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Hall of Fame or Shame?

• Kitchen Stories
Hall of Fame!

• **Kitchen Stories**
  - Large pictures of recipes
  - Photos & videos
  - Shopping list that marks off as you purchase

• **Like**
  - Large pictures of recipes
  - Photos & videos

• **Wish**
  - ?
Hall of Fame or Shame?

• Coupa Café
Hall of Shame!

- **Coupa Café**
  - remembers my usual café

- **Like**
  - how much money am I adding?
  - lots of steps to order & checkout
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- Why do usability testing?
- Choosing participants
- Ethical considerations
- Designing & conducting the test
- Using the results
- Experimental options & details
Why do Usability Testing?

• Can’t tell how good UI is until?
  – people use it!

• Expert review methods (e.g., HE) are based on evaluators who may?
  – know too much
  – not know enough (about tasks, etc.)

• Hard to predict what real users will do
Choosing Participants

• Representative of target users. How so?
  - job-specific vocab / knowledge
  - tasks

• Approximate if needed
  - system intended for doctors?
    • get medical students or nurses
  - system intended for engineers?
    • get engineering students

• Use incentives to get participants
  - t-shirt, mug, free coffee/pizza
Ethical Considerations

- Usability tests can be distressing
  - users have left in tears
- Testing/fieldwork can be coercive if there is a power imbalance (e.g., in under resourced communities)

People may feel no option but to speak to you or give you their time even though they may not get anything of value in return.
Ethical Considerations

- You have a responsibility to alleviate these issues
  - make voluntary with informed consent (form)
  - avoid pressure to participate
  - let them know they can stop at any time
  - stress that you are testing the system, not them
  - make collected data as anonymous as possible
- Often must get human subjects approval (IRB)

https://www.unthsc.edu/north-texas-regional-irb/institutional-review-board-meeting/
Usability Test Proposal

- A report that contains
  - objective
  - description of system being testing
  - task environment & materials
  - participants
  - methodology
  - tasks
  - test measures

- Get approved & then reuse for final report
- Seems tedious, but writing this will help “debug” your test
Selecting Tasks

• Tasks from low-fi design can be used
  – may need to shorten if
    • they take too long
    • require background that test user won’t have

• Don’t train unless that will occur in real deployment
• Avoid bending tasks in direction of what your design best supports
• Don’t choose tasks that are too fragmented?
  – fragmented = do not represent a complete goal someone would try to accomplish with your application
  – e.g., phone-in bank test

Check if your friend has called, find out what time he will be going to the club.
Two Types of Data to Collect

- **Process data**
  - observations of what users are doing & thinking
  - *qualitative*

- **Bottom-line data**
  - summary of what happened
    - time, errors, success
  - i.e., the dependent variables
  - *quantitative*
Which Type of Data to Collect?

- Focus on process data first
  - gives good overview of where problems are
Which Type of Data to Collect?

• Focus on process data first
  – gives good overview of where problems are

• Bottom-line data doesn’t tell you?
  – where to fix
  – just says: “too slow”, “too many errors”, etc.

• Hard to get reliable bottom-line results
  – need many users for statistical significance

The “Thinking Aloud” Method

• Need to know what users are thinking, not just what they are doing

• Ask users to talk while performing tasks
  – tell us what they are thinking
  – tell us what they are trying to do
  – tell us questions that arise as they work
  – tell us things they read
Thinking Aloud (cont.)

• Prompt the user to keep talking
  - “tell me what you are thinking”

• Only help on things you have pre-decided
  - keep track of anything you do give help on

• Make a *recording* & take good notes
  - make sure you can tell what they were doing
  - use a digital watch/clock
  - record audio & video
  - or even event logs
Will thinking out loud give the right answers?

• Not always

• If you ask, people will always give an answer, even if it is has nothing to do with facts
  - panty hose example

→ Try to avoid specific questions (especially that have binary answers)
Accessibility Issues with Thinking Out Loud

• May be less comfortable or accessible for certain users
• Factor in time/resources you need to support these interviewees
  – interpreters
  – more time for the interview
    • e.g., someone using sign language can’t give feedback while interacting with your prototype
Information concerning payroll administration, including payroll guides and deduction tables, is provided by Canada Revenue and Customs Agencies for all businesses. Most employers establishing private benefit plans are covered by provincial regulations. Select the regulation type below and "Next" to find the appropriate legislation. If you are not sure which regulations apply, review the list of business activities under "Federally Regulated" to ensure you are not covered by these laws and regulations.

- Provincially regulated
  - All other business not listed below

- Federally regulated
  - Interprovincial and international services such as railways, highway transport, telephone, telegraph, and cable systems; pipelines, canals, ferries, tunnels, and bridges; shipping and shipping services;
  - Radio and television broadcasting, including cablevision;
  - Air transport, aircraft operations, and aerodromes;
  - Banks;
  - Protection and preservation of fisheries as a natural resource;
  - Grain elevators; flour and seed mills, feed warehouses and grain-seed cleaning plants; uranium mining and processing.
Try it out!

Use the **think aloud protocol** to test **one task** in your medium-fi prototype.

In a moment, we will break you out into your teams. You have 3 minutes to identify which task to study. Select **one person** to rotate into the next breakout room down (within your studio, 1->2, 4->1). If possible, this should be someone who **has not done a HE** on that team’s prototype.

