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# How To Aid Future Development

## Gathering Feedback

Gathering information is the most effective way to improve the quality of anything. For a website, user feedback is a key method to elevate standards. When seeking feedback, it's crucial to ask questions that yield specific and relevant information.

## How to Gather Feedback

While one-to-one interviews can provide rich insights, analysing the data from many such interactions can be cumbersome for creating charts and numerical summaries. Distributing questionnaires to users offers a more efficient way to collect data from a larger audience. However, this approach can feel less personal, and technical issues with the website could negatively impact the feedback process. A balanced approach would be to have users complete a form under supervision. This ensures a positive user experience with the site while also facilitating the collection of reliable data. Additionally, having a backup presentation illustrating the intended functionality of the website can be useful if any features malfunction during the feedback session. To maximise participation, offering an incentive to users for completing the questionnaire is a recommended practice.

# Making The Form

## The Design

A crucial initial step in designing a questionnaire is identifying the target demographic. In this case, participants can be broadly categorised into those with technical expertise and those without.

## Technical Participants

These individuals possess a demonstrable level of competence in computer systems and software development. Their experience may range from a foundational understanding to advanced proficiency in software engineering principles and practices.

## Non-Technical Participants

This group, conversely, lacks formal training or significant practical experience in software development or computer systems. Accurately classifying participants is paramount for tailoring the questionnaire's language and complexity, ensuring its accessibility and relevance. While a direct "yes/no" question could offer a rudimentary classification, a more nuanced approach is preferable. This could involve a preliminary assessment of participants' educational background, professional experience, or self-reported technical skills. For example, participants could be asked to rate their proficiency in specific software or programming languages, or to describe their experience with software development methodologies.

## How To Write a Good Questionnaire

Crafting an effective questionnaire necessitates meticulous attention to detail and adherence to established best practices. The following principles are crucial.

### Relevance

Each question must directly contribute to the research objectives, avoiding extraneous or tangential inquiries, e.g., "Do you prefer crumpets or scones?".

### Conciseness

Questions should be brief and to the point, minimising cognitive load and maximising participant engagement.

### Clarity

Employing straightforward, unambiguous language is essential. Avoid jargon, technical terms, or overly complex sentence structures that may confuse respondents.

### Logical Sequencing

Questions should be arranged in a logical order, progressing from general to specific, and grouping related items thematically.

### Sensitivity

Handle sensitive or confidential data (e.g., personal information) with the utmost care, adhering to ethical guidelines and data protection regulations.

### Neutrality

Questions should be phrased in a neutral, unbiased manner, avoiding leading questions or those that may influence responses.

### Pilot Testing

Before widespread distribution, the questionnaire should be rigorously tested with a representative sample to identify any potential ambiguities, inconsistencies, or areas for improvement.

## Question Types

### Closed Questions

These offer pre-defined response options, facilitating quantitative analysis and minimising response variability.

### Open Questions

While valuable for gathering rich, qualitative data, these require more time and effort from participants and are more challenging to analyse systematically. Their use should be judicious and purposeful. It is important to note that closed questions, whilst easier to analyse, can sometimes force respondents into categories that don't truly reflect their views. Therefore, a balance of both is often advocated.

### Response Scales

When using scales (e.g., Likert scales), consider including a neutral midpoint (e.g., "neither agree nor disagree") to allow for a less decisive opinion. While avoiding a 7-point scale can prevent the central tendency bias, ensuring a clear distinction between scale points (e.g., 1 to 6) is important for meaningful data.

Regarding the platform for creating the questionnaire, several options exist for hosting online forms. While Microsoft Forms offers branching logic and integration with other Microsoft products, Google Forms is a proficient tool known for its user-friendly interface, robust data analysis features, and easy accessibility for participants. The choice of platform should be guided by factors such as the researcher's familiarity, the platform's features (including branching logic and data export options), and its compliance with data protection regulations.

### What Questions to Include

The questionnaire should elicit information directly relevant to the research objectives. At a minimum, it should include the following.

### Participant Identification

A name and, if necessary for follow-up, an email address are useful for tracking responses. However, it's vital to consider data protection and anonymity requirements.

### Technical Background

Questions about the participant's current employment or education are essential for categorising them as technical or non-technical. This section could be expanded to include specific questions about their experience with relevant technologies, programming languages, or software development methodologies.

