

Computer Graphics 2019: An iterative design process: Case of grand theft auto - Cagri Baris Kasap - Turkey

Cagri Baris Kasap

Turkey

While on one level Rockstar Games's grand larceny Auto series (GTA) is all kitschy, gratuitous violence for entertainment purposes, it's also a masterpiece of interactive design. Arguably, it presents one among the foremost sophisticated developments in commercial video gaming to render a highly traversable urban space, one during which a player performs actions with an incredible degree of freedom and unscripted spontaneity. This accounts for its wild popularity within the gaming market. The best-selling computer game in America in 2001, GTA I's success was usurped only by the discharge of the game's next evolution, grand larceny Auto: Vice City, which became the year's bestseller in 2002. With the October 2004 release of grand larceny Auto: San Andreas, likely the foremost anticipated game of the year, Rockstar has once more set the gaming world on fire with its latest sprawling work of twisted genius. Since its first version released in 1997, grand larceny Auto as a game that fulfills the standards of being an 'action-adventure', 'driving', 'role-playing', 'stealth' and 'racing' game, all directly, had skilled several (seven) version diversions. During this paper, we'll attempt to map the similarities and differences between each version. Video games are one of the most culturally important forms of computer software today. At present, however, Human-Computer Interaction (HCI) research has been limited in its consideration of them. The central reason for this is often that video games differ substantially from the normal focus of HCI: players do not "use" video games, they play them. During a very real sense, the "task" in video gameplay is the learning and exploration of the interface itself. During this paper, we present a study of grand larceny Auto: San Andreas (Rockstar Games, 2004), the newest installment within the infamous action-adventure series. We focus on qualitative data collected from both observation sessions and interviews with players of the game. An important theme in our data analysis has been players' interest in playing specifically with the user interface of the game, as against traditional views of gameplay as that specializes in game worlds or narratives. We present an analysis of this form of playing with the control system and interactive possibilities as an example of how an HCI approach to video games could be conducted.

The data presented during this paper are the players' experiences and interpretations of the play. We recruited five experienced and typical players. Each played grand larceny Auto: San Andreas for an hour while "thinking aloud." After the observation sessions, we interviewed each player for an extra forty minutes. The two approaches are complementary, with the observations providing a view of actual gameplay and therefore the interviews presenting a more reflective account of the experience. The audio from the think-aloud process and therefore the interviews were transcribed. Our analysis of the data from Grand Theft Auto: San Andreas uncovered several thematic areas concerning the activity of "playing the interface," which we'll discuss here. The key concept running throughout is that playing the interface is an important part of the gameplay, and isn't a specialist activity in the least. Altogether cases we support our discussion with the words of the players themselves. A key aim of the play is to experience everything in terms of the interface. Playing the interface might mean exploring the varied possibilities in the appearance of the avatar: "I've known tons of

individuals to spend a significant amount of time building up their character's attributes. Spending ages dressing themselves up and stuff." it'd mean understanding the chances represented by the vehicles within the game: "[This truck is] not particularly entertaining to play with, unless you've got a little enclosed area during which to play with it. Cities are good places for these [trucks], off-road is not". Playing the interface means understanding not just the available operations, but the chances for activity within the constraints of the interface. a stimulating element of this type of play is that it results in a fragmented-looking experience, though the players themselves don't necessarily experience this. Because there are constantly new interactive opportunities presented (a car to steal, a house to burgle), players shift focus often, sometimes choosing new goals every minute: One motivational refrain for players concerned the more structural elements of the sport, the narrative: "I wanted to understand what would happen, what would come next, what that they had future on behalf of me then. Then I wanted to try to to the mission". More important than this, though, was the drive for players to know the "meaning" of each possible action: "if I even have the choice of shopping for a house then I can purchase a house. Because I do not know what buying that home is getting to mean on behalf of me after I've bought it". The drive of twiddling with the interface was always to "see what happens," as we also saw within the previous section. The ultimate area of playing the interface we wish to deal with concerns the experience a player has in playing this manner, and therefore the general outcomes of that sort of play. We've already seen the broad outcomes, such as a feeling of "true" completion of the sport, as an example, but there are smaller-scale outcomes also.