

Available online at: <https://ijact.in>

Date of Submission	03/06/2019
Date of Acceptance	05/09/2019
Date of Publication	15/09/2019
Page numbers	3347-3355(9 Pages)

Cite This Paper: Azham Hussain, Idyawati Hussein, Emmanuel OC Mkpjoigou, Assessing the frustrations of practicing user experience design (UXD) among the UXD community of practice in Malaysia: A Netnographic Approach, 8(8), COMPUSOFT, An International Journal of Advanced Computer Technology. PP. 3347-3355.

This work is licensed under Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.



ISSN:2320-0790

ASSESSING THE FRUSTRATIONS OF PRACTICING USER EXPERIENCE DESIGN (UXD) AMONG THE UXD COMMUNITY OF PRACTICE IN MALAYSIA: A NETNOGRAPHIC APPROACH

¹Azham Hussain, ²Idyawati Hussein and ³Emmanuel O.C. Mkpjoigou

^{1,2}School of Computing, Universiti Utara Malaysia, 06010 UUM, Sintok, Malaysia

³Department of Computer and Information Technology, Veritas University, Abuja, Nigeria
Corresponding author: azham.h@uum.edu.my

Abstract: In this study, netnography, an ethnography method used to study communities on the Internet was employed. It adapted common ethnographic participant-observation procedures such as making a cultural entrée, gathering and analysing data, ensuring trustworthy interpretation, conducting membership checks and conducting ethical research in computer-mediated contingencies. The results reveal a collection of UXD practice related frustrations in industry.

Keywords: Community of practice; netnography; practice frustrations; user experience design practice.

I. INTRODUCTION

This study applies netnography method, a new methodological approach to study user experience design (UXD) in practice. Based on the literature and data collection results, the use of participatory action research (PAR) to identify communities of practice in the context of a developing country may be of interest to many researchers in the information systems (IS) and HCI fields. Several methods were undertaken to identify the most appropriate way to discover UXD constraints, specifically emphasising the feelings of practitioners. In this study, the constraints of practising UXD were asked by associating the practitioners' non cognitive aspect of knowledge with their motivation and behaviour (Schon, 1999; Orlikowski, 2002; Gherardi&Nicolini, 2005). The reason for choosing the 'frustration' question was due to the prior findings (Idyawati et al, 2019a; 2019b) where practitioners were

quite reluctant to share their problems as that might be revealing their own weaknesses in terms of knowledge. In the preliminary study (Idyawati et al, 2019c), all participants from the two companies involved in the research were found to be hesitated to suppress their low knowledge in UXD. With respect to values, the users were totally ignored by the participants in company A but considered as informants in Company B. The central focus of this study was on investigating the frustrations of practicing UXD among the CoP in Malaysia.

Poor usability and user experience lead to user frustration (Lazar et al., 2006; Hertzum, 2010) (see Hussain et al., 2016; 2017a; 2017b; 2017c; 2018). Frustration not only causes personal unhappiness and loss of self-efficacy, but may disrupt the workplace, result in slow learning and reduce participation in local and national communities (Bessiere et al., 2003; Ceaparu et al., 2004). It was reported that the term 'usability' is found in the Malaysian

Government Portals and Websites Assessment (MGPWA), but there is no evidence of user performance being evaluated on the national websites and portals guidelines criteria (MDEC, 2011). External consultants, not users, are involved in the assessment of these websites (Kasimin et al., 2013). According to Shneiderman and Plaisant (2010), not measuring user's performance, it implies not doing usability evaluation.

The focus on addressing usability issues is rooted in the user-centred design (UCD) principles that are taught in the Human-Computer Interaction (HCI) discipline (Benyon, 2010; Nielsen & Norman, 2014). However, UCD practices are limited even after 20 years of including HCI in higher education systems in Malaysia (Chiu et al., 2008; Yeo, et al., 2011). Therefore, the HCI discipline may need to be adjusted to promote its usefulness in the industry setting (Joshi, 2004; Smith et al, 2007).

The implication of this enforcement puts the responsibility on designers to provide the basic means of countering user frustration through effective development processes (Zimmerman et al., 2014). In this aspect, researchers and practitioners have claimed that the traditional waterfall model is less valid to the web development process (Taylor et al., 2002; O'Connell & Murphy, 2009; Lang et al., 2011). Nevertheless, the systems development life cycle (SDLC) is found to be the most practised methodology in web development in Malaysia (Solemon et al., 2010; Majid et al., 2009, 2011). From the industry perspective, the literature has suggested that a higher level of Capability Maturity Model Integration (CMMI) in a company should result in higher product quality (Paulk, 2009). However, Malaysian companies with and without CMMI certification show no significant difference in requirement problems (Solemon et al., 2008, 2009, 2010). According to Solemon et al. (2010), all problems in software development companies are generally related to human-based problems. Asnawi et al. (2010) used a qualitative approach in order to understand the adoption of Agile methods in companies in Malaysia, listing the factors and difficulties faced by the early Agile adopters by using an initial interview method. Asnawi planned further studies (questionnaires and interviews) to develop a model for predicting the successful adoption of Agile methods in Malaysia. The main constraints in Agile adoption are: (1) knowledge; (2) mindset; (3) commitment; (4) management involvement; (5) knowledge transfer; (6) organisational structure; and (7) communication. It can be seen that social factors are more important rather than technical factors when adopting Agile methods. Social factors include human behaviour, values and attitudes towards Agile practices. Solemon et al. (2010) explored the requirement engineering (RE) practices of some software development companies using a mailed survey. The data was collected from February to March 2008. The result indicated a high level of RE practices among the companies who answered the survey, pointing to the conclusion that most Malaysian IT projects have institutionalised RE practices, as part of the SDLC or waterfall approach. Nevertheless, there are

