

What We Measured

Maze Analytics - Quantitative Metrics

- Task completion rates
- Navigation patterns between information sources
- Feature interaction heatmaps
- Drop-off rates

Dovetail Analysis - Qualitative Insights

- Structured tagging framework with 26 distinct tags across 6 categories
- Thematic analysis of user comments and observations
- Coding of emotional responses to specific design elements
- Identification of recurring challenges and preferences
- Cross-categorical synthesis of findings

Key Research Questions

- Which design better supports the integration of research into content creation?
- How does each design impact creative flow and scientific accuracy?
- Where do users encounter friction in the evidence-based content workflow?

Design Insights

Key Finding: Users need integrated workflows with clearer visual guidance

Design A: Separate UI

High Friction Point:

Users struggle with unclear button labeling and lack of visual signifiers for interactive elements.

- “I think I couldn't really figure out what these were for yet, but which one?... Besides just understanding what the buttons mean and them not having, like... what the button does, just having a signal... clear labels.”

Positive Aspect: Users appreciate contextual explanations that clarify system functionality, similar to having built-in guidance.

- “Now I have an explanation of what the Creator Studio is, kind of like having a virtual assistant [so it's helpful].”

Design B: Combined UI

High Friction Point: Users are confused by the relationship between editing and content creation workflows, particularly around the studio functionality.

- “So the thing that was confusing was the edit in studio option and then after creating content, again, going to that studio and then having the option to edit.”

Positive Aspect: Users value the automatic citation functionality that provides source references without manual effort.

- “Yeah, the sources section are nice... So I do like the, the, the freedom of having the citations linked right below without even me asking for it. Otherwise you usually have to put like a statement that also link the articles information has been taken from. That's, that's, that's a good, that's a good addition.”

Workflow Insights

Key Finding: Integration is critical for evidence-based content creation

Design A: Separate UI

High Friction Point: Users struggle with context switching between research and writing. Source management described as "scattered" and creating a "mess."

- "It's kind of hard to have that in mind and go back and forth between screens."

Positive Aspect:

Some appreciate clear separation in the design.

- "It looks like there's an external link that can click. That feels pretty nice, having resources that seems pretty helpful."

Some also appreciate the reduced interface complexity

(*This also might suggest subjective views on cognitive load).

- "Then look, like it looks like a white writing space. That, that feels more like a doc. So that's much more inviting."

Design B: Combined UI

High Friction Point: *(SIMILAR TO LAST SLIDE)*

Users struggle with editing and content creation for workflow clarity.

- "I could say it and probably take it over to Chatbot to be more interactive. I don't know, cheesy or bland or something."

Positive Aspect: The unified workflow helps users maintain their train of thought throughout the content creation process.

- "That's what I was saying about, like, having everything in one place."

User Interaction Insights

Key Finding: Initial orientation and navigation clarity are essential

Design A: Separate UI

High Friction Point: Users struggle with initial orientation and navigation, unsure where to begin or how to proceed.

- "So I really don't know where to start."

Positive Aspect: Interactive elements were appealing.

- "It looked easy to play with, it looked more, More. I feel more comfortable, I feel more comfortable, I guess."

Design B: Combined UI

High Friction Point: Users struggle with the edit/create workflow and understanding different content creation options.

- "The thing that was confusing and that I did in studio editor and then after creating content, again, going to that studio and then having the option to edit."

Positive Aspect: Users find the integrated interface more intuitive and easier to use once they're familiar with it.

- "I'm just more comfortable using the first ones because we have sort of used it more and we've used like a couple of years which start like that."

Experience Insights

Key Finding: User's comfort with the tool comes from familiarity

Design A: Separate UI

High Friction Point: User feels abruptly transported into an unfamiliar and complex environment, creating a sense of cognitive overload and anxiety about mastering a new system.

- "I felt like I was all of a sudden in like a drawing paint type environment which throws me off because I'm like, oh my God, I have to master another environment."

Positive Aspect: Information is conveniently pre-collected and organized, eliminating the need for users to manually gather and synthesize content.

- "I don't have to like fish around for the information and collect it and put it together. So that's nice."

Design B: Combined UI

High Friction Point: Users encounter initial confusion with multiple options and unclear distinctions between content creation modes.

- "I was a little confused obviously, by studio, particularly difficult was the three options at the bottom of the initial text on weight discrimination and like create content and the other two."

Positive Aspect: The interface is more intuitive, with a smoother workflow and easier navigation.

- "Once you start like clicking away and knowing that you're not going to mess up anything, it's pretty user friendly."