

PREPARATIONS AND ARRANGEMENTS

WORKSHOP WHEN & WHERE

Wednesday 31st March 2021 at 13:30 hrs on MS Teams

FACILITATOR – START

[do not read out grey text or **BLUE/black bold headings**]

WELCOME

Hello, please unmute and turn on your cameras. I will be guiding you through a structured brainstorming discussion. You will be using your own knowledge, experience and imaginations to identify undesirable consequences of a potential technology intervention. I am reading from a script and following a plan provided to me by [REDACTED] is in the meeting here but will not be participating and is muted. [REDACTED] will do the writing part - noting down the negative consequences as we brainstorm. We will also record this session to make sure nothing is missed. I will start recording now.

PURPOSE [Start recording session now!]

The aims of the workshop are two-fold:

1. Identify negative consequences for an example scenario of a proposed technology intervention
2. Obtain your feedback on the method itself.

It is a joint discussion. This isn't competitive, it's collaborative. No one gets any points but everyone wins!

INTRODUCTION TO SCENARIO

The scenario we are assessing is described in a separate document. I will now paste links to the PDF and TXT versions of the scenario in the chat window.

Scenario PDF: [REDACTED]

Scenario TXT: [REDACTED]

Please take a few minutes to read the first two pages. Think about the main people in the scenario, what they are trying to achieve and who/what all the various elements are. Then read the third page. Perhaps everyone can mute while they do this. When done, please unmute.

REVIEW OF SCENARIO

Welcome back. You see the scenario is quite high-level and lacks detail about how exactly things work. That's intentional at this early design stage. The main design intent (Sarah's motive) is to receive remote help to solve her problem, but there are a number of steps each with their own design intents – did anyone have suggestions to add or change the content at the top of the third page of the scenario document. [don't spend long on this]

INTRODUCTION TO THE PROCESS

We want to focus on just this scenario's socio-technical system. The workshop's objectives are to:

- Assess what could go wrong
- Identify possible causes
- Identify negative consequences - harms **to people**.

We will be using a "guide word led" discussion. I will read out a *guide word*, and then we will think about that in relation to the scenario and speak out deviations that could occur. Everyone can chip into the discussion. A deviation is a change to the design intent, that leads to a negative consequence for people.

The method itself

This method and its standard *guide words* is utilised extensively in engineering practice, including software engineering, but typically to assess safety-critical systems. It hasn't been applied in HCI before. I will now share my screen which shows the second page of the scenario and the guide-word document.

[Share screen now!]

AN EXAMPLE

Let's use an example to get started. I will reveal the first guide word which is "**NO or NOT**". Each time we move onto the next guide word, I will read out the explanation above and below the guide word... so for this one "*No part of the original intent is achieved, and nothing else is achieved either*" and "*The intent is not done/completed. Think about what system deviations (which cause negative consequences to people) might lead to the intent not happening at all or failing completely, and nothing else being achieved either*". As an example, let's use the "sending the spectacles" sub-task.

- For "**No or NOT**" a deviation could be "*No spectacles - Physical Ad:Visor spectacles don't ever arrive in the post*"
- Possible causes could be "*Never sent by the advice agency; mis-addressed by advice agency; addressed and sent correctly but delivered to the wrong address; the delivery person stole it; someone else in the household took it; the dog ate it; etc*".
- Optionally we can think about consequences too. Those might be "*Sarah unable to receive support call; Sarah unable to get remote help/advice; the message remains misunderstood by Sarah; the message is not dealt with in time leading to some financial consequence or missed opportunity for Sarah; the advisor has a case remaining open that fails the agency's service standards leading to disciplinary action*". [don't linger on consequences]

A note about guide words

In some action, a *guide word* will not make sense; for others we will find multiple deviations. It is an open discussion, but we can take turns if needed. Don't worry if you're unsure if the deviation fits the *guide word*... the *guide words* are just prompts; the valuable outputs are the deviations and possible causes, regardless of how they were classified.

IDENTIFICATION OF DEVIATIONS

We will now start. I am going to time-limit how long we spend on each guide word – some longer than others.

NO or NOT (~10 minutes)

We will continue with “NO/NOT” ... so can anyone start us off? What deviations might occur that mean the intent is not achieved at all, **and** nothing else is achieved?

[NB: People may suggest consequences or causes first instead of deviations – ask them what intent is affected in the manner of the guide word, and after that suggest possible causes and consequences]

Focus on changes to the design intent (what is meant to happen), and afterwards think of causes and consequences.

[Keep prompting for multiple other deviations]

[Continue with each guide word – advance the page, read out the guide word then the upper and lower text – additional per guide-word timing and tips below]

[Other tips to say if things “dry up”:

“What inadvertent errors such as action slips or lapses, and mistakes in plans might occur?”

“What deliberate acts contrary to expectations, norms or rules might occur?”

“What technology faults might occur?”

“What might other people and groups in the wider system be doing that is unexpected or different?”

“What extra harms occur using the intervention compared to doing without it?”

“What harms does the intervention impose on people through its normal use?”

“What else is/could it be doing?”

“How could the intervention be used against people?”]

OTHER THAN (~5 minutes)

NB nothing of the intent, but something else entirely

REVERSE (3-4 minutes)

This is usually quicker with very few deviations identified - think of an intent; then its exact logical opposite e.g. The opposite of adding a file is deleting a file.

AS WELL AS (~10 minutes)

The intent plus (qualitatively) *[Often lots of these]*

MORE (3-5 minutes)

The intent plus (quantitatively) *[Maybe fewer of these]*

PART OF (~10 minutes)

Partial achievement of intent (qualitatively) *[Often quite a lot of these]*

LESS (3-5 minutes)

Partial (quantitatively) *[Maybe few of these]*

EARLY (~5 minutes)

This is early by time - we do ‘before’ in sequence next.

BEFORE (2-3 minutes)

Now out of order, changing the sequence. *[Very few]*

LATE (3-4 minutes)

Late for one actor/artefact is often EARLY for another so we may have done these already. Don’t worry which way round it is – the classification doesn’t matter. *[Very few]*

AFTER (2-3 minutes)

Similar to previous, may have done these in BEFORE. *[Very few]*

[All guide words have now been discussed; the process has ended]

That’s it we’re done. The method normally doesn’t have time limits but I think you can see we could keep going identifying deviations for a long time.

SUMMATION AND CLOSURE

Thank you for taking part. We have explored a scenario and come up with lots of suggestions about possible deviations, their causes and some consequences. There are some very interesting ones.

Feedback

The other aim of the workshop was to assess the method and welcome your feedback. There is an anonymous online form. I have put a link to it in the chat and also email it to you. Could you please complete that?

*Feedback form: [redacted]
[ask people to check they can access it]*

Next steps

The workshop recording and your comments will be reviewed, and the methodology assessed. The deviations identified will contribute to informing the design of a digital intervention for people eligible for social security benefits accessed via online systems. This and other scenarios are being used in upcoming interviews with welfare benefit claimants.

Consent and data

The data will be protected and will only be used anonymously as described in the information briefing. If you provided contact details on the consent form, we keep you informed about his research. Thank you for your time. I will stop recording now. **[Stop recording session now]**