

	var1	var2	cor	p
1	LA_Mean	E201_01	-0.03	0.57
2	LA_Mean	E201_02	-0.04	0.36
3	LA_Mean	E201_03	-0.13	0.01
4	LA_Mean	E201_04	-0.15	0.00
5	LA_Mean	E201_05	-0.10	0.04
6	LA_Mean	E201_06	-0.06	0.23
7	LA_Mean	E201_07	-0.10	0.03
8	LA_Mean	E201_08	-0.01	0.79
9	LA_Mean	E201_09	-0.19	0.00
10	LA_Mean	E201_10	-0.30	0.00
11	LA_Mean	E201_11	-0.08	0.08
12	LA_Mean	E201_12	-0.02	0.74
13	LA_Mean	E201_13	-0.12	0.02
14	LA_Mean	E201_14	-0.16	0.00
15	LA_Mean	E201_15	0.00	1.00
16	LA_Mean	E201_16	-0.18	0.00
17	LA_Mean	E201_17	-0.15	0.00
18	LA_Mean	E201_18	-0.13	0.01
19	LA_Mean	E201_19	-0.06	0.18
20	LA_Mean	E201_20	-0.04	0.47

Table 1: Summary statistic of correlation between Legislative Stance (LA) and Device Risk assessment (E201) measured on a 7-Point Likert scale

	var1	var2	cor	p
1	LA_Mean	E201_11	-0.08	0.08
2	LA_Mean	E201_14	-0.16	0.00
3	LA_Mean	E201_16	-0.18	0.00

Table 2: Summary statistic of correlation between Legislative Stance (LA) and Device Risk assessment (E201) measured on a 7-Point Likert scale

	var1	var2	cor	p
1	LA_Mean	A204_01	-0.06	0.24
2	LA_Mean	A204_02	-0.02	0.65
3	LA_Mean	A204_03	0.05	0.34
4	LA_Mean	A204_04	-0.05	0.34
5	LA_Mean	A204_05	-0.00	0.98
6	LA_Mean	A204_06	-0.10	0.04

Table 3: Summary statistic of correlation between Legislative Stance (LA) and Perceived Responsibility measured on a 7-Point Likert scale between Oneself (1) and the Manufacturer (7)

	Device	Cor	Method	P-Value
1	Smart Lightbulb	-0.02	Pearson	0.84
2	Smart Speaker	0.27	Pearson	0.00
3	Smart TV	0.18	Pearson	0.01

Table 4: Effect of Legislative stance on the usage on a specific device.

	Comparison	Z	P.adj
1	DACH - United Kingdom	-0.67	1
2	DACH - United States	-1.00	0.948
3	United Kingdom - United States	-0.36	1

Table 5: dunnTest comparison results for the usage of Smart Home Devices Overall by Region of Residence

	Comparison	Z	P.adj
1	DACH - United Kingdom	-3.44	0.00177357860892658 **
2	DACH - United States	-2.63	0.0256795239314102 *
3	United Kingdom - United States	0.77	1

Table 6: dunnTest comparison results for the usage of Smart TV's by Region of Residence

	Comparison	Z	P.adj
1	DACH - United Kingdom	0.86	1
2	DACH - United States	1.56	0.353219353944139
3	United Kingdom - United States	0.59	1

Table 7: dunnTest comparison results for the usage of Smart Lightbulbs Overall by Region of Residence

	Comparison	Z	P.adj
1	DACH - United Kingdom	1.16	0.733937266595988
2	DACH - United States	0.97	0.997031982916848
3	United Kingdom - United States	-0.15	1

Table 8: dunnTest comparison results for the usage of Smart Speakers by Region of Residence

	Comparison	Z	P.adj
1	DACH - United Kingdom	-0.67	1
2	DACH - United States	-1.00	0.948030957529378
3	United Kingdom - United States	-0.36	1

Table 9: dunnTest comparison results for the usage of Smart Devices Overall by Region of Residence

	p	X ²
1	0.316559487624573	Pearson's Chi-squared test

Table 10: Chi-Squared Test for significant differences in disabling features in smart home devices by Region of residence.

	Comparison	Z	P.adj	epsilonSquared
1	DACH - United Kingdom	-2.69	0.0217085578694812 *	0.0263
2	DACH - United States	-3.31	0.00281679516922897 **	0.0373
3	United Kingdom - United States	-0.69	1	NA

Table 11: DunnTest for participants opinion on Manufacturer responsibility on "Keeping the Smart Home device secure" by Region of Residence

	Comparison	Z	P.adj	Epsilon ²
1	DACH - United Kingdom	4.18	8.86348636601652e-05 ***	0.0599
2	DACH - United States	3.45	0.00171265337861234 **	0.0428
3	United Kingdom - United States	-0.69	1	NA

Table 12: Device Risk assessment dunnTest by Current Region of residence.

	Code	Comparison	Z	P.adj
1	A307_04	DACH - United Kingdom	-1.30	0.58
2	A307_04	DACH - United States	-3.39	
3	A307_04	United Kingdom - United States	-2.19	
4	A307_07	DACH - United Kingdom	-2.28	1.00
5	A307_07	DACH - United States	-2.96	
6	A307_07	United Kingdom - United States	-0.74	
7	A307_08	DACH - United Kingdom	-3.65	1.00
8	A307_08	DACH - United States	-2.95	
9	A307_08	United Kingdom - United States	0.67	
10	A307_10	DACH - United Kingdom	-2.14	
11	A307_10	DACH - United States	-4.57	
12	A307_10	United Kingdom - United States	-2.55	

Table 13: Perceived benefits of smart home devices by region of residence.

	Device	Cor	Method	P-Value
1	Smart Lightbulb	0.11	Pearson	0.292891958128455
2	Smart Speaker	0.13	Pearson	0.144954697178774
3	Smart TV	0.11	Pearson	0.105429358436913

Table 14: Household size correlation with the usage of most used devices.

	Usage_type	p_value	effect_size
1	Smart Lightbulb	0.642	0.02
2	Smart Speaker	0.211	0.06
3	Smart TV	0.114	0.08

Table 15: Perceived risk of Smart Home devices with children in the household.

	Usage_type	p_value	effect_size
1	Keeping the Smart Home device software up-to-date	0.446	0.04
2	Ensuring my privacy	0.172	0.07
3	Protecting my Smart Home ecosystem as a whole	0.0349 *	0.10
4	Keeping the Smart Home device secure	0.815	0.01
5	Fixing a hardware failure	0.605	0.02
6	Fixing a software failure	0.839	0.01

Table 16: Perceived responsibility regarding Smart Home Devices with children in the household.

	Usage_type	p_value	effect_size
1	Voice commands via a Smart Speaker	4.37e-05 ***	0.20
2	Voice commands via a Smartphone Voice Assistant	4.84e-06 ***	0.22
3	Smartphone App for the Device	0.647	0.02
4	Smartphone Widgets or Shortcuts	0.546	0.03
5	Sensors inside the Home	0.0589 .	0.09
6	Sensors outside the Home	0.0859 .	0.08
7	Automatic Operation based on Device Programming	0.7	0.02

Table 17: Usage of Smart Home Devices with children in the household.