Introduction

Our group Cognection hopes to meld the social aspects of health and fitness within our application in a user-friendly, cognitive design that gets users to go out and accomplish their group fitness activities by making planning and communication easy and informative. During the first few days of the innovation stages, we brainstormed ideas for something that people have difficulty with that we could possibly make easier to do. We came up with potential concepts for a schedule planner, school-related class syncing application, and a health and fitness application, choosing and running with the last option to try and incorporate a social aspect for motivational purposes. Though we did not realize at the time, we had basically put together a few of the main overhead concepts for our future application within our brainstorming sessions, with the schedule syncing features coming into play within our application farther down the road in the design idea process. The seven us started with an overly broad concept of a social fitness application, but a very narrow scope of domain as a mobile device app, but with the guidance received through this class, we were able to refine and polish our ideas into a more realistic product with a broad scope and narrowed concept.

Methodologies

The world of social fitness and organization of social fitness is a largely unexplored field and as such, there was very little previous data or previously designed applications for us to go off of. As such, it was determined and agreed by the group that a preliminary

survey is the best method to begin to find and engage the user base of interest. After having conducted these surveys, a small portion of knowledge was revealed to us on the user base and from there we went through a first round of interviews with the users. This was followed by the natural interpretation sessions and affinity diagram; however, this felt like an inadequate amount of information. As such, a second round of contextual interviews were conducted with the user base out in their natural setting. This was followed by interpretation and lastly a prototype that involved one last round of interviews with users testing out the prototype.

The preliminary survey was kept rather casual and open ended as to push the information in any particular direction through our own influences could skew the data. It was a simple online survey that could be distributed as widely as possible to get a feel of what sort of people were out there and reached much wider than our target user base. Each participant was first asked to input their gender, age and occupation for us to get a feel of the job roles and titles that the person belongs to. Although these job roles and titles may be different in the context of our interest, we felt it was good to be able to sort the data in this way. After this, questions regarding whether or not the individuals had a smartphone, hours of recreational activity and recreation of choice was inquired about. This was to give us an idea of the types of things people were involved in and how active they were on average. Next was a section of questions that asked individuals to evaluate their happiness with their current modes of organizing their recreational activity, by what methods they organize with others, goals for working out and if they use any mobile applications currently. The form was then ended with them giving consent with digital

signature.

Our first round of interviews followed shortly after the survey. The method for which the interviews were conducted was to be as standard as possible across all with enough flexibility to allow the interviewers to respond to the situation and get whatever information is possible. The amount of mandatory questions asked were to be kept to a minimum so as to give the interviewees the chance to fill in the interview time with the issues related to the interests of the interviewee the most and for them to guide the interview sessions rather than the interviewer. By doing this, the information is more organic and sprouts forth from the user's mind rather than the preconceived notions of the interviewers. Each interview started off with a short background information section that consisted only of the interviewee's age and whether or not they were a student. These were two of the distinction groupings that we wanted to look at based on our preliminary survey data. Next, what sort of recreational sports the interviewee participates in was asked and where they engage in these activities and the motivations for their participation. These questions are to get an understanding of what sorts of activities individuals are looking to be involved in amongst our user group and understand the mindset of the individuals that are involved in these activities. Inquiry of whether the activities they participate are group or individual activities followed by the size of the groupings were the next section of the interview. Understanding group size and the dynamics involved in differing group sizes with specific activities were something to keep in mind when designing a socially minded fitness system. From here, we delved into modes of communication for planning that are used for each activity, differentiating between activities and time frames. We wanted to know what types of

communication were used at what times for what activities. Following this was any issues and convenient features they found with their current methods. This was one of the key questions for us to glean information from as this helped to generate design ideas. Lastly, each interviewer asked about how long planning would generally take for each activity and how far in advance they would start planning. Throughout the whole interview, interviewers were encouraged to ask deeper and more probing questions should the interviewee seem to show interest or deeper levels of information with the questions.

