

1. Paper Prototype



Personal Geography Map

My first prototype was a a daily map for the user to document their personal experience of New York City. It included a a map of the 5 boroughs, spaces for taking general notes in the morning afternoon and evening, and color coded tabs for marking the users emotions for a given location on the map. The intention was that between marking the map and taking notes throughout the day, the user would be able to witness how the geography of the city affects them.

While this was a one off prototype, I would have like to have made multiples allowing several people to use the map. I think it could be a great tool for sparking conversation based on how peoples experi- ences of differnet location would differ.



2. Interactive Prototype

Collaboration with Shakti and Dana

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 various iterations/rule sets we developed.

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.

ver 3:

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.

Whoever's alibi matches best picks up pile.

New scenario card is drawn.

Player to get all of the alibi cards wins.

3. Final Prototype

Coffee House Cahoots! – Collaboration with Ben.



For this project, we wanted to create a game that forced users to challenge preconceived assumptions and give players the choice to play “offensively or defensively”. Our game went through many iterations, shifting both conceptually and mechanically. Originally our goal of challenging assumptions was presented most heavily in the concept of the game, but as we user tested and modified rules, we reached our current iteration with a more casual and fun theme, where the mechanic deals strongly with challenging assumptions and how your choices impact others.

Our final game is called “Coffee House Cahoots”. The cards represent characteristics and traits of potential suspects in an irresponsible wi-fi misuse scandal at the neighborhood coffee shop. The mechanics of the game act as an analog to the conversation and interrogation of the suspects trying to solve the case. The two piles in the game, represent different aspects of their conversation. There is a safe pile for the argument, “well it couldn’t be because I am a ...” and another pile for steering the conversation to focus on specific traits- “It appears the suspect was a ...”.

The core mechanic of “Coffee Cahoots” is in how the player decides to play their turn. There are two piles, one for general game play and another for restricting which cards can be played. By giving the player the choice of these two piles, we are giving them the choice to focus on themselves or hindering other players.

Play testing at the Point was an insightful part of this process. The only element of our game that has extended across all of our iterations has been the personality traits on the cards. Users really seemed to have fun with the characteristics on the card, but the way in which the characteristics were functioning in the game created for long turns and game play overall.

Our previous iterations involved using the traits to generate crime scenarios and direct small “interrogations” between players within the game, but we ultimately found that players responded to and had the most fun with faster game play. With our final version, the characteristics on the cards serve as a way to tie the mechanics of the game play to concept and backstory of our game.

RULES:

Coffee House Cahoots!

There is an investigation underway at a local coffeehouse for irresponsible use of the shops wi-fi. Coffee Cahoots is the conversation between the patrons trying to solve this mystery.

The Deck-

The deck is similar to a standard deck of playing cards, with each card containing a suit and a trait. The suits and traits are as follows-

'Suits'- Chai Guy Decaf Deceptor Java Joe Latte Loafer Tea Toter Rocco Cocoa	'Traits/value'- 1 - WWE Fanatic 2 - Musician 3 - Gamer 4 - Film Nut 5 - Writer 6 - Politically Active 7 - Cyclist 8 - Reader 9 - Programmer 10 - Philosophy Major 'Suits'- Chai Guy Decaf Deceptor Java Joe
--	---

Goal - Be the first player to get rid of their entire hand

Starting the Game

Each player is dealt a hand of seven cards. After this, two cards are placed face up on the table. One is the Main pile, the other is the Veto card. Dealer goes first.

Matches:

By Suit - like-suited cards can be combo'd (A WWE Fanatic Chai Guy can be placed on a Writer Chai Guy)

By Traits/ Value - like-valued cards can be combo'd (WWE Fanatic Roco Cocoa can be placed on WWE fanatic Java Joe)

By Straight - consecutive values can be combo'd (Gamer(3) Tea Toter can be placed on Musician(2) Chai Guy or Film Nut(4) Latte Loafer)

Combo Matches - A Value or Straight match may be extended if more valid cards are available. For instance, if the main pile has Gamer(3) and you match a Film Nut(4) to it, you may also play a Writer(5) of any suit in your hand, and then potentially 6, etc.

Likewise, if you match a 4 on the main deck with one from your hand, you may play any other 4s you are holding.

Veto:

The current veto card blocks certain matches from occurring, based on its suit and value. For instance, if the current veto is Philosophy Major Tea Toter:

No cards with Philosophy Major can be played

No cards with Tea Toter can be played

The exception to this rule is combo match cards after the first move. For instance, if the current combo is Gamer(3) Tea Toter and the veto is Writer(5) Latte Loafer, you could play a 4,5,6 combo.

Playing the Game

Players can do 1 of 3 actions on their turn:

Place a valid match onto the main pile.

Swap the current veto with a valid match (you take the old veto into your hand)

Draw a card

Ending the Game

Play continues until a player deals out their entire hand, at which point they win. If there are more than 2 players, play may continue until only one player remains with a hand.