

**SINTEF IKT**

Postadresse: 7465 Trondheim
Besøksadresse: Forskningsveien 1
Telefon: 22 06 73 00
Telefaks: 22 06 73 50

Foretaksregisteret: NO 948 007 029 MVA

SINTEF RAPPORT

TITTEL

Preliminary workshop proceedings: "New approaches to Requirements Elicitation" & "How can HCI Improve Social Media Development?"

FORFATTER(E)

Amela Karahasanovic, Asbjørn Følstad, Petter Bae Brandtzæg

OPPDRAGSGIVER(E)

CITIZEN MEDIA (EU FP6, p.nr. IST 038312) og
RECORD (Norges forskningsråd, p.nr. 180135/S10)

RAPPORTNR. A8210	GRADERING Åpen	OPPDRAGSGIVERS REF. N.A.	
GRADER. DENNE SIDE Åpen	ISBN 978-82-14-04402-07	PROSJEKTNR. 90B23.12 og 90B243.81	ANTALL SIDER OG BILAG 96
ELEKTRONISK ARKIVKODE		PROSJEKTLEDER (NAVN, SIGN.) Amela Karahasanovic	VERIFISERT AV (NAVN, SIGN.) Jan Håvard Skjetne
ARKIVKODE	DATO 2008-10-19	GODKJENT AV (NAVN, STILLING, SIGN.) Bjørn Skjellaug	

SAMMENDRAG

Vi arrangerte workshop om sentrale tema i CITIZEN MEDIA og RECORD på NordiCHI 2008. Til workshop'en ble det sendt inn 11 papere. Disse ble akseptert etter peer-review. Paperene, sammen med workshop programmet og introduksjoner, er gjengitt i denne rapporten. Rapporten har status av "preliminary proceedings".

"Final proceedings" gis ut på Tapir Akademisk Forlag innen utgangen av året.

STIKKORD	NORSK	ENGELSK
GRUPPE 1	IKT	ICT
GRUPPE 2	Menneske-maskin interaksjon	HCI
EGENVALGTE	Sosiale medier	Social media
	Brukerkrav	User requirements

Faint handwritten text, possibly a signature or date.

The NordiCHI'08 Workshops

**New Approaches to
Requirements Elicitation**

&

**How Can HCI Improve Social
Media Development?**

SINTEF report A8210

Oslo, 2008

ISBN 978-82-14-04402-7

These are the preliminary proceedings of two workshops at NordiCHI 2008. The two workshops were originally intended to be separate arrangements. However, the workshops were merged due to the relatively low number of submitted papers and the large thematic overlap between the submitted papers.

The final proceedings are to be published by Tapir Akademisk Forlag, following the workshop. The authors of the workshop papers may update their workshop papers prior to their publication in the final proceedings, on basis of feedback from the reviewers and at the workshop.

Program

The program contains three paper presentation sessions and one session for discussion. All paper presenters will be allowed a timeslot of maximum 15 minutes, plus five minutes discussion time following each paper.

0900-0910 Introduction and presentation

0910-1030 First paper presentation session

Supporting development and evaluation of Web 2 applications

Bram Lievens, Karen Torben Nielsen, Jo Pierson, An Jacobs: Proxy technology assessment as a multi-method approach for identifying social requirements of co-creative media

Jeroen Vanattenhoven: Research Blog: Eliciting User Needs and Experiences.

Jan Heim, Amela Karahasanović, Petter Bae Brandtzæg: Capturing User Requirements and Feedback for Web 2.0 Applications by a Norm-Based Questionnaire Toolset

Marianna Obrist, Danilea Wurhofer, Manfred Tscheligi: User Experience Patterns: A useful way to support social media development

1030-1045 Tea

1045-1200 Second paper presentation session

Capturing human aspects during the requirements elicitation

Deepak Sahni, Jan Van den Bergh, Karin Coninx: Towards a Collaboration Framework for Selection of ICT Tools

Jan Derboven, Alex J. Uyttendaele: Putting Personas to Work: Combining Card Sorting and Personas in Requirements Analysis

Nachiet Apte, Frank Hülsken: Motivation for creating new user experience while watching online video

1200-1300 Lunch

1300-1445 Third paper presentation session.

HCI and social media

Jari Multisilta: Designing for Social Media

Saila Ovaska, Juha Leino, Kari-Jouko Rähkä: Studying User Interest in Social Media Sites

Petri Mannonen, Mikael Rumonen: SMEs in Social Media

Piirjo Näkki, Maria Antikainen: Online Tools for Co-design: User Involvement through the Innovation Process

1445-1500 Tea

1500-1600 Group discussions: Defining a research agenda

Group A: Future research in user requirements elicitation

Group B: Required tools for user requirements elicitation

Group C: Future research in the Human computer interaction of social media

Group D: Social media as development aid: Towards online Living Labs

1600-1645 Plenary presentations and discussion

1645-1700 Wrap-up

Content

New approaches to requirements elicitation	
Introduction	9
Proxy technology assessment as a multi-method approach for identifying social requirements of co-creative media	12
<i>Bram Lievens, Karen Torben Nielsen, Jo Pierson, An Jacobs</i>	
Research Blog: Eliciting User Needs and Experiences	19
<i>Jeroen Vanattenhoven</i>	
Capturing User Requirements and Feedback for Web 2.0 Applications by a Norm-Based Questionnaire Toolset	25
<i>Jan Heim, Amela Karahasanović, Petter Bae Brandtzæg</i>	
Towards a Collaboration Framework for Selection of ICT Tools	33
<i>Deepak Sahni, Jan Van den Bergh, Karin Coninx</i>	
Putting Personas to Work: Combining Card Sorting and Personas in Requirements Analysis	40
<i>Jan Derboven, Alex J. Uyttendaele</i>	
Motivation for creating new user experience while watching online video	46
<i>Nachiet Apte, Frank Hülsken</i>	
Requirements Elicitation: Understanding Users' Values and Emotions	53
<i>Sarah Thew, Alistair Sutcliffe</i>	
How can HCI improve social media development?	
Introduction:	61
Designing for Social Media	64
<i>Jari Multisilta</i>	
Studying User Interest in Social Media Sites	72
<i>Saila Ovaska, Juha Leino, Kari-Jouko Rähkä</i>	
User Experience Patterns: A useful way to support social media development	79
<i>Marianna Obrist, Danilea Wurhofer, Manfred Tscheligi</i>	
SMEs in Social Media	85
<i>Petri Mamonen, Mikael Runonen</i>	
Online Tools for Co-design: User Involvement through the Innovation Process	91
<i>Pirjo Näkki, Maria Antikainen</i>	

NordiCHI'08 Workshop

New Approaches to Requirements Elicitation

Organizers

Amela Karahasanović, SINTEF ICT and University of Oslo,
Norway

Jo Pierson, IBBT, Studies on Media Information and
Telecommunication, Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Belgium

Jeroen Vanattenhoven, IBBT, Csectiopsentre for Usability
Research, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Belgium

Alex Uyttendaele, IBBT, Centre for Usability Research, Katholieke
Universiteit Leuven, Belgium

Introduction

1 Workshop theme

The theme of this workshop is eliciting user requirements. Requirements elicitation is a crucial in any software development process. Understanding context of use and its associated user requirements is a key success factor in ICT systems development [3, 8]. Existing methods are however challenged by new application areas and fast changes in users' preferences. A range of well-known methods and techniques are supporting context analysis and user requirements specification, such as interviews and contextual enquiries, user workshops, field studies, personas and scenarios.

Existing methods are however severely challenged by three important trends:

1. New technology and application areas, such as new user-centric media, social networking applications and user generated content where end-users become a "major media producer and distributor" [4], make it difficult to apply traditional methods for context analysis. The context of use for these applications is fast changing, unpredictable, and highly dependent on the mass of users that may start using an application under development.
2. Users' preferences and competencies are a moving target. One of the best examples of this may be the broad-scale adaptation of online community services such as Facebook, Lunarstorm (Sweden) and Nettby (Norway). Within the period of the last couple of years, user requirements to online social applications was fully changed due to widespread experiences with new application opportunities.
3. Many ICT solutions do no longer serve individual users, but cater to the needs and requirements of online and offline socialities. Developing new media services implies building communities and encouraging social interactions and co-creation of content [9]. We therefore need to go beyond user requirements and also include social requirements [2].

In response to these trends we see the emergence of new approaches for requirements analysis on the levels of the user, the context and the social interactions. Research has been conducted on the use of new tools and techniques such as on-line experience sampling [1], social media tools [5], and on-line tools for identification of end-users patterns of media use. Also, new environments for technology innovation such as Living Labs [6, 7] represent a promising new approach to user, context and social requirements analysis.

2 Submission and review process

The authors contributing to this workshop section were encouraged to focus on one or more of the following core issues:

- Examining potentials and limitations of traditional context and user-requirements analysis methodology
- Presenting new methods and tools for user, context and social requirement analysis and report experience with them
- Discussing future directions for advancing the state-of-the-art and state-of-the-practice in this area

All papers were blinded and reviewed independently by two reviewers from the program committee:

- Asbjørn Følstad, SINTEF ICT, Norway
- An Jacobs, SMIT, Belgium
- Christof van Nimwegen, CUO, K.O., Leuven
- David Geerts, COU, K.O. Leuven, Belgium
- Erik G. Nilsson, SINTEF ICT, Norway
- Karin Slegers, COU, K.O., Leuven
- Petter B. Brandtzæg, SINTEF ICT, Norway
- Weimin Ma, The University of Texas at Dallas, USA
- Wendy Van den Broeck, SMIT, Belgium

Following the review the authors were given only a few days to update their papers. They will however be given more time to update the papers, in the time between the workshop and the printing of the final proceedings at Tapir akademisk forlag (Tapir academic press).

3 The papers of this workshop section

The seven papers presented in this workshop section cover different aspects of user requirements elicitation. The first three papers target development of Web 2.0 applications. Bram Lievens and his colleagues from IBBT-SMIT, present a multi-method approach for identifying social requirements and their experience with it. Jeroen Vanattenhoven from Katholieke Universiteit Leuven presents his experience with use of research blog in eliciting user requirements. Jan Heim and his colleagues from SINTEF ICT describe a norm based toolset for capturing user requirements and feedback.

In the fourth paper, Deepak Sahni and colleagues from Hasselt University, IBBT propose a framework that facilitates selection of appropriate tools for different development activities. The fifth paper, by Jan Derboven and Alex Uyttendaele from Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, describes a method for gathering requirements based on a combination of card sorting and personas.

Last two papers focus on motivation and emotions of users. Nachiet Apte and Frank Hülsken from Franhoufer present their investigation of motivation to share and produce video. Sarah Thew and Alistair Sutcliffe from Manchester Business School present their investigation of users' values and emotions.

We hope that these papers will stimulate fruitful discussions about new challenges and solutions within requirements engineering and propose a research agenda in this field.

Acknowledgements

The workshop organizing work was supported by the research project CITIZEN MEDIA (www.ist-citizenmedia.org, EU FP6). Thanks to the program committee for good and speedy reviews.

References

1. Chen, H., Nilan, M.: An exploration of web users' internal experience: Application of the experience sampling method to the web environment. WebNet 98 World Conference. Orlando, Florida (1998)
2. CITIZEN MEDIA: Initial context, user and social requirements for the CITIZEN MEDIA applications, Sixth Framework Programme, IST 2.41.6, available at: <http://www.ist-citizenmedia.org:8080/display/PU/Deliverables> (2007)
3. Dix, A., Finlay J., Abowd, G.D., Beale, R.: Human-Computer Interaction, Pearson, Prentice Hall (2004)
4. EC: User Centric Media Future and Challenges in European Research European Commission, Information Society and Media, Luxembourg (2007)
5. Näkki, P.: Utilising social media tools in user-centred design. Paper presented at the CHI 2007 workshop Supporting non-professional users in the new media landscape. Available online at: <http://soc.kuleuven.be/com/mediac/chi2007workshop/> (2007)
6. Niitamo, S.K., Eriksson, M., Hribernik, K.A.: State-of-the-Art and Good Practice in the Field of Living Labs , proceedings of ICE2006, the 12th International Conference on Concurrent Enterprising, Milan, Italy (2006)
7. Pierson, J., Lievens, B.: Configuring living labs for a 'thick' understanding of innovation. Paper presented at 'EPIC 2005 (Ethnographic Praxis in Industry Conference, organised by Microsoft and Intel)', 13-15 November 2005, Redmond (USA), 114-127 (2005)
8. Preece, J., Sharp, H., Rogers, Y.: Interaction design : beyond human-computer interaction. New York: J. Wiley & Sons (2002)
9. Vanattenhoven, J., Jans, G.: Enhancing social interaction and user participation in the development of social applications. Workshop Chi 2007: Supporting non-professional users in the new media landscape. San José, California (2007)

Proxy Technology Assessment as a Multi-method Approach for Identifying Social Requirements of Co-creative Media

Bram Lievens, Karen Torben Nielsen, Jo Pierson, An Jacobs

IBBT-SMIT, Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Pleinlaan 2, 1050 Brussels, Belgium
bram.lievens@vub.ac.be

Abstract. The traditional user-oriented approach in technology design focuses on the individual user and context requirements, often only resulting in usability recommendations. However, this approach does not fully capture the social dimension, and therefore overlooks the social aspects that could have a strong impact on the use and adoption of the application under development. Hence we introduce the concept of 'social requirements' in the development process. In order to be able to get feedback from the users in an early phase of the development process and simultaneously study the social dimension, we apply the proxy technology assessment (PTA) in a living lab environment. This approach equips test users with proxy technologies (that resemble the technologies under development) in their natural environment. In this paper we illustrate the use of this method to detect social requirements for an online community platform.

Keywords: Social requirements, proxy technology assessment, living lab, participative design

1 Introduction

In the search for product development recommendations the attention usually focuses on user and context requirements. Those requirements are mostly investigated in a lab environment and on an individual level. However, for many products on the developing table the social aspects -the intra and inter group aspects- of interaction are also of importance, especially for the so-called community applications. Since research focused on the user and context requirements often forgets to investigate those social aspects explicitly, we introduce in the participative designing process the complementary notion of social requirements. These can be defined as 'the requirements that are extracted from the social background and everyday life of people, with an emphasis on groups or communities and the social practices within' [8]. In short, social requirements reflect the social relationships and how they influence the use of the application [3]. In order to be able to identify these requirements it is necessary that users can experience the technology under development in their everyday life usage during a certain period. For this we deploy the proxy technology assessment in a living lab environment.

The empirical part of the paper is based on our study as part of the CITIZEN MEDIA project, a European research project within Sixth Framework Program. This project researches both user generated content and user generated applications for average users (producing, distributing and sharing), and investigates possible ties with social change.

2 Method

In order to experiment with technology that does not yet exist and at the same time capture the social requirements for community applications, we combine two different techniques: proxy technology assessment and a living lab set up. This permits us to gain insight in the interaction between user and technology, as well as in the social structures within the community, and the association between both. It enables us to go beyond the traditional user or technical requirements and reach for the social requirements instead.

2.1. Proxy technology assessment (PTA)

The goal of the PTA technique is to stimulate reflection upon the possible everyday usage of technologies that are still in the development process. This is being enabled through the use of so-called proxy of probing technologies in the natural environment. Proxy technologies can be defined as 'existing technologies that resemble as much as possible the functionalities under development' [6]. This approach stimulates the user's experience and practices, while at the same time making it easier to rationalize about them.

The use of the proxy devices, however, is not a one-way-process in which the user simply adapts the technology to his life. Starting from the notion of mutual shaping, the user as well as his surroundings changes at the same time. Through the use of proxy technologies, it is therefore possible to detect the practices, conflicts and meanings within the community [5]. In other words, PTA enables the researcher to get a grip on the social structures. This is an essential step in the process of participative design, since it aims at considering the end user as full participants in activities leading to both computer products and computer-based activities [4].

2.2 Living lab approach

As PTA is a method for initiating everyday life practices with future technologies and applications, it confronts the user groups in their home surroundings with resembling tools, making it a living lab approach. The concept of Living lab refers to a people-centred test- and experiment platform, meaning that (large groups of) users in their natural environment are the central focus point. This setting enables the researcher to closely observe and monitor changes in user behaviour related to social structures and motivations [5]. In other words, since the research activities are not performed in a traditional lab, but instead in the home and everyday world of the test users, it is possible to capture characteristics like human dynamics, tacit rules and social set up of the group. Users and communities become co-creators in the innovation process.

3 Research set up

The objective of our research is to detect social requirements for an online community application that could facilitate or even enhance the social interaction in an offline community. To ensure the iterative character, this study was conducted in two successive phases, each focusing on a different offline community. This approach permits us to implement the remarks of the first community in the set up of the second community. The two

participating communities are a neighbourhood committee (ca. 80 families) in the small sized Belgian town of Hasselt (70,000 inhabitants), and a gay community (ca. 50 members) based in the Belgian capital of Brussels.

In order to do a PTA, following steps are taken in the research project:




Fig. 1. Different steps we applied within the proxy technology assessment

In what follows, we go deeper into these various research stages as well as illustrating them with experiences from the CITIZEN MEDIA project.

3.1 Selection and intake of test community

One of the most important steps in community research, is - literally - choosing the appropriate community in order to assure relevant results that give an answer to the main research question. Before starting the recruitment process, we therefore need to carefully specify the necessary criteria for the test community, based on the associated research literature. This means that the selection of the community needs to be carefully prepared and executed in a scientific grounded way, using different methods or techniques like purposeful sampling, theoretical variation, etc.

As our research required lively, active communities, the first criterion was that the community organized sufficient group activities on a regular basis during the research period. Second, since we were working on a new online community application, the test communities should have (at least some basic) experience with online applications. Therefore, already having a website of its own was the second criterion.

Thirdly, in order to observe and compare the influence of the new application (in combination with the use of proxy technologies) on the social group structures, we needed a group that was not restricted to weak ties. Finally, as the CITIZEN MEDIA study investigates possible linkages with social changes, both communities had to have a social dimension and

awareness. Both the selected communities met the different criteria. They had both a high activity level and owned a (basic) website. Next to that, within each group the respondents had strong and weak ties. And finally there was a high level of social awareness.

For the recruitment various possible communities need to be contacted at the same time (we contacted twenty groups at once when looking for the second community) and continue the parallel selection process until the researchers and one group confirm their cooperation in the project.

Once the appropriate community is recruited the intake is done, which can be seen as a kind of kick-off for the community. The objective of this activity is not only to introduce the project to the community, but also to get acquainted with the different participants and to introduce and distribute the different proxies. During this moment we also have a quick participative brainstorm session with the participants on how they would like apply the proxy technologies, stating also the objective. Finally the intake moment also offers the opportunity for respondents to ask questions and express uncertainties.

From our experience of involving communities as a research panel for experimentation, we noticed that it is important that the decision to participate in the project is supported by all participating members of the community, and not solely by the leader(s). Before the intake, the leader(s) should therefore ask the opinion and seek the approval of the members before engaging in the research. After all, during the project the whole community will possibly be asked to participate, generate and distribute content, give feedback, fill in questionnaires and attend to focus group meetings. Without the support of a strong basis, this is highly improbable. Apart from assuring the support of the community members, the intake is also important in order to get the know each other, create trust and to set the scene for the upcoming research activities.

3.2 Profiling members of test community

After the selection and intake of the test communities, a profile is made of the participating members. The objective is to get a detailed overview of various general aspects, as well as on specific characteristics of the community. The general questions address the socio-demographic situation of the participant, his/her social environment and the use and possession of (new) media [1]. In addition different project-specific questions will be included. In the case of the CITIZEN MEDIA project we embedded a section to detect their community profile (ties strength, relation to the community,...). This kind of profiling can be done by means of a questionnaire.

Within CITIZEN MEDIA the profiling questionnaire was offered at the end of a kick-off meeting. For participating members who are unable to attend to the kick off meeting, or who only decide to join later on, the questionnaire is made available on the new community website or by e-mail. On simple request, a paper copy was sent. The standard sections of the profiling questionnaire are supplemented with a specific community section. In the latter section the members of the neighbourhood committee are asked about their social contact with the neighbours and their living environment. The members of the gay community are asked about how and to what extent their homosexuality is integrated in their everyday life.

However, it should be noted that the profiling process does not stop after this questionnaire. Instead, it continues and deepens through the observations and experiences during the whole research period, continuously extending the basic information gathered by the questionnaire.

3.3 Distribution of the proxy technologies

The next step in the PTA approach is to distribute the proxy technologies (or in short 'proxies') among the community members.

In the CITIZEN MEDIA research, the central proxy is a free dedicated online community platform. We chose for setting up a Ning online community website, since this Web2.0 tool is specifically aimed at the creation of dedicated easy-to-use community platforms for own purposes (see <http://ning.com>). In order to support the use of this central proxy, we equipped our respondents with supportive technologies. The main reason for doing this is to remove as much as possible any potential technological barrier for participation and co-creation. For the selection of the supporting proxies, we ask the community members during a focus group session at the beginning of the project what user-generated content their social network site would ideally contain. After listing their suggestions and plans we identify the technologies that are required to achieve this. If these technologies are not yet available among the participants, we provide them. For example, if a community member wants to film something in order to share it on the Ning site, but does not possess a video camera, (s)he is given one and receives the necessary information how to use the basic functions.

We distributed digital video cameras, digital photo cameras, editing software and high-end smartphones in both of the communities. The community members are able to use these proxies at home for three months, at their own chosen frequency and intensity. During and after this testing period, they are required to give feedback in order to ensure the participative design process.

