**Instructions for extracting results from user tests**

1. **Transcribe the tests.**Use a blank interview guide as the starting point for each transcription, so you have one transcription document for each participant. The extra row under each question in the guide is for entering the transcription. This way you don’t have to write much of what the test leader has said, just what the participant has said.  
     
   If you have an observer present during the tests who can type quickly, much of the transcription can be done real-time, during the actual test session. This saves a lot of time later.
2. **Mark the transcriptions**Use the following to mark up the transcription for problems found, suggestions made or things people liked:

**Xxx Show-stoppers**

**Xx Big problems/frustration (but eventually figured it out)**

**X Minor frustrations or cosmetic things**

**0 Positive feedback**

**00 Suggestions for improvement**

You can also make notes in the transcription while you are marking them, about the nature of the problems, how they are related to the content or formating or structuring of the prototype or to other things, like the context, the person’s background knowledge.\*

1. **Pool results in a Results Table**

Pull out the problems or issues that you have marked up, and enter them in tables, in an order corresponding to each marker type (xxx show-stoppers, xx big problems, etc.)

For each issue, describe the following (in corresponding columns in the table): which participant (number), where in the prototype the problem occured, a description/interpretation of the problem, and - if obvious from the test context - indications of how it the issue could be resolved. Quotes can also be a helpful supplement for describing or illustrating the problem.

There is an example of a Results Table in the Materials for User Testing folder.

1. **Send individual transcripts and Results Table to project administrator.**
2. **Results tables from different teams will be combined and inform the next version of the prototype. Things people liked will be cultivated; suggestions for improvements will be considered, and the most serious problems will form the basis for new rounds of brainstorming/sketching.**

\* **Be aware of existing themes when identifying problems**

We have identified a thematic framework from earlier work exploring user experience of evidence – eight facets or categories we have found to be relevant to types of problems people have with this kind of information. These are: accessibility, findability, usefulness, usability, understandability, credibility, desirability, identification. These facets of user experience are our thematic starting point and are helpful concepts to have in mind when trying to untangle the nature of complex problems that you observe in the interviews. They are also helpful when trying to describe our findings in general enough terms so that they are transferable to other projects/products (for article writing). But for making design improvements of the specific product we have at hand, it is much more useful to have detailed notes in the results table about the precise nature of the problem and where they occured in relation to specific features in the prototype, rather than just labeling problems with single general terms like ”understandability”. We can tag the specific problems with these general themes later, in the article writing process. Or we may find that we need to add new themes or adjust the existing ones. See below for more description of these eight categories.

**Revised honeycomb framework of user experience**

Adapted from the original (Peter Morville’s honeycomb).

****

**Findability:** can this person locate the product or the content that they are looking for?

**Accessibility:** are there physical barriers to actually gaining access, also for

people with handicaps, like color blindness?

**Usability:** how easy and satisfying is this product to use?

**Usefulness:** does this product have practical value for this person?

**Credibility:** is the product/content experienced as trustworthy?

**Desirability:** is the product something this person wants? Has a positive emotional

response to?

**Understandability:** does this person comprehend correctly both *what kind* of product this is, and comprehend the content correctly? Is this person’s subjective experience of whether or not they understand in line with their actual (correct or incorrect) understanding?

**Identification:** does this person identify with the product, on a personal or a social level? Or is it alienating, experienced as being not designed for “someone like me”.