Prototype: Experience and Low-Fidelity Prototypes

20/20 Points

10/30/2024

| Attempt 1 ▾ | ◯ Review Feedback 10/30/2024 | Attempt 1 Score: 20/20 | 🗨 View feedback |

Anonymous grading: **no**

Unlimited Attempts Allowed

∨ **Details**

At this stage, you are focused on early prototyping. This has two deliverables: an *experience prototype* and a *low-fidelity* prototype.

This assignment text includes examples for the type of text I'm looking for.

1. Experience Prototype

Any new concept involves risks. At this stage, there are plenty of potential things that could go wrong about your concept. You should find a handful of *critical assumptions* you're making about your user's desires, behavior, or experience, select one that you can prototype and test in about 2 to 3 hours, and write up what you learned from that prototype.

a. Assumptions and Question.

Write a list of three or more assumptions you're making about a user's desires, behavior, or experience that are *fundamental* to your concept. (The five listed need not be easy to tackle.) Select one assumption that you *can* tackle in 2-3 hours to be the main question of your prototype. This question should be a yes/no format: we've moved into choosing only idea and putting all you've got on that idea.

Assumptions:

- Some people are comfortable starting to talk to a complete stranger on a train.
- There are enough people on a single train that most people can find someone to talk to.
- This matching is permitted by train conductors and social norms on the train.
- Most people who start to talk to a complete stranger on a train find it comfortable to end that conversation, too.

Experience Prototype Question: Are some people comfortable starting to talk to a complete stranger on a train?

Rubric:

2/2 - Most assumptions are fundamental to the concept; prototype question is a yes/no question. Prototype can tackle the selected question in 2-3 hours.

1/2 - Most assumptions are not fundamental to the concept, or key assumptions are missing. Prototype question is not a yes/no question.

0/2 - No assumptions.

b. Testing (6 points)

Now that you have a question, make a plan to get an answer to that question, and execute that plan. Write a one-paragraph summary of the plan you made and any changes you found as you were executing on it.

> Every day this week I'll leave a little early (15 minutes early) to have 15 min to talk to the traingoers at my stop. I'll ask them if they're interested in having a friendly 15-minute conversation with another willing rider and telling me about how it went. If two people at my stop were willing, I introduced them to each other, asked them to sit with each other on the train, and when they were done to email me very short answers at my work email address, **mrm@iit.edu (mailto:mrm@iit.edu)** .

Rubric:

4/4 - Team did the work and executed on this experience prototype.

0/4 - Team did not make this experience prototype happen.

2/2 - Plan is clear and will answer the question.

1/2 - Plan is unclear but still has a chance to answer the prototype question

0/2 - Plan does not answer the prototype question.

c. Findings (2 points)

You have results! Do they give you enough confidence to proceed, or do you want to take another approach? Write a paragraph detailing your findings, any interesting notes or stories, and conclude whether or not this concept is worth pursuing further (a simple yes or no).

- 2/2 - Results are clear, the conclusion is specific and logically connected to the results.
- 1/2 - Results are thin, conclusion is unclear, or is not logically connected to the results.
- 0/2 - No results.

> Ultimately, this was a fair assumption. Two of the three days, I was able to find a pair of riders at my own stop. One person did it twice, even. Two people on the last day noted they wanted to do this again, and I got their email address to let them know about the app. While this is only about 10% of the riders at my stop (5 of about 50 people I talked to among all the days), there is still enough to support. This is only one stop of about 8 that gathers people on the morning train, and the evening trains are even larger. I'd estimate there are about two to ten people per train who could find someone to talk to. That is definitely enough to progress with this project.

2. Low-Fidelity Prototype

The second type of risk you have is interface risk: a tool that can't be read, understood, and used by its intended audience. When you're working with established UI technologies like websites and mobile apps, this can be addressed fairly easily, with user testing. We use things like websites and applications all the time, and that intuition gives us a fair idea for how someone will use an application. However, as designers, we need to be 99% sure the application we are making is usable and "intuitive." For screen-based websites and applications, low-fidelity prototyping ensures the structure of each screen and flow between screens are not a problem for naive (new) users. (For other concepts, talk to me for what materials to prototype with; cardboard or existing physical objects are usual go-tos.)

a. Task Flows (2 points)

Write three tasks for your user to do. They should be clear from your storyboard within the ideate stage.

2/2 - All tasks describe *what* the user wants to do, not *how* to do it. All tasks are relevant to the application.
1/2 - Most tasks fit the criteria above.
0/2 - Most tasks do not fit the criteria above.

