

Usability Report for:
www.stevenpaulgreenberg.com
WR-305 Writing for the Web and Social Media
Dr. H. Allen Brizee
28 October 2020
By Steven Paul Greenberg

Table of Contents

<i>Figures List</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>Abstract.....</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>Introduction.....</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>Methods</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>Results.....</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>Discussion.....</i>	<i>7</i>
<i>Conclusion.....</i>	<i>10</i>
<i>Appendices.....</i>	<i>11</i>

Figures List

Figure 1: Questions about importance of website content, design, usability, and more.

Figure 2: Time to complete tasks

Figure 3: Meeting task benchmark times

Figure 4: Comparison of averages to benchmarks

Abstract

This report shows the results and analyses of usability testing completed for www.stevenpaulgreenberg.com. The proctor conducted preliminary and post-testing questionnaires to analyze qualitative and quantitative data. Data was collected for timed, task-based protocols, design efficiency, user centeredness, and accuracy. All participants identified as male students at Loyola University Maryland between the ages of 20 and 22. Two participants were students in WR-305 Writing for the Web and Social Media and one participant was not. One participant in from WR-305 withdrew from the course, and they failed to submit their post-testing questionnaire data.

Introduction

This report shows the data of usability testing for www.stevenpaulgreenberg.com and the documents and links attached to the website. The usability test demonstrates the effectiveness and navigability of the website's page layouts and design. Usability.gov defines usability testing as "evaluating a product or service by testing it with representative users... participants will try to complete typical tasks while observers watch, listen and takes notes. The goal is to identify any usability problems, collect qualitative and quantitative data and determine the participant's satisfaction with the product."¹ Participants consist of a mix of college-age students. Some participants are students in WR-305 Writing for the Web and Social Media course at Loyola University Maryland. Therefore, they have advanced knowledge of the usability testing process and what to anticipate when performing testing. Other participant(s) have no prior knowledge of the usability testing experience. This report will go on to explain the testing procedures, results, and suggestions made from the participants. Overall, the results and suggestions indicate that the website is easily navigable and appropriately structured for the target audience and a broader, general audience.

Methods

Overview:

Usability testing was prepared by creating tasks specific to the website design for www.stevenpaulgreenberg.com that would pertain to both the target audience and a broader, general audience. Participants had no specific preparation for the tasks prior to the start of usability testing. Testing was conducted in the following stages and order: creation of tasks and questionnaires, acquirement of demographic information, preliminary questionnaire completion, task completion, post-testing questionnaire. Finally, all datapoints were compiled, analyzed, and explained in the remainder of the usability report.

Prepare Usability Information

A preliminary questionnaire was used to gauge the importance of certain aspects of website usability. Sample questionnaires were provided by Dr. H Allen Brizee for our WR-305 course, and I did not alter the questionnaires issued. The two questionnaires issued were a preliminary and post-testing questionnaire. The preliminary questionnaire was issued before starting testing, and the post-testing questionnaire was issued after all testing was concluded. Three participants, all students at Loyola University Maryland, completed the testing and questionnaires. Two participants were randomly assigned in groups by Dr. H Allen Brizee as a part of the WR-305 course. One other participant was solicited and tested at a later time.

Moreover, each of the four tasks were assigned benchmark times prior to the start of testing. Benchmark times are used to compare expectations with results. After comparing the two, I will use the results to determine whether or not the benchmark expectations were too demanding, the website usability and navigability needs to be improved, or the results were as expected, and the website needs minimal adjustments. Benchmark times and results were measured in seconds.

¹ Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs. "Usability Testing." Usability.gov, Department of Health and Human Services, 13 November 2013, www.usability.gov/how-to-and-tools/methods/usability-testing.html.

Benchmark times were 25 seconds for Task 1, 20 seconds for Task 2, 20 seconds for Task 3, and 10 seconds for Task 4. Benchmark rankings for the post-testing questionnaire evaluated the categories of Organization, Document Design, and Content on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 representing “Strongly Disagree” and 5 representing “Strongly Agree.” Post-testing benchmarks were assigned a 4 for each category based on feedback received from Dr. H Allen Brizee regarding the website’s publication status. Dr. H Allen Brizee’s grading rubric offered a scale of 1 to 5 stages of readiness regarding the publishing status of a website. The lowest of the 5 being “Not now, thanks” and the highest of the 5 being “Accept without revisions.” The website www.stevenpaulgreenberg.com received “Accept with revisions” which is equivalent to a 4 on the 1 to 5 scale.