### Website Evaluation

Questions should assess the quality, usability, robustness, and aesthetic appeal (styles and colours) of the website under evaluation. These questions should be carefully crafted to elicit specific, actionable feedback.

### Form Evaluation

An overview of the form itself is needed to gauge the clarity and ease of completion, which can impact the accuracy and reliability of the collected data. This could include questions about the clarity of instructions, the ease of navigation through the form, and the perceived length and complexity of the questionnaire.

# The Questionnaire

## The Sections

The form has been divided into manageable sections to maintain user engagement. Each section focuses on a specific aspect of the website with a concise set of questions, aiming for the minimum number required to gather meaningful feedback.

### Section 1 (About You)

1. What is your name?
   * Open answer.
   * Aims to identify the respondent.
2. Would you describe yourself as someone with a strong interest in technology?
   * This question aims to identify technically-minded individuals for potential follow-up on more technical aspects.
   * Radio option:
     + Yes
     + No
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### Section 2 (Back-End Analysis - Based on Screenshots)

*Note: This section assumes participants are reviewing screenshots of the back-end.*

1. Based on the screenshots provided, what is the title of the course you are currently studying (if applicable)?
   * Open answer.
   * Aims to gauge the respondent's level of technical understanding.
2. How would you rate the apparent robustness (stability and error handling) of the system shown in the screenshots?
   * Likert scale:
     + 1: Very poor
     + 6: Excellent
   * Aims to assess the perceived level of error handling.
3. Based on the code snippets (if provided in screenshots), how easy do you think it would be to understand the codebase?
   * Likert scale:
     + 1: Difficult to understand
     + 6: Easy to understand
   * Aims to assess the clarity and formatting of the code.
4. Based on what you've seen, how confident would you be in your ability to contribute to the further development of this website?
   * Likert scale:
     + 1: Not at all confident
     + 6: Very confident
   * Assesses the perceived ease of working with the existing code.

A screenshot of a survey
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### Section 3 (Rolsa Account Functionality)

*Note: This section assumes participants have interacted with a simulated or actual Rolsa account.*

1. What was the email address you used for your test account?
   * Aims to retrieve the test account details if needed for later review.
2. What was the password you used for your test account?
   * Aims to retrieve the test account details if needed for later review.
3. How easy was the process of registering a new account?
   * Likert scale:
     + 1: Very difficult
     + 6: Very easy
   * Identifies potential areas for improvement in the registration process.
4. How easy was it to log in to your account?
   * Likert scale:
     + 1: Very difficult
     + 6: Very easy
   * Identifies potential issues with the login system.
5. How easy was it to change your account name?
   * Likert scale:
     + 1: Very difficult
     + 6: Very easy
   * Assesses the user-friendliness of the name change feature.
6. How easy was it to log out of your account?
   * Likert scale:
     + 1: Very difficult
     + 6: Very easy
   * Identifies any unintuitive aspects of the logout process.
7. How easy was it to find the option to delete your account?
   * Likert scale:
     + 1: Very difficult
     + 6: Very easy
   * Assesses the discoverability of the account deletion feature.

A screenshot of a computer screen
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### Section 4 (Booking System)

*Note: This section assumes participants have interacted with a simulated or actual booking system.*

1. How easy was it to create a new booking?
   * Likert scale:
     + 1: Very difficult
     + 6: Very easy
   * Aims to identify any design flaws in the booking process.
2. How easy was it to find the option to delete a booking?
   * Likert scale:
     + 1: Very difficult
     + 6: Very easy
   * Pinpoints any potential issues with the discoverability of the delete function.
3. Was it easy to find information about a specific booking?
   * Likert scale:
     + 1: Very difficult
     + 6: Very easy
   * Assesses the clarity and accessibility of booking details.

A screenshot of a survey
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### Section 5 (Calculator Functionality)

*Note: This section assumes participants have interacted with a calculator feature on the website.*

1. How easy were the questions/inputs to understand and use in the calculator?
   * Likert scale:
     + 1: Very difficult
     + 6: Very easy
   * Assesses the clarity of language and design of the calculator interface.
2. How relevant did you find the calculator's purpose and the questions it asked?
   * Likert scale:
     + 1: Not at all relevant
     + 6: Very relevant
   * Aims to determine if the calculator meets user expectations.
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### Section 6 (Home Page Experience)

*Note: This section focuses on the user's experience of the website's home page.*

1. How would you rate the quality of the articles or content presented on the home page?
   * Likert scale:
     + 1: Very poor
     + 6: Very good
   * Aims to gauge the perceived quality of the home page content.
2. How easy did you find the navigation on the home page?
   * Likert scale:
     + 1: Very poor
     + 6: Very good
   * Assesses the user-friendliness of the home page navigation.
3. How would you rate the overall layout and organisation of the home page?
   * Likert scale:
     + 1: Very poor
     + 6: Very good
   * Aims to evaluate the macro-level design of the home page.