The second round of interviews followed the more traditional lines of a contextual interview as per the guidelines set forth in the book. The interview involved a group of people that were not interviewed all at the same time but were all involved together in some way. One person, chosen at random, was slotted to be what we called the “initiator” while the rest were classified as “followers” that would be given the chance to join the activity the the initiator was planning. This set of interviews started with the initiator going through the task of creating an activity for an upcoming hiking event at Torrey Pines. The interviewee took on the role of the master in these interviews and guided the interviewer, who was playing the role of the apprentice, through the steps taken and required for planning the event. The interviewee would narrate and give reasoning for each action they took and the interviewer would stop and ask probing questions if something caught their attention. The whole time the interviewer would take notes on both what the master would say and what the master would do, consciously or subconsciously. This was then followed up by similar interview sessions with the “followers” in which they would play the role of the master to the apprentice interviewer. They would go through the process of receiving the invitation to the

event and what steps and factors are considered when deciding to attend the event or not. The interviewer would likewise ask questions here when something was unclear or felt unexplored. These interview sessions generally lasted 30 minutes with both the followers and the initiators.

The last round of interviews that we were able to do was a round of prototype interviews. Using the prototype that was generated using the data that we had gathered through the course of the previous interviews, we asked the interviewees to carry out a small set of tasks as well as explore the prototype as they saw fit. They were asked to narrate their thoughts as they explored, noting in particular what they thought certain buttons would do or would take them before they were pressed and how they thought that they could carry out certain tasks. At the end of the exploration stage of the interview, a few tasks were set up to have the user create an event, join an event, change their personal information and find out when their friends were free to participate in their activity. After the task based stage, a final stage in which the user could talk about their own ideas and any qualms they had with the prototype was given so that an open channel of communication was clearly given for the interviewees to make an impact on the interface.

Data

Initial Survey

The initial survey was conducted as a way for us to get a general feel of the field of fitness that we were venturing into. As such, we interviewed people who go to the gym, people who participated in group recreational activities, and people on sports teams such

as intramural, school teams and club teams. Of the 27 participants that we surveyed, 13 were female and 14 were male. The ages for these subjects ranged anywhere from 17 years of age to 26 years of age. A good majority of those surveyed were undergraduates at some college, with the exception of one graduate student and one high school junior. When asked if they owned either a smartphone or tablet, all but one answered yes. The average amount of time that female participants spent on recreational activity per week was 7.2 hours, while male participants spent roughly an average of 11.4 hours per week on recreational activity.

We found that males and females participated in different kinds of recreational activity. Activities such as running, yoga, going to the gym and swimming were the top trends among the female participants. On the other hand, surfing, basketball, soccer, hiking, running and weight training as well as intramural sports were the popular activities among male individuals. Even though males and females took part in different types of recreation, they all had common motivations, which were to get fit, build muscle, lose weight and bond with others.

When asked whether they liked to exercise or play recreational sports alone or with others, it became apparent that for most individuals, they preferred to go to the gym either alone or with one other person, whereas for recreational sports many sought a group of friends to go with. To coordinate these group meet ups, the default method used was texting and calling, with some groups even going as far as to use the Facebook event page. Since we were interested in building an application for fitness groups, we asked if individuals currently already used fitness applications. We found that a surprising majority

of them didn't, with only 7 of the 27 using applications such as Nike+, Gympact and MyFitnessPal. Of these 7, they reported that some features they liked in these applications were the calorie counter/ barcode scanner, the social aspects, and the fact that it logs your activity. The reasons people were turned away from the applications were that a lot of them were inconvenient, inaccurate and confusing or hard to use.

Round 1 Contextual Interviews

In the first round of contextual interviews, we narrowed our focus to only UCSD students. We each interviewed four people, putting us at a total of 28. Participants were interviewed at RIMAC, at main gym, in formal teams and in informal teams so that we could collect better data in the user's environment. Our main purpose was to get an even better understanding of the current forms of coordination and communication as well as the motivations that drive people to work out.

