**SGD103 Semester 2, 2016 Assessment Task 2c. Play-test report**
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# 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:** 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)* |  |