Reflection

The elicitation method that we used is a survey (seen on: User_Reserach.md/Herramientas). As a reference to reflect over our work, I'll use the following as source [1], which includes best practices and a recommended process. The main consideration about the original technique is that a survey is a limited tool: it has few questions and are often provided in pairs (closed-open.) So, to find more information, is combined with others such as a Semi-structured interview (recommended on the source).

The source suggested process for a survey includes pre-survey, survey and analysis steps. I'll be focusing on the first two as those were the most problematic.

In the source, the pre-survey steps define the information needed. For this, we used the artifact "User_Research.md", sub-artifacts: "Información requerida" and "Sources of information." We implemented the technique by writing on a table the information required and an argument for why we need it. But we had a problem and is that some information defined was not needed (e.g. IR3: "¿Qué información es la más importante sobre el uso de tarjetas de crédito?", we don't need it because, for this survey, we were only interested on how to deliver the information, not *on* the information). The source provides a way to solve this, to add to our artifact: Main goal, relevant user behavior, key metrics, opinions on new features and pain points. A way of improving to define the Main Goal and stick to it. (e.g. "The Main Goal of this survey is to find how our population better learns better about financial education and their limitations.") Then add relevant user behavior (E.g. time available) and key metrics (e.g. 10m, or 40m) to exemplify the conclusions. (E.g. the IR7: "Tiempo disponible del usuario para aprender información financiera." we could've added in another column "example": if is 10 minutes a day, the lessons must be *nuts-and-bolts* whereas if he answers 40+ they can be *ins-and-outs*.")

For the process of the survey, we had two problems: building the tool and scheduling. When it comes to building the tool, the source provides some best practices, some of which we applied (e.g. mixing up question types). The ones we didn't applied were on keeping it survey on topic (because some of the "Información requerida" was wrong as seen on the "Fuentes de información" and "Herramientas") and we had more than 10 questions. This could've been prevented by solving the previous problem. When writing the survey, we had some troubles with its logic, and thus some people answered questions they shouldn't have. A way to prevent this would've been to conduct a test session to detect problems with the tool and fix them prior to the actual application. In terms of scheduling, we would've needed to cite the people and apply the test, which would've added around 2 days of work (one for citing the people, and another to conduct the survey), but it would result on a better experience for the users, and better data for the analysis. The consequences of not having done this are visible on the

Credit_Card_Information_Survey.xlsx and on Processed_Responses.xlsx, in which we had to clean all the problematic data.

Overall, we applied the fundamental steps defined in the source, like mixing up the question types and selecting a tool like Google Forms. There were some steps that could've been improved, like defining objectives and our target audience. And some steps that we didn't consider at the moment (like piloting the interview) but would've improved the results. So, we were a little far from the original technique.

Reference

[1] M. Soegard, "User Experience (UX) Surveys: The Ultimate Guide | IxDF." Accessed: Mar. 19, 2024. [Online]. Available: https://www.interaction-design.org/literature/article/ux-surveys