Human-Computer Interaction IS4300

P7 – Heuristic Evaluation & Prototype Revision – Due WEDS

- I7: please make sure you emailed your reviews to the POC for each team!

- After you receive 7-8 heuristic evaluations…
- Assign each of these problems your own severity rating (cosmetic, minor, major, catastrophic)
- Modify your system to correct as many of the problems found as possible (in priority order), documenting how you do this.
- **What to Post** A link to your updated prototype and a report describing how you responded to the heuristic evaluations.

P8 – Finish Project & Do User Testing – Due 12/9

- Complete enough of your implementation to support user testing
  - Should be fully functional unless you have a compelling rationale
- Complete user testing
  - Exactly as you did in Paper Prototyping, but with your software prototype
  - 3+ users, 3+ tasks
  - Briefing
  - Can demo system on additional task first
- Redesign
  - Sort severity problems by severity
  - Address as many as possible
- Document everything
- Post
  - Final software prototype
  - Report

Review: Conducting Usability Studies

4

Test Plan

- What do you need to think about?

Formative vs. Summative Usability Test (Nielsen)

- Formative
  - Informs design in progress
  - What aspects of design are good/bad?
  - E.g., "think aloud" study
- Summative
  - Characterize a finished product, overall quality of an interface
  - E.g., comparative evaluation experiment


Formative Usability Studies
Primary purpose: identify design problems
Secondary: rough assessment of usability metrics
Approach
Have representative users work through representative tasks
Observe
Ask Questions / "Think Aloud" during test
Questionnaires / Interview post test
7


Facilitator – during test
Encourage questions but don't answer them
Use user's vocabulary
Use open-ended questions
"What will that do?"
"What are you trying to do right now?"
"What are you thinking?"
"Tell me more about that."
Watch for "hmm", "ah", "oh", "oops", furrowed brow, etc. - ask what's going on.
Make changes during test or between tests if necessary
Take a break if something goes wrong

Additional questions: Think-Aloud and Offering Help

- Using Cognitive Walkthrough Questions
  - "Is there anything there that tells you what to do next?"
  - "Is there a choice on the screen that lines up with what you want to do? If so, which one?"
  - "Now that you've tried it, has it done what you wanted it to do?"

Post-test Design Team Debrief

- Spend a few minutes immediately after the test meeting with the testing team, discussing results, clarifying problems, and writing down prioritized problems.
- Correct significant problems that can be fixed before the next test.

Your Projects

- Write user briefing (suggest full protocol)
  - Verbal informed consent
  - Backgrounder on project, process
- Write user tasks
  - Each on 1 index card
  - Goal to be accomplished (not how to do it)
- Walkthrough the entire process

Ethical Principles in Human Subjects Research (Belmont Report)

- Respect for persons (autonomy)
- Beneficience
- Justice


Experimental Design & Inferential Analyses for Quantitative studies
Users performed the set of standardized tasks in a significantly shorter time using interface FOO compared to interface BAR, t(27)=3.4, p<.05
13


Samples & Populations
Population = everyone you care about
E.g., all of your primary stakeholders, all of your customers, all gamers in the US, etc
Sample = everyone in your study
Usually |Sample|<<|Population|
Inferential statistics let us make claims about the Population based on data from one or more Samples.
If you could experiment on everyone in the population you would not need inferential statistics.
14

Typical case

- You are trying to demonstrate there is a difference between two designs/ interfaces/systems based on a usability metrics
  - E.g., performance with interface FOO vs. performance with interface BAR

15

Inferential Analyses

- Correlational
  - Systematic relationship between two measures
- Experimental
  - Between-subjects
    - Single factor, two-level
  - Within-subjects
    - Single factor, two-level

16

Example correlational study

- You survey gamers and ask what their most-played game is and their level of satisfaction (1-7 scale) with it.
- You conclude that players have the highest satisfaction with Metal Gear Solid V, Mean Satisfaction = 6.1.
- Conclusion: typical game players will have the highest satisfaction with MGSV. (?)

Experimental Designs

- Establish causality by ruling out "third variable" explanations.
- Two approaches:
  - Identifying and fixing extraneous variables
  - Randomizing participants across conditions

Types of Experimental Designs
Between-Subjects Design

- Different groups of subjects are randomly assigned to the levels of your independent variable
- Data are averaged for analysis
- If interval or ratio measures and approximately normal, use t-test for independent means
- Simplest: "single factor, two-level, between subjects" designs.

19

Types of Experimental Designs
Within-Subjects Design

- A single group of subjects is exposed to all levels of the independent variable
- Data are averaged for analysis
- aka "repeated measures design", "crossover design"
- Use t-test for dependent means aka "paired samples t-test"
- Simplest: "single factor, two-level, within subjects" designs.
- Note: If interval or ratio measures and approximately normal, use "t-test for dependent means" aka "paired samples t-test" to analyze.