Common recreational activities that the participants were involved in were very similar to what we found in our preliminary survey. A good majority engaged in at least one, if not more of certain activities like soccer, basketball, volleyball, hiking, weight lifting, and running. Individuals frequented locations that were most convenient to them and provided the desired equipment and qualities - many used school fields for soccer games as well as 24 Hour Fitness, Rimac, or Main Gym for basketball games and for working out. Their motivations behind doing so stayed roughly the same as well, with most people working out to get in shape, to socialize, or purely for entertainment.

Through the interviews, we found that there were three distinct groups of people: those who went by themselves, those who went with one or two other people, and those

who went in large groups. For those who went with one or two other people, texting was usually the preferred method of communication. For large groups, the method of communication varied more. Some groups had predefined schedules, others used Facebook messages or Facebook groups, and others used either a Google spreadsheet or email because not everyone had a Facebook. An interesting point we observed was that for these large groups, last minute changes were typically sent out through texts. Some issues that people ran into when coordinating these events were conflicts of schedule, unresponsiveness, issues of commitment, and the fact that it was difficult to switch between texting and Facebook messaging, especially when plans are changed last minute. What we also found was that among the people that we interviewed, there were people who were more proactive in seeking people out for the activities, and those who typically worked out alone or would tag along if they were invited to an event.

Round 2 Contextual Interviews

We wanted to observe the method in how people actually would go about creating and coordinating group events, as well as the factors people took into consideration when responding to the invitations, so we conducted a second round of contextual interviews. In this round, we had two separate tasks, each catered towards either an initiator or a follower.

In the initiator task, we found that it was generally pretty easy for the user to create an event. They said that it was convenient, as most of the necessary information was in one place. When choosing a time, they took into consideration when they thought most people would be free, as well as how convenient the location was for the people invited. The

invitations were generally sent to close friends; however, if the event is not too serious, the event is made public so that anyone who wants to join can proceed to do so. A few problems they encountered was that there was a little difficulty in finding the location and inputting the location information. In another case, the initiator had to pause the creation of the event to use an external site to search and save an image for the cover photo, causing a breakdown and slowing down the event creation. As a whole, the initiators did not run into too many inconveniences.

In the follower task, it was observed that the list of people going played a huge role in their deciding process. The first course of action the followers took was to quickly glance over the event, noting where the details such as the location and time and deciding whether they were interested or not. The second course of action they took was to check the “Attending” list to see if they knew anyone going. This was a big deciding factor, and the followers we interviewed decided to either ignore the request, click maybe, or if they couldn’t go, decline the request. One follower was quoted to have said “Everyone that clicks maybe is just waiting to see who goes.” Another follower had to manually take out their planner and check for availability. Features that they liked about the event page was the fact that the decline list was on a separate wall, how it displayed the predicted weather, the big cover picture, and the option to export the event to their calendars. Several key observations were that none of the followers wanted to be the first to respond as it was too much commitment, and that they only read the description if they were interested in the type of activity.

Analysis

Round 1 Interpretation Session

After completing the first round of contextual interviews, we conducted an interpretation session. There were two essential roles taken on during this process: “The Pen” and “The Interviewer.” Since every one of us interviewed a total of four people, we each had a turn to take on the role of “The Interviewer” to explain our data, and we also switched off responsibilities as “The Pen.” As one person walks through the interview with the rest of the team members, another person takes the role of The Pen and notes down important observations, design ideas, breakdowns, and other relevant information onto yellow Post-It notes. The other team members participates in the interpretation session by calling out this information as well to assure that The Pen captures these affinity notes. After every four interviews (or, essentially, after each switch of the role of the Interviewer), we paused to review the data and any high-level patterns that were emerging and noted the information on affinity notes as well. In total, we ended up with over 150 affinity notes.

