ENG1 User Evaluation

Cohort 3 - Group 28

“Team 28”

Muhammed Salahudheen
Joel McBride
Jamie Rogers
Maciek Zaweracz
Rhys Yeaxlee
Alex Spencer
Alex Firth

The method of evaluation was discussed during a group meeting where we analysed and identified what was required of the evaluation using the briefing sheet that was provided. For the recruitment, we decided that the task-based user evaluation of our prototype game should be done with as many people as people, with a minimum of three users recruited from other teams within our cohort. We wanted to make sure that there was a diverse range of people with different experiences, such as users who have already tested other teams' projects to users who haven't. With this, each user will give different feedback as their familiarity of testing and giving feedback would differ between each other. For data collections, we combined a variety of measurements and techniques including observations, interviews, task completion metrics and more to gather data. The rule we had is that, at least one, ideally two, team members would be available and present to observe each user testing the prototype. This way, we can get live feedback and identify any issues immediately, and possibly even resolve them. Furthermore, by watching the users ourselves, we would be able to understand what a typical user would do when using our product, making it easier to understand which areas we need to focus on. While the user is testing the prototype, we decided that we can also record metrics on how the tasks were completed, such as completion time, errors encountered, unexpected deviations from how we expected the user to use the system, etc. As for the interviews, after completing all the tasks, we would ask the user general questions to provide qualitative insights into their experience as well as allowing the user to give criticism and what they would like to improve for their own preference. By doing this, we can try our best to satisfy all our users and also be able to understand what is truly meaningful to the people who use our product.

The procedure in which we would do all of the tasks above would be to first introduce and brief the user on the purpose of the evaluation. We would then ask them to read our ethics form, where we would have described how we would collect the data, how we would use their data, if there are any risks involved and what risks they are. This would allow the user to know what they would be doing as well as making them feel more comfortable. Once we have had their consent, we would give them a number of objectives to complete. Once these objectives have been completed, we would then allow the user to free-roam and try things themselves in a set amount of time, so that we can observe and evaluate the prototype's usability in real-world scenarios, which would provide actionable feedback for improvement. During the process, we will take down notes on what usability problems were discovered and rate them based on how the user is reacting to the issue. We will also ask the user how severe the problem is to their enjoyment of the game and rate the issue from 1-5; 1 being a mild issue, 5 being severe. After all of this has been completed, we would have a post-test interview with them and also a debrief, where we would thank them for their time and ask them for any concerns they may have.

Overall, the goal of our user evaluation was to collect insightful input that would inspire adaptive and important changes that guarantee the system is able to satisfy and fulfil the users needs.

Issue	Severity