

Comparing Reinforcement Learning and Finite State Machine Agents in Real Time Strategy Games: Impact on Player Experience

Joshua Polanszky

*Institute of Information Communication Technology
Malta College of Arts Science and Technology
Paola, Malta*

Abstract—abstract

Index Terms—Keywords

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Theme and Topic Rationale

The Theme chosen is Decision-Making AI for Real-Time Strategy (RTS) Games, and will focus on comparing Finite State-Machine (FSMs) AI opponents traditionally used in games, against Machine Learning (ML) opponents, specifically Reinforcement Learning (RL), and their impact on player experience.

Game AI plays a huge role in player experience and immersion, as they provide the challenge and unpredictability that makes games fun and engaging. While extensive research has been conducted on the topic, most have focused more on the pure performance of the RL agent, and/or its impact on player experience, never directly comparing it to traditional FSMs, such as the work done by Grech [1], Berta, et al. [2], and Zhasulanov [3]. This study aims to address the research gap by directly comparing RL Agents to FSMs, and evaluating their impact on player experience, with the goal of identifying if the computational and development cost of implementing RL agents is justified by the improvement in player experience.

B. Positioning and Research Onion

This research addresses the gap in player experience found in the literature, building on the works of [1] and [4] on AlphaStar by providing a better understanding on the role RL agents will play in the future of RTS games. As can be seen in Figure 1, this study will follow a positivist research paradigm, following a deductive and experimental approach, gathering both quantitative and qualitative data to measure player experience.

C. Background to the Research Theme

Game AI has evolved significantly over the years, especially in RTS games. Early RTS titles, such as StarCraft, relied on Finite State Machines (FSMs) for their AI decision-making. These FSM-based approaches are deterministic and predictable, which can lead to repetitive and boring gameplay, and allow players to exploit the gameplay patterns of the AI. [4]




Fig. 1. Research Onion

More recently, RL has emerged as an alternative AI approach, taking advantage of advancements in ML and computer hardware. In games such as AlphaStar [4], RL agents were able to demonstrate adaptive and human-like behaviour, providing a more challenging and engaging experience for players. Another paper that highlights this is the work done by Grech [1], where he created multiple difficulties of AI opponents using RL, and found that players reported higher levels of enjoyment and immersion. A similar study is the one done by [2], where they trained an RL agent to act as an opponent in a fighting game, with the agent being able to adapt to the player's skill level, and provide a more engaging experience, similar to the work done by [4]

Despite all of this, the implementation of RL in commercial games remains limited due to the high computational cost, long training and development times, and added complexity. This further proves the need for research in this area, and in evaluating if the benefits of RL agents in RTS games are worth the cost compared to traditional FSMs.

D. Hypothesis

Players report a higher level of enjoyment and improved experience when playing against RL agents compared to FSMs in RTS games.

E. Independent & Dependent Variables

Independent variables are variables that are manipulated by the researcher, and are mainly used to influence the dependant variables. Dependant variables are what happen as a result of the independant variables, and are what the researcher is interested in measuring.

The independent variable in this study is the type of AI opponent. The dependant variables, those are player experience, player immersion, and perceived difficulty. Player experience will be measured through surveys and engagement metrics, player immersion will be measured through surveys and validated game design principles, and perceived difficulty will be measured through surveys, player feedback, and engagement metrics.

F. Research Aim

The aim of this study is to evaluate the impact of Reinforcement Learning (RL) and Finite State Machines (FSMs) AI opponents on player experience in Real-Time Strategy (RTS) games, and determine if the extra resources is justified by the improvement in player experience for RL agents.

To be more specific, the study will focus on the following research objectives:

- Compare player-reported enjoyment and engagement levels when playing against RL and FSM AI opponents in RTS games.
- Assess the impact of RL and FSM AI opponents on player immersion in RTS games.
- Determine if the computational and development costs and complexity of RL justify its implementation over FSMs in RTS games.

