High-Fidelity Prototype and Summative Evaluation Report

Trivago but for Package Shipping

April 5th, 2021

The Surveyors

CSC318H1

TA: Jessi Stark

Tim Cosby (tim.cosby@mail.utoronto.ca), Francesca Ho (francesca.ho@mail.utoronto.ca), Prynciss Ng (prynciss.ng@mail.utoronto.ca), Camus Lam (camus.lam@mail.utoronto.ca), Bongkyu Song (bongkyu.song@mail.utoronto.ca)

Executive Summary

The following report contains installation details and instructions on how to install the high-fidelity prototype and other information describing the functionality of the prototype. The evaluation protocol outlines the tasks participants were asked to carry out, the data collections methods used, and any other evaluation material that was used. Also included is our analysis of the study where we summarize our findings from the experiment. We then discuss the implications of our design and how it could be currently improved and how it could have been improved if we had more insight.

Table of Contents

Group Contributions

Member	Task	Estimated Time
Tim	**Discussion & Implications**	**1 Hour**
	High-Fidelity Prototype Description	**1 Hour**
	High-Fidelity Prototype Creation	**6 Hours**
Tiffany	**High-Fidelity Prototype Creation**	**9 Hours**
	High-Fidelity Prototype Description	**1 Hours**
Brandon	**High-Fidelity Prototype Carrier Select Page**	**6 hours**
Camus	**Evaluation Criteria**	**1 hour**
	Evaluation instrument	**1 hour**
	Data collection method	**1.5 hours**
	Result of the study	**2 hours**
	Micro-business user #1 testing session and editing	**1.5 hours**
	Personal User #3 testing session and editing	**1.5 hours**
Francesca	**Results of the study**	**2 hours**
	Personal user #1 testing and editing	**1.5 hours**
	Personal user #2 testing and editing	**1.5 hours**
	Research Protocol	**.5 hours**

	Executive Summary	**.5 hours**
	Critique	**1 hour**
	Evaluation protocol	**1 hour**

High-Fidelity Prototype

Description

Download link:
https://drive.google.com/file/d/1-rEB_sW0udUTFFnF8aR4clm-6mRMjMwP/view?usp=sharing

Installation instructions:

1. Ensure you have an up-to-date version of Google Chrome installed. If you do not, please install it at https://www.google.com/intl/en_ca/chrome/.
2. Download the project from the download link provided above.
3. Extract the “CSC318” folder from the downloaded .zip file.
4. Navigate to the “CSC318\templates” folder in the extracted files.
5. Open the “home.html” file in Google Chrome to launch the webapp.

Support of functional requirements and job stories descriptions:

Personal

When I need to use shipping services to return the commodity I bought online, **I am** irritated **because** I think it is unfair that I need to pay the shipping fee.

- There is nothing we can do about the required shipping fee, but our application allows the user the ability to sort all of their options to choose the cheapest shipping fee, therefore helping the user to lessen the irritated feelings. This is found on the “carrier select” page after sorting by price.

When I am choosing a shipping carrier, **I want to** get the cheapest price without loyalty to any previously used carriers, **so I can** save as much money as possible.

- Our application calculates the price for different shipping carriers, the user can also sort the price to easily select/view the cheapest carrier option.

Both type of users

When I am choosing a shipping carrier, most importantly, **I want** to find the lowest price as possible, **So I can** save as much money as possible.

- Since our app allows the user to hone in on many common factors that they would want reflected or not in the final price, we are able to provide the user the lowest price given their shipping criteria. This can be realized on the final page of the app: the “carrier select” page where they can sort by the cheapest price.

When I am choosing a shipping carrier, besides cost, **I want to** find a shipping carrier with the fastest delivery time, **So I can** get the job done as soon as possible.

- In our application, in the final ‘carrier select’ page, the user may use the ratings/reviews for each shipping carrier to determine the most reputable option available and see if the reviews are saying if it has fast delivery times.

When I am looking for new information about shipping services, **I want to** visit the shipping companies' website, **So I can** understand the services they provide.

- In the “carrier select” page, the user can click on the different shipping carrier options and it will link to the shipping company’s website and view the services they provide.

When I am using a shipping service, **I may want to** purchase package tracking for my packages, **so I can** look into it and keep track of the shipping progress.

