The responses on the level of reliability of the proposed system is measured using the scale of 1 to 5 as in Table 4.1 below

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| Highly not reliable | Not Reliable | Neutral | Reliable | Highly reliable |

Table 4. 1: Level of Reliability

* **How satisfied are you with the reliability of the proposed system?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Description** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **Total** |
| **Respondents** | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 10 |
| **%** | 0 | 0 | 10 | 30 | 60 | 100 |

Table 4. 2: Participants Response on Reliability of Proposed System

From Table 4.2 above, 6 respondents representing 60% are satisfied that the proposed system is highly reliable, 3 respondents representing 30% are satisfied that it is reliable and 1 respondent representing 10% a neutral view. Therefore, 90% (majority) of the respondents are of the opinion that the proposed system is reliable.

Summarised comments from respondents:

* Having different role for every user bring decentralisation in the use of the system given every user different role and different access/view makes it reliable
* This is a unique platform for making and taking decisions regarding academic issues

The response on the quantified level of satisfaction of the proposed system is measured in the scale of 1 to 5 as in Table 4.3 below

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| Very little | Little | Neutral | Much | Very much |

Table 4. 3: Quantified Level of Satisfaction

* **How satisfied are you with the security of the proposed system?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Description** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **Total** |
| **Respondents** | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 10 |
| **%** | 0 | 0 | 20 | 20 | 60 | 100 |

Table 4. 4: Participants Response on Security of the Proposed System

The Table 4.4 above shows that, 6 respondents representing 60% are very much satisfied with the security of the proposed system, 2 respondents representing 20% are much satisfied and 2 respondents representing 20% had a neutral view. Therefore, majority (80%) of the respondents are of the opinion that the security of the proposed is satisfactory.

Summarised comments from respondents:

* The system has limited number of users and every user has a unique way of accessing the system, therefore it is somewhat secured.
* The users can also be a threat and should be thought of as potential threat.
* **How satisfied are you with the ability to import data through excel (.csv) format?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Description** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **Total** |
| **Respondents** | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 10 |
| **%** | 0 | 0 | 10 | 20 | 70 | 100 |

Table 4. 5: Participants Response on the Ability to Import Data through Excel .CSV Format

From Table 4.5 above, 7 respondents representing 70% are very much satisfied with importing data through file in excel format, 2 respondents representing 20% are much satisfied and 1 respondent representing 10% had a neutral view. Therefore, 90% (majority) of the respondents are satisfied with the way data is imported from a file (excel).

Summarised comments from respondents:

* Importing a file brings sanity and can serve as a softcopy backup of students’ scores entered.
* Importing a file makes it easy to have all the scores entered at once.
* Eliminate some errors that might occur as a result of inputting scores via keyboard.
* **How satisfied are you with the look and feel of the software?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Description** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **Total** |
| **Respondents** | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 10 |
| **%** | 0 | 0 | 20 | 20 | 60 | 100 |

Table 4. 6: Participants Response on the look and feel of the System.

From the table above, 6 respondents representing 60% are very much satisfied with the look and feel of the software, 2 respondents representing 20% are much satisfied and 2 respondents representing 20% had a neutral view. Therefore, 80% (majority) of the respondents are satisfied with the look and feel of the software.

Summarised comments from respondents:

* It has clear simple and well-defined menus that remain static when operating the system
* The menus can always be referred to without having to switch windows.

The response on the ease of use of the proposed system are measured in the scale of 1 to 5 as in Table 4.7 below

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| Very Difficult | Difficult | Neutral | Easy | Very easy |

Table 4. 7: Ease of Use

* **How easy is it to understand how the application work?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Description** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **Total** |
| **Respondents** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 10 |
| **%** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 70 | 100 |

Table 4. 8: Participants Response on how easy it was to understand the application

From Table 4.8 above, 7 respondents representing 70% opine that it is very easy to understand how the application work, and 3 respondents representing 30% opine that it easy. Therefore, 100% (all) of the respondents observed that it is easy to understand how the application work.

Summarised comments from respondents:

* The application has an uncomplicated feature with fully inscribed pages to enable user to understand what to do and how to use the application.

The response on the level of interaction of the proposed system is measured in the scale of 1 to 5 as in Table 4.9 below

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| Very low | Low | Neutral | High | Very high |

Table 4. 9: Level of Interaction

* **How do you find the level of interaction?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Description** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **Total** |
| **Respondents** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 10 |
| **%** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 60 | 100 |

Table 4. 10: Participants response on their level of interaction with the system

From Table 4.10 above, 6 respondents representing 60% propound that the level of interaction very high, and 4 respondents representing 40% propound that it high. Therefore, 100% (all) of the respondents opine that the level of interaction is high.

