Process & Decision Documentation

Project/Assignment Decisions

I designed the project as a choice-based game to directly reflect the assignment's focus on multiple game states and branching logic. The game is structured as a simple decision tree, where each screen represents a distinct state and each user input triggers a transition to a new state. Instead of relying on randomness, the logic routes the player through different narrative paths based on their choices, ensuring that every outcome is intentional. This structure allowed the mechanics of state switching, input handling, and screen-specific logic to become part of the storytelling itself.

GenAI Documentation

No GenAI used for this task.

Summary of Process (Human + Tool)

- Planned the story as a small decision tree, mapping each choice to a specific game state.
- Structured the project using separate files for each screen, with a central router handling state changes.
- Replaced random outcomes with explicit player input to control narrative branching.
- Implemented shared input and UI patterns (buttons, keyboard controls, hover feedback) across all states.
- Debugged.
- Iteratively refined layout and alignment to ensure clarity, consistency, and responsiveness.

Decision Points & Trade-offs

- Chose a deterministic, choice-based structure instead of random outcomes to emphasize player agency and clarity in state transitions.
- Balanced narrative depth with technical simplicity by limiting the story to a small number of meaningful branches.

- Used a centralized state router for clarity, trading off flexibility for easier debugging and readability.
- Opted for minimal visual design to keep focus on decisions and text rather than complex graphics or animations.

Verification & Judgement

Here's a clear **"Verification and Judgement"** section you can add to your README:

Verification and Judgement

- Verified correct state transitions by testing every possible choice path and ensuring each led to the intended ending.
- Checked that all user inputs (mouse and keyboard) consistently triggered the same outcomes across states.
- Confirmed that the decision tree contained no dead ends or unreachable states.
- Evaluated the clarity of on-screen instructions and visual feedback to ensure users understood available actions.
- Judged the success of the project based on whether the mechanics clearly communicated player agency and the consequences of decision-making.

Limitations, Dead Ends, or Open Questions

Here's a concise **"Limitations, Dead Ends, or Open Questions"** section you can include:

Limitations, Dead Ends, or Open Questions

- The story is limited to a small number of branches, which restricts narrative complexity but keeps the decision tree manageable.
- Player choices do not accumulate or affect future states beyond the immediate branch, leaving longer-term consequences unexplored.
- The game does not include audio, descriptive graphics, or animation, which could further enhance emotional impact.
- The current structure assumes linear progression between states and does not support revisiting past decisions.
- Future iterations could explore more complex state logic, such as persistent variables or adaptive outcomes based on multiple choices.

Appendix

N/A