

## AP6168 – Assessment 2 – Applied HCI Project

### Option B – online user study

**Deadline:** Friday 24<sup>th</sup> April 2020, 11am.

**Submit via:** Turnitin link on AP6168 blackboard site.

**Word limit:** Maximum word count of 3,000 words

#### Introduction

In this module, we are very interested in the back-and-forth process of translating theory into practice, and vice-versa. We want you to not only read and understand the theories around designing jobs, work and the workplace, but to apply that knowledge appropriately. We want you to use theories to, 1) help you analyse situations, processes, and tools that you encounter at work, 2) to diagnose problems, and 3) to generate ideas and insights about solutions to those problems.

#### Details of assignment

You must plan and carry out a user study on a piece of technology that you use in your work (or study) **to facilitate remote collaboration**. Everyone should have some experience of this, given the move to online work and study in the past few weeks.

We want you to design a study that is capable of evaluating the *efficiency, effectiveness and satisfaction* of your chosen tool in supporting a specific collaborative task. Each of those three components should be considered and justified separately, we don't just want to see you making a short survey that covers all three components. Use what you have learned about necessary conditions for successful collaborative working in order to design the study and interpret findings.

Report as a formal report document containing the following sections: Abstract, Background, Study Methodology, Results, Conclusions and Recommendations.

**Abstract:** A short paragraph describing the aims of the project, the methods and the results.

#### **Background:**

1. Describe the online collaboration tool you are evaluating.
2. Specify the collaborative work-specific task(s) that the tool is designed to support.
3. Describe the expected users of that tool (training, experience, skills).
4. Describe the context in which the tool is typically used.
5. Present previous research on how to design technology to support that type of task.
6. Present previous research on *how to evaluate* that type of tool.

#### **Method:**

**Participants:** Describe the participants that you recruited. Recruit an appropriate number (roughly 5-10, depending on method, and length of study procedure).

**Materials:** Present the chosen measure(s) of effectiveness and justify your choice (why is this measure appropriate). Present the chosen measure(s) of efficiency and justify choice. Present the chosen measure(s) of satisfaction and justify your choice.

*Procedure:* Describe the step-by-step process that participants followed. There should be at least one standardized task that all participants are asked to do, and which you evaluate them in doing. We recommend that it is more useful to observe the participant undertaking the standardized task than simply asking them about the experience. Think about how you can do that from afar. For example, video call, screen sharing, etc.

*Data analysis:* Describe how you analysed your data (qualitative: which method? Quantitative: descriptive stats).

**Results:** Present your findings in an appropriate manner.

**Conclusions and recommendations:** Explain your findings in light of your literature review. Was there anything unexpected? Provide realistic recommendations for improving the design of the system in order to better support your identified task, given what you have learned about online collaboration, CSCW and socio-technical systems theory.

## Marking criteria

Criterion	%	Excellent	Very good	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
Background	20	A concise review of literature necessary to explain your chosen task			Review fails to identify and discuss research that has previously examined your chosen task
Methods	30	Describe and justify your participants, design, procedure and materials.			Methods are described but not justified with appropriate detail.
Results	20	Results presented in a clear and valid manner			Results are not presented in a manner that clearly evaluates effectiveness, efficiency and satisfaction.
Discussion and recommendations	20	Results are discussed with respect to issues raised in literature review. Specific, realistic recommendations provided for improving the design of the system.			Results described, but little effort made to discuss results with respect to issues raised in literature review. Recommendations are vague or over complicated.
Presentation	10	Work is structured, written and presented in a professional manner.			Work is poorly organised and / or failure to proofread.