Special Interest Group on Transparent Statistics in HCI

Matthew Kay
University of Washington
mjskay@uw.edu

Steve Haroz
Northwestern University
stats@steveharoz.com

Shion Guha
Cornell University
sguha@cs.cornell.edu

Pierre Dragicevic
Inria, France
pierre.dragicevic@inria.fr

Abstract

Transparent statistics is a philosophy of statistical reporting whose purpose is scientific advancement rather than persuasion. We propose a SIG to discuss problems and limitations in statistical practices in HCI and options for moving the field towards clearer and more reliable ways of writing about experiments.

Author Keywords

Statistics, methodology, user studies.

ACM Classification Keywords

H.5.m [Information interfaces and presentation (e.g., HCI)]

Motivation

Empirical studies in HCI typically consist of solitary experiments analyzed through null hypothesis significance testing (NHST). However, this traditional approach is under growing criticism at CHI [11, 3, 7, 12] and has been strongly criticized for more than 50 years in other fields [13, 5, 4].

Problems with current practices include [7, 14, 11]:

- The use of statistical constructs (e.g, p-values) that most researchers have trouble grasping intuitively
- Overemphasis on conveying evidence and numbers rather than useful information and generalizable conclusions, leading to tedious p-cluttered reports
- Dichotomous thinking, i.e., thinking of hypotheses as either true or false, and of effects and evidence as either existing or not existing
- Undisclosed flexibility in data analyses, yielding cherry-picked results or p-hacking (even if unintentional)
- Simplistic criteria for paper acceptance (e.g., looking at whether results are "significant") leading to positive results bias, and thus an incomplete and distorted literature
- A lack of focus on research as a cumulative and collective enterprise, including a lack of incentives for sharing experimental data and study materials, a lack of replication, and virtually no meta-analysis

Problems with HCI statistics extend beyond mere procedural mistakes committed by researchers who might need more statistical training. We believe this are deeper issues worthy of a conversation—here, a SIG—about how to reform the prevalent methods in the community.

What is Transparent Statistics?

Our use of the term *transparent statistics* is not meant to imply that statistical reports at CHI are necessarily opaque. Instead, it aims to emphasize transparency in reporting. More specifically, we propose to refer to transparent statistics as *a philosophy of statistical reporting whose purpose is to advance scientific knowledge rather than to persuade.* Although transparent statistics recognizes that rhetoric plays a major role in scientific writing [1], it dictates that when persuasion is at odds with the dissemination of clear and complete knowledge, the latter should prevail. For example, when empirical data provides incomplete or mixed evidence, a transparent investigator should refrain from drawing definitive conclusions and instead communicate all relevant information *"in intelligible form, in recognition of the right of other free minds to utilize them in making their own decisions"* [8]. Transparent statistics puts clarity before messiness, and messiness before false clarity—study results are often disappointingly complex, but in transparent statistics the quest for scientific truth prevails over *"aesthetic criteria of novelty, narrative facility, and perfection"* [9].

Acknowledging the messiness of results is often at odds with our desire to make strong, definitive statements (*"technique A outperforms technique B"*). But conveying uncertainty more faithfully represents our results and even makes them more useful: practitioners do not want to know if p is less than .05; they want to know by how much does technique A improve over technique B (plus-or-minus some error) so that they can perform a cost-benefit analysis and

decide whether to adopt it. Besides advancing clarity within our field, transparent statistics can help address another existential crisis for HCI—impact on real-world systems— by expressing our results in statistical language that is amenable to assessing practical significance.

How to Move Towards Transparent Statistics?

The purpose of this SIG meeting is to discuss how we can move toward more transparent statistical practice in HCI and also what HCI can contribute to broader statistical reform. We offer several discussion points, ideas, and opinions to start that conversation.

