

Week 13

Writing and Publishing a Research Paper

HCI 연구방법론 2019 Fall

Human-Computer Interaction+Design Lab _ Joonhwan Lee

오늘 다룰 내용

- Research Paper Structure
- Writing for CHI

Research Paper Structure

Research Paper

Publication is the final and essential step in a research project

Organization of a Research Paper



CHI 2008 Proceedings · Online Social Networks

April 5-10, 2008 · Florence, Italy

'Looking at', 'Looking up' or 'Keeping up with' People? Motives and Uses of Facebook

Adam N. Joinson School of Management University of Bath Bath United Kingdom BA2 7AA A.Joinson@Bath.ac.uk

ABSTRACT This paper investigates the uses of second networking site Facebook, and the gratifications users derive from those uses. In the first study, 137 users generated words or phrases to describe how they used Facebook, and what they enjoyed about their use. These phrases were coded into 46 items which were completed by 241 Facebook users in Study 2. Factor analysis identified seven unique uses and gratifications: social connection, shared identities, content, social investigation, social network surfing and status updating. User demographics, site visit patterns and the use of privacy settings were associated with different uses and gratifications.

Social networking sites, uses and gratifications, motivation

ACM Classification Keywords

Author Keywords

H1. Models and Principles: User/Machine Systems; H5.m. Information interfaces and presentation: Miscellaneous.

INTRODUCTION

Social networking sites such as MySpace, LinkedIn and Facebook have become hugely popular in the last few years. In July 2007, social networking sites occupied five of the top fifteen visited websites according to Alexa.com. On July 10, 2007, Facebook.com reported signing up its 30 millionth user, with a year on year increase in unique users of 89% [12]. In the UK, use of Facebook increased by 500% between November 2006 and May 2007 [19]. MySpace is reported (although disputed [10]) to have over 100 million users [4].

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. CHI 2008, April 5-10, 2008, Florence, Italy. Convright 2008 ACM 978-1-60558-011-1/08/04 \$5.00

Social networking sites typically provide users with a profile space, facilities for uploading content (e.g. photos, sic) messaging in various forms and the ability to make connections to other people. These connections (or 'friends') are the core functionality of a social [5, 6] although most also provide opportunities for communication, the forming of groups, hosting of content and small applications.

Given the growth of social networking sites, it is perhaps unsurprising that their use has garnered media attention, including the seemingly now obligatory scare stories involving predatory child sex offenders [20], identity theft [1], workplace usage levels [9] and even addiction [8].

In many recent cases, this coverage has focused on Facebook.com, which was originally restricted to users with an '.edu' e-mail address. In September 2006, Facebook d registration to non-college based users. This change led to rapid growth in the number of users, as well as almost viral growth within non-educational orga For instance, the British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC) network (which requires a BBC email address) has circa 10,000 members, approximately 50% of employees [21]. Since May 2007, Facebook has also allowed the development and implementation of third-party applications (see dev.facebook.com).

Before opening to non-academic (and non-US-based) users, Facebook.com was peculiar amongst social networking sites since many of the social networks its users built were based on offline, geographically confined groups (e.g. a campus). Termed 'networks' by the site (which have recently expanded to include non-university based geographic areas and workplaces), this reflection of the offline community in the online environment may have led to unique forms of use amongst users [17].

User motivation and social networking sites

Social networks serve a number of functions in offline life for instance, providing social and emotional support, information resources and ties to other people [25]. Similar kinds of social networks have been identified in online

Title

Authors & Affiliations First author, second contributor,

third and so on.

Abstract

Not an introduction. State what you did and what you found.

Keywords

Authors Keyword: keyword ACM Classification Keywords: chose one or two from ACM codes.

CHI 2008 Proceedings · Online Social Networks

April 5-10, 2008 · Florence, Italy

'Looking at', 'Looking up' or 'Keeping up with' People? Motives and Uses of Facebook

Adam N. Joinson School of Management University of Bath Bath United Kingdom BA2 7AA A.Joinson@Bath.ac.uk

ABSTRACT

This paper investigates the uses of social networking site Facebook, and the gratifications users derive from those uses. In the first study, 137 users generated words or phrases to describe how they used Facebook, and what they enjoyed about their use. These phrases were coded into 46 items which were completed by 241 Facebook users in Study 2. Factor analysis identified seven unique uses and gratifications: social connection, shared identities, content, social investigation, social network surfing and status updating. User demographics, site visit patterns and the use of privacy settings were associated with different uses and gratifications.

Author Keywords Social networking sites, uses and gratifications, protivation

ACM Classification Keywords

H1. Models and Principles: User Machine Systems; H5.m. Information interfaces and presentation: Miscellaneous.

