"Make the Voodoo Box Go Bleep Bloop:" Exploring End Users' Understanding and Information Needs Regarding Microchips

Julian Speith julian.speith@mpi-sp.org MPI-SP Bochum, Germany

Markus Weber markus.weber@rub.de Ruhr University Bochum Bochum, Germany Steffen Becker steffen.becker@rub.de Ruhr University Bochum & MPI-SP Bochum, Germany

> Yixin Zou yixin.zou@mpi-sp.org MPI-SP Bochum, Germany

Christof Paar christof.paar@mpi-sp.org MPI-SP Bochum, Germany Timo Speith timo.speith@uni-bayreuth.de University of Bayreuth Bayreuth, Germany

> Asia Biega asia.biega@mpi-sp.org MPI-SP Bochum, Germany

ABSTRACT

Microchips are fundamental components of modern electronic devices, yet they remain opaque to the users who rely on them daily. This opacity, compounded by the complexity of global supply chains and the concealment of proprietary information, raises significant security, trust, and accountability issues. We investigate end users' understanding of microchips, exploring their perceptions of the societal implications and information needs regarding these essential technologies. Through an online survey with 250 participants, we found that while our participants were aware of some microchip applications, they lacked awareness of the broader security, societal, and economic implications. While our participants unanimously desired more information on microchips, their specific information needs were shaped by various factors such as the microchip's application environment and one's affinity for technology interaction. Our findings underscore the necessity for improving end users' awareness and understanding of microchips, and we provide possible directions to pursue this end.

KEYWORDS

microchips, end users, online survey, qualitative analysis, regression analysis

1 INTRODUCTION

At the core of the digital revolution are microchips, tiny electronic devices that store and process digital data. A microchip contains numerous nanometer-sized electronic components (e.g., transistors) on a single piece of semiconductor material (typically silicon). These components work together to perform digital processing tasks such as executing computations (CPUs, GPUs), storing data (SSDs, RAM), or cryptographic and AI acceleration. Microchips serve as the basic building blocks in the electronic devices we use every day, including smartphones, vehicles, and medical equipment.

As microchips have become ubiquitous and are increasingly being used in critical areas, their geopolitical importance is growing. However, due to their rising complexity [9, 48, 69], a globally distributed supply chain [42, 86], and intentional concealment to protect trade secrets, microchips are often regarded as highly opaque. This opacity can make it challenging to identify potential safety and security issues, thereby complicating efforts to build trust in these technologies. Consequently, several concerns regarding microchips have not yet been resolved. For instance, microchips are susceptible to attacks from a diverse range of adversaries. They can be manipulated through hardware Trojans [2], particularly when employed in safety- and security-critical tasks such as encryption [20, 35]. Similarly, previous studies have demonstrated how security issues in the hardware [2, 6, 45] can impact the security of end-user devices [54].

In response to these concerns, numerous countries have introduced subsidies and regulations to bolster domestic microchip industries [22, 68]. These measures aim to secure production, promote innovation, and foster talent while, at the same time, addressing global supply chain vulnerabilities and security threats. However, their primary goals are tied to geopolitical strategy and achieving or maintaining technological leadership, underscoring the high stakes in the global microchip race.

Despite the focus on industry and geopolitics, one crucial stakeholder often overlooked in these regulatory discussions is the end user. The question arises: should users be considered, and perhaps studied, as integral stakeholders in the microchip ecosystem? We think the question is worth exploring because end users are already constantly interacting with and relying on the proper functioning of microchips in their daily lives, albeit often unknowingly and indirectly. While end users may be familiar with the fact that the CPUs within their computers are microchips, the application of microchips to other technologies and devices might be more hidden. Modern cars are built from hundreds of microchips, and smartphones and laptops contain dozens. Microchips are also increasingly found in medical equipment like insulin pumps, pacemakers, and ventilators—technologies on which someone's life may depend.

We see the potential that improving end-users' understanding of microchips can lead to numerous benefits, such as making more informed product choices, which often start with functionality. For instance, many people compare CPUs before purchasing a computer. Some vendors even make microchips the centerpiece of their marketing, such as Apple with its A- and M-series microchips. However, product choices can also be influenced by factors such as security, trustworthiness, and sustainability. In this context, the (country of the) manufacturer, materials used, and power consumed during microchip product on [28, 80, 88] could become key considerations for product choice [43].

Research in other contexts shows that limited understanding of technologies like the Internet [31], Wi-Fi [33], or home computer security [84] can lead to a false sense of security and inadequate protective practices. However, to the best of our knowledge, the academic community has yet to study end-user understanding of, information needs concerning, and trust in microchips. In light of this gap, we seek to answer the following research questions (RQs):

- *RQ1* [Understanding] How do end users currently understand microchips?
- *RQ2* [*Desiderata*] What do end users value concerning and what do they desire to know about microchips?
- *RQ3* [*Information Needs*] What factors shape end users' information needs when it comes to microchips?

To answer these RQs, we conducted and evaluated an online survey with 250 end-user participants. Our key findings include:

- End-User Understanding of Microchips. Participants had a basic understanding of what microchips are and where they are used. However, we also found several misconceptions, and participants mentioned little about the security and privacy implications of microchips.
- Desirable Properties of Microchips. When prompted, participants rated cyber security and trustworthiness as their most valued objectives for microchips. At the same time, participants rated safety, accountability, and ethical standards still as "very important" on average.
- Factors Shaping End Users' Information Needs. Our participants indicated that they want to know more about microchips and are willing to invest time to that end. The exact type of information they wished for depends on the microchip's specific application environment as well as the participant's affinity for technology interaction.

Finally, we discuss interesting patterns from our findings that call for further investigation. For example, based on our results, we find that the goals of ongoing political initiatives around microchips might not serve the needs of end users. Our study lays the foundation for future research to more thoroughly look into end users' mental models of microchips and design mechanisms that effectively convey information about microchips to end users.

2 RELATED WORK

2.1 User Understanding and Transparency

Within the usable security and privacy community, past research has studied end users' understanding of end-to-end encryption (E2EE) [64, 90], HTTPS [37], home computer security [84], the Internet [31], online behavioral advertising [92], virtual private networks (VPNs) [8, 59], and more. Some studies further draw the line between non-expert end users and experts such as system administrators and developers [8, 37]. Misconceptions are common and often have downstream effects on users' behaviors. For example, Renaud et al. [61] found that incomplete threat models and a general lack of understanding of the email architecture are possible explanations for the low adoption of E2EE for emails. Importantly, there is no perfectly correct understanding [84], and even experts (with a deeper technical understanding of the technology) can still hold false beliefs [8, 37].

Studies on end-user understanding contribute insights into theirmisconceptions [31, 58, 90, 92] and reasoning processes behind threat models [64], which then inform recommendations for how to encourage a secure use of the technology (e.g., through training, better communication, or system design changes) [8]. The mental model approach is often used to describe the model in one's mind about how things work [84], usually with metaphors from already known domains [74]. For example, Stransky et al. [75] compared six visualizations of security mechanisms for messaging apps based on users' mental models of E2EE, finding that simple text disclosures were sufficient, yet user perceptions were more fundamentally shaped by preconceived expectations. Other work has sought to build visualization dashboards [23, 60] and design probes [5] to improve users' understanding of online tracking and inferences. Researchers have also explored using labels to convey the data practices of internet of things (IoT) devices [52] and mobile apps [94] to help consumers make purchase decisions, and such initiatives have received buy-ins from industry players and regulators [19].

Parallel efforts exist in the XAI community, where the focus is to unpack the black box of AI-based systems to end users, making the decision-making more understandable and transparent [71]. An individual's understanding of an AI-based system can be increased by "white-box" explanations (i. e., that show the inner workings of an algorithm) [14], contextualizing general terminologies [70], showing each feature's contribution to the model's prediction [83], among other techniques. The understanding can also be affected by the individual's domain expertise in the decision-making task [83] as well as the explanation's modality (e. g., textual, visual, or interactive) [65]. Speith et al. [73] connect explainability to hardware in the context of requirements engineering, with a particular focus on microchips. Among their future research directions, they explicitly propose to explore end-users' mental models of microchips.

Against these backgrounds, we see the potential that a better understanding of microchips can benefit end users. Our study provides novel knowledge of end users' current understanding of microchips and their informational wants, laying the foundation for future work on transparency mechanisms and educational efforts.

2.2 Studies on Microchip (Security)

To the best of our knowledge, there has been no prior work on enduser understanding of and interactions with microchips. That being said, prior research has examined the relationship between users and various microchip-based technologies, including autonomous vehicles [12, 16, 78], drones [21], robots [46, 67], smart home devices [15], and sensors in smart cities [17, 89]. These studies collectively contribute to our understanding of how users interact with and perceive emerging microchip technologies.

Conference'17, July 2017, Washington, DC, USA

Research has also focused on improving the design and sustainability of Printed Circuit Boards (PCBs).¹ Lin et al. [44] highlighted design space exploration as a promising alternative to fully automated or manual PCB design approaches. Yan et al. [91] proposed SolderlessPCB to enhance the reusability of electronic components by eliminating the need for soldering components onto the PCB. Similarly, Arroyos et al. [4] presented a functional computer mouse made from biodegradable PCB materials, demonstrating that these components can dissolve in water, which allows for the reuse of mounted microchips. Strasnick et al. [76] introduced a PCB debugging tool that aids in analog circuit debugging by facilitating the comparison between the physical circuit and a simulated model.

Focusing on security research, a few usable security papers have touched upon the role of hardware, although the findings were often discussed in passing as a small part of the main insights. For example, Schmüser et al. [66] conducted a study on online security advice during the Ukraine war and found that the Twitter community regarded hardware as a medium-level concern, which was discussed primarily in the context of locking devices, disabling biometrics, and turning off location services. Similarly, Gallardo et al. [25] discovered that security experts and energy system operators tend to underestimate the risks associated with hardware-based attacks. Yu et al. [93] found that while cryptocurrency users prefer hardware wallets for security reasons, they often refrain from using them due to usability challenges. Reynolds et al. [62] highlighted usabilty issues in setting up YubiKeys (i. e.hardware security tokens for two-factor authentication) with Google, Facebook, and Windows accounts. Pfeffer et al. [57] later surveyed the effectiveness and usability of authenticity checks for such tokens, finding that users often neglect these essential checks, thereby undermining the security guarantees of the tokens.

Previous research has also explored the role of users in the security assurance of microchips [7, 82, 87]. These studies examine the cognitive processes [7] and strategies [87] involved in hardware reverse engineering, employing methods such as eye tracking and think-aloud protocols [82] to gain insights on how users interact with and analyze microchips.

While these works offer valuable insights into user interactions with hardware, our study goes beyond the technical aspects of hardware and broadens this inquiry by focusing on end-users' understanding of microchips, perceptions of their broader societal and security implications, and end-user information needs.

3 METHODS

We conducted an online survey with 250 participants recruited via Prolific. A core part of the survey is a vignette setup: to make the concept of microchips less abstract and more accessible, we presented the participants with five scenarios based on real-world applications of microchips. Each vignette consisted of a setting that describes a particular use case of a microchip and a desideratum (i. e., a property that might be desirable to end users). Following the vignette description, we asked participants to rate the importance of the desideratum as well as the importance of receiving specific types of information about the microchip in the respective scenario. Below, we outline our rationale for selecting vignette components and information types, present details of questionnaire design and study procedures, and address ethical considerations and data analysis techniques.

3.1 Topic Selection and Item Generation

As the first step of scoping the survey, we identified five concrete settings in which microchips may be used, five desiderata that end users may want satisfied for microchips, and five kinds of information presented to end users. The settings, desiderata, and information types were derived from a literature review and discussions among experts, and refined in pilot studies (see Section 3.3).

Derivation of settings involving microchips. To help end users relate to microchips, we selected five settings in which microchips are employed. We deliberately selected settings across a diverse range of applications, touching on aspects that end users may encounter in their everyday lives. Specifically, we consider microchips (i) controlling the entertainment system in a car, (ii) enabling wireless communication in a cell tower, (iii) controlling a pacemaker to maintain an adequate heart rate, (iv) enabling fingerprint unlocking of a smartphone, and (v) controlling the steering of an airplane.

Derivation of end-user desiderata. In our survey, we consider different goals that are desirable for end users. We borrow an initial set of desiderata from literature on other technical systems [13, 41, 72]. Through pilot testing (see Section 3.3), we narrowed down the selection to five desiderata that are relevant for microchips and at the same time relatable to end users: (a) *accountability*, (b) *safety*, (c) *cyber security*, (d) *trustworthiness*, and (e) *ethical standards*.

