

Aalto University  
School of Science  
Degree Programme of Computer Science and Engineering

Antti Paananen

# In-house software development process: The usability perspective

Master's Thesis  
Espoo, June 5, 2013

**DRAFT! — July 3, 2013 — DRAFT!**

Supervisor: Professor Marko Nieminen  
Instructor: Jouni Kuusinen M.Sc. (Tech.)

Aalto University  
School of Science  
Degree Programme of Computer Science and Engineering

ABSTRACT OF  
MASTER'S THESIS

|                       |   |               |       |
|-----------------------|---|---------------|-------|
| <b>Author:</b>        | Antti Paananen  |               |       |
| <b>Title:</b>         | In-house software development process: The usability perspective  |               |       |
| <b>Date:</b>          | June 5, 2013  | <b>Pages:</b> | 16    |
| <b>Professorship:</b> | Usability and User Interfaces   | <b>Code:</b>  | T-121 |
| <b>Supervisor:</b>    | Professor Marko Nieminen  |               |       |
| <b>Instructor:</b>    | Jouni Kuusinen M.Sc. (Tech.)  |               |       |
|                       | -   |               |       |
| <b>Keywords:</b>      | Usability, ERP, Software Development Process, Process Measurement, Cognitive walkthrough, Remote Usability Evaluation, SUS, Contextual Inquiry, ISI |               |       |
| <b>Language:</b>      | English   |               |       |

Aalto-yliopisto  
 Perustieteiden korkeakoulu  
 Tietotekniikan tutkinto-ohjelma

DIPLOMITYÖN  
 TIIVISTELMÄ

|                     |  |                   |       |
|---------------------|--|-------------------|-------|
| <b>Tekijä:</b>      | Antti Paananen   |                   |       |
| <b>Työn nimi:</b>   | Yrityksen sisäinen ohjelmistokehitysprosessi: Käytettävyyšnäkökulma  |                   |       |
| <b>Päiväys:</b>     | 5. kesäkuuta 2013  | <b>Sivumäärä:</b> | 16    |
| <b>Professuuri:</b> | Käytettävyys ja käyttöliittymät  | <b>Koodi:</b>     | T-121 |
| <b>Valvoja:</b>     | Professori Marko Nieminen  |                   |       |
| <b>Ohjaaja:</b>     | Filosofian maisteri Jouni Kuusinen   |                   |       |
| -                   |  |                   |       |
| <b>Asiasanat:</b>   | Käytettävyys, ERP, Ohjelmistokehitysprosessi, Prosessimitaus, Kognitiivinen läpikäynti, Käytettävyyden etäarviointi, SUS, Kontekstuaalinen tutkimus, ISI |                   |       |
| <b>Kieli:</b>       | Englanti   |                   |       |

# Acknowledgements

-  
-

Espoo, June 5, 2013

Antti Paananen

# Abbreviations

|     |                                   |
|-----|-----------------------------------|
| CI  | Contextual Inquiry                |
| ERP | Enterprise Resource Planning      |
| HCI | Human-Computer Interaction        |
| ISI | Interaction Sequence Illustration |
| SUS | System Usability Scale            |
| UI  | User Interface                    |

# Contents

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>Abbreviations and Acronyms</b>                   | <b>5</b>  |
| <b>1 Introduction</b>                               | <b>7</b>  |
| 1.1 Motivation and aim of the thesis . . . . .      | 7         |
| 1.2 Background and research questions . . . . .     | 8         |
| 1.3 Scope and structure of the thesis . . . . .     | 9         |
| <b>2 Methods</b>                                    | <b>10</b> |
| 2.1 Contextual Inquiry . . . . .                    | 10        |
| 2.2 Process measurement . . . . .                   | 11        |
| 2.2.1 System Usability Scale . . . . .              | 11        |
| 2.2.2 Interaction Sequence Illustration . . . . .   | 11        |
| 2.2.3 Time used and success rate . . . . .          | 11        |
| 2.3 Automated Remote Usability Evaluation . . . . . | 11        |
| <b>3 Process experiment</b>                         | <b>12</b> |
| 3.1 Steps . . . . .                                 | 12        |
| 3.2 Implementation . . . . .                        | 12        |
| <b>4 Analysis</b>                                   | <b>13</b> |
| 4.1 Results . . . . .                               | 13        |
| 4.2 Implementation analysis . . . . .               | 13        |
| <b>5 Discussion and conclusions</b>                 | <b>14</b> |
| <b>A SUS form</b>                                   | <b>16</b> |

# Chapter 1

## Introduction

In this chapter, the background and reasoning for the thesis is described together with the focus and limitations of the research. In the text, research problems and the structure of the thesis will be also defined.