still many local public user interfaces that suffer from poor design (Ashraf & Ghazali, 2010; Sivaji & Soo, 2013). Sivaji and his colleagues conducted usability evaluation in the UXLab at MIMOS Berhad (Sivaji & Soo, 2013) and found that users can be categorised into three types: (1) primary; (2) secondary; (3) indirect users, which indicated that gathering requirements from the wrong users may lead to a frustrating user experience.

These researchers have conducted a series of website evaluations based on expert heuristics and user testing, beginning in 2010. Although the focus was on identifying HCI practices, the terms HCI and usability were disregarded and alien in the context of industrial settings. The globalisation of the interactive systems industry has led to a worldwide quest for locally available usability and user experience skills (Clemmensen et al., 2013). However, the professionals, whose work focuses on usability and user experience in developing countries, specifically Malaysia, have received little attention. The problem is that there is insufficient research in three key areas:

1. First, there is a lack of reported studies on understanding the practices of IT professionals and their constraints grounded in a real-world practice (Norman, 2010a; Bruno & Dick, 2013; Kuuti et al., 2014).
2. Secondly, although, there are established standard process assessments to improve current software development process applied in Malaysia, the user experience assessment has never been identified.
3. Thirdly, the relationship between HCI knowledge and UXD practice is limited in Asian countries (Smith et al., 2007). Problems arise when there are still many poor user interface implementations and enforcement, especially in the public sector which comprises the biggest computer users in developing countries.

Hence, frustration with computer use may have an impact on the productivity of the public sector services. Thus, this has become the primary cause of the poor practice of UXD that have caused the development of poorly designed products, systems or services in the local setting. In this study netnography approach was used. It is a form of ethnography conducted on the Internet; that adapts traditional and in-person ethnographic research techniques of anthropology to the study of online cultures and communities formed through computer-mediated communications (Kozinets, 2013).

II. METHODOLOGY

The research question, "who practice UX?" was part of a larger study concerned with the current status of user experience design (UXD) in Malaysia. The focus on this approach is to screen for participant's characteristics and filter those who have an interest in practising UXD. The reason for choosing this method was to save time in


searching for high-quality participants who accept the fundamental philosophy of UXD. Netnography is an ethnography method used to study communities on the Internet (Kozinets, 2013; Kerrigan, 2014). It adapts common ethnographic participant observation procedures such as making a cultural entrée, gathering and analysing data, ensuring trustworthy interpretation, conducting membership checks and conducting ethical research in computer-mediated contingencies. The following procedures were followed during this study:

1. Planning and entrée: this begins with the formulation of research questions and identification of an appropriate online approach (Langer & Beckman, 2005). The objective of this participation approach was to uncover how members of the group find each other through the problems posed in conducting UXD. The shared repertoire or capabilities developed by UX Malaysia members over time was also recorded (UX Malaysia is the UXD community of practice used in this research). At this stage, the researchers participated in the online community through a social media channel set up by the UX Malaysia leader. Social media, in this context, consists of any website or service that enables users to create, modify, view, rate or share digital objects of interest (McCarthy, 2011). The chosen social media in this study was Facebook, with its mounting number of members and activities posted in the closed group.

2. Data collection: a question was posted on the social group UX Malaysia on the 18th of October 2012: "What are the three main frustrations in being a User Experience practitioner?" The orthogonal situation of frustration was chosen over satisfaction to identify the problem of conducting UXD (Dreyfus, 2000). Figure 1 illustrates how research ethics procedures were followed by disclosing the intention of the postings and obtaining the group members permission to use any specific posting as direct quotes in the research. The researchers had continuously followed the activities by UX Malaysia through Facebook, and active observation involved questions from the researchers to probe for further clarification of situations experienced by the group members.

3. Analysis and interpretation: this process was done with open coding, as described in the grounded theory approach by Strauss and Corbin (1994). Each response was individually analysed and sentences were coded according to affective codes, which include emotion coding and values coding. Then, the codes for each sentence were interpreted and assigned to categories. This process resulted in a list of categories and codes, which were used to get an overview of similar problems faced by members of the group. During the netnography study, affective coding was used to investigate the practitioners' frustrations. Affective codes included emotions, values, conflicts and judgments of human experience (Saldaña, 2012). Participants' sentences were analysed individually and line by line.

Hi all, am currently investigating UX practice in Malaysia and would like to know "What are your top three frustrations in being a User Experience Design Practitioners?". You may write as many as u want and your identity will not be disclosed without permission in any published materials. Thanks all.