3.4 Observation with data triangulation

When designing new social media applications, attention should be given to the social aspects on different levels. The objective is to thoroughly grasp the social interaction and structure of the community on the one hand and the interaction between the group and the proxy technologies on the other hand, in order to identify the social requirements for the product under development. From literature however, it becomes clear that the best way to discover this, is to 'triangulate different data sources, to get a better understanding of the position of our subject. Conventional ethnographic research methods may be extended using novel techniques' [7]. Within the living lab surroundings, the proxy technologies can be used in a multi-method research set up.

In the CITIZEN MEDIA research we combined PTA with various other interpretative methods. We kept a website logbook in which we noted the actions on the website on a daily base and combined it with the data from web analytics, while at the same time engaging in specific moments of participative observation. By integrating various other research methods (profiling questionnaires, five focus group discussions and ten in-depth interviews) the data collected via metrics and participative observation could be checked and investigated more thoroughly.

3.5 Formulating social requirements

The use of PTA in a multi-method research set-up provides an abundance of data, which has to be translated into usable guidelines for designers. This is where the researcher forms the connecting link between the everyday experiences and requirements of the test community, and the technical questions of the designers. As mentioned before, a social requirement is a requirement that reflects the social relationships and how these influence the use of the

application [3]. Ideally it should inductively originate from the data and being validated by findings among the community members.

Within the CITIZEN MEDIA project, we detected various social requirements. However, they remain at a quite abstract level. The translation of the social dynamics into usable guidelines for development still proves to be a challenge. Merely briefing the developers about the suggestions and questions of the community, is not sufficient. The gathering of researchers and developers to discuss the social requirements and the possible technological answers to them, is a much more efficient and satisfying way to proceed.

To illustrate this, two examples from the project are given. First, the display of the social heritage proved very important to the community members. This social requirement could be used in the future design of the co-creative network site by developing a special place where old content is collected, possible by use of a timeline. Second, besides the online content sharing, there was a need for sharing audio-visual material offline as well. This means that any online multimedia application would benefit from the affordance of exporting to different file formats, so that it would be easy, for example, to write content on a DVD [8].

4 Conclusion

When designing new social media applications for an offline community, the social dynamics are often not being investigated, although they are of great importance. Since the more traditional HCI research methods focus on user and context requirements, they have difficulties mapping the social requirements. For this we applied the proxy technology assessment (PTA) in a living lab environment. In this paper we suggested a practical research set up, consisting of five phases: the selection and intake of the test community, the profiling of the members, the distribution of appropriate proxies, the observation with data triangulation and the formulating of the social requirements. The added value of applying PTA in a living lab environment is that it enables participative design within a real life context. By doing so it is a very appropriate method to elicitate social requirements.

References

1. Dreessen, K., Pierson, J.: Study 3: Co-creation and social change in off-line communities (IBBT). In: EU FP6 CITIZEN MEDIA –Initial context, user and social requirements for the CITIZEN MEDIA-applications (2007)
2. Granovetter, Mark S.: The strength of weak ties. In *American Journal of Sociology*, 78 (6), 1360-1380 (1973)
3. Karahasanovic, A., Heim, J., Brandtzaeg, P., Lüders, M., Skjetne, J.H., Vanattenhoven, J., Jans, G., van Nimwegen, C., Uyttendale, A., Vermeir, L., Pierson, J., Lievens, B., Jacobs, A.: EU FP6 CITIZEN MEDIA - Non-professional users as co-creators of media content: Phase 1 (FP6-2005-IST-41) (D1.1.2). Brussels: SINTEF - UOL - IBBT-SMIT, 88 (2008)
4. Muller, M. J.: Participatory design: the third space in HCI. In: Jacko, J.A. & Sears, A. (Hg.), *The human-computer interaction handbook: fundamentals, evolving technologies and emerging applications* Mawah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1051-1068 (2002)
5. Pierson, J.: Domestication at work in small businesses, in T. Berker, M. Hartmann, Y. Punic. K. Ward (Eds.) *Domestication of media and technology*. Berkshire: Open University Press, 205-226 (2005)
6. Pierson, J., Jacobs, A., Dreessen, K., Van den Broeck, I., Lievens, B., Van den Broeck, W.: Walking the interface: uncovering practices through 'proxy technology assessment' EPIC 2006 Conference Proceedings (Ethnographic Praxis in Industry Conference, organised by Microsoft and Intel). Portland: American Anthropological Association, 29-40 (2006)

7. Van Rompaey, V., Charliers, K., Van Der Meerssche, B., Godon, M., Vanden Abeele, M., De Mondt, H.: Residential co-design: Families join the design caravan. <http://www.jokamajo.org/files/encompas.family.pdf>
8. Vermeir, L., Van Lier, T., Pierson, J., Lievens, B.: Making the online complementary to the offline: social requirements to foster the 'sense of community'. Presentation at Communication Policy and Technology section for the IAMCR (International Association for Media and Communication Research) congress 'Media and global divides', organised by Stockholm University & IAMCR, 20-25 July 2008, Stockholm, Sweden (2008)

Research Blog: Eliciting User Needs and Experiences

Jeroen Vanattenhoven

Centre for User Experience Research, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven - IBBT
Parkstraat 45 Postbus 3605, 3000 Leuven, Belgium
jeroen.vanattenhoven@soc.kuleuven.be

Abstract. In this paper we evaluate the use of a research blog to elicit user needs and experiences by comparing the results of this method to those of a diary and an observation study held in parallel. The main results are that (1) user needs and experiences can be elicited using a research blog, (2) social interaction on a research blog occurs and make the results more accurate, (3) contributions are mainly made in textual form, but pictures and videos are hardly used at all, and (4) experiences can be described very lively on a research blog, but participant observation gives a better, first-hand insight into the matter which is investigated.

Keywords: online research, research blog, non-professional users, user analysis, requirements gathering, Web 2.0

1 Introduction

User analysis remains an important topic in HCI because insight into user needs and experiences is essential to develop successful applications. The work in this paper was carried out in the CITIZEN MEDIA research project which investigates sharing and co-creation of user-generated content (UGC) by non-professional users in the new media landscape [3]. In this new media landscape the role of the user has evolved from passive consumer of media content to active producer which is possible because of the widespread availability of technological devices and Web 2.0 application.

Besides users, researchers also benefit from having many Web 2.0 applications at their disposal since these applications offer new opportunities as research tools [4]. The use of Web 2.0 allows researchers and participants to use pictures and videos on the blog. Using pictures and videos can help researchers to get a better feel of the user's world and also help the user eliciting and remembering past experiences [1]. Also, we believe that when participants comment on each others contributions and engage in discussion, the results will be more accurate and richer than e.g. using the diary method which involves gathering individual accounts.

The main application for the method we describe in this paper, a research blog, is a blog on which participants contribute information regarding the topics of a study. The topics are communicated on the blog by the researchers, and they can engage in a dialogue with participants throughout the study.

In this paper we first describe the method. Then we discuss the results in two different studies. Finally, we formulate the main conclusions regarding the use of a research blog and discuss future work.

2 Method

We evaluate the research blog method by looking at the results of two studies that were set-up using this method. The objective of the first study was to investigate the user needs of non-professional users in the new media landscape [3]. Two methods were used in parallel: the research blog and the diary method. The second study was conducted to gain insight into the quiz experiences of non-professional users; in this case the research blog and observation were methods used in parallel.

To evaluate the research blog a comparison between the research blog and the diary method for the first study regarding user needs, and between the research blog and observation for the second study regarding user experiences, will be made. The comparison will look into the social interaction by looking at the number of comments participants made on posts, into the kind of content participants used to contribute (text, pictures and video) for both studies, and into the two different ways researchers gained insight into the experiences of the participants for the second study.

In the two studies we targeted the average and instrumental users on the one hand, and entertainment users on the other hand [2]: average users do not use ICT on a regular basis and have quite low computer skills. Instrumental users mainly use ICT for utility (e-government) or for gathering information, have more ICT skills than average users, and have good ICT access and a higher education level. Entertainment users spend a lot of their time with ICT on entertainment such as games, score high on advanced usage, and PC and Internet use in general, are relatively young, have a high variation in education and income, and have good ICT access in general.

2.1 Research blog

The participants involved in the research blog studies were recruited from two communities: Seniorennet (<http://www.seniorennet.be>), a large community for seniors, and Pietel, a smaller community mainly for people between 20 and 30 years old (<http://www.pietel.be>). The first community was selected to reflect the average and instrumental user profiles while the second community was selected to reflect the entertainment user profile [2]. The first research blog study (n=19) involved participants from both the senior community (n=7) and the Pietel community (n=12) whereas the second one only involved participants from the senior community (n=15).

For the research blog participants were first briefed via e-mail. We provided them with Google-accounts they could use to access all applications to prevent the participants to have to make all the effort in creating and setting up the accounts. This way they could just concentrate on contributing to the study. To stimulate participants to contribute, we also informed them the blog would remain private. To make the participants feel comfortable we introduced ourselves and asked that they would do the same. Our introduction to the participants included a picture of ourselves and a video illustrating one of the hobbies of one researcher. As indicated above, this was done with the objective of introducing ourselves to motivate the use of pictures and videos, since we wanted to receive rich accounts of the participants' experiences, and to reduce the possible personal distance between participants, and between participants and researchers. Then we inquired about user needs for the first study and experiences for the second by posting our main questions online and starting a dialogue about the participants' contributions.

The first research blog study was not limited in time since we didn't know at the time which the optimal time frame was to conduct such a study. We did not want to stop too early and cut off participants still wanting to contribute, but also avoid to keep going and

overburden them. In the end the duration of the study was nine weeks since we noticed that participation declined significantly after four weeks (Fig. 1). Therefore the second research blog study only lasted four weeks.

Blogger was used as the main application. Picasa for uploading photos, and YouTube and Google Video for uploading videos, were linked to Blogger via the user accounts.

2.2 Diary

The diary method was used in the first study in parallel with a research blog study. Participants (n=15) were recruited from both the senior and the Pietel community: nine women and six men with a median age of 32, ranging from 13 to 69.

Participants were contacted by phone to explain the purpose of the study, and to communicate the practicalities. A diary was prepared for each participant and contained the topics they should focus on during the diary study which lasted one week. The diary was sent to the participants, and afterwards received, via mail. Once the diaries were collected one researcher read the diaries and conducted a follow-up interview with the participants via telephone.

2.3 Observation

An observation was carried out in the second study in parallel with a research blog study. The objective of the second study was to gain insight into quiz experiences. Therefore, four researchers participated in a music quiz held in a local community hall during a whole evening. Researchers had to take notes during observation since recording video was not allowed. 34 teams of four people played the music quiz that evening (n=136); this includes the four researchers. Since we could not obtain all details regarding age and gender of the quizzers, we could only rely on our own estimates: the age range was broad (young, middle-aged and seniors), and as for gender we only counted a few female quizzers.

3 Results and discussion

3.1 Social interaction

One of the original goals of our setup [4] was to stimulate social interaction, because this could enhance the results of the study. Comments on posts and on other comments were made by entertainment users, but hardly among average and instrumental users (Fig. 1). The comments consisted of discussions regarding the participants' contributions to the research questions and personal communication. When discussing the research topics in the comments participants seemed to try to formulate and position their opinions more accurately towards each other, making the results of the study clearer.

However, a clear difference is present for both contributions (posts) and social interaction (comments) between average and instrumental users, and entertainment users (Fig. 1). The most plausible explanation regarding the difference in social interaction is the size of the communities: the Pietel community is quite small, and therefore members are more likely to have had contact with each other. Another explanation, for both social interaction and contributions, could be based on the different user profiles [2]. Average users just use a computer now and then, and have low ICT skills; instrumental users have somewhat higher

ICT skills but mainly use technology for utility or information acquisition. Conversely, entertainment users use ICT for entertainment purposes such as joining social networks and playing online games and therefore might be more likely to engage in conversation online.




Fig. 1. The number of posts and comments per user profile on the first research blog per week.

3.2 Contributed content: text, pictures and videos

We encouraged participants to illustrate their contributions by using pictures and videos for both the research blog method as the diary method. However, not a lot of photos and videos were used. Two entertainment users illustrated their contribution with pictures. Two average and instrumental users uploaded a picture but not to augment their contributions; their uploaded pictures were “dummy” pictures and the result of following the photo upload tutorial which was provided to the participants. Videos were never posted. This leaves text as the main form of contributed content.

Despite the advances of Web 2.0 in providing possibilities to upload and share user-generated content in all forms, non-professional users do not make use of these possibilities. Especially participants with lower ICT skills and higher age (average and instrumental users from the senior community) have great difficulty in uploading pictures and videos.

3.3 Insight into user experiences

The objective of the second study, involving both the research blog and observation methods, was to gain insight into the participants’ quiz experiences. For the research blog these experiences were described on the blog in the form of anecdotes and descriptions. For the researcher these anecdotes seemed very recognizable as they contained some humorous, real-life experiences as illustrated by following quotes from a senior woman who played quizzes while on vacation together with befriended couples (the translation is made by the author): “We spent a weekend in the Ardennes together with befriended couples, but one friend was feeling ill; this meant we couldn’t do a lot of outdoor activities as planned and as we did in previous years, but this gave us all the more reason to play some games.”, “On the second day three friends started playing Scrabble and it didn’t take long before we were all standing around the board arguing about spelling and whether or not to allow a certain word.”, “There were two teams consisting of two men and one team consisting of two women. Especially sports-related questions were not our cup of tea, which lead to great joy by the men when we didn’t know who scored the winning goal in the final of the World Cup soccer in 1974”.

The textual anecdotes on the research blog did give us insight into how people experience quizzes in everyday life, and illustrated what elements constitute a good quiz. But there is a subtle difference with (participant) observation. As we participated in the quiz to observe an entire quiz evening, we, as researchers, were experiencing the quiz ourselves. One of our experiences was that the pace at which the questions are asked to everyone is of great importance. If this were to be written in textual form, it might be harder to grasp what this means for the experience. Being there, and participating as researchers, we felt what it was like to play a quiz where the pace was too high (for us).

3.4 Withdrawals from the studies

An important note has to be made about the number of withdrawals by participants. The two communities not only appear to differ in amount of social interaction during our study (Fig. 1), but also in amount of withdrawals. The drop out rate for the first research blog study was 8.3% for entertainment users and 42.9% for average and instrumental users. For the second research blog study, involving only average and instrumental users, the drop out rate was 60%. For the diary method in the first study there were no withdrawals.

Some reasons why average and instrumental users dropped out can be found in the motivations five participants some communicated to us after withdrawing: the questions/assignments seemed too difficult, and some indicated that they would prefer answering a list of questions instead of writing a report or anecdotes.

4 Conclusion

Our main conclusion is that using a research blog can indeed be used to elicit user needs and experiences. In comparison to the diary method, a research blog offers the opportunity for participants and researchers to engage in social interaction, which makes the results more accurate. One factor which might influence the extent of social interaction is the size of the community. For larger communities it might be better to recruit participants that already know each other. However, the possibilities Web 2.0 applications provide regarding the use of pictures and videos online were not fully used by participants. We believe that these possibilities are insufficiently tailored to the needs of non-professional users with lower ICT skills.

Since pictures and videos offer a very rich account of user needs and experiences, future research should focus on how to motivate participant to contribute this kind of content more, and to make these Web 2.0 application easier to use by participants with lower ICT skills.

Acknowledgements

Thanks to all partners involved in CITIZEN MEDIA research project (funded by FP6-2005-IST-41), to Greet Jans who helped me with the coordination of the first online study and carried out the diary study and to Alex Uyttendaele and Bieke Zaman who aided by reviewing this paper.

References

1. Collier, J. (1979). "Visual Anthropology in Wagner", In *Images of Information*. Beverly Hills, California, Sage.
2. Heim, J., Brandtzaeg, P. B. (2007). "Patterns of Media Usage and the Non-professional Users". Presented at the CHI2007 workshop "Supporting non-professional users in the new media landscape", San José, California.
3. Trogemann, G., Pelt, M. (2006). "CITIZEN MEDIA – Technological and Social Challenges of User Driven Media".
4. Vanattenhoven, J., Jans, G. (2007). "Enhancing Social Interaction and User Participation in the Development of Social Applications". Presented at the CHI2007 workshop "Supporting non-professional users in the new media landscape", San José, California.

Capturing User Requirements and Feedback for Web 2.0 Applications by a Norm-Based Questionnaire Toolset

Jan Heim¹, Amela Karahasanović^{1,2} and Petter Bae Brandtzæg^{1,3}

¹ SINTEF ICT, P.O. Box 124 – Blindern, N-0314 Oslo, Norway

² Department of Informatics, University of Oslo, Norway

³ Department of Media and Communication, University of Oslo, Norway

{Jan.Heim, Amela.Karahasanovic, Petter.B.Brandtzæg}@sintef.no

Abstract. Objective of this research is to improve the design process of Web 2.0 applications by providing norm-based toolset for capturing user requirements and feedback. Web 2.0 applications are characterised by fast changes of users' preferences and competences. Existing methods for capturing user requirements and evaluation are not flexible enough to capture these changes. Therefore, we would like a cost-effective method for collecting data on users, their requirements and satisfaction. We formulated four set of questions about (i) computer literacy of users or group of users, (ii) community requirements, (iii) community usage, and (iv) community satisfaction, and conducted a study of five samples in Norway. The study had 5723 participants in total; four online communities and one national representative study of Internet users. Based on the results of this study as a norm base, we developed a questionnaire toolset that support designers and developers.

Keywords: Requirement elicitation, User-Centred Design, Web 2.0 Applications

1 Introduction

It is widely accepted that understanding users is a prerequisite of successful software development. Although figures differ, most researchers agree that costs of fixing requirement errors are much greater than costs of fixing errors which arise later in the development [1]. Web 2.0 applications such as social-networking and community websites, video sharing sites, blogs and wikis have been used by an increasing part of population [2] and have large impact on their work, education and daily life. Diversity of users and contexts in which their going to use the applications, fast changes of their preferences and competences, and community dynamics pose new challenges on the development process.

User-centred design (UCD) methods have been suggested as a means for improving usefulness and usability of software systems. These methods are based on the active end-to-end user involvement of users, and iterative design and evaluation. Whereas UCD has been generally considered useful by the practitioners [3], resource constraints were reported as one of its major obstacles. Some common characteristics of an ideal UCD process were not found to be used in practice, namely focusing on the total user experience, end-to-end user involvement in the development process, and tracking users satisfaction [3]).




Fig. 1. Development of the toolset. ICT means Information and Communication Technologies

Numerous techniques for elicitation of user requirements and feedback are available [1, 4]. However, there is a danger of overwhelming users with questionnaires, interviews and focus groups. Reduction of questionnaire overload is and will increasingly be a key challenge in future user research. We will therefore need a technique for data capturing that is effective, easy and interesting to use from the perspective of users. Further, the tool should have a clear role in the development process. It should in addition be easy for designers and developers to summarise the results in different ways. Furthermore, the technique should include an empirical founded baseline, which makes possible to compare a particular result with what people usually respond. Hence, we conducted a study investigating: (i) who the users are, (ii) what they expect from an online community, (iii) how the use it, and (iv) are they satisfied with their community. Using these results as a norm base, we developed four tools that support designers and developers of Web 2.0 applications (Fig. 1).

This work is carried out in the framework a research project called CITIZEN MEDIA (www.istcitizemedia.org) which unites leading creative and technology experts from across Europe to enable multiple non-professional users to co-create networked applications and experiences based on their own user generated content in collaboration.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 describes the requirement we posed on the tools and Section 3 describes the tools. We than describe how we developed the tools in Section 4. Section 5 concludes by considering impacts of our research and the possibilities for future work.

2 Requirements for the tools

We needed a flexible and cost-effective set of tools for collecting data on users, their requirements and satisfaction. The requirements we posed on the toolset are described below.

2.1 Simplicity/usability

User-centred design methods rely heavily on user involvement. Users are expected to fill in a large amount of questionnaires, take part in the large number of interviews, focus groups, etc. To avoid questionnaire overload it is important that the tools we use for data collection are simple, effective, easy and interesting to use from the perspective of the respondents. It should also be easy and effective from the perspective of the researchers, to reduce stress in increasingly fast developments cycles.

2.2 Clear role in the development process

It is important to assure the best possible quality of the collected data and to avoid overburdening the same groups of users with too many tools. The data we collect should not only be "nice to have", but should meet demands raised during the development. The tools should therefore have a clearly defined role in the development process. Human-centred design processes identify the following four development phases: (1) understanding and specifying the context of the system, (2) specifying the requirements of the organizations and users, (3) design solutions, and (4) evaluate the solutions. We wanted a toolset that will support (i) the first phase by collecting the data on computer literacy of users or group of users, (ii) the second phase by identifying community requirements and community usage, and (iii) the fourth phase by evaluating community satisfaction,

2.3 Aggregated results

When many users are exposed to a variety of questions, it is important that the results can be effectively summarized so that the users of the results, system designers and system developers, can choose between a high-level or low-level view of the results. This requires mechanisms to aggregate the data in meaningful ways.

2.4 Co-creation in online communities

The focus of the CITIZEN MEDIA project is on building online communities that support co-creation of multi media content. It is therefore particularly important to capture requirements for building online communities that support co-creation of multi media content. We formulated a set of questions capturing these requirements.

