Michael User Interview 1 Notes

**Think-aloud process**

* skipped intro, went to aim of study
* briefly looked at methodology, starts going thru it
* moves towards discussion (5.2)
* finishes conclusion, goes back up towards background, skims parts they ran previously skipped
* goes back thru methodology and discussion back and forth quite a bit
  + for example, noticed “lagged effects” in the discussion, went back to methodology, found it was 12 weeks
* looking for contributions aside from the expected result that pure acknowledgment/encouragement fosters engagement
  + cross referencing psychological features/connotations
* doesn’t really acknowledge the charts until prompted, partially because of a lack of technical understanding
  + sees a chart of shapley values, now is understanding what higher and lower values means
  + flips back and forth between figure 2 and table
    - social behavior listing, interesting that it goes in a negative direction
    - finds certain results pretty interesting
  + now onto figure 3
    - notes an assumption that it doesn’t have \*that\* much effect bc clustered with few outliers
    - says figure 3 feels more accurate b/c you can actually see the data points
  + compares the two figures, inspects perceived anomaly

**Interview notes**

first pass - summarizing, getting a brief idea about the methodology, spending discussion to see what the papers actually about

* + anything in discussion interesting/unanswered questions, think they might’ve missed stuff so THEN they go to background → check method/analytics, go back to discussion w/ fresh perspective
  + in general they said that abstract, methods, discussion are the parts of the paper they consider most important, and will jump between those and any charts/visualizations if necessary
* if clear verbal explanation of math, helps understand it better
  + googling gives context
  + felt like they understood most, parts for looking closer could be attributed to not being as familiar, technical terms don’t necessarily need full explanation
* to think critically what do they look for?
  + back to graphs and whatnot, remembered key concepts → seeing graphs/figures and see if visual outputs align with discussion
  + for example with the 2 anomalies, either they missed smth or the paper missed something
  + text first, see figure, go to chart
* generally finds charts to be very helpful to understand data and digest methodologies
  + mentioned that the charts were decently organized, but had comments on only having a few in the paper we presented and some unexplained anomalies in them
* graph captions are good, we could potentially annotate with these if graphs don’t already have them
  + question is how much can we do manually? how much can we potentially use an LLM? how \*reliable\* is an LLM? do we WANT to be using an LLM at all?