

The State of the Art In Automating Usability Evaluations of User Interfaces

Presented by April Ahn

- Usability
 - Extent to which a computer system...
 - enables users to achieve goals effectively and efficiently
 - promotes feeling of satisfaction
- Usability Evaluation (UE)
 - Measures usability aspects of a system's UI and identifies specific problems
 - Capture
 - Analysis
 - Critique

■ Current problems with UE techniques

- Inconsistent coverage
- Widely varied findings
- Lack of systematicity and incomplete coverage in usability assessments

■ Ways to achieve systematicity and fuller coverage in usability assessments

- Increase the number of usability teams and the number of study participants
- Automate aspects of usability evaluations (e.g. capture, analysis, or critique)

■ Advantages of automation

- Reduces costs by decreasing the time spent on usability evaluations
- Increases consistency of the errors uncovered
- Can predict time and error costs across an entire design
- Widens coverage of evaluated features
- Reduces need for evaluation expertise
- Enables comparisons between alternative designs
- Incorporates evaluations within the design phase of UI development

■ Purpose of this presentation

- Discuss state of the art in usability evaluation automation
- Present taxonomy for classification of UE automation
- Summarize application of taxonomy to a select group of usability methods
- Discuss those usability methods in more detail

■ History of Usability Evaluation Automation

■ WIMP (windows, icons, pointer, mouse) versus Web interfaces

- WIMP = more functionally oriented
- Users complete tasks by following specific sequences of operations
- Web's primary role is to provide information

■ Balbo's automation taxonomy (1995)

- Sole existing survey of usability evaluation automation
 - Nonautomatic
 - Automatic Capture
 - Automatic Analysis
 - Automatic Critic
- PROBLEM: ignores nonautomated requirements of the UE methods

■ Solution?

- Group all UE methods along four dimensions
 - Method Class
 - Method Type
 - Automation Type
 - Effort Level

■ Method Class

- Five different method classes
 - Testing
 - Inspection
 - Inquiry
 - Analytical modeling
 - Simulation

■ Solution?

- Group UE methods along four dimensions
 - Method Class
 - Method Type
 - Automation Type
 - Effort Level

- Automation type (for each method class, e.g. testing, inspection, etc.)

- None
- Capture
- Analysis
- Critique

- Solution?

- Group UE methods along four dimensions
 - Method Class
 - Method Type
 - Automation Type
 - Effort Level

- Effort Level

- Minimal effort
- Model Development
- Informal Use
- Formal Use

- Automation patterns similar for WIMP and Web interfaces

- Automation in general is greatly underexplored

- Fullest, highest level of automation support is software that can critique interfaces without requiring formal or informal use

- Guideline review

- Other things to consider when thinking about usability evaluation methods, automated or not.

- Effectiveness
- Ease of use
- Ease of learning
- Applicability

- Automating Usability Testing Methods

- Usability testing with real participants

- Provides direct info about how people use computers and problems they have with the interface
- Automation's predominant role in usability testing
 - Capture of usage data
 - Analysis of usage data

- Automating Usability Testing Methods: Capture of usage data

- Performance measurement
 - Record usage during a usability test
- Remote testing
 - Enable testing between a tester and a participant who are not collocated
 - Same-time different-place (remote control testing)
 - Different-time different-place

- Different-time different-place

- Tester does not observe participant
- Journalled session
- Used to get feedback early in the design process and with released products

- Same-time different-place

- Tester observes participant's screen via network transmissions and may hear participant through speaker telephone
- Tester interacts with participant during the tests

- Discussion of automated capture in the testing method class.

- Remote testing allows evaluator to collect data from a larger number of users than traditional methods
- Saves time and cost

- Underlying hardware imposes restrictions on the type of UIs to which remote testing and performance measurement techniques can be applied

■ Performance measurement with WIMP UIs

- Log low-level events (Hammontree, et al, 1992)
 - Video recording and event logging tools align timing data with user interface events
- usAGE (user action graphing effort)
 - Replicates logged events during playback
- IDCAT (integrated data capture and analysis tool)
 - Logs events and automatically filters and classifies them into meaningful actions

■ Performance measurement with Web UIs

- Log web server requests
- Log client side activities (preferred)
 - NIST WebMetrics tool suite
 - WebVIP (Web visual Instrumentor program)
 - Wet (Web event logging tools)

■ Remote Testing in Web UIs

- WebCAT (category analysis tool)
 - Aids in Web site category analysis via card sorting technique
- Analysis of results used to inform the best information organization for a site
- Enables wider testing, faster analysis and can be scaled for a large number of topic categories

■ Automating Usability Testing Methods: Analysis of Usage Data

- Log file analysis
 - Automate analysis of data captured during formal and informal use
- Four general approaches for WIMP and Web log file analysis
 - Metric-based
 - Pattern-matching
 - Task-based
 - Inferential

■ Metric-based

- Generates quantitative performance measurements
- WIMP
 - DRUM
- Web
 - Service Metrics Site Analysis Tool

■ DRUM

- Derives
 - Task completion time
 - User efficiency (effectiveness / task completion time)
 - Productive period (no user problems)
- Speeds up video analysis

- Service Metrics' site analysis tools

- Pinpoint performance bottlenecks
- Focus is on server and network performance, but little insight into usability of Web site itself