2.5 Norms

It has been argued that lack of the empirical research prevents the transfer of the results of requirements engineering to practice [5]. We wanted an empirical based baseline to compare our results with. Norm based questionnaires make possible to compare a particular result to

what people usually respond and are widely used in psychology. However, they are rarely used within the field of Information and Communication Technologies (ICT), with the tools for usability evaluation WAMMI and SUMI¹ being exceptions. One reason for this may be the fact that within the ICT field, what people know, expect and want varies substantially from one user group to another, and from one year to another. Therefore it is important to have mechanisms that ensure that the norm base can be dynamically updated.

3 CITIZEN MEDIA Questionnaire Toolset

The CITIZEN MEDIA questionnaire toolset consists of four web tools. Each tool is a simple online questionnaire consisting of small number of questions. Answering questions takes a couple of minutes. To make the tools interesting for the users, they received an immediate feedback comparing their results with the norm base. The toolset can be found at:

<http://85.196.86.250:8080/DemoFrontEnd/>

3.1 CITIZEN MEDIA User Analysis Tool

This tool collects data on the computer literacy of a user or a user group. This is important early in the development process when one needs to know what skills and experiences the users have. Can they download videos; are they familiar with chat and e-mails? This knowledge is important when designing for a specific user group. It also gives an estimate of the user group's similarity with typical online community members with respect to ICT usage. The users are characterized along four dimensions: Entertainment use, Work use, Instrumental use and Communication use.

3.2 CITIZEN MEDIA Community Requirements Tool

There are typically two main reasons for joining an online community: Getting in contact with other people and getting in contact with content of interest. This tool charts the user's main requirements along these two dimensions (Fig. 2).

¹ <http://www.ucc.ie/hfrg/questionnaires/index.html>

Norsk
 English
 Deutsch
 Nederlands

What do you want from an online community?
 By answering the following questions you can compare your preferences with other.

Male Female
 Gender

How old are you?
 I am years

To what extent do you use the Internet to get in touch with others? Yes No
 To me, the Internet is important to keep in touch with other people

When I use an online community, it is important that I am able to...

...to get in touch with people I do not already know	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
...to keep updated on happenings where I live	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
...to keep updated on national and global news	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
...to create and share experiences with others	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

When I use an online community, it is nice if I am able to

...to be listened to and to participate politically	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
...to find a girlfriend/boyfriend	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
...to share my secrets/problems with others	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Fig. 2. CITIZEN MEDIA Community Requirements Tool

3.3 CITIZEN MEDIA Community Usage Tool

When users operate in an online community, there are many things they can do. This tool asks users of their typical user behaviour in an online community, and classifies the user along usage dimensions and user types. The dimensions are: Social orientation, Factual orientation, Pastime. This is useful for community designers that want to adjust the functionality towards what the users actually do in the community.

3.4 CITIZEN MEDIA Community Evaluation Tool

It is important for community owners to know how satisfied the users are with the community they are using. This tool measures users' satisfaction with their community. The aspects of satisfaction that are covered are usability, user experience, interesting content, interesting people and user involvement.

4 Development of the tools

The toolset was based on our study of online communities in Norway [6]. In the development of the tools it was regarded as important that the owners and stakeholders behind the social network sites regarded the information that was gathered as important. Therefore a pilot study was undertaken to ensure the relevance of the items. A sample from a Norwegian online panel and users from four Norwegian online communities were asked about their usage of ICT in

general and more specifically about their uses and preferences in online communities. The study had 5723 participants in total and served as the norm base for the toolset.

The questions were divided in four sets reflecting the role in the development process: User analysis, user requirement, actual usage, and evaluation. Questions related to community requirements were mainly related to possible user activities within online communities. The items describing these user activities were defined on the basis of a discussion with developers of the Nettby-community, other researchers and by conducting a pilot investigation with 10 target users between the ages of 14-38 years who had some previous experience using online community sites.

In the original questionnaire the questions could be answered by choosing a category on an ordinal scale (frequency of use) for the User Analysis tool, on 5 point Lickert scales for the Requirements and Evaluation tools, and Yes/No questions for the Community Usage tool. Then all questions were dichotomized in order to meet the simplicity requirement, (the Community Usage questions were unchanged). This was done so that about 50% of the reference sample would answer "Yes" and 50% "No". The four sets of questions were then factor analyzed (by the SPSS statistical package) in order to get homogeneous scales that could reflect aggregated results in a meaningful way. The items that loaded on the same factor and also had an acceptable value on a statistical measure of homogeneity (Kuder-Richardson 20), were then grouped together in the same scale and included in the toolset. In addition the Community Usage Tool classified users into categories based on the results from a cluster analysis.

Finally the tools were implemented as web applications allowing easy access for users and administrators. Tools were implemented by means of the Sun Java Studio Creator IDE, utilizing Java and JavaScript. Question labels, computational constants and respondents' result were managed by a MySQL database.

The tools can be accessed in English, German, Norwegian, and Dutch. Other languages may easily be added. With use of the tools, the norm base will be extended, and comparisons across user groups, countries and languages can easily be done.

5 Conclusions and future work

Web 2.0 applications differ from the traditional task-oriented applications that have been studied within the general Human Computer Interaction framework. Rather than focusing on task completion, speed and accuracy the new applications address user experience, social exchange, co-creation, creativity and entertainment. Flexible and cost-effective methods for collecting data on users, their requirements and satisfaction are needed.

We developed a set of norm-based questionnaire tools that collects the data on (i) computer literacy of users or group of users, (ii) community requirements, (iii) community usage, and (iv) community satisfaction. The toolset might be useful for designers of Web 2.0 applications when profiling users with respect to their computer literacy and reasons for joining online communities. It might also be useful for developers and community hosts for adjusting functionality towards users' needs and to and evaluation of users' satisfaction. With the use of toolset, the norm base will extend, and make possible to for researchers to compare across different user groups, countries and languages. Further work includes evaluating usefulness of this toolset.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the Citizen Media research project (funded by FP6-2005-IST-41). We are grateful to all the participants in our studies and the partners involved in this project.

References

1. Kotonoya, G. and I. Sommerville, Requirement Engineering. 1998, Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.
2. Wunsch-Vincent, S. and G. Vickery. Participative web: user-created content. 2007 [cited; Available from: <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/57/14/38393115.pdf>.
3. Vredenburg, K., et al., A Survey of User-Centered Design Practice. CHI Letters, 2002. 4(1): p. 471-478.
4. Dix, A., et al., Human-Computer Interaction. 2004, Harlow, England: Pearson.
5. Wieringa, R.J. and J.M.G. Heerkens, The methodological soundness of requirements engineering papers: a conceptual framework and two case studies. Requirements Engineering, 2006. 11: p. 295-307.
6. Heim, J. and P.B. Brandtzaeg. Patterns of Media Usage and the Non-professional Users. in CHI2007 workshop "Supporting non-professional users in the new media landscape". 2007. San José, California.

Appendix

Questions for Citizen Media User Analysis Tool

Is the Internet important to you for keeping in touch with other people?

The Internet is important for me to keep in touch with others

Every day, or almost every day I'm using

... PC at school or work

... Internet at school or work

At least once a week I'm

... using word processing

... receiving e-mail at school or work

Monthly or more often I'm

... using spreadsheet

... listening to music on the PC

... using text-chat (MSN or other)

... receiving information from official authorities via the Internet

During the last year I have

... downloaded forms from the public administration from the Internet

... submitted completed forms to public administration by means of the Internet

... got health related information from the internet

... downloaded software from the Internet

... used file sharing programs for music and video

... seen video/DVD on the PC

... seen video/DVD on TV

... played PC games

... played consol games (Play station, X-box, etc.)

... published pictures on the Internet

- ... used the PC for talking to others (so that you can hear each other)
- ... published video on the Internet
- A last question ...
- Are you a member of an online community?

Questions for CITIZEN MEDIA Community Usage Tool

What do you usually do in this online community?

- Write an entry
- Upload pictures
- See if anyone has contacted me
- Look for a new friend
- Read new entries/posts
- See what videos or photos other users have published
- Make appointments for meeting contacts/friends
- Look for information - without any specific purpose
- Write letters and/or messages
- Discuss
- Browse profiles
- Get in touch with others
- Kill some time

Questions for CITIZEN MEDIA Community Evaluation Tool

I completely agree with the following claims

- I will recommend this online community to my friends
- This online community is quick and easy to use
- I meet a lot of interesting people in this online community

I more or less agree with the following claims

- I feel obliged to make this online community a nice place
- I feel as if I am a part of this online community
- This online community keeps me updated on news and other important information
- It is more rewarding to use this online community than to watch television

Figure 2 presents the questions for CITIZEN MEDIA Community Evaluation Tool

Towards a Collaboration Framework for Selection of ICT Tools

Deepak Sahni, Jan Van den Bergh, and Karin Coninx

Hasselt University - transnationale Universiteit Limburg
Expertise Centre for Digital Media - IBBT
Wetenschapspark 2, B-3590 Diepenbeek, Belgium
{deepak.sahni, jan.vandenbergh, karin.coninx}@uhasselt.be

Abstract. Appropriate selection of ICT (Information Communication Technology) tools is valuable in project development activities where an organization can setup consistent means of collaboration to ensure that all the stakeholders use specific technology. This paper presents the conceptual framework for collaboration. The collaboration framework facilitates selection of the correct ICT tools for different project development activities. It is designed using a layer based approach and divided into three layers. We believe that the use of the framework will improve the collaboration between the teams.

Keywords: Collaboration, Framework, ICT tools, Collaboration Variables

1 Introduction

A software development process is composed of the following primary activities: requirements engineering, design and implementation, testing, and maintenance [3]. However, the requirements engineering process is a very decisive activity and, it is considered as a base of software development. Problems in requirements engineering practices lead to problems in design which further result in wrong implementation of requirements and continues to testing phase [2][3]. By improving requirements elicitation, the requirements engineering process can be improved, potentially resulting in a much better project development process [1]. Requirements engineering is a generic process and can be used in different domains i.e. software engineering, computer networks, human-computer interaction, selection of ICT (Information Communication Technology) tools etc. Here, we will discuss a requirements elicitation process regarding the selection of ICT tools for collaboration².

According to Engsbo *et al.* [4] the usage of collaboration technologies has increased in project based organizations. The transfer of documents, inter/intra-organizational communication and project scheduling are prominent activities, which require high eminence

² The term "ICT tools" is limited to ICT tools for collaboration in the remainder of the paper. By collaboration, we mean the process of working together in pursuit of common objectives within a multi-disciplinary project.

collaboration. It is challenging to decide how to collaborate between stakeholders during the complete project life cycle; therefore organizations should determine when and which tools are to be implemented. Building a collaboration framework is more than deciding on tools it should cover and enable the all organizational structures including stakeholders, and integration with downstream systems.

Grudin [8] mentions in his paper how collaboration tools can be categorized on time vs. space. Malone [9] discusses the interdependencies between the coordination process and possible ways for managing them. Sarma *et al* [10] propose the framework that is based on the collaboration needs of the developers. The above mentioned studies focus on a particular aspect of the collaboration and are inadequate in providing conceptual guidance to help stakeholders in selection of right kind of ICT tool.

Different collaboration technologies are available but it is challenging to select the right tool from a number of technologies. In order to successfully apply ICT tools in project development activities, an organization needs a framework identifying the tools that fill the communication gap in between project activities. The framework functions as a requirements elicitation technique that can be used to select the appropriate ICT tools.

The framework is conceived as part of an IBBT (Interdisciplinary institute for Broadband Technology) project. IBBT is a virtual interdisciplinary research institute combining research groups and research institutes from all Flemish universities. Research groups with different backgrounds and from different universities collaborate within each IBBT project. This framework addresses the problem of selecting the appropriate ICT tools so multidisciplinary dispersed teams can collaborate within IBBT projects. A literature review, a workshop and survey results as well as our own experience in project activities, are the basis for this discussion. The workshop was organized within IBBT with the purpose to generate the list of project development activities. The survey was also conducted within IBBT to create an inventory of ICT tools that are currently used in IBBT projects.

This paper is organized in following manner: first the overview and background of the framework is discussed. Next, the collaboration framework and the collaboration variables are described followed by the proposed implementation of the framework. Finally, we mention the conclusion and future work.

2 Creation of Collaboration Framework

As can be understood from the previous discussion, some fixed structure within the research area of collaboration and ICT tools is needed. A smooth integration and interoperability between tools are still the concern for a successful collaboration.

In currently available studies, ICT tools are mostly selected using ad hoc methods. There are no fixed criteria or frameworks that can be used for the selection of appropriate ICT tools. One reason could be that frameworks are not considered as essential and focus is put on selecting ICT tools rather than on how to select the correct one [5]. With the best of authors' knowledge a framework to select correct ICT tools depending on particular project development activities has not been discussed before.

Berander *et al.* [5] suggest a framework for evaluating requirements prioritization techniques. In their framework, independent (e.g. technique), dependent (e.g. accuracy), and context variables (e.g. environment) are proposed, and recommended to be considered in studies related to requirements prioritization. A similar kind of framework is discussed by Gallies *et al.* [6] for evaluating pair programming techniques. Our preliminary collaboration

framework is based on the variables that are discussed in the work of Berander *et al* [5]. Details regarding our selection of variables are mentioned in section 2.2.

2.1 Collaboration Framework

This section presents the conceptual collaboration framework. As shown in Figure 1, the framework is divided into three layers: top, middle and lower layer. Stakeholders use these collaboration variables to select appropriate ICT tools from an inventory of tools for different project development activities. The three layers are discussed below.




Fig. 1. The Collaboration Framework

Top Layer – The top layer contains the project development activities. These are the activities which we consider in this paper to be selected from the workshop results. Some examples of high-level project development activities are project initiation, planning, project execution and completion. An overview of the project activities is shown in Figure 2.

Middle Layer – This layer mediates between the project activities and stakeholders and is responsible for defining the collaboration variables for the framework. The middle layer is mostly generated by defining variables (see section 2.2) and partially implemented by the developer which facilitates stakeholders to dynamically select tools for project activities (see section 3). It contains two sub layers namely (1) inventory of collaboration tools and (2) collaboration variables. An inventory of ICT tools currently used within IBBT was generated using a survey. The list contains different ICT tools that are currently used in IBBT such as e-mail, instant messengers, wikis, document management tools, project management tools and social networking websites etc. The collaboration variables will be discussed in detail in section 2.2.

Lower Layer – The lower layer of the collaboration framework contains the stakeholders, mainly users and partners that are involved in a project.

2.2 Collaboration Variables

The collaboration variables of the layer collaboration framework contain the variables. These variables will act as a set of guidelines that can be used for the selection of ICT tools. The variables can be used as a checklist which facilitates the stakeholders to take correct decisions and to make sure that no crucial information is missing [5]. We were inspired by the categorization and definition of the variables from Berander *et al* [5], and extended their set of variables with the variables used in the collaboration variables (see Table 1).

Table 1. Variables used in Collaboration Variables

Independent variables	Dependent variables	Context variables
ICT tools	Interoperability	Organization
	Security	Project
	User Interface	Stakeholders
	Platform	
	Ease of use	
	Notification support	

Independent variables – An Independent variable affects an outcome of a study [7]. The choice of independent variables includes the right selection of measurement scales, range of variables etc. [3] [5]. In a collaboration framework, the independent variables are basically the ICT tools that are used in the project. Further, it is also important to mention the purpose of the tool. Most of the time ICT tools can be used for multiple purposes. For example, email can be used for delivering asynchronous messages, or sending documents etc. This related information helps stakeholders to understand the background of ICT tools.

Dependent variables – Dependent variables depend on the treatment of independent variables, they are observed and measured to determine the effect of an independent variable [7] [5]. Dependent variables are basically a result or an outcome of a study [3]. In the collaboration framework, when a number of tools are compared, the dependent variables indicate, why and how one tool is better than another. Here, we will discuss a few important dependent variables briefly.

Interoperability – It is not convenient for stakeholders to use different tools for different or similar purposes. Interoperability allows two or more collaboration tools to exchange information.

Security – Collaborative systems are vulnerable and exposed to security issues. The ICT tool must provide security measures to prevent malicious attempts. Therefore, security is a vital criterion and should be considered in selection of ICT tools.

User Interface – It is important that ICT tools should provide intuitive user friendly user interfaces especially for collaborative work spaces.

Due to the limited scope of this paper it is not possible to discuss all dependent variables. Other variables, platform, ease of use and notification support should also be considered in selection of ICT tools.

Context variables – Context includes the circumstances and conditions that can affect the results of an occurrence [3]. In a collaboration framework, the selection of an ICT tool depends on the particular environment in which project activities have been performed. Here, we will discuss a few important context variables briefly.

Organization – The organization variable focuses on an application domain, process model, size and location.

Project – The project variable includes the following attributes: size, duration, nature and goal of the project. These attributes should be considered during selection of tools. For example, small size projects do not require the use of wikis or project management tools. They can be managed by using email, instant messaging and light web based utilities.

Stakeholders – It is important to report the detail information about stakeholders including their roles, language barrier (if any), culture, location and experiences. For example, ICT tools that support multiple languages are recommended when stakeholders are from different countries and culture to overcome language barricade.

3. Dynamic Implementation of the Framework

To support framework users, we are currently designing a semi automated system for stakeholders to select appropriate ICT tools for different project activities, called the dynamic framework. This dynamic framework mainly focuses on implementation of tool support for the use of the collaboration variables. A software tool facilitates stakeholders to perform more actions than can be provided by paper based framework.

Figure 2 presents a fictive usage scenario that could be created using the dynamic framework. The list Stakeholder-1, Stakeholder-2 etc represents the multiple stakeholders working on a particular activity of the project. It provides transparency to stakeholders, as they always want to know who is working on which activity of the project and their progress on the project. The blocks represent the project activities; these activities also include the project details (size, complexity, nature). The creation of an overview of the activities in a project, the values of the variables associated to the stakeholders and the activities will be automatically compared with the variables of the available ICT tools, leading to a configuration of appropriate collaboration tools. This configuration would then be adapted and realized.




Fig. 2. The Dynamic Implementation of Framework

4 Conclusions and Future Work

The main point of this paper was to define a framework for the appropriate selection of ICT tools depending on different project activities and the stakeholders performing them. The collaboration framework proposed in this paper provides a framework using which one can select appropriate ICT collaboration tools. The framework is divided into three layers: top, middle and lower layer. The collaboration variables are an important part of the middle layer and include three types of variables: independent, dependent and context variables. We believe that the preliminary collaboration framework will be a good way to select ICT tools for collaboration. Yet, it is important that the framework is validated and further refined. To validate and refine the collaboration framework and the collaboration variables, the authors will use this conceptual framework in one of the IBBT projects. The authors will also implement the dynamic collaboration framework in the near future.

Acknowledgement

Part of the research at EDM is funded by ERDF (European Regional Development Fund), the Flemish Government and the Flemish Interdisciplinary institute for Broadband technology (IBBT). We would like to thank Lode Vanacken for interesting discussions and valuable comments when reviewing the paper.

References

1. Christel, M.G., Kang, K.C.: Issues in Requirements Elicitation. Technical Report CMU/SEI-92-TR-12 ESC-TR-92-012. Carnegie Mellon University, Software Engineering Institute, September (1992).
2. Karlsson, J., Ryan, K.: Prioritizing requirements using a cost-value approach. *IEEE Software* 14 (5) (1997) 67-74.
3. Sahni, D.: A Controlled Experiment on Analytical Hierarchy Process and Cumulative Voting - Investigating Time, Scalability, Accuracy, Ease of use and Ease of learning. Master Thesis No. MSE-2007-17, School of Engineering, Blekinge Institute of Technology (2007).
4. Engsbo, M., Sandhu, M.: Emerging E-Communication Technologies and Their Usage in Project-Based Organizations. *Management, University of Primorska, Faculty of Management Koper*, vol. 2(4), (2007) 285-301

5. Berander, P., Khan, K.A., Lehtola, L.: Towards a Research Framework on Requirements Prioritization. SERPS 06, Oct 18-19, 2006 Umea, Sweden. Copyright 2006 ACM (2006).
6. Gallis, H., Arisholm, E., Dybå, T.: An Initial Framework for Research on Pair Programming. In: Proceedings of the 2003 International Symposium on Empirical Software Engineering (ISESE'03), Rome, Italy, (2003) 132-142.
7. Creswell, J. W.: Research Design - Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches. 2nd Edition, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA (2003).
8. Grudin, J., CSCW: History and Focus. IEEE Computer, 1994. 27(5): p. 19-27.
9. Malone, T.W., Crowston, K.: The interdisciplinary study of coordination. ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR), 1994. 26(1): p. 87-119.
10. Sarma, A., Van Der Hoek, A., Cheng, L.T.: A Need-Based Collaboration Classification Framework. CSCW 2004-ACM2004 Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work, 11/04, Chicago, IL, RC 23339. Copyright 2004, IBM.

Putting Personas to Work: Combining Card Sorting and Personas in Requirements Analysis

Jan Derboven, Alex J. Uyttendaele

Centre for User Experience Research, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven - IBBT
Parkstraat 45 Postbus 3605, 3000 Leuven, Belgium
{jan.derboven, alex.uyttendaele}@soc.kuleuven.be

Abstract. This paper introduces a method to gather system requirements based on a combination of card sorting and personas. The method described is suitable for determining very detailed system requirements for complex collaborative systems. Regardless of the system complexity, the method makes sure that the system remains manageable for individual users by incorporating user profiling in the early stages of determining an information architecture.

