

Needs and Usability Assessment

- # Needs > requirements based on knowledge of users
- # Usability and usefulness
 - Usability: ease of learning, operation
 - Usefulness:
 - serves an intended purpose
 - serves an intended audience/community
 - meets people's needs

12/1/2001

© Prof. Nancy Van House, SIMS, UC Berkeley

How It Relates to IS204

- # Design and evaluation based on understanding users and their work
- # Social science research methods applied to design and evaluation

12/1/2001

© Prof. Nancy Van House, SIMS, UC Berkeley

Doing Needs and Usability Assessment

- # Why
 - Improved design
 - Better systems, more satisfied users
 - Improves the work supported
 - Cost savings-- less redesign
- # Why not
 - "We know what users need"
 - Time and resources
 - Lack of incentives – doesn't affect ME

12/1/2001

© Prof. Nancy Van House, SIMS, UC Berkeley

Stages (not linear; iterative)

- # Identifying users
- # Identifying/understanding user needs
- # Design & prototyping
 - Lo-fi, high-fi
- # Testing/assessing prototype
- # Implementation
- # Testing/assessing implemented system

12/1/2001

© Prof. Nancy Van House, SIMS, UC Berkeley

Early Approaches to Usability Assessment

- # Performed near end of development process; limited changes possible
- # Based on testing, experiments
- # Lab studies:
 - Controlled environment
 - Pre-defined tasks
 - Observation (e.g. 1-way mirror)
 - Measurement (time; number of errors; number of operations; and the like)

12/1/2001

© Prof. Nancy Van House, SIMS, UC Berkeley

Trends in Usability Assessment

- # Performed earlier in design process
- # Facilitates a variety of cooperative relationships between users and designers
 - users not simply critiquing design but engaged in co-design
- # Increased focus on users' work practices

12/1/2001

© Prof. Nancy Van House, SIMS, UC Berkeley

Assessing Information-Intensive Systems

- # **Content** (Is it what people need and want? Can and will they use it?)
 - Relevance
 - Trustability
 - Level (of info), presentation
- # **Functionality** (what does the system do?)
- # **Information architecture**
- # **Interface**

12/1/2001

© Prof. Nancy Van House, SIMS, UC Berkeley

METHODS

12/1/2001

Methods of Data Collection & Analysis

- # **Derived from social science research methods**
- # **Designed to prevent errors common to inquiry**
 - Inaccurate observation
 - Overgeneralization
 - Selective perception
 - Biases introduced by interests
 - Premature closure of inquiry

12/1/2001

© Prof. Nancy Van House, SIMS, UC Berkeley

Research Methods Principles

- # **Validity** – measure what they purport to measure
 - relative to the goals and purpose of the evaluation
 - relative to the ‘real’ end-users, their tasks, uses, context
 - Ecological validity
 - ability to predict end-user problems
- # **Reliability**
 - Repeated applications > similar results

12/1/2001

© Prof. Nancy Van House, SIMS, UC Berkeley

Classifying Data Collection Methods

- # **According to how performed**
 - Automatic (e.g. logging activity)
 - Empirical (usability testing)
 - Formal (models and formulas)
 - Informal (heuristics; walk-thrus)
- # **According to who does it**
 - Expert
 - Simulated user
 - Representative users
 - Few or many
- # **Setting – laboratory or real world**

12/1/2001

© Prof. Nancy Van House, SIMS, UC Berkeley

Choosing Methods

- # **Goals of evaluation effort**
- # **What is being evaluated**
- # **For what purpose**
- # **At what stage in development process**
- # **Cost-benefit assessment of the method**

12/1/2001

© Prof. Nancy Van House, SIMS, UC Berkeley

Combining Methods

- # triangulation – same issues, different perspectives
- # cost-benefit
- # complementarity – new info
- # practicality
- # level of effort
- # resources available
- # what to do when different methods > different results?

