Michael User Interview 2 Notes

**Think-aloud process**

* abstract first
  + reading pretty linearly, later notes that this is due to the paper being pretty short
* more technical, really parsed through the methodology
  + came back unconvinced, found that they made bigger claims but didn’t really have or show the data to support it
  + would inspect a few references to try to get a better understanding
  + spent a lot of time trying to understand their methodology, ultimately came back confused by their use of Shapley values and what the M model represented
    - having context around the formula/direct links to elsewhere in the paper could be helpful
  + spent a lot of time here specifically because he’s more familiar with the math and wanted to dissect their methodology
* highlights certain things here and there as he goes along
  + understand at high level, if he needs to go more in depth can go thru the underlined parts
  + normally he would do this on his iPad so he can go back and forth with ease
* figures were confusing bc of changes in magnitude across x axis, unclear how/what certain variables mean, hard to link it to text and really get clear picture
  + likes a story-based approach with graph slowly getting built layer by layer, this is something we could look at as well
* parsed through discussion a little quicker
  + at this point said that he felt the paper was “overclaiming”
  + would go back and forth between methodology and conclusion and seemed unconvinced

Interview Notes

* raw visualization of data is always nice
  + if it’s not present in a paper, having it accessible is good
* suggestions - references loading up portion of paper instead of requiring the reader to go to the reference and search for it themselves
* links again between things to prevent back and forth is helpful
* generally when he reads papers he’ll highlight things on his own so he can jump back and forth with ease without reading through the entire paper
  + things that do that automatically could be helpful to break down a paper
* also adding in a section between intro and methodology that just provides a roadmap for the paper is good