 Like · · Unfollow post · 18 October at 07:15 via Mobile

Seen by 80 N8 and N2 like this.

N2 Clients? Yeah. That's one. I had real *bad ones* long time ago. 18 October at 10:19 · Edited · Unlike · 1

Idyawati Hussein Clients attitude N2 ? Care to share?

18 October at 10:20 via mobile · Like

N2 Example: *Change* "Next" to "Proceed" button then change to "Agree", then next meeting, *change* "Agree" to "OK".

Example 2: I *like it blue*, next meeting, no lah better purple. Next meeting, change to this navy blue.

Example 3: Too wide, too narrow, too wide. All same screen.

Example 4: "If other people can do so nice, you cannot?" "I don't have the resources" "*Don't give me that nonsense*, I provided you enough! Google for them!"

Example 5: "*My [12 year old]daughter can do so much better*" 18 October at 10:26 · Edited · Unlike · 2

Idyawati Hussein Haha! OMG! This is gonna be an interesting study in our own learning curve and setting! 18 October at 10:33 via mobile · Like · 1

N4N2 then hire his daughter to do that... XD 18 October at 11:42 · Edited · Unlike · 2

N2 dunno lah N5. 18 October at 11:34 · Unlike · 1

Figure 1: Netnography approach using social media group

Table 1: Example of a coding template

Code	Category	Concept/Theme
A word or short phrase that symbolically assigns a summative, important, abstract and/or memory attribute to a portion of language-based or visual data	When codes are organised and grouped according to a certain pattern or characteristics	A phrase or sentence describing more accurate and tacit or unvoiced processes

Table 1 was developed based on the work of Saldaña (2012). The participant’s feelings were labelled according to their responses and the sources of their experiences. A participant’s emotional experiences might include multiple or conflicting emotions, so emotion coding was used concurrently with values coding. Values coding reflects a participant’s values, attitudes and beliefs (Saldaña, 2012).

Table 2: Labels for data analysis

Method of Data Collection	Meaning	Explanation
Netnography	FB: Facebook P1: Participant 1	Data collected via Facebook, categorised as digitally enabled social network (DESN) or social media (SM) FBP1 = Facebook Participant 1

Table 2 identifies the list of participating subjects. In the netnography study, FBP1 to FBP6 shows that six participants were involved in data collection via Facebook (FB). INTP1 was coded as the interview session of participant 1.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The netnography study was conducted from 1 October 2012 to 1 November 2013, with two objectives: (1) to investigate the potential of netnography in screening the UX Community of Practice (CoP); (2) to uncover the problems of conducting UXD in industry. According to Wenger et al., (2011), the main characteristics of a CoP are that the members of the group have identical problems and situations. Problems and situations are more exposed in digitally enabled social networks (DESN) or social media (SM) such as Facebook (Germonprez & Hovorka, 2013). An open-ended question was posted on frustrations in practising UXD in industry. The use of the word “frustration” was to uncover the practitioner’s sources of problems in order to classify their values. The data was analysed through manual coding using paper and pencil on hardcopies. Manual coding was possible due to the small scale of the observation from DESN, with not more than 10 responses to the question. Affective code, which included emotional labels, was chosen as guidance (Saldaña, 2012). The expressions of emotion led to the values, attitudes and beliefs of participants; these were structured, coded and summarised, then explained and interpreted (Langer & Beckman, 2005). Table 3 summarises the cause of frustration on becoming UXD practitioners. Each comment and sentence was read through, line by line and analysed individually, as described in the grounded theory approach of Strauss and Corbin (1990). 17 excerpts were identified in the open coding analysis and 10 codes could be labelled for each sentence.

Table 3: Causes of practitioner’s frustration

Excerpt	Code	Categories
“Lack of direction” “Lack of ownership” “Forgot business needs and requirements”	Goal Purpose Business goal	Unclear goals and purpose
“Being a scape goat” “Nonsense” “Clients? Bad ones” “My 12-year-old daughter can do so much better” “Difficult client” “I blame you” “You end up becoming a photocopy machine”	Blame Anger Judgmental	Client attitude
“They know what they don’t want” “If they go about colour tone of the logo, size of the button, and keep changing for the next two to three meetings, it’s a sign that they have no idea what they want” “Some clients have an unlimited amount of cash to blow but don’t care about all these (<i>referring to UX</i>).”	Not knowing	Lack of UX awareness
“It’s not so much about making things pretty” “Your design must be useful, usable and beautiful while remembering your client’s business goals”	Design	Design lacks usability
“Clearly misunderstood web design and user experience”	Understanding	Confusion between UX and GUI
“Some clients are really excited about having great UI/UX design for their products but can’t afford my rates”	Resources	Financial constraint

A code was attached to those sentences that showed a positive/negative/neutral attitude or experience related to the posted question (Ardito et al., 2013). Seven categories were created based on the codes labelled for each excerpt: unclear goals and purposes, difficult clients, client network influence, lack of knowledge, design lacks usability, confusion between UX and GUI, and financial resources.