- Pattern Matching Analysis of Log Files

- MRP (maximum repeating pattern)
 - Analyze user behavior captured in logs
 - Detects and reports repeated user actions that indicate usability problems

- Task-based

- Analyze discrepancies between what is expected of the user and what user actually does
 - QUIP (Quantitative User Interface Profiling Tool)

- QUIP (quantitative user interface profiling) tool

- More advanced approach than IBOT for Java-based UIs
- Compares task flows of users to the task flow of the interface designer

- Discussion of analysis

- All automated analysis approaches offer better alternative to manual data analysis
- Hybrid task-based pattern-matching techniques most effective

- Automating Inspection Methods

- Examines how well UI design conforms to a set of usability guidelines
- Designers biased towards aesthetically pleasing interfaces regardless of efficiency (Sears 1995)
 - Automation predominantly used to objectively check guideline conformance
 - Automatically detect and report usability violations and (sometimes) make suggestions for fixing them

- Analyze terminology and consistency of UI elements

- Studies show 10 to 25% speedup for consistent interfaces
- Sherlock
 - Evaluates visual properties of dialog boxes
 - Terminology
 - Button sizes and labels

- Analyze structure of Web pages

- Rating Game
 - Attempts to measure the quality of a set of Web pages
 - Information feature
 - Graphics feature
 - Gadgets feature
 - No improvement suggestions

- Analyze the scanning path of a Web page

- Design Advisor
 - Uses empirical results from eye-tracking studies
 - What are the effects of animation, images, and highlighting in multimedia presentations?
 - Motion, size, images, color, text style, and position is scanned in this order.
 - Determines and superimposes a scanning path on a Web page, but doesn't offer improvement suggestions

- Use HTML usability guidelines for critiquing

- UsableNet's LIFT Online and LIFT Onsite
 - Checks for use of standard and portable link, text, and background colors, and guideline violations.
- Bobby
 - Checks Web pages for their accessibility to people with disabilities

- Validity of HTML usability guidelines questioned because haven't been subjected to the rigorous development process used for WIMP interfaces

- Little consistency among 21 HTML guidelines
- 75% of recommendations appeared in only one style guide

- WebEval

- Automated critique approach being developed to validate use of HTML usability guidelines
- Provides a framework for applying established WIMP guidelines to relevant HTML components

- Automating Inquiry Methods

- Employ inquiry methods such as surveys, questionnaires, interviews to improve interface for future releases
- Automation used predominately to capture subjective impressions during formal or informal interface use

- Questionnaire embedded within the WIMP UI
- UPM (the user partnering module)
 - Uses event-driven triggers to ask users specific questions about their interface usage

- HTML forms-based questionnaires

- Users enter data into an HTML page and a program on the Web server processes responses
- Highly effective for gathering direct user feedback
- NetRaker (Web UIs)

- Automating Analytical Modeling Methods

- Enables inexpensive predicting of usability
- Different models:
 - Models for task environment analysis
 - Models to analyze user knowledge
 - Models of user performance
 - Models of the user interface

- Recent survey revealed automation support only for methods focusing on models of user performance
- Automation predominantly used to analyze task completion within WIMP UIs.
- Analytical modeling and simulation approaches based on MHP (model human processor)

- GOMS analysis (goals, operators, methods, and selection rules)
 - Predicts task execution and learning times for error-free expert performance
 - Roadblocks to GOMS use
 - Tedious task analysis
 - Need to calculate execution and learning times

- Automation of analytical modeling of Web UIs lags far behind WIMP UIs.
 - Many different ways to accomplish goals in Web task hierarchy.
 - GOMS reliance on expert users doesn't fit the diverse user community on the Web

■ Automating Simulation Methods

- Simulation can be used prior to UI implementation
- Simulation methods more difficult to use and learn than other evaluation methods
 - Constructing/manipulating complex models
- Automation used primarily in capture and analysis of usage data

- Automated capture of usage data in WIMP UIs

- Genetic Algorithm Modeling
 - Kasik and George (1996)
 - Generate and capture usage traces representing novice users
- Information Scent modeling
 - Chi et al. (2000)
 - Generate and capture navigation paths for information seeking tasks on a Web UI
- Methods enable evaluator to produce large number of usage scenarios and widen UI coverage with minimal effort

- Automated analysis of usage data in WIMP UIs

- Petri Net Modeling – mimic user interaction from usage data

- AMME
 - Construct Petri nets from usage data and analyze problem solving

- Information Processor Model – mimic user interaction

- Approximate user behavior as accurately as possible

- Automating Simulation Methods: Analysis Support -- Web UIs

- WebCriteria's Site Profile

- Employ a GOMS-like model to analyze navigation
- Four phases:
 - Gather
 - Model
 - Analyze
 - Idealistic Web user model simulates a user's information-seeking behavior
 - Model logs measurement data from a start point to a target
 - Report

- Usefulness questionable

- Only computes navigation time for shortest path between specified start and destination pages

- Applicable to all Web UIs

- Benefits of automation

- Reduces cost of nonautomated methods
- Aids in comparisons between alternative designs
- Improves consistency in evaluation results

- Further research on log file analysis, guideline review, analytical modeling, simulation techniques necessary