

P6: Use Study Evaluation

Team Members: Purva Gupta, Roshni Iyer, Shanaaz Deo, Kunal Chaudhary

Core User Task

Our core user task is to have two demographically similar individuals to discuss an issue that they have differing opinions on. The prototype that we are conducting our study on is a chat website “Chat with Me” that allows two similar individuals to discuss differing opinions on a topic in a chat room in front of an audience. Users have the option of creating a new chat with the topic of their choice and specifying their stance, or they can join a chat either as a chatter (if there is space) or as an audience member. As a chatter, the user has freedom to actively interact and engage with a similar individual and see why they might feel differently about a topic. The audience observes more passively but can participate by giving “good attitudes” and “good jobs” to either chatter if they agree with something they said or if they feel they made a good point. This helps facilitate a comfortable environment for the chatters to discuss in, since there is no space for negative comments by the audience. We went forward with our initial HMW of “how might we enable two demographically similar people to discuss opposing opinions in a comfortable environment”? since having two similar individuals talk lowers the chance of immediate dismissal of opinion and more opportunity for listening to what each has to say.

Measures for Study

Survey Questions

- 1) Did you feel stuck or confused at any point?
- 2) Did you feel that you were in a comfortable environment to fearlessly express your opinion on controversial topics?
- 3) What improvements do you want to see in the product?
- 4) Do you find this product useful?
- 5) Were you comfortable discussing controversial issues with complete strangers in the group chat?

Qualitative Measures (observations)

- 1) Intuition about what is going on-any stuck points
- 2) How do they figure out what to do next? Are we adding the proper signifiers throughout the product?
- 3) Did the user make any comments suggesting something was annoying or repetitive?
- 4) Did the user get frustrated?

Quantitative Measures

- 1) Time it takes to complete (is task completed on time?)
- 2) Number of wrong clicks
- 3) Number of long pauses (over 10 seconds)
- 4) Number of positive commentaries & number of negative commentaries while using the UI (positive commentaries % over total number of commentaries)

Study Procedure

1. Focus on measuring utility, ease of use, and overall user experience (ie. did they feel comfortable when using the product, was it enjoyable). We want the product to be self-evident in it's ability to burst echo chambers, as well as enable the user to traverse through the product unguided.
2. The user is handed our implemented hi-fi prototype and simply must rely on their intuition to use the product. We requested the users to think out loud so the individuals recording the data know what the user's thought process is.
3. One person sits next to the user and helps answer any question or steer users in the right direction if any confusion exists. One person takes notes/observations on the quantitative measures. One person takes notes/observations on the qualitative measures. One person is responsible for the survey questions and any other insightful follow-up questions.
4. Steps 1 to 3 are conducted in 15 minutes.
5. Steps 1 to 3 are repeated for the second user (also done in 15 minutes).

User 1 Study:

Survey Questions

- 1) Did you feel stuck or confused at any point?
 - a) Yes, was confused on the initial login page since it usually says connect with facebook rather than login/signup with facebook
 - b) Also after you click "join chat" its often missed that there are actually two ways you can get involved-audience vs chatter roles so maybe make that more clear
- 2) What improvements do you want to see in the product?
 - a) More interaction from audience, give audience a more meaningful reason to be there
- 3) Do you find this product useful?
 - a) Yes, product was effective and useful in allowing like minded people to discuss a few issues they disagree on. He felt like it was something he might use.
- 4) Were you comfortable discussing controversial issues with complete strangers in the group chat?
 - a) Didn't find it toxic because you can leave at any time
 - b) Seems nice that audience can only leave positive feedback
- 5) How did you feel about the viewpoint of the audience member? Would you personally want to be an audience member in this situation?
 - a) Viewing one chat (at a time) would be too slow. If there was a way to make the functionality faster (view multiple at the same time, make the chat go faster).

Qualitative Measures (observations)

- 1) Intuition about what is going on-any stuck points
 - a) Was unsure of whether they could change their stance on the chat before joining

- 2) How do they figure out what to do next? Are we adding the proper signifiers throughout the product?
 - a) Yes, in general the user knew where to click and did not have trouble figuring out where to go next
- 3) Did the user make any comments suggesting something was annoying or repetitive?
 - a) Tried to interact with the audience chat and then realized they could not
 - b) Found it frustrating that they couldn't see in which ways they were similar to the other chatter
- 4) Did the user get frustrated?
 - a) Not really, they actually seemed to be having a good time, especially with the chat responses

Quantitative Measures

1. **Time to Complete** (navigating through the entire UI): 6 min. 20 sec
2. **# Wrong Clicks:** None
3. **# Long Pauses (over 10 sec.):** 1 long pause: Was somewhat confused what the similarity percentage (98%) meant. Asked "What am I similar in". However after ~8 seconds, the user was able to answer this question by themselves.
4. **Positive Comments (66.67%):**
 - Users would use this feature more often
 - Liked the fact that audience members could motivate the chatter by giving them positive comments
 - Liked the fact that they could exit the chat room at any point
 - Profile page was very clean and easy to read
5. **Negative Comments(33.33%):**
 - When the "report" button is clicked by the audience member who wishes to report the chatter, the person is immediately reported, and there is no confirmation for this action. The user brought up the issue that they could accidentally click this button and keep reporting people.
 - In the login screen, mentioned that it was more intuitive for the button to say "connect with facebook" rather than "login with facebook"

User 2 Study:

