

SGSEEM: Evaluating Serious Game Frameworks from a Stakeholder Experience Perspective

ABSTRACT

There is little research or experience with formal evaluation of serious game frameworks. To fill this gap, this paper describes an evaluation mechanism called the Serious Game Stakeholder Experience Evaluation Method (SGSEEM). SGSEEM is designed to provide detailed insights into the strengths and weaknesses of serious game frameworks through a stakeholder perspective based approach.

In this paper, we report on the use of SGSEEM to evaluate Makahiki, an open source serious game framework for sustainability. Makahiki facilitates the development of serious games for the purpose of education and behavioral change regarding energy and water consumption. Makahiki and SGSEEM together provide useful insights into the challenges and opportunities of serious game framework design and evaluation.

Author Keywords

serious games; framework evaluation; sustainability

ACM Classification Keywords

H.5.m. Information Interfaces and Presentation (e.g., HCI): MiscellaneousK.8.0. Personal Computing Games

General Terms

Serious Game; Evaluation; Game Design; Case study.

INTRODUCTION

Serious games (games with additional goals beyond just entertainment) have been the topic of academic research for decades [15]. Such games show great potential as successful interactive media that provide engaging interfaces in various serious contexts [10, 12]. The recent phenomenon of gamification [4] also calls for game-related research in areas beyond traditional entertainment purposes.

One of the fundamental questions in assessing a serious game is the extent to which the game achieves its “serious” purpose. This is quite different from traditional entertainment games, in which assessment focuses on usability or playability [14]. In the field of serious games, there is an increasing focus on the methodology of research and evaluation [9]. De Freitas and Oliver describe a four dimensional framework [3]

for evaluating an educational game, consisting of: the context, the pedagogy, the representation, and the learner (or player). Hartevelt proposes an alternative approach called “Triadic Game Evaluation” [5], consisting of three perspectives: Reality, Meaning, and Play.

The above approaches focus on evaluation of a single game, as opposed to a game *framework*. Game frameworks (also known as game engines) are “comprised of a collection of different tools, utilities, and interfaces that hide the low-level details of the various tasks that make up a game” [13]. One of the benefits of using a serious game framework is that, if correctly designed, it will provide useful and reusable “building blocks” for a serious game. These building blocks enable the serious game developer to focus more time and thought on content and results instead of on infrastructure. Yet how are we to know if a serious game framework has been “correctly designed”?

To help answer this question, this paper proposes a method for evaluating serious game frameworks, called the Serious Game Stakeholder Experience Evaluation Method (SGSEEM). In a nutshell, SGSEEM identifies the most important stakeholders of a serious game framework and provides a method for gaining insight into the extent with which the framework is effective and efficient with respect to each stakeholders’ perspective.

To best understand SGSEEM, we will start by briefly introducing Makahiki, our serious game framework for sustainability, and how its development motivated us to create the SGSEEM method. We then describe our preliminary results from the application of SGSEEM to Makahiki. We conclude with the insights this evaluation process provides for our own work on Makahiki as well as for serious game design in general.

MOTIVATION FOR SGSEEM

Sustainability education and conservation have become an international imperative due to the rising cost of energy, increasing scarcity of natural resources, and irresponsible environmental practices. Over the past decade, energy and water challenges have become focal points for sustainability efforts at both university and industry campuses. For example, college residence hall energy competitions have been a widespread mechanism for engaging students in energy issues, with more than 160 taking place or being planned for the 2010–2011 academic year in North America [6].

Designers of such challenges typically have three choices for information technology support: (a) build their own custom in-house solution (as was done at Oberlin College in 2006 [11]); (b) out-source to a commercial provider (as was done at the University of British Columbia in 2011); or (c)

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part 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. To copy otherwise, to republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee.

Gamification’13, October 2–4, 2013, Stratford, ON, Canada.

Copyright 2013 ACM 978-1-XXXX-XXXX-X/XX/XX...\$10.00.

use a minimal tech solution such as a web page and manual posting of data and results (as was done at Harvard in 2012).

None of these choices are ideal: the custom in-house solution requires sophisticated design and implementation skills; out-sourcing can be financially expensive and impedes evolution; and the minimal tech solution does not fully leverage the possibilities of advanced information technology.

