assaulted by a third party, she was refused her complaint by the police and rejected her coverage by the insurance for lack of factual visual evidence, her word not being considered sufficient. It concludes that there is a contemporaneous obligation to record everything to be heard:

Today, people's voices are being questioned and everything must be based on facts. So today, if we don't have a camera in the car, if we don't have connected glasses to film what's going on, we're not being heard. And I find it a shame to get there. [...] We lose human relationships what. We lose this, the confidence that there could have been before. [...] We are always anticipating if this happens, if this happens.

Technology is thus invested with a defensive protection function in the face of the collapse of the credit granted to speech, since others can have these technologies at their disposal and also practice this systematic recording of the ordinary. Mathieu corroborates this position by stating that if he were to resolve to use connected glasses, it would only be in a framework of personal protection in the event of an accident, while recognizing the ethical dilemma of agreeing to film people without their knowledge.

In the rural or artisanal environments represented in our corpus, this horizontal surveillance is perceived through the prism of vulnerability to social networks. The image captured is no longer a simple computer file, it is a potential weapon of decontextualisation, as Christophe develops:

I had the case with a young trainee who took out his phone to film a young horse who had panicked while we appeared. The horse defended itself, it was impressive, but we managed the situation with the usual methods of education. I stopped work right away and told him: You erase that immediately in front of me. Why? Because the cruelty of people on social networks, it still exists. You throw this on the Internet without the context, without explaining the job, and the next day you pass for an animal executioner. People judge on three seconds of images. So imagine if someone has glasses and films all my work without me realizing it. This is the door open to any lynching.

As Jacques imagined above, the iron marshal of our corpus thus shares an experience lived within his activity that perfectly illustrates this anguish of malicious reinterpretation by the digital public.

6.2 'If I had those...'. Non-users between resistance and regret

In continuity, our results highlight a paradox shared by almost all participants. While users and non-users often make harsh criticisms of the monitoring potential of the object and the irreversibilities that can result from a massification of its use, they almost always switch to a preventive capture logic when we invite them to imagine a personal adoption scenario or when we put them in front of various possibly problematic social situations as presented previously (professional sector, family life, schooling, etc.). Thus imagined, connected glasses are invested as a tool of legal protection. In this context, to remain 'outside the game' of this surveillance, which originates in the video capture of the ordinary to anticipate the extraordinary, is to expose oneself, to be disarmed, to reinforce a vulnerability, to be the one who cannot defend himself. Later in the interview and returning to his altercation at work, Xavier tells how the absence of material traces during this incident allowed his hierarchy to stifle the incident:

If I had filmed this scene with glasses... You see, the story I was talking about, this altercation of extreme violence at work where management put everything under the carpet because it was word against word. If I had had the direct recording, at the level of my eyes, I would have had something more solid than my word. Faced with HR, facing lawyers, really I arrive, I put it on the table, I have nothing more to say. It's all there.

This need to equip oneself to prove good faith or to identify potential aggressors runs through the speeches of most respondents, whether or not they are equipped. Christophe mentions recurring conflicts of use in natural areas where the connected bezel could serve as a legal *black box*:

In my corner, we see more and more verbal and even physical altercations between riders, farmers and cyclists or hikers who do not respect anything. It goes very fast, insults flare up, and when the gendarmes arrive, everyone gives their version and no one is condemned. If the rider or craftsman has his glasses connected that rotate continuously, he has the identity of the guy, he has the registration of the vehicle, he has proof of the aggression. It's unfortunate to say, but it's coming to a point where if you want to defend yourself in this society, you have to record everything to be able to go to court.

The above excerpts converge on the conviction that connected glasses can be imagined as a substitute or even a palliative to a judicial or managerial apparatus deemed defective. There is also an ethical, sociological but also legal tension between the immoral and illegal production of evidence (constrained by the right to the image and which leads one to say 'I should not, but ...') and its use in case of need (legal value of a video which should not have been captured but which may nevertheless prove admissible). Geoffrey refers to the example of the *dashcam*, which 'insurances love' and which 'silences people'. As observed in a recent survey on the parental use

of connected soft toys,¹¹ connected glasses are close to prevention devices in a perspective of self-defence or, at the same time, discrediting the speech of the other.

For adopters, the non-recreational uses (travel, etc.) of the on-board camera are therefore often backed by a logic of reappropriation of urban security. Initially acquired to circumvent a regulatory constraint (listening to music on a bicycle without headphones to avoid fines), Lydia's glasses mutate, for example, into a passive security device: *I'm going to film my road ... because we know that some crossroads in the middle of Paris are very dangerous*. Moreover, the glasses here operate a double subversion, in that they conceal the infringement of the user (musical listening prohibited while driving) while recording for evidential purposes the infringements of others. At Geoffrey, a former podiatrist, the connected bezel is an extension of a technological trajectory marked by a culture of defensive capture (use of domestic cameras and automotive *dashcams* for two decades). For this user in a disability situation, registration becomes a legal and psychological shield. When he films a brawl at the bottom of his home, he immediately establishes himself as an archivist of reality for the authorities, able to provide an authentic testimony since increased by the image:

It is true that the glasses also provide proof of what I really witnessed, the other time I witnessed a fight not far from home, more or less serious, I filmed with my Meta and I called the police at the same time, I filmed as a witness to remember also, the details. If I had been asked, I would have given the video to justify what I actually saw, the time, the place, and not just describe it in my good faith because I can be wrong too!

