

# User Study: Lessons Learned

**Jaroslav Šnajberk**

Department of Computer Sciences and Engineering

Faculty of Applied Sciences

University of West Bohemia in Pilsen

# Agenda

- > Introduction
- > Preparations
- > The user study
- > Processing of results
- > Writing article
- > References

# Introduction

- > Evaluation of AIVA
  - > AIVA visualizes structure of component-based software
  - > It is new and interactive information visualization tool
  - > Case-study on complexity
  - > User-study on user performance
- > This is what we learned

# Preparations

- > Decide what you will test
  - > We wanted to measure performance – how fast can one finish set of tasks
- > Design a test scenario
  - > We selected six core tasks in component visualization
- > Try test scenario
  - > Try it yourself, redesign
  - > Let someone else try it, redesign

# Preparations

- > Design the user study
  - > How many people – 12
  - > Type of user study – comparative = compare with RSA
  - > Form of user study – guided 1on1 + interview
- > And finally...
  - > Threads to validity
  - > Eliminate advantage
  - > Try it, first attempt will probably fail

# The user study

- > This is the easiest part, just do what you prepared
  - > If you tried it before it should be fine
  - > Just collect all the data for future

AIVA						UML					
Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6
0:46	0:11	0:20	0:32	0:33	0:28	1:04	2:40	0:12	2:56	2:43	2:10
0:16	0:09	0:42	0:25	0:35	0:25	1:22	2:06	0:11	1:40	2:39	2:08
0:22	0:08	0:18	1:02	0:23	0:27	1:13	2:30	0:25	1:58	2:49	2:14
0:23	0:22	0:19	0:40	0:23	0:29	0:43	0:30	0:07	0:39	1:46	1:20
0:51	0:33	0:20	0:41	0:44	0:50	1:19	1:30	0:27	1:23	2:25	2:10
0:12	0:10	0:11	1:20	0:22	0:10	0:36	0:59	0:17	0:43	1:41	1:00
0:25	0:09	0:23	0:27	0:31	0:38	1:24	1:05	0:21	1:01	1:40	2:49
0:29	0:06	0:16	0:37	0:29	0:16	0:46	1:14	0:09	0:54	2:17	0:52
0:07	0:04	0:08	0:24	0:16	0:24	0:52	0:34	0:08	0:28	1:00	0:36
0:15	0:24	0:17	0:31	0:25	0:17	0:59	1:06	0:21	0:40	1:48	1:28

# Processing the results

- > Perform analysis on the data
  - > Average, median, standard deviation, etc.
  - > More advanced if needed
- > What does the results show
  - > Be precise, prevent misunderstandings
  - > Any success is suspicious for others

# Writing article

- > Hypothesis and null hypothesis you tested
  - > If you did not made one at the start of user study
- > Describe how the study was designed
  - > Goal of the study
  - > Profile of participants
  - > How did you performed the study
  - > List of tasks
  - > Other elements, that could biased the results
- > Anyone should be able to recreate it now



# Writing article

- > Presenting results
  - > Show all the raw data, so analysis can be verified
  - > Add all your analysis
  - > Do not compare results yet
- > Compare results
  - > Show graphic comparison
  - > Add some mathematics
  - > Just present these numbers, without discussion and conclusions

# Writing article

- > Discussion
  - > This is the hardest part
  - > Discuss all pros and cons, trade-offs, etc.
  - > Discuss if different tasks could make different outcome
  - > If you questioned participants summarize their opinions
  - > Create conclusions of the whole study
  - > You must convince all that scientists this is valid result

# References

- [1] C. Forsell, “A guide to scientific evaluation in information visualization,” in *Information Visualisation (IV), 2010 14th International Conference*, july 2010, pp. 162 –169.
- [2] C. North, “Toward measuring visualization insight,” *Computer Graphics and Applications, IEEE*, vol. 26, no. 3, pp. 6 –9, may-june 2006.
- [3] M. Sensalire, P. Ogao, and A. Telea, “Evaluation of software visualization tools: Lessons learned,” in *Visualizing Software for Understanding and Analysis, 2009. VISSOFT 2009. 5th IEEE International Workshop on*, 2009, pp. 19 –26.

# References

- [4] S. Carpendale, “Evaluating information visualizations,” in *Information Visualization*, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, A. Kerren, J. Stasko, J.-D. Fekete, and C. North, Eds. Springer Berlin / Heidelberg, 2008, vol. 4950, pp. 19–45.
- [5] D. H. Laidlaw, J. S. Davidson, T. S. Miller, M. da Silva, R. M. Kirby, W. H. Warren, and M. Tarr, “Quantitative comparative evaluation of 2d vector field visualization methods,” in *Proceedings of the conference on Visualization '01*, ser. VIS '01. Washington, DC, USA: IEEE Computer Society, 2001, pp. 143–150.
- [6] R. Kosara, C. G. Healey, V. Interrante, D. H. Laidlaw, and C. Ware, “Thoughts on user studies: Why, how, and when,” *IEEE Computer Graphics and Applications*, vol. 23, p. 2003, 2003.

**Thank you**