**GROUP PROJECT, GROUP 3**

**DATE: 15 October 2018**

**TIME: 15:15 – 15:50**

**ATTENDEES** Tom Gibbs, Henry Crofts | Dave Pimm

**LOCATION:** Common Room, ATRIUM

**Minute Taker: Tom Gibbs**

**Aims of arranging tutor session:**

* Discuss how to improve on design work currently attempted by team
* Identify available design resources related to project design
* Identify design theories application to project design
* Determine approach to designing a project of our genre

**Meeting:**

Team requested meeting with Dave in response to presentation feedback after concern was expressed for the team’s lack of design theory.

Team explained that if this was the impression that had been given, this was unintentional. The team wants users to want to play the final product and the best chance the team have of creating a captivating experience is through design principles.

Team shared with Dave the design that had been used to shape the project so far. While some research beyond the first-year design methods lectures had been conducted, the team were basing much of the applied theory directly from the first-year lecture content.

Dave offered to come down to the programmers’ level of understanding, asking the team to describe their design choices without the expectation of precise terminology.

This was extremely helpful and resulted in some specific, mutually understood feedback.

Dave asked the team to start from the very basics of the game, using the limitations discussed: How many players, doing what, how long do games last, why will players replay the experience.

* Suggested reading: “**hooked – Nir Eyal**”
* Example game: “**Raiders of the lost islands**” (gameplay: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ht93TgwpqbE>)
* **Heider-Simmel** anthropomorphic (video: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sx7lBzHH7c8>) to show that effective visual design does not need to be complex
* **Proxemics** – the study of spaces between objects/people
* Dave reiterated the importance of the player constantly needing to have objectives to strive for
* Dave reminded the team of the ‘**learn -> practice -> master’** loop. Loop uses progressive skill-based mechanic to push player, requiring players to demonstrate more skill as it continues.
* **‘Compulsion’ loop** (or habit loop). No skill requirement, the player can always anticipate the reward. Can aide in holding player engagement.
* Loops create **anticipation of feelings**.
* Players must always be **expecting a ‘good’ emotion**.
* If players expect a **bad emotion, players are dissuaded** from continuing, will quit the game.
* Loops can keep players engaged. Progression loops help keep players engaged for lengthier durations, possibly across multiple play sessions.
* Learn -> practice -> master loops can transition players into the **‘flow channel’**
* The faster this loop moves, the faster the player enters the flow channel.
* Dave advised the overall mechanics will likely not allow for sensory/emotional immersion
* Focus on **cognitive immersion (directed attention)**
* **Skill checks (cognitive)** – but consider cognitive, physical, social
* For amusement, stronger emotions, team should look to push this element to the limit of players (Dave gave his own example of turning pacing values to **10x** normal speed – hugely successful).
* Team should investigate **‘reinforcement schedules’**
* Team should research **player rewards**; how long players will realistically spend waiting for the next reward
* Consider **how the game will progress over time** (period of seconds within a level / over a complete level)
* **What will the player have access to in the level at [time]**
* **What will the player have access to in the game at [point]**
* Using other games as inspiration, the team should consider possibility of **competitive** elements within the cooperative experience.
* **Game balance** (through playtesting) will be a key issue during development. How often do we want the most skilled player to win.
* Team can consider adding chance to game to afford other players win opportunities (even in dying seconds of game).
* The moment a player **believes losing** is inevitable they consider the game pointless
* **Physics** = chance, **RNG** = chance, **multiple** mechanics/things to manage will require different **strategies** = chance, **negative feedback loops** = chance
* Offer players options for **risk/reward gameplay** to inspire further strategies, apply pressure
* As a multiplayer game with potential to keep players engaged for longer periods, team may consider encouraging **players to become attached to their avatars**
* Allow **social rewards**, customisation/upgrade of avatar as a goal
* **Chance** of **Social rewards** which players can strive to accrue to show off to friends
* As team have highlighted animations as an area of concern, team must identify methods of highlighting game features to players.
* Other methods of **telegraphing information** to the player should be researched

**Dave’s presentation feedback:**

“the team intends to create ‘amusement,’ they will first need to define amusement and identify the core components of amusement, and then describe the design work that will actually elicit amusement in real human players, and in the most potent form possible”

“Similarly, it is unclear what the team considers ‘fiero’ to be. (It is a blend of personal pride and triumph. Note that tension and release are requisite components of most, or even all, emotional responses.)”

“Which challenges will be -presented? Which skills will be tested for? Will these be cognitive, physical, and/or social skills? How will the skill checks change over time? What are the progression mechanics?”

Team agreed to meet tomorrow, **Tuesday October 16**, to continue discussion of tutor feedback.