Julien, a non-user, draws an interesting parallel in the continuity of Geoffrey's speech:

I see it a bit like a dashcam yes, well, it reminds me of Tesla's sentinel mode, you park and hop you film but not because you want to film something, you're in a parking lot, you don't care what happens, that's not where you're going to create travel memories, you're not going to keep your video, but you film it because you want to be reassured if something happens to your car when you're not there, and then it's a bit like you're a mobile sentinel, everyone who has these glasses actually becomes mobile sentinels, it's creepy (laughs).

Connected glasses contribute here to the objectification of speech, neutralising the one of the other but also threatening his own, potentially approximate, in favour of the infallibility of the image. For the respondent, these glasses are a continuation of the *dashcam* in cars:

I had an accident, I got into it, I wasn't wrong, but when I got out of the car I came across someone in bad faith who kept telling me 'but if you're wrong', so I said look at him, I have

¹¹ <https://www.parents.fr/être-parent/famille/nounou-sous-surveillance-on-finit-par-agir-pour-la-camera-pas-pour-lenfant-1152300>

a dashcam, do you want us to shoot the video? He replied “ah no, that's okay” and the statement was drafted in the way that it had to be drafted.

Pauline is concerned about this posture, which consists in substituting technical proof for human speech. She sees in the diffusion of connected glasses the advent of a society of systemic distrust, where we no longer exchange to solve a conflict, but where *we film to accumulate evidence*. For Pauline, the connected bezel materialises an ambient paranoia: it does not protect from danger but postulates it as permanent.

7 Identifying and verbalising the ethical issues surrounding glasses

The ability to understand, circumvent or denounce the ethical issues of these devices is socially located and indexed on the cultural capital of individuals and more precisely on the digital capital that results.

7.1 A widely discussed catch signage

The practicality of using connected glasses is at least partly explained by the disappearance of the ‘friction’ associated with the act of filming. While a smartphone imposes a visible gesture (exit the device, aim, keep the screen up) that alerts the entourage and materializes consent or refusal, connected glasses help to make the capture fluid, transparent and permanent. Mathieu theorizes this rupture: *Cameras on a phone, even if it's simpler than a camera or a camera, you still have to take out your phone, you have to activate the camera. That requires effort, which is not the case with connected glasses. So, we can, we can start filming everything and anything, at any time.*

Moreover and contrary to the smartphone, the concealment, at least partial, of the gestures of the capture is repeatedly evoked as participating in a shift towards a *discreet surveillance* according to Marion, student in Master. Several adopting participants mentioned that users and the most tech-savvy were ‘*ahead of the curve*’ in order to spot a video capture in the face of those who showed a lack of knowledge of the object. Lydia, user, explains:

“If I know the pair and I know that the person is filming and I see the little light flashing and they have asked me nothing before to be able to film the places and people working inside the establishment, I think I will kindly ask them to explain to me why they are filming and to stop filming in a place that is still public. Uh, then, so fair, I see she's wearing them, but she's not doing anything with them, I don't think I'll say anything special. It is true that I would look, if the person often puts his hand in his hair, gestures, it is true that it helps to know how it works.”

In any case, once the video capture is activated, the main witness whose role is to warn of an ongoing recording is displayed. To respond to privacy criticisms, Meta and Ray Ban have indeed integrated a diode, close to cameras, that flashes during recordings. In the scientific literature that we presented earlier, the light signal is perceived in a diametrically opposite way depending on whether one owns the object or not. In our survey, both users and non-users agree on the importance of a registration report, such as Claire, a digital analyst, who is not equipped but who has tried connected glasses twice and who relies on a situation previously encountered to justify the need to be warned of a capture in order not to be registered without her knowledge:

A signal is really important, because look, once I was in the kitchen, and I get a message from my boyfriend who was at work and who says enjoy your meal. So it really pissed me off. Because I didn't know he was looking at me through the camera. There, for the time being, to know that someone is looking through the camera with a signal, it would be not bad. From the moment I know, that's fine with me, but not knowing and receiving a message like that is special.

For most users, we see a focus on their 'good faith': Farid and Lydia rely heavily on this diode to absolve themselves of any suspicion of voyeurism or image theft. For them, the LED is a transparency contract: if it blinks, the other is warned; if he does not say anything when he sees the diode, he consents. Farid uses this argument to evade the jokes of those around him calling him a 'stalker'. This luminous prevention of the recording would help to 'innocent' the capture and to fuel the good faith of the person who originated it, which is not without revealing some contradictions since Lydia and Farid themselves state later in their respective interviews that the people who are more able to understand the signage of the diode and to translate it into the possibility of recording their own image are precisely those who are equipped or at least informed:

"The LED is for people who are a little informed about the model and who know, well it can show them that here, we are taking a picture or a video of them. Finally, if we don't know the model, we'll say yeah, the gentleman here, he has glasses that blink. Is that normal? Finally, you can ask yourself, uh, you can ask yourself a dozen questions, but you may not necessarily know the answer.