Derivation of information facilitating microchip understanding. The five different kinds of information offered to the end user are derived from different stages of the microchip design and manufacturing process [42, 86]. Microchips are designed using a high-level language similar to regular programming languages. The design descriptions are then implemented as an electronic circuit using automated software tools. Next, the design is handed to the manufacturer who produces the microchip in one of their production facilities, also known as *fabs* [27]. Derived from this process, we list the following as information to provide about microchips: (1) who designed and manufactured the microchips and (2) how the microchips were designed and manufactured.

Especially safety- and security-critical microchips must be certified by independent government bodies or dedicated testing service providers before use. As such, another useful piece of information could be (3) *how the microchips have been approved for use*.

The fabricated chip is finally integrated into a device such as a smartphone, a pacemaker, or a car. Therefore, further relevant information could be (4) *how the microchips interact with the system* and (5) *which functionality the microchips provide.*

3.2 Questionnaire Design

We drew from our team members' expertise in usable security and embedded systems when designing the questionnaire. We took care to make our questionnaire understandable to end users through several rounds of piloting. In the following, we briefly describe the flow of our questionnaire (see Appendix A for a full version).

¹A PCB is a flat surface that electrically connects electronic devices such as microchips.

3.2.1 Introduction. At the beginning, we stated the purpose of our study, the expected duration of 25 minutes, and provided information on data handling and data protection. Before participants could proceed, we asked them to give informed consent and to confirm that they were residents of the United States and at least 18 years of age (Q1). Next, we asked participants nine questions on a six-point Likert scale to assess their tendency to actively engage in technology interaction using a validated psychometric scale (Q2) [24].

3.2.2 General questions on microchips. In an open question, we asked participants what comes to mind when thinking of microchips (Q3). Further, we asked them whether or not they would like to understand more about microchips and invited them to give reasons for their choice (Q4). We also queried participants regarding the time they would be willing to invest to better understand microchips (Q5) and on the time they currently invest for the same purpose (Q6), both on a five-point scale. Next, we provided some background on microchips to align participants' basic understanding (Q 7). To conclude this block, we presented five settings in randomized order involving microchips and asked participants to rate their criticality as the impact that a microchip malfunction would have on the participant themselves (Q8).

3.2.3 Vignettes. From the 25 possible combinations of settings and desiderata (see Section 3.1), we formed five sets of five vignettes each, in which each setting and each desideratum occurs only exactly once. At the core of our questionnaire, we showed participants one of these sets. An example vignette is shown in Q10. For each vignette, we first asked participants to rate the importance of having a high level of the respective desideratum in the setting at hand on a five-point Likert scale (Q10.1). We then invited participants to explain their choices in an open-ended response (Q10.2). Second, we asked participants to rate the importance of receiving each of the five types of information (see Section 3.1) to assess the given desideratum in the specified setting on a five-point Likert scale (Q10.3). Subsequently, we requested them to briefly explain their choice for one of the information types in an open-ended response (Q10.4). Throughout the vignettes, we provided tooltips for some phrases (see red parts in Q10) that, once hovered over with the cursor, would explain desiderata and types of information in simple language so that participants' mental models of these items are aligned to our understanding and they could get clarifications as needed as they completed the survey.

3.2.4 Comprehension check. To determine whether participants actually understood the desiderata, we presented them with an assignment exercise that asked them to match five randomly ordered sentences indicating the meaning of a desideratum to the desideratum in question (Q11). The content of the sentences was based on the tooltips for the desiderata from the vignettes. We again asked participants about their willingness to invest time in understanding microchips (Q12) to see whether it has changed compared to before (Q5).

3.2.5 *Demographics.* We asked for participants to indicate their gender (Q13), age range (Q14), highest level of education (Q15), and whether they had any prior practical experience with microchips (Q16). Finally, we inquired if our participants had any feedback or anything they would like to share with us (Q17).

3.3 Survey Implementation

We implemented our questionnaire using Qualtrics and recruited US-based English-speaking participants via Prolific.

3.3.1 Pilot Testing. We conducted several pilot studies with a total of 79 participants to ensure end-user comprehension—specifically of the desiderata—by analyzing the open-ended questions Q10.2 and Q10.4 on participants' assessment of Q10.1 and Q10.3 with respect to misunderstandings. Through these pilots, we aimed to determine whether our desiderata are indeed relevant to and comprehensible for end users, and if we had missed any desiderata that were important to them. The extensive piloting led to several iterations of the questionnaire, particularly in terms of wording, sharpening of information types, and exclusion of unclear or irrelevant desiderata.

3.3.2 Data Collection. We rolled out the main study with a genderbalanced sample of 250 participants over 10 days by releasing slots to batches of 25 participants, each at different times of the day. The sample size of 250 was determined using a power analysis for multiple regression models. We aimed for the detection of a small effect size $f^2=0.15$, power=0.95, and a significance level of α =0.05. For our power analysis, we indicated a total of 27 predictors, which is the sum of the number of vignettes, one's affinity for technology interaction (ATI) score (see Q2) [24] and whether or not participants would like to understand more about microchips (see Q4). Participants took a median time of 24:19 minutes to complete our questionnaire and were compensated with 7.50 GBP, thus an hourly wage of 18.51 GBP.

3.4 Ethics and Data Protection

We could not have our planned study fully reviewed by an ethics committee because our department did not operate an institutional review board (IRB) at the time. However, we reviewed our study in line with the application form for ethical approval of human studies from another department and reached the conclusion that our study would be IRB-exempt in their case. In addition, by limiting the survey to a few demographic questions, notably not asking about region of residence, we ensured the anonymity of our participants from the beginning. All data collected were stored on our institution's own servers, to which only the researchers involved in the project have access.

3.5 Data Analysis

3.5.1 Qualitative Analysis. To obtain insights into end-user perceptions of microchips (Q3) and their willingness to understand more about microchips (Q4), we conducted qualitative analysis [49] of the open-ended responses. To this end, we used inductive thematic analysis. The coding was executed by two coders, one with a background in hardware security and the other in computer science and AI ethics. Both coders first independently coded 50 responses (20%). Each response could be assigned one or more codes. Both coders then discussed their results and agreed on a common codebook for each of the two open questions. In the process, the codebooks were refined through discussions among the coders by deleting, merging, and adding codes. In the end, the final codebook for Q3 contained 57 codes while the one for Q4 comprised 24 codes. They then both applied these codebooks to the remaining 200 responses

Conference'17, July 2017, Washington, DC, USA

(80%). To measure inter-coder reliability, Krippendorff's alpha [36] was computed over all codes based on the MASI distance [56] between codes assigned by both coders. This resulted in α =0.71 for Q3 and α =0.76 for Q4, indicating *substantial agreement* between the coders [40]. Finally, both coders discussed discrepancies in their code assignments and fully agreed on a common coding.

3.5.2 Statistical Analysis. We applied descriptive statistics to describe the sample and overall trends regarding participants' perception of the importance of different scenarios, desiderata, as well as their affinity for technology interaction [24]. To explain participants' perceived importance of desiderata in different scenarios and information that might facilitate microchip understanding, we utilized inferential statistics.

For the perceived importance of desiderata in different scenarios, we used multiple linear regression models with dummy variables. It is reasonable to assume that the ratings given by an individual participant are more similar than those given between participants. Therefore, we used multilevel modeling for this analysis. We calculated intra-class correlation (ICC) [34], or in this case, intra-individual correlation with intercept-only models. As ICC accounts for 36% - 45% of the overall variance, we decided to use random-intercept models for further linear regression analysis. For the random-intercept models, we calculated marginal R^2 as well as conditional R^2 [53]. Marginal R^2 considers only the variance of the fixed effects, while the conditional R^2 takes both the fixed and random effects-in this case, participant ID-into account. By subtracting marginal R^2 from conditional R^2 , the contribution of the random effects can be calculated. For model comparisons, we have also considered Akaike information criterion (AIC), Bayesian information criterion (BIC), and deviance.

For all regression models, we applied Bonferroni corrections to take into account the probability of observing a false positive (i. e., a type I error). In other words, we considered regression coefficients statistically significant only when p < .001 ($p = \alpha/m$ for the Bonferroni correction where *m* is the number of comparisons, and *m*=55 when we had five regression models with 11 predictors each).

3.6 Limitations

To the best of our knowledge, we are the first to explore end-user perspectives on microchips. Accordingly, we had to develop our questionnaire from scratch. To make the topic more accessible to end users, we decided to present our participants with vignettes. However, despite careful selection for diversity, our vignette settings can only represent a small sample of the actual applications of microchips. We also had to make a pre-selection for the desiderata and the types of information we investigated. We mitigated the self-selection bias by iteratively checking for missing items from participants' open-ended responses during pilot testing.

It is possible that comprehension issues may arise from the desiderata we provided (especially for similar ones like security and safety): participants may not clearly differentiate between the desiderata, or their understanding of the desiderata might differ from our definitions. We included tooltips as well as comprehension checks to address this issue, and our results show that participants correctly matched the descriptions to the respective desideratum in 90% of all cases. Participants had more issues comprehending

trustworthiness (84%) than ethical standards (94%). For the other desiderata, comprehension is between 88% and 92%.

Further, we conducted our study only with residents of the United States, and our results may not be generalizable to other countries or societies where there may be specific sociocultural and political factors that shape discussions about microchips. Last, in our survey, we only collected self-reported data about participants' willingness and time spent learning about microchips, which might not accurately reflect their actual behaviors.

4 RESULTS

4.1 Sample Description

While participants' gender distribution is balanced, nearly 80% of participants were between 18 and 44 years old and about 60% had a post-secondary education. The vast majority (92.4%) of participants indicated that they had no practical experience designing, manufacturing, testing, or deploying hardware and were not involved with the subject at a policy level. Participants exhibited a high degree of affinity for technology interaction (M=4.05, SD=0.91 on a 5-point scale). Table 2 in Appendix B provides detailed demographic information about the 250 participants.

4.2 RQ1: End User Understanding of Microchips

4.2.1 End-User Perception of Microchips. We coded participants' responses regarding their perceptions of microchips (Q 3) as described in Section 3.5 and present the main results below. See Table 3 in Appendix C for an overview of all assigned codes.

Participants' Perceptions Center Around Device Types. Participants primarily associate microchips with the applications they are deployed in. In 104 (42%) cases, participants mentioned microchips' deployment in computers, followed by phones (47; 19%), vehicles (22; 9%), and tablets (8; 3%). In addition to computers themselves, participants occasionally mentioned microchips' functioning as internal computer components (12; 5%) or even more precisely, CPU (28; 11%), motherboard (17; 7%), and memory (13; 5%). Participants also mentioned other devices or systems in 28 (11%) cases such as robotics, credit cards, and household devices.

Additionally, 71 (28%) participants mentioned the broad notion that microchips are widespread and used across devices, using phrases such as *"They are used in everything"* and *"They power many things.*" Participants also associated microchips with technology (54; 22%), electronics (50; 20%), and technological advancement (47; 19%), using phrases such as *"they advance in technology constantly.*"

Microchip Shape and Composition. Apart from the use cases of microchips, 84 (34%) participants mentioned small size as a property of microchips (e. g., "*Microchips are incredibly small*"). Another 35 (14%) participants commented on the composition of microchips (e. g., "set of electronic circuits on a small piece" and "silicon chips with thousands of [...] transistors"). Furthermore, 22 (9%) participants referred to the processing power of microchips (e. g., "powerhouse of the computer" and "powerful processing system").

Perceived Microchip Functionalities. In 83 (33%) cases, participants commented on microchips' general functionality as building blocks that make things work (e.g., *"main components of personal* *computers*" and *"make electronic devices work"*). Some other participants delved into specific aspects of functionalities such as data storage (35; 14%), data processing (25; 10%), and communication capabilities (11; 4%). Another 12 (5%) participants described microchips as things that enact control (e. g., *"dictate and command certain functions"*), and 15 (6%) participants recognized microchips' diverse functionalities (e. g., *"perform a variety of functions"*).

Misconceptions About Implanting Microchips. A recurring theme among participants' responses was microchips being implanted into humans (29; 12%) and animals (27; 11%), conveyed in phrases such as *"microchips being put into people"* and *"inserted into dogs."* This understanding likely comes from "microchipping" being a common term for animal implants in the United States. Especially in the context of pets, tracking capabilities of microchips are mentioned in 18 (7%) cases for *"locating lost pets."* Microchips implanted into humans also co-occurred with conspiracy theories in 11 (4%) cases. In particular, six (2%) participants mentioned microchips in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic (e. g., *"We were all injected with one with the coronavirus vaccine"*).

