

UNIVERSIDADE DE SÃO PAULO

Instituto de Ciências Matemáticas e de Computação

Gamification of collaborative learning scenarios: an ontological engineering approach to deal with motivational problems in scripted collaborative learning

Geiser Chalco Challco

Tese de Doutorado do Programa de Pós-Graduação em Ciências de Computação e Matemática Computacional (PPG-CCMC)

SERVIÇO DE PÓS-GRADUAÇÃO DO ICMC-USP

Data de Depósito:

Assinatura: _____

Geiser Chalco Challco

Gamification of collaborative learning scenarios: an ontological engineering approach to deal with motivational problems in scripted collaborative learning

Doctoral dissertation submitted to the Institute of Mathematics and Computer Sciences – ICMC-USP, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of the Doctorate Program in Computer Science and Computational Mathematics. *FINAL VERSION*

Concentration Area: Computer Science and Computational Mathematics

Advisor: Prof. Dr. Seiji Isotani

USP – São Carlos
July 2018

Geiser Chalco Challco

Gamificação de cenários de aprendizagem colaborativa:
uma abordagem de engenharia de ontologias para lidar com
problemas motivacionais na aprendizagem colaborativa com
scripts

Tese apresentada ao Instituto de Ciências
Matemáticas e de Computação – ICMC-USP,
como parte dos requisitos para obtenção do título
de Doutor em Ciências – Ciências de Computação e
Matemática Computacional. *VERSÃO REVISADA*

Área de Concentração: Ciências de Computação e
Matemática Computacional

Orientadora: Prof. Dr. Seiji Isotani

USP – São Carlos
Julho de 2018

ABSTRACT

CHALLCO, G. C. **Gamification of collaborative learning scenarios: an ontological engineering approach to deal with motivational problems in scripted collaborative learning.** 2018. 242 p. Tese (Doutorado em Ciências – Ciências de Computação e Matemática Computacional) – Instituto de Ciências Matemáticas e de Computação, Universidade de São Paulo, São Carlos – SP, 2018.

Increase both students' motivation and learning outcomes in Collaborative Learning (CL) activities is a challenge that the Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning (CSCL) community has been addressing in the past last years. The use of CSCL scripts to structure and orchestrate the CL process has been shown to be effective to support meaningful interactions and better learning, but the scripted collaboration often does not motivate students to participate in the CL process, which makes more difficult the use of scripts over time in CL activities. To deal with the motivational problems, the researchers, educators and practitioners are now looking at gamification as a solution to motivate and engage students. However, the gamification is a complex task, requiring from instructional designers and practitioners, knowledge about game elements (such as leaderboards and point systems), game design (e.g. how to combine game elements) and their impact on motivation, engagement and learning. Moreover, the gamification is too context-dependent, requiring personalization for each participant and situation. Thus, to address these issues, an ontological engineering approach to gamify CL sessions has been proposed and conducted in this dissertation. In this approach, an ontology has been formalized to enable the systematic representation of knowledge extracted from theories and best practices related to gamification. In this ontology, the concepts, extracted from practices and theories related to gamification, and identified as relevant to deal with the motivational problem caused by the scripted collaboration, have been formalized as ontological structures to be used by computer-based mechanisms and procedures in intelligent-theory aware systems. These mechanisms and procedures with ontological structures aim to provide support to give advices and recommendations that will help instructional designers and practitioners to gamify CL sessions. To validate this approach, and to demonstrate its effectiveness and efficiency into deal with the motivational problems caused by the scripted collaboration, four empirical studies were conducted in real situations at the University of São Paulo with undergraduate Computer Science and Computer Engineering students. The results of the empirical studies demonstrated that, for CL activities where the CSCL scripts are used as a method to orchestrate and structure the CL process, the ontological engineering approach to gamify CL scenarios is an effective and efficient solution to deal with the motivational problems because the CL sessions obtained by this approach affected in a proper way the participants' motivation and learning outcomes.

Keywords: Ontologies, Gamification, Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning, Scripts,

Motivational Problem .

RESUMO

CHALLCO, G. C. **Gamificação de cenários de aprendizagem colaborativa: uma abordagem de engenharia de ontologias para lidar com problemas motivacionais na aprendizagem colaborativa com scripts.** 2018. 242 p. Tese (Doutorado em Ciências – Ciências de Computação e Matemática Computacional) – Instituto de Ciências Matemáticas e de Computação, Universidade de São Paulo, São Carlos – SP, 2018.

Aumentar a motivação e os resultados de aprendizagem dos estudantes nas atividades de aprendizagem colaborativa é um desafio que a comunidade de Aprendizagem Colaborativa com Suporte Computacional tem abordado nos últimos anos. O uso de scripts para estruturar e orquestrar o processo de aprendizagem colaborativa demonstrou ser eficaz para dar suporte as interações significativas e um melhor aprendizado, mas a colaboração com scripts muitas vezes não motiva os alunos a participar do processo de aprendizagem colaborativa, o que dificulta o uso de scripts ao longo do tempo em atividades de aprendizagem colaborativas. Para lidar com problemas de motivação, os pesquisadores, educadores e profissionais estão agora olhando a gamificação como uma solução para motivar e envolver os alunos. No entanto, a gamificação é uma tarefa complexa, exigindo de projetistas instrucionais e profissionais, conhecimento sobre elementos do jogo (e.g. leaderboards e sistemas de pontos), design de jogos (e.g. como combinar elementos do jogo) e seu impacto na motivação, engajamento e aprendizado. Além disso, a gamificação é muito dependente do contexto, exigindo personalização para cada participante e situação. Assim, para abordar esses problemas, uma abordagem de engenharia ontologias para gamificar sessões de aprendizagem colaborativa foi proposto e desenvolvida nesta dissertação. Nessa abordagem, uma ontologia foi formalizada para possibilitar a representação sistemática de conhecimentos extraídos de teorias e melhores práticas relacionadas à gamificação. Na ontologia, os conceitos, extraídos de práticas e teorias relacionadas à gamificação, e identificados como relevantes para lidar com o problema de motivação causado pela colaboração com scripts, foram formalizados como estruturas ontológicas a serem utilizadas por mecanismos e procedimentos informatizados em sistemas inteligentes cientes de teorias. Esses mecanismos e procedimentos com estruturas ontológicas visam fornecer suporte para dar conselhos e recomendações que ajudarão os projetistas instrucionais e profissionais a gamificar as sessões de aprendizagem colaborativa. Para validar a abordagem e demonstrar sua eficácia e eficiência em lidar com o problema de motivação causado pela colaboração com scripts, quatro estudos empíricos foram conduzidos em situações reais na Universidade de São Paulo com estudantes de graduação em Ciência da Computação e Engenharia da Computação. Os resultados dos estudos empíricos demonstraram que, para as atividades de aprendizagem colaborativa no que os scripts são usados como um método para orquestrar e estruturar o processo da aprendizagem colaborativa, a abordagem de engenharia ontológica para gamificar cenários de aprendizagem colaborativa é um eficaz e eficiente solução para lidar com o problema de motivação porque as sessões de aprendizagem colaborativa obtidas

por essa abordagem afetaram de maneira adequada a motivação e os resultados de aprendizagem dos participantes.

Palavras-chave: Ontologias, Gamificação, Aprendizagem Colaborativa com Suporte Computacional, Scripts, Problema de Motivação .

CONTENTS

1	EVALUATION OF THE ONTOLOGICAL ENGINEERING APPROACH TO GAMIFY CL SCENARIOS	17
1.1	Formulation of the Empirical Studies	18
1.1.1	<i>Scoping</i>	18
1.1.2	<i>Hypothesis Formulation</i>	25
1.1.3	<i>Variables Selection</i>	28
1.1.4	<i>Selection of Subjects</i>	29
1.1.5	<i>Design</i>	30
1.1.6	<i>Instrumentation</i>	31
1.1.7	<i>Schedule, Timing, and Data Collection Procedure</i>	34
1.1.7.1	<i>Execution: Pilot Empirical Study</i>	34
1.1.7.2	<i>Execution: First Empirical Study</i>	36
1.1.7.3	<i>Execution: Second Empirical Study</i>	37
1.1.7.4	<i>Execution: Third Empirical Study</i>	39
1.1.8	<i>Validity Evaluation</i>	40
1.1.9	<i>Data Analysis Procedure</i>	41
1.2	Pilot Empirical Study: Data Analysis Results	42
1.3	First Empirical Study: Data Analysis Results	50
1.4	Second Empirical Study: Data Analysis Results	57
1.5	Third Empirical Study: Data Analysis Results	63
1.6	Interpretation and Implications of Obtained Results	74
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	81
	APPENDIX A OUTLIERS DETECTION AND TREATMENT IN DATA GATHERED FROM MOTIVATION SURVEYS	87
A.1	Removing Careless Responses	87
A.1.1	<i>Intrinsic Motivation Inventory Data</i>	87
A.1.2	<i>Instructional Materials Motivation Survey Data</i>	89
A.2	Winsorizing Extreme Values	89
A.2.1	<i>Intrinsic Motivation Inventory Data</i>	90
A.2.2	<i>Instructional Materials Motivation Survey Data</i>	90


APPENDIX B	VALIDATION OF MOTIVATION SURVEYS	97
B.1	<i>Validation Procedure</i>	97
B.1.1	<i>Participants</i>	97
B.1.2	<i>Instruments</i>	97
B.1.3	<i>Data Collection Procedure</i>	99
B.1.4	<i>Data Analysis</i>	99
B.2	<i>Results</i>	100
B.2.1	<i>Factorial Structure of the Adapted Portuguese IMI</i>	101
B.2.2	<i>Reliability Tests of the Adapted Portuguese IMI</i>	104
B.2.3	<i>Factorial Structure of the Adapted Portuguese IMMS</i>	105
B.2.4	<i>Reliability Tests of the Adapted Portuguese IMMS</i>	108
APPENDIX C	IRT-BASED MODELS FOR MEASURING MOTIVATION AND LEARNING OUTCOMES	111
C.1	<i>Construction and Validation of IRT-based Models</i>	112
C.1.1	<i>Checking Assumptions</i>	113
C.1.2	<i>Estimating Item Parameters</i>	114
C.1.3	<i>Obtaining the Latent Trait Estimates</i>	115
C.2	<i>Stacking Procedure with IRT-based Models</i>	115
C.2.1	<i>Step 1: Data Verification</i>	116
C.2.2	<i>Step 2: Item Splitting</i>	117
C.2.3	<i>Step 3: Calculating Changes in Latent Trait Estimates</i>	118
C.3	<i>RSM-based Instrument for Measuring the Intrinsic Motivation in the Pilot Empirical Study</i>	118
C.3.1	<i>Checking Assumptions</i>	118
C.3.2	<i>Item Parameters</i>	120
C.3.3	<i>Intrinsic Motivation as Latent Trait Estimates</i>	122
C.4	<i>RSM-based Instrument for Measuring the Intrinsic Motivation in the First Empirical Study</i>	124
C.4.1	<i>Checking Assumptions</i>	124
C.4.2	<i>Item Parameters</i>	126
C.4.3	<i>Intrinsic Motivation as Latent Trait Estimates</i>	128
C.5	<i>RSM-based Instrument for Measuring the Level of Motivation in the Second Empirical Study</i>	131
C.5.1	<i>Checking Assumptions</i>	131
C.5.2	<i>Item Parameters</i>	132
C.5.3	<i>Level of Motivation as Latent Trait Estimates</i>	134
C.6	<i>RSM-based Instrument for Measuring the Intrinsic Motivation in the Third Empirical Study</i>	137
C.6.1	<i>Checking Assumptions</i>	137

C.6.2	<i>Item Parameters</i>	139
C.6.3	<i>Intrinsic Motivation as Latent Trait Estimates</i>	141
C.7	RSM-based Instrument for Measuring the Level of Motivation in the Third Empirical Study	144
C.7.1	<i>Checking Assumptions</i>	144
C.7.2	<i>Item Parameters</i>	145
C.7.3	<i>Level of Motivation as Latent Trait Estimates</i>	147
C.8	Stacking Procedure for Estimating Gains in Skill/Knowledge of the Pilot Empirical Study	150
C.8.1	<i>Checking Assumptions</i>	150
C.8.2	<i>Item Parameters</i>	150
C.8.3	<i>Gains in Skill/Knowledge as Latent Trait Estimates</i>	152
C.9	Stacking Procedure for Estimating Gains in Skill/Knowledge of the First Empirical Study	152
C.9.1	<i>Checking Assumptions</i>	152
C.9.2	<i>Item Parameters</i>	153
C.9.3	<i>Gains in Skill/Knowledge as Latent Trait Estimates</i>	156
C.10	Stacking Procedure for Estimating Gains in Skill/Knowledge of the Second Empirical Study	158
C.10.1	<i>Checking Assumptions</i>	158
C.10.2	<i>Item Parameters</i>	158
C.10.3	<i>Gains in Skill/Knowledge as Latent Trait Estimates</i>	161
C.11	Stacking Procedure for Estimating Gains in Skill/Knowledge of the Third Empirical Study	163
C.11.1	<i>Checking Assumptions</i>	163
C.11.2	<i>Item Parameters</i>	163
C.11.3	<i>Gains in Skill/Knowledge as Latent Trait Estimates</i>	168
ANNEX A	WEB-BASED QPJ-BR QUESTIONNAIRE	172
ANNEX B	DATA GATHERING INSTRUMENTS FOR MEASURING PARTICIPANTS' SKILL AND KNOWLEDGE	174
B.1	Programming Problem: Calculate the Proper Divisors of a Number (P1')	174
B.2	Programming Problem: Calculate the Sum of Prime Divisors of Number (P2')	175
B.3	Programming Problem: Calculate Distance of Rebounds for an Elas- tic Ball (P3')	176
B.4	Programming Problem: Calculate the Maximum Length of a Hail- stone Sequence (P4')	177

B.5	Programming Problem: Calculate Inverse Fibonacci Sequence on Base n and m (PA')	178
B.6	Programming Problem: Calculate the Absolute Difference Between Odd and Even Numbers in an Inverse Fibonacci Sequence (PB')	180
B.7	Programming Problem: Calculate the i-th Prize of a Machine Slot (PC')	181
B.8	Programming Problem: Calculate the Highest Prize of a Machine Slot (PD')	182
B.9	Formative Evaluation: Multiple Choice Knowledge Questionnaires of Cond. Structures (provinha1a)	183
B.10	Programming Problem: Develop a Simple Virtual Temperature Monitor (P1)	189
B.11	Formative Evaluation: Multiple Choice Knowledge Questionnaires of Cond. Structures (provinha1b)	190
B.12	Programming Problem: Develop a Basal Metabolic Rate (PA)	196
B.13	Programming Problem: Develop a Diet Calculator (PB)	197
B.14	Formative Evaluation: Multiple Choice Knowledge Questionnaires of Loop Structures (provinha2a)	198
B.15	Programming Problem: Calculate the Proper Divisors of a Number (P2)	203
B.16	Programming Problem: Calculate the Maximum Length of a Hailstone Sequence (P3)	204
B.17	Formative Evaluation: Multiple Choice Knowledge Questionnaires of Loop Structures (provinha2b)	205
B.18	Programming Problem: Calculate a Geometric Sequence (PC)	212
B.19	Programming Problem: Calculate Global Minimum Coin Changes (PD)	213
B.20	Programming Problem: Count Number of Semi-primes for RSA (PE)	214
B.21	Formative Evaluation: Multiple Choice Knowledge Questionnaires of Recursion (provinha3a)	215
B.22	Programming Problem: Calculate Fibonacci Polynomials (P4)	224
B.23	Formative Evaluation: Multiple Choice Knowledge Questionnaires of Recursion (provinha3c)	225
B.24	Programming Problem: Generation of Planning Poker Sequence (PF)	234
B.25	Programming Problem: Counting Palindromes (PG)	235
B.26	Programming Problem: Maze Solving Algorithm (PH)	236

ANNEX C	DATA GATHERING INSTRUMENTS FOR MEASURING PARTICIPANTS' MOTIVATION	238
C.1	Web-based Questionnaire for the Adapted Portuguese IMI	238

C.2	Paper-based Questionnaire for the Adapted Portuguese IMI	239
C.3	Paper-based Questionnaire for the Adapted Portuguese IMMS	240
C.4	Web-based Questionnaire for the Adapted Portuguese IMI and IMMS241	



EVALUATION OF THE ONTOLOGICAL ENGINEERING APPROACH TO GAMIFY COLLABORATIVE LEARNING SCENARIOS

This chapter undertakes the evaluation of the ontological engineering approach to gamify CL scenarios proposed in this dissertation. To demonstrate the effectiveness and efficiency of my approach for dealing with motivational problems, four empirical studies, one pilot study and three full-scale quasi-experimental studies were conducted at the University of São Paulo. In these empirical studies, the participants were undergraduate Computer Science and Computer Engineering students who were enrolled in the course of Introduction to Computer Science. They participated in CL sessions that were gamified using the knowledge in the ontology OntoGaCLEs. Such CL sessions are known as ontology-based gamified CL sessions (*ont-gamified* CL sessions), and the empirical studies, as reported in this chapter, investigated their effects on the participants' motivation and learning outcomes. These effects were compared with the effects of the non-gamified CL sessions to evaluate their effectiveness, and to evaluate their efficiency, these effects were compared with the effects of CL sessions that were gamified using the conventional form - for these empirical studies, the conventional form to gamify CL sessions consisted in: the use of all the possible game elements provided by the gamification platform Moodle, gamification using one-size-fits-all approach without personalization of game elements, a gamification form where the instructional designer set up the game elements *without* using any information given by the ontology OntoGaCLEs (*w/o-gamified* CL sessions).

The chapter starts by presenting the formulation of the empirical studies in section 1.1 in which the scoping, hypothesis, subjects, instruments and data collection procedure of the empirical studies are detailed. Then, section 1.2 (Pilot Empirical Study: Data Analysis Results), section 1.3 (First Empirical Study: Data Analysis Results), section 1.4 (Second Empirical Study: Data Analysis Results), and section 1.5 (Third Empirical Study: Data Analysis Results) present

the data analysis results of four empirical studies. Finally, the interpretation and implication of obtained result in reference to the ontological engineering approach to gamify CL sessions are discussed in section 1.6.

Part of the work described in this chapter will be published in the scientific article:

- “*Using Ontology and Gamification to Improve Students’ Participation and Motivation in CSCL*” that will be published as chapter of book “*First International Workshop on Social, Semantic, Adaptive and Gamification Techniques and Technologies for Distance Learning,*” HEFA 2017 (CHALLCO; MIZOGUCHI; ISOTANI, 2018).

1.1 Formulation of the Empirical Studies

For the instructional designers and practitioners, the ontological engineering approach to gamify CL scenarios aims to give structured guidance on how to gamify CL sessions for dealing with motivational problems in a scripted collaborative learning. With this guidance given by intelligent tools that use the knowledge described in the ontology OntoGaCLeS - as was detailed in ??, the instructional designers and practitioners design, develop and execute CL sessions known as “*ontology-based gamified CL sessions*” (*ont-gamified*). These CL sessions are considered the final product to be obtained by the ontological engineering approach to gamify CL scenarios, so that to demonstrate their effectiveness and efficacy to deal with motivational problems in a scripted collaborative learning, it is necessary to investigate the effects of the ont-gamified CL sessions on the participants’ motivation and learning outcomes. The correlation between these two variables has also been evaluated to verify if there is instructional benefits of gamification by motivating and engagement the participants in the scripted collaborative learning.

Improving the participation in CL sessions has also been hypothesized as one of the benefits from the ontological engineering approach to gamify CL scenarios. Thereby, such benefit was evaluated in the pilot empirical study to demonstrate the effectiveness of this approach to deal with motivational problems in scripted collaborative learning.

1.1.1 Scoping


Following the template proposed by Wohlin *et al.* (2012), the scoping of empirical studies conducted as evaluation of the ontological engineering approach to gamify CL scenarios was:

Analyze “*the effects of ont-gamified CL sessions on the participants’ motivation and learning outcomes*” for the purpose of “*validating the ontology engineering approach to gamify CL scenarios*” with respect to “*the effectiveness and efficiency to deal with motivational problems in scripted collaborative learning*” from the point of view of the “*instructional designers and*

practitioners who would like to know the benefits of these sessions" in the context of "scripted collaborative learning."


Considering this scoping, the evaluation has been organized in four empirical studies shown in Figure 1 and Figure 2.

Figure 1 – Graphical representation of pilot and first empirical studies



Source: Elaborated by the author.

Figure 2 – Graphical representation of second and third empirical studies



Source: Elaborated by the author.

The graphical representation for the empirical studies shown above (in Figure 1 and Figure 2) is an adaptation of the Evaluand-oriented Responsive Evaluation Model (CSCL-EREM) diagram proposed by Jorín-Abellán, Stake and Martínez-Moné (2009). In the original version, the CSCL-EREM diagram is an artifact to summarize the characteristics that the researchers should be taken into account to conduct CSCL evaluations. The diagram, employed here, is an adapted version of CSCL-EREM diagram in which only the relevant aspects of the “*ontological engineering approach to gamify CL scenarios*” are summarized in the diagrams. These aspects are: the *evaluand* indicated at the center of diagram; the *goal* and *issues* shown in dashed frames at the top and bottom of circular diagram; the educational setting features in respect to the learning *environment* and *activities* indicated on the left-upper and right-upper sides of the circular diagram; and the *informants* and *data gathering instruments* employed during the evaluation *method* shown at the bottom part of the circular diagram.

Object of study. The object of study is the effects of ont-gamified CL sessions on the participants’ motivation and learning outcomes. The ont-gamified CL sessions have been gamified according to the suggestions given by intelligent tools, which in turn used the ontology OntoGaCLeS as information source to give these suggestions. Thus, the game elements were introduced intends to affect the participants’ motivation, and in consequence, to produce better learning outcomes. Thus, in the pilot, first and second empirical studies, the three issues addressed to evaluate the effectiveness of ont-gamified CL sessions for dealing with motivational problems were:

- Do the ont-gamified CL sessions have positive impacts on the participants’ motivation?
- Do the ont-gamified CL sessions affect on the participants’ learning outcomes?
- Are the participants’ motivation and learning outcomes linked in those sessions?

The three issues addressed to evaluate the efficacy of ont-gamified CL sessions in the third empirical study were:

- Do the ont-gamified CL sessions have positive impacts on the participants’ motivation?, and Are the participants’ motivation better in ont-gamified CL sessions than in w/o-gamified CL sessions?
- Do the ont-gamified CL sessions affect on the participants’ learning outcomes?, and Are the participants’ learning outcomes better in ont-gamified CL sessions than in w/o-gamified CL sessions?
- Are the participants’ motivation and learning outcomes linked in those sessions?

When the group members are adequately motivated to participate in a scripted collaborative learning, their engagement in the CL process will be increased, reducing the percentage of

students who dropout the CL process. These measurement of engagement was only evaluated in the pilot empirical study in which the CL activity assigned for the students was not mandatory. Thus, the issue addressed in the pilot empirical study is:

- Do the ont-gamified CL sessions have positive effects on the percentage of participation per groups?

These percentages of participation per group correspond to: (1) the percentage of participants per groups *having participation* that refers to a complete, semicomplete and incomplete participation level; (2) the percentage of participants per groups having an *adequate participation* that refers to a complete and semicomplete participation level; (3) the percentage of participants per groups having *incomplete participation* that refers to an incomplete and none participation level; and (4) the percentage of participants per groups *without participation* that refers to a none participation level. Therefore, the participation levels are defined as:

- *None participation level*: when the participant did not interact with other group members in CL sessions
- *Incomplete participation level*: when the participant interacted in CL sessions, but he/she did not complete all the necessary interactions
- *Semicomplete participation level*: when the student interacted in CL sessions performing all the necessary interactions, but he/she did not respond to all the requests made by other group members
- *Complete participation level*: when the participant interacted in CL sessions performing all the necessary interactions, and he/she responds to all the requests made by other group members

Purpose. The empirical studies aim to validate the ontological engineering approach to gamify CL scenarios as a method to deal with motivational problems in scripted collaborative learning. Thus, the empirical studies were oriented to provide insights in what were the benefits of this approach in reference of the participants' motivation, and the consequence of these benefits in CL activities in which the CSCL scripts are used as a method to orchestrate and structure the collaboration among the participants in the CL. Thus, in all the four empirical studies, this approach has been applied in CL activities with different levels of difficulty for their content-domains. From the easiest to the hardest level of difficulty, the content-domains for the CL activities were: conditional structures, loop structures, and recursions (subjects of the course of Introduction to Computer Science). The CSCL script used to structure and orchestrate the CL sessions was a CSCL script inspired by the Cognitive Apprentice theory.

Quality focus. The *effectiveness* was demonstrated by measuring the participants' motivation and learning outcomes in ont-gamified CL sessions, and then, by comparing these results against the results obtained in non-gamified CL sessions. Therefore, the goal in the pilot, first and second empirical studies was to evaluate the effectiveness to deal with motivational problems, and the evaluand was: *ont-gamified* vs *non-gamified* CL sessions.

The *efficiency* to deal with motivational problems was demonstrated by measuring the participants' motivation and learning outcomes in ont-gamified CL sessions, and then, by comparing these results against the results obtained in w/o-gamified CL sessions. Therefore, the goal in the third empirical study was to evaluate the efficiency to deal with motivational problems, and the evaluand was: *ont-gamified* vs *w/o-gamified* CL sessions.

It is important to clarify here, that the motivation, as was explained in the “*General Background*” (??), is a construct of different factors that explains the reason whereby a human behave or act. It means that the factors to measure the participants' motivation vary according to the chosen theory to explain their behaviors and actions, vary in function of the context in which the theory is applied, and also, from the interest under study in each theory. Thus, to validate the ontological engineering approach to gamify CL scenarios, two theories were used to measure the participants' motivation: the SDT theory, and the ARCS model of motivation.

- In the SDT theory (RYAN; DECI, 2000), the construct of motivation is known as *intrinsic motivation* that is defined as the degree of an individual owns to behave or act based on the self-determination and self-regulation. Thus, the factors to measure the motivation are: the interest/enjoyment, perceived choice, felt of pressure/tension, effort/importance, perceived competence, value/usefulness and relatedness
- In the ARCS model (KELLER, 2009), the construct of motivation is based on the expectancy-value theory in which is assumed that an individual is motivated if he/she sees value in his/her acts or behaviors and if there is an optimistic expectation for success in this acts or behaviors (WIGFIELD, 1994). Hence, the factors for the construct of motivation in the ARCS model are: attention, relevance, confidence and satisfaction.

The data gathering instrument used to measure the intrinsic motivation was the adapter Portuguese version of Intrinsic Motivation Inventory (IMI) questionnaire. It is important highlight here, that, to measure the intrinsic motivation using the IMI instrument, usually, not all factors are necessary. The interest/enjoyment is only considered per se the self-report measure of intrinsic motivation. The perceived choice and perceived competence are positive predictors, the pressure/tension is the negative predictor, the value/usefulness and effort/importance are factors to the internalization of motivation, and the relatedness factor is only applicable in context of interpersonal and friendship activities. Therefore, in the pilot, first and third empirical studies the adapted Portuguese version of the IMI questionnaire has been used as data gathering instrument to

measure: the *interest/enjoyment* as the factor directly related to measure the intrinsic motivation; the *perceived choice* as the only positive predictor; the *pressure/tension* as the negative predictor; and the *effort/importance* as the only factor related with the internalization of motivation.

In the second and third empirical studies, the data gathering instrument to measure the motivation as factors of the ARCS model was the adapter Portuguese version of Instructional Materials Motivation Survey (IMMS) questionnaire. The measurement given by this instrument was the “*level of motivation*” that consists in the factors: *attention, relevance* and *satisfaction*. The “*confidence*” factor has been removed from the original ARCS model to avoid an overlapping with the factors of “*perceived choice*” measured by the IMI questionnaire because the confidence and perceived choice are both factors related to the self-regulation. Thus, the *level of motivation* is a constructor defined by the thesis author to refer the motivation that is completely separated from the intrinsic motivation.

Perspective. The perspective for the empirical studies came from the viewpoint of the instructional designers and researchers.

- Instructional designers would like to know the benefits of using ont-gamified CL sessions instead to use non-gamified CL sessions or w/o-gamified CL sessions.
- Researchers would like to know if the ontological engineering approach to gamify CL scenarios is an effective and efficient method to deal with motivational problems in the scripted collaborative learning.

Context. The context in which the empirical studies has been conducted were the CL activities in which the CL sessions have been instantiated from a CSCL script inspired by an instructional/learning theory. Particularly, in the empirical studies conducted to validate the ontological engineering approach to gamify the CL scenarios, the CSCL script used to design and to orchestrate the interaction of participants was a CSCL script inspired by the Cognitive Apprentice theory. The domain-contents for which the scripts have been instantiated as CL sessions were three subjects for the course of “Introduction to Computer Science” with different difficulty levels. From the easiest difficulty level to the most difficult level, these subjects were: the *conditional structures* for the first empirical study; the *loop structures* for the pilot and second empirical study; and the *recursion* for the third empirical study.

1.1.2 Hypothesis Formulation

To evaluate the effectiveness for dealing with motivational problems in scripted collaborative learning (First Goal, g1), the first issue addressed in the pilot and first empirical studies was “*Do the ont-gamified CL sessions have positive impacts on the participants’ motivation?*” by testing the:

Null hypothesis, $H_{null,IM,g1}$: “*There was no significant difference between the intrinsic motivation of students who participated in ont-gamified CL sessions and the intrinsic motivation of students who participated in non-gamified CL sessions,*” against the

Alternative hypothesis, $H_{alt,IM,g1}$: “*The intrinsic motivation of students who participated in ont-gamified CL sessions was greater than the intrinsic motivation of students who participated in non-gamified CL sessions.*”

In the second empirical study, this first issue was addressed by testing the:

Null hypothesis, $H_{null,LoM,g1}$: “*There was no significant difference between the level of motivation obtained by students who participated in ont-gamified CL sessions and the level of motivation obtained by students who participated in non-gamified CL sessions,*” against the

Alternative hypothesis, $H_{alt,LoM,g1}$: “*The level of motivation obtained by students who participated in ont-gamified CL sessions was greater than the level of motivation obtained by students who participated in non-gamified CL sessions.*”

The second issue “*Do the ont-gamified CL sessions affect on the participants’ learning outcomes?*” has been addressed in the pilot, first and second empirical studies by testing the:

Null hypothesis, $H_{null,GSK,g1}$: “*There was no significant difference between the gains in skill/knowledge obtained by students who participated in ont-gamified CL sessions and the gains in skill/knowledge obtained by students who participated in non-gamified CL sessions,*” against the

Alternative hypothesis, $H_{alt,GSK,g1}$: “*The gains in skill/knowledge obtained by students who participated in ont-gamified CL sessions was different than the gains in skill/knowledge obtained by students who participated in non-gamified CL sessions.*”

In the pilot, first, and second empirical studies, the third issue “*Are the participants’ motivation and learning outcomes linked in either non-gamified or ont-gamified CL sessions?*” has been addressed by testing the:

Null hypothesis, $H_{null,\rho,g1}$: “*There was no significant correlation between the participants’ motivation and their gains of skill/knowledge in either the non-gamified CL sessions or the ont-gamified CL sessions,*” against the

Alternative hypothesis, $H_{alt,\rho,g1}$: “*There was a significant correlation between the participants’ motivation and their gains of skill/knowledge in either the non-gamified CL sessions or the ont-gamified CL sessions.*”

The four issue “*Do the ont-gamified CL sessions have positive effects on the percentages of participation per groups?*” has been addressed in the pilot empirical study by testing the:

Null hypothesis, $H_{null,Pct,g1}$: “*There was no significant difference in the percentages of participation per groups for ont-gamified and non-gamified CL sessions,*” against the

Alternative hypothesis, $H_{alt,Pct,g1}$: “*The percentages of participation per groups in ont-gamified CL sessions are better than the percentage of participation per groups in non-gamified CL sessions.*”

*To evaluate the efficiency for dealing with motivational problems in scripted collaborative learning (Second Goal, g2), the first issue “*Do the ont-gamified CL sessions have positive impacts on the participants’ motivation?, and Are the participants’ motivation better in ont-gamified CL sessions than in w/o-gamified CL sessions?*” has been addressed in the third empirical study by testing the:*

Null hypothesis, $H_{null,IM,g2}$: “*There was no significant difference between the intrinsic motivation of students who participated in ont-gamified CL sessions and the intrinsic motivation of students who participated in w/o-gamified CL sessions,*” against the

Alternative hypothesis, $H_{alt,IM,g2}$: “*The intrinsic motivation of students who participated in ont-gamified CL sessions was greater than the intrinsic motivation of students who participated in w/o-gamified CL sessions.*”

Null hypothesis, $H_{null,LoM,g2}$: “*There was no significant difference between the level of motivation obtained by students who participated in ont-gamified CL sessions and the level of motivation obtained by students who participated w/o-gamified CL sessions,*” against the

Alternative hypothesis, $H_{alt,LoM,g2}$: “*The level of motivation obtained by students who participated in ont-gamified CL sessions was greater than the level of motivation obtained by students who participated in w/o-gamified CL sessions.*”

In the third empirical study, the second issue “*Do the ont-gamified CL sessions affect on the participants’ learning outcomes?, and Are the participants’ learning outcomes better in ont-gamified CL sessions than in w/o-gamified CL sessions?*” has been addressed by testing the:

Null hypothesis, $H_{null,GSK,g2}$: “*There was no significant difference between the gains in skill/knowledge obtained by students who participated in ont-gamified CL sessions and the gains in skill/knowledge obtained by students who participated in w/o-gamified CL sessions,*” against the

Alternative hypothesis, $H_{alt,GSK,g2}$: “*The gains in skill/knowledge obtained by students who participated in ont-gamified CL sessions was greater than the gains in skill/knowledge obtained by students who participated in w/o-gamified CL sessions.*”

The third issue “*Are the participants’ motivation and learning outcomes linked in either ont-gamified or w/o-gamified CL sessions?*” has been addressed in the third empirical study by testing the:

Null hypothesis, $H_{null,\rho,g2}$: “*There was no significant correlation between the participants’ motivation and their gains of skill/knowledge in either the ont-gamified CL sessions or the w/o-gamified CL sessions,*” against the

Alternative hypothesis, $H_{alt,\rho,g2}$: “*There was a significant correlation between the participants’ motivation and their gains of skill/knowledge in either the ont-gamified CL sessions or the w/o-gamified CL sessions.*”

1.1.3 Variables Selection

Table 1 summarizes the variables involved in the empirical studies with the type of values for the variables and a brief explanation of them. The independent variables “*Type*” determined the type of CL sessions for which the evaluation of the ontological engineering approach to gamify CL scenario was carried out. Thus, when the goal of the empirical study had been to evaluate the effectiveness of dealing with motivational problems (g1), the types of CL sessions were: ont-gamified CL sessions, and non-gamified CL sessions. When the goal of the empirical study had been to evaluate the efficiency of dealing with the motivational problem (g2), the types of CL sessions were: ont-gamified CL sessions, and w/o-gamified CL sessions (CL sessions that were gamified using a conventional form to gamify).

Table 1 – Independent and dependent variables for the empirical studies

Name	Values	Description	Studies
Type	{ <i>ont-gamified</i> , <i>non-gamified</i> }	To evaluate the effectiveness, each student participated in one of these two types of CL scenarios during the empirical studies	pilot, first, second
Type	{ <i>ont-gamified</i> , <i>w/o-gamified</i> }	To evaluate the efficiency, each student participated in one of these two types of CL scenarios during the empirical studies	third
<i>Controller Variables:</i>			

Table 1 – (continued)

Name	Values	Description	Studies
CLRole	{ <i>Master</i> , <i>Apprentice</i> }	The CL role played by each participant in the CL sessions instantiated from a CSCL script inspired by the Cognitive Apprenticeship theory. These roles are assigned for a participant according to his/her current knowledge/skill state	pilot, first, second, third
<i>Dependent Variables:</i>			
Intrinsic Motivation	<i>logits</i>	The intrinsic motivation estimates for the participants as the factors: interest/enjoyment, perceived choice, pressure/tension, and effort/importance. This dependent variable and its factors have been measured on a <i>logit</i> scale	pilot, first, third
Level of Motivation	<i>logits</i>	The level of motivation estimates for the participants as the factors: attention, relevance, and satisfaction. This dependent variable and its factors have been measured on a <i>logit</i> scale	second, third
Gains in Skill/Knowledge	<i>logits</i>	The gains in skill/knowledge for the participants were measured as learning outcomes employing irt-models for programming problems and multiple choice knowledge questionnaires on a <i>logit</i> scale	pilot, first, second, third
Pct. of Participation per Groups	<i>Pct.</i>	The percentages of participation per group. These percentages correspond to the pct. of students without participation, pct. of students having participation, pct. of students having incomplete participation, and pct. of students having adequate participation.	pilot

1.1.4 Selection of Subjects

According to the real situation in which the empirical studies were carried out, the subjects for the empirical studies were chosen based on convenience. The subjects were students signed-up in the course of Introduction to Computer Science taught by the Prof. Seiji Isotani to the graduate programs in Computer Science and Computer Engineering at the University of São Paulo during the second semester of 2016 (August - December) and the first semester of 2017 (March - July). Thus, the selection of subjects, described as informants in the CSCL-EREM diagrams of Figure 1 and Figure 2 for each empirical study, were:

For the pilot empirical study, 39 undergraduate Brazilian students enrolled in the first year of bachelor of Computer Science at the University of São Paulo.

For the first empirical study, 62 undergraduate Brazilian students enrolled in the first year of bachelor of Computer Engineering at the University of São Paulo.

For the second empirical study, 58 undergraduate Brazilian students enrolled in the first year of bachelor of Computer Engineering at the University of São Paulo.

For the third empirical study, 59 undergraduate Brazilian students enrolled in the first year of bachelor of Computer Engineering at the University of São Paulo.

The participants in the empirical studies were chosen from a homogeneous population in the age range from 17 to 25 years old, sharing the same social-economy status and culture.

