# mContact & FOLO Usability Findings

An overview of results from user feedback sessions

Usability Goals

Allow users to find location-specific information for Social Security field offices and Card Centers using either a mobile phone (iPhone or Android) or desktop.

Metrics

Prior to the first round of usability testing, the sponsor and the UC agreed to the following metrics as quantitative measures of how well the design supports business goals and usability goals.

* 95% of users are able to access a map to their destination.
* 95% of users are able to access directions to their destination.
* 95% of users understand when to visit a card center versus a field office.
* 90% of users recognize that the office is closed on the day they want to visit.
* 90% of users recognize that there are other service channels (i.e. online services and phone services), in addition to in-person visits.

What We Did

Two rounds of usability testing with a mix of users on either an Android or iPhone, or a laptop

* Conducted user testing with 52 users at the Reisterstown Road and Silver Spring Field Offices on Wednesday, November 7th and Friday, November 9th.
  + Users were visitors to the Social Security Office.
  + There was a balanced mix of ages, education, and race/ethnic backgrounds represented.
  + Thirty-one users evaluated an interactive prototype of the mContact page on either an SSA test iPhone or SSA test Android phone.
  + Twenty-one users evaluated an interactive prototype of the redesigned FOLO page on an SSA laptop.
  + Notes of each session, user satisfaction surveys, and basic demographics were captured in note form by the moderator
  + Minor language changes, and one design change was made between rounds 1 and 2.
* Analyzed the results
  + Completion rates for 5 key areas of interest (see attached data sheets)
  + User satisfaction of overall experience

What We Learned

* General Impressions
  + Users tended to be very task-focused, entering a ZIP Code and reading the results. They did not explore the other links on the mobile or desktop sites.
  + Most users who needed to find a ZIP Code searched on the Internet, rather than using the USPS.gov link below the ZIP Code field.

*"I would rather use Google to find the zip code"*

* We identified the following usability or user experience issues:
  + Users were sometimes confused by the fact that they could only use a ZIP Code to locate a field office. They wanted the ability to search using address information if they didn’t know the ZIP Code.

*“If I didn't know the zip would put in the address.”*

* + During Round 1, the design of Card Center results did not test well. Users tended to “gloss over” the explanation of when one must go to a Card Center, rather than a Field Office, and focus on the office information (address, phone, hours) and map. This design was modified between rounds 1 and 2. The results were significantly more favorable during round 2.
  + Few users selected the Federal Holidays or Emergencies/Closings links, even for the scenario when they were relevant.
* What users liked:
  + Mobile and Desktop
    - How easy the pages were to use

“It can’t get any simpler than that.”

* + - How clearly the results were presented
    - How complete the information was (address, phone number, hours, map)

*“It gives everything. It can't get any simpler than that."*

* + Mobile
    - The “Map It” option on the mContact page
    - Having the ZIP Code pre-populate via GPS detection  
       *"This is a good idea."*
  + Desktop
    - Users preferred the interactive map to the static map

*"Oh Lord, I'd rather see a map with I-95."*

* What users did not like:
  + Being sent to a different website (USPS) to search for a ZIP Code. If users were confused, their first instinct was to call the 1-800#

*"I would call."*

* + Having to drill for Federal Holidays and Emergencies/Closings information. Some users expressed a preference for having closings information displayed on the screen when relevant. Others expressed a preference for a single link that would contain information about holidays and other closings.
  + Only a few users accessed the “Directions” but those who did expressed concern that they were not what they expected. The directions were static and not adjustable to location.

*“Well…they are fine if I live in the area. But if I was on holiday I would be holding up traffic looking for a street name.”*

* Please see data sheet for metrics

Task Completion

The table below shows the success rate of each key area of interest (“task”). We observed user behavior to gauge both comprehension of the task and completion of the action necessary.

For each task, the possible findings were that the application:

1. “Passed” (participant could completed the task accurately with few or no issues)
2. “Passed with Difficulty” (participant required some help or intervention to complete the task)
3. “Failed” (participant could not complete the task accurately)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Subtask Areas Evaluated | Success Rate | | |
| Pass | Difficulty | Fail |
| Users are able to access a map to their destination | *>95%* | *<2.5%* | *<2.5%* |
| Results | 73% | 7% | 6% |
| Users are able to access directions to their destination | *>95%* | *<2.5%* | *<2.5%* |
| Results | 82%% | 9% | 9% |
| Users understand when to visit a card center versus a field office | *>95%* | *<2.5%* | *<2.5%* |
| Results (Wednesday, Original design) | 29% | 28% | 43% |
| Results (Friday, After design change) | 95% | 0% | 5% |
| Users recognize that the office is closed on the day they want to visit | *>90%* | *>5%* | *>5%* |
| Results | 35% | 0% | 65% |
| Users recognize that there are other service channels (i.e. online services and phone services), in addition to in-person visits | *>90%* | *>5%* | *>5%* |
| Results | 39% | 0% | 61% |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Post Test Survey | Results | | |
| Overall | Mobile | Desktop |
| The application met user expectations | ***84%*** | ***89%*** | ***78%*** |
| The user could find the information they were looking for | **89%** | **93%** | **83%** |
| The information provided was useful | ***91%*** | ***95%*** | ***87%*** |
| The wording used was clear | **91%** | **95%** | **87%** |
| Users felt they knew what to do next | ***85%*** | ***90%*** | ***79%*** |
| Users felt confident navigating the application | **93%** | **95%** | **91%** |
| Overall Satisfaction | **89%** | **93%** | **84%** |