



## **D 5.1 FIELD TRIALS**

**Revised version**

**Detailed Evaluation Plan**

**Project title:** ELDERHOP

**Project reference number:** AAL-2010-3-037

---

**Revision: Version 0.4**

---

**Main Authors:**

**Dr Antomarini, Marco (COOSS)**  
**Dr Lupini, Lorenza (COOSS)**  
**Dr Horvath Alexandra (MMO)**  
**Elke Mattheiss (CURE)**  
**Dr Attila Nemes (KIBU)**

<b>Date: 04/10/2013</b>
<b>Dissemination Level: Restricted</b>

## **REVISION HISTORY**

Revision	Date	Author	Organisation	Description
0.4	11/10/2012	Antomarini Horvath	COOSS MMO	Final Version

## **Table of Contents**

<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>5</b>
SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES OF THE DELIVERABLE .....	5
STRUCTURE OF THE DELIVERABLE .....	5
<b>FIELD TRIALS: OBJECTIVES .....</b>	<b>6</b>
MAIN OBJECTIVE.....	6
SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES .....	6
<b>FIELD TRIALS: METHODOLOGY.....</b>	<b>7</b>
RECRUITMENT .....	7
<i>Criteria of Recruitment</i> .....	7
<i>Method of Recruitment</i> .....	8
TIMETABLE .....	8
<i>Side information about timetable</i> .....	9
LOCATION .....	10
CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION .....	10
<b>FIELD TRIALS: LEGAL AND ETHICAL ISSUES.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<i>Annex 1 – GANTT Chart of Evaluation Phase</i> .....	13
<b>REFERENCES.....</b>	<b>14</b>

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

---

The ELDERHOP project aims to provide a complex solution to elderly people wanting to be able to keep up active participation in one of the decisive, important and social activities they like doing on a daily basis – shopping. Today many IT developers think about how to help people conduct their shopping from home and develop solutions and smart home appliances to enable this. Contrary, elderly people do not want to stay home in isolation - going out shopping is a decisive program in their life, for some one of the only left; therefore it is not to be substituted, but rather facilitated. The project's target group is elderly above the age of 65 considering themselves as autonomous in daily activities (which means without significant vision impairment and/or chronic disease and/or sensing a minor forgetfulness or dementia caused by ageing); furthermore such elderly are targeted who have only basic, low or no digital skills.

Thus, ELDERHOP proposes a combination of open-source mobile technology and TV based service that supports elderly wishing to go out and conduct shopping in each step of this activity process. The ELDERHOP service will help elderly get up-to-date information about discounts of stores in their local area, help them find their way to these stores, decrease their anxiety on the way through providing an emergency service “at the push of a button” .

In order to test the prototype system with real users with the scope to evaluate it, to find bugs and to improve it, a phase of field trials and tests is foreseen; present document describes the strategy to carry on these tests, the protocol of trials, and the methods to evaluate the results of this delicate key phase of the research.

## INTRODUCTION

---

The Deliverable 5.1 titled “Field Trials Manual Report” is the output of the Task 5.1, Design field trial methodology”, within WP5. The task was intended to design field trial methods, including selection criteria to ensure that elderly people from diverse backgrounds and ICT experiences are included in samples and testing communities. Ensure that field work methods leverage research conducted in WP2 and WP6, as well as commercialization considerations such as willingness to pay. Methods include ad hoc tests with fresh users, and summative evaluations to explore impacts from continued use.

The task 5.1 had also the aim to describe how the usability of the system will be evaluated to gain insight into whether the user requirements are properly translated into the conceptual design and whether this is done in an attractive and user-friendly way. The evaluation for this will be done by means of lab tests as well.

Present updated version introduces the detailed evaluation plan; in the specific, it explain the timetable of the field trials, planned according to the date of delivery of prototypes, the recruiting criteria and method, the methodology and criteria to evaluate the results of the trials and the feedback from users, and the role of each partner during the testing phase.

### Scope and objectives of the deliverable

Present Del. 5.1 has the general scope to introduce and describe the strategy and the methodology laying down the field trials. In the specific, it aims to describe which are the goals and the expectations of the field trials, which technical and non-technical goals are targeted and how these goals will be achieved.

