The Fatalistic Game of Life: Usability Evaluation

**System Overview** 

The Fatalistic Game of Life is an actuarial statistics toy that takes demographic data and generates a hypothetical, statistical person. This person could be a millionaire, an impoverished worker, they could live exceptionally long, or die tragically young.

The key to this project is data collection. Taking data from online sources such as the US Census Bureau is a lengthy process. Our algorithm requires data be formulated in a specif way and written in proper terms. When rolling our statistics for a person we need to note that many of the tracked variables are correlated with each other. We first start rolling the least constrained variables, name, gender, race, and age. The first three remain the same over the course of a person's life, and the last increments yearly unless the person dies. Death depends on several factors, such as gender. In particular, the average woman lives longer than the average man. Data in our server backend needs to be represented in such a way that this kind of determination is efficient, and this is not always the case when we pull data from the internet.

There is no uniform way to do this. Not only does presentation format vary wildly from place to place, but the terms of the presentation change too. Non-trivial amounts of work go in to finding data and manipulating it into a usable form. The typical way we do this is 1) we download the appropriate data and load it into spreadsheet software. 2) Save the data as a comma-separated-value format. 3) Write a python script to read in the csv file and manipulate data into desirable terms, and output a python script with the appropriate values hard-coded in. 4) write an interface function to the data, accepting all constraining data as inputs. 5) modify all other variables to incorporate this new data, if there is a correlation. This solution is far less than ideal, but realistically any better solution would be out of the scope of this course.

**Evaluation Overview** 

Evaluation of this product consisted of a set of test participants performing a series of increasingly

complex tasks in a think-aloud setting. Table 1 summarizes test tasks for the evaluation.

| Task | Description   |
|------|---|
| 1    | Generate a new person   |
| 2    | Inspect variables at some specific year                           |
| 3    | Step through years one by one, inspecting each set of variables   |
| 4    | Modify the income variable at some specific year and re-roll data |

Table 1: Task enumerating

These tasks are designed to encompass the most common use-cases for The Fatalistic Game of Life.

They may not be exhaustive but they represent the most important set of functionality. Table 2 provides descriptions of the users participating in this evaluation.

| Participant | Age | Gender | Occupation                           |
|-------------|-----|--------|--------------------------------------|
| 1           | 21  | Female | Student of Linguistics, Anthropology |
| 2           | 59  | Male   | Electrical Engineer                  |
| 3           | 29  | Female | Research Scientist                   |
| 4           | 26  | Male   | Technical Support                    |

Table 2: Participant information

Two participants have engineering or similar occupations, in contrast to the researcher who has very specific knowledge in a sub-field of genetics, and a student with no technical background.

## **Evaluation Results**

| Task 1 – Generate a new person |   |  |
|--------------------------------|---|--|
| Participant                    | Action                                  |  |
| 1                              | Pressed 'Roll Again' button immediately |  |
| 2                              | Refreshed page                          |  |
| 3                              | Pressed 'Roll Again' button immediately |  |
| 4                              | Pressed 'Roll Again' button immediately |  |

Table 3: Task 1 results

| Task 2 – Inspect variables at some specific year |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| Participant                                      | Action   |  |
| 1  | Looked at screen for a moment, clicked on graph to bring up editor.        |  |
| 2  | Looked at screen for a moment, moused over bar on graph and saw variables. |  |
| 3  | Moused over bar on graph and saw variables                                 |  |
| 4  | Moused over bar on graph and saw variables                                 |  |

Table 4: Task 2 results

| Task 3 – Step through years one by one, inspecting each set of variables |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| Participant  | Action   |  |
| 1  | Clicked on graph to bring up editor, used mouse to click on arrow buttons. |  |
| 2  | Moused over bars on graph year by year.                                    |  |
| 3  | Moused over bars on graph year by year.                                    |  |

| 4 | Moused over bars on graph year by year. |
|---|---|
|   |   |

Table 5: Task 3 results

| Task 4 – Modify the income variable at some specific year and re-roll data |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| Participant  | Action   |  |
| 1  | Clicked on graph to bring up editor, edited text box, and pressed re-roll button.  |  |
| 2  | Looked at screen for a moment, pressed 'Roll Again', moused over bar on graph, clicked, edited text, and pressed re-roll button. |  |
| 3  | Clicked on graph, used arrow buttons to go to a particular year, edited text, and pressed re-roll button.                        |  |
| 4  | Looked at the screen for a moment, moused over bar on graph, clicked, edited text, and pressed re-roll button.                   |  |

Table 6: Task 4 results

It's worth noting here that at the time of the evaluation the site was still in an incomplete state. The results of task 4 produced erroneous program states which confused the user, and were well known to us at the time of the evaluation. This was explained to the participants, and since the evaluation was conducted the egregious errors were fixed.

## **Findings**

There are a number of small issues with the system. Across the board people were confused about what the two different bars on the plot represented, though several moments of inspection made things clear. A legend, or cleverer labeling, would solve this problem completely.

The second most striking issue was general confusion about how to get to the edit menu. There was no

indication that clicking would allow you to edit that year's data. This is a bit less obvious on how to fix. The most obvious fix would be to display some message explaining it until the user provides acknowledgment.

Users also felt that the edit page itself was somewhat unwieldy. This is understandable; the edit page varies significantly from what we had initially envisioned in our storyboard. This was briefly discussed with the participants after the test, and they seemed to agree that our storyboard idea would be better. However there is only so much faith we can put into these responses without actual testing.

Users also were confused at first with what exactly they were looking at. There is very little to no explanation on the front page, if the user wanted to see a succinct description of the application they needed to navigate to the 'about' page.

## **Response List**

Sorted from highest priority to lowest priority:

| Issue  | Status |
|--|--------|
| Fix bugs with editing generated person data          | Done   |
| Redo edit person page                                | To-do  |
| Add graph legend                                     | To-do  |
| Add indicator that an edit menu exists               | To-do  |
| Emphasize 'Roll Again' button                        | Done   |
| Provide better explanation for what graph represents | Done   |