Social networking sites such as MySpace, LinkedIn and Facebook have become hugely popular in the last few years. In July 2007, social networking sites occupied five of the top fifteen visited websites according to Alexa.com. On July 10, 2007, Facebook.com reported signing up its 30 millionth user, with a year on year increase in unique users of 89% [12]. In the UK, use of Facebook increased by 500% between November 2006 and May 2007 [19]. MySpace is reported (although disputed [10]) to have over 100 million users [4].

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. *CHI 2008*, A pril 5–10, 2008, Florence, Italy. Copyright 2008 ACM 978-1-60558-011-1/08/04...\$5.00. Social networking sites typically provide users with a profile space, facilities for uploading content (c.e. photos, music), messaging in various forms and the ability to make connections to other people. These connections (or 'friends') are the core functionality of a social network site [5, 6] although most also provide opportunities for communication, the forming of groups, hosting of content and small applications.

Given the growth of social networking sites, it is perhaps unsurprising that their use has garnered media attention, including the seemingly now obligatory scare stories involving predatory child sex offenders [20], identity theft [1], workplace usage levels [9] and even addiction [8].

In many recent cases, this coverage has focused on Facebook.com, which was originally restricted to users with an '.edu' e-mail address. In September 2006, Facebook opened registration to non-college based users. This change led to rapid growth in the number of users, as well as almost viral growth within non-educational organizations. For instance, the British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC) network (which requires a BBC email address) has circa 10,000 members, approximately 50% of employees [21]. Since May 2007, Facebook has also allowed the development and implementation of third-party applications (see dev.facebook.com).

Before opening to non-academic (and non-US-based) users, Facebook.com was peculiar amongst social networking sites since many of the social networks its users built were based on offline, geographically confined groups (e.g. a campus). Termed 'networks' by the site (which have recently expanded to include non-university based geographic areas and workplaces), this reflection of the offline community in the online environment may have led to unique forms of use amongst users [17].

User motivation and social networking sites Social networks serve a number of functions in offline life – for instance, providing social and emotional support, information resources and ties to other people [25]. Similar kinds of social networks have been identified in online

Introduction

Context for the research. State why it is interesting and relevant. Identify a problem as it currently exists. Give an overview of the contents of the entire paper.

Related Work Framework and theoretical background of the research

CHI 2008 Proceedings · Online Social Networks

Following this, participants were asked to respond to the following questions adapted from [23] using free text entry:

- What is the first thing that comes to mind when you think about what you enjoy most when using Facebook?
- What other words describe what you enjoy about using Facebook?
- Using single, easy-to-understand terms, what do you use Facebook for?
- What uses of Facebook are most important to you?

Results

Two raters clustered the descriptive items and phrases developed by Facebook users in response to the first question. The raters worked collaboratively to develop the clusters, and were instructed to '*identify responses that are related*'. The author then discussed the themes with the raters, and named them accordingly. The main themes identified are outlined in Table 1.

Theme (sample user generated items)	Number of mentions
'Keeping in touch'	52
Contacting friends who are away from home	
Chatting to people I otherwise would have lost contact with	
Passive contact, social surveillance	19
Virtual people-watching.	
'Re-acquiring lost contacts'	15
Reconnecting with people I've lost contact with	
Finding people you haven't seen for a while	
'Communication'	15
Being poked	
Private messages	
Writing on walls	
Photographs	11
Tagged in picture	
Posting pictures	
Sharing pictures	
Design related	4
Ease of use	
Perpetual contact	4
Seeing what people have put as their 'status'	
The continuous updates	
Seeing what my friends have been up to today	
'Making new contacts'	5
Talking to singles	
Getting new friends	
Joining groups	

Table 1: Frequency of mentions (Question 1)

April 5-10, 2008 · Florence, Italy

In keeping with previous research [e.g. 16], the use of Facebook to 'keep in touch' received the largest number of mentions, with the use of the site to make new contacts receiving a small number of mentions.

STUDY 2: IDENTIFYING USES AND GRATIFICATIONS

Item generation

A sample of items from each use and gratification proposed by users was extracted from the exploratory list developed in Study 1. Participants' responses to items 2–4 were examined, and any occurrences of other uses or gratifications not mentioned in response to the first item were added to the list. This led to a total of 46 items. Where possible, the item was taken word for word from participant responses to Study 1.

Participants

Participants were 241 Facebook users recruited using the same methods outlined in Study 1. In addition, e-mails were sent to selected mailing lists with a request for participation (e.g. AIR-L). Participants were 80 males (33.2%) and 161 (66.8%) females (mean age = 25.97 years (SD = 9.30, range 15-66 years old). The majority of the sample were full time students (n = 151, 62.7%), 6.6% (n = 16) were part-time students and worked part- or full-time (or had carer responsibilities), and 30.7% were in full-time work and not studying (n = 78). The study was open during the final week in July, and throughout August.

