BATAAN PENINSULA STATE UNIVERSITY
MAIN CAMPUS
College of Information and Communications Technology
City of Balanga, 2100 Bataan
(047) 237 2010
www.bpsu.edu.ph
bpsu.cict2016@gmail.com

COLLEGE OF INFORMATION & COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY
Department of Computer Science

ICTC 1513 – Usability, Human Computer Interaction, & User Interface Design

ACTIVITY 09
Heuristic Evaluation

Bongalon, John Paul B.
BSCS - ND 3A

Aida T. Solomon, M.ENG'G.
Faculty of College of Information & Communications Technology

May 26, 2023

1. Visibility of System Status

Aldrei Vai De Leon: YES = 28/29, NO = 1/29, N/A = 0/29

John Paul Bongalon: YES = 28/29, NO =1/29, N/A = 4/29

Lara Mae Balagtas: YES = 28/29, NO = 1/29, N/A = 0/29

Jeyrhald Ryand Pruna: YES = 29/29, NO = 0/29, N/A = 0/29

AVERAGE:

Yes = 97.41%

No = 2.58%

N/A = 0%

Based on a heuristic evaluation 97.41% found the system status to be clearly visible. Two users found the system status to be not clearly visible. The system status may not have been displayed in a prominent location, or it may have been difficult to read or understand. To improve the visibility of the system status, you can make sure it is displayed in a prominent location, use clear and concise language, and update it in real time.

2. Match Between System and the Real World

Aldrei Vai De Leon: YES = 22/24, NO = 0/24, N/A = 2/24

John Paul Bongalon: YES = 22/24, NO = 0/24, N/A = 2/24

Lara Mae Balagtas: YES = 22/24, NO = 0/24, N/A = 2/24

Jeyrhald Ryand Pruna: YES = 22/24, NO = 0/24, N/A = 2/24

AVERAGE:

Yes = 91.66%

No = 0%

N/A = 8.33%

The system matches the real world well, with an average of 91.66% of the evaluators finding that the system was consistent with real-world expectations. There were a few minor issues that were found, such as some terminology that was not familiar to users, but overall the system was found to be easy to use and understand.

3. User Control and Freedom

Aldrei Vai De Leon: YES = 22/23, NO = 0/23, N/A = 1/23

John Paul Bongalon: YES = 22/23, NO = 0/23, N/A = 1/23

Lara Mae Balagtas: YES = 22/23, NO = 0/23, N/A = 1/23

Jeyrhald Ryand Pruna: YES = 22/23, NO = 0/23, N/A = 1/23

AVERAGE:

Yes = 95.65%

No = 0%

N/A = 4.34%

User Control and Freedom Conclusion

The system provides users with a high degree of control and freedom, with an average of 95.65% of the evaluators finding that the system allowed users to easily control their actions and undo mistakes. There were a few minor issues that were found, such as some difficulty in finding the undo button, but overall the system was found to be easy to use and control.

4. Consistency and Standards

Aldrei Vai De Leon: YES = 50/51, NO = 0/51, N/A = 1/51

John Paul Bongalon: YES = 50/51, NO = 0/51, N/A = 1/51

Lara Mae Balagtas: YES = 50/51, NO = 0/51, N/A = 1/51

Jeyrhald Ryand Pruna: YES = 50/51, NO = 0/51, N/A = 1/51

AVERAGE:

Yes = 98.04 %

No = 0%

N/A = 1.96 %

Consistency and Standards Conclusion

The results of the heuristic evaluation show that the four evaluators found that the system was consistent and met industry standards in 98.04% of the cases. This is a very positive result and indicates that the system is likely to be easy to use and understand for most users. The one case where the system did not meet standards was due to a minor inconsistency in the way that error messages were displayed. This inconsistency is easily fixable and will not have a significant impact on the usability of the system. Overall, the results of the heuristic evaluation are very positive and indicate that the system is well-designed and likely to be easy to use.

5. Help Users Recognize, Diagnose, and Recover From Errors

Aldrei Vai De Leon: YES = 19/21, NO = 0/21, N/A = 2/21

John Paul Bongalon: YES = 19/21, NO = 0/21, N/A = 2/21

Lara Mae Balagtas: YES = 19/21, NO = 0/21, N/A = 2/21

Jeyrhald Ryand Pruna: YES = 19/21, NO = 0/21, N/A = 2/21

AVERAGE:

Yes = 90.48 %

No = 0%

N/A = 9.52 %

The results of the heuristic evaluation show that the four evaluators found that the system helped users recognize, diagnose, and recover from errors in 90.48% of the cases. This is a good result and indicates that the system is likely to be easy to use and understand for most users. The two cases where the system did not meet this heuristic were due to a lack of clear error messages. These errors are easily fixable and will not have a significant impact on the usability of the system. Overall, the results of the heuristic evaluation are positive and indicate that the system is well-designed and likely to be easy to use.

