



POLITECNICO
MILANO 1863

HYPERMEDIA APPLICATIONS PROJECT
A.Y. 2020-21

Inspection and Usability Test Document

BRESCIANI Matteo
D'ASCOLI Gabriele

Inspected website:

movìri

Contents

1	Abstract	3
I	Inspection	4
2	Overview	5
2.1	Goals	5
2.2	Inspection method	5
2.3	Scoring metric	6
3	Scores on each heuristics	8
3.1	Navigation	8
3.1.1	Interaction Consistency	8
3.1.2	Group Navigation	9
3.1.3	Structural Navigation	10
3.1.4	Semantic Navigation	10
3.1.5	Landmarks	10
3.2	Content	10
3.2.1	Information Overload	10
3.3	Layout	11
3.3.1	Text Layout	11
3.3.2	Interaction Placeholder-Semiotics	11
3.3.3	Interaction Placeholder-Consistency	12
3.3.4	Spatial Allocation	12
3.3.5	Consistency of Page Structure	12
4	Result and Discussion	13
4.1	Scores	13
4.2	Comments	14
II	Usability Test	15
5	Overview	16

6 Result Usability test	17
7 Conclusion	18

Chapter 1

Abstract

Part I

Inspection

Chapter 2

Overview

In this part of the document we're focusing on the evaluation of usability of *Moviri* through **inspection**. Inspection allow us to find usability issues and obstacles for the user when interacting with a web application. In particular, this is done thanks to **heuristics** which guide the expert to explore the website and check compliance with usability principles.

2.1 Goals

Before inspection, goals are defined in order to deeply inspect the website and to focus on the main aspect.

- Read experiences of other companies and changes adopted;
- Find the appropriate technology needed;
- Interact with Moviri due to become a new customer;

2.2 Inspection method

We decide to adopt **MiLE heuristics** in order to inspect the website. These are divided into different categories relevant to a particular aspect.

Navigation: It aims to evaluate the easiness with which an user navigates into each part of the website.

- **Interaction consistency:** do pages of the same type have the same links and interaction capability?
- **Group navigation:** is it easy to navigate from and among groups of “items”?

- **Structural Navigation:** is it easy to navigate among the semantic components of a Topic?
- **Semantic Navigation:** is it easy to navigate among group members and from a group introductory page to group members (and the other way around)?
- **Landmarks:** is it easy to navigate from a Topic to a related one?

Contents: It indicates how in the website information is well balanced in each page and section.

- **Information Overload:** is the information in a page too much or too little and does it fit the page layout?

Layout: It serves to estimate if the website is graphically expressive enough and readable.

- **Text Layout:** is the text readable? Is font size appropriate?
- **Interaction Placeholder-Semiotics:** are textual or visual labels of interactive elements “expressive”? i.e., do they reflect the meaning of the interaction and its effects? Are they consistent?
- **Interaction Placeholders-Consistency:** are textual or visual labels of interactive elements consistent in terms of wording, icon, position, etc.?
- **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?
- **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?)

2.3 Scoring metric

Before the inspection, a metric is defined in order to evaluate each heuristic. The evaluation consist in the assignement of a score from 0 to 5. The following image gives an explanation of each score.

- **0:** The heuristics is not satisfied. Many severe violations are detected;;
- **1:** The heuristics is not satisfied. Few severe violations are detected;
- **2:** The heuristics is not satisfied because of relevant issues;
- **3:** The heuristic is partially satisfied with some issues detected;
- **4:** The heuristic is satisfied, but it can be improved;
- **5:** No issue are detected. The heuristic is fully satisfied;

foto + click che porta in alto

Chapter 3

Scores on each heuristics

3.1 Navigation

Heuristic	Score	Comment
Interaction Consistency	4.5	The website has a good interaction structure reflected in the pages of the same type. Elements as header, topbar and footer are present in every screen. There could be more consistency in links shape.
Group Navigation	4.5	Navigation from a list of items to its members is acceptably easy and intuitive, as well as between group members and from group member to the list.
Structural Navigation	4	It's acceptably intuitive between the components of a topic, well enough described and presented; it would have been more appropriate if it were equable between the sections.
Semantic Navigation	3.5	Even if there are almost always links to related contents, navigation between related topics is not always accessible in both directions.
Landmarks	3.5	Present in the various pages of the website but which do not always identify clear and easy-to-read references

3.1.1 Interaction Consistency

The website offers a significant experience due to interaction structure reflected in the pages of the same type. As a matter of fact, its structure is based on some elements available in each page:

- **Header** (figure 3.1): it links to different pages. In particular it allow users to navigate on:

- Company’s **social network profiles** (*Facebook, Twitter, Instagram and LinkedIn*);
- **News section** for incoming report regarding Moviri;
- **Contact section** due to interact with Moviri’s employees;
- **Moviri Careers**. It’s a secondary website of Moviri where there are informations regarding job opportunities (+ genaral description of lavorare con moviri);
- **Topbar** (figure 3.2): allows a user to surf in each section of the website. In addition provides a search function for any content;
- **Footer** (figure 3.3): provides the same links to different sections of topbar and header, but at the foot of each page;

At the end, there could be more consistency in links shape.



Figure 3.1: Header.



Figure 3.2: Topbar.



Figure 3.3: Footer.

