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Two cultures

**IB Research**
- Observation
- Precise description
- Abstractions
- Human focus
- Activities and context
- Problem-oriented
- Analysis-oriented
- Disciplinary
- Courage

**IS Design**
- Intervention
- Creativity/innovation
- Artifacts
- Technology focus
- Tasks and interaction
- Solution-oriented
- Service-oriented
- Interdisciplinary
- Courage

What happens at a skate park?

Teenagers were skate boarding, watching each other, taking to each other, performing challenging moves … Then, a police officer dropped by … He drove his motorcycle over the ramp … He talked with the skaters …
Enhance the information grounds at the skate park

Observations
1. Translation is problematic but not new
2. Will come more problematic
   - Specialization (and growth) of technology
   - Wider participation in design
   - More settings to study ( __ Informatics )

• Point of talk
  - Need to engage the problem by seeking mutual understanding

Classes of mistranslation
• Recommendations
  – Often are not specific enough
  – Thus, only loosely informative, constraining

• Detailed accounts & models
  – Often lack applicability
  – Difficult to represent as concrete artifacts

Criteria
• Specificity, content appropriate
  Research in Information Behavior must apply to the actual concerns of the target domain

• Applicability, process appropriate
  The use of Research in Information Behavior must conform to the processes of the application target domain

Interaction design
Four stages
1. Welcome
2. My Risks
3. Thinking it Through
4. My Plan

CARE: Computer-Assessment & Risk reduction Education
• Objective
  Reduce behaviors that put people at risk of being infected with a STI

• Technology
  Tablet PC & rule-based system for estimating risk and suggesting changes in behaviors

• Information
  The right information (and not too much)

• People
  Young adults, especially of low economic standing

Hendry et al. (2004). Evaluating paper prototypes on the street. In CHI ’05 Extended Abstracts
• Cardboard box
• Ballpoint pen
• Twenty paper screens
• Intercepted people in the street
• Role played scenario
• No images/audio
• MD & Researcher

**In sum ...**

Paper prototyping on the street is an example research method with high **specificity** and **applicability**

Findings led to significant changes in the interaction design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedural Factor</th>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Lab</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target use setting</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant recruiting</td>
<td>Opportunistic</td>
<td>Scheduled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderator control</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data capture options</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>Many</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team observation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Takeaways**

• Translation is difficult – normal, to be expected
• Imperative: Work toward mutual understanding
• Its happening now

**Observations**

• Enfranchisement & empowerment
  – Involving people trumped all other concerns
  – Participant stories challenged assumptions
• Identified usability problems
  – More difficult to manage on the street but problems readily identified
• Interactive ambiguity and improvisation
  – Crudeness of prototype was a benefit
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