

User Evaluation

Cohort 1 Group 10

Cai Hughes<cabh500@york.ac.uk>

Ben Slater<bs1463@york.ac.uk>

Adeola Adeniji<aa3098@york.ac.uk>

Mathew Riedy<mr1723@york.ac.uk>

Riad Kasmi<rmk526@york.ac.uk>

Simon Konieczny<sk2144@york.ac.uk>

Method for User Evaluation

Recruitment

To ensure a diverse range of perspectives, users were recruited from other teams within the cohort. Each group member engaged with at least one user, resulting in a minimum of three users per group. This approach was chosen to provide varied feedback and enhance the reliability of the evaluation. Specific tasks were created for the users to complete, based on predefined scenarios which were thoroughly explained to them.

Data Collection Tools and Procedures

Tools: The evaluation utilised a combination of observation, interviews, and surveys to gather comprehensive data on users' interactions with the game prototype.

Procedure:

1. **Play Session:**
 - Users were asked to play the game while thinking aloud. This method was chosen to gain real-time insights into their decision-making processes and overall experience.
2. **Observations:**
 - During the play session, users' actions, comments, and difficulties were recorded to capture immediate usability issues.
3. **Interviews:**
 - Post-play interviews were conducted to delve deeper into users' experiences, preferences, and suggestions for improvement. This helped gather qualitative data that provided context to the observations.
4. **Surveys:**
 - A usability survey was administered to collect quantitative feedback on various aspects of the game's usability. This method was chosen to obtain measurable data that could be analysed statistically.

Ethical Considerations

Ethical procedures were rigorously followed to ensure the rights and confidentiality of participants:

1. Information Sheets:

- Participants received detailed information sheets outlining the evaluation's purpose, procedures, and their rights.

2. Consent Forms:

- Consent forms were distributed and collected before the evaluation, ensuring informed consent. Participants were assured that their feedback would be used solely for research purposes and would not affect their grades or standing within the cohort.

3. Confidentiality:

- Participants' responses were kept confidential, and all data were anonymized to protect their identities.

The chosen methods facilitated a comprehensive understanding of users' interactions with the game prototype, allowing us to identify usability issues and gather valuable feedback for refinement

b) Usability Problems and Severity Ratings

Usability Problem	Severity Rating (1-5)	Description
Confusing controls	3	Users found the buttons too small and hard to click on.
Unclear objectives	4	Users had difficulty finding where to eat, sleep, or study, and suggested the need for directional signs.
Inconsistent feedback	2	Some aspects of the game did not provide clear feedback to users (e.g., fullscreen button issue).
Difficulty managing time	2	Managing time for activities was challenging without clear guidance or instructions.
Lack of tutorial	3	Users felt the game needed instructions or a tutorial to guide new players.
Navigation challenges	3	The map was large and difficult to navigate, with some doors not visible until passed through
Movement mechanics	1	Walking diagonally was faster than

		walking straight, leading to inconsistent movement speeds.
Text and slider size	2	General text and activity sliders were too small to use comfortably.
Food effect	4	Eating food had no effect on the player or their energy, leading to confusion about its purpose.