- When using our application, the user will encounter the question “Do I want to be able to track my packages during transit?”. If “yes” is selected, then our

application will calculate and display the shipping carrier options with tracking calculated in the price in the “carrier select page”.

When I am choosing a shipping carrier, **I want to** save my time on research such as shipping cost comparison, container limitation and et cetera, **so I can** send my package as soon as possible with less effort.

- Using our application, the user will only need to enter all the relevant information then all the shipping options will be displayed. This greatly reduces the time needed to research all shipping options, calculate their price, then compare for the best option available.

When I am looking for a shipping carrier, **I may** just pick the one closest to my current position, **so I** don’t have to waste so much time considering which one to choose and get the job done as soon as possible

- In the “carrier select” page, there is a column with the destination distance displayed. The user can also sort by that column to quickly determine the closest shipping carrier available to them.

Business

When I am choosing a shipping carrier for my business, **I want to** sign up with one shipping carrier for a deal and use it consistently, **so I can** get a better price consistently in the future.

- If the user selects the ‘Business’ option in the first page, the application will automatically search for small business discounts and display them as ‘promotions’ in the final ‘carrier select’ page.

When I encounter shipping loss, **I want** a faster investigation and larger compensation from the shipping carrier, **so I can** be less affected by the shipping failure .

- In our application, in the final ‘carrier select’ page, the user may use the ratings/reviews for each shipping carrier to determine the most reputable option available.

1. The app should be able to retrieve inputs from the user based on shipping requirements (e.g. Speed, price, location, reputation).
    - Our application retrieves information such as personal/business reason for shipping, the shipping container’s size, weight, from/to address, if tracking/fragile option is needed.
2. The user should be able to set filters to narrow down shipping carrier methods that are viable to their specific needs and wants (e.g. speed, price, location, reputation).
    - The user may sort the results in the ‘carrier select’ page by price, location, and reputation.
3. The app should allow users to specify and passively display specific additional features associated with each carrier (e.g. Availability of on-site pickup, package tracking).
    - The user is able to see, indicated by icons beside the price on the carrier select page, whether or not the service has on-site pickup, or package tracking available.
4. The app should intuitively and plainly show key important metrics associated with each result (i.g. Shipping cost, if there is a special promotion going on, distance from nearest branch).
    - The metrics are shown in variety on the ‘carrier select’ page.

5. The app should provide detailed information about the shipping method (e.g. any filters that choice may fall under) as well as displaying the link of the specified carrier for the user to easily fill out packaging information.
    - The user may click on the shipping carrier option in the final ‘carrier select’ page that will lead to the website of the selected carrier.
6. The app should sort by micro-business preference by default and have an option to sort by user reviews and other metrics if needed.
    - The columns on the ‘carrier select’ page have buttons for sorting that column such as user reviews as needed.

Address all of the issues identified in A2

- Users were confused what each page was for
    - Guiding text were added under the title of each page
- Users were confused what units were being used
    - Units are clearly labelled
- Placement of buttons were confusing
    - Placement of buttons (such as the ‘back’/’next’ buttons) are standardized in each page. Unrelated buttons are not placed close to each other to avoid confusion.
- Users wanted a way to bundle packages and see the total cost instead of seeing a ‘add more package’ button
    - ‘Package Cart’ page is added to display all packages that the users have created
- The progress bar in the first page were confusing

    - Progress bar in the first page removed
- Users want an envelope option
    - Envelope option added
- ‘Use previous settings’ button were confusing
    - ‘Use Previous Package Details’ button is used instead to be more clear on the functionality of the button
- In the original dimension page, users were confused about what the ‘other’ button does
    - Button text changed to ‘Custom Dimension’ to be more clear
- For the personal weight page, users were not aware that they can specify the weight by typing
    - The textbox is now clearly outlined
- Users were concerned whether or not the “use current location” button would be accurate enough, and what the from address will be used for
    - ‘Use current location’ is removed, the reasoning for the from address is stated on the page
- Input box of the address pages are not standardized
    - Additional text boxes were added to obtain different parts of the address
- Map of the address pages were confusing (their usage, interactivity)
    - Map removed
- The symbols beside the prices in the ‘Carrier select page’ were confusing
    - Hover text added to the images

Research Protocol

1. **Project Title**: “Usability Study of High Fidelity Prototype ”.

