UC Irvine
UC Irvine Previously Published Works

Title

Lights, Camera, Action! Exploring Effects of Visual Distractions on Completion of Security Tasks

Permalink

https://escholarship.org/uc/item/9kk519cz

Authors

Berg, Bruce
Kaczmarek, Tyler
Kobsa, Alfred
<u>et al.</u>

Publication Date

2017-05-31

Copyright Information

Peer reviewed

Lights, Camera, Action!
Exploring Effects of Visual Distractions on
Completion of Security Tasks

Bruce Berg, Tyler Kaczmarek, Alfred Kobsa, and Gene Tsudik

University of California Irvine, Irvine, CA, USA
bgberg@uci.edu
tkaczmar@uci.edu
kobsa@uci.edi
gts@ics.uci.edu

Abstract. Human errors in performing security-critical tasks are typically blamed on the complexity of those tasks. However, such errors can also occur because of (possibly unexpected) sensory distractions. A sensory distraction that produces negative effects can be abused by the adversary that controls the environment. Meanwhile, a distraction with positive effects can be artificially introduced to improve user performance.

The goal of this work is to explore the effects of visual stimuli on the performance of security-critical tasks. To this end, we experimented with a large number of subjects who were exposed to a range of unexpected visual stimuli while attempting to perform Bluetooth Pairing. Our results clearly demonstrate substantially increased task completion times and markedly lower task success rates. These negative effects are noteworthy, especially, when contrasted with prior results on audio distractions which had positive effects on performance of similar tasks. Experiments were conducted in a novel (fully automated and completely unattended) experimental environment. This yielded more uniform experiments, better scalability and significantly lower financial and logistical burdens. We discuss this experience, including benefits and limitations of the unattended automated experiment paradigm.

1 Introduction

It is widely believed that the human user is the weakest link in the security chain. Nonetheless, human participation is unavoidable in many security protocols. Such protocols require extensive usability testing, since users are unlikely to perform well when faced with overly difficult or intricate tasks. Typically, security-related usability testing entails evaluating human performance in a "best-case" scenario. In other words, testing is usually conducted in sterile lab-like environments.

At the same time, security protocols involving human users have become more commonplace. Examples include activities, such as: (1) using a personal device for verification of transaction amounts, (2) entering a PIN or a password and (3) solving a CAPTCHA, (4) comparing PINs when pairing Bluetooth devices, and (5) answering personal security questions.

Since overall security of these tasks is determined by the human user (as the weakest link), extensive usability studies have been conducted. They aimed to assess users' ability to perform security tasks correctly and without undue delays, while providing an acceptable level of security [11] [5] [17] [9].

However, the focus on maximizing successful protocol completion led developers to evaluate usability under contrived and unrealistic settings. In practice, security tasks can take place in noisy environments. In real-world settings, users are often exposed to various sensory stimuli. The impact of such stimuli on performance and completion of security tasks has not been well studied. A particular stimulus (e.g., a fire alarm or flickering lights) can be unintentional or hostile, i.e., introduced by the adversary that controls the physical environment. Furthermore, recent emergence of Internet of Things (IoT) devices (such as smart speakers and light fixtures) in home and office settings creates environments where compromised (malware-infected) devices can expose users to a variety of visual and audio stimuli.

There has been just one prior study that studied the effects of stimuli on the completion of security-critical tasks. It showed that introduction of unexpected audio stimuli during Bluetooth pairing actually improved subject performance [8]. This initial result, though interesting, motivates a more thorough study in order to fully understand the effects of a range of unexpected (and potentially malicious) stimuli.

Since modern user-aided security protocols focus on maximizing successful outcomes in an ideal environment, human errors are quite rare. For example, Uzun et al. [22] assume that :

> "...[A]ny non-zero fatal error rate in the sample size of 40 is unacceptable for security applications."

Consequently, numerous trials with many subjects are needed to gather data sufficient for making claims about human error rates. The scale is further exacerbated by the need to test multiple modalities, each with a distinct set of subjects. (This is because a given subject is less likely to make a similar mistake twice, even under different conditions.) Therefore, the number of required participants can quickly grow into hundreds, which presents a logistical challenge. To ease the burden of conducting a large-scale study, we designed and employed an entirely unattended and automated experimental setup, wherein subjects receive recorded instructions from a life-sized projection of a video-recorded experimenter ("avatar"), instead of a live experimenter.

We extensively experimented with subjects attempting to pair two Bluetooth devices (one of which was the subject's own device) in the presence of various unexpected visual stimuli. We tested a total of 169 subjects in the fully unattended experiment setting.[1] We initially hypothesized that visual stimuli would have beneficial or facilitatory effects on subject task completion, as was recently experienced with its audio counterpart [8]. Surprisingly, we discovered a marked slowdown in task completion times across the board, and lower task success rates under certain stimuli.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: The next section overviews related work and background material. Then, we present the design and setup of our experi-

---

[1] All experiments described in this paper were fully authorized by the Institutional Review Board (IRB).

ments, followed by the presentation of our experimental results. Next, we derive conclusions and summarize lessons learned. The paper concludes with the discussion of limitations of our approach and directions for future work. Appendix 1 presents and analyzes performance of subjects arriving in groups. Appendix 2 contains the description of color spaces used to generate our stimuli. Details on the unattended experiment setup are in Appendix 3.

2 Background & Related Work

This section overviews related work in automated experiments, and human-assisted security methods.We also provide background information in psychology, particularly effects of sensory arousal on task performance, as well as effects of visual stimuli on arousal level and emotive state.