Unclear Goals and Purposes: The largest number of comments suggested that members of DESN believed that most frustrations came from a lack of direction and clarity of the requirements on the part of the business served by both clients and UX practitioners. “Lack of direction, lack of ownership and being a scapegoat are issues that I face as a professional” (FBP5, 11). Clients became upset and behaved unprofessionally towards UX practitioners if they were not satisfied with the end products or results. Even if the flow of information was sufficient, the exact problems and requirements of the business were perceived to be inappropriately attended to. Despite this, it was not easy to identify the right problem (Dunveley, 2003). Speaking from a client’s point of view, “I’ve seen some pretty ill thought-out work. You may experience difficulties from a client if you design

something based on your ideal user flow but forget the difficulties and the requirements of the business you're serving" (FBP4, 10). The excerpt above refers to agencies of the development team. From the clients' point of view, their attitude resulted from the quality of the agencies' work. (Agency in this example refers to the practitioner or developer).

Difficult Clients: From the practitioners' point of view, the most difficult challenge was in dealing with "bad" client. A participant gave an example of how clients behaved during the requirement elicitation stage: "Clients? I had real bad ones a long time ago. Example 1: Change the "Next" to "Proceed" button then change to "Agree", then during the next meeting, change "Agree" to "OK". Example 2: "I like it blue"; next meeting: "No, better purple"; next meeting: "Change to this navy blue". Example 3: "Too wide, too narrow, too wide". All referring to the same screen; Example 4: "If other people can do it so nicely, why can't you?", "I don't have resources", "Don't give me that nonsense, I provided you enough! Google them!"; Example 5: "My 12-year-old daughter can do so much better." (FBP1, 1). This excerpt shows how "bad" clients communicated during the development process, frustrating the practitioners because they kept changing the design requirements. It implied a lack of clear goals on the client's side. No matter how good the product's UX is, some "bad" clients will still blame the practitioners: "There are clients who can be really difficult and no matter what you do, they'll still blame you" (FBP4, 10). In this example, the clients seemed to be influential people that made decisions on the systems or products. It was observed that the client's decision was more important than the end users'. (Clients might be the stakeholders of a company, an organisation or a project.)

Client Network Influence: Some clients wanted a website that looked exactly like their competitor's or that of their family. In this case, these clients had a strong influence on the final product under development. However, they seemed to be unclear of the exact goals of the website, which is why they followed the existing products of related people, in particular, close acquaintances or cronies. (The term crony is often perceived as derogatory and refers to a close friend or companion with whom they have a long history: Dictionary, 2014.) "They [clients] just want something that looks exactly like the ones [of] their competitor, parent company or sister company. Otherwise, they shove some super boring and restrictive brand guidelines so you pretty much end up becoming a photocopy machine" (FBP6, 16). In this example, the UX practitioner or "copier machine" had little opportunity for inputs on the design decision. "It helps when you can convince a client that the purpose of the product is not to satisfy the boss, the boss's wife, mistress or daughter. The purpose of the product is to serve their customers/demographic and that's the aim. So if their customers test the product and they like it, it's a success even if the Datuk, Director or COO thinks the button looks too small on their phone" (FBP6, 16). The

result shows that users are often represented by clients. In line with previous studies in the information systems field, system stakeholders might be selected on the basis of political affiliation and compliance rather than for their understanding of the exact system requirements (Gasson, 2003).

Lack of Knowledge: Sometimes, clients did not understand the terminology or the results they wanted out of a system or product. Most comments referred to the behaviour of clients as a result of their limited knowledge or awareness of the importance of UX. Some clients did not know what they wanted, although they knew what they didn't want. This is reflected in the goal theory of approach motivation and avoidance motivation (Pintrich, 2000), in which humans divide their goals into the things they want to achieve and the things they want to avoid. The following excerpt illustrates this: "You do sometimes bump into clients who know what they're saying and clearly know what they want. I usually only pull this stunt when I suspect that clients have no idea what they want. When a client asks questions about the flow and how information is being displayed, they know what they are talking about, where the design has to be tweaked to demonstrate their idea. If they go about colour tone of the logo, size of the button, and keep changing for the next two to three meetings, it's a sign that they have no idea what they want" (FBP3, 12). This scenario created frustration among practitioners: "Don't you just hate people who know what they don't want but don't know what they do want?" (FBP4, 13). Some practitioners knew how to assess clients based on their knowledge of what they wanted, and the findings indicate one approach to the identification of clients who know what they want out of a project: observation of the client's response to the initial prototyping. They either express concern about the information flow, which indicates their level of knowledge of their proposal, or they point to visually-displayed media.