Measures

The same demographic and Facebook use measures described in Study 1 were used in Study 2. Participants also completed an item related to their use of Facebook privacy settings, specifically if they had changed the default settings, and if so, the degree to which they had made them more private or more open.

Participants were finally asked to rate, using a 7-point Likert scale, the 46 uses and gratifications derived from Study 1 using the metric, "How important are the following uses of Facebook to you personally?" The scale was anchored at 1 (very unimportant) and 7 (very important).

Results

Participants had an average of 124 friends linked to their Facebook profile (*Range* 1-1000, *Median* = 85, *SD* = 129.97). Around half of the participants had been registered on the site for less than six months (6.3% for less than one month, 9.6% for between one and two months and 29.2% for between two and six months). The remaining participants had been signed up for between six months and a year (21.7%), more than one year, but less than two (21.7%) or for more than two years (10.8%). The majority of participants visited the site either daily (38.8%) or more than once a day (27.5%). Almost a quarter visited Facebook several times a week (22.5%), with 6.7% visiting once a week on average, and 4.2% visiting less than once a week.

Method

Tell the reader what you did and how you did it

Study Design and Procedure

How the study was designed and organized. factors and levels, order of administering conditions, etc.

Participants

State the number of participants. Give demographic information, such as age, gender, relevant experience. State how they were chosen. (Note: The term "Subjects" is now obsolete.)

Procedure

Specify exactly what happened with each participant.

Apparatus Implementation

Described the hardware and software implementation process.

CHI 2008 Proceedings · Online Social Networks

Following this, participants were asked to respond to the following questions adapted from [23] using free text entry:

- What is the first thing that comes to mind when you think about what you enjoy most when using Facebook?
- What other words describe what you enjoy about using Facebook?
- Using single, easy-to-understand terms, what do you use Facebook for?
- What uses of Facebook are most important to you?

Results

Two raters clustered the descriptive items and phrases developed by Facebook users in response to the first question. The raters worked collaboratively to develop the clusters, and were instructed to '*identify responses that are related*'. The author then discussed the themes with the raters, and named them accordingly. The main themes identified are outlined in Table 1.

Theme (sample user generated items)	Number of mentions
'Keeping in touch'	52
Contacting friends who are away from home	
Chatting to people I otherwise would have lost contact with	
Passive contact, social surveillance	19
Virtual people-watching.	
'Re-acquiring lost contacts'	15
Reconnecting with people I've lost contact with	
Finding people you haven't seen for a while	
'Communication'	15
Being poked	
Private messages	
Writing on walls	
Photographs	11
Tagged in picture	
Posting pictures	
Sharing pictures	
Design related	4
Ease of use	
Perpetual contact	4
Seeing what people have put as their 'status'	
The continuous updates	
Seeing what my friends have been up to today	
'Making new contacts'	5
Talking to singles	
Getting new friends	
Joining groups	

Table 1: Frequency of mentions (Question 1)

April 5-10, 2008 · Florence, Italy

In keeping with previous research [e.g. 16], the use of Facebook to 'keep in touch' received the largest number of mentions, with the use of the site to make new contacts receiving a small number of mentions.

STUDY 2: IDENTIFYING USES AND GRATIFICATIONS

Item generation

A sample of items from each use and gratification proposed by users was extracted from the exploratory list developed in Study 1. Participants' responses to items 2–4 were examined, and any occurrences of other uses or gratifications not mentioned in response to the first item were added to the list. This led to a total of 46 mems. Where possible, the item was taken word for used from participant responses to Study 1.

Participants

Participants were 241 Facebook users recruited using the same methods outlined in Study 1. In addition, e-mails were sent to selected mailing lists with a request for participation (e.g. AIR-L). Participants were 80 males (33.2%) and 161 (66.8%) females (mean age = 25.97 years (SD = 9.30, range 15-66 years old). The majority of the sample were full time students (n = 151, 62.7%), 6.6% (n = 16) were part-time students and worked part- or full-time (or had carer responsibilities), and 30.7% were in full-time work and not studying (n = 78). The study was open during the final week in July, and throughout August.

Measures

The same demographic and Facebook use measures described in Study 1 were used in Study 2. Participants also completed an item related to their use of Facebook privacy settings, specifically if they had changed the default settings, and if so, the degree to which they had made them more private or more open.