A screenshot of a survey
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### Section 7 (Navigation and Footer)

*Note: This section assesses the ease of finding key navigational elements.*

1. How easy was it to locate the main navigation bar (navbar)?
   * Likert scale:
     + 1: Very difficult
     + 6: Very easy
   * Assesses the intuitiveness of the website's primary navigation placement.
2. How easy was it to find specific links within the navigation bar?
   * Likert scale:
     + 1: Very difficult
     + 6: Very easy
   * Evaluates the clarity and organisation of the navbar links.
3. How easy was it to locate the website's footer?
   * Likert scale:
     + 1: Very difficult
     + 6: Very easy
   * Assesses the discoverability of the footer.
4. How easy was it to find the contact address and email for Rolsa within the footer (if present)?
   * Likert scale:
     + 1: Very difficult
     + 6: Very easy
   * Assesses both the presence and discoverability of contact information in the footer.

A screenshot of a survey
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### Section 8 (Visual Design and User Interface)

*Note: This section explores the aesthetic and usability aspects of the website.*

1. Which colour scheme were you primarily using during your evaluation?
   * Radio option:
     + Light
     + Dark
   * Aims to gather data on user preference for colour schemes and potentially identify design issues specific to a particular scheme.
2. How visually pleasing did you find the colours used on the site?
   * Likert scale:
     + 1: Very harsh
     + 6: Very pleasing
   * Assesses the aesthetic appeal of the website's colour palette.
3. How easy did you find the various elements (buttons, links, text areas, etc.) on the site to use, interact with, and navigate?
   * Likert scale:
     + 1: Very poor
     + 6: Very good
   * Directly assesses the usability of individual UI elements and overall navigation.
4. Which of the following pages or sections do you think currently have good design? (Select all that apply)
   * Multiple choice:
     + Home
     + Calculator
     + Consultations
     + Booking
     + Account
     + T&Cs
     + Cookies
     + None of the above
   * Identifies areas of the website that are perceived positively in terms of design.
5. Which of the following pages or sections do you think currently have poor design? (Select all that apply)
   * Multiple choice:
     + Home
     + Calculator
     + Consultations
     + Booking
     + Account
     + T&Cs
     + Cookies
     + None of the above
   * Identifies areas of the website that are perceived negatively in terms of design.
6. Which of the following pages or sections do you think could benefit from improved design? (Select all that apply)
   * Multiple choice:
     + Home
     + Calculator
     + Consultations
     + Booking
     + Account
     + T&Cs
     + Cookies
     + None of the above
   * Identifies areas where users see potential for design enhancement.

A screenshot of a survey
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### Section 9 (Final Feedback)

1. Do you have any other comments or suggestions regarding the website?
   * Open answer.
   * Optional.
   * Provides an opportunity for users to offer detailed, free-form feedback on any aspect of the website.
2. How clear and easy to understand did you find this questionnaire?
   * Likert scale:
     + 1: Very unclear
     + 6: Very clear
   * Optional.
   * Assesses the quality and clarity of the questionnaire itself, which can impact the reliability of the responses.

A screenshot of a survey
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## Gathering The Feedback

As previously mentioned, participants were asked to interact with the website and then complete this questionnaire. As a token of appreciation for their time and effort, they were offered a lollipop upon completion of the form.

# How To Aid Future Development: Gathering Feedback on the Prototype

## Introduction

This document outlines the plan and materials for gathering feedback on the prototype digital solution. The aim is to obtain valuable insights from both technical and non-technical audiences to evaluate the prototype's effectiveness and inform future development iterations.

## Demonstration Materials

To effectively gather feedback, tailored demonstrations of the prototype's functionality will be prepared for different audiences.

### Demonstration Plan for a Technical Audience

This demonstration will focus on the underlying technical aspects of the prototype. Key areas to highlight include the following.

