

## CUE-9 Addendum – Team Y

### Evaluation Criteria were used in evaluating the site:

1. **Presentation:** Recommendations concerning visual appearance and layout
2. **Navigation and Organization:** Recommendations concerning organization, navigation and hierarchy
3. **Content:** Recommendations about page content
4. **Interaction:** Recommendations resulting from user interaction with an interface
5. **Functional :** Functional defects found throughout usability testing

### Resources used for CUE-9 (listed in hours):

Activities	Day 1	Day 2	Day 3	Day4	Day 5
Preparing for the Evaluation	1	.5			
Watching video and taking notes		2	2	2	2
Writing the report			3.5	4	8

**TOTAL: 25 HOURS**

### Comments on the evaluation:

This was a realistic evaluation in terms of the sessions I carry out. The moderator in this case did a good job of not leading the users and allowing them to complete the test at their pace, and under their own assumptions. The scenarios covered a range of activities, but focused on seeing if the user could easily rent and purchase items. Although I typically review government websites, I can imagine that when reviewing a commercial site, the focus is to make sure a user can buy what they need.

When performing user testing evaluations, I typically first perform a heuristic evaluation, then conduct the testing, and then incorporate the two findings into one report. For this report I tried to write the recommendations based on the user testing. I did, however, provide additional findings page that captured some inconsistencies that I noticed within the site. It was interesting to compare the professions of the users with their site logic to understand why they made the choices they did.

Also, since I focus on government websites, I focus a lot on the home page layout so that you guide a user to the site content/information. I rarely deal with commercial sites where the focus is making a sale. I definitely thought less about the home page layout and more about the process from start to sale.

### Other:

When performing reviews I typically do not note positive findings or good ideas (based on provided severity ratings). I typically make my findings and incorporate both positive findings and good ideas. So you will not see any of these elements specifically listed in my findings. I do find it interesting that although people may have felt they got the correct answer in the scenario, they often had a low confidence rating. I am not sure if this is indicative of human nature or what. I am curious to see what others say.

**Additional items:**

1. How familiar were you with the company U-Haul before we announced that we would use it for CUE-9?

I was somewhat familiar with Uhaul. I have never used their website, I have never used Uhaul, but knew of their name in the marketplace.

2. How familiar were you with U-Haul's website before we announced that we would use it for CUE-9?

Very unfamiliar. I had never used the site, and I did not 'play' with the site prior to reviewing the testing videos.

3. Approximately how many times have you rented a car?

Many times. If I had to approximate, 20 times in the last 5 years.

4. Approximately how many times have you rented a car on the web?

Many times. Of the 20 rentals, all were done online.

5. How much time did you spend analyzing U-Haul.com before you watched the first video?

None. Instead of performing a review on my own, I opted not to and to just watch the user videos.

6. Approximately how many times did you pause the videos to deliberate or catch up with your notes?

A handful of times. I actually watched them all first, took general notes, organized my findings, then went back to collect the specific times the finding was identified.

7. Did you watch all or parts of the videos several times? If yes, approximately how many times did you watch each part and how long were the parts of the videos that you watched several times?

Yes, I watched the several times, about 2-3 times, not the full length, but certain parts. The parts I rewatched were the core task portions.

8. Were there any burning questions that you would have asked the test participants during or after the video recorded sessions if you had been moderating the sessions? If yes, what were they?

No burning questions but I would like to tell user #2 that they didn't completely miss the damage coverage page information; I believe the data from the previous user was cached and therefore he did not actually get that screen.