2.1 Automated Experiments

Other than recent results describing effects of audio distractions [8], we are unaware of any prior usability studies utilizing a fully automated and unattended physical environment.

However, some prior work reinforces validity of virtually-attended remote experiments and unattended online surveys, in contrast with same efforts in a traditional lab-based setting. Ollesch et al. [18] collected psychometric data in: (1) a physically attended experimental lab setting and (2) its virtually attended remote counterpart. No significant differences were found. This is further reinforced by Riva et al. [21] who compared data collected from (1) unattended online, and (2) attended offline, questionnaires. Finally, Lazem and Gracanin [14] replicated two classical social psychology experiments where both the participants and the experimenter were represented by avatars in Second Life[2], instead of being physically co-present. Here too, no significant differences were observed.

2.2 User Studies of Secure Device Pairing

Secure device pairing (mostly, but not only, via Bluetooth) has been extensively researched by experts in both security and usability. While initially pairing, the two devices have no prior knowledge of one another, i.e., there is no prior security context. Also, they can not rely on either a Trusted Third Party (TTP) or a Public Key Infrastructure (PKI) to facilitate the protocol. This makes device pairing especially vulnerable to man-in-the-middle (MiTM) attacks. This prompted the design of numerous protocols requiring human involvement (integrity verification) over some out-of-band (OOB) channel, e.g., visual or audio comparison or copying/entering numbers.

For example, Short Authenticated String (SAS) protocols ask the user to compare two strings of about 20 bits each [13].

Uzun et al. [22] performed the first usability study of Bluetooth pairing techniques using SAS. It determined that the "compare-and-confirm" method – which involves the

---
[2] See `secondlife.com`

user comparing two 4-to-6-digit decimal numbers and indicating a match or lack thereof – was the most accurate and usable approach.

Kobsa et al. [11] compiled a comprehensive comparative usability study of eleven major secure device pairing methods. They measured task performance times, completion times, completion rates, perceived usability and perceived security. This led to the identification of most problematic as well as most effective pairing methods, for various device configurations.

Goodrich et al. [5] proposed an authentication protocol that used "Mad-Lib" style SAS. Each device in this protocol creates a nonsensical phrase based on the protocol outcome, and the user then determine if the two phrases match. This approach was found to be easier for non-specialist users.

Kainda et al. [9] examined usability of device pairing in a group setting. In this setting, up to 6 users tried to connect their devices to one another by participating in a SAS protocol. It was found that group effort decreased the expected rate of security and non-security failures. However, if a single individual was shown a SAS different from that of all others participants, the former often lied about the SAS in order to fit in with the group, demonstrating so-called "insecurity of conformity."

Gallego et al. [4] discovered that subject's performance in secure device pairing could be improved if it were to be scored. In other words, notifying subjects about their performance score resulted in fewer errors.

2.3 Effects of Sensory Stimulation

Sensory stimulation has variable impact on task performance. This is due to many contributing factors, including the subject's current level of arousal. The Yerkes-Dodson Law stipulates an inverse quadratic relationship between arousal and task performance [2]. It implies that, across all contributing stimulants, subjects who are either at a very low, or very high, level of arousal are not likely to perform well, and there exists an optimal level of arousal for correct task completion.

An extension to this law is the notion that completion of less complex tasks that produce lower levels of initial arousal in subjects benefits from inclusion of external stimuli. At the same time, completion of complex tasks that produce a high level of initial arousal suffers from the inclusion of external stimuli. Hockey [7] and Benignus et al. [1] classified this causal relationship by defining the complexity of a task as a function of the task's event rate (i.e., how many subtasks must be completed in a given time-frame) and the number of sources that originate these subtasks. External stimulation can serve to sharpen the focus of a subject at a low arousal level, improving task performance [19]. Conversely, it can overload subjects that are already at a high level of arousal, and induce errors in task completion [6].

O'Malley and Poplawsky [20] argued that sensory noise affects behavioral selectivity. Specifically, while a consistent positive or negative effect on task completion may not occur, a consistent negative effect was observed for tasks that require subjects to react to signals on their periphery. Meanwhile, a consistent positive effect on task completion was observed for tasks that require subjects to react to signals in the center of their field of attention. This leads to the claim that sensory stimulation has the effect of narrowing the subject's area of attention.

2.4 Unique Effects of Visual Stimuli

In addition to being general external stimuli that serve to raise arousal level, visual stimuli, particularly colors, have social and emotional implications. Naz and Epps [15] surveyed 98 college students about their emotional responses to five principal hues (red, blue, purple, green and yellow), five intermediate hues (yellow-red, green-yellow, blue-green, and red-purple) as well as three achromatic colors (white, gray, and black.) They found that principal hues are more likely to foster positive emotive responses. Furthermore, different colors within each group induce differing levels of arousal: some (red or green-yellow) increase arousal, while others (blue and green) are perceived as relaxing.

Moreover, visual stimuli were found to be dominating in multi-sensory contexts. Eimer [3] showed that in experiments with tactile, visual, and audio stimuli, subjects overwhelmingly utilized visual queues to localize tactile and auditory events.

3 Methodology

This section describes our experimental setup, procedures and subject parameters.

