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| Name of the study or artefact evaluated | When during the design the evaluation occurred | How controlled was the study and what role did users have? | Which methods were used? | What kind of data was collected and how was it analysed? | What was learned from the study? | Notable issues |
| An Experiment Investigating a Computer Game – an ice hockey computer game. | Game had already been developed. | Controlled environment under strict conditions. | Measuring of physiological data to measure enjoyment. Participants were videoed. User satisfaction questionnaires. | Physiological responses. Means scores for aspects of the user experience analysed. | Participants preferred playing against a friend. | Use of subjective and physiological measures meant they could not be compared easily. |
| In the Wild Study of Skiers | App had been developed. | Not that controlled, in natural environment. | Logging of app use on smartphone. Focus group. | Tracking data. Qualitative feedback from focus group | Users did not use the app when the developers expected. In the bar vs on the slopes. | Method revealed unexpected results. |
| Designing and evaluating the Mobile Experience Through Iterative Field Studies | Before implementation, paper prototype, interactive prototype. Design stage. | Natural environment, so not as controlled as lab. Also in testing in makeshift lab for advanced prototype. | Field studies with interviews of travelers at beginning and after interaction. Webcam to video users’ screen. Written questionnaire. | Qualitative interview answers. Notes on observation. Video footage. | Fields studies make recruiting representative users easier. Careful planning is key to success. | Carried out in non-static environment, changeable. Difficult to take notes while in transit. |