14.3 Clickable Prototype Testing
Tiffany Wolff

The main takeaway this week in testing was that the route map which originally was designed as a secondary map would be better as primary. The route map previously functioned as an interactive map to schedule different stops and drop-offs. The consensus was users preferred the map with ordered stops so they didn't have to rely on notifications. They could see the path of the bus and assess their current situation with children because some days you just need more time and they felt more in control. I also found this week that the notifications were clear and depending on the mood and circumstances of the user they would change up whether they would clear or click through to live map. Somedays I found parents were just done with interactions. They would just make sure their children were on the bus and be done with it. Somedays they want to see the bus arrived at school. This app needs to be able to adjust and accommodate with needs and moods of the ever-demanding lives of parents.

	Are notifications clear?	Are walk and arrival times clear?	Where is your stop?	Do you see the value in having both icons and text in menu?	Route map as primary map	Would you access the notification message center	Is there further information are you looking for?
User 1	Y	Y	✓	Y	Y	N	N
User 2	Y	Y	✓	Y	N	N	N
User 3	Y	Y	✓	Y	Y	N	N

CLICKABLE LINK TO PROTOTYPE

TEST SCRIPT + Notes

To begin, I will talk a bit about the aim of this app and how it functions. This school bus locating app is designed through the parent perspective. It is to allow the parent ease of navigating bus transportation. The main function is to view the bus location on a real-time map and alert parents when the bus is nearing their stop. Parents are notified if there is a change of route or time of arrival at their stop. Notifications are sent confirming their children have boarded or left

the bus. Parents can change pickups or drop off points due to a change in schedule or a missed bus. They can track attendance, timings, routes, and stops.

This app's main functionality is through notifications. Today we will test an average everyday experience flow that begins with a notification. I would like you to run through the task flow presented and have you talk aloud about your actions and expectations. There are no right or wrong answers just information.

You use the app every day to help your children catch the bus.
The journey begins with a notification alert on your home mobile screen.

SLIDE 2
Are the notifications clear?
Do you need more information?

SLIDE 3
Does the live map provide the information you need?
- Are walk times and arrival times clear?
- Where your stop is?

SLIDE 4
Please click Menu -
Do icons and text make sense together? Do you see the value in having both?

SLIDE 5
Please click Menu and go to Route
- Comparison of regular map and route map - Originally the route map was to schedule alternate stops in case of differing circumstances - ie missed the bus and catching at a different stop or to go to a friend's, etc…..
- What would your primary use for route map be?
- Would you have different uses for both live maps - route/home?
- Do you see more value in the Home map or Route map?

Please click the bottom of Route screen to swipe up and continue

SLIDE BUS ARRIVAL
Are the notifications clear?
Would you expect to click or clear notification?
Would you click through to the live map?

Would you access the notification message center -if so where?
Would you access live map - if so where?
Is there further information are you looking for?

User 1
Would check notifications for school arrival and if missed notifications would check live map.
But general out of sight out of mind - wouldn't check the live map after boarded.

When on menu should have X in corner to replace hamburger
Icons and text make sense together - especially with large menu real estate
Change route icon
Flyout menu with half page real estate

User 2
After longer notification user 2 would like to see live map
Arrival and walk times clear. User 2 identities stop
User 2 likes both icons and text - provides succinct identification - especially the bus and live map - provides faster visual clarity
Likes the 2 maps and only wants to refer to route map when needed - to much clutter with additional stops but would like to refer to it and use in specific instances
Would refer to map to check for boarding stop otherwise clear notifications.

User 3
After longer notification user 3 would like to see live map
Arrival and walk times clear. User 3 identities stop
User 3 likes both icons and text but could do without icons
Prefers route map and would use as primary
Would not return to live map in last 3 notifications

PAPER VS CLICKABLE PROTOTYPE

I feel like I learned more in the earlier stages due to place in the process. It was more concept than details so the curve was faster and greater. Using the paper prototype in this phase also lent itself to curiosity as it isn't the usual medium people interact with for an app. The process lent itself to more curiosity and engagement all around. The first thing I noticed with the digital prototype is people seemed more impatient and ready to click through. With the actual digital component, I think the users treated it more like an app they wanted to more quickly form to their preferences. Which is more informative for the reality of use and expectations but inhibits the process of questioning.

