**SGD103 Semester 2, 2016 Assessment Task 2c. Play-test report**

# Inprism

Blake Chapman 1093048

David Wallman 1028789

Jesse Hughes 1088448

# Section 1. Summary of Iterative Changes made due to Play-testing

For further development on level design we could look at developing the tutorial level design. David has already implemented control tutorials which helps describe how to play the game, but through playtesting I found that players are still confused with the puzzle. We could look at possibly implementing a simple tutorial puzzle where the player only has to pick up a dark block and move to correct coloured button so the player gets a feel for the puzzle first then know what to do for the next puzzle. This will help improve the dramatic element of challenge, making the game easier to play and understand. It will also improve on the formal elements of procedures and outcome.

# Section 2. Individual Play-test reports

**Play-tests conducted by:** Jesse Hughes

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Play test *One*** | |
| **Date:** | 20/10/2016 |
| **Aim:** | Functionality of the prototype in terms of game programming, rather than design |
| **Participants:** | Three participants, male, 18-20 years |
| **Play-test Script / Plan:** | The genre of the game and the basic objective was explained to the playtesters. As the playtest was performed over the Internet, I could not easily observe and so asked the playtesters to take notes themselves on any bugs or other errors they could find in the prototype they were given, for me to later test myself with their input if needed. |
| **Key Outcomes & Rating:**  Rating scale  0 = not a problem at all;  1 = cosmetic;  2 = minor problem;  3 = major problem;  4 = catastrophic problem | * Because the player can only pick up blocks that are next to them, if they drop a block in a space that is not wide enough for both the player and the block to fit, that block is impossible to recover. (rating: 3) * The player can walk off the side of the screen (rating: 2). |
| **Proposed Changes to game design:** | * A new mechanic could be added to allow the player to pick blocks up from beneath them, and/or the level designs could avoid having spaces too thin. * Adding a check to prevent the player walking off the side of the screen, or ensuring the player’s route to the edge is always blocked in the level design. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Play test *Two*** | |
| **Date:** | 26/10/2016 |
| **Aim:** | With the mechanics and level design implemented for the game’s first level, this test was again focused on how well-programmed the mechanics were, and whether any bugs or exploits existed. |
| **Participants:** | Same as previous test |
| **Play-test Script / Plan:** | Much like the previous test, this test was performed with participants over the Internet. This time, we kept verbal communication throughout the playtest via online services and the participants gave their thoughts as they played, while I took notes for them. |
| **Key Outcomes & Rating:**  Rating scale  0 = not a problem at all;  1 = cosmetic;  2 = minor problem;  3 = major problem;  4 = catastrophic problem | * When the switch-toggled platforms are inactive, the player can still jump off of them even if they do not collide with them, allowing a skilled player to skip the puzzle (rating: 4) * The button to activate the first set of platforms also blocks the player’s path back should they fall or have activated those platforms before the others. This is very easy to do, and causes the player to become stuck with no way to finish the level. (rating: 4) * One specific block in the level is sometimes non-solid to the player; walking on top of it will cause the player to fall through it, and the player can walk into it from the side, but if they jump on top of it they can still stand on it. Not an issue with this level design, but could be indicative of a wider problem with the game’s physics. (rating: 2) * The unactivated platforms appear more solid than the activated platforms. (rating: 1) |
| **Proposed Changes to game design:** | * Adding a simple check to see whether the object a player is jumping off of is an actual solid object, in which case it will work as usual, or an unactivated platform, which should not work. * There are multiple ways to solve this issue. Two which we will implement are giving the player a larger jump height, which gives more freedom to modify the level design to prevent this issue in the current and future levels. * This requires additional debugging of the player movement code and/or the collision system in the game to find and fix the bug. * Switching the appearance between activated/unactivated platforms should make their current state more intuitive. |

**Play-tests conducted by:** David Wallman

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Play test *Three*** | |
| **Date:** | 24/10/2016 |
| **Aim:** | To test if the serious purpose of the game is clear to new players, and if it is effective, and to receive general feedback about the current state of the game. |
| **Participants:** | One, Michael Wallman |
| **Play-test Script / Plan:** | The participant will be given two versions of the game to test, and asked to voice any thoughts or concerns they experience during the testing period. The participant will be given 10 minutes to test each version; during this time the tester will observe silently noting any points of interest raised by the participant.  Questions to ask at conclusion of play test.  What is the objective of the game?  Was anything confusing?  Was the serious purpose of the game apparent?  Was the serious content conveyed effectively? |
| **Key Outcomes & Rating:**  Rating scale  0 = not a problem at all;  1 = cosmetic;  2 = minor problem;  3 = major problem;  4 = catastrophic problem | Summarise your findings from the play-test and give a rating for how important it is that changes are made to the game-play to accommodate this outcome.   * *The participant felt the objective of the game was easily understood (rating: 0)* * *The participant understood some of the serious purpose of the game, after exploring the menu and reading information provided, but felt that the serious aspect could be implemented more thoroughly into the gameplay (rating: 3)* * *The tester was initially confused about the pick-up and drop function, as it was not explicitly stated how this function worked (rating 3)* |
| **Proposed Changes to game design:** | The serious element of the game needs to be better implemented with game play elements. For example, information reveals when players interact with objects or the game environment.  Instructions need to be given to the player so they are not forced to guess controls and how to interact with objects. |
| **Photographic evidence *(optional)*** |  |