### 1.1 Motivation and aim of the thesis

In the 1980s, when the usage of personal computers (PCs) became more common, software design practices were still falsely assuming that the users were knowledgeable and competent in computer science. As an outcome, big part of the users were practically incapable of using operating systems and applications. During these times, the concepts of Human Computer Interaction (HCI) and usability, became important. Since then, the design process of interactive software for common people emphasized usability. [4] TÄHÄN VIELÄ ISO-STANDARDISTA JUTTUA!!!!!!

The term Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) was invented in the early 1990s.[5] The purpose of the ERP software is to offer techniques and concepts for integrated and thorough management of business, as well as making it more efficient. The usage of ERP software has increased globally and nowadays even service organizations have invested a lot of resources in ERP implementation.[6, 2]

Despite the importance of the efficiency aspect, the usability of ERP systems is not a widely studied topic. However, weaknesses in usability may lead into a low productivity and make it harder for users to achieve their goals.[8]

The aim of this thesis is to examine if the usability of a service-oriented ERP system can be enhanced by integrating usability inquiries, inspections and measures into the software development process. In the research, one

well defined business process is examined and the state of its usability in the system is determined by using variety of applicable methods:

- Contextual Inquiry to define the business process.
- Cognitive walkthrough for usability inspection.
- Interaction Sequence Illustration (ISI) to measure the amount of interaction steps in the process.
- System Usability Scale (SUS) to give a global view of subjective assessments of usability.
- Remote Usability evaluation and Usability logging for remote usability evaluation.

The measurements are focused on time, error rate and user satisfaction.

## 1.2 Background and research questions

The subscriber of this thesis is a middle-sized company which is offering information services globally and practicing in-house software development. Because of the fast pace of growth, the company is willing to reform their current ERP system as well as the whole software development process. The aim of this thesis is to join usability perspective into this process and give answers to following research questions.

- ***How usability methods can help to identify critical disparities in the usage of a system?***

Understanding the differences in the system usage between individuals can help to understand and deploy best practices throughout the organization and therefore improve efficiency.

- ***How the user efficiency is affected by the usability measurements?***

It is important to find the most effective and usable user interface solutions and thus decrease the average time spent on tasks. Local differences can be tracked with remote usability measurements.

- ***What usability methods can be practically joined with the software development process of an ERP system?***

Finding practical and efficient usability methods to be joined with the software development process can improve the quality of the end product.



### 1.3 Scope and structure of the thesis

This thesis covers research about usability of the in-house software development process and its scope does not include any other aspects of the process. The literature research consists of a few usability methods and even though the target of the research is ERP software, literature about them are not covered in the thesis. The results of the research may not be suitable for every organization.

The first actual chapter of the thesis is about the usability methods. Every usability method used in the research is discussed carefully. In the second chapter the process experiment is being introduced. It covers the experiment steps and the implementation details. In the third chapter, the data gathered in the experiment, and the implementation process is being analyzed. In the last chapter the research will be summed up and discussed.

## Chapter 2

# Methods

In order to be able to discover reliable research data, the research methods must be understood thoroughly. In this research, the data is gathered with a few types of usability methods. Inquiries are used to study the business process. The process itself is measured from many different aspects and also remote evaluation is utilized. All the methods is described in detail in the following chapter.

### 2.1 Contextual Inquiry

Handbook of human-computer interaction - T-TALON KIRJASTOSTA! historiaa menetelmästä.

Contextual Inquiry was originally developed to overcome the three following challenges [7]:

1. To identify a design process for systems that will be used similarly in different business contexts and in different cultures.
2. To identify a convenient process for gathering user information in limited time.
3. To identify a way to acquire information about users' work in an eligible format.

In addition to those challenges, the technique is capable of much more. CI cherish participatory design and, because of that quality, users are able to involve in the design. Users' contributes to the design by providing a deep understading about the nature of the work. This is done through inquiry and it's a basis for fundamental work concepts. As soon as the understanding about the work is available a design for a system model can be created. [7]

## 2.2 Process measurement

### 2.2.1 System Usability Scale

In his paper Brooke [3] argued that usability is not any real existing quality, but a good usability artefact is *appropriate to its purpose*. In other words "the usability of any tool or system has to be viewed in terms of the context in which it is used, and its appropriateness to that context" [3]. Still in many cases, context related usability evaluation is not desirable. The reason for this is that a large scale context analysis is usually neither cost-efficient nor practical. [3] SUS responds to these challenges by offering an easy and quick way to get subjective ratings about the usability of a system. It is not limited to any specific technology, which makes it universal tool for usability evaluation. [1]

