Information
Experience
Laboratory
University of Missouri

-

UNIVERSITY *of* MISSOURI

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

SCHOOL OF INFORMATION SCIENCE & LEARNING TECHNOLOGIES

Virtual Meeting Software User Experience

Technical Report

December 13, 2021

Leadership

Dr. Isa Jahnke, Director

Study Team

Karen Ballengee
Andrea Compton
Vanessa Doutherd
YuanYuan Gu
Nathan Riedel

Information Experience Laboratory
University of Missouri

1. About the IE Lab

Founded in 2003, the mission of the Information Experience Lab, in short, IE Lab, is to improve digital information and communication systems through research methodologies that blend traditional usability evaluation with user experience data, human information behavior research, and socio-technical integration design. The IE Lab is operated by the School of Information Science & Learning Technologies (SISLT) in the College of Education at the University of Missouri. The IE Lab has provided service to a range of clients across Missouri, including MU researchers, corporate, non-profit, and other academic partners.

Working closely with clients, the IE Lab director, and a doctoral project leader guide the study that is conducted by a team of SISLT doctoral students who are trained as usability and UX researchers. The website is http://ielab.missouri.edu

Information Experience Laboratory
University of Missouri

2. Executive Management Summary

The IE Lab intern project team conducted a usability test of the virtual meeting software Zoom and Microsoft Teams from December 3, 2021, through December 8, 2021. The purpose of the test was to evaluate the virtual meeting software Zoom and Microsoft Teams for system quality and overall usability regarding inexperienced users.

Seven participants from a variety of backgrounds participated in our task-based analysis. Each individual session lasted approximately forty-five minutes.

To evaluate the aforementioned systems, the team used a task-based virtual moderated user experience test including a Think Aloud protocol, SEQ, Successful Task Completion rate, and measurement of Time on Task, the System Usability Scale (SUS) survey, and a follow-up interview. Most participants rated their experience using virtual meeting software as intermediate or higher. Those who were testing Zoom had been using it for 2 years or more. Those testing Microsoft teams reported less experience using the platform than those testing Zoom.

During the usability test, the participants completed 7 tasks, rated the task's difficulty, and completed a SUS survey.

The SUS score for Teams is 63 and Zoom is 85. SUS scores are reported with A-D and F (failed). A score above 68 is average with scores below 68 revealing issues with the design that need to be addressed, and scores above 68 indicating an opportunity for minor improvements. An A is given with a score of 80+.

The score of 85 for Zoom is an A, which means that the platform is "excellent," though participant comments indicated a few areas that could still use improvement. The score of 63 for Teams is a D, which means that the platform is "poor," and there is a lot of room for improvement. Overall, the participants found Zoom to be easier to use than Microsoft Teams. The test identified these problems. Namely, with teams, the participant and host must be logged in using the same organization or even basic features such as chat may be unavailable to the participants.

The average completion time in Zoom ranged from 8 seconds (task 4) to 47.5 seconds. Tasks in teams ranged from an average of 13.75 seconds to 51.5 seconds.

Overall, the Zoom platform had a higher task completion rate than Microsoft Teams. Zoom participants were able to complete 86% of tasks across all participants while Teams participants were only able to complete 60% of tasks.

3. Goals

In this study, the IE Lab aimed to understand the usability quality of Zoom virtual meeting software compared to the usability quality of Microsoft Teams for inexperienced users.

The goal of this study was to conduct a comparison test on the usability and user experience (UX) of both Zoom and Microsoft Teams. The IE Lab used common usability instruments - such as the System Usability Scale survey and the Single Ease Question survey - in addition to qualitative questions to gather user feedback and assess these systems.

Finally, this report provides recommendations. These recommendations include both those related to the type of testing and data collection and those related to pilot testing the study's virtual testing environment.

4. Methods

The IE Lab conducted a task-based usability test using the think-aloud method. The test was supported with the System Usability Scale (SUS) survey and a follow-up interview with open-ended questions. Because of the Covid-19 situation, the study was conducted remotely. Data collection and analysis were conducted by three Usability Research Interns in the IE Lab. The interns analyzed the data through the use of Zoom Meeting recordings and surveys to examine the participant information while using the video conferencing software. The participants for the usability test of the software were collected by the testers themselves.

4.1 Participants

The participants for this test were identified by each of the testers. Each tester identified 1-3 participants for a total of 7 participants. Each participant was contacted virtually via email or text message to voluntarily participate in the test. Constraints stipulated by the client mandated that the participants chosen had little experience in the software they were being asked to test.