Broader Societal and Security Implications Rarely Mentioned. While microchips are featured prominently in geopolitical debates, supply chain issues about microchips were mentioned only occasionally in 18 (7%) cases (e. g., "They are scarce in many places" and "caused a massive shortage of vehicles"). In particular, foreign manufacturing was identified as an issue in nine (4%) cases (e. g., "Most that we need in America are made in Taiwan"). Another 20 (8%) participants commented on microchips' societal impacts (e. g., "they are a major part of society") and political aspects (e. g., "they passed the CHIPS Act"). Only nine (4%) participants mentioned security and privacy issues related to microchips proactively, commenting that microchips are "vulnerable to cybersecurity attacks" and expressing "I have privacy concerns with them."

4.2.2 End User Willingness to Understand More About Microchips. In Q4, we asked participants whether they wanted to understand more about microchips and to provide reasons for their choice; we further asked participants about their aspirational and current time spent to understand microchips (Q5) and (Q6). Table 4 in Appendix C includes an overview of all assigned codes for participants' reasoning, and below we summarize key findings.

Participants Willing to Learn More About Microchips. In response to Q 4, 76% of participants stated that they would like to know more about microchips, and 24% did not want to know more. When comparing responses to Q5 and Q6, we observe the trend that participants would like to spend more time understanding microchips (e. g., for a newly acquired device) compared to the time they spend at the moment, reflecting a strong aspiration for learning more about microchips. We asked participants twice about the time they are willing to spend on better understanding microchips—once at the beginning (Q5) and once towards the end of the survey (Q12) to check on potential social desirability bias, and we did not see noticeable changes in the responses to these two questions.

Motivation: Gaining Knowledge, as Existing Knowledge is Lacking. In 96 (38%) cases, participants mentioned that they want to know more about microchips to gain knowledge in general (e.g., *"I like*" *learning in general*" and "*I can expand my knowledge*"). Another 20 (8%) participants stated their motivation came from a desire of wanting to keep up with progress (e. g., "*to stay up to date on technology*"), and 24 (10%) expressed interest in following along the scientific progress (e. g., "*I would love to know how it develops*"). In addition, 46 (18%) participants wanted to better understand the functionality of microchips (e. g., "*I would like to know how they work*"), and 10 (4%) wanted to better understand the manufacturing processes. The motivation to learn more is also related to participants' self-reported lack of existing knowledge, as 24 (10%) participants stated that they had incomplete knowledge of microchips so far (e. g., "*they feel a bit like magic*" and "*I don't know much about them*").

Motivation: Importance and Influence on (Future) Life. In 32 (13%) cases, participants acknowledged that microchips are omnipresent in daily life (e. g., "they became more integrated into our everyday lives"). Additionally, 24 (10%) participants mentioned microchips' impact on society (e. g., "what dangers it could bring to society") or their importance for the future (e. g., "it is a huge part of the future"). Another 16 (6%) participants commented that they wanted to broaden their understanding because of microchips' inherent link to technology (e. g., "I could learn how to better use tech").

Hurdle: Lack of Interest and Need. Among participants who did not want to know more about microchips, 28 (11%) expressed that they have no interest in the topic (e. g., "I don't care" and "It is a boring topic"). Another 16 (6%) participants did not see the need to understand more (e. g., "I know as much as I need to know about them" and "It's not something I have to deal with a lot").

Hurdle: Satisfaction, Complexity, and Fear. In 25 (10%) cases, participants mentioned that they were satisfied with their current level of knowledge about microchips or they would be satisfied as long as the microchips work as intended even if they do not know why (e.g., "as long as microchips work I don't care why or how"). A total of 15 (6%) participants felt that the topic was too complicated (e.g., "it sounds too intricate" and "It's too complicated and will hurt my brain"). Another eight (3%) participants expressed fear regarding microchips in general (e.g., "I worry what will be developed in the future" and "I am afraid of them").

Summary in Light of RQ1. A majority of participants have a basic understanding of what microchips are, where they are deployed, and what they are capable of. Furthermore, about three-quarters of our participants expressed a desire to learn more about microchips, mostly to expand their knowledge and keep up with the rapid technological advances. Nevertheless, participants rarely commented on the societal implications of microchips or expressed concerns about the security and privacy aspects. Thus, we observe that end users have the baseline knowledge and motivation to be involved as stakeholders in the hardware ecosystem, but educational efforts are needed to deepen their existing understanding and address misconceptions.

4.3 RQ2: Importance of Desiderata and Information Types

4.3.1 Criticality of Microchip Application Settings. Figure 1 depicts our participants' perceived criticality of the five settings on a scale from 1—not at all critical to 5—extremely critical. In line with our expectations, the most critical settings were microchips deployed in an airplane (M=4.72, SD=0.69) and in a pacemaker (M=4.71, SD=0.83). The two settings at the intermediate level were microchips that enable wireless communication in a cell tower (M=3.86, SD=1.04) and microchips that enable fingerprint unlocking in a smartphone (M=3.20, SD=1.20). Microchips in the entertainment system of a car were rated the least critical (M=2.66, SD=1.28).

A Welch's ANOVA revealed significant differences in the perceived criticality across scenarios (F(4)=198.35, p<.001). Subsequent pairwise Wilcoxon rank sum tests with Bonferroni corrections revealed significant differences between all scenarios except between the airplane and pacemaker scenarios.

4.3.2 Importance of Desiderata in Different Settings. We asked participants about their perceived importance of five desiderata on a scale from 1—not at all important to 5—extremely important. The most important desiderata were cyber security (M=4.29, SD=1.11) and trustworthiness (M=4.09, SD=1.19). Safety comes in third (M= 4.00, SD=1.31) followed by accountability (M=3.80, SD=1.35) and ethical standards (M=3.73, SD=1.28). Figure 2 reports more finegrained mean values, connecting each desideratum to the different microchip application settings.

4.3.3 Importance of Information Types. We asked participants to rate the importance of different types of information in relation to the deployment setting and desideratum respectively, on a scale from 1—not at all important to 5—extremely important. Across all desiderata and settings, information on which functionality a microchip provides was rated the most important (M=3.60, SD=1.33). This is followed by information about how a microchip was approved for use (M=3.56, SD=1.36) and how the microchip interacts with the surrounding system (M=3.51, SD=1.38). Participants placed less importance on the manufacturing aspects, namely information on who manufactured the microchip (M=3.25, SD=1.35).

Figure 3 shows the trend that the type of information desired by end users depends on the application setting in which they are used at least to some extent. Information on the functionality of a microchip, how it has been approved for use, and how it interacts with the system were perceived to be more important than the other types of information, particularly in airplane and pacemaker settings. For other settings, such as the car and the smartphone, these differences still exist but are not as pronounced. For instance, information on a microchip's functionality was rated the most important for the smartphone setting.

Figure 4 shows that the desired information types may also depend on the target desideratum. For example, to evaluate cyber security and trustworthiness, information on the microchip's functionality, how it has been approved for use, and how it interacts with the system were rated more important than the manufacturing-related information. A similar trend was observed for safety, although here, information on how the microchips have been approved has a small edge over the two others. When end users want to evaluate accountability or ethical standards, the ratings were similar and no particular types of information stood out.

Summary in Light of RQ2. Participants had diverse perceptions regarding the criticality of different application settings for microchips. While participants considered all five desiderata very important (M>3.5 for all), cyber security and trustworthiness emerged to be the more important ones. For information types, participants desired to know more about the microchip's functionality, how it is approved for use, and how it interacts with the underlying system than about the manufacturing processes. We also observe the trend that the desired information types depend on the application setting and the target desideratum, and we quantitatively test the correlations in Section 4.4.

4.4 RQ3: Factors Shaping End Users' Information Needs

To gain more granular insight into the factors that shape end users' information needs, we applied multilevel regression modeling to each of the five information types. For settings, the *microchips controlling the entertainment system in a car* was used as a baseline because of its lowest criticality rating (see Section 4.3.1). For desiderata, *ethical standards* was chosen as the baseline as participants rated it as least important (see Section 4.3.2). Compared to the intercept-only models without any predictors, the random intercept models containing the settings and desiderata had significantly lower deviances (e. g., $\chi^2(8)=59.95$, p<.001 for the *which functionality* model), indicating a better fit to our data.

We then tested the specific predictors for the significant explanatory power expressed by marginal R^2 . In addition to the application setting's perceived criticality and the desideratum's perceived importance as the main effects, we included participants' general desire to understand more about microchips as a binary predictor (*no* as the baseline) and their ATI score [24] (applying grand-mean centering, utilizing the ATI mean value as the baseline). We further tried including participants' demographics (i. e., gender, age, and educational background) in our models, but they did not add significantly more explanatory power. We thus omit these variables from the analysis. Our final models with the random intercept reached a better fit (AIC=[3725.2 - 3913.7]; BIC=[3806.9 - 4062.5]) compared to our base models (AIC=[3969.6 - 4123.4]; BIC=[3985.0 - 4138.8]).

Table 1 shows the regression outputs. Below we unpack a few key findings. We report separate regression models that look into the interaction effects between settings and desiderata in Appendix D, which show similar patterns as the findings reported here.²

Higher Information Needs for Critical Settings. Looking at the main effect of application settings, we observe that settings with higher criticality ratings were significantly correlated with higher information needs. Compared to *car* as the baseline, participants

²While the models with interaction effects enable a more nuanced examination of information needs in response to individual vignettes, the number of participants per vignette was limited to 25, negatively affecting the statistical power and increasing the alpha error accumulation. We thus opted to report the interaction effects in Appendix D.




Figure 1: Participants' criticality ratings of the five different settings presented in our survey vignettes.

Table 1: Multilevel regression analysis based on participants' ratings of the importance of receiving different types of information
to evaluate a desideratum in a given setting, on a scale from 1—not at all important to 5—extremely important.

Predictors	which func- tionality Est.	how interacts Est.	how approved Est.	who manu- factured Est.	how manu factured Est.
intercept: ethical standards (desideratum) \times car (setting)	2.61***	2.35***	2.63***	2.66***	2.71***
setting (baseline=car)					
smartphone	0.25	0.29	0.35***	0.25	0.37***
cell tower	0.15	0.21	0.34***	0.22	0.24
pacemaker	0.97***	0.99***	1.13***	1.02***	0.92***
airplane	0.56***	0.71***	0.87***	0.72***	0.73***
desideratum (baseline=ethical standards)					
accountability	0.13	0.23	-0.02	-0.25	-0.04
safety	0.14	0.18	0.13	-0.36***	-0.35***
trustworthiness	0.32***	0.25	0.02	-0.30***	-0.29
cyber security	0.41***	0.54***	0.27	-0.24	-0.11
desire to understand more about microchips	0.53***	0.63***	0.41	0.50	0.43
ATI score	0.26***	0.27***	0.23	0.26	0.24
marginal R ²	0.171	0.190	0.155	0.165	0.129
conditional R ²	0.461	0.469	0.507	0.554	0.521

*** p<.001; we only highlighted coefficients with p<.001 due to the Bonferroni correction




Figure 2: Participants' mean importance ratings of our desiderata in the context of the considered settings.

gave significantly higher ratings across the five information types for vignettes featuring *airplane* and *pacemaker*. *Smartphone* and *cell tower* as setting also drove up the information needs to some degree. However, this pattern only applies to certain types of information, namely *how the microchip is approved for use* (for both settings) and *how the microchip is manufactured* (only for *smartphone*).

Nuanced Influences from Desiderata. In contrast to findings on application settings, where there was a clear association between high perceived criticality and high information needs, the effect

of desiderata on information needs is more nuanced. Compared to ethical standards, participants had a stronger desire for information on the microchip's functionality and how it interacts with the system when *cyber security* was the target desideratum. Participants also valued information on the microchip's functionality for *trustworthiness*. Conversely, participants attached less importance to information about the microchip's manufacturing process, but only when the target desiderata were *safety* (for both information types) and *trustworthiness* (for *who manufactured* only). Between ethical standards and *accountability*, participants' information needs were similar with no statistically significant differences.

Information Needs Shaped by the Desire to Understand and ATI. A general desire of participants to know more about microchips also shapes participants' information needs. The coefficients are positive across the five information types, and the influences were particularly pronounced for information on the microchip's functionality and how the microchip interacts with the system. These observations are in line with our findings regarding RQ1, where participants shared their willingness to learn more about microchips open-endedly, and their existing understandings revolve around functionalities and application settings. Similarly, a higher ATI score contributes to more desire for information, particularly for functionality and interactions with the system.

