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**Usability Heuristic – Inspection**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | H1 | H2 | H3 | H4 | H5 | H6 | H7 | H8 | H9 |
| Marco  Buratti | 3 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 4 |
| Sergio  Canzoneri | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 |
| Christian  Cammareri | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 4 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| AVG | 3.3 | 2.67 | 3.3 | 4 | 2.67 | 3.3 | 3.67 | 2.3 | 4 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **AVG area** | **3.3** | **2.67** | **3.3** |

* Navigation:

The pages of the same group refer to similar pages and are built with JavaScript; they are similar to each other and navigable. The homepage is perhaps too full of links to other pages, resulting a bit too messy and not so easy to navigate. In any case, it is possible to distinguish the various groups quite well.  
Landmarks of the navbar are all clearly visible and clickable. Below the main screen there is a carousel with images that are a bit too hidden.

The info on the pages are complete. The site has the purpose of making users able to book and plan a trip within a natural park, it is therefore necessary to have as much information as possible.

The first four groups refer to the evaluation of the Navigation:

H1 - Interaction consistency: do pages of the same type have the same links and interaction capability?

H2 - Group navigation: is it easy to navigate among group members and from a group introductory page to group members (and the other way around)?

H3 - Structural Navigation: is it easy to navigate among the semantic components of a Topic?

H4 - Landmarks: are landmarks useful to reach the key parts of the web site?

* Content:

Try to evaluate the overall layout of the web page, based on the first impression that the page gives to users.

H5 - Information overload: is the information in a page too much?

* Layout:

The writings have all the same font that is simple enough to read. Sometimes, however, the choice of writing and background colors makes it a bit harder for the user to read- for example, at the bottom of the page there are green words on a gray background.

H6 - Text lay out: is the text readable? Is font size appropriate?

H7 - Interaction placeholder: are textual or visual labels of interactive elements “expressive”?

H8 - Spatial allocation: is the on-screen allocation of contents and visual appropriate for their relevance? Are “semantically related” elements close and “semantically distant” element far away?

H9 - Consistency of Page Structure: do pages of the same type have the same lay out (same visual properties of each component and similar lay-out organization of the various elements?)

**Evaluation From – User Testing**

* Define Scenario:

To evaluate the usability of the website we have chosen to use the usability test, so we have selected some real users. In order to evaluate it we have chosen two scenarios. The first one is based on the first impression that the Homepage gives to the user, whereas the second one asks how easy/difficult it is to obtain information on the costs of the natural park. The score is given on a five-point base.

* Recruitments:

For usability test we identified two main categories of user profiles, we asked to people 20/25 years old and to families who had to book holidays to test the web page.

* Homepage

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Questions | Tester 1 | Tester 2 | Tester 3 | Tester 4 |
| 1 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 |
| 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 |
| 4 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 |
| 5 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 |

1)Clear call for action. Users know what to do and they understand the purpose of the web page.

AVG = 3.25.

2) First Impression. The home page creates a positive first impression and supports navigation. AVG = 2.5.

3) Major changes on the web page are advertisements. For example, changes on the restaurants’ offer….

AVG = 3.75.

4) These is a privacy policy. Cookie session and user info. AVG = 2.5.

5) Company location and contact info. Is it easily accessible from the home page? AVG = 3.5.

* User Experience

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Question | Tester 1 | Tester 2 | Tester 3 | Tester 4 |
| 1 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 |
| 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 |
| 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 |
| 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 |

1) Personalized Features. Currency, language, taxes… and other info. AVG = 3.25

2) Transparent price. Prices are clearly displayed. There is no hidden cost. AVG = 3.5

3) Pages are responsive? Can user visualize all the info from any devices? AVG = 3.75

4) Sample Content. Is there a newsletter or a forum where users can ask any questions?

AVG = 3.5

**Analysis of Result**

Users have responded to every task presented to them. Calculating the average score of each question we can see that, according to most users, the home page is a bit too full and messy. The second table shows that the information needed to plan a trip is well exposed. In the future, in case the site had to be redesigned, major changes should be made on the home page, since the other pages are easily understandable and well organized.