Performing Usability Testing and Receiving Feedback

Before testing commenced, each participant was emailed a document containing the demographics questionnaire, preliminary questionnaire, tasks, post-testing questionnaire. Participants were asked to complete the demographics questionnaire and preliminary questionnaire as truthfully and accurately as possible. After testing and tasks were completed, the participants were asked to fill out the post-testing questionnaire. The preliminary questionnaire asked participants to rank the importance of website aspects such as content, design, layout, expectations and desires. The first two questions were to be ranked on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 signifying “Not Important” and 5 signifying “Most Important.” The last two preliminary questions required open-ended feedback about the participants’ expectations. All answers and results are stated later in the document.

Tasks for Participants 1 and 2 were administered over a video conference using the Zoom application. Tasks for Participant 3 were administered in person at a secure location in Bayville, New Jersey. Participants were instructed that each task would be read aloud to them twice, and they were not allowed to begin the task until I, the proctor, said “Go” after reading the task for the second time. One other person was present for the first two participants to time the completion of their tasks. Participant 3 was timed by me. After completing the tasks, I documented the amount of time needed to complete each task, the navigation path and the amount of clicks used to arrive to an answer, the participants reactions while completing the tasks, and whether or not they answer the questions and completed the tasks correctly. The participants completed the following tasks:

1. What is the location of the farm containing 3 silos in photograph titled “Undisturbed”?
2. What internship is listed at the top of my résumé?
3. What is the third word in the body text of my most recent blog?
4. What webpage does the Job Doc page bring you to?

Results

Overview of Results

Results were broken down into four categories: demographic information, preliminary questionnaire, task-based protocols, and the post-testing questionnaire. Two out of three participants had advanced knowledge of the usability testing processes prior to engaging in this study. The one other participant had no specific knowledge of the usability testing processes.

Participant Demographics and Preliminary Questionnaire

The demographics questionnaire offered insight to the three participants. All three participants identified as male. Two participants were 20 years of age. One participant was 22 years of age. Two participants identified as White. One participant identified as Middle Eastern, Asian, and White. Two participants had advanced knowledge of the usability testing processes and were students in WR-305 at Loyola University Maryland. One participant, also a student at Loyola University Maryland, had no specific knowledge of the usability testing processes and was not a WR-305 student. None of the participants were provided with information regarding a target audience or a broader, general audience. Table 1 contains the participants' rankings for the first two questions of the preliminary questionnaire. The average responses were 4.67 for question 1 and 3.33 for question 2.

Table 1

	Participant 1	Participant 2	Participant 3	Average
Importance of the content of a website	5	4	5	4.67
Importance of the design of a website	3	3	4	3.33

Table 1: Responses were recorded on using a scale of 1 to 5 with 5 representing highest importance and 1 representing least importance regarding content and design of a website.

Task-Based Protocols

Average times for tasks 2 and 3 met the benchmark times. Average times for task 1 did not meet the benchmark time. No benchmark was established for task 4. Only one participant completed task 1 within the established benchmark. The average for task 1 was 21.3 seconds above the benchmark. Participants 1 and 3 completed all tasks correctly. Participant 2 incorrectly answered task 3.

Table 2

	Participant 1	Participant 2	Participant 3	Benchmark	Average
Task 1	89 sec	30 sec	20 sec	25 sec	46.3 sec
Task 2	12 sec	12 sec	11 sec	20 sec	11 sec
Task 3	33 sec	10 sec	9 sec	30 sec	17.3 sec
Task 4	4 sec	4 sec	7 sec	N/A	5 sec

Table 2: Participants task completion measured in seconds.

Table 3

	Task 1	Task 2	Task 3	Task 4
Against Benchmark	33.3%	100%	66.7%	N/A

Table 3: This table shows success rates of participants that were able to complete tasks within the established benchmarks. Table 2 differs by comparing average times to benchmarks.

Post-Testing Questionnaire

After testing was completed, participants were asked to complete an additional, post-testing questionnaire. Questions were separated into the categories of Organization, Document Design, and Content. Those questions were assigned also assigned benchmark rankings on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 representing “Strongly Disagree” and 5 representing “Strongly Agree.” Post-testing benchmarks were assigned a 4 for each category based on feedback received from Dr. H Allen Brizee regarding the website’s publication status. Table 4 compares the average scores given by participants to the benchmark scores assigned prior to testing. Open-ended post-testing questions are outlined later in this section. The averages do not accurately represent the survey results of all three participants, because data from Participant 2 was never submitted to me after testing. Participant 2, a student in WR-305 at the time of testing, withdrew from the course. However, Participants 1 and 3 scored all categories with a 5 on the 1 to 5 scale. This exceeded the established benchmark of 4.