Design lacks Usability: Although UX is associated with a broad range of fuzzy and dynamic concepts, including emotional, affective, experiential, hedonic and aesthetic variables (Khalid, 2006), the fundamental need must first be fulfilled is usability. In the following excerpt, a participant describes an example of web design and UX. "Being attractive and good to look at is one thing, but solving a problem is more crucial. It's not so much on the making things pretty, but as a UI/UX designer you must be clever enough to use your design skills to solve a client's problem. Then only can you create great user experience. Remember, as a designer, your design must be useful, usable and beautiful while remembering your client's business goals" (FBP2, 14). One participant gave another example of where the clients do not know what they want although they do know what they don't want. "I've had agencies come to me with great ideas and approaches that were pretty and all but they never took into account the business needs and requirements. Agencies just come in and get a brief and work on based on that brief. However, to be able to truly provide good UX, the

entire business must be understood” (FBP4, 10).The excerpt used the word “pretty” which is categorised as pleasurable design. However, problems occur when business needs and requirements are not being addressed properly. UX cannot be achieved if fundamental problems, i.e. business needs and requirements, are not fulfilled indicating that there should be a progression from the bottom to the top in a hierarchical structure. This result is in line with Maslow’s hierarchy (1968) which specifies that higher-level needs can be fulfilled only after lower-level needs have been satisfied, with the foundation of the hedonomic hierarchy being safety. Once the user is ensured of safe operating conditions, the next level requires a functional system that enables the user to accomplish the goals, followed by other fragile psychological needs (Hancock, 2005).

Confusion between UX and GUI: The confusion between UX and GUI was highlighted as one of the reasons for practitioners being frustrated. “Education was one of the proposed solutions for the misunderstanding of concepts, terminology and others. I believe some people clearly misunderstood web design and user experience” (FBP2, 7). “If clients are not worth investing in, then the practitioner should suggest abandoning the project. We seem to confuse UX and GUI most of the time. FBP2 has a point and FBP4 has a point for us to weigh. Although, clients should learn to trust the agency/designer they hire. If its bad then stop. Then again, clients need to be educated” (FBP5, 15). Another proposed solution suggested by the practitioners was to tell clients that the UI has been changed accordingly. This reduces the time taken in dealing with subjective and uncertain design requirements. However, not all clients will accept this. ‘Some clients write their own notes of their requests during meetings, hence detecting deliberate deception in complying with earlier agreements. Has anyone tried showing clients the exact same design as the last meeting, but telling them you’ve adjusted it according to their feedback? I tried, and usually with positive comments: “Good! Now it looks better”, “Told you the button should be wider” and everyone goes home happy’ (FBP3, 8). “It can be seen that under some conditions, practitioners have to absorb the client’s wishes during requirement elicitation. With luck, they might succeed in tricking clients into accepting the earlier proposed design. Compliance with every single client requirement may not be the best practice, especially when the requested items are related to subjective elements such as the UX of the product. Usually, I don’t let clients interfere with our work to the point where they decide what colour the button should be or how the specific flow of an app should be. All that will be discussed and agreed upon during the planning stages. If they hire us to do the work, then I’ll make sure we do the work” (FBP6, 16). Some practitioners refrain from letting the clients’ become involved in the subjective design features as it is difficult to measure and comply with them. Too often, clients request changes in terms of colour, appearance and other aesthetic elements, and practitioners would rather

“sign off” on the design first to avoid such changes that may put their projects’ schedule at risk.

Financial Resources: Finance was found to be among the reasons for practitioners’ frustration, not because there were insufficient resources but because clients lacked consideration of UX. In the analysis, both limited and unlimited financial resources were the reasons practitioners felt disappointed. “Limited financial resources were expected to be a problem, but unlimited financial resources were even more irritating because the clients were concerned with trivia rather than the overall UX; Some clients have an unlimited amount of cash to blow but don’t care about all these (*referring to UX*). Some clients are really excited about having great UI/UX design for their products but can’t afford my rates” (FBP6, 16).Based on the descriptions, comments, use of language and expression by the members of the group, it was found that there was general interest by people in the same domain, that is usability and user experience. The problems posed by the netnography participants were in line with the problems faced by practitioners who tried to introduce UCD in development processes (Ardito et al., 2013; Vukelja, 2007; Gould and Lewis, 1985).

In summary, the findings explain the current status of UXD in industry settings and have uncovered the constraints in practice. The results of the netnography approach showed more openness from wider perspectives than did face-to-face interview sessions, focus groups or open-ended question in a survey. It was found that practitioners were more open in expressing their attitudes, opinions, motives, and concerns even though they did not hide their real identities. This study suggests that netnography is a suitable methodology for the study of sensitive research topics, especially when dealing with problems related to social and political endeavours (Langer & Beckman, 2005). Especially in a high power-distance culture such as Malaysia, it is expected that Malaysians in general are willing to accept the fact of inequality in power as being normal (Yeo, 1998). Power distance is defined as the extent to which the less powerful members of institutions and organisations within a country expect and accept that power is distributed unequally (Hofstede, 2001). In this case, it can be seen that practitioners and clients were divided in terms of design decision making and empowerment. However, the dimensions of design decision making were unidentified in the netnography study. The mantra “the customer is always right” was the key aspect of some clients being less courteous and respectful towards practitioners (Grandey et al., 2004). This was revealed from verbally abusive sentences drawing attention to the “dark side” of the UX practitioner and client relationship. Question about frustration are relevant in revealing deeper insights into the participants’ motives, concerns and experience (Langer & Beckman, 2005).