20

Within-Subjects Designs Benefits

- Can ask users to directly compare interfaces.
  - "Which did you like better?"
- More Power! *Why?*
  - Controls for all inter-subject variability
  - Randomized between-subjects design just balances the effects between groups

22

Within-Subjects Designs Disadvantages

- More demanding on subjects, especially in complex designs
- Subject attrition is a problem
- *Carryover effects:* Exposure to a previous treatment affects performance in a subsequent treatment

24

Carryover Example

- Embodied Conversational Agents to Promote Health Literacy for Older Adults

Brochure Computer

T0 → T1 → T2

Diabetes Knowledge Assessment	Diabetes Knowledge Assessment	Diabetes Knowledge Assessment

25

Some Sources of Carryover

- *Learning*
  - Learning a task in the first treatment may affect performance in the second
- *Fatigue*
  - Fatigue from earlier treatments may affect performance in later treatments
- *Habituation*
  - Repeated exposure to a stimulus may lead to unresponsiveness to that stimulus
- *Sensitization*
  - Exposure to a stimulus may make a subject respond more strongly to another
- *Contrast*
  - Subjects may compare treatments, which may affect behavior

26

Example Study – Best design? Handheld ECAs



Example – Best Design?

- You've just developed the "Matchmaker" – a handheld device that beeps when you are in the vicinity of a compatible person who is also carrying a Matchmaker.
- You evaluate the number of users who are married after six months of use compared to a non-intervention control group.

28

Example – Best Design?

- You've just developed "Reado Speedo" that reads print books using OCR and speaks them to you at twice your normal reading rate. You want to evaluate your product against the old fashioned way on reading rate, comprehension and satisfaction.

29

Example – Best Design?

- You've developed a new web-based help system for your email client. You want to compare your system to the old printed manual.

30

Type of Errors in Inferential Statistics

Research Hypothesis: There is a difference
(e.g., FOO better than BAR)

	"The Truth"	
	No diff	**Diff**
Conclude diff	**Type I Error**	**Correct Decision**
Conclude no diff	**Correct Decision**	**Type II Error**

'p' = Probability of Type I Error
The likelihood the difference observed is not real.

32

Relationship Between Population and Samples When a Treatment Had No Effect



'p' = Likelihood of this happening.

33

t-test for independent means

- Two samples, interval or ratio
- No other information about comparison distribution
- Assumptions:
  - Sample randomly selected from population.
  - The sampling distribution of means is normal
  - Variances of the two populations (whether they are the same or different) are the same.

34

Excel T.TEST, returns 'p'

Syntax

```
T.TEST(array1,array2,tails,type)
```

The T.TEST function syntax has the following arguments:

- **Array1** Required. The first data set.
- **Array2** Required. The second data set.
- **Tails** Required. Specifies the number of distribution tails. If tails = 1, T.TEST uses the one-tailed distribution. If tails = 2, T.TEST uses the two-tailed distribution.
- **Type** Required. The kind of t-Test to perform.

Parameters

If type equals	This test is performed
1	Paired
2	Two-sample equal variance (homoscedastic)
3	Two-sample unequal variance (heteroscedastic)

35

t-test

- If assumptions are followed, T.TEST returns 'p'
  - Likelihood of differences observed being due to chance, or error
  - = Probability of Type I error
- If p<threshold (conventionally 0.05), we say there is a significant difference
- If p>=threshold, we conclude nothing (experiment was inconclusive)

36

Reporting results

- Significant results, scientific articles
  t(df)=*tscore*, p<*sig*
  e.g., t(38)=4.72, p<.05
- Non-significant results
  e.g., t(38)=4.72, n.s.
- Informal usability reports:
  - t-test for independent means indicated that performance with FOO was significantly better than performance with BAR, p<.05
  - t-test for independent means for performance with FOO vs. BAR was not significant.

37

How many users do I need?

- For small, informal, qualitative, debugging usability tests
  - 5 users gets 80% of "usability defects"
- For quantitative usability experiments
  - Should do a "Power Analysis"
    - See online "Power Analysis Calculator"
    - Parameters: α, β (or power=1- β), anticipated effect size, number of tails
    - May need a "pilot study" to estimate effect size

40

Nielsen on Usability Testing

Usability Engineering

Ch 6

Methodological Pitfalls

- Reliability
  - Test-retest
- Validity
  - Are the results correct and meaningful?

Reliability

- Sources of variability in results?
- Individual differences are huge
  - 10x difference in performance from best to worst user
  - Best 25% of users are twice as fast as worst 25%
- How to accommodate?
- Sampling and Statistics!
  - Descriptives: measures of spread
  - Comparisons: inferential stats
    - More variance => more subjects!

Another way to think about descriptive stats

- How many test users do I need to characterize a usability metric?



Another way to think about descriptive stats

- How many test users do I need to characterize a usability metric?



Validity of a Usability Test

- Internal
  - Have you followed sound methodology?
  - E.g., sound inferencing
  - E.g., experiment: no confounds
- External
  - Can results be generalized to other situations of interest?
    - Random, unbiased, representative sample
    - Ecological validity
    - Face validity (e.g., do measures make sense?)

Sampling

- Sometimes you really can measure the entire population (e.g., workgroup, company), but this is rare…
- "Convenience sample"
  - Cases are selected only on the basis of feasibility or ease of data collection.

