

Snowflake

Report on evaluation of game's scenarios and teaching notes

Description of group of testing people

Group consisted of 17 participants: 14 male and 3 females. They are all currently working in various positions from consultants to managers of departments and companies. Two people are experts on simulations, as they work for CESIM business simulation company in Lithuania.

Date and place of testing

Test was performed at ISM University of management and economics on January the 30th, 2014. All participants came with their laptops and were assigned to groups of 3 people. Thus we had 5 groups of 3 and 1 group of 2 participants. Project and simulation environment was introduced. Each group received a simulation scenario printout as well as login instructions. All members of the group would login with same login to ensure that they all have access to same information.

Results of survey

The participants of the pilot testing of the game filled in the game evaluation survey form. The survey consisted of 15 questions with comments and recommendations.

The chart below depicts the results of the carried out game evaluation survey.



The analysis of the survey results disclosed the general positive acceptance of the game. The participants liked the interface of the game (12 participants) and clear functions of the game, the strong analytical approach of the game and its engaging content (13 participants). They also thought that the story behind the game was relevant (8 participants) and catching, and that it was a perfect occasion to try something new for those participants who had already been involved in the simulation games either like amateurs or even professionals (5 participants). Meanwhile there were some critical comments related to the duration of the game (3 participants), 2 participants expressed their wish to have more reference material, and for 2 participants the structure of the game was not clear.

Additionally, based on the questions of the survey and its results and further discussions, the following ideas for further improvement of the simulation game were identified:

- (a) Decision summary screen is needed, to ensure that game participants can double - check if all necessary decisions have been made.
- (b) More information about competitors is needed (their pricing for each product in each region, product features, advertising, and salaries).
- (c) While developing new products, new products should be named differently in an automatic way because now system creates identically named products with same features.
- (d) Advertising should be allocated according to the regions.
- (e) Option for market surveys should be provided.
- (f) Better features for multiple concurrent logins by the same teammates should be provided. For example, currently it is impossible to provide the same role to multiple people.
- (g) Better financial reports that would allow easier comparison between periods are needed.
- (h) More detailed financing options would be preferable because the cost of financing is not clear.
- (i) More feedback would be appreciated on consequences of options selected by participants. For example, the selection of the ridiculous price per refrigerator let us say 110000 should produce a warning.
- (j) ANY description of onscreen elements is much needed. It is completely unclear what some of the headings mean, and there is no in-game help provided.
- (k) More information about advertising efficiency is needed.
- (l) It is unclear how large sales offices should be. For example, while selecting an option to open a sales office, no one knows how many salespeople would fit there.
- (m) More fine - grained representation of the market is needed. Russia is not only Moscow. More cities would be appropriate.
- (n) No information about market segment willingness to pay or size (absolute size) is provided.
- (o) No forecasting information is given. For example, information about the market expansion or contraction and its scope.

How the survey results were implemented into the final version of scenario

Taking into consideration the results of the survey of the pilot testing of the game and the general comments of the participants which have been listed above (a-o), the *Snowflake* strategic simulation game development team came to the conclusion that some of the remarks (a-j) were not within the scope of the team capabilities and were related to the upgrading of the simulation game platform in particular.



UNIVERSITY OF MANAGEMENT
AND ECONOMICS



As for remark (k) – *more information about advertising efficiency is needed* - the changes have been made in game scenario by including promotion impact factors to the customer groups. With regards to the remark (l) - *it is unclear how large sales offices should be, for example, while selecting an option to open a sales office, no one knows how many salespeople would fit there* - the more exact information on the number of sales people per one sales office has been given in the game scenario. The single location of Moscow in case of Russia, which has been mentioned in remark (m) - *more fine-grained representation of the market is needed* - Russia is not only Moscow - more cities would be appropriate has been chosen for the reason of simplicity; meanwhile the master of the game can choose any preferred location. Reacting to the remark (n) - *no information about market segment willingness to pay or size (absolute size) is provided* - the team came to the conclusion that practically it is impossible to define the absolute size of each location market because the majority of the market share is taken by the main giant manufacturers; though in the scenario the players will find the whole necessary information about target groups of customers and their main attributes. The simulation game team decided to react to the remark (o) - *no forecasting information is given, for example, information about the market expansion or contraction and its scope* - by introducing the information in the game scenario that market growth will be stimulated if the customer needs are satisfied within the scope of 5 to 10 per cent.