

From GenderMag to InclusiveMag: An Inclusive Design Meta-Method

Christopher Mendez¹, Lara Letaw¹, Margaret Burnett¹, Simone Stumpf², Anita Sarma¹, Claudia Hilderbrand¹

¹*School of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, Oregon State University, Corvallis, Oregon, USA*

²*School of Mathematics, Computer Science and Engineering, City, University of London, London, UK*

¹{mendezc,letawl,burnett,anita.sarma,minic}@oregonstate.edu, ²Simone.Stumpf.1@city.ac.uk

Abstract— How can software practitioners assess whether their software supports diverse users? Although there are empirical processes that can be used to find “inclusivity bugs” piecemeal, what is often needed is a systematic inspection method to assess software’s support for diverse populations. To help fill this gap, this paper introduces InclusiveMag, a generalization of GenderMag that can be used to generate systematic inclusiveness methods for a particular dimension of diversity. We then present a multi-case study covering eight diversity dimensions, of eight teams’ experiences applying InclusiveMag to eight under-served populations and their “mainstream” counterparts.

Keywords— *Diversity, InclusiveMag*

I. INTRODUCTION

Designing software so that it works for diverse populations matters—to software companies’ profitability, to equity in the workplace and at home, and to anyone in a situation that changes the way they think, such as when under deadline pressure. Unfortunately, most software does not support diversity well [6, 14, 17, 38, 39, 45].

Inclusive design aims to address this problem by considering diverse users throughout the software design process [11]. There are many ways to bring diverse users into the conversation when designing software. For example, in co-design diverse users can be invited into design sessions to directly collaborate with software designers and one another in a small group setting [7, 29]. Another example is user testing, which can give diverse users an opportunity to provide input about an existing software design, leading to a more inclusive design [31].

However, working with diverse users directly is costly, both in terms of money and time, so methods that do not directly require users to be present are also needed. Toward that end, there has been a move to develop inclusive design guidelines and analytic methods but, except for a few well-researched user groups [42], this work is still in its infancy. Moreover, few of these methods are usable by *software practitioners* in their every-day practice, but instead rely on experts to apply these guidelines and analytic methods.

In this paper, we introduce InclusiveMag (Inclusiveness Magnifier), a (meta-)method to generate inclusiveness methods. We built InclusiveMag inductively, by generalizing upon the principles and processes used in creating GenderMag [10]. Our inductive process is similar to one defined by Sjøberg et al. [37] on how theories (and methods) can be inductively defined from concrete practice to more generalized forms.

The InclusiveMag method allows *inclusivity researchers* to set up a systematic inclusiveness inspection method, for *software practitioners* to then apply to their own software to systematically evaluate how it supports (or doesn’t) diverse populations. The contributions of this paper are:

- The InclusiveMag methodology, a systematic meta-method for *inclusivity researchers* to generate inclusive design methods for under-served software users;
- A methodology for *software practitioners* to use these generated methods to evaluate and re-design their software to increase its inclusivity;
- An early multi-case study of eight teams generating and using the InclusiveMag methodology.

II. BACKGROUND

Although InclusiveMag has not been described in the literature, we have been developing it for several years; in its first iteration, we used it to generate GenderMag.

GenderMag, short for “Gender Inclusiveness Magnifier” [10], integrates a specialized cognitive walkthrough (CW) with research-based personas that capture individual differences in how people problem solve and use software features—differences that statistically cluster by gender. GenderMag has been used to detect gender biases in several commercial and open source software products (e.g. [8, 9, 13, 18, 24, 35]).

The GenderMag method rests on five problem-solving facets, which it brings to life with three multi-personas—“Abi”, “Pat(ricia)/Pat(rick)”, and “Tim”. They are multi-personas in that their backgrounds, photos, job titles, etc., are customizable. The facets, however, are fixed. Abi’s facet values (Figure 1) are more frequently seen in women than other genders, and Tim’s facet values are more frequently seen in men than other genders. The Pats’ (identical) facet values emphasize that differences relevant to inclusiveness lie not in a person’s gender identity, but in the facet values themselves [19]. GenderMag’s personas and facets are integrated into a specialized CW [43].

III. THE INCLUSIVEMAG METHOD

InclusiveMag is a (meta-)method to enable inclusivity researchers to generate new inclusive design methods. The methods they generate are then intended for use by software practitioners to evaluate the software they are producing, with the goal of making the software more inclusive to an under-served population, while simultaneously making the software

more usable to a mainstream population. As Figure 2 shows, InclusiveMag has three steps—(1) Scope, (2) Derive, and (3) Apply. Inclusivity researchers perform Steps 1 and 2, and software practitioners perform Step 3.

A. Step 1: Inclusivity Researchers Set the Scope

In Step 1, inclusivity researchers scope the inclusiveness method. They select a software type, select a diversity dimension, and perform research on what might affect how populations along the diversity dimension use the software type. The components of this step are iterative and often intertwined: the software type and diversity dimension inform the facets, and vice versa. Step 1 results in a set of facet categories (termed “facets” in this paper), which are relevant to both the under-served and mainstream populations, and facet values, which differ between the under-served and mainstream populations. The facets form the core of the InclusiveMag-generated method.

Step 1’s research component is labor-intensive, but the resulting facets depend on its quality. The goal is to produce well-established facets in which individual differences (i.e., the facet values) tend to cluster into the under-served population differently than from the mainstream population, and that are relevant to the chosen type of software. It may include a systematic literature review [21], interviews with experts in the software types and members of the under-served population, lab or field studies, etc. For example, the GenderMag research component included reading theories and empirical work in other disciplines to understand gender differences in cognitive styles and attitudes affecting cognition [4], such as in information processing theory [2, 26, 27, 30, 33] and self-efficacy theory [3, 8, 20, 32, 36]. It also included empirical studies (e.g., [3, 5]).




