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## Problem and Solution Overview

Grocery shopping is something that almost everyone has experience with, often of the negative kind. When shopping, it can be infuriating to come into a store and see the prices of the items you want to buy be either more expensive than they were the last time you came in or cheaper (meaning you wasted money). Almost everyone knows that coupons and other ways to save exist, but few people actually go out of their way to use them due to the incredible inconvenience of clipping out physical coupons or printing out PDFs from poorly designed coupon websites. As we found during our research, college students and young people tend in general to not bother with these coupons, even though paradoxically they are the people who could benefit from them the most. While some grocery stores do now have apps that allow customers to save more conveniently, it's not in the interest of the grocery store to make these apps that useful so frequently they are lacking and (of course) only deal with one store at a time.

Our solution to this problem, MetaGrocer, is an app that uses crowdsourcing to maintain a database of current product prices and coupons across all major and local grocery stores. By telling our app what items they want to buy, the customer can then receive trip suggestions that allow them to split their purchases across multiple stores in order to save money. Our app's database also allows for quick price and coupon retrieval for any item that a customer might want to buy. This allows the customer to scan items and automatically receive any applicable coupons, while also enabling them to contribute to the database with just a couple clicks.

## Initial Paper Prototype

## Design / Tasks

Our initial prototype design was primarily focused on allowing users to save on groceries in a variety of ways (planned / unplanned) without having to spend a significant amount of time dealing with coupons and researching prices at stores. To this end, we implemented a shopping list "trip
 plan" feature that would convert a user's wanted items into an easy to read trip plan for multiple stores telling them where to buy which items. Coupons, where applicable, are automatically retrieved and displayed in a manner that the user could scan at checkout from their phone without hassle (and without holding up the line).


While this feature enabled users to perform the task of planning their trip in a way that saves money without wasting much time, we also implemented a scanning feature so that users could make impulse buys in the most cost-effective and time-efficient way possible. By scanning a barcode, a user can see a product's price at nearby stores and have any available coupons for the item automatically added to the app's coupon list.

Task 1: Price Comparison








Task 2: Finding Coupons



## Testing Process

## Heuristic Evaluations

To gain some initial feedback on whether or not our design violated basic design heuristics principles, we conducted two heuristic evaluations with other groups (the "Social Parking" and "Food Waste" projects) from CSE 440. This essentially consisted of Lulu and Kevin explaining the concept behind MetaGrocer to other project teams and then having them explore the interface in a semi-guided (but mostly free) manner while Ryan "executed" the app and Tim made notes of their heuristic evaluation feedback. After the heuristic evaluation was completed, we then went through the notes and ranked them in order of importance, and noted which part of the interface they pertained to. We used these rankings and prioritizations to make revisions to our interface.

## Usability Testing Sessions

After making some changes based on our heuristic evaluations (detailed in the "Testing Results" section), we then conducted three usability tests featuring random UW students as our participants. Our testing methodology did not change much throughout the three tests since the first one went well and ran quite smoothly; however, one significant change we did make is the location of our subsequent tests. To avoid accidentally recruiting students with engineering backgrounds, we decided to move our test location from the CSE building to the Odegaard Undergraduate Library. This worked well, as our second and third test candidates came from a much broader pool of students than primarily CS/EE majors. Throughout the tests, Tim played the role of the "computer" while Lulu took notes and Ryan/Kevin performed a combined greeter/facilitator role. We gained tons of useful insights from this part of the design process, and have documented them extensively in the "Testing Results" section of this report.

## Refinement

We refined our testing process over the course of the heuristic and user tests by solidifying the roles that we were originally assigned and preparing as much of the test beforehand as possible. During our first user test, we each had different roles than we did during the heuristic evaluation. After conducting the test, we decided that these roles fit us well, and that it would be best if we each continued in them for the rest of the tests. Our first user test also took longer than the following tests because we had not laid out the elements of the interface very well. After the first test, we improved our element layout, so that the second test went faster, and we improved it even more after that, so that the third test was the fastest, all other factors being held constant.

## Testing Results

## Heuristic Evaluation

From our heuristic evaluations, we primarily received feedback about displaying information to the user. This came in two forms. The first was displaying the system's state. It was suggested that coupon counts per item, how much money the coupons would save in total, and the quantity of an item should be shown to the user. The second was giving a first-time user more instruction about the app's use. Through the evaluation, we learned that some of the parts that we thought were evident to the user actually needed some prompting. We added clarification in parts of the app, such as what the levels on the profile page mean and what exactly the "Search" tab searches for. With these changes, we reduced the learning curve for a first-time user.