3.1 Apparatus

Fig. 1. Experimental environment: subject's perspective   **Fig. 2.** Experimental environment: side view

The experimental setting was designed to facilitate fully automated experiments with a wide range of sensory inputs. We located the experiment in a public, but low-traffic alcove at the top floor of the Computer Science Department building in a large public university. Figure 1 shows our setup from the subject's perspective (front view), and Figure 2 depicts it from the side. More photos can be found in Appendix 2. The setup is comprised of readily available off-the-shelf components:

- A 60"-by-45" touch-sensitive interactive Smartboard[2] whiteboard with a Hitachi CP-A300N short-throw projector[2]. The Smartboard acts as both an input and a display device. It reacts to tactile input, i.e., the user touches its surface, similar to a large touch-screen.
- A Logitech C920 HD Webcam[2].
- Two pairs of BIC America RtR V44-2 speakers[2]: one alongside the smartboard, and the other – on the opposite wall. Their arrangement is such that the subject is typically standing in the center of the four speakers.
- Four programmable wirelessly controllable Phillips Hue A19 LED lightbulbs[3] to deliver the visual stimuli.

device. All prospective subjects were explicitly informed, during recruitment, that they would need to use their own personal device that supports Bluetooth communication. We could have instead provided a device to the subjects, which might have fostered a more uniform subject experience. However, there would have been some drawbacks:

- We wanted to avoid accidental errors due to the use of an unfamiliar device that might have a different user interface from that of the subject's own device. Mitigating this unfamiliarity would have required some training, which is incompatible with the unattended experiment setting.
- Virtually all current Bluetooth pairing scenarios involve at least one of the devices being owned by the person performing the pairing. Forcing subjects to use our device would have resulted in a more contrived or synthetic experience.
- From a purely practical perspective, an unattended portable device provided by us would have been more prone to damage or theft than other components, which are bulky and attached to walls and/or ceilings.

Not surprisingly, the majority of subjects' devices (152 out of 169) were smartphones. Tablets (13) and laptops (4) accounted for the rest.

Bluetooth pairing is not as common as other security-critical tasks, such as password entry or CAPTCHA solving. However, we believe that Bluetooth pairing is the ideal security-critical task for the unattended experiment setup. It is preferred to passwords and PINs since it does not require subjects to reveal existing, or to select new, secrets. The security task at the core of Bluetooth pairing involves the user comparing two 6-digit decimal numbers – one displayed by each device being paired – and pressing a single button. This is a much more discrete and uniform activity than solving CAPTCHA-s, which vary widely in terms of difficulty and require higher-resolution displays as well as more extensive user input. These factors, even without external stimuli, would yield large variations in error rates and completion times.

3.2 Procedures

As mentioned earlier, instead of a live experimenter, we used a life-size video/audio recording of a experimenter giving instructions. This avatar is the subjects' only source of information about the experiment. Actual experimenter involvement is limited to

---

[3] See: `meethue.com` for Hue Bulbs, `smarttech.com` for the Smartboard, `logitech.com` for the Webcam, `bicamerica.com` for speakers, and `hitachi.com` for the projector.

strictly off-line activities, such as infrequent recalibration of avatar video volume and visual effects, as well as occasional repair of some components that suffered minor wear-and-tear damage throughout the study. This unattended setup allows the experiment to run without interruption 24/7 over a 5 month period.

Recall that the central goal of the experiment is to measure performance of subjects who attempt to pair their personal Bluetooth device to our Bluetooth device – an iMAC that uses the SmartBoard as an external display. This iMAC is hidden from the subject's view; it is situated directly on the other side of the SmartBoard wall in a separate office. During the pairing process, each subject is exposed to one randomly selected (from a fixed set) visual stimulus. This is done by rapid change in the ambient lighting of the room's four overhead lightbulbs to the chosen stimulus condition.

The experiment runs in four phases:

1. Initial: the subject walks in, presses a button on the wall which activates the experiment. Duration: instant.
2. Instruction: the avatar delivers instructions via Smartboard display and speakers. Duration: 45 seconds.
3. Pairing: the subject attempts to pair personal device with SmartBoard which represents the hidden iMAC desktop. In this phase, the subject is exposed to one (randomly selected out of 7) visual distraction stimulus. Duration: up to 3 minutes.
4. Final: the subject is prompted, on the SmartBoard, to enter some basic demographic information, as well as an email address to deliver the reward – an Amazon discount coupon. The information is entered directly into the SmartBoard, acting as a touch-screen input device. Duration: up to 6 minutes.

The total duration of the experiment ranged between 5 and 10 minutes.

In order to mitigate any disparities in task completion times between subjects that already had Bluetooth Discovery enabled and those who did not, the avatar informs subjects in the first 15 seconds of the instruction dialog that they will need to perform Bluetooth pairing with their personal device. This gives subjects over 30 seconds to enable Bluetooth Discovery Mode on thier device, if it is not enabled already.

We selected 6 visual effects that differed across two dimensions: color and intensity. In terms of color, we picked 3 values in the CIE chromatic space: Red, Blue, and Yellow-Green. Each is either *Solid*, i.e., shown at constant maximum intensity for the duration of the effect, or *Flickering*, i.e., its intensity grows and shrinks from the minimum to the maximum and back, completing one full cycle every second. In all settings, the maximum saturation was used. Color and intensity parameters for the 4 Phillips Hue bulbs under each condition are as follows (CCV stands for CIE Chromatic Value) [23]:

1. Red, CCV: X= 0.674, Y = 0.322
2. Blue, CCV: X = 0.168, Y = 0.041
3. Yellow-Green, CCV: X = 0.408, Y = 0.517
4. Solid intensity lumen output: 600 lm
5. Flickering intensity lumen range: 6 lm - 600 lm

These color conditions were picked based on capabilities of programmable bulbs as well as background knowledge about emotive effects of color. Phillips Hue is an LED system based on creating white light. It can not create a blacklight effect or any achromatic

light, which limits color selection to the subspace of the CIE color space [23] that Hue supports. (See Appendix 2 for more information).