4.2 Description of Tasks and Instruments

There were six (6) different data collection methods used in this study. These data collection methods are:

1. Introductory Interview
2. Task-based usability test with Concurrent Think Aloud (via Zoom or Microsoft Teams)
3. Observation with Task Completion Success rate (notes were Google Sheets)
4. Single Ease Question (via Zoom or Microsoft Teams)
5. System Usability Scale, SUS (via Zoom or Microsoft Teams)
6. Follow-up interview (via Zoom or Microsoft Teams)

4.2.1 Introductory Interview

The introductory interview consisted of demographic questions and use questions. Use questions were split into two types. The first type aimed to determine the participants' experience with virtual meeting software both specific to the software being tested and general to virtual meeting software in general.

4.1.2 Descriptions of Tasks

Seven (7) tasks were developed for the overall study. The same seven tasks were used across both platforms in the same order. Thus, the word “system” in the following list of tasks can be substituted with either Zoom or Microsoft Teams.

1. Join the system training session.
2. Activate the system video.
3. Use the mute function.

4. Answer the Poll.
5. Send a Message in Chat.
6. Open a Link Provided by the Trainer.
7. Use Reactions.

4.1.3 Observation

As each participant performed the tasks, the observer made notes as the participant described their experience during the think-aloud process. The observer noted the 'Task Completion Success Rate and recorded Time on Task.

4.1.3.1 Think Aloud Method

During the task-based usability test, a Think-Aloud method was used to help collect information about the thought processes of the Participants. Participants were encouraged to verbalize what their thought process was during task completion, and when they were completed with the task.

4.1.3.2 Task Completion Success Rate

Each observer noted the 'Task Completion Success Rate' by tracking if the participant had completed the task with either ease or difficulty or failed to complete it at all. The observer scored the performance of the participant through the following criteria:

- 0- Failure
- 1- Completed with difficult
- 2- Completed with ease

4.1.3.3 Time on Task

Each observer timed and recorded how long each task took for the participant by starting a timer after the task was read and stopping it once the participant expressed they were finished with the task.

4.1.3.4 Single Ease Question

Following each task, the participants were asked to rate the difficulty of the task on a scale of 1-7 with 1 being the most difficult and 7 being the easiest.

4.1.4 System Usability Scale

After the participants had completed all tasks, they were asked questions from the System Usability Survey (SUS) verbally through Zoom or MS Teams. The participants verbally scored the following ten statements with one of five different responses, ranging from Strongly Agree (5) to Strongly Disagree (1).

The items of the System Usability Scale are:

1. I think that I would like to use this system frequently.
2. I found the system unnecessarily complex.
3. I thought the system was easy to use

4. I think that I would need the support of a technical person to be able to use this system.
5. I found the various functions in this system were well-integrated
6. I thought there was too much inconsistency in this system.
7. I would imagine that most people would learn to use this system very quickly
8. I found the system very cumbersome to use.
9. I felt very confident using the system.
10. I needed to learn a lot of things before I could get going with this system.

SUS is meant to measure how learnable and usable a system is, based on the user responses to the SUS questionnaire. These scores range from 0 to 100, with __ being the average user satisfaction score. Higher scores are thought of as an indicator of a more satisfactory design, while lower scores can represent a less than satisfactory design (Sauro, 2011).

4.1.5 Follow-up Interview

After the SUS, a follow-up interview was conducted. The follow-up interview consisted of two parts which focused on the experience and Final questions. The Experience section aimed t assess the overall experience that participants had during the test, the opinions they formed about the software they used as a result of the test, and the impact of the VoiceThread training on their ability to complete the task. The Final Questions section provided an opportunity for participants to ask or provide additional comments about the system. The questions were:

1. Experience

1.1 How was your overall experience with the system?
1.2 Is there anything you like about the system?
1.3 Is there anything you dislike about the system?
1.4 Did you feel distracted from the training while trying to complete the tasks?

2. Final questions

2.1 Are there any changes that you would want with the system?
2.2 Is there anything important about the system that you want to tell us but we didn't ask?
2.3 Please provide any additional comments if you have.

4.3 Method for Testing & Recording

To conduct the user experience tests, the research team had to construct a complex digital testing environment. Typically, testing of a software platform would be conducted in person. However, due to COVID-19 and the efforts to reduce its spread, the testing needed to be conducted at a distance. To do so, the team used virtual meeting platforms to conduct the tests. However, since virtual meeting software was the platform to be analyzed, a unique solution was required.