Conference'17, July 2017, Washington, DC, USA




Figure 3: Importance of different types of information depending on the setting in which microchips are employed. The results are aggregated across all desiderata.




Figure 4: Importance of different kinds of information depending on the desiderata to be evaluated by the end user. The results are aggregated across all settings.

Summary in Light of RQ3. The factors driving end users' information needs are multifaceted. Higher information needs generally occurred when participants perceived the setting in which the microchip was deployed to be highly critical, whereas desiderata do not consistently predict information needs. Participants' general desire to understand microchips and ATI also played a significant role in shaping information needs, particularly for the microchip's functionality and how it interacts with the system.

5 DISCUSSION

Below, we reflect on the fundamental questions of why end users need to understand more about microchips and the role of end users in the microchip ecosystem (Section 5.1). We then discuss our findings' implications for future research that promotes user understanding of microchips and microchip transparency (Section 5.2). Finally, we reflect on our work's policy implications considering regulatory efforts around microchips (Section 5.3).

5.1 Do End Users Need to Understand More About Microchips?

Our study is motivated by the fact that microchips run the electronics of the world and are featured prominently in regulatory efforts, yet microchips remain largely opaque from the general public view. Nonetheless, they play an increasingly vital role in security as they often form the root of trust in a system, e.g., as a cryptographic accelerator, hardware security module (HSM), or trusted execution environment (TEE). In other domains and application areas, such as AI and IoT devices, we have seen concrete evidence that a lack of transparency causes security and trust issues [81]. In contrast, end users are empowered to make more informed decisions with a better understanding of the system's inner structure and potential risks [29, 51]. Thus, we see the value of at least envisioning the integration of end users into the hardware ecosystem since their role is largely overlooked at the moment. Our findings further underscore the necessity of helping end users understand more about microchips in a few ways.

First, the need is supported by our participants' own preferences— 76% of participants indicated they would personally like to understand more about microchips, recognizing microchips' omnipresence in their daily lives and expressing particular interest in knowing more about microchip's functionality and interactions with the underlying system.

Second, while our participants exhibited a basic understanding of what microchips are and where they are used, we found a lack of awareness regarding potential security and privacy concerns, the critical societal aspects of microchips, and misconceptions such as linking microchips to animal implants and conspiracy theories. Beliefs in such conspiracies can lead to hesitations in adopting new technologies and mistrust in government bodies. In fact, during the COVID-19 pandemic, conspiracy theorists falsely claimed vaccines were used to implant microchips into people, which led to lower vaccination rates [63, 79].

Finally, helping end users better understand microchips has numerous practical impacts. For instance, with a better understanding, end users would be more equipped to participate in discussions around legislative efforts such as the US CHIPS and Science Act [68] and the European Chips Act [22], and—as citizens in democratic societies—to inform and hold their governments accountable for the significant investment through such programs.

With all the reasons summarized, we believe that the remaining question is not *whether* we need to help end users understand more about microchips, but rather *when* and *how* to achieve this objective. Regarding the "when" aspect, it is important to acknowledge that end users have varying degrees of decision-making across the different scenarios in which microchips are deployed. For instance, when the device in question is a computer or tablet provided with dozens of microchips, we can reasonably expect that end users may adjust their level of trust in the device to purchase based on information about the microchip's performance (e. g.., about its functionality), security (e. g., based on certifications), and ethical considerations (such as fair wages and working conditions) for workers involved in the manufacturing processes.

However, this is less likely the case when deciding which airplane to take, as microchips are deployed en masse in planes and are generally inaccessible to end users. Here, other factors such as the ticket's price and availability come as priorities [3], and end users can only rarely choose the airplane type. Interestingly, this stands in contrast to our finding that our participants rated the airplane and pacemaker scenarios as the most critical (and more critical scenarios drive higher information needs). In the pacemaker scenario, the deployment of microchips is less complicated. Beyond medical reasons [39], end users have a fair degree of decisionmaking agency between individual devices and vendors.

The key to finding the right "when" moment is to identify other application settings that are not only important and relevant to end users, but also offer space for end users to make meaningful and informed decisions. Going beyond the scenarios presented in our survey, we could imagine smartwatches and smartglasses as well as IoT and smart home devices to fall into this category. However, other complex applications, such as industrial machines and (digital) infrastructure components, are likely out of scope.

5.2 Towards Microchip Transparency for End Users

We believe that future interdisciplinary research is required and the usable security community is uniquely positioned to tackle the "how" aspect of helping end users better understand microchips. Below, we outline a few possible directions informed by our findings and speculate potential ideas to explore based on our own knowledge.

5.2.1 Building Mental Models of Microchips. As our study is firstof-its-kind for the topic and exploratory in nature, we gauged participants' understanding of microchips in a simple open-ended question. Our initial results pave the way for more thorough analyses of end users' mental models of microchips, which serve as foundational knowledge for any tools, resources, and educational interventions that seek to teach users about microchips. For instance, future work can elicit end users' mental models in qualitative methods such as interviews, focus groups, co-design sessions, and

drawing activities that enable deeper insights into users' reasoning processes and why misconceptions occur [30].

Future work can also replicate prior studies on the mental models of computer security [11, 84] and privacy [55] in the microchip setting to see to what extent users' existing models and metaphors still apply. Moreover, as prior work has consistently demonstrated the gaps between experts and laypeople regarding mental models [8, 10, 55], and microchips remain opaque even to experts [73], it is crucial to compare the mental models held by non-expert end users with those held by other stakeholders in the hardware ecosystem (such as designers, manufacturers, system integrators, and policymakers) [73] in order to identify and close the gaps.

5.2.2 Deciding Specific Information to Provide to End Users. Our study hints at the types of information that end users prioritize for understanding more about microchips. However, the categories we presented in our study were quite broad. Future work is needed to empirically compare the effectiveness and downstream impacts on users (e. g., in terms of comprehension, trust in the system, and purchase behaviors) across the different information types, ideally with vignettes that feature the specific information adapted for the application setting. Inspirations can also be drawn from the nudging literature for the framing of the presented information [1].

For instance, since our findings demonstrate that end users may lack awareness of the broader societal, economic, and security implications of microchips regarding risks and harms, future work can explore the effectiveness of presenting information that saliently features concrete harms. Examples of harm can include hardware security issues, critical malfunctions in pacemakers, and environmental harms in communities involved in the mining of resources required for microchip manufacturing. By making more informed purchase decisions, collective actions from end users could help improve working conditions and reduce environmental impact.

5.2.3 Designing and Evaluating Transparency Mechanisms for Microchips. Once the specific information to be provided has been determined, the follow-up question is how to effectively convey the information to laypeople through transparency mechanisms specifically applicable to microchips. For instance, hardware datasheets have existed for a while. They contain information on the functionality and connectivity of a microchip as well as on its ideal operating conditions. However, they often contain technical jargon that makes them inaccessible to end users. Drawing from standardized labels for IoT devices [51] and mobile apps [18], model cards for ML models [50], and datasheets for datasets [26], we see the promise of creating "microchip labels" that enhance existing hardware datasheets beyond providing the typical technical documentations to make them more accessible and useful to end users. Taking our findings into account, the label can cover the microchip's functionality, interaction with the system, supply chain actors, involved certification bodies, and more. Such a label for a tablet computer could, for example, provide a score related to all microchips in the device based on manufacturing location and conditions, sustainability, and security. A QR code as part of this label could then lead to a list of all contained microchips as well as details on properties such as their functionality, manufacturer, and interoperability. Similar to the IoT label development pipeline [19], much more work is needed after the initial proposal to reach a

consensus on details surrounding the label (e.g., having minimal vs. more complicated labels, the presence of a QR code, the label's size, and how the label is encouraged or mandated in regulations).

5.3 Involving End Users in Regulatory Initiatives Around Microchips

Microchips represent a subject with natural policy implications. Against the background of public discourse about the use of Huawei equipment in network infrastructure [85] and the political efforts to promote domestic chip production in the United States and the European Union [22, 68], one of our key findings stands out—our participants were less interested in information about how and by whom a microchip was manufactured compared to the other types of information, whereas this aspect has been featured front and center in these regulatory initiatives.

Our study suggests that there is a potential gap between what legislators prioritize to address versus what end users desire to know. This may be due to the fact that microchip manufacturing is an intricate process that end users are mostly unaware of. Given the level of knowledge required to comprehend microchip manufacturing, we argue that it would be best to leave technical manufacturing details to the regulators and instead focus on ethical aspects of manufacturing as well as microchip functionality and interaction within a system when designing explanations for end users.

One thing is known for sure: we cannot assume that the current multi-billion dollar investments from regulators will guarantee end-user trust in microchips. Therefore, similar to existing research on user perceptions of rights prescribed in the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) [32, 38, 47, 77], more work is needed to understand end users' perceptions of ongoing regulatory initiatives around microchips in order to capture and embed laypeople's opinions about microchips into policymaking.

6 CONCLUSION

Microchips have become ubiquitous in people's daily lives, whether in the cars we drive, the phones we use, or even in our household appliances. This observation highlights their indispensable role within socio-technical systems. To better understand end-user perceptions of microchips, we conducted a survey with 250 participants.

While our participants appear to have a fundamental understanding of what microchips are and what they are used for, their knowledge of the consequences of microchip malfunction and their impact on society, in general, seems limited. In particular, few participants had issues like cyber security, trustworthiness, or safety in mind, yet they considered them very important when explicitly asked about them. Furthermore, our participants' information needs depend on their general affinity for technology, their willingness to understand more about microchips, and the considered desideratum and use case. Based on our findings, future work could further explore end users' mental models of microchips and how to determine and convey information about them, so that end users can make more informed decisions about the purchase and use of electronic devices in the future.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank an anonymous Prolific user whose answer to Q3 inspired our paper's title.

Work on this paper was funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) under Germany's Excellence Strategy—EXC 2092 CASA—390781972, through the DFG grant 389792660 as part of TRR 248, and by the Volkswagen Foundation grants AZ 9B830, AZ 98509, and AZ 98514 "Explainable Intelligent Systems" (EIS).

The Volkswagen Foundation and the DFG had no role in preparation, review, or approval of the manuscript; or the decision to submit the manuscript for publication. The authors declare no other financial interests.

REFERENCES

- [1] Alessandro Acquisti, Idris Adjerid, Rebecca Balebako, Laura Brandimarte, Lorrie Faith Cranor, Saranga Komanduri, Pedro Giovanni Leon, Norman Sadeh, Florian Schaub, Manya Sleeper, et al. 2017. Nudges for privacy and security: Understanding and assisting users' choices online. ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR) 50, 3 (2017), 1–41.
- [2] Sally Adee. 2008. The Hunt For The Kill Switch. IEEE Spectrum 45, 5 (2008), 34–39. https://doi.org/10.1109/MSPEC.2008.4505310
- [3] Misbahul Anwar and Dodi Andrean. 2021. The effect of perceived quality, brand image, and price perception on purchase decision. In 4th International Conference on Sustainable Innovation 2020-Accounting and Management (ICoSIAMS 2020). Atlantis Press, 78–82.
- [4] Vicente Arroyos, Maria L. K. Viitaniemi, Nicholas Keehn, Vaidehi Oruganti, Winston Saunders, Karin Strauss, Vikram Iyer, and Bichlien H. Nguyen. 2022. A Tale of Two Mice: Sustainable Electronics Design and Prototyping. In CHI '22: CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, New Orleans, LA, USA, 29 April 2022 - 5 May 2022, Extended Abstracts, Simone D. J. Barbosa, Cliff Lampe, Caroline Appert, and David A. Shamma (Eds.). ACM, 263:1–263:10. https: //doi.org/10.1145/3491101.3519823
- [5] Natä M. Barbosa, Gang Wang, Blase Ur, and Yang Wang. 2021. Who Am I?: A Design Probe Exploring Real-Time Transparency about Online and Offline User Profiling Underlying Targeted Ads. Proc. ACM Interact. Mob. Wearable Ubiquitous Technol. 5, 3 (2021), 88:1–88:32. https://doi.org/10.1145/3478122
- [6] Georg T. Becker, Francesco Regazzoni, Christof Paar, and Wayne P. Burleson. 2013. Stealthy Dopant-Level Hardware Trojans. In Cryptographic Hardware and Embedded Systems - CHES 2013 - 15th International Workshop, Santa Barbara, CA, USA, August 20-23, 2013. Proceedings (Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol. 8086), Guido Bertoni and Jean-Sébastien Coron (Eds.). Springer, Berlin/Heidelberg, Germany, 197-214. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-40349-1_12
- [7] Steffen Becker, Carina Wiesen, Nils Albartus, Nikol Rummel, and Christof Paar. 2020. An Exploratory Study of Hardware Reverse Engineering - Technical and Cognitive Processes. In Sixteenth Symposium on Usable Privacy and Security, SOUPS 2020, August 7-11, 2020, Heather Richter Lipford and Sonia Chiasson (Eds.). USENIX Association, 285–300. https://www.usenix.org/conference/soups2020/ presentation/becker
- [8] Veroniek Binkhorst, Tobias Fiebig, Katharina Krombholz, Wolter Pieters, and Katsiaryna Labunets. 2022. Security at the End of the Tunnel: The Anatomy of VPN Mental Models Among Experts and Non-Experts in a Corporate Context. In 31st USENIX Security Symposium, USENIX Security 2022, Boston, MA, USA, August 10-12, 2022, Kevin R. B. Butler and Kurt Thomas (Eds.). USENIX Association, 3433–3450. https://www.usenix.org/conference/usenixsecurity22/presentation/ binkhorst
- Jenna Burrell. 2016. How the machine 'thinks': Understanding opacity in machine learning algorithms. *Big Data & Society* 3, 1 (2016), 2053951715622512. https: //doi.org/10.1177/2053951715622512
- [10] Jean Camp, Farzaneh Asgharpour, Debin Liu, and IN Bloomington. 2007. Experimental evaluations of expert and non-expert computer users' mental models of security risks. *Proceedings of WEIS 2007* (2007), 1–24.
- [11] L Jean Camp. 2009. Mental models of privacy and security. IEEE Technology and society magazine 28, 3 (2009), 37–46.
- [12] Xiang Chang, Zihe Chen, Xiaoyan Dong, Yuxin Cai, Tingmin Yan, Haolin Cai, Zherui Zhou, Guyue Zhou, and Jiangtao Gong. 2024. "It Must Be Gesturing Towards Me": Gesture-Based Interaction between Autonomous Vehicles and Pedestrians. In Proceedings of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, CHI 2024, Honolulu, HI, USA, May 11-16, 2024, Florian 'Floyd' Mueller, Penny Kyburz, Julie R. Williamson, Corina Sas, Max L. Wilson, Phoebe O. Toups Dugas, and Irina Shklovski (Eds.). ACM, 88:1–88:25. https://doi.org/10.1145/ 3613904.3642029

