

# Feasibility and Acceptance of chatbots embedded in healthcare curricula:



—  
CEPEH report  
—

*December*

2022

see [cepeh.eu](http://cepeh.eu) for more information

# Acknowledgements

This work is supported by the ERASMUS+ Strategic Partnership in Higher Education “Chatbot Enhance Personalise European Healthcare Curricula (CEPEH)” ([www.cepeh.eu](http://www.cepeh.eu)) (2019-1-UK01- KA203-062091) project of the European Union.

CEPEH Team

# Abstract

This document details the evaluation of each resource in terms of the feasibility and acceptance from the end-users. There was evidence of identifying the feasibility of such resources into formal training and studies exist on the acceptance of such resources, with promising results. However, all these studies defined the need for further research in the area until the use of chatbots in healthcare education became common. Furthermore, the creation process of CEPEH resources was significantly different and had improvements to current methods, due to the co-creation process, and use of low cost but effective technology.

# Contents

<b>List of Figures</b>	<b>vii</b>
<b>List of Tables</b>	<b>viii</b>
<b>List of Abbreviations</b>	<b>ix</b>
<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
Background . . . . .	2
<b>1 Method</b>	<b>4</b>
1.1 Participants . . . . .	4
1.2 Procedure . . . . .	5
1.3 Design . . . . .	6
1.4 Materials and Measures . . . . .	6
<b>2 Results</b>	<b>12</b>
2.1 Learner Background . . . . .	12
2.2 Chatbot Usability Questionnaire (CUQ) . . . . .	15
2.3 System Usability Scale (SUS) Scores . . . . .	17
2.4 Technology Acceptance Model . . . . .	19
<b>3 Training Event Results</b>	<b>26</b>
3.1 CEPEH Training Event C1 . . . . .	26
<b>4 Overall Training Events Evaluation</b>	<b>27</b>
4.1 CEPEH Training Event 2 . . . . .	27
4.2 Cross-referencing . . . . .	32
4.3 Collaborative writing . . . . .	34
4.4 Additional resources . . . . .	35
<b>5 Discussion</b>	<b>36</b>
5.1 Reach, Impact, and Qualitative analysis . . . . .	37

## *Contents*

<b>6</b>	<b>Text Mining, Natural Language Processing, and Sentiment Analysis</b>	<b>49</b>
6.1	CEPEH Qualatative Feedback . . . . .	49
6.2	Tokenising . . . . .	49
6.3	3 Analysing frequencies . . . . .	51
6.4	The vocabulary of Texts . . . . .	58
<b>7</b>	<b>Sentiment analysis</b>	<b>60</b>
	<b>Appendix</b>	<b>67</b>
	<b>Appendices</b>	
<b>A</b>	<b>The First Appendix</b>	<b>69</b>
<b>B</b>	<b>The Second Appendix, for Fun</b>	<b>70</b>
	<b>References</b>	<b>71</b>

# List of Figures

2.1	A marvel-lous meme . . . . .	16
5.1	Font sizes in LaTeX . . . . .	47

# List of Tables

4.1	Stopping cars . . . . .	33
-----	-------------------------	----



# List of Abbreviations

<b>CEPEH</b>	. . . . .	Chatbot Enhance Personalised European Healthcare curricula
<b>RLO</b>	. . . . .	Reusable Learning Object
<b>NLP</b>	. . . . .	Natural Language Processing
<b>NLU</b>	. . . . .	Natural Language Understanding
<b>A.I</b>	. . . . .	Artificial Intelligence

# Introduction

Personalised Healthcare Education is needed to meet growing demand and quality maintenance. There is a growing evidence around chatbots, namely machine conversation systems- these programs have the potential to change the way students learn and search for information.

Chatbots can quiz existing knowledge, enable higher student engagement with a learning task, or support higher-order cognitive activities. In large-scale learning scenarios with a high student-to-lecturer ratio, chatbots can help tackle the issue of individualized student support and facilitate personalised learning. However, limited examples of chatbots in European Healthcare Curricula have been utilised to combine both the continuum of cognitive processes presented in Bloom's taxonomy, with the idea that some repetitive tasks can be done with a chatbot- to provide greater access or to scale faculty time.

Thus, CEPEH strategic partnership has co-created open access chatbots utilising artificial intelligence, promoting innovative practices in digital era, by supporting current curricula and fostering open education.

CEPEH Erasmus+ strategic partnership aimed to co-design and implement new pedagogical approaches and, in particular, chatbots for European medical and nursing schools. CEPEH used participatory design to engage stakeholders (students, healthcare workforce staff, lecturers, clinicians, etc.) in order to co-design effective chatbots and release them as open access resources. Through CEPEH, effective use of digital technologies and open education were incorporated into healthcare curricula. This enabled students to increase their health and medical related skills through flexible learning.

## *Introduction*

CEPEH expected that students adopted this new digital pedagogy and improve their skills and competences through flexible personalised learning, while the teaching staff enhanced their e-learning tool co-creation competences and make use of co-design best practices and recommendations for use. It is also expected increased cooperation between the partners. Thus, in the long term, CEPEH expects to influence the development of medical and nursing curricula with this digital innovation, foster the quality of the future healthcare workforce and further improve international competitiveness of the partners' healthcare curricula. This document details the evaluation of the resources created by the CEPEH team.

The evaluation specifically explored the feasibility and acceptance from the end-users. These end-users are learners in European healthcare higher education institutions.

There was firstly evidence for the need to identify the feasibility of chatbots and similar resources into formal education and training, with a further need to improve access to these types of learning resources. Of course, studies exist on the acceptance of chatbots, virtual patients, and many other healthcare applications, with promising results. However, through various limitations, we believed there was further research to be completed to accelerate the design, development, implementation, and evaluation processes. These have financial, stakeholder, time, and efficacy benefits. The creation process of CEPEH resources was significantly different to most in the literature, and this report highlights the approach of the CEPEH team towards enhancing personalised healthcare education can be achieved.

## **Background**

The working practices of CEPEH are aimed at maximizing efficacy of these chatbots as learning resources, and provided a sense of shared development and ownership from all stakeholders. The process normally begins with workshops in which the project is scoped and team building occurs. The CEPEH workshops involve the widest possible team of stakeholders including tutors, students, healthcare

## *Introduction*

workers, learning technologists, health service users and carers- depending on the materials being created.

For readers who are interested in using these high quality digital resources please access them for free at [CEPEH.EU](http://CEPEH.EU)

The next section will now present the evaluation of all CEPEH chatbot resources.

# 1

## Method

### Contents

---

<b>1.1</b>	<b>Participants . . . . .</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>1.2</b>	<b>Procedure . . . . .</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>1.3</b>	<b>Design . . . . .</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>1.4</b>	<b>Materials and Measures . . . . .</b>	<b>6</b>
1.4.1	Chatbot Usability Questionnaire (CUQ) . . . . .	7
1.4.2	UTAUT2 (Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology) . . . . .	7
1.4.3	System Usability Scale . . . . .	7
1.4.4	Computer Self-Efficacy Scale Tool . . . . .	8
1.4.5	Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) . . . . .	9
1.4.6	Qualitative Measure- Focus Group Discussions . . . . .	9

---

## 1.1 Participants

This dataset had 14 males and 28 females therefore a total of 42 participants. It was a repeated measure design whereby each participant used the 4 chatbots developed by the CEPEH team. Therefore, there are 42 points of data in the condition before testing, and 126 data points after testing the chatbots- for a total of 168 row of data, 5 per participant. There were 78 questions asked in total, therefore the full dataset has over 4000 cells recorded.

## 1. Method

There were 22 females and 6 males from Greece. There were 3 females and 4 males from Cyprus. There were 2 females and 2 males from Sweden.

6 participants differed from the majority (33) who were student, as 3 were learning technologists, 2 were lecturers, and 1 was a doctor. Although there could be a difference in these groups, the design was within- groups therefore each participants pre-usage metrics were the comparative control data, and participant differences cannot affect the evaluation.

Profession	n
College student	3
Learning Technologist	3
Lecturer	2
Mature Student	2
Medical doctor	1
Student on a Healthcare course	28

## 1.2 Procedure

For each resource created by the Partners, the same experimental methodology was followed. For each resource created by partners, students performed a study within an online or face to face workshop or course. Student participants joined from Greece, Cyprus, Sweden, and the United Kingdom. A repeated measures design was used as the same group measures were taken before and after usage of the chatbots. They were recruited via staff members in the CEPEH group.

Participants were asked prior to the study if they agree to participate, providing them with a PIS form. Participants had the opportunity to discuss with the research team prior to the study and before consent is given. Then, participants used the chatbot resources independently and technical support was provided. Finally, post-intervention measures were recorded.

Some of the participants were invited to participate in Focus Group Discussions (FGD), and each FGD lasted between 15 to 25 minutes, with 5-10 participants. Participants were asked if they would like to be informed of the findings of the study.

## 1. Method

### 1.3 Design

The data captured from the participants were their initials and numerical day of birth, used as anonymous identifier for pre-post analysis. Their institution was captured (Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, CYENS Centre of Excellent, Karolinska Institute, and The University of Nottingham), and Sex (Male/Female/Other).

Before any interaction with the learning resources, various perceptions of chatbot such as confidence and easy of use, usefulness, Influence from others, and current learning resources (videos, textbooks, Google, friends etc), were captured. Descriptive data was produced alongside repeated measures t-tests. Repeated measures t-tests were the appropriate test to use as this explores differences between groups, there were no covariates and we did not have several dependant variables. There was one Independent factor being Chatbot use having 2 levels (pre/post). There were 3 chatbots therefore there was option for ANOVA to determine where differences lie if statistical differences were found however this was not wholly appropriate for the data type and not necessary for pre-post comparison.

### 1.4 Materials and Measures

The measures used fit within a newly developed Chatbot Evaluation Framework which takes the best measures of 5 previous frameworks. Denecke and Warren [2] derived several quality dimensions and attributes from previous chatbot literature. They formed six perspectives from their review of articles and mobile health applications.

These six perspectives were: 1) Task-oriented, 2) Artificial intelligence, 3) System quality perspective, 4) Linguistic perspective, 5) UX Perspective, 6) Healthcare quality perspective.

To capture these perspectives, we used several validated materials that can distinguish these elements of the CEPEH chatbots.

## *1. Method*

### **1.4.1 Chatbot Usability Questionnaire (CUQ)**

The Chatbot Usability Questionnaire (CUQ) [4] is a new questionnaire specifically designed for measuring the usability of chatbots by an interdisciplinary team from the Ulster University. CUQ can be used alongside the prevalent System Usability Scale Score (SUS) [5]. Multiple metrics are more appropriate when measuring usability of chatbots [6] therefore a combination of two scores can provide an all-inclusive overview.

### **1.4.2 UTAUT2 (Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology)**

The underpinning theory of the UTAUT2 is that there are four key constructs to the intentions of using technology based resources: 1) performance expectancy, 2) effort expectancy, 3) social influence, and 4) enabling conditions.

The TAM and the UTAUT2 have cross over in measuring technology acceptance, however the UTAUT2 has more applied probing questions. Few studies exist that use technology acceptance theories for the intention to use products that explicitly incorporate AI. A recent extension of the UTAUT2 model added five (health, convenience comfort, sustainability, safety, security, and personal innovativeness) additional influencing factors to accommodate for AI [7]. This can be used for products in either health, household use, or mobility and can help to explain behavioural intention and use behaviour of chatbots.

### **1.4.3 System Usability Scale**

The System Usability Scale (SUS) was used [10] and is a widely used and adopted usability questionnaire. It is popular due to its unbiased and agnostic properties, a non proprietary, and quick scale of 10 questions.

1. I think that I would like to use this system frequently.
2. I found the system unnecessarily complex.
3. I thought the system was easy to use.



## *1. Method*

4. I think that I would need the support of a technical person to be able to use this system.
5. I found the various functions in this system were well integrated.
6. I thought there was too much inconsistency in this system.
7. I would imagine that most people would learn to use this system very quickly.
8. I found the system very cumbersome to use.
9. I felt very confident using the system.
10. I needed to learn a lot of things before I could get going with this system.

The SUS was developed with a scoring system, in which the following should be performed: For each of the odd numbered questions, subtract 1 from the score. For each of the even numbered questions, subtract their value from 5. Add up these numbers to find the total score, then multiply this by 2.5. The result is a score out of 100 and can be compared against a determined average score of 68. Further, 80.3 or higher is excellent, and 51 or under suggests significant usability problems.

### **1.4.4 Computer Self-Efficacy Scale Tool**

The 10 question CSEST was based on the 32-item questionnaire by Murphy, Coover, and Owen (1989). Participants were provided with the facilitator stating 'Imagine you have found a new technology product that you have previously not used. You believe this product will make your life better. It doesn't matter specifically what this technology product does, only that it is intended to make your life easier and that you have never used it before. I could use the new technology...