1.1.5 Design

Employing the scoping, hypothesis formulation, variables selection, and selection of subjects detailed in the previous subsections, the principles to design the four empirical studies were:

Randomization. The CL role was not randomly assigned to the students in the empirical studies.

If the student has known how to use the cognitive or meta-cognitive skill and had experience in how to use this skill, he/she played the master role, otherwise the student played the apprentice role. The students as subjects of empirical studies were not selected randomly, they were the students signed-up to the course of Introduction to Computer Science at the University of São Paulo during the second semester of 2016 and the first semester of 2017. With these students as subjects of empirical studies, a theory-driven group formation was carried out according to the pseudo-algorithm proposed by Isotani and Mizoguchi (2008); and then, randomly, one half of the groups were assigned to participate in one of two types of CL sessions that are defined as *evaluand* in each empirical study, whereas the other half of groups were assigned to participate in the other type of CL sessions. Thus, for the pilot, first and second empirical studies, one half of groups defined by the theory-driven group formation was randomly chosen to participate in non-gamified CL sessions, and the other half of groups were chosen to participate in ont-gamified CL sessions. For the third empirical study, one half of groups were randomly participated in ont-gamified CL sessions, and the other half of groups participated in w/o-gamified CL sessions.

Blocking. No systematic approach to block the independent and control variables applied in the empirical studies. The decision to assign CL roles for the students as subject of empirical studies was based on their current skill/knowledge states, so that this determination could be contemplated a way to block the effect of students having different levels of knowledge and having different levels of cognitive or meta-cognitive skills.

Balancing. The empirical studies did not have a balanced design because they were conducted in real situations given by the course of Introduction to Computer Science at the University of São Paulo during the 2nd semester of 2016 and the 1st semester of 2017.

According to the principles mentioned above, the four empirical studies have been defined as quasi-experiments with a 2×2 factorial design, and with a randomized assignment of the type of CL session for the groups defined by the theory-driven group formation proposed by Isotani and Mizoguchi (2008). Furthermore, each empirical study has been conducted in three phases: pre-test phase, intervention phase, and post-test phase. During the pre-test phase, the skill and knowledge levels of students were estimated to assign the CL roles. The necessary and desired conditions to assign Player roles for the participants have also been obtained in the pre-test phase through a questionnaire of player types. The gains in skill/knowledge for the participants were estimated as the difference of their skill and knowledge obtained in the post-test phase and their skill and knowledge obtained in the pre-test phase. In the post-test phase, motivation surveys were applied to the participants for measuring the participants' motivation as measurement of the intrinsic motivation and the level of motivation.

1.1.6 Instrumentation

As was shown in the conceptual flow to gamify CL sessions using the knowledge described in the ontology OntoGaCLeS (??), to obtain the ont-gamified CL sessions, it is necessary to have information about the necessary and desired conditions to assign player roles for the students in each empirical study. This information has been collected in the Moodle platform through a Web-based version of QPJ-BR questionnaire (ANDRADE *et al.*, 2016) - that is detailed in Appendix A.

Programming problem tasks and multiple-choice knowledge questionnaires were used as information sources to estimate the skill and knowledge of participants in the pre-test and post-test phases. The skill and knowledge estimates from pre-test were also been used to assign the CL roles for the participants of empirical studies. Table 2 shows the programming problem tasks and multiple-choice knowledge questionnaires employed in the empirical studies. All the programming problem tasks were implemented in an adapted version of *VPL module*¹, and the multiple-choice knowledge questionnaires were developed using the *AMC software*²

Table 2 – Programming problem tasks and multiple choice knowledge questionnaires

Code	Study	Phase	Title	Appendix B
P1'	pilot	pre-test	Programming Problem: Calculate the proper divisors of a number (<i>Divisores próprios</i>)	section B.1
P2'	pilot	pre-test	Programming Problem: Calculate the sum of prime divisors of number (<i>Soma dos divisores próprios</i>)	section B.2
P3'	pilot	pre-test	Programming Problem: Calculate distance of rebounds for an elastic ball (<i>Distância dos rebates da bola de elástico</i>)	section B.3

¹ Virtual Programming Lab for Moodle 2 with screen and code recordings - <https://github.com/geiser/moodle-mod_vpl>

² Software to create multiple-choice questionnaires - <<https://www.auto-multiple-choice.net/>>

Table 2 – (continued)

Code	Study	Phase	Title	Appendix B
P4'	pilot	pre-test	Programming Problem: Calculate the maximum length of a hailstone sequence (<i>Máximo comprimento das sequências de números granizo</i>)	section B.4
PA'	pilot	post-test	Programming Problem: Calculate the Inverse Fibonacci sequence on base n and m (<i>Sequência inversa Fibonacci de base n e m</i>)	section B.5
PB'	pilot	post-test	Programming Problem: Calculate the absolute difference between odd and even numbers in an inverse Fibonacci sequence (<i>Diferença absoluta entre os números pares e ímpares na sequência inversa Fibonacci</i>)	section B.6
PC'	pilot	post-test	Programming Problem: Calculate the i -th prize of a machine slot (<i>O i-ésimo prêmio da caça-níquel</i>)	section B.7
PD'	pilot	post-test	Programming Problem: Calculate the highest prize of a machine slot (<i>Ganhando o prêmio maior da caça-níquel</i>)	section B.8
P1	first	pre-test	Programming Problem: Develop a simple virtual temperature monitor (<i>Monitor de Temperatura Virtual</i>)	section B.10
p1a	first	pre-test	Formative Evaluation: Multiple choice knowledge questionnaires of cond. structures (<i>provinha1a</i>)	section B.9
PA	first	post-test	Programming Problem: Develop a Basal Metabolic Rate (<i>TMB - Taxa Metabólica Basal</i>)	section B.12
PB	first	post-test	Programming Problem: Develop a diet calculator (<i>Calculadora de dieta</i>)	section B.13
p1b	first	pre-test	Formative Evaluation: Multiple choice knowledge questionnaires of cond. structures (<i>provinha1b</i>)	section B.11
P2	second	pre-test	Programming Problem: Calculate the proper divisors of a number (<i>Divisores próprios</i>)	section B.15
P3	second	pre-test	Programming Problem: Calculate the maximum length of a hailstone sequence (<i>Máximo comprimento das sequências de números granizo</i>)	section B.16
p2a	second	pre-test	Formative Evaluation: Multiple choice knowledge questionnaires of loop structures (<i>provinha2a</i>)	section B.14
PC	second	post-test	Programming Problem: Calculate a geometric sequence (<i>Sequências de potências</i>)	section B.18
PD	second	post-test	Programming Problem: Calculate global minimum coin changes (<i>Caixa eletrônico</i>)	section B.19
PE	second	post-test	Programming Problem: Count number of semi-primes for RSA (<i>Contagem de semi-primos para o algoritmo RSA</i>)	section B.20
p2b	second	post-test	Formative Evaluation: Multiple choice knowledge questionnaires of loop structures (<i>provinha2b</i>)	section B.17

Table 2 – (*continued*)

Code	Study	Phase	Title	Appendix B
P4	third	pre-test	Programming Problem: Calculate fibonacci polynomials (<i>Polinômios de Fibonacci</i>)	section B.22
p3a	third	pre-test	Formative Evaluation: Multiple choice knowledge questionnaires of recursion (<i>provinha3a</i>)	section B.21
PF	third	post-test	Programming Problem: Generation of planning poker sequence (<i>Planning Poker</i>)	section B.24
PG	third	post-test	Programming Problem: Counting palindromes (<i>Contagem de palíndromos</i>)	section B.25
PH	third	post-test	Programming Problem: Maze solving algorithm (<i>A saída do labirinto</i>)	section B.26
p3c	third	post-test	Formative Evaluation: Multiple choice knowledge questionnaires of recursion (<i>provinha3c</i>)	section B.23

In the empirical studies, the data gathering instruments used to measure the participants' motivation were:

- a Web-based questionnaire for the adapted Portuguese version of the Intrinsic Motivation Inventory (Appendix C: section C.1) employed in the pilot empirical study to gather information related to the participants' intrinsic motivation
- a Paper-based questionnaire for the adapted Portuguese version of the Intrinsic Motivation Inventory (Appendix C: section C.2) employed in the first empirical study to gather information related to the participants' intrinsic motivation
- a Paper-based questionnaire for the adapted Portuguese version of the Instructional Materials Motivation Survey (Appendix C: section C.3) employed in the second empirical study to gather information related to the participants' level of motivation
- a Web-based questionnaire for the adapted Portuguese version of the Intrinsic Motivation Inventory and the adapted Portuguese Instructional Materials Motivation Survey (Appendix C: section C.4) employed in the third empirical study to gather information related to the participants' intrinsic motivation and level of motivation

The ont-gamified CL sessions in the empirical studies were obtained through the conceptual flow to gamify CL sessions shown in ??, so that the information encoded in the “*ontological model to apply gamification as persuasive technology in CL scenarios based on the Cognitive Apprenticeship theory and with the player roles based on the Yee's model to personalize the gamification*” has been used with the *Gamification plug-ins* in the Moodle platform to define the

ont-gamified CL sessions. However, due to the lack of automatic support given by the Gamification plug-ins to set and to configure the game elements in the Moodle learning environment, the gamification of CL sessions was not carried out using all the three ontological structures to represent gamified CL scenarios described in this ontology-based model. Thus, only two of three ontological structures were employed simultaneously in each empirical study to set and configure the Gamification plug-ins:

- For the pilot, first and second empirical studies, the ontological structures to represent “*Gamified Cognitive Apprenticeship Scenario for Master/Yee Achiever and Apprentice/Yee Achiever*” and “*Gamified Cognitive Apprenticeship Scenario for Master/Yee Socializer and Apprentice/Yee Socializer*” were used to obtain the ont-gamified CL sessions.
- For the third empirical study, the ontological structures to represent “*Gamified Cognitive Apprenticeship Scenario for Master/Yee Achiever and Apprentice/Yee Achiever*” and “*Gamified Cognitive Apprenticeship Scenario for Master/Social Achiever and Apprentice/Social Achiever*” were used to obtain the ont-gamified CL sessions.

Finally, in all the types of CL sessions (ont-gamified CL sessions, non-gamified CL sessions, and w/o-gamified CL sessions), a CSCL script inspired by the Cognitive Apprenticeship theory and illustrated in ?? was used as a method to orchestrate and structure the collaboration among the participants. This script was implemented as CL activities in the Moodle platform employing the *Scripting-forum module*³.

1.1.7 Schedule, Timing, and Data Collection Procedure

Preparation: The aspects under study in the empirical studies and the hypotheses stated in this dissertation were not informed to the participants (students) of the empirical studies, but they were aware that the researcher wanted to use the data gathered by their participation in the course. All participants (students) were guaranteed anonymity, and all materials that were used in the data collection procedure were prepared in advance. Before the intervention phase, as part of the preparation phase, the students were instructed in how to participate in CL activities using the *Scripting-forum module* in the Moodle platform.


1.1.7.1 Execution: Pilot Empirical Study

The pilot empirical study was executed over three weeks with the schedule, timing, and data collection procedure showed in Figure 3.

During the pre-test phase (1 week), from 11 November 2016 to 18 November 2016, the Web-based QPJ-BR questionnaire has been answered by all the participants through the

³ Available at the URL: <https://github.com/geiser/moodle_scripting_forum>

Figure 3 – Diagram of the schedule, timing and data collection procedure in the pilot empirical study



Source: Elaborated by the author.

Moodle platform using the *Questionnaire module*⁴. During this phase, to gather data related to the skill/knowledge, four programming problem tasks (P1', P2', P3', and P4' - detailed in Table 2) have also been solved by the students in the Moodle platform using the VPL module.

During the intervention phase (1 week), from 18 November 2016 to 25 November 2016, the thirty-nine students participated in either non-gamified CL sessions or ont-gamified CL sessions. These students were formed into nine groups of four or five members with nine masters and thirty apprentices assigned according to the theory-driven group formation (ISOTANI; MIZOGUCHI, 2008). Four of these nine groups participated in non-gamified CL sessions, and five groups participated in ont-gamified CL sessions.

The ontological structures to represent “*Gamified Cognitive Apprenticeship Scenario for Master/Yee Achiever and Apprentice/Yee Achiever*” and “*Gamified Cognitive Apprenticeship Scenario for Master/Yee Socializer and Apprentice/Yee Socializer*” were used to obtain the ont-gamified CL sessions in which:

- The students who had more liking for achievement-components than positive liking for social-components were assigned to play the *Yee Achiever role* in gamified CL sessions instantiated from the ontological structure “*Gamified Cognitive Apprenticeship Scenario for Master/Yee Achiever and Apprentice/Yee Achiever*” to support a CL Gameplay experience of *individual competition*.
- The students who had more positive liking for social-components than positive liking for achievement-components were assigned to play the *Yee Socializer role* in gamified CL sessions instantiated from the ontological structure “*Gamified Cognitive Apprenticeship Scenario for Master/Yee Socializer and Apprentice/Yee Socializer*” to support a CL Gameplay experience of *cooperative competition*.


⁴ Available at the URL: <https://github.com/geiser/moodle-mod_questionnaire>

During the post-test phase (1 week), from 25 November 2016 to 02 December 2016, to gather data related to the skill/knowledge, four programming problem tasks (PA', PB', PC', and PD' - detailed in Table 2) have been solved by the students in the Moodle platform using the VPL module. The students also answered the IMI questionnaire through the Moodle platform using the *Questionnaire module* to gather data related to the participants' intrinsic motivation.

1.1.7.2 Execution: First Empirical Study

The first empirical study was executed over four weeks and four days with the schedule, timing, and data collection procedure showed in Figure 4.

Figure 4 – Diagram of the schedule, timing and data collection procedure in the first empirical study



Source: Elaborated by the author.

During the pre-test phase (1 week), from 23 March 2017 to 30 March 2017, to gather information of students' preference related to their liking for game-components, the Web-based QPJ-BR questionnaire has been answered by all the participants through the Moodle platform using the *Questionnaire module*. Data related to the participants' initial skill/knowledge were gathered from one programming problem task (P1) and one multiple-choice knowledge questionnaire of conditional structures (p1a), both instruments are detailed in Table 2. The programming problem task (P1) was solved by the students in the Moodle platform using the *VPL module*, and the students answered the multiple-choice knowledge questionnaire (p1a) - during 2 hours on March, 30th - at the classroom in the University of São Paulo as a formative evaluation during the course of Introduction to Computer Science.

During the intervention phase (2 weeks & 4 days), from 31 March 2017 to 18 April 2017, the sixty-two students participated in either non-gamified CL sessions or ont-gamified CL sessions. These students were formed into thirty-one groups of two members with thirty-one masters and thirty-one apprentices assigned according to the theory-driven group formation (ISOTANI; MIZOGUCHI, 2008). Sixteen of thirty one groups participated in non-gamified CL sessions, and fifteen groups participated in ont-gamified CL sessions.

The ontological structures to represent “*Gamified Cognitive Apprenticeship Scenario for Master/Yee Achiever and Apprentice/Yee Achiever*” and “*Gamified Cognitive Apprenticeship Scenario for Master/Yee Socializer and Apprentice/Yee Socializer*” were used to obtain the ont-gamified CL sessions in which:

- The students who had more liking for achievement-components than positive liking for social-components were assigned to play the *Yee Achiever role* in gamified CL sessions instantiated from the ontological structure “*Gamified Cognitive Apprenticeship Scenario for Master/Yee Achiever and Apprentice/Yee Achiever*” to support a CL Gameplay experience of *individual competition*.
- The students who had more positive liking for social-components than positive liking for achievement-components were assigned to play the *Yee Socializer role* in gamified CL sessions instantiated from the ontological structure “*Gamified Cognitive Apprenticeship Scenario for Master/Yee Socializer and Apprentice/Yee Socializer*” to support a CL Gameplay experience of *cooperative competition*.


During the post-test phase (1 week), from 18 April 2017 to 25 April 2017, to gather data related to the skill/knowledge, the multiple-choice knowledge questionnaire of conditional structures (p1b) was answered by the participant’s - during 2 hours on April, 18th - at the classroom in the University of São Paulo as a formative evaluation in the course of Introduction to Computer Science. Two programming problem tasks (PA, PB - detailed in Table 2) have been solved by the students in the Moodle platform using the VPL module. The students also answered the paper-based IMI questionnaire at the classroom in the University of São Paulo to gather data related to the students’ intrinsic motivation.

1.1.7.3 Execution: Second Empirical Study

The second empirical study was executed over four weeks with the schedule, timing, and data collection procedure shown in Figure 5.

During the pre-test phase (1 week), from 18 April 2017 to 25 April 2017, students’ preferences related to their liking for game-components were gathered through a paper-based QPJ-BR questionnaire answered by all the students in the Moodle platform using the *Questionnaire module*. Data related to the participants’ initial skill/knowledge were gathered from one programming problem task (P2, and P3 - detailed in Table 2) and one multiple-choice knowledge questionnaire of loop structures (p2a). The students solved the programming problem tasks in the Moodle platform using the *VPL module*, and they answered the multiple-choice knowledge questionnaire (p2a) - during 2 hours on April, 25th - at the University of São Paulo as a formative evaluation in the course of Introduction to Computer Science.

Figure 5 – Diagram of the schedule, timing and data collection procedure in the second empirical study



Source: Elaborated by the author.

During the intervention phase (2 weeks), from 25 April 2017 to 9 May 2017, the fifty-eight students participated in either non-gamified CL sessions or ont-gamified CL sessions. These students were formed into nineteen groups of three members with nineteen masters and thirty-nine apprentices assigned according to the theory-driven group formation (ISOTANI; MIZOGUCHI, 2008). Eleven of nineteen groups participated in non-gamified CL sessions, and eight groups participated in ont-gamified CL sessions.

The ontological structures to represent “*Gamified Cognitive Apprenticeship Scenario for Master/Yee Achiever and Apprentice/Yee Achiever*” and “*Gamified Cognitive Apprenticeship Scenario for Master/Yee Socializer and Apprentice/Yee Socializer*” were used to obtain the ont-gamified CL sessions in which:

- The students who had more liking for achievement-components than positive liking for social-components were assigned to play the *Yee Achiever role* in gamified CL sessions instantiated from the ontological structure “*Gamified Cognitive Apprenticeship Scenario for Master/Yee Achiever and Apprentice/Yee Achiever*” to support a CL Gameplay experience of *individual competition*.
- The students who had more positive liking for social-components than positive liking for achievement-components were assigned to play the *Yee Socializer role* in gamified CL sessions instantiated from the ontological structure “*Gamified Cognitive Apprenticeship Scenario for Master/Yee Socializer and Apprentice/Yee Socializer*” to support a CL Gameplay experience of *cooperative competition*.


During the post-test phase (1 week), from 9 May 2017 to 16 May 2017, to gather data related to the skill/knowledge, the multiple-choice knowledge questionnaire of loop structures (p2b) was answered by the student’s - during 2 hours on May, 9th - at the classroom in the

University of São Paulo as a formative evaluation in the course of Introduction to Computer Science. Three programming problem tasks (PC, PD, PE - detailed in Table 2) have been solved by the students in the Moodle platform using the VPL module. To gather data related to the participants' level of motivation, the students answered the paper-based IMMS questionnaire at the classroom in the University of São Paulo.

1.1.7.4 Execution: Third Empirical Study

The third empirical study was executed over six weeks and three days with the schedule, timing, and data collection procedure showed in Figure 6.

Figure 6 – Diagram of the schedule, timing and data collection procedure in the third empirical study



Source: Elaborated by the author.

During the pre-test phase (1 week), from 18 May 2017 to 25 May 2017, the Web-based QPJ-BR questionnaires were answered by all the participants through the Moodle platform using the *Questionnaire module*. To gather data related to the skill/knowledge, students solved one programming problem task (P4) in the Moodle platform using the VPL module, and they answered the multiple-choice knowledge questionnaire of recursion (p3a) at the classroom in the University of São Paulo - during 2 hours on May 25th.

During the intervention phase (4 week & 3 days), from 26 May 2017 to 27 June 2017, the fifty-nine students participated in either the ont-gamified CL sessions or the w/o-gamified CL sessions . The students were formed into twenty-one groups of two or three members with twenty-one masters and thirty-eight apprentices assigned according to the theory-driven group formation (ISOTANI; MIZOGUCHI, 2008). Eleven of twenty-one groups participated in w/o-gamified CL sessions, and ten groups participated in ont-gamified CL sessions.

The ontological structures to represent “*Gamified Cognitive Apprenticeship Scenario for Master/Yee Achiever and Apprentice/Yee Achiever*” and “*Gamified Cognitive Apprenticeship Scenario for Master/Social Achiever and Apprentice/Social Achiever*” were used to obtain the ont-gamified CL sessions in which:

- The students who had liking for achievement-components and did not have liking for social-components were assigned to play the *Yee Achiever role* in gamified CL sessions instantiated from the ontological structure “*Gamified Cognitive Apprenticeship Scenario for Master/Yee Achiever and Apprentice/Yee Achiever*” to support a CL Gameplay experience of *individual competition*.
- The students who had positive liking for social-components and achievement-components were assigned to play the *Social Achiever role* in gamified CL sessions instantiated from the ontological structure “*Gamified Cognitive Apprenticeship Scenario for Master/Social Achiever and Apprentice/Social Achiever*” to support a CL Gameplay experience of *individual and cooperative competition*.

During the post-test phase (1 week), from 27 June 2017 to 04 July 2017, to gather data related to the skill/knowledge, a multiple-choice knowledge questionnaire of recursion (p3c) has been answered by the participants at the classroom in University of São Paulo during 2 hours on June 27th. Three programming problem tasks (PF, PG and PH - detailed in Table 2) have been solved by the students in the Moodle platform using the VPL module. To gather data related to the students' intrinsic motivation and level of motivation, the students answered the IMI and IMMS questionnaire through the Moodle platform using the *Questionnaire module*.

1.1.8 Validity Evaluation

To measure the students' motivation regarding to the participation in CL sessions, the IMI and IMMS questionnaires have been adapted and translated from their original English versions into Portuguese by the thesis author. Therefore, a validation analysis is necessary to ensure that the translated items are psycho-metrically sound. Without a validity of the psychometric measurement instruments, the accuracy and consistency of them are not guaranteed because the participants may not understand the semantic of the items, they may lie in their answers, and they may give responses bias, producing false and inconsistent results.

According to the guidelines for validating psychometric questionnaires proposed by Bolarinwa (2015), Tsang, Royse and Terkawi (2017), there are several varieties of reliability and validity tests to explore the bias and distortion of questionnaires. The reliability, as the ability of questionnaire to produce consistent results, is mainly estimated through the *Cronbach's Alpha* that measure the *internal consistency* of a questionnaire as the consistency of results across items. The validity, as the degree to which a questionnaire produces true results, may be described as face validity, construct validity, content validity and criterion validity. The most valuable measure to validate a psychometric questionnaire is the construct validity that indicates the consistency of the conceptual structure proposed to explain a behavior as a theoretical psychological construct. Thus, the IMI and IMMS questionnaires cannot be valid unless they are reliable. The reliability analysis and Confirmatory Factorial Analysis (CFA) as methods of

validation for the IMI and IMMS questionnaires are detailed in Appendix B. Prior to perform this validation, the inconsistent responses (careless and exaggerated responses) were detected and treated as outliers as it is detailed in Appendix A.

Instead of using *Classical Test Theory* (CTT), the thesis author uses *Item Response Theory* (IRT) to build the measurement instruments that estimates the participants' motivations and their knowledge/skills. Several researchers argue that IRT-based measurement instruments are superior to CTT-based measurement instruments (PETRILLO *et al.*, 2015; ABEDALAZIZ; LENG, 2013/00/00). Instead to use a common value estimates for all individuals, the IRT-based measurement instruments depend on the latent trait values (Psychological constructs that are hidden and cannot be measured directly - e.g. motivation and skill/knowledge). Thus, in IRT-based measurement instruments, the item characteristics are separated from the latent trait values, making these instruments more reliable because the item characteristics need to be calibrated for each population. As the seven point likert scale was used to gather all the responses in the IMI and IMMS questionnaires, Rating Scale Model (RSM) was used to build the IRT-based measurement instruments for the data analysis of participants' motivation. Appendix C shows the RSM-based instruments built to calculate the participants' motivation estimates in the empirical studies.

For each empirical study, the participants' learning outcomes were calculated as the gains in skill/knowledge of participants. These gains were estimated employing a stacking procedure proposed by Wright (2003) to investigate the impact of an intervention on latent traits of participants from a perspective of IRT-based measurement instruments. As programming tasks and multiple-choice knowledge questionnaires were used during the pre-test and post-test phases to gather information about the initial and final knowledge/skill of participants, General Partial Credit Model (GPCM) was used to build the IRT-based measurement instruments to estimate the participants' *skill/knowledge* (latent traits) being justify the use of stacking procedure. Appendix C shows GPCM-instruments built and the stacking procedure used to calculate the gains in skill/knowledge of participants with the data gathered in each empirical study.

1.1.9 Data Analysis Procedure

To measure the students' intrinsic motivation and level of motivation towards their participation in the ont-gamified CL sessions, non-gamified CL sessions, and w/o-gamified CL session, RSM-based instruments (Appendix C) were used as a psychometric instrument for analyzing the self-reported data collected by the motivation surveys in the empirical studies. The RSM-based instruments are measurement instruments built as Item Response Theory (IRT) models in which the latent trait being measured by the items is estimated in function of rating scale data (GEORGE, 2005). These instruments are appropriate for the data gathered through the motivation surveys in which all the items have a seven-likert scale response format (??).

After having the participants' intrinsic motivation estimates, and the level of motivation

estimates by means of RSM-based instruments, two-way ANOVA tests have been carried out to compare the effects on the participants' motivation caused by the ont-gamified CL sessions. The results on these tests were calculated employing a variation between the types of CL sessions (*ont-gamified* CL sessions, *non-gamified* CL sessions, and *w/o-gamified* CL sessions) and the CL roles played by the participants in these sessions.

To investigate the effect of different types of CL sessions on the learning outcomes, the gains in knowledge/skills for the participants have been estimated employing the stacking procedure proposed by Wright (2003) in which the knowledge/skills for the participants were estimated from the pre-test and post-test phases using GPCMs. Appendix C details the stacked data analyses that were carried out to obtain the gains in knowledge/skills for the empirical studies. After having these results, two-way ANOVA tests have been run to compare the learning outcomes in the different types of CL sessions and the CL roles played by the participants.

After carrying out the ANOVA tests by evaluating whether there was no significant differences on the participants' motivation and learning outcomes, Spearman's rank-order correlation tests have been run to find out whether the effects of different types of CL sessions on the participants' motivation and learning outcomes were significantly linked.

1.2 Pilot Empirical Study: Data Analysis Results

Do the ont-gamified CL sessions have positive impacts on the participants' motivation?

To answer this question, two-way between-subjects ANOVA tests were conducted to compare the effects of ont-gamified and non-gamified CL sessions on the participants' intrinsic motivation, perceived choice, pressure/tension and effort/importance estimates. The interaction effects between these two types of CL sessions and the CL roles, *Master* and *Apprentice*, are evaluated in these tests. Table 3 shows the results in which there is statistically a significant difference at the 0.05 level for the participants' intrinsic motivation and perceived choice. The effect on the intrinsic motivation for the type of CL session yielded an *F* ratio of $F(1, 26) = 4.702$, $p = 0.039$ with significant differences between non-gamified CL sessions and ont-gamified CL sessions. In relation to the perceived choice, the effect for the type of CL session yielded an *F* ratio of $F(1, 26) = 6.980$, $p = 0.014$, indicating significant differences between non-gamified CL sessions and ont-gamified CL sessions.

Table 3 – Two-way ANOVA results for the latent trait estimates of intrinsic motivation, interest/enjoyment, perceived choice, pressure/tension and effort/importance in the pilot empirical study

	Sum Sq	Df	F value	Pr(>F)	Sig
Intrinsic Motivation>Type	2.397	1	4.702	0.039	*

Signif. codes: 0 *** 0.01 ** 0.05

Table 3 – (continued)

	Sum Sq	Df	F value	Pr(>F)	Sig
Intrinsic Motivation>Type:CLRole	0.080	1	0.156	0.696	
Intrinsic Motivation:Residuals	13.254	26			
Interest/Enjoyment>Type	8.107	1	3.495	0.073	
Interest/Enjoyment>Type:CLRole	0.599	1	0.258	0.616	
Interest/Enjoyment:Residuals	60.314	26			
Perceived Choice>Type	3.675	1	6.980	0.014	*
Perceived Choice>Type:CLRole	1.050	1	1.994	0.170	
Perceived Choice:Residuals	13.689	26			
Pressure/Tension>Type	1.125	1	2.472	0.128	
Pressure/Tension>Type:CLRole	0.012	1	0.026	0.874	
Pressure/Tension:Residuals	11.838	26			
Effort/Importance>Type	0.335	1	0.645	0.429	
Effort/Importance>Type:CLRole	0.273	1	0.525	0.475	
Effort/Importance:Residuals	13.516	26			

Signif. codes: 0 ‘***’ 0.01 ‘**’ 0.05

Tukey post-hoc comparisons have been run to confirm the significant differences occurred between the types of CL sessions and the CL roles. Table 4 summarizes the descriptive statistics and the results of post-hoc comparisons. According to these results, the intrinsic motivation of students who participated in ont-gamified CL sessions ($lsmean = 0.419$ logit, and $SE = 0.206$) is greater than the intrinsic motivation of students who participated in non-gamified CL sessions ($lsmean = -0.322$ logit, and $SE = 0.273$) with a p-adj. value of 0.013 and Hedges' $g = 0.956$ large effect size. The interest/enjoyment of participants in ont-gamified CL sessions ($lsmean = 0.848$ logit, and $SE = 0.440$) is greater than the interest/enjoyment of participants in non-gamified CL sessions ($lsmean = -0.515$ logit, and $SE = 0.582$) with a p-adj. value of 0.039 and Hedges' $g = 0.780$ medium effect size. In ont-gamified CL sessions, the perceived choice with $lsmean = 0.382$ logit and $SE = 0.209$ is significantly greater than the perceived choice in non-gamified CL sessions with $lsmean = -0.535$ logit and $SE = 0.277$ at the p-adj. value of 0.031 and Hedges' $g = 0.814$ large effect size.

Having these results, the null hypothesis, $H_{null,IM,g1}$: “*There was no significant difference between the intrinsic motivation of students who participated in ont-gamified CL sessions and the intrinsic motivation of students who participated in non-gamified CL sessions,*” is rejected. Thus, this pilot empirical study becomes an evidence to support the alternative hypothesis, $H_{alt,IM,g1}$: “*The intrinsic motivation of students who participated in ont-gamified CL sessions was greater than the intrinsic motivation of students who participated in non-gamified CL sessions,*” with positive impacts in the participants' intrinsic motivation, interest/enjoyment, and perceived choice.

Table 4 – Descriptive statistics and Tukey post-hoc test results for the latent trait estimates of intrinsic motivation, interest/enjoyment, perceived choice, pressure/tension and effort/importance in the pilot empirical study

	N	mean	Ismean	SE	df	Iwr.CI	upr.CI	t.ratio	p.value	p-adj.	g	sig	mag
Intrinsic Motivation:non-gamified	14	-0.389	-0.322	0.273	26	-0.882	0.239						
Intrinsic Motivation:ont-gamified	16	0.305	0.419	0.206	26	-0.004	0.843						
Intrinsic Motivation:non-gamified - ont-gamified	30	-0.694	-0.741	0.342	26	-1.231	-0.157	-2.168	0.039	0.013	-0.956	*	large
Intrinsic Motivation:non-gamified.Apprentice	12	-0.416	-0.416	0.206	26	-0.839	0.008						
Intrinsic Motivation:ont-gamified.Apprentice	12	0.190	0.190	0.206	26	-0.233	0.614						
Intrinsic Motivation:non-gamified.Apprentice - ont-gamified.Apprentice	24	-0.606	-0.606	0.291	26	-1.406	0.194	-2.079	0.048	0.034	0.186	-0.818	
Intrinsic Motivation:non-gamified.Master	2	-0.228	-0.228	0.505	26	-1.266	0.810						
Intrinsic Motivation:ont-gamified.Master	4	0.649	0.649	0.357	26	-0.085	1.382						
Intrinsic Motivation:non-gamified.Master - ont-gamified.Master	6	-0.876	-0.876	0.618	26	-2.573	0.820	-1.417	0.168	0.500	-0.991		
Interest/Enjoyment:non-gamified	14	-0.617	-0.515	0.582	26	-1.711	0.680						
Interest/Enjoyment:ont-gamified	16	0.591	0.848	0.440	26	-0.056	1.752						
Interest/Enjoyment:non-gamified - ont-gamified	30	-1.208	-1.363	0.729	26	-2.354	-0.063	-1.869	0.073	0.039	-0.780	*	medium
Interest/Enjoyment:non-gamified.Apprentice	12	-0.658	-0.658	0.440	26	-1.562	0.246						
Interest/Enjoyment:ont-gamified.Apprentice	12	0.335	0.335	0.440	26	-0.569	1.238						
Interest/Enjoyment:non-gamified.Apprentice - ont-gamified.Apprentice	24	-0.993	-0.993	0.622	26	-2.698	0.713	-1.596	0.123	0.398	-0.612		
Interest/Enjoyment:non-gamified.Master	2	-0.372	-0.372	1.077	26	-2.586	1.841						
Interest/Enjoyment:ont-gamified.Master	4	1.361	1.361	0.762	26	-0.204	2.927						
Interest/Enjoyment:non-gamified.Master - ont-gamified.Master	6	-1.734	-1.734	1.319	26	-5.352	1.885	-1.314	0.200	0.562	-1.100		
Perceived Choice:non-gamified	14	-0.316	-0.535	0.277	26	-1.105	0.034						
Perceived Choice:ont-gamified	16	0.290	0.382	0.209	26	-0.048	0.813						
Perceived Choice:non-gamified - ont-gamified	30	-0.607	-0.918	0.347	26	-1.152	-0.061	-2.642	0.014	0.031	-0.814	*	large
Perceived Choice:non-gamified.Apprentice	12	-0.229	-0.229	0.209	26	-0.659	0.202						
Perceived Choice:ont-gamified.Apprentice	12	0.199	0.199	0.209	26	-0.232	0.629						
Perceived Choice:non-gamified.Apprentice - ont-gamified.Apprentice	24	-0.427	-0.427	0.296	26	-1.240	0.386	-1.442	0.161	0.486	-0.557		
Perceived Choice:non-gamified.Master	2	-0.842	-0.842	0.513	26	-1.897	0.212						
Perceived Choice:ont-gamified.Master	4	0.566	0.566	0.363	26	-0.180	1.312						
Perceived Choice:non-gamified.Master - ont-gamified.Master	6	-1.408	-1.408	0.628	26	-3.132	0.316	-2.241	0.034	0.139	-1.767		

Signif. codes: 0 ‘***’ 0.01 ‘**’ 0.05

Table 4 – (continued)

	N	mean	Ismean	SE	df	Iwr.CI	upr.CI	t.ratio	p.value	p-adj.	g	sig	mag
Pressure/Tension:non-gamified	14	0.238	0.285	0.258	26	-0.245	0.814						
Pressure/Tension:ont-gamified	16	-0.230	-0.223	0.195	26	-0.624	0.177						
Pressure/Tension:non-gamified - ont-gamified	30	0.468	0.508	0.323	-	-0.040	0.976	1.572	0.128	0.069	0.699		
Pressure/Tension:non-gamified.Apprentice	12	0.219	0.219	0.195	26	-0.181	0.620						
Pressure/Tension:ont-gamified.Apprentice	12	-0.237	-0.237	0.195	26	-0.637	0.164						
Pressure/Tension:non-gamified.Apprentice - ont-gamified.Apprentice	24	0.456	0.456	0.275	-	-0.300	1.212	1.656	0.110	0.366	0.624		
Pressure/Tension:non-gamified.Master	2	0.350	0.350	0.477	26	-0.631	1.331						
Pressure/Tension:ont-gamified.Master	4	-0.210	-0.210	0.337	26	-0.903	0.484						
Pressure/Tension:non-gamified.Master - ont-gamified.Master	6	0.560	0.560	0.584	-	-1.044	2.163	0.958	0.347	0.774	0.950		
Effort/Importance:non-gamified	14	0.028	0.162	0.275	26	-0.404	0.728						
Effort/Importance:ont-gamified	16	-0.084	-0.115	0.208	26	-0.543	0.313						
Effort/Importance:non-gamified - ont-gamified	30	0.112	0.277	0.345	-	-0.430	0.654	0.803	0.429	0.674	0.155		
Effort/Importance:non-gamified.Apprentice	12	-0.025	-0.025	0.208	26	-0.453	0.403						
Effort/Importance:ont-gamified.Apprentice	12	-0.052	-0.052	0.208	26	-0.480	0.376						
Effort/Importance:non-gamified.Apprentice - ont-gamified.Apprentice	24	0.027	0.027	0.294	-	-0.780	0.835	0.092	0.927	1.000	0.037		
Effort/Importance:non-gamified.Master	2	0.349	0.349	0.510	26	-0.699	1.397						
Effort/Importance:ont-gamified.Master	4	-0.178	-0.178	0.361	26	-0.919	0.563						
Effort/Importance:non-gamified.Master - ont-gamified.Master	6	0.527	0.527	0.624	-	-1.186	2.240	0.844	0.406	0.833	0.545		

Signif. codes: 0 ‘***’ 0.01 ‘**’ 0.05

Do the ont-gamified CL sessions affect on the participants' learning outcomes?

In order to answer this question, two-way between-subjects ANOVA tests were run to compare the effects of ont-gamified CL sessions (*ont-gamified*) and non-gamified CL sessions (*non-gamified*) on the gains in skill/knowledge estimates. These tests evaluated the interaction effects between these two types of CL sessions and the two CL roles: *Master* and *Apprentice*. The results of these tests are shown in Table 5 in which there is not a statistical significant difference at the 0.05 level for the gains in skill/knowledge estimates for the “*signed-up students*” (SignedUpPs) and “*students with effective participation*” (EffectivePs).