When they arrive, ask your visitor to complete the task while speaking their thought process aloud. Take notes!
Using the Test Results

• Summarize the data
  - make a list of all critical incidents (CI)
    • positive & negative
  - include references back to original data
  - try to judge why each difficulty occurred

• What does data tell you?
  - UI work the way you thought it would?
    • users take approaches you expected?
  - something missing?
Using the Results (cont.)

- Update tasks & rethink design
  - rate severity & ease of fixing CIs
  - fix both severe problems & make the easy fixes
Administrivia

• Group project grades (60% of your overall grade)
  - your project grade can be impacted by your contribution to the team ➔ pull your weight!
  - midway due studio this week (show >= 1 task working!)

• Assignments due next week
  - Poster & pitch slide drafts (Mon) & finals (Wed)
  - Video demo (Wed)
  - Prototype (Fri)
  - Report (Sun)
TEAM BREAK
Fixing designs & building your hi-fi prototype
Measuring Bottom-Line Usability

• Situations in which numbers are useful
  - time requirements for task completion
  - successful task completion %
  - compare two designs on speed or # of errors

• Ease of measurement
  - time is easy to record
  - error or successful completion is harder
    • define in advance what these mean

• Do not combine with thinking-aloud. Why?
  - talking can affect speed & accuracy
Analyzing the Numbers

- Example: trying to get task time \( \leq 30 \text{ min.} \)
  - test gives: 40, 5, 20, 90, 10, 15
  - mean (average) = 30
  - median (middle) = 17.5
  - looks good!

- Did we achieve our goal?
- Wrong answer, not certain of anything!
- Factors contributing to our uncertainty?
  - small number of test users \((n = 6)\)
  - results are very variable (standard deviation = 32)
    - std. dev. measures dispersal from the mean
Analyzing the Numbers (cont.)

• This is what basic statistics can be used for

• Crank through the procedures and you find
  – 95% certain that typical value is between 5 & 55
### Analyzing the Numbers (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant #</th>
<th>Time (minutes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Number of participants**: 6
- **Mean**: 30.0
- **Median**: 17.5
- **Std dev**: 31.8

The **standard error of the mean** is calculated as `stddev / sqrt (#samples)` and results in 13.0.

Typical values will be mean +/- 2*standard error, which translates to 4 to 56!

What is plausible? Confidence (alpha=5%, stddev, sample size) is approximately 25.4, hence 95% confident between 4.6 & 55.4.
Analyzing the Numbers (cont.)

• This is what basic statistics can be used for

• Crank through the procedures and you find
  – 95% certain that typical value is between 5 & 55

• Usability test data is *highly variable*
  – need lots to get good estimates of typical values
  – 4x as many tests will only narrow range by 2x
    • breadth of range depends on sqrt of # of test users
  – this is when online methods become useful
    • easy to test w/ large numbers of users
Measuring User Preference

• How much users like or dislike the system
  - can ask them to rate on a scale of 1 to 10
  - or have them choose among statements
    • “best UI I’ve ever…”, “better than average”…
  - hard to be sure what data will mean
    • novelty of UI, unrealistic setting …
• If many give you low ratings → trouble

• Can get some useful data by asking
  - what they liked, disliked, where they had trouble, best part, worst part, etc.
  - redundant questions are OK
Comparing Two Alternatives

• *Between groups* experiment
  - two groups of test users
  - each group uses only 1 of the systems

• *Within groups* experiment
  - one group of test users
    • each person uses both systems (cheaper)
    • can’t use the same tasks or order (learning)
  - best for low-level interaction techniques
    • e.g., new mouse, new swipe interaction, ...
Comparing Two Alternatives

- Between groups requires many more participants than within groups

- See if differences are statistically significant
  - assumes normal distribution & same std. dev.

- Online companies can do large AB tests
  - look at resulting behavior (e.g., buy?)
Instructions to Participants

- Describe the purpose of the evaluation
  - “I’m testing the product; I’m not testing you”
- Tell them they can quit at any time
- Demonstrate the equipment
- Explain how to think aloud
- Explain that you will not provide help
- Describe the task
  - give written instructions
  - one task at a time
Reporting the Results

• Report what you did & what happened
• Images & graphs help people get it!
• Video clips can be quite convincing
Heuristic Evaluation vs. User Testing

- HE is much faster
  - 1-2 hours each evaluator vs. days-weeks
- HE doesn’t require interpreting user’s actions
- User testing is far more accurate (by def.)
  - takes into account actual users and tasks
  - HE may miss problems & find “false positives”
- Good to alternate between HE & user testing
  - find different problems
  - don’t waste participants
Summary

- User testing is important, but takes time/effort
- Use real tasks & representative participants
  - real tasks & representative participants
- Be ethical & treat your participants well
- Want to know what people are doing & why? collect
  - process data
- Bottom line data requires more participants to get statistically reliable results
  - more participants
- Difference between between & within groups?
  - between groups: each subject participates in only one of n conditions
  - within groups: everyone participates in multiple conditions
Further Reading on Ethical Issues With Community-based Research


- “Imperialist Tendencies” blog post by Jan Chipchase, [http://janchipchase.com/content/essays/imperialist-tendencies/](http://janchipchase.com/content/essays/imperialist-tendencies/)

- “To Hell with Good Intentions” by Ivan Illich, speech to the Conference on InterAmerican Student Projects (CIASP), April 20, 1968, [https://www.southwestern.edu/live/files/1158](https://www.southwestern.edu/live/files/1158)
Next Time

• Lecture
  - Design Patterns

• Studio
  - A8 Midway Milestone Presentations
  - Group Work