User Evaluation

Group 14

Tecch Titans:

Bradley Mitchell

Daniz Hajizada

Ellie Gent

Joel Crann

Keela Ta

Leo Crawford

Lukas Angelidis

User Evaluation Methods:

The procedures undertaken for user evaluation consisted of planning, participant recruitment, holding sessions, data collection and data analysis. Throughout the user evaluation process, we adapted to standard interaction design usability testing guidelines[1].

The first aspect involved planning our sessions with the users so that the feedback can provide valuable insight into improvements for our game. Tasks were set out for users to complete in each in-game day, alongside a series of general questions in relation to our non-functional requirements to assess the extent to which they have been met. Each user evaluation planned to follow the same created schedule for standardisation.

Recruitment:

For the user evaluation, we recruited several individuals to test and review our game. We aimed to select a diverse group of people to test our game to ensure strong and varied feedback and each participant provided their informed consent to take part in the testing. Each participant was allocated a team member who would oversee the testing and evaluation process. Then the participant would be given a brief rundown of the game and how to navigate their way through it to ensure they knew how to complete given objectives. This allows for a smooth testing experience and ensures high quality results.

Tools and Data:

This then led to in-depth task-based sessions where a selection of tasks was given to the user to perform in each day of gameplay. This provided valuable insight into user opinions on our product, allowing us to analyse bugs and generate ideas for improvements. The real-time nature of these sessions allowed for semi-structured questions and qualitative feedback on each task and general gameplay. Audio and video recording was not permitted and instead, writing software like google docs was used to record user observations and responses.

Data Collection/Data Analysis:

For the testing of our game, the participants were given a set of tasks to perform throughout the game week. The tasks given varied in granularity, for example a task may be broad and say "Do a recreational activity" and another may be specific and say "Eat at the Ron cooke hub". This ensures that feedback is given in predetermined areas, but also allows the participants to have freedom in their gameplay. This allows for a range of well mixed and meaningful feedback, providing valuable insights into specific game elements and overall user experience.

Usability Problems:

Problem No.	Brief Description	Severity Rating (Minor, Moderate, Major, Critical)	Number of users mentioned
1	The meaning behind the scores and streaks were unclear. Not explained on the instructions page and therefore no incentive for them throughout the game.	Major	5
2	The sign blocks the user from freely interacting with the piazza	Major	1
3	Buildings on the town section of the map (Luigi's Pizza/Himark, Kosta Koffee) were hard to identify	Moderate	5
4	Hard to navigate the large map - difficult to locate where you are	Moderate	3
5	Was not always evident which activities are recreational	Moderate	2
6	Energy bar blends into parts of the tilemap (green on green)	Moderate	1
7	User was unable to go back if they accidentally interacted with something they didn't intend to	Moderate	1
8	Player walks too slowly	Minor	5
9	Unclear which of the buildings in town are interactive	Minor	4
10	Art clipping through buildings	Minor	2
11	Scroll on the leaderboard page was slightly unclear	Minor	2
12	User would like access to the leaderboard from inside the game	Minor	1
13	Unclear when the avatar was selected	Minor	1
14	Unrealistic sleep system (i.e allowing the user to go to sleep at 8am)	Minor	1
15	Town map felt a little small in comparison to the larger campus map	Minor	1

References:

[1] Y. Rogers, H. Sharp, and J. Preece, *Interaction Design*. John Wiley & Sons, 2023.