But this coverage of the action by a light signal is contrary to the critical lucidity of non-users: Mathieu recalls, without being the only one, that this luminous witness is *easily bypassable*. For Inès, the object leaves the field of leisure to become deeply *vicious* because of its discretion: Nobody realizes that *we're filming being, uh, talking normally. With a phone, it can be seen right away, while with connected glasses, it can't be seen*. Inès describes this LED as a *sham transparency* and recalls that in full sun, a small light is invisible, that it can be easily hidden by a

piece of adhesive or a black felt, and especially that it does not indicate the destination of the data (local storage, live broadcast, etc.).

In any case, this difference in representations between users and non-users does not always make sense, since users themselves evoke the facilities of circumventing the LED. Patrick refers to accessories that are *'easy to find on e-commerce websites'*, when Jacques adds that it is not difficult to *'delete the LED directly via the software, by modifying a few lines of code'*.

7.2 Keeping control and making use of 'a lead time': Who talks about privacy?

For Christophe, Charles and Olivier, all non-users, a major defect of today's connected glasses lies in their aesthetic ability to conceal. By seeking to imitate conventional frames, the technology industry is making a morally questionable choice. For Patrick, regulation should impose a radical aesthetic break to restore the transparency of intentionality, while Christophe regrets the discretion of the luminous witness:

If the state allows these objects, the design must require transparency. You need a red light, big as a ball, that flashes ultra-violently as soon as the camera turns on. Something you can't hide with a piece of tape without blocking the device. The person in front must know, ten meters away, that they are entering a recording studio (laughs). If it's discreet, it's espionage, that's all.

This requirement for universal and mandatory signage is pushed even further by Olivier, who draws a parallel with the normative ethical frameworks of academic research. According to the researcher, the public space cannot ignore the principles of informed consent that govern the social sciences. Mobilising academic standards, Olivier denounces what he thinks is a legal float granted to manufacturers of technologies:

When we, researchers, conduct interviews, we are subject to strict regulations, consent forms, guarantee withdrawal rights, explain what we will do with each sentence, we are somewhere under the control of the CNIL. All this is regulated. And there, the connected glasses would escape all these rights. I don't see in the name of what. That is to say, in fact, I do not see in the name of which we could be filmed, even by a motorist, eh, who would then argue that as a pedestrian, I crossed at the wrong time. He's not allowed to film me. In any case, he has no right to use these images. And there, private companies would be allowed to market glasses allowing anyone to capture the face, voice and political opinions of their fellow citizens without their knowledge in the public space, that's all.'

The refusal of adoption is formalized here in a project of collective resistance. We thus observe that critical non-users, who are in our investigation among the individuals most endowed with cultural capital, do not position themselves as passive victims of technology, but as defenders of

the conditions of possibility of the democratic space, which requires the maintenance of areas of free relational, anonymity and shared trust free of any desire for archiving everyday life. It is in this context that Jacqueline, 68, a former school teacher, adds:

“Access to certain technologies, such as what you are talking about, should be reserved for few people. For me all that ... heu ... filming in public space, of course you will find people who don't agree at all with putting on cameras or whatever and I respect that, but if we film public space it has to be up to the state to do that, you understand? And in some respects it also bothers me that there are these cameras, but for me it's like ... you know, they say that the state has a monopoly on legitimate violence in a democracy, that's the same, we should ask ourselves whether the state should have a monopoly on legitimate video capture, and if so under what conditions, because if not anyone arrives with their little video to teach you life after filming you without your knowledge’.

When ‘everyone’ is rewarded with that ability to produce their video content within the public space itself, there is a risk that some users will be perceived by those around them as a potential ‘stalker’, a ‘walking sensor’ according to Farid. The wearer of connected glasses introduces despite himself a filter of suspicion which, for Jacques and Geoffrey solicited on this subject, can alter the quality of his spontaneous relationships. The latter explain that they must regularly justify themselves – even if it means lying, like Geoffrey for health reasons:

‘Now there is advertising everywhere so people are starting to know what it is, plus on the networks influencers are using it to trap people so I'm told 'ah you've got this stuff like this TV guy who was trapping people'. So today if I am asked the question I talk about it, but I also have to protect myself, people can think things about me, so I show my blood sugar sensor, this is reassuring, I tell them that I have information in the glasses, but if I was not diabetic it might be worse. As I don't see well I also say that it helps me to read the signs, they tell me in return 'ah we didn't know'. I regularly feel this need to justify myself.

For non-users, who nevertheless stand out in their ability to identify capture devices, the social space can become anxious in that it requires additional vigilance, a continuous lookout to become aware of the possibility of being filmed or not. Charles explains:

“Because I am not a user and, moreover, I do not know any of them in my circle, I do not know how they work. I don't know how to tell if we're filming or not. And I don't know what kind of control the person has on their glasses. And this, I think here it is, it plays a lot on the mistrust. I think that since we do not know the object, we are much more wary of it.

He is joined here by Claire, also a non-user:

Often people are refractory to everything they don't know well. For example, parents to their children who say that social media is bad, it's unhealthy, be careful on social media, etc. And I think people who are wary of a lot of things would also tend to be wary of connected glasses because they don't really know the object.