1. If there was no one around to tell me what to do as I go
2. If I had never used a product like it before
3. If I had only the product manuals for reference
4. If I had seen someone else using it before trying it myself
5. If I could call someone for help if I got stuck
6. If someone else had helped me get started
7. If I had a lot of time to complete the job for which the product was provided

## 1. Method

8. If I had just the built-in help facility for assistance
9. If someone showed me how to do it first
10. If I had used similar products before this one to do the same job

### 1.4.5 Technology Acceptance Model (TAM)

The Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) [1] was specifically developed with the primary aim of identifying the determinants involved in computer acceptance in general; secondly, to examine a variety of information technology usage behaviours; and thirdly, to provide a parsimonious theoretical explanatory model. TAM suggests that attitude would be a direct predictor of the intention to use technology, which in turn would predict the actual usage of the technology. The only modification to the nine sub-scales of the questionnaire consists of applying the items to the context of chatbots. All the items, except those measuring attitudes, utilize a seven-point Likert scale ranging from “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree” with a middle neutral point [2].

The nine sub-scales of the questionnaire:

Ease of use of chatbots    Perceived usefulness of chatbots    Intention of use.  
Attitude toward usage of chatbots.    Perception of personal efficacy to use a chatbot resource.    Perception of external control toward chatbots.    Anxiety toward chatbot use.    Intrinsic motivation to use chatbot resources.    Perceived costs of chatbots.

### 1.4.6 Qualitative Measure- Focus Group Discussions

Focus groups are a pervasive means of market research and provides credible acceptance evaluators regarding the penetration that a product or service will have on a target demographic. Focus groups are a form of qualitative research consisting of interviews or structured discussions, in which a group of people are asked about their perceptions, opinions, beliefs, and attitudes towards a product, service, concept, advertisement, idea, or packaging.

Questions are asked in an interactive group setting where participants are free to talk with other group members. During this process, the researcher either takes

## *1. Method*

notes or records the vital points he or she is getting from the group. Researchers select members of the focus group carefully for effective and authoritative responses. Relevant stakeholders, then, can use the information collected through focus groups to receive insights on a specific product, issue, or topic focus [7].

A series of short focus group sessions identified the feasibility of CEPEH resources for formal curricular integration. These sessions, spanning no more than 1-1.5 hours and consisting of no more than 5-7 persons each explored all axes of curricular integration such as accessibility in the classroom, use case scenarios, technology requirements for curricular integration etc. These axes were formalized by the research team, in each evaluation site, to consider the curricular details of each institution.

## 1. Method




Figure 1: Flow diagram of the recruitment process

# 2

## Results

### Contents

---

<b>2.1</b>	<b>Learner Background . . . . .</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>2.2</b>	<b>Chatbot Usability Questionnaire (CUQ) . . . . .</b>	<b>15</b>
2.2.1	CUQ Calculation tool . . . . .	15
<b>2.3</b>	<b>System Usability Scale (SUS) Scores . . . . .</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>2.4</b>	<b>Technology Acceptance Model . . . . .</b>	<b>19</b>
2.4.1	Other Findings . . . . .	19

---

## 2.1 Learner Background

Most learners use books or online books as resources. Of course, they may use multiple sources however they were asked to note the primary source. Only 6 stated their primary sources were *Online videos/interactive materials* which includes such tools as chatbots.


---

Current Materials	n
1 to 1 workshops or lectures	2
Books	21
Online journals/books	13
Online videos/interactive material	6

---


## 2. Results

This can be supported when asked the amount of time participants have used a chatbot- in any form or subject: 23 stated they had never used a chatbot, being educational or not. 2 individuals had spent what would be extensive time with usage- these were the Learning Technologist and Mature Student.



There was only 1 'Strongly Disagree' response. The agreement options counted for the majority of the data.

## 2. Results




For CYENS, even though the knowledge of the topic was not perceived to improve

by some participants, this box plot shows how 34/42 stated they would reuse the

chatbot developed by CYENS.

## 2. Results



CYENS chatbot had around 10 more participants stating that they were neutral on gaining knowledge oo the topic

Previous_Chatbot_Usage	n
1-4 hours	15
10-19 hours	1
20+ hours	1
5-9 hours	2
Never	23


## 2.2 Chatbot Usability Questionnaire (CUQ)

### 2.2.1 CUQ Calculation tool

The CUQ was developed by researchers at Ulster University (see) {<a href=“<https://www.ulster.ac.uk/research/topic/computer-science/artificial-intelligence/projects/cuq>” } and as the calculation can be complex a dedicated calculation tool has been created.



## 2. Results



**Figure 2.1:** A marvel-lous meme  
(#fig:cuq image)

Please download the CEPEH CUQ calculation tool which has all of the data entered, so you can see the CEPEH CUQ scoring.

[click here to download CUQ calc tool](#)

[click here to download CUQ score image](#)

We refer to this image with \@ref(fig:cuq image). So Figure @ref(fig:cuq image) is [this image](#).

The score for all 3 chatbots grouped was 65.2/100, This scoring system was designed to be comparable to SUS and may be freely used alongside it, or in combination with other usability metrics. There has been evidence of correlation of 76% between the CUQ and SUS therefore we expect the SUS scored to be between 48.75 and 81%. We believe the CUQ has more validity towards measuring the concepts of interest on this study.

[Read the CUQ development paper, see page 3 for correlation](#)

## 2. Results

### 2.3 System Usability Scale (SUS) Scores

*Note= The amount of ‘agreement’ is defined as the addition of ‘Agree’ and ‘Strongly agree’ responses.*

The SUS score should consist of 10 items. However, some SUS questions were improved upon by 1 or more CUQ questions, specifically to this Chatbot study. The SUS results would be overshadowed by the CUQ scores, except 2 that did not have cross-over. The two questions were:

- I would like to use the CEPEH chatbot I tested, more frequently (SUS1)(post)
- I felt confident using the CEPEH chatbot (SUS2)(post)

This meant the score of the SUS was not created, however the CUQ score better represented the Learners’ perceptions of the CEPEH chatbot in terms of feasibility of reuse and acceptability in healthcare curricula.

##	KeepUsing	Confident	V1
## 9	Neutral	Disagree	1
## 13	Strongly Agree	Not Applicable	1
## 15	Strongly Disagree	Agree	1
## 16	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree	1
## 11	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	3
## 7	Disagree	Neutral	4
## 2	Agree	Disagree	5
## 6	Disagree	Disagree	5
## 4	Agree	Strongly Agree	6
## 5	Disagree	Agree	6
## 10	Neutral	Neutral	6
## 8	Neutral	Agree	10
## 12	Strongly Agree	Agree	10
## 3	Agree	Neutral	11
## 14	Strongly Agree	Strongly Agree	12

## 2. Results

## 1	Agree	Agree 44	
##	Keep_Using_Chatbots	Confident	Count
## 9	Neutral	Disagree	1
## 13	Strongly Agree	Not Applicable	1
## 15	Strongly Disagree	Agree	1
## 16	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree	1
## 11	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	3
## 7	Disagree	Neutral	4
## 2	Agree	Disagree	5
## 6	Disagree	Disagree	5
## 4	Agree	Strongly Agree	6
## 5	Disagree	Agree	6
## 10	Neutral	Neutral	6
## 8	Neutral	Agree	10
## 12	Strongly Agree	Agree	10
## 3	Agree	Neutral	11
## 14	Strongly Agree	Strongly Agree	12
## 1	Agree	Agree	44

Keep_Using_Chatbots	Confident	Count
Agree	Agree	44
Agree	Disagree	5
Agree	Neutral	11
Agree	Strongly Agree	6
Disagree	Agree	6
Disagree	Disagree	5
Disagree	Neutral	4
Neutral	Agree	10
Neutral	Disagree	1
Neutral	Neutral	6
Not Applicable	Not Applicable	3
Strongly Agree	Agree	10
Strongly Agree	Not Applicable	1
Strongly Agree	Strongly Agree	12
Strongly Disagree	Agree	1

## 2. Results

Keep_Using_Chatbots	Confident	Count
Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree	1

## 2.4 Technology Acceptance Model

The TAM had 3 sections (Ease of Use, Perceived Usefulness, and Intention of Use). Ease of Use results showed significant increases in Users' usage with each Chatbot. Perceived Usefulness: There were not significant findings for the Perceived usefulness. The justification for this may be due to being early versions of applications with limited functionality and functions which can be difficult for user to experience the intended further range of features and learning exercises.

Intention of Use: For users' intentions to use within their course, the result of the Mann-Whitney U test was not significant,  $U =$  ,  $z =$  ,  $p =$  . in their intentions before use (m=xx, mode=xx) compared to after (m=xx, mode=x), however there was improvement therefore the chatbots may have more benefit than expected by students.

### 2.4.1 Other Findings

Other questions

I intend to continue using chatbots in the future (BI1)

The chatbot provided the information I needed with minimal commands

My knowledge of the topic improved after i had used the Chatbot

My confidence in understanding the topic improved after I had used the Chatbot

The chatbot provided me with the type of response i expected from asking a tutor/lecturer

The information provided was reliable

The chatbot has a high level of trustworthiness

The duration of conversations to find my answer was too long

The videos/images provided were useful to my questions

## 2. Results

The chatbot exceeded my expectation of how it could help me

The chatbot exceeded my expectation of how it could engage with me

I think this learning method could help me to acquire knowledge


I would use this tool again as it has some value to me

I think i will actively use this learning method

I believe I had some choice about learning during chatbot use

I would trust the chatbot to provide me with information for my course

One piece of knowledge i learned from the chatbot was..



Repeated Measures t-test, aka paired t-test (before and after measurements)

```
## [1] "sex"
## [2] "before"
## [3] "after"
## [4] "Code"
## [5] "Location"
```

## 2. Results

```
## [6] "Profession"
## [7] "CurrentMaterials"
## [8] "Previous_Chatbot_Usage"
## [9] "Use chatbots frequently (pre)"
## [10] "...10"
## [11] "I find chatbots can be useful in my daily life (PE1)(pre)"
## [12] "Using chatbots increases my chances of achieving things that are important"
## [13] "Using chatbots can help me accomplish things more quickly (PE3)(pre)"
## [14] "UseChatbotsFrequently"
## [15] "Learning how to use chatbots is, or would be, for me (EE1)(pre)"
## [16] "My interactions with chatbots are clear and understandable (EE2)(pre)"
## [17] "I find chatbots easy to use (EE3)(pre)"
## [18] "It is easy for me to become skilful at using chatbots (EE4)(pre)"
## [19] "People who are important to me think that I should use chatbots (SI1)(pre)"
## [20] "People who influence my behaviour think that I should use chatbots (SI2)(pre)"
## [21] "People whose opinions that I value prefer that I use chatbots (SI3)(pre)"
## [22] "I have the resources necessary to use chatbots (FC1)(pre)"
## [23] "I have the knowledge necessary to use chatbots (FC2)(pre)"
## [24] "Chatbots are compatible with other technologies I use (FC3)(pre)"
## [25] "I can get help from others when I have difficulties using chatbots (FC3)(pre)"
## [26] "Using chatbots is enjoyable (HM2)(pre)"
## [27] "Using chatbots is very entertaining (HM3)(pre)"
## [28] "I intend to continue using chatbots in the future (BI1)(pre)"
## [29] "ChatbotUsed"
## [30] "Information_with_minimal_command_post"
## [31] "knowledge_improved_after_use"
## [32] "My confidence in understanding the topic improved after I had used the Chatbot"
## [33] "The chatbot provided me with the type of response i expected from asking a question"
## [34] "The information provided was reliable (post)"
## [35] "The chatbots personality was realistic and engaging (CUQ1)(post)"
```

