Kiosk UI user testing results (Draft 4)

Nov. 13 - 17, 2009
Completed by Vicki Moulder, Alistair Jones, Leah Maestri and Leila Aflatooni.

Summary

We are in the process of testing our 06 and 07 iterations of the in-museum kiosk wireframes. The test includes two options, the first deals with a standard architectural model for selecting gallery themes in a linear way, this also includes a separate interaction model that invites people to search using the cover flow interaction. Option two explores the same archtecture using a node model, relationships to this information is viewable, and the end process of printing and sending the planed tour.

Outline to the Casual Test Plan

Goals

This test should discover:

- The best architecture and interaction model that works for people, whether that is 'linear', 'node' or 'cover flow'
- The length of time it would take people to complete tasks.
- Areas of confusion in the overall design
- The over all impression and experience - whether that is confusing, excited or found the tasks to difficult.

Recommendations

Underlying design patterns and description of component behavior.

After you have written your casual user test notes, try to summerize the main point of your test results. Then with a critical mind look at the wireframes and make recommendations as to how we could change the current wireframes to support a better user experience. Add these recommendation to this section in a bulleted list.

Recommendations - November 15th, 2009
The kiosk test proofed to be very helpful in understanding the complexity of the design space.   In nutshell, we learned that the design of the design of the kiosk can be divided into 3 sections the kiosk introduction – the video or flash pre-kiosk use that introduces the person to kiosk and what it does; the kiosk interaction – this is the actual process of looking up the gallery information: and the interaction between the physical/virtual aspects of how the kiosk works - for example knowing where a person would pick up the printed copy, would inform directions. Below is a list of the design recommendations for each section:
The Kiosk Introduction
•   Currently we do not have an instructional introduction to how the kiosk work. We need to think about how this video or flash animation can clearly state what a person can do at the kiosk.
The Kiosk Interaction
•   We need to rethink how we confirm the theme/gallery selection process, maybe use bread crumbs or some other feature that tracks the process.
•   The design of the images need to have the characteristics of a button
•   "What's on today" needs to take a lower level of priority
•   Icons need to be designed and placed more strategically
•   The cover flow interaction model works – can we use multi-touch?
•   Limit the amount of text on each screen.
• Language choices should be written in the language they represents

The physical/virtual Interaction
•   We need to think about how the navigational text maps to the physical space – currently it is too complicated.

Participant Observation Quick Notes
Based on our observations the functionality of the kiosk and content displayed needs to:

1) The usefulness of a kiosk at the initial stage of the museum visit needs to have the following attributes and considerations:

- Fast, immediate feedback and display of materials
- To the point
- Engaging
- Short
- Playful
- Entertaining (vs. work), Hedonic

The Kiosk should NOT be, anything that requires "planning" or is seemingly work related may negate people from using a kiosk at the front end of their museum visit.

Lead the user easily in way that's managed clearly and that doesn't require them to have to make sense or re-interpret information. Information isn't overwhelming

- Keywords: Cognitive load, choice fatigue

The cover flow interface does this well in that it leads user from viewing one item at a time, as well as hint at more content for browsing.

2) For an individual visitor, it seems more relevant for he/she to look at "What's Happening Today," rather than to make an itinerary. Creating an itinerary seems more plausible if:

- The visitor is with other people, in which case one might need to consider the interests of everyone in the group
- The visitor is conducting research or is a student researching a particular project
- If the visitor has a specific interest in a theme or object in mind

3) Emailing Itinerary function: this option is more relevant if a visitor has already been through the museum and has had the experience. This affordance may need to be rethought as an affordance offered later in the visit.

4) Use of Language: It is important when naming galleries that the titles and names are easy to interpret. Participant found names like "Art and the Cycle of Life" and "Surviving Traditions" cognitively heavy and hard to interpret. It didn't engage participant to explore these further. Also, it is important to foreground titles more as a lot of the information hierarchy was difficult to read.

Results

Full notes and analysis of the user tests.

🛈 *Link to the the word document describing the detailed notes and analysis of this round of user testing.*

* Casual Test Results_Kiosk (LM)

* Analysis and Transcripts (AJ)

* Notes form Casual User Test Results (LA)