Interview - Teilnehmer 12:

Bevor das Interview beginnt, wird der Teilnehmer über die Studie debriefed und es werden nochmal alle Warnungen durchgezeigt.

I: So, first some general questions. How did you perceive the warnings? Did they stand out to you?

..Inconspicuous

B: These ones did not stand out; they came from the corner. (referring to banner, side)

I: I see. And the other ones?

..Inconspicuous
..Positive

B: The ones from the top? Yeah, they didn't stand out either. But I don't rely solely on the warning; I take it as a signpost, then I try to go through the email. Sometimes the emails had information that seemed too specific to be fake, so I was hesitant to trust them.

I: Were there any particular elements in the warnings that caught your eye?

..Clarity and Legibility

B: The red color, yeah.

I: And do the warnings play a significant role in your decision-making?

B: Yes, they are significant. However, it's not like they determine my decision entirely, but I do take them into account if I notice a warning signal.

I: How do you assess the effectiveness of each warning? Can you rank them from most to least effective?

..Potential Improvements

B: For me, the most effective warnings are those that show some indication in the email inbox list itself. Most of the time, I won't even open these emails, even if they were from a known company, because when you're working, you often already know what emails you'll receive, so you don't need to read them all. But I see that those types of warnings were not part of this study.

I: So what would make a warning effective for you in the inbox?

B: I would like to see something like a red exclamation mark right in the inbox. Most of the time, I won't open the emails because I would have already been informed about them by my superiors or subordinates.

I: What about once you've opened an email? Which feature helps you the most then?

..Positive

B: Once I've opened an email, the best feature is something like this one that helps prevent me from clicking on a link accidentally.

I: And were there two versions of each warning, one more detailed and one less so? Which one did you prefer?

..Simplicity

B: I think the detailed one is too much? Maybe splitting it into two parts would work better, with the warning at the top and other details, like flagged images, at the bottom.

I: How do you evaluate the design of the warnings, like the color and animations?

..Clarity and Legibil
..Inconspicuous
..Potential Improve

B: The part that stands out for me is the red background. But not when it's just a little warning sign from the corner. I've missed those because they were too small and out of my line of sight, especially on

a phone.

21 I: Did you like the animation of the warnings?

22 B: I didn't like the delay. If it doesn't pop up immediately, by that time, I would have moved on to the next email. I just missed it.

23 I: Any suggestions for improving the design?

24 B: My top suggestion would be to put something noticeable right in the inbox itself. After that, removing the delay would be crucial.

25 I: Any final thoughts on new pieces of information or how you handle emails when there's a suspicion of phishing but no warning?

26 B: Well, mostly I don't even open my emails unless necessary. Google usually filters suspicious ones to the spam folder. When I do click on them, I mainly look at the language used in the body of the email. But that's only if I decide to open the email.