Ultimately, the confrontation between the logics of Lydia, Jacques, Christophe or Geoffrey, who film to archive reality and protect themselves, and those of Mathieu, Pauline, Claire or Inès, who distance themselves from these practices, draws the contours of a discrete but deep fracture: in the social uses of connected glasses are projected security ambitions and yet antagonistic desires for transparency and anonymity.

The fear of dispossession of one's image in public space may also be compounded by the fear of dispossession of certain personal data, in particular medical data. After an afternoon at the home of a friend who was equipped to read his blood test, Julien (26, looking for a job) wondered: *'I realised that it was not the camera that bothered me, at least not totally, it was rather the description of what he had in front of him, he 'read' my blood test by asking Meta to do it and so it helped me well but later I thought about it, I wondered, but where did my health data go after that?'* This split of two temporalities in the use of the device (practice at the moment, but which leads to reflection afterwards) is not unknown in digital sociology and joins broader results concerning the tension between a utilitarian logic, favoured by the social actor who wants – or feels compelled to – access information in a context of necessity or even urgency, and a reflexive logic (Jauréguiberry, 2003) which leads to questioning his practice or even adapting it accordingly. The use of connected glasses for the purpose of informational gain, even if it is subsequently identified as compromising for personal and/or sensitive data, cannot therefore be dissociated from the injunction to connect in the professional world (ibid.) or the sharing of its geographical location (Bruna, 2006). While the probative capacity of smart glasses is undoubtedly, in the light of the speech collected, superior to that of other 'interveillancial' devices, in particular because it is based on the exploitation of image and sound, the Meta Ray-Ban are not so much singular interpersonal monitoring devices; they actually participate in their extension.

7.3 Social-digital inequalities in the receptions and uses of tools

The socio-demographic diversity of respondents – users and non-users – invites us to distinguish certain social groups concerning the imaginaries or practices of the devices studied. Individuals who are highly endowed with cultural and symbolic capital stand out for their ability to conceptualize, put into words the ethical dilemmas of glasses and mobilize complex references. Olivier, a teacher-researcher who remains poorly informed about connected glasses, nevertheless produces a highly reflective analysis and spontaneously mobilizes the normative frameworks of academic research to politicize his refusal of the object, which would escape any control. Much more informed, Baptiste, Charles and Claire also theorise this singular relation to

the image introduced by this supervisory device. Their speech does not fail to make the link with the collection and processing of personal data, to which other respondents – including users – declare themselves with humility and not without a certain fatalism when Charles declares, for example, that he is '*completely outdated*'. As a result, surveyed fractions with high cultural capital have a greater ability to rationalize and verbalize the political and ethical paradoxes of emerging technologies of which connected glasses are still a part.

Conversely, among profiles facing precariousness or strong professional constraints, embedded in complex hierarchical relationships, acceptability is not built around an ethical debate on private life, but around a practical imperative of self-defence: Moussa, a delivery man, explains that he uses video capture for the sole purpose of preserving his precarious job. Its acceptance of the tool is dictated by the algorithmic rating of the platforms. Marc, a logistician, would have liked to have been able to justify a racist attack and deplores the lack of video capture to reinforce the weight of his word vis-à-vis a hierarchical superior. He also explains that he plans to equip himself '*if everything around him does, like the smartphone at the time, so as not to be left behind*'. Patrick, a bus driver, was equipped to respond to legal uncertainty (the hitch-and-run offences) in order to be able to provide factual evidence to his employer, and Xavier, a temporary worker now looking for a job, expresses regret that he did not have this device to face his management during an altercation with a full-time employee. For these profiles, users or not once again, technology is less *discussed* but more *adopted out of necessity* (or envisaged to be), and invested as a 'weapon of legal protection' in the face of heterogeneous power relations.

Continuing, digital capital translates in a very concrete way into the 'advance time' that tech-savvy users have on lay profiles. Particularly tech-savvy, for reasons of interest or professional training, Jacques and Geoffrey explain that it is technically easy to circumvent Meta's protections by going to '*delete the LED directly via the software, by modifying a few lines of code*' for Jacques or by showing enough ability to lie about the role of the diode for Geoffrey. Lydia, also a user, masters the body codes of the device: she knows how to spot if a third party is filming by observing his "gesture" (for example, if the person often puts his hand in his hair) and explains having developed vigilance to this movement. On the other hand, we find, for example, Charles, a non-user and layman, who certainly manages to put into words the ethical stakes of the device but remains disempowered by his lack of knowledge of how the object works: *I don't know how they work. I don't know how to know if we're filming or not*. The unequal distribution of digital capital thus creates a divide between those who know how to manipulate/detect the device and appear as the dominants of the supervisory game and those who undergo this environment '*augmented*' by the capture of the gaze and its transformation into data.