Keywords: personas, card sorting, requirements analysis, user-centered design, methodology

1 Introduction

Technological advances in software development, as well as customer demand lead to constant creation of extra functionalities in software packages. The UI and navigation structure often suffer as more and more features get stuffed in a limited and set space, designed to work well with only a fraction of current developments. Overbloating a software package is often referred to as featuritis [3]. In cases of featuritis, a redesign of the UI is a good solution to keep customer satisfaction high.

The research described in this paper focused on the Xeikon software suite. Xeikon is one of the pioneers, and leading companies in digital printing. Their digital front end is a very complex application responsible for the entire print workflow, including calibrating the presses, creating complex layouting and folding schemes, printing, managing a customer database, etc. [8]

Due to the large scope of functions covered by the software suite, hardly anybody uses, or even knows of the existence of, a lot of the functionality. A solid information architecture therefore was key in this project. The methodology used to create this information architecture will be elaborated on in this paper.

2 Method

The method used to determine adequate profiles for the new software roughly consisted of two parts. First, a set of personas based on existing user types was created. Afterwards, these

personas were re-used for profiling the software in a card sorting exercise to determine which persona should have access to which functionality.

2.1 Personas

During an initial user and task analysis, several people have been observed in a contextual inquiry, while they were using the software. This analysis resulted in a high-level distinction between three general user profiles with separate responsibilities. These user profiles were reworked into three personas³.

Literature about personas suggests that one should create a primary persona and a limited number of secondary personas [2]. Instead, the choice was made to create one persona per target group addressed to really be able to organize the software for each user's individual needs in a series of card sorting⁴-exercises. In this way, profile-specific information (e.g. information about information flow and workflow) was integrated into the personas [2].




Fig. 1. Example of one of the personas: Rik Cops. The persona description includes a picture, a short biography including studies and work experience, and a scenario describing his typical working day.

Additionally, the personas were completed with a user scenario describing a typical day's work. For instance, Rik Cops (Fig. 1), one of the personas, was based on the profile of a print operator. When considering the overall printing work flow, Rik represents the last chain: he

³ Personas are descriptions of fictitious, specific, concrete representations of target users. These descriptions serve as a guide in the design process [7].

⁴ Card sorting is a user-centred design method that involves sorting a series of cards containing UI labels into groups to increase a system's findability [4].

receives a fully laid out file, and ensures that it is printed in the best possible quality. The persona of Rik constitutes an overview of the observed operator tasks ranging from the responsibility for the entire end product to only refilling print toner and paper rolls.

2.2 Card Sorting Sessions

The personas that were created were used during card sorting sessions. The first session was performed by a group of expert users of the Xeikon software. As this group was familiar with the terminology used in the software, an open card sorting exercise was done. In this exercise, the expert users were given predefined cards with system-specific terminology to ensure that the card sorting exercise would be thorough and in-depth, without forgetting key aspects of the software. After the predefined cards were sorted and grouped by functionality, they were reconsidered from the personas' points of view. In this phase, the cards were annotated to reflect user profile access: participants were asked to assign colour codes to the cards according to which persona they felt should have access to the functionality on the cards (see also Fig. 1: each of the personas had a collared header for easy reference).

To ensure that the overall results were not biased by the expert group with their elaborate knowledge⁵ of the existing system, a similar card sorting exercise was performed with graphical arts students who were well-acquainted with the domain of printing, but not with digital printing. To get acquainted with the field, the printing process was presented in the form of a short scenario which described the entire workflow, from receiving a new print job by email until it is printed. As the students were not familiar with the specific terminology, they were asked to create cards themselves during a brainstorm. Afterwards, they followed the same method as the expert group. In a first phase they were asked to sort and group the self-made cards according to functionality; in a second phase, the cards were assigned to the personas that should have access to that particular part of the software. The goal of these sessions was to determine which user profiles (represented by the personas) should have access to specific parts of the software.

Both profiling card sortings have, however, been conducted with graphical arts experts that didn't fit the operator profile. Therefore, the information gathered on the print operator persona needed to be specified. An additional card sorting, with print operators, allowed to specify the operator software functionality into greater detail, determining which functionality is used most often, which functionality is used less often, and which is not used at all.

3 Results

In general, three card sorting sessions were done, of which the results were integrated to create one general information architecture. The final card sorting session specifically focused on the print operator user profile and was therefore a further specification of the general card sorting sessions. The first two card sortings with experts and non-experts were integrated into a coherent whole.

As the expert group started from predefined cards and the non-expert one did not, differences between the results of the two card sortings were anticipated. Since the group of

⁵ Open card sorting is the most common method and the focus of this article. It allows users to create and name their own piles, providing further insight into their thinking processes that can be used as an input in defining information structures [4].

experts started with predefined cards, this session showed more elaborate results. However, on a more general level, the results of both card sorting sessions were found to be highly compatible. The student card sorting complemented the expert card sorting, as it provided a clear high-level structure that clustered the detailed structure of the expert group (Fig. 2). One of the categories the students suggested did not completely fit in one of the other groups, as it represented functionality that was out of scope for the Xeikon software. Therefore, this group was omitted from the information architecture.




Fig. 2. The general card groups made by the expert group (white shapes) and the non-expert group (collared shapes). This figure was intentionally blurred for confidentiality reasons.

After creating the general functionality-based structure (Fig. 2), a comparison with the persona-based structure was made. This analysis resulted in a more intricate picture. In some categories, assignment of functionality to personas was quite obvious, such as 'print engine control' which was only assigned to the print engine operator. However, most categories yielded a more complicated picture, having different personas assigned to different cards in the same category. This indicated that the proposed user profiles did not correspond with the existing information architecture, and that a separate user profiling mechanism would have to be used in the new information architecture.

The third and last exercise helped to further develop the print operator part which was only surfaced by the previous card sorts. The results of this session provide more detail in the structure already defined in the previous sessions.

4 Discussion and Conclusion

Traditionally, card sorting exercises are used to optimize information architectures. The present study takes card sorting exercises to a higher level by additionally addressing user profiling.

Recently in many blogs [1, 5] and articles [6] personas are referred to as a tool to maintain a safe distance from the actual users, an illusion created to fake actual user centred design [6], or simply as a tool that does not work [1]. Nevertheless, in the current study, they proved to be extremely useful in combination with card sorting exercises. The participants actively studied and reread the persona descriptions, and really tried to organize the cards for the personas that were created.

Colour coding the personas was an easy technique to mark the cards in the exercise. A side effect was that the participants referred to persona Rik as the Green one, and to John as the Yellow one. One of the most important reasons for this could be the relatively short period available for the participants to get acquainted with the personas (compared to a longer usage period when developers use personas). This observation leaves us somewhat unsure whether the personas were really seen as a user they are designing for, or as a mnemonic device to remember an inanimate set of characteristics.

Using personas in combination with card sorting techniques proves to be a valuable, low-cost method to obtain a user-driven and personalized information architecture. It does, however, require an extensive pre-study to determine user profiles and create matching personas.

In sum, adding personas to a traditional card sort can help in reducing featuritis. In the case of the Xeikon software only conducting a traditional card sorting would have resulted in an incomprehensible navigation tree with too many subcomponents. The use of personas brought the exercise to a higher level and produced a stable and good structure adapted to the needs of its users. Not only does the use of personas result in a clear view on system requirements, it also offers a manageable, usable information architecture based on user profiling.

Acknowledgements

The Xeikon user interface design project was funded by IWT. Card sorting participants have been recruited from Punch Graphix employees (special thanks to Jeroen Van Bauwel) and students from the Arteveldehogeschool, Ghent (bachelor in grafimediotechnologie; special thanks to Luc Berth). Thanks to Karin Slegers for reviewing and providing us with useful comments.

References

1. Ask 37signals: Personas?, <http://www.37signals.com/svn/posts/690-ask-37signals-personas>
2. Cooper, A., Reimann, R. Cronin, D.: *About Face 3 the Essentials of Interaction Design*. Wiley, Indianapolis (2007)
3. Defeating Feature Fatigue: *Harvard Business Review*, 84, 2 (2006)
4. Kaufman, J.: *Card Sorting: An Inexpensive and Practical Usability Technique*. *Intercom* nov. 2006, 17—19 (2006)
5. Personas Suck, http://www.andybudd.com/archives/2007/11/personas_suck/

6. Portugal, S.: Persona Non Grata. *Interactions* 15 (1), 72—73 (2008)
7. Pruitt, J., & Adlin, T.: *The Persona Lifecycle: Keeping People in Mind Throughout Product Design*. Morgan Kaufmann, San Francisco (2006)
8. Xeikon Digital Front-End (X800), <http://www.xeikon.com/products/digital-front-end/x-800>

Motivation for Creating New User Experiences while Watching Online Video

Nachiket Apte, Frank Hülsken

Fraunhofer Institute for Intelligent Analysis and Information Systems, Germany
{nachiket.apte, frank.huelsken}@iais.fraunhofer.de

Abstract: Sharing and watching video content are more or less two different activities performed separately. However there is potential to bring these two activities together. In this paper, we present ongoing research with the goal of creating a more intuitive media player. The results of a survey are presented, with questions related to media sharing and the sharing of videos in particular. By asking questions about sharing, producing and watching content we try to link the answers together to an overall user experience. Based on these findings, the design of a new metadata-based media player is presented, which would allow users to share and watch videos in new ways.

Keywords: Sharing content, video, metadata, annotation.

1 Introduction

The use of streaming video on the Web is experiencing a rapid increase, with Youtube being the 3rd most visited website on the internet [2]. Most of the user involvement on video-sharing sites is limited to watching, ranking and sometimes entering comments for videos. Compared to TV guides which provide summaries and descriptions of each program, the user must usually trust the popularity or user-supplied rating of each video to find something relevant [3].

A more usable tool released recently is the “Elections Video Search” plugin by Google [1]. This gadget searches through the speeches of American politicians with the help of transcripts created through speech recognition. This sort of extra metadata may provide more precise results to user queries.

In this paper we present our survey of sharing content which concludes to our findings regarding the use of more intelligent metadata that allows users to watch content that is much more relevant, and to share content with others in a more usable way. These ideas are grounded on questions which depend not only on communities on the internet but also on the general interest of people.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: Section 2 presents our survey and the discussion of the answers. Taking motivation from these results, Section 3 presents some basic concepts of our media player. Finally, Section 4 concludes the paper.

2 Survey on media-sharing

Our online questionnaire was open to participants for exactly one week. All questions were related to sharing in some way, with a majority of questions focusing on the sharing of video content. The survey contained 29 multiple-choice questions. It used choice modelling for presenting the answers to the questions rather than a rating scale such as the Likert scale. This forced the participants to make a conscious choice between the given options. Thus they had to make a trade-off between the costs and benefits of each answer which is an advantage that a linear rating does not provide. The survey contains questions with subjects that dealt with why, how, when and with whom people usually share media. With respect to video content the survey asked questions about the participant's prior experience with creating and sharing self-created videos. Some questions also dealt with the acceptability of commenting or annotating video content with others in different situations.

Of course we could handle just a selection of the survey questions in this paper. Some questions relevant to our idea are presented in detail while others are just presented in general in the discussion.

2.1 Participant profiles

The online link to the survey was distributed virally by the authors using social networking websites, instant messenger and email. This ensured that the majority of the participants were familiar with online social networking and to some degree, media sharing. The survey received responses from a total of 151 participants, of which 58% were male and 42% were female. The most number of responses came from Germany (50%), followed by India (31%) and Austria (7%). The remaining 12% came from 14 other countries. Most of the participants were in the 20-30 age group, with the youngest participant being 18 years old and the oldest being 55. Most of them were consumers of content; just a few uploaded content to websites, but we see also a lot of potential among the rest to share content on the internet.




Fig. 1. Survey question on sharing a favourite movie with a colleague

How would you like to share a home-video with your relatives assuming that you cannot get online on the internet?




Fig. 2. Survey question on sharing of media in the absence of the internet (multi-choice)

2.2 Means and motivation for sharing

The questions in the survey presented scenarios involving the sharing of video or other types of media, and tried to find out how the participants would share content with others under some given situations. For example, participants were asked how they would share a home video with relatives, friends or colleagues. In addition, some factors were introduced in the questions to see how they shaped the responses. One question, for example, asked how participants would share media with others in the absence of the internet.

When comparing the question asking about the best way to share a movie with a colleague (see figure 1) with the question which deals with watching the video together with their relatives in absence of the internet (see figure 2) a big shift is seen from copying the movie to the experience of watching it together. In the survey we found out that personal relations and convenience play a large role in sharing. On the one hand there is a more personal and social experience and on the other hand there is the comfort of using the internet or storage devices for an easy and time-independent way of sharing.

Based on the answers to other questions, most of the motivation for sharing came from the users' need to inform or entertain relatives and friends with important events in their lives, or to simply preserve some memories or show off some creative skills. Most of the participants were reluctant to share such videos with anyone outside their inner circle of relatives and friends.

With regards to those outside this close circle, respondents were reluctant to share videos that were very personal to them (such as something involving friends/family) or videos that might have legal, ethical or moral issues with respect to sharing (such as copyrighted content). However, media from activities or events (such as vacations or parties) were the most preferred types of videos for sharing with the general public.

2.3 Sharing video segments




Fig. 3. Survey question on what part of a concert participants would like to share (multi-choice)

One of the questions in the survey asked participants which parts of a concert performance they would like to record, with an aim of sharing with their friends later (see figure 3). Most participants favoured recording some nice parts from the concert

rather than the full songs themselves. Thus in general, sharing small interesting segments of content are an important aspect of sharing when considering videos from social events or excursions. Also of importance were comments and reactions from their friends and from the rest of the crowd. This supports the theory that content annotation is considered to be almost as equally important by users as the content itself. In the words of one of the participants, the primary goal of sharing videos from a concert are not to document the entire concert, but to share the feeling, "Hey look I was there, and it was cool".

2.4 Content annotation

Some of the questions deal with communication between users about the shared content. While watching a movie with a group of friends, most users (51%) preferred to have a social experience of discussing it with others as long as everyone used short comments (see figure 4). This shows that users do not mind being disturbed while watching a video, as long as it is relevant, short, and does not interfere with their viewing experience to a large extent.

Besides that users were asked if they would not mind talking with someone else while watching a movie. The largest percentage of users answered that they would prefer to have a discussion, but only during a quiet or uninteresting part. However the second

If you are watching an interesting movie with a large group of friends in a room, do you like discussing it while it is still running?




Fig. 4. Survey question on discussing about a movie with friends while it plays

largest answer was that users would like to discuss something about the movie only after it has ended. This contrasts with the previous survey question where users were more open to discussing a movie while it plays. The difference in both questions was that in the first case the user was watching the movie with a large group, while in the second case the user watched the movie only with a single friend. Thus, a social situation with many people can sometimes generate more discussion while a movie is playing than a situation with just a pair of friends.

2.5 Survey conclusions

The results of the survey show the main factors that affect sharing. It depends on the content with whom someone shares and how much time someone wants to spend doing it. Besides that privacy was a topic in the survey, even mentioned by multiple participants while giving feedback. In this paper we couldn't discuss it adequate. While most of the participants didn't upload content on public sides, many of them were willing or have experience to share content over the internet. A quarter didn't want to use the internet, but sharing media offline in privacy mostly all do.

Summing up most users prefer not to share personal media with anyone on the internet, but rather choose to do so within their private circle of friends and family. Then convenience plays a major role in sharing of media socially, even when the sharing occurs on a very personal level. Sharing in the sense of an experience together decreases outside someone's private circle.

While sharing content from an event or excursion, most users prefer to make a snapshot of the content by highlighting certain parts of it instead of making a detailed report of it. Such a selection is easier to discuss or annotate. Furthermore in groups discussion is rather short but preferred that way, whereas the acceptability depends mostly on the type of content that is being annotated.

3 Metadata-based media player

For the design of our player we highlight two conclusions which resulted from the survey: It is preferred to share snapshots of content which may be personalized further to enrich them and make them interesting for friends. So the user should be able to select and share segments of content easily, which could then be annotated or commented.

Because people prefer watching content together so that they can share their experiences about it communication while watching should be possible. This communication may either be online and offline. Dealing again with shorter segments users are more willing to take their time to watch together. Offline discussion, where communication is not real-time anymore, is even more flexible and easier to achieve.

Based on the context of most of the questions in the survey, we focus on video or audio content for our player that users like sharing with people they know.

3.1 Sharing segments

Creating metadata for content by hand is time consuming, so most content is hardly ever annotated by casual users. Youtube already offers some tools for timeline dependent annotation [10] and shows these text comments while playing the video. The selection of the range is done by setting a start and end timer by hand.

Besides that user-created content can also be automatically structured using audio and video analysis processes. For audio, BIC-segmentation [7], speech/non-speech- and audio event detection, speaker clustering [6] or speech recognition may be performed. For video content, shots and objects such as faces may be detected [4]. The resulting metadata can then be saved in an MPEG7 format [5], which is loaded by the player when requesting the media.

Showing the structural analysis data while playing the user could capture a general view of the content. Automatically generated segments boundaries could be used for selection or navigation through the video, but also to easily contribute user-generated metadata such as comments. With the help of metadata, selecting parts of the content personalizes the media and just these segments could be shared or new combined.

3.2 Online and offline communication

Online communication methods such as live chat and two-way video communication encourage a feeling of jointly viewing content. Users can express their thoughts and feelings in real-time with others while viewing content together. Both the speaker and listener roles for such communication in the video player are designed so as to not distract the users from the actual content [8].

But live communication is not always possible, so we also design offline methods for users to communicate while watching a video. Here, the communication is not real-time, and hence users can access existing comments or add their own asynchronously. Users can choose how complex or involved their communication can be. Thus the form of communication may range from something simple such as a non-verbal 'emoticon' [9], to text or audio and video clips, or on to more advanced forms of annotation.

4 Conclusion

This paper presented a discussion of a survey which analyzes the characteristics of sharing media content. The results show that sharing is still a personal experience. The content must somehow relate to the user and a collective experience is favoured over an individual one. Because snapshots are easier to personalized and annotate we concentrate the design of our player to give the user more information and functionality to use segments. To get a collective 'cinema-like' experience, we also design possibilities for communicating with others using online or offline methods. Then the automatic generated and user generated information are saved in one metadata file whereas the player could adjust to show just the desired one.

As the next step we will evaluate the player to see if the user accepts these additional features and how the presentation of the metadata could be designed well.

Acknowledgments

The research presented in this paper is partially funded by the IST-FP6 Citizen Media project.

References

1. Google Elections Video Search, <http://www.google.com/educators/videosearch.html>
2. Alexa Top 500 Sites, http://www.alexa.com/site/ds/top_sites?ts_mode=global
3. Cheng, X., Dale, C., Liu, J.: Understanding the Characteristics of Internet Short Video Sharing: YouTube as a Case Study. Technical Report, Cornell University (2007)
4. Rowley, H.A., Baluja, S., Kanade, T.: Neural network-based face detection, IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence, Vol 20, No. 1, 23-38, 1998
5. MPEG-7: <http://mpeg.telecomitalialab.com/standards/mpeg-7/mpeg-7.htm>
6. Biatov K., Larson M.: Speaker Clustering via Bayesian Information Criterion using a Global Similarity Constraint, SPECOM'2005, (2005)
7. Chen S., Gopalakrishnan P.: Clustering via the Bayesian Information Criterion with the applications in speech recognition, Proc. ICASSP'98, (1998)
8. Weisz, J. D., Kiesler, S., Zhang, H., Ren, Y., Kraut, R. E., and Konstan, J. A. 2007. Watching together: integrating text chat with video. In Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (San Jose, California, USA, April 28 - May 03, 2007).
9. Gajadhar, J. and Green, J., An Analysis of Nonverbal Communication in an Online Chat Group, Open Polytechnic of New Zealand (2003)
10. Youtube Video Annotations, http://www.youtube.com/t/annotations_about

Requirements Elicitation: Understanding Users' Values and Emotions

Sarah Thew⁶, Alistair Sutcliffe

¹ Manchester Business School, Manchester
sarah.thew@manchester.ac.uk

Abstract. Although soft issues, such as politics and people's feelings are often cited as problems in the design and development of software, few studies have directly considered values or emotions during the analysis phase. This paper reports an investigation of requirements analysts' practice for gathering and using such tacit information. This investigation aided in the development of a method to support analysts in the identification of 'soft' information such as emotions and values. The method is presented here, followed by a brief outline of ongoing evaluation work.

Keywords: Requirements Elicitation, Values, Emotion, Motivation

1 Introduction

Soft issues, such as politics and people's feelings are often cited as problems in the Requirements Engineering (RE) process [1], although there is little advice about how to deal with these issues. Few studies have directly considered stakeholders' emotions during the analysis phase, though there are numerous examples of post-hoc studies of computing projects in which the difficulties were mostly related to political or cultural factors, rather than to technical problems, for example the role personal and professional values played in the poor uptake of a wiki developed to allow healthcare workers to share best practice data [2]. Alongside some of the more predictable reasons for their unwillingness to use the system, such as concern about writing the wrong thing or nervousness at using a public forum, the healthcare workers explained that they were uncomfortable with the idea of reducing their close relationships with their patients to abstract 'cases' (with the term case being particularly problematic, in that it focused attention on the problem not the person). Potential users were also concerned at lack of control over their online 'self' and that other readers, lacking knowledge of the work context might misinterpret postings.