Round 1 Affinity Diagram

Two days after conducting the interpretation session, our team met up again to build and analyze our affinity wall in order to organize the data. We approached this process by dividing up the affinity notes evenly between all members in our group. In order to keep our method more organized, one person started the process of the affinity building first, and then the rest of the group members followed. Eventually, all the notes were up on the wall and arranged into their naturally-occurring categories. We titled these categories using the

blue Post-It notes. We had a wide range of emerging groups which we further categorized into even broader categories using pink Post-It notes: group-based issues, individual-based issues, technology-based issues, and issues with human behavior. Finally, we grouped these pink Post-It notes into categories as well using Green Post-It notes: Motivation, Issues, and Methods of Coordination.

We began to see patterns among our data and came across some interesting recurring observations. For example, we noticed that people had distinct reasons and motives for performing and participating in fitness activities: for self-improvement (either in health or image), for competitive reasons, for social interaction, or for fun. Within this category, we also observed that there were different types of people: people who enjoy doing fitness activities by themselves, people who prefer to do fitness activities with only one or two other people, and people who participate in large-group fitness activities. Within the people who participate in large-group activities, we also saw two types of personalities: initiators (people who like to plan, initiate, and invite their friends to participate in an activity) and followers (people who respond to invites from their friends). We also noted the different forms of communication within this category. People who only preferred going with one or two other people would usually text, call, or Facebook message their friends while people who go in large groups of people use other forms of communication such as Facebook Events, mass texting or Facebook messaging, or Groupme (a mobile application that allows for group text messaging and resolves the issue of mass texting over different devices).

However, the most important realization that we came across through the process of

building and analyzing an affinity wall is that the subject of social fitness is so vast. Our collection of data was too broad to design or resolve any issue, since motives and means of communication differed from the different categories of people. Our affinity wall helped us to realize that we had to narrow down our topic even further. As a result, we decided to focus only on large-group communication since individual and small group communication didn't have any apparent issues with coordinating fitness activities.

Upon making this decision, we were able to focus more on the relevant data. There were some interesting observations and apparent breakdowns within the current form of large group communication and coordination that were noted. One of the most prominent problems is planning an event that would coordinate with everybody's schedule. Most of the time, people who initiated the event and invited their friends usually knew the general times that their friends were available (i.e. after 5:00, in the evening, etc.). The initiators would then contact their friends -- either through Facebook messaging, texting, Groupme -- asking if they wanted to, for example, play a basketball game at a certain time. If everybody is available and interested, then the process flows smoothly. However, most of the time, that is not the case. While analyzing our affinity wall, we noticed that many initiators had trouble when some friends aren't available at the proposed time, but other friends are. This requires the initiator to message everybody again to figure out a common time when everyone will be available.

There is a prominent breakdown at this point in the process as our users scatter to resolve this problem. Some would individually text or message each person, find out when each person is available, and then find a mutual time when everyone is free. Many people

stated that this was very difficult and that the procedure became messy very quickly. Some people would coordinate between different modes of communication for different group members. For example, they would be Facebook messaging some and then texting others simultaneously. Either way, the process would take a long time. Sometimes this is due to people not responding to their messages. Other people use a mass form of communication, such as mass texting, mass Facebook messaging, or Groupme. However, these methods were also problematic for the same reasons as the individual form of communication in that it was difficult and disorganized, and also took a long time. In addition, it also caused unnecessary spamming to all members in the group, which reduces the value of each message sent. As a result, not every message, including some that may have been important such as stating time and location -- may have been read by every person. Furthermore, although this method does resolve the headache of switching between different modes of communication, we saw an apparent breakdown here as well when there is a group member that does not have access to the used form of communication. We realized that not everybody at UC San Diego uses Facebook or has a smartphone, which was something that we assumed at the beginning.