Reporting Transparent Statistics

Transparent statistics are about both *what* we report and *how* we report it. While methodologists have been discussing *what* to report to maximize transparency (e.g, communicating simple/standardized effect sizes with frequentist/Bayesian interval estimates, clearly distinguishing between planned and unplanned analyses), HCI can advance guidelines for *how* to report transparent statistics in a user-friendly manner. For instance, clear, straightforward graphical communication of effects can be written into modern reporting guidelines [7]. These approaches could become both the standard within HCI and the standard we aspire to create through new statistical tools—what if the output of any procedure in a statistical package was an annotated, self-explanatory visualization, rather than a cryptic table? This approach may make some uncomfortable, as guidelines already exist that insist upon many orthodox practices that can be harmful to transparent statistical communication. These older standards lead to ubiquitous impenetrable results sections that are peppered with numerical statistical results. We plan to discuss how authors can educate reviewers when writing results that do not follow old norms. This includes amassing a set of citations that lend credence

to (currently) unorthodox approaches; e.g., essays by advocates of estimation [5, 7] and of Bayesian methods [12].

Having more papers in the field using these methods can also help. Done well, these methods could speak for themselves. Clearer communication (with relevant citations) can be enough to convince reviewers simply through the deeper understanding they gain from the work. However, some re-thinking is still necessary: a wide confidence interval that just overlaps 0 in a small-n study is more honest than a *p* value just above .05 (and better informs future meta- or Bayesian analysis), but might feel like a lackluster result to a reviewer used to thinking in binary rejection criteria.

Emphasizing Practical Significance over Testing

In contrast to a focus on binary testing (is A better than B?), transparent statistics emphasize effect size (how much better?) and uncertainty (what are the upper and lower bounds on the difference?). These inform us on practical significance: is the difference large enough, and are we certain enough to act on it? Given an estimated difference between two conditions, a practitioner could apply a cost function to decide whether the increase in performance is worth the cost of switching to a new interface or technique. Cost/benefit analysis, not statistical significance, is the language of industry, and therefore one way for results from HCI to make it out of the lab and into real-world systems.

Training and Education

Training and education is an important part of this debate. Many HCI researchers learn statistics in one of two ways: through an applied statistics course (for non-statisticians) taught by statisticians, or through a course (or part of a course) taught by an HCI or computer science professor in their home departments. The latter approach can perpetuate old norms in the field which, as we have argued, need

to be reexamined and reformed. How can we better integrate transparent statistics education into HCI curricula (as is becoming more common in other fields)?

Open Data and Replications

While clear communication of statistical analyses is critical, publishing the underlying data allows those analyses to be verified. Open data allows readers to answer questions about aspects of analysis that may be missing from the text. It also allows subsequent researchers to analyze facets of the data that the original researchers did not examine, perform meta analyses on multiple publications, and more easily use existing data to form priors for future Bayesian analyses. Science is a cumulative and collective enterprise.

Nevertheless, questions have arisen regarding the costs and merits of open data. Documenting and anonymizing data takes time. There are also limits to its error-correcting ability. While reexamination of an experiment's data can help detect mistakes, problems can occur in any stage of an experiment, including incorrect stimulus presentation, incorrect response recording, and the possibility of a statistical fluke. Furthermore, reusing materials can propagate these mistakes across multiple publications. Overcoming these problems requires complete experiment replication [14], not just reproduction of the analysis.

Transparent Conclusions

While our focus is on reporting and analysis, transparent statistics necessarily go hand-in-hand with well-designed and implemented experiments, and should be followed by reasonable conclusions. Conclusions should be nuanced and not convey false certainty [7]. It is also easy to over-generalize experimental results; If a technique is beneficial in one implementation or task [10], how can we use theory to make conclusions that extend beyond the narrow scope

of the experiment? Often, HCI research is divided into hypothesis-driven and data-driven approaches, themselves direct successors of deductive and inductive reasoning [6]. These different approaches have uncodified conventions in how we write about generalizability. Failure to differentiate the two often results in overclaiming about the external validity or generalizability of human-centered research [2]. Transparency is increased if research projects describe (1) how they connect to and build off of existing theories and (2) why or if the conclusions are externally valid.

