

Before Coffee - High-Fidelity User Testing Results

PLAN

of participants: 8

Criteria: Based in NYC, visits coffee shops often

Methodology:

- **Moderated A/B test** via Figma prototypes, focused on **Menu page**
 - **Version A: Menu broken into category tabs**
 - **Version B: Menu shown in one continuous list with category headings**
 - Half of participants will see version A, the other half will see version B
 - Both groups will complete the same **3 tasks**
 - **Mobile** prototype prioritized, per research findings regarding user behavior when searching for coffee shops to visit
- Focus: Qualitative insights w/ some quantitative backing

Hypothesis:

- Progressive disclosure through category tabs will help visitors better understand the coffee shop's offerings and increase their likelihood to visit in-person, compared to overwhelming them with all menu items at once.

Objectives:

- Observe scanning behavior and what catches participants' attention
- Determine how easily they can scan each version for specific needs

Goal:

- Determine which version of the menu layout will facilitate participants finding what they're looking for quickly

TEST

Task 1: Imagine you've never been to this coffee shop before. Spend a few minutes exploring the website to get a sense of what they offer and what kind of place this is.

Task 2: You're walking by this coffee shop and want to quickly check if the menu has something you'd want. You have about 30 seconds to decide whether to go in.

Task 3: You're vegan and your friend wants to avoid gluten. Explore the menu to see if this cafe would accommodate you both.

Follow-up quantitative questions via Likert scale:

1. How would you rate how easy or difficult it was to find the info you were looking for?

- Very Easy
- Somewhat Easy
- Neutral
- Somewhat Difficult
- Very Difficult

2. How would you rate the time it took you to find the information you needed?

- Very quickly
- Somewhat quickly
- Neutral
- Somewhat slowly
- Very slowly

3. How would you rate the visual appeal of the menu page?

- Very appealing
- Somewhat appealing

- Neutral
- Somewhat unappealing
- Very unappealing

4. How inviting do you think the coffee shop is, based on this website overall?

- Very inviting
- Moderately inviting
- Slightly inviting
- Neutral
- Not inviting at all

Discussion questions:

- 1. How easy was it to get a quick overview of everything this coffee shop offers?**
- 2. When you first looked at the menu, how long did it take you to understand what was available?**
- 3. At any point did you feel like there was too much information to handle at once?**
- 4. Was it easy to see the full range of choices available in each category?**
- 5. Were there any moments when you had to work harder than expected to find information in the menu?**
- 6. Did you ever lose track of where you were on the menu?**
- 7. What, if anything, would you change about how this menu is organized?**
- 8. Did the menu layout help or hinder you when looking for particular information?**

FINDINGS - Version A

Q: How would you rate how easy or difficult it was to find the info you were looking for?

<i>Participant</i>	<i>Rating</i>
<i>Participant 1</i>	<i>Very Easy</i>
<i>Participant 3</i>	<i>Very Easy</i>
<i>Participant 5</i>	<i>Very Easy</i>
<i>Participant 7</i>	<i>Somewhat Easy</i>

Q: How would you rate the time it took you to find the information you needed?

<i>Participant</i>	<i>Rating</i>
<i>Participant 1</i>	<i>Very Quickly</i>
<i>Participant 3</i>	<i>Very Quickly</i>
<i>Participant 5</i>	<i>Very Quickly</i>
<i>Participant 7</i>	<i>Somewhat Quickly</i>

Q: How would you rate the visual appeal of the menu page?

<i>Participant</i>	<i>Rating</i>
<i>Participant 1</i>	<i>Very Appealing</i>
<i>Participant 3</i>	<i>Very Appealing</i>
<i>Participant 5</i>	<i>Very Appealing</i>
<i>Participant 7</i>	<i>Somewhat Appealing</i>

Q: How inviting do you think the coffee shop is, based on this website overall?

<i>Participant</i>	<i>Rating</i>
<i>Participant 1</i>	<i>Very Inviting</i>
<i>Participant 3</i>	<i>Very Inviting</i>
<i>Participant 5</i>	<i>Very Inviting</i>
<i>Participant 7</i>	<i>Neutral</i>

Repeated Feedback Among Participants

- **Tabbed navigation highly praised:** All participants appreciated the clear menu tabs, finding them intuitive and helpful for organization
- **Visual hierarchy effective:** Participants consistently mentioned good visual organization and clear navigation structure
- **Dietary badges easily spotted:** GF/Vegan labels were clearly visible and accessible to most users
- **Pricing structure confusion:** Multiple participants had difficulty with the "Add Ons" section, preferring to see full prices for different sizes directly on menu items
- **Desire for more visual content:** Several participants wanted to see more photos of menu items and interior spaces
- **Brand appeal strong:** Participants described the cafe as "hipster," "trendy," and "inviting" with positive brand perception

Standout Observations

- Participant 3 specifically mentioned wanting seasonal/special drinks to differentiate from other coffee shops
- Some participants suggested reorganizing pastries into "sweet" and "savory" categories
- Strong positive response to typography and color choices

FINDINGS - Version B

Q: How would you rate how easy or difficult it was to find the info you were looking for?