Table 4

	Benchmark	Average
Organization		
Organization of website is clear:	4	5
Usability of the website is effective:	4	5
Webpage Design		
Webpage appearance makes it easy to read:	4	5
Heading, layout and white space is effective:	4	5
Content		
Short bio is effective:	4	5
News articles are effective:	4	5
Job documents are effective:	4	5
Overall, this document is effective in fulfilling its purpose:	4	5

Table 4: Average scores compared to the pre-established benchmark scores.

Discussion

Overview of Conclusions

Overall, the participants found the website’s design to be very effective, useful, and navigable. The results obtained from the task-based protocols suggest that either the benchmark scores were too demanding or that there is room for improvement on the website’s navigability and page layout. Results from the post-testing questionnaire indicate that the website is in good standing with users and clearly conveys the information to users. Participants had very few visible

reactions while completing the task-based protocols. However, the participants are not representative of the website's target audience. The participants assigned to and solicited for the usability testing are in a significantly lower age range, have little to no financial independence, have not yet obtained an undergraduate or graduate degree, are not currently employed in the field of academia, and all identify as male. Therefore, the overall usability of www.stevenpaulgreenberg.com might not accurately be applied to the older, and possibly less tech-savvy, target audience. Lastly, Participants 1 and 2 completed the tasks and questionnaires over the Zoom video application while Participant 3 completed the tasks and questionnaires in-person.

Analysis

Preliminary Questionnaire

The goal of the preliminary questionnaire was to gauge the participants' expectations of website design and layout as a whole before engaging with www.stevenpaulgreenberg.com. According to the results of the preliminary questionnaire, the content of the website was of substantial importance (scoring an average of 4.67 out of 5). The results also showed that participants believed that the design of the website was only of slightly above moderate importance (scoring an average of 3.33 out of 5). Since two participants were students in the WR-305 class, they likely answered the importance of content with higher importance because they had been taught the importance of a website's content information in the course in accordance with *Letting Go of the Words – Writing Web Content that Works* by Janice (Ginny) Redish. Their expectations showed advanced knowledge of the usability testing procedures, which was expected before testing began.

Time on Task and Navigation Pathways

The average times for tasks 2 and 3 met the benchmark expectations. However, the average time for task 1 did not meet the benchmark expectations; and, due to an error by me, there was no benchmark established for task 4. The average time for task 1 was 46.3 seconds (the benchmark was 25 seconds). The average time for task 4 was 5 seconds. Although no benchmark was established before testing began, Participants 1 and 2 completed task 4 in 4 seconds (1 second below the average). Even though Participant 3 completed task 1 within the benchmark of 25 seconds, Participants 1 and 2 finished the tasks in 89 seconds (Participant 1) and 30 seconds (Participant 2). Although I would not consider Participant 1 to be an outlier, I believe it is important to acknowledge how drastically that one data point impacted the average.

Review of the participants' navigation pathways showed that all participants, with the exception of Participant 1 during Task 1, completed the tasks using the same navigation pathways. Participant 1 deviated from the other participants during Task 1 by clicking on the "About Me" page instead of the "Creations" page to complete the task. Benchmarks were not assigned to the number of clicks needed to complete the tasks. Participants 2 and 3 completed Task 1 in three clicks. Participant 1 completed Task 1 in four clicks. All participants completed Task 2 in three clicks. All participants completed Task 3 in three clicks. All participants completed Task 4 in one click. Although Participant 2 completed Task 3 in the same clicks, they answered the question incorrectly. Further discussion concluded that Participant 2 was confused by the wording of the task.

Post-Testing Questionnaire

All of the participants provided either positive feedback or no feedback at all. Participant 1 stated that “the website was very well designed, and the white space was used very effectively,” when asked to offer any positive or negative feedback about the website. None of the feedback criticized any organization, navigability or accessibility, or design. However, Participant 1 did suggest that I add a “Highlights” section to the “Résumé” page “to emphasize the most important parts of the resume.” This suggestion may even be considered with to incorporate a “Relevant Coursework” page. Participant 3 only left one comment as a suggestion to improve the website, and the comment was to add “more content.” Initially, this seemed to suggest that there was a lack of content. However, after reviewing Participant 3’s overall rating of the website (5 out of 5) and effectiveness of the content provided (all received 5 out of 5 in the content category) I’ve interpreted this comment as enthusiasm for more content to be published in the future.