Participants were finally asked to rate, using a 7-point Likert scale, the 46 uses and gratifications derived from Study 1 using the metric, "How important are the following uses of Facebook to you personally?" The scale was anchored at 1 (very unimportant) and 7 (very important).

Results

Participants had an average of 124 friends linked to their Facebook profile (*Range* 1-1000, *Median* = 85, *SD* = 129.97). Around half of the participants had been registered on the site for less than six months (6.3% for less than one month, 9.6% for between one and two months and 29.2% for between two and six months). The remaining participants had been signed up for between six months and a year (21.7%), more than one year, but less than two (21.7%) or for more than two years (10.8%). The majority of participants visited the site either daily (38.8%) or more than once a day (27.5%). Almost a quarter visited Facebook several times a week (22.5%), with 6.7% visiting once a week on average, and 4.2% visiting less than once a week.

Results and Discussion

Use subsections as appropriate. If there were outliers or problems in the data collection, state this upfront.

Organize results by the dependent measures. Give means across conditions. Use statistical tests as appropriate (e.g., analysis of variance). Again... It's your story to tell.

Use charts, tables, etc., as appropriate.

Don't overdo it! Giving too many charts or too much data means you can't distinguish what is important from what is not important. Give the results that are important, no more, no less.

Don't give the same result twice.

CHI 2008 Proceedings · Online Social Networks

earlier work on traditional media, content gratification predicted the amount of time spent on the site. However, the use of the site for social investigation, viewing and posting photographs and viewing status updates predicted the frequency of visits. It would seem from the present data that 'keeping in touch' may in actuality refer to 'checking up on regularly', while the 'stickiness' of the site (in terms of time spent on it) depends on use of the content and applications. This insight is clearly important for designers of social networking sites and associated content. If repeat visits are motivated by different uses and gratifications than the amount of time spent on the site, it is important to design content gratification alongside the ability to build and maintain social connections. It also suggests that the furor caused by the introduction of the newsfeed [2] has subsided, and been replaced by its new role as a 'killer app', at least in terms of repeat visits to the site. In many ways, this use of Facebook reflects the desire for 'perpetual contact' [15], and previously supplied by standalone services like Twitter [24]. While the social implications of this interest in perpetual contact and updates on 'friends' are beyond the remit of the present paper, it is worth noting that an increased awareness of others' actions has potentially important implications for how we relate to others, and understand ourselves.

Design Implications

The designers of social networking sites should consider the varied uses and gratifications reported by users, and need to recognize that not all users have the same uses of a social networking site, nor derive the same gratifications from their use. For instance, there are clear distinctions between the use of Facebook to maintain and re-create connections with friends, its use as a surveillance tool and for content delivery. There were also differences in reported uses by age, gender and occupational status. It may be that different demographic groups are motivated to use social networking sites for different purposes, with social connectivity and perpetual contact motivating younger (and female) users more than older (and male) users.

The differing goals for the use of Facebook are reflected not only in usage patterns, but also in users' privacy settings. People who have made their privacy settings more permissive are more likely to want to meet new people (they also score higher on the content gratifications scale). This is a designed aspect of the system - in both cases, to fulfill one's goal often requires a more permissive approach to profile privacy. Many of the applications are social in nature (e.g. comparing oneself with others, asking questions to 'friends', viewing people from one's neighborhood), and often circumvent elements of the default privacy settings. Similarly, if the goal is to meet new people, making one's profile more open than by default allows others pursuing the same gratification to view your profile, and presumably increases the chances of an interaction. For these users, the profile within Facebook is likely to become a key selfApril 5-10, 2008 · Florence, Italy

presentation tool, rather than simply a way to 'keep in touch' with others [6, 26].

Limitations and Further research

The present research is a 'snap shot' of Facebook users, and further work should consider the possibility of researching the development of use over time. In particular, it would be of interest to see how people's uses and gratifications of Facebook develop, and if the frequency of visit is motivated by 'perpetual contact' over time. There is, for instance, considerable research in the field of habit formation that could inform the study of social network site use. HCI research should also consider ways in which the desire to meet new people, and to allow oneself to be viewe strangers, can be accommodated in a priva manner [14]. At present, Facebook has reasonably nuanced privacy controls. From the results of the present research, it would seem that users are changing the default privacy settings in a motivated manner. However, the present study only colle ted reported privacy settings. It would be to complete research that actually examined ettings via automated querying of the site [e.g. 13], or by studying a corpus of actual interactions [e.g. 11]

It should also be noted that the nature of the sampling method, and the self-selection of respondents, may have influenced the pattern of responses and overall levels of activity. Future research may wish to study a wider group of participants, or attempt to identify patterns of usage amongst non-respondents compared to respondents

CONCLUSIONS

Users derive a variety of uses and gratifications from social networking sites, including traditional content gratification alongside building social capital, communication, surveillance and social networking surfing. The different uses and gratifications relate differentially to patterns of usage, with social connection gratifications tending to lead to increased frequency of use, and content gratifications to increased time spent on the site. The variety of uses to which Facebook is put by its users identifies particular challenges for the designers of such sites. For instance, a default privacy setting may be *too restrictive* for users seeking to meet new people, or who wish to allow new people to discover them.

