In Inky this week, I found it a bit harder to layout the choices as I tried to make a puzzle of sorts. In the previous week, I had followed the Zork story and just mainly had each plot line be separate based on your choices, while this week, I attempted to have some overlap. Something I found interesting was that if you try to loop, or divert back to a previously visited knot, whatever option was chosen the first time is now gone. It gave an error about the line running out of content, and kind of disrupted my plans to attempt to let the user loop through the story over and over until they realized the correct path. Instead, I ended up just adding a “I give up” choice to get them to the ending.

The experience of trying to make a puzzle-type game, instead of a more fun choose your own adventure, reminded me of Bogost and proceduralism. In a puzzle game, there’s normally only one way to win, or one end goal. In a puzzle game, or in my game, the procedures really are what give the game meaning because you must follow certain procedures to reach success. Players active that process by starting to solve the puzzle, and then the game’s meaning is revealed. I personally agree more with Sicart, however and felt like in my last Ink story, the player gave the game meaning because there were multiple endings, and more choices. For the puzzle story I made, you had to get the puzzle right to get “a win”, which felt more proceduralist. In that way, maybe there are some games that are procedural, while others aren’t. If the procedures are more linear, as in there’s only one right way, maybe that requires proceduralism, while some games have multiple paths, and then are less proceduralist and more player-centered.