User Evaluation Report

Cohort 2 Team 1 (Assessment 1)
Ahmet Abdulhamit
Zoey Ahmed
Tomisin Bankole
Alanah Bell
Sasha Heer
Oscar Meadowcroft
Alric Thilak

Cohort 2 Team 2 (Assessment 2)
Bader Albeadeeni
Dan Hemsley
Jennifer Bryant
Mathilde Couturier-Dale
Oliver Elliott
Rosie-Mae Connolly
William Mutch

User Evaluation Report

A)User evaluation Method

Recruitment

The user evaluation involved six participants aged 18 or above. The participants were recruited from other ENG1 teams using opportunity sampling by asking other students from the same cohort. None of the participants were part of the development team, and none had tried the game DebugThugs2 before. This recruitment approach was due to time constraints

Data collection tools and data

The data was collected using direct observation and qualitative user feedback. An evaluator guided the session, while participants completed the tasks, an observer took notes on the player behaviour, the navigation decisions, and any difficulties encountered by the participant. After the session, the participants were asked to describe any usability issues they experienced and to rate the severity of each issue as Low, Medium, or High. This approach was used to identify usability problems during realistic gameplay.

Procedures

Each user evaluation session was conducted in person and online. Before starting the sessions, each participant was given an information sheet and was asked to sign an informed consent form.

During the sessions, the participants were asked to do a series of gameplay tasks given by the evaluator, where the evaluator worked to guide the session, and another group member acted as an observer and recorded notes. Participants were asked to think aloud while completing the tasks, but it was noted as optional. The sessions didn't include any audio or video recordings, and all the sessions lasted no longer than 30 minutes.

The tasks given during evaluation sessions are:

1. Start the game and review the tutorial, then start playing the game.
2. Explore the map and rooms, and interact with the NPCs.
3. Trigger an event (quiz, ticket, feed the goose, find the box, dean repellent)
4. Encounter the dean(enemy) and avoid getting caught.
5. Find and collect the bus ticket required to escape the university.
6. Finish the game and open the leaderboard/achievements.

All sessions followed the University of York's ethical procedures, ensuring everything was in line with the fast-track ethical approval form.

User Evaluation Report

B) A table listing the usability problems found by users in the prototype system and the users' severity ratings of those problems.

usability problem	Task	participants severity ratings
Invisible walls are unclear, making it hard to walk around the map	Task 2	Medium
Some signs don't display information, while other signs do, confusing	Task 2	Medium
The ticket is hidden next to the spawn. It's very easy to finish the game fast if known	Task 5	Medium
The leaderboard is unclear and doesn't indicate whose score is shown	Task 6	Low
Event text flashes fast, doesn't give enough time to read NPC dialogue	Task 2	Low
Progression relies on trial and error, not enough game guidance	Task 4	Low
Dean can kill the player without the player initially realising that it's an enemy	Task 4	Medium
The bus escape condition is unclear, making it hard to understand how to escape	Task 5	High
The tutorial is skipped most of the time	Task 1	Low
The vault event is not explained clearly, and is difficult to finish	Task 3	Medium
Walkable and non-walkable textures are not clear	Task 2	Medium

User Evaluation Report

References

Vasiliou, C.(2025). User Evaluation. Department of Computer Science, University of York