The document aims to detail the pathway to be followed in order to arrange the trials, the description of the users’ selection criteria, the locations and the definition of the system functions to be tested. Also, the document will introduce how the Consortium will manage any legal and ethical issue which could raise any time real users are involved in research activities. The method to evaluate the trials results will be described too, in order to define a method scientifically valuable and replicable.

### Structure of the deliverable

The Deliverable is divided into 6 Chapters: Chapter 1 introduces the rationale of the document, objectives and structure; Chapter 2 lists the goals and the objectives of the field trials, describing the expectations of the Consortium from this specific phase; Chapter 3 will describe the methodology to be implemented, fixing the users’ selection criteria, the locations, the protocols of use, the role of the Consortium Partners, the risk analysis and the equipment to be tested; Chapter 4 will list the methods to evaluate the field trials results, Chapter 5 will specify the expected results from technical and social points of view and finally Chapter 6 will demonstrate the attention given by the Consortium to the Ethical and Legal issues by the definition of a Strategy to deal with and manage them.

## FIELD TRIALS: OBJECTIVES

---

ELDERHOP general strategy is based on the direct involvement of direct and indirect final users in the three key moment of the project life: the requirements analysis, the usability engineering and the evaluation tasks. Collected and analysed the users' needs and expectations and transformed them in functional and non-functional requirements of the system, the next step is to come back to the users and ask them to evaluate the system performances and verify that the system properly reflect their requirements.

### Main Objective

As stated in the Proposal, the major objectives are to (1) detect the conformance of services with the end-user-specific expectations and needs; (2) find potential ergonomic design strengths and weaknesses. So the main goal of the field trials is to match the users' requests and expectations, expressed within WP2, and dealing with functional requirements and non-functional requirements; in order to reach that goal there are several specific objectives which need to be targeted; they can be classified in objectives concerning the system performances and objectives concerning the impact on users.

### Specific Objectives

#### *Objectives concerning the system performances:*

Efficiency: the system functions should do what they are expected to in a reasonable time; therefore the prototype has to be able to support users during shopping as promised.

Fixed bugs: any kind of technical issue should be studied and fixed in order to obtain, for the end of the project, a prototype as closer as possible to the final prototype.

Performances: the system performances will be monitored in order to verify if it is usable, friendly, accessible and easy-to-learn.

Interoperability and scalability

#### *Objectives concerning the impact on users:*

Efficacy: the system proposed to the users really acts as a support during shopping activities; all its functions have to closely answer the users' requirements and needs.

Benefits provided: the prototype has a positive impact on users' lives; in particular it is able to integrate into the users' usual lifestyle providing positive solutions without significant change in users' attitudes.

Usability: the system interfaces have to be usable for the users, and particularly for those with specific impairments; the prototype has to be able to adapt itself to the users' capabilities.

Attractiveness: the system should be attractive and should be perceived by the users as a useful tool to be purchased.

#### *Objectives concerning the business opportunities:*

Users feedback should produce also relevant information to build up a feasible business model (or more than one). Therefore, within the survey, users will be asked how much they would be

available to pay in order to purchase the system (app) and if and how much they would invest in a social service (from the public or from private companies, i.e. NGO's or Insurances).

Such information will directly provide inputs to WP6.

## **FIELD TRIALS: METHODOLOGY**

---

The Consortium planned to conduct exhaustive field-trials to gain information from end-users about modules, features and components of ELDERHOP. The results of the tests will provide useful feedback to the partners involved in the development. In the final part of the project also end-to-end demonstrators will be launched where elderly can evaluate how ELDERHOP helps them in the complete process of a shopping trip. COOSS will involve the users for these testing.

It is very important, as stated in the Project proposal, to investigate not only how well the solution functions from a technical point of view, but what the benefit delivered and emotions triggered are for the users. Therefore key performance indicators will be set up before the piloting starts to outline the approach and main aspects of gathering and evaluating user feedback on these issues and what level of benefit and satisfaction we want to achieve. During the pilots, mentors will be provided for elderly participants who will guide and assist them during shopping trips in using the modules and applications of the solution.