Since user's desire to engage in surveillance of their peers also motivates the frequency of site visit, this also poses a unique challenge in balancing user's privacy concerns and controls with a key *raison d'être* of social networking sites like Facebook. At present, Facebook allows users to manage their 'feed', removing 'stories' as they wish. This solution not only provides a degree of privacy control to users, but it also enables users to engage with the site as a self-presentation tool [26] at numerous levels – not only via their profile and network, but also through their activity (and the removal of specific 'stories'). As perpetual contact continues to develop, designers will need to face the

Limitations Limitation of the current study.

Design Implications*

How the result of the study can be applied or used. Important for CHI community. Consider that we have large volume of audience from various background.

Conclusions

Sum up what you did, restating the important findings. Restate the contribution. Restate any problems noted earlier. Identify topics for future work.

Do not develop any new ideas in the conclusion.

Parts of a Research Paper



Tinwala, H., & MacKenzie, I. S. (2010). Eyes-free text entry with error correction on touchscreen mobile devices. Proc NordiCHI 2010, 511-520, New York: ACM.





Title

- The title must...
 - Identify the subject matter of the paper
 - Narrow the scope of the work
 - + A title should be neither too broad nor too narrow.
- + Good title can tell content of the paper
- + Previous example paper:

Eyes-free Text Entry with Error Correction on Touchscreen Mobile Devices



Title

- A title may include a sub-title, usually following a separator, such as a colon (no rules here)
- + A title may strive to catch the reader's attention:
 - Silk From a Cow's Ear: Extracting Usable Structures
 From the Web¹
- A title may include an invented keyword (good for subsequent searches):
 - TwitInfo: Aggregating and Visualizing Microblogs for Event Exploration²

¹ Pirolli, P., Pitkow, J., & Rao, R. (1996). Silk from a cow's ear: Extracting usuable structures from the Web. Proc CHI '96, 118-125, New York: ACM.
² Marcus, A., Berstein, M. S., Badar, O., Karger, D. R., Madden, S., & Miller, R. C. (2011). Twitinfo: Aggregating and visualizing microblogs for event exploration. Proc CHI 2011, 227-236, New York: ACM.

Authors and Affiliations

- + ... follow the title
- Format as per the template file (check venue's template)



From the SIGCHI template file...





Abstract

- Written last
- Typically a word limit (e.g., 150 words)
- + A single paragraph, no citations
- + The abstract's mission is to tell the reader...
 - What you did
 - What you found
- Give the most salient finding(s)
- + Common fault:
 - Treating the abstract as an introduction to the subject matter (don't!)

Abstract Example

This study addresses to what extent spatial mnemonics can be used to assist users to memorize or infer a set of text input chords. Users mentally visualize the appearance of each character as a 3x3 pixel grid. This grid is input as a sequence of three chords using one, two, or three fingers to construct each chord. Experiments show that users are able to use the strategy after a few minutes of instruction, and that some subjects enter text without help after three hours of practice. Further, the experiments show that text can be input at a mean rate of 5.9 words per minute (9.9 words per minute for the fastest subject) after 3 hours of practice. On the downside, the approach suffers from a relatively high error rate of about 10% as subjects often resort to trial and error when recalling character patterns.

(144 words)

Sandnes, F. E. (2006). Can spatial mnemonics accelerate the learning of text input chords? Proceedings of the Working Conference on Advanced Visual Interfaces - AVI 2006, 245-249, New York: ACM.

Abstract Example

What was done

This study addresses to what extent spatial mnemonics can be used to assist users to memorize or infer a set of text input chords. Users mentally visualize the appearance of each character as a 3x3 pixel grid. This grid is input as a sequence of three chords using one, two, or three fingers to construct each chord. Experiments show that users are able to use the strategy after a few minutes of instruction, and that some subjects enter text without help after three hours of practice. Further, the experiments show that text can be input at a mean rate of 5.9 words per minute (9.9 words per minute for the fastest subject) after 3 hours of practice. On the downside, the approach suffers from a relatively high error rate of about 10% as subjects often resort to trial and error when recalling character patterns.