8 Conclusion

Under the exterior of a tool for entertainment or optimization of everyday life (productivity, multitasking, hands-free), connected glasses, frequently distinguished from the smartphone by manufacturers as well as by their owners, seem to operate a paradigmatic break in the relationship to public space, to professional worlds and more broadly to otherness. Our analysis highlights a diversity of social uses of these schemes, which ultimately focus *on* objectives that are more convergent than they appear. The major result is indeed the prevalence of preventive capture and evidence building, which crosses the corpus of respondents and largely supplants in our survey the willingness to specifically monitor one's peers and loved ones. Faced with a social environment that seems, from childhood, marked by a growing injunction to be justified by traces (Galinon-Mélénec and Zlitni, 2013; Bruna, 2026), almost all participants – including the most critical – reinvest connected glasses as a tool for anticipating potential negativity. Since the device rewards its user with the ability for spontaneous vigilance of the physical space, whose proximity to the field of vision enhances the authenticity of the capture, it ultimately becomes an instrument for the administration of evidence whenever it becomes necessary. Whether bus drivers or delivery workers protecting their precarious jobs, cyclists anticipating road hazards or wishing to protect themselves from the 'bad faith' of others, gaze recording becomes a rational strategy of self-defence in an environment where the gaze of the other is no longer limited to seeing, but also to recording, storing and archiving; In short, to produce data instead of producing speech. Staying out of this economy of evidence is thus equated with systemic vulnerability: connected glasses function as vectors for the judicialisation of everyday life, where the image captured acquires an ontological and probative superiority over human speech, which it helps to reinforce, serve or replace.

More expected, the results also demonstrate that the acceptability of connected glasses is inseparable from the structure of individuals' cultural and digital capital. Far from homogeneous appropriation, the ability to decode risks, problematize ethical dilemmas and verbalize the paradoxes of the tool is a statutory privilege strongly correlated with the best endowed social categories. The latter show a critical reflexivity and a supervisory agency which also allow them to rationalize their uses or to formalize postures of political resistance. The prospects for the evolution of these technologies, in particular the imminent integration of augmented reality and potentially facial recognition features that could be associated with it, suggest a hardening of this asymmetry between an augmented 'sight', a non-possessor who is nevertheless informed and an 'observed' who is both dispossessed of the tool and its knowledge. While some users are already circumventing social reprobation through strategies of justification or concealment of their intentions, the collective resistance expressed by some non-users – who demand radical design constraints or the strict application of current or imagined consent rights – outlines a future political struggle.

9 References

- AIM O. (2020), *Theories of Surveillance. From Panoptics to Surveillance Studies*, Paris, Armand Colin, coll. "U".
- AKRICH M. (1993), Technical objects and their users, from design to action, *Practical reasons*, No 4, pp. 35-57.
- AKRICH M. (1998), Users, Innovation Actors, *Continuing Education*, No 134, pp. 79-89.
- BALLEYS C., MARTIN O., JOCHEMS S. (2018), Contemporary families and digital practices: what adjustments for which standards?, *Childhood Families Generations* [Online], <http://journals.openedition.org/efg/6094>
- BOURDIEU P. (1979). *The distinction. Social Critique of Judgment*, Paris, ed. of Midnight.
- BOYADJIAN J. (2026). A sociology of the audiences of digital cultural spaces. In V. Berry, A. Jonchery and A. Louguet, *Culture en régime numérique*, Ministère de la Culture – DEPS, pp. 199-222. <https://doi.org/10.3917/deps.berry.2026.01.0199>.
- BROTCORNE P., VALENDUC G. (2009), Digital skills and inequalities in internet use How to reduce these inequalities?, *Les Cahiers du numérique*, 5(1), 45-68.
- BRUNA Y. (2026, forthcoming), Monitor and Prove. The probative purposes of inter-individual monitoring by geolocation, *Quaderni*, No 120.
- DISAGE M. (2018). Exposing yourself on a Snapchat ghost network and the reputation of middle school students in a popular environment. *Networks*, 208-209(2), 147-172. <https://doi.org/10.3917/res.208.0147>.
- DEMAZIÈRE D., DUBAR C. (1997), *Analyzing Biographical Interviews. The example of narratives of insertion*, Paris, Nathan.
- GALINON-MÉLÉNEC B., ZLITNI S. (2015), *Digital traces: From production to interpretation*, Paris, CNRS Editions.
- GRANJON F. (2009). Digital inequalities and social recognition. Popular uses of connected computing. *Les Cahiers du numérique*, 5(1), 19-44.
- GRANJON F. (2011). Digital fracture. *Communications*, 88(1), 67-74. <https://doi.org/10.3917/commu.088.0067>.