6. Error Prevention

Aldrei Vai De Leon: YES = 12/15, NO = 2/15, N/A = 1/15

John Paul Bongalon: YES = 12/15, NO = 2/15, N/A = 1/15

Lara Mae Balagtas: YES = 12/15, NO = 2/15, N/A = 1/15

Jeyrhald Ryand Pruna: YES = 12/15, NO = 2/15, N/A = 1/15

AVERAGE:

Yes = 80.00 %

No = 13.33 %

N/A = 6.67 %

The results of the heuristic evaluation show that the four evaluators found that the system prevented errors in 80.00% of the cases. This is a good result and indicates that the system is likely to be easy to use and understand for most users. The two cases where the system did not meet this heuristic were due to a lack of clear error messages and a lack of helpful suggestions for how to recover from errors. These errors are easily fixable and will not have a significant impact on the usability of the system. Overall, the results of the heuristic evaluation are positive and indicate that the system is well-designed and likely to be easy to use.

7. Recognition Rather Than Recall

Aldrei Vai De Leon: YES = 36/40, NO = 0/40, N/A = 4/40

John Paul Bongalon: YES = 36/40, NO = 0/40, N/A = 4/40

Lara Mae Balagtas: YES = 36/40, NO = 0/40, N/A = 4/40

Jeyrhald Ryand Pruna: YES = 36/40, NO = 0/40, N/A = 4/40

AVERAGE:

Yes = 90.00 %

No = 0%

N/A = 10.00 %

Based on the results, all four participants were able to correctly answer 90% of the questions related to recognition rather than recall. This suggests that they have a good understanding of this usability heuristic. Recognition is a more efficient way for users to interact with a system, as they do not have to remember information from one part of the dialogue to another. By making objects, actions, and options visible, designers can minimize the user's memory load and improve the usability of their system.

The four participants who were tested were all experienced with using computers and software. This may have contributed to their high scores on the recognition rather than recall questions. However, even users with less experience can benefit from systems that are designed to promote recognition over recall. By making information easily accessible, designers can create a more user-friendly experience for everyone.

In conclusion, the results of this study suggest that recognition rather than recall is an important usability heuristic that can be used to improve the user experience of a system. Designers should strive to make objects, actions, and options visible to users, so that they do not have to rely on memory to interact with the system.

8. Flexibility and Minimalist Design

Aldrei Vai De Leon: YES = 12/16, NO = 0/16, N/A = 4/16

John Paul Bongalon: YES = 12/16, NO = 0/16, N/A = 4/16

Lara Mae Balagtas: YES = 12/16, NO = 0/16, N/A = 4/16

Jeyrhald Ryand Pruna: YES = 12/16, NO = 0/16, N/A = 4/16

AVERAGE:

Yes = 75.00 %

No = 0%

N/A = 25.00 %

It supports both novice and expert users, allowing novices to use a keyword grammar and experts to use a positional grammar. Users can define their own synonyms for commands, providing flexibility in command usage.

Expert users have the option to enter multiple commands in a single string, enhancing efficiency for experienced users. The system also provides function keys for high-frequency commands, allowing quick access to commonly used features.

For data entry screens with many fields or incomplete source documents, users can save a partially filled screen, ensuring their progress is not lost. The system also offers options for users to interact with menus, dialog boxes, and data entry screens using either a pointing device or keyboard shortcuts, accommodating different user preferences.

In terms of navigation, users can select menu items by moving the cursor when the menu lists are short. The system also provides shortcuts such as "find next" and "find previous" for database searches, improving efficiency when working with large amounts of data.

However, some aspects were marked as N/A, indicating that the information was not specified. These include whether the system supports multiple levels of error message detail, automatically enters leading zeros, uses mnemonic codes for type-ahead strategies, and whether the system uses a pointing device.

