



	REPORT SHEET ON PILOT ACTIVITIES
FIELD THEME	
(Online) gaming as social self-exclusion	
PLACE, DATE, TIME OF SESSION	
Gdansk, GCPU: 19.6.2015, 17:00 – 19:00	
TARGET GROUP, NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS	
Parents and their children (aged 6-21), 17 participants Adult trainer (GCPU), 1	
OBJECTIVE OF THE SESSION (WHAT DID WE WANT TO ACHIEVE)	
(1) Test good practices; (2) Train trainers; (3) Talk about gaming as social self-exclusion.	
METHODS USED (ILLUSTRATE WITH IMAGES WHEN POSSIBLE)	
Tat good practice, Who are you until now good practice, C2C good practice	
REACTIONS - OBSERVATIONS – EVALUATIONS: WHAT ADVANTAGES AND RISKS OF THE METHOD HAVE WE FOUND?	
<p>The Who are you until now good practices showed that the participants followed the mold of the first participant who defined himself in relation to his wife and child present. Others defined themselves in those relational terms too, leaving one participant, an 18-year old boy who had come alone, puzzled with what he should say. This was an eye-opener for the other participants who realized that defining themselves in such a way as they had done excluded others.</p> <p>The Tat good practice inspired no surprises.</p> <p>The C2C dialogues were extremely intense. The motivation of the parents became clear.</p>	



While some were sincerely interested in what their child counterpart – not necessarily their own since there had been a straw drawing to establish the pairs – others were using negative, moralistic language, hardly listened to the answers and insisting on their point of view. The analysis by the therapist after the session was confrontational. Many parents had felt their closed attitude during the dialogue but now this was discussed in the open.

Almost all parents decided after the workshop to investigate whether it had not been them who excluded their gaming children rather than their children self-excluding themselves by spending a lot of time behind the computer/ game console.

One father still hesitated at the end. He said he was disappointed that he had not received a quick fix for the situation but on the other hand did not reject the outcome of the session that he also needed to reflect. He said he would be present at a next session again.

All other participants then declared that they wanted a next session too.

ANY FURTHER OBSERVATIONS