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Abstract

The following document aims at resuming the results of the **Usability Study** conducted by our team for the evaluation of the following website <http://www.pngp.it/>.

The main **goal** of our report and of our study was to evaluate the website among this step:

1. **Inspection**;
2. **User Testing**;
3. **Reporting**: comparison of the results of the 2 evaluation process;

In the following we will illustrate and discuss the **evaluation method** adopted, along with the tools and instruments we used in order to accomplish our study.

Inspection

### About inspection report we first select which criteria is used for evaluating the heuristic score and then we done a table to report all this value to study which section of the site work well or not.

Finally, we report a short conclusion where we discuss the inspection result.

### **Definition of heuristic:**

* + **Navigation Heuristic:**
* Interaction consistency (H1): do pages of the same type have the same links and interaction capability?
* Group Navigation (H2): is it easy to navigate among group members and from a group introductory page to group members (and the other way around)?
* Structural Navigation (H3): is it easy to navigate among the semantic components of a topic?
* Semantic Navigation (H4): is it easy to navigate from a topic to a related one?
* Landmarks (H5): are landmarks useful to reach the key parts of the web site?
  + **Content**
* Information overload (H6): is the information in a page too much/too little?
  + **Layout**
* Text layout (H7): is the text readable?
* Interaction Placeholder (H8): are textual or visual labels of interactive elements “expressive” and they reflect the meaning of the interaction and its effects?
* Spatial Allocation (H9): is the on-screen allocation of contents and visual appropriate for their relevance?
* Consistency of page structure (H10): do pages of the same type have the same layout?

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Category | Heuristic | Score | Comment |
| Navigation | | | |
|  | H1 |  |  |
|  | H2 |  |  |
|  | H3 |  |  |
|  | H4 |  |  |
|  | H5 |  |  |
| Content | | | |
|  | H6 |  |  |
| Layout | | | |
|  | H7 |  |  |
|  | H8 |  |  |
|  | H9 |  |  |
|  | H10 |  |  |

* PROVIDE AGGREGATED DATA, e.g., MEAN VALUE FOR ALL EURISTICS, (MEAN) SCORE BY DIMENSIONS (e.g., for CONTENT HEURISTICS, NAVIGATION HEURISTICS, etc.)
* PROVIDE VISUAL REPRESENTATIONS OF RESULTS (diagrams, summary tables...)
* Include a short conclusion section where you briefly discuss inspection results

User testing

Briefly describe:

* Design of the study
* How/where/when it was executed
* Results - please provide aggregated data (e.g. Mean values for the various measures, diagrams, etc.) in numerical and visual form
* Short discussion of results

Reporting

**Comparisons** of the results the 2 evaluation process