We also noticed that people tended to change their form of communication as an event approaches and the need for instant responses arises. Those who used Facebook Events or Facebook Messaging switched to texting or calling (both mass and individual) to remind or update people in their group. This was an interesting observation and we noted down some design ideas that would incorporate some form of instant communication.

The current process of coordinating and communicating events, and getting

updates to revolve around changes in schedules, was such a hassle and caused a lot of frustration to our users that most of the time, groups ended up just settling for situations such as playing a game with a shortage or uneven number of people, or even just playing by themselves.

Round 2 Interpretation Session

The second round of contextual interviews were conducted to better understand the thought process of the two types of users we identified. The initiator, who is the person that usually starts off and organizes a group event/activity, and the follower, who is the person that gets invited to these sorts of events. Task interviews were conducted, and very detailed notes were taken on the process of each user. The data gathered was then analyzed in the interpretation session. High-level patterns were determined and issues were drawn from these to be categorized as problems that the team would aim to solve. This is where the design ideas come into play, these were suggested as we went over the problems. We divided the issues into two different categories, those that belonged to the initiators and those that belonged to the followers. However based off our data, initiators were the users experiencing the most issues and so most of our analysis from round two is dedicated to attempting to solve those problems. Initiators had the most problem dealing with a reliable number of responses from the followers, i.e. the guests invited to the activity. This is crucial to the initiator because a predictable and reliable number of guests yields to a successful event. Issues noted were unresponsiveness to the event and attendees showing up even when they did not confirm on the event page. In the attempt to solve this issue, the team suggested applying a system that automatically responds “Not Attending”

once the follower has seen the invitation to the activity. This way, if the followers decides to follow through they will consciously change their status on the event page to “Attending”. On the other hand, if they are decide to not attend then the system has already done their homework for them. It is better for the initiator to have some sort of response than to have a number of unreliable “Attending” and “Not Attending”. This system will therefore improve the mediated activity interface between the initiator and the follower. That concludes the most important aspect on the initiator’s side of the interpretation. Moving onto the follower, the team determined a very different set of issues. Based off our data followers mostly and if not completely deal with personal issues when completing their task. In this case, it is important to acknowledge those components but because they are personal issues the team has no way of righteously and successfully intervene upon them in an attempt to solve them. However, to better understand the users the team still listed the factors affecting the follower’s decision as the following: availability for the set time and date of the event, interest in the activity of the event, convenience of the location and attendance of mutual friends. By understanding these personal factors, the team can take into consideration these human elements and attempt to better implement them in the design process.

Design Ideas and Changes

Sport Event Mobile Application

Before any contextual interviews were conducted, our area of focus was way too broad and uncertain. The data that we collected from the initial survey suggested that people rarely use fitness applications, which contradicted our initial mindset of creating a fitness mobile application. As a result, we felt that it was necessary for us to create a prototype to further

collect additional data that will advance our project and narrow down our focus. Therefore we rushed into our first mobile prototype based on just the data that we collected through the initial survey.

We later presented our ideas and progress of the project to our TA during an in-class discussion. She strongly advised us to take a step back from the first prototype and reevaluate our data and progress. With the TA's guidance, we realize our first prototype was built upon insufficient data. The functionalities, features, or even just the idea of creating a mobile application was based on what our group wanted and what we thought it would be great for the users, instead of a solid user-centered contextual design that solely based on user data. Therefore we put the idea of designing an mobile application on hold.

Facebook Event Redesign

We took a huge step back and reevaluated our initial data, and conducted two rounds of contextual interviews and we found valuable information and data that are crucial for the prototype. Through the first round of contextual interviews, we found that the majority of the people share a common domain for coordinating events and activities - Facebook. To be more specific, Facebook Events and Groups dominate the majority of the coordinating and communication methods in many user's lives. However, our user data suggested that there are still issues within these forms of coordination, so we decided to focus and possibly redesign Facebook Event. According to the user data, there are too many people in the "maybe" and "waiting for reply" lists in Facebook Event, and some users expressed that people don't always show up even though they are in the "Going" list, and some people who don't reply will show up anyway. These issues makes the numbers of people in different lists in Facebook Event really unreliable, and cause the success rate of events happening unpredictable. One of our initial design ideas was to simply take out the maybe option and force everyone to make a decision.