To provide a better alternative to these three choices, we designed and implemented an open source serious game framework for sustainability called Makahiki [8]. Makahiki implements an extensible framework with a variety of common services for developing sustainability games including: authentication; game mechanics such as leaderboards, points, and badges; a variety of built-in games and content focused on sustainability; a responsive user interface; cloud-based deployment; and the ability to customize the game to the needs of individual organizations. Figure 1 illustrates a home page implemented using Makahiki.



Figure 1. Makahiki Game Instance

To explore the ability of the Makahiki framework to support sustainability games in different environments, we ran three challenges at different organizations in Fall 2012: The University of Hawaii, Hawaii Pacific University, and the East-West Center. While these experiences provided anecdotal evidence for the usefulness of Makahiki as a framework, we realized that a more rigorous evaluation of the framework would yield better insight into its current quality and requirements for future enhancement.

Upon reviewing the literature, we found little prior work concerning formal evaluation for the particular needs of serious game frameworks. As a result, we designed SGSEEM, and began applying it to gain better insight into Makahiki as a result of its usage in three game challenges during 2012.

SERIOUS GAME STAKEHOLDER EXPERIENCE EVALUATION METHOD (SGSEEM)

The goal of SGSEEM is to determine to what extent the serious game framework under evaluation, as an Information

Technology (IT) infrastructure, can effectively and efficiently support the development and play of a serious game.

An *effective* serious game framework can produce a game with the desired outcome with respect to its “serious” goals for the players. For example, an effective serious game framework for energy education and conservation produces a game that increases players’ energy literacy and reduces their energy consumption during (and, hopefully, after) the game. Because the goals of serious games are always subject specific, the desired effect of a serious game for sustainability is different than the desired effect of a serious game for language learning, or for healthy eating. In this paper, we will refer to subject-specific goals relevant to sustainability, but users of SGSEEM in other domains will substitute goals for their area.

An *efficient* serious game framework can support the full life cycle of game development, execution, and wrap-up of the serious game, including design, management, administration, development, and improvement of the game.

Methodology

Creswell [2] categorizes research methods into three approaches: quantitative, qualitative, and mixed-methods, according to what constitutes knowledge and how knowledge is best acquired. Derived from his work, SGSEEM is based upon the mixed-methods with both qualitative and quantitative data collection and analysis.

In SGSEEM, qualitative analysis involves structured interviews and questionnaires to stakeholders designed to gain insight about their experiences with the framework under study. Besides qualitative analysis, SGSEEM also employs quantitative analysis involving the analytical data recorded by the system, including website logs, player interaction logs, feedback, resource usage, etc.

Stakeholders

There are many more stakeholders in serious games than in traditional entertainment games. The following are the stakeholders we identified for our sustainability serious game framework:

- *Players*: those who participate in the game play.
- *System Admins*: those who install and maintain the technological game infrastructure.
- *Game Designers*: those who design the content and game mechanics.
- *Game Managers*: those who manage the game during the period of game play.
- *Developers*: those who extend, enhance and debug the game framework.
- *Researchers*: those who are conducting research using the game framework.
- *Spectators*: those who do not participate in the game play but are interested in the game and the results of game play.
- *Community partners*: those who partner with the game organizers to help run the game (such as coordinating real-world events as part of the game).

- *Facilities*: those who are responsible for the resources (energy, water, etc) associated with the game.
- *Funding organizations*: the organizations who provide funding to the project.

The overall success of a serious game framework for sustainability depends on the individual success of all of these stakeholders. However, as SGSEEM focuses on the software infrastructure, it does address the spectator, community partner, facilities, and funding organization stakeholders. These are important stakeholders but outside the scope of our evaluation method.

Our case study evaluation of Makahiki using SGSEEM evaluates (1) aspects of effectiveness of the system for Players, and (2) aspects of both effectiveness and efficiency for Game Designers, Game Managers, System Admins, Developers, and Researchers.

Figure 2 provides an overview of the evaluation framework. The following sections describe in detail the evaluation mechanism for each stakeholder.

Stakeholder	Evaluation Goal
Players	Effectiveness of the game to players in terms of literacy and behavior change in sustainability, player engagement
System admins	Efficiency in administrating the system
Game designers	Efficiency in designing a game
Game managers	Efficiency in managing a game
Developers	Efficiency in developing a game or enhancing the system
Researchers	Efficiency in performing research

Figure 2. Overview of SGSEEM

1. Player Effectiveness

SGSEEM assesses the “effectiveness” of a serious game framework for the Player stakeholder by addressing three questions: (a) To what extent does the game increase player’s literacy in sustainability? (b) To what extent does the game produce positive player behavior change in sustainability? (c) To what extent does the game engage players?

