

we collected over 1,200 logs, 168 exit surveys, and 36 interviews with end-users. Our mixed-method study and analysis showed that LemonAid was helpful, intuitive, and desirable for reuse for over 70% of users across all the deployment sites and that users found LemonAid to be a refreshing approach compared to other modern forms of help. (See [3] for a description of the field study and more detailed findings).

CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES

Users' Perceptions of the Social Aspects of Help

Overall, we found that users appreciated the social aspects of retrieving help through LemonAid. For example, as users browsed through other users' questions and saw other votes on questions, it was a validating experience for them to know that they were not alone in experiencing particular issues. Users also felt that the serendipitous discovery of new information about the application or tips through the contextual Q&A was also useful when they were not looking for any particular answers. The help content in LemonAid was also noted as being valuable because the Q&A came from other people using the application and not "jargon" from a predefined help document (a limitation of other forms of contextual help approaches).

Community Participation in the Larger Context

While end users were overall positive about LemonAid, we found that most of the Q&A content came from the software teams rather than other users. For example, the logs of our largest deployment with a library site showed that only 16 new questions were added during the deployment, constituting about 1.6% of the total help sessions (972) over 15 weeks. We also found that no end users answered a question; library staff answered all new questions. (We did find that the 16 new questions asked by users received 121 views, accounting for about 21.5% of all question views and 74.3% of the corresponding answers were marked as helpful.)

Although it seems that few users contributed questions and answers in our deployments, prior work has shown that this level of activity is typical of what occurs in technical forums [6,7,9]. Similar low end user participation has also been observed in other community-based systems, such as *AnswerGarden* [1]. Also, this level of participation is characteristic of communities that exist more broadly on the Internet (e.g., "the 1% rule" [2]) where most users are consumers of online content rather than contributors. Still, our interviews revealed that users were even more cautious about posting content in LemonAid because the Q&A overlaid on the application's interface seemed "more official" (versus a separate forum or social networking site). This challenge is perhaps unique to crowdsourced contextual help systems given that the Q&A are accessed from within the application.

In future work, it would be interesting to compare the level of participation that we saw in the current set of deployments to: 1) sites that have perhaps millions of active users; and 2) sites that use a closed familiar social network to crowdsource

Q&A. We are curious to tease out whether there are differences in a small community-based Q&A forum (e.g., our deployment sites that had a few hundred or thousands of users) vs. a larger crowdsourced Q&A forum (e.g., sites such as *YouTube* that draw millions of daily users) vs. a closed social-network Q&A forum (i.e., sites that connect to only Facebook or Twitter friends). Our hunch is that we would see some differences in the level of activity, but in any of these cases, there would still be need to incentivize users to participate on a regular basis. We could, for example, consider incentives such as badges, awards and leaderboards that help make forums such as *Stack Overflow* successful [8].

The Role of Software Teams in Moderating Q&A

Despite the seemingly low end user participation in the Q&A, the promising finding in the study of LemonAid was that users still derived benefit from using this crowdsourced contextual help approach. We believe that users could still find the content valuable because the host software teams were actively involved in maintaining the Q&A. For example, the host teams were able to devote time and resources to seed the initial database with existing FAQs, monitor the questions as they were entered, and provide answers. It may be that to sustain the same level of quality in answers, a long-term commitment from the host teams would be necessary. Since many modern organizations have already opted to create peer-to-peer support forums, perhaps engaging with users through crowdsourced contextual help is a natural extension. Also, users noted that when a staff member provided an answer, they were more likely to trust the authority and quality of that answer.

Unlike other forms of social Q&A, we feel that moderation by software teams can be integral to crowdsourced contextual help rather than seen as an extra feature. For example, the team members who participated in our study felt that investing in one-to-many support is more efficient and provides greater cost-savings in the long run compared to supporting users one-on-one. So, if team members can be alerted of new questions posted by users and teams can provide timely answers, it can be mutually beneficial for teams and a large number of users. Also, since LemonAid appeared to be "a part of" the application, maintaining the quality and accuracy of the help content was more critical for the host teams and team members appreciated having the additional control over the Q&A.

In summary, we have described the concept of crowdsourced Q&A-based contextual help for software and discussed the design of LemonAid. We have also discussed some results from a large field study that we carried out to understand users' perceptions of LemonAid in the wild and the challenges and opportunities that arise from our findings. We look forward to having discussions with other researchers and practitioners at the Social Media Question Asking workshop and learning about ways to tackle some of these challenges and the opportunities that they bring.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Tovi Grossman for useful discussions and feedback.

REFERENCES

1. Ackerman, M.S. Augmenting organizational memory: a field study of answer garden. *ACM Trans. Inf. Syst.* 16, 3 (1998), 203–224.
2. Arthur, C. What is the 1% rule? *The Guardian*, 2006.
3. Chilana, P.K., Ko, A.J., Wobbrock, J.O., and Grossman, T. A Multi-Site Field Study of LemonAid: Usage and Perspectives of End-Users and Software Teams. *Proceedings of the 2013 ACM annual conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, ACM (2013), to appear.
4. Chilana, P.K., Ko, A.J., and Wobbrock, J.O. LemonAid: selection-based crowdsourced contextual help for web applications. *Proceedings of the 2012 ACM annual conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, ACM (2012), 1549–1558.
5. Kajko-Mattsson, M. Problems within front-end support. *Journal of Software Maintenance and Evolution: Research and Practice* 16, 4-5 (2004), 309–329.
6. Ko, A.J. and Chilana, P.K. How power users help and hinder open bug reporting. *Proceedings of the 28th international conference on Human factors in computing systems*, ACM (2010), 1665–1674.
7. Lakhani, K.R. and Von Hippel, E. How open source software works: “free” user-to-user assistance. *Research policy* 32, 6 (2003), 923–943.
8. Mamykina, L., Manoim, B., Mittal, M., Hripcsak, G., and Hartmann, B. Design lessons from the fastest q&a site in the west. *Proceedings of the 2011 annual conference on Human factors in computing systems*, ACM (2011), 2857–2866.
9. Matejka, J., Grossman, T., and Fitzmaurice, G. IP-QAT: in-product questions, answers, & tips. *Proceedings of the 24th annual ACM symposium on User interface software and technology*, ACM (2011), 175–184.
10. Morris, M.R., Teevan, J., and Panovich, K. What do people ask their social networks, and why?: a survey study of status message q&a behavior. *Proceedings of the 28th international conference on Human factors in computing systems*, ACM (2010), 1739–1748.
11. Rettig, M. Nobody reads documentation. *Communications of the ACM* 34, 7 (1991), 19–24.
12. Singh, V., Twidale, M.B., and Rathi, D. Open Source Technical Support: A Look at Peer Help-Giving. *Proceedings of the 39th Annual Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences - Volume 06*, IEEE Computer Society (2006), 118.3.
13. TurboTax Support. <http://turbotax.intuit.com/support/>.