A line between clients and real users is to be drawn in order to study design requirements. The implication for practitioners was to understand the culture in a specific context, in order to attain the goals and

purpose of the proposed projects. Influential people in design decision making might actually have the least knowledge and lack of appreciation of UX. In this study, in order to assess the practice, practitioners who appreciated UX needed to be identified; the community of practice was found on the Internet. However, researchers had to be aware that a website itself is not a community of practice (Wenger, 2006). Irrespective of the nature of the job and the departments to which participants were attached, all the IT professionals who participated were guilty of ignoring user involvement in the development process, but somehow explained the reasons in terms of elements of user experience such as colour, the look of a website and other subjective measurements. The results of similar studies (Conti & Sobiesk, 2010; Hertzum, 2010) pointed to a compliance with malicious design which caused user frustration. Even during the Renaissance period, the importance of a man who created design was highlighted: only a good person can create good things (Faroughi & Faroughi, 2013). The Western perspective puts great emphasis on human behaviour, starting with Aristotle, by assuming that actions are motivated by goals (Csikzenmihalyi, 1997; Bandura, 2012). A good (or bad) feeling is defined as “user experience” when a user interacts with any part of a product, system or service physically, perceptually or conceptually (Hassenzahl et al., 2008; Benyon, 2010; Nielsen, 2012). The results of this study indicate how user experience is closely related to humane practice, and only designers who have empathy and passion to help end users will succeed in engaging with UXD practice. This is due to uncontrolled constraints related to the awareness and attitudes of clients, which were difficult to resolve immediately. The most interesting finding was that practitioners who have affective cognition towards UXD will strive to practise their knowledge regardless of the constraints. The second question considered the largest set of constraints that can be categorised into three levels of control. Designers are able to evaluate the categories of constraint and start working on their circle of influence to solve the problems. A similar approach was found in the literature on design thinking. Prior studies that have noted the importance of management support as a successful factor in UXD implementation supports these findings.

IV. CONCLUSION

In this study, netnography, an ethnography method used to study communities on the Internet was employed. It adapted common ethnographic participant-observation procedures such as making a cultural entrée, gathering and analysing data, ensuring trustworthy interpretation, conducting membership checks and conducting ethical research in computer-mediated contingencies. The results reveal a collection of UXD practice related frustrations in industry. The results of the netnography approach showed more openness from participants in the community of practice in comparison to

other methods like the face-to-face interview sessions, focus groups or open-ended question in a survey. Practitioners were more open in expressing their attitudes, opinions, motives, and concerns even though they did not hide their real identities. This study suggests that netnography is a suitable methodology for the study of sensitive research topics, especially when dealing with problems related to social and political endeavours. Also, the results of this study indicate how user experience is closely related to humane practice, and only designers who have empathy and passion to help end users will succeed in engaging with UXD practice.

V. REFERENCES

- [1]. Ardito, C., Buono, P., Caivano, D. V., Costabile, M. F., & Lanzilotti, R. (2013). Investigating and promoting UX practice in industry: an experimental study. *International Journal of Human-Computer studies*.
- [2]. Ashraf, M., & Ghazali, M. (2013). *Physicality quantitative evaluation method*. Paper presented at the Proceedings of the 25th Australian Computer-Human Interaction Conference: Augmentation, Application, Innovation, Collaboration.
- [3]. Bandura, A. (2012). On the functional properties of perceived self-efficacy revisited. *Journal of Management*, 38(1), 9-44.
- [4]. Benyon, D. (2010). *Designing Interactive Systems: A Comprehensive Guide to HCI and Interaction Design* (2nd ed.). Essex, England: Pearson Education Limited.
- [5]. Bruno, V., & Dick, M. (2013). Improving Usability Outcomes for each of the Usability Practitioner Roles. *name Electronic Journal of Information Systems Evaluation*, 16(3), 173.
- [6]. Ceaparu, I., Lazar, J., Bessiere, K., Robinson, J., & Shneiderman, B. (2004). Determining causes and severity of end-user frustration. *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction*, 17(3), 333-356.
- [7]. Chiu, P. C., Sharbini, H., Lim, T., Islamiah, D., & Semuni, M. H. (2008). *Human Computer Interaction Education in Universities in Malaysia*. Paper presented at the Fifth International Cyberspace Conference on Ergonomics, 2008.
- [8]. Clemmensen, T., Hertzum, M., Yang, J., & Chen, Y. (2013). Do Usability Professionals Think about User Experience in the Same Way as Users and Developers Do? In P. Kotzé, G. Marsden, G. Lindgaard, J. Wesson & M. Winckler (Eds.), *Human-Computer Interaction – INTERACT 2013*, Vol. 8118, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 461-478.
- [9]. Conti, G., & Sobiesk, E. (2010). *Malicious Interface Design: Exploiting the User*. Paper presented at the 19th International Conference on World Wide Web (WWW'10), Raleigh, NC, USA.