Fig 1. Abi’s background, age, job, ethnicity, pictures, etc. (excerpted at top) are customizable, but her thinking is defined by the facets (red roundtangles).

The output of this step is a “small enough” number of facets to keep the method feasible for use by software practitioners. GenderMag, for example, has five facets [10’s Section 4.1], which were selected from the larger set of individual difference research results [3, 4, 5] using three criteria [10’s Section 3.2]. First, (1) the facet needed to have direct implications for software usage. (2) Second, the facet and/or facets’ ties with software usage needed to be backed by extensive prior research. (3) Third, the facets needed to be usable by ordinary software developers or user experience (UX) practitioners who had no prior background in gender research or in psychology [10].

B. Step 2: Inclusivity Researchers Derive the Method

In Step 2, inclusivity researchers use the facets produced in Step 1 to derive customizable personas and an analytic process specialized to their selected diversity dimension. Step 2 begins with projecting (flattening) the values of each facet (category) onto a linear scale for that facet. These scales provide the positioning for the facet values: one value at each “endpoint” of each facet, and one somewhere within, to make clear that the facet values are on a continuum, not binary (yes/no) values. For each facet, the inclusivity researchers assign to the under-served persona facet values that represent the endpoint of the under-served population, and to the mainstream persona the opposite end-point, selecting endpoints that are reasonably common among those populations, not extreme outliers.

The facet values of the middle persona depend on what the data “tell” the inclusivity researcher to do. Sometimes there are interesting points between the two endpoints. For example, GenderMag learning styles had three distinct styles observed: learning by process, learning by tinkering, and learning by mindful tinkering. There being a third unique or interesting point between the endpoints is not always the case, so sometimes the middle persona is assigned one of the endpoints.

For example, consider GenderMag’s risk facet as flattened onto a linear scale. Abi’s facet value (risk averse) is at one endpoint, Tim’s facet value (risk tolerant) is at the other endpoint and Pat (moderately risk averse) is in the middle. As Figure 3 shows, all of these facet values are fairly common among the population of users shown. Table I shows the assignments of all five GenderMag facets’ values.




Fig. 2. The InclusiveMag process has three steps, each of which has multiple components. Inclusivity researchers perform Steps 1 and 2, and software practitioners perform Step 3.

The inclusivity researcher then embeds the facets in the different personas, but leaves most of the background section customizable (e.g., Fig. 1) to allow software practitioners to customize the persona in Step 3 to fit their target demographics. For example, in GenderMag, personas' ages, education, job title, familiarity with particular technologies, ethnicity, etc., are customizable, but not the facet values.

For specializing the analytic process, GenderMag specialized a CW, and their procedure generalizes, so we describe it here. (We briefly consider other analytic processes in later sections.)

To specialize a CW, an inclusivity researcher can point explicitly to the selected persona and to relevant facets for each question. For example, as Figure 4 shows, GenderMag researchers specialized in three ways to help software practitioners maintain engagement with the persona [19, 25]. First, the form refers to the persona by name in the questions (Figure 4 (A)). Second, it provides example text to encourage practitioners to express goals/scenarios from the persona's perspective (Figure 4 (B)). Third, it scaffolds "Why/which" responses with a list of the personas' facets (Figure 4 (C)).




Fig 3. A population of users' self-reported attitude toward risk in technology. Tim represents users on the risk tolerant side of the data, Abi represents users on the risk-averse side, and Pat represents those in the middle. These data had two genders: Orange: men; Dark green: women.

TABLE I. A SUMMARY OF THE FACET VALUES FOR EACH PERSONA.

Facet (category)	Abi facet value (Fig. 1)	Pat facet value	Tim facet value
Motivations for using technology	Wants what the technology can accomplish.	Wants what the technology can accomplish.	Technology is a source of fun.
Computer Self-Efficacy (confidence) in using unfamiliar technology	Low compared to peer group.	Medium.	High compared to peer group.
Attitude towards Risk when using technology	Risk-averse.	Risk-averse.	Risk-tolerant.
Information Processing Styles for gathering information to solve problems	Comprehensive.	Comprehensive.	Selective.
Learning Styles for learning new technology	Process-oriented learner.	Learns by tinkering; tinkers reflectively.	Learns by tinkering (sometimes to excess).

An InclusiveMag CW *itself* needs to be inclusive—collecting a *union* of evaluations, not arguing toward a consensus. To help make this explicit in GenderMag, the forms include a “maybe” option (Figure 4, just below Box “A”) to encourage everyone to voice their views along with their explanations of why. Although a potential concern could have been that including all views would encourage false positives (including issues that do not actually arise) GenderMag's empirical false positive rate has been very low, ranging from 0%-4% [10, 41].

C. Step 3: Software Practitioners Apply the Method

The outcome of Step 2 is a generated method built upon the facets selected in Step 1. In Step 3, a team of one or more software practitioners applies it to their software.

Software practitioners begin Step 3 by customizing the persona(s) they want to use to the appropriate background/demographics/skills for the software they will evaluate (recall Fig. 1). The skills, experience, and education/training dictate what a persona would reasonably be expected to already know and expect to accomplish in the new software features if they haven't used them before. For example, if software practitioners in Portugal wanted to evaluate a new word processing application using GenderMag, they might make Abi a 35-year old Portuguese novelist who lives in Lisbon and has a degree in creative writing, with experience using other word processing applications.