This way testing in real user environments will be achieved and real life problems and difficulties associated with ELDERHOP can be considered in the development and upgrading process of the system. Having young mentors accompany elderly will also create a more personal feeling for the technology and a sense of well-being to both sides taking part in such activities (provide value to each other, for young people through doing something good and for elderly through receiving attention from the younger generations).

### **Recruitment**

The users will be recruited for the tests and the demonstrative sessions; the recruitment criteria are based on the description of the target group of the project declared since its beginning. Here a list of recruitment criteria is reported and a method to recruit volunteers is described.

#### **Criteria of Recruitment**

The users involved will be people 65 years old and over;  
They should have physical impairment (audio/visual) and/or minor memory disorder and/or dementia at an initial stage;  
They should have low or no digital literacy and skills;  
Living independently, both alone or with a partner;  
Usually going out for shopping.

## Method of Recruitment

Volunteers will be possibly recruited among those persons already involved in the investigation and research phase of the project, so those persons who expressed their needs and expectations about the proposed solution. Each pilot site will try to involve maximum 5 users, both for the lab tests and for the demonstrations in real life situations.

The recruitment is based on the idea to involve users of the social services provided by COOSS at local level. Volunteers can be recruited within aged persons benefiting of COOSS home care services, daily centres and among those living within Social Houses managed/owned by COOSS (where users live independently, and served by COOSS social support). The legal and ethical principles will be strictly followed, as described forward.

## Timetable

Consortium agreed on the arrangement of two iterations of tests to be started as soon as the first prototype system will be ready; a First Iteration, called Lab-tests, will be arranged within COOSS premises and it allows both volunteers and researchers to interact and familiarise with the prototype and the devices it is installed on: during these tests, users will be asked to access each function of the prototype, i.e. plan a road trip, or look for a product to store within the system, etc.; system functions available will be tested in order to evaluate the system performances, its efficacy and to identify weaknesses and possible changes to be provided (functional requirements). This iteration is expected to last one week.

A Second Iteration, called Field Trials, with the final integrated prototype with all possible functions, will consist on a longer test phase: system will be deployed at volunteers houses in order to let them freely interact with it. The aim of the Field Trials is wider than the First Iteration as it will be to assess the system efficacy, efficiency and its impact on daily living. This Iteration has an expected duration of 2 days per user, and a total of 20 users involved is expected. The last days of the project life will be devoted to evaluate the field trials, reporting activities and collection of final users' evaluations.

The field trials will be monitored by experts and researchers from COOSS; each of them is experienced in research and study about seniors' attitudes, behaviours and, social and health conditions, and they will be asked to:

- Report to technical partners about findings on weekly basis by e-mail;
- Communicate to technical partners in real time about each single unexpected issue or problem of technical nature incurred during the trials; this activity is intended to facilitate immediate problem-solving.
- To have a daily diary.
- Collect users feedback both in real time during the tests and also by an interview with each single user to be arranged after each single test.
- To collect comments and opinions from indirect beneficiaries, relatives, caregivers living around the senior volunteer involved in the tests.



- To design and write down two Reports about the evaluation phase; an Interim evaluation report due for the end of December 2013 and a final evaluation report due for the end of the project (31<sup>st</sup> January 2014)<sup>1</sup>.

In both Iterations, users will devote 2 hours to get familiar with the devices (TV and smartphone); trainers will assisted them and support them in case of troubles or questions; in this time, they will go through all functions in order to be aware about all possibilities given by the System. In the lab-tests, volunteers will be asked to test each function in order to evaluate a) time to reach the desired function, b) understanding of function scope, c) execution of a test, d) efficacy, e) efficiency, f) usability.

In the field trials, volunteers will be asked to use the system freely during their activity outdoor, in order to verify the capability of the System to be useful as expected and to be exploited during those actions it is intended for. Each test session will allow each user to get familiar with the system, assisted by a Researcher due to the English version of the system, only available, and then s/he will be able to go through the single functions; s/he will try to find a product, plan a shopping trip, find discounts and special offers. After this, and after the shopping trip is completed, s/he will be interviewed by the Researcher, who will use a questionnaire (see [Annex 2](#)).

