Survey:

**Implementation:** We talked about and decided on the most important questions we had regarding the redesign of our website. We formatted these questions into various open response-option, closed-response, open-ended, and likert scale questions based on how someone could best answer them. We received many responses containing very useful info.

**Data collected:** The first several questions in the survey helped us determine what functions are most important to users, while the last couple questions dealt with the visual design. We also collected class standing (junior, senior, etc.) to see if that affected opinions on the website.

**Summarize Data:** 75% of respondents said they appreciated the simple and easy layout of all the information on the pages. Equally, 75% of respondents said they their biggest grievance with the site was our design (either color scheme or choice of font). This shows us that functionally, people like our site. However, we need to make the site more visually appealing for our users.

In order to not just improve the original Trivago website, but also perfect our own first attempt at a redesign, multiple methods of peer evaluation had to be utilized. These analyses served as a way for us to better understand what a typical consumer desired from our site. Each type of evaluation highlighted specific aspects of the site for participants to weigh in on; the survey supplied us with feedback on our style choices and told us what functions were most important to users, the card sorting helped us to determine how to arrange the numerous filters associated with hotel searching, and the heuristic evaluation allowed us to interpret the severity our existing usability flaws. By setting up multiple evaluations, each with their own focus area, we were able to collect more valuable and beneficial data to bring new insights to our group about how to improve the site and create a more user-friendly interface.

Survey

As previously stated, the primary objectives of our survey were to 1) gather feedback on our first-stage redesign and 2) determine the functions most important to potential consumers. In order to achieve these two goals, we constructed a survey based on Fred Davis’ Technology Acceptance Model (TAM). Davis’ (1989) original TAM explained that the user’s acceptance of a new technology (in our case, the redesign of Trivago) is based on two factors: the user’s perceived usefulness (PU) and their perceived ease of use (PEOU). Davis defined the former of these two terms as “the degree to which a person believes that using a particular system would enhance his or her job performance” (‘job performance’ refers to task at hand) and the latter as "the degree to which a person believes that using a particular system would be free of effort” (Davis, 1989, p. 320). By associating objective 1 (gather feedback on the redesign) with PEOU and objective 2 (determining important functions) with PU, we were able to gather valuable and actionable feedback.

The survey consisted of 10 questions including open-ended, open response-option, closed-response, and likert scale type questions. The first few questions were open-response option and closed-response type questions that dealt with the functionality of the site. When asked what the most important factor in choosing a hotel was, 75% of participants responded that customer reviews were the priority, while 25% chose quality (star rating) of hotel. Both of these filters existed in their own menu outside the larger list of search parameters in our first-stage prototype. When asked what affects a user’s decision on the location of their hotel the most, the answers were split 50/50 between nearby activities and price per night. Both of these filters also existed in our first-stage prototype. This data can be interpreted as a high PU of the users who took the survey. It wasn’t until we introduced an image of our prototype and open-response questions that we could begin to see the users’ PEOU.

The final questions were open-response questions with dealt primarily with the design and layout of information of our search results page. When asked what the user liked best about the layout, 75% of participants referenced the easy to navigate and uncluttered feel of the site. When asked what they liked least, another 75% mentioned that either the color scheme or font. Interpreting this data, we realized that for as strong as they felt about the PEOU, they felt just as strong about the need for a visual revamp.

After interpreting all the data collected from our survey, very few changes were made to the layout of information on our website. However, a large overhaul of the interface design took place. From the first prototype, shown in *Figure 3.2*, to the final project, shown in *Figure 3.3*, the dark blue background has been replaced with a lighter, more appealing shade and we increased the size of almost all text boxes, fonts, and icons that were hard to see or interpret.

In our first-stage design, menus for additionally filters included “Price per Night”, “Hotel Type” (in reference to quality), “Guest Reviews”, and “More Filters” (list of all other search parameters). Seeing as how 100% most important factors were already included in their own menus, one can assume the PU of our original design was extremely high.