Proof of concept / high fidelity prototype on understanding another's POV, or experiencing a story / event from multiple perspectives
[Dana Avesar, Alex Dinsmore, Shakti Mb]

Our goal for this project was to come up with a game that would facilitate understanding of each other's points of view and give the other person "the benefit of the doubt" when it comes to accusatory situations. It takes the form of a card game that relies on role-playing. This prototype went through many iterations that began as a purely roleplaying experience to a BS based version, to an Apples to Apples version. The last iteration went as follows:

Players pick up a scenario card such as "someone stole the cookies from the cookie jar". Each player has three Alibi cards with one word on them. They must invent a story for why they were not guilty in the scenario by using all three words on their Alibi cards to generate the best defense. The winner is the person that comes up with the best Alibi. There were two variations that we tested of this iteration. In the first version,players defended themselves by creating their own alibi cards. In the second version, the players would pass three alibi cards of their choice to the player on their right, who would then act as their "attorney" by interpreting the words to form a defense.

Below are the rule sets and notes for our previous iterations.

BS version

ver 1:
1 accuser 1 accused-

Players: A and B

A is accused B is investigator

A has alibi cards (list of reasons they couldn't have eaten the cookies)

B has to ask the right kind of questions for A to put Alibi cards on table

B wins round if all cards are revealed within allotted time.

New scenario switch roles.

ver2:
both players are accusing each other of same crime

Each player has a set of alibi cards.

Players take turns asking one another questions. If question matches up with alibi, player puts it down on a table.

Whoever gets the other player to reveal all of their cards first wins.

APPLES TO APPLES version

All players are accused.

All players are given a set of alibi cards

Scenario card is put on table.

Players match the scenario with their best fitting alibi card.

Whoevers alibi matches best picks up pile.

New scenario card is drawn.
Player to get all of the alibi cards wins.

-

INITIAL GAME IDEAS (inspired by prisoners dilemma)
ver 1
Players: A & B
Someone stole cookies from the cookie jar.

A is guilty. B doesn't know if A is guilty or no, has to come up with reasons with A is not guilty.

Information for A:
You stole cookies from the cookie jar. You can choose to be guilty or not guilty. At the end of the conversation, you must convince B of whatever you choose to be. Co-operating with each other will provide a reward.

Information for B:
Someone stole cookies from the cookie jar. At the end of the conversation with A, you must reason why A is not-guilty.

B has to prove A not-guilty.

A is guilty but can choose to be guilty or not-guilty (without a punishment), but has to make sure that what he chooses is same as B. A is unaware that B has to prove "A" not-guilty.

Co-operating with each other will provide a reward.

For B: forces B to give A the benefit of doubt

For A: has to co-operate with B and get B to see what they want them to see.

What is the scenario?
Should the players be given an objective goal to arrive at?
        "A is innocent because of so-and-so reasons"
        "A is innocent because of 3 reasons" (specific limit)
No time limit
Prompt cards for conversation

****
Possible Scenarios
Dishes in sink, riding a bike on the sidewalk, getting caught with paint on you, shoplifting.

****

ver 2
Players: A & B
There are dishes in the sink.

A is guilty. B has to prove A not guilty.

Information for A:
You stole cookies from the cookie jar. You can choose to be guilty or not guilty. At the end of the conversation, you must convince B of whatever you choose to be. Co-operating with each other will provide a reward.

Information for B:
Someone stole cookies from the cookie jar. At the end of the conversation with A, you must reason why A is not-guilty.

B has to prove A not-guilty.

A is guilty but can choose to be guilty or not-guilty (without a punishment), but has to make sure that what he chooses is same as B. A is unaware that B has to prove "A" not-guilty.

Co-operating with each other will provide a reward.

For B: forces B to give A the benefit of doubt

For A: has to co-operate with B and get B to see what they want them to see.

What is the scenario?
Should the players be given an objective goal to arrive at?
        "A is innocent because of so-and-so reasons"
        "A is innocent because of 3 reasons" (specific limit)
No time limit
Prompt cards for conversation

****

When you have to cooperate with someone what comes of it?

Game goal:
Come up with reasons to empathize with your partner. Accuser gives a list of reasons why they are going to give the accused the benefit of doubt.

Game play
    1. Scenario card is drawn (Elaborate scenario card)

2. coin flipped to determine role of each player (i.e accuser/accused)
3. players draw 3 cards each from personality traits pile for traits to embody
4. Pick out cards from the "prompt deck" to guide gameplay
5. After "prompt pile" is finished, players list reasons to give each other the benefit of the doubt.

A/B Tests

1. Should players be given a larger backstory before drawing cards outs?

Based on feedback:

1. Provide more information in the scenario cards. Behind the scenario cards… provide more questions for the police?
2. The personality traits - pick up only one card? (get more weird with personality card)
3. Inform them that the suspect could be guilty or not.

Who stole the cookies from the cookies jar edition

1. Scenario card is pulled
2. Coin flipped to determine role of each player (accuser/accused)
3. Players pull cards from personality traits pile
4. The accused states their defense/alibi/back-story
5. Accuser pulls through prompt cards to guide conversation-accused answers accordingly
6. Accuser lists three reasons for empathizing with accused/why they couldn't have done it/what they should do next time they want a cooke.

<u>Inspiration</u>
Game theory is a mathematical approach to studying decision making that can help explain and address social problems. It tends to focus, most often, on the choice between competition and cooperation. Since games often reflect or share characteristics with real situations -- especially competitive or cooperative situations -- they can suggest strategies for dealing with such circumstances.

Some games, like some real situations are "winner-take-all." These games are by their nature very competitive, as only one person can win. (Chess would be an example of such a game.) Other games, however, require cooperation to win.

<u>Gameplay</u>
1. The scenario sheet is pulled and read out to both players, Strawberry and Ted.
2. Strawberry and Ted are individually given a sheet of paper describing their roles and goals (listed below). They are additionally given two "decision cards" for the end of the game.
3. Once they are ready, they can have a conversation.
4. At the end of the conversation, both will be asked to draw one decision card from two cards they were given. Based on the decision card put down by both, winner is revealed.

<u>Scenario</u>
Someone left the dirty dishes in the sink. Ted says he saw a small figure (a figure that looks like strawberry) in the kitchen.

<u>Info for Strawberry</u>
It wasn't you who left the dishes in the sink. Figure out the details of the story to prove that Ted is lying.

TWIST: Regardless of whether you prove ted is lying, if both of you can come to decide the same story, both of you win.

Ted has been given a task, and if he can prove that, he wins.
Decision cards for Strawberry: "co-operate" and "ted is lying"

<u>Info for Ted</u>
You are not lying about seeing a small figure (that looks like Strawberry). Figure out the details of the story to prove that Strawberry is lying.

TWIST: Regardless of whether you prove that Strawberry is guilty, if both of you can come decide the same thing, both of you win.

Strawberry has been given a task, and if she can prove that, she wins.
Decision cards for Ted: "co-operate" and "Strawberry is guilty"

****
Theory: SB is not guilty, and Ted is not lying. So they will be forced to co-operate?

WINNER OUTCOMES

Strawbery	Co-operate
Ted	Guilty
Winner	**Strawberry**

Ted	Co-operate
Strawbery	Guilty
Winner	**Ted**

Ted	Co-operate
Strawbery	Co-operate
Winner	**Both**

Ted	Lying
Strawbery	Guilty
Winner	**Nobody**