The structure of each meeting needed to be carefully executed. First, the virtual meeting platform the participant would be observed in needed to be chosen. To reduce the number of platforms used in the study, the observation platform would be the one not being analyzed. Essentially, if the participant were testing Zoom, the observation would occur in Microsoft Teams and vice versa. The remainder of this section will continue with this example.

The research team would send a Teams meeting to the participant. The preliminary interview would occur with only Teams open. Once the Tasks section (i.e., part 2) began, the participant was instructed to share their screen. Next, the research team would send the participant a link to the platform to be analyzed – in this case, Zoom. With the Teams screen share active, the research team could view the participant's Zoom meeting.

The test would continue as normal with the participant completing tasks as instructed by the research team. When arriving at Task 4, the research team would start a screen share in the platform to be analyzed, in this case, Zoom. The research team would share a VoiceThread that contained training over Google Drive, complete with slides and a voice-over. The test would resume with the training continuing in the background. Once all the tasks were complete, the research team stopped the screen share within Zoom. Immediately following the end of the Zoom screen share, the participant was asked to stop their screen share within Teams. Once the participants' screen share stopped, the research team moved on to the SUS section of the study (i.e., part 3).

5. Results

5.1 Demographics (i.e., all of the data collected prior to starting the tasks in the notes).

Seven (7) participants took part in the study. The participants were students or employees in the education field and between the ages of 26 and 64. Six (6) participants were female and one (1) was male. Five (5) of the participants were Caucasian and one (1) participant was African American and one (1) participant was Asian. Six (6) of the participants spoke English as their primary language and one (1) of the participants spoke Chinese as their primary language. Five (5) of the participants were testing Teams and two (2) of the participants were testing Zoom. We intended to look for inexperienced users for the virtual meeting software in order to test the usability of the software for new users. However, due to the pandemic, most people have used Zoom for a certain amount of time for school or work. Therefore, we were only able to have two (2) testers who have been tested for Zoom, and five (5) testers have been tested for Teams.

Of the seven (7) participants, the self-assessed level of experience with video conferencing platforms is as follows:

Experience	**Total**
Novice	1
Intermediate	4
Expert	2

The majority of participants indicated they have only been using video conferencing platforms since 2019 with one using various platforms for approximately five (5) years. The frequency of using Zooms among participants ranged from once per week to daily. The frequency of using Teams was much less at every few months to every few weeks.

Table 1. Participant Demographics (P=Participants); current students or employees in the education field

P	Age	Gender	Ethnicity	Language	Education Level	Software	Experience Level
1	26	female	Caucasian	English	Bachelor	Teams	Intermediate
2	57	female	African American	English	Masters	Zoom	Intermediate
3	49	female	Caucasian	English	Masters	Teams	Novice
4	36	male	Asian	English	Masters	Teams	Expert

P	Age	Gender	Ethnicity	Language	Education Level	Software	Experience Level
5	52	female	Caucasian	English	Masters	Zoom	Intermediate
6	61	female	Caucasian	English	Masters	Teams	Expert
7	64	female	Caucasian	English	High School	Teams	Intermediate

5.2 SEQ

Table 2. SEQ task scores for participants using Zoom.
Scale 1 (most difficult) to 7 (most easy)

Zoom SEQ	**Tasks**							**AVE per User**
User	**T 1**	**T 2**	**T 3**	**T 4**	**S 5**	**T 6**	**T 7**	
1								
2	6	7	7	7	7	7	7	**6.86**
3								
4								
5	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	**7**
6								
7								
AVE per Task	6.5	7	7	7	7	7	7	**6.93**

Table 3. SEQ task scores for participants using Teams
Scale 1 (most difficult) to 7 (most easy)

Teams SEQ	Tasks							AVE per User
User	**T 1**	**T 2**	**T 3**	**T 4**	**S 5**	**T 6**	**T 7**	
1	7	7	1	1	1	2	1	**2.86**
2								
3	7	2	7	1	6	6	1	**4.29**
4	7	7	7	7	7	7	6	**6.89**
5								
6	6	7	7	1	1	1	2	**3.57**
7	7	1	7	7	7	7	7	**6.14**
AVE per Task	6.8	4.8	5.8	3.4	4.4	4.6	3.4	**4.74**

Looking at both Teams and Zoom, the average SEQ score was considerably lower for Teams, but there was a wide range of responses across participants in Teams. This was due to complexities with Teams that stem from whether or not the participant and host are logged into the same organization when participating in a video conference along with whether they were using the desktop application or web application. Since Teams is a comprehensive collaboration tool that combines video conferencing with audio calls, ongoing chats, file sharing, and integration of other Office 365 applications and various third-party tools, users gain access to the most features and usability by logging into their Microsoft account from within the same organization.