- *Signed-up students* (SignedUpPs) were students enrolled in the courses, and that were participants in the CL sessions
- *Students with effective participation* (EffectivePs) were signed-up students who had a complete, semicomplete or incomplete participation level in the CL sessions. It means that they were students with at least interacted one time in the CL session (non-gamified CL session or ont-gamified CL session) with other member of CL group.

Table 5 – Two-way ANOVA results for the gains in skill/knowledge estimates in the pilot empirical study

	Sum Sq	Df	F value	Pr(>F)	Sig
SignedUpPs>Type	0.432	1	0.096	0.759	
SignedUpPs>Type:CLRole	3.485	1	0.772	0.388	
SignedUpPs:Residuals	117.368	26			
EffectivePs>Type	3.087	1	0.874	0.363	
EffectivePs>Type:CLRole	0.427	1	0.121	0.732	
EffectivePs:Residuals	60.040	17			

Signif. codes: 0 *** 0.01 ** 0.05

To confirm the significant differences occurred between the types of CL sessions and the CL roles, Tukey post-hoc comparisons have been run, and Table 6 summarizes the results of post-hoc comparisons and the descriptive statistics. Although the gains in skill/knowledge estimates for students with effective participation in ont-gamified CL sessions were greater than the gains in skill/knowledge estimates for students with effective participation in non-gamified CL sessions, there were not significant differences in the gains in skill/knowledge of signed-up students and students with effective participation. Thus, the null hypothesis, $H_{null,GSK,g1}$: “*There was no significant difference between the gains in skill/knowledge obtained by students who participated in ont-gamified CL sessions and the gains in skill/knowledge obtained by students who participated in non-gamified CL sessions,*” is not rejected.

Table 6 – Descriptive statistics and Tukey post-hoc test results for the gains in skill/knowledge estimates in the pilot empirical study

	N	mean	lsmean	SE	df	lwr.CI	upr.CI	t.ratio	p.value	p.adj	g	sig	mag
SignedUpPs:non-gamified	14	3.768	2.705	0.692	26	1.282	4.127						
SignedUpPs:ont-gamified	16	2.829	2.427	0.573	26	1.249	3.604						
SignedUpPs:non-gamified - ont-gamified	30	0.940	0.278	0.898		-0.659	2.538	0.309	0.759	0.238	0.376		
SignedUpPs:non-gamified.Apprentice	11	4.566	4.566	0.641	26	3.249	5.883						
SignedUpPs:ont-gamified.Apprentice	11	3.499	3.499	0.641	26	2.182	4.816						
SignedUpPs:non-gamified.Apprentice - ont-gamified.Apprentice	22	1.067	1.067	0.906		-1.418	3.553	1.178	0.249	0.646	0.517		
SignedUpPs:non-gamified.Master	3	0.843	0.843	1.227	26	-1.678	3.365						
SignedUpPs:ont-gamified.Master	5	1.355	1.355	0.950	26	-0.599	3.308						
SignedUpPs:non-gamified.Master - ont-gamified.Master	8	-0.511	-0.511	1.552		-4.768	3.745	-0.330	0.744	0.987	-0.176		
EffectivePs:non-gamified	8	2.535	2.196	0.686	17	0.749	3.644						
EffectivePs:ont-gamified	13	3.392	3.010	0.536	17	1.880	4.140						
EffectivePs:non-gamified - ont-gamified	21	-0.858	-0.814	0.871		-2.639	0.924	-0.935	0.363	0.324	-0.346		
EffectivePs:non-gamified.Apprentice	5	3.550	3.550	0.840	17	1.776	5.323						
EffectivePs:ont-gamified.Apprentice	8	4.666	4.666	0.664	17	3.264	6.068						
EffectivePs:non-gamified.Apprentice - ont-gamified.Apprentice	13	-1.116	-1.116	1.071		-4.162	1.929	-1.042	0.312	0.728	-0.740		
EffectivePs:non-gamified.Master	3	0.843	0.843	1.085	17	-1.446	3.132						
EffectivePs:ont-gamified.Master	5	1.355	1.355	0.840	17	-0.419	3.128						
EffectivePs:non-gamified.Master - ont-gamified.Master	8	-0.511	-0.511	1.372		-4.413	3.390	-0.373	0.714	0.982	-0.176		

Signif. codes: 0 ‘***’ 0.01 ‘**’ 0.05

Are the participants' motivation and learning outcomes linked in either the non-gamified CL sessions or the ont-gamified CL sessions?

Spearman's rank-order correlation tests were run to determine the relationship between the motivation and learning outcomes obtained by signed-up students (*SignedUpPs*) and students with effective participation (*EffectivePs*) in the ont-gamified CL sessions (*ont-gamified*) and the non-gamified CL sessions (*non-gamified*). Table 7 shows the results of the correlation tests and their p-values in which the gains in skill/knowledge estimates were used as learning outcome measurement, and the intrinsic motivation, interest/enjoyment, perceived choice, pressure/tension and effort/importance estimates were used as motivation measurement.

According to these results, there was not significant correlation between the participants' motivation and learning outcomes in the non-gamified CL sessions and ont-gamified CL sessions. Thus, the null hypothesis, $H_{null,\rho,g1}$: “*There was no significant correlation between the participants' motivation and their gains in skill/knowledge in either the non-gamified CL sessions or the ont-gamified CL sessions,*” is not rejected.

Table 7 – Correlation matrices and their p-values for the motivation and learning outcomes of participants in the pilot empirical study

Gains in Skill/Knowledge	Intrinsic Motivation	Interest/Enjoyment	Perceived Choice	Pressure/Tension	Effort/Importance
SignedUpPs:non-gamified	-0.3500 (0.24)	-0.2368 (0.43)	-0.0700 (0.82)	-0.0948 (0.75)	0.0112 (0.97)
SignedUpPs:ont-gamified	-0.3771 (0.18)	-0.4327 (0.12)	-0.3872 (0.17)	0.3131 (0.27)	0.3067 (0.28)
SignedUpPs:non-gamified.Apprentice	-0.3149 (0.34)	-0.1628 (0.63)	-0.3466 (0.29)	-0.0419 (0.90)	0.2150 (0.52)
SignedUpPs:ont-gamified.Apprentice	-0.0486 (0.89)	-0.1094 (0.76)	-0.0973 (0.78)	0.2294 (0.52)	0.5368 (0.10)
EffectivePs:non-gamified	0.0721 (0.87)	0.3784 (0.40)	0.3945 (0.38)	0.1802 (0.69)	0.1182 (0.80)
EffectivePs:ont-gamified	-0.4772 (0.11)	-0.5123 (0.08)	-0.3996 (0.19)	0.4137 (0.18)	0.3215 (0.30)
EffectivePs:non-gamified.Apprentice	0.1026 (0.86)	0.5643 (0.32)	-0.7105 (0.17)	0.4104 (0.49)	0.6579 (0.22)
EffectivePs:ont-gamified.Apprentice	-0.3114 (0.45)	-0.1796 (0.67)	-0.0599 (0.88)	0.4424 (0.27)	0.4817 (0.22)

method: spearman

Do the ont-gamified CL sessions have positive effects on the percentages of participation per groups?

In order to answer this question, Mann-Whitney's U tests have been run on different percentages of participation per group in ont-gamified CL sessions (*ont-gamified*) and non-gamified CL sessions (*non-gamified*). These percentages were: the percentage of students per groups having any participation (*PctHavingParticipation* - refers to complete, semicomplete and

incomplete participation level); the percentage of students per groups having an adequate participation (*PctAdequateParticipation* - refers to complete and semicomplete participation level); the percentage of students per groups having incomplete participation (*PctIncompleteParticipation* - refers to incomplete and none participation level); and the percentage of students per groups without participation (*PctWithoutParticipation* - refers to none participation level).

The participation levels are defined as:

- *None participation level*: when the student did not interact with others in CL sessions
- *Incomplete participation level*: when the student interacted in CL sessions, but he/she did not complete all the necessary interactions
- *Semicomplete participation level*: when the student interacted in CL sessions carried out all the necessary interactions, but he/she did not respond to all requests made by others
- *Complete participation level*: when the student interacted in CL sessions performing all the necessary interactions, and he/she responds to all requests made by others

Table 8 shows the results of Mann-Whitney's U tests in which there were significant differences for all the percentages of participation per groups except the percentage of students per groups having an adequate participation. According to these results, the percentage of students per groups having any participation in ont-gamified CL sessions (*median* = 0.50) was greater than the percentage of students per groups having any participation in non-gamified CL sessions (*median* = 0.40). This result indicates a significant difference with values of $U = 10.5$, $Z = -1.78$, $p\text{-value} = 0.035$ and $r = 0.477$ (medium effect size). The percentage of students per groups having an incomplete participation in ont-gamified CL sessions (*median* = 0.25) was significantly less than the percentage of students per groups having an incomplete participation in non-gamified CL sessions (*median* = 0.60) with values of $U = 21.0$, $Z = 1.79$, $p\text{-value} = 0.048$ and $r = 0.567$ (large effect size). Finally, with values of $U = 12.0$, $Z = 2.16$, $p\text{-value} = 0.029$ and $r = 0.816$ (large effect size), the percentage of students per groups without participation in ont-gamified CL sessions (*median* = 0.25) was significantly less than the percentage of students per groups without participation in non-gamified CL sessions (*median* = 0.60).

Table 8 – Mann-Whitney's U results for the pct. of participation per groups in the pilot empirical study

	Type	N	Med	Mean.R	U	Z	p.value	r	mag	Sig
PctHavingParticipation	non-gamified	6	0.40	5.25	10.5	-1.78	0.035	0.477	med	*
PctHavingParticipation	ont-gamified	8	0.50	9.19	10.5	-1.78	0.035	0.477	med	*
PctAdequateParticipation	non-gamified	4	0.40	4.12	6.5	-1.45	0.082	0.436	med	
PctAdequateParticipation	ont-gamified	7	0.50	7.07	6.5	-1.45	0.082	0.436	med	
PctIncompleteParticipation	non-gamified	5	0.60	7.20	21.0	1.79	0.048	0.567	larg	*
PctIncompleteParticipation	ont-gamified	5	0.25	3.80	21.0	1.79	0.048	0.567	larg	*
PctWithoutParticipation	non-gamified	3	0.60	6.00	12.0	2.16	0.029	0.816	larg	*
PctWithoutParticipation	ont-gamified	4	0.25	2.50	12.0	2.16	0.029	0.816	larg	*

Signif. codes: 0 *** 0.01 ** 0.05

Based on these results, the null hypothesis, $H_{null,Pct,g1}$: “*There was no significant difference between the percentages of participation per groups in ont-gamified CL sessions and the percentages of participation per groups in non-gamified CL sessions,*” is rejected. In this sense, this empirical study becomes an evidence to support the alternative hypothesis, $H_{alt,Pct,g1}$: “*The percentages of participation per groups in ont-gamified CL sessions are better than the percentage of participation per groups in non-gamified CL sessions,*” increasing the percentage of students per groups having any participation, and reducing the percentage of students per groups having an incomplete participation and without participation.

1.3 First Empirical Study: Data Analysis Results

Do the ont-gamified CL sessions have positive impacts on the participants' motivation?

In order to answer this question, two-way ANOVA tests have been run to compare the effects of ont-gamified CL sessions (*ont-gamified*) and non-gamified CL sessions (*non-gamified*) on the participants' intrinsic motivation, interest/enjoyment, perceived choice, pressure/tension and effort/importance. Table 9 shows the results of the ANOVA tests, and according to these results, there was a statistical significant difference at the 0.05 level for the participants' intrinsic motivation, interest/enjoyment, pressure/tension and effort/importance. On the participants' intrinsic motivation, the effect for the type of CL session yielded a F ratio of $F(1, 56) = 8.103$ and $p = 0.006$ indicating significant differences between non-gamified CL sessions and ont-gamified CL sessions. The effect on the participants' perceived choice for the type of CL session yielded a F ratio of $F(1, 56) = 7.885$ and $p = 0.007$ indicating significant differences between non-gamified CL sessions and ont-gamified CL sessions. On the participants' pressure/tension, the effect for the type of CL session and CL roles yielded a F ratio of $F(1, 56) = 6.151$ and $p = 0.016$ indicating significant differences between the pressure/tension of apprentices in non-gamified CL sessions and the pressure/tension of apprentices in ont-gamified CL sessions. The effect on the effort/importance for the type of CL session yielded a F ratio of $F(1, 56) = 4.303$ and $p = 0.043$ indicating significant differences between non-gamified CL sessions and ont-gamified CL sessions.

Table 9 – Two-way ANOVA for the latent trait estimates of intrinsic motivation, interest/enjoyment, perceived choice, pressure/tension and effort/importance in the first empirical study

	Sum Sq	Df	F value	Pr(>F)	Sig
Intrinsic Motivation>Type	3.087	1	8.103	0.006	**
Intrinsic Motivation>Type:CLRole	0.020	1	0.053	0.819	
Intrinsic Motivation:Residuals	21.333	56			
Interest/Enjoyment>Type	0.946	1	0.942	0.336	

Signif. codes: 0 ‘***’ 0.01 ‘*’ 0.05

Table 9 – (continued)

	Sum Sq	Df	F value	Pr(>F)	Sig
Interest/Enjoyment>Type:CLRole	2.003	1	1.993	0.164	
Interest/Enjoyment:Residuals	52.258	52			
Perceived Choice>Type	6.371	1	7.885	0.007	**
Perceived Choice>Type:CLRole	0.050	1	0.061	0.805	
Perceived Choice:Residuals	45.244	56			
Pressure/Tension>Type	2.428	1	2.352	0.131	
Pressure/Tension>Type:CLRole	6.351	1	6.151	0.016	*
Pressure/Tension:Residuals	57.815	56			
Effort/Importance>Type	3.861	1	4.303	0.043	*
Effort/Importance>Type:CLRole	0.799	1	0.891	0.349	
Effort/Importance:Residuals	50.244	56			

Signif. codes: 0 ‘***’ 0.01 ‘**’ 0.05

Tukey post-hoc comparisons were run to confirm the significant differences in the participants' motivation of ANOVA tests. Table 10 shows the results of the post-hoc comparisons in which the intrinsic motivation of participants in ont-gamified CL sessions ($lsmean = 0.129$ logit, and $SE = 0.113$) is greater than the intrinsic motivation of participants in non-gamified CL sessions ($lsmean = -0.325$ logit, and $SE = 0.113$) with a p-adj. value of 0.006 and Hedges' $g = 0.743$ medium effect size. The perceived choice of participants in ont-gamified CL sessions ($lsmean = 0.310$ logit, and $SE = 0.164$) is greater than the perceived choice of participants in non-gamified CL sessions ($lsmean = -0.343$ logit, and $SE = 0.164$) with a p-adj. value of 0.007 and Hedges' $g = 0.724$ medium effect size. The pressure/tension of apprentices in ont-gamified CL sessions ($lsmean = -0.237$ logit, and $SE = 0.262$) is less than apprentices in non-gamified CL sessions ($lsmean = 0.817$ logit, and $SE = 0.272$) with a p-adj. value of 0.035 and Hedges' $g = 0.964$ large effect size. The participants' effort/importance in ont-gamified CL sessions ($lsmean = 0.218$ logit, and $SE = 0.173$) is greater than the participants' effort/importance in non-gamified CL sessions ($lsmean = -0.290$ logit, and $SE = 0.173$) with a p-adj. value of 0.035 and Hedges' $g = 0.544$ medium effect size.

According to the results obtained in the two-way ANOVA tests and Tukey post-hoc comparisons, the null hypothesis, $H_{null,IM,g1}$: “*There was no significant difference between the intrinsic motivation of students who participated in ont-gamified CL sessions and the intrinsic motivation of students who participated in non-gamified CL sessions,*” is rejected becoming this empirical study an evidence to support the alternative hypothesis, $H_{alt,IM,g1}$: “*The intrinsic motivation of students who participated in ont-gamified CL sessions was greater than the intrinsic motivation of students who participated in non-gamified CL sessions,*” with positive impacts in the intrinsic motivation, perceived choice, pressure/tension (of apprentices), and effort/importance.

Table 10 – Descriptive statistics and Tukey post-hoc test results for the latent trait estimates of intrinsic motivation, interest/enjoyment, perceived choice, pressure/tension and effort/importance in the first empirical study

	N	mean	Ismean	SE	df	Iwr.CI	upr.CI	t.ratio	p.value	p-adj.	g	sig	mag
Intrinsic Motivation:non-gamified	30	-0.329	-0.325	0.113	56	-0.552	-0.099						
Intrinsic Motivation:ont-gamified	30	0.129	0.129	0.113	56	-0.097	0.354						
Intrinsic Motivation:non-gamified - ont-gamified	60	-0.458	-0.454	0.160	-777	-0.138	-2.847	0.006	0.006	-0.743	**	medium	
Intrinsic Motivation:non-gamified.Apprentice	14	-0.274	-0.274	0.165	56	-0.605	0.056						
Intrinsic Motivation:ont-gamified.Apprentice	15	0.143	0.143	0.159	56	-0.176	0.462						
Intrinsic Motivation:non-gamified.Apprentice - ont-gamified.Apprentice	29	-0.418	-0.418	0.229	-1.025	0.190	-1.820	0.074	0.074	0.275	-0.583		
Intrinsic Motivation:non-gamified.Master	16	-0.376	-0.376	0.154	56	-0.686	-0.067						
Intrinsic Motivation:ont-gamified.Master	15	0.114	0.114	0.159	56	-0.205	0.434						
Intrinsic Motivation:non-gamified.Master - ont-gamified.Master	31	-0.491	-0.491	0.222	-1.078	0.097	-2.212	0.031	0.132	-0.896			
Interest/Enjoyment:non-gamified	28	-0.217	-0.217	0.189	52	-0.597	0.163						
Interest/Enjoyment:ont-gamified	28	0.062	0.043	0.190	52	-0.338	0.424						
Interest/Enjoyment:non-gamified - ont-gamified	56	-0.279	-0.260	0.268	-0.816	0.259	-0.970	0.336	0.336	0.303	-0.274		
Interest/Enjoyment:non-gamified.Apprentice	14	-0.097	-0.097	0.268	52	-0.635	0.441						
Interest/Enjoyment:ont-gamified.Apprentice	13	-0.215	-0.215	0.278	52	-0.773	0.343						
Interest/Enjoyment:non-gamified.Apprentice - ont-gamified.Apprentice	27	0.118	0.118	0.386	-0.906	1.143	0.307						
Interest/Enjoyment:non-gamified.Master	14	-0.337	-0.337	0.268	52	-0.875	0.201						
Interest/Enjoyment:ont-gamified.Master	15	0.302	0.302	0.259	52	-0.217	0.821						
Interest/Enjoyment:non-gamified.Master - ont-gamified.Master	29	-0.639	-0.639	0.373	-1.628	0.350	-1.715	0.092	0.092	0.326	-0.678		
Perceived Choice:non-gamified	30	-0.340	-0.343	0.164	56	-0.672	-0.013						
Perceived Choice:ont-gamified	30	0.310	0.310	0.164	56	-0.019	0.639						
Perceived Choice:non-gamified - ont-gamified	60	-0.650	-0.652	0.232	-1.115	-0.185	-2.808	0.007	0.007	-0.724	**	medium	
Perceived Choice:non-gamified.Apprentice	14	-0.376	-0.376	0.240	56	-0.857	0.106						
Perceived Choice:ont-gamified.Apprentice	15	0.219	0.219	0.232	56	-0.246	0.684						
Perceived Choice:non-gamified.Apprentice - ont-gamified.Apprentice	29	-0.595	-0.595	0.334	-1.479	0.290	-1.781	0.080	0.080	0.293	-0.617		
Perceived Choice:non-gamified.Master	16	-0.310	-0.310	0.225	56	-0.760	0.141						
Perceived Choice:ont-gamified.Master	15	0.401	0.401	0.232	56	-0.064	0.865						
Perceived Choice:non-gamified.Master - ont-gamified.Master	31	-0.710	-0.710	0.323	-1.565	0.145	-2.198	0.032	0.136	-0.802			
													Signif. codes: 0 ‘***’ 0.01 ‘**’ 0.05

Table 10 – (continued)

	N	mean	Ismean	SE	df	Iwr.CI	upr.CI	t.ratio	p.value	p-adj.	g	sig	mag
Pressure/Tension:non-gamified	30	0.484	0.505	0.186	56	0.132	0.877						
Pressure/Tension:ont-gamified	30	0.102	0.102	0.186	56	-0.270	0.473						
Pressure/Tension:non-gamified - ont-gamified	60	0.382	0.403	0.263		-0.144	0.908	1.534	0.131	0.151			0.358
Pressure/Tension:non-gamified.Apprentice	14	0.817	0.817	0.272	56	0.273	1.361						
Pressure/Tension:ont-gamified.Apprentice	15	-0.237	-0.237	0.262	56	-0.763	0.288						
Pressure/Tension:non-gamified.Apprentice - ont-gamified.Apprentice	29	1.054	1.054	0.378		0.054	2.054	2.792	0.007	0.035	0.964	*	large
Pressure/Tension:non-gamified.Master	16	0.193	0.193	0.254	56	-0.316	0.701						
Pressure/Tension:ont-gamified.Master	15	0.441	0.441	0.262	56	-0.084	0.967						
Pressure/Tension:non-gamified.Master - ont-gamified.Master	31	-0.249	-0.249	0.365		-1.216	0.718	-0.681	0.499	0.904	-0.249		
Effort/Importance:non-gamified	30	-0.311	-0.290	0.173	56	-0.637	0.057						
Effort/Importance:ont-gamified	30	0.218	0.218	0.173	56	-0.128	0.564						
Effort/Importance:non-gamified - ont-gamified	60	-0.529	-0.508	0.245		-1.019	-0.039	-2.074	0.043	0.035	-0.544	*	medium
Effort/Importance:non-gamified.Apprentice	14	0.025	0.025	0.253		-0.482	0.532						
Effort/Importance:ont-gamified.Apprentice	15	0.302	0.302	0.245	56	-0.188	0.792						
Effort/Importance:non-gamified.Apprentice - ont-gamified.Apprentice	29	-0.277	-0.277	0.352		-1.209	0.655	-0.786	0.435	0.860	-0.260		
Effort/Importance:non-gamified.Master	16	-0.605	-0.605	0.237	56	-1.079	-0.130						
Effort/Importance:ont-gamified.Master	15	0.134	0.134	0.245	56	-0.356	0.624						
Effort/Importance:non-gamified.Master - ont-gamified.Master	31	-0.739	-0.739	0.340		-1.640	0.162	-2.171	0.034	0.144	-0.839		

Signif. codes: 0 ‘***’ 0.01 ‘**’ 0.05

Do the ont-gamified CL sessions affect on the participants' learning outcomes?

In order to answer this question, two-way between-subjects ANOVA tests were conducted to compare the effects of non-gamified and ont-gamified CL sessions on the gains in skill/knowledge estimates. The results of these tests are indicated in Table 11 in which there was a significant difference on the gains in skill/knowledge estimates of students with effective participation in CL sessions (EffectivePs). This significant difference is indicated for the interaction between the type of CL session and CL roles with a F ratio of $F(1, 42) = 7.609$ and $p = 0.009$ (EffectivePs:Type:CLRole).

Table 11 – Two-way ANOVA results for the gains in skill/knowledge estimates in the first empirical study

	Sum Sq	Df	F value	Pr(>F)	Sig
SignedUpPs:Type	0.031	1	0.927	0.340	
SignedUpPs:Type:CLRole	0.002	1	0.067	0.796	
SignedUpPs:Residuals	1.693	50			
EffectivePs:Type	0.095	1	2.124	0.152	
EffectivePs:Type:CLRole	0.342	1	7.609	0.009	**
EffectivePs:Residuals	1.887	42			

Signif. codes: 0 *** 0.01 ** 0.05

Table 12 shown the Tukey post-hoc comparisons results for the first empirical study. These comparisons have been run to confirm the significant differences found by the ANOVA tests on the gains in skill/knowledge for the types of CL sessions and the CL roles. According to these results, for the master students with effective participation, the gains in skill/knowledge in ont-gamified CL sessions ($lsmean = 0.271$ logit, and $SE = 0.057$) were significantly less than the gains in skill/knowledge in non-gamified CL sessions ($lsmean = 0.542$ logit, and $SE = 0.075$) with a p-adj. value of 0.030 and Hedges' $g = 1.108$ large effect size.

Having the results of Tukey post-hoc comparisons, the null hypothesis, $H_{null,GSK,g1}$: “*There was no significant difference between the gains in skill/knowledge obtained by students who participated in ont-gamified CL sessions and the gains in skill/knowledge obtained by students who participated in non-gamified CL sessions,*” is rejected. However, the first empirical study is not an evidence to support the alternative hypothesis, $H_{alt,GSK,g1}$: “*The gains in skill/knowledge obtained by students who participated in ont-gamified CL sessions was different than the gains in skill/knowledge obtained by students who participated in non-gamified CL sessions,*” because the gains in skill/knowledge estimates of master students in non-gamified CL sessions were significantly greater than the gains in skill/knowledge of master students in ont-gamified CL sessions.

Table 12 – Descriptive statistics and Tukey post-hoc test results for the gains in skill/knowledge estimates in the first empirical study

	N	mean	Ismean	SE	df	Iwr.CI	upr.CI	t.ratio	p.value	p.adj	g	sig	mag
SignedUpPs:non-gamified	24	0.419	0.407	0.038	50	0.331	0.482						
SignedUpPs:ont-gamified	30	0.455	0.455	0.034	50	0.388	0.523						
SignedUpPs:non-gamified - ont-gamified	54	-0.036	-0.049	0.050		-0.137	0.065	-0.963	0.340	0.478	-0.147		
SignedUpPs:non-gamified.Apprentice	13	0.558	0.558	0.051	50	0.455	0.660						
SignedUpPs:ont-gamified.Apprentice	15	0.620	0.620	0.048	50	0.524	0.715						
SignedUpPs:non-gamified.Apprentice - ont-gamified.Apprentice	28	-0.062	-0.062	0.070		-0.247	0.124	-0.885	0.380	0.813	-0.376		
SignedUpPs:non-gamified.Master	11	0.255	0.255	0.055	50	0.144	0.367						
SignedUpPs:ont-gamified.Master	15	0.291	0.291	0.048	50	0.196	0.386						
SignedUpPs:non-gamified.Master - ont-gamified.Master	26	-0.036	-0.036	0.073		-0.230	0.159	-0.486	0.629	0.962	-0.166		
EffectivePs:non-gamified	18	0.532	0.533	0.050	42	0.432	0.635						
EffectivePs:ont-gamified	28	0.439	0.439	0.040	42	0.359	0.520						
EffectivePs:non-gamified - ont-gamified	46	0.093	0.094	0.064		-0.036	0.222	1.457	0.152	0.155	0.369		
EffectivePs:non-gamified.Apprentice	10	0.525	0.525	0.067	42	0.390	0.660						
EffectivePs:ont-gamified.Apprentice	14	0.608	0.608	0.057	42	0.494	0.723						
EffectivePs:non-gamified.Apprentice - ont-gamified.Apprentice	24	-0.084	-0.084	0.088		-0.318	0.151	-0.953	0.346	0.777	-0.429		
EffectivePs:non-gamified.Master	8	0.542	0.542	0.075	42	0.390	0.693						
EffectivePs:ont-gamified.Master	14	0.271	0.271	0.057	42	0.156	0.385						
EffectivePs:non-gamified.Master - ont-gamified.Master	22	0.271	0.271	0.094	0.020	0.522	2.885	0.006	0.030	1.108	*	large	

Signif. codes: 0 *** 0.01 ** 0.05

Are the participants' motivation and learning outcomes linked in either the non-gamified CL sessions or the ont-gamified CL sessions?

Spearman's rank-order correlation tests were run to determine the relationship between the motivation and learning outcomes obtained by signed-up students and students with effective participation in the ont-gamified and non-gamified CL sessions. The results of these tests and their p-values are shown in Table 13 in which the gains in skill/knowledge estimates were used as learning outcome measurement, and the intrinsic motivation, interest/enjoyment, perceived choice, pressure/tension and effort/importance estimates were used as motivation measurement.

Table 13 – Correlation matrices and their p-values for the motivation and learning outcomes of participants in the first empirical study

Gains in Skill/Knowledge	Intrinsic Motivation	Interest/Enjoyment	Perceived Choice	Pressure/Tension	Effort/Importance
SignedUpPs:non-gamified	0.0600 (0.79)	0.1896 (0.39)	-0.1347 (0.55)	0.1505 (0.50)	0.2631 (0.23)
SignedUpPs:ont-gamified	-0.1594 (0.41)	-0.3114 (0.10)	-0.1451 (0.46)	-0.0789 (0.68)	0.0066 (0.97)
SignedUpPs:non-gamified.Master	-0.1500 (0.70)	-0.2510 (0.51)	-0.4790 (0.19)	-0.1881 (0.62)	0.3521 (0.35)
SignedUpPs:ont-gamified.Master	-0.0215 (0.93)	-0.1213 (0.66)	-0.0898 (0.75)	-0.1618 (0.56)	-0.2577 (0.35)
SignedUpPs:non-gamified.Apprentice	0.1699 (0.57)	0.3899 (0.18)	0.0419 (0.89)	-0.1537 (0.61)	-0.1136 (0.71)
SignedUpPs:ont-gamified.Apprentice	-0.4451 (0.12)	-0.3333 (0.26)	-0.3435 (0.25)	0.2918 (0.33)	0.1365 (0.65)
EffectivePs:non-gamified	0.2962 (0.23)	0.1404 (0.57)	0.1912 (0.44)	0.0052 (0.98)	0.4230 (0.08)
EffectivePs:ont-gamified	-0.1621 (0.42)	-0.3131 (0.11)	-0.2139 (0.29)	-0.0644 (0.75)	0.0658 (0.74)
EffectivePs:non-gamified.Master	0.3095 (0.46)	0.0614 (0.88)	0.2857 (0.50)	0.0988 (0.81)	0.7470 (0.03)
EffectivePs:ont-gamified.Master	-0.1850 (0.52)	-0.1495 (0.61)	-0.2947 (0.30)	-0.0536 (0.85)	-0.2905 (0.31)
EffectivePs:non-gamified.Apprentice	0.2121 (0.55)	0.4970 (0.14)	-0.0671 (0.85)	-0.1223 (0.73)	0.1529 (0.67)
EffectivePs:ont-gamified.Apprentice	-0.4545 (0.14)	-0.3328 (0.29)	-0.3761 (0.22)	0.2628 (0.40)	0.2420 (0.44)

method: spearman

According to the results of Spearman's rank-order correlation tests, a strong positive correlation between the gains in skill/knowledge and effort/importance of master students, which was statistically significant with $\rho = 0.75$, and $p = 0.03$. Thus, the null hypothesis, $H_{null,\rho,g1}$: “*There was no significant correlation between the participants' motivation and their gains of skill/knowledge in either the non-gamified CL sessions or the ont-gamified CL sessions,*” is rejected, and the first empirical study becomes an evidence to support the alternative hypothesis, $H_{alt,\rho,g1}$: “*There was a significant correlation between the participants' motivation and their gains of skill/knowledge in either the non-gamified CL sessions or the ont-gamified CL sessions,*”

indicating that, in CL sessions instantiated from a CSCL script based on cognitive apprenticeship theory, there is a strong positive association between the effort/importance and gains in skill/knowledge of master students with effective participation in non-gamified CL sessions.

1.4 Second Empirical Study: Data Analysis Results

Do the ont-gamified CL sessions have positive impacts on the participants' motivation?

In order to answer this question, two-way between-subjects ANOVA tests were run to compare the effects of ont-gamified and non-gamified CL sessions on the participants' level of motivation, attention, relevance and satisfaction. Table 14 shows the results of ANOVA tests in which there is no one statistically significant differences at the 0.05 level. Table 15 shows the Tukey post-hoc comparisons that have been run to confirm the significant differences in the participants' level of motivation, attention, relevance and satisfaction. According to these results, the null hypothesis, $H_{null,LoM,g1}$: “*There was no significant difference between the level of motivation obtained by students who participated in ont-gamified CL sessions and the level of motivation obtained by students who participated in non-gamified CL sessions,*” is not rejected.

Table 14 – Two-way ANOVA results for the latent trait estimates of level of motivation, attention, relevance and satisfaction in the second empirical study

	Sum Sq	Df	F value	Pr(>F)	Sig
Level of Motivation:Type	0.261	1	0.345	0.559	
Level of Motivation:Type:CLRole	0.770	1	1.022	0.317	
Level of Motivation:Residuals	40.727	54			
Attention:Type	1.605	1	1.031	0.314	
Attention:Type:CLRole	2.002	1	1.286	0.262	
Attention:Residuals	84.055	54			
Relevance:Type	0.057	1	0.116	0.735	
Relevance:Type:CLRole	0.016	1	0.033	0.856	
Relevance:Residuals	26.662	54			
Satisfaction:Type	0.084	1	0.056	0.814	
Satisfaction:Type:CLRole	1.311	1	0.871	0.355	
Satisfaction:Residuals	79.806	53			

Signif. codes: 0 ‘***’ 0.01 ‘**’ 0.05

Table 15 – Descriptive statistics and Tukey post-hoc test results for the latent trait estimates of level of motivation, attention, relevance and satisfaction in the second empirical study

	N	mean	Ismean	SE	df	Iwr.CI	upr.CI	t.ratio	p.value	p-adj.	g	sig	mag
Level of Motivation:non-gamified	34	-0.113	-0.064	0.159	54	-0.383	0.255						
Level of Motivation:ont-gamified	24	0.117	0.081	0.188	54	-0.296	0.458						
Level of Motivation:non-gamified - ont-gamified	58	-0.231	-0.145	0.246	54	-0.695	0.234	-0.588	0.559	0.324	-0.264		
Level of Motivation:non-gamified.Apprentice	23	-0.204	-0.204	0.181	54	-0.567	0.159						
Level of Motivation:ont-gamified.Apprentice	16	0.190	0.190	0.217	54	-0.245	0.625						
Level of Motivation:non-gamified.Apprentice - ont-gamified.Apprentice	39	-0.394	-0.394	0.283	54	-1.143	0.356	-1.393	0.169	0.509	-0.451		
Level of Motivation:non-gamified.Master	11	0.075	0.075	0.262	54	-0.450	0.600						
Level of Motivation:ont-gamified.Master	8	-0.029	-0.029	0.307	54	-0.644	0.587						
Level of Motivation:non-gamified.Master - ont-gamified.Master	19	0.104	0.104	0.404	54	-0.966	1.174	0.258	0.797	0.994	0.111		
Attention:non-gamified	34	-0.278	-0.204	0.229	54	-0.662	0.255						
Attention:ont-gamified	24	0.219	0.156	0.270	54	-0.386	0.697						
Attention:non-gamified - ont-gamified	58	-0.497	-0.359	0.354	54	-1.164	0.170	-1.015	0.314	0.141	-0.396		
Attention:non-gamified.Apprentice	23	-0.415	-0.415	0.260	54	-0.937	0.106						
Attention:ont-gamified.Apprentice	16	0.346	0.346	0.312	54	-0.280	0.971						
Attention:non-gamified.Apprentice - ont-gamified.Apprentice	39	-0.761	-0.761	0.406	54	-1.837	0.316	-1.873	0.066	0.252	-0.601		
Attention:non-gamified.Master	11	0.008	0.008	0.376	54	-0.746	0.762						
Attention:ont-gamified.Master	8	-0.034	-0.034	0.441	54	-0.918	0.850						
Attention:non-gamified.Master - ont-gamified.Master	19	0.042	0.042	0.580	54	-1.495	1.579	0.072	0.943	1.000	0.032		
Relevance:non-gamified	34	-0.053	-0.027	0.129	54	-0.285	0.231						
Relevance:ont-gamified	24	0.028	0.041	0.152	54	-0.264	0.346						
Relevance:non-gamified - ont-gamified	58	-0.081	-0.068	0.199	54	-0.457	0.294	-0.340	0.735	0.666	-0.116		
Relevance:non-gamified.Apprentice	23	-0.101	-0.101	0.147	54	-0.395	0.193						
Relevance:ont-gamified.Apprentice	16	0.003	0.003	0.176	54	-0.349	0.356						
Relevance:non-gamified.Apprentice - ont-gamified.Apprentice	39	-0.104	-0.104	0.229	54	-0.711	0.502	-0.455	0.651	0.968	-0.130		
Relevance:non-gamified.Master	11	0.047	0.047	0.212	54	-0.378	0.471						
Relevance:ont-gamified.Master	8	0.078	0.078	0.248	54	-0.420	0.576						
Relevance:non-gamified.Master - ont-gamified.Master	19	-0.031	-0.031	0.327	54	-0.897	0.834	-0.096	0.924	1.000	-0.064		

Signif. codes: 0 *** 0.01 ** 0.05

Table 15 – (continued)

	N	mean	Ismean	SE	df	lwr.CI	upr.CI	t.ratio	p.value	p-adj.	g	sig	mag
Satisfaction:non-gamified	33	-0.047	0.034	0.227	53	-0.420	0.489						
Satisfaction:ont-gamified	24	-0.021	-0.048	0.266	53	-0.581	0.485						
Satisfaction:non-gamified - ont-gamified	57	-0.026	0.082	0.349		-0.687	0.634	0.236	0.814	0.937	-0.021		
Satisfaction:non-gamified.Apprentice	22	-0.210	-0.210	0.262	53	-0.734	0.315						
Satisfaction:ont-gamified.Apprentice	16	0.034	0.034	0.307	53	-0.581	0.649						
Satisfaction:non-gamified.Apprentice - ont-gamified.Apprentice	38	-0.243	-0.243	0.403		-1.313	0.826	-0.604	0.549	0.930	-0.188		
Satisfaction:non-gamified.Master	11	0.278	0.278	0.370	53	-0.464	1.021						
Satisfaction:ont-gamified.Master	8	-0.130	-0.130	0.434	53	-1.000	0.740						
Satisfaction:non-gamified.Master - ont-gamified.Master	19	0.408	0.408	0.570		-1.104	1.921	0.716	0.477	0.890	0.344		

Signif. codes: 0 *** 0.01 ** 0.05

Do the ont-gamified CL sessions affect on the participants' learning outcomes?