With that restriction, we looked to the state-of-the-art about emotive reception and sensory effects of various colors in the Munsell color space [16]. (See Appendix 2 for more information). It has been shown that *principal hues* – Red, Yellow, Purple, Blue, and Green – are typically positively received. In contrast, *intermediate hues*, i.e., mixtures of any two principal hues, are more often negatively associated. Also, various colors have been shown to have either an arousing or a relaxing effect on subjects exposed to them. Based on this information, we chose three colors that differ as much as possible [15]:

– Red: Principal hue with positive emotional connotations, high associated arousal levels
– Blue: Principal hue with positive emotional connotations, low associated arousal levels
– Yellow-Green: Intermediate hue with negative emotional connotation, high associated arousal levels

Furthermore, we chose to have multiple modalities of light intensity for each color, with the expectation that a more complex modality would be more arousing and have a greater effect than its simple counterpart [12]. Not having found any previous work on the impact of exposure to colored light on performance of security-critical tasks, we include *Solid* light – the simplest modality of exposure that corresponds to the base level of stimulation. As a more complex modality, we included *Flickering* light.

Clearly, these two modalities were not the only possible choices. For example, it might have been intuitive to include even a more complex and startling *Strobing* light modality, achievable through rapid modulation of light intensity. It would have probably engendered a more profound impact on the subjects. However, ethical considerations coupled with the unattended nature of the experiment preclude using any modality that could endanger subjects with certain sensitivity conditions, such as photosensitive epilepsy. This led us to select a safe flickering frequency of $1Hz$.

We also found that all three light colors (under both intensity modalities) do not interfere with readability of a backlit personal wireless device or the image projected on the Smartboard. All experimenters, including one who used corrective lenses, could *correctly* read the screens of their personal devices, under all color conditions and intensity modalities.

3.3   Prior Results with a Similar Setup

A very similar setup was used in a previous study that assessed effects of unexpected audio distractions on 147 subjects performing Bluetooth pairing. As reported in [8], introduction of audio stimuli *significantly increased subject success rates* for every stimulus used. There was no significant impact on task completion time for any stimulus condition. This phenomenon was likely due to increased sensory arousal, as discussed in [8]. Our expectations for the impact of unexpected visual stimuli are rooted in these prior results.

3.4 Initial Hypotheses

We started out by hypothesizing that introduction of unexpected visual distractions during the process of human-aided pairing of two Bluetooth devices would have similar effects to those observed in prior experiments with audio distractions. Specifically, we expected two outcomes, as compared to a distraction-free setting:
[H1]: Lower error rates, and
[H2]: No effect on task completion times

3.5 Recruitment

The main challenge we encountered in the recruitment process is the scale of the experiments. Prior studies of usability of human-aided pairing protocols [5, 9, 17], demonstrated that 20-25 subjects per tested condition represents acceptable size for obtaining statistically significant findings. Our experiment has one condition for each of the six visual distraction variations, plus the control condition with no distractions. Therefore, collecting a meaningful amount of data requires at least 140 iterations of the experiment.

We used a four-pronged strategy to recruit subjects:
1. Email announcements sent to both graduate and undergraduate Computer Science students.
2. Posters placed (as signboards) near the entrance, and in the lobby, of a large campus building which housed the experimental setup.
3. Several instructors promoted participation in the experiment in their lectures.
4. Printed fliers handed out at various campus locations during daily peak pedestrian traffic times.

Recruitment efforts yielded 169 subjects in total, of whom 125 were male and 44 – female, corresponding to a 74%-26% gender split. This is expected, given that the location of our experimental setup was in the Computer Science and Engineering part of campus. Most subjects (161) were of college age (18-24 years), while 8 were in the 30+ group. This distribution is not surprising given the university population and the fact that older subjects generally correspond to researchers, faculty and staff, all of whom are much less likely to be attracted to being a subject in an experiment.

As follows from the above, our subjects' demographic was dominated by young, tech-savvy male undergraduate students.

4 Results

This section discusses the results, starting with data cleaning and proceeding to subject task completion effects.

4.1 Data Cleaning

We had to discard subject data for three reasons.

First, although instructions (in fliers, announcements and signs near the setup) specifically stated that subjects were to arrive alone, and perform the experiment without anyone else present, 37 groups (2 or more) of subjects participated. We found that the initial participant from each group performed in a manner consistent with individual subjects. However, subsequent group members who tried the experiment were (not surprisingly) significantly faster and more accurate in their task completion. Consequently, we discarded data of every subject who arrived in a group and was not the initial participant. We discuss this issue in more detail in Appendix 1.

The second reason for discarding data would have been due to subject auditory and/or visual impairment. A subject with an auditory impairment would have difficulties understanding the avatar's spoken instructions. A visually impaired subject would have difficulties with using the Smartboard and with the pairing process which relies on reading and comparing numbers. After carefully reviewing all subject video records, we could not identify any obvious visual or auditory impairment in any subject.

Some subjects successfully completed the experiment several times, perhaps hoping to receive multiple participation rewards. This occurred despite explicit instructions to the contrary. The system automatically rejected any repeated pairing attempts from devices already paired with the system, and any repeated attempts with different devices were discovered by visual inspection of subject trials. Every such repeated instance was discarded.

