Tumble Rumble Lo-Fi User Study Results

Method:

Prototype:

Our light-weight prototype consisted of several general sketches of various game scenarios, and a couple small paper cutouts of Tumbleweeds glued at the end of sticks for the user to control and use in interact with our scenario sketches.

Session Information:

6 separate sessions were held, with a total of 12 participants. Regarding the study conditions, each session was held in a similar, distraction-free environment. The participants all sat down at a chair while one of us held up the scenario sketches. The users (Each session required 2 people) held a tumbleweed stick and used it to click on buttons, advancing to the next scenario. When the main scenario was presented (an arena) we began the fight, allowing the tumbleweeds would use their weapons to fight against each other and dodge obstacles. To gather the data, we had our users play several different modes and then answer the following questions:

- 1. Which arena style do you prefer?
 - a. (Open vs. closed)
- 2. Which Rumble style did you like/dislike?
 - a. (Several Rumble styles were played out: one involving characters with different special abilities, one with all characters sharing the same ability, and one with the characters without any abilities at all. Some of the more popular abilities include extra speed, extra damage given, and less damage received)
- 3. What is your favorite part about the game?
- 4. What is your least favorite part of the game?
- 5. What are some changes you want to make to the game?

Each participant's response to the questions were recorded and are visually represented in our revised IdeaMache, linked below. For the most part, analyzing our data was easy as the first couple of questions have binary answers. The last three, however, are open-ended and allowed us to receive the constructive feedback we needed. However, because they were open-ended, we received a couple of fairly vague answers. For example, one of the overwhelming responses to the third question involved an appreciation for the fighting aspect of the game. Answers, as these, do not help the analysis since fighting is the core mechanic. Vague answers like this were obvious and expected, and so we decided beforehand not to include them in our analysis. On the other hand, we did receive a few specific answers. These answers were used in constructing the qualitative analysis, whereas the all the answers to the first 2 questions were used to construct the quantitative analysis

Data:

Question 1 Responses:

Open: 9 Closed: 3

Question 2 Responses:

Dynamic Special: 10 Static Special: 2 No Special: 0

Question 3 Responses:

Here, the responses were more freeform. Most of the participants agreed that the most enjoyable part of the game was the actual fighting part, but we already knew this, as that is our core mechanic. When pressed further, some of the participants said that they liked the duel ranged-and-close-combat aspect of the game (guns and swords).

Question 4 Responses:

The response to this question was overwhelmingly similar: either the participants claimed to have no negative responses to the game (4 out of the 12 said this), or they said they didn't like the closed-arena (the remaining 8 said this), which correlates to most of the answers from question 1. A few other responses received, such as implementing certain abilities we aren't planning on implementing, among other things we aren't taking into consideration.

Question 5 Responses:

Piggybacking off of question 4, most of the users either had no response to this question, or they wanted to scrap the closed-system arena (Only 3 out of the 8 who said they didn't like the arena in question 4 said this).

A visual analysis of our quantitative data (from questions 1 & 2) can be seen [here](www.google.com). As far as analyzing our quantitative data, it would seem the participants are in agreement on a common theme: get rid of the open-system arena. Three participants said it was too similar to brawl, and two others from lab pointed out it would be difficult to implement things like grabbing ledges.

Observations:

This lo-fi user study was actually a very helpful tool in directing us which way to go with our project. We observed that people really enjoy the Super Smash Bros. similarities in the design of our game. They also seem to enjoy open-arena maps vs closed. This preference may also stem from the fact that most Super Smash Bros. arenas are also open-arena maps.

People seem to be satisfied with our lo-fi design, even though wasn't very exciting as the actual game will be, probably because of the idea our game was based on. Observing weapons, abilities, and power-ups was also an important part of this study for our group. The weapons and abilities seemed to be a "smashing" hit with our users. However, someone was able to point out that our original idea for power-ups was very similar to Super Smash Bros. which isn't something we are trying to duplicate. We want our users to have the loads of fun while playing our game, but at the end of the day it is important we make our own game. This more or less field study was a great way to gather information and come up with ideas to further progress in the design of our multiplayer game.

Discussion:

It is abundantly clear how we should interpret out data. First of all, it should be stated that our game was well received. Based off of the popular game series Super Smash Bros, our game has a good foundation. All we're doing is slightly modifying the fighting mechanics and altering the characters and arenas. On the topic of arenas, we have decided it would be best to scrap the open-system arenas and stick with the closed-system arenas, for several reasons. Firstly, this helps make our game more original, as it puts even more distance between our inspiration (Super Smash Bros) and our game. It also allows us to put more time and energy on the closed-system arenas, which will give us more obstacles and consequently a more challenging game. So, until we have a working prototype, the only change in our design is to get rid of the open-system arenas and more heavily build the closed-system arenas.