- [13] Larissa Chazette, Wasja Brunotte, and Timo Speith. 2021. Exploring Explainability: A Definition, a Model, and a Knowledge Catalogue. In Proceedings of the 29th IEEE International Requirements Engineering Conference (South Bend, Indiana, USA) (RE 2021), Jane Cleland-Huang, Ana Moreira, Kurt Schneider, and Michael Vierhauser (Eds.). IEEE, Piscataway, NJ, USA, 197–208. https: //doi.org/10.1109/RE51729.2021.00025
- [14] Hao Fei Cheng, Ruotong Wang, Zheng Zhang, Fiona O'Connell, Terrance Gray, F. Maxwell Harper, and Haiyi Zhu. 2019. Explaining Decision-Making Algorithms through UI: Strategies to Help Non-Expert Stakeholders. In Proceedings of the 2019 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, CHI 2019, Glasgow, Scotland, UK, May 04-09, 2019, Stephen A. Brewster, Geraldine Fitzpatrick, Anna L. Cox, and Vassilis Kostakos (Eds.). ACM, 559. https://doi.org/10.1145/3290605. 3300789
- [15] Yi-Shyuan Chiang, Omar Khan, Adam Bates, and Camille Cobb. 2024. More than just informed: The importance of consent facets in smart homes. In Proceedings of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, CHI 2024, Honolulu, HI, USA, May 11-16, 2024, Florian 'Floyd' Mueller, Penny Kyburz, Julie R. Williamson, Corina Sas, Max L. Wilson, Phoebe O. Toups Dugas, and Irina Shklovski (Eds.). ACM, 849:1–849:21. https://doi.org/10.1145/3613904.3642288
- [16] Mengdi Chu, Keyu Zong, Xin Shu, Jiangtao Gong, Zhicong Lu, Kaimin Guo, Xinyi Dai, and Guyue Zhou. 2023. Work with AI and Work for AI: Autonomous Vehicle Safety Drivers' Lived Experiences. In Proceedings of the 2023 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, CHI 2023, Hamburg, Germany, April 23-28, 2023, Albrecht Schmidt, Kaisa Väänänen, Tesh Goyal, Per Ola Kristensson, Anicia Peters, Stefanie Mueller, Julie R. Williamson, and Max L. Wilson (Eds.). ACM, 753:1–753:16. https://doi.org/10.1145/3544548.3581564
- [17] Eric Corbett and Graham Dove. 2024. Signs of the Smart City: Exploring the Limits and Opportunities of Transparency. In Proceedings of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, CHI 2024, Honolulu, HI, USA, May 11-16, 2024, Florian 'Floyd' Mueller, Penny Kyburz, Julie R. Williamson, Corina Sas, Max L. Wilson, Phoebe O. Toups Dugas, and Irina Shklovski (Eds.). ACM, 850:1–850:14. https://doi.org/10.1145/3613904.3641931
- [18] Lorrie Faith Cranor. 2022. Mobile-app privacy nutrition labels missing key ingredients for success. Commun. ACM 65, 11 (2022), 26–28. https://doi.org/10. 1145/3563967
- [19] Lorrie Faith Cranor, Yuvraj Agarwal, and Pardis Emami Naeini. 2024. Internet of Things Security and Privacy Labels Should Empower Consumers. *Commun.* ACM 67, 3 (2024), 29–31. https://doi.org/10.1145/3637630
- [20] Jean DaRolt, Giorgio Di Natale, Marie-Lise Flottes, and Bruno Rouzeyre. 2011. New security threats against chips containing scan chain structures. In HOST 2011, Proceedings of the 2011 IEEE International Symposium on Hardware-Oriented Security and Trust (HOST), 5-6 June 2011, San Diego, California, USA. IEEE Computer Society, 110. https://doi.org/10.1109/HST.2011.5955005
- [21] Kaixu Dong, Zhiyuan Zhang, Xiaoyu Chang, Pakpong Chirarattananon, and Ray LC. 2024. Dances with Drones: Spatial Matching and Perceived Agency in Improvised Movements with Drone and Human Partners. In Proceedings of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, CHI 2024, Honolulu, HI, USA, May 11-16, 2024, Florian 'Floyd' Mueller, Penny Kyburz, Julie R. Williamson, Corina Sas, Max L. Wilson, Phoebe O. Toups Dugas, and Irina Shklovski (Eds.). ACM, 263:1–263:16. https://doi.org/10.1145/3613904.3642345
- [22] European Comission. 2022. A Chips Act for Europe Comission Staff Working Document. https://digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu/en/library/european-chips-actstaff-working-document
- [23] Florian M. Farke, David G. Balash, Maximilian Golla, and Adam J. Aviv. 2024. How Does Connecting Online Activities to Advertising Inferences Impact Privacy Perceptions? *Proc. Priv. Enhancing Technol.* 2024, 2 (2024), 372–390. https: //doi.org/10.56553/POPETS-2024-0055
- [24] Thomas Franke, Christiane Attig, and Daniel Wessel. 2019. A personal resource for technology interaction: development and validation of the affinity for technology interaction (ATI) scale. *International Journal of Human–Computer Interaction* 35, 6 (2019), 456–467.
- [25] Andrea Gallardo, Robert Erbes, Katya Le Blanc, Lujo Bauer, and Lorrie Faith Cranor. 2024. Interdisciplinary Approaches to Cybervulnerability Impact Assessment for Energy Critical Infrastructure. In Proceedings of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, CHI 2024, Honolulu, HI, USA, May 11-16, 2024, Florian 'Floyd' Mueller, Penny Kyburz, Julie R. Williamson, Corina Sas, Max L. Wilson, Phoebe O. Toups Dugas, and Irina Shklovski (Eds.). ACM, 828:1–828:24. https://doi.org/10.1145/3613904.3642493
- [26] Timnit Gebru, Jamie Morgenstern, Briana Vecchione, Jennifer Wortman Vaughan, Hanna M. Wallach, Hal Daumé III, and Kate Crawford. 2021. Datasheets for datasets. Commun. ACM 64, 12 (2021), 86–92. https://doi.org/10.1145/3458723
- [27] Randall L. Geiger, Phillip E. Allen, and Noel R. Strader. 1990. VLSI Design Techniques for Analog and Digital Circuits. McGraw-Hill Publishing Company, New York, NY, USA.
- [28] Udit Gupta, Young Geun Kim, Sylvia Lee, Jordan Tse, Hsien-Hsin S. Lee, Gu-Yeon Wei, David Brooks, and Carole-Jean Wu. 2021. Chasing Carbon: The Elusive Environmental Footprint of Computing. In IEEE International Symposium on High-Performance Computer Architecture, HPCA 2021, Seoul, South Korea, February 27 -

March 3, 2021. IEEE, 854-867. https://doi.org/10.1109/HPCA51647.2021.00076

- [29] Shane D Johnson, John M Blythe, Matthew Manning, and Gabriel TW Wong. 2020. The impact of IoT security labelling on consumer product choice and willingness to pay. *PloS one* 15, 1 (2020), e0227800.
- [30] Natalie A Jones, Helen Ross, Timothy Lynam, Pascal Perez, and Anne Leitch. 2011. Mental models: an interdisciplinary synthesis of theory and methods. *Ecology and society* 16, 1 (2011).
- [31] Ruogu Kang, Laura Dabbish, Nathaniel Fruchter, and Sara Kiesler. 2015. "My Data Just Goes Everywhere:" User Mental Models of the Internet and Implications for Privacy and Security. In *Eleventh symposium on usable privacy and security* (SOUPS 2015). 39–52.
- [32] Smirity Kaushik, Yaxing Yao, Pierre Dewitte, and Yang Wang. 2021. "How I Know For Sure": People's Perspectives on Solely Automated Decision-Making (SADM). In Seventeenth Symposium on Usable Privacy and Security, SOUPS 2021, August 8-10, 2021, Sonia Chiasson (Ed.). USENIX Association, 159–180. https: //www.usenix.org/conference/soups2021/presentation/kaushik
- [33] Predrag Klasnja, Sunny Consolvo, Jaeyeon Jung, Benjamin M Greenstein, Louis LeGrand, Pauline Powledge, and David Wetherall. 2009. "When I am on Wi-Fi, I am Fearless:" Privacy Concerns & Practices in Everyday Wi-Fi Use. In Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems. 1993–2002.
- [34] Gary G. Koch. 2006. Intraclass Correlation Coefficient. https://doi.org/10.1002/ 0471667196.ess1275.pub2
- [35] Paul C. Kocher, Joshua Jaffe, and Benjamin Jun. 1999. Differential Power Analysis. In Advances in Cryptology - CRYPTO '99, 19th Annual International Cryptology Conference, Santa Barbara, California, USA, August 15-19, 1999, Proceedings (Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol. 1666), Michael J. Wiener (Ed.). Springer, 388–397. https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-48405-1_25
- [36] Klaus Krippendorff. 2018. Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology. Sage publications.
- [37] Katharina Krombholz, Karoline Busse, Katharina Pfeffer, Matthew Smith, and Emanuel von Zezschwitz. 2019. "If HTTPS Were Secure, I Wouldn't Need 2FA" -End User and Administrator Mental Models of HTTPS. In 2019 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy, SP 2019, San Francisco, CA, USA, May 19-23, 2019. IEEE, 246–263. https://doi.org/10.1109/SP.2019.00060
- [38] Lin Kyi, Abraham Mhaidli, Cristiana Teixeira Santos, Franziska Roesner, and Asia J. Biega. 2024. "It doesn't tell me anything about how my data is used": User Perceptions of Data Collection Purposes. In Proceedings of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, CHI 2024, Honolulu, HI, USA, May 11-16, 2024, Florian 'Floyd' Mueller, Penny Kyburz, Julie R. Williamson, Corina Sas, Max L. Wilson, Phoebe O. Toups Dugas, and Irina Shklovski (Eds.). ACM, 984:1–984:12. https://doi.org/10.1145/3613904.3642260
- [39] Gervasio A. Lamas, Chris L. Pashos, Sharon-Lise T. Normand, and Barbara McNeil. 1995. Permanent Pacemaker Selection and Subsequent Survival in Elderly Medicare Pacemaker Recipients. *Circulation* 91, 4 (1995), 1063–1069. https://doi.org/10.1161/01.CIR.91.4.1063 arXiv:https://www.ahajournals.org/doi/pdf/10.1161/01.CIR.91.4.1063
- [40] J. Richard Landis and Gary G. Koch. 1977. The Measurement of Observer Agreement for Categorical Data. *Biometrics* 33, 1 (1977), 159–174. http: //www.jstor.org/stable/2529310
- [41] Markus Langer, Daniel Oster, Timo Speith, Holger Hermanns, Lena Kästner, Eva Schmidt, Andreas Sesing, and Kevin Baum. 2021. What Do We Want From Explainable Artificial Intelligence (XAI)? – A Stakeholder Perspective on XAI and a Conceptual Model Guiding Interdisciplinary XAI Research. Articifial Intelligence 296, Article 103473 (2021), 24 pages. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.artint.2021.103473
- [42] Jens Lienig and Juergen Scheible. 2020. Fundamentals of layout design for electronic circuits. Springer.
- [43] Pei-Chun Lin and Yi-Hsuan Huang. 2012. The influence factors on choice behavior regarding green products based on the theory of consumption values. *Journal of Cleaner Production* 22, 1 (2012), 11–18. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2011.10. 002
- [44] Richard Lin, Rohit Ramesh, Parth Nitin Pandhare, Kai Jun Tay, Prabal Dutta, Bjoern Hartmann, and Ankur Mehta. 2024. Design Space Exploration for Board-level Circuits: Exploring Alternatives in Component-based Design. In Proceedings of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, CHI 2024, Honolulu, HI, USA, May 11-16, 2024, Florian 'Floyd' Mueller, Penny Kyburz, Julie R. Williamson, Corina Sas, Max L. Wilson, Phoebe O. Toups Dugas, and Irina Shklovski (Eds.). ACM, 338:1–338:14. https://doi.org/10.1145/3613904.3642009
- [45] Moritz Lipp, Michael Schwarz, Daniel Gruss, Thomas Prescher, Werner Haas, Anders Fogh, Jann Horn, Stefan Mangard, Paul Kocher, Daniel Genkin, Yuval Yarom, and Mike Hamburg. 2018. Meltdown: Reading Kernel Memory from User Space. In Proceedings of the 27th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 2018), William Enck and Adrienne Porter Felt (Eds.). USENIX Association, Berkeley, CA, USA, 973–990. https://www.usenix.org/conference/usenixsecurity18/ presentation/lipp
- [46] Jiadi Luo, Veronika Domova, and Lawrence H. Kim. 2024. Impact of Multi-Robot Presence and Anthropomorphism on Human Cognition and Emotion. In Proceedings of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, CHI 2024, Honolulu, HI, USA, May 11-16, 2024, Florian 'Floyd' Mueller, Penny Kyburz,