(144 words)

Sandnes, F. E. (2006). Can spatial mnemonics accelerate the learning of text input chords? Proceedings of the Working Conference on Advanced Visual Interfaces - AVI 2006, 245-249, New York: ACM.

Abstract Example

What was done

This study addresses to what extent spatial mnemonics can be used to assist users to memorize or infer a set of text input chords. Users mentally visualize the appearance of each character as a 3x3 pixel grid. This grid is input as a sequence of three chords using one, two, or three fingers to construct each chord. Experiments show that users are able to use the strategy after a few minutes of instruction, and that some subjects enter text without help after three hours of practice. Further, the experiments show that text can be input at a mean rate of 5.9 words per minute (9.9 words per minute for the fastest subject) after 3 hours of practice. On the downside, the approach suffers from a relatively high error rate of about 10% as subjects often resort to trial and error when recalling character patterns.

What was found

(144 words)

Sandnes, F. E. (2006). Can spatial mnemonics accelerate the learning of text input chords? Proceedings of the Working Conference on Advanced Visual Interfaces - AVI 2006, 245-249, New York: ACM.





Keywords

- + Used for database indexing and searching
- Chosen by the author(s)
- Keywords example:

Keywords

Eyes-free, text entry, touchscreen, finger input, gestural input, *Graffiti*, auditory display, error correction, mobile computing.

Computing Classification System

- Since 1998, ACM conference and journal papers are required to also include categories, subject descriptors, and general terms (the latter are optional for conference papers)
- + Provided by the ACM (not the author)

Categories and Subject Descriptors H.5.2 [Information Interfaces and Presentation]: User Interfaces – *input devices and strategies (e.g., mouse, touchscreen)*

General Terms Performance, Design, Experimentation, Human Factors

(http://www.acm.org/about/class/how-to-use)





Introduction

- Opening section of the research paper
- + Headings vary (e.g., Introduction, Background, ...)
- + Gives the context for the research
- Opening comments characterise the state of the art
- A UI problem or challenge is noted and the reader is alerted to the impending solution (which is developed and evaluated in the rest of the paper)

Overview of Paper

 Usually an overview of the entire paper is given early on, at a convenient place

In the following section, we briefly describe our original prototype. This is followed with a review of related work on automatic error correction. A redesign of the original prototype is then described followed by details of a user study to test the prototype.

Expected Content

- Contribution of the work
 - What is novel and interesting about the research?
- Literature review
 - Discuss related work (how it is similar and how it differs) - include citation at end
- + Technical details of the proposed solution
- + Aids
 - Use formulae, photos, drawings, screen snaps, sketches, or any appropriate visual aide to help the reader





Method

- The Method section tells the reader how the experiment was designed and carried out
- Headings vary (Method, Methodology, Experiment, User Study, Evaluation, ...)
- In style, the method section must be straightforward: simple, clear, predictable (like a recipe)
- + Research must be replicable (as already noted)
 - The Method section must provide sufficient information that a skilled researcher could replicate the experiment if he/she chose

Predictability

- The organization of method section must be predictable
- Allows a reader to scour papers quickly to find key points in the design of the experiment
- Convention dictates that the method section contains the following sub-sections (and in the following order):
 - Participants
 - Apparatus
 - + Procedure
 - Design

Participants

- The Participants sub-section tells the reader the number of participants and how they were selected
- Were they volunteers or were they paid?
- Demographic information is also given (e.g., age, gender, related experience, ...)
- Other details, as appropriate (e.g., income, highest level of education, visual acuity, ...)
- + This section is usually short, however...
- If a property of the user is an independent variable (e.g., expertise in judging web sites for accessibility), more detail is needed

Apparatus

- The Apparatus sub-section describe the system (hardware and software)
- + Headings vary (e.g., Materials, Interface, ...)
- Reproducibility extremely important
 - + Give all the details necessary
- Use screen snaps or photos of the interface
- If technical details were disclosed in the Introduction, just refer the reader back to an earlier section (e.g., "the software included the algorithm described in the preceding section")

Procedure

- The Procedure sub-section tells the reader exactly what happened with each participant
- + Things to note:
 - + Instructions
 - Task description
 - Demonstration or practice
 - Questionnaire administering
 - + Trial repetitions, rest breaks, total time
 - + etc.

Experiment Task

- Procedure section describes the task:
 - What was the task?
 - What was the goal of the task?
 - + When did timing begin and end?
 - Were errors recorded?
 - Were participants instructed to, or allowed to, correct errors?
 - + How were errors corrected?
 - Did participants correct errors at their discretion?
 - Were rest breaks allowed, encourage, or enforced?
 - + Etc. (give all the details!)

