

Research and testing

Key findings



Key questions and topics from user testing in Sprint 3

We carried out usability testing with the Assisted Notification prototype, testing 2 journeys with each user test participant and 6 journeys in total. Key questions / topics addressed included:

- Does the Task List Pattern work for users - can they progress in good time and there any impediment to their progress?
- Are the user able to fill in the necessary form fields, and skip form fields that are optional?
- Are users able to identify the dispute jurisdiction that applies to them or the person they are representing?
- Investigate our hypothesis that the form should prompt users to provide a succinct explanation of their reason for dispute. Do users want or need to provide more detail at this stage, or later?
- How do user's react request for ACAS to speak to the respondent before speaking to them?
- Can users identify respondents legal name and address? Is the link to Companies House useful to them?



Key finding 1

- **QUESTION: Does the Task List Pattern work for users - can they progress in good time and there any impediment to their progress?**
- In general terms yes.
- The option to provide only an email address was welcomed by some.
 - A union person stated that email was better for them as it made record keeping much easier.
 - Someone who worked in the UK, but who was not from the UK preferred email only as they were not so sure exactly who ACAS were and were wary of receiving unsolicited calls
- The exact order of the task pattern was called into question by the question asking whether the user would permit ACAS speaking to the respondent straight away.
 - We observed even though the questions could be filled in, in any order that all users without exception followed from top to bottom.
 - We made a hypothesis that if users were able to first fill in their



Key finding 2

QUESTION: Are the user able to fill in the necessary form fields, and skip form fields that are optional?

- We observed that users did not consistently understand that certain fields were optional
- When users did note there were very different reactions
 - A Union person said that they didn't understand why giving dispute details was optional, as they would always advise their members to provide this information
 - One claimant gave the impression that they were providing information reluctantly
- We hypothesis that
 - We should prepare users with why it could help them to provide the necessary information for ACAS to move forward with their case
 - That all optional sections should be made so that that fact that they are optional is clearer - ethically we do not want to suggest users provide information they would rather skip providing



Key finding 3

QUESTION: Investigate our hypothesis that the form should prompt users to provide a succinct explanation of their reason for dispute. Do users want or need to provide more detail at this stage, or later?

- We observed that users were able to provide the necessary information, using the structured and progressively revealed way in which the prototype form asks users to provide reasons for and details about their dispute
- We observed and heard comments that the free text boxes suggested that only a limited number of words could be inputted, and this appeared to frame the 'ask' as provide a succinct amount of information.
- One user thought that they would really like to provide more information.
 - We hypothesise that the optimal time to provide this information is once they have a Conciliator allocated, and that we can investigate the best way of doing this - potentially a dashboard.



QUESTION: How do user's react request for ACAS to speak to the respondent before speaking to them?

Key findings

Key finding 4

- We observed that some users were give pause by this question and that it was not always an easy question for them to answer.
- Even with the option to say no, some users appeared to feel unnecessarily pressured by this question.
- One user thought that they would always want to speak to the ACAS conciliator first, as they felt that this was their privilege as the party raising the dispute, and their implied thought process was that there was an advantage to be gained by getting in their side of the story first.
- We hypothesise that this question should be moved after the reasons for dispute have been given.
- We hypothesis that making it clearer that answering this question is optional may benefit some users, and avoid them failing to progress.
- We hypothesises if after testng this question in a new position in the user journey that if this question still causes issues, that we should consider removing it.



Key finding 5

QUESTION: Can users identify respondents legal name and address? Is the link to Companies House useful to them?

- We found that identifying the respondents legal name and address was known by professional representatives as something of an issue for claimants.
- Recent pay slips, P60, P45s were regarded as reliable sources of truth.
- One union person said that they recommended that claimants used recent letters such as letter of dismissal or anything related to the grievance for this information
- From observation of users going to Companies House lookup on Gov.uk and discussions with users who had used Companies House we conclude that there is not good evidence to place a link to Companies House lookup in the form.
 - We observed that the Companies House lookup could mislead users.
 - If retained, we would need to find a way that communicated how to use the lookup effectively.



Anything surprising

Anything surprising, or interesting

- We tested with a person with Dyslexia. We were able to observe erratic mouse movement suggesting a difficulty sometimes in scanning the page, and finding the content they wanted.
- We tested with a person who was using a mobile phone with a viewport set to an approximately 200% zoom, and noticed that without being able to view the whole screen it was necessary that each design element, for example button text, needed to make sense irrespective of context.
- We saw that for some users being able to 'tell their story' to ACAS first, before ACAS spoke to the respondent was important to them emotionally.
- We again - this point was also observed in sprint 2 - saw that for users who engaged in a quite realistically emotional way with the prototype move through the prototype much much more slowly than test participants who are less emotionally engaged. We think this quite strongly suggests that for some claimants filling in the form will take some time.



Thanks