**Prototype Evaluation**

The developed prototype was evaluated on six volunteers. Volunteers were our peers with whom we were in contact on regular basis.

Evaluation was done in two ways, one by volunteers reading the conversation transcript and another by volunteers listening to the conversation that transpired between two of the team members using the same transcript.

**Evaluation by reading the transcript:**

There were 4 volunteers that were considered for this type of evaluation. They were given the printed transcripts that they were allowed to read(on thursday). The transcripts were then taken from them. They were again contacted next week (on tuesday) and asked some questions about the conversation to determine if they read the conversation.

Questions (Part 1)!!

1. Number of people involved in the conversation.
2. What is the topic of the conversation?
3. Which two countries are involved in the conversation?

All 4 volunteers were able to answer this question.

The volunteers were then showed the prototype, and asked the following questions to determine how effective is the conversation.

Questions (Part 2)!!

1. Which was the cleaner country?
2. What methods they used to dispose poo in sweden to keep the country clean?
3. What was dog’s name mentioned in the conversation?
4. Was the dog her’s or someone else?
5. Were they a dog person or cat person? - mentioned in story board

* First question was correctly answered by all four volunteers.
* In Second question, two volunteers mentioned all three methods, one was able to mention two method, and one was able to mention only one method that was mentioned in the storyboard.
* Only one volunteer was able to answer the third question.
* Three of them said the dog was her neighbours one said it was hers.
* All four of them answered they were a dog person.

**Evaluation by listening to the transcript:**

There were two volunteers considered for this conversation. Two members of the team, read the conversation to the volunteers individually (on tuesday).

The day after next day(on Thursday) they were asked exactly the same questions as in Questions(Part 2).

* First question was answered correctly by both of them.
* All three ways were mentioned by the both the volunteers.
* Both of them correctly answered the dog’s name
* Both of them said that the dog was her’s correctly.
* Both of them said that the people in the conversation were dog persons.

**Results**: A detailed result grid is attached in the same folder with the name detailedResults.xls

**Deductions from Results**: The following are the deductions that we made from the study

* Mostly people can remember the gist and people of the conversation without having to see the ConversationCloud.
* People can very well recall what they see in the storyboard of ConversationCloud.
* Names if not mentioned in the storyboard of ConversationCloud are difficult to recall.
* Some people can answer questions with multiple answers only partially.

Overall we feel that once the person himself/herself has been a part of the conversation the ConversationCloud will be an effective way to recall the conversation.

**Constrains**: The following are the constraints on our report

* The less number of people taken into consideration for the study can be a constraint.
* Only sequential conversations were evaluated.

**Conclusion**: Using the results from the prototype evaluation, we calculated the accuracy of the prototype, which is 83.33%.