Introduction

User testing of our app went without a hitch and we were able to get feedback from 15 individuals. Ideally, we would have more responses for our feedback, the aim being closer to 30, but 15 still gives us a large enough sample size to see the core issues within our app. Overall, the feedback helped us understand both where we had succeeded in the ideas and implementation of our app and where the oversights where.

The Good

It was immediately clear from the feedback that our app scaled well and had no accessibility problems, mainly thanks to the scaling labels that were implemented. The majority of the user's, 60%, gave the highest score, and a further 20% giving just one less than the top score, when asked whether the font was easy to read with only one user giving the lowest score.

Furthermore, we received, overall, a somewhat positive result when asking whether the game was easy to understand but a much more positive result for game navigation. Two third's of the testing group stated that "'the mechanics of the game were clear and easy to understand," with the majority also stating that there were "no difficulties in navigating and interacting with the game." While two third's is a high amount, the mechanics are crucial to the game and thus this is something we would look to improve.

There were more mixed results, but still generally positive for the overall enjoy-ability of the game. Just over half of the participants rated the game a 4 out of 5 for how engaging the game was. On the other hand a third rated a two out of five, which is lower than we hoped. The feedback we received from this group was helpful, feature suggestions such as a narrative were something we had aimed to implement but fell short due to the time crunch.

The Bad

Other aspects of the user testing presented some areas where we had not got it quite right, for instance user's felt unsure about the consequences of their actions. This was a common theme throughout testing, a reported 53.33% stating this, were people felt unsure either how they had died or what had actually happened as a result of their choice. This was something that we had overlooked ourselves as we had a great understanding of the game and thus understood it implicitly, however when new users attempted to play the game they didn't have this same intuition.

One other aspect of the game that a large minority felt was not quite right was the pacing of the game. One third of the user's reported that the pacing was "too slow." Our feedback form failed to gather detailed information on this exact topic and is thus something that we would ask a question on in further testing. With this feedback, we may have been able to improve this overall without necessarily making it worse for those that thought the pacing was good.

Improvements

One of the key areas where we aimed to improve following the feedback was with clarification of the mechanics of the game. User understanding of the game was improved through a help button, that would auto display to the user when starting a new game. This information, also provided through the GitHub Wiki, aimed to explain the options the user had along with the aim of the game.

Furthermore, to help user's understanding of the consequences of their actions, we improved the resulting messages of the user's actions. This was done more subtly in an attempt to maintain some "realism" where you would not know exactly how thirsty, tired or hungry you are. However, with a further round of user testing, we believe it would have been ideal to user test giving precise values to the user with how much their bars have been affected.

There were also more suggestions that, while great, we lacked the time to implement. Feature suggestions such as a soundtrack, and a narrative experience were high up on our to-do list and in a more complete release of our game we would likely include.