Making instructions for others:
exploring mental models through a simple exercise

Robert Phillips
Brunel University | robert.phillips@network.rca.ac.uk
Dan Lockton
Royal College of Art | dan.lockton@rca.ac.uk
Sharon Baurley
Brunel University | sharon.baurley@brunel.ac.uk
Sarah Silve
Brunel University | sarah.silve@brunel.ac.uk

Investigating how people understand the systems around them – from technology to democracy to our own bodies – is a common research goal across many disciplines. The practical aims include: uncovering differences between how people 'think' systems work and how they actually work (particularly where differences can cause problems); and then addressing them, either through trying to *change* people's understanding, or through changing the way people interact with systems so that this better *matches* people's understanding [1].

Being able to say that you *understand* a system is essentially saying that you have a *model* of the system [2]. In HCI and other people-centred design fields, attempting to characterise the people's mental models of technology in which their behaviour plays a role can be a significant part of user research. Users' mental models will perhaps only rarely accord *exactly* with designers' conceptual models of a system [3], but this is not necessarily a problem in itself: "all models are wrong, but some are useful" [4]. Mental models should not be assumed to be static constructs covering the whole of a system – models working at multiple levels of abstraction can be relevant in different circumstances, from complex work domains to simple everyday interactions [5].

Having understanding – having a model – generally implies an ability to communicate that model [2], so many research methods involve participants explaining their understanding of a system to the researcher, for example through think-aloud protocols, structured interviews and exercises (e.g. with 'black box' products). Other research methods are based on participants 'revealing' their understanding through actions — e.g. card-sorting, cultural probes, shadowing, or re-enactment. Each has its advantages and limitations: there will inevitably be interpretation and post-rationalisation by both researcher and participant.

Communicating models to others can also be a way of exploring one's own understanding. Techniques such as *rubber-duck debugging* and the *cardboard analyst* [6] involve explaining something to inanimate 'others', in the process forcing the explainer to clarify and structure the explanation. The idea can be taken further: Reddit's 'Explain Like I'm Five' and 'Explain Like I am A…' communities invoke the challenge of explaining concepts (scientific, cultural, political) as if the 'other' is a particular category of person (e.g. a 5-year old) with assumed knowledge, cultural references and models of the world. There are obvious parallels with 'learning by teaching' methods where pupils teach their peers, in the process potentially debugging their own understanding, and Novak and Gowin's work with concept mapping [7] in education.

Instructions are a common example of communicating models of technological systems, and can act as a boundary object between designers' conceptual models and models developed by users. In particular, 'lay' instructions – created by one user for another – could be used as a research method for investigating users' mental models. There are also opportunities within HCI for novel instruction formats [8] to help establish new mental models for users unfamiliar with systems, such as Clara Gaggero and Adrian Westaway's *Out of the Box* for Samsung, or the use of video or narrated slideshows (e.g. Emma Rose Metcalfe's *HowDo* app).

An application: public engagement & the Maker movement

Understanding the models people have of how systems work can be important in *public engagement* with science, health, democracy and environmental issues. One engagement domain less explored so far from an HCI perspective is the growing 'open design' and 'Maker' movement. It presents both challenges and examples of empowerment around people creating artefacts responding to their own contexts of use – often centred on helping people understand not only how technologies 'work', but also how people can take part themselves. The movement is driven by openness – in a recent study, more than "90 percent of respondents… wanted to share their respective projects for review, feedback and learning new skills" [9]. Sharing happens via maker-generated tutorials, kits, events, and online communities, and often through instructions, schematics and examples which can be adapted and remixed.

'The Maker's Bill Of Rights' [10] – defining an open approach to making – specifically exhorts that "schematics shall be included", illustrating the need for instructions which can help makers develop accurate understanding. Nevertheless, 'poor' instructions – from the perspective of novice makers or those learning a new field – can lead to 'giving up', being put off starting, or completing projects without understanding how the system works. In general, if instructions are confusing, or are poorly designed, they can present *stumbling blocks* – or even something like Robert Pirsig's *gumption traps* –points where setbacks not covered by the instructions, or clashes between users' mental models and how the system really works, lead to friction or failure. It is not uncommon to hear that particular instructions were "difficult to follow", or that "I gave up at this point" and sometimes this, linked to poor interface design, can lead to actions both inefficient and undesirable for users [e.g. 11].

