

Blake's Paper

Blake Buckingham
11/10/2015

Assignment Week 5

Thinking Strategies: TCH115

Thinking as a whole process is a skill that needs to be constantly evolved and exercised. In this paper I have three issues facing the game industry, and five thinking strategies that can be applied to problem solving each with their own strength and merits. Lateral thinking the wild child of thinking which applies to breaking patterns and reframing information. Creative thinking which lateral thinking is a spin-off of, this form of thinking is all about innovating on available or unavailable information, turning into something new or placing it into a pattern. Systems thinking which swirls around creative and lateral, it examines the systems as they affect our ideas in whole in and around the ideas we have. Critical thinking which is the tool we use to heavily analyze information, understand information, and challenge the strength and integrity of our information. Finally, we have parallel thinking which is all about focusing our thoughts and actions to occur in separate frames of time, allowing us to approach multiple problems at once and approach thinking in logical distinct steps.

What is the issue here? When we talk of this issue we are talking about at the core missed knowledge, and that ignorance being communicated. Why is this bad? There is an effect from designer to consumer a chain that needs to be preserved for either to be satisfied a clear an open connection must be there. With fans hating designers how can we expect designers to remain customer centered? The consumers want something that they feel they are being cheated out of and the designers are trying to avoid these issues and make better gameplay by adding more content after release something that should be a unanimous win-win. The problem is the question of whether the fans ideas are based in truth and if not what are they based in. Seeking more information about the topic they know little about they go places where they can find more information about these things, obviously seeking something that agrees and causes no cognitive dissonance. When the information is bad that is being delivered to them not only does it hurt them as their support dwindles and they lose faith in the teams making these products. This public opinion is what is reflected back to the actual designers, complaints of things that are being seen as lost. The issue is mainly in the fact at this point it is hard to put stock into what is being said when most of it stems from bad information. If the communication is clear, strong and accurate it allows the feedback that can be helpful based from what is real as opposed to a miscommunication that is likely to encourage the people receiving the feedback to tune out this

content that the view as wrong and useless. Disallowing either party being able to benefit from successful feedback.

If looked at through the ideas of systems thinking we see that the whole flow of communication is off. The communication and transparency that probably should be there is lifted. The chain of communication is off in several ways. First and foremost, there is no communication from the designers to the journalist. The journalist presents a bias that is largely fraud and ignorant of the real processes that occur. On the other end of the spectrum the responsibility of the reporting falls in the hands of the actual reporter. Why is it that direct accounts regularly conflict what is being said by the people who are perceived as knowledgeable of the systems they speak of? The final issue lies in the hands of the people who believe them. Why are you accepting these people as credible sources when something as simple as an occasional quote or reference is not present. With systems thinking we see quite a bit of discrepancies in this information exchange.

Having established some form of understanding through looking at this process as an entire system we see quite a bit of issues that could be addressed. This can be quite simplified though, we don't need to look at the whole system in this case just understand the core of what is happening here. Applying lateral thinking perhaps we can create a few alternatives to what is happening here. We see that the communication is off, but how can we change that. What ways can we improve upon this. The first is the whole reframing of this situation the overlying question being does it even matter. Whether people are wrong or not perceptions have a ton of meaning. If people are having an issue with the final product the legitimacy of that claim still remains is enough coming out? Second, we can approach this head on what are the ways we can improve this communication? Perhaps simply only allowing verified people to comment on these subjects we might see a resurgence of the truth. Maybe these writers need to be allowed into the minds of the people they are talking about. Another option is allowing for a third party to bridge the bad communication between either party. Perhaps a simple fix of holding articles like this to a higher standing allowing peer reviews to allow both parties a chance to input information, and have their ideas and truths exposed on a respectable level. Maybe a simple upvoting or a mandatory comment section to allow other parties to comment as fitting. To spin from this put a rating system on journalist to show their reputation for truly finding the truth as opposed to

presenting bias. Perhaps this should be taken with a grain of salt as the input allows open exchange of how the other side feels.