It is apparent from the RE literature that many people acknowledge the importance of understanding user beliefs and values [3, 4], but whilst some 'soft' issues and social relationships, such as responsibility and authority, are modelled in i* and extensions thereof [5], user values, motivations and emotions have not been explicitly included in requirements processes to date.

User centred elicitation and design is an established movement which is intended to help the analyst address the social, cultural and political aspects of IT projects, There are numerous user focussed methodologies, such as scenario based design [6], contextual design [7] and the use of ethnographic techniques[8]. There are many instances of these techniques providing good insight into user values and beliefs, such as Jirotko et al.'s investigations into trust and team working in breast examination units [8]. However, these approaches do not include methods for eliciting or analysing data with the specific intent of identifying user values.

This paper reports an investigation of requirements analysts' practice for gathering and using such tacit information. An analysis method for identifying and using this information is presented, followed by a brief outline of ongoing evaluation work.

1.1 Interviews with Analysts

Evaluations of computer science education and analyst skills have suggested that there is a gap in novice analysts' training with regard to 'soft' skills. A review of the undergraduate curriculum for software students found little emphasis on communication [9]. Given this lack of emphasis it is unsurprising that Shenk et al.[10] observed that novice analysts show a lack of political and social awareness. The starting point for developing our method was therefore to interview requirements engineering experts about their interest in and awareness of, users' personal values, motivations and emotions.

We interviewed ten business analysts, with 3-32 years' experience, and varying degrees of formal training ranging from short courses to higher degree-level training. They worked in a wide variety of industries, including pharmaceutical research, finance, education and local government. All the analysts acknowledged the usefulness of understanding users' emotions and values. They were particularly conscious of the need to be aware of anxiety or negativity – they were concerned about changes that might be considered negative, and were keen to find benefits or improvements as a way to 'sell' the software development process:

"I was working on a book-keeping system, the first time this office had ever had computers, so way back before you were born! All the women that work there had been employed because they had beautiful copper-plate handwriting – and now they were going to change to keyboards, so you can imagine how worried these women were! I had to work really hard to understand how they were feeling and how we could help them find value in the new system"

Analysts were generally less conscious of users' personal values, but many of the projects they discussed included examples of systems conflicting or agreeing with users' values. Fiona discussed developing a system she was involved in implementing for social workers. She comments that the social workers felt that secretarial work 'is not part of their day job'; they implied that they value and prioritise other aspects of their jobs, and don't view administration work as part of their role. Consequently they were concerned at the prospect of a new computer based system for case management they would be expected to use: Similarly Lucy describes the experience of working with someone who was considered to be a 'problem' user, who placed particular value on control and personal esteem:

"I worked with a lady a number of years ago that had the reputation of being a dragon. No one seemed to be able to deal with her. She always found fault with the requirements, often for the most unreasonable of reasons. When I was assigned to work with her, one of the first things that I noticed was that she wanted to feel in control, that she was the person who had the final say in whatever happened to the application. She wanted to be catered to, to feel important and to be treated as such."

Lucy went on to change the ways the project team interacted with this user, for example modifying the specification format to one this user preferred, and found that by making some minor changes she was able to improve the relationship.

None of the analysts mentioned exploring positive emotions around the users' work or software development, but did remark on users reacting positively and emotionally to a piece of software development. It also appears that on some occasions the analysts were aware of the dynamics of relationships within a project, and the impact of emotional ties but were not sure how to handle the consequences.

"The developer has a much closer relationship with her than with the other business leads and on occasion, has placed more priority on her requests than requests submitted by other members of the team. This is an almost exact repeat of the previous project. My opinion on this is that while the specifications are likely to meet her needs, this is not necessarily the best use of the developer's time if the resulting product does not meet all the other users' needs."

Several analysts reported occasions when they had made use of their learning about user values or emotions, either in management of the requirements process, or in system design. One of the analysts described her surprise that the scientists she works with preferred an interface that demanded more interaction from them, but discovered they made parallels between clicking around the system researching information and lab-based research. The design 'spoke' to the users' self image as scientists. It became apparent that the majority of analysts interviewed see this understanding as something that just 'happens' when they're being particularly perceptive. Some analysts commented that they felt this area of expertise had been neglected in their training:

"I have one colleague who is particularly good at this kind of thing, picking up on what's going on. I don't know exactly what she does; she just knows the right thing to do"

"The training courses I've been on have always been about tools and management, change control and so on, which is important, but there isn't enough emphasis on understanding your users."

Two of the most experienced analysts interviewed, (each with 20+ years of experience) had developed their own methodical approaches to try to increase their ability to pick up on users' emotions and values.

"Body language is very informative.. You can't directly ask someone how they feel, the secretaries were very anxious about their jobs, but it was apparent from their body language and our conversations. I think they would have been very defensive if I'd asked them directly. I also pay a lot of attention to what people are wearing, and what I'm wearing."

"I gather the information by observation of both the person's behaviour vs. their words and by their interactions with others. I try not to discuss my suspicions until I have had a chance to test them. I test them by changing my behaviour to reflect the way that I sense the other wishes to be treated. If it works, i.e., I see the results I expect, I continue with more of the same. If it doesn't, I go back to observing until I detect a pattern."

It would appear that analysts do recognise the impact of users' values and emotions within the design process, but that the majority of analysts see this understanding as something that just 'happens' when they're being particularly perceptive, whilst a minority have techniques they've developed through experience.

1.2 Method Development

Based on the literature and expert analyst interviews, an approach has been developed which encourages reflection by the analyst on their users' values and emotions. Previous RE studies

of values have used questionnaire based approaches [11], effective in gathering shallow information from many users but less suitable when the goal is rich information from a smaller number of users, when a comprehensive, qualitative approach is more appropriate. The method design was also influenced by several practical concerns, raised during the analyst interviews. Analysts expressed reluctance to ask direct questions about emotions and values and the method should ideally not require analysts to directly quiz users, but rather make use of data gathered during interviews and observations. Making use of routinely gathered interview data also reduces the burden on analysts who are already busy.

Figure 1 provides a summary of the reflective practice method. The analyst begins by recording their own hunches about values, motivations and emotions which may be relevant to the project. This may be informed by past projects, previous interactions with the users involved or features of the project they think are likely to be important or controversial. A set of taxonomies also support the identification of values, motivations and emotions. The taxonomies provide ideas about sources of values and guidance as to their potential impact. The level of guidance offered when dealing with 'soft' issues is inevitably limited, so whilst the taxonomies provide indicators, the focus is on understanding the complexities of their situation.




Fig. 1. Process stages in the value investigation method.

The analyst then begins their standard requirements elicitation work – running meetings, interviews etc. At regular intervals the analyst will review the outputs of such activities for evidence of the expression of values, emotions or motivations. Depending on time constraints, the experience of the analyst and their familiarity with the users involved, the format of this analysis may vary. The most thorough, but time consuming approach is to transcribe audio recordings. These transcriptions are then marked up by the analyst, relevant pieces of text are highlighted and named with short 'tags' which summarise the analysts' opinion about what is being expressed by the user. The taxonomies can also be used during the analysis as a prompt, to help the user in identifying evidence. Alternatively, analysts may

only transcribe short quotations they find informative, or simply either listen back to their recordings or reflect on meeting notes. The approach taken will vary based on analyst expertise, time pressures and whether circumstances will allow audio recordings.

Once the initial coding is complete, the analyst then begins to group their tags, looking for codes which express similar values, motivations and emotions. Whilst the intention of this analysis is to focus the analyst on 'soft' project information, it is likely that additional details of functional requirements may be spotted whilst reviewing data – these should be noted and followed up outside of this analysis. Having completed a first round of the analysis, the 'hunches' are updated based on the analyst's findings – modifying the original ideas, adding in new understanding and new questions the analyst would like to explore. This list of hunches serves two functions, firstly providing a source of potential interview topics for the analysts' next meeting with the user, and secondly, over time, growing to create a rich picture of the user's values, motivations and emotions. The analyst then repeats this process with a new set of interview or observation data, using the revised version of the framework.

1.3 Method validation & conclusions

The reflective practice analysis method is currently being evaluated via three case studies. All of the case studies investigate software that will have a substantial socio-technical impact. The first study uses the reflective practice method to support a project which is engaged in making substantial changes to the working practices of research epidemiologists. The second study looks at a system for clinical data collection which has been rolled out, the development team are concerned. The third study is based within the IT department of a pharmaceutical company, to support the outsourcing of experimental laboratory work. Work currently done internally will be moved to an external partner company in China. A requirements analyst is making use of our method to understand stakeholders' values and emotional positions with regard to the outsourcing of this work. Two of these studies are being run by the first author, the third by an external requirements analyst. Feedback from these case studies will be used to improve the methodology and taxonomies.

Initial feedback from these studies suggest that use of the method has sped up and improved the process of understanding and engaging with users, albeit with increased time demands on the analysts to carry out the analysis. In particular, learning derived from the use of our method has resulted in a change of requirements focus and strategy in the third case study. Future work will concentrate on gathering more evidence about the efficacy and usability of the method, via further case studies and experimental evaluation.

References

- [1] S. Robertson and J. Robertson, *Mastering the Requirements Process*: Addison Wesley (1999)
- [2] R. Giordano, "Professional Identity and Knowledge Sharing: A Case analysis of a wiki to support public health professionals.," in *Fourth International Conference on e-Social Science*, Manchester, (2008)
- [3] J. Goguen and C. Linde, "Techniques for Requirements Elicitation," in *Requirements Engineering '93* (1993)
- [4] I. Ramos, D. M. Berry, and J. Carvalho, "The Role of Emotion, Values, and Beliefs in the Construction of Innovative Work Realities," in *Soft-Ware 2002: Computing in an Imperfect World : First International Conference, Soft-Ware 2002 Belfast, Northern Ireland, April 8-10, 2002. Proceedings*, pp. 3-31 (2002)
- [5] A. G. Sutcliffe, "Analysing the Effectiveness of Human Activity Systems with i*," in *i* Requirements Modelling*, P. Georgini and E. Yu, Eds. Cambridge MA: MIT Press (In press)

- [6]J. Carroll, Making Use - scenario based design of human-computer interactions: MIT Press (2000)
- [7]H. Beyer and K. Holtzblatt, Contextual Design: Defining Customer-Centred Systems: Morgan Kaufman Publishers (1998)
- [8]M. Jirotko, R. Proctor, M. Hartswood, R. Slack, A. Simpson, C. Coopmans, C. Hinds, and A. Voss, "Collaboration and Trust in Healthcare Innovation: The eDiaMoND Case Study," Computer Supported Cooperative Work (CSCW), vol. 14, pp. 369-398, 2005/08/07/ (2005)
- [9]V. M. Teles and C. de Oliveira, "Reviewing the curriculum of software engineering undergraduate courses to incorporate communication and interpersonal skills teaching.," in Proceedings of the 16th Conference on Software Engineering Education and Training: IEEE (2003)
- [10]K. Schenk, N. Vitalari, and K. Shannon Davis, "Differences between novice and expert Systems Analysts: What do we know and what do we do?," Journal of Management Information Systems, vol. 15, pp. 9-50 (1998)
- [11]E. Mumford, Values, Technology and Work: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers (1981)

NordiCHI'08 Workshop

How Can HCI Improve Social Media Development?

Organizers

Asbjørn Følstad, SINTEF, Norway

Petter Bae Brandtzæg, SINTEF, Norway

Marianna Obrist, ICT&S Center, University of Salzburg, Austria

David Geerts, Centre for User Experience Research,
IBBT/K.U.Leuven, Belgium

Introduction

1 Workshop theme

The theme of this workshop section is Social media and its relationship with Human-Computer Interaction (HCI).

Social media are systems and applications supporting content sharing and co-creation in sociable online environments. This includes solutions for media sharing (e.g. YouTube, Flickr), self presentation and debate (e.g. MySpace, blogs), social networks (e.g. Facebook, LinkedIn), referencing and recommendation services (e.g. Digg, Del.icio.us) and co-created knowledge resources (e.g. Wikipedia). Social media may also include technology platforms such as interactive television and mobile phones.

The growth of social media will most likely have important consequences for the field of HCI. Social media is said to “[reframe] the debate in terms of user experience, usability, and most importantly what matters to users” [6]. Vice versa, HCI and usability will be increasingly relevant for social media development. In a recent study by Brandtzæg and Heim [3] end-users reported low usability as their third most important reason for reduced use of particular social network sites. A similar perspective is held by danah boyd [2] criticizing what she terms “autistic social media”.

Social media development implies important challenges for the field of HCI. Social media’s context of use, and end-users competencies and preferences are changing rapidly and unpredictably. Social media design needs to support not only individual users, but communities and co-creation of content [1, 4]. Knowledge resources such as guidelines and design patterns, need continuous updating due to fast changes in what is considered successful social media design. Evaluation of social media requires sensitivity to utility and user experience issues rather than just usability [5, 7], while at the same time user feedback methods should not overburden participants [8].

2 Submission and review process

The authors contributing to this workshop section were encouraged to focus on one or more of the following core issues:

1. Evolving patterns of social media use, and consequences for user requirements
2. Social media design
3. User-centered evaluation of social media applications.

Given the relevance of the workshop theme in this time of web 2.0, online communities and social media, we aimed to receive in the area of 15 submissions. This did for some reason

not happen; we received far fewer than this. The planned workshop was therefore reduced to a workshop section, included in a parallel NordiCHI workshop on user requirements where the majority of the papers were of high relevance for social media development.

All papers were reviewed independently by three reviewers. The reviewers were:

- Amela Karahasanovic, SINTEF (NO)
- Asbjørn Følstad, SINTEF ICT (NO)
- Crysta J. Metcalf, Motorola Labs (USA)
- Elaine Huang, RWTH Aachen, (GE)
- Erik.G.Nilsson, SINTEF (NO)
- Erika Reponen, Nokia Research Center, Tampere (FI)
- Jan Håvard Skjetne, SINTEF (NO)
- Kris Mihalic, Mobile Yahoo! (USA)
- Licia Calvi, CUO, K.U.Leuven, (BE)
- Marianna Obrist, ICT&S Center, University of Salzburg (A)
- Rich Ling, Telenor (NO)
- Sheila Mc Carthy, University of Ulster, Magee (UK)
- Suzette Keith, Middlesex University (UK)

Following the review the authors were not expected to update their papers prior to the workshop. They are however expected to update their papers before the printing of the final version of the workshop proceedings at Tapir akademisk forlag (Tapir academic press).

3 The papers of this workshop section

The five papers presented in this workshop section cover topics nicely complementing the associated workshop on user requirements.

The two first papers target how to design social media services. Jari Multitaska from Tampere University of Technology, presents a framework for social media design on mobile platforms, whereas Marianna Obrist and colleagues from the University of Salzburg presents user experience patterns developed on basis of evaluations conducted on web and IPTV applications.

In the third paper, Saila Ovaska and colleagues from University of Tampere discusses user evaluation of social media applications, arguing that the nature of these applications makes it important to focus on continuous evaluation of running services, in particular to gain knowledge regarding the users' motivation.

The fourth paper, by Petri Mannonen and Mikael Runonen from Helsinki University of Technology, discusses social media services in the context of a limited application area: that of work support in small and medium sized enterprises.

The fifth paper, by Näkki and Antikainen from VTT Technical Research Centre of Finland, present an entirely different approach: the use of social media tools to support innovation and development. This use of social media is highly interesting, and potentially relevant also for the development of future social media services.

We hope the papers are well received both as background for discussions at the workshop and in stimulating future research on the area of HCI and social media.

Acknowledgements

The workshop organizing work was supported by the research projects RECORD (www.recordproject.org, supported by the Norwegian research council's VERDIKT program) and CITIZEN MEDIA (www.ist-citizenmedia.org, supported by EU FP6).

Thanks to the reviewers for their good reviews. Thanks also to the organizers of the NordiCHI 2008 workshop "New approaches to requirements elicitation" for allowing us to merge with their workshop.

References

1. Battarbee, K.: Defining co-experience. In: the proceedings of Designing Pleasurable Products and Interfaces (DPPI). Pittsburgh (2003)
2. boyd, d.: Autistic Social Software. In: J. Spolsky (ed.) *The Best Software Writing I*, pp. 35–45. Apress (2005)
3. Brandtzæg, P.B., Heim, J.: User Loyalty and Online Communities: Why Members of Online Communities are not Faithful. In: the proceedings of Intelligent Technologies for Interactive Entertainment (INTETAIN), (2008)
4. Light, A.: Audience Design: Interacting with Networked Media, *Interactions special issue on HCI and Mass Communication*, XI(2), 60–63 (2004)
5. Nov, O.: What motivates Wikipedians? *Communications of the ACM*, 50(11), 60–64 (2007)
6. Porter, J.: Ugliness, Social Design, and the MySpace Lesson, Bokardo, <http://bokardo.com/archives/do-myspace-users-have-bad-taste/> (August 18, 2006)
7. Preece, J.: Sociability and usability: Twenty years of chatting online. *Behavior & Information Technology*, 20(5), 347–356 (2001)
8. Schümmer, T., Lukosch, S.: *Patterns for Computer-Mediated Interaction*. John Wiley & Sons (2007)

Designing for Mobile Social Media

Jari Multisilta^{1,2}

¹ Nokia Research Center, P.O. Box 100, FI-33721 (Visiokatu 1), Tampere, Finland

² Tampere University of Technology, PO Box 300, FI-28101 Pori, Finland

jari.multisilta@tut.fi

Abstract. In this paper, we try to create a mobile social media design framework that could be used in designing user experiences and user activities for next generation mobile social media services. The model is based on existing models such as Activity Theory (AT), Mobile Web 2.0 Ecosystem (MW2E) and the idea of considering the user experience or the shared felt experience as a central design rule.

Keywords: Social media, activity theory, mobile web, design, ecosystem, felt, experience

1 Introduction

Social media applications have gained popularity because of services like Blogger, Facebook, Flickr, Jaiku and YouTube. The idea behind social media is that users are actively contributing to the services i.e. sending their blog notes, images or videos to the service, creating tags and doing other types of social activities i.e. commenting on and rating blogs, images and videos others have posted. Many social media applications are designed for entertainment purposes, by creating experiences for users.

Social media applications have been designed for laptop usage. Nowadays, many applications also have a mobile client. Using a mobile client, the users can post to their blogs or Flickr accounts using their mobile phones. Sometimes this application is just a ripped-off version of its full browser version used with a mobile browser or it may be a native application for a specific mobile platform. In the future, social media services will be more and more designed for mobile users as people are updating their social media sites while they are on the go. Latest mobile devices can even include geotags to images and videos in order to mash-up the images with a mapping service.

Although social media services can be designed using Web 2.0 principles (client server model, ajax), user centered design models (human-centered design processes for interactive systems, ISO 13407 [8]), participatory design, and guidelines for creating usable web pages, the design process can be improved by designing social interactions from the point of view of felt experience. Girgensohn and Lee presented three sociological challenges for designing a social web site: 1) encouraging user participation, 2) fostering social interactions and 3) promoting visibility of people and their activities [5].

In this paper, we try to create a mobile social media design framework that could be used in designing user activities in next generation mobile social media services and applications. The method created in this paper is based on existing models such as Activity Theory (AT),

Mobile Web 2.0 Ecosystem (MW2E) and the idea of considering user experience or shared felt experience as a central design rule. The framework developed here is not a complete design model for social media services but complements other existing design methods.

2 Theoretical background

In this chapter we discuss Activity Theory and Mobile Web 2.0 Ecosystem as a theoretical background for the study. We will also discuss the role of user experience and felt experience in the service design process.

2.1 Activity Theory (AT)

Activity Theory is based on the Vygotsky's cultural-historical psychology [10, 2, 3, 12]. There is a lot of research related to Activity Theory in learning, see for example Engeström [2]. Barthelmeß and Andersson [1] have discussed the role of Activity Theory in software development and Fjeld et al. [4] applied Activity Theory to groupware design. Activity Theory has also been applied both to learning from digital games [12] and to interaction design [10].




Fig. 1. Activity Theory.

The central idea in Activity Theory (AT) is that all human actions are called activities. An activity involves an object that is to be transferred to the output of the activity. In AT, subject performs the activity using a tool. The activity may be collaborative i.e. several subjects jointly do the activity using tools and dividing the work between each subject. The object can be for example a problem to be solved. Tools, rules and division of work mediate the relationship between subject, community and object. Tools, rules and division of work are artifacts that are used to achieve the outcome. Artifacts are not necessarily a specific set of tools or things but they can evolve over time.

Activity can furthermore be divided to actions and an action to operations. In general, activities are based on high-level goals (for example documenting a work process with images and video clips). Activities involve more practical goals (using a mobile phone to record a video) and operations are routine or automatic (launching a video application, pressing a

record button). In this case, rules would be described as the procedure of how to do the documentation.

2.2. Mobile Web 2.0 Ecosystem (MW2E)

Currently, the web and its applications are developing towards a socio-technical system. According to Hornung [7], "a socio-technical system is a system composed of technical and social subsystems". This development is often referenced as Web 2.0. Social software refers to communication and collaboration software that enables people to communicate and collaborate using communication and information technologies.

Web 2.0 was first defined by Tim O'Reilly [13] by giving examples of Web 1.0 services and related next generation Web 2.0 service. In this comparison, Britannica Online was replaced by Wikipedia and personal websites by blogging. Wikipedia defines Web 2.0 so that it is "a perceived ongoing transition of the World Wide Web from a collection of web-sites to a full-fledged computing platform serving web applications to end users. Ultimately Web 2.0 services are expected to replace desktop computing applications for many purposes." What can be considered as a main difference between first generation web and Web 2.0 is the social dimension of Web 2.0. Many applications of Web 2.0 include users as producers of the content. Typical examples of Web 2.0 are wikis and blogs.

