USER TESTING REPORT

Group 3

Liam Martin
Aaliya Williams
Lucy Crabtree
Kai Nichol
Sammy Hori
Tim Gorst
Zac Ribbins

The client said that the target audience was people who are finishing school or going to university, but since we don't know many people who are still in school, we thought it would be best to test it across university students. For our testers, we decided it would be best to vary them as much as possible, so we recruited students from different year groups, ranging from 1st year to postgraduate, with various degrees and capability in playing video games. To reflect a varied user base.

We decided to create a list of tasks that would help the user become familiar with the functions of the game and a map of the area. A scenario was given of a university student in exam week so that the user could get invested into the game. We decided to start them off in the dorm room, since tasks that will raise each different stat are available there, then guide them around the map while allowing them to explore. Link to PDF (Figure 2)

The area that we would carry out the tasks was debated, as we have seen students playing various games all around campus, so what we decided to do was book a room in the library and have each tester come in when they were available that day to carry out the test, as that meant it was a suitably controlled environment, while also in a place the testers were familiar with.

Once the game was in a state to be tested, we ran through the game with the tasks and found that some adjustments needed to be made. One in particular was that the buildings referenced in the instruction guide were confusing to find unless you already knew what they looked like. We resolved this by including pictures of everything referenced in the instruction guide.

When the testers arrived at the room, we first had them read through and complete the instructions and consent forms provided on the VLE. We then provided them with our task sheet and allowed them to work through the game by themselves so as not to interfere with the results. To test the performance of the users in the game, we recorded their score at the end of the game, as well as their average study score and happiness score at the end of each day across the whole 7 days. We then sent them a form to fill out after they had completed testing. We chose not to ask them the questions in person so that they would not feel pressured to respond more positively than they felt, but asked them to submit the form by the end of the same day so that they would still remember the experience. We also asked them to tell us any problems they had with the system, which we compiled later in the day, once the process had finished, and then sent out another form asking the participants to rate the severity of each issue.

We then analysed our data and found that none of our participants managed to rank above a third on their playthrough. While there is usually a learning curve with games, we were expecting the average score to be higher than the actual result, which was 41.4. Our System Usability Scale came back fairly positive, with an average of 48.6%, so we are confident that the users enjoyed playing the game. Most participants also commented that they enjoyed the aesthetic of the game and found the prompts easy to follow. Link to PDF (Figure 3)

We found multiple things we could do better throughout this process, mainly that our scoring algorithm was too harsh and so it didn't allow the players to score highly. While observing the players, we also noticed that they were having difficulty getting around the map in certain areas, as the programmed walls were a little off to the walls on the screen.

The problems in this table were indicated by the users after they had finished playing through the game. Later in the same day, we compiled these issues and sent out a form asking the users to rate the severity of each issue; they are listed here with the mode rating given in the final column.

Severity rating by each user, red = high, orange = medium, green = low

Problem	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mode rating
Harsh scoring system								
Collisions with walls that were a little to the right of where the player would be stopped - little difficulty getting around the map								
When interacting with objects, the placement the player would have to stand in would also be a little off								
No transitions when doing activities or going to bed, so if not watching the clock, the player would often think on the first day that the action hadn't been completed, and try and complete the action again, sometimes resulting in wasting time								
When exiting buildings, the player always spawns in the same place, no matter which building is exited								
No walking animation								
No indication of day or night in the game								