For those unaware, this is the fourth game show I have made. The first two were entirely virtual (as they took place amidst the pandemic) and the third was the first game show I hosted here on G6. Each game was always one-event, as in they happened entirely within one day, or more specifically, one night.

So it goes without saying that I have a decent idea of how to plan these games. After the first G6 game show (which was extremely well responded to), I was immediately thinking about the next one.

But, as per usual, I wanted to do things as differently as possible. Among the ideas I had for another one-event game, there was an outlier. I thought of breaking the idea of a one-event game entirely. Thus, the potential for a long-term game was born.

So, immediately after the first G6 game show, I started brainstorming ideas for a long-term game show. This continued from mid October 2022 to early February 2023.

Why this took so long was already evident, in that this was extraordinarily new territory for me, and you don't get far by just brainstorming. But I was also struggling to come up with a game that would work in the first place.

As you could probably guess, I am extremely careful and diligent with how I plan my games. That is what allows them to flow smoothly despite the intended chaos. And through this extreme diligence, I kept finding ways to completely break every idea I had in an unfixable way. Repeat this process several times, and that is what you get over the course of those gameless months.

However, after playing with a deck of cards that Ethan threw at me last semester, I got the idea for the Card Economy, upon which the entire game could function. And after considering an idea of "Standard Rules," which would serve as the backbone of the game, I knew I was set.

So, that Friday, I began teasing the game, even though I hadn't written down anything yet, i.e., I had no plan. I asked you all to see me in private before Sunday to initiate you into the game with your first card, and then I planned most of the game show in a single class period.

Other than altering and replacing challenges and creating and expanding the database, the rest is history to you.

From a design perspective, here were my goals for a long-term game show:

- Keep competitors engaged over the course of the game
- Find new interesting ways to challenge competitors that wouldn't apply in a one-event game (make it unique)

- Design the game to be ever-expanding and dynamic by slowly altering how it would be played
- Test competitors in many different ways, including intellect, physicality, strategy, etc.

All in all, I would say I achieved these goals to a satisfactory level, both to myself and the perceived reaction to the game. Despite this, let me discuss what I would change about this game.

For one, it was just too long. Ten weeks seems excessive, and in all honesty, it was.

I had no idea how long this game would last. I didn't know if too many people would get eliminated too fast, or not enough people get eliminated fast enough, I didn't know if people would lose interest in the game too quickly, I didn't know how committed people would be to the game, you get the point. There was only so much I could plan for a long-term game show, there was still a lot left to the reactions of the competitors.

So I planned accordingly. You may have noticed that there was no real reason for the game to last ten weeks specifically. That is because, by design, I could put an end (or accelerate) the game at any time, with a hard cap at ten weeks since that would bring us to the end of the semester, conveniently before finals.

Which resulted in me planning for ten weeks, being aware that the game could last much less than that. After seeing the reaction to the game, I correctly predicted that we would reach ten weeks without a problem anyway, and maybe even more if time allowed.

Still, if I had the chance, I would probably cut the total game time by about half, and maybe more. This would make the game faster paced, but I believe that would improve the experience of the game overall.

Secondly, I'm just not sure about some challenges I gave you.

Yes, one of my goals was to test you all in multiple different ways with the intention of playing to the strengths of some and the weaknesses of others, while flipping those groups upside down the next week. The intention was to keep you on your toes and ready for anything.

I believe I fulfilled these intentions, however, given that the challenges were 80% of the game anyway, I could have put more effort into them. I could have made them more interesting in many different ways, I could have given you options, I could have directly involved competitors, the list never ends. Point is, I don't think I put as much effort into the challenges as I should have.

Granted, I did not make it easy to create quality challenges. For one, testing competitors in many different ways opens up a lot of opportunities, but it makes it difficult to stick to a consistent theme, which would have made it easy to create good challenges.

Also, by encouraging you all to break the rules as much as possible, I was directly asking competitors to not do what I asked, which put some limitations on what I could ask from you in the first place.

In addition, I can only make the challenges so complicated. While planning, I was aware that this game would not be close to the top of your priorities list, so I wanted to keep challenges simple to ensure that people understand them and can complete them.

However, that does not mean I could not have made them more interesting. I mean, really, think back to all the weeks of this game and try to remember each challenge. It isn't even easy for me. That is partly because every challenge lacks in, for lack of a better word, character.

Regardless, these are not valid excuses. Nearly every part of this game had extreme thought and consideration put into it, yet I cannot say the same for the challenges. It was the main part of your participation in this game and it was sub-par.

Finally, I left way too much up to ambiguity.

Initially, I considered this to be a great idea. Allowing competitors to compete in their own unique way and play to their strengths.

However, I didn't actually do this. All I did was encourage you to break the rules and "figure it out." When you think about it, the only two real "play styles" are either passive or cooperative, i.e., alone or with a team. Given how many opportunities I gave you to stab others in the back, it's no surprise most people decided to play passively.

Ideally, something I should have done was create specific play styles as if they were classes in a video game. Things like rogues or mages could be synonymous with the Efficiency Bonus or Savior's Dividend. I had so much opportunity to directly create unique ways to play, yet I threw it all out the window in favor of you doing whatever you want, which resulted in most people playing identically.

Just writing about "classes" sounds awesome. It would have been a great way to increase engagement and overall enjoyment. But I failed to deliver.

Nonetheless, I am very pleased with how this game show turned out, both in terms of myself and the reaction of the competitors, especially due to the fact that these were very new territories for me. Despite the fact that

I just wrote about it, there isn't much I would change about how it performed.

If there is another G6 game show (full disclosure, no plans for one), you can expect it to be better than the previous two, as you might be able to tell, these things only get better.

Thank you all for your participation and commitment and trust in this silly game. I did what I could to be the best host possible and that was the exact response I got from you.

- Host, Developer, and Maintainer of the G6 Gameshow, Semester 2, Kyle