During the testing for Teams in this study, there was a stark contrast between the scores in several areas based on whether the participant was logged into Teams in the same organization as the host or if the participant was outside of the host's organization. When the participant and host are not logged in using the same organization, even basic features such as chat may be unavailable to the participant. Further, other features require additional plug-ins in order to be functional. This was the case with polls. Teams is capable of creating and responding to polls in both the chat channel and during a video conference. However, to use the poll feature, another application must be connected to Teams, such as Microsoft Forms, before that feature is available.

5.3 SUS

The System Usability Scale (SUS) Score indicates usability in the areas of effectiveness, efficiency, and overall ease of use.

The average SUS score is 68. The following table gives the general guidelines for interpreting SUS scores:

SUS Score	Grade	Adjective Rating
>80.3	A	Excellent
68-80.3	B	Good
68	C	Okay
51-68	D	Poor
<51	F	Awful

Table 4. SUS scores for participants using Zoom.
Scale 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree)

Zoom SUS	Statements										Total
User	S 1	S 2	S 3	S 4	S 5	S 6	S 7	S 8	S 9	S 10	
1											
2	3	1	1	1	5	1	3	1	4	1	77.5
3											
4											
5	5	1	5	3	4	1	5	1	5	1	92.5
6											
7											
Overall AVE	4	1	3	2	4.5	1	4	1	4.5	1	85

Table 5. SUS scores for participants using Teams
Scale 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree)

Teams SUS	Statements										Total
User	S 1	S 2	S 3	S 4	S 5	S 6	S 7	S 8	S 9	S 10	
1	2	4	2	4	2	3	2	4	3	2	35
2											
3	2	4	4	5	4	1	4	1	3	3	57.5
4	5	1	5	1	5	1	5	1	5	1	100
5											
6	5	4	2	5	1	4	1	5	2	4	97.5
7	5	1	5	1	5	1	5	1	5	1	100
Overall AVE	3.8	2.8	3.6	3.2	3.4	2	3.4	2.4	3.6	2.2	63

The average SUS score for all Zoom participants is 85. The average SUS score for all Teams participants is 63. Zoom scores

In reviewing the individual SUS results for Zoom and Teams, Zoom has more typical results where Teams clearly indicates some issues with usability. For instance, the participants involved in the Teams testing clearly indicated that they would not want to use the platform frequently and did not feel it was easy to use.

5.4 Task Success

Table 6. Time on Task (In seconds)

Time on Task (In seconds)

Participant	Task 1	Task 2	Task 3	Task 4	Task 5	Task 6	Task 7
1	112	1	1	-	90	152	30
2	46	20	15	20	40	39	24
3	-	-	-	-	-	12	-
4	19	1	1	6	5	10	15
5	3	-	1	1	1	1	-
6	19	63	27	37	95	4	30

7	49	61	26	15	16	1	11
ZOOM MIN	3	20	1	1	1	2	-
ZOOM MAX	46	-	15	20	40	39	24
ZOOM AVG	47.5	20	8	10.5	20.5	20.5	24
TEAMS MIN	19	1	1	6	1	1	11
TEAMS MAX	112	63	27	37	95	152	30
TEAMS AVG	49.75	31.5	13.75	19.33	51.5	35.8	21.5
TOTAL MIN	3	1	1	1	1	1	11
TOTAL MAX	112	63	27	37	95	152	30
TOTAL AVG	35.42	29.2	11.83	15.8	41.16	31.28	22

***** *Participants using teams are highlighted.*

Tasks were timed and calculated in minutes. Note that some participants did not complete tasks so their times are not calculated in the minimum, maximum, or average times. Tasks in both platforms have an average completion time from 11.83 seconds (task 3) to 41.6 seconds (task 5). The average completion time in Zoom ranges from 8 seconds (task 3) to 47.5 seconds (task 1). Tasks in teams ranged from an average of 13.75 seconds (task 3) to 51.5 seconds (task 5).