Design

- The Design sub-section summarizes the experiment in terms of the variables, assignment of conditions, etc.
- For short papers, these details are sometimes given in the Procedure section
- + Common beginning...
 - + "The experiment was a 3 × 2 within-subjects design..."
- + Conclude with a big-picture summary:

Aside from training, the amount of entry was 12 participants \times 3 feedback modes \times 3 blocks \times 4 phrases/block = 432 phrases.





- Results and discussion are usually combined
- Same level heading as Method (results are not part of the method)
- If there were outliers or any data filtering or transformations, state this up front
- Statistical approach and tests sometimes conveyed in an opening paragraph
- No strict rules, but a common approach is to organize this section by dependent variables, beginning with the most important (e.g., speed, task completion time)

- For each dependent variable, begin with a broad observation, then progress to finer details
- Give the effect size in absolute and/or relative terms:

The mean task completion time for method A was 2.7 seconds. Method B was 9.1% slower with a mean task completion time of 3.0 seconds.

- + Discuss and explain the results:
 - What caused the differences in the measurements across experimental condition?
 - What detail in the interaction cause one method to be faster/slower than the other?
 - Did one condition require more input actions?
 - Were participants confused?
 - Was the method hard to learn?
 - + Did participants experience fatigue or discomfort?
 - + etc.

- Differences are likely
- Were the difference real or just an artifact of the variability in measurements?
- Usually, this question is answered by an analysis of variance (ANOVA)
- Give the ANOVA results parenthetically, in supporting statements such as...

As expected, entry speed increased significantly across blocks ($F_{2,18} = 6.2, p < .05$). There was also a significant difference by entry mode ($F_{2,18} = 32.3, p < .0001$).

- + Do not give too many results
 - It is your job to distinguish what is important and relevant from what is unimportant
- + Compare
 - Draw comparisons with related work (cited, of course)
- Visuals
 - + Use as appropriate, to illustrate and create interest
 - + Line charts, bar charts, etc.
- Participant feedback
 - + Interviews, questionnaires, etc.
 - Analyse, discuss





Conclusion, References

- + Conclusion
 - Summarize what you did
 - Restate contribution and/or significant findings
 - Identify topics for further work (but avoid developing new ideas in the Conclusion section)
- Acknowledgment
 - Optional (thank people who helped, funding agencies)
- References
 - + Full bibliographic information for papers cited
 - Format as required (details matter!)

Writing for CHI

What is CHI

- <u>Association for Computing Machinery</u>'s special interest groups (ACM SIGCHI)
- Stands for Computer-Human Interaction
- + World's leading organization in HCI field
- ACM SIGCHI hosts annual international HCI conference, CHI
 - formed in 1982
 - interdisciplinary academic conference

"Originally a small conference for psychologists interested in user interface design, the annual CHI conference has grown to include a very diverse participant group (such as interaction designers, computer scientists, engineering psychologists, developers, performing artists and more)."

from chi2012.acm.org

CHI Facts

- More than 2500 professionals from over 40 countries.
 - + Korea #4-5 in attendees number
- More than 1600 papers (Papers & Notes) are submitted every year.
- Acceptance rates are overall 23%





hci+d lab.

46

Upcoming Deadlines

- + 13, 20 September 2019
 - Submissions for Papers
- + 16 October 2019
 - Submissions for Doctoral Consortium, Case Studies, Installations, Courses, Workshops/Symposia
- + 6 January 2020
 - Submissions for Late-Breaking Work, alt.chi, Panels & Fireside Chats, Demonstrations, Special Interest Groups (SIGs), Video Showcase, Student Research Competition, Student Design Competition

Papers

- + Main CHI publications.
- + Full: 10 pages in length (max)
 - must break new ground and provide complete and substantial support for its results and conclusions.
- Short: 6 pages in length (max)
 - focused and succinct contribution to the research program and is likely to have a smaller — yet still significant — scope of contribution than CHI papers.
 - observation, design, implementation, evaluation, etc. are not required
- Full and Short papers are handled by same reviews considered as the same major publication.

http://chi2017.acm.org/papers.html

Selecting Sub Committee

- The CHI program committee consists of subcommittees that each focus on a subset of topics in human-computer interaction. The author decides which subcommittee reviews his or her paper.
 - Usability, Accessibility and User Experience
 - Specific Application Areas
 - Interaction Beyond the Individual
 - Design
 - Interaction using Specific Capabilities or Modalities
 - Understanding People: Theory, Concepts, Methods
 - Interaction Techniques and Devices
 - Expanding Interaction through Technology, Systems and Tools