In order to answer this question, two-way between-subjects ANOVA tests were conducted to compare the effects of non-gamified and ont-gamified CL sessions on the gains in skill/knowledge estimates. The results of tests are indicated in Table 16 in which there is no one significant difference at the level of 0.05.

Table 16 – Two-way ANOVA results for the gains in skill/knowledge estimates in the second empirical study

	Sum Sq	Df	F value	Pr(>F)	Sig
SignedUpPs>Type	0.026	1	1.343	0.253	
SignedUpPs>Type:CLRole	0.049	1	2.540	0.118	
SignedUpPs:Residuals	0.824	43			
EffectivePs>Type	0.013	1	0.923	0.343	
EffectivePs>Type:CLRole	0.039	1	2.650	0.112	
EffectivePs:Residuals	0.555	38			

Signif. codes: 0 *** 0.01 ** 0.05

Tukey post-hoc comparisons have been run with the data gathered in the second empirical study to confirm the significant differences on the gains in skill/knowledge for the types of CL sessions and the CL roles. Table 17 shows the results of these comparisons in which there is no one statistically significant difference. According to these results, the null hypothesis, $H_{null,GSK,g1}$: “*There was no significant difference between the gains in skill/knowledge obtained by students who participated in ont-gamified CL sessions and the gains in skill/knowledge obtained by students who participated in non-gamified CL sessions,*” is not rejected.

Table 17 – Descriptive statistics and Tukey post-hoc test results for the gains in skill/knowledge estimates in the second empirical study

	N	mean	lsmean	SE	df	lwr.CI	upr.CI	t.ratio	p.value	p.adj	g	sig	mag
SignedUpPs:non-gamified	29	0.005	0.004	0.029	43	-0.054	0.062						
SignedUpPs:ont-gamified	18	-0.008	-0.052	0.039	43	-0.131	0.027						
SignedUpPs:non-gamified - ont-gamified	47	0.013	0.056	0.049		-0.071	0.097	1.159	0.253	0.752	0.092		
SignedUpPs:non-gamified.Apprentice	21	0.005	0.030	43		-0.055	0.066						
SignedUpPs:ont-gamified.Apprentice	14	0.027	0.027	0.037	43	-0.048	0.101						
SignedUpPs:non-gamified.Apprentice - ont-gamified.Apprentice	35	-0.021	-0.021	0.048		-0.149	0.106	-0.443	0.660	0.971	-0.145		
SignedUpPs:non-gamified.Master	8	0.003	0.003	0.049	43	-0.095	0.102						
SignedUpPs:ont-gamified.Master	4	-0.131	-0.131	0.069	43	-0.270	0.009						
SignedUpPs:non-gamified.Master - ont-gamified.Master	12	0.134	0.134	0.085		-0.093	0.360	1.580	0.121	0.401	1.010		
EffectivePs:non-gamified	26	0.012	0.009	0.026	38	-0.043	0.061						
EffectivePs:ont-gamified	16	0.006	-0.032	0.035	38	-0.103	0.038						
EffectivePs:non-gamified - ont-gamified	42	0.006	0.042	0.043		-0.072	0.083						
EffectivePs:non-gamified.Apprentice	18	0.015	0.015	0.028	38	-0.042	0.073						
EffectivePs:ont-gamified.Apprentice	12	0.044	0.044	0.035	38	-0.026	0.115						
EffectivePs:non-gamified.Apprentice - ont-gamified.Apprentice	30	-0.029	-0.029	0.045		-0.150	0.092	-0.642	0.525	0.918	-0.227		
EffectivePs:non-gamified.Master	8	0.003	0.003	0.043	38	-0.083	0.090						
EffectivePs:ont-gamified.Master	4	-0.109	-0.109	0.060	38	-0.231	0.014						
EffectivePs:non-gamified.Master - ont-gamified.Master	12	0.112	0.112	0.074		-0.087	0.311	1.515	0.138	0.439	0.929		

Signif. codes: 0 ‘***’ 0.01 ‘**’ 0.05

Are the participants' motivation and learning outcomes linked in the non-gamified CL sessions or the ont-gamified CL sessions

Spearman's rank-order correlation tests were run to determine the relationship between the motivation and learning outcomes obtained by signed-up students and students with effective participation in the ont-gamified CL sessions and in the non-gamified CL sessions. Table 18 shows the results of these tests in which the gains in skill/knowledge estimates were used as learning outcome measurement, and the intrinsic motivation, interest/enjoyment, perceived choice, pressure/tension and effort/importance estimates were used as motivation measurement.

According to these results, in non-gamified CL sessions, there was statistically a significant strong positive correlation between the gains in skill/knowledge and the relevance of signed-up master students with $\rho = 0.7365$, and $p = 0.03$ (SignedUpPs:non-gamified.Master). For students with effective participation in non-gamified CL sessions, a statistical strong positive correlation were found between the gains in skill/knowledge and the relevance of master students with $\rho = 0.7365$, and $p = 0.03$ (EffectivePs:non-gamified.Master).

Based on the Spearman's rank-order correlation tests obtained above, the null hypothesis, $H_{null,\rho,g1}$: “*There was no significant correlation between the participants' motivation and their gains of skill/knowledge in either the non-gamified CL sessions or the ont-gamified CL sessions,*” is rejected. Thus, the second empirical study becomes an evidence to support the alternative hypothesis , $H_{alt,\rho,g1}$: “*There was a significant correlation between the participants' motivation and their gains of skill/knowledge in either the non-gamified CL sessions or the ont-gamified CL sessions,*” indicating that, there is a strong positive association between the relevance and the gains in skill/knowledge for signed-up master students and students with effective participation in non-gamified CL sessions.

Table 18 – Correlation matrices and their p-values for the motivation and learning outcomes of participants in the second empirical study

Gains in Skill/Knowledge	Level of Motivation	Attention	Relevance	Satisfaction
SignedUpPs:non-gamified	0.1815 (0.35)	0.0986 (0.61)	0.3144 (0.10)	0.2382 (0.22)
SignedUpPs:ont-gamified	-0.2173 (0.38)	-0.2560 (0.30)	-0.0348 (0.89)	-0.2404 (0.33)
SignedUpPs:non-gamified.Master	0.5000 (0.21)	0.5000 (0.21)	0.7365 (0.03)	0.2892 (0.48)
SignedUpPs:ont-gamified.Master	-0.7379 (0.26)	-0.5000 (0.50)	-0.7379 (0.26)	-0.7379 (0.26)
SignedUpPs:non-gamified.Apprentice	0.1483 (0.53)	0.0482 (0.84)	0.2433 (0.30)	0.2741 (0.24)
SignedUpPs:ont-gamified.Apprentice	-0.2340 (0.42)	-0.3108 (0.27)	0.0221 (0.94)	-0.2235 (0.44)
EffectivePs:non-gamified	-0.0135 (0.94)	-0.0593 (0.77)	0.2120 (0.30)	0.0735 (0.72)
EffectivePs:ont-gamified	-0.2358	-0.2750	-0.0067	-0.3093

method: spearman

Table 18 – (continued)

Gains in Skill/Knowledge	Level of Motivation	Attention	Relevance	Satisfaction
	(0.37)	(0.30)	(0.98)	(0.24)
EffectivePs:non-gamified.Master	0.5000	0.5000	0.7365	0.2892
	(0.21)	(0.21)	(0.03)	(0.48)
EffectivePs:ont-gamified.Master	-0.7379	-0.5000	-0.7379	-0.7379
	(0.26)	(0.50)	(0.26)	(0.26)
EffectivePs:non-gamified.Apprentice	-0.1007	-0.1463	0.1256	0.0766
	(0.70)	(0.57)	(0.63)	(0.77)
EffectivePs:ont-gamified.Apprentice	-0.3439	-0.4114	0.0211	-0.3669
	(0.27)	(0.18)	(0.94)	(0.24)

method: spearman

1.5 Third Empirical Study: Data Analysis Results

Do the ont-gamified CL sessions have positive impacts on the participants' motivation?, and Are the participants' motivation better in ont-gamified CL sessions than in w/o-gamified CL sessions?

In order to answer these two question, the two-way between-subjects ANOVA tests have been run to compare the effects of ont-gamified and w/o-gamified CL sessions on the participants' intrinsic motivation, interest/enjoyment, perceived choice, pressure/tension, effort/importance, level of motivation, attention, relevance and satisfaction. Table 19 summarizes the results of ANOVA tests in which there were statistically significant difference at the level of 0.05 for the intrinsic motivation, perceived choice, pressure/tension and effort/importance. The effect on the intrinsic motivation for the type of CL session yielded a F ratio of $F(1,47) = 6.812$ and $p = 0.012$ indicating significant differences between ont-gamified CL sessions and w/o-gamified CL sessions. The effect on the perceived choice for the type of CL session yielded a F ratio of $F(1,47) = 8.236$ and $p = 0.006$ indicating significant differences between ont-gamified CL sessions and w/o-gamified CL sessions. On the effort/importance, the effect for the type of CL session yielded a F ratio of $F(1,47) = 7.258$ and $p = 0.010$ indicating significant differences between ont-gamified CL sessions and w/o-gamified CL sessions.

Table 19 – Two-way ANOVA results for the latent trait estimates of intrinsic motivation, interest/enjoyment, perceived choice, pressure/tension, effort/importance, level of motivation, attention, relevance and satisfaction in the third empirical study

	Sum Sq	Df	F value	Pr(>F)	Sig
Intrinsic Motivation>Type	2.533	1	6.812	0.012	*
Intrinsic Motivation>Type:CLRole	0.468	1	1.258	0.268	
Intrinsic Motivation:Residuals	17.481	47			
Interest/Enjoyment>Type	2.149	1	1.568	0.217	

Signif. codes: 0 *** 0.01 ** 0.05

Table 19 – (continued)

	Sum Sq	Df	F value	Pr(>F)	Sig
Interest/Enjoyment>Type:CLRole	2.804	1	2.046	0.159	
Interest/Enjoyment:Residuals	64.426	47			
Perceived Choice>Type	11.013	1	8.236	0.006	**
Perceived Choice>Type:CLRole	1.641	1	1.227	0.274	
Perceived Choice:Residuals	62.848	47			
Pressure/Tension>Type	0.018	1	0.035	0.853	
Pressure/Tension>Type:CLRole	0.020	1	0.039	0.845	
Pressure/Tension:Residuals	24.175	47			
Effort/Importance>Type	7.319	1	7.258	0.010	**
Effort/Importance>Type:CLRole	0.022	1	0.022	0.883	
Effort/Importance:Residuals	47.391	47			
Level of Motivation>Type	0.175	1	0.513	0.477	
Level of Motivation>Type:CLRole	0.045	1	0.131	0.719	
Level of Motivation:Residuals	15.976	47			
Attention>Type	0.028	1	0.020	0.889	
Attention>Type:CLRole	0.246	1	0.171	0.681	
Attention:Residuals	67.644	47			
Relevance>Type	1.559	1	3.541	0.066	
Relevance>Type:CLRole	0.791	1	1.797	0.187	
Relevance:Residuals	20.698	47			
Satisfaction>Type	4.424	1	1.661	0.204	
Satisfaction>Type:CLRole	0.438	1	0.165	0.687	
Satisfaction:Residuals	125.193	47			

Signif. codes: 0 ‘***’ 0.01 ‘*’ 0.05

Table 20 shows the results of Tukey post-hoc comparisons that have been run to confirm the significant differences between the types of CL sessions and the CL roles. According to these results, the intrinsic motivation of participants in ont-gamified CL sessions ($lsmean = 0.349$ logit, and $SE = 0.129$) was significantly greater than the intrinsic motivation of participants in w/o-gamified CL sessions ($lsmean = -0.126$ logit, and $SE = 0.129$) with a p-adj. value of 0.015 and Hedges' $g = 0.682$ medium effect size. The perceived choice of participants in ont-gamified CL sessions ($lsmean = 0.554$ logit, and $SE = 0.244$) was significantly greater than the perceived choice of participants in w/o-gamified CL sessions ($lsmean = -0.435$ logit, and $SE = 0.244$) with a p-adj. value of 0.009 and Hedges' $g = 0.752$ medium effect size. The effort/importance of participants in ont-gamified CL sessions ($lsmean = 0.318$ logit, and $SE = 0.212$) was significantly greater than the effort/importance of participants in w/o-gamified CL sessions ($lsmean = -0.489$ logit, and $SE = 0.212$) with a p-adj. value of 0.007 and Hedges' $g = 0.785$ medium effect size.

Based on the ANOVA results and Tukey post-hoc comparisons, the null hypothesis, $H_{null,IM,g2}$: “*There was no significant difference between the intrinsic motivation of students who participated in ont-gamified CL sessions and the intrinsic motivation of students who participated in w/o-gamified CL sessions,*” is rejected. Thus, the third empirical study becomes an evidence to support the alternative hypothesis, $H_{alt,IM,g2}$: “*The intrinsic motivation of students who participated in ont-gamified CL sessions was greater than the intrinsic motivation of students who participated in w/o-gamified CL sessions,*” with positive impacts in the intrinsic/motivation, perceived choice, and effort/importance. The null hypothesis, $H_{null,LoM,g2}$: “*There was no significant difference between the level of motivation obtained by students who participated in ont-gamified CL sessions and the level of motivation obtained by students who participated w/o-gamified CL sessions,*” is not rejected.

Table 20 – Descriptive statistics and Tukey post-hoc test results for the latent trait estimates of intrinsic motivation, interest/enjoyment, perceived choice, pressure/tension, effort/importance, level of motivation, attention, relevance and satisfaction in the third empirical study

Table 20 – (continued)

	N	mean	Ismean	SE	df	Iwr.CI	upr.CI	t.ratio	p.value	p-adj.	g	sig	mag
Pressure/Tension:ont-gamified	24	-0.006	-0.119	0.151	47	-0.423	0.185						
Pressure/Tension:w/o-gamified	27	0.009	-0.159	0.151	47	-0.463	0.145						
Pressure/Tension:ont-gamified - w/o-gamified	51	-0.014	0.040	0.214		-0.419	0.390	0.187	0.853	0.943	-0.017		
Pressure/Tension:ont-gamified.Apprentice	15	0.335	0.335	0.185	47	-0.038	0.707						
Pressure/Tension:w/o-gamified.Apprentice	19	0.253	0.253	0.165	47	-0.078	0.584						
Pressure/Tension:ont-gamified.Apprentice - w/o-gamified.Apprentice	34	0.082	0.082	0.248		-0.578	0.742	0.331	0.742	0.987	0.119		
Pressure/Tension:ont-gamified.Master	9	-0.573	-0.573	0.239	47	-1.054	-0.092						
Pressure/Tension:w/o-gamified.Master	8	-0.571	-0.571	0.254	47	-1.081	-0.061						
Pressure/Tension:ont-gamified.Master - w/o-gamified.Master	17	-0.002	-0.002	0.348		-0.930	0.926	-0.006	0.995	1.000	-0.002		
Effort/Importance:ont-gamified	24	0.365	0.318	0.212	47	-0.108	0.743						
Effort/Importance:w/o-gamified	27	-0.429	-0.489	0.212	47	-0.915	-0.063						
Effort/Importance:ont-gamified - w/o-gamified	51	0.794	0.806	0.299		0.228	1.361	2.694	0.010	0.007	0.785	**	medium
Effort/Importance:ont-gamified.Apprentice	15	0.509	0.509	0.259	47	-0.013	1.031						
Effort/Importance:w/o-gamified.Apprentice	19	-0.342	-0.342	0.230	47	-0.805	0.122						
Effort/Importance:ont-gamified.Apprentice - w/o-gamified.Apprentice	34	0.851	0.851	0.347		-0.073	1.775	2.453	0.018	0.081	0.835		
Effort/Importance:ont-gamified.Master	9	0.126	0.126	0.335	47	-0.547	0.799						
Effort/Importance:w/o-gamified.Master	8	-0.636	-0.636	0.355	47	-1.350	0.078						
Effort/Importance:ont-gamified.Master - w/o-gamified.Master	17	0.762	0.762	0.488		-0.538	2.062	1.562	0.125	0.410	0.707		
Level of Motivation:ont-gamified	24	0.091	0.108	0.123	47	-0.140	0.355						
Level of Motivation:w/o-gamified	27	-0.018	-0.017	0.123	47	-0.264	0.230						
Level of Motivation:ont-gamified - w/o-gamified	51	0.109	0.125	0.174		-0.220	0.438	0.717	0.477	0.507	0.188		
Level of Motivation:ont-gamified.Apprentice	15	0.041	0.041	0.151	47	-0.262	0.344						
Level of Motivation:w/o-gamified.Apprentice	19	-0.021	-0.021	0.134	47	-0.290	0.248						
Level of Motivation:ont-gamified.Apprentice - w/o-gamified.Apprentice	34	0.062	0.062	0.201		-0.475	0.598	0.306	0.761	0.990	0.097		
Level of Motivation:ont-gamified.Master	9	0.174	0.174	0.194	47	-0.217	0.565						
Level of Motivation:w/o-gamified.Master	8	-0.013	-0.013	0.206	47	-0.428	0.401						
Level of Motivation:ont-gamified.Master - w/o-gamified.Master	17	0.187	0.187	0.283		-0.567	0.942	0.662	0.511	0.911	0.365		

Signif. codes: 0 ‘***’ 0.01 ‘**’ 0.05

Table 20 – (continued)

	N	mean	Ismean	SE	df	Iwr:CI	upr:CI	t:ratio	p:value	p-adjust.	g	sig	mag
Attention:ont-gamified	24	-0.039	0.002	0.253	47	-0.507	0.511						
Attention:w/o-gamified	27	0.045	0.052	0.253	47	-0.457	0.560						
Attention:ont-gamified - w/o-gamified	51	-0.085	-0.050	0.358	-0.762	0.592	-0.140	0.889	0.803	-0.071			
Attention:ont-gamified.Apprentice	15	-0.162	-0.162	0.310	47	-0.786	0.461						
Attention:w/o-gamified.Apprentice	19	0.036	0.036	0.275	47	-0.518	0.589						
Attention:ont-gamified.Apprentice - w/o-gamified.Apprentice	34	-0.198	-0.198	0.414	-1.302	0.906	-0.478	0.635	0.964	-0.147			
Attention:ont-gamified.Master	9	0.166	0.166	0.400	47	-0.639	0.970						
Attention:w/o-gamified.Master	8	0.068	0.068	0.424	47	-0.785	0.921						
Attention:ont-gamified.Master - w/o-gamified.Master	17	0.098	0.098	0.583	-1.455	1.650	0.168	0.867	0.998	0.104			
Relevance:ont-gamified	24	0.181	0.256	0.140	47	-0.025	0.538						
Relevance:w/o-gamified	27	-0.131	-0.116	0.140	47	-0.397	0.165						
Relevance:ont-gamified - w/o-gamified	51	0.312	0.372	0.198	-0.063	0.686	1.882	0.066	0.101	0.450			
Relevance:ont-gamified.Apprentice	15	-0.046	-0.046	0.171	47	-0.391	0.299						
Relevance:w/o-gamified.Apprentice	19	-0.153	-0.153	0.152	47	-0.459	0.153						
Relevance:ont-gamified.Apprentice - w/o-gamified.Apprentice	34	0.107	0.107	0.229	-0.503	0.718	0.467	0.643	0.966	0.150			
Relevance:ont-gamified.Master	9	0.559	0.559	0.221	47	0.114	1.004						
Relevance:w/o-gamified.Master	8	-0.079	-0.079	0.235	47	-0.551	0.393						
Relevance:ont-gamified.Master - w/o-gamified.Master	17	0.637	0.637	0.322	-0.221	1.496	1.977	0.054	0.211	1.039			
Satisfaction:ont-gamified	24	0.380	0.306	0.344	47	-0.386	0.998						
Satisfaction:w/o-gamified	27	-0.281	-0.321	0.344	47	-1.013	0.371						
Satisfaction:ont-gamified - w/o-gamified	51	0.661	0.627	0.486	-0.260	1.582	1.289	0.204	0.156	0.404			
Satisfaction:ont-gamified.Apprentice	15	0.602	0.602	0.421	47	-0.246	1.449						
Satisfaction:w/o-gamified.Apprentice	19	-0.223	-0.223	0.374	47	-0.976	0.530						
Satisfaction:ont-gamified.Apprentice - w/o-gamified.Apprentice	34	0.824	0.824	0.564	-0.677	2.326	1.462	0.150	0.468	0.472			
Satisfaction:ont-gamified.Master	9	0.011	0.011	0.544	47	-1.084	1.105						
Satisfaction:w/o-gamified.Master	8	-0.419	-0.419	0.577	47	-1.580	0.742						
Satisfaction:ont-gamified.Master - w/o-gamified.Master	17	0.430	0.430	0.793	-1.683	2.542	0.542	0.591	0.948	0.279			
													Signif. codes: 0 ‘***’ 0.01 ‘**’ 0.05

Do the ont-gamified CL sessions affect on the participants' learning outcomes?, and Are the participants' learning outcomes better in ont-gamified CL sessions than in w/o-gamified CL sessions?

In order to answer these question, two-way between-subjects ANOVA tests were run to compare the effects of ont-gamified CL sessions on the gains in skill/knowledge estimates against the effects of w/o-gamified CL sessions. Table 21 shows the results of ANOVA tests in which the effect on the gains in skill/knowledge for signed up students (SignedUpPs:Type) yielded a F ratio of $F(1, 45) = 7.066$ and $p = 0.011$ indicating a significant difference between ont-gamified CL sessions and w/o-gamified CL sessions. A significant difference between ont-gamified CL sessions and w/o-gamified CL sessions is also indicated in the effect on the gains in skill/knowledge for students with effective participation (EffectivePs:Type) yielding a F ratio of $F(1, 36) = 5.837$ and $p = 0.021$.

Table 21 – Two-way ANOVA results for gains in skill/knowledge estimates in the third empirical study

	Sum Sq	Df	F value	Pr(>F)	Sig
SignedUpPs:Type	0.039	1	7.066	0.011	*
SignedUpPs:Type:CLRole	0.000	1	0.060	0.808	
SignedUpPs:Residuals	0.248	45			
EffectivePs:Type	0.029	1	5.837	0.021	*
EffectivePs:Type:CLRole	0.003	1	0.711	0.405	
EffectivePs:Residuals	0.177	36			

Signif. codes: 0 *** 0.01 ** 0.05

Tukey post-hoc tests comparisons have been conducted to confirm the significant differences found on the gains in skill/knowledge for the types of CL sessions and the CL roles. Table 22 shows the results of these comparisons in which the gains in skill/knowledge of signed-up students in ont-gamified CL sessions ($lsmean = 0.014 \text{ logit}$, and $SE = 0.017$) were greater than the gains in skill/knowledge of signed-up students in w/o-gamified CL sessions ($lsmean = -0.048 \text{ logit}$, and $SE = 0.016$) with a p-adj. value of 0.005 and Hedges' $g = 0.792$ medium effect size. The gains in skill/knowledge of signed-up apprentice students in ont-gamified CL sessions ($lsmean = 0.048 \text{ logit}$, and $SE = 0.019$) were greater than the gains of apprentice students in w/o-gamified CL sessions ($lsmean = -0.020 \text{ logit}$, and $SE = 0.017$) with a p-adj. value of 0.045 and Hedges' $g = 0.993$ large effect size.

Table 22 – Descriptive statistics and Tukey post-hoc test results for the gains in skill/knowledge estimates in the third empirical study

	N	mean	lsmean	SE	df	lwr.CI	upr.CI	t.ratio	p.value	p.adj	g	sig	mag
SignedUpPs;ont-gamified	23	0.028	0.014	0.017	45	-0.019	0.048						
SignedUpPs;w/o-gamified	26	-0.035	-0.048	0.016	45	-0.081	-0.015						
SignedUpPs;ont-gamified - w/o-gamified	49	0.063	0.063	0.024		0.020	0.106	2.658	0.011	0.005	0.792	**	medium
SignedUpPs;ont-gamified.Apprentice	16	0.048	0.048	0.019	45	0.011	0.085						
SignedUpPs;w/o-gamified.Apprentice	19	-0.020	-0.020	0.017	45	-0.055	0.014						
SignedUpPs;ont-gamified.Apprentice - w/o-gamified.Apprentice	35	0.068	0.068	0.025		0.001	0.136	2.708	0.010	0.045	0.993	*	large
SignedUpPs;ont-gamified.Master	7	-0.019	-0.019	0.028	45	-0.076	0.037						
SignedUpPs;w/o-gamified.Master	7	-0.076	-0.076	0.028	45	-0.133	-0.019						
SignedUpPs;ont-gamified.Master - w/o-gamified.Master	14	0.057	0.057	0.040		-0.049	0.163	1.429	0.160	0.488	0.583		
EffectivePs;ont-gamified	22	0.023	0.001	0.017	36	-0.033	0.035						
EffectivePs;w/o-gamified	18	-0.048	-0.057	0.018	36	-0.093	-0.022						
EffectivePs;ont-gamified - w/o-gamified	40	0.071	0.059	0.024		0.026	0.116	2.416	0.021	0.003	0.904	**	large
EffectivePs;ont-gamified.Apprentice	16	0.048	0.048	0.018	36	0.013	0.084						
EffectivePs;w/o-gamified.Apprentice	12	-0.031	-0.031	0.020	36	-0.072	0.010						
EffectivePs;ont-gamified.Apprentice - w/o-gamified.Apprentice	28	0.079	0.079	0.027		0.007	0.151	2.954	0.006	0.027	1.160	*	large
EffectivePs;ont-gamified.Master	6	-0.045	-0.045	0.029	36	-0.103	0.013						
EffectivePs;w/o-gamified.Master	6	-0.083	-0.083	0.029	36	-0.141	-0.025						
EffectivePs;ont-gamified.Master - w/o-gamified.Master	12	0.038	0.038	0.040		-0.071	0.147	0.943	0.352	0.782	0.444		

Signif. codes: 0 ‘***’ 0.01 ‘**’ 0.05

The gains in skill/knowledge obtained by students with effective participation in ont-gamified CL sessions ($lsmean = 0.001 \text{ logit}$, and $SE = 0.017$) were significantly greater than the gains in skill/knowledge obtained by them in w/o-gamified CL sessions ($lsmean = -0.057 \text{ logit}$, and $SE = 0.018$) with a p-adj. value of 0.003 and Hedges' $g = 0.904$ large effect size. The gains in skill/knowledge of apprentice students with effective participation in ont-gamified CL sessions ($lsmean = 0.048 \text{ logit}$, and $SE = 0.018$) were significantly greater than the gains in skill/knowledge obtained by them in w/o-gamified CL sessions ($lsmean = -0.031 \text{ logit}$, and $SE = 0.020$) with a p-adj. value of 0.027 and Hedges' $g = 1.160$ large effect size.

Based on the results obtained in the ANOVA tests and Tukey post-hoc comparisons, the null hypothesis, $H_{null,GSK,g2}$: “*There was no significant difference between the gains in skill/knowledge obtained by students who participated in ont-gamified CL sessions and the gains in skill/knowledge obtained by students who participated in w/o-gamified CL sessions,*” is rejected. Thus, the third empirical study becomes an evidence to support the alternative hypothesis, $H_{alt,GSK,g2}$: “*The gains in skill/knowledge obtained by students who participated in ont-gamified CL sessions was greater than the gains in skill/knowledge obtained by students who participated in w/o-gamified CL sessions,*” indicating that the ont-gamified CL sessions positively affect the participants’ learning outcomes, the gains in skill/knowledge obtained by the participants in ont-gamified CL sessions were better than the gains in skill/knowledge obtained by the participants in w/o-gamified CL sessions. In particular, apprentice students were more positively affected in ont-gamified CL sessions than in w/o-gamified CL sessions.

Are the participants’ motivation and learning outcomes linked in either the ont-gamified CL sessions and the w/o-gamified CL sessions?

Spearman’s rank-order correlation tests were run to determine the relationship between the participants’ motivation and learning outcomes obtained in the ont-gamified and w/o-gamified CL sessions. Table 23 shows the results for the correlation tests and their p-values in which the gains in skill/knowledge estimates were used as learning outcome measurement, and the intrinsic motivation, interest/enjoyment, perceived choice, pressure/tension, effort/importance, level of motivation, attention, relevance and satisfaction estimates were used as motivation measurement.

Table 23 – Correlation matrices and their p-values for the motivation and learning outcomes of participants in the third empirical study

Gains in Skill/Knowledge	Intrinsic Motivation	Interest/ Enjoyment	Perceived Choice	Tension	Pressure/ Importance	Effort/ Motivation	Level of Attention	Relevance	Satisfaction
SignedUpPs:w/o-gamified	-0.3489 (0.08)	-0.5229 (0.007)	-0.1528 (0.46)	0.3022 (0.14)	0.0237 (0.91)	-0.3617 (0.07)	-0.2876 (0.16)	0.0379 (0.85)	-0.4126 (0.04)
SignedUpPs:ont-gamified	0.0753 (0.74)	-0.1743 (0.45)	0.0806 (0.72)	-0.0678 (0.77)	0.2440 (0.28)	0.0857 (0.71)	0.0390 (0.86)	0.0749 (0.74)	0.2308 (0.31)
SignedUpPs:w/o-gamified.Master	-0.6307	0.0545	-0.0091	0.5964	-0.2883	0.0901	0.2342	-0.4220	-0.3784
SignedUpPs:ont-gamified.Master	0.8929 (0.01)	-0.1441 (0.75)	0.9286 (0.006)	-0.8895 (0.007)	0.7388 (0.05)	0.3214 (0.49)	-0.0180 (0.96)	0.7568 (0.04)	0.4505 (0.31)
SignedUpPs:w/o-gamified.Apprentice	-0.2473 (0.32)	-0.7037 (0.001)	-0.1149 (0.64)	0.0866 (0.73)	0.0804 (0.75)	-0.4669 (0.05)	-0.4901 (0.03)	0.1585 (0.53)	-0.3892 (0.11)
SignedUpPs:ont-gamified.Apprentice	-0.2659 (0.35)	-0.0687 (0.81)	-0.1720 (0.55)	0.1545 (0.59)	-0.1879 (0.51)	0.0990 (0.73)	0.0968 (0.74)	-0.0597 (0.83)	0.1257 (0.66)
EffectivePs:w/o-gamified	-0.0155 (0.95)	-0.2437 (0.32)	0.1507 (0.55)	0.1529 (0.54)	-0.0073 (0.97)	-0.0497 (0.84)	-0.0891 (0.72)	0.1152 (0.64)	-0.0789 (0.75)
EffectivePs:ont-gamified	-0.0519	-0.2286	-0.0169	0.0253	0.2093	-0.0309	-0.0911	0.0057	0.1789
EffectivePs:w/o-gamified.Master	-0.4638 (0.82)	0.0000 (0.33)	0.2794 (0.94)	0.4459 (0.91)	-0.7537 (0.37)	0.0580 (0.89)	-0.6765 (0.70)	-0.0580 (0.98)	0.45 (0.45)
EffectivePs:ont-gamified.Master	0.8286 (0.05)	-0.0857 (0.91)	0.1821 (0.03)	0.1526 (0.02)	-0.2324 (0.22)	0.1849 (0.91)	-0.0982 (0.91)	-0.2403 (0.14)	-0.6377 (0.14)
EffectivePs:w/o-gamified.Apprentice	0.1821 (0.57)	-0.5158 (0.08)	0.1526 (0.63)	-0.2324 (0.46)	0.1849 (0.56)	-0.0982 (0.76)	-0.2403 (0.45)	0.2905 (0.35)	0.0370 (0.90)
EffectivePs:ont-gamified.Apprentice	-0.2750 (0.34)	-0.0910 (0.75)	-0.1689 (0.56)	0.1514 (0.60)	-0.2072 (0.47)	0.0815 (0.78)	0.0771 (0.79)	-0.0377 (0.89)	0.1049 (0.72)

method: spearman

According to the results of correlation tests, in w/o-gamified CL sessions, there was a significant strong negative correlation between the interest/enjoyment and gains in skill/knowledge for the signed-up students with $\rho = -0.5229$, and $p = 0.007$ (SignedUpPs:w/o-gamified), and there was a significant moderate negative correlation between the satisfaction and gains in skill/knowledge for the signed-up students with $\rho = -0.4126$, and $p = 0.04$ (SignedUpPs:w/o-gamified). For signed-up apprentice students that participated in w/o-gamified CL sessions, the correlation between the interest/enjoyment and gains in skill/knowledge was significantly strong negative with $\rho = -0.7037$, and $p = 0.001$ (SignedUpPs:w/o-gamified.Apprentice), and the correlation between the attention and gains in skill/knowledge was significantly moderate negative with $\rho = -0.4901$, and $p = 0.03$ (SignedUpPs:w/o-gamified.Apprentice). The gains in skill/knowledge of signed-up master students that participated in ont-gamified CL sessions (SignedUpPs:ont-gamified.Master) were significantly strong positive correlated: to the intrinsic motivation with $\rho = 0.8929$ and $p = 0.01$; to the perceived choice with $\rho = 0.9286$ and $p = 0.006$; and to the relevance with $\rho = 0.7568$, and $p = 0.0489$. There was also a significant strong negative correlation between the pressure/tension and gains in skill/knowledge obtained by the signed-up master students in ont-gamified CL sessions with $\rho = -0.8895$ and $p = 0.007$ (SignedUpPs:ont-gamified.Master). For the master students with effective participation in ont-gamified CL sessions (EffectivePs:ont-gamified.Master), there was a significant strong positive correlation between the perceived choice and gains in skill/knowledge with $\rho = 0.8857$ and $p = 0.0333$; and there was a significant negative correlation between the pressure/tension and gains in skill/knowledge with $\rho = -0.8697$ and $p = 0.0244$.

Based on the results of the correlation tests, the null hypothesis, $H_{null,\rho,g2}$: “*There was no significant correlation between the participants’ motivation and their gains of skill/knowledge in either the ont-gamified CL sessions or the w/o-gamified CL sessions,*” is rejected. Thus, this empirical study becomes an evidence for the alternative hypothesis, $H_{alt,\rho,g2}$: “*There was a significant correlation between the participants’ motivation and their gains of skill/knowledge in either the ont-gamified CL sessions or the w/o-gamified CL sessions,*” indicating that the gains in skill/knowledge is strongly associated to the intrinsic motivation, perceived choice, pressure/tension and relevance in ont-gamified CL sessions for signed-up master students, and in particular, for master students with effective participation in ont-gamified CL scenario, the gains in skill/knowledge are strongly correlated to the perceived choice and pressure/tension.

1.6 Interpretation and Implications of Obtained Results

Previous sections emphasize, in an independent way, the results obtained in each empirical study conducted in this PhD thesis dissertation. However, nothing in reference to the global contribution, the ontological engineering approach to gamify CL scenarios as an effective and efficient method to deal with motivational problems in scripted collaborative learning, has been carried out. In this section, a cross-analysis is undertaken to explore the relationships across the results obtained in the empirical studies, and so to demonstrate the effectiveness and efficiency of the global contribution. Thus, the objective of this cross-analysis is to make assertions about the effects of *ont-gamified* CL sessions, *non-gamified* CL sessions, and *w/o-gamified* CL sessions on participants' motivation and learning outcomes, and the relationships between these effects.

Figure 7 shows the graphical representation of the cross-analysis conducted to evaluate the significant differences on the participants' motivation and learning outcomes, and their correlations of these differences found in the empirical studies. The topics addressed as content-domains in the CL activities, from the easiest to the hardest level of difficulty, were: conditional structures, loop structures, and recursions.

The inferred assertions based on the cross analysis are:

Assertion (1): The ontological engineering approach to gamify CL scenarios is an effective method to deal with motivational problems in scripted collaborative learning because the participants' perceived choice and intrinsic motivation in ont-gamified CL sessions are better than in non-gamified CL sessions.

As was indicated in ?? (Motivational Problems in the Scripted Collaborative Learning), in CL activities where the CSCL scripts are used as a method to orchestrate and structure the collaboration among the participants, the motivational problems referred as amotivation and demotivation can occur when the participants have a perception of a lack of perceived choice in scripted collaborative learning, more specifically: when they have a sense of obligation by the lack of choice over the sequence of interaction; when they believe that the group work is an imposition of the teacher; and when they feel that the script is too coercive limited their choices over the interactions. In this sense, as the participants' perceived choice in ont-gamified CL sessions is significantly better than in non-gamified during the empirical studies, the ont-gamified CL sessions obtained through the ontological engineering approach to gamify CL sessions have been demonstrated to be an efficient method to avoid the lack of perceived choice in scripted collaborative learning. The pilot and first empirical studies demonstrated the effectiveness of the approach for dealing with motivational problems by indicating that the participants' perceived choice in ont-gamified CL sessions was significantly greater than in non-gamified CL sessions with large and medium effect sizes.

The internalization of motivation has been defined by the SDT theory (RYAN; DECI,

2000) as an internal psychological change that occurs, from a non-freely choice of behaviors or actions to a freely choice by oneself, when a person is intrinsic motivated. In this sense, if this change does not occur in ont-gamified CL sessions, it is an indicative that the participants in these sessions act following the interaction defined by scripts in a non-freely choice, which makes more difficult to participate in scripted collaborative learning over time. Then, ensuring that the participants are more intrinsic motivated in ont-gamified CL sessions than in non-gamified CL session is an evidence that these sessions produce the internalization of motivation in an effective way. This fact has been demonstrated in the pilot and first empirical studies where the participants' intrinsic motivation in ont-gamified CL sessions was greater than in non-gamified CL sessions with large and medium effect sizes.

Assertion (1.a): In addition to be an effective method to deal with motivation problems in scripted collaborative learning, the ontological engineering approach to gamify CL scenarios through the ont-gamified CL sessions have positive effect on the participants' interest/enjoyment when the content-domain to be learn in the scripted collaborative learning is not easy.

