**CHAPTER IV**

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

**(Presentation, Analysis and Interpretation of Data)**

Intro

**Part I. Provide answer in your objective no. 1**

**Part II.**

**Part III.**

To evaluate the developed system using the ISO/IEC \

**Part IV. Evaluation of the Developed Web Application using the ISO/IEC 25010 Product Quality Instrument**

**Evaluators of the System.** Table 3 presents the evaluators of the

**Table 3.**

**Evaluators of the Developed System/Web Application/Mobile Application**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Evaluators | Frequency (f) | % |
| CICT Faculty | 5 |  |
| IT Experts | 5 |  |
| Client | 5 |  |
|  | **15** | **100%** |

discussion

In order to provide a complete interpretation, the proponents used a Likert Scale as follows:

Scale range Descriptive Interpretation

Table 4 presents the results of the evaluation of the faculty members, IT experts and clients in terms of Functional Suitability using the ISO/IEC Product Quality.

Continue the discussion …..

**Table 4.**

**Frequency Distribution and Descriptive Measures of the**

**Developed System Evaluation in terms of Functional Suitability**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *No.* | *Sub-Characteristics* | *5* | *4* | *3* | *2* | *1* | *Mean* | *Descriptive Interpretation* |
| 1 | ***Functional Completeness.*** *The set functions of the developed system covers all the specified tasks and user objectives.* | 12 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.80 | Strongly Agree |
| 2 | ***Functional Correctness.***The functions of the  developed system provide the correct results with the  needed degree of precision. | 4 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.27 | Agree |
| 3 | *Functional Appropriateness.* The functions of the  developed system facilitate the accomplishment of  specified tasks and objectives. | 0 | 9 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 3.67 | Agree |
| Weighted Mean | | | | | | | **4.24** | **Agree** |

… It could be interpreted that in terms of functional completeness, since the total mean is 4.80, interpreted as *Strongly Agree,* the developed system met the standard, and the quality is commendable.

A weighted mean of 4.31 was generated, and interpreted as *Agree* based on the evaluation of the abovementioned evaluators.

Table 5 shows the results of the evaluation done by the faculty, experts and clients where

**Table 5.**

**Frequency Distribution and Descriptive Measures of the**

**Developed System Evaluation in terms of Performance Efficiency**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *No.* | *Characteristic* | *5* | *4* | *3* | *2* | *1* | *Mean* | *Descriptive Interpretation* |
| 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Weighted Mean | | | | | | |  |  |

**Table 6.**

**Frequency Distribution and Descriptive Measures of the**

**Developed System Evaluation in terms of ?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *No.* | *Characteristic* | *5* | *4* | *3* | *2* | *1* | *Mean* | *Descriptive Interpretation* |
| 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Weighted Mean | | | | | | |  |  |