aws ReverseHand

Usability Testing

Report

PREPARED BY
Cache Money

Why usability testing?

To evaluate the non-functional requirement of having a usable system, usability testing was carried out by the Cache Money team.

The purpose of such a test is to collect both qualitative and quantitative data about the user's experience with your application. This data can serve as an indication of whether your product is ready to be used in real-world applications, as well as highlight what user journeys can be added or improved upon.

Our approach to usability testing.

Usability testing was facilitated by members of the Cache Money team. Users would either install the application on their phone, to help determine if usability remained consistent on different devices or use a phone of a Cache Money team member.

Thereafter, a facilitator would guide users through a set of scenarios for clients and contractors, respectively. Facilitators would not interfere with the user journey, but only provide the task that the user was meant to complete.

Here follows the **scenarios** for the respective roles, where each user would take on a single role:

Contractor	**Client**
Signing Up	Signing Up
Making a Bid	Creating an Advert
Communicate with the client	Accept a Bid
Reporting an advert	Finish a job, i.e., communicating with the contractor, closing, and reviewing the process

(Table A)

After each user would complete their respective user journey from start to finish, they were asked to give feedback on the usability of the system. Feedback was provided by answering a set of questions, which differed slightly depending on which role they fulfilled during testing.

Here follows the **questions** that users were presented with:

The first set of questions for each role was to rate the ease with which they were able to complete the scenarios in *Table A*, on a Likert scale from 1 to 5, where 1 represented "Very Difficult" and 5 represented "Very Easy".

The second portion of questions asked users to indicate which of the listed features (ranging from core features to features added for convenience to the user) they had realised were available to them:

Contractor	**Client**
Filtering Adverts	Filtering Bids
Editing your Bid	Editing an Advert
Editing your Profile	Editing your Profile
Viewing your Past Jobs	Favouriting a Bid

Viewing your Reviews	Viewing your Past Jobs
Viewing Notifications	Viewing Notifications

(Table B)

Users of either roles were then asked a “yes” or “no” question- whether they think that this application solves a current need or desire.

Lastly, users were asked which elements assisted them most through their user journey for a more qualitative type of feedback.

The results.

Likert scale results:

Every scenario, performed by both clients and contractors, were rated as a 4 or a 5, where 5 represents “Very Easy” and 1 represents “Very difficult”. Therefore, every scenario could be completed with relative ease.

Checkbox results:

Features could be recognised by most users, with 66% being the lowest rate at which users noticed a feature available to them.

“Yes or No” results:

100% of users indicated that they believe the ReverseHand application solves a current need or desire.

Qualitative feedback:

Users gave very insightful feedback on what assisted them in completing the presented scenarios. This feedback was then analysed to determine what element users were referring to. For example, one user response reads, “I liked that I could sign in with google, as well as the visual cues in the profile setup. The text instructions also helped show all the functionality”. This feedback represents social signup, icons, and hint text, even though users did not directly name those categories. All feedback was analysed in this way and compiled into the graph that can be seen below.