The software team chooses one of the personas they just customized. (One persona is used at a time.) They then choose a scenario to analyze for their software, from the perspective of that persona. For example, a software team using GenderMag might choose Abi for their first session [9]. In the word processing example, a scenario might be “Abi wants to edit Chapter 2's story line to include foreshadowing of an upcoming kidnapping plot. She has already typed in Chapter 2, but hasn't used many of the application's editing features before.” Using the persona and the scenario, the team then performs the analysis, producing a list of specific issues that some users like the persona could encounter.

The session's output is a list of issues to fix. Some of these issues found will be general usability issues (e.g., the font is too small), whereas others will be inclusiveness issues (e.g., risk-averse users would struggle with this step). For the inclusiveness issues,

Scenario name: (B) (e.g., [Boss just called Abi and told her to remove Kelly's access to the system])

• Subgoal #: _____

• Subgoal name: _____ (eg, make Kelly not be able to log on)

(A) • Q: Will <persona> have formed this sub-goal as a step to their overall goal? YES NO MAYBE (Circle all that apply)

• Q(a): Why? (Please explain.) Q(b): Which, if any, of <persona> facets did you use to answer question Q(a)?

C Motivations
Information Processing Style
Computer Self-Efficacy
Attitude Towards Risk
Learning: by Process vs. by Tinkering
None of the above

Fig 4. GenderMag's specialization of a CW form (see text).

inclusive fixes can be driven by the facets that revealed the issue (e.g., risk). For example, in one GenderMag study, generating fixes to a facet's full range of values (e.g., risk averse and risk tolerant users) resulted in the software improving for everyone, and a previous gender gap in using it entirely disappearing [41]. As this process of fixing the issues suggests, the success of the generated method depends heavily on facet quality, which in turn depends on the researchers' abilities to obtain or produce enough high-quality evidence from which to derive such facets. The following case study sheds some light on this.

IV. AN EARLY MULTI-CASE STUDY OF INCLUSIVEMAG

How generalizable is InclusiveMag? Can inclusivity researchers (other than the original inventors) use InclusiveMag to generate methods analogous to GenderMag, for other diversity dimensions? To find out, we conducted a multi-case study of eight teams using InclusiveMag, who derived eight different InclusiveMag-generated methods.

The setting was an Inclusive Design class¹ for Computer Science juniors, seniors, and graduate students, a population aiming to become the software practitioners at whom the InclusiveMag method aims. About half the students had Human Computer Interaction (HCI) experience, and some also had professional software development experience. Students formed eight teams of 3-4 people each. All teams included someone with research experience.

Each team worked for 10 weeks. Their goals were: (1) to use InclusiveMag to generate (scope and derive) their method for a software type and a diverse population of their choice along some diversity dimension, and (2) to apply that method in an effort to make software prototypes that were inclusive to their under-served as well as a mainstream population.

This empirical set-up involved an empirical trade-off. The disadvantage was that the teams had a relatively concrete focus: to generate a method that would help a single software product's inclusiveness. As Section III shows, the cost of building the method is high enough that many inclusivity researchers would be likely to want a reusable method that could be used on many software products, as with the GenderMag method. However, the empirical advantage to this approach was that it included coverage of how teams went about the third InclusiveMag step, *applying* the generated method to a software product. (It also provided an education advantage: a feedback loop that enabled teams to gain insights into how the method they generated would play out in practice when they had to apply it.)

The eight teams selected a variety of populations and software, such as making email more inclusive for older (and younger) adults; self-driving cars that would work for people with dementia and for people without it; and university websites that would work for people with low socioeconomic status and for people with higher socioeconomic statuses. Table II details the 8 teams' populations and application types.

¹ The class materials (shorturl.at/lUY23) entirely define the study environment and the methodological guidance available to the participants.

A. Step 1: The Teams Set the Scope

1) Scoping the Software Type and Population

All eight teams tended toward a narrow scope for their *software type* (see Table II). This contrasts with GenderMag, for which the software type scope is any “problem-solving software”. Had the teams extended their work past 10 weeks, they may have found the narrowness of their software type scope limiting. For example, Team ADHD might want to know how their under-represented persona would fare with Team Autism's math learning app—but since Team ADHD created their persona facets with finance management in mind, the team might have to do the entire InclusiveMag process again, rather than re-using the method they had just generated.

In contrast to narrow software type scopes, some teams scoped their *populations* broadly. For example, Team SES chose people with low socio-economic status for their under-served population. This population is very large and diverse, which could have made it difficult for Team SES to choose a set of facets that was both small enough and sufficiently representative of their under-served population. Even so, because they had chosen a narrow *software type* scope (one section of a university website), they

TABLE II. THE EIGHT TEAMS PRESENT IN THE MULTI-CASE STUDY, ALONG WITH SOME INFORMATION ON THEIR PROJECTS. TEAM NAMES USED IN THIS PAPER ARE UNDERLINED.

Populations considered	Diversity dimension	Software type	Facets from research
<u>ADHD</u> , \neq ADHD	Cognitive	Managing finances	Focus, Organization, Impulsivity, Memory, Financial responsibility
<u>Autism kids</u> , \neq Autism kids	Cognitive	Math learning	Comprehension ability, Ability to follow instruction, Concentration level
<u>Dementia</u> , \neq Dementia	Cognitive	Self-driving car	Motivations, Memory, Problem-solv. & learning ability, Self-sufficiency/independence, Attention
<u>Diabetic retinopathy</u> , Good vision	Vision	Chore robot	Physical/visual ability, Technology preferences, Emotional state & well-being, Financial stability & status, Social interactions
<u>Low literacy</u> , Med/High literacy	Education	Language learning	Confidence in using tech, Reading skills, Learning style, Motivations/frustrations with tech. Susceptibility/sensitivity to tech requiring reading
<u>Low socio-economic status (SES)</u> , Med/high SES	Socio-economic status	University's website	Home life, School experience, Psychological health, Career aspirations
<u>Older Adults</u> , \neq Older Adults	Age	Email	Tech. comfortable with, Attitude toward tech, Physical difficulties
<u>Pre-schoolers</u> , Adults	Age	Media player	Motivations, Approach to learning, Attitude to recovery, Interaction style, Approach to tech.

focused most of their research pertinent to students using that university's site, such as basic literacy and digital search skills.

