Hypothesis for first round of testing:

People won’t have a problem looking at someone’s phone

A found phone is naturally intriguing

Curiosity can trump caution

We tested this by applying two tests

First was a short group questionnaire that asked our users about their various giving’s or misgivings over looking through someone’s phone, whether they saw it as an immoral thing or whether they considered themselves fine because they were trying to return the phone.

The 2nd was a simple paper test where the users assigned a name to a given text. The texts given were generic texts with 1 stalkerish themed text thrown in. They were given 3 sheets with texts and 4 name-tags and could associate them however they liked.

**What we found is with the first test is:**

**People seem to have a problem with looking at the contents of a phone:**

Certain apps would be more considered more invasive than others. Dating apps and messages were considered amongst the most private. With users not wanting to delve deeper.

**People would rather turn the phone over and be rid of the responsibility:**

Users were worried that there was some kind of legal issue with viewing someone’s phone, despite the testing being about a game where you find a phone, perhaps we could have been clearer. Next round of testing will fix this issue.

**Everyone was overly cautious:**

What we did notice is that while some people may have initially shown curiosity as soon as the first member of the testing group said it was immoral or wrong then everyone else would mirror this sentiment. We surmise this is because of a group mentality, we’ll test this next week in a narrower test that is taken 1 by 1 rather than as a whole group.

**What we found with the 2nd test was:**

While there was no technical right or wrong answer for the texts, we created some texts with a certain answer in mind. For instance, we created the stalker text assuming people would attribute it to the unknown number tag, where as in reality they attributed it to someone they assumed was the best friend of their character. What we hoped to test for was whether texts were predictable, because we had a certain character in mind for each text while we created them. When the user was given the texts and names and told to select which was for which, without context they ’de attribute them in a way we hadn’t expected. If we were to continue this idea further, then perhaps there’s a game mechanic to be had with assigning names to solve the puzzle.