Bonds

Interview, Observation, Peer Review, Usability Testing, and

Showcase: Paper Prototype Showcase and Testing

Triangulation: Observation, Prototyping, Peer Review

Charlotte Weiss - Data Mage Studios

Reflection

Doing the testing at the event was incredibly fun and gave us a much clearer idea about how the prototype would work in the end. The way we set up testing made the process incredibly smooth as well- One person per player to test and a separate person to observe then jot down notes as well as interview. This made sure each person testing had their task and were able to fully focus on either notes or testing rather than having to worry about the other thing.

For writing this, it was nice to be able to summarize my notes in a succinct way, though I am unsure if the tables I made were the best. If need be I'll be adjusting them at a later date, for the summaries I feel as though they are clear.

Summary

Paper prototype testing at the semester 3 event / test day. I observed and took notes for 5 groups of two that tested our paper prototype game.

We created 4 research questions to determine what we would test for, focusing on how / if our game encourages communication. From testing and reviewing all notes from all groups from 10:00 - 12:00 I determined the following-

1. Demo took far too long, even digitised it will take longer then wanted for the NON event

2. People were friendly in the game, 4 / 5 groups communicated well during the testing with overall experiences being positive

3. Friends interacted and communicated much quicker than strangers did. Previous knowledge of a person hastened the process, though in total 4 / 5 groups communicated well. The other group had one person trying to communicate with the other not being interested.

4. There was confusion regarding talking to NPC's, directional buttons, lockpicking minigame, the culprit for the mystery, and overall directions given

5. The minigames encouraged natural communication and especially after the maze minigame people communicated far better and far more. Having to talk to one NPC per player also forced players to discuss their findings.

   Summaries for each group's notes are contained in a table in the Results section.

Current Situation

Our team created a paper prototype of how our game would work overall, however we are currently unsure if the mechanics we have will work in the final product. We have been presented with an opportunity to showcase our prototype with a large number of participants.

Process

Our group started by creating research questions for the event, as we wanted to have a centralized goal to test during the event. Our questions are summarized as follows -

- How do people communicate during the game before, during, and after?
- Do people interact differently if they are strangers, acquainted, or friends before the game begins testing?

- Are there going to beany moments that confuse people or hold hem up during testing? Looking specifically for game mechanic issues.
- Does the game naturally encourage communication?

For each round of testing, we did as follows. Two players would sit at opposing sides of the table in front of a 'game screen'. There were W A S D buttons to act as directions and a ' screen ' that would display what they would see in the game as well directional arrows to show where they could go. There were two moments where they would need to play a physical minigame in order to progress further in the game.

Two people from our group would assist in running the prototype test, one for each player. A third member would sit away from the testers to observe their actions and note down anything they deemed significant or important. This third person would also ask interview questions before and after the testing. The questions were as follows -

Before

- What are your names?
- What do you think the main goal of the game will be?
- How well do you currently know each other?

After

- How did you experience the game?
- Were there points where the overall game flow (not the minigames) confused or slowed you down? Which ones?
- Do you feel like the dynamic between you two changed during the game? And how?
- Any final questions, comments, or concerns?

I acted as the interviewer / observer from 10:00 to 12:00 and conducted 5 tests total

Results

Before Interview Questions

	Main Goal	How well acquainted
Group 1 - Adeline +Yurick	Meet someone and win the game as a competition.	Never met previously
Group 2 -Hirsty +Alex	Were aware of the premise, working together to explore Eindhoven in a fantasy setting	Acquaintances since Sem 1 and are very good friends
Group 3 - Tamer + Fabi	To follow the story / Win something, competition	Acquaintances since Sem 2, currently in group project
Group 4 - Jerryl + Mia	Mia was unsure what to expect, Jerryl fully aware of goal	Never Met previously
Group 5 - Medhat + Petra	-Petra thinks there's a respawn mechanic meaning they could die. -Medhat believes a maze will be involved that they have to solve	Surface level knowledge of each other Coworkers