12/1/2001

© Prof. Nancy Van House, SIMS, UC Berkeley

ASSESSING NEEDS

12/1/2001

Who are your intended users?

- Purpose of system
- Identity of users
 - Captive audience, well-defined group, general...
- Relevant characteristics, behaviors, preferences
 - Experienced/inexperienced: with technology, with content area
 - W3C and disability, other relevant abilities
 - internationalization/globalization: language, icons that work x cultures

12/1/2001

© Prof. Nancy Van House, SIMS, UC Berkeley

Assessing Needs

- Directly: asking them what they want/need
 - People don't always know how they would use innovations
 - Technology and work co-evolve
- Indirectly: understanding their intentions and activities
 - Task analysis
 - Scenarios
- Assessing existing resources
 - Competitive analysis

12/1/2001

© Prof. Nancy Van House, SIMS, UC Berkeley

Methods of getting information from users

- # Surveys (written questionnaires)
- # Interviews
- # Focus Groups
- # Workshops
- # Field studies

12/1/2001

© Prof. Nancy Van House, SIMS, UC Berkeley

Surveys (written questionnaires)

- # Benefits: many responses, easy to analyze, low effort for respondents
- # Problems:
 - limited to short answer/check off questions, inability to follow up
 - Finding respondents, getting responses, especially from non-captive audiences (e.g., non-users)

12/1/2001

© Prof. Nancy Van House, SIMS, UC Berkeley

Survey Methods

- # Sampling
 - Deciding on sample characteristics, size, sampling method
 - Avoiding bias, understanding limitations (esp'ly small and/or self-selected samples)
- # Questionnaire design
 - Writing questions based on your goals
 - Wording questions such that users can answer, you can understand results
 - Length (short)

12/1/2001

© Prof. Nancy Van House, SIMS, UC Berkeley

Survey Data Analysis

- # Knowing what conclusions you can (and cannot) draw from data
- # Correlating variables, e.g. user characteristics and behavior

12/1/2001

© Prof. Nancy Van House, SIMS, UC Berkeley

Interviews (face-to-face, phone)

- # Benefits
 - Complex questions and answers
 - Ability to follow up
- # Difficulties
 - Labor intensive for both interviewer and interviewee
 - Possible interviewer effects

12/1/2001

© Prof. Nancy Van House, SIMS, UC Berkeley

Interviewing Issues

- # Medium: Face-to-face, phone, email...
- # Interview schedule: what to ask and how
- # Gaining cooperation
- # Avoiding bias

12/1/2001

© Prof. Nancy Van House, SIMS, UC Berkeley

Focus Groups

- # Directed group discussion
- # Benefits
 - Synergy within the group
 - Multiple participants simultaneously
 - Complex questions and discussion
- # Difficulties
 - Group interaction conditions responses
 - Labor intensive
 - Analyzing results can be difficult

12/1/2001

© Prof. Nancy Van House, SIMS, UC Berkeley

Focus group methods

- # Choice of participants: which types, which individuals; how heterogeneous?
- # Guiding the discussion
- # Reporting the results
 - video
 - written summaries

12/1/2001

© Prof. Nancy Van House, SIMS, UC Berkeley

Field studies/Ethnography

- ✦ Focus is on understanding work, practices, resources Studying people's activities in their natural setting
- ✦ Learning participants' understanding of their own activity
- ✦ Approaching activity in context of other activities, resources

12/1/2001

© Prof. Nancy Van House, SIMS, UC Berkeley

Types of Ethnographic Studies

- ✦ Studies of work - where new tech might be intro'd but w/o explicit design agenda
- ✦ Studies of technology in use - situated use of specific technologies/classes of technology
- ✦ Participatory/work-oriented design - people who use/are affected involved

12/1/2001

© Prof. Nancy Van House, SIMS, UC Berkeley

Ethnography / Field Observation Methods

- ✦ Visit work site
- ✦ Video work in action
- ✦ Photograph resources, layout
- ✦ Interviews, group discussions
- ✦ "Hiring in" – becoming a part of the work group