4.2 Task Failure Rate

Table 1 shows the number of subjects who, respectively, succeeded and failed at Bluetooth device pairing under each stimulus condition. It also details the failure rate for each condition.

Table 2 shows results from Barnard's exact test applied pairwise to the subject failure rate of the control condition and each stimulus. It demonstrates that differences between failure rates are statistically significant at the $\alpha = 0.05$ level with respect to all *Flickering* conditions: *Flickering Red*, *Flickering Blue*, and *Flickering Yellow-Green*. This even holds if we apply a conservative Bonferroni correction to account for three pairwise comparisons. This leads us to the mixed rejection of the initial hypothesis **H1**, as the failure rate increases significantly with the introduction of certain kinds of visual distractions, and remains unaffected by others. The next section discusses this further.

Table 3 shows odds ratios and 95% confidence interval for the failure rates under each stimulus, as compared to the control condition's failure rate. Interestingly, under this analysis, only the confidence intervals of *Flickering Blue* and *Flickering Yellow-Green* do not include a possible odds ratio of 1.0. Therefore – under this method of analysis – they are the only statistically significant stimuli at the $\alpha = 0.05$ level. The confidence interval defined for the *Flickering Red* condition challenges the claim of statistical significance at the $\alpha = 0.05$ level, as established by Barnard's exact test.

We also examined subject failure rates by gender. As shown by Table 4 there is no statistically significant difference in failure rates between male and female participants; Wald statistic $= 0.36$, nuisance parameter $= 0.01$, $p = 0.46$.

Table 1. Subject Failure Statistics

Stimulus	#Successful Subjects	#Failed Subjects	Failure Rate
None (control)	32	15	0.32
Solid Red	11	9	0.45
Flickering Red	9	11	0.55
Solid Blue	14	6	0.30
Flickering Blue	8	12	0.60
Solid Yellow-Green	10	12	0.54
Flickering Yellow-Green	7	13	0.65
Total	91	78	0.46

Table 2. Barnard's Exact Test on failure rates

Stimulus	Total Pairings	Failure Rate	Wald Statistic	Nuisance Parameter	p
None(Control)	47	0.32	–	–	–
Solid Red	20	0.45	1.02	0.88	0.17
Flickering Red	20	0.55	1.77	0.86	0.04
Solid Blue	20	0.30	0.15	0.05	0.49
Flickering Blue	20	0.60	2.14	0.96	0.03
Solid Yellow-Green	22	0.54	1.79	0.94	0.06
Flickering Yellow-Green	20	0.65	2.51	0.91	0.01

Table 3. Subject Failure Rate by Gender

Stimulus	Odds Ratio wrt control	95% Confidence Interval wrt control
None (control)	-	–
Solid Red	1.70	0.60-5.11
Flickering Red	2.61	0.89-7.63
Solid Blue	0.91	0.29-2.85
Flickering Blue	3.20	1.08-9.47
Solid Yellow-Green	1.79	0.91-7.24
Flickering Yellow-Green	3.96	1.31-11.6

Table 4. Subject Failure Rate by Gender

Gender	#Successful Subjects	#Unsuccessful Subjects	Failure Rate
Male	65	59	0.48
Female	25	20	0.44

4.3 Task Completion Times

Table 5[4] [5] shows average completion times in successful trials under each stimulus. After applying a conservative Bonferroni correction to account for six pairwise comparisons between individual stimulus conditions and the control condition, every stimulus condition shows an overwhelmingly large, statistically significant departure from

---

[4] Std Dev = Standard Deviation

[5] DF = Degrees of Freedom.

the control condition. This results in rejection of hypothesis **H2**. The following section examines possible causes of this slowdown, as well as its implications.

Table 5. Avg times (sec) for successful pairing.

Stimulus	Mean Time	Std Dev	DF wrt control	t-value wrt control	p
None	34.50	11.93	–	–	–
Solid Red	87.81	24.56	41	9.56	< 0.001
Flickering Red	90.44	15.62	39	11.59	< 0.001
Solid Blue	106.36	17.39	44	16.32	< 0.001
Flickering Blue	91.25	24.11	38	9.61	< 0.001
Solid Yellow-Green	90.30	19.08	40	11.1	< 0.001
Flickering Yellow-Green	90.29	19.06	37	10.01	< 0.001

Table 6. Cohen's d on Completion Times wrt Control

Stimulus	Cohen's d wrt control
None (control)	-
Solid Red	-3.42
Flickering Red	-4.49
Solid Blue	-5.33
Flickering Blue	-3.90
Solid Yellow-Green	-4.12
Flickering Yellow-Green	-4.29

Table 6 shows Cohen's d for completion times under each stimulus when compared to the control condition. $|d| > 1.0$ in all cases, which means that every stimulus condition shows an overwhelmingly large, statistically significant departure from the control condition for the evaluation of Cohen's d. This result is statistically significant: it indicates that, with convincing probability, the mean completion time observed under the control is representative of a different distribution than that observed under each stimulus condition. This supports rejection of hypothesis **H2**.

Next, we looked into subject completion times for successful completion attempts by gender. Results are displayed in Table 7. A pairwise t-test shows that observed differences are not statistically significant; $t(84) = 0.04$, $p = 0.96$.

