

Joseph Lee – 999958611 – g4joseph
Assignment 5, CSC318

Date and Time: Mar 17, 6:25PM

Method Used: Cognitive Walkthrough and Questionnaire

Group 13: 5 Piece Bonafide

Name of Facilitator: Cynthia Li

Details of Research: Group 13 tried to incorporate a "safety map" into your phone, which would help especially for tourists. They asked information about our usage of applications like those and how often we travel and how likely we would be using something like that.

Impressions: Their method was effective, by having a short demo of how the application worked; they clearly stated how a user would interact with the product and their steps through it. They had good coverage of the landmarks in their selected areas, in our case they surveyed around Toronto, Hong Kong, and Seoul. They focused mainly downtown around the campus area and through that it was easy to identify which places were safe. There is anonymous reviews from the application, which could lead into bad or false reviews as they can be written with malicious intentions. They asked relevant questions and as a frequent traveler myself, I could see it being useful and something that people would want to use if they ever go to a place where they are not familiar with. The facilitator seemed enthusiastic and excited to show the product, and was engaged with the presentation.

Date and Time: Mar 17, 6:32PM

Method Used: Cognitive Walkthrough and Questionnaire

Group 1: 5 Guys No Burgers and Fries

Name of Facilitator: Chidi Nwaka

Details of Research: Group 1 tried to introduce an ATM system to immigrants that is easy for them to financially deal with their problems. This is mainly focused for those who are new to the country and don't speak the tongue of the country they are in.

Impressions: Their method was effective, they went to ask initially what our native tongue is, and based on that their questions would change and their demo would be more focused on the details of it. Chidi actively engaged in the questions and explained the two demos (one if you aren't an English native speaker and one if you are), which shows that they are looking at both sides of the problem space. The UI was really basic and it leads to people not being confused. With the simplicity, it included big buttons and many language capabilities, and a few good uses of graphs to show the economic state of their bank account. Notably, it also had big font and was really friendly to people who are hard of seeing. I would recommend a back button as if there was a mistake, they would have to do a transaction of 0 dollars to get back to the main screen.

Date and Time: Mar 17, 6:42PM

Method Used: Cognitive Walkthrough

Group 4: Focars

Name of Facilitator: N/A

Details of Research: Group 4 tried to ask questions about my driving experience, and with that they asked us questions of how we drive and what we expect when we are driving.

Impressions: Their method was effective, by weeding out the drivers and non-drivers; it really focused on the drivers since they know what the road rules are. Their idea involves including a keyboard on the steering wheel, which really displaces a bunch of the key features of the steering wheels like volume control or the horn. This tends to increase the distraction done while driving. There is voice activated commands which is like what modern cars have so it is not that much of a difference in new technology.

The facilitator did not look really enthusiastic as it looked like he wanted to check other groups, so he rushed through the procedure and it was difficult getting an accurate assessment of the groups application.