- [10]. Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1997a). Flow and the Psychology of Discovery and Invention. *HarperPerennial, New York.*
- [11]. Faroughi, A., Faroughi, R. (2013). On the Poetry of Design. In: Marcus, A. (ed.) DUXU/HCI 2013, Part I. LNCS, vol. 8012, pp. 38–47. Springer, Heidelberg.
- [12]. Gherardi, S., & Nicolini, D. (2005). The passion for learning and knowing. Paper presented at the 6th International Conference on Organizational Learning and Knowledge.
- [13]. Germonprez, M., & Hovorka, D. S. (2013). Member engagement within digitally enabled social network communities: new methodological considerations. *Information Systems Journal*, 23(6), 525-549. doi: 10.1111/isj.12021
- [14]. Grandey, A. A., Dickter, D. N., & Sin, H.-P. (2004). The customer is not always right: customer aggression and emotion regulation of service employees. *Journal of Organisational Behavior*, 25, 1-22.
- [15]. Hancock, P. A., Pepe, A. A., & Murphy, L. L. (2005). Hedonomics: the power of positive and pleasurable ergonomics. *Ergonomics Design*, 13(1), 8-14.
- [16]. Hassenzahl, M., Schobel, M., & Trautmann, T. (2008). How Motivational Orientation Influences the Evaluation and Choice of Hedonic and Pragmatic Interactive Products: The Role of Regulatory Focus. *Interacting with Computers*, 20, 8. doi: 10.1016/j.intcom.2008.05.001
- [17]. Hertzum, M. (2010). *Frustration: A common user experience*. Paper presented at the DHRS2010: Proceedings of the Tenth Danish Human-Computer Interaction Research Symposium.
- [18]. Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions, and Organizations Across Nations*. 2nd ed., Thousand Oaks, London: Sage Publications
- [19]. Hussain, A., Abdullah, A., Husni, H., & Mkpjojiogu, E.O.C. (2016). Interaction Design Principles for Edutainment Systems: Enhancing the Communication Skills of Children with Autism Spectrum Disorders. *Rev. Tec. Ing. Univ. Zulia*. 39(8), 45-50. doi: 10.21311/001.39.8.06
- [20]. Hussain, A., Abd Razak, M.N.F., Mkpjojiogu, E.O.C. & Hamdi, M.M.F. (2017). UX evaluation of a video streaming application with teenage users. *Journal of Telecommunication, Electronic & Computer Engineering (JTEC)*, 9 (2-11), 129-131
- [21]. Hussain, A., Isam, M., & Mkpjojiogu, E.O.C. (2017). A UX assessment of a mobile recommender app for household electrical energy savings. *Journal of Telecommunication, Electronic & Computer Engineering*, 9 (2-11)
- [22]. Hussain, A., Mkpjojiogu, E.O.C., Musa, J., & Mortada, S. (2017). A user experience evaluation of amazon kindle mobile application. *Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Applied Science and Technology (ICAST'17), Kedah, Malaysia. AIP Conference Proceedings* 1891 (1), 020060,
- [23]. Hussain, A., Mkpjojiogu, E.O.C., Musa, J., Mortada, S., & Yue, W.S. (2018). Mobile Experience Evaluation of an e-Reader App. *Journal of Telecommunication, Electronic & Computer Engineering (JTEC)*, 10(1-10), 11-15.
- [24]. Hussein, I, Hussain, A., Mkpjojiogu, E.O.C., Nathan, S.S., & Zaaba, Z.F. (2019). The knowledge of human-computer interaction (HCI) and user experience design (UXD) in Malaysia: an analysis of the characteristics of an HCI-focused conference. *International Journal of Innovative Technology and Exploring Engineering*, 8(8S),483-490.
- [25]. Hussein, I, Hussain, A., Mkpjojiogu, E.O.C., & Nathan, S.S. (2019). The state of user experience design practice in Malaysia. *International Journal of Innovative Technology and Exploring Engineering*, 8(8S), 491-497.
- [26]. Joshi, A. (2004). Institutionalizing HCI - the challenges in India. *White Paper*.
- [27]. Kasimin, H., Aman, A., & Noor, Z. M. (2013). Using Evaluation to Support Organisational Learning in E-Government System: A Case of Malaysia Government. *International Journal of Electronic Government Research (IJEGR)*, 9(1), 45-64. doi:10.4018/ijegr.2013010103
- [28]. Khalid, H. M. (2006). Embracing diversity in user needs for affective design. *Applied Ergonomics*, 37, 409-418. doi: 10.1016/j.apergo.2006.04.005
- [29]. Kerrigan, N. (2014). A very short, fairly interesting and reasonably cheap book about qualitative research. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 11(1), 117-119.
- [30]. Kozinets, R. V. (2013). Netnography and the digital consumer: The quest for cultural insights. In R. Belk & R. Llamas (Eds.), *The Routledge companion to digital consumption* (pp. 93–101). London: Routledge.
- [31]. Kuutti, K., Jokela, T., Nieminen, M., & Jokela, P. (1998). Assessing human-centred design processes in product development by using the INUSE maturity model. *IFAC Proceedings Volumes*, Volume 31, Issue 26, 1998, Pages 89-94, ISSN 1474-6670.
- [32]. Lang M. (2011) The Influence of Short Project Timeframes on Web Development Practices: A Field Study. In: Song W. et al. (eds) *Information Systems Development*. Springer, New York, NY.
- [33]. Langer, R., & Beckman, S. C. (2005). Sensitive research topics: netnography revisited. *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*, 8(2), 189-203.
- [34]. Lazar, J., Jones, A., & Shneiderman, B. (2006). Workplace user frustration with computers: an exploratory investigation of the causes and severity.

