### CSC 484 Lecture Notes Week 2

# **The Process of Interaction Design (ID)**

- I. Relevant reading.
  - A. Textbook Chapter 9.
  - **B.** Paper of the fortnight:
    - Investigating attractiveness in web user interfaces

# **II.** Assignment 1 presentation schedule.

A. Unless teams want to volunteer otherwise:

Day	Time	Team
Mon, Apr 14	12:10 - 12:34 12:34 - 1:00	Sports PDF
Wed, Apr 16	12:10 - 12:34 12:34 - 1:00	IM Mail
Fri, Apr 18	12:10 - 12:34 12:34 - 1:00	Music Word

A1 presentation schedule, cont'd

**B**. Ordering rationale: smaller teams later.

C. All written deliverables, including slides, due Monday.

#### **III. This week's lab schedule:**

A. Mon: discuss A1 progress; free time for A1

- **B. Wed:** full-class discussion of current research paper; some time for A1 work
- **C. Fri:** 25 minute quiz; remaining time for A1 team work.

# IV. More on Wed lab discussion.

- A. Please read it by then.
- **B**. Bring your opinions.
- C. Specifically,
  - 1. Do you buy it?
  - 2. Is there any real science going on here?
  - 3. Overall, thumbs up or down?

- V. Intro to ID process (Sec 9.1).
  - A. Much in common with the SE process.
  - **B**. Both have goal of developing a product.
  - **C**. High-level steps of ID process:

### **Intro to ID Process, cont'd**

- 1. Identify needs and establish requirements.
- 2. Develop alternative designs.
- 3. Build interactive versions.
- 4. Evaluate throughout the process.



# Announcement

# **Computer Science Fee Allocation Committee** seeks members for next year.

Applications available on department website.

# VI. What is involved in ID? (Sec 9.2)

- A. User-centrality is fundamental tenet of ID.
- **B**. Should be fundamental to good SE process.

- C. Some software involves no HCI.
  - 1. Systems and embedded software.
  - 2. User-centered design not appropriate here.

- **D**. Concrete examples are highly effective.
  - 1. Show users sketches.
  - 2. Describe things in prose.
  - 3. Draw diagrams, in users' appl'n domain.
  - 4. Show them interface prototypes.

E. Critique of book's Box 9.1 on "The value of prototyping".

- 1. Yes indeed, it can be very valuable.
- 2. Chosen example may not motivate well.
- 3. What they're getting at is attaining *full user engagement*.

- 4. A delicate balancing act to
  - build prototype as rapidly as possible
  - show everything the user cares about
  - leave out time-consuming imple'n detail

# VII. Importance of involving users (Sec 9.2.1).

A. We said it plenty in 308.

**B**. We'll say it plenty here in 484.

# Involving users, cont'd

- **C**. "Expectation management" simply means:
  - 1. Don't build up expectations with hype.
  - 2. Rather, show users what it will look like, and deliver them that.

#### Involving users, cont'd

D. User involvement helps develop sense of ownership -- psychologically important.

# VIII. Degrees of user involvement (Sec 9.2.2).

A. Involvement levels, high to low:

1. Users are paid permanent members of development staff.

2. Users are interim paid members.

- 3. Users are involved on voluntary basis
- 4. Users participate indirectly, through paid representative(s).
- 5. Users are regularly surveyed and studied.

- 6. Users are recruited "off the street".
- 7. Users are "simulated" by product marketing staff and/or other development team.

**B**. Choosing level(s) is very organization and product/project specific.

C. Broadly,

- 1. For particular organization, involve real end users who work for the organization.
- 2. Off-the-shelf products have represented users, with actual users recruited.

# Announcements

- Team presentations next week in lab.
- A1 written material due Monday, 11AM.
- See recent clarifications in A1 writeup.

- IX. More on user-centeredness (Sec 9.2.3).
  - A. Early focus on users and tasks.
    - 1. Users' tasks and goals are driving force.
    - 2. Users' behavior and context are studied.
    - 3. Users' characteristics are captured.
    - 4. Users are consulted throughout.
    - 5. Design decisions made in users' context.

### User-centeredness, cont'd

# **B.** *Empirical measurement*.

- 1. Identify and agree upon usability goals.
- 2. Use them to evaluate continuously.