Survey Questions

- 1) Did you feel stuck or confused at any point?
 - a) Was confused about the difference between signing up and logging in with facebook
- 2) What improvements do you want to see in the product?
 - a) Might be nice to have some sample suggestions on interesting and popular topics to chat about if people are having trouble getting started

- b) Would be interesting to see if as the chat progresses if any audience members are changing their opinions
- 3) Do you find this product useful?
 - a) Felt like it was useful but would be nice if all users had some sort of resolve to work towards
- 4) Were you comfortable discussing controversial issues with complete strangers in the group chat?
 - a) Feels more comfortable joining chat vs creating chat because you are completely on the spot

Qualitative Measures (observations)

- 1) Intuition about what is going on-any stuck points
 - a) Confused about which stance they represent in the chat, and what the difference is between login/signup with facebook
- 2) How do they figure out what to do next? Are we adding the proper signifiers throughout the product?
 - a) Mostly clear, but had trouble figuring out how to end/leave the chat or if they needed to wait for something
- 3) Did the user make any comments suggesting something was annoying or repetitive?
 - a) Annoyed that audience had limited role and options, wished there was more audience engagement
- 4) Did the user get frustrated?
 - a) Not really, it went pretty smoothly

Quantitative Measures

- 6. **Time to Complete** (navigating through the entire UI): 7 min. 5 sec
- 7. **# Wrong Clicks:** None
- 8. **# Long Pauses (over 10 sec.):**
- 9. **Positive Comments (57.14%):**
 - Liked the fact that audience members could motivate the chatter by giving them positive comments
 - Liked the comfortable chat environment where no negative remarks could be directed by the audience members to the chatters
 - Found the chat screen and audience view of chat screen intuitive to use
 - Liked the functionality to be able to report chatters
- 10. **Negative Comments(42.86%):**
 - There should be a notification mentioning that a particular chatter has left the conversation
 - Would have liked to see some stats about the chat discussion from a chatter or audience member perspective before joining the chat room. (Stats could be #audience members currently viewing the chat, how long from the time created has the chat discussion being going on)

-Felt that it would be more user friendly to have a chat bubble icon or a delay when displaying simulated chats from the other user (ie. "Kunal's" messages)

Pilot Reflection

Today, we conducted our pilot of our working prototype; in our pilot, we had three users (one including our uGSI, Emily), test our product. In this pilot, we were able to see what functionality was clear to the user, what functionality the user was looking for while working with the product, and additional ways in which we could enhance the product.

The first area of confusion was the login page; on our login page, we had two buttons. One said "Log in with Facebook" and the other said "Sign up with Facebook". However, when websites/applications are linked with Facebook, there is usually just one button that says "Connect with Facebook"; therefore, we are going to add this button in and remove "Sign up" and "Log in" to avoid confusion.

Another area of confusion was participating in the chat: our users were confused on when the chat actually ended. They were also confused about what would happen if they clicked on the button that said "Leave the Chat"; would the chat be finished, or would a new user be able to enter the chat room and debate against the opposing viewpoint? Another key comment said was that the way the chat messages appeared seemed very sudden/violent; instead, there should be some sort of indication that the other user is typing a response (such as a "...") to make the chat room seem much more approachable. We can achieve this by creating a delay for the messages to appear to user or use a wizard of oz technique.

Lastly, many users had key ideas pertaining to the similarity of the users speaking in the chat room with one another. One user suggested that we could show the users how they are similar to one another either at the beginning or end of the debate. One user believe that the two users should see how they are similar to each other in the beginning of the chat because then a connection is formed between the two users instantly. It also gives the users ideas on where they share common ground and may help facilitate their discussion. We are thinking of displaying some of the ways the users are similar before they enter the chat.

Overall, I believe that we gained a lot of insight into what we need to improve with our working prototype for our next iteration. Instead of merely testing our product by having slowly the interface development (and not the back end), we will be implementing a Wizard of Oz testing technique to see how we can further improve our product and provide a more enjoyable experience for the user.

User Testing Informed Consent Form

Study administrator(s) is/are: _____

Participant is: _____

This is a use study designed solely for designers/developers to evaluate the utility, easy of use and user experience for a web application prototype. The goal of the web application is to connect users with similar backgrounds but differing opinions on particular topic(s) while enabling users to discuss their opinions in a comfortable, stress-free environment. Your participation will help us achieve this goal.

In this study, you will be working with our newly implemented web application and will be asked to navigate it. We encourage you to think out loud as we aim to understand user thought process to help enhance our prototype for future iterations. Member(s) of the design and development team will sit next to you, quietly observing and taking notes. There will be another individual from the team who will work with you to answer any queries or provide guidance if at any point you are confused about the application. While we hope that you enjoy using our application and your use study experience, you may at any point leave the study if you feel the need to.

All information collected in the use study is confidential and we ask that all participants refrain from discussing information from the use study pertaining to our application outside of the session. All work regarding the web application and idea belongs to the Chat With Me design and development team at the University of California, Berkeley. All data collected from this session will remain confidential, or anonymous if published, and will be used solely for enhancing our application. We will not videotape the use study session unless you provide consent (see below).

Statement of Informed Consent

I have read the description of the study and of my rights as a participant. I voluntarily agree to participate in the study.

Please circle (YES NO): I give consent to being videotaped during this session. I understand that all data collected during the use study will remain confidential and anonymous.

Print Name: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____