#### System Architecture

A visual overview (if applicable) and explanation of the main components and their interactions.

#### Code Structure and Quality

Showcase well-structured, commented code and adherence to coding standards (using code snippets or a walkthrough of key modules).

#### Algorithms and Logic

Explain any complex algorithms or logical processes implemented, emphasizing efficiency and robustness.

#### Data Handling

Demonstrate how data is stored, retrieved, and manipulated within the prototype.

#### Integration with other systems (if applicable)

Show how the prototype interacts with external APIs or databases.

#### Error Handling and Robustness

Briefly demonstrate how the prototype handles potential errors and edge cases (linking to the "Back-end Analysis" section of the questionnaire).

The demonstration will likely involve a screen share of the development environment and potentially a live walkthrough of specific code sections. Questions will be encouraged throughout.

### Demonstration Plan for a Non-Technical Audience

This demonstration will focus on the user-facing aspects and overall experience of the prototype. Key areas to highlight include the following.

#### User Interface (UI)

Showcase the visual design, layout, and branding of the prototype.

#### Key Features and Functionality

Demonstrate the core features of the prototype in a clear and concise manner, focusing on user workflows.

#### User Experience (UX)

Emphasize the ease of use, intuitiveness, and overall satisfaction of interacting with the prototype.

#### Navigation and Information Architecture

Show how users can move through the prototype and find the information they need.

## Feedback Gathering Plan

This plan outlines the strategy for collecting feedback from both technical and non-technical users.

### Target Audiences

#### Technical Audience

Software developers (potentially from within the course or externally), individuals with a strong understanding of programming principles.

#### Non-Technical Audience

Potential end-users (if identifiable), clients (if applicable), individuals with limited or no technical background.

### Methods

The following methods will be employed to gather feedback.

#### Demonstrations

As outlined above, tailored demonstrations will provide context for the feedback.

#### Questionnaire

The detailed questionnaire provided in the previous version will be used to gather structured feedback on specific aspects.

#### Observation (if feasible)

Observing users interacting with the prototype (either during the demonstration or separately) can provide valuable insights into usability issues.

#### Informal Discussions

Encouraging open discussion and questions during and after the demonstrations.

### Timeline and Location

Feedback will be gathered during the scheduled supervised time and potentially during unsupervised time from external sources. This will involve:

#### Supervised Sessions

Demonstrating the prototype to peers and potentially instructors (acting as technical or non-technical users) and administering the questionnaire.

#### Unsupervised Sessions

Seeking feedback from individuals outside the immediate learning environment (e.g., friends, family, or online communities if appropriate and ethical).

### Focus Areas for Feedback

Feedback will be actively sought on the following aspects:

#### Usability

How easy and intuitive is the prototype to use?

#### Functionality

Does the prototype perform as expected and meet the intended requirements?

#### Design (UI/UX)

How visually appealing and user-friendly is the interface?

#### Performance

Is the prototype responsive and efficient? (More relevant for technical feedback)

#### Robustness

How well does the prototype handle errors? (More relevant for technical feedback)

#### Clarity of Information

Is the information presented clearly and understandably?

## Using the Materials to Gather Feedback

The demonstrations will serve as an introduction to the prototype, providing context for the questionnaire. For technical users, the demonstration will allow them to assess the underlying architecture and code quality before answering more specific questions. For non-technical users, the demonstration will focus on their experience and allow them to provide feedback on usability and design.

Following the demonstrations (or during user observation), participants will be asked to complete the questionnaire. Open discussions will be encouraged to gather more qualitative feedback and address any specific questions or concerns.

## Recording the Feedback

The feedback received will be recorded in the following formats to facilitate analysis.

### Questionnaire Responses

The data from the Google Form (or other platform used) will be collected and potentially exported for analysis (e.g., to a spreadsheet).

### Notes from Demonstrations and Discussions

Key points, observations, and suggestions raised during the demonstrations and informal discussions will be documented in written notes. These notes will include the type of user (technical/non-technical) and the specific aspects of the prototype they are referring to.

### Categorised Feedback Log

A separate log (e.g., a spreadsheet) may be created to summarise the feedback, categorising it by user type, affected feature, type of issue (usability, functionality, design), and a brief description of the feedback. This will aid in identifying recurring themes and prioritising areas for improvement.