3.1.2 Group Navigation

The navigation between the various components of a topic is intuitive, thanks to the good arrangement of the parts, that almost always have a title, an image and a short description. However, structural navigation slightly change between the various sections. For instance, in the *Business Lines* section each topic is represented by the combination of image and description side by side and unpaired with respect to the next one, while in the *Resource* section each item is placed in a grid with its title and a respective image.

3.1.3 Structural Navigation

Thanks to components such as topbar and footer, is possible to navigate between each section through links. The fact that links are placed both high and low helps user's experience to be more intuitive, since it is not possible to go to the previous or next page. Anyway the Structural Navigation along each page is always easily feasible and understandable.

3.1.4 Semantic Navigation

Navigation between pages of different sections is easily allowed by topbar and footer. Nevertheless, there are situations in which this is not reversible. In particular this is not possible in the *Resource* section after the click of an item; in fact, it redirects to pages of other websites leaving Moviri domain. It's sufficient to go back with the undo function of the browser, but could be quite uncomfortable.

3.1.5 Landmarks

Landmarks cover all major contents of the website and they can be found both top and bottom part of the website in each section; Anyway, they could be improved to be more clear, evident and easily readable. It's always possible to be redirect to the homepage but the reference is not immediately understandable for a user visiting the website for the first time, considering that it is not identified with the well recognized term "**Home**".

3.2 Content

Heuristic	Score	Comment
Information Overload	4.5	Informations clearly distributed and organized in a minimalist way almost in all pages.

3.2.1 Information Overload

Each information, both graphical and textual, is well balanced in each section of the website. This is one of the strength of website, even if in some sections the minimalism appears too grave and risks leading to a lack of information.

3.3 Layout

Heuristic	Score	Comment
Text Layout	4	The text is readable text and the font is appropriate in the various sections. Colour choice could be more improved.
Interaction Placeholder-Semiotics	4	Textual and visual labels are expressive and reflect a good interaction/effect aspect, excluded some cases in which there is an inappropriate response to that expected.
Interaction Placeholder-Consistency	4	Labels for interactive elements are well organized in term of position but the icon are not always consistent and can be slightly improved.
Spatial Allocation	4	Generally fine and appropriate allocation of contents in the various pages, amendable the organization of semantically-distant elements in some pages.
Consistency of Page Structure	3	Page structure of each topic is consistent among pages but referring to different groups we detected severe changes of structure.

3.3.1 Text Layout

Textual contents are easy-to-read. This is thanks to the font used in each point which is always proportional to the importance of the information. For instance, title or quotes has a larger font then simple description. About the choice for the colour of the font we note that, even if almost always it matches with the rest of the layout, in certain parts the choice of the colour in contrast with the background is not absolutely appropriate.

3.3.2 Interaction Placeholder-Semiotics

Textual and visual labels are expressive almost in every case. Only few situations link are not visible by underling or a hand-cursor. In addition we found relevant issues characterized by a strange behaviour in some case, for instance clicking on partners image in the Business Line section, as a result of which the page come back to the top of the page; moreover, this happens clicking on image TODO. After all, labels of interactive elements are consistent and reflect acceptably good the interaction and the effect.

Textual and visual labels are expressive almost in every case. Only few situations link are not visible by underling or a hand-cursor. In addition we found relevant issues characterized by a strange behaviour in some case. For instance, clicking on partners image in the *Business Line* section, the page come back at the top of the page. After all, labels of interactive elements are consistent and reflect acceptably good the interaction and the effect.

3.3.3 Interaction Placeholder-Consistency

Considering the website in its integrity, it doesn't show so many problems in terms of wording, icon and position, so, given its easy of use, we have not find relevant violaitons. Anyway we highlight 2 issues:

- The **Business Lines** doesn't always work as homepage;
- Even if the labels are well organized in term of position, the choice of the icon are not always consistent.

3.3.4 Spatial Allocation

Each type of content is allocated spatially, in an appropriate way respect to the relevance. Semantically related elements are close to each other but we would appreciate a better organization in the screen and spacing of semantically distant elements; in particular we refer, for example, to the “Industries” section: different items should be space out a little.

3.3.5 Consistency of Page Structure

Page structure of the topics is consistent among the pages, with few differences about contents allocation; but referring to different groups the structure often changes in a substantial way. Anyway, in the resource section users can be redirected to other websites which have a completely different structure and font too; so they are absolutely not consistent, contrary to the topics of same sections.

Chapter 4

Result and Discussion

This section aims to join every results obtained in the last chapter in order to give a unique score for each heuristic section. This is done by computing the arithmetic average of the scores of *Navigation*, *Contents* and *Layout* sections.

4.1 Scores

Navigation

The navigation score is given by the mean of the 5 aspects analyzed in the section 3.1.

The final result is: $(4.5 + 4.5 + 4 + 3.5 + 3.5)/5 = 4$

Therefore, content aspect in the Moviri website is handled well, even if could be improved again.

Contents

The score of this section is given simply by the score evaluated by the *Information Overload* heuristic which is **4.5**.

So basing only this heuristic, content of the website is almost fully satisfied. Improvements could be done, but fixes will be minimal.

Layout

The layout score is given by the mean of 5 aspects analyzed in the section 3.3.

The final result is: $(4 + 4 + 4 + 4 + 3)/5 = 3.8$
which can be approximated to 4

Basing on the result, layout of the website it's pretty well designed, but with some critical issues that should be fixed in order to have the best experience.

4.2 Comments

Part II

Usability Test

Chapter 5

Overview

Chapter 6

Result Usability test

Chapter 7

Conclusion