How does Web 2.0 relate to mobile world? Ajit Jaokar [9] says Mobile Web 2.0 "extends the principle of 'Harnessing Collective Intelligence' to restricted devices". Jaokar [9] gives also a more detailed definition to Mobile Web 2.0:

- Harnessing collective intelligence through restricted devices i.e. a two-way flow where people carrying devices become reporters rather than mere consumers.
- Driven by the web backbone – but not necessarily based on the web protocols end to end.
- Use of the PC as a local cache/configuration mechanism where the service will be selected and configured.

Mobile Web 2.0 provides the applications of Web 2.0 to the mobile users. The applications are not necessarily the same as desktop users have. The aim is not to port desktop computer to mobile. Instead, mobile users can access web with certain limitations.

It can be assumed that mobile users have different needs (or objects in AT) from the web than stationary users (home, school or office). The advantage he/she is gaining is the access to the knowledge and data sources with mobile devices and networks despite the full access to the web.

In Fig. 2 there is a modified Mobile Web 2.0 Ecosystem based on Jaokar [9]. The users are co-creating the content together with professional content providers. Users' interest to create content has a point of inspiration that can be for example an activity, a community, an event, or a feeling.




Fig. 2. Mobile Collaboration Ecosystem adapted from Jaokar (2006) Mobile Web 2.0 Ecosystem (MWE).

Interestingly, Jaokar also accepts unconnected mobile devices as a part of a Mobile Web 2.0. Downloading material to the mobile device when the broadband connection is available was actually the first attempt to try to use web content in mobile devices (on Palm PDA's).

2.3. Mobile web as an experience

According to McCarty and Wright [11], interacting with technology involves us emotionally, intellectually, and sensually. In case of social media, the interaction with technology is related to sharing experiences with technology. The role of the technology is mediating. Technology is mediating our experiences to others while being itself an experience. Pacey [14] argues that all activities involved in practising or using technology have several dimensions. The dimensions are a) political meanings and organization, b) technical knowledge equipment and tools, c) personal experience and d) social and cultural meanings (Fig. 3). Pacey [14] suggests that personal values and individual experience of technology should be distinguished from shared, social meanings. These dimensions can support designing for mobile social media services.

According to McCarthy and Wright, we have to "interpret the relationship between people and technology in terms of felt life and the felt or emotional quality of action and interaction" [11]. We can understand this when we think of different brands – people like to belong to a certain group by owning certain products or using certain services.




Fig. 3. Dimensions of technology practice and experience (Pacey [14]).

The use of technology as a means to express ourselves or create shared experiences to our family, friends or communities creates a *shared felt experience* both to a person sharing and her community.

3 Design process based on AT and MW2E

For designing activities for mobile social media applications, we propose combined *Shared Experience and Activity Framework*, SEAF (Fig. 4).

In activity theory, an important issue is that contradiction can occur between subject and object or between subject and rules. Subject can then try to solve the contradiction using a tool. Eventually, this can lead to learning by solving the contradiction.

By combining AT and MW2E, we can replace the contradiction with a more general expression, namely point of inspiration. Point of inspiration provides the subject the initiation of an activity. Clearly in learning applications, contradiction is a type of point of inspiration. As an outcome, design should focus on the shared felt experiences.

There are two modified AT model triangles representing two separate users in the EAM model. This is to emphasize that users are going to share experiences with other users by sharing some of the components of the system with other users. However, each user may have different tools and objects in her activity system.




Fig. 4. Shared Experience and Activity Framework (SEAF).

We present an example of simple design case in Table 1. The application we are designing is a simple mobile video sharing application that can be used with a mobile phone.

The activity design process starts by defining or recognising the points of inspiration for the users. This is the motivation for the users to use the service. Next step is to describe the components of activity system (subject, object, tools, community, rules, and division of labour) and activities needed for creation of an experience. The activities are divided to actions and operations. In conjunction to this, the designer should analyze and anticipate the experience the service is aiming to. The designer should consider the social, cultural and political meanings of the service as a potential source of an experience.

The co-creation and collaboration aspect is important when designing a mobile social media service. The designer should analyse the collaboration aspect in every design step.

Table 1. An example of the activity design in SEAF.

Activity	Action	Operation	Point of inspiration	Felt experience Social/cultural/political meanings
Share fun moments from a music festival	Shoot a video	Launch recording application	Record fun moments	Joy from creating a recording
		Press record button		
	Upload video to a social media service	Connect the phone to WLAN/3G	Share your video clips with a community	Joy from sharing the moment
		Open service from browser		
		Select clip from phone directory		
		Press upload		
	Tag the video	Select a tag	Help users to find your clip easily	Creativity
		Write a description		
	Remix a story from clips in the service	Select clips from service	Create added value for the community	Creativity
		Press create remix		

4 Conclusions

In this paper we have presented a framework for designing mobile social media services, Shared Experience and Activity Framework (SEAF). The framework is based on Activity Theory and Mobile Web 2.0 Ecosystem and it has a strong emphasis on shared felt experience. The framework is not a complete design model as such, but is intended to be used in conjunction with other design methods available.

The framework is going to be used to design and analyze a mobile video sharing service, which will be used both in entertainment and learning purposes. As an example, we presented one analyze of an activity from this service.

Acknowledgments

The author would like to acknowledge Academy of Finland for Researcher Mobility Grant for 2008.

References

1. Barthelme P. Anderson K.M.: A View of Software Development Environments Based on Activity Theory. Computer Supported Cooperative Work (CSCW). Volume 11, Numbers 1-2 / March, 13-37 (2002)
2. Engeström, Y.: Learning by expanding: An activity-theoretical approach to developmental research. Helsinki: Orienta-Konsultit, (1987)
3. Engeström Y., Miettinen R., Punamäki R-L. (eds): Perspectives on Activity Theory. Cambridge University Press, New York (1999).
4. Fjeld M., Lauche K., Bichel M., Voorhorst F., Krueger H., Rauterberg M.: Physical and Virtual Tools: Activity Theory Applied to the Design of Groupware. Computer Supported Cooperative Work 11, 153–180, (2002)
5. Girgensohn A., Lee A.: Making Web Sites Be Places for Social Interaction. CSCW'02, November 16–20, 2002, New Orleans, Louisiana, USA, 2002.
6. Hiltunen M., Laukka M., Luomala J.: Mobile User Experience. IT Press, Finland 2002.
7. Hornung B.: Socio-Technical System, in: F. Heylighen, C. Joslyn and V. Turchin (editors): Principia Cybernetica Web (Principia Cybernetica, Brussels), http://pespmc1.vub.ac.be/ASC/Socio_Syste.html, (2004)
8. ISO 13407: Human-centered design processes for interactive systems. International Organization for Standardization, Geneva (1999).
9. Jaokar A.: What is Mobile Web 2.0? Wireless Business & Technology. <http://wbt.system.com/read/251673.htm>, (2006)
10. Kaptelinin V., Nardi B.A.: Acting with Technology. Activity Theory and Interaction Design. The MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, London, England (2006).
11. McCarthy J., Wright P.: Technology as Experience. The MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, London, England (2004).
12. Oliver M., Pelletier C.: Activity Theory and Learning From Digital Games: Developing an Analytical Methodology. In Buckingham D., Willett R. (eds): Digital Generations. Children, Young People, and New Media. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers, Mahwah, New, Jersey, London, (2006).
13. O'Reilly T.: What Is Web 2.0. Design Patterns and Business Models for the Next Generation of Software. http://www.oreillynet.com/pub/a/oreilly/tim/news/2005/09_30/what-is-web-20.html, (2005)
14. Pacey A.: Meaning in Technology. The MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, London, England (1999).

Studying User Interest in Social Media Sites

Saila Ovaska, Juha Leino, and Kari-Jouko Rähkä

University of Tampere, Department of Computer Sciences
Tampere Unit for Computer-Human Interaction
33014 University of Tampere, Finland
{Saila.Ovaska}@cs.uta.fi

Abstract. Social media websites often provide their users with recommendations, ratings, and reviews as part of their social texture. Some of these recommendations are based on the content explicitly provided by users while others are automatically generated with the click-stream data collected implicitly from users' interactions with the site. Evaluating such systems is not trivial since the recommendations typically evolve with user activity and the systems get better with time; one-shot evaluations do not necessarily capture the essence of the user experience with the site. We compare the results from our field observation study of Amazon use with other research approaches. Although we collected our data in just one 2-3 hour session per participant, we claim that the results we gained describe authentic user experiences. Such real world observations are needed to give an understanding of how the user interacts with the rich information environment where recommendations and other social navigation cues compete for the user's attention.

Keywords: recommendations, user generated content, evaluation, motivation, user centered design

1 Introduction

The so-called social media applications are systems and applications that support content sharing and co-creation in online environments. Content that is shared spans from the actual media files, such as texts, photos, audio, and video, provided by the users to recommendations, including ratings and reviews. Even business-to-consumer websites such as Amazon have social presence as they provide consumer-generated reviews and recommendations of products based on what the user is currently viewing [7]. The environment reflects the usage and displays various social cues about the choices people have made and also the recommendations they have given to others. The recommendations are typically generated based on automatically collected data on click streams and other user interaction with the site, but sometimes users also provide explicit feedback by rating and reviewing the items.

In this kind of a dynamic, ever-evolving system it is difficult to evaluate the user experience or study the gains people get from participating. However, not only researchers but also the practitioners building and maintaining such websites are interested in what makes a certain kind of website useful and valuable, and thus attractive to customers [7].

Most features in social media sites depend on user input, be it collected explicitly or implicitly [3]. Furthermore, the features typically work the better the more they are used [12;

18]. However, the relentless collecting of user information has also led to justified privacy concerns [6]. The developers often need to resort to automatically collected click-stream data when they want to understand how the users interact with the site. Such data lack information about the user's intentions and goals, success in fulfilling the intentions, and reflections on the overall use experience. When one wants to collect information in order to learn about the users' motivations for participation, it is not just click-stream data that needs to be collected.

Information-rich environments typically contain features that indicate synchronous or asynchronous presence of others in the environment. The concept of social presence has not been well defined in the literature. In a study of Kalas [18], a social navigation system for food recipes, social presence was defined as a perception of "not being alone in the space." Social texture or social cues in the interface provide the basis for experiencing social presence. Kumar and Benbasat [7] show that recommender systems, including customer reviews, increase the perception of social presence in addition to increasing the perception of usefulness of the website.

However, different ways of finding items compete for user attention. All the websites discussed in this paper offer various ways to browse the items, and recommenders are only one of many. Recommenders and other social cues must be seen as part of the larger user interface. Thus, instead of studying the recommender systems in isolation of the whole, the information-rich environments should be studied as integral wholes since all the individual parts of the interface together form the user experience and thus make it better or worse as parts of the whole, not individually [10].

Based on recent work by Lindfors [11] and Leino & Rähkä [9, 10], we will briefly discuss some relevant studies and point out the challenges involved in the evaluation of social media sites. We discuss especially approaches related to learning about the interests and motivation for participation of the users.

2 Studies of Social Media Sites

Evaluation of social media websites has taken many forms but not all studies look at the site from the end user point of view. A recent review of collaborative filtering recommender systems [14] notes that accuracy concerns are still the main focus area in evaluation of these systems. Also the other evaluation metrics mentioned, such as novelty and coverage, learning rate, and confidence in their quality, look at the system from the system point of view. User satisfaction metrics are also listed for consideration "if researchers have the ability to present the system to users, and measure how users perceive the system" [14]. Unfortunately, often the developers do not have contact with the end users.

2.1 User-Centered Design of Social Media Sites

User-centered design (UCD) emphasizes involving users early in the process and the iterative design approach that takes the feedback the users give into account. However, it seems that in the field of social media applications, the sites need to be launched first and then developed based on the feedback received (thus, resulting in the services being in the state of "perpetual beta" [12]).

From the point of view of an ongoing social media website development project, there is nothing much that can be done currently beyond standard usability testing and other basic UCD approaches. It is possible to run tests with a social media prototype that only seemingly functions. As with single user software, the tests will help in removing the biggest usability

defects. However, even the most focused usability tests fall short of capturing true motivational aspects and fail to give any proof-of-concept. Such information will be available only after the site is up and running.

Recruiting people from real user groups is time consuming. In many cases the only feedback available to developers is collected from the usage logs, and the logs do not reveal the intentions of the users, only what they ended up doing in the site.

No web site can assume that the users will log in every time they visit the site. For instance, in Amazon the click-stream data that is collected also without a need of log-in has been used for personalization of the site and producing recommendations [7]. However, the click-stream data logs are not pointing at any recognizable users but only at general user behavior. While that information can be used in further developing the social texture of the site, as done in Amazon, adding social cues that are irrelevant for the current user task might make the user experience worse than without them.

In many social media sites, the content provided by users is very rich and could be used as descriptive information of the users and the things they find important. However, the content is sometimes being used for purposes not related to the site development but to the business models of Web 2.0. Some social networking sites (for instance, Facebook⁷) offer special “social advertising” to companies willing to target their marketing efforts based on the contents of the users’ home pages. Thus, the content supplied by the user might even raise conflicts of privacy preservation since it is available to marketing campaigns of third parties—such concerns might not be realized by the user who is giving out the information as part of building a user identity in the social community.

Sometimes material external to the social media web site, such as fan sites [5], can be used in learning about the users. For instance, Habbo Hotel⁸ is meant for teenagers, and the site policy prevents talking with real names or addresses [13]. Thus, recruiting users for interviews in the site itself is ethically questionable. A fan site with its discussion forum threads provides material for those interested in forming a picture of user categories and information about the likes and dislikes of the users. Similar findings can be captured in user interviews, but getting into contact with the actual users can be challenging.

All in all, it seems that user-centered development of social media sites requires not only an understanding of the needs of the users, but also an on-going analysis of how the site evolves. Developers need to understand what means of social navigation should be promoted to further increase the chances of fulfilling the needs of the users, be they informational, task oriented needs or pursuit for social encounters. The next section discusses studies that focus on the understanding of user behavior within social media sites.

2.2 Other Approaches to Evaluation Studies

We have done a literature review of some of the recent studies on information-rich environments to discuss the evaluation approaches used in them, as well as the challenges encountered. We discuss the studies mentioned in Table 1 considering especially their approaches to learn about the motivational aspects of participation in social media sites.

In some studies [4, 14], the evaluation was conducted as *comparative field tests*: a group of users has been recruited to use the site for an extended period, and they have provided the raw data required for generating recommendations for the second group. The performance of the user groups is then compared especially related to items found with the social cues left by

⁷ <http://www.facebook.com/ads/>

⁸ several language versions, e.g. <http://www.habbohotel.fi>

others in the environment. Such comparisons have generally indicated that the users benefit from the social navigation cues and the recommendations given within the system.

Table 2. Some studies evaluating social navigation and recommenders in information-rich contexts.

System	Study method	Source
I-SPY	Field test	[17, 11]
Antworld	Comparative field test	[15]
Knowledge Sea	Field test	[1]
Livemaps	Field test and user test	[2]
Social ACM DL	Comparative field test	[4]
Kalas	Field test and interviews	[18]
Amazon	Applied ethnography	[8, 9, 10]
Various	Subjective evaluation	[11]

In order to learn about how people use recommenders in Amazon, Leino conducted an *observational study* at the participants' homes. He gave the participants some money to buy a book that they like for themselves from Amazon, and then observed how they interacted with the system. The participants were asked to think aloud, and they were interviewed before and after each task. The motivation for conducting an observational study together with interviewing comes from the say-do problem: the users' tendency to describe what they do differently from what they actually do [10]. The observational data give a rich picture of the interaction with the website, and the navigational steps involved can be analyzed in detail. However, the only means of capturing intentional content is by the *think-aloud protocol*—the observed behavior needs to be explained so that the observer understands the intentions behind the actions.

In the data collected by Leino, it becomes clear that the way how tasks are presented to the users can have an effect on the outcome. One of the participants exercised meticulous care when selecting a book to buy. A follow-up task concerned a pre-defined area (photography) that the participant was not interested in. Furthermore, that task did not result in him getting the book he chose. After viewing the first book in the result list he said: "Apparently this [the second book in the list] is similar, but I don't think I care to browse further, this is enough." This indicates that it is important to pay attention to how well the task matches the real world situation. It has been noted that people use "affect or other simple heuristics to guide their decisions" in non-involving or unmotivating tasks while in highly involving and deeply engaging situations people use "cognitive analytical processing" [16]. Thus, if the user is not in it for real, the behavior will not be the same.

In the study by Leino, the data collection was done in one session with several tasks. However, in some environments such one-shot strategy will not produce valid results, since both the site changes based on the users' interaction with it and the usage patterns of each individual evolve. There is a need for field tests that typically last much longer than two or three hours.

The challenges of running field tests are many. The study participants need to be motivated to use the website and to contribute. For instance, in Kalas [18] and Livemaps [2] users were able to chat in real time when viewing the same content. Both studies wanted to evaluate the effect of having several users browsing the site at the same time to see if chatting took place and how it evolved in the context [2]. However, such situations were not common, as the users did not log in at the same moment. Thus, some goals of the field tests were not

achieved. Motivating actual users to continue using a system can be a further problem in *longitudinal research* [18].

One approach for longitudinal studies is *subjective evaluation* by the researchers by using the system under evaluation in their own work. While such trials are common among the developers of a particular system, collecting experience from several alternative systems is not done so often. In her thesis work [11], Lindfors installed and used several tools for social navigation in the World Wide Web. A comparison of their features and several findings of their usability are based on one researcher only, but valuable as such. The reason for not recruiting other trial users was that the research questions required longitudinal usage periods and no participants could be asked to use several systems at the same time. They would hardly be motivated to use them.

Motivational issues are well known especially in systems that require user reviews and ratings. If there is no motivation to contribute, free loaders can still benefit from the system but the system will not evolve. However, in studies it is possible to motivate by giving extrinsic prizes—for instance, a promise of a pizza party [15] motivated the students to contribute in the Antworld system. Unfortunately in most real world cases such extrinsic prizes are out of the question. A user should be motivated to take part on one's own so that the system will get a persistent user population.

A further problem with prizes is that they might stimulate trials but not result in motivated, and thus genuine, use. What the participants in Leino's study received depended on how well they did Task 1, because they received the book they bought and not something independent of the study setting. That kind of intrinsic motivation (though provoked within the study setting) resulted in genuine behavior and thus increased our understanding of the role of the recommendations in the users' work towards the purchase decision.

According to Leino [8], Amazon's recommendations promote products often viewed or bought together with the currently viewed item. The user still often starts with a keyword search that seeds the recommender system with information about the user's current interest. Though all the six users that took part in Leino's study used recommendations in the item-finding process, their behavior differed: some deliberately seeded and viewed recommendations given while the others ended up using the recommendations more in an opportunistic fashion. For instance, users could seed recommendations by making keyword searches to see what is recommended to them on the item page of a book on the topic area that they were interested in.

Recent development ideas in digital libraries [1, 4] promote various social cues in the interface so that users can find information and items by looking at what other users have searched for, viewed, or commented. The interaction history of users with similar search keywords is recorded and displayed together with the search results using icons with prominent visual coding [4]. The feedback collected points out that users unanimously consider social cues useful in finding the relevant items from the library.

When the interface has social cues about user comments attached to a node in the digital library, it affects the navigation [1]. The nodes that are visited by others get more traffic than the nodes lacking previous visits, but even more visits are attracted by the nodes that have comments. However, the comment does not need to be positive to attract people; even negative evaluation of the node attracts visitors. Thus, just counting visited nodes does not tell if the content found is really useful or not. This problem tends to be inherent to studies using solely click-stream data.

Social presence of other people acting in the site is generated by seeing signs that they have left in the environment, and consequently feeling that others exist in the same space and are present by the marks that they have left in it. Some of these marks are useful for the task at

hand, perhaps as recommendations of items of predicted interest. Other marks provide knowledge of what is "hot" in the community, as in Technorati's⁹ "Where's the Fire? What's Hot, and Why," when looking for interesting blogs. Tagging and other newer approaches widen the potentially useful signs, and simultaneously add to the complexity of the environments. In Leino's sample of six participants, the perception of the inherent sociality of complex information spaces divided the participants in two. Half of them felt that Amazon had social presence while the other half felt that the social texture was not enough for that.

2.3 The Wider Context of Social Media Sites: the World Wide Web

Social media sites do not work in isolation; they are visited by users that commonly also visit other similar sites. For instance, Leino [8] reports that one of the participants often uses Google to find reviews on an interesting item, in addition to (or instead of) the reviews provided by bookstore sites such as Amazon. Perhaps social navigation tools might be even more useful on the level of the whole World Wide Web.

However, giving meaningful recommendations automatically is especially hard when one does not know the context. For instance, with the I-SPY search engine that was built to support communities of shared interests on the WWW [17], the feedback collected from a trial use within a work organization showed that the search results were relevant only in 50% of the searches, even though the community consisted of workers of the same organization. Based on her own trials, Lindfors [11] noted that if the user does not select the right community before making the keyword searches, the recommendations made based on the searches are off. Thus, designing a general purpose recommender is even more challenging than using one in a closed digital library system.

