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Abstract-The location-based services (LBS) user experience in controlled indoor settings in this scientific research. The environments included a range of user demographics, device configurations, and ambient factors. According to our findings, customer satisfaction ratings ranged from 5 to 9 on a scale of 1 to 10, and the average location accuracy was 1.1 meters (±0.4 meters) across various interactions and locales. These conclusions were supported by qualitative comments, which expressed satisfaction with the effectiveness of the check-in procedures and the practicality of several LBS features. Negative reviews, on the other hand, revealed difficulties with positioning technology accuracy, highlighting the intricate interactions among variables influencing indoor location-based services user experiences. This study provides a solid scientific basis for indoor location-based services (LBS) optimization, highlighting the need of tackling practical issues to improve user contentment and the usefulness of such services in indoor environments.

Keywords: interior settings, location-based services, accuracy, optimization, and user experience

1 INTRODUCTION

Location-based services (LBS) are being widely used due to the prevalence of mobile devices with positioning technology. These services—which are supported by the Global Positioning System (GPS), Bluetooth, Wi-Fi, and other positioning technologies—have revolutionized outdoor navigation and have enormous potential to improve user experiences inside as well. The possible uses of indoor location-based services (LBS) are many and growing as the globe becomes more networked[1]–[5]. These uses may include anything from bettering interior navigation and asset monitoring in commercial settings to boosting accessibility to academic facilities and cultural organizations. However, the capacity of these services to provide smooth, accurate, and user-friendly experiences is a prerequisite for their effective deployment[6]–[11]. It is clear that extensive analyses of indoor LBS user experiences in carefully monitored scientific trials are required[12]–[17]. The goal of these systems' performance optimization and customization to meet the unique requirements of users in various interior contexts is shared by researchers and developers. A rigorous scientific methodology including extensive user testing, data collecting, and analysis is required for this kind of optimization. In order to provide insightful analysis and empirical support for the further development and improvement of location-based services in indoor settings, this article provides a thorough user experience test. This study's main goal is to evaluate indoor LBS's accuracy, usability, and user satisfaction in a variety of controlled environments[18]–[22]. Users with varying degrees of expertise may participate in the experimental framework, and equipment configurations and ambient circumstances can be changed. The information gathered from the trials provides a thorough examination of the functionality of location-based services as well as the chance to look at how variables like user demographics, interaction style, and location accuracy affect the overall user experience[23]–[27]. The article is organized as follows: Section 2 identifies the gaps in the literature and gives an overview of relevant studies. The scientific studies' methodology, including participant selection, experimental setup, and data collecting techniques, is covered in length in Section 3. The study and findings are presented in Section 4, which provides information on how indoor LBS performs in various scenarios. The ramifications of the results, their applicability in the actual world, and possible areas for improvement are covered in Section 5. The report is finally concluded in Section 6, which highlights the need of further research and development efforts in the area of indoor LBS and summarizes the major results. In the end, this study will help to improve indoor location-based services (LBS) and their capacity to enhance user experiences by illuminating the advantages and disadvantages of this kind of service.

1 Location-Based Services (LBS) Context

The opening of this section emphasizes how location-based services, or LBS, are becoming more and more significant in today's world. It emphasizes how commonplace mobile devices are with integrated positioning systems, which makes
location-based services (LBS) an essential aspect of everyday life. Although outside navigation has been the main emphasis of LBS, the introduction also highlights the rising desire in bringing these services inside[28]–[30].

2 Possibilities and Difficulties for Indoor LBS

The introduction recognizes that smooth, accurate, and user-friendly experiences are necessary for indoor LBS to be successful. It presents the notion that in order to overcome the difficulties and realize the full potential of indoor LBS, scientific assessment and optimization are crucial.

3 Research Goal and Methodology

This section summarizes the paper's main goal, which is to carry out an extensive user experience test for indoor LBS inside of carefully monitored scientific investigations. It highlights the goal of providing insightful analysis and factual support for these services' continuous growth and improvement[29], [31]–[37].

2 REVIEW OF LITERATURE

1 Place-Based Services (LBS) in Interior Settings

In both indoor and outdoor settings, Location-Based Services (LBS) have become a potent tool for improving user experiences. Although outside location-based services (LBS) that largely use GPS technology have become commonplace, there is increasing interest in expanding similar services to inside environments. Within restricted areas like retail centers, educational institutions, medical facilities, and office buildings, indoor location-based services (LBS) seek to provide consumers tailored services, real-time information, and navigation.

2 Difficulties with Indoor LBS

Because of the restricted availability of GPS signals, the existence of objects that may impede positioning systems, and the need for exact location accuracy, indoor locations provide particular problems for location-based services (LBS). Indoor location-based services (LBS) have to meet the high expectations of users by providing precise and dependable location data while keeping user-friendly interfaces.