## 2. Results

## [36] "The chatbot seemed too robotic (CUQ2)(post)"

## [37] "The chatbot was welcoming during initial setup (CUQ3)(post)"

## [38] "The chatbot seemed very unfriendly (CUQ4)(post)"

## [39] "The chatbot explained its scope and purpose well (CUQ5)(post)"

## [40] "The chatbot gave no indication as to its purpose (CUQ6)(post)"

## [41] "The chatbot was easy to navigate (CUQ7)(post)"

## [42] "It would be easy to get confused when using the chatbot (CUQ8)(post)"

## [43] "The chatbot understood me well (CUQ9)(post)"

## [44] "The chatbot failed to recognise a lot of my inputs (CUQ10)(post)"

## [45] "Chatbot responses were useful, appropriate and informative (CUQ11)(post)"

## [46] "Chatbot responses were irrelevant (CUQ12)(post)"

## [47] "The chatbot coped well with any errors or mistakes (CUQ13)(post)"

## [48] "The chatbot seemed unable to handle any errors (CUQ14)(post)"

## [49] "The chatbot was very easy to use (CUQ15)(post)"

## [50] "The chatbot was very complex (CUQ16)(post)"

## [51] "I would like to use the CEPEH chatbot i tested, more frequently (SUS1)(post)"

## [52] "...52"

## [53] "...53"

## [54] "The chatbot has a high level of trustworthiness(post)"

## [55] "The duration of conversations to find my answer was too long(post)"

## [56] "I found the CEPEH chatbots useful in my daily life (PE1)(post)"

## [57] "Using CEPEH chatbots increases my chances of achieving things important to me (PE2)(post)"

## [58] "Using CEPEH chatbots can help me accomplish things more quickly (PE3)(post)"

## [59] "Using CEPEH chatbots increases my productivity (PE4)(post)"

## [60] "Learning how to use CEPEH chatbots is easy for me (EE1)(post)"

## [61] "My interaction with CEPEH chatbots is clear and understandable (EE2)(post)"

## [62] "CEPEH\_chatbots\_easy\_use\_EE3POST"

## [63] "It is easy for me to become skilful at using CEPEH chatbots (EE4)(post)"

## [64] "People who are important to me think that I should use CEPEH chatbots (SI1)(post)"

## [65] "People who influence my behaviour think that I should use CEPEH chatbots (SI2)(post)"

## 2. Results

```
## [66] "People whose opinions that I value prefer that I use CEPEH chatbots (SI3)"
## [67] "I have the resources necessary to use CEPEH chatbots (FC1)(post)"
## [68] "I have the knowledge necessary to use CEPEH chatbots (FC2)(post)"
## [69] "CEPEH Chatbots are compatible with other technologies I use (FC3)(post)"
## [70] "I can get help from others when I have difficulties using CEPEH chatbots ("
## [71] "Using CEPEH chatbots is enjoyable (HM2)(post)"
## [72] "Intend"
## [73] "The videos/images provided were useful to my questions(post)"
## [74] "The chatbot exceeded my expectation of how it could help me(post)"
## [75] "The chatbot exceeded my expectation of how it could engage with me(post)"
## [76] "The chatbot exceeded my expectation of how entertaining it was to use(post"
## [77] "I think this learning method could help me to acquire knowledge(post)"
## [78] "ReuseChatbot"
## [79] "I think i will actively use this learning method(post)"
## [80] "I believe i had some choice about learning during chatbot use(post)"
## [81] "I would trust the chatbot to provide me with information for my course(pos"
## [82] "Informed of results(post)"
## [83] "CUQ"


## # A tibble: 168 x 3
##   sex      before after
##   <chr>    <dbl> <dbl>
## 1 Female      2      2
## 2 Female      2      2
## 3 Female      2      2
## 4 Female      2      2
## 5 Female      2      2
## 6 Female      2      2
## 7 Female      2      2
## 8 Female      2      2
## 9 Female      2      2
```




2. Results

```
## 10 Female      2      2
```

```
## # ... with 158 more rows
```



## 2. Results



```
##
## Paired t-test
##
## data: before and after
## t = -1.3109, df = 41, p-value = 0.1972
## alternative hypothesis: true mean difference is not equal to 0
## 9.5 percent confidence interval:
## -0.1819341 -0.1513992
## sample estimates:
## mean difference
## -0.1666667
```

This t-test compares confident using mobile chatbots before and after CEPEH chatbot usage.

# 3

## Training Event Results

### Contents

---

<b>3.1 CEPEH Training Event C1 . . . . .</b>	<b>26</b>
--	-----------

---

### 3.1 CEPEH Training Event C1

The CEPEH training event C1 held at the premises of University of Nottingham aiming to prepare participants for the practical elements of co-creation and implementation of chatbots as an educational resource. It combined both theoretical and hands-on training. 15 participants were from RISE, AUTH, UoN.

Project managers of partners signposted the person involved, and relevant announcements were made through social media channels to the wider public. External to the project speakers were from University of Leeds, and Computer Science Department of University of Nottingham. It included academics, medical doctors, and researchers with focus both on clinical research and digital innovations in healthcare education and IT specialist/learning technologists 11.18 years of experience (SD=7.2). A balance between male and female participants achieved.

# 4

## Overall Training Events Evaluation

Participants were asked to highlight what they liked for each day and how each day can be improved. Findings are described below per day of the training event

### Day 1

The participants comment that they liked the design method for educational resources presented using a co-creation approach, they liked the interactions with other groups, and they liked the overview of existing chatbot resources of the partners. On the areas that can be improved, more media material were requested.

Day 2 Participants enjoyed the presentation from the invited speaker from another faculty of the University of Nottingham, the CEPEH resources presented and the storyboarding process. Participants highlighted that the participation of more clinicians in the event would be an added value in regards with the storyboarding process.

Day3 Participants liked the hands-on activities of the day also enjoyed the creativity of the groups on the online chatbot development tool. As an area of improvement, participants wanted more time on hands on sections.

### 4.1 CEPEH Training Event 2

**Pre-Training Event survey May 9th-13th 2022 Thessaloniki, Greece**

#### *4. Overall Training Events Evaluation*

Twenty-six participants attended the Training Event, along with approximately 10 staff members. There were 21 undergraduate students and 5 postgraduate students, who completed the survey for a total of 26 responses. There were 86% of participants who stated they had not been to a similar event like the training event CEPEH facilitated. There were 90% of students who found the event schedule very organised, and 70% agreed most of the planned sessions were relevant to that interest with the remaining 30% not having enough experience to understand the context to determine if they are interested in the training event. There were 95% of students agreeing or strongly agreeing the training event location is great, the remaining person did not leave additional comments.

Table 1 suggested attendees had minimal intention to share their own ideas due to lack of previous experience of attending such events, or due to lack of knowledge on the area. However, most were interested in listening to other groups and hearing contextual cases in healthcare.

There were 77% of participants stated they were novices in experience with chatbots in healthcare and were attending to learn more. The remaining 23% (7 students) stated they were competent and had limited experience with chatbots in healthcare.

One day had several events regarding cybersecurity in healthcare. When asked before these events, 83% stated they were neutral or disagreed that they felt confident about their cybersecurity knowledge in healthcare. In addition, 80% stated they were neutral or disagreed that they felt they had strong cybersecurity safety in healthcare. Table 2 shows the main pre and post results suggesting a positive experience for more than 75% of attendees on all measures.

There were 90% (23) of students who heard about the event through a lecturer or a professor, the CEPEH newsletter (2), and 1 person was informed through the anatomy tutoring system at Karolinska Institute. Additionally, 60% suggested the training event to somebody else before the course started.

There were six individuals who stated neutral or disagree when asked if having issues on registration or finding the information for the event. This may have

#### 4. Overall Training Events Evaluation

been due to being dependent on emails to receive the information, instead of a dedicated website where the information is available anytime.

As this was face-to-face, participants were asked about sufficient Covid-19 precautions in place at the facility, 94% agreed with sufficient precautions, two individuals stated no but did not give further information in the additional input box provided. In summary, most participants were undergraduate students with novice experience, happy with the training event location, felt the sessions were relevant to them, and most shared the event with their colleagues. The values of co-creation, chatbots in healthcare, and taking patient history were bestowed to students in an engaging and well-received manner. Notably, the highest ratings were for staff friendliness which is key to engagement and consistent interaction throughout the intense and long 5-day duration. The sessions were recorded there for the online recordings may be viewed with higher numbers over the subsequent weeks.

The usual way to include citations in an *R Markdown* document is to put references in a plain text file with the extension **.bib**, in **BibTeX** format.<sup>1</sup> Then reference the path to this file in **index.Rmd**'s YAML header with **bibliography: example.bib**.

Most reference managers can create a .bib file with your references automatically. However, the **by far** best reference manager to use with *R Markdown* is [Zotero](#) with the [Better BibTeX plug-in](#), because the **citr** plugin for RStudio (see below) can read references directly from your Zotero library!

Here is an example of an entry in a **.bib** file:

```
@article{Shea2014,  
  author =      {Shea, Nicholas and Boldt, Annika},  
  journal =     {Trends in Cognitive Sciences},  
  pages =       {186--193},  
  title =       {{Supra-personal cognitive control}},  
  volume =      {18},  
  year =        {2014},
```

---

<sup>1</sup>The bibliography can be in other formats as well, including EndNote (**.enl**) and RIS (**.ris**), see [rmarkdown.rstudio.com/authoring\\_bibliographies\\_and\\_citations](https://rmarkdown.rstudio.com/authoring_bibliographies_and_citations).

#### 4. Overall Training Events Evaluation

```
doi = {10.1016/j.tics.2014.01.006},  
}
```

In this entry highlighted section, ‘Shea2014’ is the **citation identifier**. To default way to cite an entry in your text is with this syntax: `[@citation-identifier]`.

So I might cite some things (Lottridge et al., 2012; Mill, 1965 [1843]; Shea et al., 2014).

##### 4.1.1 Appearance of citations and references section (pandoc)

By default, `oxforddown` lets `Pandoc` handle how citations are inserted in your text and the references section. You can change the appearance of citations and references by specifying a CSL (Citation Style Language) file in the `cs1` metadata field of `index.Rmd`. By default, `oxforddown` by the American Psychological Association (7th Edition), which is an author-year format.

With this style, a number of variations on the citation syntax are useful to know:

- Put author names outside the parenthesis
  - This: `@Shea2014 says blah.`
  - Becomes: Shea et al. (2014) says blah.
- Include only the citation-year (in parenthesis)
  - This: `Shea et al. says blah [-@Shea2014]`
  - Becomes: Shea et al. says blah (2014)
- Add text and page or chapter references to the citation
  - This: `[see @Shea2014, pp. 33–35; also @Wu2016, ch. 1]`
  - Becomes: Blah blah (see Shea et al., 2014, pp. 33–35; also Wu, 2016, ch. 1).

#### *4. Overall Training Events Evalaution*

If you want a numerical citation style instead, try `csl: bibliography/transactions-on-comput` or just have a browse through the [Zotero Style Repository](#) and look for one you like. For convenience, you can set the line spacing and the space between the bibliographic entries in the reference section directly from the YAML header in **index.Rmd**.

If you prefer to use `biblatex` or `natbib` to handle references, see [this chapter](#).



## 4. Overall Training Events Evaluation

### 4.1.2 Insert references easily with RStudio's Visual Editor

For an easy way to insert citations, use RStudio's [Visual Editor](#). Make sure you have the latest version of RStudio – the visual editor was originally really buggy, especially in relation to references, but as per v2022.02.0, it's great!

## 4.2 Cross-referencing

We can make cross-references to **sections** within our document, as well as to **figures** (images and plots) and **tables**.

The general cross-referencing syntax is `\@ref(label)`

### 4.2.1 Section references

Headers are automatically assigned a reference label, which is the text in lower caps separated by dashes. For example, `# My header` is automatically given the label `my-header`. So `# My header` can be referenced with `\@ref(my-section)`

Remember what we wrote in section ???

We can also use **hyperlink syntax** and add `#` before the label, though this is only guaranteed to work properly in HTML output:

- So if we write `Remember what we wrote up in [the previous section](#citations)?`
- It becomes `Remember what we wrote up in the previous section?`

### Creating custom labels

It is a very good idea to create **custom labels** for our sections. This is because the automatically assigned labels will change when we change the titles of the sections - to avoid this, we can create the labels ourselves and leave them untouched if we change the section titles.

We create custom labels by adding `{#label}` after a header, e.g. `# My section {#my-label}`. See [our chapter title](#) for an example. That was section 3.

#### 4. Overall Training Events Evalaution

**Table 4.1:** Stopping cars

speed	dist
4	2
4	10
7	4
7	22
8	16

#### 4.2.2 Figure (image and plot) references

- To refer to figures (i.e. images and plots) use the syntax `\@ref{fig:label}`
- **GOTCHA:** Figures and tables must have captions if you wish to cross-reference them.

Let's add an image:

We refer to this image with `\@ref{fig:captain}`. So Figure ?? is [this image](#).

And in Figure ?? we saw a [cars plot](#).

#### 4.2.3 Table references

- To refer to tables use the syntax `\@ref{tab:label}`

Let's include a table:

We refer to this table with `\@ref{tab:cars-table2}`. So Table 4.1 is [this table](#).

And in Table ?? we saw more or less [the same cars table](#).