     (1) Create a profile, (2) Match with riders, (3) Coordinate a meeting with a matched rider.

b. Initial Paper Prototype (2 points)

Develop a low-fidelity prototype that (in theory) allows the user to complete these task flows. Take a photo or video of this paper prototype.

Prototype Fidelity:
1/1 - Prototype is of fidelity good enough to get feedback (it resembles the prototype shown in class.)
0/1 - Prototype is too detailed or not detailed enough to get good feedback.

Prototype Scope:
1/1 - Prototype contains enought screens / steps that a user could plausibly complete the tasks
0/1 - Prototype does not contain enough screens / steps for a user to plausibly complete the tasks.

c. Test 1 Feedback (2 points)

un a test with at least two users. Note the interface's successes and failures. Where did they need
:tra help? Where were they confused by wording? Where did they get lost? Note that your
edback will be likely be four times as long as this (this is just one person without a lot of changes.)

./2 - Descriptions are clear, both participants were run, and changes are interpreted correctly.
1/2 - Descriptions are unclear, only one participant was run, or the proposed changes do not solve

the problems faced.

0/2 - Descriptions are unintelligible or results are missing.

> Participant 1 initially pressed the "create a profile" to (presumably) jump to the profile screen, which was not meant to be a live link. This can be made into a live link to the profile screen. They also had trouble scrolling down to see the save button, which could be addressed with a scroll bar or better visual placement of these boxes. Once they saved their profile, they asked for clarification about the word "match" and suggested "connect" would be a better world because it wasn't two-sided. We asked ChatGPT for 20 word suggestions and ultimately decided that "connect" was best of them for the second prototype. We noted Participant 1 had trouble articulating how to meet up with someone on a train, but because they were not a regular traingoer, we interpreted the feedback to find regular traingoers, with a note for the future that we could provide structure for inexperienced traingoers (how many cars, which car they are in, what level, etc).

d. Revised Prototype (2 points)

Using the feedback, create a new prototype. Submit photos or a video of the prototype. Highlight (with one-sentence descriptions or shorter) the changes to the prototype (what has changed in the interface) along with their motivation (what you expect the user will do differently).

2/2 - Descriotions are clear and always contain both the interface

1/2 - Descriptions are unclear or missing parts, or the prototype is not provided.

> - We changed the profile creation box to extend beyond the break, so participants saw there was a reason to scroll down.
> - We modified the language to "connect" rather than "match" to indicate it's a one-sided action still relying upon the other person's approval.
> - (etc, for all the changes)

e. Test 2 Feedback (2 points)

Run a test with one more user. What worked and what didn't? What still needs changing? Write up the results in the same style as part 2c.

2/2 - Descriptions are clear, both participants were run, and changes are interpreted correctly.

1/2 - Descriptions are unclear, only one participant was run, or the proposed changes do not solve the problems faced.

0/2 - Descriptions are unintelligible or results are missing.

File name	Size	
📄 CS495_Pro...art_5.pdf	5.47 MB	✅

File name	Size	
Paper_Pro...Video.MOV	257 MB	✓

Page   ❮   1   ❯   of 3   —   ZOOM   +   ⤢

Fatima Mariyam; A20527616   Bushra Ibrahim; A20531477   Tushar Gwal;

CS495 - Intro to Human-Computer Interaction

Experience + Lofi Prototype

Due 10/30/24

Part 1: Experience Prototype

a. Assumptions and Questions.

- We assume people make grocery lists for grocery shopping
- We assume people are willing to download an app to fulfill a grocery-shopping purpos
- We assume people would benefit from the grocery list suggestions of an app
- We assume that people would trust the app to handle their purchasing data.

Experience Prototype Question: Are people willing to use an app-generated list for grocery s

b. Testing

To see if people would be open to using an app that creates grocery lists for them, we are goin
quick survey with ten random people. This group will include students, friends, and a few shop
a local store. We'll explain how the app works, highlighting that it generates grocery lists base
they've bought in the past and their shopping habits. Then, we'll ask each person if they would
comfortable using an app-generated list while shopping, and we'll just need a simple yes or no
For those who are unsure, We'll ask some follow-up questions to understand their concerns, li
accuracy, convenience, or data privacy. We'll note down their response and look for any comm
in their feedback to help us understand their thoughts better. This whole process should take al
hours.

You are unable to submit to this assignment as your enrolment in this course

has been concluded.