2. **Investigators**: Names and email addresses of all members of the team.

- Tim Cosby (tim.cosby@mail.utoronto.ca)
- Francesca Ho (francesca.ho@mail.utoronto.ca)
- Prynciss Ng (prynciss.ng@mail.utoronto.ca)
- Camus Lam (camus.lam@mail.utoronto.ca)
- Bongkyu Song (bongkyu.song@mail.utoronto.ca)

3. **Purpose**: The purpose of this evaluation is to evaluate the usability of our high-fidelity prototype by asking participants to complete a series of tasks. We also wish to use the results of this evaluation to further improve on our design and refine our product. A brief description of our design problem is: to derive the optimal shipping carrier using the package’s associated dimensions and weight for individual or micro-businesses depending on their needs and preferences.

4. **Process to be followed**: We will brief the participants about the purpose of the study, explain how the session will work, explain to them the tasks they must complete and ask them to narrate aloud. Then we will let them use the app accordingly and let them ask any questions at the very end after they finished all tasks.

5. **Participant selection:** Participants will be chosen from our friends and family who meet our desired criteria (have sent packages before, is a micro-business owner)..

6. **Relationships**: Our relationship to the participants may be described as follows: Friends, families.

7. **Risk and benefit:** There will be minimal risk to the participants, for example that they feel that they have wasted their time. The only benefit will be to contribute to the education of the investigators. Participants are free to withdraw before or at any time during the study without the need to give any explanation.

8. **Consent details**: We will brief the participants on the purpose of the study, their responsibility during the study and how the study recordings will be used. Since the study involves recordings, we asked for participants' consent about having their voice/face camera recorded before we started the session.

9. **Compensation**: Participants will receive no compensation.

10. **Information sought:** The information to be sought is the thought process and opinions of participants while using the app so we can improve upon our design.

11. **Confidentiality**: Information will be kept confidential by the investigators. Names or other identifying or identified information will not be kept with the data, but will be featured in the think-aloud session recordings in the appendix. The only other use will be to include excerpts or copies in the assignment submitted, but names and other identifying or identified information will not be submitted.

Evaluation Protocol

To conduct our experiment, we found four participants from our family and friends such that three would be personal users and one would represent the micro-business stakeholders. We will use Discord or Zoom to call the participants and use OBS Studio to record the screen and audio. The participants will be informed that the experiment is recorded and be given the research protocol. Participants in the personal user stakeholder group will be asked to do the following tasks:

1. Send a small (5 cm x 5 cm x 5 cm), fragile package with tracking using the pre-sized package options such that the package will reach its destination as fast as possible
2. Send a large package (80 cm x 80 cm x 80 cm) that does not require shipping or tracking as cheaply as possible
3. Send an envelope using the pre-selected dimension size that requires tracking such that the package will reach its destination as fast as possible
4. Send a package with customized dimension instead of the predefined ones
5. On the carrier select panel, click onto one of the carrier option to look for contact/shipping information from the company's website

Tasks 2 and 3 test how effectively and intuitively users are able to ship packages using the predetermined packages sizes provided. Taks 1 and 3 test how users' ability to use the custom dimensions package size screen. Tasks 1 through 4 are each given different criteria on the shipping options because we wanted to see how users interacted with the fragile and tracking button options as well as testing to see if users would use the sorting feature on the carrier select screen. We designated task 5 to evaluate how users interacted with the carrier select screen and if they intuitively clicked on a company's website to look for more information.

Participants in the micro-business user stakeholder group will be asked to do the following tasks:

1. Send a package of their product to a customer that does not want tracking as cheaply as possible
2. Send a fragile package of their product to a customer that wants tracking as quickly as possible
3. Send three packages separate of their products with tracking as cheaply as possible
4. Send another 4 packages with the same settings (addresses, dimensions) with the best shipping service
5. On the carrier select panel, click onto one of the carrier option to look for contact/shipping information from the company's website

Tasks 1 through 4 are given to micro-business users to test the different shipping combinations that we imagine the average online business would receive. For example, some customers do not care about when the package arrives as long as the shipping is cheap as possible or some customers want to receive their package as soon as possible. Tasks 3 and 4 specifically sees if micro-business users will use the "use previous settings" button and how they deal with the challenge of having to ship multiple packages. In addition, tasks 1 and 2 are designed to see how micro-business users are able to use the tracking and fragile options similar to personal users. Finally, the rationale for task 5 is the same as for personal users.