#### 4.2.4 Including page numbers

Finally, in the PDF output we might also want to include the page number of a reference, so that it's easy to find in physical printed output. LaTeX has a command for this, which looks like this: `\pageref{fig/tab:label}` (note: curly braces, not parentheses)

When we output to PDF, we can use raw LaTeX directly in our .Rmd files. So if we wanted to include the page of the cars plot we could write:

#### 4. Overall Training Events Evalaution

- This: `Figure \@ref(fig:cars-plot)` on page `\pageref(fig:cars-plot)`
- Becomes: Figure ?? on page ??

#### Include page numbers only in PDF output

A problem here is that LaTeX commands don't display in HTML output, so in the gitbook output we'd see simply "Figure ?? on page".

One way to get around this is to use inline R code to insert the text, and use an `ifelse` statement to check the output format and then insert the appropriate text.

- So this: ``r ifelse(knitr::is_latex_output(), "Figure \@ref(fig:cars-plot) on page \pageref{fig:cars-plot}", "")``
- Inserts this (check this on both PDF and gitbook): Figure ?? on page ??

Note that we need to escape the backslash with another backslash here to get the correct output.

### 4.3 Collaborative writing

Best practices for collaboration and change tracking when using R Markdown are still an open question. In the blog post [One year to dissertate](#) by Lucy D'Agostino, which I highly recommend, the author notes that she knits `.Rmd` files to a word document, then uses the `googledrive` R package to send this to Google Drive for comments / revisions from co-authors, then incorporates Google Drive suggestions *by hand* into the `.Rmd` source files. This is a bit clunky, and there are ongoing discussions among the *R Markdown* developers about what the best way is to handle collaborative writing (see [issue #1463](#) on GitHub, where [CriticMarkup](#) is among the suggestions).

For now, this is an open question in the community of R Markdown users. I often knit to a format that can easily be imported to Google Docs for comments, then go over suggested revisions and manually incorporate them back in to the `.Rmd` source files. For articles, I sometimes upload a near-final draft to [Overleaf](#),

#### *4. Overall Training Events Evalaution*

then collaboratively make final edits to the LaTeX file there. I suspect some great solution will be developed in the not-to-distant future, probably by the RStudio team.

### **4.4 Additional resources**

- *R Markdown: The Definitive Guide* - <https://bookdown.org/yihui/rmarkdown/>
- *R for Data Science* - <https://r4ds.had.co.nz>

# 5

## Discussion

### Contents

<b>5.1</b>	<b>Reach, Impact, and Qualatative analysis</b>	<b>37</b>
5.1.1	Making your table pretty	37
5.1.2	If your table is too wide	37
5.1.3	If your table is too long	38
5.1.4	Max power: manually adjust the raw LaTeX output	47

Here is a (very large) table with all of the currently active RLOS.

sex	time	Code	Location	Profession	CurrentMater
NA	Post	bb4	NA	NA	NA
Female	Pre	E. P. 03/03/2003	Greece	Student on a Healthcare course	Books
Female	Pre	E.K 25/09/2003	Greece	Student on a Healthcare course	Books
NA	Post	ED2310	NA	NA	NA
NA	Post	E.G 01/10/1968	NA	NA	NA
NA	Post	E.K 25/09/2003	NA	NA	NA

Those results can be interpreted that the learning objectives of the training event was chosen appropriately for the diverse audience including clinicians, academics, researchers, and learning technologists/IT specialist resulting to a successful training event that enable participants to take the acquired knowledge back to their organisations in order to co-design and implement. As it was expected and can be depicted from self-confidence statements that some participants being

## 5. Discussion

very confident before the event, not all the objectives expected to be reached by everyone, since the training was targeting both technical and non-technical participants. However, on both average and individual matched responses participants self-statements showed that they improved their knowledge and understanding in using co-creation approaches to develop digital education resources and in designing and developing chatbots as educational resources.

### 5.1 Reach, Impact, and Qualatative analysis

Dealing with tables in LaTeX can be painful. This section explains the main tricks you need to make the pain go away.

(Note: if you are looking at the eBook version, you will not see much difference in this section, as it is only relevant for PDF output!)

#### 5.1.1 Making your table pretty

When you use `kable` to create tables, you will almost certainly want to set the option `booktabs = TRUE`. This makes your table look a million times better:

Compare this to the default style, which looks terrible:

	mpg	cyl	disp	hp	drat	wt	qsec	vs	am	gear	carb
Mazda RX4	21.0	6	160	110	3.90	2.620	16.46	0	1	4	4
Mazda RX4 Wag	21.0	6	160	110	3.90	2.875	17.02	0	1	4	4
Datsun 710	22.8	4	108	93	3.85	2.320	18.61	1	1	4	1
Hornet 4 Drive	21.4	6	258	110	3.08	3.215	19.44	1	0	3	1
Hornet Sportabout	18.7	8	360	175	3.15	3.440	17.02	0	0	3	2
Valiant	18.1	6	225	105	2.76	3.460	20.22	1	0	3	1

#### 5.1.2 If your table is too wide

You might find that your table expands into the margins of the page, like the tables above. Fix this with the `kable_styling` function from the [kableExtra](#) package:

This scales down the table to fit the page width.

## 5. Discussion

	mpg	cyl	disp	hp	drat	wt	qsec	vs	am	gear	carb
Mazda RX4	21.0	6	160	110	3.90	2.620	16.46	0	1	4	4
Mazda RX4 Wag	21.0	6	160	110	3.90	2.875	17.02	0	1	4	4
Datsun 710	22.8	4	108	93	3.85	2.320	18.61	1	1	4	1
Hornet 4 Drive	21.4	6	258	110	3.08	3.215	19.44	1	0	3	1
Hornet Sportabout	18.7	8	360	175	3.15	3.440	17.02	0	0	3	2
Valiant	18.1	6	225	105	2.76	3.460	20.22	1	0	3	1

### 5.1.3 If your table is too long

If your table is too long to fit on a single page, set `longtable = TRUE` in the `kable` function to split the table across multiple pages.

	mpg	cyl	disp	hp	drat	wt	qsec	vs
Mazda RX4	21.0	6	160.0	110	3.90	2.620	16.46	0
Mazda RX4 Wag	21.0	6	160.0	110	3.90	2.875	17.02	0
Datsun 710	22.8	4	108.0	93	3.85	2.320	18.61	1
Hornet 4 Drive	21.4	6	258.0	110	3.08	3.215	19.44	1
Hornet Sportabout	18.7	8	360.0	175	3.15	3.440	17.02	0
Valiant	18.1	6	225.0	105	2.76	3.460	20.22	1
Duster 360	14.3	8	360.0	245	3.21	3.570	15.84	0
Merc 240D	24.4	4	146.7	62	3.69	3.190	20.00	1
Merc 230	22.8	4	140.8	95	3.92	3.150	22.90	1
Merc 280	19.2	6	167.6	123	3.92	3.440	18.30	1
Merc 280C	17.8	6	167.6	123	3.92	3.440	18.90	1
Merc 450SE	16.4	8	275.8	180	3.07	4.070	17.40	0
Merc 450SL	17.3	8	275.8	180	3.07	3.730	17.60	0
Merc 450SLC	15.2	8	275.8	180	3.07	3.780	18.00	0
Cadillac Fleetwood	10.4	8	472.0	205	2.93	5.250	17.98	0
Lincoln Continental	10.4	8	460.0	215	3.00	5.424	17.82	0
Chrysler Imperial	14.7	8	440.0	230	3.23	5.345	17.42	0
Fiat 128	32.4	4	78.7	66	4.08	2.200	19.47	1
Honda Civic	30.4	4	75.7	52	4.93	1.615	18.52	1
Toyota Corolla	33.9	4	71.1	65	4.22	1.835	19.90	1
Toyota Corona	21.5	4	120.1	97	3.70	2.465	20.01	1
Dodge Challenger	15.5	8	318.0	150	2.76	3.520	16.87	0
AMC Javelin	15.2	8	304.0	150	3.15	3.435	17.30	0
Camaro Z28	13.3	8	350.0	245	3.73	3.840	15.41	0
Pontiac Firebird	19.2	8	400.0	175	3.08	3.845	17.05	0
Fiat X1-9	27.3	4	79.0	66	4.08	1.935	18.90	1
Porsche 914-2	26.0	4	120.3	91	4.43	2.140	16.70	0

## 5. Discussion

Lotus Europa	30.4	4	95.1	113	3.77	1.513	16.90	1
Ford Pantera L	15.8	8	351.0	264	4.22	3.170	14.50	0
Ferrari Dino	19.7	6	145.0	175	3.62	2.770	15.50	0
Maserati Bora	15.0	8	301.0	335	3.54	3.570	14.60	0
Volvo 142E	21.4	4	121.0	109	4.11	2.780	18.60	1
Mazda RX41	21.0	6	160.0	110	3.90	2.620	16.46	0
Mazda RX4 Wag1	21.0	6	160.0	110	3.90	2.875	17.02	0
Datsun 7101	22.8	4	108.0	93	3.85	2.320	18.61	1
Hornet 4 Drive1	21.4	6	258.0	110	3.08	3.215	19.44	1
Hornet Sportabout1	18.7	8	360.0	175	3.15	3.440	17.02	0
Valiant1	18.1	6	225.0	105	2.76	3.460	20.22	1
Duster 3601	14.3	8	360.0	245	3.21	3.570	15.84	0
Merc 240D1	24.4	4	146.7	62	3.69	3.190	20.00	1
Merc 2301	22.8	4	140.8	95	3.92	3.150	22.90	1
Merc 2801	19.2	6	167.6	123	3.92	3.440	18.30	1
Merc 280C1	17.8	6	167.6	123	3.92	3.440	18.90	1
Merc 450SE1	16.4	8	275.8	180	3.07	4.070	17.40	0
Merc 450SL1	17.3	8	275.8	180	3.07	3.730	17.60	0
Merc 450SLC1	15.2	8	275.8	180	3.07	3.780	18.00	0
Cadillac Fleetwood1	10.4	8	472.0	205	2.93	5.250	17.98	0
Lincoln Continental1	10.4	8	460.0	215	3.00	5.424	17.82	0
Chrysler Imperial1	14.7	8	440.0	230	3.23	5.345	17.42	0
Fiat 1281	32.4	4	78.7	66	4.08	2.200	19.47	1
Honda Civic1	30.4	4	75.7	52	4.93	1.615	18.52	1
Toyota Corolla1	33.9	4	71.1	65	4.22	1.835	19.90	1
Toyota Corona1	21.5	4	120.1	97	3.70	2.465	20.01	1
Dodge Challenger1	15.5	8	318.0	150	2.76	3.520	16.87	0
AMC Javelin1	15.2	8	304.0	150	3.15	3.435	17.30	0
Camaro Z281	13.3	8	350.0	245	3.73	3.840	15.41	0
Pontiac Firebird1	19.2	8	400.0	175	3.08	3.845	17.05	0
Fiat X1-91	27.3	4	79.0	66	4.08	1.935	18.90	1
Porsche 914-21	26.0	4	120.3	91	4.43	2.140	16.70	0
Lotus Europa1	30.4	4	95.1	113	3.77	1.513	16.90	1
Ford Pantera L1	15.8	8	351.0	264	4.22	3.170	14.50	0
Ferrari Dino1	19.7	6	145.0	175	3.62	2.770	15.50	0
Maserati Bora1	15.0	8	301.0	335	3.54	3.570	14.60	0
Volvo 142E1	21.4	4	121.0	109	4.11	2.780	18.60	1

When you do this, you'll probably want to make the header repeat on new pages. Do this with the `kable_styling` function from `kableExtra`:



## 5. Discussion

	mpg	cyl	disp	hp	drat	wt	qsec	vs	am	gear	carb
Mazda RX4	21.0	6	160.0	110	3.90	2.620	16.46	0	1	4	4
Mazda RX4 Wag	21.0	6	160.0	110	3.90	2.875	17.02	0	1	4	4
Datsun 710	22.8	4	108.0	93	3.85	2.320	18.61	1	1	4	1
Hornet 4 Drive	21.4	6	258.0	110	3.08	3.215	19.44	1	0	3	1
Hornet Sportabout	18.7	8	360.0	175	3.15	3.440	17.02	0	0	3	2
Valiant	18.1	6	225.0	105	2.76	3.460	20.22	1	0	3	1
Duster 360	14.3	8	360.0	245	3.21	3.570	15.84	0	0	3	4
Merc 240D	24.4	4	146.7	62	3.69	3.190	20.00	1	0	4	2
Merc 230	22.8	4	140.8	95	3.92	3.150	22.90	1	0	4	2
Merc 280	19.2	6	167.6	123	3.92	3.440	18.30	1	0	4	4
Merc 280C	17.8	6	167.6	123	3.92	3.440	18.90	1	0	4	4
Merc 450SE	16.4	8	275.8	180	3.07	4.070	17.40	0	0	3	3
Merc 450SL	17.3	8	275.8	180	3.07	3.730	17.60	0	0	3	3
Merc 450SLC	15.2	8	275.8	180	3.07	3.780	18.00	0	0	3	3
Cadillac Fleetwood	10.4	8	472.0	205	2.93	5.250	17.98	0	0	3	4
Lincoln Continental	10.4	8	460.0	215	3.00	5.424	17.82	0	0	3	4
Chrysler Imperial	14.7	8	440.0	230	3.23	5.345	17.42	0	0	3	4
Fiat 128	32.4	4	78.7	66	4.08	2.200	19.47	1	1	4	1
Honda Civic	30.4	4	75.7	52	4.93	1.615	18.52	1	1	4	2
Toyota Corolla	33.9	4	71.1	65	4.22	1.835	19.90	1	1	4	1
Toyota Corona	21.5	4	120.1	97	3.70	2.465	20.01	1	0	3	1
Dodge Challenger	15.5	8	318.0	150	2.76	3.520	16.87	0	0	3	2
AMC Javelin	15.2	8	304.0	150	3.15	3.435	17.30	0	0	3	2
Camaro Z28	13.3	8	350.0	245	3.73	3.840	15.41	0	0	3	4
Pontiac Firebird	19.2	8	400.0	175	3.08	3.845	17.05	0	0	3	2
Fiat X1-9	27.3	4	79.0	66	4.08	1.935	18.90	1	1	4	1
Porsche 914-2	26.0	4	120.3	91	4.43	2.140	16.70	0	1	5	2
Lotus Europa	30.4	4	95.1	113	3.77	1.513	16.90	1	1	5	2
Ford Pantera L	15.8	8	351.0	264	4.22	3.170	14.50	0	1	5	4
Ferrari Dino	19.7	6	145.0	175	3.62	2.770	15.50	0	1	5	6
Maserati Bora	15.0	8	301.0	335	3.54	3.570	14.60	0	1	5	8
Volvo 142E	21.4	4	121.0	109	4.11	2.780	18.60	1	1	4	2
Mazda RX41	21.0	6	160.0	110	3.90	2.620	16.46	0	1	4	4
Mazda RX4 Wag1	21.0	6	160.0	110	3.90	2.875	17.02	0	1	4	4
Datsun 7101	22.8	4	108.0	93	3.85	2.320	18.61	1	1	4	1
Hornet 4 Drive1	21.4	6	258.0	110	3.08	3.215	19.44	1	0	3	1
Hornet Sportabout1	18.7	8	360.0	175	3.15	3.440	17.02	0	0	3	2
Valiant1	18.1	6	225.0	105	2.76	3.460	20.22	1	0	3	1
Duster 3601	14.3	8	360.0	245	3.21	3.570	15.84	0	0	3	4
Merc 240D1	24.4	4	146.7	62	3.69	3.190	20.00	1	0	4	2

## 5. Discussion

(continued)

	mpg	cyl	disp	hp	drat	wt	qsec	vs	am	gear	carb
Merc 2301	22.8	4	140.8	95	3.92	3.150	22.90	1	0	4	2
Merc 2801	19.2	6	167.6	123	3.92	3.440	18.30	1	0	4	4
Merc 280C1	17.8	6	167.6	123	3.92	3.440	18.90	1	0	4	4
Merc 450SE1	16.4	8	275.8	180	3.07	4.070	17.40	0	0	3	3
Merc 450SL1	17.3	8	275.8	180	3.07	3.730	17.60	0	0	3	3
Merc 450SLC1	15.2	8	275.8	180	3.07	3.780	18.00	0	0	3	3
Cadillac Fleetwood1	10.4	8	472.0	205	2.93	5.250	17.98	0	0	3	4
Lincoln Continental1	10.4	8	460.0	215	3.00	5.424	17.82	0	0	3	4
Chrysler Imperial1	14.7	8	440.0	230	3.23	5.345	17.42	0	0	3	4
Fiat 1281	32.4	4	78.7	66	4.08	2.200	19.47	1	1	4	1
Honda Civic1	30.4	4	75.7	52	4.93	1.615	18.52	1	1	4	2
Toyota Corolla1	33.9	4	71.1	65	4.22	1.835	19.90	1	1	4	1
Toyota Corona1	21.5	4	120.1	97	3.70	2.465	20.01	1	0	3	1
Dodge Challenger1	15.5	8	318.0	150	2.76	3.520	16.87	0	0	3	2
AMC Javelin1	15.2	8	304.0	150	3.15	3.435	17.30	0	0	3	2
Camaro Z281	13.3	8	350.0	245	3.73	3.840	15.41	0	0	3	4
Pontiac Firebird1	19.2	8	400.0	175	3.08	3.845	17.05	0	0	3	2
Fiat X1-91	27.3	4	79.0	66	4.08	1.935	18.90	1	1	4	1
Porsche 914-21	26.0	4	120.3	91	4.43	2.140	16.70	0	1	5	2
Lotus Europa1	30.4	4	95.1	113	3.77	1.513	16.90	1	1	5	2
Ford Pantera L1	15.8	8	351.0	264	4.22	3.170	14.50	0	1	5	4
Ferrari Dino1	19.7	6	145.0	175	3.62	2.770	15.50	0	1	5	6
Maserati Bora1	15.0	8	301.0	335	3.54	3.570	14.60	0	1	5	8
Volvo 142E1	21.4	4	121.0	109	4.11	2.780	18.60	1	1	4	2

Unfortunately, we cannot use the `scale_down` option with a `longtable`. So if a `longtable` is too wide, you can either manually adjust the font size, or show the table in landscape layout. To adjust the font size, use `kableExtra`'s `font_size` option:

	mpg	cyl	disp	hp	drat	wt	qsec	vs	am	gear	carb
Mazda RX4	21.0	6	160.0	110	3.90	2.620	16.46	0	1	4	4
Mazda RX4 Wag	21.0	6	160.0	110	3.90	2.875	17.02	0	1	4	4
Datsun 710	22.8	4	108.0	93	3.85	2.320	18.61	1	1	4	1
Hornet 4 Drive	21.4	6	258.0	110	3.08	3.215	19.44	1	0	3	1
Hornet Sportabout	18.7	8	360.0	175	3.15	3.440	17.02	0	0	3	2
Valiant	18.1	6	225.0	105	2.76	3.460	20.22	1	0	3	1
Duster 360	14.3	8	360.0	245	3.21	3.570	15.84	0	0	3	4
Merc 240D	24.4	4	146.7	62	3.69	3.190	20.00	1	0	4	2
Merc 230	22.8	4	140.8	95	3.92	3.150	22.90	1	0	4	2

## 5. Discussion

(continued)

	mpg	cyl	disp	hp	drat	wt	qsec	vs	am	gear	carb
Merc 280	19.2	6	167.6	123	3.92	3.440	18.30	1	0	4	4
Merc 280C	17.8	6	167.6	123	3.92	3.440	18.90	1	0	4	4
Merc 450SE	16.4	8	275.8	180	3.07	4.070	17.40	0	0	3	3
Merc 450SL	17.3	8	275.8	180	3.07	3.730	17.60	0	0	3	3
Merc 450SLC	15.2	8	275.8	180	3.07	3.780	18.00	0	0	3	3
Cadillac Fleetwood	10.4	8	472.0	205	2.93	5.250	17.98	0	0	3	4
Lincoln Continental	10.4	8	460.0	215	3.00	5.424	17.82	0	0	3	4
Chrysler Imperial	14.7	8	440.0	230	3.23	5.345	17.42	0	0	3	4
Fiat 128	32.4	4	78.7	66	4.08	2.200	19.47	1	1	4	1
Honda Civic	30.4	4	75.7	52	4.93	1.615	18.52	1	1	4	2
Toyota Corolla	33.9	4	71.1	65	4.22	1.835	19.90	1	1	4	1
Toyota Corona	21.5	4	120.1	97	3.70	2.465	20.01	1	0	3	1
Dodge Challenger	15.5	8	318.0	150	2.76	3.520	16.87	0	0	3	2
AMC Javelin	15.2	8	304.0	150	3.15	3.435	17.30	0	0	3	2
Camaro Z28	13.3	8	350.0	245	3.73	3.840	15.41	0	0	3	4
Pontiac Firebird	19.2	8	400.0	175	3.08	3.845	17.05	0	0	3	2
Fiat X1-9	27.3	4	79.0	66	4.08	1.935	18.90	1	1	4	1
Porsche 914-2	26.0	4	120.3	91	4.43	2.140	16.70	0	1	5	2
Lotus Europa	30.4	4	95.1	113	3.77	1.513	16.90	1	1	5	2
Ford Pantera L	15.8	8	351.0	264	4.22	3.170	14.50	0	1	5	4
Ferrari Dino	19.7	6	145.0	175	3.62	2.770	15.50	0	1	5	6
Maserati Bora	15.0	8	301.0	335	3.54	3.570	14.60	0	1	5	8
Volvo 142E	21.4	4	121.0	109	4.11	2.780	18.60	1	1	4	2
Mazda RX41	21.0	6	160.0	110	3.90	2.620	16.46	0	1	4	4
Mazda RX4 Wag1	21.0	6	160.0	110	3.90	2.875	17.02	0	1	4	4
Datsun 7101	22.8	4	108.0	93	3.85	2.320	18.61	1	1	4	1
Hornet 4 Drive1	21.4	6	258.0	110	3.08	3.215	19.44	1	0	3	1
Hornet Sportabout1	18.7	8	360.0	175	3.15	3.440	17.02	0	0	3	2
Valiant1	18.1	6	225.0	105	2.76	3.460	20.22	1	0	3	1
Duster 3601	14.3	8	360.0	245	3.21	3.570	15.84	0	0	3	4
Merc 240D1	24.4	4	146.7	62	3.69	3.190	20.00	1	0	4	2
Merc 2301	22.8	4	140.8	95	3.92	3.150	22.90	1	0	4	2
Merc 2801	19.2	6	167.6	123	3.92	3.440	18.30	1	0	4	4
Merc 280C1	17.8	6	167.6	123	3.92	3.440	18.90	1	0	4	4
Merc 450SE1	16.4	8	275.8	180	3.07	4.070	17.40	0	0	3	3
Merc 450SL1	17.3	8	275.8	180	3.07	3.730	17.60	0	0	3	3
Merc 450SLC1	15.2	8	275.8	180	3.07	3.780	18.00	0	0	3	3
Cadillac Fleetwood1	10.4	8	472.0	205	2.93	5.250	17.98	0	0	3	4
Lincoln Continental1	10.4	8	460.0	215	3.00	5.424	17.82	0	0	3	4
Chrysler Imperial1	14.7	8	440.0	230	3.23	5.345	17.42	0	0	3	4
Fiat 1281	32.4	4	78.7	66	4.08	2.200	19.47	1	1	4	1
Honda Civic1	30.4	4	75.7	52	4.93	1.615	18.52	1	1	4	2
Toyota Corolla1	33.9	4	71.1	65	4.22	1.835	19.90	1	1	4	1
Toyota Corona1	21.5	4	120.1	97	3.70	2.465	20.01	1	0	3	1
Dodge Challenger1	15.5	8	318.0	150	2.76	3.520	16.87	0	0	3	2
AMC Javelin1	15.2	8	304.0	150	3.15	3.435	17.30	0	0	3	2
Camaro Z281	13.3	8	350.0	245	3.73	3.840	15.41	0	0	3	4
Pontiac Firebird1	19.2	8	400.0	175	3.08	3.845	17.05	0	0	3	2
Fiat X1-91	27.3	4	79.0	66	4.08	1.935	18.90	1	1	4	1
Porsche 914-21	26.0	4	120.3	91	4.43	2.140	16.70	0	1	5	2
Lotus Europa1	30.4	4	95.1	113	3.77	1.513	16.90	1	1	5	2

## 5. Discussion

*(continued)*

	mpg	cyl	disp	hp	drat	wt	qsec	vs	am	gear	carb
Ford Pantera L1	15.8	8	351.0	264	4.22	3.170	14.50	0	1	5	4
Ferrari Dino1	19.7	6	145.0	175	3.62	2.770	15.50	0	1	5	6
Maserati Bora1	15.0	8	301.0	335	3.54	3.570	14.60	0	1	5	8
Volvo 142E1	21.4	4	121.0	109	4.11	2.780	18.60	1	1	4	2