- GRANJON F. (2022). Social inequalities, provisions and uses of digital technology. *Education and Societies*, 47(1), 81-97. <https://doi.org/10.3917/es.047.0081>.
- JAURÉGUIBERRY F. (2014). Disconnection to communication technologies. *Networks*, 186(4), 15-49. <https://doi.org/10.3917/res.186.0015>.
- JAURÉGUIBERRY F. (2003), *Les branchés du portable*, Paris, PUF.
- JAURÉGUIBERRY F., PROULX S. (2011), *Uses and challenges of communication technologies*, Ramonville-Saint-Agne, Erès.
- KAVIANI F., LYALL B., KOPPEL S. (2024), Exploring social perceptions of everyday smartglass use in Australia. *PLOS ONE*, 19(11), online: <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0313001>
- KOELLE M., BOLL S. (2019), The Privacy Mediation Cards. A Participatory Design Approach towards Respectful Smart Glasses, online: https://marionkoelle.de/data/paper/2019_Koelle_PrivacyMediationCards_cameraready.pdf
- LICOPPE C. (2012), 'Les forms de la presence', *Revue française des sciences de l'information et de la communication* [Online], Vol.1, n°1. <https://doi.org/10.4000/rfsic.142>
- LUPTON D. (2013a), Quantifying the body: monitoring and measuring health in the age of mHealth technologies. *Critical Public Health*, 23 (4), 393-403. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09581596.2013.794931>
- LUPTON D. (2013b), *Google Glass: A sociological perspective*, online: <https://simplysociology.wordpress.com/2013/08/05/google-glass-a-sociological-perspective/>
- PASQUIER D. (2018), *The Internet of Small Families. Survey in rural France*, Paris, Presses des Mines.
- PHARABOD A.-S. (2019). "Take your 10,000 steps," really? An investigation into ordinary self-tracking practices. *Networks*, 216(4), 157-187. <https://doi.org/10.3917/res.216.0157>.
- PHARABOD A.-S., NIKOLSKI V. and GRANJON F. (2013). A comprehensive approach to personal measurements. *Networks*, 177(1), 97-129. <https://doi.org/10.3917/res.177.0097>
- REGENBRECHT H., KNOTT A., FERREIRA J., PANTIDI N. (2024), To See and Be Seen. Perceived Ethics and Acceptability of Pervasive Augmented Reality. *IEEE Access*, Vol.12, online: <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/10436676/>
- ZEKANY E. (2015), Through the Google Glass: Configurations of Attention in the Age of Digital Media, *MeCCSA-PGN 2015 Conference Issue*, online.

10 Annexes

User Interview Guide

1. Let's start with your relationship with everyday technologies

1.1 Can you tell me about the connected equipment you have? (smartphone, tablet, computer, etc.) Can you briefly tell me what you use it for?

1.2 Apart from this equipment, do you have any other connected objects that you carry on you (watch, bracelet, GoPro-type camera, VR headset, etc.)? If so, can you tell me about your use of these items?

1.3 All equipment combined, what do you think of the time you spend on screens on a daily basis? If possible, what would you like to change? What does your entourage/relatives think?

1.4 Are you one of the people who acquire new technologies as soon as they are released? Do you have an anecdote about this? Have you ever regretted a purchase? Why?

1.5 To situate yourself, would you say that you are rather ahead / in the average / behind the new technologies? Why? What does your entourage/relatives think?

1.6 What do you think characterises people who are 'advanced' on technology? What image do you have of it? And "backwards"? Again, what image do you have of it?

1.7 In the last two years, how much do you estimate your personal expenses related to the acquisition of these new technologies? What do you think? Have you ever bought a product with the conviction that it would quickly become obsolete? What was this product and why?

2. Let's talk about your discovery and then your current use of connected glasses

2.1 Do you wear eyeglasses on a daily basis? (If yes) Do you consider that it was easier to take the step of connected glasses because you already had to wear eyeglasses? In your opinion, would you still use connected glasses if you did not need eyeglasses? (If not) Were you bothered by having to wear glasses to enjoy the functionality of connected glasses?

2.2 Can - tell me as accurately as possible how you came to use connected glasses? What was - that triggered the initial interest (advertising, friend, work, curiosity ...)?

2.3 Do you remember the exact moment when you decided to buy/try them? (if purchase) What triggered this purchase? (if offered) By whom? Why do you think it's such a gift?

2.4 Since when do you use - connected glasses? Which model is -? Can you introduce him to me? Why this model rather than another (price, reputation, functionalities, trust in the company)? What are the qualities and defects of your connected glasses?

2.5 What was your reaction the first time you wore these glasses? And what was the first reaction of your loved ones / those around you? Do you have an anecdote about this?

2.6 For your part, do you know other users of connected glasses? Since when (before/after buying glasses for the first time)? Do you talk to them often? Of what? Where did you meet them (private groups)?

2.7 In your opinion, is there a typical profile of users of connected glasses today? And on the contrary, who is completely refractory to it?

2.8 Have - ever had the impression that you have been associated with a certain 'label' since wearing these glasses (geek, privileged, stalker, influencer, etc.)? (if yes) Who made the remark to you? How did - take it from you: annoying, flattering, indifferent, etc.? Has it changed anything in the way you wear them (places, frequency, people)?

3. Let us now look at the contexts in which these connected glasses are used.

3.1 In which situations do - wear these connected glasses most often?

- Work, leisure, travel, holidays, sport?
- Rather indoors, outdoors?
- With whom: alone, with friends, with family, with colleagues?

3.2 What functions do you use most often (photo, video, audio, calls, augmented reality, something else)? Can - give me a recent concrete example for each important function? What do you do with your video productions (nothing, keep for yourself, family, share friends, RS)?

3.3 Can you tell me what these glasses specifically bring you? (According to equipment), what do these glasses bring you that would not bring you a smartphone or a connected watch for example? A camera carried? A VR headset?

3.4 And finally, what do these glasses bring you that would not bring you a headphones or headphones?

3.5 As with the smartphone above, could you describe to me a typical day of using your glasses? (if not) Why?

3.6 In your opinion, in which places or situations is it 'acceptable' to use your glasses? Relaunch: Public spaces (street, transport) vs private (home, others)? At work, at school, in medical and administrative institutions?

