## Immersiveness Indicators

To properly evaluate the global experience of the game in both game’s post-tests, a choice was factors to consider relevant was required. Giving the volunteers more freedom in reporting their relevant factors was considered and would be valuable for a general evaluation. The PANAs scale was considered too, for a tallying of subjective mood. However, the need for a comparative evaluation dictates that the post-test surveys would have to be more targeted, more focused at a consistent set of elements between the two user groups, that covered more factors.\\

We’ve already looked at several aspects of the content, the game, with other questions in the post-test. A proper UX questionnaire ought to look into the other two elements of interaction: The Person, their experience, their anticipations, their characteristics, their relationships; and the Form, the technology by which the game is delivered, the extra content not part of the game’s primary progression. The latter is interesting mostly in aspects that may have affected the former, as people’s focus and attention is performed in a generally scattered yet not truly expectable manner. What some find amusing, distracting and correctly perceive, others may fail to because of form factors.\\

The following were the indicators chosen: Emotional Impact; Internal Expectations; Self-Consciousness; External Expectations and Sharing; Recall and Recognition; Enjoyment and Repeatability; Subjective Sense of Comfort; Technological and Methodological Impact; Symbolic Feedback and Sense Making. Some indicators were discovered in other works but didn’t feel like they fit well with the current work, such as Monetary Value, the willingness to pay money for similar experiences; or Reputation, which did not make sense given the fact the technology was almost entirely unknown to the participants prior. These were asked to the volunteers through questionnaire, and the answers were weighed to a scale ranging from 0 to 50. Table (?) shows the scores of indicator for the Cultural and Non-Cultural Group.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | score |  |  |
| Emotional Impact | 43.75 |  | Total |
| Internal Expectations | 37.50 |  | 382.60 |
| Self-Consciousness | 47.92 |  |  |
| External Expectations and Sharing | 43.75 |  | Mean |
| Recall and Recognition | 43.75 |  | 42.51 |
| Enjoyment and Repeatability | 43.75 |  |  |
| Subjective Sense of Comfort | 43.75 |  | Std Deviation |
| Technological and Methodological Impact | 40.63 |  | 3.31 |
| Symbolic Feedback and Sense Making | 37.81 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | score |  |  |
| Emotional Impact | 50.00 |  | Total |
| Internal Expectations | 28.13 |  | 342.59 |
| Self-Consciousness | 45.83 |  |  |
| External Expectations and Sharing | 43.75 |  | Mean |
| Recall and Recognition | 24.31 |  | 38.07 |
| Enjoyment and Repeatability | 46.88 |  |  |
| Subjective Sense of Comfort | 47.92 |  | Std Deviation |
| Technological and Methodological Impact | 34.38 |  | 11.12 |
| Symbolic Feedback and Sense Making | 21.41 |  |  |

Performing a two-sample t-test, we can attempt to prove our hypothesis through an opposite one of that which we're looking for. By attempting to discredit that the samples have similar characteristics, we could find suggesting evidence and a given level of significance that the games had different impacts on the players. However, at a significance level of 0.05, we already find no convincing enough evidence that the two samples differ significantly in their immersiveness. And given that at, at p-value 0.05, there's at least 23\% (and typically close to 50\%) chance of incorrectly suggesting the alternate hypothesis, this proves to not be a valid vector by which difference between the two groups can be established.

## Loose Observations

Both cultural and non-cultural groups were requested to name the most memorable part of the game. Out of 4 exceptions, both parties named the same element. Those exceptions include 2 users speaking of their frustration with movement, and 2 speaking of the moment of victory. All remaining 13 users singled out the blue animated humanoid NPC due to the richness of its responsiveness and interaction. Also, as noted earlier, this NPC reacted by performing its own gestures, two of which were done in a similar fashion to the Cultural Group's (Waving and Pointing), which may have influenced the Non-Cultural Group's memory of the experience.\\

On the second part of the second trial’s post-test, after the being questioned about the tasks, the

volunteers were asked about substitutions to the gesture set, while also being reminded of what the

actual gesture set was. Out of 19 (17 from the Non-Cultural Group) suggestions, only 1 did not in-

volve a cultural gesture, and only an additional 2 didn’t involve emblematic gestures. Non-Cultural

Group participants were fixated on gestures that ended up belonging to the Cultural gesture set.