Shared Digital Entry Point Test Feedback

Wednesday, 27 March 2019





Participants

Demographics

- 5 People
- 2 from SDS
- 3 from HIE
- 4 Male
- 1 Female

Sectors

- 1 Construction
- 1 Retail/Tourism
- 2 Social Enterprise
- 1 Healthcare

Overview / Purpose

Review domain TLD's (.scot or .gov.scot)

Review Intro Paragraphs

Review the SEP prototype with a focus on content

 Probe around who customers expect to talk to once they have made contact or enquired.

Website Names

- .gov.scot was preferred by 4 of the 5 interviews, as it was seen to suggest more trustworthy provenance.
 - 'It gives the idea of people working for the good of others.'

scot was preferred by 1 of the 5 as it was viewed as simple

Home Page Intro Paragraph

Option 1 was preferred by 3 of 5

- 'Good wording'
- 'Pretty accurate and reasonable'
- If you are on a site like this then you are probably looking for help already
- 'It covered everything'
- 'Nice positive statements'
- 'Add Gathering from option 4 to option 1 and it would be perfect'

Option 3/4 was preferred by 2 of 5

- 'It just cuts to the chase'
- 'Lots of questions'
- 'It is exactly what you want to read'

Nobody loved Option 2

Confused a lot of people, training, mentor, exporting, GYB.....

Layout & Design

- Text is too small
- Nice simple layout
- Nice headings]
- Could do with more colour
- Some listings were too thin on content
- Some listings were too dense on content
- Add videos....(1 person)
- Put eligibility and cost higher up
- Content links were superfluous on short pages but welcomed on longer pages (Links did not actually work in prototype)
- People wanted someone with "Answers" to respond to them
- People wanted to correspond with the person who initially responded to them (Build up a relationship)
- Most people were happy to go to whoever was the expert in this area
- 1 Person expected to stay on the site in case they lost her info during a transition
- People expect an organisation to know where I came from (findbusinesssupport....) and understand what I am looking for (the product or service that was being viewed)

Layout & Design 2

- Some people need advice that will never be neatly serviced by a "Product or Service". They just need some advice.
- Initial listings could have slightly richer info such as provider or other meta-data (my words)
- It would also help to see what each body does and where they sit in the public sector landscape. This would help trust.

BUT

Some people had negative views on certain bodies, based on previous bad experiences.

- Some users would like a callback as they value speaking to a person
- 3 out of the 5 raised accessibility issues
 - Text was too small!
 - Autistic/Dyslexic spectrum users would welcome more pictures.
 - 'Is accessibility going to come at a later stage'

Quotes

- Reduce the noise
- I want to talk to someone with answers and not questions
- I like the way the listing is presented
- Add some colour and enthusiasm to the pages
- Good bold headings
- Put eligibility and costs at the top
- Body text is a bit too small
- Maybe it is just my eyesight, but that seems quite small (body text)
- I like that the back button works BUT it lost my place on the page
- The language is a bit dry
- To a non office worker like myself, it feels a bit jargons

Interaction preferences

- 80% wanted to go to where the experts were
- 10% wanted to stay on this website (mainly out of fear)
- Most people wanted to maintain a relationship with the person who first contacted them
- People want to talk to people with "Answers" rather than more "Questions"
- People expect that whoever calls them back, will know where they have come from

fin

Accesibility Principles

- Perceivable Information and user interface components must be presentable to users in ways they can perceive.
 - This means that users must be able to perceive the information being presented (it can't be invisible to all of their senses)
- Operable User interface components and navigation must be operable.
 - This means that users must be able to operate the interface (the interface cannot require interaction that a user cannot perform)
- Understandable Information and the operation of user interface must be understandable.
 - This means that users must be able to understand the information as well as the operation of the user interface (the content or operation cannot be beyond their understanding)
- Robust Content must be robust enough that it can be interpreted reliably by a
 wide variety of user agents, including assistive technologies.
 - This means that users must be able to access the content as technologies advance (as technologies and user agents evolve, the content should remain accessible)