However, this doesn't solve the problem of too many "waiting for reply" (further design ideas that help improve this issue will be discussed in the Website prototype below).

As the second round of contextual interviews came around, we found a significant issue that changed our direction - a need for a common domain. Our second contextual interview user data suggested that not everyone has a smartphone or a Facebook account, so we envisioned for a common domain that contains a broader range of people. As a result, we have decided to abandon the ideas of creating a mobile application and redesigning Facebook Event in favor of creating a web-based application.

Website For Event Making

The current prototype iteration is a stand-alone website with many similarities to the "Events" feature for Facebook. The prototype includes the interfaces that our two main user groups interact with: "Initiators" and "Followers". In moving forward with this iteration, we kept in mind the data collected in previous rounds of surveys and interviews. Namely, we maintained a focus on improving group communication for coordinating events. Along with this goal, we sought to address issues of last minute event changes, effective mass communication, and delayed individual responses. In addition, we concluded that a web based design would be the best solution since it was the domain that was most widely accessed by our users. The current prototype addresses each of these issues and data-based design decisions supports a seamless process of event coordination from the creation of the event to the very last minutes until its start.

The main data used to inform the design was the second round of contextual interviews. In the second round of interviews subjects were prompted to interact with the Facebook "Events" interface; however, subjects from the "Initiators" user group and subjects from the "Followers" user group were instructed to complete different tasks. Subjects in the "Initiators" group were

instructed to create an event, give a description of the event (i.e. date, time, weather, summary), and invite their friends. Subjects in the “Followers” group were instructed to respond to an event invitation.

The website design was done in Axure RP Pro 6.5. After discussing the main features of the redesign as a group, we assigned each person to create a process within the user flow. Following the general flow through the redesign, we created the following pages: Home page, Create an Account, Set your Schedule, Login, Activity map, Unique Activity page, Create an Event, Your Availability, Profile, and My Events.

The Home page has two call-to-action buttons, Login and Create Account, prominent at the the top of the page. The main feature of this page is dynamic display of the activities occurring in the upcoming week. The activities are color coordinated for the purpose of visual hierarchy and indicate the number of people and friends participating in an activity. If the user is interested in an activity he/she can click on the event which will take them to the login or create account page. The Create your Account page features general information such as name, location, date, gender, and phone number. Although this may seem like a lot of information for a user to input right off the bat, the information is essential for the functionality of the application. The page also asks users to choose their preferred activities by drag-and-drop method. The last step in creating an account is an optional one. The interface asks the user to set their schedule to facilitate coordinating events with friends. Since this step requires more personal information, we decided to make it optional and thereby allowing the user to ‘skip’ it.

The user is then redirected to a landing page similar to the home page. It features the option to view activities via a feed, calendar, or map. The page also lets the users view their events, profile or to log out. The main call-to-action button on this page is “Create an Event”. Once the user has viewed the events in their area, we wanted to facilitate the processes of

coordinating an event. If the user wants to browse an event shown on the feed, calendar, or map, he/she can look into the details of a unique event. This would take them to the unique Activity page.

The unique Activity page, other than displaying the information of the event, has three buttons that a “Follower” can interact with. They are: “Attend!”, “Suggest Event”, and “Post to Facebook”. If the users decides to attend, he/she will be given commenting capabilities. The purpose of the “Suggest Event” action is to give an event publicity by referral. The “Post to Facebook” has the same purpose, but is less personalized than the “Suggest Event” action.