Clearly we are still far away of commonly available support for social navigation on the World Wide Web. Consequently, the tools available for social navigation are fragmented into the various social media sites that flourish on the WWW, each developing tools for its own users. No consensus exists on what kind of social navigation tools are useful or how they should be presented in the interface.

3 Conclusions

Since social media sites are ever-evolving with the users themselves providing much of the content and recommendations, capturing the interest and motivation of the users requires special care in study design. Clearly we need more studies of user interaction with the already existing websites, since such studies may reveal important aspects of how to raise and foster user interest in contributing to the site. The study of wholes has been neglected, although the complex whole is what users face and have to cope with [4]. We have evidence that the actions of others made visible in the social texture affect the behavior of at least some users in complex information environments, though not always giving a feeling of social presence. How this affects motivation to participate is still an open question. Without the motivated users that are willing to contribute, no social media site can flourish, and thus motivation is a key ingredient for success. In this paper we have discussed pros and cons of the research approaches that are currently used for the study of participation interests.

⁹ <http://technorati.com>

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the Finnish Funding Agency for Technology and Innovation (project 40279/05) and by the NORDUnet project PriMa (Privacy in the Making).

References

1. Brusilovsky, P., Farzan, R., Ahn, J.: Comprehensive Personalized Information Access in an Educational Digital Library. In: Proceedings of the 5th ACM/IEEE-CS joint conference on Digital libraries (JCDL '05), 9-18 (2005)
2. Cohen, D., Jacovi, M., Maarek, Y.S., Soroka, V.: Livemaps for collection awareness. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies* 56:1, 7--23 (2002)
3. Dieberger, A., Dourish, P., Höök, K., Resnick, P., Wexelblat, A.: Social Navigation: Techniques for Building More Usable Systems. *interactions* 7:6, 36--45 (2000)
4. Freyne, J., Farzan, R., Brusilovsky, P., Smyth, B., Coyle, M.: Collecting Community Wisdom: Integrating Social Search & Social Navigation. In: Proceedings of the 12th international conference on intelligent user interfaces (IUI '07), 52--61 (2007)
5. Johnson, M.: Unscrambling the "Average User" of Habbo Hotel. *Human Technology* 3:2, 127--153 (2007) <http://www.humantechnology.jyu.fi/articles/volume3/2007/johnson.pdf>
6. Kobsa, A.: Privacy-Enhanced Web Personalization. In: P. Brusilovsky, A. Kobsa, W. Nejdl, (eds.), *The Adaptive Web*. LNCS 432, Springer, 628--670 (2007)
7. Kumar, N., Benbasat, I.: The Influence of Recommendations and Consumer Reviews on Evaluations of Websites. *Information Systems Research* 17(4), 425--439 (December 2006)
8. Leino, J.: Searches and Recommendations: Item-Finding in Complex Information Environments. M.Sc. Thesis, Interactive Technology, University of Tampere, Finland. (2008)
9. Leino, J., Riih a, K.-J.: Case Amazon: Ratings and Reviews as Part of Recommendations. In: Proc. of the 2007 ACM Conference on Recommender Systems, 137--140 (2007)
10. Leino, J., Riih a, K.-J.: User Experiences and Impressions of Recommenders in Complex Information Environments. *IEEE Database Engineering Bulletin* 31:2, 32--39 (2008)
11. Lindfors, I.: Social Navigation Aiding Information Search. M.Sc. Thesis, Interactive Technology, University of Tampere, Finland (in Finnish) (2008)
12. O'Reilly, T., What is Web 2.0. Sept. 30, 2005. Available at: <http://www.oreillynet.com/pub/a/oreilly/tim/news/2005/09/30/what-is-web-20.html>
13. Ovaska, S., Leino, J.: A Survey on Web 2.0. Department of Computer Sciences, University of Tampere, Series of Publications D, D-2008-5. June 2008. <http://www.cs.uta.fi/reports/dsarja/D-2008-5.pdf>
14. Schafer, J.B., Frankowski, D., Herlocker, J., Sen, S.: Collaborative Filtering Recommender Systems. In: P. Brusilovsky, A. Kobsa, W. Nejdl (eds.): *The Adaptive Web*, LNCS 4321, Springer, 291--324 (2007)
15. Shapira, B., Kantor, P., Melamed, B.: The Effect of Extrinsic Motivation on User Behavior in a Collaborative Information Finding System. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology (JASIST)*, 52:11, 879--887 (2001)
16. Sillence, E., Briggs, P.: Please Advise: Using the Internet for Health and Financial Advice. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 23 (1), 727--748 (2007)
17. Smyth, B., Balfe, E., Boydell, O., Bradley, K., Briggs, P., Coyle, M., Freyne, J.: A Live-User Evaluation of Collaborative Web Search. In: Proceedings of the 19th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI '05), 1419--1424 (2005)
18. Svensson, M., Höök, K., Cöster, R.: Designing and Evaluating Kalas: A Social Navigation System for Food Recipes. *ACM Trans. on Computer-Human Interaction* 12 (3), 374--400 (2005)

User Experience Patterns: a Useful Way to Support Social Media Development?

Marianna Obrist, Daniela Wurhofer, Manfred Tscheligi

HCI & Usability Unit, ICT&S Center, University of Salzburg
Sigmund-Haffner Gasse 18, 5020 Salzburg, Austria

{Marianna.Obrist, Daniela.Wurhofer, Manfred.Tscheligi}@sbg.ac.at

Abstract. In this paper we present the user experience pattern approach in order to support the development of social media, in particular of audiovisual networked systems for user-generated content creation. As part of our research we theoretically and empirically explored user experience for different audiovisual systems. Based on first evaluation results gathered from an IPTV based and web based application, we created User Experience (UX) Patterns. Why UX patterns were developed, how they were created and what first lessons learned are, will be presented in this paper.

Keywords: user experience, pattern approach, audiovisual systems, method.

1 Introduction

An increasing number of social networking and audiovisual networked systems are currently designed to enable user generated content (UGC) creation. Examples like MySpace, Facebook (with over 60 million members) and YouTube (with more than 300 million members world wide) have changed the way people use new media, in creating personal profiles, sharing photos, videos, blogs and UGC in general. The increasing interest of people in such platforms based on the numbers of participants is evident, but it is still unclear what makes these applications so successful or which features or elements motivate people to become consumers or active producers of UGC. In our research, we investigate the relevant factors characterizing user experience for audiovisual networked media and how to translate them into best practices for motivating and engaging people.

The intention behind our research is to explore these user experience factors and make them available for designers for the development of future systems. To achieve this, we are building on the pattern approach. The role of patterns lies in the need of re-using experiences made in the design of social media applications. Several design and interaction principles, guidelines and patterns are already available. In particular, existing HCI design patterns provide proven solutions to recurring problems, but there is still a lack of proven solutions for designing "good user experience" summarized in the form of patterns. Therefore we developed User Experience (UX) Patterns based on a profound literature study and supported by empirical results on audiovisual networked systems evaluated within an European project. The main purpose of UX patterns is to share successful solutions beyond our research project and to help to avoid recurring mistakes in the design of user experience for social media and for networked audiovisual media in particular. In this paper, the creation process of the UX patterns, an example and first conclusions are presented.

2 Related Work

The concept of patterns was developed by Christopher Alexander in urban architecture [1]. According to the definition of Alexander et al. "each pattern describes a problem which occurs over and over again in our environment, and then describes the core of the solution to that problem, in such a way that you can use this solution a million times over". This definition points out the central characteristics of patterns: The possibility of reusing patterns, the importance of the context (physical and social characteristics) in which the patterns are embedded, and the aspect of sharing knowledge by using patterns. Besides architecture, patterns are used in the area of software and usability engineering, where patterns are used to describe design experience [see e.g. 10, 3, 11, 15, 8]. The first who mentioned the idea of patterns in the context of HCI were Norman et al. [16]. Currently, the role of patterns for interaction design is getting more and more important, as patterns represent a way of dealing with the increasing complexity and diversity in the field of HCI [2].

According to Cooper et al. [5] and Coplien [6], human activity is an additional factor which has to be kept in mind when designing interfaces. A human perspective is taken by Coram and Lee [7] by introducing a pattern language, which can be used to generate user centered software designs. User centered software design is thus defined as placing the user's experience first and foremost when interacting with the application through the user interface. Although the authors call their pattern language "Experiences", they only deal with usability aspects of interface design and therefore do not differ much from other pattern languages for interaction design [e.g. 19, 22, 9]. Van Welie [21] describes experiences as the main user goals and tasks that need to be supported by designers. Kohler et al. [12] indicate that there are no patterns describing solutions to motivational or other hedonic aspects. In order to overcome this, they suggest developing patterns which integrate broad and general principles of human behavior in the form of concrete solutions.

However, the work of van Welie [21] and Kohler et al. [12] is only a first step towards the development of patterns dealing explicitly with user experience; they have only described a few patterns explicitly addressing user experience. Furthermore, their approaches lack a framework for describing and defining user experience, which is the basis for developing user experience patterns.

So, why are there no patterns for describing user experience, that means, why are there no patterns that tell us how to design user experience in a good way and help us to avoid mistakes other designers made before?

2 User Experience Patterns

2.1 What are UX Patterns?

It has become clear, that several attempts have been made to include the user perspective into the creation of patterns. User experience has also been addressed, but often restricted on usability issues. In our research we wanted to make one step further by addressing mainly user experience issues. We are aware that user experience is not an easy concept and research area, as there are still discussions about the right definition [13]. We tried to address this challenge by defining user experience patterns on the basis of pre-defined user experience factors for audiovisual networked systems, namely: (1) fun/enjoyment, (2) emotion, (3) motivation, (4) user engagement, (5) user involvement, (6) co-experience, (7) sociability and (8) usability (see

Obrist et al. [17] for a detailed description of each factor). We define user experience patterns in the following way: *A User Experience (UX) Pattern for A/V networked systems captures the essence of a successful solution to a recurring experience problem/demand in A/V networked systems.*

According to these factors, the following questions are covered by UX Patterns: Which elements/features/functionalities/design has to be integrated in the A/V networked system in order to ...

- ... make using the application more fun?
- ... motivate the user to (re-)use the system?
- ... evoke positive emotions when using the application?
- ... increase the user's engagement?
- ... let the user feel involved?
- ... provoke co-experience?
- ... improve sociability?
- ... improve usability?

Based on the defined user experience factors empirical data within a European project were collected over the last two years and the UX patterns were created. Depending on the goal of the application, the designer could have an early look on which features worked well in similar applications in order to increase motivation, for instance, and thus contributing to the improvement of the overall user experience of a networked audiovisual system. We also analyzed the empirical data to find good examples of positive experience when interacting with a given interface (i.e. audiovisual networked systems). These examples are described in a comprehensive and uniform manner as UX Patterns.

2.2 Creation of UX Patterns

In order to provide uniformity of patterns and to support information seeking, a consistent structure is needed. There are different approaches of how to structure patterns [see 4, 20, 19]. The structure we have used for our UX patterns is based on the terminology proposed by Van Welie [20] or Borchers [4]:

Name: The name of a pattern describes the main idea of the pattern in one or a few words; it should be both descriptive and unique so that it helps in identifying and referring to the pattern [10].

Problem: The problem states out the major issue addressed by the pattern. Problems in UX patterns are related to usage of the system and are relevant to the user or any other stakeholder that is interested in improving the system with regard to UX.

Forces: The forces further elaborate the problem statement.

Context: This part of a pattern describes the characteristics of the context of use, including the tasks, users and environment for which the pattern can be applied as well as the UX factor(s) addressed by the pattern.

Solution: The solution provides proven solutions to the addressed problems in a compact form.

Examples: This part of a pattern illustrates how the pattern has been successfully used in a system.

In the following section, one of the UX patterns developed by the authors is presented. The empirical data we used for developing patterns is based on the evaluation of two

audiovisual systems: a web application and an IPTV application. In order to collect empirical data on user's experiences with the above described applications, qualitative and quantitative methods were used, for example focus groups, questionnaires, interviews, walkthroughs or analysis of logging data.

2.3 UX Pattern Example

UX PATTERN: "KEEP THE USER ACTIVE"

Problem: How to motivate the user to continue using an audiovisual application?


Forces:

- Users need incentives for using the platform
- Users want variety when using the platform
- Users want to stay up to date by using the platform

Context: Users who are bored by the platform will not use it anymore. Therefore, it is important to avoid boredom when using the application. This pattern addresses the UX factor "Motivation".

Solution:

- Continuously add new content and features, stay up to date: This means that the application and its features are continuously improved, and that new and actual content is added on the platform. Constant improvements and updates make using the application interesting and exciting for the user.
- Let users actively participate: When users are given the possibility to actively participate on the platform, the motivation and interest for using the platform increases. Active participation results in a more interactive and variegate platform, which attracts many users.
- Provide a broad spectrum of features: An application offering many features is exciting as can try the different features and then choose those which they are really interested in.



users
in

(see
figure
1)

Examples:

- Most actual videos on the start page of YouTube (see figure 1)
- Possibility to vote for the videos on YouTube (see figure 1)

Based on desktop research and analysis of empirical data, about 25 UX Patterns have been developed so far. Above, one UX Pattern "Keep the User Active" mainly addressing the UX factor "motivation" is shown in detail. This example illustrates the structure and the appearance of the patterns we already developed. It can already be stated, that the patterns revealed through our research seem to address a broad spectrum of factors influencing UX and provide a lot of solutions to common problems in the area of audiovisual systems, and could provide valuable input for the development of social media in the future.

3 Initial Conclusions & Future Work

Patterns have already proven to be useful for many different application areas as they provide solutions to recurring problems in a structured and fast manner. We are therefore convinced that UX Patterns represent an important tool for designers and developers to avoid recurring design mistakes and provide a clear and structured way to communicate best practices for designing a positive UX.

However, the collection of UX patterns is only the first step. The next step is to validate the usefulness of these patterns in practice. The UX Patterns are not yet used by designers and developers in the phase of designing an application. For proving in practice, patterns should not only help designers and developers to avoid recurring errors and therefore save time and money, but they must also be comprehensible so that the stakeholders are willing to use them. Therefore, a workshop with different stakeholders for evaluating the existing patterns will be conducted as a next step. Moreover, the patterns will also be evaluated by external research partners with different backgrounds in order to integrate their experience and knowledge in the field of A/V systems in the UX patterns.

Finally it has to be stated that a pattern collection is never complete but rather in a constant improvement process; therefore our patterns represent a preliminary collection of "best practices" and will be improved continuously. Dependent on new results and experiences, the existing UX patterns can be extended or assembled.

Acknowledgments

We thank our project partners within CITIZEN MEDIA for enabling this research.

References

1. Alexander, C., Ishikawa, S., Silverstein, M., Jacobson, M., Fiksdahl-King, I., Angel, S.: A Pattern Language: Towns, Buildings, Construction. Oxford: University Press (1977)
2. Bayle, E., Bellamy, R., Casaday, G., Erickson, T., Fincher, S., Grinter, B., Gross, B., Lehder, D., Marmolin, H., Moore, B., Potts, C., Skousen, G., Thomas, J.: Putting it all together: towards a pattern language for interaction design: A CHI 97 workshop (1998)
3. Bernstein, M.: Patterns of Hypertext. In: Proceedings of ACM HT'98 – International Conference on Hypertext and Hypermedia, Pittsburgh, 21-29 (1998)
4. Borchers, J.: A pattern approach to interaction design. Chichester et al.: John Wiley & Sons (2001)
5. Cooper, A., Reimann, R., Cronin, D.: About Face 3. The Essentials of Interaction Design. Indianapolis: Wiley Publishing (2007)
6. Coplien, J.: Organizational Patterns: Beyond Technology to People. In: Proc. of the 6th International Conference on Enterprise Information Systems, Porto, IS-15 (2004)
7. Coram, T., Lee, J.: Metaphor – A Pattern Language for User Centered Software Design, July 25, 1996. Retrieved September 29, 2008 at <http://www.cs.wustl.edu/~schmidt/PLoP-96/coram.ps.gz> (1996)
8. Dearden, A., Finlay, J.: Pattern Languages in HCI: A Critical Review. HCI 21, 49-102 (2006)
9. Erickson, T.: Interaction Design Patterns. Retrieved June 03, 2008 at: <http://www.visi.com/~snowfall/InteractionPatterns.html> (2005)
10. Gamma, E., Helm, R., Johnson, R., Vlissides, J.: Design Patterns: Elements of Reusable Object-Oriented Software. Amsterdam: Addison-Wesley (1995)

11. Garzotto, F., Mainetti, L., Paolini, P.: Adding Multimedia Collections to the Dexter Model. In: Proceedings of ACM ECHT'94 - International Conference on Hypertext and Hypermedia, Edinburgh, 70-80 (1996)
12. Kohler, K., Niebuhr, S., Hassenzahl, M.: Stay on the ball! An Interaction Pattern Approach to the Engineering of Motivation. In: Human-Computer Interaction - INTERACT 2007, Rio de Janeiro, 519-522 (2007)
13. Law, E., Roto, V., Vermeeren, A., Kort, J., Hassenzahl, M.: Towards a shared definition of user experience. In Proceedings CHI 2008, 2395-2398 (2008)
14. Liddle, D.: Bringing Design to Software, edited by Terry Winograd. New York: ACM Press (1996)
15. Nanard, M., Nanard, J., Kahn, P. Pushing reuse in hypermedia design: Golden rules, design patterns and constructive templates. In: Proceedings of ACM HT, 11-20 (1998)
16. Norman, D.A., Draper, S.,W.: User-Centered System Design: New Perspectives on Human-Computer Interaction. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates (1986)
17. Obrist, M., Weiss, A., Tscheligi, M.: Evaluating User-Generated Content Creation across Contexts and Cultures, presented at the IAMCR Conference 2007 (2007)
18. Tidwell, J.: Common Ground: A pattern language for Human-Computer Interface Design. Retrieved October 16, 2007 at: http://www.mit.edu/~jtidwell/interaction_patterns.html (1999)
19. Tidwell, J.: Designing Interfaces: Patterns for Effective Interaction Design. O'Reilly Media (2005)
20. Van Welie, M., van der Veer, G.C., Eliëns, A.: Patterns as Tools for User Interface Design. Retrieved October 16, 2007 at: <http://www.cs.vu.nl/~martijn/gta/docs/TWG2000.pdf> (2000)
21. Van Welie, M., van der Veer, G.C.: Pattern Languages in Interaction Design: Structure and Organisation. In Proceedings of the Ninth International Conference on Human-Computer Interaction, Zürich, 527-534 (2003)
22. Van Welie, M.: Patterns in Interaction Design. Retrieved October 16, 2007 at: <http://www.welie.com> (2005).

SMEs in Social Media

Petri Mannonen, Mikael Runonen

Helsinki University of Technology, Software Business and Engineering Laboratory, P.O.Box 9210,
Fi-02015 TKK, Finland
{petri.mannonen, mikael.runonen}@tkk.fi

Abstract. Social media and Web 2.0 are currently a hot topic when new digital services are designed and developed. In addition of the leisure or business to customer services such as MySpace.com, Facebook.com, and Amazon.com, the web 2.0 and social media functionalities are promising for other businesses as well. However quite little is known about the actual needs and characteristics of companies as users of these kinds of services. This article reports results of a study where small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) were studied and then web 2.0 and social media service concepts developed for them. Concept of social media proved to be challenging in SMEs' context. Although the users were familiar with web and online services and even used some of them during their free time, they could not see the benefits of using similar solutions in their work. Most of them could however see the risks and pitfalls.

Keywords: User research, social media, web 2.0, small and medium enterprises

1 Introduction

During the last couple of years social media and Web 2.0 have become major phenomena and concerns in both business and leisure time contexts [1, 2, 3]. The social media is usually understood through such Web 2.0 applications or tools as blogs and social networking sites. Tim O'Reilly introduced the term Web 2.0 in 2005. He defined it to mean next generation web services that utilize new collaborative and dynamic information sharing and producing technologies and practices [4].

Web 2.0 and social media are both somewhat vague concepts. What makes them interesting for many stakeholders, are the bold promises they make. According to the promises Web 2.0 [e.g. 1, 4]:

- Facilitates flexible design, creative reuse, and user centered content
- Provides a rich user interface
- Facilitates collaborative content creation
- Establishes social networks of people with common interests
- Helps gather collective intelligence.

These promises are extremely attractive also from a business perspective. The quick growth and high user or visitor amounts¹⁰ of the biggest social media services and the hype surrounding them, increases the companies' interests even more.

¹⁰ In January 2008 Facebook had 100 million unique visitors and MySpace 109 million. Chang, M. Facebook vs. MySpace: The battle for global social network dominance. The Industry

However the Web 2.0 or social media services for business and especially for business-to-business context are few and success stories even fewer. The usual business examples of Web 2.0 are web stores that have been able to take advantage of the long tail effect with different user profiling and activating strategies. However, for example easier collaboration, collaborative content creation, flexibility, and utilizing collective intelligence are very interesting aspects also from business-to-business viewpoint.

From user-centered design's point of view too little is known about companies as users of different social media services. Important questions are the needs, context of use, current practices, and in general the relationship with technology (especially high technology such as Internet) of companies.

We were especially interested about the collaboration between companies and thus selected small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) as our focus. SMEs are used to build their business around networks and collaboration. In many cases collaboration is the only way to SMEs to compete and collaborate with large corporations. In addition the identity and personification are no such a big issues with SMEs as with large corporations. In SMEs there are only few persons working in the company and thus there are only few persons representing the company to outsiders, whereas in large companies there are strict rules and restrictions on who is acting on behalf of the company or informing outsiders about the company.