- + alt.chi
 - alt.chi formed with the CHI program committee's recognition that sometimes innovative and insightful work goes unrecognized through the standard process of review. Particularly where methodologically far afield, or critical of accepted practices, promising contributions may be systematically overlooked.

http://chi2017.acm.org/alt.html

- Late Breaking Work
 - A concise report of recent findings or other types of innovative or thought-provoking work relevant to the CHI community.
 - Late Breaking Work submissions represents work that has not reach a level of completion that would warrant the full Refereed selection process.

http://chi2017.acm.org/lbw.html

Doctoral Consortium

- The Consortium has the following objectives:
 - Provide a supportive setting for feedback on students' current research and guidance on future research directions
 - Offer each student comments and fresh perspectives on their work from researchers and students outside their own institution
 - Promote the development of a supportive community of scholars and a spirit of collaborative research
 - Contribute to the conference goals through interaction with other researchers and conference events

http://chi2017.acm.org/dc.html

Review Process

Review Process

- External Review
 - 3 reviewers (5-scale score)
- Meta Review
 - An AC (Associate Chair) compiles reviews and add meta review
- + Notice
 - + Authors are getting their review score
- Rebuttal
 - Authors can defend their paper
 - Very important for those who get 2.5-3.5

Review Process

- Program Committee Meeting (Dec)
 - + All Subcommittees are gathering for final decision
 - + Papers with 3.0 or more are being discussed
 - + Flagged papers (e.g. papers with large deviation)
 - Papers and Notes are handled equally
 - Trying to meet 20% acceptance rate
 - Some papers are suggested to go alt.chi or interactivity
- Final Notice
 - with additional comments
- Revise paper for camera-ready

Review

Examples of reviews suitable for CHI Review 1 — paper medium-rated — review suitable

This review does a first-rate job of summarizing its main points and then assessing the paper's contribution in terms of relevant past work. It provides helpful feedback to the authors concerning the presentation of the work. It is preceded by a contribution summary that mentions reservations about the originality of the work.

Contribution

The paper presents a set of six guidelines on menu design, drawn from two experiments studying menu selection in the presence of other targets on a GUI desktop. These can inform choices between certain menu types in UI design. However, some of the guidelines appear to have been published already.

Review

This paper does an excellent job of citing and summarizing past work in the area. The studies seem robust and their findings generalizable. The research does not seem to offer much, however, beyond what has already been published.

The three most related papers are probably the two by Offord, et al, and the one by Masters and Selisky. With these as context, the six design guidelines seem accurate, but fairly incremental. Guidelines 1, 2 and 6 appear to be restatements of prior research (particularly Offord, Masters). Guidelines 3 and 4 appear to be a summary of the paper's experimental findings. Guideline 5 is very interesting and novel. But the studies seem to be summarizable as "we found the same results for a 5-element pull-down menu and for more freeform menus as Offord did for pie menus." While the result is rigorous, it is only a small incremental step.

I found the paper hard to follow in places, because it consistently reported details but did not offer me any opportunities to use these details in seeing a larger picture. While the studies were rigorous, the visual presentation of the results was not. Specifically, in Figure 4, are the results on a scale of 0 to 20, and is it displaying the mean? In Figure 6, are these results the mean per subject, out of 200 trials, with a theoretically unbounded maximum number of errors? Please explain, and also add confidence bars.

Of great importance: On page three (and also later), what units are "N"? My assumption is that the numbers are a fraction of the maximum force the phantom is capable of generating, but this is unclear.

Review Criteria

- Contribution to the field of HCI and impact or benefit to the field
 - What will be the contribution?
 <u>http://www.sigchi.org/chi2001/call/categories/</u>
 <u>papers.html</u>
- + Evaluation or demonstration of the results
- + Originality of the work
- Written Presentation

Thought on Review

READ THESE FIRST!

- Review Guide
 - + <u>http://chi2012.acm.org/cfp-reviewers-guide.shtml</u>
- Thoughts on Review
 - <u>http://beki70.wordpress.com/2010/06/30/some-</u> <u>thoughts-on-writing-for-chi/</u>
 - + <u>http://oulasvirta.posterous.com/86113982</u>

Additional Notes

Sister Conferences

- UIST (ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology)
 - + Around Oct. Paper deadline is April.
- CSCW (ACM Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work)
 - Around Feb. Paper deadline is June.
- DIS (The ACM conference on Designing Interactive Systems)
 - Biannual Conference. Around June. Paper deadline is Jan.

Student Volunteer

- + The SV lottery opens at around mid-September.
- After 4-5 weeks of being open we will close the lottery and 130 students will be chosen as SVs.
- All other students who registered will be assigned a position on the waiting list.
- + To sign up for the lottery, visit <u>chisv.org</u>.

Questions...?