Since each respective user group’s personalities, dispositions, and therefore goals are different, we tried to consolidate many features to meet both group’s needs. For example, the incorporation of the automated “Not Attending” feature caters to both user groups. The act of pre-determining a decision once the user has viewed the event provides the “Initiator” with a more definite idea of who is considering attending and who is not. Since a “follower‘s” decision is based on the current list of attendees, this feature eliminates the “Maybe attending” category of Facebook’s current “Events” interface and therefore, influences the “follower’s” decision-making process. Although we understand that removing the middle ground of “maybe” and non-response may make users feel forced into a decision they are not ready to make, it is our goal to facilitate a particular process and improve the interaction between initiators and his/her event-coordinating interface.

From the landing page, a user can also create an event. Other than basic information about the event, the user can suggest their event to friends and push their event to Facebook. When suggesting the event to friends, the user is given a visual display of his/her friend’s availability. Since the “initiator” wants their event to be successful, they will

look to maximize the number of possible attendees. The interface which they are presented with displays the number of friends, and close friends available for a particular time slot. Users will also be able to view specifically who is available with a hover over feature.

A main feature that the “Initiator” can interact with is making changes to the event page. Since one of the issues we wanted to address was how to effectively mass communicate last minute changes, we implemented a mass texting option for the “Initiator” to smoothly coordinate their activity. If the user makes a change within the last day, he/she will be given the option to send a mass text to the current attendees.

Once the user’s activity is scheduled, it will automatically be added to an “Activities I’m Planning” on their “My Events” home page. The “My Events” homepage also has lists for “Activities I’m Watching” and “Activities I’m Attending”. Since a “Followers”’s decision to attend the event is largely based on the amount of friends attending, the “Activities I’m Watching” list allows “Followers” to monitor the number of attendees before confirming their attendance.

Users also have a profile that they can edit and add photos to. The content of this interface will be largely images and short descriptive text. The user can decide which elements will be visible to the public.

Final Implementations

We are looking to move forward and address the issues brought up in our Prototype Interview. Because the prototype was created to simply function as an event making application, we will continue to add functionality when needed. With each Prototype

Interview, we will be presented with specific issues that will inform our next design iteration.

During the first Prototype interview, two main concerns were brought to our attention: availability calendar is easy to overlook and onboarding was non-existent when users created an account. To fix the first issue, we have discussed the idea of incorporating color into the calendar to achieve a sense of visual hierarchy. Furthermore, the colors will stand out and draw the attention of the user to this particular feature. To fix the second issue, we will implement a form of onboarding to ease the users confusion for why they must input certain types of information. These design adjustments will help fill in the holes we have encountered during our first round of prototype interviews. However, it is our understanding that in order to create a truly seamless product, several more rounds of prototyping, testing, and redesigning is necessary.

Conclusion

Within the past ten weeks, our group, Cognection, was able to constantly tweak and eventually cultivate the social fitness web application we had hoped of forming from the start. Not having much past data to rely upon was one of the biggest challenges we faced in the beginning. We floundered in having a defined focus, and relied upon baseline information from an undetailed preliminary survey. Our principal mistake was in jumping the gun and going ahead in creating a prototype from meager data that did not really tell us anything of what users wanted or looked for in such an application and that we were still unsure of. In taking a step back from prototyping and starting from the data retrieved from the first round of in-person contextual interviews in a natural setting, we were able to truly get a stronger foothold of what was pertinent and necessary to

users and would need to be incorporated into our application. With a far more refined focus than the excessively broad and general scope from the initial survey, it was then that our group was able to make significant headway into the right direction for what and how we hoped to accomplish. The interpretation session, creating the affinity wall, and walking the wall all came together to highlight the relevant observations we needed in forming a more concise idea of what features to include in our application. A second round of contextual interviews following the two emergent user types of initiators and followers helped cement the user process, and helped bring up unforeseen issues. Compiling everything we had accumulated to that point, we created our first prototype using the program Axure, which was used for a round of prototype interviews. In continuation, we hope to increase functionality as well as improve visual features for clarity and better communication.