G. Purpose Statement

This study is important because AI opponents shaoe the core gameplay experience of RTS games. While FSMs remain widely used due to their simplicity, RL-based AI has the potential to revolutionise RTS games by providing adaptive and unpredictable opponents. However, the significant resource demand from developers raise questions if the benefits of RL are worth the investment.

By investigating the difference in player experience between RL and FSM AI, this study will provide valuable insights to game developers, AI designers, and the broader gaming community, helping them in making more informed decisions regarding AI decision-making strategies in RTS game development.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

The difference between academic and non academic literature is that academic literature is peer-reviewed, and is as such, more reliable and trustworthy than non-academic literature,

which can easily be biased or contain false information. Academic literature can also be more in-depth and detailed, due to the high research standards and requirements of academic institutions, especially IEEE.

Literature review goes here

The goal of a game developer is to create a game that is fun and engaging, and they do this by creating a game that is challenging, but not too challenging. As Csikszentmihalyi's flow theory states, the goal of a game is to create a state of flow, where the player is fully immersed in the game, and is not bored, but also not overwhelmed. There are many ways to achieve this, and one of them is through the use of AI opponents. Traditionally, FSMs are used as AI opponents, as they are simple to implement and easy to understand, and when done correctly, provide a good challenge to the player. However, given enough time, players can learn the patterns of the FSMs, and exploit them, making the game feel boring. It is possible to combat this through weakening the player, or making the AI more difficult, as is done in Souls-like games, however this can prove too challenging and overwhelm the player, once again breaking the flow.

RL agents, on the other hand, are able to learn how to play the game, and as such, adapt to the player and given scenario. This creates a more engaging and immersive experience, as the player feels like they are playing against a real opponent, and not just a computer. This is especially true in RTS games, due to the complexity of the game, and the many strategies that can be taken, which can be seen in the work done by [4]. There is an issue with this, however, as not only are RL Agents computationally expensive, but they can be trained too far, and become too difficult for the player, once again breaking the flow state. In the work done by [1], they balance this by taking snapshots of the RL agent at different stages in training. This allows them to create different difficulties of AI opponents, which can be used to better match a player's skill level.

III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A. Research Questions

1. How do RL and FSM AI opponents compare in terms of player experience in RTS games? 2. What are the key factors that influence player experience when playing against RL and FSM AI opponents in RTS games? 3. How do RL and FSM AI opponents impact player immersion in RTS games?

B. Research objectives

The objective for the research is to evaluate the impact of RL and FSM opponents in RTS games, and to determin their impact on player experience and immersion, and what are the key factors that cause this impact/influence. This is to be done by creating a simple RTS game, and implementing both RL and FSM agents, and then conducting a play test experiment with players, where both groups will then be surveyed to gather data on their experience. Along with this, data gathered during the playtest through unity analytics will be used to measure player engagement and immersion.

C. Suitable Methodology

This study adopts a **positivist research philosophy**, which means it emphasizes the use of objective measurements and observable phenomena, and it is suitable for this study as it aims to evaluate the impact of RL and FSM AI opponents on player experience through measurable data, aligning it with **quantitative methodology**. It follows a **deductive approach**, with an **experimental research design**, as it starts with a hypothesis, and then using an experimental prototype, tests the hypothesis by allowing participants to play it, and then uses the data to observe the difference the independent variable (AI type) has on the dependent variables (player experience, immersion, and perceived difficulty). This will then be used to answer the research questions and prove the hypothesis. It is important to note that the study will also gather a very small amount of qualitative data, making it a **mixed-methods approach**. This is done to help align the more human aspects of player experience with the more quantitative aspects.