Suggestions and Improvements

After revisiting suggestions and improvements from the post-testing questionnaire, I found that all of the comments were either neutral, meaning they had no suggestions for improvement, or they supported the current website structure and page designs. Positive comments were made about the effective use of white space and the readability of the information provided on the website. Participants also made positive comments about the aesthetic appeal and design of the website making it very user friendly and user centered. One suggestion that will be taken into account when preparing www.stevenpaulgreenberg.com for its final revision will be the idea to incorporate a “Relevant Coursework” page to the “About Me” section. Ideally, this will offer more information to potential employers and others interested in learning more about my qualifications and undergraduate experiences.

Limitations and Additional Factors to Consider

Since Participant 2 withdrew from the WR-305 course, they did not submit their post-testing questionnaire. I have contacted Participant 2 and asked that they send over their completed post-testing questionnaire. However, it is important to note that if they do send over the completed questionnaire, the results might not accurately represent the initial impressions of www.stevenpaulgreenberg.com on Participant 2. Other participants filled out the post-testing questionnaire immediately after testing was concluded. Therefore, they had the website’s information, layout, and design present in their minds while completing the questionnaire. Participant 2 will have to use their memory to recall their initial impressions. This may offer flawed and misrepresented information.

Moreover, the usability testing participants were all male students at Loyola University Maryland. They do not best represent the target audience, for the target audience is middle-aged, degree holding females employed in a college or university. Additional testing may be conducted at a later time prior to the finalized publication of www.stevenpaulgreenberg.com.

Conclusion

Further testing on participants of different demographics should be conducted in order to discover the usability and effectiveness of www.stevenpaulgreenberg.com on the target audience. Currently, the website stands with mostly positive feedback and comments with only one major suggestion. After the one major suggestion is incorporated, the website shall receive another complete review in pursuit of possible areas of improvement. Prior to testing, the expectations were that the website would offer low click volume and fast paced usability. My goal is to take the timing results from the task-based protocols and search for ways to lower the average times of tasks that failed to meet benchmark expectations. Participants 1 and 3 gave the website an overall rating of a 5 on a scale of 1 to 5. Once further testing is done on a different demographic, I will look to compare the results and incorporate additional suggestions and improvements into a later version of the website. Overall, the website achieved the goal of receiving positive feedback, but still needs to revisit benchmark goals or reconsider the benchmark goals entirely.

References

Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs. “Usability Testing.” Usability.gov, Department of Health and Human Services, 13 November 2013, www.usability.gov/how-to-and-tools/methods/usability-testing.html.

Appendices

APPENDIX A: Usability Testing Introduction

Introduction

This document contains the readability/usability test informed consent form, participant demographic questionnaire, protocols, and surveys that you will use to assess your documents or website. Normally, writers and designers would develop their own test methods. But in many cases, customized testing resources are augmented by existing models.

To simplify our testing process, I am providing these resources. If you feel that they do not work with your documents/project, feel free to alter them to match your requirements.

Usability Testing Script and Protocols

Purpose: The purpose of this test is to collect data from participants while they read your documents or use your website. The author should use this data to help her/him improve the deliverable. Under normal testing conditions, designers would collect data from at least 11 participants. Moreover, data would be collected by multiple data recorders. For this session, however, you will adapt your testing scenario to your project and your group.

Read the following:

- a. *Thank you for agreeing to spend time with us today. Please remember that you can stop testing at any time for any reason. If you are uncomfortable or want a break for any reason, simply tell me and we will take a break. My name is Steve, and I can answer any questions that may occur to you during testing. In addition to walking you through these tests, we are recording your reactions, timing how long it takes you to find information, and noting phrases that you use to describe the documents/website we are testing today. Overall, this test should take less than an hour. We may break at any time, or you may choose not to continue the testing if you feel uncomfortable.*

APPENDIX B: Informed Consent Form

Informed Consent Form

(This is a sample form used for class and not part of a formal research study)

Purpose of Research

The purpose of this research is to test the readability/usability of a deliverable. Students are completing this test as part of coursework for a professional writing class.

Specific Procedures to be Used

Participants will fill out a demographic survey, complete task-based protocols on the deliverable to find information, and fill out a post-test questionnaire.