## Usability Test 1

One type of issue that came up in this usability test was making some of the app's functionality apparent to the user. This cropped up in a couple of places, the first being the trip planning page. When the participant entered the page, they immediately selected one of the routes from the "1 Store" tab, not even noticing that there were routes on other tabs that would have been cheaper. Another part of the app that the participant bypassed was the barcode scanning. Knowing that they needed to add an item, they simply used the item searching as they had before. To assist the user in discovering the barcode scanner, we decided to move it directly into the search bar. Apps like MyFitnessPal already do this.

The most important change that came from this test was with the Store Set functionality. Originally, we allowed the user to maintain separate lists of stores to shop at. This way, a user could have one list for when they are at home and another list for when they are visiting their parents. While this would have been useful, it was not worth the confusion that it caused the testing participant. They immediately tried searching for specific stores when entering the screen, rather than making a new set and adding the store. To solve this problem, users now have only one group of stores to edit. We did decide to keep the "Within 2 Miles" option on the list screen, though, to make one-time shopping trips quicker.

## Usability Test 2

This was the quickest and smoothest of the usability tests. A lot of the intuitive leaps that the participant made matched up with the design of the app. There were still a couple of minor
issues that cropped up during the testing, though. The first was simply due to the "low-fi" nature of the prototype. The participant had issues recognizing what the symbols on the map in the "Add Store" screen meant. To fix this in future tests, we decided to do this screen in color matching Google Map's symbols. Another issue occurred when the participant tried to start planning a trip without selecting a store group. We quickly made an error pop-up to continue the testing, but later made the "Plan Trip" button greyed out until a group is selected.

## Usability Test 3

This test resulted in large changes to our "Shopping Plan" screen. Originally, tabs were used for each store, similar to the "Trip Planning" screen. However, two issues arose with that design. After shopping at the first store, the participant wanted to click the tab and move on to the next store. By missing the "Check Out" button, the user would have lost out on their coupons and we would have lost the opportunity to gather data from their receipt. The fact that the participant couldn't see their entire shopping list on the first tab made it seem like some of their items had been lost. We fixed these issues by changing the shopping screen from tabs to a list of stores and their item counts. These stores can be expanded by tapping to show the grocery lists for that store as well as the checkout button. When the user first enters the screen, they can see by looking at the item counts that their entire shopping list is represented. Also, the vertical layout of the new screen implies an order between the stores and their checkout buttons. The redesigned screen has more similarities to a traditional grocery list than the original did.

As in previous tests, we continued to run into issues with the participant not realizing that barcode scanning was an option. We also had second thoughts about having the scanner only be in the search bar, as it would require more actions to get to that screen. To fix both these issues, we re-added the barcode scanner to the bottom bar, while also keeping it in the search bar. Having the scanner in the navigation bar makes it easier for the non-planned shoppers to use, while also keeping it in a place that the planned shoppers will notice.

## Final Paper Prototype

## Overview



Task 1: Price Comparison






|  | indicate that they have been added to the physical basket/cart. | The app displays the strawberries coupon for the user to scan. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $x$ | $x$ | Profile |
|  |  | DemoUser |
|  |  | Reciepts Scanned: <br> People Heloed |
|  |  | Money Saradi, \$2.00 |
|  |  | Status: $\square$ level: |
|  | Reciect suclessfully scamed! Ther iyou! | Edit My Stores |
| Photo will automatically take. |  |  |
|  | The user receives a thank you | User is sent back to the profile |
| Camera turns on for user to scan their receipt. | receipt. |  |

## Task 2: Finding Coupons




Digital Mockup

Overview




## Task 1: Price Comparison

Our goal was to assist the user in saving money. Doing this involves taking information from the user such as what stores they are willing to shop at and what items they want. We did our best to make gathering this as low-effort as possible for the user. The store selection is a one-time setup that can be reused for future trips. Meanwhile, after the initial setup, the app defaults to the shopping list page. As adding an item to their shopping list will be an action repeatedly taken over the course of a week, it was important to make that as efficiently as possible.

Another aspect of the design is that it allows users to make their own decisions of how much time they are willing to spend in order to save money. This is important to do, as our usability testing showed that people had different values of these two resources. The first way this is accomplished is through letting the user select their own stores. They can add further stores if they are willing to make the trip. Letting the user see multiple routes and compare their costs relative to their travel distances also lets them make an informed decision.