Evaluation Criteria

In the usability testing, both quantitative and qualitative data are collected according to the following three criteria:

Effectiveness:

Qualitative:

- Descriptive notes about the sequence of steps performed by the users when completing the tasks
- Users comments related to completing the given tasks

Quantitative

- Number of errors committed when completing each task (e.g. buttons misclicked, frequency of wrong data input)
- Number of tasks successfully completed
- Performance rating given by users on the SUS after each task

Efficiency:

Qualitative:

- Users comments about efficiency of the prototype

Quantitative:

- Average time spent by users to complete each task
- Number of clicks performed by users to complete each task
- Efficiency rating given by users on the SUS after each task

Satisfaction:

Qualitative:

- Users comments about how they liked the prototype

Quantitative:

- Satisfaction rating given by users on the SUS

Besides the three criteria mentioned above, the acceptability of the system will also be measured by collecting users' acceptance of the system using the SUS form.

Data collection method

Quantitative Data:

All quantitative data mentioned in the evaluation criteria section (e.g. Average time spent by users to complete each task) were collected by analyzing the recordings of the usability testing sessions. All recordings were reviewed during the data analysis to measure the data metrics needed for the testing conclusions. For example, the number of clicks performed by each user to complete each task was measured by reviewing the session recordings. Compared to measuring the data during the session, this method can reduce measurement error due to time constraints and allow our testers to focus more on managing the testing flow and collecting qualitative comments from our users.

The only quantitative data that was collected right after the testing session is users' acceptance of the system. Data of users' acceptance were collected by asking our users to fill out the System Usability Scale form after completing all tasks. This data is collected right after the testing session to make sure our users had a fresh memory of the design when they were filling out the form. The acceptability of the design is then calculated later by computing all scores provided by the users' responses collected.

Qualitative Data:

All qualitative data are collected by taking notes when users were doing the assigned tasks and asking users for their comments after the testing sessions. Qualitative data were collected in this

manner as users' real-time expressions such as speaking volume, thinking time, can provide insight into users' feelings, thoughts to the design.

Evaluation Instruments

Quantitative Data:

Users' acceptance scores were measured using a system usability scale form containing 10 statements. Users are required to rate each statement from 1(Strongly disagree) to 5 (Strongly agree) to express their degree of agreement. The statements focus on asking users about their ratings for the design's ease of learning, likeability and efficiency as outlined below:

Ease of learning:

- I thought the system was easy to use
- I think that I would need the support of a technical person to be able to use this system
- I would imagine that most people would learn to use this system very quickly
- I needed to learn a lot of things before I could get going with this system

Likeability:

- I think that I would like to use this system frequently
- I thought there was too much inconsistency in this system
- I felt very confident using the system

Efficiency:

- I found the system unnecessarily complex
- I found the various functions in this system were well integrated
- I found this system very cumbersome to use

The statements are arranged in the order that higher scores of odd number statements represent a more acceptable system while lower scores of even number statements represent a more acceptable system. This arrangement is to avoid possible question-order bias that may affect users' response and to help to spot inappropriate responses that should be discarded.

Except for users' acceptance scores, other quantitative data such as the average number of errors committed when completing each task are measured manually by reviewing the session recordings.

Qualitative Data:

Qualitative data were collected by asking users for their comments after they have completed all assigned tasks. The following three questions were asked with each of them targeting different evaluation criteria outlined above:

- How effectively do you think the design can solve the assigned tasks and problem of selecting carriers in daily lives? (Effectiveness)

- How long in general would you use to find a suitable carrier for your packages? Do you think this app can help you find the best options more efficiently? (Efficiency)

- Overall, are you satisfied with the current design? Are there any future improvements you think are needed to make the design work better? (Satisfaction)

Results of the Study

Quantitative Data:

Users' acceptance Scores (SUS evaluations):

Our study consisted of four participants, three being part of the personal user stakeholder group and one being a micro-business user. From the SUS evaluations, overall the average was 79.4 which indicates that the system has excellent usability. But looking at each question individually we can get more insight.