Duration of Participation

The readability/usability test session should take less than an hour.

Benefits to the Individual

Participants will learn about readability/usability testing, and testing may contribute to a body of knowledge that supports innovation in readability and usability research.

Risks to the Individual

Risks for participating in this study are minimal and are no more than people would encounter in everyday life or in the course of studies at Loyola University Maryland.

Compensation

Participants will not receive any compensation for this study.

Confidentiality

Confidentiality cannot be guaranteed because of the nature of large groups—the class. Participant responses cannot be guaranteed to be anonymous because Dr. Allen Brizee cannot guarantee that other classroom participants will not disclose my participation in the study. Furthermore, documents created for the course may be posted on online.

Information collected during the test will be stored by the tester (the author). Aggregate results—data compiled from test responses—will be shared with the class and included in readability/usability documents. No information from this course-based study will be published in peer-reviewed venues.

Voluntary Nature of Participation

While the testing is part of the class requirements, I understand that I can stop the testing process at any time without penalty.

Participant's Signature and Date

APPENDIX C: Participant Demographic Questionnaire

Age:

How do you identify?:

- American Indian/Alaskan Native
- Asian (including Indian subcontinent and Philippines)
- Black/African-American
- Black/African Heritage
- Black/ Caribbean American
- Chicano/Latino/Hispanic

- Middle Eastern
- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
- White

How do you identify:

- Female
- Male
- Transgender
- Questioning
- Prefer not to answer

1. On a scale of 1 to 5 (with 1 being the lowest and 5 being the highest), how important is the content of a website to you? 1 2 3 4 5

2. On a scale of 1 to 5 (with 1 being the lowest and 5 being the highest), how important is the design of a website to you? 1 2 3 4 5

3. What are some features that you think are important in a website?

4. What kinds of information would you expect to see in a website?

APPENDIX D: Task-Based Protocols

This protocol is a quantitative, task-based process combined with a short questionnaire about the experience. The proctor will ask the participant questions that will require them to find information in your deliverable, time the participant, and record whether or not the participant successfully answers the question.

Note: Make sure each computer has your documents open. Also, the proctor is permitted to repeat the task or clarify questions about the task itself but is not to assist the participant or answer questions relating to the navigation of your deliverable. (i.e., the proctor can help the participant understand the task but not complete it).

Proctor: *The computer in front of you is displaying one of the documents/websites that we are testing today. During this phase of the test, we would like you to use the document to find specific information, which will be given to you shortly. You are not going to be evaluated on your proficiency with using the computer; rather, this test is to see how well the document allows you to find particular information. We are testing the document and not you.*

Task 1: What is the location of the farm containing 3 silos in the photograph titled “Undisturbed”?

Time:

Navigation path:

Reaction:

Did the participant answer the question correctly? Y N

Thank you. Please return to the beginning of the document.

Task 2: What internship is listed at the top of my résumé?

Time:

Navigation path:

Reaction:

Did the participant answer the question correctly? Y N

Thank you. Please return to the beginning of the document.

Task 3: What is the third word in the body text of my most recent blog?

Time:

Navigation path:

Reaction:

Did the participant answer the question correctly? Y N

Thank you. Please return to the beginning of the document.

Task 4: What web page does the Job Doc page bring you to?

Time:

Navigation path:

Reaction:

Did the participant answer the question correctly? Y N

Thank you. Please return to the beginning of the document. Please take a few minutes to read the document/surf the website. As you familiarize yourself with it, please complete the after-test survey below. Thank you.

APPENDIX E: Post-Testing Survey and Questionnaire

Please fill out this survey and questionnaire based on your experiences with the job documents.
Thank you for your time today. (Adjust to fit your project.)

Organization					
Organization of website is clear:	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
Usability of the website is effective:	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
Document Design					

Document/web page appearance makes it easy to read:	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
Headings, layout, and white space is effective:	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
Content					
Short bio is effective:	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
News articles are effective:	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
Job documents are effective:	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
Overall, this document is effective in fulfilling its purpose:	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree

Is there any missing information? If so, what is it?

Do you have any specific (positive or negative) comments on this document?

Do you have any suggestions on how to improve this document?