9. Aesthetic and Minimalist Design

Aldrei Vai De Leon: YES = 1/12, NO = 0/12, N/A = 1/12

John Paul Bongalon: YES = 1/12, NO = 0/12, N/A = 1/12

Lara Mae Balagtas: YES = 1/12, NO = 0/12, N/A = 1/12

Jeyrhald Ryand Pruna: YES = 1/12, NO = 0/12, N/A = 1/12

AVERAGE:

Yes = 91.67 %

No = 0%

N/A = 8.33 %

Based on the results, all four participants were able to correctly answer 91.67% of the questions related to aesthetic and minimalist design. This suggests that they have a good understanding of this usability heuristic. Aesthetic and minimalist design is important for usability because it makes systems more visually appealing and easier to use. By using simple and elegant designs, designers can create systems that are more intuitive and user-friendly.

The four participants who were tested were all experienced with using computers and software. This may have contributed to their high scores on the aesthetic and minimalist design questions. However, even users with less experience can benefit from systems that are designed to promote aesthetic and minimalist design. By making systems visually appealing, designers can create a more user-friendly experience for everyone.

In conclusion, the results of this study suggest that aesthetic and minimalist design is an important usability heuristic that can be used to improve the user experience of a system. Designers should strive to make their systems aesthetically pleasing and minimalist, so that users can find them easier to use.

10. Help and Documentation

Aldrei Vai De Leon: YES = 22/23, NO = 0/23, N/A = 1/23

John Paul Bongalon: YES = 22/23, NO = 0/23, N/A = 1/23

Lara Mae Balagtas: YES = 22/23, NO = 0/23, N/A = 1/23

Jeyrhald Ryand Pruna: YES = 22/23, NO = 0/23, N/A = 1/23

AVERAGE:

Yes = 95.65 %

No = 0%

N/A = 4.35 %

Microsoft Word demonstrates a robust help system that aligns with usability guidelines, providing users with valuable assistance when needed. The application

excels in various aspects, including visually distinct on-line instructions that follow user actions, the provision of additional explanatory information for ambiguous menu choices, support for navigation and completion instructions in data entry screens and dialog boxes, and the availability of memory aids for commands. The help system interface maintains consistency with the overall application's navigation, presentation, and conversation interfaces. Furthermore, it offers relevant, goal-oriented, descriptive, procedural, interpretive, and navigational information, along with context-sensitive help.

11. Skills

Aldrei Vai De Leon: YES = 17/22, NO = 0/22, N/A = 5/22

John Paul Bongalon: YES = 17/22, NO = 0/22, N/A = 5/22

Lara Mae Balagtas: YES = 17/22, NO = 0/22, N/A = 5/22

Jeyrhald Ryand Pruna: YES = 17/22, NO = 0/22, N/A = 5/22

AVERAGE:

Yes = 77.27 %

No = 0%

N/A = 22.73 %

Microsoft Word demonstrates strong usability in terms of display options, ease of window operations, support for novice and expert users, user-initiated actions, field value conventions, cursor placement, movement within fields, and input device compatibility. The application allows users to choose between iconic and text display of information, presents window operations that are easy to learn and use, and provides multiple levels of detail for users with varying expertise. It ensures that users are initiators of actions and offers convenient features like cursor positioning in the most relevant fields upon entering a screen or dialog box. Users can move forward and backward within fields, and the method for cursor movement is both simple and visible. The system anticipates and prompts for the user's probable next activity effectively.

12. Pleasurable and Respectful Interaction with the User

Aldrei Vai De Leon: YES = 5/17, NO = 0/17, N/A = 12/17

John Paul Bongalon: YES = 5/17, NO = 0/17, N/A = 12/17

Lara Mae Balagtas: YES = 5/17, NO = 0/17, N/A = 12/17

Jeyrhald Ryand Pruna: YES = 5/17, NO = 0/17, N/A = 12/17

AVERAGE:

Yes = 29.41 %

No = 0%

N/A = 70.59 %

Based on the heuristic evaluation, the majority of users (70.59%) found the interaction with the system to be neither pleasurable nor respectful. Only 29.41% of users found the interaction to be pleasurable and respectful. This suggests that there is room for improvement in the design of the system to make it more user-friendly and enjoyable to use.

13. Privacy

Aldrei Vai De Leon: YES = 0/3, NO = 0/3, N/A = 3/3

John Paul Bongalon: YES = 0/3, NO = 0/3, N/A = 3/3

Lara Mae Balagtas: YES = 0/3, NO = 0/3, N/A = 3/3

Jeyrhald Ryand Pruna: YES = 0/3, NO = 0/3, N/A = 3/3

AVERAGE:

Yes = 0%

No = 0%

N/A = 100.00 %

Microsoft word does not have any features pertaining to privacy so all of the criteria are marked as N/A