To put the table in landscape mode, use kableExtra's `landscape` function:

	mpg	cyl	disp	hp	drat	wt	qsec	vs	am	gear	carb
Mazda RX4	21.0	6	160.0	110	3.90	2.620	16.46	0	1	4	4
Mazda RX4 Wag	21.0	6	160.0	110	3.90	2.875	17.02	0	1	4	4
Datsun 710	22.8	4	108.0	93	3.85	2.320	18.61	1	1	4	1
Hornet 4 Drive	21.4	6	258.0	110	3.08	3.215	19.44	1	0	3	1
Hornet Sportabout	18.7	8	360.0	175	3.15	3.440	17.02	0	0	3	2
Valiant	18.1	6	225.0	105	2.76	3.460	20.22	1	0	3	1
Duster 360	14.3	8	360.0	245	3.21	3.570	15.84	0	0	3	4
Merc 240D	24.4	4	146.7	62	3.69	3.190	20.00	1	0	4	2
Merc 230	22.8	4	140.8	95	3.92	3.150	22.90	1	0	4	2
Merc 280	19.2	6	167.6	123	3.92	3.440	18.30	1	0	4	4
Merc 280C	17.8	6	167.6	123	3.92	3.440	18.90	1	0	4	4
Merc 450SE	16.4	8	275.8	180	3.07	4.070	17.40	0	0	3	3
Merc 450SL	17.3	8	275.8	180	3.07	3.730	17.60	0	0	3	3
Merc 450SLC	15.2	8	275.8	180	3.07	3.780	18.00	0	0	3	3
Cadillac Fleetwood	10.4	8	472.0	205	2.93	5.250	17.98	0	0	3	4
Lincoln Continental	10.4	8	460.0	215	3.00	5.424	17.82	0	0	3	4
Chrysler Imperial	14.7	8	440.0	230	3.23	5.345	17.42	0	0	3	4
Fiat 128	32.4	4	78.7	66	4.08	2.200	19.47	1	1	4	1
Honda Civic	30.4	4	75.7	52	4.93	1.615	18.52	1	1	4	2
Toyota Corolla	33.9	4	71.1	65	4.22	1.835	19.90	1	1	4	1
Toyota Corona	21.5	4	120.1	97	3.70	2.465	20.01	1	0	3	1
Dodge Challenger	15.5	8	318.0	150	2.76	3.520	16.87	0	0	3	2
AMC Javelin	15.2	8	304.0	150	3.15	3.435	17.30	0	0	3	2
Camaro Z28	13.3	8	350.0	245	3.73	3.840	15.41	0	0	3	4
Pontiac Firebird	19.2	8	400.0	175	3.08	3.845	17.05	0	0	3	2

(continued)

	mpg	cyl	disp	hp	drat	wt	qsec	vs	am	gear	carb
Fiat X1-9	27.3	4	79.0	66	4.08	1.935	18.90	1	1	4	1
Porsche 914-2	26.0	4	120.3	91	4.43	2.140	16.70	0	1	5	2
Lotus Europa	30.4	4	95.1	113	3.77	1.513	16.90	1	1	5	2
Ford Pantera L	15.8	8	351.0	264	4.22	3.170	14.50	0	1	5	4
Ferrari Dino	19.7	6	145.0	175	3.62	2.770	15.50	0	1	5	6
Maserati Bora	15.0	8	301.0	335	3.54	3.570	14.60	0	1	5	8
Volvo 142E	21.4	4	121.0	109	4.11	2.780	18.60	1	1	4	2
Mazda RX41	21.0	6	160.0	110	3.90	2.620	16.46	0	1	4	4
Mazda RX4 Wag1	21.0	6	160.0	110	3.90	2.875	17.02	0	1	4	4
Datsun 7101	22.8	4	108.0	93	3.85	2.320	18.61	1	1	4	1
Hornet 4 Drive1	21.4	6	258.0	110	3.08	3.215	19.44	1	0	3	1
Hornet Sportabout1	18.7	8	360.0	175	3.15	3.440	17.02	0	0	3	2
Valiant1	18.1	6	225.0	105	2.76	3.460	20.22	1	0	3	1
Duster 3601	14.3	8	360.0	245	3.21	3.570	15.84	0	0	3	4
Merc 240D1	24.4	4	146.7	62	3.69	3.190	20.00	1	0	4	2
Merc 2301	22.8	4	140.8	95	3.92	3.150	22.90	1	0	4	2
Merc 2801	19.2	6	167.6	123	3.92	3.440	18.30	1	0	4	4
Merc 280C1	17.8	6	167.6	123	3.92	3.440	18.90	1	0	4	4
Merc 450SE1	16.4	8	275.8	180	3.07	4.070	17.40	0	0	3	3
Merc 450SL1	17.3	8	275.8	180	3.07	3.730	17.60	0	0	3	3
Merc 450SLC1	15.2	8	275.8	180	3.07	3.780	18.00	0	0	3	3
Cadillac Fleetwood1	10.4	8	472.0	205	2.93	5.250	17.98	0	0	3	4
Lincoln Continental1	10.4	8	460.0	215	3.00	5.424	17.82	0	0	3	4
Chrysler Imperial1	14.7	8	440.0	230	3.23	5.345	17.42	0	0	3	4

(continued)

	mpg	cyl	disp	hp	drat	wt	qsec	vs	am	gear	carb
Fiat 1281	32.4	4	78.7	66	4.08	2.200	19.47	1	1	4	1
Honda Civic1	30.4	4	75.7	52	4.93	1.615	18.52	1	1	4	2
Toyota Corolla1	33.9	4	71.1	65	4.22	1.835	19.90	1	1	4	1
Toyota Corona1	21.5	4	120.1	97	3.70	2.465	20.01	1	0	3	1
Dodge Challenger1	15.5	8	318.0	150	2.76	3.520	16.87	0	0	3	2
AMC Javelin1	15.2	8	304.0	150	3.15	3.435	17.30	0	0	3	2
Camaro Z281	13.3	8	350.0	245	3.73	3.840	15.41	0	0	3	4
Pontiac Firebird1	19.2	8	400.0	175	3.08	3.845	17.05	0	0	3	2
Fiat X1-91	27.3	4	79.0	66	4.08	1.935	18.90	1	1	4	1
Porsche 914-21	26.0	4	120.3	91	4.43	2.140	16.70	0	1	5	2
Lotus Europa1	30.4	4	95.1	113	3.77	1.513	16.90	1	1	5	2
Ford Pantera L1	15.8	8	351.0	264	4.22	3.170	14.50	0	1	5	4
Ferrari Dino1	19.7	6	145.0	175	3.62	2.770	15.50	0	1	5	6
Maserati Bora1	15.0	8	301.0	335	3.54	3.570	14.60	0	1	5	8
Volvo 142E1	21.4	4	121.0	109	4.11	2.780	18.60	1	1	4	2

## 5. Discussion

### 5.1.4 Max power: manually adjust the raw LaTeX output

For total flexibility, you can adjust the raw LaTeX output from `kable/kableExtra` that generates the table. Let us consider how we would do this for the example of adjusting the font size if our table is too wide: LaTeX has a bunch of standard commands that set an approximate font size, as shown below in Figure 5.1.

<code>\tiny</code>	Lorem ipsum
<code>\scriptsize</code>	Lorem ipsum
<code>\footnotesize</code>	Lorem ipsum
<code>\small</code>	Lorem ipsum

**Figure 5.1:** Font sizes in LaTeX

You could use these to manually adjust the font size in your longtable in two steps:

1. Wrap the longtable environment in, e.g., a `scriptsize` environment, by doing a string replacement in the output from `kable/kableExtra`
2. Add the attributes that make R Markdown understand that the table is a table (it seems R drops these when we do the string replacement)

	mpg	cyl	disp	hp	drat	wt	qsec	vs	am	gear	carb
Mazda RX4	21.0	6	160.0	110	3.90	2.620	16.46	0	1	4	4
Mazda RX4 Wag	21.0	6	160.0	110	3.90	2.875	17.02	0	1	4	4
Datsun 710	22.8	4	108.0	93	3.85	2.320	18.61	1	1	4	1
Hornet 4 Drive	21.4	6	258.0	110	3.08	3.215	19.44	1	0	3	1
Hornet Sportabout	18.7	8	360.0	175	3.15	3.440	17.02	0	0	3	2
Valiant	18.1	6	225.0	105	2.76	3.460	20.22	1	0	3	1
Duster 360	14.3	8	360.0	245	3.21	3.570	15.84	0	0	3	4
Merc 240D	24.4	4	146.7	62	3.69	3.190	20.00	1	0	4	2
Merc 230	22.8	4	140.8	95	3.92	3.150	22.90	1	0	4	2
Merc 280	19.2	6	167.6	123	3.92	3.440	18.30	1	0	4	4
Merc 280C	17.8	6	167.6	123	3.92	3.440	18.90	1	0	4	4
Merc 450SE	16.4	8	275.8	180	3.07	4.070	17.40	0	0	3	3
Merc 450SL	17.3	8	275.8	180	3.07	3.730	17.60	0	0	3	3



## 5. Discussion

(continued)

	mpg	cyl	disp	hp	drat	wt	qsec	vs	am	gear	carb
Merc 450SLC	15.2	8	275.8	180	3.07	3.780	18.00	0	0	3	3
Cadillac Fleetwood	10.4	8	472.0	205	2.93	5.250	17.98	0	0	3	4
Lincoln Continental	10.4	8	460.0	215	3.00	5.424	17.82	0	0	3	4
Chrysler Imperial	14.7	8	440.0	230	3.23	5.345	17.42	0	0	3	4
Fiat 128	32.4	4	78.7	66	4.08	2.200	19.47	1	1	4	1
Honda Civic	30.4	4	75.7	52	4.93	1.615	18.52	1	1	4	2
Toyota Corolla	33.9	4	71.1	65	4.22	1.835	19.90	1	1	4	1
Toyota Corona	21.5	4	120.1	97	3.70	2.465	20.01	1	0	3	1
Dodge Challenger	15.5	8	318.0	150	2.76	3.520	16.87	0	0	3	2
AMC Javelin	15.2	8	304.0	150	3.15	3.435	17.30	0	0	3	2
Camaro Z28	13.3	8	350.0	245	3.73	3.840	15.41	0	0	3	4
Pontiac Firebird	19.2	8	400.0	175	3.08	3.845	17.05	0	0	3	2
Fiat X1-9	27.3	4	79.0	66	4.08	1.935	18.90	1	1	4	1
Porsche 914-2	26.0	4	120.3	91	4.43	2.140	16.70	0	1	5	2
Lotus Europa	30.4	4	95.1	113	3.77	1.513	16.90	1	1	5	2
Ford Pantera L	15.8	8	351.0	264	4.22	3.170	14.50	0	1	5	4
Ferrari Dino	19.7	6	145.0	175	3.62	2.770	15.50	0	1	5	6
Maserati Bora	15.0	8	301.0	335	3.54	3.570	14.60	0	1	5	8
Volvo 142E	21.4	4	121.0	109	4.11	2.780	18.60	1	1	4	2
Mazda RX41	21.0	6	160.0	110	3.90	2.620	16.46	0	1	4	4
Mazda RX4 Wag1	21.0	6	160.0	110	3.90	2.875	17.02	0	1	4	4
Datsun 7101	22.8	4	108.0	93	3.85	2.320	18.61	1	1	4	1
Hornet 4 Drive1	21.4	6	258.0	110	3.08	3.215	19.44	1	0	3	1
Hornet Sportabout1	18.7	8	360.0	175	3.15	3.440	17.02	0	0	3	2
Valiant1	18.1	6	225.0	105	2.76	3.460	20.22	1	0	3	1
Duster 3601	14.3	8	360.0	245	3.21	3.570	15.84	0	0	3	4
Merc 240D1	24.4	4	146.7	62	3.69	3.190	20.00	1	0	4	2
Merc 2301	22.8	4	140.8	95	3.92	3.150	22.90	1	0	4	2
Merc 2801	19.2	6	167.6	123	3.92	3.440	18.30	1	0	4	4
Merc 280C1	17.8	6	167.6	123	3.92	3.440	18.90	1	0	4	4
Merc 450SE1	16.4	8	275.8	180	3.07	4.070	17.40	0	0	3	3
Merc 450SL1	17.3	8	275.8	180	3.07	3.730	17.60	0	0	3	3
Merc 450SLC1	15.2	8	275.8	180	3.07	3.780	18.00	0	0	3	3
Cadillac Fleetwood1	10.4	8	472.0	205	2.93	5.250	17.98	0	0	3	4
Lincoln Continental1	10.4	8	460.0	215	3.00	5.424	17.82	0	0	3	4
Chrysler Imperial1	14.7	8	440.0	230	3.23	5.345	17.42	0	0	3	4
Fiat 1281	32.4	4	78.7	66	4.08	2.200	19.47	1	1	4	1
Honda Civic1	30.4	4	75.7	52	4.93	1.615	18.52	1	1	4	2
Toyota Corolla1	33.9	4	71.1	65	4.22	1.835	19.90	1	1	4	1
Toyota Corona1	21.5	4	120.1	97	3.70	2.465	20.01	1	0	3	1
Dodge Challenger1	15.5	8	318.0	150	2.76	3.520	16.87	0	0	3	2
AMC Javelin1	15.2	8	304.0	150	3.15	3.435	17.30	0	0	3	2
Camaro Z281	13.3	8	350.0	245	3.73	3.840	15.41	0	0	3	4
Pontiac Firebird1	19.2	8	400.0	175	3.08	3.845	17.05	0	0	3	2
Fiat X1-91	27.3	4	79.0	66	4.08	1.935	18.90	1	1	4	1
Porsche 914-21	26.0	4	120.3	91	4.43	2.140	16.70	0	1	5	2
Lotus Europa1	30.4	4	95.1	113	3.77	1.513	16.90	1	1	5	2
Ford Pantera L1	15.8	8	351.0	264	4.22	3.170	14.50	0	1	5	4
Ferrari Dino1	19.7	6	145.0	175	3.62	2.770	15.50	0	1	5	6
Maserati Bora1	15.0	8	301.0	335	3.54	3.570	14.60	0	1	5	8
Volvo 142E1	21.4	4	121.0	109	4.11	2.780	18.60	1	1	4	2

# 6

## Text Mining, Natural Language Processing, and Sentiment Analysis

### 6.1 CEPEH Qualatative Feedback

The focus group discussions provided a lot of feedback for how the participants experienced their interactions with the chatbots, and how the CEPEH team can improve them, improve the design and development processes, and improve uptake and sharing.

