Usability Testing WG – Meeting Notes

The April 25 meeting of the usability testing working group focused on finding areas of testing for which there is consensus in order to begin the larger RFP process for testing firms.

The goals were:

- Identify as many consensus areas to test as possible
- Make recommendations on how the test results will be used

While we did not determine how individual test results would be used, we discussed 2 basic possibilities:

- Using Test Results to propose modifications to the code
- Using Test Results to inform the accompanying documentation for developers

Our Findings

Issues With Consensus to Test		
	Issue Proposed for Testing	*Intended Outcome*
1.	Test the comparative effectiveness of a text-only approach vs. a text+icons（"hybrid"）approach.	
2.	Test the comparative effectiveness of different methods of displaying the parenthetical text listed in draft code Sections II(A) and II(B). *E.g.*　next to the bold text vs. layered presentation vs. pop-up.	
3.	Test whether users understand that sharing disclosed pursuant to Section II(B) may involve data that is not part of the	

	collection disclosed pursuant to Section II(A).	
4.	Testing that reflects the actual online conditions individuals confront when dealing with mobile application decision-making. This includes testing *via* the leading models for app discoverability and monetization.	
5.	*(Testing Design Requirement – primarily for Test 1)* Test the independent effectiveness of different options to ensure that options are "effective" independently of whether one might be better than the other.	

Issues on Which There are Mixed Views Regarding Testing

	Issue Proposed for Testing	*Intended Outcome*
6.	**Two Related Tests –** There was near consensus on A, but biz community members want B to be included and privacy groups were not initially supportive. a. Test the comparative effectiveness of different methods of displaying the data elements listed in draft code Sections II(A) and II(B) but NOT collected by an app. *E.g.* grayed out element vs. unchecked box vs. display of the word "NO" vs. two separate lists. b. Test the comparative effectiveness of the nutrition-label approach (i.e. displaying all data elements listed in draft code Sections II(A) and II(B), whether collected	

	by an app or not) vs. displaying only the elements collected by an app.	
7.	Test the comparative effectiveness of an icons-only approach in addition to text-only approach vs. text+icons（"hybrid"）approach.	
8.	Test the comparative effectiveness of the words (including both bolded terms and parenthetical descriptions) listed in draft code Sections II(A) and II(B) vs. other words. Related issue: test the comparative effectiveness of the current category-based approach to the parenthetical text (*e.g.* "a list of websites visited, or the calls or texts made or received"）vs. more specific disclosures (*e.g.* "texts made or received."）	
9.	Test the comparative effectiveness of existing disclosure formats (*e.g.* ESRB, TRUSTe, ACT, ADA *et al.*)	