Figure 3 illustrates the process for player effectiveness evaluation, which involves a pre-game and post-game measurement for literacy and behavior change, as well as the in-game data logging to measure the level of player engagement.




Figure 3. Player Effectiveness Evaluation Process

(a) *Literacy assessment*: One important goal of a serious game for sustainability is to produce a change in knowledge

in the players. A literacy assessment can indicate whether this goal is being met.

SGSEEM uses an approach similar to that described in [1] to assess the impact of the game on player literacy. In general, a set of literacy survey questionnaires are presented to a random selection of the players before the game. After the game ends, the same survey (post-game) is presented to the players who responded the pre-game survey. These two set of survey response data are compared to understand if the game has had an impact on literacy.

The extent of players’ sustainability literacy change will indicate the degree of educational effectiveness of the serious game for sustainability.

(b) *Behavior change assessment*: Positive behavior change is another main goal of a serious game for sustainability. A serious game for sustainability may include some degree of resource consumption measurement. SGSEEM uses resource consumption data before and after the game as part of the assessment of the players’ sustainability behavior change. A resource consumption baseline can be established based on historical consumption data. During and after the game, we can compare the resource consumption with the baseline for a particular day to understand to what extent the resource consumption has changed.

The problems with using a baseline to assess the energy reduction in the case of dormitory energy challenges is discussed in detail by Johnson et al. [7]. As a method for evaluating the effectiveness of serious game for sustainability in a broader context beyond the dormitory challenge, we continue to use the baseline method as one way to assess changes in resource consumption.

In addition to resource consumption, SGSEEM can include the use of a behavior survey to measure self-reported behavior change. A pre-game survey is presented to the players to ask about their current sustainability behavior, then after the game, a post-game survey is presented to ask about the players’ behavior again. These two sets of survey response data can be compared to understand if there is any changes.

The combination of resource consumption changes and self-reported behavior changes can be used to assess the degree of behavior effectiveness of the serious game for sustainability.

(c) *Engagement assessment*: Player engagement is an important measure for understanding the effectiveness of a serious game. By investigating the degree of engagement, we can determine to what extent individuals are participating in the game, as well as to what extent the community population is participating in the game.

Engagement has a subtle relationship to the overall effectiveness of a serious game. It is possible for the game to be played by only a subset of the target population, but have an impact on those not playing by virtue of their contact with players. Gaining better insight into this effect is an area of active study for us.

To obtain engagement data, SGSEEM requires the framework to support the following measures based upon system log data:

- participation rate
- number of players per day
- play time of a player per day
- submissions of all player per day
- social interaction of all player per day
- website errors per day

The participation rate measures the percentage of users who used the game system based on the total eligible players. In the serious game context, it indicates the level of involvement or awareness of the serious matters. The number of players and play time per day measure how frequently the players interact with the game system. The submissions per day measures the rate of serious game specific activities (online or real world) players completed, while the social interaction per day measures the rate of any social interaction between the players. At last, the website errors per day measures the rate of errors encountered by the players. In general, with the opposite of website error measurement, the higher value of these measurements are, the higher engagement level the system has.

2. System Admin Efficiency

System administrators simply install the framework and dependent libraries, do backups, and so forth. SGSEEM assesses the efficiency of the system admin stakeholder through interviews involving the following questions:

- How much time did you require to install the system, including the dependency?
- How much time did you require to maintain the system?
- What problems did you encounter?
- Did you find it difficult to admin the system? What was difficult?
- What did you like the least about administering the system?

After the interview data is acquired, the evaluator will perform qualitative data analysis, which involves transcribing (if the interview data is in audio format), categorizing and coding the problem or difficulty description. Once the categories of problems are coded, the evaluator could analyze the time and problem they reported to identify the area of strength (less time spent) and weakness (problems and difficulties).

3. Game Designer Efficiency

SGSEEM measures the efficiency of a serious game framework with respect to the Game Designer stakeholder by addressing the following two questions: (a) How much time is required to design an instance of a serious game using the framework? and (b) How many, and how problematic are the errors that designers encounter during the design process?