# Analysis of User Feedback: Initial Trends

This section provides a preliminary analysis of the feedback gathered from the questionnaire. Due to the limited dataset (10 responses), these observations highlight initial trends and should be interpreted with caution. Further data collection would be needed for more statistically significant conclusions.

## Technical Interest and Background

### Technical Inclination

Most of the respondents (6 out of 10) indicated they have a strong interest in technology. This suggests a good mix of perspectives, with both technically minded and non-technical users providing feedback.

### Course of Study (Technical Participants)

Among those with a technical interest, the reported courses varied, including GCSE Computer Science, Computer Science, Software Development (T-Level and general), and MA Education with Technology. This diversity in technical backgrounds could provide varied insights into the system's technical aspects.

## Perceived Robustness and Code Understandability (Technical Participants)

### Robustness

The technical participants generally rated the apparent robustness (stability and error handling) of the system shown in screenshots moderately high, with scores ranging from 4 to 5 (on a scale of 1 to 6). This suggests an initial positive impression of the system's underlying stability.

### Code Understandability

Opinions on the ease of understanding the codebase (based on screenshots) were more varied among technical participants, with scores ranging from 1 to 6. This could indicate differences in code clarity, commenting, or the participants' individual experience levels. One participant expressed low confidence (score of 1) in their ability to contribute, which warrants further investigation.

## Account Functionality

### Ease of Use

Across all respondents, the core account functionalities (registering, logging in, changing name, logging out, and finding the delete option) were generally rated as easy to use, with most scores falling between 5 and 6 (on a scale of 1 to 6). This suggests a user-friendly design for basic account management. However, there were a few lower ratings (3 and 4) for finding the delete option, indicating a potential area for improved discoverability.

## Booking and Calculator Functionality

### Booking System

The ease of creating, deleting, and finding information about bookings was also generally rated positively (mostly 5 and 6). This suggests the booking system is perceived as relatively intuitive.

### Calculator

The feedback on the calculator functionality was more mixed. While the ease of understanding and using the inputs received moderate ratings (mostly 5), the perceived relevance of the calculator's purpose and questions varied more significantly (ranging from 3 to 6). This suggests a potential need to re-evaluate the calculator's utility or the clarity of its purpose.

## Home Page Experience

### Content Quality

The perceived quality of the articles or content on the home page received somewhat lower ratings (ranging from 2 to 6), indicating a potential area for improvement in content relevance or presentation.

### Navigation and Layout

The ease of navigation and the overall layout and organization of the home page were rated more positively (mostly 5 and 6), suggesting a generally well-structured home page in terms of usability.

## Navigation and Footer

### Locating Elements

Finding the main navigation bar, specific links within it, and the website's footer was consistently rated as easy (mostly 5 and 6). This indicates good placement and visibility of these key navigational elements.

### Contact Information

Locating the contact address and email within the footer also received high ease-of-finding ratings, suggesting this information is readily accessible.

## Visual Design and User Interface

### Colour Scheme Preference

The "Dark mode" was the overwhelmingly preferred colour scheme among the respondents who specified their preference.

### Visual Appeal

Ratings for the visual pleasantness of the colours used on the site were moderate (ranging from 1 to 6), with a few lower scores. This suggests the colour scheme might not be universally appealing and could benefit from further consideration.

### Ease of Interaction

The ease of using various elements (buttons, links, text areas) generally received positive ratings (mostly 5 and 6), indicating good usability of individual UI components.

## Perceived Good and Poor Design

### Good Design

The "Home" page was frequently selected as having good design. Other sections like "Calculator" and "Booking" also received multiple positive mentions.

### Poor Design

"Home" and "Calculator" were also mentioned as having poor design by some respondents, highlighting potentially conflicting opinions or specific elements within these sections that need attention. "Account," "T&Cs," and "Cookies" were also identified as areas of poor design by at least one respondent.

## Questionnaire Clarity

The clarity and ease of understanding the questionnaire were generally rated positively (mostly 4 to 6), suggesting the feedback instrument itself was reasonably well-designed. However, a few lower ratings (1) indicate that some respondents found it difficult to understand.

## Other Comments and Suggestions

One respondent suggested improving the website layout, allowing the navigation bar to stay out of the way, making the navigation bar text link to the home page, and improving colour and design options. This provides specific actionable feedback. Another respondent simply stated, "very swag," which, while positive, lacks specific details.