

Hypermedia Applications Project A.y. 2020-21

Inspection and Usability Test Document

Bresciani Matteo D'Ascoli Gabriele

Inspected website:



Contents

1	Abs	stract		2					
Ι	Ins	$_{ m specti}$	on	3					
2	Ove	erview		4					
	2.1	Goals		4					
	2.2	Inspec	etion method	4					
	2.3	Scorin	g metric	5					
3	Scores on each heuristics 7								
	3.1	Naviga	ation	7					
		3.1.1	Interaction Consistency	7					
		3.1.2	Group Navigation	8					
		3.1.3	Structural Navigation	8					
		3.1.4	Semantic Navigation	8					
		3.1.5	Landmarks	8					
	3.2	Conte	nt	8					
		3.2.1	Information Overload	8					
	3.3 Layout								
		3.3.1	Text Layout	9					
		3.3.2	Interaction Placeholder-Semiotics	9					
		3.3.3	Interaction Placeholder-Consistency	9					
		3.3.4	Spatial Allocation	9					
		3.3.5	Consistency of Page Structure	9					
4	Res	ult and	d Discussion	10					
II	U	sabili	ty Test	11					
5	Cor	nclusio	n	12					

Abstract

Part I Inspection

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.TODO

- **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 assignment of a score from 0 to 5. The following image gives an explanation of each score.

- **0**: Many severe violations are detected;
- 1: Some severe violations are detected;
- 2: Few violations are detected;
- 3: Small issues are detected;
- 4: No issue are detected. The heuristic is satisfied;
- 5: No issue are detected. The heuristic is fully satisfied;

foto + click che porta in alto

Scores on each heuristics

3.1 Navigation

Heuristic	Score	Comment
Interaction Consistency	1110.1	a
Group Navigation	10.1	b
Structural Navigation	23.113231	c
Semantic Navigation	23.113231	c
Landmarks	23.113231	c

3.1.1 Interaction Consistency

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

- **Header**: 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 oppurtunities (+ genaral description of lavorare con moviri);
- **Topbar**: allows a user to surf in each section of the website. In addition provides a search function for any content;

• **Footer**: provides the same links to different sections of topbar and header, but at the foot of each page;

3.1.2 Group Navigation

Thanks to components such as topbar and footer, is possibile 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.

3.1.3 Structural Navigation

Navigation along each page is easily feasible and understandable. Structural navigation change slightly between section.

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.

3.1.4 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 possibile 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

These can be found both top and buttom part of the website in each section. It's always possibile to be redirect to the homepage. Anyway they could be improved to be more evident.

3.2 Content

Heuristic	Score	Comment
Information Overload	1110.1	a

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.

3.3 Layout

Heuristic	Score	Comment
Text Layout	1110.1	a
Interaction Placeholder-Semiotics	10.1	b
Interaction Placeholder-Consistency	23.113231	c
Spatial Allocation	23.113231	c
Consistency of Page Structure	23.113231	c

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. An other important aspect is the choice of the font colour. In fact this is always matched with the rest of the layout.

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 caracterized 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. Moreover, it happens that cliking on image TODO.

3.3.3 Interaction Placeholder-Consistency

Website is consistent due to its component such as wording, icon and position. In fact, due to the easiness of the website, this has no relevant issue.

3.3.4 Spatial Allocation

Each type of content is allocated spatially and semantically very well.

3.3.5 Consistency of Page Structure

The layout in each page is generally the same, with few differences about contents allocation. Anyway, in the resource section users can be redirected to other websites with a completely different structure.

TODO

Result and Discussion

Part II Usability Test

Conclusion