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Introduction

**Suggested word-length: 150**

In this section you introduce your subject matter and identify why you have decided to cover this game. You also outline the structure of the rest of the document.

Questions to consider answering in this section:

* What system or systems was the game originally released for?
* When was it originally released?
* What price point was it released at?
* What was its target market as identified by the publisher?
* What kind of game is it?
* Is it unique within its genre? Or did it enter a crowded genre?
* What makes it worth analysis?
* How many players does this game support?

Critical Analysis

**Suggested word-length: 1200 (including all sub-sections)**

In this section you will analyse the game you have chosen in a structured fashion. Remember, analysis is not a game review, and it also **should not be based on your personal opinion**. You should be using the literature, research and work of other designers to inform your analysis.

Gameplay

**Suggested word-length: 700**

In this sub-section, identify how the mechanics come together and interact to create gameplay. If there are elements of meaningful play or ways in which the implementation or design of some mechanics mean they do not work together in the way in which they were designed to, this can be identified here. References in this section could be identifying other games where similar mechanics have come together to form gameplay, identifying alternative ways in which mechanics could have been combined, or identifying alternative gameplay that could have been taken advantage of but has not been.

* 1. Analysis

**Suggested word-length: 500**

In this sub-section, you are looking to critically analyse the gameplay and mechanics that you have now identified and gone into depth on. You can identify alternatives to this game, or things that make this game unique (maybe it has combined a series of mechanics to create some gameplay that no other game has?). You can also analyse the way in which the game has been designed. Could it have been done better, and if so how? Which principles does it follow well from the literature? Which does it not follow? If it does not follow them all, can you identify why it has not? It may be suitable to express some opinions within this section – but mark them clearly within the text as being so, keep them to a minimum, and back them up. E.g. “Miyazaki (1999) did not attempt to link together the player mechanics of hiding and combat (see section 2.1) to create an alternative way for the player to engage in combat gameplay. In the opinion of the author, this would have been a worthwhile addition to the game, as Gumbridge (1994) states that providing multiple alternatives to players enhances engagement”.

Conclusion

**Suggested word-length: 150**

In this section you should conclude your analysis, summing up the various aspects of the game that you have covered. You can also use this section to make any final comparisons or statements on the game overall that you may wish to make considering the critical analysis that has been performed.

# References

**References do not count towards your word-limit.**

You can create your references by hand, following the documentation available on the Universities library website. Alternatively, you could use Endnote, MS-Word’s built in reference manager (although it is important to note that this is per-document), or an alternative solution such as Mendeley or Zotero.

Anything can be referenced, including conversations (Kellagher, 2010), magazines, computer games, films. But not all references are created equal. Proper academic references would be from peer reviewed publications such as journal papers (Bayer and Finkel, 2004), reference textbooks (Masters, 1993), conference publications (Baker, 1987) and PhD or MSc theses (Woodward, 2012). I You must include at least ten academic references. You may include as many references as you wish. It is also possible to include references in the following format, when you wish to refer to the author more explicitly in text: “Minsky and Papert (1969) invented the first mathematical model for an artificial neuron, although this model had no capacity for learning.“.

Some additional random references to increase the size of the references list (Ashley et al., 2008; Bayes and Price, 1763; Coello, 2005; Fonseca and Cabral, 2017; Geman and Geman, 1984; Wood and Su, 2017; Woodward et al., 2013b, 2013a).

Your references section should include none of this explanatory text, just a section similar to the following:
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