Finally, we preformed Bartlett's test for homogeneity of variances as well as a One-Way analysis of variance (ANOVA) test between average task completion times of all stimulus conditions, excluding the control. Bartlett's test failed to reject the null hypothesis that all stimulus conditions share the same variance ($\chi^2 = 2.80$, $p = 0.731$). Furthermore, the one-way ANOVA test indicated no significant difference between any sample distributions (F = 1.466, p = 0.217.) Table 8 shows the results; their implications are discussed in the following section.

5   Discussion of Observed Effects

Several types of visual stimuli appear to have a negative effect on the subjects' successful completion of the Bluetooth Pairing task. However, collected data shows that this is

Table 7. Avg times (sec) by gender

Gender	Mean Time	Standard Deviation
Male	75.27	22.31
Female	75.20	24.10

Table 8. One-Way ANOVA test

	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F	p
Between Groups	2964.28	5	592.86	1.466	0.217
Within Groups	21440.33	53	404.535		
Total	24404.61	58			

not consistent across all stimuli. Instead, the negative effect may be tied to certain features of the particular stimulus. Instances of significant degradation in subject success rates were linked to the *Flickering* modality, for all color stimuli. This result implies that emotional perception of the stimulus may not be as much of a contributing factor to the overall increase of subject arousal as the presence of a dynamic visual stimulus. Also, in contrast with a previous study of audio distractions that observed positive effects [8], we noted no benefit to subject success rates under **any** visual stimulus.

These negative and neutral responses to static and dynamic light stimuli, respectively, are reinforced by the psychological concept of attentional selectivity. This concept assumes that the capture of an individual's attention by an aversive stimulus is likely to be momentary, occurring primarily when the stimulus is first introduced. In cognitive science, attention is conceptualized as a limited resource. For good evolutionary reason, the greatest demand on attention is in response to any change in one's environment. Once an assessment of the stimulus is made, and determined not to require additional action, attentional devotion to that stimulus fades quickly. This means that – while a static, adverse lighting change may remain adverse throughout its duration – its capacity to interfere with subject performance will fade rapidly after its onset. Instead, dynamically changing stimuli can more effectively capture subject attention and impair their performance, since many assessments are needed for many environmental changes occurring throughout the stimulus's duration.

Negative impact on subject task completion rates prompts a new attack vector for the adversary who controls ambient lighting. By taking advantage of color effects with shifting intensity levels, the adversary could force a user into failing Bluetooth pairing as a denial-of-service (DoS) attack. Moreover, the adversary might induce failure by using positively perceived colors of varying intensity. These colors may not even register as malicious in the user's mind, as they are innately associated with beneficial or pleasant emotions.

However, a much greater effect was observed in terms of average completion time. During review of subject trials, we noted that, upon exposure to the stimulus, subjects often take their gaze off their personal device (or the avatar) and focus their attention to the colorful, and possibly flickering, lights. The resulting delay frequently caused the

subject's device to exit the Bluetooth pairing menu due to a time-out, and re-initiate the pairing protocol, resulting in much longer completion times overall.

Furthermore, as shown by Table 8, the introduced delay in subject task completion time was not based on the particular stimulus. Instead, the mere presence of a visual stimulus was enough to slow down successful subjects. Similar to the result in inducing user failure, the adversary is not forced to rely on an overtly malicious stimulus in order to cause substantial slowdown in task completion. However, the adversary has even more choices in stimulus selection, since all stimuli (including those with static intensity levels) were shown to impact task completion times the same way.

This effect shows further power for the adversary in control of ambient lighting. One possibility is that the adversary's goal is a denial-of-service attack by frustrating user's pairing attempts. In a more sinister scenario the adversary could try to "buy time" by introducing its own malicious device(s) alongside changes to ambient lighting and then leverage the user's lapse in focus (when being exposed to new sensory stimuli) to trick the user into pairing with that device. In the worst case, the adversary might take advantage of the user's inattentiveness while their gaze shifts away from their device and trick them into accepting a non-matching authenticator.

6 Unattended Setup: Limitations

Based on our earlier discussion of Data Cleaning, some subjects' data had to be removed from the dataset because they did not conduct the experiment alone. This occurred even though all recruitment materials (and means) as well as the avatar's instructions stated that subjects were to perform the task alone. This illustrates a basic limitation of the unattended setup: no one is present to enforce the rules in real time.[6]

We did not manage to capture fine-grained data about the subjects' awareness of a distraction. We have some anecdotal evidence from video recordings showing that some subjects noticed the distraction in obvious ways, e.g., verbal remarks or turning their heads. However, we have no evidence of subjects who failed to notice the stimulus. Information about subjects noticing a change in the environment is very important to the development of a realistic adversary model for future studies.

7 Study Shortcomings

In this section we discuss some shortcomings of our study.

7.1 Homogeneous Subjects

Our subject group was dominated by young, tech-savvy male college students. This is a consequence of the experiment's location. Replication of our experiment in a non-academic setting would be useful. However, recruiting a really diverse group of subjects

---

[6] However, it would have been possible (though quite difficult in practice) to instrument our recording of the experiment to abort upon detecting simultaneous presence of multiple subjects.

is hard. Ideal venues might be stadiums, concert halls, fairgrounds or shopping malls. Unfortunately, deployment of our unattended setup in such public locations is logistically infeasible. Since these public areas already have many sensory stimuli, reliable adjustment of our subjects' arousal level in a consistent manner would be very hard. Furthermore, it would be very difficult to secure specialized and expensive experimental equipment.