A serious game framework always provides certain tools or interfaces to game designers with the hope that these will simplify the design of a game. Such tools might involve configuring global settings for the game, such as how long will the game run, who are the players, and how to design individual game elements.

SGSEEM requires the evaluator to first identify the sequence of tasks to be carried out by the Game Designer, then acquire two sets of assessment data. The first dataset is the system log data for the interaction between the game designer and the serious game framework. This data can help determine how much time it takes a designer to complete a certain design task using the game framework, and any errors encountered.

A second set of data is obtained by interviewing the designer and asking the following questions:

- How much time did you spend to complete each design task?
- What problems did you encounter?
- Did you find it difficult to configure? What was difficult?
- Did you find it difficult to design a specific game? Which one, and what was difficult?
- What did you like the least when using the system?

The interview data will also be transcribed (if audio recording), categorised, coded. The time data from the interviews will be validated by the system log data, while the descriptive problem categories will be correlated with the system log time and error data.

4. Game Manager Efficiency

SGSEEM measures the efficiency of a serious game framework with respect to the Game Manager stakeholder with questions similar to those above: (a) How much time is required to manage an instance of a serious game using the framework? and (b) How many, and how problematic are the errors that managers encounter during the design process?

Serious game frameworks normally provide certain interfaces for the managers to manage the game. This may involve managing player submissions, monitoring the game state, entering manual resource data, notifying winners of the game, etc.

As before, SGSEEM requires the evaluator to identify management tasks, then analyze two sets of data to assess game manager efficiency. The first set of data is the system log data for the interaction between the game manager and the serious game framework. This log data can help determine the time it takes a manager to complete management tasks using the interface, and any system error he or she encountered.

A second set of data is obtained by interviewing the managers to answer the following questions:

- How much time did you spend to complete each managing task?
- What problems did you encounter?
- Did you find it difficult to manage? What was difficult?
- What did you like the least when using the system?

The analysis is similar to the game designer efficiency. It is common for the same person(s) to occupy both the role of Game Designer and later, the role of Game Manager. When interviewing the person with multiple roles, the evaluator should clarify the asking questions are for which stakeholder role.

5. Developer Efficiency

The Developer stakeholder is different from the Game Designer stakeholder, in that the Game Designer stakeholder tailors the framework without requiring any software development, while the Developer stakeholder enhances, corrects, and extends the system by manipulating code.

To investigate how efficient it is to understand, extend, and debug a serious game framework, SGSEEM assesses how much time it takes to develop an enhancement to the game framework, and how many errors are encountered during the process. This is accomplished by interviewing the developer(s) to answer the following questions:

- How much time did you spend to set up the development environment?
- How much time did you spend developing and debugging an enhancement to the game framework?
- What problem(s) did you encounter?
- Did you find it difficult to understand, extend and debug the system? What was difficult?
- What did you like the least when developing the game enhancement?

Similarly, the descriptive data will be categorized and coded. The evaluator could analyze the time and problem they reported to identify the area of strength (less time spent) and weakness (problems and difficulties) of the system.

6. Researcher Efficiency

Finally, the Researcher stakeholder is one who uses the serious game framework to investigate questions about gaming in general, human computer interaction, etc.

To investigate how efficient it is to do research with the system, SGSEEM assesses how much time it takes to use the system for specific research queries, and how many errors are encountered during the process. We interview the researcher(s) to answer the following questions:

- How much time did you spend to collect the research data for a specific topic?
- What problems did you encounter when collecting the data?
- Did you find the data you collected helpful to your research? If not, what can be improved?
- Did you find it difficult to collect data from the system? What was difficult?
- What did you like the least about using the system?

CASE STUDY OF MAKAHIKI

Now that we have described SGSEEM, this section will discuss a case study of how we applied SGSEEM to evaluate the Makahiki serious game framework for sustainability. First we will first describe the Makahiki framework.

Makahiki in Brief

We have developed an innovative serious game framework for sustainability called Makahiki. It is a software and hardware infrastructure for the development of sustainability challenges. Makahiki explores one section of the design space where virtual world game mechanics are employed to affect real world sustainability behaviors.