Lateral thinking shows a general idea that there are more than many approaches to this. We see there is a lot to improve upon which means the system is rather flawed. The main occurring theme is we can't approach this from one side. The systems thinking shows that it is more than one thing that is causing the problem, so we see there are quite a few ways to positively impact it. Now at the core we can just discuss the issue. We see we are flawed but how do we impact this system the most? We see it is more than one party and what is happening is disconnect so the most important thing to do is bring the parties together either through direct contact, transparencies, or continual exchange. The issue being immediate and having a quickly detrimental effect we must hit it at the source of the issue, that being the disconnect. We have to approach this with both sides contributing at the same time, also we need to establish people to be responsible if these rules are broken. Straight to the author and website those responsible for the ideas presented need to be held accountable to actually publish truth, not just one sided opinionated rants.

The issue is simple bad communication, all parties need to understand who is responsible for what parts. If you are keeping methods and practices secrets it is time to open up. With that comes the responsibility of "journalists" to seek the truth. If you avoid this practice of your field your lack of credibility should be announced. Whether it is a private site or not, we need to hold these people accountable. With all these things we don't need to think and establish these understandings as a group we just need uniform understandings of these things. Mostly that the journalism part falls to the journalist but also there is a social requirement for groups to not make information hard to get to.

Going through this we see how each thinking style can and is distinctively involved in the approach of an idea and it can be done with any issue. Taking the cue from that to approach my other two issues Lack of formally trained video game designers and job security we can do the same thing.

Approaching these problems as systems we see them as actually intertwined in the exact same system. How valuable these workers are on one hand and exploring options to making them stand out and valuable. Applying creative thinking we think of new ways for anyone in the

game design field to be trained and retained. Making themselves as valuable as possible through various stages of design. Which alone is not enough we need to creatively to really approach a multitude of issues.

While creative thinking and systems thinking were directly stated critical thinking occurred throughout that entire process and stays as a constant as you approach any form of thinking. This is less present as creative thinking pushes us into a specific piece of creative thinking that being lateral thinking. We find possible approaches to the problem of lack of formally trained game professionals this can come in the form of more comprehensive on the job training which begets hire retention rates for the companies, our other issue. We see the directly focused schools developing such as this once, but more importantly the acceptance of this as a real thing as a societal whole. Lateral thinking on the other side allows us to look at other issue in some other lights. What has happened in other fields to remedy this type of thing. Another thing is realizing that likely time and the growth of the other idea will probably fix this in time itself. Less time will be spent as a learning curve as the employees not only understand their jobs better but the other parties understand what is happening on a more complete level. The education growing will likely mean less of the slight mistakes adding up over time, and the benefit of learning directly about the field as opposed to simply applying similar knowledge and learning on the fly. Now incorporating parallel thinking and bringing up systems thinking again we really see these as not completely unique ideas. If approached as one thing and not adversarial, in terms of not only these problems but thinking methods in general we are able to kill several birds with no stone.

Every one of these strategies is a great piece, a fantastic move, but they are also a part of a single connected arsenal. These are all at our disposal and not only should we use them all, but we should use them all simultaneously. These thought methods just don't improve our lives but the world around us. Each one having its distinctness but like Voltron we find the most value in the synergy of these principles as separate parts. This is why I would not pick one to be more valuable to me. They all provide a great wealth of advantages. I linked both lateral thinking and

parallel thinking to improving brainstorming, which is something I would be doing regularly in my field. Taking one away means weakening my potential for this important facet. Systems thinking is key when it comes to recognizing patterns and it is hard to be creative or go lateral without understanding the systems things fit into whether to break it or add context to it. I can't imagine avoiding creative thinking or else my games would be a 1.5 version of games that are already created, and how could I improve my projects? Critical thinking overshadows all others if I am not able to truthfully and fully gather, understand, and implement my knowledge what good can I be in any field?

References:

Mateas, Michael. Design Issues for Undergraduate Game-Oriented Degrees. Retrieved from <https://users.soe.ucsc.edu/~ejw/papers/mateas-design-issues-final.pdf>

Issues on the Video Game Industry. Retrieved from <http://videogameindustryissues.weebly.com/index.html>

Gamedev.net (2014, August 14) The corruption of Gaming journalism: The Quinsgate Scandal. Message posted to <http://www.gamedev.net/topic/660190-the-corruption-of-gaming-journalism-the-quinnsqate-scandal/>