In addition to being tech-savvy, young subjects are in general more apt to quickly recover from changes in the lighting of their surroundings than older adults [10]. It is possible that unexpected visual stimuli would have a different effect on an older (less technologically adept) population.

7.2 Sufficiently Diverse Stimuli

We selected six conditions to obtain as many diverse stimuli types as we could rigorously test, in addition to control. We first varied them by changing the regularity of the stimulus, expecting that a varying signal would have greater impact on subjects' arousal than a steady signal. We then varied the colors, with the expectation that using colors that evoked different emotive responses and general arousal levels would impact task performance differently.

An ideal experiment would have included a stimulus with negative emotional connotation and low arousal levels. However, between three colors, two intensity conditions, and the control, we had seven total conditions to test. Furthermore, due to the nature of our experiment, we could only reasonably expect each subject to be tested under a single condition, since prior knowledge about the experiment would clearly bias the results. Adding just one additional stimulus (for both intensity modalities) would have required at least 40 more subjects. This would have placed a heavy logistical burden for our already nearly-depleted subject pool.

We also note that variance in intensity of our flickering modality did not approach the technical limit of Philips Hue bulbs. Instead, we deliberately limited the frequency of intensity fluctuations to $1Hz$ in order to avoid any possible negative reaction from light-sensitive subjects. This ethical issue does not reflect real-world conditions where an adversary (with no ethical qualms) could create a very fast strobing effect, possibly causing physical harm.

7.3 Synthetic Environment

Our unattended setup, while a step closer to an everyday setting than a sterile and highly controlled lab, is still quite synthetic. First, our choice to place it in a low-traffic area makes it quieter than many common settings. Second, our choice to situate it indoors makes it free of temperature fluctuations, air flow, and exposure to sunlight. Finally, our equipment (such as the Smartboard projector system) is not commonly encountered by most subjects.

7.4 Ideal Setting

Drawing upon aforementioned shortcomings, the ideal setting for our experiment would be one where:

- – Subject demographics are more varied
- – Subjects are not aware of the nature of the experiment until they are debriefed after task completion
- – The environment is more commonplace
- – The task is more security-critical

All of these criteria could be trivially met if, for example, we conducted the experiment at a busy bank ATM. The task at hand would be the obviously security-critical entry of the subject's PIN. A modern ATM comes standard with all of the features needed for our experiment: it has a keypad, a screen, a speaker (for visually impaired users), a video camera, and are in areas that are artificially lit. Similarly, a busy gas station would fit our needs, as each fuel pump typically includes a keypad for PIN entry, speakers, a screen, artificial lighting, and a video camera recording the transaction. However, despite their attractive qualities, there would be serious ethical and logistical obstacles to setting up an unattended automated experiment in one these location examples.

8 Conclusions & Future Work

As human participation in security-critical tasks becomes more commonplace, so does the incidence of users performing these tasks while subject to accidental or malicious distractors. This strongly motivates exploring user error rates and their reactions to various external stimuli. Our efforts described in this paper shed some light on understanding human errors in security-critical tasks by studying the effects of visual stimuli on users attempting to pair two Bluetooth devices.

We feel that this unattended experiment paradigm is a valuable approach that deserves further study. The development of standardized unattended and automated experimental setups could greatly lower the logistical and financial burdens associated with conducting large-scale user studies.

Given the observed negative effect on subject completion times, one interesting next step would be to conduct a similar experiment, where, instead of measuring subjects' ability to pair Bluetooth devices, we would examine the rates of incorrect pairing when the subjects are shown mis-matched numbers during the pairing process. This could help us determine whether (and how) visual distractions make users more likely to pair their device to some other (perhaps adversary-controlled) device.

Another direction is investigating effects of hybrid (e.g., audio/visual) distractions. Finally, we plan to conduct a study of subjects performing security-critical tasks, while being exposed to *multiple visual stimuli* lasting longer than 3 minutes. This might allow us to learn whether subjects' sensory arousal is the result of the surprise (due to the sudden visual stimulus), or an unavoidable psychophysical reaction.

Acknowledgments

References

1. V. A. Benignus, D. A. Otto, and J. H. Knelson. Effect of low-frequency random noises on performance of a numeric monitoring task. *Perceptual and motor skills*, 40(1):231–239, 1975.

2. R. A. Cohen. Yerkes–Dodson law. In *Encyclopedia of clinical neuropsychology*, pages 2737–2738. Springer, 2011.

3. M. Eimer. Multisensory integration: how visual experience shapes spatial perception. *Current biology*, 14(3):R115–R117, 2004.

4. A. Gallego, N. Saxena, and J. Voris. Exploring extrinsic motivation for better security: A usability study of scoring-enhanced device pairing. In A.-R. Sadeghi, editor, *Financial Cryptography and Data Security*, volume 7859 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 60–68. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2013.

5. M. T. Goodrich, M. Sirivianos, J. Solis, C. Soriente, G. Tsudik, and E. Uzun. Using audio in secure device pairing. *International Journal of Security and Networks*, 4(1):57–68, 2009.

6. W. Harris. *Stress and Perception: The Effects of Intense Noise Stimulation and Noxious Stimulation upon Perceptual Performance*. Ph.D. thesis, University of Southern California, 1960.

7. G. R. J. Hockey. Effect of loud noise on attentional selectivity. *The Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 22(1):28–36, 1970.

8. T. Kaczmarek, A. Kobsa, R. Sy, and G. Tsudik. An Unattended Study of Users Performing Security Critical Tasks Under Adversarial Noise. In *Proceedings of the NDSS Workshop on Useable Security 2015*, pages 14:1–14:12.