Makahiki consists of a configurable game framework that can be customized to the needs of different organizations. It includes a library of pre-built game “widgets” that implement a variety of game mechanics. Using the widgets, an organization can create a custom sustainability challenge in which players can compete individually or in teams to earn points and reduce consumption of resources such as water or energy. Figure 4 illustrates the architecture of Makahiki. Figure 5 shows a few examples of the games implemented in the Makahiki game library. More detailed description of Makahiki can be found here [8].




Figure 4. Architecture of Makahiki




Figure 5. Makahiki Game Library

Experiences with Makahiki

We had used Makahiki to create four different Kukui Cup Energy Challenges. Kukui Cup Energy challenges were held at the University of Hawaii (UH) in 2011 and 2012 for over 1,000 first year students living in the residence halls. Hawaii Pacific University (HPU) held a Kukui Cup Energy challenge in Fall 2012 for about 200 students. An international organization called the East-West Center (EWC) held a Kukui Cup Energy and Water challenge for the international residents living in the residence halls without smart meters, so the resource consumption data had to be entered by the game managers manually.

The successful creation of serious game challenges by three different organizations provides four types of evidence that the Makahiki serious game framework can be tailored to the needs of different organizations. First, UH and HPU used

different metering infrastructure, and EWC collected their resource data manually. Second, while UH and HPU challenges involved only energy consumption data, the EWC challenge involved both energy and water consumption data. Third, the IT infrastructure at UH and HPU provided authentication services using CAS (Central Authentication Service) and LDAP, while EWC used the built-in Django authentication. Fourth, the user interface was customized to “brand” each challenge with the logo, thematic elements, and the education contents of the sponsoring organizations.

Besides the real world usage of Makahiki in the series of Kukui Cup challenges, we also performed in-lab evaluation experiments. Makahiki was used in a serious game development course in Spring semester of 2013 at the University of Hawaii Information and Computer Sciences department. There were total 8 students that participated in the experiments. They were senior undergraduates or graduate students majoring in Computer Science. During the course, the students installed Makahiki, configured and designed a serious game instance with Makahiki, and finally developed an enhancement to the Makahiki framework. We asked the students taking the course to voluntarily participate in the evaluation experiments of Makahiki, using SGSEEM.

Evaluation of Makahiki

This section describes the details of Makahiki evaluation using SGSEEM. Some preliminary results are discussed here.

Player Effectiveness Evaluation

We evaluated player effectiveness using the 2011 Kukui Cup Challenge at the University of Hawaii at Manoa. There were over 1000 eligible players for this challenge, who were mostly first year college students living in a cluster of four similar structured resident halls. Makahiki recorded detailed logging data from every interaction between the players and the website.

To assess the effectiveness in players’ literacy in sustainability, we conducted two surveys, one before the challenge (pre-game) and one after the challenge (post-game). The players’ sustainability literacy and behavior change was:

To assess the effectiveness in positive player behavior changes in sustainability, the energy consumption data before, during and after the challenge were examined to understand any usage pattern or reduction during and after the challenge. The results were:

To assess the level of player engagement of the game, we calculated the engagement metrics. The results were shown in Figure 6:

As we can see here, the participation rate is 29% which is relatively high comparing to other sustainability challenges. over the course of the challenge, an average player spent average 15 minutes per day on the website. One player spent 8.8 hours in one of the days he played. There are 111 average serious game related activity submissions and 101 social interactions between players per day. This data provide an detailed insight about the high level of engagement of one of the Makahiki game instances.

Measurement	Value
Participation rate	29
Number of players per day (AVG, MAX, MIN)	(40, 130, 1)
Play time per day (AVG, MAX, MIN)	(15mins, 8.8hours, 1mins)
submissions per day	111
social interaction per day	101

Figure 6. Makahiki Engagement Metrics

System Admin Efficiency Evaluation

System admin efficiency evaluation was performed using the in-lab experiment. Students in the serious game class were tasked with installing the Makahiki system into their local computers as well as the cloud environment. In order to understand how much time it takes to install the Makahiki and what problems might be encountered, We designed two Google Forms which details the steps of installing Makahiki both locally and in the cloud, and for each step, we asked the students to record the time they spent and the problems they encountered.

Figure 7 illustrates a partial Google Form used for Makahiki system admin evaluation.

Makahiki Local Installation Log

Please follow the steps outlined in this form to install Makahiki locally (including Virtualbox Linux Guest) and log the time you spent for each step.