What is your overall rating of this document (5 being the highest rating)?: 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5

APPENDIX F: Coded and Analyzed Data

Importance Aspects of Website Ratings

	Participant 1	Participant 2	Participant 3	Average
Importance of the content of a website	5	4	5	4.67
Importance of the design of a website	3	3	4	3.33

Task-Based Protocols Times, Benchmarks and Averages

	Participant 1	Participant 2	Participant 3	Benchmark	Average
Task 1	89 sec	30 sec	20 sec	25 sec	46.3 sec
Task 2	12 sec	12 sec	11 sec	20 sec	11 sec
Task 3	33 sec	10 sec	9 sec	30 sec	17.3 sec
Task 4	4 sec	4 sec	7 sec	N/A	5 sec

Task-Based Protocol Results

	Task 1	Task 2	Task 3	Task 4
Participant 1	Correct	Correct	Correct	Correct
Participant 2	Correct	Correct	Incorrect	Correct
Participant 3	Correct	Correct	Correct	Correct

Task-Based Protocol Success Rate

	Task 1	Task 2	Task 3	Task 4
Against Benchmark	33.3%	100%	66.7%	N/A

Post-Testing Questionnaire Summary

	Benchmark	Average
Organization		
Organization of website is clear:	4	5
Usability of the website is effective:	4	5
Webpage Design		
Webpage appearance makes it easy to read:	4	5
Heading, layout and white space is effective:	4	5
Content		
Short bio is effective:	4	5
News articles are effective:	4	5
Job documents are effective:	4	5
Overall, this document is effective in fulfilling its purpose:	4	5

Task-Based Protocols Pathway

Participant 1	Pathway
Task 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Clicked "About Me" -Then hovered over "Creations" -Then clicked "Photo Gallery" tab -Scrolled to correct photo -Clicked on photo -Said "Done" and read aloud answer to question when asked
Task 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Clicked "About Me" -Then clicked "Résumé" tab

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Then clicked “View Steven’s Most Recent Résumé” -Viewed résumé -Said “Done” and read aloud answer to question when asked
Task 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Clicked “Creations” -Then clicked “Blog” -Then clicked correct link -Said “Done” and read aloud answer to question when asked
Task 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Clicked “About Me” -Then clicked “Job Doc” link -Viewed Cornell MMH webpage - Said “Done” and read aloud answer to question when asked

Participant 2	Pathway
Task 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Clicked “Creations” -Then clicked “Photo Gallery” tab -Scrolled to correct photo -Clicked on photo -Said “Done” and read aloud answer to question when asked
Task 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Clicked “About Me” -Then clicked “Résumé” tab -Then clicked “View Steven’s Most Recent Résumé” -Viewed résumé -Said “Done” and read aloud answer to question when asked
Task 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Clicked “Creations” -Then clicked “Blog” -Then clicked correct link -Said “Done” and read aloud INCORRECT answer to question when asked
Task 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Clicked “About Me” -Then clicked “Job Doc” link -Viewed Cornell MMH webpage - Said “Done” and read aloud answer to question when asked

Participant 3	Pathway
Task 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Clicked “Creations” -Then clicked “Photo Gallery” tab -Scrolled to correct photo -Clicked on photo -Said “Done” and read aloud answer to question when asked
Task 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Clicked “About Me” -Then clicked “Résumé” tab -Then clicked “View Steven’s Most Recent Résumé”

	-Viewed résumé -Said “Done” and read aloud answer to question when asked
Task 3	-Clicked “Creations” -Then clicked “Blog” -Then clicked correct link -Said “Done” and read aloud answer to question when asked
Task 4	-Clicked “About Me” -Then clicked “Job Doc” link -Viewed Cornell MMH webpage - Said “Done” and read aloud answer to question when asked

Post-Testing Survey Rankings

	Participant 1	Participant 2	Participant 3	Average
Organization				
Organization of website is clear:	5	N/A	5	5
Usability of the website is effective:	5	N/A	5	5
Webpage Design				
Webpage appearance makes it easy to read:	5	N/A	5	5
Heading, layout and white space is effective:	5	N/A	5	5
Content				
Short bio is effective:	5	N/A	5	5
News articles are effective:	5	N/A	5	5
Job documents are effective:	5	N/A	5	5
Overall, this document is effective in fulfilling its purpose:	5	N/A	5	5

Overall Website Ratings

Participant 1	Participant 2	Participant 3	Average
5	N/A	5	5

Website Feedback

Taxonomy	Aesthetic Appeal	Content
Definitely navigable	Engaging	Useful
Well-Organized and easy to find information	“Wow” -Participant 2	Should add “Highlights” page for quick view of résumé
	Nice photos	Serves its purpose very well
	Great flow	