Through the use of our design, the user is able to quickly find ways to save money at stores they shop at.




| - 4.1230 | - 4 - ${ }^{1230}$ | - 4.1230 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\leftarrow$ Yogurt | $\leftarrow$ Yogurt | $\leftarrow$ Shopping List |
|  | $\square$ | Strawberries, 1-1b $\quad \odot 1 \oplus$ |
|  |  | Yoplait Yogurt, 6 oz 2 |
| Yoplait Yogurt, 6 oz | Yoplait Yogurt, 6 oz |  |
| S1.00 a t Safeway S1.99 at ofc | $\$ 1.00$ at Safeway S1.99at FFC |  |
| $\odot 1 \oplus$ | $\odot 2 ¢$ |  |
| Update List | Update List | Select Stores |
|  |  |  |
| $\checkmark \quad \bigcirc \quad \square$ | $\checkmark \quad \bigcirc \quad \square$ | $\checkmark \quad \bigcirc \quad \square$ |
| The user increases the quantity of the yogurt they want to get. | The user adds 2 Yoplait Yogurt to their shopping list. | Yoplait yogurt is now in the user's shopping list along with the strawberries they have previously added. <br> The Plan Trip button is still greyed out. |





## Task 2: Finding Coupons

While we tried to make the process of making a shopping list as easy as possible, there were some design research participants who didn't us shopping lists at all. We still wanted to help those potential users save money without the hassle of planning trips. One way we found to do this was through couponing. The app allows the user to scan the barcode of an items they pick up and get any applicable coupons for them to check out.

Although coupons are a way for us to help these users, we wanted to keep the coupons themselves as hidden as possible. Our research showed that, apart from the relatively low-effort Safeway app coupons, coupons were largely ignored. To keep the process as simple as possible, all prices in the app already have coupons applied. This way, the only time the user needs to worry about coupons is when they scan them at checkout.



## Changes

Though we did not make many changes when going from our paper prototype to our digital mock up, we did decide that a few changes were necessary. We chose to allow the user to add an image to their profile screen, which also meant that we needed to add a button which would allow the user to edit that image. Even though this change is not considered critical, we do think that it makes the profile page look better than before, and is therefore worthwhile. We also added grocery store logos to the shopping plan because we realized that this will make it much easier for the user to quickly identify which store is which, especially since most stores use their own logo in many places, so that people become very accustomed to them. These logos also make the shopping plan screen more aesthetically appealing. In the "Add Store" section we added the address of each store below its name so that the user can make sure they are selecting the correct store to add to their list. Instead of using indented buttons on the "Trip Planner" screen, we decided to add a yellow bar to the bottom of the selected tab. We did this because the UI element that we chose was better suited for the device we were using, and went along better with the rest of the design than using indented buttons. Which tab is selected is still easy to see. At first we just used a + and - sign to have the user change the quantity of the items in the shopping list. The only problem with this is that the user would have to tap a very small area to select the buttons. To solve this problem, we put the + and -inside of circles that are larger, and much easier to tap. When we made our paper prototype, we transferred the bottom navigation from one screen to the next. This meant that the bottom bar looked the same for all the screens. When making our digital mockup we decided to highlight the tab that the user was on to provide visual feedback, and make the app easier to use. Because the "Receipt" and "Scan Barcode" tabs take the user to the camera right away and remove the bottom navigation when they do so, the user will never see either of those two tabs highlighted.

## Discussion

The iterative design process that we went through in the development of MetaGrocer was quite interesting and incredibly useful. Although our first selected design from our early sketches was "solid" and fundamentally "on the right track", it had many glaring issues that we were blind to by virtue of being the designers and not uninvested users. Many interface elements broke basic design heuristics, but in ways that were not obvious to experienced users (in this case, the designers) of the interface. If we had more or less settled with our initial paper prototype design, we would have essentially ended up with a practically unusable app for everyone but us!

Our earliest designs centered around the two greater goals of saving money and time while shopping through use of an app. After our later contextual inquiries, we realized that the scope of the design was possibly too broad to really serve any of its users well. We narrowed down our focus to the specific tasks of saving money in both planned and spontaneous ways while shopping, but initially did not change our design in some ways that would be conducive to that. For instance, knowing that we needed to significantly overhaul the "flow" of the shopping trip functionality of our app truly required usability testing, as we were unable to notice the flaws in our initial design that could lead to users getting stuck or potentially "breaking" the state of the interface.