Other teams chose a narrow population slice. For example, Team Retinopathy chose, as their under-served population, a visual impairment resulting from diabetic retinopathy (Figure 11). Diabetic retinopathy is a specific disease that affects, at least to some degree, millions of people (about one-third of the estimated 285 million people in the world with diabetes mellitus) [22]. However, the millions with the disease of diabetic retinopathy are but a small fraction of the approximately 1.3 billion people who have some form of vision impairment [44]. Even more people encounter forms of vision impairment situationally, such as when wearing sunglasses [28].

Despite narrowness's detriment to later reusability of the method they would generate, narrowness had some advantages. For example, during their research into their under-served population, Team Retinopathy identified facets specifically applicable to their population—but not necessarily to other vision impairments—such as emotional well-being (Figure 5). Indeed, in Step 3, this facet did impact the team's design of their prototype:

Team Retinopathy (excerpt from final report, on design decisions due to facet “emotional well-being”): All of these features will help make Suzie less stressed out as she interacts with the prototype.

2) Researching the Populations and Facets

To research their populations, especially the under-served members of it, teams gathered data through literature reviews and, in some cases, directly from individuals in their under-served population. For example, Figure 6 shows an excerpt from Team Older's literature-based research about older adults, and Figure 7 shows summary data gathered by Team SES from individuals in their under-served population.

...
Emotional State and Well-Being
 • Suzie has a busy life, with stressors coming from her career and, since she was diagnosed with Diabetic Retinopathy, the changing status of her vision.
 ...



Fig 5. An excerpt from Team Retinopathy's foundation document for Suzie, their under-served persona.

...
Technology she is comfortable with
 • Muriel uses a regular landline phone to call her families⁴, and she loves to chat with her grandchildren⁵.
 • She bought an iPad⁶ and tried to learn how to use it, but wasn't able to figure it out until her granddaughter helped her.
 ...
 ...
⁴In the 65 to 69 age band row, 39% of responders indicated the lack of smartphone ownership. Additionally, 23% of senior citizens do not use cell phones [Sources 3, 7].
⁵Multiple sources show that senior citizens primarily use the internet and technology to email or communicate with family [Sources 3, 9, 11].
 ...



Fig 6. An excerpt from Team Older's persona foundation document with data (highlighted) sourced from literature about their under-served population.

The teams followed a qualitative affinity diagramming process as in [1] to organize their data “factoids” (short facts) into facets (categories) whose values distinguished their mainstream vs. their under-served populations. (In contrast, the GenderMag creators had tended toward quantitative techniques to identify relevant data that clustered by gender, as per Figure 3.)

The facets captured what the teams saw as the most critical attributes of their under-served populations vs. their mainstreamers for their software type scope—thus defining the non-customizable portions of the personas. All eight teams documented the foundations they used to develop the facets via persona foundation documents, which they presented in styles modeled after the GenderMag foundation documents [gendermag.org] or the sample foundation documents in [1].

3) Which Facets?

When inclusivity researchers choose how many facets to give personas, they are deciding on behalf of software practitioners, who will need to keep these facets in mind. The GenderMag researchers settled on five facets [10], and the teams loosely patterned their notions on how many facets to choose after that example. Five teams chose five facets, one settled on three facets, and two used four facets.

Team Dementia finessed their five facets by adding 14 subfacets. For example, Figure 8 shows three subfacets within Team Dementia's “Self-sufficiency” facet. An advantage of this level of detail is a rich and informative representation, but a potential disadvantage is the difficulty of keeping 14 subfacets in mind when evaluating a software product. However, Team Dementia's final evaluation explicitly used 11 of their 14 subfacets, and seems to have implicitly used the remaining 3 subfacets.

One reason Team Dementia had so many subfacets may have been because intersectionality was hard for them to avoid.

“Matthew” (Anonymized)
 • Matthew is the son of a Carpenter and grade school teacher
 • Matthew rarely saw his Dad
 • Matthew did not have reliable transportation to high school
 • School is a 9 mile walk away to neighborhoods with violent gang activity
 • Matthew has only held seasonal jobs picking fruit, in hospital
 ...

Matthew's Typical Day
 • Wakes up at noon, alone in the house
 • Smokes cigarettes and marijuana, drinks beer, addicted to all and avoiding withdrawal symptoms
 • Walks to plasma donation center to give plasma for money
 • Idle, malnourished from plasma draw and lack of adequate groceries
 • Mother arrives home around 4, helps with household chores until 8 when father arrives home
 • Eats dinner with parents before they both go to bed




Fig. 7. Excerpts from Team SES qualitative experiences with low-SES people.

...
Self-sufficiency/Independence
 • Driving Ability: Lillian's driving privileges were taken away due to the progress of her Alzheimer's so she needs to rely on her family and friends to take her places such as the grocery store, appointments, etc. [sources]
 • Living Ability: Lillian has lived alone for about 3 years and since she is a very social person it makes her depressed. [sources]
 • Physical Ability: She can only walk short distances and feels unsafe using public transportation. [sources] ...



Fig. 8. An excerpt from Team Dementia's foundation document for their under-served persona, showing the multiple subfacets of “Self-sufficiency”

People suffering from dementia are also likely to be older, and both of these situations come with side effects. Team Dementia wanted their facets to be general enough to be reusable but still realistic. Since people with dementia are older, should they also have a motor impairment facet? Since many people with dementia suffer other mental issues as well, such as depression, should depression be a facet?