#	Question	Average Score
1	I think that I would like to use this system frequently	3.5
2	I found the system unnecessarily complex	1.75
3	I thought the system was easy to use	4.25
4	I think that I would need the support of a technical person to be able to use this system	1
5	I found the various functions in this system were well integrated	2.75
6	I thought there was too much inconsistency in this system	2.5
7	I would imagine that most people would learn to use this system very quickly	5
8	I found this system very cumbersome to use	2
9	I felt very confident using the system	4
10	I needed to learn a lot of things before I could get going with this system	1

We can see from the SUS results that users have very little difficulty using and learning the system based on the scores for questions 3, 4, 7, and 10. This can be greatly attributed to the linearity of our app since it only has two paths, personal and business and our minimalistic design. For example, by simplifying fragile and tracking options to simple yes or no buttons and having pre-set , we were able to greatly reduce the cognitive load for users.

The score of 3.5 for question 1 indicates that users found the system at least somewhat convoluted and unnecessary considering the scale of the problem. Many participants commented about how they assumed that the app would take them to a purchase screen at the end and that they could print the label from the site. So once they reached the carrier select screen and selected a carrier, many participants were disappointed to find they were just redirected to another website.

Furthermore, the low score for question 5 suggests that our high-fidelity prototype was lackluster and needed more work before being given to the participants in our study. Some examples being, the province text field entry is missing when entering an address and there was no autofill feature for entering addresses.

The results of question 6 can mostly be attributed to the inconsistencies in the system from the package dimensions unit. The units in the pre-set package dimensions are in imperial while the custom dimensions screen is in metric. Considering that in Canada there is a wide variation between people when using metric vs imperial it would have been better to implement an option to switch between units. Furthermore, the range of values in the slider for package weight in the personal user path are not helpful. One user commented that a packaging weighing 10 grams does not make sense unless it's an envelope and then otherwise almost all other packages will be over a few hundred grams, thus they thought the slider was pointless. (See "custom dimensions units comment" link in appendix.)

Other statistic data:

Besides users' acceptance scores, other quantitative data were also measured by reviewing the recordings. The results are as follows:

- Average time spent by users to complete each task: ~1.5 to 2.5 mins per task
- Average number of clicks performed by users to complete each task: ~20 to 25 clicks per task

- Average number of errors committed when completing each task (e.g. buttons misclicked, frequency of wrong data input) ~0 to 2 errors (most of them are trivial typing error)
- Average number of tasks successfully completed: 5 (All assigned tasks were successfully completed)

All quantitative data collected to support that the design is rather efficient and effective in helping users to select carriers. In particular, each task only took 1.5 to 2.5 mins to complete with only 20 to 25 clicks needed. Compared to searching through the internet manually, which may require up to 15 mins (mentioned by users during comment sessions), the design can filter out the best options in a short time, which shows that the design is pretty efficient.

Besides efficiency, the data also shows that the design is pretty effective, as users can generally complete all 5 assigned tasks while only making a few trivial typing errors (no error related to the interface itself).

Qualitative Data:

Qualitative comments were collected in the Q&A session after users have completed all assigned tasks. Users' comments were generally positive as most of them thought that the design is both effective and efficient. There were also some comments and suggestions about possible rooms of improvement, as outlined below:

Positive comments:

- "As long as the final version of the design can help users find out which carriers are the cheapest or fastest, then I think the design is a good idea" - Micro business user #1
- "Depends on the packages i'm sending, usually i would spend around 10 to, may be less than 15 minutes to look for different carriers before sending the packages….I think this app is pretty efficient, like i mentioned before, it only took me less than 2 minutes to find out the best options, so I would say, just considering the task of looking for carriers, the app can finish the task efficiently" - Personal user #3

- “Just considering all the functions the app provides, I would say yes, I'm satisfied with the functionality of the app.” - Personal user #3

For positive comments, most users think that the app has sufficient functionalities to solve the task of selecting carriers quickly. Users also mentioned that generally, it would take at least 10 mins to find a suitable carrier from the internet, so in contrast, this design is pretty efficient in completing the task. (Only 2 to 3mins required)

Suggestions for Improvements:

- “In terms of creating and selecting packages, I think the design could improve in some domain of efficiency, for example if i want to send several same packages, if there's a button that can let me just copy an old order without going through all the pages again, that will make the design much more efficient” - Micro Business User #1
- ".....Perhaps you can change these circle buttons (sorting button) to arrows, which usually represents sorting in order, so it would be easier for users to understand the options they have" - Micro Business User #1
- “However, there are also some features, especially the metrics, that made me feel confused while doing the tasks…..”, “....and I think this could be improved by... maybe install some plugins to help us to do the conversion automatically if it is possible” - Personal user #3
- “Also the art design looked kinda... I would say not clean enough? I would recommend changing the art to make it looks more professional and simplistic” - Personal user #3

For suggestive comments, the comments can be divided into two main parts: Functionality suggestions and quality of life suggestions.

For functionality comments, users generally suggested adding two extra functions to make the design more efficient, including automatic data conversion between different metrics, and fill up similar info automatically. As observed in the testing sessions, users usually spend

quite a lot of time converting data to the required metrics, users also reflected that this task is cumbersome and should be shortened.

Besides, users also wanted to include the "copy" function, which allows users to copy old orders info to skip the input process for similar packages. This shows that users are not satisfied with the existing "use previous package info" function and want to further shorten the data input process.

For the quality of life suggestions, users generally want to make the art design look more professional and to improve some of the button designs. Some users suggested that the current art design does not look appealing and "clean" enough to users and they think a more simplistic and professional art design should be used in the app. For button design, some users think the button designs are not intuitive enough, which sometimes causes them to overlook some of the available options. This can be improved by changing button designs into more conventional designs that can better represent their functions.

Discussion and Implications

How it succeeded:

Due to the colour and layout design of our prototype, users in the usability study were able to without prior training on how to use the app, found it very intuitive to use and were able to complete all tasks given. The process was fairly harmless, taking only 4-5 steps depending on the stakeholder to reach the carrier selection screen in which the users were able to efficiently find the carrier which best fit their needs of shipping their package regardless if there was one or more packages. Thanks to these limited steps, the users were able to complete each task of varying complexity within 2-3 minutes. This is seen as a success, as going back to the first study, we found users spent typically 10-30 minutes to properly ship out a package. Since this app has a minimal time sink and takes you directly to the carrier of choice's webpage to finish your process, we believe that this would save the user time and money when they go to ship a package. Overall, these results indicate that the app performs its job of helping users to find the optimal carrier to send their package with well.

How it can be improved:

Improvements that can be made to our app which were uncovered from the usability study are largely quality of life features and minor fixes. For instance, our original fully featured prototype only allowed a specific set of units which weren't consistently in one system. A solution for this, that we did go back to fix, is to create an always available when in the setup process that changes what units the prototype is using. I.e., after pressing the button, all measurements in centimeters are converted to inches and likewise, kilograms to pounds.

Another quality of life change we could make is an address autofill when typing in a to/from address to make sure the target destinations are not misspelled or misrepresented which were issues found when conducting the usability study. A solution for this that a lot of companies use is the Canada Post “AddressComplete” utility. Unfortunately however, this is a limitation of our app not being a product we intend to market as it requires us to both, run the app on a server, and purchase the product.

A feature that we found was not used to its full potential was the “use previous settings” button, which was often skipped over in favour of manual input. Since the button is abnormal to most users, as there are not many mainstream equivalents. An alternative approach we could try out in the future is to instead allow the users to edit the package details of any package on the package cart page. Hence, if we then allow users to duplicate any package on the package cart page, it will perform the same action as the “use previous settings” button did, but in a more comprehensive and intuitive way that most users are already accustomed to.

A lot of users also found that the weight slider was too small and unnecessary. Though we originally created the weight slider to allow a greater breadth of users a more intuitive way of interfacing with the app, we found that it was more frowned upon by most users in the studies we have conducted. Hence, a future change would be to remove the value slider from the weight selection page, leaving only the raw value input field.

Finally, adding a layer of polish is something that users expected more from the app, things like page animations and more intricate ways to show what is happening on the page. This was mostly a limitation of time and resources as no one in the group was a full-fledged web design expert to be able to create such refinements under our time crunch. Hence, while many of these improvements stem from the app we are creating, not intended to come to market, there are still many valuable insights that we can take away and improve our high-fidelity prototype for future studies.