One method of analysing this data is with use of text mining and data manipulation, creating word clouds, sentiment analysis, and using a model which can distinguish the unique themes in text, and highlights for us what text is used to create these themes.

Therefore, we have created such tools to allow efficient and intelligent analysis of this open/free focus group data.

### 6.2 Tokenising

A Token is “a meaningful unit of text, most often a word, that we are interested in using for further analysis” Meaning, for each word we give it a property that we can call upon later.

## 6. Text Mining, Natural Language Processing, and Sentiment Analysis

The data manipulation for this included removing punctuation, converting to lower-case, and setting word type to word (and not such types as “characters”, “ngrams”, “sentences”, “lines”, “regex”, “paragraphs”)

```
## readtext object consisting of 6 documents and 0 docvars.
## # Description: df [6 x 3]
##   doc_id word      text
##   <fct> <chr>    <chr>
## 1 1      p1      "\"\"\"..."
## 2 1      for     "\"\"\"..."
## 3 1      me      "\"\"\"..."
## 4 1      personally "\"\"\"..."
## 5 1      it      "\"\"\"..."
## 6 1      was     "\"\"\"..."
```

### 6.2.1 2.2 Removing non-alphanumeric characters

- `str_extract` is used to get rid of non-alphanumeric characters (because we don’t want to count *word* separately from word)

### 6.2.2 2.3 Stop words

- Stop words: very common, “meaningless” function words like “the”, “of” and “to” – not usually important in an analysis (i.e. to find out that the most common word in two books you are comparing is “the”)
- `tidytext` has a built-in `df` called `stop_words` for English
- remove these from your dataset with `anti_join`

We can take a look:

```
## # A tibble: 1,149 x 2
##   word      lexicon
##   <chr>    <chr>
## 1 a      SMART
```

## 6. Text Mining, Natural Language Processing, and Sentiment Analysis

```
## 2 a's          SMART
## 3 able         SMART
## 4 about        SMART
## 5 above        SMART
## 6 according    SMART
## 7 accordingly  SMART
## 8 across       SMART
## 9 actually     SMART
## 10 after       SMART
## # ... with 1,139 more rows

## readtext object consisting of 806 documents and 0 docvars.
## # Description: df [806 x 3]
##   doc_id word      text
##   <fct> <chr>      <chr>
## 1 1      personally "\"\"..."
## 2 1      nice       "\"\"..."
## 3 1      week       "\"\"..."
## 4 1      ive        "\"\"..."
## 5 1      feeling    "\"\"..."
## 6 1      chatbots   "\"\"..."
## # ... with 800 more rows
```

Define other stop words:

Break: Prepare your data with the steps above. 1) Unnest tokens, 2) Remove alpha-numeric characters, 3) Remove stopwords

### 6.3 3 Analysing frequencies

#### 6.3.1 3.1 Find most frequent words

- Easily find frequent words using `count()`
- Data must be in tidy format (one token per line)

## 6. Text Mining, Natural Language Processing, and Sentiment Analysis

- `sort = TRUE` to show the most frequent words first

```
tidy_books %>% count(word, sort = TRUE)
```

```
library(tidytext)
library(tidyverse)
library(tm)
library(tigerstats)
library(tidyselect)

CEPEHQ_freq <- CEPEHQ_tidy %>% group_by(doc_id) %>% count(word,
  ↪ sort=TRUE)

CEPEHQ_freq <- CEPEHQ_freq[-6,]

CEPEHQ_freq

## # A tibble: 386 x 3
## # Groups:   doc_id [1]
##   doc_id word          n
##   <fct> <chr>        <int>
## 1 1      cybersecurity  11
## 2 1      information    11
## 3 1      presentation    9
## 4 1      helpful        8
## 5 1      understand      8
## 6 1      ideas            7
## 7 1      lot              7
## 8 1      workshop        7
## 9 1      beginning        6
## 10 1     dont            6
## # ... with 376 more rows
```

The preparation of these words has some use in understanding the frequencies, but their emotional valence are not compared. The table above has the word *‘helpful’* which has a positive connotation, however there are 386 words, with many having several occurrences.

## 6. Text Mining, Natural Language Processing, and Sentiment Analysis

What is the sentiment of all participants? What is types of emotional words are being used?


```
## # A tibble: 387 x 3
## # Groups:   doc_id [1]
##   doc_id word          n
##   <fct> <chr>          <int>
## 1 1      cybersecurity  11
## 2 1      information   11
## 3 1      presentation   9
## 4 1      helpful       8
## 5 1      understand     8
## 6 1      idea           7
## 7 1      ideas          7
## 8 1      lot            7
## 9 1      workshop       7
## 10 1     beginning      6
## # ... with 377 more rows
```

### Plotting word frequencies - bar graphs

Bar graph of top words in CEPEHQ.

Basic graph:

## 6. Text Mining, Natural Language Processing, and Sentiment Analysis




The words can be grouped and plotted onto a bar chart, and to show more words

this chart is presented with horizontal bars. The most frequent words present

in the various focus group discussions after using the 4 CEPEH chatbots are in

the Figure below.

## 6. Text Mining, Natural Language Processing, and Sentiment Analysis



Although the frequency is not high for each word, we are able to get a general picture of the sentiments, intensities, and concerns which would be immediately occurring when plotted.

### 6.3.2 3.2 Normalised frequency

- when comparing the frequencies of words from different texts, they are commonly normalised
- convention in corpus linguistics: report the frequency per 1 million words
- for shorter texts: per 10,000 or per 100,000 words
- calculation:  $\text{raw frequency} * 1,000,000 / \text{total numbers in text}$

```
## # A tibble: 1 x 2
## # Groups:   doc_id [1]
##   doc_id `sum(n)`
##   <fct>     <int>
```



## 6. Text Mining, Natural Language Processing, and Sentiment Analysis

```
## 1 1          682

## # A tibble: 385 x 2

##   word          pmw

##   <chr>        <dbl>

## 1 cybersecurity 16.3

## 2 information   16.3

## 3 presentation 13.3

## 4 helpful       11.8

## 5 understand    11.8

## 6 ideas         10.4

## 7 lot           10.4


## 8 workshop      10.4

## 9 beginning     8.88

## 10 dont         8.88

## # ... with 375 more rows
```

### Plotting normalised frequency



Now we can plot, for example, the 20 most frequent words (by pmw).

### 6.3.3 3.3 Word clouds

Let's visualise the most frequent words in a word cloud. Here, the size indicates the frequency, with words that occur more often being displayed in a larger font size, but this can also be used to visualise e.g. normalised frequency (pmw) or length or




anything else you pass to the `freq =` part of the command.

## 6.4 The vocabulary of Texts

Here is a graph that has plotted the words in places depending on the word frequen-

cies. Additionally, colour coding shows how different the frequencies are - darker

items are more similar in terms of their frequencies, lighter-coloured ones more fre-



quent in one text compared to the other.

# 7

## Sentiment analysis

```
## # A tibble: 6 x 2
##   word      sentiment
##   <chr>     <chr>
## 1 2-faces   negative
## 2 abnormal negative
## 3 abolish  negative
## 4 abominable negative
## 5 abominably negative
## 6 abominate negative

## readtext object consisting of 6 documents and 1 docvar.
## # Description: df [6 x 4]
##   doc_id word      sentiment text
##   <fct> <chr>      <chr>    <chr>
## 1 1      nice      positive  "\"\"..."
## 2 1      invaluable positive  "\"\"..."
## 3 1      facilitate positive  "\"\"..."
## 4 1      difficult negative  "\"\"..."
## 5 1      benefits   positive  "\"\"..."
```

## 7. Sentiment analysis

```
## 6 1      easier      positive "\"\"..."
## readtext object consisting of 2 documents and 0 docvars.
## # Description: df [2 x 3]
##   sentiment      n text
##   <chr>         <int> <chr>
## 1 negative      24 "\"\"..."
## 2 positive      62 "\"\"..."

## readtext object consisting of 6 documents and 1 docvar.
## # Description: df [6 x 4]
##   word      sentiment      n text
##   <chr>      <chr>        <int> <chr>
## 1 helpful   positive       8 "\"\"..."
## 2 benefit   positive       4 "\"\"..."
## 3 difficult negative       4 "\"\"..."
## 4 enjoyed   positive       4 "\"\"..."
## 5 nice      positive       4 "\"\"..."
## 6 easy      positive       3 "\"\"..."

## readtext object consisting of 2 documents and 1 docvar.
## # Description: df [2 x 4]
##   doc_id sentiment      n text
##   * <fct> <chr>        <int> <chr>
## 1 1      negative      24 "\"\"..."
## 2 1      positive      62 "\"\"..."

## readtext object consisting of 2 documents and 0 docvars.
## # Description: df [2 x 3]
##   sentiment      n text
##   <chr>         <int> <chr>
## 1 negative      24 "\"\"..."
## 2 positive      62 "\"\"..."
```

## 7. Sentiment analysis

```
## readtext object consisting of 6 documents and 1 docvar.
```

```
## # Description: df [6 x 4]
```

```
##   word      sentiment      n text
```

```
##   <chr>     <chr>      <int> <chr>
```

```
## 1 helpful   positive      8 "\"\"\"..."
```

```
## 2 benefit   positive      4 "\"\"\"..."
```

```
## 3 difficult negative      4 "\"\"\"..."
```

```
## 4 enjoyed   positive      4 "\"\"\"..."
```

```
## 5 nice      positive      4 "\"\"\"..."
```

```
## 6 easy      positive      3 "\"\"\"..."
```

```
##   max(total_score) min(total_score)
```

```
## 1                38                38
```



## 7. Sentiment analysis

<br>

```
```r
```

```
# install.packages(pdftools)
# split PDF into pages stored in figures/sample-content/pdf_embed_example/split/
# pdftools::pdf_split("figures/sample-content/pdf_embed_example/Lyngs2020_FB.pdf",
#   output = "figures/sample-content/pdf_embed_example/split/")

# grab the pages
pages <- list.files("figures/sample-content/pdf_embed_example/split", full.names =

# set how wide you want the inserted PDFs to be:
# 1.0 is 100 per cent of the oxforddown PDF page width;
# you may want to make it a bit bigger
pdf_width <- 1.2