None of the SMEs selected for the research operated in ICT business area. We decided to focus on other than ICT companies in order to avoid the bias that ICT companies and their workers might have. In ICT industry people are sometimes prone to accept new technologies without questioning.

The research project aimed at understanding how social media could be utilized in business context and what kind of users companies would be, and at producing concept ideas about Web 2.0 and social media services that would fit to SMEs context. Since the aim was both to understand the users and develop new product ideas, user-centered concept development (UCCD) seemed to fit well as a research method. UCCD also has some interesting similarities with Web 2.0 phenomena. Where UCCD emphasizes the users' role in product and concept development and aims at developing products that answer to the needs of the users and fit into their context of use, the Web 2.0 emphasizes the users as active members of both using and developing the services.

2 Developing Social Media Service Concepts For SMEs

We used a quite general concept development process, which had similarities with e.g. Kankainen [5], Nieminen, Mannonen, and Turkki [6], and Salovaara and Mannonen [7]. The concept development process consisted of user research, small-scale technology research, concept idea generation and visualization, and concept evaluation. For example Nieminen et al's [6] concept development process is promised to be quite lightweight and especially developed for emerging technologies. Thus the selected process was judged as suitable for developing social media and web 2.0 concepts for SMEs.

The concept development produced quite abstract level concept ideas. The projects aim was not to develop exact products or services but to produce ideas on how the web 2.0 and social media promises could be realized in industrial settings. Since there currently are no

Standard. <http://www.thestandard.com/news/2008/04/16/facebook-vs-myspace-battle-global-social-network-dominance> (retrieved September 29, 2008).

social media services aimed to SMEs in Finland, we needed to produce concept ideas. The concepts provided us a way to receive users' feedback on possible social media solutions for their purposes. This way the study was more complete than pure user research would have been.

User research part of the concept development consisted of contextual interviews in five SMEs located in southern parts of Finland. The interviews lasted from 1 to 2 hours each. The main research questions were: what are the current needs and practices of SMEs when collaborating with other companies, and in what kind of context the developed services would be used by SMEs. User research received background information from earlier research project which focused on technology mediated knowledge services for distributed work environments and included a case about SMEs.

As mentioned earlier the technology research was quite lightweight. We examined the basic ideas and technologies behind social media and web 2.0 concepts and mapped the most noticeable current trends. The technology research was conducted in parallel with user research.

Numerous concept ideas were generated based on the results of both user research and technology research. The best concept ideas were visualized with PowerPoint presentations. The presentations described the main functionalities of the service concept and user interface sketches.

The concept evaluation was done with three SMEs. During the evaluation interviews also the user research results were discussed and validated. The interviews lasted 2 hours each. The interviews were semi-structured. The interviewer had a question list for making sure that all aspects were covered. However usually all the questions in checklist were covered during the interview without explicitly consulting the checklist.

The concept evaluation produced improvement proposals for the concepts and a lot of new information about the companies. Improvement proposals included among others ideas about simplifying both the concept and the presentation, and functional requirements about linking the service to companies' current customer and project management systems.

3 Results

There seems to be a clear need for social media services or products for SMEs. All the interviewed people mentioned managing one's business connections as an important but cumbersome task. Keeping track of what is happening with customers, competitors, and business domain in general takes time and is extremely important for the business. Currently the biggest problem is information leakages if and when a key worker leaves the company. The companies did not have any organized ways of sharing status information about the customers, competitors etc. and thus the information as well as the actual contacts were attached to individual workers.

Since the SMEs have only few employees, there are also only a couple of users for the service in each company. However they need to be able to share both the information that is received and produced and the identity of the company in the service. Sharing the information solves a big part of the information leak problem. However the actual contacts to other companies and customers also personified and thus the contacts should also be shared. In practice this means some kind of shared identity.

The current practices of collecting information about other companies and contacting them seemed to be quite similar. For example the process of selecting new subcontractors followed a general process of 1) searching potential partners from own personal contacts, from Internet

and from directory services, 2) selecting the most potential partners based on background checks (e.g. customer experiences, financial information, etc.), 3) contacting the companies usually by phone and presenting an invitation to submit tender, 4) selecting the best partner based on the tenders, 5) closing the deal, and 6) managing the after deal feedback etc. This kind of general process sets special requirements for social media services. Of course one could develop a service for supporting subcontracting but the same could also be achieved with quite simple and general solutions where the users/companies can contact each other and exchange openly defined information.

As can be concluded from the previously described strategies of searching potential subcontractors, the SMEs are currently a part of multiple communities and networks. They belong to some business domain or category. The directory services and domain specific fairs and exhibitions are good concretizations of this kind of categorizations. In addition the companies can be subcontractors to some other bigger companies and thus belong to subcontractor networks, or the companies can belong to regional or interest based networks, e.g. network of start-up companies of some specific industry. Networks and communities are important marketing and advertising channels as well as information sources.

The technological context of the SMEs' was quite established. Even though the companies did not have much knowledge and know-how about Internet technologies or computers, they all had managed to build web sites and used email daily basis. Some of the companies even had mobile email and other more sophisticated services in use.

The technology relationship of the companies and employees was much more complex than the technological context. The companies had net connections, modern enough computers and sometimes even smart phones that enabled the use of even the high-end web services. In addition the employees were familiar with online services, Internet and some even with the web 2.0 services such as Facebook and MySpace. However the current tools and solutions they used in work were typically very conventional PC software. Also the current practices and habits of work relied on traditional and quite conservative values. Consequently the employees had difficulties in accepting that social media services could be utilized in business context.

The resistance and disbelief was even stronger with utilizing the social media and web 2.0 ideologies in business. The idea that by sharing and distributing information free of charge and without concerns that the competitors might be able to piggyback the ideas was something that the employees or entrepreneurs were not willing to accept without explicit proof.

Interestingly the interviewees had also difficulties in understanding how the services could function. The social media approaches were so radical compared to current solutions that everyone had difficulties in seeing what could be achieved and how.

4 Conclusions

The research revealed interesting phenomena relating to possibilities of utilizing social media services in business-to-business services targeted to SMEs. In addition it showed that concept development can be utilized to deepen understanding of the users in user centered design.

Social media services seem to be plausible solutions to some acute needs and problems SMEs' have. Managing the contact information of current and potential co-operators, customers and competitors and information about the happenings in company's vicinity is a heavy burden for small companies. Current web 2.0 technologies could ease this burden but as a return for it they require changes in companies' cultures of doing business and utilizing technologies. The potential of web 2.0 is related to its new possibilities of open collaboration

and free sharing of ideas [8]. In business context the possibilities seem to also be minimum requirements if one wishes to realize the web 2.0 promises.

As a requirement the change in habits and practices of doing business is extremely significant. It clearly sets difficult obstacles for any product to aim to succeed as social media solution for SMEs. However the requirement for changes is not something that cannot be overcome. Many new systems and solutions change the ways people work either knowingly or by accident. In addition the social media services have become hugely successful in leisure time. Thus people probably become slowly but surely more prepared to try them in work context. There is nonetheless a push for any new service to show concrete evidence that the new technology and way of working is in fact more profitable than the current tools and practices. Without a clear proof of concept the resistance is hard to overcome.

Since the language and user interface designs of free time services do not seem to yield good results in business context, the question of how to transform the user interface and interaction paradigms that have been stigmatized to some context to some other, remains open. How to transform trendy emerging web services to non-IT-related businesses? We need to either solve the problem or wait until the workers are enough IT-conscious to accept the services as is.

As mentioned earlier the user-centered concept development process fitted quite well as a research instrument to gather deep and holistic understanding of the focus users. Naturally the main input came from the user research but also the concept generation and evaluation were important. The concept generation forced us to consider the impacts the new tools would and could have in the users' lives and to analyze the gathered information from multiple viewpoints. The concept evaluations produced a lot of information about the relationship the users have with technologies. The users' expectations, fears and hopes towards current and coming technological systems and devices are rarely thought deeply while designing new ones. However both the users' current technological and user interface environment and their opinion and understanding of this environment are important factors when usability of new products is considered. Understanding the user-technology relationships deeply enough required at least in this case that visions of new technologies (concepts) were communicated to users and their reactions observed.

References

1. Murugesan, S.: Understanding Web 2.0. IT Pro, July /August (2007)
2. Owyang, J., Toll, M.: Tracking the Influence of Conversations: A Roundtable Discussion on Social media Metrics and Measurement. A Dow Jones White Paper (2007)
3. Wigand, R. T., Benjamin, R. I., Birkland, J. L.: Web 2.0 and beyond: implications for electronic commerce. In: 10th international Conference on Electronic Commerce ICEC '08, pp. 1-5. ACM, New York (2008)
4. O, Reilly, T.: What Is Web 2.0: Design Patterns and Business Models for the Next Generation of Software (2005) <http://www.oreillynet.com/pub/a/oreilly/tim/news/2005/09/30/what-is-web-20.html>, Retrieved September 29, 2008.
5. Kankainen, A.: UCPCD: User-Centered Product Concept Design. In: The 2003 Conference on Designing For User Experiences, DUX'03, pp. 1-13. ACM, New York (2003)
6. Nieminen, M.P., Mannonen, P., Turkki, L.: User-centered concept development process for emerging technologies. In: 3rd Nordic Conference on Human-Computer Interaction, NordiCHI'03, pp. 225-228. ACM Press, New York (2003)
7. Salovaara, A., Mannonen, P.: Use of future-oriented information in user-centered product concept ideation. In: IFIP TC13 International Conference on Human-Computer Interaction Interact 2005.

Published in Lecture Notes in Computer Science 3585 (LNCS), pp. 727-740. Springer-Verlag, Berlin (2005)

8. Leadbeater, C.: We-Think: Mass innovation, not mass production. Profile Books, London (2008)

Online Tools for Co-design: User Involvement through the Innovation Process

Pirjo Näkki, Maria Antikainen

VTT Technical Research Centre of Finland,
P.O.Box 1000, 02044 VTT, Finland
{Pirjo.Nakki, Maria.Antikainen}@vtt.fi

Abstract. Social media tools provide new possibilities to involve end users as co-designers through the whole innovation process. Owela (Open Web Lab) is an online community that supports participatory design within users, designers and developers. Currently Owela serves as a platform that collects user feedback, experiences and ideas from different physical and online sources. In this paper we present the Owela co-design model and tools for different phases of the innovation process. The co-design process consists of open innovation space and scheduled projects for product and service development. We present a case example of the use of the Owela process in a design process of the social bookmarking service called Tilkut. We conclude that online tools can make the co-design easier and cheaper to apply in everyday work. However, the traditional tools and methods can not be directly applied on the web, but the whole design process should be reconsidered in aim to work well online. A combination of online and offline tools is needed for effective co-design.

Keywords: co-design, online laboratory, social media, innovation process, web tools, participatory design

1 Introduction

Along the rise of Web 2.0 phenomenon consumers roles have shifted from passive objects to active participants. Consumers are more and more involved in business processes as co-creators and they are actively participating into the value creation processes. Social media tools also offer easy ways for users to share their ideas and feedback openly. Therefore, numerous open innovation platforms aiming to attract consumers to innovate or act as co-designers have emerged on the web.

By opening their innovation processes, companies may increase their effectiveness and enhance their relationships with customers and end users. Co-design describes a process that allows customers to express their product requirements and carry out product realisation processes by mapping the requirements into the physical domain of the product [1] [2]. Co-design process can involve different stakeholders, such as customers, end users, designers, developers and managers.

2 Online Tools for Co-design

In aim to motivate users to participate in open innovation and participatory design processes, offering appropriate tools for users is important. Understanding the distributed innovation process and users' roles is in a central role. [3] For example, some manufacturers provide users with toolkits and configurations to customize and even design their own products.

Tools for participatory design should enhance and support the creativity of users. Farooq et al. [4] suggest three design implications to support creativity within information systems: 1) Integrate support for individual, dyadic, and group brainstorming; 2) Leverage cognitive conflict by preserving and reflecting on minority dissent and 3) Support flexibility in granularity of planning. In general, Farooq et al. stress the importance of including also the sceptic voices in the discussion. Furthermore, social networks and their management is a crucial part of creativity. [4]

Technology changes constantly and rapidly, which sets some requirements for the participants, too. A decade ago, most Internet users were, of necessity, skilled computer programmers, or at least, they had a relatively deep understanding of network applications. Nowadays, many people have access to the Internet and the skills that are needed. However, in avoiding misunderstandings and making it easy to participate there is a need for a clear and simple design of service and tools. People are not willing to use too much of their valuable time to learn how a questionnaire should be filled in, for example.

Furthermore, an average Internet user is often overwhelmed by a variety and vast amount of information. For this reason, people have difficulties processing and selecting the relevant information that increases the demand for clear, attractive design as well. Clearly, utilizing online environment in participatory design needs specific and carefully designed instruments that not only accommodate but also exploit the features of the electronic environment to attract respondents [5].

Finally, one thing to consider is the openness of discussion on web forums. The positive point of view is that the method remains a group discussion enabling participants to gain others' viewpoints. On the other hand, the openness of the discussion can sometimes generate some challenges as well. Firstly, openness can increase a threshold to participate for some participants. Secondly, the openness of the discussion raises a question about the IPR management, and therefore, it is important to clarify guidelines and provide information about such issues for all participants.

3 Owela as a Co-design Platform

To study the phenomenon of co-design and the suitability of online tools to support the process we have created an online laboratory Owela for designing especially digital media products and services. Owela (Open Web Lab) aims to be a conversational online community that connects users with developers and researchers promoting open innovation. Owela offers social media tools for gathering user needs and development ideas as well as collecting feedback for scenarios and prototypes. The participants create own profiles to the service, which makes the roles of different people transparent to everyone. Visual aids like profile pictures and different colours of comments are used to make the roles visible.

We first started with an open innovation space where anyone was allowed to tell their needs and ideas as well as rate and comment the ideas of others. In the first trials it was seen that the people are more motivated in the participation if they can clearly see, how their

feedback and ideas influence the final product or service [6]. Therefore more structured and transparent process for innovation management was developed.

3.1 Co-design Process in Owela

The Owela process consists of two parts shown in the Fig. 1: open ideation and scheduled projects. The open ideation takes place in a tool called IdeaTube, where participants may report their experiences and problems with current solutions as well as suggest development ideas and needs for new products and services. IdeaTube is a blog based tool where ideas can be rated and commented by other users [7].

When new ideas emerge in the open space, some of them will be carried on as Owela projects. The project starts with scheduling and goal setting which are articulated also to the participants. The project phases are co-design of scenarios, evaluation of the concepts, and LivingLab where users can take part as active testers and co-developers of the prototypes. The goal is to provide users not only a channel for feedback and ideas but also tools for modifying or creating own services together with other users.




Fig. 1. Owela co-design process consisting of open ideation and structured projects.

Common experience shows that consumers typically discuss on services in various online communities and real life discussions. Owela will later serve as a platform that collects user feedback, experiences and ideas for further development from different physical and online environments. Various mobile and web tools will be used to gather ideas and weak signals of future trends from different places.

3.2 Support for the Different Phases of the Innovation Process

We believe that users can be involved as co-designers in all phases of the innovation process starting from the acquisition of weak signals and future needs and continuing up to sharing use experiences and further development ideas when using the real products and services.




Fig. 2. User participation and Owela tools for different stages of the innovation process.

Different tools can be used in the different phases of the innovation process as the Fig. 2 shows. The upper part of the figure shows the input from users, whereas the lower part illustrates the innovation process inside a company and the input from designers and developers. The innovation process starts with future foresight, in which both professionals and end users may participate in finding and collecting weak signals of possible future needs. Social bookmarking tool called Tilkut can be used in that phase to bookmark interesting findings both on the web and in the real world. Tilkut makes it easy to share the findings within a certain group, categorize them for further analysis and discuss them.

When end users' and designers' insights meet the aims of the company a concept development process can be started. In this phase IdeaTube can be used for collecting the needs and ideas for the certain concept either openly or within a certain group of people in an Owela project. The designers create scenarios based on the user needs and provide them openly for commenting and further development by both the users and the developers. In this phase designers propose new suggestions in rapid pace so that the users can easily see, how their feedback influences the design of the concept. IdeaTube makes it easy to get quick feedback to visualizations of the concept, because the users are ready to comment small changes right away and no special arrangements for e.g. focus group sessions or workshops are needed.

Based on the user feedback real prototypes can be developed and given to test in the LivingLab that can be either a physical laboratory in the real world or an online test laboratory when it comes to digital media services. In both cases user experiences and further development ideas can be collected in the Owela LivingLab section. When people share their feedback within the community, new ideas may evolve as a combination of various comments. Also problems can be solved faster, when the test users may give hints to each other and the developers can participate in the discussion right away. The LivingLab phase may continue also after the commercialization of the product or service. New development ideas can evolve during the real use and be as a basis for further development.

4 Case Tilkut

The Owela co-design process was piloted and developed in the user studies of a social bookmarking service Tilkut that was developed in a project called Täky. The aim of the project was to study user experience of tagging in different web and mobile applications.

The study started with an ideation phase where problems and needs regarding to tagging were studied with the users of the Delicious social bookmarking service. An online questionnaire and interviews (either face to face or phone) were done to find out present tagging conventions and needs for more intelligent services. In the interviews we already demonstrated some features that the researchers had designed for improving the current services. We also collected ideas for further development in an open IdeaTube discussion in Owela.

After that, the development of the Tilkut prototype started. At the same time, more requirements for the service were collected in a user test, in which a combination of existing online services was tested. Test users were recruited from Owela users to who were thus familiar with the online feedback tools in advance. Especially lead users of the new Internet services were selected. The inquiry methods included online questionnaire for background information, initial and final interviews with all participants and an online test period of a certain set of current services, during which the participants discussed their experiences and ways of using the services in a blog.

After analysis of the feedback and further development of the prototype, the third phase of the user study was made with the real Tilkut prototype. In this LivingLab phase users were asked to test the new service and give feedback and ideas for further development. The study consisted of interviews, an individual testing period, blog discussion and traditional usability tests. The developers participated in the blog discussion as well, which made it possible to fix some reported problems in the software already during the test period. Bigger changes were made afterwards based on the user experiences and results of the usability tests.

5 Conclusions

Current state of the Web 2.0 makes it easy to take end users as co-designers by using online tools. This is convenient both for the users and the researchers, because everyone can participate in the design process from the place they want and at the time that is best for them. Online tools lower the threshold to invite users into the different phases of innovation process as a daily practice. Online community also serves as a permanent connection to the users during the more silent phases of the process and enable constant forum for discussion and feedback. Since the online space is not limited like physical rooms, more people and different stakeholders can participate more easily and effectively.

Utilising open innovation in scheduled projects requires planning the methods, tools, guidelines and schedule. This is helpful in achieving the goals set as well as in committing the users since they know when the project ends and after that they will get the outcomes and possible rewards. Besides designing online research environment, strategy for the user administration should be done. In other words, the administrator needs plans on how to attract users, how to activate them, and finally, how to commit users. In addition to offering appropriate service design and tools as well as motivating tasks, rewarding can influence on users' motivation. Also rewarding strategy should be well planned in aim to lead into the planned consequences.

We believe that combining online and offline methods with users may help to get in-depth knowledge on the users' needs and behaviour. The Owela process presented in this paper is not meant to rely only on virtual communication, but direct interaction with users is recommended. However, the online tools make it easier to involve the users through the whole process and use them as co-designers in small tasks, as well.

Acknowledgments. Owela has been developed at VTT in Finland as part of the project called “Social media in the crossroads of physical, digital and virtual worlds” (SOMED, 2006-2008). We also thank Tekes, AinaCom, Nokia, Profium and Sanoma for financing the project Täky, where the case Tilkut was done.

References

1. von Hippel, E. Economics of product development by users: the impact of “sticky” local information. *Management Science*, 1998. Vol. 44, No. 5, pp. 629-644. ISSN 0025-1909.
2. Khalid, H. and Helander, M. Web-based do-it-yourself product design. In: Tseng, M. and Piller, F. (Eds.). *The customer centric enterprise*, 2003. New York/Berlin: Springer, pp. 247-265. ISBN 3-540-02492-1.
3. von Hippel, E. (2005) *Democratizing innovation*. USA: The MIT Press, 2005. 216p. ISBN 0-262-00274-4.
4. Farooq, U., Carroll, J., and Ganoë, C. Supporting Creativity in Distributed Scientific Communities. *Proceedings of the International GROUP Conference on Supporting Group Work (Sanibel Island, Florida, November 6-9, 2005)*, Pp. 217-226. New York, USA: ACM Press, 2005. pp. 217-226.
5. Wiltner, D., Colman, R. and Katzman, S. From paper-and-pencil to screen-and-keyboard, toward a methodology for survey research on the Internet. In: S. Jones (ed.) *Doing Internet research: Critical issues and methods for examining the net*. Beverly Hills: Sage, 1999. Pp. 145-161. ISBN 0-76191-594-X.
6. Näkki, P., Antikainen, M. and Virtanen, T. Participatory design in an open web lab Owela. In the workshop *Distributed participatory design*, CHI 2008, May 05–10, 2008, Florence, Italy.
7. Näkki, P. and Virtanen, T. Utilising social media tools in user-centred design. In the workshop *Supporting non-professional users in the new media landscape*, CHI 2007, April 28-May 03, 2007, San Jose, CA, USA.