3 Experience of Users in Indoor LBS

One important factor in indoor location-based services' success is the user experience. When using these services, users anticipate simple and straightforward interactions. A number of variables, including user happiness, usability, and overall UI quality, may be used to gauge how successful indoor LBS is. Extensive testing and research in controlled situations are necessary to maximize user experiences.

4 User Experience Optimization and Testing

The significance of carrying out user experience testing in the context of indoor LBS has been highlighted by a number of studies. This includes controlled tests to evaluate indoor LBS performance in different scenarios. Researchers seek to comprehend the ways in which many elements impact the entire user experience, including user demographics, the kind of user engagement, and the accuracy of location data.

5 Knowledge Gaps

There are significant research gaps in the body of current literature, despite the increased interest in indoor LBS and UX testing. The effect of shifting environmental factors (such as signal interference or changing illumination) on LBS performance, the significance of user familiarity with the technology, and the possibility of enhancing indoor LBS interfaces and capabilities are a few topics that need further research.

The importance of indoor LBS and the crucial part that user experience plays in their success are highlighted in this overview of the literature. It emphasizes the need for thorough scientific investigation to assess and enhance indoor location-based services (LBS), considering several aspects that impact the user experience. Future research in this area may fill in research gaps and help create indoor LBS solutions that are easier to use and more efficient.

3 TECHNIQUES
1 Selection of Participants

- The process of choosing volunteers for the user experience test is an essential aspect of this study. It is important to choose participants who span a variety of demographics and levels of expertise. In order to do this, we will choose participants based on the following criteria:
  - Demographics: People of different ages, genders, and professions will be chosen as participants. This variety guarantees a sample that is representative.
  - Experience Level: Based on their past use of location-based services, participants will be divided into three groups: Novice, Intermediate, and Experienced LBS users. This classification makes it possible to evaluate user experiences thoroughly at various skill levels.

2 Setup for an Experiment

- The controlled trials will take place in a variety of interior spaces. The setup and site selection play a critical role in ensuring the repeatability and dependability of the outcomes.
  - Location Selection: A variety of indoor settings, such as workplaces, educational facilities, and public gathering places, will be considered. This variation makes it possible to evaluate indoor LBS performance more broadly.
  - Configuration of the Equipment: We will set up the interior settings with a range of LBS equipment, such as RFID sensors, GPS beacons, Bluetooth tags, and Wi-Fi signals, in order to assess the effects of various positioning technologies.
  - Environmental Conditions: A variety of environmental factors, including lighting, noise levels, temperature, and signal interference, will be adjusted to see how they affect the user experience.

3 Three. Data Gathering

For the purpose of the user experience test, we will combine qualitative and quantitative methodologies to collect thorough data.

- User Interactions and Measurements: Participants will be required to carry out certain LBS operations, such as order placing, searches, and check-ins. Measurements such as location accuracy (measured in meters) and user satisfaction ratings (measured on a scale of 1 to 10) will be captured throughout these encounters. Every interaction will be recorded with a timestamp.
- User Comments and Observations: We’ll be encouraging participants to share their experiences in the form of comments and feedback. This qualitative data will provide information about the subtleties of customer satisfaction and interactions.
- Variable settings: Experiments will be done under various settings, such as changes in positioning technology, environmental elements, and user situations. The experiments will be planned with an emphasis on the modification of variables to determine their influence on user experiences. A busy café, for instance, can be the setting for one scenario, while a calm library would be the setting for another.

A comprehensive analysis of the gathered data will be performed in order to derive significant insights and conclusions. A statistical analysis will be performed on quantitative data, such as user satisfaction ratings and location accuracy. The user comments and feedback that make up the qualitative data will be subjected to thematic analysis. The study will abide by ethical standards, guaranteeing participant privacy, informed consent, and data security. The goal and methods of the study will be explained to the participants, and their involvement is entirely optional. This technique recognizes its possible drawbacks, such as the controlled character of studies that could not accurately represent real-world circumstances. The findings’ generalizability may also be impacted by the size and variety of the sample. Through the use of this thorough approach, the study seeks to further the development and optimization of indoor location-based services by offering empirical data and insights into the user experience of these services under varied settings.

4 FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant ID</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Experience Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>Experienced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Novice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Data Analyst</td>
<td>Experienced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Designer</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The user experience test participants' demographics and levels of experience are shown in Table 1. The data suggests that the participants were dispersed equally across different age groups, genders, and professions. 40% of the participants were categorized as novices, 30% as intermediate users, and 30% as experienced users based on their degree of expertise. We were able to get a variety of viewpoints about indoor LBS performance thanks to this distribution.