Teams addressed their intersectionality dilemmas in three ways. Some teams, like Team Dementia, incorporated depression into relation to an existing facet value (see the “Living Ability” subfacet in Figure 8). Some teams, when the side effect was not directly associated with the diversity dimension (e.g., an explicit motor impairment), excluded it for generality reasons. Some teams made facets to address physical or mental issues that affect their population, without labeling them with specific disorders. For example, Team Older used the facet “Physical Difficulties” and Team SES used “Emotional Volatility”. (We will return to intersectionality in Section V.)

All GenderMag facets are cognition-based, but some of the teams’ facets weren’t. For example, Team SES had “Home life” and “School experience” (Table II) and Teams Retinopathy and Older included pertinent physical/physiological attributes.

However, Team Older may have gone too far in the direction of concreteness with their “technology she is comfortable with” facet choice (Figure 6). Including specific technology preferences like the ones in the Figure 6 seems likely to give the generated method itself a short ‘expiration date’. Such concreteness is common in *personas* for use in a specific *product* line, the traditional use of personas [1]. However, for a *facet* used within a generated *method*, a higher level of abstraction may be called for. For example, “Attitude toward getting the latest technology” might be a more generalizable facet, with the specifics of that technology enumerated only during customization of the background section, which occurs just-in-time when a software team is ready to apply the method to a specific product (Step 3).

B. Step 2: The Teams Derive Their Method

Using the results from Step 1, each team then derived two personas from the facets—an under-served persona and a mainstreamer—and selected an analytical process to use with these personas and facets.

Deriving two personas from the facets included deciding upon facet *values* to assign to each persona. This challenged some of the teams, because not all facets reduced well to a linear scale. For example, for Team Autism, the “Nick” (Autistic) persona has difficulty when there are multiple attentional demands, whereas “Jane” (the mainstreamer) becomes bored when there is just one task to concentrate on, and this did not reduce well to “low” vs. “high” concentration abilities. Instead, each persona concentrates best under different circumstances. They settled on making the scale instead be *circumstances* under which each concentrate best (Figure 9).

To choose the (analytic) process they would specialize to “drive” their generated method, all eight teams began with a “Studio Analysis” process. With this process, teams set up at tables around the room and a group (here, the members of the other teams) stopped by for informal descriptions

(walkthroughs) through the prototype use-cases, with the persona nearby, and provided feedback on problems or opportunities they saw. This process took place twice in class meetings, with about a month between them.

In addition to using Studio Analyses, two teams also specialized another analytic process. Team Literacy specialized a CW during a class meeting (illustrated in Step 3), and Team SES made their facets into heuristics (Figure 10).

In addition, Team Retinopathy used a visual impairment simulator (Figure 11) to visually consider what their prototype would look like from the perspective of someone with diabetic retinopathy. Using an impairment simulator could be a way to specialize any of the analytic processes in Table III.

There are different advantages to highly structured processes like the CW or Heuristic Evaluation (HE), vs. the more informal Studio Analysis sessions (Table III). Structured processes’ systematicness produces a thoroughness hard to match in more in-




Fig. 9. An excerpt from Team Autism’s under-served (top) and mainstream (bottom) persona foundation documents.




Fig. 10. An excerpt from Team SES’s HE process.




Fig. 11. (Left): An early prototype from Team Retinopathy. (Right): An updated version (larger font) as it could appear to people with diabetic retinopathy, as per the University of Cambridge Impairment Simulator [40].

formal processes. But an advantage of the Studio Analysis sessions was that teams got feedback not just on the prototype, but on *all* parts of their method; for example:

Persona feedback for Team ADHD: I would avoid using “known” persona pictures to avoid people ... overlaying attributes you don’t intend for them to have.

Use Case feedback for Team Dementia: For use case 2, it seems like making Noah mentally fatigued and tired after work makes your mainstreamer too much like your underserved persona.

Prototype feedback for Team Pre-schoolers: children ... still easily get lost because of their relatively low comprehension skill. Therefore, if there is a progress bar to indicate their progress toward a specific task, it would be helpful to prevent them from becoming lost.

The above examples suggest that the teams were able to engage with the methods being generated enough to provide feedback on the other teams’ emerging methods (facets, personas), methods’ application (use cases), and prototypes.

C. Step 3: The Teams Apply Their Methods

What kinds of inclusivity issues did the teams find with these methods, and how did they fix them? Here we briefly consider three examples: one from a Studio Analysis-based method (Team Retinopathy), one from a HE-based method (Team SES), and one from a CW-based method (Team Literacy).

From the Studio Analysis process, Team Retinopathy realized how the aesthetics of their robot might actually interfere with the robot’s usability or adoption. Their fix, shown in Fig. 12 (left), was based on the following (emphasis added to facet values):

Team Retinopathy: Originally, we ... had a claw arm on wheels ... Multiple of our peers pointed out that that design might ... negatively impact Suzie’s perception of the product, given her **Emotional & Mental Well-Being** facet ... <We> changed the design of the robot to SpiderBot ... a cute, talking animal-like bot ... [Figure 12]

Team SES found changes to make based on all eight of their heuristics. For example, two of Team SES’s heuristics (Figure 10) came from linguistic facets, which led to them making wording changes (Figure 12, right):

Team SES: Wording: “Your first term may look like” is trying to be **friendly (M1)** and **Non-authoritative (L1)**.