#### User-centeredness, cont'd

**C**. Iterative design

1. Show the users something concrete.

- 2. Get their feedback.
- 3. Repeat until done.

- X. Practical issues (Sec 9.3).
  - A. Who are the users?
  - **B**. What do we mean by "needs"?
  - **C**. How do we generate alternative designs?
  - **D**. How do we choose among alternatives?

# XI. Identifying users (Sec 9.3.1).

A. Book broadens discussion to stakeholders.

**B**. Term well known in SE circles, includes:

# Identifying users, cont'd

1. end users -- actual product users

2. *customers* -- people who buy it

3. *domain experts* -- people who know a lot

# **Identifying users, cont'd**

- 4. *developers* -- people who build it
- 5. evaluators -- people who test it
- 6. *managers* -- people who nag
- 7. *visionaries* -- people with "vision thing"
- 8. *other interested parties* -- any imaginable

#### XII. Identifying user needs (Sec 9.3.2).

- A. Some articulated directly by users.
- B. Others observed, measured characteristics,
  - physical
  - behavioral
  - psychological
  - social

#### **Identifying user needs, cont'd**

- C. Can often understand new needs based on how current needs are met
- D. CHI study found non-electronic habits good for understanding web-based needs.

# XIII. Generating alternative designs (9.3.3).

- A. Start by looking at what else is out there.
- **B.** Consider incremental improvements to existing solutions.
- C. Talk to people with different backgrounds.

#### Generating alternative designs, cont'd

- D. Introspect on your own creative processes.
- E. Draw analogies from other problems.
- F. And, alas, talk to your lawyer about potential copyright and patent infringements.

#### **XIV.** Choosing among alt designs (Sec 9.3.4).

- A. Examine external factors -- *does user like it?*
- **B**. Examine internal factors -- *implementable*?
- **C**. Determine how to present design alternatives:

# Choosing among alt designs, cont'd

- 1. Prose descriptions and diagrams.
- 2. End-user scenarios.
- 3. Prototypes.

# Choosing among alt designs, cont'd

- D. Clearly define quality criteria.
  - 1. Performance.
  - 2. Functional characteristics.
  - 3. Aesthetic characteristics.

#### **Choosing among alt designs, cont'd**

E. Develop quantifiable usability criteria (more in coming weeks).

# XV. Lifecycle models --ID process meets SE process (Sec 9.4).

A. Familiar territory from SE.

**B**. Sec 9.4.1 sketches simple ID process model.

C. Sec 9.4.2 is rehash of known SE processes.

D. Sec 9.4.3 is HCI wrinkle on things.

### XVI. ID process mapped to SE processes (Sec 9.4.1 + 9.4.2).

Drawn on board during class.

# **ID** mapped to SE, cont'd

- A. Agile process involves frequent iterations.
- **B.** Design is often not explicit step of Agile.
- **C.** Evaluate step often not explicit in SE.

# **ID** mapped to SE, cont'd

- 1. Difference between Evaluate and Test:
  - former focuses purely on end-user evaluation
  - latter focusing on functional system testing, e.g., JUnit.

# **ID** mapped to SE, cont'd

- 2. End-user evaluation could be considered part of a pervasive testing step.
- 3. It's worth emphasizing that ID evaluation is different than software system testing.

#### **XVII.** Process models in HCI (Sec 9.4.3).

- A. The *Star* model.
  - 1. Do traditional steps in any order.
  - 2. Always do evaluation after each step.
  - 3. An iterative SE process, where steps can be skipped, and evaluation is pervasive.

B. Usability engineering model.

- 1. Can be mapped to any SE model.
- 2. Adds more details to requirements analysis
- 3. More clearly defines user-centered eval.

#### **Usability engineering, cont'd**

C. *ISO 13407* human-centered design standards -- nothing really new here.

# **XVIII. General observations from SE side.**

A. ID process in book is very skimpy on details.

- **B**. To get a real product to market, one must *manage* things
  - version control
  - bug tracking
  - regression testing

#### **General observations from SE, cont'd**

- **C**. Value-added of ID process is user evaluation as explicit and pervasive.
- D. SEs under appreciate user involvement less today, than 10 or 15 years ago.
- E. SEs probably do under appreciate quantified usability analysis.

CSC484-S08-L2

Slide 50