# for each PDF page, insert it nicely and
# end with a page break
cat(stringr::str_c("\\newpage \\begin{center} \\makebox[\\linewidth][c]{\\includegraphics{",
```



## ‘I Just Want to Hack Myself to Not Get Distracted’: Evaluating Design Interventions for Self-Control on Facebook

Ulrik Lyngs<sup>1</sup>, Kai Lukoff<sup>2</sup>, Petr Slovak<sup>3</sup>, William Seymour<sup>1</sup>, Helena Webb<sup>1</sup>,  
Marina Jirotko<sup>1</sup>, Jun Zhao<sup>1</sup>, Max Van Kleek<sup>1</sup>, Nigel Shadbolt<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Computer Science, University of Oxford, UK, {first.last}@cs.ox.ac.uk

<sup>2</sup>Human Centered Design & Engineering, University of Washington, Seattle, US, kai.l@uw.edu

<sup>3</sup>Department of Informatics, King’s College London, UK, petr.slovak@kcl.ac.uk

### ABSTRACT

Beyond being the world’s largest social network, Facebook is for many also one of its greatest sources of digital distraction. For students, problematic use has been associated with negative effects on academic achievement and general wellbeing. To understand what strategies could help users regain control, we investigated how simple interventions to the Facebook UI affect behaviour and perceived control. We assigned 58 university students to one of three interventions: goal reminders, removed newsfeed, or white background (control). We logged use for 6 weeks, applied interventions in the middle weeks, and administered fortnightly surveys. Both goal reminders and removed newsfeed helped participants stay on task and avoid distraction. However, goal reminders were often annoying, and removing the newsfeed made some fear missing out on information. Our findings point to future interventions such as controls for adjusting types and amount of available information, and flexible blocking which matches individual definitions of ‘distraction’.

### Author Keywords

Facebook; problematic use; self-control; distraction; ICT non-use; addiction; focus; interruptions

### CCS Concepts

•Human-centered computing → Empirical studies in HCI;

### INTRODUCTION

Research on ‘Problematic Facebook Use’ (PFU) has investigated correlations between Facebook use and negative effects on outcomes such as level of academic achievement [35] and subjective wellbeing [58, 57]. A cross-cutting finding is that negative outcomes are associated with difficulty at exerting self-control over use, as well as specific use patterns including viewing friends’ wide-audience broadcasts rather than receiving targeted communication from strong ties [13, 58].

Much of this work has focused on self-control over Facebook use in student populations [2, 44, 46], with media multitasking research finding that students often give in to use which provides short-term ‘guilty pleasures’ over important, but aversive academic tasks [76, 88, 60]. In the present paper, we present a mixed-methods study exploring how two interventions to Facebook — goal reminders and removing the newsfeed — affect university students’ patterns of use and perceived control over Facebook use. To triangulate self-report with objective measurement, our study combined usage logging with fortnightly surveys and post-study interviews.

We found that both interventions helped participants stay on task and use Facebook more in line with their intentions. In terms of use patterns, goal reminders led to less scrolling, fewer and shorter visits, and less time on site, whereas removing the newsfeed led to less scrolling, shorter visits, and less content ‘liked’. However, goal reminders were often experienced as annoying, and removing the newsfeed made some participants fear missing out on information. After the study, participants suggested a range of design solutions to mitigate self-control struggles on Facebook, including controls for filtering or removing the newsfeed, reminders of time spent and of use goals, and removing features that drive engagement. As an exploratory study, this work should be followed by confirmatory studies to assess whether our findings replicate, and how they may generalise beyond a student population.

### RELATED WORK

#### Struggles with Facebook use

Whereas many uses of Facebook offer important benefits, such as social support, rapid spread of information, or facilitation of real-world interactions [78], a substantial amount of research has focused on negative aspects [58]. For example, studies have reported correlations between patterns of Facebook use and lower academic achievement [77, 86], low self-esteem, depression and anxiety [51], feelings of isolation and loneliness [2], and general psychological distress [15]. Such ‘Problematic Facebook Use’ (PFU) has been studied under various names (including ‘Facebook dependence’ [87] and ‘Facebook addiction’ [5]), but a recent review summarised a common definition as ‘problematic behaviour characterised by addictive-like symptoms and/or self-regulation difficulties related to Facebook use leading to negative consequences in personal and social life’ [58].

Permission to make digital or hard copies of part or all of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for third-party components of this work must be honored. For all other uses, contact the owner/author(s).

CHI ’20, April 25–30, 2020, Honolulu, HI, USA.

© 2020 Copyright is held by the author/owner(s).

ACM ISBN 978-1-4503-6708-0/20/04.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/3313831.3376672>

## 7. Sentiment analysis

CHI 2020 Paper

CHI 2020, April 25–30, 2020, Honolulu, HI, USA

### REFERENCES

- [1] Alexander T. Adams, Jean Costa, Malte F. Jung, and Tanzeem Choudhury. 2015. Mindless Computing: Designing Technologies to Subtly Influence Behavior. In *Proceedings of the 2015 ACM International Joint Conference on Pervasive and Ubiquitous Computing*. ACM, 719–730. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/2750858.2805843>
- [2] Sami Abdo Radman Al-Dubai, Kurubaran Ganasegeran, Mustafa Ahmed Mahdi Al-Shagga, Hematram Yadav, and John T. Arokiasamy. 2013. Adverse Health Effects and Unhealthy Behaviors among Medical Students Using Facebook. <https://www.hindawi.com/journals/tswj/2013/465161/>. (2013). DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1155/2013/465161>
- [3] All Party Parliamentary Group on Social Media and Young People's Mental Health and Wellbeing. 2019. *#NewFilters to Manage the Impact of Social Media on Young People's Mental Health and Wellbeing*. Technical Report. UK Parliament.
- [4] Hunt Allcott, Luca Braghieri, Sarah Eichmeyer, and Matthew Gentzkow. 2019. *The Welfare Effects of Social Media*. Working Paper 25514. National Bureau of Economic Research. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3386/w25514>
- [5] Cecilie Schou Andreassen, Torbjørn Torsheim, Geir Scott Brunborg, and Staale Pallesen. 2012. Development of a Facebook Addiction Scale. *Psychological Reports* 110, 2 (apr 2012), 501–517. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2466/02.09.18.PR0.110.2.501-517>
- [6] Yummy Apps. 2019. Todobook. (May 2019).
- [7] Albert Bandura. 1982. Self-efficacy mechanism in human agency. *American Psychologist* 37, 2 (1982), 122–147. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066x.37.2.122>
- [8] Fanni Bányaí, Ágnes Zsila, Orsolya Király, Aniko Maraz, Zsuzsanna Elekes, Mark D. Griffiths, Cecilie Schou Andreassen, and Zsolt Demetrovics. 09-Jan-2017. Problematic Social Media Use: Results from a Large-Scale Nationally Representative Adolescent Sample. *PLOS ONE* 12, 1 (09-Jan-2017), e0169839. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0169839>
- [9] Elliot T Berkman, Cendri A Hutcherson, Jordan L Livingston, Lauren E Kahn, and Michael Inzlicht. 2017. Self-Control as Value-Based Choice. *Current Directions in Psychological Science* 26, 5 (2017), 422–428. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0963721417704394>
- [10] Walter R. Boot, Daniel J. Simons, Cary Stothart, and Cassie Stutts. 2013. The Pervasive Problem with Placebos in Psychology. *Perspectives on Psychological Science* 8, 4 (jul 2013), 445–454. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1745691613491271>
- [11] Amara Brook. 2011. Ecological Footprint Feedback: Motivating or Discouraging? *Social Influence* 6, 2 (April 2011), 113–128. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15534510.2011.566801>
- [12] Gharad Bryan, Dean Karlan, and Scott Nelson. 2010. Commitment Devices. *Annual Review of Economics* 2, 1 (Sept. 2010), 671–698. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev.economics.102308.124324>
- [13] Moira Burke and Robert E. Kraut. 2016. The Relationship Between Facebook Use and Well-Being Depends on Communication Type and Tie Strength. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* 21, 4 (2016), 265–281. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/jcc4.12162>
- [14] Moira Burke, Cameron Marlow, and Thomas Lento. 2010. Social Network Activity and Social Well-Being. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI '10)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 1909–1912. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/1753326.1753613>
- [15] Wenhong Chen and Kye-Hyoung Lee. 2013. Sharing, Liking, Commenting, and Distressed? The Pathway between Facebook Interaction and Psychological Distress. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior and Social Networking* 16, 10 (oct 2013), 728–734. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1089/cyber.2012.0272>
- [16] Justin Cheng, Moira Burke, and Elena Goetz Davis. 2019. Understanding Perceptions of Problematic Facebook Use: When People Experience Negative Life Impact and a Lack of Control. In *Proceedings of the 2019 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI '19)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 199:1–199:13. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/3290605.3300429>
- [17] Jacob Cohen. 1992. A Power Primer. *Psychological Bulletin* 112, 1 (1992), 155–159. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.112.1.155>
- [18] Anna L Cox, Sandy J J Gould, Marta E Cecchinato, Ioanna Iacovides, and Ian Renfree. 2016. Design Frictions for Mindful Interactions: The Case for Microboundaries. In *Proceedings of the 2016 CHI Conference Extended Abstracts on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI EA '16)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 1389–1397. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/2851581.2892410>
- [19] Helen Creswick, Liz Dowthwaite, Ansgar Koene, Elvira Perez Vallejos, Virginia Portillo, Monica Cano, and Christopher Woodard. 2019. "... They don't really listen to people". *Journal of Information, Communication and Ethics in Society* 17, 2 (May 2019), 167–182. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/jices-11-2018-0090>
- [20] Angela L. Duckworth, Katherine L. Milkman, and David Laibson. 2018. Beyond Willpower: Strategies for Reducing Failures of Self-Control. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest* 19, 3 (Dec. 2018), 102–129. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1529100618821893>

7. Sentiment analysis

<p>Title of your Thesis</p> <p>John Doe</p>	<p><b>Thesis committee</b></p> <p><b>Promotor:</b> Prof.dr. J. Smith Professor of Geo-information Science and Remote Sensing Wageningen University</p> <p><b>Co-promotors:</b> Dr. Name of co-promotor Assistant Professor, Laboratory of Geo-information Science and Remote Sensing Wageningen University</p> <p><b>Other members:</b> Prof.dr. Jury member 1, Wageningen University Prof.dr. Jury member 2, Affiliation Prof.dr. Jury member 3, Affiliation Prof.dr. Jury member 4, Affiliation</p> <p>This research was conducted under the auspices of the C.T. de Wit Graduate School of Production Ecology &amp; Resource Conservation (PERC)</p>	<p>Title of your thesis</p> <p>John Doe</p> <p><b>Thesis</b> submitted in fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of doctor at Wageningen University by the authority of the Rector Magnificus Prof. Dr A.P.J. Mol, in the presence of the Thesis Committee appointed by the Academic Board to be defended in public on Date of your defense at 4 p.m. in the Aula</p>
<p>John Doe Title of your thesis 77 pages PhD thesis, Wageningen University, Wageningen, NL (2015) With references, with summary in English ISBN XXX-YYY</p>	<p>For Yihai Xie</p>	<p>Acknowledgements</p> <p>This is where you will normally thank your advisor, colleagues, family and friends, as well as funding and institutional support. In our case, we will give our thanks to the people who developed the ideas and tools that allow us to push open science a little step forward by writing plain-text, transparent, and reproducible thses in R Markdown.</p> <p>We must be grateful to John Gruber for inventing the original version of Markdown, to John MacFarlane for creating Pandoc (<a href="http://pandoc.org">http://pandoc.org</a>) which converts Markdown to a large number of output formats, and to Yihai Xie for creating knitr which introduced R Markdown as a way of embedding code in Markdown documents, and bookdown which added tools for technical and longer-form writing.</p> <p>Special thanks to Chetwynd Jemmy, who created the <i>thesisdown</i> package that helped many a PhD student write their theses in R Markdown. And a very special thanks to John MacFarlane, whose adoption of Stan Evans' adaptation of Keith Gilmer's original mumble template for writing an Oxford University DPhil thesis in L<sup>A</sup>T<sub>E</sub>X provided the template that I in turn adopted for R Markdown.</p> <p>Finally, profuse thanks to JJ Allaire, the founder and CEO of RStudio, and Hadley Wickham, the mastermind of the tidyverse without whom we'd all just given up and done data science in Python instead. Thanks for making data science easier, more accessible, and more fun for us all.</p> <p>Ulrik Lengen Linacre College, Oxford 2 December 2018</p>

# Appendix

# Appendices



## The First Appendix

This first appendix includes an R chunk that was hidden in the document (using `echo = FALSE`) to help with readability:

**In `02-rmd-basics-code.Rmd`**

**And here's another one from the same chapter, i.e. Chapter ??:**

B

The Second Appendix, for Fun

## References

- Darwin, C. (1859). *On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life*. John Murray.
- Goethe, J. W. von. (1829). *Wilhelm Meisters Wanderjahre oder die Entsagen-den*. Cotta.
- Lottridge, D., Marschner, E., Wang, E., Romanovsky, M., & Nass, C. (2012). Browser design impacts multitasking. *Proceedings of the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society 56th Annual Meeting*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1071181312561289>
- Mill, J. S. (1965 [1843]). *A system of logic, ratiocinative and inductive: Being a connected view of the principles of evidence and the methods of scientific investigation*. Longmans.
- Shea, N., Boldt, A., Bang, D., Yeung, N., Heyes, C., & Frith, C. D. (2014). Supra-personal cognitive control and metacognition. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 18(4), 186–193. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2014.01.006>
- Wu, T. (2016). *The Attention Merchants: The Epic Scramble to Get Inside Our Heads*. Knopf Publishing Group.