9. R. Kainda, I. Flechais, and A. W. Roscoe. Usability and security of out-of-band channels in secure device pairing protocols. *Proceedings of the 5th Symposium on Usable Privacy and Security*, pages 11:1–11:12, 2009. ACM ID: 1572547.

10. D. W. Kline and F. Schieber. Vision and aging. 1985.

11. A. Kobsa, R. Sonawalla, G. Tsudik, E. Uzun, and Y. Wang. Serial hook-ups: a comparative usability study of secure device pairing methods. *Proceedings of the 5th Symposium on Usable Privacy and Security*, pages 10:1–10:12, 2009. ACM ID: 1572546.

12. H. S. Koelega, J.-A. Brinkman, B. Zwep, and M. N. Verbaten. Dynamic vs static stimuli in their effect on visual vigilance performance. *Perceptual and motor skills*, 70(3):823–831, 1990.

13. S. Laur, N. Asokan, and K. Nyberg. Efficient mutual data authentication using manually authenticated strings. Cryptology ePrint Archive, Report 2005/424, 2005. `http://eprint.iacr.org/`.

14. S. Lazem and D. Gracanin. Social traps in second life. In *2010 Second International Conference on Games and Virtual Worlds for Serious Applications (VS-GAMES)*, pages 133–140, Mar. 2010.

15. K. Naz and H. Epps. Relationship between color and emotion: A study of college students. *College Student J*, 38(3):396, 2004.

16. D. Nickerson. History of the munsell color system and its scientific application. *Journal of the Optical Society*, 1940.

17. R. Nithyanand, N. Saxena, G. Tsudik, and E. Uzun. Groupthink: usability of secure group association for wireless devices. *Proceedings of the 12th ACM international conference on Ubiquitous computing*, pages 331–340, 2010. ACM ID: 1864399.

18. H. Ollesch, E. Heineken, and F. P. Schulte. Physical or virtual presence of the experimenter: Psychological online-experiments in different settings. *International Journal of Internet Science*, 1(1):71–81, 2006.

19. E. L. Olmedo and R. E. Kirk. Maintenance of vigilance by non-task-related stimulation in the monitoring environment. *Perceptual and motor skills*, 44(3):715–723, 1977.
20. J. J. O'Malley and A. Poplawsky. Noise-induced arousal and breadth of attention. *Perceptual and motor skills*, 33(3):887–890, 1971.
21. G. Riva, T. Teruzzi, and L. Anolli. The use of the internet in psychological research: comparison of online and offline questionnaires. *CyberPsychology & Behavior*, 6(1):73–80, 2003.
22. E. Uzun, K. Karvonen, and N. Asokan. Usability analysis of secure pairing methods. In S. Dietrich and R. Dhamija, editors, *Financial Cryptography and Data Security*, volume 4886 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 307–324. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2007.
23. G. Wyszecki and W. S. Stiles. *Color science*, volume 8. Wiley New York, 1982.

Appendix 1: Analysis of Group Initiators

Table 9. Failure Rates: Initiators vs. Individuals

Participant Type	#Successful Subjects	#Unsuccessful Subjects	Failure Rate
Group Initiator	19	18	0.49
Individual	72	60	0.45

Table 10. Avg times (sec): Initiators vs. Individuals

Participant Type	Mean Time	Standard Deviation
Group Initiator	76.63	23.00
Individual	76.20	17.93

We considered potential differences in failure rates between subjects who performed the task alone, and those who did it as part of a group. As mentioned in the discussion of Data Cleaning, for each group, we only consider the initial participating group member, referred to as the Group Initiator. As Table 9 shows, there is no significant difference between failure rates of individual subjects and Group Initiators; Wald Statistic $= 0.34$, Nuisance parameter $= 0.01$, $p = 0.51$. Furthermore, as Table 10 shows, a pairwise t-test of completion times for individuals – compared to group initiators – shows that observed differences are not statistically significant; $t(84) = 0.09$, $p = 0.93$.

Appendix 2: A Few Colorful Words

Munsell Color System

The Munsell Color System is used for creating and describing colors. In it, all colors are grouped into two categories: primary and intermediate hues. Primary hues include: Red, Yellow, Purple, Blue, and Green, arranged in a circular shape as in Figure 3. Intermediate hues are mixtures of two adjacent primary hues, such as Yellow-Green or Purple-Blue. Colors are defined on three dimensions: hue, lightness, and color purity. The Munsell system is based on human perception which makes it useful for rigorously defining human reaction to specific color forms. However basing the system on human perception makes the Munsell system a poor tool for direct conversion of light described by its physical wavelength into human-perceptible color.

Fig. 3. Munsell Color Space (Image best viewed in color

CIE Color Space

The Phillips Hue bulbs use the CIE color space. In CIE, colors are defined as a 2-dimensional space with X and Y values moving along a roughly triangular curve that corresponds to the translation of wavelengths of light to their human perception in the visible spectrum. The exact color range of the Philips Hue bulb is shown in Figure 4


Fig. 4. Phillips Hue CIE Color Space (Image best viewed in color

Appendix 3: Unattended Experiment Setup

Fig. 5. The Experiment Environment during the Solid Blue condition (Image best viewed in color)


**Fig. 6.** The subject's perspective during the Solid Red condition (Image best viewed in color.)


Fig. 7. Subject entering email address on Smartboard

Fig. 8. Post-experimental review of video recordings (separate office)