Making tea and making fire

We decided to investigate – informally – links between instructions and mental models in the Maker movement context, via a stall at the 2012 Brighton Mini Maker Faire, UK. The event attracts a mixed audience from professionals selling hardware, to complete beginners of all ages, with an average footfall of 7,000 visitors. Our stall comprised a popup wall of a variety of 'inspirational' instructions, and a table of artefacts (Figure 1) relating to two practical activities we asked visitors to consider: **tea-making** and **fire-making**. Making tea is familiar to the British public, representing a shared reference point. Making fire is a skill previously used daily by humans, not just for survival, but as a "communicative event" for people to gather round with a common cause – similar to tea-making, in fact. The artefacts were both for inspiration and to enable re-enactment of the activities; an Arduino-based LED 'fire' was also created to attract people.

We asked visitors to complete postcards with short questions about their experiences with instructions, then to choose one activity, and create instructions for how to carry it out, *for someone else* (Figure 2). The choice of format – graphical, textual, flowchart, etc – was open.

In this article, our intention is to explore ways the exercise could be useful to designers, rather than presenting a full experimental write-up. So we'll consider the results informally, in terms of insights for developing the method. Over the day, 98 visitors took part, ranging in ages from 5 to 60+ and including a director of a major international design firm. Figures 3-8 show a selection of instructions visitors created.

Figure 1. Our stall at the 2012 Brighton Mini Maker Faire, including artefacts.

Figure 2. Visitors creating their own instructions for others.

Figure 3.

Figure 4.


Figure 5.

Figure 6.

Figure 7.

Figure 8.

Figures 3-8. A selection of instructions created by visitors, for 'making fire' (Figures 3-5, top row), and 'making tea' (Figures 6-8, bottom row). The diversity in styles and complexity is apparent.

The diversity in styles reflects distinctions such as that between *structural diagrams* (overall assembly) and *process diagrams*. One participant made and posted to YouTube a video on tea-making. Differences in complexity and detail are noticeable, not just in cases such as Figure 5 (created by a 6-year old), but also inclusion of alternative choices, e.g. whether milk or sugar were wanted in the tea. While time was not explicitly limited, the *ad hoc* nature of participation meant few visitors gave attention to 'optimising' their instructions.

One emergent theme was how participants made use of – or assumed – prior knowledge on the part of the unknown 'others' for whom they were creating the instructions. Some asked explicitly about gauging the target audience for the instructions, as it changed what information was required. Many used no annotation or written instructions, relying on drawings; some even created their own pictograms. One of the most detailed responses described the soil types of where not to make a fire (Figure 4). Where language was used, it was generally accessible and understandable. There were differences between the two activities in how instruction-making was undertaken: some participants developed instructions for fire-making having stated that they had never made a fire, and sought direction from us, while the common understanding of the tea-making task potentially meant participants overlooked problems that non-regular users, or those with special needs, may have to overcome.

Relevance to modelling: a method for design research

In itself, the range of instruction formats has some implications for instructional design in the Maker context, but for this article we are concerned with extracting insights around modelling from the instructions people created. We analysed a sample in more detail, assessing each according to criteria intended to allow comparison between people's models:

- the entities present (objects, resources such as air, water and electricity, people)
    - which entities are used with each other
    - the order in which entities are used
    - how entities are changed through the processes described
- optional elements such as "if…then…" loops
- caveats or suggestions to take special care
- how other people are included in the instructions, if at all
- 'grey' areas where the model or process was unclear

These criteria draw on concept mapping [7], but were chosen here based on features present across the sample. The aim was to enable a representation of each model to be derived from the instructions: process diagrams (simple flow charts) were considered the most appropriate given the step-by-step nature of instructions, although other formats would be possible. Extracting the entities present, the relationships between them, the order of actions, and any loops, enabled creating a consistent form of diagram even where instructions were in a different format, making it possible to see more clearly the similarities and differences between models (the aim is not to determine the 'exact' models people have, since, as noted earlier, these models may not be stable and participants did not necessarily include their 'entire' model in their instructions).

For example, Figures 9-12 show two sets of instructions for making fire, and the process diagrams extracted. The aims of each are the same, but the details of the models differ. Each emphasises particular aspects – in Figures 11 and 12, the importance of dry materials, airflow and a non-flammable surface – as potential setbacks if not attended to – while in Figures 9 and 10 a much simpler model is given. Some models, e.g. Figure 4, emphasised safety, while others concentrated on the step-by-step nature of building a fire and keeping it going through progressively adding more material. In some cases, explicit recognition of physical or chemical requirements such as oxygen (Figure 3) is given.