### Interior Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiment ID</th>
<th>Location ID</th>
<th>Location Name</th>
<th>Building Name</th>
<th>Equipment Used</th>
<th>Environmental Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>Laboratory A</td>
<td>Science Center</td>
<td>RFID Sensors</td>
<td>Controlled Temperature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>Office Space 1</td>
<td>Tech Park</td>
<td>GPS Beacons</td>
<td>Variable Lighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Bluetooth Tags</td>
<td>Quiet Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>Cafeteria</td>
<td>Office Tower</td>
<td>Wi-Fi Signals</td>
<td>Noise and Crowds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An overview of the interior sites utilized for the studies may be seen in Table 2. These places were chosen to symbolize different types of interior spaces. The data contains details on the surroundings and equipment used in each location. For instance, the café depended on Wi-Fi connections and dealt with noise and people, whereas the laboratory had RFID sensors and regulated temperature. This variation in the experimental design was essential for evaluating LBS performance under various conditions.

### TABLE II. MEASUREMENTS AND USER INTERACTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interaction ID</th>
<th>Participant ID</th>
<th>Experiment ID</th>
<th>Interaction Type</th>
<th>Timestamp</th>
<th>Location Accuracy (meters)</th>
<th>User Satisfaction (1-10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Check-In</td>
<td>07-11-2023 09:00</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>Search</td>
<td>07-11-2023 10:30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>Order Food</td>
<td>07-11-2023 12:15</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 3. Measurements and User Interactions

Measurements and user interaction data are shown in Table 3. It contains user satisfaction ratings on a scale of 1 to 10 as well as real location accuracy data (measured in meters). The information shows that participants' experiences differed depending on the interactions and settings. For example, the average location accuracy for the "Search" interaction at Location 102 was 2.0 meters, and the user satisfaction rating was 5. Understanding the effects of various aspects on the user experience may be gained by analyzing the percentage change in these values across multiple interactions and places.

TABLE III. INPUT FROM USERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback ID</th>
<th>Participant ID</th>
<th>Experiment ID</th>
<th>Feedback Type</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>&quot;The check-in process was efficient, and the RFID sensors worked well.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>&quot;The GPS beacons were often inaccurate, making the search feature frustrating.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>&quot;Ordering food was convenient, and the Bluetooth tags ensured a smooth process.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>&quot;The check-in process at the cafeteria was quick, and the Wi-Fi signals were strong.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>&quot;The experiment setup feature functioned as expected, but the user interface could be improved.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 4. Input from Users
User comments and observations are included in Table 4. Positive, negative, and neutral responses as well as participant qualitative remarks are included. For instance, during the “Search” interaction, a participant in Experiment ID 102 expressed dissatisfaction with the accuracy of the GPS beacons. To optimize indoor location-based services (LBS), we can better understand the unique challenges and advantages of these services by examining the distribution of feedback categories and the substance of qualitative comments.

5 Conclusion

The purpose of this study is to evaluate the usability, accuracy, and overall quality of user experiences for location-based services (LBS) in indoor contexts via a thorough user experience test. A systematic and scientific process that included participant selection, controlled experiments, and data collecting served as the foundation for the study. The investigation and findings provided insightful information about how indoor LBS performed under different circumstances and interactions. Our research shows that a wide range of parameters, including as user demographics, ambient characteristics, and location data quality, affect how well indoor location-based services (LBS) work for users. The information showed that various positioning systems and equipment configurations had differing effects on location data accuracy, with percentage variations in location accuracy across various interactions and locations illuminating the practical difficulties indoor location-based services have. Furthermore, the intricacies of user interactions and pleasure were clarified by the qualitative data gathered from user observations and comments. Positive, negative, and neutral feedback helped us comprehend the advantages and disadvantages of indoor location-based services (LBS), while qualitative remarks gave us more in-depth knowledge about the preferences and problems of users. All things considered, this study highlights how important the user experience is to the success of indoor LBS. To fulfill the high expectations of consumers, it need continuous efforts in the creation and improvement of these services. Through the identification and resolution of research gaps and the application of insights obtained from this study, developers and researchers may strive toward improving indoor location-based services (LBS) to provide more precise, intuitive, and fulfilling experiences. The results of this study are pertinent and contemporary as the demand for tailored services and efficient interior navigation increases along with the globalization of society. Optimizing indoor location-based services (LBS) has advantages for both individual users and a broad range of possible applications, such as asset monitoring, accessibility, and indoor navigation in a variety of interior situations. In summary, the study's findings add to the corpus of information on indoor LBS and user experiences. Our objective is that these results will stimulate greater research and development, which will in turn result in more effective and user-focused indoor location-based services that cater to people's changing demands in indoor settings.
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