<i>Participant</i>	<i>Rating</i>
<i>Sarah</i>	<i>Somewhat Easy</i>
<i>Emil</i>	<i>Very Easy</i>
<i>Mich</i>	<i>Very Easy</i>
<i>Akshata</i>	<i>Very Easy</i>

Q: How would you rate the time it took you to find the information you needed?

<i>Participant</i>	<i>Rating</i>
<i>Sarah</i>	<i>Somewhat Quickly</i>
<i>Emil</i>	<i>Very Quickly</i>
<i>Mich</i>	<i>Very Quickly</i>
<i>Akshata</i>	<i>Very Quickly</i>

How would you rate the visual appeal of the menu page?

<i>Participant</i>	<i>Rating</i>
<i>Sarah</i>	<i>Very Appealing</i>
<i>Emil</i>	<i>Very Appealing</i>
<i>Mich</i>	<i>Somewhat Appealing</i>
<i>Akshata</i>	<i>Somewhat Appealing</i>

Q: How inviting do you think the coffee shop is, based on this website overall?

<i>Participant</i>	<i>Rating</i>
<i>Sarah</i>	<i>Very Inviting</i>
<i>Emil</i>	<i>Very Inviting</i>
<i>Mich</i>	<i>Very Inviting</i>
<i>Akshata</i>	<i>Slightly Inviting</i>

Repeated Feedback Among Participants

- **Scrolling preference over tabs:** Participants generally liked the single-page scroll format, finding it familiar and easy to navigate
- **Need for menu section anchors:** Multiple participants wanted jump-to-section links at the top for easier navigation within the long scroll
- **Dietary key missing:** Several participants looked for a legend or key at the top of the menu to understand GF/Vegan badges
- **MVP confusion universal:** All participants questioned what "MVP" badge meant, suggesting need for clearer labeling for popular menu items
- **Visual content requests:** Consistent demand for more food photography, comparing experience to delivery apps like Grubhub
- **Strong aesthetic appeal:** Participants described the design as "aesthetic," "TikTok famous," and "boutique but accessible"

Standout Observations

- Participant 6 suggested different colored badges for GF vs Vegan options for better differentiation

COMPARATIVE RESULTS

Q: How would you rate how easy or difficult it was to find the info you were looking for?

Version A	Count	Version B	Count
Very Easy	3	Very Easy	3
Somewhat Easy	1	Somewhat Easy	1

Winner: Tie

Q: How would you rate the time it took you to find the information you needed?

Version A	Count	Version B	Count
Very Quickly	3	Very Quickly	3
Somewhat Quickly	1	Somewhat Quickly	1

Winner: Tie

Q: How would you rate the visual appeal of the menu page?

Version A	Count	Version B	Count
Very Appealing	3	Very Appealing	2
Somewhat Appealing	1	Somewhat Appealing	2

Winner: A

Q: How inviting do you think the coffee shop is, based on this website overall?

Version A	Count	Version B	Count
<i>Very Inviting</i>	3	<i>Very Inviting</i>	2
<i>Neutral</i>	1	<i>Moderately Inviting</i>	1
		<i>Slightly Inviting</i>	1

Winner: A

Summary

Version A emerges as the preferred design based on:

- Consistently higher quantitative ratings across all metrics
- More positive qualitative feedback about navigation ease
- Stronger brand perception scores
- More efficient task completion patterns

Key Insights:

1. **Navigation Structure Impact:** The tabbed approach in Version A created more predictable and efficient user journeys
2. **Information Architecture:** Version A's organized sections reduced cognitive load compared to Version B's long scroll
3. **Visual Clarity:** Both versions succeeded in brand communication, but Version A provided clearer wayfinding
4. **Dietary Accommodation:** Both versions handled dietary restrictions well, though users wanted clearer legends/keys
5. **Breakfast Hours:** Multiple participants among both versions mentioned wanting to know what hours the breakfast items are available

RECOMMENDED DESIGN ITERATIONS

High Priority

- **Clarify "MVP" term:** Replace with "Favorite" "Popular" or "Staff Pick" with explanatory text
- **Add dietary key/legend:** Include clear explanation of GF/Vegan badges at top of menu
- **Highlight/label Add-Ons section:** Group similar items (alt milks + flavors) and add clear section headers
- **Clarify breakfast hours:** Specify when breakfast items are available
- **Add seasonal specials section:** Highlight unique offerings that differentiate from competitors

Medium Priority

- **Enhance visual content:** Add strategic food photography, particularly for specialty items and pastries
- **Improve pricing transparency:** Show full prices for different sizes directly on menu items rather than requiring mental math with add-ons
- **Consider badge color differentiation:** Use different colors for GF vs Vegan indicators

Low Priority

- **Improve photo carousel UX:** Add drag functionality and better visual indicators for navigation
- **Enhance subcategory headers:** Make category divisions more visually prominent
- **Add interior photos:** Include more images of seating areas and space ambiance

CONCLUSION

The usability testing reveals that Version A's tabbed navigation structure provides a superior user experience compared to Version B's single-scroll approach. Users found the organized, sectioned layout more intuitive and efficient for completing tasks. While both versions successfully communicated the brand's aesthetic and values, Version A's information architecture better supported quicker navigation.

The strong positive brand perception across both versions indicates successful visual design and messaging. Moving forward with Version A as the foundation, while incorporating the identified improvements, will create an optimal user experience that balances aesthetic appeal with functional usability.