In [Annex 1](#) a Gantt table showing the previously described activities is provided: starting date of the Evaluation phase is 1<sup>st</sup> December 2013, the final date is 31<sup>st</sup> January 2014.

### Side information about timetable

Purchase of devices is already started; equipment will be available in beginning of November 2013; a training section devoted to let researchers and COOSS staff involved in the evaluation phase to get familiar with the system is foreseen; also installation and deployment activities are included and already started<sup>2</sup>.

Recruitment is also already started within the COOSS daily centres; also, during dissemination activities at local level, COOSS researchers have been contacted by skilled seniors, already familiar with ICT and interested in the innovation within the sector; they asked to be involved in the field trials to know more about the system. As it can have a positive impact in terms of possible business opportunities, COOSS will devote efforts and resources to try to involve them and let them use the prototype according to availability of devices. COOSS staff expects significant feedback from these skilled potential users.

<sup>1</sup> A 2 months second Project Extension have been asked and approved, and the field trials deadline is 31<sup>st</sup> January 2014.

<sup>2</sup> The installation process is requiring further equipment, as the apps can be only installed via a WIN8 Computer, with high requirements. COOSS will buy it, also (extra-budget). COOSS bought also micro-sim cards for the smartphones.

**COOSS has currently available two full sets (Smart TV + Smartphone) of devices where the prototype will be installed.**

### Location

The First Iteration will be hosted in COOSS environments, where users will be invited to make some tests with the system at a preliminary stage of development; the second Iteration will be in the houses of the users: the “home” components of the system will be deployed in private houses, and the “mobile” components will be used by volunteers every time they go out for shopping, in a given period. For the evaluation of the complete system, an evaluation of the whole shopping process will be implemented.

### Criteria for Evaluation

The criteria to evaluate the results of the field trials will be:

OBJECTIVES	CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION
Efficiency	Provide a sufficient quantity of contents Can be personalised High quality of contents Battery duration sufficient All functions used at least one time
Performances	Number of interactions of users with the system; Frequency of use Duration of daily trial Number of function used Battery duration Time spent to use the system during shopping
Efficacy	Users interact frequently with the system Every functions are used in the expected way and circumstances The users feel safer and satisfied in using the system and in having the system with them during the shopping trip Products and prizes and all the information provided by the system really support the users
Benefits	The users frequently go out, more than usual; Users find discounts and cheaper prizes unknown before; Users verified that the system makes effectively their life easier.
Usability	The system is handy Icons big enough Functions easy to be reached and launched

	Easy to install Fluent and reactive
Interoperability	The system can be installed easily in existing technologies as smart TVs and Smartphones.

## FIELD TRIALS: LEGAL AND ETHICAL ISSUES

---

According to the **relevant laws and regulations** of each Consortium Members' country, the Field Trials will follow a detailed Plan for the management of the ethical issues which could incur and rise during the involvement of end users in the research.

According to the nature of the system, which is not classifiable as a Medical Device and not intrusive, the involvement of end users must be established by a written Informed Consensus signed by each user; each user will sign the Informed Consensus only after a demonstration of the system and will participate to the trials only after a dedicated session of training. Anyway, even after the signature of the Informed Consensus, in any case the user can interrupt her/his participation; it's up to the Consortium to be ready to find another user. The users will be accompanied, supported and assisted by mentors who can mediate between users, engineers and researchers.

The Company hosting the trials is responsible of users' safety and for this reason the Ethical Committee of each company hosting the trials must approve the trials plan and the system. For this reason present Trials Plan will be submitted to the Ethical Committee of COOSS in order to get the approvals and also a Demonstration Session is planned.

As personal data are collected and exchanged more frequently, regulations on data transfers become necessary and will be implemented and observed in the ELDERHOP project. It is stated explicitly that data will be transferred from one partner to another within the EU only after it was made anonymous. The international laws regarding data protection concerning good data management practices on the part of the entities that process data, called 'data controllers', will be followed during the project. These include the obligation to process data fairly and in a secure manner and to use personal data for explicit and legitimate purposes. National laws also guarantee a series of rights for individuals, such as the right to be informed when personal data have been processed and the reason for this processing, the right to access the data and if necessary, the right to have the data amended or deleted.

