# Blackbox testing of Creature Game – Feedback form version 1

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Date: (DD/MM/YY)** | **Your Age: (Tick Box)**   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | 16 & under |  | Over 16 | / | | **Played Before: (Tick Box)**   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Yes |  | No | / | |
| **Scope**  To be played by school children  The game simulates looking into a microscope and watching the lives of creatures. The sole purpose of the creatures is to reach a target. They age, move, feed, can give birth and die.  The object of the game is to keep one of the creatures (the red one) alive the longest. During the game you are expected to think about how the behavior of the creatures change as time goes by. You can move the target that the creatures will follow and place food for them. Using these two abilities can you keep the red creature alive longest? There is also an ethical element to this game. While you are trying to keep your creature alive you are killing / starving other creatures. Is this ethical considering that the creatures kill each other.  How do the creatures kill each other?  Does the environment change how these creatures behave?  Can you work out the simple rules that the creatures use?  **Teachers**  The game is provided to aid learning about how simple rules applied to something can become complex and unpredictable. The ethical aspect is that creatures kill themselves and others through their own behavior. If these creatures are killing themselves is it right of us to kill them. Can it be demonstrated that as people we can change their environment to help them? What are the consequences of helping them? What are the consequences of favoring one creature over another and exploiting their own behavior? Can we demonstrate simple rules have complex and unintended outcomes? | | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Questions** | **Scale 1 to 5**  **1 = agree**  **5 = disagree** |
| You can understand the purpose of the game. | N/A |
| You found learning how to play easy. | 4 |
| The game controls were intuitive. | 2 |
| The visuals were good. | 5 |
| The game was fun. | 2 |
| You want to play again. | 4 |
| If you played it a 2nd time you would not need to know what the controls were or how to play because it was easy to remember everything you needed to know. |  |
| All aspects of the game worked. | 5 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Comments / What’s wrong or missing within the game. Does it work as expected or as stated?** | |
| The game worked as expected. | |
| **Aspect of the game** | **Missing / Faulty / Bad** |
| Controls Mouse Buttons | Missing |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Comments** |
| You can understand the purpose of the game.  I had this explained to me directly, so I applied a N/A flag to this question. Though the organism’s idea is clear from the design choices made for the game. |
| You found learning how to play easy.  The comments on the side of the Scratch window detailing the controls are very helpful. |
| The game controls were intuitive.  The controls are not intuitive. Adding mouse controls / buttons to the side of the window could be useful rather than using keyboard shortcuts. |
| The visuals were good.  The visuals work for the microscope idea. The design is good and it is easy to spot things that are happening on screen e.g. microorganism not having enough food. |
| The game was fun.  The game seems more like a learning tool than one to derive enjoyment from, though it was amusing at times seeing how the AI behaved when many others were around (blocked in etc). |
| You want to play again.  It will be interesting to see how it develops when moving beyond Scratch. |