HCI Can Help Statistics!

Beyond advancing transparent statistics within our own field, the HCI community can provide a unique voice in the ongoing conversation around improving the usability of analysis tools and improving the clarity of statistical communication. We can help improve the cryptic systems that are difficult to learn, require substantial background, and even fail silently (returning incorrect results to unwitting users).

Conclusion

We propose a meeting at CHI to discuss the present and future of transparent statistical communication in HCI, a conversation we hope will improve the clarity, reliability, and impact of quantitative results in the field.

References

[1] Robert P Abelson. 2012. *Statistics as principled argument*. Psychology Press.

[2] Michael S Bernstein, Mark S Ackerman, Ed H Chi, and Robert C Miller. 2011. The trouble with social computing systems research. In *CHI'11 Extended Abstracts*. ACM, 389–398.

[3] Paul Cairns. 2007. HCI... not as it should be: inferential statistics in HCI research. In *People and Computers: HCI... but not as we know it*, Vol. 1. 195–201.

[4] Open Science Collaboration and others. 2015. Estimating the reproducibility of psychological science. *Science* 349, 6251, aac4716.

[5] Geoff Cumming. 2013. The new statistics why and how. *Psychological science*.

[6] Andrew Dillon and Charles Watson. 1996. User analysis in HCI–the historical lessons from individual differences research. *Int J Human-Comp Studies* 45,6.

[7] Pierre Dragicevic. 2016. Fair Statistical Communication in HCI. In *Modern Statistical Methods for HCI*, J. Robertson and M.C. Kaptein (Eds.). Springer. tinyurl.com/fairstats-author In press.

[8] Ronald Fisher. 1955. Statistical methods and scientific induction. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)*, 69–78.

[9] Roger Giner-Sorolla. 2012. Science or art? How aesthetic standards grease the way through the publication bottleneck but undermine science. *Perspectives on Psychological Science* 7, 6, 562–571.

[10] Steve Haroz and David Whitney. 2012. How capacity limits of attention influence information visualization effectiveness. *IEEE TVCG* 18, 12, 2402–2410.

[11] Maurits Kaptein and Judy Robertson. 2012. Rethinking statistical analysis methods for CHI. In *CHI 2012*.

[12] Matthew Kay, Gregory Nelson, and Eric Hekler. 2016. Researcher-centered design of statistics: Why Bayesian statistics better fit the culture and incentives of HCI. In *CHI 2016*.

[13] Rex B Kline, American Psychological Association, and others. 2004. Beyond significance testing: Reforming data analysis methods in behavioral research.

[14] Max Wilson, Wendy Mackay, Ed Chi, Michael Bernstein, and Jeffrey Nichols. 2012. RepliCHI SIG: From a panel to a new submission venue for replication. In *CHI'12 Extended Abstracts*.

Supplementary material for CHI SIG on Transparent Statistics in HCI

Matthew Kay, Steve Haroz, Shion Guha, Pierre Dragicevic

Abstract. Transparent statistics is a philosophy of statistical reporting whose purpose is scientific advancement rather than persuasion. We propose a SIG to discuss problems and limitations in statistical practices in HCI and options for moving the field towards clearer and more reliable ways of writing about experiments.

Background of Organizers

Matthew Kay is a PhD candidate in Computer Science & Engineering at the University of Washington. He studies the design of user-facing uncertainty in everyday sensing and prediction, such as personal informatics systems for health and applications for real-time transit prediction. He has also published work advancing the use of Bayesian statistics in VIS (InfoVis 2015) and CHI (CHI 2016). His website is: http://www.mjskay.com.

