

Usability review

Garnata Tours

Score

Comments



Hover over a guideline for more information, examples of good practice and importance to the overall user experience.

N/A = not applicable or can't be assessed

Optional - Provide a short rationale for the score, such as a description of the issues found, examples of good practice and the likely impact for users.

Features & functionality

			Weighting (out of 5)	Weighting ratio	Rating (0 - 5)	Score	Out of
1	Features and functionality meet common user goals and objectives.	Moderate					
			5	100%	3	3	5
2	Features and functionality support users desired workflows.	Poor					
			5	100%	2	2	5
3	Frequently-used tasks are readily available (e.g. easily accessible from the homepage) and well supported (e.g. short cuts are available).	Good					
			4	80%	4	3,2	4
4	Users are adequately supported according to their level of expertise (e.g. short cuts for expert users, help and instructions for novice users).	Moderate					
			3	60%	3	1,8	3
5	Call to actions (e.g. register, add to basket, submit) are clear, well labelled and appear clickable.	Poor					
			3	60%	2	1,2	3

Homepage / starting page

6	The Homepage / starting page provides a clear snapshot and overview of the content, features and functionality available.	Good					
			3	60%	4	2,4	3
7	The home page / starting page is effective in orienting and directing users to their desired information and tasks.	Moderate					
			4	80%	3	2,4	4
8	The homepage / starting page layout is clear and uncluttered with sufficient 'white space'.	Poor					
			3	60%	2	1,2	3

Navigation

9	Users can easily access the site or application (e.g. the URL is predictable and is returned by search engines).	Very poor					
			2	40%	1	0,4	2
10	The navigational scheme (e.g. menu) is easy to find, intuitive and consistent.	Very poor					
			4	80%	1	0,8	4
11	The navigation has sufficient flexibility to allow users to navigate by their desired means (e.g. searching, browse by type, browse by name, most recent etc...).	Moderate					
			3	60%	3	1,8	3
12	The site or application structure is clear, easily understood and addresses common user goals.	Poor					
			5	100%	2	2	5
13	Links are clear, descriptive and and well labelled.	Poor					
			3	60%	2	1,2	3
14	Browser standard functions (e.g. 'back', 'forward', 'bookmark') are supported.	Moderate					
			4	80%	3	2,4	4

15	The current location is clearly indicated (e.g. breadcrumb, highlighted menu item).	Good		2	40%	4	1,6	2
16	Users can easily get back to the homepage or a relevant start point.	Excellent		2	40%	5	2	2
17	A clear and well structure site map or index is provided (where necessary).	Very poor		1	20%	1	0,2	1
Search								
18	A consitent, easy to find and easy to use search function is available throughout (where desirable).	Very poor	Tiene un buscado pero en lugar de buscar te muestra las categorias.	4	80%	1	0,8	4
19	The search interface is appropriate to meet user goals (e.g. multi-parameter, prioritised results, filtering search results).	Poor		4	80%	2	1,6	4
20	The search facility deals well with common searches (e.g. showing most popular results), misspellings and abbreviations.	Good		2	40%	4	1,6	2
21	Search results are relevant, comprehensive, precise, and well displayed.	Good		4	80%	4	3,2	4
Control & feedback								
22	Prompt and appropriate feedback is given (e.g. following a successful or unsuccessful action).	Moderate		4	80%	3	2,4	4
23	Users can easily undo, go back and change or cancel actions; or are at least given the chance to confirm an action before committing (e.g. before placing an order).	Poor		3	60%	2	1,2	3
24	Users can easily give feedback (e.g. via email or an online feedback / contact us form).	Moderate		1	20%	3	0,6	1
Forms								
25	Complex forms and processes are broken up into readily understood steps and sections. Where a process is used a progress indicator is present with clear numbers or named stages.	Very poor	No tiene apenas formularios y el proceso de reserva parece desactivado ya que en todas las actividades als fechas estan no disponibles	3	60%	1	0,6	3
26	A minimal amount of information is requested and where required justification is given for asking for information (e.g. date of birth, telephone number).	Good		2	40%	4	1,6	2
27	Required and optional form fields are clearly indicated.	Good		2	40%	4	1,6	2
28	Appropriate input fields (e.g. calendar for date selection, drop down for selection) are used and required formats are indicated.	Very poor	No comprueba los input para el formulario de contacto	3	60%	1	0,6	3
29	Help and instructions (e.g. examples, information required) are provided where necessary.	Poor		3	60%	2	1,2	3
Errors								
30	Errors are clear, easily identifiable and appear in appropriate location (e.g. adjacent to data entry field, adjacent to form, etc.).	Very poor	En el caso de fallo no indica el error	4	80%	1	0,8	4

31	Error messages are concise, written in easy to understand language and describe what's occurred and what action is necessary.	Good		3	60%	4	2,4	3
32	Common user errors (e.g. missing fields, invalid formats, invalid selections) have been taken into consideration and where possible prevented.	Poor		3	60%	2	1,2	3
33	Users are able to easily recover (i.e. not have to start again) from errors.	Good		3	60%	4	2,4	3
Content & text								
34	Content available (e.g. text, images, video) is appropriate and sufficiently relevant, and detailed to meet user goals.	Good	Informacion relevante sobre la actividad son precisos y consistentes.	5	100%	4	4	5
35	Links to other useful and relevant content (e.g. related pages or external websites) are available and shown in context.	Good		2	40%	4	1,6	2
36	Language, terminology and tone used is appropriate and readily understood by the target audience.	Good		4	80%	4	3,2	4
37	Terms, language and tone used are consistent (e.g. the same term is used throughout).	Good		3	60%	4	2,4	3
38	Text and content is legible and scanable, with good typography and visual contrast.	Moderate	En algunos apartados la cantidad de informacion es abrumadora.	3	60%	3	1,8	3
Help								
39	Online help is provided and is suitable for the user base (e.g. is written in easy to understand language and only uses recognised terms). Where appropriate contextual help is provided.	N/A	No lo hemos podido probar ya que al poner que contacte con nosotros por correo no recibimos respuesta.Ademas de que el boton de contacto no esta situado enun sitio claro de la pagina.	4	80%	0	0	0
40	Online help is concise, easy to read and written in easy to understand language.	N/A		3	60%	0	0	0
41	Accessing online help does not impede users (i.e. they can resume work where they left off after accessing help).	N/A		3	60%	0	0	0
42	Users can easily get further help (e.g. telephone or email address).	N/A		2	40%	0	0	0
Performance								
43	Site or application performance doesn't inhibit the user experience (e.g. slow page downloads, long delays).	Excellent		4	80%	5	4	4
44	Errors and reliability issues don't inhibit the user experience.	Excellent		4	80%	5	4	4
45	Possible user configurations (e.g. browsers, resolutions, computer specs) are supported.	Excellent		3	60%	5	3	3
Overall usability score (out of 100) *				5		77,4	132	

* Very poor (less than 29) - Users are likely to experience very significant difficulties using this site or system and might not be able to complete a significant number of important tasks.

- * Poor (between 29 and 49) - Users are likely to experience some difficulties using this site or system and might not be able to complete some important tasks.
- * Moderate (between 49 and 69) - Users should be able to use this site or system and complete most important tasks, however the user experience could be significantly improved.
- * Good (between 69 and 89) - Users should be able to use this site or system with relative ease and should be able to complete the vast majority of important tasks.
- * Excellent (more than 89) - This site or system provides an excellent user experience for users. Users should be able to complete all important tasks on the site or system.