Julie R. Williamson, Corina Sas, Max L. Wilson, Phoebe O. Toups Dugas, and Irina Shklovski (Eds.). ACM, 594:1–594:15. https://doi.org/10.1145/3613904.3642795

- [47] Vincenzo Mangini, Irina Tal, and Arghir-Nicolae Moldovan. 2020. An empirical study on the impact of GDPR and right to be forgotten - organisations and users perspective. In ARES 2020: The 15th International Conference on Availability, Reliability and Security, Virtual Event, Ireland, August 25-28, 2020, Melanie Volkamer and Christian Wressnegger (Eds.). ACM, 37:1-37:9. https://doi.org/10.1145/3407023.3407080
- [48] Sara Mann, Barnaby Crook, Lena Kästner, Astrid Schomäcker, and Timo Speith.
 2023. Sources of Opacity in Computer Systems: Towards a Comprehensive Taxonomy. In 31st IEEE International Requirements Engineering Conference, RE 2023
 Workshops, Hannover, Germany, September 4-5, 2023, Kurt Schneider, Fabiano Dalpiaz, and Jennifer Horkoff (Eds.). IEEE, 337–342. https://doi.org/10.1109/ REW57809.2023.00063
- [49] Philipp Mayring. 2014. Qualitative Content Analysis: Theoretical Foundation, Basic Procedures and Software Solution. SSOAR, Klagenfurt, Austria.
- [50] Margaret Mitchell, Simone Wu, Andrew Zaldivar, Parker Barnes, Lucy Vasserman, Ben Hutchinson, Elena Spitzer, Inioluwa Deborah Raji, and Timnit Gebru. 2019. Model Cards for Model Reporting. In Proceedings of the Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency, FAT* 2019, Atlanta, GA, USA, January 29-31, 2019, danah boyd and Jamie H. Morgenstern (Eds.). ACM, 220–229. https: //doi.org/10.1145/3287560.3287596
- [51] Pardis Emami Naeini, Yuvraj Agarwal, Lorrie Faith Cranor, and Hanan Hibshi. 2020. Ask the Experts: What Should Be on an IoT Privacy and Security Label?. In 2020 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy, SP 2020. IEEE, San Francisco, CA, USA, 447–464. https://doi.org/10.1109/SP40000.2020.00043
- [52] Pardis Emami Naeini, Janarth Dheenadhayalan, Yuvraj Agarwal, and Lorrie Faith Cranor. 2022. An Informative Security and Privacy "Nutrition" Label for Internet of Things Devices. *IEEE Secur. Priv.* 20, 2 (2022), 31–39. https://doi.org/10.1109/ MSEC.2021.3132398
- [53] Shinichi Nakagawa and Holger Schielzeth. 2012. A general and simple method for obtaining R2 from generalized linear mixed-effects models. *Methods in Ecology* and Evolution 4, 2 (Dec. 2012), 133–142. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2041-210x.2012. 00261.x
- [54] NVD. 2023. CVE-2023-38606. https://nvd.nist.gov/vuln/detail/CVE-2023-38606 Common Vulnerabilities and Exposures.
- [55] Maggie Oates, Yama Ahmadullah, Abigail Marsh, Chelse Swoopes, Shikun Zhang, Rebecca Balebako, and Lorrie Faith Cranor. 2018. Turtles, Locks, and Bathrooms: Understanding Mental Models of Privacy Through Illustration. Proc. Priv. Enhancing Technol. 2018, 4 (2018), 5–32. https://doi.org/10.1515/POPETS-2018-0029
- [56] Rebecca Passonneau. 2006. Measuring agreement on set-valued items (MASI) for semantic and pragmatic annotation. (2006).
- [57] Katharina Pfeffer, Alexandra Mai, Adrian Dabrowski, Matthias Gusenbauer, Philipp Schindler, Edgar R. Weippl, Michael Franz, and Katharina Krombholz. 2021. On the Usability of Authenticity Checks for Hardware Security Tokens. In 30th USENIX Security Symposium, USENIX Security 2021, August 11-13, 2021, Michael D. Bailey and Rachel Greenstadt (Eds.). USENIX Association, 37–54. https://www.usenix.org/conference/usenixsecurity21/presentation/pfeffer
- [58] Emilee Rader, Samantha Hautea, and Anjali Munasinghe. 2020. "I Have a Narrow Thought Process": Constraints on Explanations Connecting Inferences and Self-Perceptions. In Sixteenth Symposium on Usable Privacy and Security (SOUPS 2020). 457–488.
- [59] Reethika Ramesh, Anjali Vyas, and Roya Ensafi. 2023. "All of them claim to be the best". Multi-perspective study of VPN users and VPN providers. In 32nd USENIX Security Symposium, USENIX Security 2023, Anaheim, CA, USA, August 9-11, 2023, Joseph A. Calandrino and Carmela Troncoso (Eds.). USENIX Association, 5773–5789. https://www.usenix.org/conference/usenixsecurity23/presentation/ ramesh-vpn
- [60] Nathan Reitinger, Bruce Wen, Michelle L. Mazurek, and Blase Ur. 2024. What Does It Mean to Be Creepy? Responses to Visualizations of Personal Browsing Activity, Online Tracking, and Targeted Ads. *Proc. Priv. Enhancing Technol.* 2024, 3 (2024), 715–743. https://doi.org/10.56553/POPETS-2024-0101
- [61] Karen Renaud, Melanie Volkamer, and Arne Renkema-Padmos. 2014. Why Doesn't Jane Protect Her Privacy?. In Privacy Enhancing Technologies - 14th International Symposium, PETS 2014, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, July 16-18, 2014. Proceedings (Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol. 8555), Emiliano De Cristofaro and Steven J. Murdoch (Eds.). Springer, 244–262. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-08506-7_13
- [62] Joshua Reynolds, Trevor Smith, Ken Reese, Luke Dickinson, Scott Ruoti, and Kent E. Seamons. 2018. A Tale of Two Studies: The Best and Worst of YubiKey Usability. In 2018 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy, SP 2018, Proceedings, 21-23 May 2018, San Francisco, California, USA. IEEE Computer Society, 872–888. https://doi.org/10.1109/SP.2018.00067
- [63] Daniel Romer and Kathleen Hall Jamieson. 2020. Conspiracy theories as barriers to controlling the spread of COVID-19 in the U.S. Social Science & Medicine 263 (2020), 113356. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2020.113356
- [64] Leonie Schaewitz, David Lakotta, M. Angela Sasse, and Nikol Rummel. 2021. Peeking Into the Black Box: Towards Understanding User Understanding of

E2EE. In EuroUSEC '21: European Symposium on Usable Security 2021, Karlsruhe, Germany, October 11 - 12, 2021. ACM, 129–140. https://doi.org/10.1145/3481357. 3481521

- [65] Timothée Schmude, Laura Koesten, Torsten Möller, and Sebastian Tschiatschek. 2023. On the Impact of Explanations on Understanding of Algorithmic Decision-Making. In Proceedings of the 2023 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency, FAccT 2023, Chicago, IL, USA, June 12-15, 2023. ACM, 959–970. https://doi.org/10.1145/3593013.3594054
- [66] Juliane Schmüser, Harshini Sri Ramulu, Noah Wöhler, Christian Stransky, Felix Bensmann, Dimitar Dimitrov, Sebastian Schellhammer, Dominik Wermke, Stefan Dietze, Yasemin Acar, and Sascha Fahl. 2024. Analyzing Security and Privacy Advice During the 2022 Russian Invasion of Ukraine on Twitter. In Proceedings of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, CHI 2024, Honolulu, HI, USA, May 11-16, 2024, Florian 'Floyd' Mueller, Penny Kyburz, Julie R. Williamson, Corina Sas, Max L. Wilson, Phoebe O. Toups Dugas, and Irina Shklovski (Eds.). ACM, 574:1–574:16. https://doi.org/10.1145/3613904.3642826
- [67] Eike Schneiders, Steve Benford, Alan Chamberlain, Clara Mancini, Simon Castle-Green, Victor Zhi Heung Ngo, Ju Row-Farr, Matt Adams, Nick Tandavanitj, and Joel E. Fischer. 2024. Designing Multispecies Worlds for Robots, Cats, and Humans. In Proceedings of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, CHI 2024, Honolulu, HI, USA, May 11-16, 2024, Florian 'Floyd' Mueller, Penny Kyburz, Julie R. Williamson, Corina Sas, Max L. Wilson, Phoebe O. Toups Dugas, and Irina Shklovski (Eds.). ACM, 593:1–593:16. https://doi.org/10.1145/3613904.3642115
- [68] Senate of the United States. 2022. CHIPS and Science Act 2022 (P.L. 117-167). https://science.house.gov/chipsandscienceact
- [69] Stephen Shankland. 2022. M1 Ultra: Apple Just Unveiled Its Most Powerful Mac Chip Yet. CNET. https://www.cnet.com/tech/computing/m1-ultra-apple-justunveiled-its-most-powerful-chip-yet/
- [70] Hong Shen, Haojian Jin, Ángel Alexander Cabrera, Adam Perer, Haiyi Zhu, and Jason I. Hong. 2020. Designing Alternative Representations of Confusion Matrices to Support Non-Expert Public Understanding of Algorithm Performance. Proc. ACM Hum. Comput. Interact. 4, CSCW2 (2020), 153:1–153:22. https://doi.org/10. 1145/3415224
- [71] Timo Speith. 2022. A Review of Taxonomies of Explainable Artificial Intelligence (XAI) Methods. In FAccT '22: 2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency, Seoul, Republic of Korea, June 21 - 24, 2022. ACM, 2239–2250. https://doi.org/10.1145/3531146.3534639
- [72] Timo Speith. 2023. Building bridges for better machines: from machine ethics to machine explainability and back. Ph. D. Dissertation. Saarland University.
- [73] Timo Speith, Julian Speith, Steffen Becker, Yixin Zou, Asia Biega, and Christof Paar. 2024. Explainability as a Requirement for Hardware: Introducing Explainable Hardware (XHW). In 32nd IEEE International Requirements Engineering Conference, RE 2024, Reykjavik, Iceland, June 24-28, 2024, Grischa Liebel, Irit Hadar, and Paola Spoletini (Eds.). IEEE, 354–362. https://doi.org/10.1109/RE59067.2024.00042
- [74] Nancy Staggers and Anthony F. Norcio. 1993. Mental Models: Concepts for Human-Computer Interaction Research. Int. J. Man Mach. Stud. 38, 4 (1993), 587–605. https://doi.org/10.1006/IMMS.1993.1028
- [75] Christian Stransky, Dominik Wermke, Johanna Schrader, Nicolas Huaman, Yasemin Acar, Anna Lena Fehlhaber, Miranda Wei, Blase Ur, and Sascha Fahl. 2021. On the Limited Impact of Visualizing Encryption: Perceptions of E2E Messaging Security. In Seventeenth Symposium on Usable Privacy and Security, SOUPS 2021, August 8-10, 2021, Sonia Chiasson (Ed.). USENIX Association, 437–454. https://www.usenix.org/conference/soups2021/presentation/stransky
- [76] Evan Strasnick, Maneesh Agrawala, and Sean Follmer. 2021. Coupling Simulation and Hardware for Interactive Circuit Debugging. In CHI '21: CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, Virtual Event / Yokohama, Japan, May 8-13, 2021, Yoshifumi Kitamura, Aaron Quigley, Katherine Isbister, Takeo Igarashi, Pernille Bjørn, and Steven Mark Drucker (Eds.). ACM, 667:1–667:15. https: //doi.org/10.1145/3411764.3445422
- [77] Joanna Strycharz, Jef Ausloos, and Natali Helberger. 2020. Data protection or data frustration? Individual perceptions and attitudes towards the GDPR. *Eur. Data Prot. L. Rev.* 6 (2020), 407.
- [78] Tram Thi Minh Tran, Callum Parker, Marius Hoggenmüller, Yiyuan Wang, and Martin Tomitsch. 2024. Exploring the Impact of Interconnected External Interfaces in Autonomous Vehicles on Pedestrian Safety and Experience. In Proceedings of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, CHI 2024, Honolulu, HI, USA, May 11-16, 2024, Florian 'Floyd' Mueller, Penny Kyburz, Julie R. Williamson, Corina Sas, Max L. Wilson, Phoebe O. Toups Dugas, and Irina Shklovski (Eds.). ACM, 89:1–89:17. https://doi.org/10.1145/3613904.3642118
- [79] I. Ullah, K.S. Khan, M.J. Tahir, A. Ahmed, and H. Harapan. 2021. Myths and conspiracy theories on vaccines and COVID-19: Potential effect on global vaccine refusals. *Vacunas* 22, 2 (2021), 93–97. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vacun.2021.01.001
- [80] Aurélie Villard, Alan Lelah, and Daniel Brissaud. 2015. Drawing a chip environmental profile: environmental indicators for the semiconductor industry. *Journal* of Cleaner Production 86 (2015), 98–109. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2014.08. 061