**Play-tests conducted by:** David Wallman

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Play test *Four*** | |
| **Date:** | 27/10/2016 |
| **Aim:** | Does the player movement and control feel responsive to the player, and inline with expectations of other platforming games? |
| **Participants:** | One, Zack Camille |
| **Play-test Script / Plan:** | The participant will be given two versions of the game to test, and asked to voice any thoughts or concerns they experience during the testing period. The participant will be given 10 minutes to test each version; during this time the tester will observe silently noting any points of interest raised by the participant.  Questions to ask at conclusion of play test.  Was there anything you found frustrating?  Did the controls feel intuitive? Did they make sense?  Was the movement too slow/fast?  Did the movement feel responsive?  Did anything feel clunky or awkward?  Would you change anything about the controls or movement? |
| **Key Outcomes & Rating:**  Rating scale  0 = not a problem at all;  1 = cosmetic;  2 = minor problem;  3 = major problem;  4 = catastrophic problem | * *The participant felt that the player movement felt responsive, fluid and was satisfied with the player speed (rating: 0).* * *The participant noted that the pick-up object control was buggy and not working as intended (rating: 3).* * *The participant would change the controls so that only one block could be held at a time, rather than the player holding multiple blocks at once and being unable to visibly see this (rating: 2).* * *The participant noted that the control for the pick-up and drop feature was poorly positioned if the player was using the WASD control scheme (rating: 2)* |
| **Proposed Changes to game design:** | * Debug the pick-up/drop feature to ensure it is working as intended. * Adjust game programming so that players can only pick up and hold one object at a time. * Change the key binding related to the pick-up/ drop feature, so that players using the WASD control scheme feel less awkward when using this control. |
| **Photographic evidence *(optional)*** |  |

**Play-test conducted by:** Blake Chapman

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Play test *Five* | |
| Date: | 26/10/2016 |
| Aim: | Bugs |
| Participants: | 1 player, My friend Ryan Bydder |
| Play-test Script / Plan: | From this playtest I will be observing the player to see where they can get to without help from a developer. This will test the games level design and help test to see if there are any bugs. I will be asking the player questions while taking notes from the response. It will take around 15 minutes. |
| Key Outcomes & Rating:  Rating scale  0 = not a problem at all;  1 = cosmetic;  2 = minor problem;  3 = major problem;  4 = catastrophic problem | Below findings from the playtest are shown, giving a rating and expressing how important it is to change this aspect to accommodate this outcome:   * Continue left on screen and player disappears bug (rating: 2) * Control tutorial (don’t know how to pick up) (rating: 2) * Can pick up 2 blocks but can’t move (rating: 2) * Trouble dropping blocks (rating: 2) |
| Proposed Changes to game design: | * Put collision on left side of screen * Only allow the player to pick up one block at a time * Debug dropping objects to make sure player can complete puzzles. |
| Photographic evidence *(optional)* |  |

**Play-test conducted by:** Blake Chapman

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Play test *Six* | |
| Date: | 27/10/2016 |
| Aim: | Level Design |
| Participants: | 1 player, My Brother, Matt Chapman, Age 16 |
| Play-test Script / Plan: | From this playtest I will be observing the player to see where they can get to without help from a developer. This will test the games level design and help test to see if there are any bugs. I will be asking the player questions while taking notes from the response. It will take around 15 minutes. |
| Key Outcomes & Rating:  Rating scale  0 = not a problem at all;  1 = cosmetic;  2 = minor problem;  3 = major problem;  4 = catastrophic problem | Below findings from the playtest are shown, giving a rating and expressing how important it is to change this aspect to accommodate this outcome:   * Need tutorial player doesn’t know mechanics (rating: 2) * Jumping and movement mechanic works well (rating: 0) * Level design seems to work well (rating: 0) |
| Proposed Changes to game design: | * Start with a simple puzzle of just picking up a block and placing on a button telling the player what to press then they can get a good feel for it. Then when the player comes to the real puzzle they get a better idea of what to do. |
| Photographic evidence *(optional)* |  |