3.7 In what context do you voluntarily decide not to wear them?

- Places (work, specific public places, home, - medical appointment ...)?
- Social situations (meals, meetings, meetings, ... dates)?
- (Declining locations/situations) Why? (if non-response, orient -> Discomfort, fear of looking at others, fear of breaking a rule, etc.)?

3.8 More specifically, in what context do you voluntarily decide not to wear them when you would like to do so? Why?

3.9 Are you - and have you ever used your glasses in situations that you consider inappropriate?
– For example, in places where photography is normally prohibited? On people who were not aware?

– How do you see - in these situations in hindsight?

3.10 Are there any risks or problems associated with these connected glasses? (recovery on health then sequencing with privacy)

4. Let's think about some ethical issues around these technologies

4.1 Do people react when they notice that you are wearing connected glasses?

– Have - given you concrete examples of strong reactions: curiosity, mistrust, questions, etc.?

– Do you have examples from different people (close relatives, spouse, strangers, colleagues, police officers, ... traders)? Any anecdotes?

4.2 Have - ever been asked or forced to remove your glasses because of a negative reaction from someone? How did it go? What did you do? Does this situation in -t - permanently change your habits?

4.3 Have - set up personal rules, even informal ones, to protect the privacy of others when filming with these glasses? (e.g. reminders) not to film children, avoid sensitive places, not to publish certain videos, blur faces, ask for agreement before posting, etc.

4.4 Have you ever warned the people around you (public space) that you were filming? (if yes) What were the reactions? Give me an example. (if not) Why did you not?

4.5 In your opinion, should there be a visual or audible indication that you are recording/filming? Why? What type(s) of indication do you think about?

4.6 On a daily basis, do your connected glasses give you 'something extra' compared to people who do not have them? (relaunch on: access to more information, translation into several languages, keeping a discreet record of an event, etc.)

4.7 How would you react if someone were to use connected glasses in a context that you consider unacceptable? For example, to film yourself or someone around you?

4.8 Have you ever told yourself that you could 'watch others' using your glasses? (if yes) What others in particular? Do you have an example? What do you think in hindsight?

4.9 Does being able to film/record your travels make you feel safer? Explain to me. Do you have an anecdote about this?

4.10 Do you know what data is collected by your glasses (images, sounds, metadata, - geolocation)? By whom?

– Did - consult your privacy settings or terms of use? (if so) Where exactly? Can you show me?

– Did - change some settings that did not suit you (local backup vs cloud, automatic sharing, etc.)? Why? Can you show me?

4.11 Are you aware of any laws already in place to regulate the use of smart glasses? (if yes) Can you tell me more? Do you think - that they are enough? Why?

5. Let's end with some general questions about these glasses and yourself ...

5.1 In your opinion, what is missing or what needs to change in order for connected glasses to be more successful (functionalities/framework/acceptability)? Explain to me.

5.2 Between the time you bought these glasses and today, would you say that you use them differently? (if yes) What has changed? Explain to me.

5.3 If you had to sum up in a few words what connected glasses are changing in your daily life, what would - you say?

5.4 If from now on you could no longer use smart glasses, what would change in practice for you? (indifference, lack, regret, for later)

5.5 How do you imagine these connected glasses in 5 years? (functionalities, discretion, who will wear them, acceptance, etc.)

5.6 Is -t - something that we did not talk about and that you think is important about these glasses?

5.7 What did you think of this interview? Do you feel that you have answered all the questions honestly?

6. Can you tell me a bit more about yourself ...

Gender:

Age or age group:

Common size (nb. hab.):

Department/canton:

Occupation:

Level/diploma title:

Parent occupation:

Parents' level/title:

Method of recruitment:

Pseudonym assigned:

Non-user Interview Guide

1. Let's start with your relationship with everyday technologies

1.1 Can you tell me about the connected equipment you have? (smartphone, tablet, computer, etc.) Can you briefly tell me what you use it for?

1.2 Apart from this equipment, do you have any connected objects that you carry on you (watch, bracelet, GoPro-type range camera, VR headset, etc.)? If so, can you tell me about your use of these items?

1.3 All equipment combined, what do you think of the time you spend on screens on a daily basis? If possible, what would you like to change? What does your entourage/relatives think?

1.4 Are you one of the people who acquire new technologies as soon as they are released? Do you have an anecdote about this? Have you ever regretted a purchase? Why?

1.5 To situate yourself, would you say that you are rather ahead / in the average / behind the new technologies? Why? What does your entourage/relatives think?

1.6 What do you think characterises people who are 'advanced' on technology? What image do you have of it? And "backwards"? Again, what image do you have of it?

1.7 In the last two years, how much do you estimate your personal expenses related to the acquisition of these new technologies? What do you think? Have you ever bought a product with the conviction that it would quickly become obsolete? What was this product and why?

2. Let's continue with your knowledge and representations of connected glasses

2.1 What does the expression 'connected glasses' mean to you? What comes to your mind first when we talk about it? (brands/fictions/debates/situations)

2.2 From what you know or imagine, what are these glasses for? (according to answer) What can they do? How do you view this (interest/curiosity/indifference/prudence/etc.)?