- [81] Warren J Von Eschenbach. 2021. Transparency and the black box problem: Why we do not trust AI. Philosophy & Technology 34, 4 (2021), 1607–1622.
- [82] René Walendy, Markus Weber, Jingjie Li, Steffen Becker, Carina Wiesen, Malte Elson, Younghyun Kim, Kassem Fawaz, Nikol Rummel, and Christof Paar. 2024. I see an IC: A Mixed-Methods Approach to Study Human Problem-Solving Processes in Hardware Reverse Engineering. In Proceedings of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, CHI 2024, Honolulu, HI, USA, May 11-16, 2024, Florian 'Floyd' Mueller, Penny Kyburz, Julie R. Williamson, Corina Sas, Max L. Wilson, Phoebe O. Toups Dugas, and Irina Shklovski (Eds.). ACM, 831:1–831:20. https://doi.org/10.1145/3613904.3642837
- [83] Xinru Wang and Ming Yin. 2021. Are Explanations Helpful? A Comparative Study of the Effects of Explanations in AI-Assisted Decision-Making. In *IUI* '21: 26th International Conference on Intelligent User Interfaces, College Station, *TX, USA, April 13-17, 2021*, Tracy Hammond, Katrien Verbert, Dennis Parra, Bart P. Knijnenburg, John O'Donovan, and Paul Teale (Eds.). ACM, 318–328. https://doi.org/10.1145/3397481.3450650
- [84] Rick Wash. 2010. Folk models of home computer security. In Proceedings of the Sixth Symposium on Usable Privacy and Security. 1–16.
- [85] Graham Webster. 2019. It's not just Huawei. Trump's new tech sector order could ripple through global supply chains. The Washington Post. https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2019/05/18/its-not-just-huaweitrumps-new-tech-sector-order-could-ripple-through-global-supply-chains/
- [86] Neil HE Weste and David Harris. 2015. CMOS VLSI design: a circuits and systems perspective. Pearson Education India.
- [87] Carina Wiesen, Steffen Becker, René Walendy, Christof Paar, and Nikol Rummel. 2023. The Anatomy of Hardware Reverse Engineering: An Exploration of Human Factors During Problem Solving. ACM Trans. Comput. Hum. Interact. 30, 4 (2023), 62:1–62:44. https://doi.org/10.1145/3577198
- [88] Eric D Williams. 2004. Environmental impacts of microchip manufacture. Thin Solid Films 461, 1 (2004), 2–6. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tsf.2004.02.049 Proceedings of Symposium on Semiconducting Silicides: Science and Future Technology of the 8th IUMRS International Conference on Advanced Materials.
- [89] Maximiliane Windl, Verena Winterhalter, Albrecht Schmidt, and Sven Mayer. 2023. Understanding and Mitigating Technology-Facilitated Privacy Violations in the Physical World. In Proceedings of the 2023 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, CHI 2023, Hamburg, Germany, April 23-28, 2023, Albrecht Schmidt, Kaisa Väänänen, Tesh Goyal, Per Ola Kristensson, Anicia Peters, Stefanie Mueller, Julie R. Williamson, and Max L. Wilson (Eds.). ACM, 585:1–585:16. https://doi.org/10.1145/3544548.3580909
- [90] Justin Wu and Daniel Zappala. 2018. When is a Tree Really a Truck? Exploring Mental Models of Encryption. In Fourteenth Symposium on Usable Privacy and Security, SOUPS 2018, Baltimore, MD, USA, August 12-14, 2018, Mary Ellen Zurko and Heather Richter Lipford (Eds.). USENIX Association, 395–409. https://www. usenix.org/conference/soups2018/presentation/wu
- [91] Zeyu Yan, Jiasheng Li, Zining Zhang, and Huaishu Peng. 2024. SolderlessPCB: Reusing Electronic Components in PCB Prototyping through Detachable 3D Printed Housings. In Proceedings of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, CHI 2024, Honolulu, HI, USA, May 11-16, 2024, Florian 'Floyd' Mueller, Penny Kyburz, Julie R. Williamson, Corina Sas, Max L. Wilson, Phoebe O. Toups Dugas, and Irina Sklovski (Eds.). ACM, 345:1–345:17. https://doi.org/ 10.1145/3613904.3642765
- [92] Yaxing Yao, Davide Lo Re, and Yang Wang. 2017. Folk Models of Online Behavioral Advertising. In Proceedings of the 2017 ACM Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work and Social Computing, CSCW 2017, Portland, OR, USA, February 25 - March 1, 2017, Charlotte P. Lee, Steven E. Poltrock, Louise Barkhuus, Marcos Borges, and Wendy A. Kellogg (Eds.). ACM, 1957–1969. https://doi.org/10.1145/ 2998181.2998316
- [93] Yaman Yu, Tanusree Sharma, Sauvik Das, and Yang Wang. 2024. "Don't put all your eggs in one basket": How Cryptocurrency Users Choose and Secure Their Wallets. In Proceedings of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, CHI 2024, Honolulu, HI, USA, May 11-16, 2024, Florian 'Floyd' Mueller, Penny Kyburz, Julie R. Williamson, Corina Sas, Max L. Wilson, Phoebe O. Toups Dugas, and Irina Shklovski (Eds.). ACM, 353:1–353:17. https://doi.org/10.1145/ 3613904.3642534
- [94] Shikun Zhang, Lily Klucinec, Kyerra Norton, Norman Sadeh, and Lorrie Faith Cranor. 2024. Exploring Expandable-Grid Designs to Make iOS App Privacy Labels More Usable. In Twentieth Symposium on Usable Privacy and Security, SOUPS 2024, Philadelphia, PA, USA, August 11-13, 2024, Patrick Gage Kelley and Apu Kapadia (Eds.). USENIX Association, 139–157. https://www.usenix.org/ conference/soups2024/presentation/zhang

A SURVEY MATERIAL

A.1 Your Perspective on Microchips

(1) Thank you for your interest in our study!

Purpose: Increasing digitalization in all areas of life is being driven by the constantly rising performance and efficiency of microchips. With this survey, we would like to learn more about the desired goals of end users regarding their understanding of microchips, and how these goals may be achieved. By faithfully completing this survey, you can help make microchips more understandable to end users in the future.

Duration: Participation in the study is expected to take a maximum of 25 minutes. You are not subject to any anticipated risks by participating. Please answer the survey as honestly as possible. You may stop at any time if you no longer wish to participate in the study. In case you drop out of the study, all responses recorded so far will be discarded. Data Privacy Statement & Informed Consent: Your responses to this study are stored in anonymized form in a way which will not reveal your identity. No data will be passed on to third parties. By starting this questionnaire you consent to data collection for the purposes of conducting this study. Your personal data is processed based on Article 6 (1) a GDPR and [redacted for review]. You have the right to revoke your consent to the data processing at any time as well as to request information, correction, processing restrictions and deletion of the data stored about you. To exercise these rights, please contact the email address listed below. The responsible supervisory authority is the [redacted]. If you have additional questions about data protection, please contact [redacted].

To participate, you must be 18 years of age or older and a resident of the United States.

- (1.1) I am 18 years of age or older. \circ Yes $~\circ$ No
- (1.2) I am a resident of the United States. \circ Yes $~\circ$ No
- (1.3) I confirm that I accept the participation conditions for this study. \circ Yes $~\circ$ No
- (1.4) I do not agree and don't want to participate. \circ Yes \circ No

A.2 Your Interaction with Technical Systems

(2) In the following questionnaire, we will ask you about your interaction with technical systems. The term 'technical systems' refers to apps and other software applications, as well as entire digital devices (e.g. mobile phone, computer, TV, car navigation).

Please indicate the **degree** to which you **agree/disagree** with the following statements.

- (2.1) I like to occupy myself in greater detail with technical systems. \circ completely disagree \circ largely disagree \circ slightly disagree \circ slightly agree \circ largely agree \circ completely agree
- (2.2) I like testing the functions of new technical systems.

 completely disagree
 o largely disagree
 o slightly agree
 o largely agree
 o completely agree
- (2.3) I predominantly deal with technical systems because I have to. \circ completely disagree \circ largely disagree \circ slightly disagree \circ slightly agree \circ largely agree \circ completely agree

- (2.4) When I have a new technical system in front of me, I try it out intensively.

 completely disagree
 largely disagree
 largely agree
 completely agree
 completely agree
- (2.5) I enjoy spending time becoming acquainted with a new technical system. completely disagree largely disagree
 slightly disagree slightly agree largely agree
 completely agree
- (2.6) It is enough for me that a technical system works; I don't care how or why. completely disagree largely disagree
 slightly disagree slightly agree largely agree
 completely agree
- (2.7) I try to understand how a technical system exactly works.
 o completely disagree o largely disagree o slightly disagree o slightly agree o largely agree o completely agree
- (2.8) It is enough for me to know the basic functions of a technical system.

 completely disagree
 largely disagree
 slightly disagree
 largely agree
 completely agree
- (2.9) I try to make full use of the capabilities of a technical system. \circ completely disagree \circ largely disagree \circ slightly disagree \circ slightly agree \circ largely agree \circ completely agree

A.3 Microchip Understanding

- (3) What comes to your mind when you think of microchips, also known as "computer chips" and "integrated circuits"? Please take a minute to think about the question and write down everything that comes to your mind. [free text]
- (4) Would you personally like to understand more about microchips? Yes, because ... [free text] No, because ... [free text]
- (5) How much time would you be willing to invest per newly acquired device to better understand the microchips it contains? less than 1 hour 1 to less than 2 hours 2 to less than 3 hours 3 to less than 4 hours 4 or more hours
- (6) How much time do you currently invest per newly acquired device to better understand the microchips it contains? less than 1 hour 1 to less than 2 hours 2 to less than 3 hours 3 to less than 4 hours 4 or more hours

A.4 A Brief Background on Microchips

(7) Microchips are tiny objects that store and operate on information in the form of digital data. They are a crucial part of many electronic devices we use every day, like phones, cars, planes, medical implants, and industrial systems. Microchips play a major role in the development of digital technology and make advanced applications like artificial intelligence possible. These chips are highly complex, they are composed of extremely small structures, and are made in various facilities around the world.

