B. DE SCHUTTER, A.R. ROBERTS. **A workshop on intergenerational game concept design and paper prototyping.** *Gerontechnology 2016;15(suppl):34s*; doi:10.4017/gt.2016.15.s.761.00
Purpose While digital games can hold a strong appeal[1] and positive outcomes[2] for older adults, it is remarkable how few are designed for older adults. A recent survey of the game industry found that only 1% of game developers is over 50[3]. This project aims to improve game design for older adults by enlisting them as game designers, and to collaborate with undergraduate game design students in game design workshop. The project investigated the following research questions: (i) What differences and communalities exist between the older adult and college participants with regards to games? (ii) How do the students and older adults collaborate and learn from each other during the workshop? (iii) What kind of themes and game designs emerge from the workshop, and how do they appeal to both groups? **Method** The workshop used a 4-step process that was spread across 5 sessions of 90 minutes. The workshop had a custom design, yet similar to what Howard et al.[4] described as an analysis, generation, evaluation and implementation phase. First, the instructor introduced the research team and explained the workshop to the participants. The participants (i.e., a focus group of 5 retired older men with no experience playing modern video games and 4 male college students that were enrolled in a game design program) were given the opportunity to play a few independently published games. Next, they performed a free association exercise and started the workshop generating ideas by writing them on blank playing cards. The 'idea cards' were collected and shuffled. In the next phase, they gathered in intergenerational groups and received a deck of random idea cards per group. They were asked to order the cards in clusters and make personal notes. Next, the participants summarized each cluster onto a blank card. They moved to another table with clusters that were organized by a different group and rearranged them and integrated them with their 'summary cards'. After this, the teams were asked to design two or more game concepts and to illustrate them on flipcharts. These visualizations were used to present the games to the others. Finally, everyone created a paper prototype of their concept. These were shown and discussed, after which a focus group session was held. Data was collected by means of observation[5] and was subsequently analyzed using open, selective and finally theoretical coding[6]. **Results & Discussion** The study revealed that (i) both groups came in with different expectations, (ii) both groups had different creative interests, and (iii) both groups different in their perception of the medium (i.e., for the students it was a medium for self-expression, while for the older adults games are a tool towards self-improvement). We found that the creative process was dependent on a balance of power between the student and older adults, and this balance was different for each team. If the balance of power shifted too far to either side, the other team member disconnected and this stopped the creative process. The workshop resulted in 6 design concepts (i.e., 'escape the room', 'facing fears', 'dreamtime', 'dating an assassin', 'battlefield sim', 'game of life'). Interestingly, the older adults seemed to steer towards games that were closely tied to professional skills and accomplishments.

References
1. De Schutter B. Never Too Old to Play: The Appeal of Digital Games to an Older Audience. Games and Culture: A Journal of Interactive Media 2011;6(2):155–170; doi:10.1177/1555412010364978
2. Granic I, Lobel A, Engels RCME. The benefits of playing video games. American Psychologist 2013;69(1): 66-78; doi:10.1037/a0034857
3. Edwards K, Weststar J, Meloni W, Pearce C, Legault M-J. Results from the IGDA's Game Developers Satistfaction Survey. New Jersey: IGDA; 2014
4. Howard TJ, Culley SJ, & Dekonick E. Describing the creative design process by the integration of engineering design and cognitive psychology literature. Design Studies 2008;29(2):160-180; doi:10.1016/j.destud.2008.01.001
5. Delamont S. Ethnography and participant observation. Qualitative Research Practice. Pp 217-229, in: Seale C, Gobo G, Gubrium JF, Silvermand D, editors, Qualitative Research Practice. Thousand Oaks: Sage; 2004
6. Charmaz K. Constructing Grounded Theory. Qualitative Research Practice. Thousand Oaks: Sage; 2006
Address: Miami University, Oxford, Ohio, USA; *E*: b@bobdeschutter.be