The Directive to follow during the ELDERHOP project is the Directive 95/46/EC and all personal health data will be treated as "sensitive personal data". As a result, the personal data of all citizens will have equivalent protection across the Union. The fifteen Member States of the EU were required to bring their national legislation in line with the provisions of the Directive by 24th October 1998. In addition, Directive 2002/58/EC specifically deals with the protection of privacy in telecommunications. This Directive states that Member States must guarantee the confidentiality of communication through national regulations. This means that any unauthorized listening, tapping, storage or other kinds of interception of surveillance of communications is illegal.

To ensure that the information is easy to understand, all written information that is given to patients/subjects has to be proved by experts on **“Easy to Read” Guidelines**. All collaboration will be based on an **“Informed Consent Form”**. Participants will get information in a way that is easy to understand. There has to be consent for all activities of each single participant to take part in the project. A cancellation of the participation is possible at any point and any time without giving a reason. There will be written information about the usage of all collected data and in particular about the usage of personal or medical data. The project does not involve individuals not able to give consent. The project neither involves children.

All the necessary legal and ethical authorizations will be provided to the Commission service in due course, before starting the phase of the project concerned by the authorizations themselves. No trial will be performed without previous approval by the ethical commissions of the involved organizations and data protection authorities of the respective countries.

The pilot/field trials conducted in WP5 are for testing and validation purposes and will respect the following aspects:

- Subjects will be informed volunteers;
- A formal informative consent will be prepared and signed by the subjects/patients;
- The re-examination of data is independent from the presence of the patient/subject;
  - Data will be password protected to ensure privacy.

## Annex 1 – GANTT Chart of Evaluation Phase

[illegible]

## REFERENCES

---

- Charness, N. & Boot, W.R. (2009). Aging and Information Technology Use: Potential and Barriers. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, October 2009; vol. 18, 5: pp. 253-258.
- Gilly, M.C. & Zeithaml, V.A. (1985). The Elderly Consumer and Adoption of Technologies. *Journal of Consumer Research*. Vol. 12., No. 3., 353-357.
- Guy, C. (1985). The Food and Grocery Shopping Behaviour of Disadvantaged Consumers: Some Results from the Cardiff Consumer Panel. *Transactions of the Insititute of British Geographers. New Series*, Vol. 10, No. 2, 181-190.
- Kohtsuka, T., Onozato, T., Tamura, H., Katayama, S. & Kambayashi, Y. (2011). Design of a Control System for Robot Shopping Carts. KES 2011. Berlin Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag.
- López-de-Ipina, D., Llorido, T. & López, U. (2011). BlindShopping: Enabling Accessible Shopping for Visually Impaired People through Mobile Technologies. ICOST 2011. Berlin Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag.
- Lumpkin, J.R. (1985). Shopping Orientation Segmentation of the Elderly Consumer. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*. Vol. 13, No. 2, 271-289.
- Meulendijk, M., Wijngaert, L.v.d., Brinkkemper, S., Leenstra, H. (2011). AmI In Good Care? Developing design principles for ambient intelligent domotics for elderly. *Informatics for Health & Social Care*. Vol.36(2), pp. 75-88.
- Myers, H. & Lumbers, M. (2008). Understanding older shoppers: a phenomenological investigation. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*.
- Renaud, K. & Biljon, J.v. (2008). Predicting Technology Acceptance and Adoption by the Elderly: A Qualitative study. SAICSIT 2008.
-



## Annex 2 - Questionnaire for users' feedback

**Project title:** ELDERHOP

**Project reference number:** AAL-2010-3-037

**General Information**

Sex: ☐ male  
☐ female

Age: \_\_\_\_\_ years

Highest education: ☐ Compulsory school  
☐ Apprenticeship  
☐ High-school diploma  
☐ Post-graduate  
☐ Post-doctoral