Observational Notes

	Speaking Manner	Strangers vs Friends Communication	Confused / Hesitated Moments	Natural Communication?	Other Observations
Group 1 - Adeline +Yurick	-Begun very quiet, mostly discovering things on their own. -After the maze minigame they seemed more keen on communicating with each other -Spoke a bit during the voting part, seemed invested towards the end	-Strangers. They seemed awkward at first, but after the second minigame with the maze they seemed more comfortable communicating	-Unsure how to talk to NPC's -Yurick seemed bored during dialogue, scribbling while NPC's would talk -Unsure how to communicate with each other	-Forced talking at the start, minigame helped eased tension	-The maze puzzle was a catalyst, however the lockpick puzzle was focused on one player which made conversing difficult

			-Did not like that NPC's were locked per player. -Asked and wanted to vote separately		
Group 2 -Hirsty +Alex	-Playful and friendly -Some slightly heated moments, however since they were close it was played for laughs -Clear and quick to the point	Friends. -Communication was clear and succinct when giving directions, which I interpret as a good thing since they know each other well Discussion for voting was more vibrant.	-Were informed ahead of time only one could talk to an NPC before locked. Were still confused	Natural communication from the start, no change	-Mentioned it was similar to DND -Asked for reward for helping -Lockpick game was confusing for them.
Group 3 - Tamer + Fabi	Playful and friendly Clearest communication and were the fastest duo to complete the game.	Friends Communicated clearly with each other and were playful. Tamer played a bit aggressively but overall had a fun time and talked with each other well.	-Fabi did not know what WASD meant -Unsure if working together or separate	Natural communication from the start, no change	-Tamer was impatient while pressing buttons and playing the game
Group 4 - Jerryl + Mia	Very little communication	Strangers, no communication change through game and did not speak much	-Lockpicking minigame was unclear to when you beat it -'Counterclockwise' was a term that needed to be explained	No communication / Very little communication whole time	-Confused at the concept initially but got it after a while. May be due to limits of paper prototype

					-Mia was very disinterested the whole time, save for the maze minigame -Need to plan for if a player goes inactive, since Mia left Jerryl to talk to most NPC's
Group 5 - Medhat + Petra	-Playful and interested the entire time, were very interested and testing every part of the prototype while discussing with each other. Seemed forced at first, but towards the end their communication seemed more genuine.	Coworkers / Surface level knowledge of the other Both extroverted and were constantly discussing and explaining.	Unsure how to talk with each other at first Waiting for the other player was frustrating at times for them Thought the choice for vote was not well thought out Having them go separately sped up the process and gave them more to discuss at the end Indicators for directions were unclear at first	Natural communication towards the middle. Seemed forced at first before turning to genuine interest.	Second minigame was much clearer for them then lockpicking Another DND comparison

After Interview Questions

	Game experience	Overall slowed gameplay moments	Changed dynamic	Other comments
Group 1 - Adeline +Yurick	-Fun minigames -Unsure how meeting in game worked but understood as time passed.	-Were confused on talking to NPC's adn didn't like only one person could communicate per NPC	-Easier to speak to each other towards the end, and felt communicatio n was improved	-Assigning an NPC per player could smooth the process
Group 2 -Hirsty +Alex	-Game felt cool -Lots of loading -Fun game, good prototype	-Talking to the guard slowed them, since they didn't realize both needed to talk to the guard -Too much 'loading' while waiting for the other player	- No change in communicatio n	N/A
Group 3 - Tamer + Fabi	-Interacticve, especially with minigames -Story fun, but could be better developed, though they see the potential	-Confused on going through the areas -WASD was not clear to Fabi who is not a gamer -Character's give good context but talk too much	-During the maze communicatio n improved. -They felt more in sync the more time passed and they talked in game	-Fabi's view on winning changed at the end and she had fun cooperating
Group 4 - Jerryl + Mia	-Confusing at first, made sense after a while -Lockpick minigame was difficult, not enough information provided -Gave 'old ass rpg' vibes	-Gameplay feels slow -Did no like waiting for each other -Loading screens were annoying	-Short gameplay they felt was not enough to change their dynamic	-Digital aspects will help convey the concept better -Minigames were fun, maze was clear

Group 5 - Medhat + Petra	-Fun and immediately pulls you in -Should have simplistic interactions other then just talking to NPC -The traitor choice was too simple	-Confused when they had to wait at the gate -Confusion on how to communicate with the other player	-At first they played separately but converged in the end -Minigames were essential to starting communication	-What is the main goal of the game? -Needs surface level 'get to know you' questions to better acquaint players -Enjoyable overall