D. Description of methodology, design, and approach

Create a simple RTS game, and implement both RL and FSM agents. Conduct a deductive experiment, where players will be split into 2 groups, where the first group will play against the FSM, fill out a questionnaire to gather data on their experience, and then play against the RL agent, and again answer the questionnaire. The second group will do the same, but in reverse order, playing against the RL agent first, and then the FSM. The end of each experiment's questionnaires will have an open ended question, where players can provide feedback on their experience, which will be used to gather qualitative data on their experience. Qualitative data will be used to support the quantitative data gathered from the questionnaires, as well as some in-game analytics and logs. This should help capture the more qualitative aspects of player experience, while still keeping everything quantitative and measurable. This should help in answering the research questions, and in determining the validity of the Hypothesis.

E. Reflection on validity and reliability of the research design

Validity: The study ensures validity by designing the experiment to control for confounding variables, such as the order in which participants play, since on the second playtest they would be more familiar with the game mechanics and controls. The use of validating the survey results with in-game analytics and engagement metrics further strengthens the validity of the research being conducted.

Reliability: To help ensure reliability, the same setup, game environment and surveys will be used for all participants. Any and all instructions will be standardised, using text and/or video/audio recordings to ensure that all participants are given the same instructions, without any bias that comes from the researcher. All data collection processes will be automated, further standardising the process and ensuring reliability.

Generalizability/Transferability: While the finding will be focused on the specific RTS game developed for this

study, the insights gained can be generalised to other games within the RTS genre, which follow similar game mechanics. The results may also be applicable to other game genres with similar AI opponent implementations, such as turn-based strategy games, but the transferability of results could be limited, and as such should be explored in future research.

F. Ethical considerations

Since the playtest will not be conducted on minors, and will not involve any sensitive or identifiable data, the main ethical considerations would fall onto the type of content in the game, and if it is appropriate for the players. In this case, it will be a simple cartoon like game, so there should not be any issues with this. The participants will be informed of the nature of the game and the study, and be required to sign a consent form before participating, and will be free to withdraw at any time.

IV. FINDINGS

Findings go here

V. CONCLUSION

Conclusion goes here:

REFERENCES

- [1] G. Grech, "Creating Difficulty Levels with Reinforcement Learning in a Strategy Game," bachelor's thesis, Malta College of Arts Science and Technology (MCAST), Paola, Malta, June 2023.
- [2] A. A. Bin Ramlan, A. M. Ali, N. H. Abdul Hamid, and R. Osman, "The Implementation of Reinforcement Learning Algorithm for AI Bot in Fighting Video Game," in *2021 4th International Symposium on Agents, Multi-Agent Systems and Robotics (ISAMSR)*, (Batu Pahat, Malaysia), pp. 96–100, IEEE, Sept. 2021.
- [3] D. Zhasulanov, B. Marat, K. Erkin, R. Omirgaliyev, A. Kushekkaliyev, and N. Zhakiyev, "Enhancing Gameplay Experience Through Reinforcement Learning in Games," in *2024 IEEE 4th International Conference on Smart Information Systems and Technologies (SIST)*, pp. 175–180, 2024.
- [4] O. Vinyals, I. Babuschkin, W. M. Czarnecki, M. Mathieu, A. Dudzik, J. Chung, D. H. Choi, R. Powell, T. Ewalds, P. Georgiev, J. Oh, D. Horgan, M. Kroiss, I. Danihelka, A. Huang, L. Sifre, T. Cai, J. P. Agapiou, M. Jaderberg, A. S. Vezhnevets, R. Leblond, T. Pohlen, V. Dalibard, D. Budden, Y. Sulsky, J. Molloy, T. L. Paine, C. Gulcehre, Z. Wang, T. Pfaff, Y. Wu, R. Ring, D. Yogatama, D. Wünsch, K. McKinney, O. Smith, T. Schaul, T. Lillicrap, K. Kavukcuoglu, D. Hassabis, C. Apps, and D. Silver, "Grandmaster level in StarCraft II using multi-agent reinforcement learning," *Nature*, vol. 575, pp. 350–354, Nov. 2019. Publisher: Nature Publishing Group.