12/1/2001

© Prof. Nancy Van House, SIMS, UC Berkeley

Ethnography – Limits

- ✦ Labor intensive for all parties
- ✦ Not easy to do well – requires training and practice
- ✦ Time required – often does not match project schedule

12/1/2001

© Prof. Nancy Van House, SIMS, UC Berkeley

Contextual Inquiry/Design

- ✦ Applied, structured ethnography
- ✦ Aimed at helping turn inquiry into design
- ✦ Complex, hard to learn, time-consuming

12/1/2001

© Prof. Nancy Van House, SIMS, UC Berkeley

EVALUATION

12/1/2001

EVALUATION

- # Who does it
 - Experts
 - Users
- # On what basis
 - Inspection
 - Empirical testing
 - Simulated/artificial use
 - Real use

12/1/2001

© Prof. Nancy Van House, SIMS, UC Berkeley

Expert-based evaluation - Inspection

- # Competitive analysis
- # Heuristic evaluation
- # Cognitive Walkthrough
- # Formal Usability Inspection
- # Feature Inspection
- # Standards Inspection
- # Guideline checklists – including accessibility for the disabled

12/1/2001

© Prof. Nancy Van House, SIMS, UC Berkeley

Expert-based evaluation grounded in fieldwork

- # Scenarios
- # Task analysis
- # [contextual inquiry]
- # Benefits:
 - Investigators trained in methods and criteria
 - Grounded in user work
- # Difficulties:
 - Investigators not the same as users
 - Time, effort to collect ethno data

12/1/2001

© Prof. Nancy Van House, SIMS, UC Berkeley

Formal Testing

- # Rooted in experiments
- # Controlled tasks and conditions > comparable data x designs, users, conditions
- # Where:
 - In lab
 - In user's workplace (remote testing)
- # Measures:
 - System performance
 - User performance

12/1/2001

© Prof. Nancy Van House, SIMS, UC Berkeley

Testing Issues

- # Benefits: controls for sources of observed differences
- # Difficulty: ecological validity of artificial tasks and conditions
 - Validity of the tasks used
 - People generally use variety of resources in their work

12/1/2001

© Prof. Nancy Van House, SIMS, UC Berkeley

Testing – Thinking Aloud Protocol

- # Real-time
 - direct response; but may interfere
- # Retrospective with video
- # Co-discovery method - 2 users

12/1/2001

© Prof. Nancy Van House, SIMS, UC Berkeley

“Automatic” Evaluation

- # Methods
 - Logs – e.g. server logs
 - Monitoring – e.g. cookies
- # Advantages
 - 100% cooperation (unless user actively resists)
 - Unobtrusive
- # Disadvantages
 - Need to understand what data you can and cannot collect, inferences can/cannot make

12/1/2001

© Prof. Nancy Van House, SIMS, UC Berkeley

Reporting

- # Formal written reports
- # Video
- # Workshops with designers
 - usability professionals as user advocates
 - users

12/1/2001

© Prof. Nancy Van House, SIMS, UC Berkeley

DESIGN

12/1/2001

Design Methods Rooted in Understand Users

- # user-centered design
- # contextual design
- # participatory design
- # prototyping, co-operative prototyping
- # case-based prototyping – Xerox law firm ex

12/1/2001

© Prof. Nancy Van House, SIMS, UC Berkeley

PRINCIPLES

- # To be useful and used, a system has to be rooted in *users' actual work goals/intentions and practices*, coordinated with the resources they use
- # Users are experts in what they do; designers may be experts in technology but not the users' work
- # Technology design is work re-design
- # Design continues in use – work adapts to tools, users adapt tools to the work – cannot fully anticipate

12/1/2001

© Prof. Nancy Van House, SIMS, UC Berkeley