Please choose the closest value from the list that best matches the time you spent during the installation.

Thank you!

*** Required**

2.1.1.1.2. Install Python *
Complete the "Install Python" section in Makahiki Local Installation Manual (<http://makahiki.readthedocs.org/en/latest/installation-makahiki-unix.html#install-python>), record the time you spent for this section only:

Record any problem(s) you encountered when installing Python:

2.1.1.1.3. Install C Compiler *
Complete the "Install C Compiler" section in Makahiki Local Installation Manual (<http://makahiki.readthedocs.org/en/latest/installation-makahiki-unix.html#install-c-compiler>), record the time you spent for this section only:

0 minute (Come with the OS install) in installing C compiler:
5 minutes
15 minutes
30 minutes
1+ hour

Figure 7. Makahiki Evaluation Form

We also asked the students to provide feedback about their installation experiences in the form of blog posts.

The google form data shows that the average total time to successfully install Makahiki is 1.4 hours for local environment, and 2.2 hours for the cloud environment. The maximum time for local install is 2 hours while the maximum time for cloud install is 5.5 hours. The minimum time for local install is 0.9 hour while the minimum time for cloud install is 0.7 hour. Some problems the students encountered during the installation are: a) difficulty in configuring the Postgres database which is one of the dependencies of the Makahiki

system. b) confusion in using the Amazon S3 cloud service that Makahiki cloud installation depends on. c) an error in using a uppercase name within the Amazon S3 service. This is identified as a software bug of Makahiki.

We generalized the installation tasks into 6 categories which are common to a serious game framework. We calculated the time for each task from the data we collected from the google form, and coded the descriptive feedback reported by the students in both the google form and their blog posts. If the student reported problems in one of the tasks, we assigned the task a rating value as -1(negative); if the student gave positive comments for the task, we assigned the task value 1(positive). We aggregated all the ratings from the feedback of the 8 students participated in the experiment. Figure 8 shows the result of the analysis:

Category	Average Time (minutes)	Feedback rating
Setup runtime environment	10	5.3
Install dependencies	25.3	0
Install and configure Database	6.6	-0.6
Download the software	7.2	1
Install the software	24.3	1.7
Start the server	2.4	2.6

Figure 8. Makahiki Installation Analysis

Game Designer Efficiency Evaluation

We used both the real world instances and in-lab experiment to evaluate the game designer efficiency of Makahiki.

We interviewed the game designers of the Hawaii Pacific University challenge and the East-West Center challenge, asking questions outlined in the game designer experience section of the SGSEEM. We analyzed both the qualitative data collected from the interviews and email exchanges, and the quantitative data collected from the admin interface log data.

One of the class assignment for students in the in-lab experiment was to design a Kukui-Cup-like serious game using Makahiki. We asked the students to follow specific design steps and record the time required and any problems encountered during their design process, using a Google Form similar to the one used for the system admin evaluation. In addition, students were asked to provide feedback about their design experiences in the form of blog posts.

Game Manager Efficiency Evaluation

Game manager efficiency evaluation was performed by interviewing the game managers of the Hawaii Pacific University and East-West Center at Hawaii challenges. The interviews took place after the challenge. We asked them about their experiences in using the Makahiki admin interface for the managing process during the challenge. The admin interface log data was also analyzed to assess if there were any errors encountered during challenge management.

Developer Efficiency Evaluation

In one of the assignments of the serious games class of the in-lab experiment, the students were tasked with developing an enhancement to Makahiki. This involved setting up a development environment, following the tutorial to create a "Hello

world" widget using Makahiki, and finally, developing an enhancement which extended the functionality of Makahiki.

The students were asked to submit their development source code to the public source code repository (GitHub) and write a blog post to discuss their efforts to complete the development activity.

We reviewed their source code to compare their code to a reference implementation, analyzed the blog posts from the students, as well as any email correspondence from students discussing problems they encountered.

Researcher Efficiency Evaluation

Several researchers in our department and another department are currently using Makahiki and the Kukui Cup challenge to do research on the areas of energy behavior changes and their motivations. As of the writing of this paper, we have not formally evaluate their experience regarding the role of researcher stakeholder. As one of the future work, We are planning to interview them and analyze the data as outlined in the the SGSEEM researcher experience efficiency section.