A.5 Criticality of Use Cases

- (8) On a scale from from 1-not at all critical to 5-extremely critical, how critical do you personally consider the following microchip use cases. Think about the impact a malfunctioning or failing microchip has on you in each particular use case.
- (8.1) You are a passenger in an airplane that contains microchips to control its steering.

 1-not at all critical
 2-slightly critical
 3-moderately critical
 4-very critical
- (8.2) You are driving in a car that contains microchips to control its entertainment system. 1—not at all critical 2—slightly critical 3—moderately critical 4—very critical 5—extremely critical
- (8.3) You use a smartphone that contains microchips enabling fingerprint unlocking. ○ 1—not at all critical ○ 2—slightly critical ○ 3—moderately critical ○ 4—very critical ○ 5—extremely critical
- (8.4) You are making a call through a cell tower that relies on microchips for wireless communication. ○ 1—not at all critical ○ 2—slightly critical ○ 3—moderately critical ○ 4—very critical ○ 5—extremely critical
- (8.5) You have a pacemaker implanted that contains microchips to maintain an adequate heart rate. o 1—not at all critical o 2—slightly critical o 3—moderately critical o 4—very critical o 5—extremely critical

A.6 Vignettes

(9) Next, we will show you five different scenarios of devices containing microchips and ask you to answer a few questions for each scenario.

Please read the descriptions of each scenario carefully and answer the questions thoughtfully.

(10) Scenario x/5

Please imagine **yourself** being in the following situation: You are a passenger in an **airplane** that contains microchips to **control its steering**.

Think about the **safety implications** of these microchips. Safety means keeping yourself and the system safe from physical harm.

(i) By hovering over a word marked in red, you can get more information on the respective term.

(10.1) On a scale from 1-not at all important to 5-extremely important, how important is it to you personally to have a high level of safety for microchips controlling the steering of an airplane?

(i) When rating the importance of safety in this scenario, you could think about the following questions: Is it relevant to you? Would you care about it? \circ 1—not at all important \circ 2—slightly important \circ 3—moderately important \circ 4—very important \circ 5—extremely important

- (10.2) Please briefly explain why you rated the importance of safety to you in this scenario as you did. [free text]
- (10.3) On a scale from 1-not at all important to 5-extremely important, how important is it to you personally to receive the following information for assessing the safety

of microchips controlling the steering of an airplane?

(i) When rating the importance of information, you could think about the following questions: Could such information provide any benefit to you? Would they be helpful for you to evaluate the safety?

- (10.3.1) Information about who designed and manufactured the microchips. ○ 1-not at all important ○ 2-slightly important ○ 3-moderately important ○ 4-very important ○ 5-extremely important
- (10.3.2) Information about how the microchips interact with the system. ○ 1-not at all important ○ 2-slightly important ○ 3-moderately important ○ 4-very important ○ 5-extremely important
- (10.3.3) Information about how the microchips have been approved for use. 1-not at all important 2-slightly important 3-moderately important 4-very important 5-extremely important
- (10.3.4) Information about which functionality the microchips provide. ○ 1-not at all important ○ 2-slightly important ○ 3-moderately important ○ 4-very important ○ 5-extremely important
- (10.3.5) Information about how the microchips were designed and manufactured. ○ 1-not at all important ○ 2slightly important ○ 3-moderately important ○ 4very important ○ 5-extremely important
- (10.4) Please briefly explain why you rated the importance of receiving "information about who designed and manufactured the microchips" to you in this scenario as "4-very important".

(i) By hovering over a word marked in red, you can get more information on the respective term. [free text]

A.7 Microchip Properties

- (11) Please assign each description on the left to one of the properties on the right. There is one matching description for each property. If you don't know the assignment, please make a guess. Properties:

 safety
 ethical standards
 cyber security
 trustworthiness;
 descriptions:
 Ensures that microchips do not cause harm to you or the system.
 Enables figuring out who is responsible in case something goes wrong.
 Defines practices for responsible treatment of employees and the environment.
 Makes sure that sensitive information is kept safe from people who are not allowed to see it or change it.
 Guarantees that a microchip works properly and can also demonstrate this fact.
- (12) Now that you have answered the previous questions, how much time would you be willing to invest per newly acquired device to better understand the microchips it contains? less than 1 hour 1 to less than 2 hours 2 to less than 3 hours 3 to less than 4 hours 4 or more hours

A.8 Demographics

- (13) What is your gender? ∘ Male ∘ Female ∘ Non-binary
 ∘ Describe yourself: [free text] ∘ I prefer not to answer this question
- (14) What is your **age**? \circ 18-24 \circ 25-34 \circ 35-44 \circ 45-54 \circ 55-64 \circ 65 or older \circ I prefer not to answer this question
- (15) What is your highest level of education? ∘ High school or equivalent ∘ Some college, no degree ∘ Associate's degree, occupational ∘ Associate's degree, academic ∘ Bachelor's degree ∘ Master's degree ∘ Professional degree ∘ Doctoral degree ∘ I prefer not to answer this question
- (16) Do you have practical experience with microchips, e. g., from chip design, manufacturing, testing, deployment, or policies in the semiconductor domain? ∘ Yes ∘ No ∘ I prefer not to answer this question

A.9 Feedback

- (17) Is there anything you would like to tell us about this survey? Please give us your feedback. [free text]
- (18) We thank you for your time spent taking this survey. Your response has been recorded.Please click the button below to be redirected to Prolific and register your submission.

B DEMOGRAPHICS

Table 2: Demographics of our 250 participants consisting of gender, age, highest level of education, prior practical experience with microchips, and affinity for technology interaction [24].

Demographics (<i>n</i> =250)							
Gender	n	%	Education	n	%		
Male	121	48.4	High school or equivalent	35	14.0		
Female	121	48.4	Some college, no degree	54	21.6		
Non-binary	8	3.2	Associate's degree, occupational	8	3.2		
Describe yourself	0	0.0	Associate's degree, academic	16	6.4		
No answer	0	0.0	Bachelor's degree	98	39.2		
Age	n	%	Master's degree	31	12.4		
18-24	50	20.0	Professional degree	2	0.8		
25-34	89	35.6	Doctoral degree	4	1.6		
35-44	57	22.8	No answer	2	0.8		
45-54	32	12.8	Prior Experience	n	%		
55-64	15	6.0	Yes	13	5.2		
65 or older	7	2.8	No	231	92.4		
No answer	0	0.0	No answer	6	2.4		
ATI	mean	4.05		sd	0.91		

C CODEBOOKS FOR Q3 AND Q4

Table 3: Codebook with absolute and relative code frequencies for 250 responses to Q3 ("What comes to your mind when you think of microchips, also known as "computer chips" and "integrated circuits"?").

code	free	quency	code	frequency	
coue	abs.	rel.	coue	abs.	rel.
computer	104	0.42	circuit	10	0.04
small size	84	0.34	manufacturing challenges	10	0.04
building block that makes things work	83	0.33	foreign manufacturing	9	0.04
used across devices	71	0.28	gaming	9	0.04
technology	54	0.22	political aspects	8	0.03
electronics	50	0.20	AI	8	0.03
phone	47	0.19	circuit board	8	0.03
technological advancement	47	0.19	GPU	8	0.03
data storage	35	0.14	high complexity	8	0.03
microchip composition	35	0.14	tablet	8	0.03
human implant	29	0.12	fear	7	0.03
CPU	28	0.11	health	7	0.03
other named devices	28	0.11	soldering	7	0.03
animal implant	27	0.11	vaccines	6	0.02
data processing	25	0.10	no idea	5	0.02
brain similarity	24	0.10	privacy	5	0.02
processing power	22	0.09	binary values	4	0.02
vehicle	22	0.09	pop culture reference	4	0.02
tracking	18	0.07	security	4	0.02
supply chain issues	18	0.07	authentication	3	0.01
motherboard	17	0.07	economical dependence	3	0.01
diverse functionality	15	0.06	Elon Musk	3	0.01
memory	13	0.05	ethical concerns	3	0.01
companies	12	0.05	flat	3	0.01
computer parts	12	0.05	profitable	3	0.01
control	12	0.05	stock market	3	0.01
communication	11	0.04	internet	2	0.01
conspiracy	11	0.04	toys	2	0.01
societal impact	11	0.04			

Table 4: Codebook with absolute and relative code frequencies for 250 responses to Q4 ("Would you personally like to understand more about microchips? Yes/No, because ...").

code	freq	quency		free	frequency		
	abs. rel.		code	abs.	rel.		
gain knowledge	96	0.38	application areas	12	0.05		
understand functionality	46	0.18	impact on society	10	0.04		
omnipresent in daily life	32	0.13	understand manufacturing	10	0.04		
no interest	28	0.11	professional needs	9	0.04		
incomplete knowledge	24	0.10	satisfied	9	0.04		
scientific progress	24	0.10	fear	8	0.03		
keep up with progress	20	0.08	informed decision making	7	0.03		
operation before knowledge	18	0.07	risk assessment	7	0.03		
no need	16	0.06	diagnose issues	6	0.02		
using technology	16	0.06	improve productivity	4	0.02		
too complicated	15	0.06	improve quality of life	4	0.02		
importance for future	14	0.06	explain to others	2	0.01		

D DETAILED RESULTS OF MULTILEVEL REGRESSION ANALYSIS

Table 5: Multilevel regression analysis, including interactions, based on participants' ratings of the importance of receiving different types of information to evaluate desideratum in a given setting, on a scale from 1–not at all important to 5–extremely important (see Q10.3 for an example question presented to participants).

Predictors	which func- tionality Est.	how interacts Est.	how approved Est.	how manu- factured Est.	who manu factured Est.
intercept: car (setting) \times ethical standards (desideratum)	2.87***	2.43***	2.82***	2.71***	2.66***
	2.07	2.43	2.02	2.71	2.00
interactions (baseline=car \times ethical standards)					
car imes accountability	-0.16	-0.01	-0.21	-0.37	0.00
car imes safety	-0.25	0.09	-0.10	-0.33	-0.08
car imes trustworthiness	-0.03	0.04	-0.56*	-0.65**	-0.53*
car imes cyber security	0.12	0.65**	0.36	-0.03	0.11
smartphone $ imes$ ethical standards	0.02	0.25	0.37	0.29	0.60*
smartphone \times accountability	0.22	0.07	0.06	0.17	-0.06
smartphone \times safety	0.18	0.05	-0.04	-0.07	-0.53
smartphone \times trustworthiness	0.44	0.13	0.39	0.08	-0.05
smartphone $ imes$ security	0.32	-0.07	-0.48	-0.40	-0.52
cell tower $ imes$ ethical standards	-0.11	0.31	0.28	0.39	0.63*
cell tower \times accountability	0.24	-0.01	-0.39	-0.62	-0.93*
cell tower $ imes$ safety	0.47	-0.10	0.27	-0.18	-0.64
cell tower $ imes$ trustworthiness	0.28	-0.02	0.28	0.12	-0.16
cell tower \times security	0.33	-0.35	0.15	-0.19	-0.21
pacemaker $ imes$ ethical standards	-0.11	0.31	0.28	0.39	0.63*
pacemaker \times accountability	0.42	0.67	0.60	0.19	0.25
pacemaker × safety	0.88*	0.49	0.41	0.53	0.16
pacemaker \times trustworthiness	0.60	0.67	1.23**	1.23**	1.12**
pacemaker \times security	0.47	-0.04	0.10	0.18	0.14
airplane \times ethical standards	0.20	0.53*	0.48	0.81**	0.78**
airplane \times accountability	0.59	0.67	0.61	0.19	0.25
airplane × safety	0.43	0.01	0.52	-0.38	-0.34
airplane \times trustworthiness	0.46	0.31	0.99**	0.34	0.30
airplane \times security	0.31	-0.07	-0.22	-0.61	-0.48
desire to understand more about microchips	0.54***	0.63***	0.40*	0.49**	0.41*
ATI score	0.26***	0.27***	0.26**	0.28***	0.26**
marginal R ²	0.177	0.198	0.180	0.189	0.155
conditional R ²	0.465	0.478	0.522	0.571	0.536

* p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001