

An insight into human-computer interaction research methodologies

COMP210 - Interfaces and Interaction

1707981

October 6, 2018

This is a research journal and may well not require an abstract.

1 Introduction

2 Ask AI

Can we use first-person perspective in this journal?

3 Projects to evaluate

- Critical Critters - Wall running - Static bars - health bars - The pause menu and Team Ghost, etc - Genesis - Adding a modifier - Hard modelling - Extruding etc - Bugs - SpyroEdit - Texture editing and paletting rules - Moving objects, etc - PlayStation Assembly Tool - Demiurge - Pause menu usefulness - Mouse effectiveness - Should the crosshair scale? - Audio project with Mango - Should we use words in the interface, or will unlabelled colours do?

4 Look up

Qualitative Interviews Automated Data Collection Focus Groups - Physiological Data Diaries - Eye Tracking Camera Study- Task Analysis Surveys - A/B testing Heuristic Evaluation - Bench Marking Cognitive Walkthroughs - Surveys Ethnographic Field Study - Click Stream Analysis Think Aloud Protocol - System Usability Scale (SUS)

5 Proposal

Interface design faces many usability challenges. The importance of each design factor, such as ease of use and aesthetics, may depend on the project in question. When testing the efficacy of an interface, one would be wise to tailor the research to this. I anticipate mine to be focused on my 3D modelling project, Genesis. Its user interface is designed to optimise the following elements:

- The time it takes for a user to find an item or feature of interest
- How quickly a user may find an unfamiliar or advanced feature
- How cluttered or confusing the interface may be
- The aesthetic of the interface

Some of these elements may be easy to measure quantitatively. Others may lend themselves to qualitative questionnaires, or A/B variants to test efficiency. An advantage to this project is that the source code is readily available, such that multiple versions of the interface may be tested and compared.

6 Potential user testing methods

6.1 Eye tracking

Eye tracking involves non-invasively monitoring a user's eye movement to broadly determine their focus of attention. [1] It traditionally uses a costly specialised camera, making the method less accessible outside of lab scenarios [?], thereby restricting the demographic range of subjects. However, recent developments [2] [3] have managed to achieve similar effects with low-cost portable IR cameras. Additional developments in the field of VR suggest that eye-tracking may be a widely accessible strategy in the near future.

In HCI analysis, eye tracking takes advantage of the theory that eye movement and fixation directly correlates to the user's interest. [1] Specialised tools can then record and visualise the user's area of focus in a heat map which provides a visualisation immediately depicting areas of interest. However, this is unlikely to be useful alone, and a more detail recording of the path of a user's eye focus may be more substantial [4].

While eye tracking is an exciting prospect, is unlikely to be affordable and achievable in the limited time I have, due to the requirement of (perhaps expensive) technologies that are still in a development and research phase.

6.2 A/B testing

TO READ: [5]

A/B testing is historically interesting in the fact that the subjects of an A/B test are not necessarily aware.

A/B testing is useful in that it can help identify the actual efficacy of a design with minimal bias. However, it can still be influenced by the choice of demographics for each group. Furthermore, the sample size required to identify a trend (and therefore a preferred strategy) is quite large, and after the fact, A/B testing does not necessarily offer a solution for further improvement of the trend.

6.3 Click stream testing

Click stream testing involves the tracing of a user's clicking habits. This is especially useful in web development , where a 'three second rule' exists amongst designers, stating 'never expect a user to spend more than three seconds on a web page'. This rule highlights the importance of giving the user a path to their destination page quickly. By tracking the path of links clicked by the user, click stream analysis can show to a web developer both which pages the user was most interested in, and how long it took them to get there. They could then optimise the design so the user may reach the page more quickly.

Click stream analysis is unlikely to be especially useful in games, except where they have an extensive menu system.

7 Surveys, interviews and bias

For a designer to get specific answers to their questions about their design approaches - such as how effectively it works - they may be tempted to ask the users directly.

Interviewing and **surveying** are two methods of data collection wherein a user is asked a specific set of questions about their experience on a topic.

This method, however, is strongly impacted by bias. Several sources of bias, such as: the demographic difference between a voluntary respondent and a non-respondent; motivational influence of the interviewer; language and cultural differences; social desirability bias (especially on sensitive topics [6]); and even the order of questions [7]. Many of these issues are shared across surveys, interviews and computers [8] [7].

Surveys are closely similar to interviews in terms of the specific questions that can be addressed. Fortunately, in an ironic celebration of human-computer interfacing, computer surveys are known to be more preferred by users, faster to complete, and significantly more effective at delivering fully completed responses in general. [9] They

do, however, suffer from many of the same biases.(cite?)

Although these methods have advantages in the collection of qualitative data, an analysis of human-computer-interaction may well benefit more from automated data collection software. This is leveraged by the fact that an HCI evaluation will already involve a computer, making it efficiently non-invasive.

8 Method comparison

9 Method choices and why

10 Quality of experience – Priorities

Based on the above findings, a preliminary priority list of asset downloads is proposed:

- Player movement, to enable initial player autonomy and feedback [?]
- Player avatar, so they can see where they are, enhancing the above
- Untextured level geometry (nearby), so the player has locations to visit
- Interactive objects, for further feedback
- Player animations and object animations to deliver the aesthetic [?]
- Untextured level geometry (distant, low-detail) for greater immersion
- Textures and sounds to further enhance and complete the aesthetic
- Additional resources.

10.1 Server system

11 Conclusion

a new demand for games with building elements. Should this happen, their development should hope to drive this area of research forward.

References

- [1] A. Poole and L. Ball, “Eye tracking in human-computer interaction and usability research: Current status and future prospects,” in *Encyclopedia of Human Computer Interaction*, pp. 211–219, Jan. 2006.
- [2] J. R. Khonglah and A. Khosla, “A low cost webcam based eye tracker for communicating through the eyes of young children with ASD,” in *2015 1st International Conference on Next Generation Computing Technologies (NGCT)*, pp. 925–928, Sept. 2015.
- [3] H. Ho, “Low cost and better accuracy eye tracker,” in *2014 International Symposium on Next-Generation Electronics (ISNE)*, pp. 1–2, May 2014.
- [4] S. T. Dumais, G. Buscher, and E. Cutrell, “Individual Differences in Gaze Patterns for Web Search,” in *Proceedings of the Third Symposium on Information Interaction in Context, IliX ’10*, (New York, NY, USA), pp. 185–194, ACM, 2010.
- [5] P. Hynninen and M. Kauppinen, “A/B testing: A promising tool for customer value evaluation,” in *2014 IEEE 1st International Workshop on Requirements Engineering and Testing (RET)*, pp. 16–17, Aug. 2014.
- [6] R. Tourangeau and T. W. Smith, “Asking Sensitive Questions: The Impact of Data Collection Mode, Question Format, and Question Context,” *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, vol. 60, no. 2, pp. 275–304, 1996.

- [7] A. Bowling, “Mode of questionnaire administration can have serious effects on data quality,” *Journal of Public Health*, vol. 27, pp. 281–291, Sept. 2005.
- [8] B. C. Choi and A. W. Pak, “A Catalog of Biases in Questionnaires,” *Preventing Chronic Disease*, vol. 2, Dec. 2004.
- [9] J. M. Ryan, J. R. Corry, R. Attewell, and M. J. Smithson, “A comparison of an electronic version of the SF-36 General Health Questionnaire to the standard paper version,” *Quality of Life Research*, vol. 11, pp. 19–26, Feb. 2002.