

The following excerpts are pulled from my midterms exam discussion, as well as some commentary between MVPS

A note on communities of practice;

As it turns out, it is exceptionally easy to embed flutter applications within existing HTML websites. Namely by using an IFrame. Wordpress - for example - has its own tutorial on how to do exactly this.

Knowing this, I've put more thought into whether my application should be a platform or a tool. It was originally envisioned as a platform (offering its own blog, etc). However, this would require a lot of expert curation. On the other hand, there are existing resources that offer the same learning opportunities. As such, I believe it would be ideal for my application to be an embeddable tool.

I could then create my own website/blog that also embeds the game, phone apps that consist of *just* the game (or perhaps a blog). In this way, members of the COP may use my application as supplemental material for their own content while not having to borrow or depend on the blog/info-sheet features. I would reach more users this way, while still being able to offer my own blog in the future.

Additionally, this direction separates concerns and enables re-use throughout the community. It is more in-line with Domain-Driven-Design, and Object Oriented principles. In short, users should not *need* my proposed blog to enjoy the game with other tools.

For example, if miniclip wanted to embed my game as it was originally proposed, they would need to suffer including my side-blog features.

Mouse Pointers and familiarity; deviating from standards. (This is more relating to previous classes with Tim)

I can't really see a place for unique pointers, as mobile users would not benefit from it. Further, changing the pointer would deviate from the user's familiarity. The most I would do is change the color or arrow - but retain the familiar arrow shape. A "net" is hard to see what your pointer is pointing at. Is it the tip of the net? The middle? The end of the stick? From my experience, I have never enjoyed a fancy pointer because most times it just makes clicking confusing. With oddly-shaped pointer, you think your pointer is on a button, but its not.

Product Quality & Change Stewardship **Change management**

I realise I've spoken a lot about Kaila's question, but find that it touches on these topics quite strongly, and that many of their points go hand-in-hand. In the case of change management, making my tool widely available should encourage existing platforms to grow and benefit from my novel addition - that is, if it is an attractive addition. Being an embedded tool means that a platform is not making too much change, but also provides a fun new experience. In this way, my tool should support change in existing groups while not causing platform-wide disarray. In addition to helping other platforms change, my tool too can change by observing its hosts and reinforcing existing concepts or making corrective actions if it is deemed popular

amongst poorly fact-checked resources. In this case, a change management team would observe what areas of our tool needs to change in order to be sought after by reliable sources. From here, we would perform an after-action review to see if our changes have actually shifted us onto desired platforms and proceed iteratively from there to slowly inch towards our ideal hosts. I believe making my tool embeddable would provide a large amount of necessary feedback which I could then benefit from in my change management plans and action. It would allow for a large amount of diagnostics.

Supporting Learning & Collaboration with Gamification

I think it probably goes without saying given my project that I am a huge proponent of gamification. For my project, the crux of my argument was that too many information sites fail to accurately gamify their content for children. Most web-based learning games are single-player; most are disconnected from heaps of additional reading material; most do not have an addictive loop or elicit emotional activation (what use is a game if it doesn't fire off dopamine?); most do not foster "10000 hours of collaboration", fun with strangers, or meaningful rewards. In short, learning games are meant to be the gamification of teaching - they're meant to make learning fun but often fail to do so.

On the topic of gamification, I discussed making trivia available manually, making it easily accessible. This brings on its own concerns, as I need to work out a way to display that library of information but in a gamified way. I said earlier that most game are separated from heaps of dry, boring reading material. How can I avoid the same in my trivia information center? There are a few options. We could tie trivia into a collectible achievement system. In this way, trivia is hidden until it is first happened upon in gameplay. So you would start with a library of ??? rows. As a user plays the game and receives trivia popups, they would simultaneously be awarded an achievement. These achievements would reveal themselves with a fun name or pun, and make the facts accessible on a whim; changing from ??? to actual content and the title/pun. This might also be an effective way for teachers to track a students participation by assigning weekly trivia milestones. I.e; "achieve 10 more trivia milestones by tomorrow". This would not only gamify the library of trivia, but also classroom assignments.

Content & Dis/Information (Re)Design & Strategy

In a digital habitat, content must be findable, discoverable and accessible. This is explained in slides 8 and 9. As trivia popups, my content is discoverable and partially accessible. However, I do not believe it is findable in its current state. Trivia informs the user and engages them in concepts they may be unfamiliar with. However, it also bars them from reviewing said information. To do so, a user would need to trigger the trivia popup multiple times until it landed. If our list of trivia grew into the thousands or more, it would be an ordeal; such a state would also make content inaccessible, in a way. While not envisioned in my current set of MVPs, a hub for trivia should exist in my game - an area for users to search trivia they recall or want more information on. Results should provide the trivia, and perhaps expand on the snippet of information (paragraphs, link to resources, citations, etc). So, my content strategy would be to

attract attention with the game, foster curiosity with trivia and provide an area to access specific units of knowledge on a whim. If a user was so inclined, they could peruse all of the trivia on their own. This enables individuals to learn at their own pace; it does not overwhelm, but also won't limit as much. As I said in early documents, my tool should encourage youth to seek out further information that my tool neglects to provide or expand on in detail. One difficulty I see in this is that excessive amounts of information would likely take away from the material a hosting platform wishes to present. A user shouldn't spend **all** their time on my game, and I wouldn't want my content to distract too much. My trivia should plant seeds for further inquiry, not answer everything.

Sharing Community Anchors & Collaborative Production

While my tool cannot be edited, I see no reason why I shouldn't make it available on other platforms. If my tool is available to anyone interested, it is therefore available to both genuine and disingenuous. Ideally, my tool would be widely adopted by reliable sources. Now, malicious platforms could use my game to attract audiences; but if said game is more popular with reliable sources, users have a far greater chance of congregating *there* instead of anywhere with unreliable information. You might ask "how can you be sure it will be used by reliable sources", and the answer is easy; I can't be sure. However, we could observe where my game is trending; what platforms players most often frequent to access it. If my game and the information it presents is overwhelmingly popular amongst "fake news" outlets, it only means that I need to reevaluate the way I present knowledge. What am I disclosing that is so attractive to the dishonest or less informed? This feedback would prompt changes to encourage reception from reliable sources. If I were to segregate my tool into its own platform, I would have far less outreach. Furthermore, I would receive less feedback about my tool and the knowledge it presents - which means I would be incorrectly informing children/students. In short, making my tool embeddable should provide me with the feedback I need to tailor my system for my target audience, and appropriately inform the youth. If it is used by the reliable, it is likely reliable itself. This is not to say that it **is** reliable, only that it is a positive indicator.