Cohort 3 - Group 22: The Wafflers

Eng1 Assessment 2

User Evaluation

Team Members:

Tunahan Sisman
Yousef Omar
Merrill Davis
Tom Comrie
Rohan Sandhu
Cameron Pounder
Daniel Redshaw

User evaluation methods and tools

The user evaluation methodology used for the project involved conducting several task-based evaluations.

User recruitment
Seven users were interviewed for our project, all being University of York Students.

Data collection tools
To perform the interviews, a questionnaire based collection method was used because it allows for an understanding to be developed of the issues the user faced when playing the game in a simple and systematic way.

To do this, a questionnaire was created using google forms. This allowed for both short and long answer responses to be used. A Likert scale was used for the responses, where users could give a response to a question from a scale of "Strongly disagree" to "Strongly agree", the questions are worded so that "Strongly disagree" would indicate a negative opinion, and "Strongly agree" indicates a positive opinion to that feature.

These responses could then be imported straight into a spreadsheet, where the results can be analysed and averages can be taken to identify problem areas.

Procedures
Before conducting the interviews, the users were asked to look through the information sheets and sign the consent form. When conducting the evaluations, the users were shown the tasks and then loaded up the game. The user was then free to go through all of the tasks at their own pace, being able to ask the interviewer for advice or guidance with any task.

After completing all 5 tasks, the user could proceed to the first page of the form, and answer questions based on each of the tasks. The tasks chosen for the user covered all aspects of the game, such as: using the tutorial, playing through a day of the game, exploring the full regions of the map, finishing the game whilst trying to win, getting streaks if possible, and then using the leaderboard. The questions asked were mainly Likert scale questions where the user is given a statement and has to say whether they agree or disagree. As well as these, every task had an optional long section in which the user can express any frustrations or difficulties they encountered when completing the task.

After obtaining the feedback from each of the 7 responses, the responses were used to create a table that shows the usability problems our users discovered.

To effectively extract problems from the responses, firstly the questions using the Likert scale were evaluated. As these questions were answered from 1, meaning strongly disagree, to 5, meaning strongly agree, any questions that had an average response lower than 3 were considered usability problems. This allowed for problems to be effectively identified within the game as it allowed for a general understanding of users' opinions to be formed regarding several of the gameplay mechanics. As well as this, any difficulties or problems the user entered in the long answer questions were considered as usability issues.

Table of discovered usability problems

To assign severity ratings to the problems, a scale of 1, least severe, to 5, most severe was used, with each usability problem being assigned a value through one of two methods. For the Likert scale questions, the average response to each question was calculated and subtracted from 6 to give an overall severity rating. For example, if every user strongly disagreed with a question, (i.e. the average response is 1), the severity of that response would be 6 - 1 = 5, the maximum severity. For the open responses given by the users, severity was decided by speaking to the user about this during the interview, in combination with how often that problem was raised by the users.

Problem description	Severity
It is not very clear the map is larger than just the starting zone of east campus.	4
The character can walk behind the game's HUD at certain locations of the map which can be unclear and confusing for the user.	4
It is not clear on how to get streaks.	3
It is not clear enough on how to improve and get a better score.	3
When interacting with activities, the text stays green for too long, so interacting multiple times can be unclear.	2
At the end of the game, it isn't clear on how to enter your name, there is no cursor or prompt.	2
The arrow keys cannot control the player, only WASD.	2
To enter your name into the leaderboard you cannot confirm with the "Enter" key, you must use the mouse.	1
The game returns back to the main menu after entering your name instead of going to the leaderboard.	1