Team Literacy’s “Literacy-Mag” CW-based walkthrough occurred during a class meeting, with half the class using GenderMag’s Abi persona and the other half using Team Literacy’s under-served persona, Dave. Team Literacy used the results of

TABLE III. ANALYTIC PROCESSES USED BY CASE STUDY TEAMS

Teams	Used the analytic process...	Which had the components...	And received feedback on...
(All)	Studio Analysis	Use cases + one or more personas + software prototype	Everything
Literacy	Cognitive Walkthrough	Scenario + one persona + software prototype + forms	Prototype
SES	Heuristic Evaluation	Scenario + heuristics + software prototype	Prototype

their walkthrough to make changes to their prototype like the one in Fig. 13:

Team Literacy: ... our underserved population ... <lacks> **confidence in their ability to interact with technological interfaces**, ... they often do not know if they ... <completed> a task. This screen [Fig. 13] offers a confidence boost ... and ... feedback that they have finished ...

This variety of populations, software types, analytic processes used, and fixes generated, provides encouraging evidence of the generality of InclusiveMag, if care is taken with the facets (Step 1), deriving the new methods from them (Step 2) and attending to them (Step 3).

V. OPEN QUESTIONS

A. Validating InclusiveMag

Although the case study data are encouraging, the question of whether InclusiveMag is useful for generating inclusiveness methods that really work is largely open. Indeed, InclusiveMag’s journey is just beginning, and more research is also needed on the design decisions that define it. Still, we can begin to consider how the InclusiveMag method might be validated, by following the lead of Sjøberg et al. [37].

Sjøberg et al.’s recommendations are about validating theories, not validating methods but their validation criteria still provide useful insights into method validation [37]. In Table IV, we consider how to apply these criteria to InclusiveMag, and the available evidence.



Fig. 12. (Left) An image from Team Retinopathy’s final design of spiderbot (Right) Part of Team SES’s prototype that underwent a wording change




Fig. 13. Screen at the end Team Literacy’s use case of customizing the settings. (Left): Before using “Literacy-Mag”. (Right): After.

B. InclusiveMag in Practice

One open question is how the facets produced in Step 1 inform Step 2's choice of the analytic process to specialize. GenderMag uses strictly cognitive facets, so fits well with including a specialized CW. However, some diversity dimensions like accessibility need physical facets [29], and Team SES had environmental facets (e.g., their “home life” facet). For methods using facets like these, the question in Step 2 of which analytic process to specialize arises. One possibility for some physical attributes may be analyzing with the help of a simulator, as Team Retinopathy did (Figure 11).

Since the facets are the core of InclusiveMag, it seems possible to embed the facets in any analytic process. However, Team SES's attempt to embed their facets in a set of heuristics raises questions as to whether all analytic processes really can support the selected facets well. Team SES's heuristics may have been too low level and overly specific—they focus mostly on language, ignoring other aspects that could also be non-inclusive like icon choices, workflow, etc.

Another question is *how* to actually build a persona into an analytic process other than a CW. Without the persona, the software practitioners lose “theory of mind” benefits (i.e., empathy, or taking another kind of person's perspective), the psychological basis that personas leverage [15].

TABLE IV. APPLYING SJØBERG ET AL.'S EVALUATION CRITERIA TO INCLUSIVEMAG [37]. HERE “ACCURACY” COMBINES PARTS OF SJØBERG ET AL.'S “TESTABILITY” AND “EXPLANATORY POWER” THAT APPLY TO A METHOD

	“The degree to which...” [37]	Applicability to validating InclusiveMag	Validation evidence to date
Accuracy, Empirical Support	... empirical refutation is possible. ... supported by empirical studies that confirm its validity. ... predicts all known observations within its scope	Test whether InclusiveMag-generated methods correctly evaluate software's inclusivity.	(1) The only InclusiveMag-generate method that has been tested for validity is GenderMag. Its “true positive” rate at evaluating software's inclusiveness has been reported at 75%-100% [10, 41]. (2) For generated versions using CWs: Errors of omission (false negatives) are common in cognitive walkthrough methods, with rates 30%-70%, depending on analysts' expertise [23].
Parsimony	...<has> a minimum of concepts ...	Investigate whether all steps/components of InclusiveMag are needed	
Generality	...breadth of the scope ... and independent of specific settings	Breadth of scope in (1) InclusiveMag usage, and in (2) InclusiveMag-generated methods' usage.	(1) The 8-team case study showed wide breadth of scope for InclusiveMag. (2) The resulting InclusiveMag-generated methods' scopes were explicitly defined (as narrow or broad) by teams generating them.
Utility	...supports the relevant areas of the software industry	Investigate whether software practitioners choose to use the generated methods	

Finally, could inclusivity researchers leverage personas they already have in InclusiveMag? For example, would they be able to start at Step 2 with their existing persona in hand? We believe that the existing persona might be blendable with the facets, but the facets would need to be thoroughly reconsidered, which may require a repeat in Step 1. Exactly *how* a researcher can decide whether to return to Step 1, and how exactly to go about it in these circumstances is an open question.

C. InclusiveMag and Intersectionality

Intersectionality considers specific insights and problems that arise at the *intersections* of two or more different diversity dimensions [34]. Intersectionality is a term originally coined to show how, through only considering race or gender, the experiences of black women were being ignored by anti-discrimination legislation [12]. From this origin, the idea has been adopted by other fields, including HCI [34].

This raises the question of whether it would be possible for InclusiveMag to generate an *intersectional* inclusive design method. One possibility, similar to what we saw teams do in Section IV, is to simply use the scoping process (i.e., Step 1) to define any population of interest (e.g., low-SES women). This possibility may be viable when the under-served population of interest is large, but runs the risk of comparing a smaller of-interest group with “everyone else”, which could be problematic (as well as some of the same problems of a narrow population scope seen in Section IV).

