**SGD210 Semester 1, 2015 Assessment Task 2c. Play-test report**

# Inprism

Blake Chapman,

Jesse Hughes, 1088448

David Wallman, 1028789

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

Give an overview of the changes you made to the game as a result of play-testing. You may like to refer to these in terms of the relevant formal or dramatic elements.

# Section 2. Individual Play-test reports

For each play-test you conduct (minimum of 2 per student), complete a play-test report using the table below as a guide.

**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 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-tests conducted by:** Blake Chapman

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Play test *Insert Number*** | |
| **Date:** | Date of test |
| **Aim:** | Describe what you are testing. |
| **Participants:** | Number of players, who the players are. |
| **Play-test Script / Plan:** | Prior to conducting your play-test, write a script or plan explaining how you are going to conduct your play-test. Examples can be found in Chapter 9 of your text book. Describe how you will collect data to test your game (eg. observation, note taking, asking questions). Also explain how long you will require for this play-test. |
| **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. *Examples:*   * *The core mechanic of rolling the die and choosing a number that is a multiple of the number rolled worked well (rating: 0).* * *Moving the star marker at the end of each turn makes each turn take too long (rating: 3).* |
| **Proposed Changes to game design:** | Outline any proposed game changes that result from this play-test. This should link directly to the outcomes you observed. |
| **Photographic evidence *(optional)*** | If you have any, include a photograph or screenshot of this play-test session. It may be of the participants playing the game or the game-screen or anything else of interest that occurred during the session. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Play test *Insert Number*** | |
| **Date:** | Date of test |
| **Aim:** | Describe what you are testing. |
| **Participants:** | Number of players, who the players are. |
| **Play-test Script / Plan:** | Prior to conducting your play-test, write a script or plan explaining how you are going to conduct your play-test. Examples can be found in Chapter 9 of your text book. Describe how you will collect data to test your game (eg. observation, note taking, asking questions). Also explain how long you will require for this play-test. |
| **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. *Examples:*   * *The core mechanic of rolling the die and choosing a number that is a multiple of the number rolled worked well (rating: 0).* * *Moving the star marker at the end of each turn makes each turn take too long (rating: 3).* |
| **Proposed Changes to game design:** | Outline any proposed game changes that result from this play-test. This should link directly to the outcomes you observed. |
| **Photographic evidence *(optional)*** | If you have any, include a photograph or screenshot of this play-test session. It may be of the participants playing the game or the game-screen or anything else of interest that occurred during the session. |

Copy and paste the tables as required. Please delete the placeholder text and replace with your own.