The users' behaviors overall were more confident in clicking a digital prototype vs a paper prototype. The digital version lends itself immediately to the actions and behaviors as digital content. Whereas the paper prototype there was more novelty and curiosity.

Again I'm sure the being in the latter phase of the process had a part in the behavior and choices of the users. There was also the digital component that changed the process too.

PROTOTYPING: PAPER VS DIGITAL

When I began reading the article I could see his reasoning but I didn't always agree with the practicality and reality of the situations. When he wrote his own experience I felt more of a resounding yes.

With my paper prototypes, I was inhibited with the need for all lines and type to be clean and grided for visual clarity for the user. It became quickly clear to me that the user needed really clean sketches to understand the digital references. I never quite arrived at the "quicker + easier" angle of paper prototyping. It was actually very time intensive. I could make cleaner digital sketches so much faster. The user could better understand even my more simplistic work.

I do think the paper prototype lends itself to more curiosity and engagement for the user in its presentation of creativity and novelty. My initial understanding was the digital version actually provided more ease of critique being that it was in its native environment and has set behaviors. The paper prototype at times almost had too many separate moving pieces to accurately gain information from. I now see that maybe it does provide ease of critique in its rawness. Something I will have to look at through a different lens next time. The other benefit of paper prototyping was the different angle of perspective. It gave me a different way of thinking about digital structure and reduced the ideas to their most primary function. This was a great value.

Also in this time of remote testing, the digital prototype makes it much easier. Although I did a paper prototype test online over this time. It was fun and felt creative to figure out testing and engagement.

IS PAPER BETTER THAN DIGITAL

Attribute	Article	Your Answer	Notes	Support
Speed	tie	digital	In my testing I found digital to be faster on because of consistent sketches and ability to copy from page to page	I disagree with the ease of hand drawn sketches or that you can create them quickly. I may not spend time on perfection but they do need to be clear which requires architectural drawing acumen.
Ease of making changes	tie	digital	In my testing, I found digital to be easier in making changes to one screen or consistent changes across many.	I disagree with "It's very easy to change paper prototypes, using an eraser or white out, then drawing a new element. Paper prototypes let you easily make changes during or between test sessions" It is

				clunky and easier to take notes. Changes may to drastic to reconstruct manually in a test and too messy to have clarity for user.
Informality	paper	paper	In my testing, the informality of paper led to fun and curiosity and engagement for the user.	I agree the low fidelity of paper prototypes causes you to think about the design at a higher level, preventing your getting too bogged down in the details.
One direction or many	paper	paper	In my testing, the clunkiness of the paper streamlined the process to simplicity.	I agree with the fact that you have to draw elements on paper and find creative ways of simulating interactions limits how much depth you can create in your prototype. So your prototype stays at a high level and focuses on just the most important interactions.

Cost	paper	digital	In my testing the cost of time was a big element. Also as I use all digital interfaces for work the cost was already built-in.	I disagree with cost although I understand their reasoning for my personal experience the cost of time was important and I already had the tools available.
Group prototype	paper	paper	In my testing, I didn't have group prototyping but I could see the more interactive group value in paper.	I agree with digital tools are more solitary in development and made more for passing or handing off rather than communal integration.
Honest Feedback	paper	digital	In my testing the more relevant feedback came from the real life behavior using digital apps.	I agree with the idea that the sketchy look may be easier to critique but digital behavior makes it more relevant.
Professional Appearance	digital	digital	In my testing, digital is easier to understand.	I agree clients are more likely to feel confident about conducting usability testing
Realistic Interactions	digital	digital	Digital platforms promote real digital	I agree that while participants can use their

			behaviors.	imagination, there are limits to the realism of the interactions you're testing in a paper prototype.
Testing Anywhere	digital	digital	In my testing, although I could pass off a paper prototype online with creativity - the digital version lent itself to remote more easily.	I agree the easiest way is sending participants a link to your digital prototype, and they can easily access it online.
Ease of Usability Testing	digital	digital	In my testing, I had to use video as the role of the observer as I had to be the facilitator with paper testing.	I agree that with digital testing no one has to play the role of the computer. Instead, you can fully focus on facilitating the test and observing the participant.