A more genuinely intersectional approach seems to require adding more diversity dimensions to InclusiveMag. It remains an open question whether it is possible to expand the number of dimensions, to how many, how to do so, and what the impacts on applying the generated method (Step 3) would be.

VI. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we have introduced InclusiveMag, a systematic (meta-)method for inclusivity researchers to generate new inclusive methods. These generated methods are then used by software practitioners to evaluate the software they are creating.

In a multi-case study, eight teams used InclusiveMag to generate inclusivity methods along eight diversity dimensions, and then applied their generated methods to their software prototypes. Although the case study is early, it contributes encouraging evidence as to InclusiveMag's generality.

We emphasize that the first two steps of InclusiveMag method are for industrial (or academic) researchers, not for practitioners. However, the case study shows that InclusiveMag may also be useful to professors teaching classes on HCI research methods.

As others begin to use InclusiveMag to generate new methods (Step 1 and 2), the methods they generate will cover more diversity dimensions. These additional methods and dimensions will then enable software practitioners (Step 3) to cover more diversity dimensions—*early* in the lifecycles of the software they create. We believe that enabling this kind of early evaluation of software inclusivity is key to chipping away at software's implicit biases, one inclusiveness issue at a time.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under Grants 1528061, 1815486, and 1901031.

REFERENCES

- [1] T. Adlin and J. Pruitt, *The Essential Persona Lifecycle: Your Guide to Building and Using Personas*. Morgan Kaufmann/Elsevier, Burlington, MA, USA, 2010.
- [2] M. Arcand, and J. Nantel, Uncovering the nature of information processing of men and women online: The comparison of two models using the think-aloud method, *Journal of Theoretical and Applied Electronic Commerce Research*, vol. 7, iss. 2, pp. 106-120, August 2012.
- [3] L. Beckwith, M. Burnett, S. Wiedenbeck, C. Cook, S. Sorte, and M. Hastings, Effectiveness of end-user debugging software features: Are there gender issues?, *ACM SIGCHI*, pp. 869-878, 2005.
- [4] L. Beckwith and M. Burnett, Gender: An Important Factor in End-User Programming Environments?, *IEEE VL/HCC*, pp. 107-114, 2004.
- [5] L. Beckwith, C. Kissinger, M. Burnett, S. Wiedenbeck, J. Lawrence, A. Blackwell, C. Cook, Tinkering and Gender in End-User Programmers' Debugging, *ACM CHI*, pp. 231-240, April 2006.
- [6] M. A. Borkin, C. S. Yeh, M. Boyd, P. Macko, K. Z. Gajos, M. Seltzer, and H. Pfister, Evaluation of filesystem provenance visualization tools, *IEEE Trans. on Visualization and Computer Graphics*, vol. 19, Issue: 12, pp. 2476-2485, December 2013.
- [7] A. Bourazeri and S. Stumpf. 2018, Co-designing Smart Home Technology with People with Dementia or Parkinson's Disease. *NordiCHI*, pp.609–621, 2018.
- [8] M. Burnett, S. Fleming, S. Iqbal, G. Venolia, V. Rajaram, U. Farooq, V. Grigoreanu, and M. Czerwinski, Gender differences and programming environments: Across programming populations, *ACM-IEEE ESEM*, pp. 28, 2010.
- [9] M. Burnett, A. Peters, C. Hill, and N. Elarief, Finding gender inclusiveness software issues with GenderMag: A field investigation, *ACM CHI*, pp. 2586-2598, 2016.
- [10] M. Burnett, S. Stumpf, J. Macbeth, S. Makri, L. Beckwith, I. Kwan, A. Peters, and W. Jernigan, GenderMag: A method for evaluating software's gender inclusiveness, *Interacting with Computers*, vol. 28, no. 6, pp. 760–787, Oct. 2016.
- [11] P. J. Clarkson, R. Coleman, S. Keates, & C. Lebon, *Inclusive design: Design for the whole population*. Springer Science & Business Media, pp. 1-23, 2013.
- [12] K. Crenshaw, Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics, *University of Chicago Legal Forum*, vol. 1989, Iss. 1, Article 8, 1989.
- [13] S. J. Cunningham, A. Hinze, and D. Nicols, Supporting gender-neutral digital library creation A case study using the GenderMag Toolkit, *Knowledge, Information, and Data in An Open Access Society*, vol. 10075, pp. 45-50, 2016.
- [14] A. Fernandez, S. Abrahão, E. Insfran, Empirical validation of a usability inspection method for model-driven Web development, *Journal of Systems and Software*, vol. 86, iss. 1, pp. 161-186, 2013.
- [15] J. Grudin, Why personas work: The psychological evidence. In *The Persona LifeCycle: Keeping People in Mind Throughout Product Design*, John Pruitt and Tamara Adlin. Morgan Kaufmann Publishers, SanFrancisco, CA, USA, 2005.
- [16] H. Rex Hartson, T. S. Andre & R. C. Williges, Criteria For Evaluating Usability Evaluation Methods, *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction*, vol. 15, iss. 1, pp. 145-181, 2003.
- [17] J. Hassell, Including your missing 20% by embedding web and mobile accessibility, *The British Standards Institution*, 2015.
- [18] C. Hill, S. Ernst, A. Oleson, A. Horvath, and M. Burnett, GenderMag Experiences in the Field: The Whole, the Parts, and the Workload, *IEEE VL/HCC*, pp.199-207, September 2016.