In addition to the positive influence in the participants' intrinsic motivation and perceived choice, the pilot empirical study indicated that the ont-gamified CL sessions were more interested and enjoyable for the participants than the non-gamified CL sessions. Although the same result was not found during the first full-scale empirical study, it is possible to argue that the content-domain “*Conditional Structures*” was easier than the content-domain “*Loop Structures*,” causing in this way few interest in the participants even when the scripted collaborative learning was gamified.

Assertion (1.b): When the scripted collaborative learning is based on the Cognitive Apprenticeship theory with pairs of participants per group members, the ontology engineering approach to gamify CL scenarios through ont-gamified CL sessions have positive effects on the participants' effort/importance and on the apprentices' pressure/tension.

During the first full-scale empirical study, the pressure/tension of participants who played the apprentice role in ont-gamified CL sessions was significantly lesser than in non-gamified CL sessions, and the effort/importance of any participant in ont-gamified CL sessions was significantly better than in non-gamified CL sessions. The difference of pressure/tension probably does not occur during the pilot empirical study because of the number of apprentices who participated in each group. When the number of apprentices is fewer in a cognitive apprentice session, they probably feel more pressure/tension to accomplish their tasks because they feel more monitored and observed by the student who plays the master role. In the same reasoning line, the groups with a greater number of participants require less effort to accomplish collaborative task, some students can develop their own knowledge/skill imitating the behavior of other students. Thus, if the number of participants is greater, they will probably require few efforts,

and the introduced game element will not incentive the participants to put more effort in their collaboration.

Assertion (2): The ontological engineering approach to gamify CL scenarios is an efficient method to deal with motivational problems in scripted collaborative learning because the participants' intrinsic motivation, perceived choice and effort/importance in ont-gamified CL sessions than in w/o-gamified CL sessions.

As was mentioned before, the sense of obligation caused by the lack of choice over the sequence of interactions defined by a CSCL script is avoided by increasing the participants' perceived choice, and the ont-gamified CL sessions in the third empirical study demonstrated their efficacy to accomplish this task by indicating that the participants' perceived choice was greater in these sessions than in w/o-gamified CL sessions with a medium effect size.

To avoid the motivational problems in an efficient way, the internalization of motivation should be better in ont-gamified CL sessions than in w/o-gamified CL sessions. In this sense, this efficacy has been demonstrated in the third empirical study in which the participants were significantly more intrinsic motivated in ont-gamified CL session than in w/o-gamified CL session with a medium effect size.

Assertion (3): The ontological engineering approach to gamify CL scenarios is a method that, to obtain positive learning outcomes, affects in a proper way the participants' motivation towards scripted collaborative learning because the participants' gains in skill/knowledge as measurement of learning outcomes were not significantly different than in non-gamified CL sessions and ont-gamified CL sessions, and the participants' gains in skill/knowledge obtained in ont-gamified CL sessions are better than in w/o-gamified CL sessions

As the ontological engineering approach to gamify CL scenarios introduces extrinsic motivators in the learning environment in which the CL sessions are executed, and the extrinsic motivators have been shown to negatively affect people motivation as was indicated by Bénabou and Tirole (2003), Frey and Jegen (1999). Thus, it is likely that game elements would undermine the participants motivation' to their participation in scripted collaborative learning, which in turn can cause unintended negative learning outcomes. In this direction, the pilot and second empirical studies demonstrated that there was not significant difference between the gains in skill/knowledge obtained by students who participated in ont-gamified CL sessions and those gains obtained by students who participated in non-gamified CL sessions.

Although, in the first empirical study, the gains in skill/knowledge obtained by the master students with effective participation in non-gamified CL sessions were significantly better than the gains in skill/knowledge obtained in ont-gamified CL sessions, this difference was apparently not related to the effects on participants' motivation caused by the game elements introduced in ont-gamified CL sessions. According to the correlation tests, there was a significant strong

positive correlation between the effort/importance and the gains in skill/knowledge obtained by the master students with effective participation in non-gamified CL sessions, but there was not the same significant correlation by the master students with effective participation in ont-gamified CL sessions. It means that probably the effort/importance of master students in ont-gamified was not enough to be significant, and thus, to increase their gains in skill/knowledge in ont-gamified CL sessions. However, the effort/importance of participants (master and apprentice) in ont-gamified CL sessions was significantly greater than the effort/importance of participants in non-gamified CL session. This fact can be assumed as a contradiction to the correlation between the effort/importance and the gains in skill/knowledge whereby this correlation did not indicate a causal relationship. Furthermore, taking into account that the difficulty level of the topic (Cond. Structures) used as content-domain in the first empirical study to design the CL sessions was the easiest level of difficulty, we can hypothesize that, when the content-domain to instantiate the CL session has an easiest difficulty level, the game elements should increase the effort/importance of participants in the primary focus of the CSCL script to obtain at least the same gains in skill/knowledge that is obtained in non-gamified CL sessions. In the first empirical study, this primary focus was master students, and to test this hypothesis is necessary to repeat the first empirical study but using other content-domain with an easiest difficulty level.


Because the gains in skill/knowledge of signed-up students and students with effective participation were significantly greater than the gains in skill/knowledge obtained in w/o-gamified CL sessions in the third empirical study, and these gains were significantly correlated with the positive effects on the participants' motivation, the ontological engineering approach to gamify CL scenarios is considered a method to obtain more positive learning outcomes than conventional forms to gamify CL scenarios. In ont-gamified CL session, by increasing the perceived choice of master students, their gains in skill/knowledge will be likely increased because of the strong positive correlation between the perceived choice and the gains in skill/knowledge obtained by signed-up master students and master students with effective participation, and because the participants' perceived choice was significantly greater in ont-gamified CL sessions than in w/o-gamified CL sessions with a medium effect size. In ont-gamified CL sessions, the gains in skill/knowledge of signed-up master students were also significantly strong positive correlated to the intrinsic motivation, but not for the master students with effective participation, so that the gains in skill/knowledge of master students when they were influenced by an increasing in their intrinsic motivation probably occurred as consequence of interacting at least one time in the CL process with other group members.

Assertion (4): The ontological engineering approach to gamify CL sessions is a method to improve the participation in CL sessions instantiated from CSCL scripts

The pilot empirical study demonstrated this assertion when groups of four to five members in ont-gamified CL sessions instantiated from a CSCL script based on the Cognitive Apprenticeship theory have better percentages of participation per groups than in non-gamified

CL sessions. The percentage of participants per group having any participation (incomplete, semi-complete and complete participation levels for the signed-up students) was significantly greater in ont-gamified CL sessions than in non-gamified CL sessions, and the percentages of participants per group having an incomplete participation (none and incomplete participation levels for the signed-up students) and without participation (none participation level for the signed-up students) were significantly less in ont-gamified CL sessions than in non-gamified CL sessions.

Figure 7 – Cross-analysis of significant differences and correlations found in empirical studies for the participants' motivation and learning outcomes



Source: Elaborated by the author.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ABEDALAZIZ, N.; LENG, C. H. The Relationship between CTT and IRT Approaches in Analyzing Item Characteristics. **Malaysian Online Journal of Educational Sciences**, v. 1, n. 1, p. 64–70, 2013/00/00. ISSN 2289-3024. Citation on page 41.
- ADAMS, R. J.; WILSON, M.; WU, M. Multilevel Item Response Models: An Approach to Errors in Variables Regression. **Journal of Educational and Behavioral Statistics**, v. 22, n. 1, p. 47–76, 1997. ISSN 10769986, 19351054. Citation on page 112.
- ADAMS, R. J.; WU, M. L. The Mixed-Coefficients Multinomial Logit Model: A Generalized Form of the Rasch Model. In: **Multivariate and Mixture Distribution Rasch Models: Extensions and Applications**. New York, NY: Springer New York, 2007. p. 57–75. ISBN 978-0-387-49839-3. Citation on page 112.
- ALFONS, A. **robustHD: Robust Methods for High-Dimensional Data**. [S.l.: s.n.], 2016. R package version 0.5.1. Citation on page 90.
- ANDRADE, F.; MARQUES, L.; BITTENCOURT, I. I.; ISOTANI, S. QPJ-BR: Questionário para Identificação de Perfis de Jogadores para o Português-Brasileiro. In: **XXVII Brazilian Symposium on Computers in Education**. Maceio, Brazil: [s.n.], 2016. v. 27, p. 637–646. Citation on page 31.
- BÉNABOU, R.; TIROLE, J. Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation. **The Review of Economic Studies**, v. 70, n. 3, p. 489–520, Jul. 2003. ISSN 0034-6527. Citation on page 76.
- BOCK, R. D.; AITKIN, M. Marginal maximum likelihood estimation of item parameters: Application of an EM algorithm. **Psychometrika**, v. 46, n. 4, p. 443–459, 1981. ISSN 1860-0980. Citations on pages 113, 114, 120, 126, 132, 139, 145, 151, 153, 154, 158, 160, 163, and 165.
- BOLARINWA, O. Principles and methods of validity and reliability testing of questionnaires used in social and health science researches. **Nigerian Postgraduate Medical Journal**, v. 22, n. 4, p. 195–201, 2015. Citation on page 40.
- BROWN, T. **Confirmatory Factor Analysis for Applied Research, Second Edition**. [S.l.]: Guilford Publications, 2014. (Methodology in the Social Sciences). ISBN 978-1-4625-1781-7. Citations on pages 100 and 113.
- CHALLCO, G. C.; MIZOGUCHI, R.; ISOTANI, S. Using Ontology and Gamification to Improve Students' Participation and Motivation in CSCL. In: CRISTEA, A. I.; BITTENCOURT, I. I.; LIMA, F. (Ed.). **Higher Education for All. From Challenges to Novel Technology-Enhanced Solutions**. [S.l.]: Springer, 2018. p. 174–191. ISBN 978-3-319-97934-2. Citation on page 18.
- COOK, D. A.; BECKMAN, T. J.; THOMAS, K. G.; THOMPSON, W. G. Measuring motivational characteristics of courses: Applying Keller's instructional materials motivation survey to a web-based course. **Acad Med**, v. 84, n. 11, p. 1505–1509, Nov. 2009. ISSN 1938-808X. Citation on page 107.

DIMITROV, D. M.; RUMRILL, P. D. Pretest-posttest designs and measurement of change. **Work**, v. 20, n. 2, p. 159–165, 2003. ISSN 1051-9815. Citation on page 115.

EXTREME Response Style. In: ENCYCLOPEDIA of Survey Research Methods. 2455 Teller Road, Thousand Oaks California 91320 United States of America: Sage Publications, Inc., 2008. ISBN 978-1-4129-1808-4 978-1-4129-6394-7. Citation on page 89.

FREY, B. S.; JEGEN, R. **Motivation Crowding Theory: A Survey of Empirical Evidence**. [S.l.: s.n.], 1999. Citation on page 76.

GEORGE, E. **Item Response Theory (IRT) Models for Rating Scale Data**. [S.l.]: American Cancer Society, 2005. ISBN 978-0-470-01319-9. Citation on page 41.

GLÜCK, J.; SPIEL, C. Item response models for repeated measures designs: Application and limitations of four different approaches. **Methods of Psychological Research Online**, v. 2, n. 1, p. 1–18, 1997. Citation on page 115.

GUADAGNOLI, E.; VELICER, W. F. Relation to sample size to the stability of component patterns. **Psychological Bulletin**, v. 103, n. 2, p. 265–275, 1988. ISSN 1939-1455 0033-2909. Citation on page 99.

GUTTMAN, L. The basis for scalogram analysis. In: **Scaling: A Sourcebook for Behavioral Scientists**. [S.l.]: Taylor & Francis, 2017. ISBN 978-1-351-49206-5. Citation on page 116.

HAMBLETON, R. K.; SWAMINATHAN, H.; ROGERS, H. J. **Fundamentals of Item Response Theory**. [S.l.]: Newbury Park, Calif. : Sage Publications, 1991. ISBN 0-8039-3646-X. Citation on page 114.

HATTIE, J. Methodology Review: Assessing Unidimensionality of Tests and Items. **Applied Psychological Measurement**, v. 9, n. 2, p. 139–164, Jun. 1985. ISSN 0146-6216. Citation on page 113.

HU, L.-t.; BENTLER, P. M. Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. **Structural Equation Modeling**, v. 6, n. 1, p. 1–55, 1999. ISSN 1532-8007(Electronic),1070-5511(Print). Citation on page 100.

HUANG, B.; HEW, K. Measuring learners' motivation level in massive open online courses. **International Journal of Information and Education Technology**, 2016. Citation on page 107.

ISOTANI, S.; MIZOGUCHI, R. Theory-Driven Group Formation through Ontologies. In: WOOLF, B. P.; AÏMEUR, E.; NKAMBOU, R.; LAJOIE, S. (Ed.). **Intelligent Tutoring Systems: 9th International Conference**. Montreal, Canada: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2008. p. 646–655. ISBN 978-3-540-69132-7. Citations on pages 30, 31, 35, 36, 38, and 39.

Jorín-Abellán, I. M.; STAKE, R. E.; Martínez-Moné, A. The Needlework in Evaluating a CSCL System: The Evaluand Oriented Responsive Evaluation Model. In: **Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Computer Supported Collaborative Learning - Volume 1**. Rhodes, Greece: International Society of the Learning Sciences, 2009. (CSCL'09), p. 68–72. ISBN 978-1-4092-8598-4. Citation on page 22.

KELLER, J. M. **Motivational Design for Learning and Performance: The ARCS Model Approach**. [S.l.]: Springer Science & Business Media, 2009. Citations on pages 24, 98, and 99.

- KLINE, P. **A Handbook of Test Construction: Introduction to Psychometric Design**. Place of publication not identified: Routledge, 1986. ISBN 978-1-138-90512-2. Citation on page 99.
- LI, C.-H. Confirmatory factor analysis with ordinal data: Comparing robust maximum likelihood and diagonally weighted least squares. **Behav Res**, v. 48, n. 3, p. 936–949, Sep. 2016. ISSN 1554-3528. Citation on page 100.
- LOORBACH, N.; PETERS, O.; KARREMAN, J.; STEEHOUWER, M. Validation of the Instructional Materials Motivation Survey (IMMS) in a self-directed instructional setting aimed at working with technology. **British Journal of Educational Technology**, v. 46, n. 1, p. 204–218, 2015. ISSN 1467-8535. Citation on page 107.
- LORD, F. M. The Measurement of Growth. **ETS Research Bulletin Series**, v. 1956, n. 1, p. i–22, 1956. ISSN 2333-8504. Citation on page 115.
- _____. Further problems in the measurement of growth. **Educational and Psychological Measurement**, v. 18, n. 1, p. 437–451, 1958. Citation on page 115.
- MARKLAND, D.; HARDY, L. On the factorial and construct validity of the Intrinsic Motivation Inventory: Conceptual and operational concerns. **Res Q Exerc Sport**, v. 68, n. 1, p. 20–32, Mar. 1997. ISSN 0270-1367. Citation on page 104.
- MASTERS, G. N.; WRIGHT, B. D. The Partial Credit Model. **Handbook of Modern Item Response Theory**, p. 101, 1996. Citation on page 115.
- MCAULEY, E.; DUNCAN, T.; TAMMEN, V. V. Psychometric Properties of the Intrinsic Motivation Inventory in a Competitive Sport Setting: A Confirmatory Factor Analysis. **Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport**, v. 60, n. 1, p. 48–58, Mar. 1989. ISSN 0270-1367. Citation on page 104.
- MOKKEN, R. **A Theory and Procedure of Scale Analysis with Applications in Political Research**. [S.l.]: Mouton, 1971. (Methods and models in the social sciences). Citation on page 114.
- MONTEIRO, V.; MATA, L.; PEIXOTO, F.; MONTEIRO, V.; MATA, L.; PEIXOTO, F. Intrinsic Motivation Inventory: Psychometric Properties in the Context of First Language and Mathematics Learning. **Psicologia: Reflexão e Crítica**, v. 28, n. 3, p. 434–443, Sep. 2015. ISSN 0102-7972. Citations on pages 98 and 104.
- NANDAKUMAR, R.; YU, F.; LI, H.-H.; STOUT, W. Assessing Unidimensionality of Polytomous Data. **Applied Psychological Measurement**, v. 22, n. 2, p. 99–115, 1998. ISSN 0146-6216. Citation on page 113.
- PETRILLO, J.; CANO, S. J.; MCLEOD, L. D.; COON, C. D. Using Classical Test Theory, Item Response Theory, and Rasch Measurement Theory to Evaluate Patient-Reported Outcome Measures: A Comparison of Worked Examples. **Value in Health**, v. 18, n. 1, p. 25–34, Jan. 2015. ISSN 1098-3015. Citation on page 41.
- QUEIROZ, O. A. de; PRIMI, R.; CARVALHO, L. d. F.; ENUMO, S. R. F. Employment of Item Response Theory to measure change in Children's Analogical Thinking Modifiability Test. **Estudos de Psicologia (Campinas)**, v. 30, n. 4, p. 479–486, 2013. Citation on page 115.
- R Core Team. **R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing**. Vienna, Austria, 2017. Citations on pages 90, 100, 113, 114, and 115.

REVELLE, W. **Psych: Procedures for Psychological, Psychometric, and Personality Research.** Evanston, Illinois, 2017. R package version 1.7.8. Citation on page 100.

RHEMTULLA, M.; Brosseau-Liard, P. E.; SAVALEI, V. When can categorical variables be treated as continuous? A comparison of robust continuous and categorical SEM estimation methods under suboptimal conditions. **Psychological Methods**, v. 17, n. 3, p. 354–373, 2012. ISSN 1939-1463(Electronic),1082-989X(Print). Citation on page 100.

ROBITZSCH, A. **Sirt: Supplementary Item Response Theory Models.** [S.l.: s.n.], 2018. R package version 2.6-9. Citation on page 113.

ROBITZSCH, A.; KIEFER, T.; WU, M. **TAM: Test Analysis Modules.** [S.l.: s.n.], 2018. R package version 2.10-24. Citations on pages 114 and 115.

ROGOSA, D. R.; WILLETT, J. B. Understanding correlates of change by modeling individual differences in growth. **Psychometrika**, v. 50, n. 2, p. 203–228, 1985. ISSN 0033-3123, 1860-0980. Citation on page 115.

ROSSEEL, Y. Lavaan: An R Package for Structural Equation Modeling. **Journal of Statistical Software**, v. 48, n. 2, p. 1–36, 2012. Citations on pages 100 and 113.

ROUQUETTE, A.; FALISSARD, B. Sample size requirements for the internal validation of psychiatric scales. **International Journal of Methods in Psychiatric Research**, v. 20, n. 4, p. 235–249, 2011. Citation on page 99.

RYAN, R. M.; DECI, E. L. Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. **American Psychologist**, v. 55, n. 1, p. 68–78, 2000. ISSN 1935-990X(Electronic);0003-066X(Print). Citations on pages 24, 75, and 98.

STOUT, W.; HABING, B.; DOUGLAS, J.; KIM, H. R.; ROUSSOS, L.; ZHANG, J. Conditional Covariance-Based Nonparametric Multidimensionality Assessment. **Applied Psychological Measurement**, v. 20, n. 4, p. 331–354, Dec. 1996. ISSN 0146-6216. Citation on page 113.

TSANG, S.; ROYSE, C. F.; TERKAWI, A. S. Guidelines for developing, translating, and validating a questionnaire in perioperative and pain medicine. **Saudi J Anaesth**, v. 11, n. Suppl 1, p. S80–S89, May 2017. ISSN 1658-354X. Citation on page 40.

Van der Ark, L. A. Mokken Scale Analysis in R. **Journal of Statistical Software**, v. 20, n. i11, 2007. Citation on page 114.

_____. New Developments in Mokken Scale Analysis in R. **Journal of Statistical Software, Articles**, v. 48, n. 5, p. 1–27, 2012. ISSN 1548-7660. Citation on page 114.

WARM, T. A. Weighted likelihood estimation of ability in item response theory. **Psychometrika**, v. 54, n. 3, p. 427–450, 1989. ISSN 0033-3123, 1860-0980. Citations on pages 113 and 115.

WIGFIELD, A. Expectancy-value theory of achievement motivation: A developmental perspective. **Educ Psychol Rev**, v. 6, n. 1, p. 49–78, Mar. 1994. ISSN 1040-726X, 1573-336X. Citation on page 24.

WOHLIN, C.; RUNESON, P.; HST, M.; OHLSSON, M. C.; REGNELL, B.; WESSLN, A. **Experimentation in Software Engineering.** [S.l.]: Springer, 2012. ISBN 3-642-29043-4 978-3-642-29043-5. Citation on page 18.

WRIGHT, B. D. Rack and stack: Time 1 vs. time 2. **Rasch measurement transactions**, v. 17, n. 1, p. 905–906, 2003. Citations on pages 41, 42, and 115.

YURDUGUL, H. Minimum Sample Size for Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha: A Monte-Carlo Study. **Hacettepe University Journal of Education**, v. 35, p. 397–405, 2008. ISSN 1300-5340. Citations on pages 99, 104, and 107.

ZHANG, J. Conditional Covariance Theory and Detect for Polytomous Items. **Psychometrika**, v. 72, n. 1, p. 69–91, 2007. ISSN 1860-0980. Citation on page 113.

OUTLIERS DETECTION AND TREATMENT IN DATA GATHERED FROM MOTIVATION SURVEYS

Prior to any statistical analysis related to participants' motivation in the empirical studies, outliers identified as careless responses have been drop out from the data collected by motivational surveys (section A.1). These outliers correspond to incorrectly entered data by the students in the adapted Portuguese version of Intrinsic Motivation Inventory (IMI) and the Instructional Materials Motivation Survey (IMMS). After to remove the careless responses, outliers identified as extreme values are replaced to the trimmed minimum and maximum values by the Winsorization method (section A.2).

A.1 Removing Careless Responses

The questionnaires of the adapted Portuguese IMI have 24 items, so that a careless response is defined as a response in which the length of uninterrupted identical values for the items is greater than 12 (half of the items). For the data collected by the questionnaires of the adapted Portuguese IMMS, a careless response is defined as a response in which the length of uninterrupted identical values is greater than half of the items (12 items).

A.1.1 *Intrinsic Motivation Inventory Data*

Table 24 shows the two careless responses identified and removed from the IMI data collected over the pilot empirical study. These two careless responses corresponds to participants with user IDs 10119 and 10133; and they were identified in 32 responses collected from computer science undergraduate students by a web-based questionnaire of the adapted Portuguese version of IMI (shown in section C.1).

Table 24 – Summary of careless responses in the IMI data collected over the pilot empirical study

@@	UserID	Item01	Item02	Item03	Item04	Item05	Item06	Item07	Item08	...
	10116	3	7	4	4	2	6	4	4	...
—	10119	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	...
	10120	7	3	7	7	6	2	1	1	...
...
	10132	1	7	7	6	4	4	3	4	...
—	10133	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	...
	10134	2	6	4	4	3	3	4	6	...
...

Table 25 shows the careless responses identified and removed from the data collected over the first empirical study. These two careless responses correspond to participants with user IDs 10229 and 10241, and they were identified in a set of 62 responses collected from computer engineer undergraduate students by means of the paper-based questionnaire version of IMI (shown in section C.2).

Table 25 – Summary of careless responses in the IMI data collected over the first empirical study

@@	UserID	Item01	Item02	Item03	Item04	Item05	Item06	Item07	...
...
	10213	7	4	2	7	4	1	4	...
—	10229	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	...
—	10241	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	...

Table 26 shows the four careless responses identified and removed from the IMI data collected over the third empirical study. These careless responses correspond to participants with user IDs 10178, 10196, 10211 and 10240. These four careless responses were identified in 55 responses collected from computer engineer undergraduate students by means of the web-based questionnaire version of IMI (shown in section C.4).

Table 26 – Summary of careless responses in the IMI data collected over the third empirical study

@@	UserID	Item01	Item02	Item03	Item04	Item05	...
...
	10176	3	6	4	4	5	...
—	10178	4	4	4	4	4	...
	10179	6	5	6	6	2	...
...
	10193	1	1	1	1	2	...
—	10196	4	4	4	4	4	...

Table 26 – (*continued*)

@@	UserID	Item01	Item02	Item03	Item04	Item05	...
	10197	4	4	4	4	4	...
...
	10210	1	7	7	4	1	...
—	10211	4	4	4	4	4	...
	10213	1	7	7	7	3	...
...
	10238	3	5	5	5	4	...
—	10240	4	4	4	4	4	...

A.1.2 Instructional Materials Motivation Survey Data

No one careless response has been identified in 58 responses collected over the second empirical study by means of the paper-based questionnaire of the adapted Portuguese IMMS (section C.3). Table 27 shows the three careless responses identified and removed in the IMMS data collected over the third empirical study. These careless responses correspond to participants with user IDs 10196, 10211 and 10240; and they were identified in 55 responses collected from computer engineering undergraduate students by means of the web-based questionnaire version of IMMS (shown in section C.4).

Table 27 – Summary of careless responses in the IMMS data collected over the third empirical study

@@	UserID	Item01	Item02	Item03	Item04	Item06	...
...
	10193	1	1	1	2	1	...
—	10196	4	4	4	4	4	...
	10197	7	5	3	7	5	...
...
	10210	1	1	1	1	1	...
—	10211	4	4	4	4	4	...
	10213	5	7	7	5	7	...
...
	10238	4	5	5	4	5	...
—	10240	4	4	4	4	4	...

A.2 Winsorizing Extreme Values

In surveys, a extreme value is an outliers that happens when a participant has an extreme response style score (EXTREME..., 2008). These tendency of some participants to answer

surveys indicating extreme lower and upper values generates representative outliers that cannot simply removed from the data for the statistical analyses. Thus, to reduce the impact of extreme values in the surveys, by transforming the extreme values into a specified percentile of the data, the data collected by the motivation surveys had been Winsorized. Winsorization is a method that shrink extreme values to the border of the main part of the data, and it had been carried out with the robustHD package version 0.5 (ALFONS, 2016) in R software version 3.4.3 (R Core Team, 2017).

A.2.1 *Intrinsic Motivation Inventory Data*

Table 28 show the responses identified as extreme values in the data collected by means of the adapted Portuguese IMI over the empirical studies. This table also shows how these extreme values had been transformed into the trimmed minimum and maximum values by the Winsorization method for the validation of the adapted Portuguese IMI.

A.2.2 *Instructional Materials Motivation Survey Data*

Table 29 presents the responses identified as extreme values in the data collected over the empirical studies by means of the adapted Portuguese version of IMMS. This table also shows the changes in these extreme values by the Winsorization method for the validation of the adapted Portuguese IMMS.

Table 28 – Summary of Winsorized responses for the validation of adapted Portuguese IMI

@@	Study	UserID	Item01	Item02	Item03	Item04	Item05	Item06	Item07	Item08	Item09	...	Item12	Item13	Item14	Item15	Item16	Item17	Item18	Item19	Item20	Item21
...	pilot	10126	5	2	5	7	6	2	5	1	6	6	
...	pilot	10127	4	2	5	7	6	3	5	4	6	6->5	2	2	4	4	4	2	1	2	2	
>	pilot	10128	1	4	1->2	1->3	7	1	7->6	1	7->6	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	
>	pilot	10129	1	7	7	4	2	4	2	4	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7->6	
>	pilot	10130	4	3	6	5	4	5	2	5	5	4	1	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	
>	pilot	10131	4	5	6	7	4	7	1	2	5	5	7	3	1	1	7	2	2	1	7	
>	pilot	10132	1	7	6	4	4	4	1	3	4	1	3	2	3	2	2	2	2	1	6	
>	pilot	10134	2	6	4	3	3	4	6	2	2	2	4	3	5	3	3	4	4	2	2	
>	pilot	10135	5	4	5	7	7	1	5	6	5	2	4	2	4	2	4	2	2	2	5	
>	pilot	10136	1	7	3	1->3	4	5	1	6	6	1	1	5	1	5	3	7->6	4	6	1	
...	pilot	10137	5	1	5	4	5	5	1	1	1	5	6	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	
...	pilot	10139	1	4	5	7	4	4	4	4	4	1	6	3	4	4	4	4	3	1	6	
>	pilot	10140	1	4	3	2->3	4	4	4	4	4	1	4	1	5	1	5	4	4	1	6	
>	pilot	10141	2	4	5	4	5	4	6	3	4	5	4	3	5	4	4	3	4	5	5	
...	pilot	10143	4	4	6	6	5	3	2	2	2	5	
>	pilot	10145	1	7	7	4	1	4	1	4	4	4	4	4	1	4	4	4	4	4	2	
>	pilot	10146	5	3	6	6	6	6	3	2	2	5	5	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	3	
pilot	10148	4	3	6	4	4	4	4	1	1	1	4	4	4	4	2	4	3	2	2	5	
>	pilot	10149	4	3	7	6	7	4	1	7	5	7->6	1	1	1	1	1	7->5	6	5	7	
>	pilot	10152	7	3	7	5	5	7	3	2	2	5	5	5	5	2	2	2	2	2	7	
pilot	10153	5	4	5	4	5	4	2	6	3	5	4	2	5	2	6	2	5	2	4	3	
>	pilot	10154	3	6	5	4	5	4	2	6	3	5	4	2	5	2	6	3	4	4	7->6	
...	pilot	10158	7	3	7	7	4	4	1	1	6	6	1	1	1	4	1	1	1	2	6	
...	first	10171	6	2	3	7	2	1	1	6	6	1	1	3	1	1	2	1	5	
>	first	10172	6	4	5	7	7	3	2	4	1	3	6	1	1	2	1	2	1	2	3	
first	10174	4	4	6	7	4	4	4	1	1	3	5	4	1	1	4	1	1	2	3	4	
...	first	10201	5	2	7	7	4	3	1	2	4	1	1	2	1	1	1	2	2	1	7	
>	first	10202	4	7	1	5	7	7	4	1	5	1	7	4	1	1	3	1	1	4	4	
first	10203	7	1	5	7	7	7	4	1	5	1	7	4	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	7->5	
...	first	10208	6	4	7	7	4	1	1	1	6	6	1	1	2	4	1	1	2	2	7	
>	first	10209	4	7	7	6	6	3	5	1	5	1	7	4	1	1	1	4	5	3	3	
>	first	10210	4	6	6	6	3	3	6	6	6	3	7	5	5	4	4	4	6	5	2	
first	10211	7	7	3	3	6	6	7	3	2	6	6	2	6	2	6	2	3	2	2	6	
first	10212	5	3	6	6	7	3	2	1	6	6	1	6	2	1	4	2	2	1	1	7	

Table 28 – (*continued*)


Table 28 – (continued)

@@	Study	UserID	Item01	Item02	Item03	Item04	Item05	Item06	Item07	Item08	Item09	...	Item12	Item13	Item14	Item15	Item16	Item17	Item18	Item19	Item20	Item21
>	third	10221	2	6	5	2	5	3	6	3	3	...	2	4	2	4	4	6->5	4	6	3	
>	third	10223	5	4	5	5	4	3	4	4	5	...	5	4	4	4	4	2	4	3	6	
>	third	10224	4	4	5	5	3	4	5	4	4	...	4	4	4	5	5	5	4	3	4	
>	third	10226	1	7	1->2	1->3	1	7	7->6	1	1	...	1	7->5	7->5	7->5	7	7->6	7->5	4	4	
>	third	10227	5	3	4	5	5	3	3	3	3	...	5	5	5	4	4	4	3	3	6	
>	third	10228	1	1	1->2	1->3	1	1	1	2	1	...	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	1	2	
>	third	10230	4	3	3	6	4	3	2	5	5	...	5	3	5	4	4	4	6->5	6	3	
>	third	10231	6	2	1->2	6	7	2	4	2	4	...	5	3	1	1	1	1	2	4	4	
>	third	10232	4	3	5	4	4	4	1	4	4	...	5	1	2	3	2	3	2	1	2	
>	third	10234	1	7	1->2	5	3	6	6	6	2	...	2	6->5	4	6	2	6	5	2	5	
>	third	10237	4	3	4	5	5	3	4	4	5	...	6	2	6->5	6	5	3	4	4	3	
>	third	10238	3	5	5	5	4	5	2	4	4	...	4	1	5	7	5	5	5	4	4	

Table 29 – Summary of Winsorized responses for the validation of adapted Portuguese IMMS

Table 29 – (*continued*)

@{@}		Study	UserID	Item01	Item02	Item03	Item04	Item05	Item06	Item07	Item08	Item09	Item10	Item11	...	Item20	Item21	Item22	Item23	Item24	Item25	Item26
>	third	10190	3	6	5	6	6	5	4	4	5	5	3	...	5	5	4	4	1->2	3	3	
third	10191	4	4	3	2	4	2	6	2	3	3	1	2	3	...	7	4	6	5	5	5	
third	10192	4	4	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	1	1	1	...	7	4	6	5	5	6	
third	10193	1	1->2	2	1->2	2	1->2	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	...	1	1	1	1->2	1->2	1	
>	third	10197	7	5	3	7	4	5	4	5	5	1	1	1	...	5	5	4	4	4	3	
...	
...	third	10203	4	7	4	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	...	4	4	4	4	4	4	
>	third	10204	1	1->2	4	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	...	3	3	3	3	3	3	
...	third	10206	4	5	4	4	4	4	3	4	5	5	5	5	...	6	3	3	3	3	3	
third	10208	2	4	3	2	4	2	4	2	3	4	3	3	3	...	4	4	4	4	4	4	
third	10209	2	4	1->2	2	4	1	1	1	1	4	6	4	4	...	3	3	3	3	3	3	
>	third	10210	1	1->2	1	1->2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	...	1	1	1	1	1	1	
...	third	10213	5	7	5	7	5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	...	2	2	2	2	2	2	
...	third	10214	3	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	...	5	5	5	5	5	5	
...	third	10215	5	2	2	4	2	4	2	1	1	1	1	1	...	1	1	1	1	1	1	
...	third	10220	4	7	4	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	...	4	4	4	4	4	4	
...	third	10221	2	2	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	3	4	4	...	2	2	2	2	2	2	
third	10223	4	4	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	...	6	5	5	5	5	5	
third	10224	5	5	4	5	4	5	4	5	4	5	4	3	4	...	4	4	4	4	4	4	
third	10226	4	4	3	3	5	4	5	4	5	4	1	4	4	...	4	4	4	4	4	4	
third	10227	5	4	5	4	5	4	5	4	5	4	2	5	4	...	6	4	4	4	4	4	
third	10228	1	1->2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	...	2	2	2	2	2	2	
third	10230	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	...	5	5	5	5	5	5	
...	third	10232	4	6	5	4	5	4	5	4	5	4	5	4	...	4	4	4	4	4	4	
...	third	10234	6	2	1->2	2	1->2	2	1->2	2	1->2	2	1->2	2	1->2	...	6	6	6	6	6	6
...	third	10237	3	5	3	5	3	5	3	5	3	5	3	5	3	...	2	2	2	2	2	2



VALIDATION OF MOTIVATION SURVEYS

This appendix details the validation process on the motivation surveys employed in the empirical studies of this PhD dissertation. These instruments are the Intrinsic Motivation Inventory (IMI), and the Instructional Materials Motivation Survey (IMMS). Both instruments have been adapted and translated from their original English versions into Portuguese by the thesis author to measure the students' motivation regarding to their participation in CL sessions. Thus, the validation and reliability analysis presented here ensure that the translated items are psycho-metrically sound. The procedure for the validation and reliability tests is presented in section B.1, and the results of this procedure is detailed in section B.2.

B.1 Validation Procedure

B.1.1 Participants

The collected data to conduct the validation and reliability tests of the motivation surveys come from 103 undergraduate Brazilian students who were enrolled in the first year of bachelor degree programs in computer science and computer engineering at the University of São Paulo. 37 of these participants were students signed up on the course “Introduction to Computer Science” for the second semester of 2016 (September-December), and 66 of them were students signed up on the course for the first semester of 2017 (March-July). These participants were in the age range from 18 to 25 years old, sharing similar social-economy status and culture.

B.1.2 Instruments

Intrinsic Motivation Inventory (IMI)

The IMI is a psychometric instrument in which the Self-Determinant Theory (SDT) has been used as theoretical fundament to define seven scales (Interest/Enjoyment, Perceived Choice,

Perceived Competence, Pressure/Tension, Effort/Importance, Value/Usefulness, and Relatedness) to measure the intrinsic motivation of participants towards a target activity (MONTEIRO *et al.*, 2015; RYAN; DECI, 2000). According to the authors of this instrument, no all the scales are needed to measure the intrinsic motivation, the scales can be selected according to the situation, removing those that are redundant and those that are not in accordance to the situation. In the adapted Portuguese IMI, four scales have been selected by the thesis author to measure the intrinsic motivation of Brazilian students towards their participation in CL sessions. These subscales are: the Interest/Enjoyment, Perceived Choice, Pressure/Tension, and Effort/Importance.

The Interest/Enjoyment is the self-report direct measure of intrinsic motivation whereby the items related to this scale has been included in the adapted Portuguese IMI. The Perceived Choice and Perceived Competence are both scales defined as positive predictors of the intrinsic motivation, so that the items related to the Perceived Competence had been removed from the instrument, and items related to the Perceived Choice have been selected as the only positive predictor. Furthermore, the scale of the perceived choice has been selected to measure the intrinsic motivation because the thesis author hypothesizes that the scripted collaboration increases the feeling of obligation in the participants. Items related to the Pressure/Tension have been included in the adapted Portuguese IMI as the negative predictor of intrinsic motivation. Items related to the scale of Effort/Importance has been included in the adapted Portuguese IMI to measure the internalization of motivation. Items related to the scale of Relatedness have not been included in the adapted Portuguese IMI because this scale intends to measure the feeling to be connected to others participants in target activity where the goal of activity is obtain interpersonal relationships.

Three questionnaires of the adapted Portuguese IMI had been used to collect the students' motivation data over the empirical studies. These questionnaires in the paper-based version (Annex C.2) and web-based version (Annex C.1 and Annex C.4) comprised 24 items, with all the items scored on a 7-point Likert scale using the ranging from 1 (*not at all*) to 7 (*very true*).