One of the other issues that the testing process helped with was finding a way to introduce new users to the interface without having to compromise the speed of the interface for experienced users too much. We had floated a variety of ideas to help with this, but ultimately we wouldn't have known if the one we settled on (brief hideable pop-ups that describe key features of the app on the first launch) was actually useful without testing it on a variety of users (which we did).

In the move to a digital mockup, some minor design ambiguities that were difficult to elucidate on paper (such as embossed/selected/grayed out buttons, for instance) became much clearer, and it would in fact be nice to see if users responded better to these final changes than they did to the same screens in the final paper prototype; unfortunately, due to the structure of the project it is unlikely we will have a chance to test this. Essentially, we still feel there's some significant possibility for improvement from further iterations, but the work we've done so far probably brings us $80-90 \%$ of the way to the maximum design improvement possible from testing.

Appendix

Heuristic Evaluation Cards


Assindir at Mlinudist Design
Don't start off on profile

Aesthetic and Minimalist Design
"Do. we choose.
. .between the two stores now?"
item Dear Detail page

Floxility \& Efficacy of use
Add user preferences Cheat vs. min dis toe

Visibility of System Status
Put the unit next to the quality

Coussitency and Standards 4
What happens When you select add?

Display coupon count pas item.

Vitality of System Status





## Usability Testing Tasks

$N$

## MetaGrocer

This is an app that helps users plan their grocery shopping trips. You search the items you want in MetaGrocer and the app will give you the best route.

## Task 1

1. Add QFC and Safeway to the store list you want to go to
2. Add the cheapest strawberries to your shopping list
3. Add two of the cheapest yogurt to your shopping list
4. Begin the shopping trip
5. Find the cheapest route
6. Complete your shopping trip

## Task 2

Pretend you are already at Safeway, looking for Chip Ahoy cookies. You open MetaGrocer to look for coupons for the cookies. Add the cookies to your shopping list and use the coupon when you check out.

## Usability Test 1





## Usability Test 2

| Before Image | Seve <br> rity | Issue | Design Changes | After Image |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Add stre |  |  |  |  |

## Usability Test 3

| Before Image | Seve <br> rity | Issue | Design Changes | After Image |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| QFC <br> Name Qy Price <br> $\pm$ Yoplad Yogut $-2+\$ 2.00$ <br> Total: $\$ 4.00$ <br> Cheok Out | 4 | After picking up all their items at the first store on the trip, the participant attempted to select the other store, rather than pressing the checkout button. This would cause them to miss out on the coupons that would have been displayed. | In response to a couple of issues on our shopping page, we decided to greatly change it. The new page now shows multiple stores on the same page that can be selected to show an expanded list of the items, as well as the checkout button. We believe that this indicates that the stores are in an order and should be "checked out" individually, rather than as a couple. |  |
|  |  | After adding QFC to the list of stores, the participant tapped the QFC entry again. This led them back to the map screen where the stores are selected. | This wasn't an action we had previously considered, so we were uncertain how the app should behave in this situation. We alter decided that store list entries cannot be edited. Stores can be added and removed from the list, but not changed. As a result, the participants action would have resulted in no change to the app's state. | N/A |


| Profile | 3 | The participant went to the | We changed the button's label to say | Protile |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Demolser <br> Reciepts samed: 3 <br> People Helped:' 0 <br> Money Savili (1.00 <br> Status: $\square$ heuc:! <br> My Stores |  | "Search Items" stores. They later said that they were confused by the "My Stores" button, thinking it would show them only stores that they had already selected rather than letting them find more stores. | better communicate its use. | DenoUser <br> Reciepts scanned: - <br> People Helped: Money Saredi \$lso 0 <br> Stratus: $\square$ leurl: <br> Edit My Stores |
| Details <br> Strawberries 1-ib $\$ 1.50$ at QFC $\$ 2.00$ at Solernay <br> upate List | 3 | The participant would attempt to select a store at this page, which isn't something that is decided at this point in the process. | We believe that this issue comes from a lack of fidelity in the paper prototype. It can sometimes be difficult to tell what is interactable and what is not. As we move on to the digital mock-up, we plan to ensure that the text does not look clickable in any way, just like the "Offer Details" section on the screen to the right. |  |




