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## Background

The Designing for Healthy Cognitive Ageing (DesHCA) aimed to test, understand, and identify facilitators and barriers for various stakeholders, including older people, in achieving cognitively sustainable housing, in both new-build and retrofit contexts.

The DesHCA project has developed a co-produced legacy tool called ‘Our House’ as part of its Work-Package 4, led by Professors McCall and Rutherford. The archived data attached to this work-package has been generated from 10 playtests of the serious game legacy tool that was developed. Our House is a serious game that was developed to generate research insights on how to deliver housing for older people that is cognitively sustainable and inclusive.

## Overview

These are the first set of notes (1 of 2) from playtest session 2, which took place on the 24th of April 2023. The playtest comprised of 11 participants.

These notes have been fully anonymised, with all identifiable characteristics, including the participants’ names, removed, or replaced with pseudonyms.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Vignette number participant** | **Participant dialogue/responses** | **Direct quotes** |
| 7.2 | Began designing home before viewing the budget modifier. Frustrated body language (twisting of lips, breathy sighs) expressed as they had to immediately adapt their original floor plan. |  |
| 7.1 | Initial reaction to begin with hard to adapt rooms and fix them later in the game. |  |
| 5.1 | Thankful that there was no budget modifier impacting their team, emphasises the difficulty of making a reasonable home on constrained budget. |  |
| 5.2 | Identifies plan is to build as big and accessible home as possible and work backwards to fit within the constraints of the budget. |  |
| 5.1 | Sees the bathroom and bedroom as priorities in the home choosing immediately accessible rooms like wet room. |  |
| 5.2 | Realises the cost impact of incorporating the most accessible room choices, audibly gasps at impact to budget. | *“Oh no! The bathroom is five credit’s- that is a LOT of our budget!”* |
| 5.1 | Attempts to reassure teammate of the necessity of the room believes the investment could and should be prioritised over other rooms. |  |
| 1.1 | Focuses on tight budget. Is beginning the game attempting to most accurately reflect the current home the vignette includes. |  |
| 1.2 | Identified that they will prioritise changing the rooms later in the game. |  |
| 1.1 | Is unsure about potential moving process. Is not considering moving currently. |  |
| 1.2 | Would like to keep player in their home as much as possible, outlining sentimental and social value that comes from resident's experience in living in their home. |  |
| 7.1 | Due to budget modifier only 15 credits where available to the team who found this very difficult. |  |
| 7.1 | Attempting to visualise city flats in order to develop a home that is a reflection of real-life housing in the city. |  |
| 5.1 | Struggling with sacrificing rooms as a result of budget. |  |
| 5.2 | Explains that they found it difficult to plan ahead for the future because they were so consumed with trying to make their budget work. |  |
| 5.1 | Did not feel it would be possible to save any of the budget for the future based on their existing needs. |  |
| 1.2 | Uses a similar approach to team 5 choosing to use all of their budget to develop their home rather than save any budget. |  |
| 5.2 | Is unhappy about their home set up. |  |
| 5.2 | When probed about how they would fee, if this was their own living situation 5.2 emphasised they would want to move. |  |
| 5.1 | Originally agreed but when asked about the wellbeing of the characters participant changes their mind. |  |
| 5.1 | Thinks characters could have high wellbeing based on their social relationships and lengthy experience living in their home. |  |
| 1.2 | Continued to put as many rooms on the board as possible then waiting to find out what budget is left. |  |
| 7.1 | Does not view the beginning home as permanent. Is not as concerned about future accessibility as they think they will move eventually. |  |
| 7.2 | Believes despite the characters housing situation being less desirable the character lives a fulfilling life. | *“I think he’s thriving; he’s going out to eat, is very social and is just having fun, he doesn’t need to worry too much about his house”* |
| 5.2 | Sympathetic towards characters situation considers factors like their employment status and how long they have lived in a council flat as indicator that they cannot move. | *“...they’re working past retirement age… they probably don’t have any savings and actually needs to live in the flat”* |
| 5.1 | Moving to an area that would add to the budget is not an option as there are no services or shops nearby. |  |
| 7.2 | Considers impact of being in a rented property when considering what adaptions they can have. |  |
| 5.2 | Needs to adapt multiple rooms but has a restricted budget finding this very challenging. |  |
| 7.1 | Considers integrated adaptions as useful for character but rejects incorporation assuming private landlord would not approve. |  |
| 1.2 | Wants to stay in the home as far as possible prioritising grant support. |  |
| 1.1 | May consider moving if grant is denied. |  |
| 5.2 | Applied for 14 points for adaptions originally rejected negotiated for 8 and approved. |  |
| 7.1 | Applied for kitchen aids for memory problems and were rejected due to lack of diagnosis. |  |
| 7.2 | Considers the importance of living and wellbeing. | *“what’s important is we want to keep them safe but also ensure that they are still able to feel good about themselves”* |
| 7.1 | Believes house is no longer suitable would like to move to an assisted living facility. |  |
| 5.2 | Mitigated future challenges within the home by applying adaptions that exceeded their original needs. |  |
| 5.2 | When asked if they are happy with the home they said yes. When asked how they would feel if this was their home, they said they would feel frustrated. | *“personally if this was my living situation I would be feeling frustrated, especially about the stairs, I would be wanting to move to a bungalow but I know that that would be stressful and expensive.”* |
| 5.1 | Suggests using the spare room as a rental space and taking in a lodger to make extra money. |  |
| 5.2 | Also shares that having an extra lodger is an extra source of support around the house and could provide a social relationship. |  |
| 7.1 | When building their new supported living home is frustrated at being unable to find an open plan living design which would be more typical in assisted living settings. |  |
| 1.2 | Participant is frustrated a flood has forced them to move. |  |
| 7.2 | Agrees with partner that there should be more options for open living that could be more supportive for characters in game play. |  |
| 1.2 | Explains they are glad they ended up moving as they were then able to build a home that met their needs and was not as constrained by their budget improving the characters overall wellness scale. |  |

**Post game discussions**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Participant number** | **Observation** |
| 5.2 | Initially compromises on rooms knowing they would need to be adapted earlier but forced into situation by budget constraints. |
| 5.1 | Explains this game helps highlight the problem of income inequality in society and the two-tiered system that working to limit lower income households’ opportunities in living freely. |
| 5.2 | Glad that they had some easy to adapt rooms that prepared them early on. |
| 7.2 | Believes their character ended up reasonably happy in their new assisted living neighbourhood believing the move allowed him to maintain his social confidence and leaves the opportunity for him to still continue meeting with friends or family but that this can now be done in his home. |
| 7.1 | Imagines these spaces as having a shared garden this way their character still has access to a natural environment but not the pressure of having to maintain it |
| 1.1 | Feels more clarity about the moving process and when one can move could make game play simpler in the future. |
| 7.2 | Attempting to perceive potential risk during the aging process is difficult. Potentially incorporating mixed housing styles in developments within neighbourhoods could allow for people to be a part of their local community without having to sacrifice a suitable living location. |
| 7.2 | Figuring out how to visualise a forever home in its journey of supporting ageing is difficult and requires consideration towards micro impacts like the aesthetic of the home. |