# Blackbox testing of Creature Game – Feedback form version 1

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Date: (DD/MM/YY)**  **21/02/20** | **Your Age: (Tick Box)**   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | 16 & under |  | Over 16 | X | | **Played Before: (Tick Box)**   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Yes |  | No | X | |
| **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. | 1 |
| You found learning how to play easy. | 4 |
| The game controls were intuitive. | 3 |
| The visuals were good. | 2 |
| The game was fun. | 3 |
| You want to play again. | 2 |
| 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. | 4 |
| All aspects of the game worked. | 2 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Comments / What’s wrong or missing within the game. Does it work as expected or as stated?** | |
|  | |
| **Aspect of the game** | **Missing / Faulty / Bad** |
| Mouse click for food had a small delay, intentional? | Faulty? |
| Unsure what red arrow signified. | Bad |
| Instruction window to small. | Bad |
| Unclear as to the impact of Healthier/Poorer attribute | Bad |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Comments** |
| An interesting concept, and overall an enjoyable experience, although it took me a few restarts to get my head around and fully appreciate it. I personally preferred to just sit back observe, with a few interactions now and again to see the outcome.  I found myself scrolling up and down to refresh myself of the keys quite often, instead of playing the game. This was due partly to the small navigable window, and wanting to dive straight into the game.  Some of the features where a little unclear to me, for instance, I could not see a noticeably improved/decline in health very well.  As learning tool, it hits the mark. I think further development geared towards simulation would be best as I think school children may will get bored/give up pretty quickly.  Sound effects were good/appropriate, the visuals were also good, although could maybe be improved by adding more specific colours for certain actions/events. |