

# Gamification Effectiveness on Education\*

Sachin Chhikara

April 15, 2024

First sentence. Second sentence. Third sentence. Fourth sentence.

## 1 Introduction

Games have been part of human history for a long time and are loved by many young and old. The design behind why game are so fun have investigated in recent time and how to apply those element that are fun and to apply them to other fields, this is known as gamification. Gamification is used in fields such as enterprise, sales, lifestyle and education. In this paper we will focusing on application of education, we be using data from Duolingu, training model and making inference off, real life application of gamification to an individual productive.

In this paper, we are doing replication of a study ... , which has a control and treatment where the treatment is applied gamification, while the control is using an ordinary education system. Yeah there benefits, but there are downside when comes to how the gamification as it might discourage learning. Furthermore, an wide use application of gamification is a language learning app called Duolingo, which has ... active users and this app learning is recognized in certain Universities as legitimate English learning. So we examine game design that are use. Ways to apply gamification in daily lives, like this app called Habitica: Gamify your tasks.

## 2 Data

### 2.1 Data Source

### 2.2 Methodology

The original study used 379 undergraduates for their experiments and there were randomly assigned into 5 groups Control(N=76), Educational game(N=75), Gamification Plugin(N=77),

---

\*Code and data are available at: [LINK](#).

Social networking website(N=75), Social gamified networking website(N=76). The experiment was carried out on 10-week first year undergraduate class called ‘Qualification for ICT Users’ with hybrid learning. This course is an introduction to basic computing concepts such as word processing, spreadsheets, presentations and databases. There is an assignment for each of these four concepts which focus on testing practical skills. While, the final examination is cumulative and focus on testing conceptual knowledge.

Students have lecture every two weeks and must work independently rest of the work to learn then material. Supplementary learning material was provided such as videos and communication tools in learning material platform.

The control group just use what was mention above. Educational game used was called Ribbonhero offered by Microsoft as as free download to download Software, and player plays as virtual character Clippy and must overcome six challenges with increasing difficulty. Gamification plugin (Figure 1) is integrated in the institutional management system where there are challenges, trophies/badges and a leader board. Social Networking website was run on a open source engine, Elgg (Figure 2) and it functions very similar to social media where students can share their thoughts, make friends and discuss the material in class. Social gamified networking website use the same engine as the previous group and having similar features to Gamification plugin(Figure 3). A summary of the groups features and potential benefits(**(tb-summary-group?)**). The study highlights that the educational game is not necessarily aligned with the learning goals, while the gamification used in this study was.




Figure 1: Gamification Plugin. Leaderboard and challenges.



Figure 2: Social Networking Website.



Figure 3: Social gamification website: Gamification tools (left), dashboard (top-right) & leaderboard (bottom-right).

Instrument	Features
Educational game	Challenges, levels, points, narrative
Gamification plugin	Trophies, badges, challenges, leaderboard
Social networking website	Blogging, questions & answers, liking, friends, built-in twitter, dashboard
Social gamification website	Blogging, questions & answers, liking, friends, built-in twitter, dashboard, challenges

## 2.3 Data Cleaning Procedure

For our replication, we drop 20 rows of data from the original dataset provided since those rows contained missing data on grades of some assessments and final examination. The age row was removed since in the original study it mention that there age range for each group but in the dataset provided they made every value in that column to 19 since that the average age in the study. To summarize, the size of the dataset we use in this replication is  $N = 359$  (Control=75, Game=66, Plugin=73, Social Network=74, Social Gamification=71).

This dataset was chosen since my many studies in gamification don't have easy access to their datasets. In addition, this dataset includes control and treatment group which is useful for examining the difference between a traditional education system and gamification.

## 2.4 Data Visualization

Table 2: The results of the pretest.

Evaluation_item	Group	N	Mean	Std_err	Std_dev
Word Processing	Control	75	47.76	1.80	15.63
Word Processing	Ed. Game	66	45.83	2.53	20.56
Word Processing	Gamification	73	44.90	2.06	17.56
Word Processing	Social	74	45.19	1.80	15.51
Word Processing	Social Gamif.	71	44.77	2.50	21.06
Spreadsheets	Control	75	50.45	1.92	16.67
Spreadsheets	Ed. Game	66	51.50	1.90	15.46
Spreadsheets	Gamification	73	53.34	2.07	17.65
Spreadsheets	Social	74	51.30	2.16	18.54
Spreadsheets	Social Gamif.	71	52.37	1.87	15.72
Presentations	Control	75	44.11	1.61	13.99
Presentations	Ed. Game	66	45.33	1.45	11.82
Presentations	Gamification	73	45.21	1.60	13.67
Presentations	Social	74	44.59	1.39	11.92

Evaluation_item	Group	N	Mean	Std_err	Std_dev
Presentations	Social Gamif.	71	45.39	1.66	14.03
Databases	Control	75	51.80	2.09	18.06
Databases	Ed. Game	66	57.18	2.29	18.56
Databases	Gamification	73	54.86	2.03	17.38
Databases	Social	74	51.28	2.02	17.40
Databases	Social Gamif.	71	55.17	2.15	18.11

Table 3: The results of the posttest.

