

User Evaluation

Cohort 2 Team 5

Harry Beaumont-Smith

Tom Nolan

Will Punt

Ruth Russell

Mimi Shorthouse

Lottie Silverton

Stanley Thompson

User Evaluation

To conduct this user evaluation we used forms and a working prototype of our game in the form of a JAR file. The form started with a consent form, and if they agreed to the consent form, then moved on to playing the game and answering general questions about the game. We created these questions with a variety of things in mind. These included the functionality of our events, the usability of our game and the experiences had when the user was playing the game.

Our users, who took part in the evaluation, were chosen from people within our cohort. This was due partially due to the ethics approval, but also due to the fact that the people in our cohort were our games designed demographic, so were the ideal people to test our game. We ensured the users read the information sheet and consented to the test prior to testing our game.

When the users were taking part in the tests we had someone from our group with them. This was in order to supervise the user if they had any questions as well as to ensure they clarified themselves when filling out the forms. Instead of it being entirely monitored by our group, we wanted to test how intuitive our game was and whether all the game's events would be triggered naturally, without our intervention.

We did ask the users to perform specific tasks, such as testing the main menu, use the leaderboard, use the pause button and attempt to go into as many rooms in the maze as possible. We did this just so we could prove the robustness of our game as a whole and additionally receive feedback on our complete game. We wanted to ensure that the whole game worked and all the functionalities we initially incorporated into the previous teams user requirements were met (according to the users).

When asking for feedback from the users we let them fill in the form as well as tell us what they thought of the game. The questions allowed for both positive and negative feedback that would help us inform our actions following the evaluation.

We also made sure to ask them if they overall enjoyed playing the game and if they thought it was difficult enough. At the end of the form, if they hadn't already expressed to us everything they wanted to, they got the opportunity to state and residual thoughts they had about our game, good or bad, just to ensure we got a full understanding of our users' impressions of the game.

To discuss some of our results, 100% of the users enjoyed playing the game, 66.7% of the users thought the game was easy, 100% of the users thought our main menu was easy to navigate (however, one user was also unsure about what difficulty they had selected). This was reassuring as it meant that our game overall was a fun product that was easy (enough) to play. As well as this our users also thoroughly enjoyed the colour and aesthetic of our game, particularly the graphics/items. This was good as we got specific feedback that everything was very clear and easy to distinguish, which meant that our game was accessible and easy to play for everyone.

In terms of more qualitative feedback we also got feedback that our events were fun, varied and challenging which made the game more unique and enjoyable.

Usability Problems

When asking for issues/negative feedback in our game we allowed our users to point out parts that didn't work as well as things they didn't like. They then verbally assessed how serious these were, if more than one user brought up the same issue this would heighten the severity. This will help us to improve the game in future iterations, with the severity informing us of the priority of each complaint.

| Usability Problem | Severity rating |
|--|-----------------|
| Cannot return to the main menu from settings using the button | High |
| Selecting difficulty crashes the game | High |
| When entering a name for the leaderboard, it didn't work and only entered null | Medium |
| Leaderboard design wasn't intuitive on how to use | Medium |
| Some doors were labelled with incorrect arrows, which made it confusing for the user | Medium |
| Could be more dialogue to add a more clear storyline to the game | Low |

When assessing priority, we took into account the users feelings, how much it came up and the overall impact on the game. Where experiences like crashing were high and usability features that were additional bonuses were low.