Instructional Materials Motivation Survey (IMMS)

The IMMS is the psychometric instrument developed by Keller (2009) to assess the students' motivational attitude towards instructional materials or courses. This instrument has been developed in correspondence with the ARCS model, thereby the scales of Attention, Relevance, Confidence and Satisfaction (ARCS) are used to measure the reaction of students to instructional materials or course, and this reaction is then considered a self-report measure to the students' motivational attitude.

Instead to use the 36 items defined in the original version of IMMS, the adapted Portuguese IMMS has been defined using only 25 item. 11-items related to the scale of *C: Confidence* have been removed from the instrument, because the scales of *C: Confidence* and *PC: Perceived Choice* measure the self-regulation of an individual. Removing the scale of Confidence in the adapted Portuguese IMMS avoid an overloading of work for the participants when they were

requested to answered the questionnaires. Furthermore, the author of the original version of IMMS indicates that each one of the four scales defined in the IMMS could be used and scored independently (KELLER, 2009). Thus, in the adapted Portuguese IMMS, the students' motivational attitude towards the CL sessions had been measured as the *LM: Level of Motivation*, a measure that consists in the scales of *A: Attention*, *R: Relevance*, and *S: Satisfaction*.

Two questionnaires of the adapted Portuguese IMMS had been used to collect the students' motivation data over the empirical studies. These questionnaires in the paper-based version (Annex C.3) and web-based version (Annex C.4) had been scored on a 7-point Likert scale using the ranging from 1 (*not at all*) to 7 (*very true*).

B.1.3 Data Collection Procedure

Web-based questionnaires of the motivation surveys were used to collect the responses through the Moodle platform during the pilot and third empirical studies, and paper-based questionnaires of these surveys were used at the classroom to collect the responses during the first empirical study. During the pilot study, 32 responses to the adapted Portuguese IMI were collected from the 37 computer science students by means of a web-based questionnaire (detailed in Annex C.1). During the first empirical study, 62 responses to the adapted Portuguese IMI were collected from the 66 computer engineering students by means of a paper-based questionnaire (detailed in Annex C.2). During the second empirical study, 58 responses to the adapted Portuguese IMMS were collected from the 66 computer engineering students by means a paper-based questionnaire (detailed in Annex C.3). During the third empirical study, 55 responses to the adapted Portuguese IMI and the adapted Portuguese IMMS were collected by means of a web-based questionnaire (detailed in Annex C.4).

B.1.4 Data Analysis

Although the common statistical advice to perform the validation of surveys indicates a minimum sample size of 300 observations (KLINE, 1986), recent simulations demonstrated that the validation process is possible with small samples under certain circumstances (GUADAGNOLI; VELICER, 1988; ROUQUETTE; FALISSARD, 2011; YURDUGUL, 2008). According to these studies, to conduct the validation of surveys and the reliability tests of them with small samples, the items must sufficiently correspond to the scale for which they are intended, and the Cronbach's alpha coefficient (α) must be stable in this small sample. Thus, the correspondence of items and scales had been validated by a factorial analysis using *varimax* rotation, and the items with a component loading less than 0.40 and those with a cross-loading value less than 0.20 had been removed from the instrument. The stability of Cronbach's alpha (α) had been evaluated using the cut-off values defined by Yurdugul (2008). According to these cut-off values, if the sample size is between 30 and 50 observations, and the level of the first eigenvalue is less than 6, the Cronbach's alpha (α) is not stable; if the sample size is between 50 and 100, and the level

of the first eigenvalue is between 3 and 6, the Cronbach's alpha (α) is stable, but an informed decision must be conducted by reviewing the literature and/or consulting with specialists to confirm the number of scales; and if the sample is between 100 and 300 observation and the level of the first eigenvalue is between 1 to 3, the Cronbach's alpha (α) is stable but a informed decision should be conducted to define the number of scales.

After to verify the correspondence of the items with the scales and to ensure the stability of Cronbach's alpha (α), the structure of the items in the motivation surveys had been evaluated with a Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) by testing three different models: multidimensional, second order and bi-factor models. To select the model that best fits for the collected data, the CFA had been carried out using the diagonally weighted least squares (WLSMV) estimator. The WLSMV estimator is a estimator specifically designed for small samples with ordinal data (such the 7-point Likert scale used in the IMI and IMMS), and it makes no distributional assumptions about the observed variables (BROWN, 2014; LI, 2016; RHEMTULLA; Brosseau-Liard; SAVALEI, 2012). The result of CFA is a set of goodness fit indices used to select the model that best fits for the collected data. These indices were: Chi-square (χ^2), Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index (AGFI), the Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI), the Comparative Fit Index (CFI) and the Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA). As the χ^2 is highly sensitive to the sample size (HU; BENTLER, 1999), this indicator was only be used in the case that the others indicators do not significantly differ in relation with the others models. In this case, the model that best fits with the collected data is the model with smaller Chi-square (χ^2). Values between 0.90 to 0.95 were considered acceptable thresholds for the indices of AGFI, TLI and CFI; and values higher than 0.96 were considered good fit. The RMSEA obtained by the CFA had been a scaled value of the RMSEA, so that it was considered acceptable when the value was 0.10s and good when the value was less than 0.10. After to select the model that best fits for the collected data, separate reliability tests had been conducted in the global sample and the samples obtained in each empirical study to evaluate the consistency of the motivation surveys. In these tests, values in the Cronbach's alpha (α) greater than 0.70 were considered as acceptable, and values above 0.80 were considered as highly reliable.

The CFA and reliability tests had been carried out in R software version 3.4.3 (R Core Team, 2017) using the lavaan package version 0.5 (ROSSEEL, 2012) for the CFA, and the psych package version 1.7.8 (REVELLE, 2017) for the reliability tests. The R scripts for the validation of the adapted Portuguese IMI and the adapted Portuguese IMMS are available, with the data files, at the URL: <<https://geiser.github.io/phd-thesis-evaluation/>>

B.2 Results


Prior to the data analysis detailed above, the outliers identified as careless responses had been removed from the data, and the outliers identified as extreme values had been treated

using the winsorization method. The detection and treatment of these outliers is detailed in ???. After removing the careless responses, the global sample size employed to obtain the results presented here were 141 observations and 110 observations to validate the adapted Portuguese IMI and IMMS, respectively. To validate the Portuguese adapted IMI, the data consisted in 30 observations from the pilot study, 60 observations from the first empirical study, and 51 observations from the third empirical study. To validate the Portuguese adapted IMMS, the data consisted in 58 observations from the empirical study and 52 observations from the third empirical study.

B.2.1 Factorial Structure of the Adapted Portuguese IMI

Figure 8 shows the multidimensional, second-order factor and bi-factor models that had been tested in the CFA to validate the factorial structure of the adapted Portuguese IMI. The construction of these models had been conducted according to the criteria defined in the validation procedure by removing items that had loaded with a value less than 0.4, and also, by removing items that had cross-loading less than 0.2. This construction ensures that the items correspond to the scale for which they are intended, and that the Cronbach's α is stable.

Figure 8 – Models tested in the CFA to validate the factorial structure of the adapted Portuguese IMI



As result of the construction of these models, the Item 19 - “Achei que a atividade seria chata” as translated version of “I thought this was a boring activity” - was removed from the factorial structure because it loads in the scale of *PC: Perceived Choice* for which it does not have

concordance. The Item 04 - “*Para mim foi importante realizar bem a atividade*” as a translated version of “It was important to me to do well at this task” - was also removed from the factorial structure because it does not load in the scale of *EI: Effort/Importance* for which it was intended, and because it loads in the scale of *IE: Interest/Enjoyment* where it lacks of concordance. Instead to load in the scale of *PT: Pressure/Tension*, the Item01 - “*Foi muito descontraido realizar a ativide*” as the translated version of “I was very relaxed in doing the activity” - loaded in the the scale of *IE: Interest/Enjoyment* because the word “*descontraido*” was understood by the participants in the sense of enjoyment rather than the pressure. Thus, the Item 01 has been used as an item to measure the Interest/Enjoyment rather than to measure the Pressure/Tension.

Table 30 shows the goodness fit statistics for the models tested in the validation of the adapted Portuguese IMI. The results presented in this table indicate that all the models have adequate goodness fit indices for all the samples (the global sample, and the data collected over the pilot, first and third empirical studies). The bi-factor model had not converged for the data collected over the third empirical study, and the second-order factor model had partially converged for those data. According to this results, the model that best fits the global sample is the second-order factor model with $\chi^2 = 63.27$ that outperforms the multidimensional model ($\chi^2 = 80.08$) and the bi-factor model ($\chi^2 = 86.28$). The AGFI index for the multidimensional model and the second-order factor model are better than the AGFI index for the bi-factor model. In relation to the TLI and CFI indices, the the second-order factor model with $TLI = 0.90$ and $CFI = 0.82$ outperforms the multidimensional model ($TLI = 0.89$ and $CFI = 0.76$), and the bi-factor model ($TLI = 0.84$ and $CFI = 0.72$). The RMSEA of all models are acceptable for a robust estimation with a good value for the lower limit in the confidence interval.

Table 30 – Goodness of fit statistics in the validation of the adapted Portuguese IMI

	df	χ^2	AGFI	TLI	CFI	RMSEA	CI.lwr	CI.upr
Global sample: Multidimensional model	26.59	80.08	0.99	0.89	0.76	0.12	0.10	0.14
Global sample: Second-order factor model	23.35	63.27	0.99	0.90	0.82	0.11	0.09	0.13
Global sample: Bi-factor model	22.70	86.28	0.98	0.84	0.72	0.14	0.12	0.16
Pilot study: Multidimensional model	8.25	14.30	0.96	0.83	0.86	0.16	0.11	0.21
Pilot study: Second-order factor model	7.88	14.06	0.96	0.82	0.85	0.16	0.11	0.21
Pilot study: Bi-factor model	9.90	18.39	0.97	0.80	0.80	0.17	0.11	0.23
First study: Multidimensional model	18.93	25.80	0.99	0.92	0.87	0.08	0.02	0.12
First study: Second-order factor model	17.92	26.26	0.98	0.90	0.84	0.09	0.05	0.13
First study: Bi-factor model	17.83	34.68	0.98	0.80	0.68	0.13	0.09	0.16
Third study: Multidimensional model	16.43	30.22	0.98	0.85	0.76	0.13	0.09	0.17
Third study: Second-order factor model	131.00		0.97				0.00	0.00
Third study: Bi-factor model								

df: degree of freedom; AGFI: Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index; CFI: Comparative Fit Index; TLI: Tucker-Lewis Index;

RMSEA: Root Mean Square Error of Approximation

In relation to the data collected in each empirical study, the goodness of fit statistics in

the validation of the adapted Portuguese IMI (shown in Table 30) have slight differences. For the data collected over the pilot study, the second-order factor model with $\chi^2 = 14.06$ fits better than the multidimensional model and the bi-factor model but the difference is not significant. For the data collected over the first empirical study, the multidimensional model with $\chi^2 = 25.80$ outperforms the bi-factor model and the multidimensional model. For the data collected over the third empirical study, the multidimensional model with $\chi^2 = 30.22$ is the only model that had converged in the simulation.

Table 31 – Summary of the factor analysis for the adapted Portuguese IMI

	MR1	MR3	MR2	MR4
<i>IE: Interest/Enjoyment</i>				
Item22: <i>Achei a atividade muito agradável</i>	0.837	-0.237	-0.111	-0.073
Item09: <i>Gostei muito de fazer a atividade</i>	0.828	-0.256	-0.168	-0.106
Item12: <i>A atividade foi divertida</i>	0.827	-0.218	-0.157	-0.092
Item24: <i>Enquanto estava fazendo a atividade, refleti ...</i>	0.787	0.024	-0.060	-0.188
Item21: <i>Descreveria a atividade como muito interessante</i>	0.772	-0.210	0.052	-0.093
Item01: <i>Foi muito descontraído realizar a atividade</i>	0.691	-0.234	-0.216	-0.012
<i>PC: Perceived Choice</i>				
Item17: <i>Fiz a atividade porque eu não tinha outra escolha</i>	-0.168	0.802	0.246	0.184
Item15: <i>Fiz a atividade porque eu tinha que fazer</i>	-0.132	0.721	0.070	0.053
Item06: <i>Realmente não tive escolha para realizar ...</i>	-0.108	0.748	0.133	0.012
Item02: <i>Senti como se eu tivesse sido obrigado ...</i>	-0.270	0.707	0.167	-0.020
Item08: <i>Senti que não fiz a atividade por vontade ...</i>	-0.360	0.651	0.214	0.240
<i>PT: Pressure/Tension</i>				
Item16: <i>Eu me senti ansioso enquanto trabalhava ...</i>	0.040	0.197	0.839	-0.056
Item14: <i>Eu me senti muito tenso ao realizar a atividade</i>	-0.121	0.245	0.788	0.110
Item18: <i>Seti-me pressionado enquanto fazia a atividade</i>	-0.157	0.386	0.739	0.089
Item11: <i>Não me senti nervoso ao realizar a atividade</i>	0.365	0.043	-0.636	0.037
<i>EI: Effort/Importance</i>				
Item13: <i>Não me esforcei muito para realizar bem atividade</i>	-0.030	0.184	0.185	0.708
Item03: <i>Me esforcei muito na realização da atividade</i>	0.276	0.041	0.194	-0.650
Item07: <i>Não coloquei muita energia (esforço) na atividade</i>	-0.062	0.076	0.031	0.691
SS loadings	4.280	3.206	2.624	1.589
Cumulative Var	0.238	0.416	0.562	0.650
Proportion Explained	0.366	0.274	0.224	0.136

CFI: 0.822; TLI: 0.904; df: 23.354; χ^2 : 63.271; RMSEA: 0.11 [0.09, 0.132];

Table 31 shows the summary of the factor analysis conducted with the global sample for the adapted Portuguese IMI. The factor loadings, eigenvalues, cumulative variance and proportion explained by the items indicates the emergence of four factors: Interest/Enjoyment (F1), Perceived Choice (F2), Pressure/Tension (F3), and Effort/Importance (F4). The items in the first factor (F1: Interest/Enjoyment) have strong primary loadings with values greater than 0.6, and the majority of proportion (36%) is explained by the first factor. These results are similar to the findings obtained in previous validation of the IMI conducted by McAuley, Duncan and

Tammen (1989), Markland and Hardy (1997), Monteiro *et al.* (2015). According to the cut-off value defined by Yurdugul (2008), the first eigenvalue has a level of 4.2 indicating stability in the Cronbach's α for a sample size ($N = 141$) between 100 to 300 observation.

B.2.2 Reliability Tests of the Adapted Portuguese IMI

The overall and internal consistency of the adapted Portuguese IMI had been evaluated by reliability tests in the global sample, and in the data collected over each empirical study (the pilot study, and the first and third studies). Table 32 shows the results of the reliability tests in which the Cronbach's alpha (α) for the Intrinsic Motivation have good overall consistency for the global sample and the data collected in each empirical study with values greater than 0.80. The Cronbach's alpha (α) in the scales of *IE: Interest/Enjoyment*, *PC: Perceived Choice*, *PT: Pressure/Tension* indicate good consistency and high reliability for all the samples with values greater than 0.70 and 0.80. The Cronbach's alpha (α) in the scale of *EI: Effort/Importance* indicate an acceptable consistency for the global sample and the data collected over the third empirical study. Although the Cronbach's alpha (α) in the scale of *EI: Effort/Importance* have values less than 0.70 for the data collected over the pilot and first studies, these values ($\alpha_{pilot} = 0.699$ and $\alpha_{third} = 0.692$) are consider acceptable because they are close to 0.70.

Separate reliability tests had also been conducted in the adapted Portuguese IMI for the collected data in each empirical study and by dividing this data into: responses from students who participated in non-gamified CL sessions (*non-gamified*), responses from students who participated in ontology-based CL sessions (*ont-gamified*), and responses from students who participated in CL sessions that had been gamified without using ontologies (*w/o-gamified*). Table 33 shows the results of these reliability tests. For the data collected over the pilot study where the groups of responses had been divided into ont-gamified CL sessions and non-gamified CL sessions, the results of reliability tests indicate, in the majority of scales and groups, highly consistent with good (Cronbach's α in 0.80s) and excellent (Cronbach's α in 0.90s) internal consistency. The Cronbach's α indicates only questionable internal consistency for the "*ont-gamified*" group in the scale of *PT: Pressure/Tension* with a Cronbach's alpha $\alpha = 0.608$. In the scale of *EI: Effort/Importance*, the reliability test for the "*non-gamified*" group indicates a Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.690$ that is a value close to the threshold of 0.70 by which its internal consistency is consider acceptable.

For the data collected over the first empirical study where the groups of responses had been divided into ont-gamified CL sessions and w/o-gamified CL sessions, the results of reliability tests indicates good and excellent internal consistency in all the scales and groups, the only exception occurs for the "*ont-gamified*" group in the scale of *EI: Effort/Importance* that indicates a questionable consistency with a Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.632$. For the data collected over the third empirical study where the groups of responses had been divided into ont-gamified CL sessions and w/o-gamified CL sessions, the results of reliability tests shows highly internal

reliability in all the scales and groups. Only, the result in the group “*ont-gamified*” for the scale of *EI: Effort/Importance* indicates a poor internal consistency with a Cronbach’s $\alpha = 0.580$.

Table 32 – Result of reliability analysis for the adapted Portuguese IMI

Cronbach's alpha (α)	Global	Pilot Study	First Study	Third Study
<i>Intrinsic Motivation</i>	0.894	0.890	0.865	0.850
<i>IE: Interest/Enjoyment</i>	0.926	0.944	0.895	0.917
<i>PC: Perceived Choice</i>	0.882	0.813	0.876	0.905
<i>PT: Pressure/Tension</i>	0.861	0.770	0.835	0.848
<i>EI: Effort/Importance</i>	0.724	0.699	0.692	0.783


Table 33 – Results of reliability tests in the adapted Portuguese IMI for each empirical study

Cronbach's alpha (α)	Global	<i>non-gamified</i>	<i>ont-gamified</i>	<i>w/o-gamified</i>
<i>Pilot study: Intrinsic Motivation</i>	0.890	0.896	0.850	
<i>Pilot study: Interest/Enjoyment</i>	0.944	0.931	0.947	
<i>Pilot study: Perceived Choice</i>	0.813	0.811	0.759	
<i>Pilot study: Pressure/Tension</i>	0.770	0.833	0.608	
<i>Pilot study: Effort/Importance</i>	0.699	0.690	0.704	
<i>First study: Intrinsic Motivation</i>	0.865	0.859	0.830	
<i>First study: Interest/Enjoyment</i>	0.895	0.886	0.894	
<i>First study: Perceived Choice</i>	0.876	0.862	0.871	
<i>First study: Pressure/Tension</i>	0.835	0.860	0.811	
<i>First study: Effort/Importance</i>	0.692	0.710	0.632	
<i>Third study: Intrinsic Motivation</i>	0.850		0.782	0.875
<i>Third study: Interest/Enjoyment</i>	0.917		0.929	0.906
<i>Third study: Perceived Choice</i>	0.905		0.883	0.908
<i>Third study: Pressure/Tension</i>	0.848		0.823	0.879
<i>Third study: Effort/Importance</i>	0.783		0.580	0.878

B.2.3 Factorial Structure of the Adapted Portuguese IMMS

Figure 9 shows the multidimensional, second-order factor and bi-factor models that had been tested in the CFA to validate the factorial structure of the adapted Portuguese IMMS. The construction of these models had been conducted according to the criteria defined in the validation procedure by removing items that had loaded with a value less than 0.4, and also, by removing items that had cross-loading less than 0.2. This construction ensures that the items correspond to the scale for which they are intended, and that the Cronbach's α is stable.

Figure 9 – Models tested in the CFA to validate the factorial structure of the adapted Portuguese IMMS



Instead to load in the scale of *A: attention*, the Items 08, 10 and 21 loaded in the scale of *R: Relevance*. The Item 08 - “A atividade foi muito abstrata que foi difícil manter minha atenção” as an adapted and translated version of “The lesson was so abstract that it was hard to keep my attention on it” - was understood by the participants in the sense of abstraction rather than keeping attention, thereby this item has more concordance with the scale of *R: Relevance*. The Item 10 - “O ambiente em que foi executada a atividade pareceu sem graça e desagradável” as an adapted and translated version of “The pages of this lesson looked dry and unappealing” - was understood in the sense of quality of the CL session rather than keeping focus, thereby this item lacks of concordance with the scale of *A: Attention*. The Item 21 - “O ambiente e as tarefas da atividade foram chatos ou entediantes” as an adapted and translated version of “The style of writing was boring” - was understood by the participants in the sense of quality rather than feeling bored, thereby this item is correlated with the scale of *R: Relevance*. The Item 13 - “A atividade teve coisas que estimularam minha curiosidade” as an adapted and translated version of “The lesson had things that stimulated my curiosity” - and the Item 17 - “Aprendi algumas coisas que foram surpreendentes e/ou inesperadas” as an adapted version of “Aprendi algumas coisas que foram surpreendentes e/ou inesperadas” - were understood by the participants in the sense of feeling comfortable rather than playing close attention, thereby these both items loaded in the scale of *S: Satisfaction* rather than loaded in the scale of *A: attention*.

Table 34 shows the goodness fit statistics for the models tested in the validation of the adapted Portuguese IMMS. The results presented in this table indicate that all the models have

adequate goodness fit indices for all the samples (the global sample, and the samples obtained over the second and third empirical studies). Based on these results, the model that best fits the global sample is the bi-factor model with $\chi^2 = 22.29$ that outperforms the multidimensional model ($\chi^2 = 26.39$), and the second-order factor model ($\chi^2 = 26.39$). The AGFI index has the same value in the multidimensional and second-order model, and these indices are outperformed by the bi-factor model with $TLI = 0.99$ and $CFI = 0.97$. The RMSEA of all models indicates good fit with values less than 0.08.

Table 34 – Goodness of fit statistics in the validation of the adapted Portuguese IMMS

	df	χ^2	AGFI	TLI	CFI	RMSEA	CI.lwr	CI.upr
Global sample: Multidimensional model	19.07	26.39	1.00	0.98	0.93	0.06	0	0.11
Global sample: Second-order factor model	19.07	26.39	1.00	0.98	0.93	0.06	0	0.11
Global sample: Bi-factor model	18.62	22.29	1.00	0.99	0.97	0.04	0	0.10
Second study: Multidimensional model	12.04	13.65	1.00	0.99	0.97	0.05	0	0.14
Second study: Second-order model	12.04	13.65	1.00	0.99	0.97	0.05	0	0.14
Second study: Bi-factor model	11.51	12.14	1.00	1.00	0.99	0.03	0	0.14
Third study: Multidimensional model	12.65	13.83	0.99	0.99	0.97	0.04	0	0.13
Third study: Second-order factor model	12.65	13.83	0.99	0.99	0.97	0.04	0	0.13
Third study: Bi-factor model	14.08	16.55	0.99	0.97	0.95	0.06	0	0.14

df: degree of freedom; AGFI: Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index; CFI: Comparative Fit Index; TLI: Tucker-Lewis Index;

RMSEA: Root Mean Square Error of Approximation

In relation to the data collected in each empirical study, the goodness of fit statistics (shown in Table 34) for the validation of the adapted Portuguese IMMS have slight differences. For the data collected over the second empirical study, the bi-factor model with $\chi^2 = 12.14$ fits better than the multidimensional model and the second-order factor model. For the data collected over the third empirical study, the multidimensional model and the second-order factor model with $\chi^2 = 13.83$ outperform the bi-factor model ($\chi^2 = 16.55$), but there are not difference in the AGFI index. With the data collected over the third empirical study, the multidimensional model and second-order factor model with $TLI = 0.99$ and $CFI = 0.97$ outperform the bi-factor model ($TLI = 0.97$ and $CFI = 0.95$).

Table 35 shows the summary of the factor analysis conducted with the global sample for the adapted Portuguese IMMS. The factor loadings, eigenvalues, cumulative variance and proportion explained by the items indicates the emergence of tree factors: Attention (F1), Relevance (F2), and Satisfaction (F3). The items in the first factor (F1: Attention) have strong primary loadings with values greater than 0.6, and the majority of proportion (50%) is explained by the first factor. These results are similars to the findings obtained in previous validation of the IMMS conducted by Loorbach *et al.* (2015), Cook *et al.* (2009), Huang and Hew (2016). According to the cut-off value defined by Yurdugul (2008), the first eigenvalue has a level of 3.9 indicating stability in the Cronbach's α for a sample size ($N = 110$) between 100 to 300 observation .

Table 35 – Summary of factor analysis for the adapted Portuguese IMMS

		MR1	MR2	MR3
<i>A: Attention</i>				
Item12: <i>A forma como a informação foi organizada no ambiente ...</i>		0.857	-0.198	0.203
Item19: <i>O feedback ou outros elementos fornecidos na atividade, ...</i>		0.785	-0.004	0.243
Item04: <i>O ambiente e tarefas da atividade foram atraentes</i>		0.738	-0.304	0.204
Item20: <i>A variedade de tarefas e coisas no ambiente, ajudou a ...</i>		0.726	-0.133	0.270
Item16: <i>As tarefas e sua organização na atividade transmitiram a ...</i>		0.693	-0.241	0.334
Item01: <i>Houve algo interessante no início desta atividade que chamou ...</i>		0.653	-0.337	0.234
<i>R: Relevance</i>				
Item15: <i>A quantidade de tarefas repetitivas na atividade na atividade me ...</i>		-0.087	0.614	-0.125
Item21: <i>O ambiente e as tarefas da atividade foram chatos ou entediantes</i>		-0.321	0.662	-0.144
Item10: <i>O ambiente em que foi executada a atividade pareceu sem graça ...</i>		-0.347	0.625	-0.076
Item08: <i>A atividade foi muito abstrata que foi difícil manter minha atenção</i>		0.011	0.484	-0.179
<i>S: Satisfaction</i>				
Item13: <i>A atividade teve coisas que estimularam minha curiosidade</i>		0.307	-0.360	0.810
Item14: <i>Eu realmente gostei de participar na atividade</i>		0.434	-0.343	0.644
Item17: <i>Aprendi algumas coisas que foram surpreendentes e/ou inesperadas</i>		0.388	-0.104	0.568
SS loadings		3.995	2.019	1.849
Cumulative Var		0.307	0.463	0.605
Proportion Explained		0.508	0.257	0.235

CFI: 0.966; TLI: 0.989; df: 18.619; chi²: 22.291; p-value: 0.25; RMSEA: 0.043 [0, 0.104];

B.2.4 Reliability Tests of the Adapted Portuguese IMMS

The overall and internal consistency of the adapted Portuguese IMMS had been evaluated by reliability tests in the global sample, and in the data collected over each empirical study (the second and third empirical studies). Table 36 shows the results of the reliability tests in which the Cronbach's alpha (α) for the Level of Motivation have good overall consistency ($\alpha = 0.909$) for the global sample and the data collected in the second and third empirical studies with values greater than 0.80. The Cronbach's α in the scales of *A: Attention*, *R: Relevance*, *S: Satisfaction* indicate good consistency and high reliability for all the samples with values greater than 0.70 and 0.80. The only exception had been found in the scale of *R: Relevance* for the data collected over the third empirical study in which the Cronbach's α with value 0.66 indicates questionable reliability, but this value is close to 0.70, thereby the reliability is considered acceptable.

Table 36 – Result of reliability analysis for the adapted Portuguese IMMS

Cronbach's alpha (α)	Global	Second Study	Third Study
<i>Level of Motivation</i>	0.909	0.930	0.874
<i>A: Attention</i>	0.918	0.930	0.900
<i>R: Relevance</i>	0.728	0.748	0.696
<i>S: Satisfaction</i>	0.851	0.836	0.876

Separate reliability tests had also been conducted in the adapted Portuguese IMMS for the collected data in each empirical study and by dividing this data into: responses from students who participated in non-gamified CL sessions (*non-gamified*), responses from students who participated in ontology-based CL sessions (*ont-gamified*), and responses from students who participated in CL sessions that had been gamified without using ontologies (*w/o-gamified*). Table 37 shows the results of these reliability tests, where the Cronbach's α in the majority of scales and groups indicate good (α in 0.80s) and excellent (α in 0.90s) internal consistency. The only questionable internal consistency occurs in the scale of *R: Relevance* for the data collected over the third study in the "*w/o-gamified*" group with a Cronbach's α of 0.684, but this value is close to the threshold of 0.7 which by this internal consistency is considered as acceptable.

Table 37 – Results of reliability tests in the adapted Portuguese IMMS for each empirical study

Cronbach's alpha (α)	Global	<i>non-gamified</i>	<i>ont-gamified</i>	<i>w/o-gamified</i>
<i>Second study:</i> Level of Motivation	0.930	0.932	0.926	
<i>Second study:</i> Attention	0.930	0.935	0.915	
<i>Second study:</i> Relevance	0.748	0.728	0.784	
<i>Second study:</i> Satisfaction	0.836	0.851	0.817	
<i>Third study:</i> Level of Motivation	0.874		0.886	0.866
<i>Third study:</i> Attention	0.900		0.924	0.881
<i>Third study:</i> Relevance	0.696		0.725	0.684
<i>Third study:</i> Satisfaction	0.876		0.884	0.889

ITEM RESPONSE THEORY-BASED MODELS FOR MEASURING MOTIVATION AND LEARNING OUTCOMES

For the empirical studies conducted in this PhD thesis dissertation, statistical instruments based on the Item Response Theory (IRT) had been used to estimate the participants' motivation and the learning outcomes. Instead to use the average scores of motivation surveys as measurement of motivation, Rating Scale Model (RSM) is used to estimate the intrinsic motivation and the level of motivation. The learning outcomes had been calculated as gains in skill/knowledge by stacking pre-test and post-test data with Generalized Partial Credit Model (GPCM) to estimate the changes in skill/knowledge when the data were gathered from multiple choice knowledge questionnaires and programming tasks. The first section (section C.1) details the construction and validation procedure of IRT-based models employed in the construction of instruments for measuring the motivation and learning outcomes in the empirical studies. The second section (section C.2) details the procedure for stacking the pre-test data and post-test data with IRT-based models for estimating changes in the latent trait estimates from the pre-test to post-test phase.

The rest of sections are organized as follows:

- section C.3 presents the validation and results of the RSM-based instrument used to estimate the intrinsic motivation in the pilot empirical study;
- section C.4 presents the validation and results of the RSM-based instrument used to estimate the intrinsic motivation in the first empirical study;
- section C.5 presents the validation and results of the RSM-based instrument used to estimate the intrinsic motivation in the second empirical study;

- section C.6 presents the validation and results of the RSM-based instrument used to estimate the intrinsic motivation in the third empirical study;
- section C.7 presents the validation and results of the RSM-based instrument used to estimate the level of motivation in the third empirical study;
- section C.8 presents the validation and stacking procedure for estimating gains in skill-/knowledge of the pilot empirical study;
- section C.9 presents the validation and stacking procedure for estimating gains in skill-/knowledge of the first empirical study;
- section C.10 presents the validation and stacking procedure for estimating gains in skill-/knowledge of the second empirical study; and
- section C.11 presents the validation and stacking procedure for estimating gains in skill-/knowledge of the third empirical study;

C.1 Construction and Validation of IRT-based Models

Let be $i = \{1, 2, \dots, I\}$ the items in a set of responses; and let be $x = \{0, 1, \dots, X\}$ the categories of responses for the item i ; then, the probability that a person n scores x on the item i is described in a nonparametric IRT-based model by the item response model (ADAMS; WU, 2007; ADAMS; WILSON; WU, 1997) as:

$$P(X_{n,i} = x | \theta_n) \propto \exp(b_{i,x}\theta_n + a_{i,x}\xi).$$

where the symbol “ \propto ” means that the probabilities in the responses are normalized such that $\sum_{x=0}^X P(X_{n,i} = x | \theta_n) = 1$; the parameter $a_{i,x}\xi$ is the item intercept ($AXsi$) related to the location on latent trait; and the parameter $b_{i,x}$ is the slope related to the item discrimination.

As this item response model is a generalization of nonparametric models (such as Rasch model, Rating Scale Model - RSM, Partial Credit Model - PCM, General Partial Credit Model - GPCM, and Nominal Response Model - NRM), to be used as an instrument for measuring unidimensional latent traits such as the motivation and skill/knowledge of participants in the empirical studies, three fundamental assumptions related to unidimensional nonparametric models must be checked. These assumptions are the the unidimensionality of data structure, the local independence of items, and the monotonicity of the item characteristic curve. The unidimensionality determines whether items in the instrument measure only one latent trait θ , the local independence verifies the statistical relationship between examinees' responses for each pair of items in the instrument, and the monotonicity checks the relationship between the item responses and the latent trait θ measured by the instrument.

After to check these three fundamental assumptions, the values for the intercept and slope parameters are estimated by means of the Marginal Maximum Likelihood (MML) method

(BOCK; AITKIN, 1981); then, the latent trait θ that represents the measurement of motivation or skill/knowledge for the participants in the empirical studies are computed by the Weighted Likelihood Estimator (WLE) (WARM, 1989).

C.1.1 Checking Assumptions

Test of Unidimensionality

Currently, there are a variety of statistic methods to assess the dimensionality of IRT-based models (HATTIE, 1985; NANDAKUMAR *et al.*, 1998), but not one of them is universal to determine the dimensionality. The most common statistic methods are based on factor analysis with eigenvalue-greater-than-one rule, ratio of first-to-second eigenvalues, parallel analysis, Root Means Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) or chi-square tests. For the data gathered by means of motivation surveys, the unidimensional Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) (BROWN, 2014) and the DETECT analysis (STOUT *et al.*, 1996; ZHANG, 2007) had been carried out to determine the dimensionality of IRT-based models.

Indices based on factor analysis, Chi-square (χ^2), Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index (AGFI), Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI), and Comparative Fit Index (CFI) are used in the unidimensional CFA as indices to evaluate whether the items in is unidimensional (BROWN, 2014). Lower values of the Chi-square (χ^2) indicates best fit. Values of AGFI, TLI and CFI are considered acceptable for the range of 0.90 to 0.95, and they indicate good fit when these values are higher than 0.95. The DETECT analysis under a conditional covariance-based nonparametric multidimensionality assessment computes the indices DETECT, ASSI and RATIO (ZHANG, 2007), where DETECT index greater than 1.00 indicates strong multidimensionality, DETECT index between 0.40 and 1.00 indicates moderate multidimensionality, DETECT index between 0.20 and 0.40 indicates weak multidimensionality, and DETECT index lower than 0.20 indicates essential unidimensionality. *Essential unidimensionality* in the data structure is indicated when the $\text{ASSI} < 0.25$ and $\text{RATIO} < 0.36$, and *essential deviation from unidimensionality* is indicated when the $\text{ASSI} > 0.25$ and $\text{RATIO} > 0.36$.

The test of unidimensionality had been carried out in R software version 3.4.3 (R Core Team, 2017) in which the lavaan package version 0.5 (ROSSEEL, 2012) and the sirt package version 2.6 (ROBITZSCH, 2018) had been used to conduct the unidimensional CFA and the DETECT analysis, respectively. The R scripts for the test of unidimensionality are available at the URL: <<https://geiser.github.io/phd-thesis-evaluation/>>

Test of Local Independence

For unidimensional IRT models:

“Local independence means that when abilities influencing test performance are held constant, examinees’ responses to any pair of items are

statistically independent. In other words, after taking examinees' abilities into account, no relationship exists between examinees' responses to different items. Simply put, this means that the abilities specified in the model are the only factors influencing examinees' responses to test items" (HAMBLETON; SWAMINATHAN; ROGERS, 1991)

Thus, the independence is tested by the $Q3$ statistic of item pairs i and j in which the correlation of items i and j is calculated as $Q3_{i,j} = \text{Cor}(e_{n,i}; e_{n,j})$, where $e_{n,i} = X_{n,i} - E(X_{n,i})$ represents the residual between the response of a person n for the item i and the expected response. According to the null test in the condition of independence, the effect size of model fit is defined by the average of absolute values of adjusted correlation $Q3$ ($MADaQ3$), and by the maximum adjusted correlation $Q3$ ($maxaQ3$). In this sense, under local independence the average of absolute of adjusted correlation $Q3$ is slightly smaller than zero ($MADaQ3 \approx 0$), and the null condition is not rejected ($p > 0.05$).

The TAM: Test analysis modules package version 2.10 (ROBITZSCH; KIEFER; WU, 2018) is employed to carried out the test of local independence in R software version 3.4.3 (R Core Team, 2017). The R scripts for the test of local independence are available at the URL: <<https://geiser.github.io/phd-thesis-evaluation/>>

Test of Monotonicity

For evaluating the manifest monotonicity in the IRT-based models, the Mokken scale analysis (MOKKEN, 1971; Van der Ark, 2007) had been carried out with the data gathered through motivation surveys. In this analysis, the monotone homogeneity model and the double monotonicity model are used to check the assumptions of monotonicity. Employing these models, the *item step response function* $P(X_i \geq x|\theta)$ calculates the ordering of the scores for each item i reflecting the hypothesized ordering on the latent trait θ . The violation of monotonicity in this function is indicated at a significance level $\alpha = 0.05$ when the criteria $minvi$ is greater than 0.03.

