POLITECNICO
MILANO 1863

Inspection and Usability Test Document

BRESCIANI Matteo
D'ASCOLI Gabriele

Inspected website:

`https://www.moviri.com`

Contents

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 appropirate 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**: do pages of the same type have the same links and interaction capability?

- **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 intro- ductory 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 assigment 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

Chapter 3

Scores on each heuristics

Chapter 4

Result and Discussion

Part II

Usability Test

Chapter 5

Conclusion