This paper quantitively and qualitatively conveys the subjective nature of UX, investigates if background variables could be the reason for the subjectivity and defines a rough scope for UX. The paper also emphasizes the difficulty of coming up with a universally agreed upon definition, as the one brought together by the standardization body ISO, was ultimately classed as ambiguous, with regards to when it occurs. Moreover, there is controversy relating to, if UX is socially or individually experienced.

There exists commonalities about UX, for example “The confidence intervals for the first three statements showed a strong mean agreement” **[Law et al., 2009]** , these statements emphasized the “importance of users’ internal states and context for UX” **[Law et al., 2009]**. Knowing that many participants, who know a thing or two about UX, agreed on this, helps to filter our thoughts of what UX is, especially, In the case where one is new to this topic. Also it means we know something about UX.

The results showed that background variables did have an effect on the differences in opinions, but only a small subset made a considerable effect. For example, It was found that the more experience a participant had in UX/UCD “the less the respondents agreed about the subjective nature of UX” **[Law et al., 2009]**  and “the less the respondents agreed on the need of a standard definition” **[Law et al., 2009]**. These findings, insinuate that UX can be understood through experience of application and because of this, there is less subjectivity. The other background variable, Country of Residence, created disagreements relating to the subjectivity of UX, what causes UX and how it should be approached, between the most participated countries, UK, USA and Finland. Specifically, The irony of different opinions about UX begin subjective, confirms it’s subjective nature.

In conclusion, the paper narrows down UX, which means less time is wasted trying to find the standard definition. Furthermore, the paper distinguishes UX from other experiences which gives reason for its existence.
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