The test of monotonicity is carried out in R software version 3.4.3 (R Core Team, 2017) by employing the mokken package version 2.8.10 (Van der Ark, 2012; Van der Ark, 2007). The R scripts for the test of monotonicity are available at the URL: <<https://geiser.github.io/phd-thesis-evaluation/>>

C.1.2 Estimating Item Parameters

Employing the Marginal Maximum Likelihood (MML) method (BOCK; AITKIN, 1981), the item intercepts $AXsi$ ($a_{i,k}\xi$) and the slopes related to the item discrimination ($b_{i,x}$) had been calculated by the TAM: Test analysis modules package version 2.10 (ROBITZSCH; KIEFER; WU, 2018) in the R software version 3.4.3 (R Core Team, 2017). The R scripts used for estimating the item parameters are available at the URL: <<https://geiser.github.io/phd-thesis-evaluation/>>

C.1.3 Obtaining the Latent Trait Estimates

The latent trait estimates (intrinsic motivation, level of motivation and skill/knowledge) is calculated by the Weighted Likelihood Estimator (WLE) (WARM, 1989) in which the latent trait distribution is assumed as a normal distribution with mean of $\mu = 0$ and units in *logits*. These estimates had been calculated in the R software version 3.4.3 (R Core Team, 2017) employing the TAM: Test analysis modules package version 2.10 (ROBITZSCH; KIEFER; WU, 2018). The R scripts used to obtain the latent trait estimates are available at the URL: <<https://geiser.github.io/phd-thesis-evaluation/>>

C.2 Stacking Procedure with IRT-based Models

Traditionally, the measures of changes in latent traits estimates (e.g. motivation, mood, and skill/knowledge) are calculated as a difference of scores in the IRT-base gathering instruments. Such difference is calculated by subtracting the initial score obtained in a pre-test phase from the final score obtained in post-test phase, but this measurement causes some errors of measurements and misinterpretation (LORD, 1956; LORD, 1958). In addition, the variance, correlations, and reliability of score difference are dependent of population. To overcome these difficulties, different statistical methods such as residual change scores, and multi-wave methods have been proposed for measuring changes in latent traits estimates (DIMITROV; RUMRILL, 2003; ROGOSA; WILLETT, 1985), but the use of IRT-based models is the most effective in solving the classical problems in the measurement of change in latent trait estimates (GLÜCK; SPIEL, 1997; QUEIROZ *et al.*, 2013).

Measurement of change in the latent trait estimates using IRT-based models presents a challenge in which the measurement from Time 1 to Time 2 should also consider a change in the item parameters. To measure this change, it is necessary to define a reference frame encompassing both times in one unambiguous representation. This process of placing Time 1 data and Time 2 data together in an unique frame of reference is known as *stacking procedure* (WRIGHT, 2003). For the empirical studies conducted in this dissertation, the stacking procedure involves the treating of formative assessments as source of data in which the Time 1 is the pre-test phase and Time 2 is the post-test phase. As these data are gathered from programming tasks and multiple knowledge choice questionnaires, the General Partial Credit Model (GPCM) (MASTERS; WRIGHT, 1996) had been used as instrument to estimate the skill/knowledge. With this model, the measure of gains in skills and knowledge is carried out in three steps: (1) Data verification, (2) Item splitting, and (3) Calculating changes. This stacking procedure had been carried out in the R software version 3.4.3 (R Core Team, 2017) using the TAM: Test analysis modules package version 2.10 (ROBITZSCH; KIEFER; WU, 2018). The R scripts for the stacking procedure with GPCM are available at the URL: <<https://geiser.github.io/phd-thesis-evaluation/>>

C.2.1 Step 1: Data Verification

The data verification consists into carried out GPCM analyses for the data gathered in pre-test phase and post-test phase, independently. This verification aims to detect and eliminate gross errors in the data entry. As result of these analyses, items and observations that distort or degrade the measurement system had been removed from the stacked analysis. For the identification of these items and observations, *Infit* and *Outfit* statistics are used in which mean-square values greater than 2 indicate the distortion and degradation. The stability of the reference frame is also obtained in this step by plotting the item parameters estimated by the GPCM analyses with the post-test data (Time 2 data) against those item parameters estimated with the pre-test data (Time 1). In this plot, a close fit to the identity line indicates stability in the reference frame.

Prior to the data verification, the responses gathered from multiple choice questionnaires and the programming tasks are scored according to the rules described below.

Scoring-rule for Multiple Choice Questionnaires

Let NBC be the number of correct responses which have been checked, NM be the number of wrong responses; and NMC be the number of wrong responses which have been checked; then, the scoring rule for a n-th question in a multiple choice questionnaire is given by:

$$score(n) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } NBC = 0 \text{ or} \\ (NBC)(NM + 1) - NMC & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Construction of Guttman-based Scoring-rules for Programming Tasks

Guttman-based scoring rules for programming tasks (GUTTMAN, 2017) are scoring rules based on the principle of Guttman scale in which a unidimensional scale is defined as an aggregation of different indicators. In this sense, a Guttman-based scoring rule consists in a function that defines the combination of indicators based on a set of thresholds. For example, giving the indicators of correctness (Q) and time (T); and the thresholds of $Q = 1$ when the programming task has been solved adequately, and $T_n = 1$ when the time to solve the programming task is less than n-th percentile; then, a Guttman-structure scoring rule can be defined by the cartesian product $Q \times T_{75} \times T_{50} \times T_{25}$ as follows (x denotes either of 0 and 1):

- $(0, x, x, x) = 0$ when the solution is incorrect
and the solving time is irrelevant
- $(1, 0, x, x) = 1$ when the solution is correct
and the solving time is greater than 75-th percentile (3rd quartile)
- $(1, 1, 0, x) = 2$ when the solution is correct
and the solving time is greater than 50-th percentile (median)
- $(1, 1, 1, 0) = 3$ when the solution is correct
and the solving time is greater than 25-th percentile (1st quartile)
- $(1, 1, 1, 1) = 4$ when the solution is correct
and the solving time is less than 25-th percentile (1st quartile)

Let P_i be a programming task solved by the participants during the pre-test and post-test phases, it has been scored according to the following four Guttman-based scoring rules:

$P_iS_1:$	Q	
	$(0) = 0$	when the solution is incorrect
	$(1) = 0$	when the solution is correct
$P_iS_2:$	$Q \times T_{50}$	
	$(0, x) = 0$	when the solution is incorrect and the solving time is irrelevant
	$(1, 0) = 1$	when the solution is correct and the solving time is greater than median
	$(1, 1) = 2$	when the solution is correct and the solving time is less than median
$P_iS_3:$	$Q \times T_{67} \times T_{33}$	
	$(0, x, x) = 0$	when the solution is incorrect and the solving time is irrelevant
	$(1, 0, x) = 1$	when the solution is correct and the solving time is greater than 33-th percentile
	$(1, 1, 0) = 2$	when the solution is correct and the solving time is greater than 67-th percentile
	$(1, 1, 1) = 3$	when the solution is correct and the solving time is less than 67-th percentile
$P_iS_4:$	$Q \times T_{75} \times T_{50} \times T_{25}$	
	$(0, x, x, x) = 0$	when the solution is incorrect and the solving time is irrelevant
	$(1, 0, x, x) = 1$	when the solution is correct and the solving time is greater than 75-th percentile (3rd quartile)
	$(1, 1, 0, x) = 2$	when the solution is correct and the solving time is greater than 50-th percentile (median)
	$(1, 1, 1, 0) = 3$	when the solution is correct and the solving time is greater than 25-th percentile (1st quartile)
	$(1, 1, 1, 1) = 4$	when the solution is correct and the solving time is less than 25-th percentile (1st quartile)

After scoring the programming tasks with the four Guttman-based scoring rules (P_iS_1 , P_iS_2 , P_iS_3 and P_iS_4) defined above, each possible combination of rules is tested one by one using the GPCM and a set of programming tasks related to the pre-test phase or post-test phase. With the results of these tests, the measurement instrument of skill/knowledge for the pre-test phase or post-test phase is built employing the combination of rules that best fits with the data gathered over the empirical studies. The chosen set of Guttman-based scoring rules is the one that has best indices in the tests of unidimensionality, local independence and monotonicity for the GPCM (detailed in subsection C.1.1).

C.2.2 Step 2: Item Splitting

In this step, data gathered from the pre-test phase (Time 1) and post-test phase (Time 2) are stacked together vertically, so that each participant in the empirical study appears twice times

and each item appears once time. With these stacked data, the item parameters are estimated employing the MML method in the GPCM. These item parameters are used to plot the stability of reference frame, where: (1) items that are away from the identity line are “*splitting*” into two separate items by splitting their responses into two data sets with missing data at the other time point in which the item is defined; and (2) items that are close to the identity line defines the calibration items for calculating the changes in skill/knowledge.

C.2.3 Step 3: Calculating Changes in Latent Trait Estimates

For calculating the changes in skill/knowledge as changes in the latent trait estimates, the post-test phase (Time 2) is installed as the benchmark to measure the change from the pre-test phase (Time 1). Item parameters (D_2) and skill/knowledge (B_2) for the calibration of measurement system are obtained by a GPCM using data gathered from the post-test phase (Time 2). These item parameters (D_2) are applied in the GPCM with the data gathered from the pre-test phase (Time 1) for estimating the skill/knowledge (B_1) and the item parameters for the split items (D_1).

With the skill/knowledge measured in the pre-test phase (Time 1, B_1) against the skill/-knowledge in the post-test phase (Time 2, B_2), the changes in the skill/knowledge are calculated as $B_2 - B_1$ that define an unambiguously frame of reference.

C.3 RSM-based Instrument for Measuring the Intrinsic Motivation in the Pilot Empirical Study

C.3.1 Checking Assumptions

Test of Unidimensionality

Table 38 shows the results for the test of unidimensionality in which the goodness of fit statistics indicate moderate multidimensionality ($0.40 < DETECT < 1.00$) to measure the intrinsic motivation with a DETECT index of 0.565. Essential unidimensionality ($ASSI < 0.25$ and $RATIO < 0.36$) is indicated by the ASSI and RATIO indices with values of 0.020 and 0.015, respectively. The index of $AGFI = 0.945$ in the unidimensional CFA indicates an acceptable fit for measuring the *Intrinsic Motivation*. The sub-scales of *Interest/Enjoyment*, *Perceived Choice*, *Pressure/Tension* and *Effort/Importance* have a good fit indicated by the AGFI index with values greater than 0.95. A good fit with the unidimensional CFA is indicated by the TLI and CFI indices for all the sub-scales with exception of the *Perceived Choice*. The ASSI index indicates essential unidimensionality in the sub-scales of *Interest/Enjoyment* and *Perceived Choice*, and it indicates an essential deviation from unidimensionality in the sub-scales of *Pressure/Tension* and *Effort/Importance*. Essential unidimensionality is indicated by the RATIO index in the sub-scales

of *Interest/Enjoyment* and *Effort/Importance*, and essential deviation from unidimensionality is indicated in the sub-scale of *Perceived Choice* and *Pressure/Tension* by this index.

Table 38 – Goodness of fit statistics related to the test of unidimensionality in the RSM-based instrument for measuring the intrinsic motivation in the pilot empirical study

	df	chisq	AGFI	TLI	CFI	DETECT	ASSI	RATIO
Intrinsic Motivation	8.451	19.955	0.945	0.690	0.729	0.565	0.020	0.015
Interest/Enjoyment	2.468	1.426	0.998	1.023	1.000	0.716	0.067	0.049
Perceived Choice	3.064	9.713	0.978	0.711	0.788	22.998	0.200	0.714
Pressure/Tension	1.982	0.534	0.998	1.117	1.000	17.068	0.333	0.873
Effort/Importance	0.000	0.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	10.746	0.333	0.358

df: degree of freedom; AGFI: Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index; CFI: Comparative Fit Index; TLI: Tucker-Lewis Index;

Test of Local Independence

Results from the test of local independence in the RSM-based instrument for measuring the intrinsic motivation in the pilot empirical study are summarized in Table 39. According to the p-values, the null condition of local independence is not rejected in any of the four sub-scales of RSM-based instrument. The Standardized Root Mean Squared Residual (SRMSR) indicates a good fit (< 0.10) for the sub-scales of *Interest/Enjoyment* and *Effort/Importance*, and acceptable fit (0.10s) for the *Perceived Choice* and *Pressure/Tension*.

Table 39 – Item residual correlation statistics related to the test of local independence in the RSM-based instrument for measuring the intrinsic motivation in the pilot empirical study

	max.chisq	maxaQ3	MADaQ3	SRMSR	p.value
Interest/Enjoyment	498.445	0.353	0.157	0.083	1.000
Perceived Choice	114.058	0.500	0.248	0.165	0.093
Pressure/Tension	36.673	0.302	0.214	0.153	0.696
Effort/Importance	38.718	0.066	0.044	0.037	1.000

aQ3: adjusted correlation of item residuals; maxaQ3: maximum aQ3;

MADaQ3: Median Absolute Deviation of aQ3;

Test of Monotonicity

Table 40 summarizes the test of monotonicity in the RSM-based instrument for measuring the intrinsic motivation in the pilot empirical study. These results indicates that there are no one violation of monotonicity in the items at the significance level $\alpha = 0.05$.

Table 40 – Test of monotonicity in the RSM-based instrument for measuring the intrinsic motivation in the pilot empirical study

	ItemH	ac	vi	vi/ac	maxvi	sum	sum/ac	zmax	zsig	crit
Interest/Enjoyment:Item22IE	0.85	0	0		0.00	0.0		0	0	0
Interest/Enjoyment:Item09IE	0.79	0	0		0.00	0.0		0	0	0
Interest/Enjoyment:Item12IE	0.81	0	0		0.00	0.0		0	0	0
Interest/Enjoyment:Item24IE	0.77	4	0	0.0	0.00	0.0	0.00	0	0	0

vi: number of violations; vi/ac: proportion of active pairs; maxvi: maximum violations;
sum: sum of all violations; zmax: maximum z-value; zsig: number of significant z-values; crit: critical value

Table 40 – (continued)

	ItemH	ac	vi	vi/ac	maxvi	sum	sum/ac	zmax	zsig	crit
Interest/Enjoyment:Item21IE	0.72	0	0		0.00	0.0		0	0	0
Interest/Enjoyment:Item01IE	0.69	0	0		0.00	0.0		0	0	0
Perceived Choice:Item17PC	0.60	4	0	0.0	0.00	0.0	0.00	0	0	0
Perceived Choice:Item15PC	0.47	4	0	0.0	0.00	0.0	0.00	0	0	0
Perceived Choice:Item06PC	0.52	1	0	0.0	0.00	0.0	0.00	0	0	0
Perceived Choice:Item02PC	0.47	5	0	0.0	0.00	0.0	0.00	0	0	0
Perceived Choice:Item08PC	0.38	0	0		0.00	0.0		0	0	0
Pressure/Tension:Item16PT	0.53	0	0		0.00	0.0		0	0	0
Pressure/Tension:Item14PT	0.45	3	0	0.0	0.00	0.0	0.00	0	0	0
Pressure/Tension:Item18PT	0.56	4	0	0.0	0.00	0.0	0.00	0	0	0
Pressure/Tension:Item11PT	0.36	0	0		0.00	0.0		0	0	0
Effort/Importance:Item13EI	0.46	0	0		0.00	0.0		0	0	0
Effort/Importance:Item03EI	0.44	0	0		0.00	0.0		0	0	0
Effort/Importance:Item07EI	0.48	0	0		0.00	0.0		0	0	0

vi: number of violations; vi/ac: proportion of active pairs; maxvi: maximum violations;
sum: sum of all violations; zmax: maximum z-value; zsig: number of significant z-values; crit: critical value

C.3.2 Item Parameters

Table 41 shows the estimated parameters for the RSM-based instrument used to measure the *Interest/Enjoyment* in the pilot empirical study. These parameters had been calculated using the MML method (BOCK; AITKIN, 1981), so that the value in row “B.Cat x ” and column “ i ” is the item slope $b_{i,x}$ of item i in the category “ x ”, and the value in the row “AXsi.Cat x ” and column “ i ” is the item intercept $a_{i,x}\xi$ of item i in the category “ x ”. According to the Infit/Outfit statistics of items, no one mean-square value is greater than 2.0 indicating that the measurement system of *Interest/Enjoyment* is not distorted or degraded by the items.

Table 41 – Estimated parameters in the RSM-based instrument for measuring the interest/enjoyment in the pilot empirical study

	Item01IE	Item09IE	Item12IE	Item21IE	Item22IE	Item24IE
xsi.item	0.888	-0.023	0.368	-0.132	0.332	0.472
B.Cat0	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
B.Cat1	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
B.Cat2	2.000	2.000	2.000	2.000	2.000	2.000
B.Cat3	3.000	3.000	3.000	3.000	3.000	3.000
B.Cat4	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000
B.Cat5	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000
B.Cat6	6.000	6.000	6.000	6.000	6.000	6.000
AXsi.Cat0	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
AXsi.Cat1	0.451	1.362	0.971	1.471	1.007	0.867
AXsi.Cat2	0.349	2.172	1.390	2.390	1.460	1.180
AXsi.Cat3	0.783	3.517	2.345	3.844	2.450	2.030
AXsi.Cat4	-0.153	3.493	1.929	3.929	2.070	1.510
AXsi.Cat5	-2.115	2.442	0.487	2.987	0.663	-0.037
AXsi.Cat6	-5.328	0.140	-2.205	0.794	-1.995	-2.834
Outfit	1.532	0.815	0.773	1.058	0.580	0.836
Infit	1.386	0.882	0.801	1.284	0.635	0.957

Table 42 shows the estimated parameters for the measurement instrument of *Perceived Choice* in which the Infit/Outfit statistics of items indicate that no one item distorts or degrades the measurement system with mean-square greater than 2.0.

Table 42 – Estimated parameters in the RSM-based instrument for measuring the perceived choice in the pilot empirical study

	Item02PC	Item06PC	Item08PC	Item15PC	Item17PC
xsi.item	0.112	-0.237	-0.491	0.030	-0.469
B.Cat0	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
B.Cat1	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
B.Cat2	2.000	2.000	2.000	2.000	2.000
B.Cat3	3.000	3.000	3.000	3.000	3.000
B.Cat4	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000
B.Cat5	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000
B.Cat6	6.000	6.000	6.000	6.000	6.000
AXsi.Cat0	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
AXsi.Cat1	1.185	1.534	1.788	1.267	1.766
AXsi.Cat2	0.898	1.597	2.104	1.062	2.061
AXsi.Cat3	2.082	3.130	3.891	2.328	3.826
AXsi.Cat4	1.103	2.500	3.515	1.431	3.428
AXsi.Cat5	0.368	2.115	3.383	0.779	3.275
AXsi.Cat6	-0.674	1.422	2.944	-0.181	2.814
Outfit	1.066	0.968	1.452	1.025	0.700
Infit	1.007	0.994	1.375	1.001	0.704

Table 43 shows the estimated parameters for the measurement instrument of *Pressure/Tension* in the pilot empirical study in which the Infit/Outfit statistics of items indicate that no one item distorts or degrades the measurement system with mean-square greater than 2.0.

Table 43 – Estimated parameters in the RSM-based instrument for measuring the pressure/tension in the pilot empirical study

	Item11PT	Item14PT	Item16PT	Item18PT
xsi.item	-0.036	0.288	-0.054	0.347
B.Cat0	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
B.Cat1	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
B.Cat2	2.000	2.000	2.000	2.000
B.Cat3	3.000	3.000	3.000	3.000
B.Cat4	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000
B.Cat5	5.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
B.Cat6	6.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
AXsi.Cat0	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
AXsi.Cat1	1.034	0.272	0.614	0.213
AXsi.Cat2	1.249	-0.275	0.410	-0.392
AXsi.Cat3	2.096	-0.190	0.837	-0.367
AXsi.Cat4	1.895	-1.152	0.217	-1.387
AXsi.Cat5	1.711			
AXsi.Cat6	0.216			
Outfit	1.355	1.000	0.861	0.850
Infit	1.361	0.915	0.842	0.919

Table 44 shows the estimated parameters for the measurement instrument of *Effort/Importance* in which the Infit/Outfit statistics of items indicate that no one item distorts or degrades the measurement system with mean-square greater than 2.0.

Table 44 – Estimated parameters in the RSM-based instrument for measuring the effort/importance in the pilot empirical study

	Item03EI	Item07EI	Item13EI
xsi.item	-1.793	-1.571	-1.620
B.Cat0	0.000	0.000	0.000
B.Cat1	1.000	1.000	1.000
B.Cat2	2.000	2.000	2.000
B.Cat3	3.000	3.000	3.000
B.Cat4	4.000	4.000	4.000
B.Cat5	5.000	5.000	5.000
B.Cat6	6.000	6.000	6.000
AXsi.Cat0	0.000	0.000	0.000
AXsi.Cat1	7.416	7.195	7.243
AXsi.Cat2	9.886	9.444	9.541
AXsi.Cat3	9.821	9.158	9.303
AXsi.Cat4	10.943	10.059	10.252
AXsi.Cat5	10.732	9.626	9.868
AXsi.Cat6	10.756	9.429	9.719
Outfit	1.012	1.063	0.987
Infit	0.992	1.035	1.030

C.3.3 ***Intrinsic Motivation as Latent Trait Estimates***

Table 45 shows the latent trait estimates by the RSM-based instrument for measuring the *Intrinsic motivation* in the pilot empirical study.

Table 45 – Latent trait estimates and person model fit of the RSM-based instrument for measuring the intrinsic motivation in the pilot empirical study

UserID	Intrinsic Motivation				Interest/Enjoyment				Perceived Choice				Pressure/Tension				Effort/Importance			
	theta	error	Outfit	Infit	theta	error	Outfit	Infit	theta	error	Outfit	Infit	theta	error	Outfit	Infit	theta	error	Outfit	Infit
10116	-0.404	0.154	0.569	0.557	-0.114	0.340	0.991	1.063	-0.842	0.347	0.487	0.456	0.207	0.387	0.482	0.499	-0.595	0.444	0.020	0.021
10120	0.969	0.240	0.595	0.566	1.906	0.483	0.791	0.888	1.372	0.492	0.530	0.588	-1.126	0.578	0.398	0.306	0.694	0.577	0.864	0.879
10121	0.050	0.161	0.661	0.694	0.399	0.382	1.481	1.713	0.587	0.361	0.402	0.425	0.345	0.396	0.487	0.452	-0.119	0.426	0.017	0.017
10122	-0.171	0.155	1.833	1.867	-2.052	0.572	0.878	0.690	1.170	0.443	0.441	0.480	-0.488	0.420	1.565	1.940	-0.119	0.426	1.391	1.366
10123	-0.311	0.154	0.497	0.495	-0.832	0.330	0.240	0.260	0.236	0.340	0.375	0.387	0.207	0.387	0.821	0.793	-0.430	0.428	0.672	0.685
10126	0.490	0.188	0.917	0.803	1.273	0.443	0.452	0.457	1.170	0.443	0.156	0.122	-0.488	0.420	0.854	0.996	-0.119	0.426	1.376	1.400
10127	0.183	0.167	1.085	1.042	1.906	0.483	0.740	0.808	0.236	0.340	0.780	0.781	-0.195	0.390	0.350	0.359	-0.779	0.473	0.434	0.443
10128	-0.521	0.155	2.364	2.405	-3.515	1.347	0.087	0.096	0.587	0.361	3.270	3.014	-0.336	0.401	2.149	2.637	-2.817	1.034	0.766	0.763
10129	-0.794	0.164	0.817	0.850	-1.785	0.486	0.427	0.471	-0.622	0.335	0.418	0.391	3.173	1.487	0.122	0.133	0.043	0.438	1.521	1.516
10130	-0.147	0.155	0.870	0.817	0.553	0.395	0.119	0.119	-0.305	0.330	0.676	0.674	1.413	0.633	0.328	0.321	0.694	0.577	0.282	0.288
10131	0.239	0.170	1.986	2.120	2.400	0.530	2.083	2.163	-0.959	0.358	1.745	1.866	-0.860	0.496	0.247	0.199	0.429	0.504	0.534	0.572
10132	-0.474	0.154	1.148	1.144	-3.515	1.347	0.087	0.096	-0.199	0.330	1.129	1.136	-0.195	0.390	0.252	0.298	0.221	0.462	0.454	0.421
10134	-0.666	0.159	0.281	0.298	-1.285	0.375	0.139	0.130	-0.731	0.340	0.743	0.778	0.345	0.396	0.232	0.232	-0.595	0.444	0.020	0.021
10135	-0.025	0.159	1.089	1.052	0.399	0.382	1.010	1.099	0.349	0.345	2.289	2.180	0.345	0.396	0.861	0.901	-0.274	0.422	0.757	0.757
10136	-1.021	0.178	0.958	0.997	-3.515	1.347	0.087	0.096	-1.371	0.418	0.510	0.401	0.073	0.383	1.402	1.309	-1.869	0.792	0.419	0.393
10137	0.969	0.240	0.854	0.798	1.474	0.455	0.324	0.317	1.372	0.492	1.290	1.524	-2.621	1.373	0.129	0.145	0.694	0.577	1.150	1.098
10138	-0.001	0.159	0.790	0.756	0.553	0.395	0.711	0.716	-0.410	0.330	0.489	0.492	0.345	0.396	0.297	0.304	1.902	1.193	0.177	0.179
10139	-0.099	0.157	1.163	1.175	-0.223	0.334	0.920	0.888	0.125	0.336	2.016	2.018	-0.488	0.420	1.866	1.854	-0.595	0.444	0.269	0.266
10140	-0.617	0.157	0.514	0.490	-1.045	0.346	0.503	0.513	-0.199	0.330	0.115	0.115	0.845	0.472	1.194	1.258	-1.004	0.524	0.275	0.277
10141	-0.218	0.154	0.484	0.470	0.002	0.349	0.430	0.449	-0.410	0.330	0.483	0.485	-0.060	0.384	0.718	0.632	-0.430	0.428	0.455	0.450
10142	0.076	0.162	0.798	0.791	0.553	0.395	0.872	0.821	-0.305	0.330	0.364	0.365	-0.860	0.496	1.680	1.816	-0.119	0.426	0.500	0.494
10143	0.102	0.163	0.125	0.127	0.125	0.358	0.118	0.119	0.349	0.345	0.140	0.137	-0.060	0.384	0.136	0.149	0.429	0.504	0.028	0.029
10145	-0.357	0.154	0.864	0.851	-0.631	0.324	0.606	0.600	-0.842	0.347	0.785	0.731	0.493	0.411	0.398	0.413	1.902	1.193	0.177	0.179
10146	0.327	0.176	0.384	0.356	0.895	0.420	0.102	0.108	0.349	0.345	0.135	0.136	-0.336	0.401	1.140	1.388	0.694	0.577	0.282	0.288
10148	0.076	0.162	1.010	0.904	0.257	0.370	0.588	0.542	0.714	0.373	0.766	0.739	0.845	0.472	1.200	1.263	0.694	0.577	0.301	0.323
10149	-0.716	0.161	1.830	1.804	-0.936	0.337	3.322	3.288	-1.083	0.371	2.091	1.735	3.173	1.487	0.122	0.133	0.221	0.462	2.008	2.064
10152	0.562	0.194	2.241	1.987	5.221	1.494	0.080	0.089	0.714	0.373	0.625	0.606	-0.195	0.390	0.201	0.184	-0.595	0.444	2.314	2.363
10153	-0.001	0.159	0.675	0.682	0.553	0.395	1.292	1.194	-0.199	0.330	0.880	0.877	-0.336	0.401	0.073	0.082	-0.274	0.422	0.853	0.854
10154	-0.741	0.162	0.489	0.499	-1.160	0.358	1.153	1.092	-1.218	0.391	0.078	0.091	0.493	0.411	0.679	0.655	-0.430	0.428	0.455	0.450
10158	1.160	0.269	1.112	1.220	3.026	0.623	0.865	0.850	0.587	0.361	0.827	0.784	-2.621	1.373	0.129	0.145	1.902	1.193	0.177	0.179

C.4 RSM-based Instrument for Measuring the Intrinsic Motivation in the First Empirical Study

C.4.1 Checking Assumptions

Test of Unidimensionality

Table 46 shows the results for the test of unidimensionality in which the goodness of fit statistics indicate weak multidimensionality ($0.20 < DETECT < 0.40$) to measure the intrinsic motivation with a DETECT index of 0.227. Essential unidimensionality (ASSI < 0.25 and RATIO < 0.36) in the data structure is indicated for the intrinsic motivation by the ASSI and RATIO indices with values of 0.221 and 0.008, respectively. The index of AGFI = 0.980 in the unidimensional CFA indicates an acceptable fit for measuring the *Intrinsic Motivation*. The sub-scales of *Interest/Enjoyment*, *Perceived Choice*, *Pressure/Tension* and *Effort/Importance* have a good fit indicated by the AGFI index with values greater than 0.95. A good fit with the unidimensional CFA is indicated by the TLI and CFI indices for all the sub-scales. The ASSI index indicates essential unidimensionality in the data structure for the sub-scales of *Pressure/Tension* and *Effort/Importance*, essential deviation from unidimensionality is indicated in the data structure of the scales: *Interest/Enjoyment* and *Perceived Choice*. The Ratio index in all the sub-scales indicate essential deviation from unidimensionality.

Table 46 – Goodness of fit statistics related to the test of unidimensionality in the RSM-based instrument for measuring the intrinsic motivation in the first empirical study

	df	chisq	AGFI	TLI	CFI	DETECT	ASSI	RATIO
Intrinsic Motivation	16.260	44.744	0.980	0.649	0.456	0.227	0.221	0.008
Interest/Enjoyment	2.040	2.245	0.996	0.993	0.994	8.710	0.467	0.553
Perceived Choice	2.848	3.640	0.997	0.983	0.975	12.694	0.400	0.605
Pressure/Tension	1.676	2.886	0.979	0.924	0.925	5.922	0.333	0.480
Effort/Importance	0.000	0.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	13.237	0.333	0.564

df: degree of freedom; AGFI: Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index; CFI: Comparative Fit Index; TLI: Tucker-Lewis Index;

Test of Local Independence

Results from the test of local independence in the RSM-based instrument for measuring the intrinsic motivation in the first empirical study are summarized in Table 47. Although the null condition of local independence are rejected in the sub-scale of *Interest/Enjoyment* and *Pressure/Tension*, their Standardized Root Mean Squared Residual (SRMSR) indicates a good fit (< 0.10) for the sub-scale of *Pressure/Tension*, and an acceptable fit (0.10s) for the *Interest/Enjoyment*, *Perceived Choice* and *Effort/Importance*.

Table 47 – Item residual correlation statistics related to the test of local independence in the RSM-based instrument for measuring the intrinsic motivation in the first empirical study

	max.chisq	maxaQ3	MADaQ3	SRMSR	p.value
Intrinsic Motivation	147.064	0.616	0.190	0.225	0.000
Interest/Enjoyment	519.944	0.495	0.200	0.107	0.003
Perceived Choice	67.919	0.355	0.149	0.106	0.073
Pressure/Tension	42.092	0.397	0.159	0.099	0.017
Effort/Importance	49.082	0.057	0.038	0.015	1.000

aQ3: adjusted correlation of item residuals; maxaQ3: maximum aQ3;

MADaQ3: Median Absolute Deviation of aQ3;

Test of Monotonicity

Table 48 summarizes the test of monotonicity in the RSM-based instrument for measuring the intrinsic motivation in the first empirical study. These results indicates that there are no one violation of monotonicity in the items at the significance level $\alpha = 0.05$.

Table 48 – Test of monotonicity in the RSM-based instrument for measuring the intrinsic motivation in the first empirical study

	ItemH	ac	vi	vi/ac	maxvi	sum	sum/ac	zmax	zsig	crit
Intrinsic Motivation.Item22IE	0.38	0	0		0.00	0.00		0	0	0
Intrinsic Motivation.Item09IE	0.47	0	0		0.00	0.00		0	0	0
Intrinsic Motivation.Item12IE	0.43	0	0		0.00	0.00		0	0	0
Intrinsic Motivation.Item24IE	0.28	6	1	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0	0	0
Intrinsic Motivation.Item21IE	0.39	0	0		0.00	0.00		0	0	0
Intrinsic Motivation.Item01IE	0.36	4	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0
Intrinsic Motivation.Item17PC	0.44	3	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0
Intrinsic Motivation.Item15PC	0.36	0	0		0.00	0.00		0	0	0
Intrinsic Motivation.Item06PC	0.26	0	0		0.00	0.00		0	0	0
Intrinsic Motivation.Item02PC	0.37	0	0		0.00	0.00		0	0	0
Intrinsic Motivation.Item08PC	0.41	0	0		0.00	0.00		0	0	0
Intrinsic Motivation.Item16PT	0.07	0	0		0.00	0.00		0	0	0
Intrinsic Motivation.Item14PT	0.28	2	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0
Intrinsic Motivation.Item18PT	0.36	0	0		0.00	0.00		0	0	0
Intrinsic Motivation.Item13EI	0.10	0	0		0.00	0.00		0	0	0
Intrinsic Motivation.Item03EI	0.11	5	1	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0
Intrinsic Motivation.Item07EI	0.12	0	0		0.00	0.00		0	0	0
Interest/Enjoyment.Item22IE	0.59	0	0		0.00	0.00		0	0	0
Interest/Enjoyment.Item09IE	0.66	0	0		0.00	0.00		0	0	0
Interest/Enjoyment.Item12IE	0.69	3	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0
Interest/Enjoyment.Item24IE	0.57	5	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0
Interest/Enjoyment.Item21IE	0.59	0	0		0.00	0.00		0	0	0
Interest/Enjoyment.Item01IE	0.57	0	0		0.00	0.00		0	0	0
Perceived Choice.Item17PC	0.69	0	0		0.00	0.00		0	0	0
Perceived Choice.Item15PC	0.63	0	0		0.00	0.00		0	0	0
Perceived Choice.Item06PC	0.53	0	0		0.00	0.00		0	0	0
Perceived Choice.Item02PC	0.59	3	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0
Perceived Choice.Item08PC	0.62	0	0		0.00	0.00		0	0	0
Pressure/Tension.Item16PT	0.63	0	0		0.00	0.00		0	0	0
Pressure/Tension.Item14PT	0.61	0	0		0.00	0.00		0	0	0
Pressure/Tension.Item18PT	0.54	0	0		0.00	0.00		0	0	0

vi: number of violations; vi/ac: proportion of active pairs; maxvi: maximum violations;
sum: sum of all violations; zmax: maximum z-value; zsig: number of significant z-values; crit: critical value

Table 48 – (continued)

	ItemH	ac	vi	vi/ac	maxvi	sum	sum/ac	zmax	zsig	crit
Pressure/Tension.Item11PT	0.56	0	0		0.00	0.00		0	0	0
Effort/Importance.Item13EI	0.44	0	0		0.00	0.00		0	0	0
Effort/Importance.Item03EI	0.48	0	0		0.00	0.00		0	0	0
Effort/Importance.Item07EI	0.47	0	0		0.00	0.00		0	0	0

vi: number of violations; vi/ac: proportion of active pairs; maxvi: maximum violations;
 sum: sum of all violations; zmax: maximum z-value; zsig: number of significant z-values; crit: critical value

C.4.2 Item Parameters

Table 49 shows the estimated parameters for the RSM-based instrument used to measure the *Interest/Enjoyment* in the first empirical study. These parameters had been calculated using the MML method (BOCK; AITKIN, 1981), so that the value in row “B.Catx” and column “*i*” is the item slope $b_{i,x}$ of item *i* in the category “*x*”, and the value in the row “AXsi.Catx” and column “*i*” is the item intercept $a_{i,x}\xi$ of item *i* in the category “*x*”. According to the Infit/Outfit statistics of items, no one mean-square value is greater than 2.0 indicating that the measurement system of *Interest/Enjoyment* is not distorted or degraded by the items.

Table 49 – Estimated parameters in the RSM-based instrument for measuring the interest/enjoyment in the first empirical study

	Item01IE	Item09IE	Item12IE	Item21IE	Item22IE	Item24IE
xsi.item	-0.353	-0.989	-0.529	-0.661	-0.661	-0.307
B.Cat0	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
B.Cat1	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
B.Cat2	2.000	2.000	2.000	2.000	2.000	2.000
B.Cat3	3.000	3.000	3.000	3.000	3.000	3.000
B.Cat4	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000
B.Cat5	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000
B.Cat6	6.000	6.000	6.000	6.000	6.000	6.000
AXsi.Cat0	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
AXsi.Cat1	1.419	2.055	1.595	1.727	1.727	1.373
AXsi.Cat2	2.794	4.066	3.145	3.408	3.408	2.701
AXsi.Cat3	4.736	6.644	5.262	5.657	5.657	4.595
AXsi.Cat4	4.182	6.726	4.884	5.411	5.411	3.995
AXsi.Cat5	3.581	6.762	4.458	5.117	5.117	3.348
AXsi.Cat6	2.121	5.937	3.173	3.963	3.963	1.840
Outfit	1.044	0.756	0.625	0.996	1.003	1.402
Infit	1.039	0.775	0.640	1.106	1.101	1.427

Table 50 shows the estimated parameters for the measurement instrument of *Perceived Choice* in which the Infit/Outfit statistics of items indicate that no one item distorts or degrades the measurement system with mean-square greater than 2.0.

Table 50 – Estimated parameters in the RSM-based instrument for measuring the perceived choice in the first empirical study

	Item02PC	Item06PC	Item08PC	Item15PC	Item17PC
xsi.item	-0.541	-0.688	-1.117	-0.292	-1.284
B.Cat0	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
B.Cat1	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
B.Cat2	2.000	2.000	2.000	2.000	2.000
B.Cat3	3.000	3.000	3.000	3.000	3.000
B.Cat4	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000
B.Cat5	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000
B.Cat6	6.000	6.000	6.000	6.000	6.000
AXsi.Cat0	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
AXsi.Cat1	1.607	1.754	2.183	1.358	2.350
AXsi.Cat2	2.434	2.729	3.587	1.937	3.920
AXsi.Cat3	3.944	4.386	5.674	3.199	6.174
AXsi.Cat4	3.608	4.197	5.914	2.614	6.581
AXsi.Cat5	3.659	4.396	6.542	2.417	7.375
AXsi.Cat6	3.245	4.129	6.704	1.754	7.704
Outfit	1.046	1.396	0.895	1.013	0.619
Infit	1.090	1.313	0.835	1.071	0.701

Table 51 shows the estimated parameters for the measurement instrument of *Pressure/Tension* in the first empirical study in which the Infit/Outfit statistics of items indicate that no one item distorts or degrades the measurement system with mean-square greater than 2.0.