2.3 As far as you know, what do these glasses not allow to be made? (according to answer) Is this a problem/advantage in your opinion?

2.4 Have you ever seen - people wearing connected glasses?

- (if yes) How did you react the first time? Tell me about it. Is anyone around you wearing it? What do you think?

- (if not) In your opinion, how is it done? (relations: limited commercial success / geographical location / indifference / difficult to notice / etc.)

2.5 In your opinion, what types of people wear (or would be interested in wearing) such glasses? What brings you to these conclusions? And on the contrary, who would be completely refractory to it?

2.6 Have you ever wondered if you too would like to wear smart glasses? (if yes) For what purposes? What is blocking you at the moment? (if not) And if tomorrow a majority of people were wearing these glasses, what would change? (Nothing/social pressure/will to resist/etc.)

2.7 Are there any risks or problems associated with these connected glasses? (recovery on health then sequencing with privacy)

3. Let's think about some ethical issues around these technologies

3.1 I'm going to tell you about five people who could adopt connected glasses. Tell me for each one what you would think about it and how you would react if you did:

- Your spouse
- Your employer or a colleague
- A police officer
- A health professional
- A passer-by on the street

3.2 Can you think of a situation in which you were filmed or recorded without your consent? What device was it with? Tell me as accurately as you can. How did you react? (If no reaction -> Why?)

3.3 In your opinion, should a visual or audible indication prevent you from being filmed or recorded by connected glasses? Why? What type(s) of indication do you think about?

3.4 Are there any situations in which you would consider it acceptable for a person to use connected glasses to film or record? Could you introduce me to some of them?

3.5 Conversely, in what situations would - say that this is not acceptable? Why?

3.6 What other technologies would you compare them to connected glasses? Would you associate them with surveillance technologies? Why?

3.7 In your opinion, is it the same to be filmed by a smartphone, smart glasses or public video surveillance? Why?

3.8 Do you know what data is collected by your glasses (images, sounds, metadata, - geolocation)? By whom?

3.9 In a situation where everyone uses connected glasses, which aspects would seem to you to be the most problematic for privacy? (according to response, restart on collection, treatment, augmented reality with facial reco, etc.). Would you also see something positive?

3.10 Are you aware of any laws already in place to regulate the use of smart glasses? (if yes) Can you tell me more? Do you think - that they are enough? Why?

4. Let's end with some general questions about these glasses and yourself ...

4.1 In your opinion, what is missing or what needs to change for connected glasses to be more successful (relaunching on functionalities, framing, acceptability)? Explain to me.

4.2 How do you imagine these connected glasses in 5 years? (functionalities, discretion, who will wear them, acceptance, etc.)

4.2 Is -t - something that we have not talked about and that you think is important about these devices?

4.3 What did you think of this interview?

5. Can you tell me a bit more about yourself ...

Gender:

Age or age group:

Common size (nb. hab.):

Department/canton:

Occupation:

Level/diploma title:

Parent occupation:

Parents' level/title:

Method of recruitment:

Pseudonym assigned:

Sociography*						
ID	Pseudonym	Gender	Age	Status	Diploma	Profession
1	Marc	H	60-64	Non-user	Bac pro	Logistician
2	Patrick	H	55-59	User	CAP, BEP or equivalent degree	Bus driver
3	Claire	F	25-29	Non-user	Bac + 5	Data Analyst
4	Xavier	H	25-29	Non-user	Bac pro	Qualified worker (electrical engineering)
5	Christophe	H	50-54	Non-user	Bac	Marshal Ferrant
6	Charles	H	35-39	Non-user	Bac + 5	Bartender (in conversion)
7	Olivier	H	60-64	Non-user	Doctorate	Teacher-researcher
8	Marion	F	20-24	Non-user	Bac + 3 to Bac + 4	Student/servant
9	Jaqueline	F	40-44	Non-user	Bac	Unemployed / Disabled Adult
10	Farid	H	35-39	User	Bac pro	Cook
11	Lydia	F	30-34	User	Bac	Restaurant manager
12	Baptiste	H	65-69	Non-user	Doctorate	Teacher-researcher
13	Ines	F	50-54	Non-user	Bac + 3 to Bac + 4	Public Service Executive
14	Germaine	F	55-59	Non-user	Bac	Home help
15	Pauline	F	25-29	Non-user	Bac + 5	Payroll Manager
16	Mathieu	H	25-29	User	CAP, BEP or equivalent degree	Optician
17	Jacques	H	60-64	User	Bac + 5	Security Systems Manager
18	Geoffrey	H	60-64	User	Bac + 6	Podologist
19	Alice	F	40-44	Non-user	Bac + 5	Executive in a web company
20	Julien	H	50-29	Non-user	None	Looking for a job
21	Moussa	H	30-34	User	None	Deliverer/ Self-employed
22	Jacqueline	F	65-69	Non-user	Bac + 3 to Bac + 4	School teacher (retired)

* For confidentiality reasons, several sociodemographic variables essential to the constitution of our diverse sample (diploma level and profession of parents, department) are voluntarily absent from this sociography.

Contact: ybruna@parisnanterre.fr