Task1: Join the system training session. This task has a range from 3-112 seconds with two participants taking between 30 and 60 seconds (one in Teams and one in Zoom) and one participant in Teams taking over 60 seconds.

Task 2: Activate the system video. This task has a range from 1-63 seconds with 0 participants between 30 and 60 seconds and two in Teams who took over 60 seconds.

Task 3: Use the mute function. This task has a range from 1-27 seconds with no participants taking over 30 seconds.

Task 4 Answer the Poll. This task has a completion time between 1 and 37 seconds with one

participant using Teams with a time between 30 and 60 seconds.

Task 5: Send a Message in Chat. This task has a time range between 1 and 95 seconds. One participant in Zoom took between 30 and 60 seconds while two participants in Teams took over 60 seconds.

Task 6: Open a Link Provided by the Trainer. This task took between 1 and 152 seconds with one Zoom participant taking between 30 and 60 seconds and one Teams participant taking more than 60 seconds.

Task 7: Use Reactions. This task has a completion rate between 11 and 30 seconds. Two Teams participants took between 30 and 60 seconds to complete this task.

Table 7. General Completion Rate

	Task 1	Task 2	Task 3	Task 4	Task 5	Task 6	Task 7
P1	1	2	2	0	0	0	0
P2	2	2	0	2	2	2	2
P3	2	0	2	0	0	2	0
P4	2	2	2	2	2	2	1
P5	2	1	2	2	2	2	0
P6	2	1	2	0	0	0	0
P7	1	0	2	2	2	2	0
Zoom Success	2/2	2/2	1/2	2/2	2/2	2/2	1/2
Zoom Completion	100%	100%	50%	100%	100%	100%	50%
Teams Success	5/5	3/5	5/5	2/5	2/5	3/5	1/5
Teams Completion	100%	60%	100%	40%	40%	60%	20%
Total Success	7/7	5/7	6/7	4/7	4/7	5/7	2/7
Total Completion Rate	100%	71%	86%	57%	57%	71%	29%

* *Participants using Zoom are highlighted.*

Task success was determined by the observer. A score of 0 indicates that the task was not completed. Either the participant did not complete the task and stated that they were done or they stated that they were done and the task was completed incorrectly. One example is task 8 in Teams, participants 1,6, and 7 stated they were done but had actually waved, instead of giving a thumbs up. Participants 1 and 6 didn't have the chat option available in Teams so they were unable to complete the tasks that required using the chat. A score of 1 indicates that the users completed the task, but encountered difficulty. All tasks that were completed without difficulty are rated as 2. Tasks are considered a total success if they are rated a 1 or 2.

The Zoom platform has a higher completion rate with tasks 3 and 7 being the only two tasks below 100%. Conversely, Teams only had two tasks (task 1 and task 3) that were 100% completed. The rest were 60% or below. Task 7 has the lowest completion rate overall in both platforms while task 1 has the overall highest completion rate in both platforms.

5.5 Open-Ended Questions

Upon completion of the tasks, participants provided feedback on what they liked most and least about the virtual meeting software:

Zoom:

User Activities:

- Training
- Participate video meetings
- Host video meetings
- Teaching classes
- Polls
- Book club
- Catch up
- Tech support

Layout and Design of the app:

Likes

- Basic features are easier to access
- Features are easy to see at the bottom

Operation and Navigation of the app:

Likes

- Emojis/raise hand
- Breakout rooms
- Better connection

Dislikes

- The alternative host was not able to make a poll during the meeting
- Time limits/don't want to pay for it

Teams:

User Activities:

- Participate online meetings
- Sharing files

Layout and Design of the app

Dislikes

- UI is more complex than Zoom
- Show limited number of people on the screen during the meeting
- The poll function could not be located
- Having trouble finding the chat function
- Reactions location is not very clear
- Feature visibility should be improved (i.e. able to see it and better labeled/visualized)

Operation and Navigation of the app:

Likes

- Hold files and easy to access and share files during the video conference
- Camera on/off is easy
- Audio on/off is easy

Dislikes

- Chat should be simplified

Usability Problems and Examples from Participants

Problem #1

Participants had difficulty finding the chat function during the test in Teams. The chat function was not prominent for users to locate immediately during a training session. This issue is likely due to Teams' restricting features to meeting attendees that are not a part of the host's organization.

Quotes from participants

- “Oh no. I don't know how. I don't know how. is it this? It's [pause] okay. oh boy.”
- “I feel like I should be more tech-savvy than this.”
- Just [pause] I can't. Yeah, I can't see any chat or anything on here. Am I totally missing it?”