Questionnaire for User Satisfaction <sup>3</sup>													
<b>1a. What's your reaction to the overall System?</b>													
1.1. What's your opinion in general?	Terrible	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	NA	wonderful	
1.2. Is it difficult for you to deal with it?	Difficult	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	NA	Easy	
1.3. how do you feel while using it?	Frustrating	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	NA	Satisfying	
1.4. Do you perceive it as adequate to your needs and attitudes?	Inadequate	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	NA	Adequate	
1.5. Do you feel stimulated by it?	Dull	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	NA	Stimulating	
1.6. Does it looks rigid or flexible enough?	Rigid	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	NA	Flexible	
<b>1b. What's your feedback concerning the Smartphone look?</b>													
1.7. Is reading on the screen easy or hard?	Hard	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	NA	Easy	
1.8. Is finding tasks and functions easy or hard?	Not at all	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	NA	Very much	
1.9. Are information well organized?	Confusing	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	NA	Very clear	
1.10. Are sequence of screens well organized?	Confusing	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	NA	Very clear	
<b>1c. What's your feedback concerning the SmartTV look?</b>													
1.7. Is reading on the screen easy or hard?	Hard	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	NA	Easy	
1.8. Is finding tasks and functions easy or hard?	Not at all	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	NA	Very much	
1.9. Are information well organized?	Confusing	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	NA	Very clear	
1.10. Are sequence of screens well organized?	Confusing	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	NA	Very clear	
<b>1d. What's your opinion about terminology and system information?</b>													
1.11. Are terms and words consistent for you?	Inconsistent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	NA	Consistent	
1.12. Can you understand the terms for each task?	Never	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	NA	Always	
1.13. Do you feel confident	Never	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	NA	Always	

<sup>3</sup> Based on: Chin, J.P., Diehl, V.A., Norman, K.L. (1988) Development of an Instrument Measuring User Satisfaction of the Human-Computer Interface. ACM CHI'88 Proceedings, 213-218. ©1988 ACM.

with the position of info on the screen?													
1.14. Are Error messages helpful?	Unhelpful	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	NA	Helpful	
<b>1e. Did you easily learn to ...?</b>													
1.15. ...move through the functions/tasks?	Difficult	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	NA	Easy	
1.16. ...look for new functions?	Difficult	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	NA	Easy	
1.17. ...remember names and use of commands?	Difficult	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	NA	Easy	
1.18. ...perform a task?	Difficult	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	NA	Easy	
<b>1f. Is the system reactive and adequate to your capabilities?</b>													
1.19. Is the system fast?	Slow	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	NA	Fast	
1.16. Does the system looks designed for all level of users?	Never	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	NA	Always	
<b>List the most NEGATIVE aspects?</b>													
<b>List the most POSITIVE aspects?</b>													

Perceived Usefulness and Ease of Use <sup>4</sup>										
<b>2a. Do you perceive the System as Useful?</b>										
2.1 Would the use of the system in your shopping trip enable you to accomplish tasks more quickly and easily?	Unlikely	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA	Likely
2.2. Would the use of the system facilitate your shopping?	Unlikely	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA	Likely
2.3 Would the use of the system increase your will to go out for shopping?	Unlikely	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA	Likely
2.4. Would the use of the system enhance your self-confidence while shopping?	Unlikely	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA	Likely
<b>2b. It was easy for you to learn the use of the system?</b>										
2.7. It was easy for you to learn how to use it?	Hard	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA	Easy
2.8. Would you easily get the system to do what you want to do?	Not at all	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA	Very much
2.9. Would it be easy for you to become skilful at using the system?	Confusing	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA	Very clear

<sup>4</sup> Based on: Davis, F. D. (1989) Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, and User Acceptance of Information Technology. MIS Quarterly, 13:3, 319-340.

### FREE QUESTIONS

**What do you think about the overall system?**

---

---

---

---

**Which additional functionalities should the system include?**

---

---

---

---

**Which are the main difficulties that you faced?**

---

---

---

---

**How much would you be willing to pay for it?**

---

---

---

---

**Would you suggest the system to friends/relatives? Why/Why not?**

---

---

---

---

**What would you change at the system?**

---

---

---

---