

User Scenarios

Context-Aware Diagnostic Notification Effectiveness in Problem Reporting

Kyle Owen | Project Design | October 2026

Purpose and Evidence Status

These provisional scenarios apply the survey-derived and pilot-informed personas to the proposed notification workflow. The scenarios are design and testing artifacts rather than completed study results. Exact technical thresholds, persistence intervals, inactivity boundaries, and recovery criteria will be calibrated and locked before formal participant testing.

Scenario 1: Waiting During a Persistent Performance Condition

Scenario Element	Definition
Associated persona	The Cautious Wait-and-See User
Scenario type	Qualifying performance-degradation scenario
Starting situation	The participant begins an assigned computer-based task. The bounded memory-pressure process starts, and application responsiveness gradually declines. The participant initially waits because the condition may be temporary and may consider restarting.
Notification behavior	After the calibrated persistence and task-impact conditions are met, the notification explains that an ongoing performance condition may be affecting the active task. The notification explains that reporting while the condition remains active may preserve useful diagnostic context.
Permitted participant response	The participant may select Continue Working or intentionally begin the simulated report. No report begins automatically.
Design and testing purpose	The scenario tests whether the prompt helps the participant distinguish a temporary condition from a meaningful condition without pressuring the participant to submit.

Scenario 2: Reviewing Permission and Diagnostic Scope

Scenario Element	Definition
Associated persona	The Control- and Privacy-Focused User
Scenario type	Qualifying condition with transparency and control emphasis
Starting situation	A qualifying condition occurs while the participant is working. The participant first wants to know whether a report has already been created and what information may be shared.
Notification behavior	The notification states that no report has been submitted, describes the detected condition as a possible category rather than a diagnosis, and explains the limited simulated diagnostic context. Dismissal and approved suppression controls remain visible.
Permitted participant response	The participant may dismiss, mute, continue working, or intentionally open the simulated Helpdesk Button workflow.
Design and testing purpose	The scenario tests permission clarity, trust, control visibility, suppression, and data-minimization language.

Scenario 3: Completing a Low-Effort Reporting Workflow

Scenario Element	Definition
Associated persona	The Low-Effort Prompt Responder
Scenario type	Qualifying condition followed by simulated submission
Starting situation	A meaningful performance condition occurs during the assigned task. The participant receives a concise notification containing the condition category, practical relevance, and a direct reporting control.
Notification behavior	The participant selects Begin Simulated Report. The workflow requests only the approved information and does not require the participant to diagnose the cause.
Permitted participant response	The simulated workflow records opening, initiation, completion, cancellation, or abandonment.
Design and testing purpose	The scenario tests whether a concise explanation and short reporting path support completion without removing explicit permission.

Scenario 4: Pilot-Informed Selective Reporting

Scenario Element	Definition
Associated persona	The Pilot-Informed Selective Non-Reporter
Scenario type	Qualifying condition with notification-fatigue safeguards
Starting situation	A performance condition begins during routine computer use. The participant initially waits and may consider restarting rather than submitting a ticket.
Notification behavior	A single qualifying notification provides simple but detailed information, states that no ticket has been created, and offers a short reporting path. Duplicate suppression prevents repeated pop-ups during the same continuing condition.
Permitted participant response	The participant may continue working, dismiss or mute the prompt, or intentionally begin the simulated report.
Design and testing purpose	The scenario tests whether infrequent, plain-language, permission-based prompting can support a user who does not normally submit tickets. The scenario remains pilot-informed and is not treated as representative of a population segment.

Shared Scenario Safeguards

Safeguard	Application
Explicit permission	No simulated submission begins without intentional participant action.
No automatic diagnosis	The initiating category is presented as possible context rather than a confirmed root cause.
Bounded resource use	The pressure process remains within approved allocation, duration, stopping, release, and recovery limits.
Duplicate suppression	One continuing condition does not generate repeated prompts.
Privacy and data minimization	The workflow excludes passwords, client identities, confidential configurations, and production diagnostic reports.
Equivalent comparison	Control and notification groups receive the same task, timing, reporting tools, and investigator interaction except for notification exposure.