

User Evaluation

Cohort 2 Team 4 (THADJAM)

Abdul Fofanah

Matthew Holleran

Toby Watchorn

Arwen Minton

Daneena Roydean

Jessica McKerill

Henry Bambrough

User Evaluation Method

In order to recruit participants to test our game and gather information for the user evaluation, we first approached students from other teams in the cohort who fit the criteria of our chosen target audience. This is so then we would have sufficient data to fill out the table to figure out all the possible usability problems that could be in our game from a range of participants. This also made sure that we had more than 3 participants for our tests (7).

The main tasks we will be asking our participants to complete are: interacting with an event inside the maze, finding the bus ticket to escape on the map and finally escaping the maze. It is not a requirement that the participant will be able to complete these tasks but these are core implementations of our game, so it's essential to find out if players are going to have any issues.

Once we had found enough people willing to participate, we organised a meeting time over a video call, such as Zoom or WhatsApp, with the participant and another team member. Before any tests can begin, the participant would be handed both the informed consent and information sheet so they are fully aware of everything the test will be asking them to do, alongside giving us consent to run the test and record the data. Having two people run the test is so that we would have one person there to be able to run the test of our game and instruct the participant through different stages of the test. We utilised the think-aloud protocol, and the other team member would then be in charge of writing down all the possible usability problems that the participant came across while playing our game. This structured approach ensured consistency across all 7 evaluators.

Everything is written down straight into the table below on Google Docs so that after the test is complete, the team member in charge of writing the problems down can go through and have the participant rate each problem on severity of 1-5 (1 being not a problem and 5 being a severe problem). This is so that during the test, the participant can fully immerse themselves in the game and not be distracted by having to answer questions about their problems while also having to focus on completing the test.

In the table below, we used a Severity Rating Key to identify the severity of any issues:

Key:

- 1: Cosmetic (Minor issue with no impact on gameplay or completion).
- 2: Minor (Small usability issue that causes slight confusion but does not affect game completion)
- 3: Moderate (Noticeable usability issue that disrupts gameplay flow)
- 4: Major (Serious usability issue that significantly impacts the user experience)
- 5: Critical (Critical usability issue that strongly affects user experience, clarity, or the game quality, even if the game is completable)

Usability Problems

Num	Usability Problem	Severity Rating
1	Can only type with an onscreen keyboard instead of a regular keyboard	1/5
2	Some objects look interactable, but aren't	2/5
3	Some text goes offscreen sometimes	2/5
4	Nothing to show when some objects aren't interactable	3/5
5	If interacting with an object too quickly, it doesn't show what it is	1/5
6	Some penalties were not clear where they came from	2/5
7	Not always clear if a sprite is an NPC or an Enemy	1/5
8	Random teleportation was not clear and confusing	3/5
9	Some text wasn't very direct with descriptions	4/5
10	The enemy can spawn camp sometimes	1/5
11	Incorrect hitboxes on the map and sprites	3/5
12	Slow walking speed	2/5
13	The quiz event has the same answer keys as the keys on the keyboard	4/5
14	Tiles look too similar	3/5
15	Font is inconsistent	1/5
16	Pressing space to continue is not obvious in the tutorial	2/5
17	Minor bugs present when going to freeze the enemy	1/5
18	Difficult to tell what is an interactable	4/5
19	It wasn't obvious that the player could drown in water	3/5
20	Beginning screens could be more aesthetic and interesting	3/5
21	Instructions could be confusing for new-time players	1/5
22	Not clear whether the enemy could disappear	4/5
23	Graphics are sometimes misleading	1/5
24	The pause button binding is not intuitive	2/5
25	Not clear that the space button is used to progress	1/5
26	Quite slow at times	2/5
27	Hitboxes can be unforgiving	3/5
28	Alphabetical onscreen keyboard instead of QWERTY	4/5
29	The enemy sometimes came out of nowhere	4/5
30	A couple of bugs around the map	2/5
31	Some of the consequences aren't explained	3/5
32	No timer for the enemies being frozen	5/5
33	Sometimes generally confusing	5/5
34	A little too easy as a game	5/5
35	Map layout is a little unclear	2/5