Evaluation_item	Group	N	Mean	Std_err	Std_dev
Word Processing	Control	75	64.37	1.95	16.90
Word Processing	Ed. Game	66	79.54	1.88	15.27
Word Processing	Gamification	73	74.11	2.81	24.05
Word Processing	Social	74	84.23	1.78	15.30
Word Processing	Social Gamif.	71	84.20	1.91	16.06
Spreadsheets	Control	75	61.74	3.04	26.32
Spreadsheets	Ed. Game	66	82.50	2.87	23.35
Spreadsheets	Gamification	73	79.93	2.75	23.50
Spreadsheets	Social	74	80.43	2.15	18.51
Spreadsheets	Social Gamif.	71	86.10	1.93	16.25
Presentations	Control	75	75.76	1.46	12.61
Presentations	Ed. Game	66	93.56	1.06	8.62
Presentations	Gamification	73	90.91	1.25	10.65
Presentations	Social	74	90.27	1.86	15.96
Presentations	Social Gamif.	71	86.78	1.27	10.68
Databases	Control	75	52.04	2.43	21.08
Databases	Ed. Game	66	55.48	3.94	31.97
Databases	Gamification	73	73.22	2.67	22.82
Databases	Social	74	70.86	2.41	20.75
Databases	Social Gamif.	71	66.85	3.15	26.57

And also planes (**?@fig-planes**). (You can change the height and width, but don't worry about doing that until you have finished every other aspect of the paper - Quarto will try to make it look nice and the defaults usually work well once you have enough text.)

Talk way more about it.

## 3 Model

The goal of our modelling strategy is twofold. Firstly,...

Here we briefly describe the Bayesian analysis model used to investigate... Background details and diagnostics are included in [?@sec-model-details](#).

### 3.1 Model set-up

Define  $y_i$  as the number of seconds that the plane remained aloft. Then  $\beta_i$  is the wing width and  $\gamma_i$  is the wing length, both measured in millimeters.

$$y_i | \mu_i, \sigma \sim \text{Normal}(\mu_i, \sigma) \tag{1}$$

$$\mu_i = \alpha + \beta_i + \gamma_i \tag{2}$$

$$\alpha \sim \text{Normal}(0, 2.5) \tag{3}$$

$$\beta \sim \text{Normal}(0, 2.5) \tag{4}$$

$$\gamma \sim \text{Normal}(0, 2.5) \tag{5}$$

$$\sigma \sim \text{Exponential}(1) \tag{6}$$

We run the model in R (R Core Team 2023) using the `rstanarm` package of Goodrich et al. (2022). We use the default priors from `rstanarm`.

#### 3.1.1 Model justification

We expect a positive relationship between the size of the wings and time spent aloft. In particular...

We can use maths by including latex between dollar signs, for instance  $\theta$ .

## 4 Results

Our results are summarized in [Table 4](#).

Table 4: Explanatory models of flight time based on wing width and wing length

	First model
(Intercept)	−0.15 (0.65)
certainty	0.14 (0.10)
Num.Obs.	53
R2	0.039
Log.Lik.	−32.999
ELPD	−35.1
ELPD s.e.	2.7
LOOIC	70.2
LOOIC s.e.	5.5
WAIC	70.2
RMSE	0.47

## 5 Discussion

### 5.1 First discussion point

If my paper were 10 pages, then should be at least 2.5 pages. The discussion is a chance to show off what you know and what you learnt from all this.

### 5.2 Second discussion point

### 5.3 Third discussion point

### 5.4 Weaknesses and next steps

Weaknesses and next steps should also be included.

## Appendix

### A Additional data details

### B Model details

#### B.1 Posterior predictive check

In `?@fig-ppcheckandposteriorvsprior-1` we implement a posterior predictive check. This shows...

In `?@fig-ppcheckandposteriorvsprior-2` we compare the posterior with the prior. This shows...

Examining how the model fits, and is affected by, the data

#### B.2 Diagnostics

Figure 4a is a trace plot. It shows... This suggests...

Figure 4b is a Rhat plot. It shows... This suggests...




Figure 4: Checking the convergence of the MCMC algorithm



## References

- Arel-Bundock, Vincent. 2022. “modelssummary: Data and Model Summaries in R.” *Journal of Statistical Software* 103 (1): 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v103.i01>.
- de-Marcos, Luis, Eva Garcia-Lopez, and Antonio Garcia-Cabot. 2016. “On the Effectiveness of Game-Like and Social Approaches in Learning: Comparing Educational Gaming, Gamification & Social Networking.” *Computers & Education* 95: 99–113. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2015.12.008>.
- de-Marcos, Luis, Eva García-López, and Antonio García-Cabot. 2017. “Dataset on the Learning Performance of ECDL Digital Skills of Undergraduate Students for Comparing Educational Gaming, Gamification and Social Networking.” *Data in Brief* 11: 155–58. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dib.2017.01.017>.
- Gebru, Timnit, Jamie Morgenstern, Briana Vecchione, Jennifer Wortman Vaughan, Hanna Wallach, Hal Daumé Iii, and Kate Crawford. 2021. “Datasheets for Datasets.” *Communications of the ACM* 64 (12): 86–92.
- Goodrich, Ben, Jonah Gabry, Imad Ali, and Sam Brilleman. 2022. “Rstanarm: Bayesian Applied Regression Modeling via Stan.” <https://mc-stan.org/rstanarm/>.
- Horst, Allison Marie, Alison Presmanes Hill, and Kristen B Gorman. 2020. *Palmer penguins: Palmer Archipelago (Antarctica) Penguin Data*. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3960218>.
- R Core Team. 2023. *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing. <https://www.R-project.org/>.
- Richardson, Neal, Ian Cook, Nic Crane, Dewey Dunnington, Romain François, Jonathan Keane, Dragoş Moldovan-Grünfeld, Jeroen Ooms, Jacob Wujciak-Jens, and Apache Arrow. 2024. *Arrow: Integration to 'Apache' 'Arrow'*. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=arrow>.
- Wickham, Hadley, Mara Averick, Jennifer Bryan, Winston Chang, Lucy D’Agostino McGowan, Romain François, Garrett Grolemund, et al. 2019. “Welcome to the tidyverse.” *Journal of Open Source Software* 4 (43): 1686. <https://doi.org/10.21105/joss.01686>.