FUTURE WORK

The development of SGSEEM creates another research question: what are the strengths and weaknesses of this evaluation method itself? To answer this question, we are planing to apply SGSEEM to another serious game framework. With the insights gained from another case study, SGSEEM can be further improved.

One area of effectiveness evaluation that is currently not addressed in SGSEEM: the longitudinal evaluation of player effectiveness. It would be very useful to determine whether the serious game experience actually had lasting impacts on players. In the context of Makahiki-based serious games for sustainability, this would include things such as whether the student players were able to continue any positive sustainability behaviors after leaving their residence halls.

CONCLUSION

We have developed a serious game framework evaluation method called Serious Game Stakeholder Experience Evaluation Method (SGSEEM). SGSEEM evaluates serious game frameworks from the perspective of different stakeholders' experiences: player effectiveness, system administrator efficiency, game designer efficiency, game manager efficiency, developer efficiency, and researcher efficiency. These experiences are evaluated qualitatively and quantitatively to determine the extent of effectiveness and efficiency of a serious game framework.

We also applied SGSEEM to Makahiki. The preliminary results of the evaluation show that: a) Makahiki is effective from players' perspective in the ways of increase in player sustainability literacy, decrease in energy consumption, and engaging players, b) Makahiki is relatively easy to install from a system administrator's perspective, c) Makahiki has rooms for improvement in the efficiency of a game designer, d) Makahiki is relatively easy to manage from a game manager's perspective, e) Makahiki could be improved by providing better support for developers.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Omitted from review version.

REFERENCES

1. Brewer, R. S. *Fostering Sustained Energy Behavior Change And Increasing Energy Literacy In A Student Housing Energy Challenge*. PhD thesis, University of Hawaii, Department of Information and Computer Sciences, March 2013.
2. Creswell, J. W. *Research design: qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*, 2nd ed. ed. Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, California, 2003.
3. De Freitas, S., and Oliver, M. How can exploratory learning with games and simulations within the curriculum be most effectively evaluated? *Computers & Education* 46, 3 (2006), 249–264.
4. Deterding, S., Dixon, D., Khaled, R., and Nacke, L. From game design elements to gamefulness: Defining “gamification”. In *Proceedings of MindTrek* (2011).
5. Harteveld, C. Triadic game evaluation: A framework for assessing games with a serious purpose. In *Workshop of the ACM SIGCHI Symposium on Engineering Interactive Computing Systems* (2010).
6. Hodge, C. Dorm energy competitions: Passing fad or powerful behavior modification tool? Presentation at the 2010 Behavior Energy and Climate Change conference, November 2010.
7. Johnson, P. M., Xu, Y., Brewer, R. S., Lee, G. E., Katchuck, M., and Moore, C. A. Beyond kWh: Myths and fixes for energy competition game design. In *Proceedings of Meaningful Play 2012* (October 2012), 1–10.
8. Johnson, P. M., Xu, Y., Brewer, R. S., Moore, C. A., Lee, G. E., and Connell, A. Makahiki+WattDepot: An open source software stack for next generation energy research and education. In *Proceedings of the 2013 Conference on Information and Communication Technologies for Sustainability (ICT4S)* (February 2013).
9. Mayer, I. Towards a comprehensive methodology for the research and evaluation of serious games. *Procedia Computer Science* 15, 0 (2012), 233 – 247.
10. McGonigal, J. *Reality is broken: Why games make us better and how they can change the world*. Penguin Press, 2011.
11. Petersen, J. E., Shunturov, V., Janda, K., Platt, G., and Weinberger, K. Dormitory residents reduce electricity consumption when exposed to real-time visual feedback and incentives. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education* 8, 1 (2007), 16–33.
12. Reeves, B., and Read, J. *Total engagement: using games and virtual worlds to change the way people work and businesses compete*. Harvard Business School Press, 2009.
13. Sherrod, A. *Ultimate 3D Game Engine Design & Architecture*. Charles River Media, Inc., 2006.
14. Song, S., Lee, J., and Hwang, I. A new framework of usability evaluation for massively multi-player online game: Case study of “World of Warcraft” game. In *Human-Computer Interaction. HCI Applications and Services*. Springer, 2007, 341–350.
15. Zyda, M. From visual simulation to virtual reality to games. *IEEE Computer* 38, 9 (Sep 2005), 25 – 32.