51

Acquiring A Sample

- You should obtain a *representative sample*
  - The sample closely matches the characteristics of the population
- A *biased sample* occurs when your sample characteristics don't match population characteristics
  - Biased samples often produce misleading or inaccurate results
  - Usually stem from inadequate sampling procedures

52

Sampling Techniques

- *Simple Random Sampling*
  - Randomly select a sample from the population
  - *Random digit dialing* is a variant used with telephone surveys
  - Reduces systematic bias, but does not guarantee a representative sample
    - Some segments of the population may be over- or underrepresented

53

Sampling Techniques

- *Systematic Sampling*
  - Every k^{th} element is sampled after a randomly selected starting point
    - Sample every fifth name in the telephone book after a random page and starting point selected, for example
  - Empirically equivalent to random sampling (usually)
    - May still result in a non-representative sample
  - Easier than random sampling

54

Advanced Sampling Techniques (usually not for usability testing)

- *Stratified Sampling*
  - Used to obtain a representative sample
  - Population is divided into (demographic) strata
    - Focus also on variables that are related to other variables of interest in your study (e.g., relationship between age and computer literacy)
  - **A random sample of a fixed size is drawn from each stratum**
  - May still lead to over- or underrepresentation of certain segments of the population
- *Proportionate Sampling*
  - Same as stratified sampling except that the proportions of different groups in the population are reflected in the samples from the strata

55

Advanced Sampling Techniques

- *Cluster Sampling*
  - Used when populations are very large
  - The unit of sampling is a group (e.g., a class in a school) rather than individuals
  - Groups are randomly sampled from the population (e.g., ten classes from a particular school)

56

Sampling

- Most statistics assume a random sample.
  - Every person in your population has an equal chance of being in your sample

58

Sample size

- In all empirical research, you should motivate your *sample size*
- Formative usability testing:
  - 3-5 test users => 80% of bugs
- Summative Experimental testing:
  - Do a statistic power analysis
  - Google "power analysis calculator"

59



Test Plan

- Goal of test
- When and where conducted?
- Length of sessions?
- Computers used? Software used?
- What should system load and response time be?
- Who are the experimenters?
- Who are the users? How many?
- What tasks? Completion criteria?
- User aids? (manuals, etc?)
- How much will experimenters help users?
- Etc etc.

Test Budget

- Personnel
- Tester compensation
- Computers
- Lab
- Special equipment (e.g., gaze tracker)
- Video/audio tapes

- WAG: $3k + $1k/user for typical industry test
  - 1993 $, ~+150% now)

Usability Test ROI

- Number of usability problems found = $N(1 - (1 - \lambda)^i)$
  - i = number of test users
  - N = total number of usability problems
  - λ = P(finding any given problem by an given user)
- Examples
  - Value of finding a usability problem = $15k
  - N = 41
  - $\lambda = 0.31$

Payoff ratio given these assumptions



Pilot Test

- Always run 1-2 test subjects first to debug the study protocol.
- Also used to characterize effect size to power for a larger experimental study

Performance Metrics



Be clear about the relationship between the specific measure you are using and the higher-level concept you are really interested in.

Performance Metrics

- Time to complete a task
- Number of tasks completed
- Time spent recovering from errors
- Number of errors
- Number of commands/functions used
  - Absolute or Unique
- Frequency of help use; time using
- Proportion who say they would use the product over a competitor's
- Etc.

Thinking aloud

- May be the single most valuable usability method
  - Identify misconceptions
  - Gather a great deal of qualitative data from few testers
  - Disadvantage: interferes with performance measurement
  - Be sure to also analyze what they *did* – they may not understand reasons

Thinking Aloud

- Moderator / Facilitator continuously prompts
  - What is he/she thinking?
  - E.g., "What are you trying to do now?"
- But, do not answer questions or lead the user
  - "What do you think this button will do?"

Thinking Aloud: Several Types

- Constructive Interaction
  - Aka co-discovery learning
  - Two testers use interface at same time
  - Naturally talk to each other about what they are doing, so don't need to prompt
  - Especially good for children
  - Need 2x users

Thinking Aloud: Several Types

- Retrospective Testing
  - Video record the test session
  - Review the video with the user afterwards
  - Good when users are scarce
  - Disadvantage: takes at least 2x time to test

Thinking Aloud: Several Types

- Coaching
  - User can ask any questions of an "expert" coach.
  - Use to discover information needs of novice users
  - Use to develop training & help documentation

Which?

Exercise: Usability study of origami instructions

- Teams of 3+, 1 user, 1 moderator, N observers

P7 – Heuristic Evaluation & Prototype Revision – Due WEDS

- After you receive the heuristic evaluations…
- Assign each of these problems your own severity rating (cosmetic, minor, major, catastrophic)
- Modify your system to correct as many of the problems found as possible (in priority order), documenting how you do this.

- **What to Post** A link to your updated prototype and a report describing how you responded to the heuristic evaluations.

To do

- Read
  - Chapter on Ubicomp & Wearables
- Finish P7
- Start P8, P9