Problem #2

Participants found difficulty in finding the thumbs up in Teams. It took a while for several users to locate this feature and yet choose the incorrect one. This issue is believed to be related to Teams’ organizational features.

Quotes from participants

- “Feeling that somewhere? Oh no. You see it done. Thank you. Alright. See?”

Problem #3

Participants found the features layout in Teams were not as straightforward as in Zoom.

Quotes from participants

- “And like I mentioned, I would want it to be very straightforward. I like that on Zoom for example, when hover down in the bottom, in the footer of Zoom, you can see participants chat, share screen. It’s all spelled out there for you.”
- “I know you can’t copy other platforms, but using consistent icons that people would be able to even recognize would be useful.”

5.6 Limitations

This study had two limitations. The inability to test in person required a unique testing setup, as outlined in the Methods section. This setup came with several unanticipated difficulties. First, participant confusion. P6 expressed frustration with not knowing which system’s function they were utilizing. On tasks for accessing video and audio, the participant was having difficulty telling if they were turning their video or audio off in Teams (the testing system) or Zoom (the observation system).

An additional difficulty with the testing setup is access to cameras. Since this study was meant to replicate a training, the research team would share the training material in the system being tested. Typically, if an individual starts a screen share in Zoom, the other meeting participants enter a full-screen view. The study’s initial task list contained a total of 8 tasks, with a different task 3. The original task 3 asked users to exit the full screen after the tester shared the training materials. During a pilot test, the research team discovered that having an additional meeting software open prevented Zoom from opening in full screen. This required the elimination of the original task 3.

The dual meeting software setup makes studies of this nature more complex. In future studies, this

complexity needs to be accounted for. This research team recommends conducting several pilot tests to ensure that participants can differentiate the system functions they are supposed to be testing from those that are being used by the observation system. Additionally, future studies should conduct several pilot tests to ensure that all tasks are possible with both tools running, as well as ensure that microphone and camera access is not an issue.

The second limitation was the experience levels of our users. The goal of this study was to find users with little to no experience with virtual meeting software. However, as a result of social distancing measures due to COVID-19, many individuals that may not usually have used Zoom or Teams have now been exposed to it over the past year and a half. As a result, finding inexperienced users was difficult. Of particular note is finding participants for testing Zoom. Zoom saw a rapid growth in users due to COVID-19 leading to many people becoming familiar with the product. Therefore, finding participants that are inexperienced with Teams proved to be easier than finding those that are inexperienced with Zoom.

6. Conclusion and Recommendations

As virtual meetings become increasingly central to people's everyday lives, it is important to understand how different platforms affect users' experience. The goal of this study was to explore the system quality and usability of two platforms of online meeting for inexperienced users.

By testing the daily tasks of virtual meeting platforms Zoom and Teams during a training session, this study established that the user accessibility of Zoom is much better than Teams for the purpose of training, with a strong correlation between the amount of time spent on the platform and the intention to use the platform. However, the result of this study was moderated by the purpose of each platform: Zoom was designed for more common general use while Teams was designed more exclusively for communication and collaboration within the organization. During the test, we found out that the functionality and exclusivity of Teams is quite different when used by users within the same organization and users outside the organizations, as well as when a participant was using the desktop application versus the web application.

This suggests that it is also important to consider the context and how people are using these platforms. One recommendation would be to conduct further tests with more participants in order to understand more about these platforms and how they are being used in different contexts and for different purposes. Future studies might also include focus groups to hone in on some of the most common uses of these virtual meeting platforms and evaluate results on micro

The tests in this study were conducted virtually due to COVID-19. Another recommendation would be to conduct future tests in person rather than adding an additional virtual meeting platform

to the process for conducting the session itself. Removing the virtual meeting platform needed to hold the session will reduce confusion and unnecessary complexity to the testing process while allowing the participant to truly focus on just the platform being tested. Conducting tests in person will also allow for the Teams portion of tests to be conducted within the same organization and control the use of the desktop application versus the web application, reducing even more hurdles to completing an effective study. An additional recommendation would be to only recruit participants from within the research team's organization.

In the end, both Zoom and Teams provide virtual meeting platforms that are effective and useful (allowing teams to gather virtually) and efficient and engaging (i.e., allow teams to interact with each other and the host via chat, reactions, sharing links, sharing video, and sharing audio). Teams was less effective than Zoom due to those limitations with regard to organization and type of application.