Summarised comments from respondents:

* The level of interaction of the proposed system makes it easy for users to explore the interface and get the best out of its functionality.

The responses on the level of satisfaction of the proposed system is measured using the scale of 1 to 5 as in Table 4.11 below

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| Not at all satisfied | Not satisfied | Somewhat satisfied | Very satisfied | Extremely satisfied |

Table 4. 11: Level of Satisfaction

* **How satisfied are you with the registration processes (course registration, Student registration, staff registration) in this software?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Description** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **Total** |
| **Respondents** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 10 |
| **%** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 50 | 100 |

Table 4. 12: Participants level of Satisfaction with the registration process

From Table 4.12 above, 5 respondents representing 50% are extremely satisfied with the registration processes of the proposed system, and 5 respondents representing 50% are very satisfied. Therefore, 100% (all) of the respondents are satisfied with the process of the registration processes of the proposed system.

Summarised comments from respondents:

* The forms for registration in the system has inscription at the top to tell the user how to use the forms and prompt users for wrong entries and empty fields when submitted.
* **How satisfied are with the broad sheet page?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Description** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **Total** |
| **Respondents** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 4 | 10 |
| **%** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60 | 40 | 100 |

Table 4. 13: Participants response on how satisfied they were with the broadsheet page

From Table 4.13 above 4 respondents representing 40% are extremely satisfied with the format of the broadsheet page, and 6 respondents representing 60% are very satisfied. Therefore, 100% (all) of the respondents are satisfied with the format of the broadsheet page.

Summarised comments from respondents:

* The broadsheet page comprises of all details required to fully describe students results
* It shows both current and previous information of students’ results.
* **How satisfied are with the analysis page?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Description** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **Total** |
| **Respondents** | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| **%** | 0 | 0 | 30 | 20 | 50 | 100 |

Table 4. 14: Participants response on how satisfied they were with the analysis page

From Table 4.14 above 5 respondents representing 50% are extremely satisfied with the result analysis page, 2 respondents representing 20% are very satisfied and 3 respondents representing 30% are somewhat satisfied. Therefore, 70% (majority) of the respondents are satisfied with the result analysis page.

Summarised comments from respondents:

* The result analysis is tabulated showing analysis of each course per grade
* Including a tabulated summary analysis of the entire result
* It should include visualisation and should be able to give analysis on a separate page with showing the results.
* **Were you in any point confused while exploring the software?**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Description** | **Yes** | **No** | **Not sure** | **Total** |
| **Respondents** | 0 | 9 | 1 | 10 |
| **%** | 0 | 90 | 10 | 100 |

Table 4. 15: Participants response on whether they were confuse or not, exploring the system

Table 4.15 above shows that 90% representing 9 respondents were not in any point confused while exploring the software and 10% representing 1 respondent were not sure. Therefore, majority (90%) of the respondent opine that they were not in any point confused exploring the system.

* **In your own words explain why you were confused**

No response, none of the respondents give their opinion

* **Does anything distract you or get in your way?**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Description** | **Yes** | **No** | **Not sure** | **Total** |
| **Respondents** | 0 | 10 | 0 | 10 |
| **%** | 0 | 100 | 0 | 100 |

Table 4. 16: Participant response on distraction when using the system

From Table 4.16 above, 100% representing 10 respondents propound that there were no distractions while using the software. Therefore, all (100%) of the respondent opine that they were nothing get in there way while exploring the system.

* **In your own words explain what distract or get in your way**

All respondents suggest that there is no distraction

* **Does the information architecture and navigation make sense? (Can you find what you are looking for?)**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Description** | **Yes** | **No** | **Not sure** | **Total** |
| **Respondents** | 10 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| **%** | 100 | 0 | 0 | 100 |

Table 4. 17: participant response on the information architecture and navigation

From Table 4.17 above, 100% representing 10 respondents propound that the navigation make sense. Therefore, all (100%) of the respondent find the navigation worthwhile as they can find what they are looking for.

* **Do you have any thought on how this software can be improve?**

Opinion of respondent on how the software can be improve

* Should be able to keep backups in case of loss
* Should protect the system from users misusing it.
* Let the analysis page include visualisation and graphical view of the analysis
* Provide search field for records
* **How would you describe this software using you own words?**

Participant respondent describing the system in their own words

* Good
* It almost perfect
* Helpful, simple and plain user interfaces
* Look original
* **Any suggestions or observation?**

Suggestions made by respondents

* Make sure the software reaches out to the real users for implementation
* If the software is implemented, the changeover procedure should be in parallel.
* Use a plain white background, avoid dark colourful backgrounds