- Behaviour & Information Technology*, 25(3), 239-251.
- [35]. Majid, R. A., Noor, N. L. M., Adnan, W. A. W., & Mansor, S. (2009). *A survey on HCI considerations in the Software Development Life Cycle: from practitioner's perspective*. Paper presented at the The 2nd International Conference on Interaction Sciences: Information Technology, Culture and Human, Seoul, Korea. <http://portal.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=1655929>
- [36]. Majid, R. A., Noor, N. L. M., Adnan, W. A. W., & Mansor, S. (2011). User's Frustration and HCI in the Software Development Life Cycle. *International Journal of Information Processing and Management*, 2(1), 44-49.
- [37]. Maslow, A. H. (1968). *Toward a psychology of being*. New York : D. Van Nostrand Company.
- [38]. McCarthy, J. (2011). Bridging the gaps between HCI and Social Media. *Interactions: A Bimonthly Publication of ACM*, 15-18.
- [39]. Nielsen, J. (1993). *Usability engineering*. Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc. San Francisco, CA, USA
- [40]. Nielsen, J., & Norman, D. A. (2014). The definition of user experience. *Evidence-based user experience research, training and consulting*. Accessed 20 April 2019 <<http://www.nngroup.com/articles/definition-user-experience/>>
- [41]. Norman, D.A. (2010a). The research-practical gap: the need for translational developers. *Interaction*, 17(4), 9-12.
- [42]. O'Connell, T. A., & Murphy, E. D. (2009). The Usability Engineering Behind User-Centered Processes for Web Site Development Lifecycles. In Z. Panayiotis & A. Chee Siang (Eds.), *Human Computer Interaction: Concepts, Methodologies, Tools and Applications*. London: IGI Global
- [43]. Orlikowski, W. J. (2002). Knowing in practice: Enacting a collective capability in distributed organizing. *Organisation Science*, 13(3), 249-273.
- [44]. Paulk, M.C. (2009). A history of the capability maturity model for software. *Software Quality Professional Magazine*, 12(1).
- [45]. Pintrich, P. R. (2000). An achievement goal theory perspective on issues in motivation terminology, theory, and research. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25, 92-104.
- [46]. Saldaña, J. (2012). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*: Sage, London.
- [47]. Schon, D. A. (1999). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*: Ashgate Arena. Aldershot, England.
- [48]. Shneiderman, B., & Plaisant, C. (2010). *Designing the User Interface: Strategies for Effective Human-Computer Interaction* (5th ed.): Pearson. Boston, USA.
- [49]. Sivaji, A., & Soo, S. T. (2013). Understanding, Enhancing and Automating HCI Work Practices: Malaysian Case Studies. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 97, 656-665. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.10.285>
- [50]. Smith, A., Joshi, A., Liu, Z., Bannon, L., Gulliksen, J., & Li, C. (2007). Institutionalizing HCI in Asia. Paper presented at the INTERACT 2007, Rio de Janeiro, Brasil.
- [51]. Solemon, B., Sahibuddin, S., & Ghani, A. A. A. (2008). Requirements engineering problems in 63 software companies in Malaysia. Paper presented at the Information Technology, 2008. ITSIm 2008. International Symposium on Information Technology.
- [52]. Solemon, B., Sahibuddin, S., & Ghani, A. A. A. (2009). Requirements Engineering Problems and Practices in Software Companies: An Industrial Survey. Paper presented at the ASEA 2009, CCIS.
- [53]. Solemon, B., Sahibuddin, S., & Ghani, A.A. (2010). Adoption of requirements engineering practices in Malaysian software development companies. *ASEA 2010, CCIS*, 117, 141-150.
- [54]. Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1994). Grounded Theory Methodology: An Overview. In N. K. Denzin, & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (Chapter 17, pp. 273-285). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- [55]. Taylor, M. J., McWilliam, J., Forsyth, H., & Wade, S. (2002). Methodologies and website development: a survey of practice. *Information and Software Technology*, 44(6), 381-391.
- [56]. Wenger, E. (1998). Community of Practice: a Brief Introduction. *Learning in Doing*, 15(4), 1-7. <https://doi.org/10.2277/0521663636>.
- [57]. Yeo, A. (1998). Cultural effects in usability assessment. Paper presented at the CHI 98 Conference Summary on Human Factors in Computing Systems, Los Angeles, California, USA.
- [58]. A. W. Yeo, P. C. Chiu, T. Y. Lim, P. P. Tan, T. Lim, and I. Hussein, "Usability in Malaysia," In *Global Usability*, Springer London, 211-222, 2011.
- [59]. Nichole K. Zimmerman, Everett Sambrook & Jonathan S. Gore (2014) The effects of a computer malfunction on subsequent task performance, *Behaviour & Information Technology*, 33:9, 874-881, DOI: 10.1080/0144929X.2012.733412