**Interview - Teilnehmer 5:**

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

I: First, how did you generally perceive the warnings? Were they immediately noticeable?

B: Yes, they were immediately noticeable because they were sketchy and ironic, which made them stand out. They all are so blatantly obvious.

I: Were there any elements in the warnings that particularly stood out to you?

B: I liked that they covered the links. That was very effective.

I: What role did the warnings play in your decisions? Did you notice a difference when a warning was seen?

B: I can't really say. I haven't thought about it enough to judge. Spontaneously, I’d say yes of course but I suppose that’s kinda expected.

I: Moving on to the effectiveness of each warning, how do you rate their effectiveness? Which did you find the most effective?

B: I believe the one covering the link was the most effective because it immediately prevented interaction. Those that just flew in and had standard text might be the weakest. The ones providing more explanation would be in the middle.

I: You mentioned liking simpler warnings. Would the clickable aspect appeal to you or...?

B: I might be too uncertain in the moment. Theoretically, you could assume that the embedded links are part of the phishing, which makes it suboptimal.

I: And about the design—colors, animations, icons—did that affect your attention?

B: Yes, but it's tricky because the weirder the warning, the more effective it seems to be, yet scammers now also use weird warnings. It's hard to find a balance.

I: Any improvement suggestions that come to mind?

B: Red as a signal color works, and I like the animation because it suggests that it's external to the email.

I: Regarding your personal habits with phishing awareness, were there new pieces of information in the warnings that you hadn't paid attention to before?

B: No new information caught my attention, not really.

I: Typically, when you suspect phishing but your email client hasn't flagged it, what details do you check?

B: I look at whether pictures load, the origin of the email, how often I've received it, and if any images are realistic. Also, how the email is structured or if there are mistakes with salutations, like when you get a "Hello" followed by a misplaced title, which instantly signals a scam.

I: That was quicker than I thought. I'll stop the recording now.