

Homework 04 - Interviews and Content Logs

Andrew Carter and Beryl Egerter

February 19, 2013

1 Interview: ACBE1

1.1 Post Interview Reflection

- Hard to tell when participant is asking questions we should answer.
- Did first two questions prime participant too much to completely understand the code instead of trying to fix specific problem?
- Always started from a top of file
- When functions were small, would skip around if a function was called, but not as much skipping around when looking at larger functions.
- Got lost in code, think forgot what initial question was - we want to provide printed question to participant in future interviews in order to try and make sure they remember what they are doing
- Often when confused, didn't have a specific question that we could answer without leading too much
- Ruby question actually worked well because we knew more when we should step in and explain a ruby question because participant hadn't seen ruby before
- Occasionally missed pieces of the code (eg. a plus sign between two function calls)
- Got bogged down in functions that didn't matter to question - wanted to understand code fully which we believe contributed to forgetting initial question in 2.2

1.2 Interview Summary

Interview length: 49:20m

Technical difficulties:

- Table is reflective
- Paper was missing a new page mark, so two questions had strange paper size
- Double equals doesn't have a break in the middle because of the font

We went through Questions 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, and 2.2.

1.3 Most Interesting Pieces

1.4 Content Log

2 Interview: ACBE2

2.1 Post Interview Reflection

- Went through first two problems very efficiently
- In 2.1, figured out problem with tomorrow and how to fix it, and what the problem with yesterday was, but not how to fix yesterday until prompted
- Much less thrown off by ruby than previous participant

- Could infer some syntax correctly (inferred some incorrectly) but was still able to work with the code without being told that her assumptions about syntax were incorrect/correct
- backtraced on the smaller functions, skipped str function but not score in 2.2
- didn't backtrace on 2.2 even though there was code that would backtrace similarly to the first two problems
- needed to understand whole class, not just specific functions within it
- first question was put off by passing functions but recovered quickly
- like previous participant, replaced function calls with results but only in comprehension
- relied on names a lot in second two questions

2.2 Interview Summary

Interview length: 36:25m

Technical difficulties:

- Camera setting were slightly different, but recording came out fine

We went through Questions 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, and 2.2.

2.3 Most Interesting Pieces

2.4 Content Log

3 Next Interviews

Our scheduled interviews:

1. Interview with DE at 9:00pm on Tuesday, February 26
2. Interview with EG to be scheduled