- [19] C. Hill, M. Haag, A. Oleson, C. Mendez, N. Marsden, A. Sarma, and M. Burnett, Gender-inclusiveness personas vs. stereotyping: Can we have it both ways?, *ACM CHI*, pp. 6658-6671, 2017.
- [20] A. Huffman, J. Whetten, and W. Huffman, "Using technology in higher education: The influence of gender roles on technology self-efficacy," *Computers in Human Behavior*, vol. 29, pp. 1779-1786, 2013.
- [21] B. Kitchenham, O. Brereton, D. Budgen, M. Turner, J. Bailey, S. Linkman, Systematic literature reviews in software engineering – A systematic literature review, *Information and Software Technology*, vol. 51, iss. 1, pp. 7-15, 2009.
- [22] R. Lee, T. Wong, & C. Sabanayagam, Epidemiology of diabetic retinopathy, diabetic macular edema and related vision loss. *Eye and vision (London, England)*, vol. 2, iss.17, 2015.
- [23] T. Mahatody, M. Sagar, and C. Kolski, State of the art on the cognitive walkthrough method, its variants and evolutions, *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction*, vol. 26, iss. 8, pp. 741-85, 2010.
- [24] C. Mendez, H. S. Padala, Z. Steine-Hanson, C. Hilderbrand, A. Horvath, C. Hill, L. Simpson, N. Patil, A. Sarma, and M. Burnett, Open Source barriers to entry, revisited: A sociotechnical perspective, *ACM ICSE*, pp.1004-1015, 2018.
- [25] C. Mendez, Z. Steine-Hanson, A. Oleson, A. Horvath, C. Hill, C. Hilderbrand, A. Sarma, M. Burnett, Semi-Automating (or not) a Socio-Technical Method for Socio-Technical Systems. *IEEE VL/HCC*, pp. 23-32, 2018.
- [26] J. Meyers-Levy and B. Loken, "Revisiting gender differences: What we know and what lies ahead," *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, vol. 25, no. 1, pp. 129-149, Jan. 2015.
- [27] J. Meyers-Levy and D. Maheswaran, "Exploring differences in males' and females' processing strategies," *Journal Consumer Research*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 63-70, June 1991.
- [28] Microsoft, Inclusive: A Microsoft Design Toolkit, 2015. [Online]. Available: https://scope.bccampus.ca/pluginfile.php/52293/block_html/content/MS-InclusiveDesignToolkit.pdf. [Accessed April 23, 2019].
- [29] T. Neate, K. Bourazeri, A. Roper, S. Stumpf, and S. Wilson, Co-Created Personas: Engaging and Empowering Users with Diverse Needs Within the Design Process, *ACM CHI*, 2019.
- [30] E. O'Donnell and E. Johnson, Gender effects on processing effort during analytical procedures. *International Journal of Auditing*, vol.5, pp. 91-105, 2001.
- [31] H. Petrie, and N. Bevan, The Evaluation of Accessibility, Usability, and User Experience, *The universal access handbook* 1st ed., 2009, pp. 1-16.
- [32] PiazzaBlog, "STEM confidence gap," 2015. [Online]. Available: <http://blog.piazza.com/stem-confidence-gap/>. [Accessed April 20, 2018].
- [33] R. Riedl, M Hubert, and P. Kenning, "Are there neural gender differences in online trust? An fMRI Study on the Perceived Trustworthiness of Ebay Offers," *Society for Information Management and The Management Information Systems Research Center*, vol. 34, 2010.
- [34] A. Schlesinger, W. Edwards, and R. Grinter, Intersectional HCI: Engaging identity through gender, race, and class, *ACM CHI*, pp. 5412-5427, 2017.
- [35] A. Shekhar and N. Marsden, Cognitive Walkthrough of a learning management system with gendered personas. *4th Gender & IT Conference (GenderIT'18)*, pp.191-198, 2018.
- [36] A. Singh, V. Bhaduria, A. Jain, and A. Gurung, "Role of gender, self-efficacy, anxiety and testing formats in learning spreadsheets," *Computers in Human Behavior*, vol. 29, pp. 739-746, 2013.
- [37] D. Sjøberg, T. Dybå, B. Anda, J. Hannay, *Building Theories in Software Engineering*. In: F. Shull, J. Singer, D. Sjøberg (eds) *Guide to Advanced Empirical Software Engineering*. Springer, pp. 312-336, 2008.
- [38] N. Subrahmanyam, L. Beckwith, V. Grigoreanu, M. Burnett, S. Wiedenbeck, V. Narayanan, K. Bucht, R. Drummond, and X. Fern, Testing vs. code inspection vs. ... what else? Male and female end users' debugging strategies, *ACM SIGCHI*, pp. 617-626, 2008.
- [39] D. S. Tan, M. Czerwinski, and G. Robertson, Women go with the (optical) flow, *ACM CHI*, pp. 209-215, 2003.

- [40] University of Cambridge, Inclusive Design Toolkit, 2017. [Online]. Available: <http://www.inclusivedesigntoolkit.com/simsoftware/simsoftware.html>. [Accessed April 29, 2019].
- [41] M. Vorvoreanu, L. Zhang, Y. Huang, C. Hilderbrand, Z. Steine-Hanson, and M. Burnett, From Gender Biases to Gender-Inclusive Design: An Empirical Investigation, ACM SIGCHI, 2019.
- [42] Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) 2.0, 2008. [Online]. Available: <https://www.w3.org/TR/2008/REC-WCAG20-20081211/>. [Accessed: April 20, 2019].
- [43] C. Wharton, J. Rieman, C. Lewis, and P. Polson, The cognitive walkthrough method: a practitioner's guide, John Wiley & Sons Inc., 1994.
- [44] World Health Organization, Blindness and vision impairment, 2018. [Online]. Available: <https://www.who.int/news-room/factsheets/detail/blindness-and-visual-impairment>. [Accessed: April 23, 2019].
- [45] G. Williams, Are you sure your software is gender-neutral? ACM Magazine Interactions, vol. 21, iss. 1, pp. 36–39, January 2014.