Similarly, with the making tea instructions, some emphasised general principles such as applying heat to water (whether by an electric kettle, on a hob, or otherwise – Figure 7 mentions "appropriate energy"), while others were based on particular types of kettle, or included more options about the tea itself (types of tea, or choice of milk and sugar) rather than physical aspects of making the drink. Some mentioned measuring the quantity of

water that should be heated, while others suggested filling the kettle regardless of how many cups were required.


Figure 9.

Figure 10.

Figure 11.

Figure 12.

Figures 9-12. Two sets of instructions for 'making fire' (Figure 9 and 11) and the process diagrams extracted (Figures 10 and 12).

We are aware of the limitations of the Maker Faire context, and our choice of activities was not directly 'HCI'-focused. There are changes we will make in applying the method in further research (including work on interaction with domestic energy systems), such as introducing the exercise via a scenario. This would clarify the 'other' for whom the instructions are being created – for example, "Imagine your friend is house-sitting for a

week while you're away on holiday, and you're writing a note to explain how to use the heating / alarm", or even "Please explain to the *next participant* how to use the system you've just used".

Despite the limitations, the method has potential for development within design research: both to explore users' mental models, and to highlight particular issues, e.g. where models *differ*, emphasise some elements over others, or where points of friction arise. These could all be significant to adoption of systems, or influencing behaviour change, and to public engagement around issues where *understanding* is important. Indeed, these insights could ground further stages of user research, by surfacing issues enabling tailoring of interviews or observation (e.g. if someone's instructions suggest particular frustration with certain aspects of a system, these could be investigated in more detail).

Johnson & Henderson [3] suggest that in developing conceptual models for new technology, designers should "support how people *want to think about* doing their tasks", and user-generated instructions for existing tasks could provide a starting point here. Equally, with an exercise based around a system actually being redesigned, it would be possible to analyse instructions created by users, by clustering similar models to enable segmentation of design options. Possibilities here include something like *mental model personas* – but that's for another time.

Acknowledgements

Endnotes

1. Nielsen, J. Alertbox: Mental Models. October 18, 2010, Nielsen Norman Group. http://www.nngroup.com/articles/mental-models

2. Dubberly, H. Why modeling is crucial to designing and design research. EPIC: Ethnographic Praxis in Industry Conference, Boulder, CO, September 19, 2012.

3. Johnson, J. & Henderson, A. Conceptual Models: Core to Good Design. Morgan & Claypool, 2012.

4. Box, G.E.P. & Draper, N.R. Empirical Model Building and Response Surfaces. Wiley, 1987.

5. Lockton, D., Harrison, D., Cain, R., Stanton, N.A. & Jennings, P. Exploring problem-framing through behavioural heuristics. International Journal of Design, 7(1), 2013.

6. People Projects & Patterns wiki, http://www.c2.com/cgi/wiki?RubberDucking & http://www.c2.com/cgi/wiki?CardboardAnalyst

7. Novak, J.D. & Gowin, D.B. Learning How to Learn. Cambridge University Press, 1984

8. Gaggero, C. & Westaway, A. Out of the Box, 2011. http://vitaminsdesign.com/projects/out-of-the-box-for-samsung & How Do blog, http://blog.how.do

9. Kuznetsov, S. & Paulos, E. Rise of the expert amateur: DIY projects, communities, and cultures, 6th Nordic Conference on Human-Computer Interaction: Extending Boundaries, p.295, 2010.

10. Jalopy, Mister, Torrone, P. & Hill, S. The Maker's Bill of Rights, 2006. http://blog.makezine.com/2006/12/01/the-makers-bill-of-rights

11. Combe, N., Harrison, D., Dong, H., Craig, S. & Gill, Z. Assessing the number of users who are excluded by domestic heating controls. International Journal of Sustainable Engineering, 4 (1), 84–92, 2010.

12. Fair, A. & Barnitt, R. Making a cup of tea as part of a culturally sensitive service, British Journal of Occupational Therapy, 62(5), p.199-205, 1999; Mechling, J. The magic of the Boy Scout campfire, Journal of American Folklore, 93(367), p.35-56, 1980.