Steve Haroz is a postdoctoral research fellow in the Psychology Department at Northwestern University. He researches how the brain perceives and understands visually displayed information, and he has experience with the experiment design and statistical practices in both computer science and psychology. Steve also maintains a list of InfoVis publications which include statistically analyzed quantitative experiments: steveh.co/experiments

Shion Guha is a doctoral candidate of information science at Cornell University. He studies facets of boundary negotiation in social networks such as privacy, surveillance and deception. This puts him at the intersection of HCI, CSCW and computational social science. He also contributes to methodological HCI research especially in the context of mixed methods research. He can be found online at: https://www.cs.cornell.edu/~sguha/

Pierre Dragicevic is a permanent research scientist at Inria since 2007, and studies information visualization (infovis) and human-computer interaction. He is interested in reforming statistical practice in HCI and infovis, with a focus on replacing dichotomous testing with estimation thinking. He gives regular talks (e.g., at the BELIV 2014 biannual workshop) and publishes papers (alt.CHI '14, Chapter in upcoming Springer Book on Modern Statistical Methods for HCI) on the topic. He also maintains a Web page with reading material: www.aviz.fr/badstats

Communities to which this SIG will be of interest

We believe this SIG will be of interest to the following communities:

- Researchers and students who have some experience in conducting and analyzing user studies and endorse the values of transparent statistics in HCI. They may be interested in how they can **help advance statistical practice** in HCI and in how they can help shape new standards of practice for statistical communication in the field.
- Researchers and students whose primary focus is not statistics but who (perhaps begrudgingly) need to conduct studies and do statistics to validate/evaluate the output of their research. Such researchers are found across CHI and related communities (CSCW, Ubicomp, UIST, VIS, CogSci, etc.), and may include computer scientists, designers, psychologists, or e-health researchers. They are mostly concerned about **getting their ideas published** and having impact in real-world systems, all topics we aim to discuss.
- Researchers and students who are interested in educating themselves and **improving their methods** of statistical analysis and reporting. This group overlaps strongly with the previous ones.
- Researchers and students who are interested in **building new tools** to support more effective statistical analysis and communication in HCI. This group may want to know what kinds of approaches make transparent statistics possible, and how tools might help improve statistics in the field.
- Practitioners, who are interested in how to **make the most of empirical HCI research**.
- Experts from other disciplines, who may be interested in sharing their expertise with the CHI community: psychologists, statisticians, methodologists, and medical researchers.

Assumed attendee background

We hope to attract students, researchers and practitioners spanning the CHI communities outlined above (CSCW, Ubicomp, UIST, VIS, CogSci, etc.), statisticians or researchers with a strong background in statistics, as well as tool builders. Because our goal is both to have conversations that shape the future of statistical communication and to begin the process of education, we will not assume all attendees have a strong statistical background. However, this SIG is not intended to be a statistics tutorial; rather, we plan to explain the limitations of current practices, provide a brief overview of transparent statistics, and provide a set of resources for those who wish to learn more.

Approach for organizing and presenting the SIG

We aim to have 30 minutes of short talks given by the organizers followed by 50 minutes of discussion. Part of the goal of these talks will be to give attendees some common background on transparent statistics, as well as to seed the discussion period. The talks will be organized around the themes and discussion ideas presented in the extended abstract for our SIG:

- 5 min: Short introduction to this SIG
- 5 min: Pierre Dragicevic: NHST and the limits of dichotomous testing
- 5 min: Matthew Kay: Bayesian methods and practical significance
- 5 min: Steve Haroz: Generalizability and open data

- 5 min: Shion Guha: Training and education
- 5 min: How to move forward, list of possible questions

For more details of these topics, see our extended abstract submission.

Plan to attract attendees

We represent and have contacts in a diverse set of communities related to our proposal, including VIS (Dragicevic, Haroz, Kay), UIST (Dragicevic), social computing and CSCW (Guha), UbiComp (Kay), psychology and cognitive science (Haroz), e-health (Kay), and statistics (Guha). Using our combined professional and social networks, we will reach out to attract attendees via:

- Social media (Facebook, Twitter, Foursquare)
- Spreading the word at CSCW in March
- Community and departmental mailing lists (e.g. CHI, SOUPS, Cornell, Northwestern, UW, INRIA, cognitive science)

Primary contact

Matthew Kay, mjskay@uw.edu