System Usability Scale (see SUS form) is a ten-item *Likert scale*, meaning that every item consist of the scale of five, ranging from "Strongly disagree" to "Strongly agree". The questionnaire is generally being filled right after the possibility to use the system to be evaluated. The focus should be on immediate responses and too much time shouldn't be given to the respondents. [3]

The outcome of SUS is a single value which express the overall usability of the system. The value consist of all the items and none of them are meaningful as such. System Usability Scale can be calculated by first summing the score contribution (range from 0 to 4) from each item. Before summing the scale positions of the items 1,3,5,7 and 9 need to be substracted by one and the scale positions of the items 2,4,6,8 and 10 need to be subtracted from 5. The last step is to multiply the sum of the scores by 2.5 to get the overall SUS value, which will range from minimum of 0 to maximum of 100. [3] The resulting single score is an easy-to-understand measure, and can therefore be discussed with the wide range of stakeholders. [1]

TÄHÄN LISÄÄ!!!

### 2.2.2 Interaction Sequence Illustration

### 2.2.3 Time used and success rate

## 2.3 Automated Remote Usability Evaluation

## Chapter 3

# Process experiment

Introduction to the chapter.

### 3.1 Steps

- Creating the model for gathering data
- Modified contextual inquiry
- Process measurement methods
- Analysis 1.
- Prototype creation
- Remote evaluation -i process measurement methods.
- Analysis 2.

### 3.2 Implementation

## **Chapter 4**

# **Analysis**

### **4.1 Results**

-Comparison between country offices

### **4.2 Implementation analysis**

-Should these methods be implemented as a part of the process or not.

## Chapter 5

# Discussion and conclusions

# Bibliography

- [1] BANGOR, A., KORTUM, P. T., AND MILLER, J. T. An empirical evaluation of the system usability scale. *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction* 24, 6 (07/29; 2013/07 2008), 574–594. doi: 10.1080/10447310802205776; M3: doi: 10.1080/10447310802205776; 03.
- [2] BOTTA-GENOULAZ, V., AND MILLET, P.-A. An investigation into the use of erp systems in the service sector. *International Journal of Production Economics* 99, 1-2 (0 2006), 202–221.
- [3] BROOKE, J. Sus -a quick and dirty usability scale. *Usability evaluation in industry* 189 (1996), 194.
- [4] COCKTON, G. *Usability Evaluation*. The Encyclopedia of Human-Computer Interaction, 2nd Ed. The Interaction Design Foundation, Aarhus, Denmark, 2013.
- [5] JACOBS, F. R. Enterprise resource planning (erp) - a brief history. *Journal of Operations Management* 25, 2 (2007), 357–363.
- [6] LEON, A. *Enterprise resource planning*. Tata McGraw-Hill Education, 2007.
- [7] SCHULER, D., AND NAMIOKA, A. *Participatory design: Principles and practices*. Routledge, 1993.
- [8] TOPI, H., LUCAS, W., AND BABAIAN, T. Identifying usability issues with an erp implementation. In *Proceedings of the Seventh International Conference on Enterprise Information Systems* (2005), Citeseer.

# Appendix A

## SUS form

### *System Usability Scale*

© Digital Equipment Corporation, 1986.

|  | Strongly<br>disagree     |                          |                          |                          | Strongly<br>agree        |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. I think that I would like to use this system frequently                                   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|  | 1                        | 2                        | 3                        | 4                        | 5                        |
| 2. I found the system unnecessarily complex  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|  | 1                        | 2                        | 3                        | 4                        | 5                        |
| 3. I thought the system was easy to use  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|  | 1                        | 2                        | 3                        | 4                        | 5                        |
| 4. I think that I would need the support of a technical person to be able to use this system | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|  | 1                        | 2                        | 3                        | 4                        | 5                        |
| 5. I found the various functions in this system were well integrated                         | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|  | 1                        | 2                        | 3                        | 4                        | 5                        |
| 6. I thought there was too much inconsistency in this system                                 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|  | 1                        | 2                        | 3                        | 4                        | 5                        |
| 7. I would imagine that most people would learn to use this system very quickly              | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|  | 1                        | 2                        | 3                        | 4                        | 5                        |
| 8. I found the system very cumbersome to use   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|  | 1                        | 2                        | 3                        | 4                        | 5                        |
| 9. I felt very confident using the system  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|  | 1                        | 2                        | 3                        | 4                        | 5                        |
| 10. I needed to learn a lot of things before I could get going with this system              | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|  | 1                        | 2                        | 3                        | 4                        | 5                        |