**MODERATED USABILITY TEST - REPORT**

GROUP 05 Mars Project 2022-23: Thibo, Glenn, Pieter, Wiebe and Delia

**User profiles**

* **Bauwens Mike**: 3rd year Applied Computer Science Student
* **Dobbenie Arthur**: 3rd year Applied Computer Science Student
* **Saelen Gauthier**: 3rd year Applied Computer Science Student

**Tested scenarios**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Research question: | Can users send an item on our application? |
| Scenario: | You want to send an item that fits your Transporter (ID 12) device to the Transporter device where your last item was sent to with the recipient being Thibo Verbeerst. |
| Inputs/data: | transporter ID: 12, item name: headphones recipient: Thibo Verbeerst, destination: ??? |
| **User paths** | |
| Bauwens Mike | *(General: user was extremely quick in all scenarios and didn’t give much feedback. User scanned the wireframes before user tests took place.)*  Clicked on “Send Item” button in the Dashboard.  Linked his transporter. He understood the intention of the calculated cost. Used the default name for an item (“<Name>’s Item”). User got the destination of where the last item was sent to through the History page. But at first, he thought that the list of all destinations where the most recent ones, we had to correct him.  The rest of the workflow he completed in no time (literally 5 seconds). |
| Dobbenie Arthur | User clicked first on the “Send Item” button in the Dashboard.  User could easily link their Transporter.  User understood the calculated cost and entered the name of item.  When the user wanted to fill in the Destination Details of the item, there was some doubt. **User didn’t know if the listed recipients and destinations were recent or all.** User requested for an additional section where he can see all his recent recipients/destinations.  After the user couldn’t find the most recent destination that was sent to, he went to the History page. There he found the name of the transporter. When restarting the send item flow, user entered the correct destination and continued. Upon landing de Destination Check, user immediately understood what was displayed and found this very helpful. After the check, user continued to the Confirm page. On this page, user confirmed the item details with ease and clicked send item. |
| Saelen Gauthier | Navigating to the “Send Item” workflow was no problem.  User was able to connect with their Transporter with ease.  User understood the calculated cost and used the default name for an item.  In the “Destination Details” step we asked if the user understood the concept of having a recipient and a destination. His response: “I think recipient is the person who’s the package attended for, and destination is the location to where the item will be delivered”.  **User didn’t know if the listed recipients and destinations were recent or all.** User requested to list all the recipients and destinations in the future in alphabetical order. And said that it would be handy if the last recipient and destination was selected by default.  In the check destinations page the checks should be dynamically rendered like in a command line interface…  After the check, user continued to the Confirm step. On this step, user confirmed the item details with ease and clicked send item. |
| **General conclusions after testing:** | |
| Keep it, this works! | Modifications |
| The navigation to the send item workflow is perfect. Generally, the ux of the workflow is good. The different steps inside the workflow should be kept. No extra or less steps are required for a user to complete the send item workflow. | (1) **IMPORTANT:** When listing the recipients and destinations there should be section with all and a small section with recent.  (2) Nice to have: add a popup map of all destinations.  (3) List all the destinations and recipients in alphabetical order.  (4) Select the last destination and recipient by default. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Research question: | Can users send an item that doesn’t fit the receiving Transporter and find an alternative? |
| Scenario: | You want to send an item with your Transporter (ID 12) device to the Farm Dome 230 Transporter with the recipient being Thibo Verbeerst. But the item doesn’t fit the Transporter of the destination. Thibo Verbeerst did say that he is willing to pick-up the item at a Pick-Up Point instead. |
| Inputs/data: | transporter ID: 12, item name: headphones, recipient: Thibo Verbeerst, destination: ??? |
| **User paths** | |
| Bauwens Mike | User immediately went to the “Destinations” page to find a pick-up point and completed the rest of the workflow like the first scenario. |
| Dobbenie Arthur | User went to the Send Item page via the sidebar nav. Linked his Transporter, viewed the item cost and entered the name, recipient and destination of the item. Upon receiving the error page, because item doesn’t fit the destination, user moved to the Destinations page. Selected a Pick-Up point. **User requested to view the size of a Transporter when clicking on a marke**r (already implemented in the client). After knowing a Pick-Up point, user redid the Send Item flow with success. |
| Saelen Gauthier | User followed the same path and comment as Dobbenie Arthur, with the following additional remarks:  Upon clicking “Retry Connection” when destination check is unsuccessful, should navigate to the Destination Details step instead of the step where user is required to enter the name of an item again.  When listing all destinations, strikethrough all transporters that don’t fit the size of the item.  Have the option to popup a map of all destinations in the Destinations Details step. |
| **General conclusions after testing:** | |
| Keep it, this works! | Modifications |
| The UX of the workflow is good. The different steps inside the workflow should be kept. No extra or less steps are required for a user to complete the workflow. | (1) When listing all destinations, strikethrough all transporters that don’t fit the size of the item.  (2) Upon clicking “Retry Connection” when destination check is unsuccessful, should navigate to the Destination Details step instead of the step where user is required to enter the name of an item again. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Research question: | Can users calculate the cost to send an item and view how many items he/she can still send for that day on our application? |
| Scenario: | You want to calculate the cost to send your item, and check if you haven’t reached your daily limit yet. Do this with the help of your Transporter (ID:12) |
| Inputs/data: | transporter ID: 12 |
| **User paths** | |
| Bauwens Mike | He knew he could find his daily limit on the Dashboard and Statistics page. The calculate price of an item he successfully completed with “Calculate Price” page. |
| Dobbenie Arthur | We asked the user where he could find his daily limit, and he immediately looked at the Dashboard first. Which was correct, but he thought this was the only place where he could find his limit. Upon telling him that there are two locations where he could find his limit, he did find Statistics page. But only after scanning the sidebar for a while…  The calculate price flow he could easily find via the side nav. He successfully linked his Transporter and could calculate the cost of his item in no time. User was very pleased with how easy this was. |
| Saelen Gauthier | User immediately found his limit on the Dashboard and the Statistics page. He requested to give this tile a green color when his limit isn’t reached yet and a red color when he is over his limit.  User was able to calculate the price of the item through the “Calculate Price” page. When price is calculated user requested for a “Go back home…” button. |
| **General conclusions after testing:** | |
| Keep it, this works! | Modifications |
| Scenario was simple and straight forward. Users had in general no problem at all to complete this task. In other words, everything should be kept. | Green color when his/her limit isn’t reached yet and a red color when he/she is over his/her limit.  Modifications are not really required for this scenario. |