Critique

If we had more time, we would have a larger focus on the user's experience with the carrier select screen and how they would interact with a carrier's website after being redirected from ours. It would be great insight to see their reactions exploring a carrier's website for more information after being on our website. It is possible that their reactions could be a combination of annoyance that they have to look again for more information on the carrier's website or relief that they no longer have to scroll through Google. Some tasks we could have given participants include asking them to find the nearest branch of the carrier they select after the carrier select screen or double checking the cost of shipping their package on the carrier's website.

Another area we would have wished to focus on was the user's experience with the "use previous settings" feature. Some participants did not notice the button whatsoever and even when given repetitive tasks would repeat the process of entering the package's dimensions over and over again much to their annoyance. So if we had more time, we would redo the experiment with even more participants after making the "use previous settings" button more apparent by changing its colour, adding extra text on the screen or moving the position of the button. After doing the experiment a few times with different participants and with the button having different characteristics, we could then analyze what is the most optimal solution for users noticing the button.

Appendices

Micro-business stakeholder participant #1

	Strongly disagree		Neutral		Strongly Agree
I think that I would like to use this system frequently					x
I found the system unnecessarily complex	x				
I thought the system was easy to use					x
I think that I would need the support of a technical person to be able to use this system	x				
I found the various functions in this system were well integrated			x		
I thought there was too much inconsistency in this system	x				
I would imagine that most people would learn to use this system very quickly					x
I found this system very cumbersome to use	x				
I felt very confident using the system			x		
I needed to learn a lot of things before I could get going with this system	x				

Score: 36 * 2.5 = 90

Personal stakeholder participant #1

	Strongly disagree		Neutral		Strongly Agree
I think that I would like to use this system frequently			x		
I found the system unnecessarily complex		x			
I thought the system was easy to use				x	
I think that I would need the support of a technical person to be able to use this system	x				
I found the various functions in this system were well integrated		x			
I thought there was too much inconsistency in this system				x	
I would imagine that most people would learn to use this system very quickly					x
I found this system very cumbersome to use			x		
I felt very confident using the system					x
I needed to learn a lot of things before I could get going with this system	x				

Score: 30 * 2.5 = 75

Personal stakeholder participant #2

	Strongly disagree		Neutral		Strongly Agree
I think that I would like to use this system frequently			x		
I found the system unnecessarily complex		x			
I thought the system was easy to use				x	
I think that I would need the support of a technical person to be able to use this system	x				
I found the various functions in this system were well integrated			x		
I thought there was too much inconsistency in this system		x			
I would imagine that most people would learn to use this system very quickly					x
I found this system very cumbersome to use		x			
I felt very confident using the system				x	
I needed to learn a lot of things before I could get going with this system	x				

Score: 31 * 2.5 = 77.5

Personal stakeholder participant #3

	Strongly disagree		Neutral		Strongly Agree
I think that I would like to use this system frequently			x		
I found the system unnecessarily complex		x			
I thought the system was easy to use				x	
I think that I would need the support of a technical person to be able to use this system	x				
I found the various functions in this system were well integrated			x		
I thought there was too much inconsistency in this system			x		
I would imagine that most people would learn to use this system very quickly					x
I found this system very cumbersome to use		x			
I felt very confident using the system				x	
I needed to learn a lot of things before I could get going with this system	x				

Score: 30 * 2.5 = 75

Links to recordings:

Personal User #2 Testing session:

https://drive.google.com/file/d/1B2LI0Bb6wZixGruCyRZGcCqw3mlWj7Ef/view?usp=sharing

Personal User #2 Comment session:

https://drive.google.com/file/d/1wYyToqQ32GQpA490J613SIduhlawSqfa/view?usp=sharing

Personal User #3 Comment session:

https://drive.google.com/file/d/1iVVtzI7WCjWHPww0-6piw557ynTHuYwf/view?usp=sharing

Custom dimensions units comment:

https://drive.google.com/file/d/1LQcoaKGjH7ixw8JeMDFgf8W_zSyGKNbf/view?usp=sharing

Personal User #1:

https://youtu.be/yzcX44YOfhw

Micro-Business User #1:

https://youtu.be/BDMWfEZJweE