Table 51 – Estimated parameters in the RSM-based instrument for measuring the pressure/tension in the first empirical study

	Item11PT	Item14PT	Item16PT	Item18PT
xsi.item	1.344	2.034	1.310	1.765
B.Cat0	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
B.Cat1	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
B.Cat2	2.000	2.000	2.000	2.000
B.Cat3	3.000	3.000	3.000	3.000
B.Cat4	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000
B.Cat5	5.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
B.Cat6	6.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
AXsi.Cat0	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
AXsi.Cat1	-0.810	-1.566	-0.843	-1.298
AXsi.Cat2	-1.985	-3.498	-2.051	-2.960
AXsi.Cat3	-2.780	-5.050	-2.880	-4.243
AXsi.Cat4	-5.108	-8.135	-5.241	-7.059
AXsi.Cat5	-6.783			
AXsi.Cat6	-8.065			
Outfit	0.998	0.879	0.892	1.110
Infit	1.276	0.827	0.922	1.111

Table 52 shows the estimated parameters for the measurement instrument of *Effort/Importance* in which the Infit/Outfit statistics of items indicate that no one item distorts or degrades the measurement system with mean-square greater than 2.0.

Table 52 – Estimated parameters in the RSM-based instrument for measuring the effort/importance in the first empirical study

	Item03EI	Item07EI	Item13EI
xsi.item	-1.543	-1.880	-2.684
B.Cat0	0.000	0.000	0.000
B.Cat1	1.000	1.000	1.000
B.Cat2	2.000	2.000	2.000
B.Cat3	3.000	3.000	3.000
B.Cat4	4.000	4.000	4.000
B.Cat5	5.000	5.000	5.000
B.Cat6	6.000	6.000	6.000
AXxi.Cat0	0.000	0.000	0.000
AXxi.Cat1	6.967	7.305	8.108
AXxi.Cat2	8.636	9.312	10.918
AXxi.Cat3	9.827	10.840	13.250
AXxi.Cat4	10.075	11.426	14.639
AXxi.Cat5	10.097	11.785	15.802
AXxi.Cat6	9.256	11.282	16.102
Outfit	0.861	1.087	1.070
Infit	0.821	1.174	1.162

C.4.3 Intrinsic Motivation as Latent Trait Estimates

Table 53 shows the latent trait estimates by the RSM-based instrument for measuring the *Intrinsic motivation* in the first empirical study.

Table 53 – Latent trait estimates and person model fit of the RSM-based instrument for measuring the intrinsic motivation in the first empirical study

UserID	Intrinsic Motivation				Interest/Enjoyment				Perceived Choice				Pressure/Tension				Effort/Importance			
	theta	error	Outfit	Infit	theta	error	Outfit	Infit	theta	error	Outfit	Infit	theta	error	Outfit	Infit	theta	error	Outfit	Infit
10169	0.081	0.188	0.888	0.884	0.774	0.401	0.405	0.433	-0.345	0.341	1.313	1.394	0.822	0.443	0.896	1.063	0.214	0.594	0.216	0.194
10170	0.435	0.216	0.331	0.341	0.339	0.388	0.339	0.339	0.813	0.497	0.318	0.249	-0.914	1.254	0.135	0.149	0.214	0.594	0.256	0.188
10171	0.435	0.216	0.568	0.585	0.774	0.401	0.317	0.325	0.432	0.415	0.202	0.149	-0.007	0.714	0.299	0.321	-0.083	0.547	1.865	2.092
10172	0.012	0.184	0.999	0.735	0.339	0.388	0.336	0.333	0.010	0.363	0.536	0.587	-0.914	1.254	0.135	0.149	-1.296	0.509	1.656	1.655
10174	0.046	0.186	0.467	0.460	0.045	0.393	0.810	0.799	-0.565	0.334	0.044	0.045	-0.007	0.714	0.299	0.321	1.115	0.851	0.303	0.292
10175	0.582	0.233	2.160	1.196	0.774	0.401	0.317	0.325	2.481	1.316	0.105	0.119	-0.914	1.254	0.135	0.149	-0.587	0.505	3.794	3.400
10176	-0.179	0.176	0.651	0.702	-0.622	0.399	0.340	0.354	0.279	0.393	1.286	1.460	1.277	0.383	0.045	0.047	-0.823	0.499	0.796	0.836
10178	0.152	0.192	0.554	0.392	0.194	0.389	0.058	0.058	0.279	0.393	0.537	0.513	0.990	0.414	0.669	0.586	0.214	0.594	0.256	0.188
10179	-0.413	0.169	0.513	0.532	-0.944	0.376	0.155	0.162	-1.210	0.340	0.129	0.119	0.822	0.443	0.131	0.133	1.115	0.851	0.303	0.292
10181	0.152	0.192	0.669	0.743	-0.447	0.403	0.984	0.992	0.432	0.415	0.764	0.654	-0.914	1.254	0.135	0.149	0.214	0.594	1.183	1.322
10183	-0.209	0.175	0.441	0.436	-0.790	0.389	0.316	0.340	0.010	0.363	0.863	0.820	1.277	0.383	0.098	0.109	-0.083	0.547	0.104	0.101
10184	0.116	0.190	0.662	0.648	-0.275	0.402	0.257	0.253	0.140	0.376	1.263	1.339	0.990	0.414	0.528	0.497	1.115	0.851	0.303	0.292
10185	-0.385	0.170	0.159	0.141	-0.790	0.389	0.054	0.055	-0.565	0.334	0.295	0.282	0.990	0.414	0.383	0.393	-0.587	0.505	0.339	0.307
10186	0.189	0.195	1.271	1.106	-0.111	0.398	1.043	1.019	0.605	0.448	1.257	1.383	1.407	0.376	0.389	0.301	2.256	1.456	0.164	0.191
10187	0.826	0.269	2.906	1.891	3.747	1.435	0.083	0.086	0.432	0.415	1.176	1.163	1.658	0.376	1.921	1.937	1.115	0.851	0.303	0.292
10188	-0.269	0.173	0.261	0.248	-0.944	0.376	0.205	0.205	-0.231	0.346	0.243	0.233	0.372	0.563	0.530	0.438	-0.823	0.499	0.101	0.100
10189	-0.269	0.173	1.213	1.010	-0.790	0.389	1.412	1.439	-0.113	0.354	0.599	0.616	1.658	0.376	1.136	1.096	0.581	0.677	0.154	0.093
10190	-0.117	0.178	0.697	0.774	-0.275	0.402	0.272	0.268	0.279	0.393	1.277	1.423	0.625	0.488	0.148	0.100	-1.296	0.509	0.472	0.498
10191	0.081	0.188	1.074	1.161	0.774	0.401	0.821	0.878	-0.113	0.354	1.116	1.184	-0.007	0.714	0.316	0.348	-1.057	0.501	1.676	1.705
10192	0.081	0.188	1.990	2.285	1.281	0.457	1.176	1.304	-0.565	0.334	3.047	3.084	-0.914	1.254	0.135	0.149	-1.057	0.501	1.495	1.458
10193	-0.148	0.177	0.463	0.473	0.045	0.393	0.301	0.301	-0.565	0.334	0.648	0.671	-0.007	0.714	0.299	0.321	-0.823	0.499	0.356	0.360
10195	0.116	0.190	0.477	0.417	1.435	0.083	0.097	0.098	-0.456	0.337	0.694	0.648	-0.914	1.254	0.135	0.149	0.214	0.594	0.256	0.188
10196	-0.179	0.176	0.960	0.999	-0.790	0.389	0.054	0.055	-0.672	0.332	2.341	2.358	-0.914	1.254	0.135	0.149	0.581	0.677	0.678	0.730
10197	0.306	0.204	1.249	1.259	0.045	0.393	0.562	0.568	1.495	0.741	0.470	0.516	-0.914	1.254	0.135	0.149	-0.587	0.505	2.915	3.082
10198	3.433	1.352	0.030	0.034	3.747	1.435	0.482	0.389	0.2481	1.316	0.105	0.119	-0.914	1.254	0.135	0.149	2.256	1.456	0.164	0.191
10199	0.046	0.186	1.503	1.549	-0.790	0.389	2.383	2.418	2.481	1.316	0.105	0.119	1.277	0.383	1.793	1.898	-0.823	0.499	0.101	0.100
10200	0.390	0.212	1.049	0.755	1.495	0.495	0.461	0.473	0.010	0.363	0.341	0.350	-0.914	1.254	0.135	0.149	-0.587	0.505	1.515	1.343
10201	0.637	0.240	1.181	0.671	1.495	0.495	0.942	1.004	0.279	0.393	0.242	0.281	0.822	0.443	0.902	0.618	2.256	1.456	0.164	0.191
10202	-0.607	0.166	1.613	1.457	-0.790	0.389	0.054	0.055	-1.210	0.340	0.914	0.856	4.700	1.542	0.119	0.147	2.256	1.456	0.164	0.191
10203	0.081	0.188	2.427	2.880	-0.790	0.389	8.029	7.999	2.481	1.316	0.105	0.119	-0.007	0.714	0.316	0.348	-0.823	0.499	0.796	0.836
10204	0.983	0.298	1.019	1.077	2.625	0.830	0.476	0.536	0.605	0.448	1.257	1.383	-0.914	1.254	0.135	0.149	0.214	0.594	0.498	0.462
10206	0.081	0.188	0.802	0.674	-0.275	0.402	0.520	0.525	1.082	0.578	0.504	0.410	1.658	0.376	0.425	0.464	-0.083	0.547	0.104	0.101

Table 53 – (continued)

UserID	Intrinsic Motivation			Interest/Enjoyment			Perceived Choice			Pressure/Tension			Effort/Importance			
	theta	error	Outfit	Infit	theta	error	Outfit	Infit	theta	error	Outfit	Infit	theta	error	Outfit	Infit
10208	0.582	0.233	1.369	1.071	1.495	0.495	0.379	0.346	0.140	0.376	0.917	0.940	0.625	0.488	1.162	1.350
10209	-0.662	0.166	1.676	1.710	-1.436	0.337	0.586	0.597	-2.665	0.591	0.229	0.180	-0.914	1.254	0.135	0.149
10210	-0.716	0.166	1.157	1.122	-1.210	0.352	1.032	0.992	-1.441	0.354	0.066	0.068	2.074	0.423	0.873	1.001
10211	-0.413	0.169	1.845	1.928	1.281	0.457	0.565	0.578	-1.324	0.346	0.741	0.764	0.822	0.443	0.740	0.814
10212	0.435	0.216	1.137	0.867	1.495	0.495	0.770	0.812	0.432	0.415	0.713	0.827	1.140	0.395	0.373	0.451
10213	-0.117	0.178	1.603	1.681	0.626	0.393	1.743	1.790	-0.456	0.337	1.967	2.002	-0.914	1.254	0.135	0.149
10214	-0.634	0.166	0.420	0.397	-1.540	0.332	0.482	0.499	-0.885	0.332	0.140	0.141	0.822	0.443	0.742	0.866
10215	0.531	0.227	0.983	0.952	0.194	0.389	0.780	0.781	2.481	1.316	0.105	0.119	-0.914	1.254	0.135	0.149
10216	0.347	0.208	1.114	1.342	0.045	0.393	3.186	3.120	0.813	0.497	0.948	1.241	-0.007	0.714	0.866	0.660
10217	0.152	0.192	0.965	1.090	-0.944	0.376	0.591	0.609	1.495	0.741	0.385	0.451	-0.914	1.254	0.135	0.149
10218	-0.298	0.172	0.812	0.794	-1.326	0.343	0.387	0.387	0.010	0.363	0.740	0.683	1.658	0.376	0.227	0.198
10219	-0.385	0.170	0.454	0.427	-1.083	0.364	0.171	0.174	-0.456	0.337	0.676	0.666	-0.914	1.254	0.135	0.149
10220	0.531	0.227	1.140	1.367	0.626	0.393	1.926	1.943	0.813	0.497	1.707	1.863	-0.914	1.254	0.135	0.149
10221	0.116	0.190	0.353	0.320	-0.275	0.402	0.110	0.109	0.010	0.363	0.579	0.523	-0.914	1.254	0.135	0.149
10222	-1.430	0.190	0.779	0.811	-4.054	1.200	0.092	0.099	-2.382	0.505	0.215	0.148	1.787	0.385	0.258	0.195
10223	0.637	0.240	0.738	0.466	1.495	0.495	0.346	0.303	0.813	0.497	0.164	0.108	-0.007	0.714	0.316	0.348
10224	-0.179	0.176	1.965	2.040	1.757	0.553	0.376	0.354	-1.564	0.364	1.337	1.314	0.372	0.563	1.401	1.249
10226	-0.413	0.169	0.841	0.835	-0.944	0.376	0.610	0.685	-1.324	0.346	0.251	0.256	0.372	0.563	1.401	1.249
10227	-0.825	0.167	0.743	0.729	-1.643	0.331	1.498	1.501	-0.672	0.332	0.324	0.321	2.074	0.423	0.205	0.235
10228	-0.239	0.174	0.522	0.406	-0.790	0.389	0.275	0.279	-0.345	0.341	0.448	0.464	0.990	0.414	1.138	0.983
10230	-0.441	0.169	1.544	1.607	-1.744	0.331	1.999	2.063	0.010	0.363	2.000	1.786	1.533	0.373	1.534	1.752
10231	1.664	0.476	0.874	0.975	3.747	1.435	0.083	0.086	1.495	0.741	0.273	0.309	-0.914	1.254	0.135	0.149
10232	0.189	0.195	0.477	0.528	0.626	0.393	1.330	1.273	-0.113	0.354	0.313	0.345	1.407	0.376	1.445	1.785
10233	-0.689	0.166	0.712	0.715	-1.950	0.341	0.518	0.527	-0.992	0.333	0.935	0.941	-0.007	0.714	0.602	0.575
10234	-0.580	0.167	0.808	0.818	-1.326	0.343	1.571	1.543	-0.885	0.332	0.978	0.983	-0.007	0.714	0.866	0.660
10237	-0.021	0.182	0.792	0.859	0.045	0.393	0.988	0.961	0.010	0.363	0.999	1.060	-0.914	1.254	0.135	0.149
10238	-0.716	0.166	0.825	0.771	-0.944	0.376	0.330	0.302	-1.324	0.346	0.586	0.541	2.074	0.423	0.873	1.001
10240	-0.743	0.166	0.948	0.943	-1.210	0.352	0.707	0.686	-2.168	0.453	0.379	0.357	-0.914	1.254	0.135	0.149

C.5 RSM-based Instrument for Measuring the Level of Motivation in the Second Empirical Study

C.5.1 Checking Assumptions

Test of Unidimensionality

Table 54 shows the results for the test of unidimensionality in which the goodness of fit statistics indicate strong multidimensionality ($DETECT > 1.00$) with a DETECT index of 2.305. Essential unidimensionality ($ASSI < 0.25$ and $RATIO < 0.36$) in the data structure is indicated for the level of motivation by the ASSI and RATIO indices with values of 0.212 and 0.152, respectively. The index of $AGFI = 0.990$ in the unidimensional CFA indicates an acceptable fit for measuring the *Level of Motivation*. The sub-scales of *Attention*, *Relevance*, and *Satisfaction* have a good fit indicated by the AGFI index with values greater than 0.95. A good fit with the unidimensional CFA is indicated by the TLI and CFI indices for all the sub-scales. The ASSI index indicates essential unidimensionality in the data structure for the sub-scale of *Attention*, essential deviation from unidimensionality is indicated in the data structure of the scales: *Relevance* and *Satisfaction*. The Ratio index in all the sub-scales indicate essential deviation from unidimensionality.

Table 54 – Goodness of fit statistics related to the test of unidimensionality in the RSM-based instrument for measuring the level of motivation in the second empirical study

	df	chisq	AGFI	TLI	CFI	DETECT	ASSI	RATIO
Level of Motivation	6.883	11.704	0.990	0.951	0.912	2.305	0.212	0.152
Attention	4.632	4.865	0.998	0.998	0.993	5.641	0.067	0.506
Relevance	1.427	1.133	0.997	1.018	1.000	19.151	0.667	0.669
Satisfaction	0.000	0.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	10.099	0.333	0.495

df: degree of freedom; AGFI: Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index; CFI: Comparative Fit Index; TLI: Tucker-Lewis Index;

Test of Local Independence

Results from the test of local independence in the RSM-based instrument for measuring the level of motivation in the second empirical study are summarized in Table 55. The null condition of local independence is only rejected in the sub-scale of *Relevance* but its Standardized Root Mean Squared Residual (SRMSR) indicates an acceptable fit (0.10s) with value of 0.120. The null condition of local independence are not rejected in the sub-scale of *Attention* and *Satisfaction*, and their SRMSRs indicates a good fit (< 0.10).

Table 55 – Item residual correlation statistics related to the test of local independence in the RSM-based instrument for measuring the level of motivation in the second empirical study

	max.chisq	maxaQ3	MADaQ3	SRMSR	p.value
Level of Motivation	288.358	0.485	0.163	0.124	0.022

aQ3: adjusted correlation of item residuals; maxaQ3: maximum aQ3;

MADaQ3: Median Absolute Deviation of aQ3;

Table 55 – (continued)

	max.chisq	maxaQ3	MADaQ3	SRMSR	p.value
Attention	286.339	0.237	0.134	0.061	1.000
Relevance	68.696	0.366	0.151	0.120	0.040
Satisfaction	54.715	0.237	0.158	0.074	0.237

aQ3: adjusted correlation of item residuals; maxaQ3: maximum aQ3;
MADaQ3: Median Absolute Deviation of aQ3;

Test of Monotonicity

Table 56 summarizes the test of monotonicity in the RSM-based instrument for measuring the level of motivation in the second empirical study. These results indicates that there are no one violation of monotonicity in the items at the significance level $\alpha = 0.05$.

Table 56 – Test of monotonicity in the RSM-based instrument for measuring the level of motivation in the second empirical study

	ItemH	ac	vi	vi/ac	maxvi	sum	sum/ac	zmax	zsig	crit
Level of Motivation.Item12A	0.64	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level of Motivation.Item19A	0.52	0	0		0	0		0	0	0
Level of Motivation.Item04A	0.64	0	0		0	0		0	0	0
Level of Motivation.Item20A	0.59	0	0		0	0		0	0	0
Level of Motivation.Item16A	0.62	0	0		0	0		0	0	0
Level of Motivation.Item01A	0.63	0	0		0	0		0	0	0
Level of Motivation.Item15R	0.42	0	0		0	0		0	0	0
Level of Motivation.Item21R	0.59	0	0		0	0		0	0	0
Level of Motivation.Item10R	0.53	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level of Motivation.Item13S	0.58	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level of Motivation.Item14S	0.60	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level of Motivation.Item17S	0.51	0	0		0	0		0	0	0
Attention.Item12A	0.77	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Attention.Item19A	0.66	0	0		0	0		0	0	0
Attention.Item04A	0.70	0	0		0	0		0	0	0
Attention.Item20A	0.72	0	0		0	0		0	0	0
Attention.Item16A	0.70	0	0		0	0		0	0	0
Attention.Item01A	0.71	0	0		0	0		0	0	0
Relevance.Item15R	0.43	0	0		0	0		0	0	0
Relevance.Item21R	0.53	0	0		0	0		0	0	0
Relevance.Item10R	0.49	0	0		0	0		0	0	0
Relevance.Item08R	0.35	0	0		0	0		0	0	0
Satisfaction.Item13S	0.70	0	0		0	0		0	0	0
Satisfaction.Item14S	0.66	0	0		0	0		0	0	0
Satisfaction.Item17S	0.61	0	0		0	0		0	0	0

vi: number of violations; vi/ac: proportion of active pairs; maxvi: maximum violations;
sum: sum of all violations; zmax: maximum z-value; zsig: number of significant z-values; crit: critical value

C.5.2 Item Parameters

Table 57 shows the estimated parameters for the RSM-based instrument used to measure the *Attention* in the second empirical study. These parameters had been calculated using the MML method (BOCK; AITKIN, 1981), so that the value in row “B.Catx” and column “*i*” is the

item slope $b_{i,x}$ of item i in the category “ x ”, and the value in the row “AXsi.Cat x ” and column “ i ” is the item intercept $a_{i,x}\xi$ of item i in the category “ x ”. According to the Infit/Outfit statistics of items, no one mean-square value is greater than 2.0 indicating that the measurement system of *Attention* is not distorted or degraded by the items.

Table 57 – Estimated parameters in the RSM-based instrument for measuring the attention in the second empirical study

	Item01A	Item04A	Item12A	Item16A	Item19A	Item20A
xsi.item	-0.004	0.053	0.015	-0.290	0.034	0.090
B.Cat0	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
B.Cat1	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
B.Cat2	2.000	2.000	2.000	2.000	2.000	2.000
B.Cat3	3.000	3.000	3.000	3.000	3.000	3.000
B.Cat4	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000
B.Cat5	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000
B.Cat6	6.000	6.000	6.000	6.000	6.000	6.000
AXsi.Cat0	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
AXsi.Cat1	1.688	1.632	1.670	1.974	1.651	1.594
AXsi.Cat2	2.833	2.720	2.795	3.405	2.757	2.644
AXsi.Cat3	4.141	3.971	4.084	4.999	4.028	3.858
AXsi.Cat4	3.591	3.365	3.516	4.735	3.440	3.214
AXsi.Cat5	1.928	1.645	1.833	3.357	1.739	1.456
AXsi.Cat6	0.023	-0.317	-0.090	1.739	-0.203	-0.543
Outfit	1.048	1.029	0.606	0.961	1.313	1.046
Infit	1.119	1.075	0.630	0.995	1.425	0.863

Table 58 shows the estimated parameters for the measurement instrument of *Relevance* in which the Infit/Outfit statistics of items indicate that no one item distorts or degrades the measurement system with mean-square greater than 2.0.

Table 58 – Estimated parameters in the RSM-based instrument for measuring the relevance in the second empirical study

	Item08R	Item10R	Item15R	Item21R
xsi.item	-1.152	-0.777	-0.821	-0.766
B.Cat0	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
B.Cat1	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
B.Cat2	2.000	2.000	2.000	2.000
B.Cat3	3.000	3.000	3.000	3.000
B.Cat4	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000
B.Cat5	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000
B.Cat6	6.000	6.000	6.000	6.000
AXsi.Cat0	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
AXsi.Cat1	4.435	4.060	4.104	4.049
AXsi.Cat2	5.226	4.475	4.563	4.453
AXsi.Cat3	6.531	5.405	5.537	5.372
AXsi.Cat4	6.807	5.305	5.481	5.262
AXsi.Cat5	6.965	5.089	5.309	5.034
AXsi.Cat6	6.913	4.662	4.925	4.596
Outfit	1.231	0.989	0.948	0.832
Infit	1.209	1.020	0.902	0.849

Table 59 shows the estimated parameters for the measurement instrument of *Satisfaction* in the second empirical study in which the Infit/Outfit statistics of items indicate that no one item distorts or degrades the measurement system with mean-square greater than 2.0.

Table 59 – Estimated parameters in the RSM-based instrument for measuring the satisfaction in the second empirical study

estimated	Item13S	Item14S	Item17S
xsi.item	-0.415	-0.344	0.025
B.Cat0	0.000	0.000	0.000
B.Cat1	1.000	1.000	1.000
B.Cat2	2.000	2.000	2.000
B.Cat3	3.000	3.000	3.000
B.Cat4	4.000	4.000	4.000
B.Cat5	5.000	5.000	5.000
B.Cat6	6.000	6.000	6.000
AXsi.Cat0	0.000	0.000	0.000
AXsi.Cat1	2.615	2.544	2.175
AXsi.Cat2	3.805	3.662	2.924
AXsi.Cat3	5.326	5.112	4.004
AXsi.Cat4	5.125	4.839	3.363
AXsi.Cat5	4.154	3.797	1.952
AXsi.Cat6	2.492	2.064	-0.151
Outfit	0.939	1.000	1.064
Infit	0.957	1.039	1.025

C.5.3 Level of Motivation as Latent Trait Estimates

Table 60 shows the latent trait estimates by the RSM-based instrument for measuring the *Level of Motivation* in the second empirical study.

Table 60 – Latent trait estimates and person model fit of the RSM-based instrument for measuring the level of motivation in the second empirical study

UserID	Level of Motivation				Attention				Relevance				Satisfaction			
	theta	error	Outfit	Infit	theta	error	Outfit	Infit	theta	error	Outfit	Infit	theta	error	Outfit	Infit
10169	-1.408	0.260	0.453	0.528	-1.957	0.419	0.224	0.269	-0.869	0.400	0.922	0.875	-1.982	0.611	0.042	0.044
10170	0.226	0.248	0.641	0.640	0.568	0.435	0.852	0.854	0.006	0.365	0.808	0.789	-0.348	0.554	0.362	0.361
10171	0.802	0.262	0.363	0.344	0.758	0.428	0.134	0.132	1.438	0.726	0.420	0.433	0.978	0.578	0.195	0.194
10172	0.288	0.249	1.043	1.056	0.758	0.428	1.437	1.471	0.265	0.389	0.309	0.295	-0.645	0.536	0.893	0.905
10174	-0.628	0.231	1.109	1.119	-0.952	0.357	0.786	0.796	-1.028	0.425	0.916	0.948	-0.348	0.554	2.933	3.002
10175	1.319	0.294	1.086	1.139	1.764	0.425	1.141	1.166	2.358	1.265	0.133	0.136	0.978	0.578	1.191	1.186
10176	-0.838	0.232	0.270	0.269	-1.070	0.353	0.022	0.020	-1.028	0.425	0.406	0.390	-0.910	0.524	0.408	0.412
10178	0.413	0.252	0.227	0.226	0.758	0.428	0.164	0.163	-0.114	0.359	2.052	1.945	-0.014	0.570	0.145	0.142
10179	0.103	0.246	0.289	0.284	-0.041	0.428	0.082	0.079	0.132	0.374	0.182	0.175	-0.014	0.570	1.042	1.040
10181	-0.248	0.238	1.060	1.074	-0.041	0.428	2.256	2.269	-0.351	0.358	0.286	0.287	-0.645	0.536	0.691	0.675
10183	-0.628	0.231	0.627	0.626	-0.952	0.357	0.855	0.868	-0.726	0.383	0.404	0.383	-0.348	0.554	0.041	0.043
10184	0.870	0.265	0.437	0.449	1.436	0.413	0.571	0.575	0.579	0.441	0.314	0.280	0.978	0.578	0.561	0.565
10185	-0.134	0.240	0.261	0.265	-0.041	0.428	0.531	0.538	-0.114	0.359	0.187	0.184	-0.348	0.554	0.041	0.043
10186	0.043	0.244	2.338	2.347	-0.829	0.364	3.208	3.043	0.006	0.365	0.997	0.981	1.292	0.594	0.773	0.749
10187	-0.191	0.239	1.134	1.102	0.367	0.439	0.732	0.732	-1.212	0.462	0.162	0.147	0.333	0.575	0.078	0.078
10188	0.043	0.244	0.427	0.424	-0.041	0.428	0.548	0.551	0.132	0.374	0.722	0.696	0.333	0.575	0.324	0.324
10189	-1.985	0.335	1.655	2.149	-3.114	0.777	0.617	0.577	-1.028	0.425	2.393	2.356	-4.308	1.561	0.157	0.161
10190	-0.522	0.233	2.803	2.767	-1.665	0.377	1.204	1.170	-0.114	0.359	2.233	2.246	1.628	0.631	1.793	1.868
10191	1.237	0.287	0.858	0.730	1.937	0.438	0.537	0.501	0.412	0.410	0.784	0.837	1.628	0.631	0.036	0.040
10192	1.702	0.340	4.317	3.505	4.367	1.348	0.085	0.086	0.412	0.410	2.788	2.952	1.628	0.631	1.793	1.868
10193	-0.628	0.231	0.731	0.720	-0.557	0.386	0.386	0.366	-0.233	0.357	1.303	1.295	-1.408	0.532	0.651	0.673
10196	-0.469	0.233	0.919	0.912	-0.557	0.386	1.244	1.252	-0.869	0.400	0.343	0.324	-0.014	0.570	0.192	0.189
10197	0.164	0.247	1.334	1.338	0.161	0.437	2.566	2.560	0.006	0.365	1.057	1.049	-0.014	0.570	1.042	1.040
10198	2.516	0.511	1.764	2.085	4.367	1.348	0.085	0.086	0.779	0.489	2.488	2.022	1.628	0.631	1.793	1.868
10200	0.226	0.248	0.470	0.460	0.367	0.439	0.240	0.239	-0.233	0.357	0.325	0.330	0.978	0.578	0.148	0.146
10201	0.670	0.257	0.289	0.293	0.568	0.435	0.240	0.238	0.132	0.374	0.701	0.640	1.628	0.631	0.036	0.040
10202	-0.248	0.238	0.185	0.187	-0.230	0.415	0.346	0.347	-0.726	0.383	0.711	0.779	-0.348	0.554	0.041	0.043
10203	4.338	1.368	0.043	0.045	4.367	1.348	0.085	0.086	2.358	1.265	0.133	0.136	3.664	1.437	0.164	0.171
10204	1.953	0.381	1.280	1.112	3.360	0.789	0.508	0.529	0.779	0.489	0.601	0.604	2.024	0.704	0.955	0.991
10206	0.043	0.244	0.499	0.496	-0.402	0.400	0.435	0.447	-0.114	0.359	1.308	1.267	0.333	0.575	0.371	0.371
10208	-0.469	0.233	0.553	0.543	-0.402	0.400	0.445	0.454	-0.595	0.370	0.464	0.455	-0.645	0.536	0.353	0.352
10209	-1.545	0.273	1.163	-2.357	0.510	1.388	1.668	-0.595	0.370	1.646	1.700	-1.408	0.532	1.341	1.382	

Table 60 – (continued)

UserID	Level of Motivation			Attention			Relevance			Satisfaction		
	theta	error	Outfit	Infit	theta	error	Outfit	Infit	theta	error	Outfit	Infit
10210	-0.522	0.233	1.262	1.233	-0.952	0.357	0.765	0.744	-0.114	0.359	1.136	1.159
10211	-1.700	0.292	0.547	0.564	-2.652	0.599	0.425	0.418	-0.351	0.358	0.929	0.932
10212	-0.522	0.233	0.419	0.417	-0.829	0.364	0.405	0.408	0.006	0.365	0.131	0.129
10213	0.350	0.250	0.675	0.682	0.367	0.439	1.132	1.129	0.006	0.365	0.125	0.124
10214	0.164	0.247	0.440	0.433	0.367	0.439	0.252	0.251	0.412	0.410	0.131	0.141
10215	0.540	0.254	1.450	1.450	0.367	0.439	1.269	1.272	2.358	1.265	0.133	0.136
10216	-0.134	0.240	1.427	1.454	-0.402	0.400	2.949	3.013	0.006	0.365	0.819	0.790
10217	0.540	0.254	0.328	0.332	0.758	0.428	0.535	0.530	0.412	0.410	0.131	0.141
10218	-0.134	0.240	0.852	0.870	-0.952	0.357	0.926	0.908	0.132	0.374	0.202	0.198
10219	-1.052	0.238	1.485	1.466	-1.301	0.353	1.751	1.756	-1.212	0.462	1.333	1.265
10220	-0.248	0.238	4.191	4.152	-2.357	0.510	2.272	2.082	2.358	1.265	0.133	0.136
10221	-0.838	0.232	0.611	0.610	-0.698	0.373	0.440	0.452	-0.726	0.383	0.834	0.882
10223	-1.475	0.266	0.513	0.456	-1.803	0.395	0.694	0.670	-1.212	0.462	0.388	0.391
10224	0.870	0.265	0.829	0.794	1.274	0.413	0.875	0.876	0.579	0.441	1.065	1.082
10226	0.939	0.268	0.617	0.610	0.938	0.421	0.802	0.811	0.779	0.489	1.047	0.919
10227	1.159	0.281	0.246	0.270	1.764	0.425	0.483	0.490	0.579	0.441	0.038	0.038
10228	-0.076	0.242	0.136	0.134	-0.041	0.428	0.178	0.177	-0.114	0.359	0.115	0.117
10230	1.159	0.281	1.190	1.158	2.124	0.459	0.627	0.640	0.579	0.441	0.625	0.616
10231	-0.575	0.232	0.964	0.953	-1.417	0.357	0.522	0.521	0.006	0.365	0.994	0.976
10232	1.010	0.271	0.297	0.276	1.109	0.416	0.067	0.068	1.040	0.568	0.452	0.442
10233	-0.785	0.232	2.458	2.444	0.161	0.437	3.419	3.431	-1.028	0.425	0.231	0.229
10234	0.103	0.246	1.444	1.421	0.568	0.435	1.133	1.129	0.132	0.374	2.005	2.061
10237	-0.076	0.242	0.527	0.517	-0.402	0.400	0.337	0.325	0.579	0.441	0.281	0.250
10238	0.103	0.246	0.222	0.219	0.367	0.439	0.240	0.239	-0.351	0.358	0.176	0.177
10240	-1.475	0.266	0.147	0.166	-1.803	0.395	0.019	0.023	-0.869	0.400	0.024	0.024
10242	-2.395	0.417	0.964	1.247	-4.171	1.373	0.085	0.087	-1.028	0.425	0.578	0.545

C.6 RSM-based Instrument for Measuring the Intrinsic Motivation in the Third Empirical Study

C.6.1 Checking Assumptions

Test of Unidimensionality

Table 69 shows the results for the test of unidimensionality in which the goodness of fit statistics indicate strong multidimensionality ($DETECT > 1.00$) to measure the intrinsic motivation with a DETECT index of 6.096. Essential unidimensionality ($ASSI < 0.25$ and $RATIO < 0.36$) in the data structure is indicated for the intrinsic motivation by the ASSI and RATIO indices with values of 0.242 and 0.128, respectively. The index of $AGFI = 0.899$ in the unidimensional CFA indicates an acceptable fit for measuring the *Intrinsic Motivation*. The sub-scales of *Interest/Enjoyment*, *Perceived Choice*, *Pressure/Tension* and *Effort/Importance* have a good fit indicated by the AGFI index with values greater than 0.95. A good fit with the unidimensional CFA is indicated by the TLI and CFI indices for all the sub-scales. The ASSI index indicates essential unidimensionality in the data structure for the sub-scales of *Interest/Enjoyment* and *Pressure/Tension*, essential deviation from unidimensionality is indicated in the data structure of the scales: *Perceived Choice* and *Effort/Importance*. The Ratio index in all the sub-scales indicate essential deviation from unidimensionality.

Table 61 – Goodness of fit statistics related to the test of unidimensionality in the RSM-based instrument for measuring the intrinsic motivation in the third empirical study

	df	chisq	AGFI	TLI	CFI	DETECT	ASSI	RATIO
Intrinsic Motivation	9.598	54.026	0.899	0.156	0.226	6.096	0.242	0.128
Interest/Enjoyment	5.419	8.602	0.996	0.963	0.887	6.028	0.200	0.507
Perceived Choice	4.040	3.576	0.998	1.006	1.000	12.178	0.600	0.803
Pressure/Tension	1.765	1.113	0.999	1.014	1.000	17.469	0.000	0.644
Effort/Importance	0.000	0.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	17.820	0.333	0.776

df: degree of freedom; AGFI: Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index; CFI: Comparative Fit Index; TLI: Tucker-Lewis Index;

Test of Local Independence

Results from the test of local independence in the RSM-based instrument for measuring the intrinsic motivation in the third empirical study are summarized in Table 70. The Standardized Root Mean Squared Residual (SRMSR) indicates a good fit (< 0.10) for the sub-scales of *Interest/Enjoyment*, *Perceived Choice* and *Effort/Importance*. An acceptable fit (0.10s) has found for the sub-scale of *Pressure/Tension* with value of 0.189. The null condition of local independence is not rejected in the sub-scales of *Interest/Enjoyment*, *Perceived Choice* and *Effort/Importance*.

Table 62 – Item residual correlation statistics related to the test of local independence in the RSM-based instrument for measuring the intrinsic motivation in the third empirical study

	max.chisq	maxaQ3	MADaQ3	SRMSR	p.value
Intrinsic Motivation	169.797	0.738	0.276	0.274	0.000
Interest/Enjoyment	1034.187	0.329	0.147	0.096	0.339
Perceived Choice	180.200	0.316	0.113	0.054	0.284
Pressure/Tension	64.855	0.500	0.338	0.189	0.003
Effort/Importance	52.489	0.211	0.141	0.081	0.430

aQ3: adjusted correlation of item residuals; maxaQ3: maximum aQ3;
MADaQ3: Median Absolute Deviation of aQ3;

Test of Monotonicity

Table 71 summarizes the test of monotonicity in the RSM-based instrument for measuring the intrinsic motivation in the third empirical study. These results indicates that there are no one violation of monotonicity in the items at the significance level $\alpha = 0.05$.

Table 63 – Test of monotonicity in the RSM-based instrument for measuring the intrinsic motivation in the third empirical study

	ItemH	ac	vi	vi/ac	maxvi	sum	sum/ac	zmax	zsig	crit
Intrinsic Motivation.Item22IE	0.33	0	0		0.00	0.00		0.00	0	0
Intrinsic Motivation.Item09IE	0.33	0	0		0.00	0.00		0.00	0	0
Intrinsic Motivation.Item12IE	0.28	5	1	0.2	0.08	0.08	0.02	0.53	0	51
Intrinsic Motivation.Item24IE	0.18	0	0		0.00	0.00		0.00	0	0
Intrinsic Motivation.Item21IE	0.25	6	0	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0
Intrinsic Motivation.Item01IE	0.29	4	0	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0
Intrinsic Motivation.Item17PC	0.33	0	0		0.00	0.00		0.00	0	0
Intrinsic Motivation.Item15PC	0.32	6	0	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0
Intrinsic Motivation.Item06PC	0.38	0	0		0.00	0.00		0.00	0	0
Intrinsic Motivation.Item02PC	0.33	4	0	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0
Intrinsic Motivation.Item08PC	0.39	0	0		0.00	0.00		0.00	0	0
Intrinsic Motivation.Item16PT	0.16	4	0	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0
Intrinsic Motivation.Item14PT	0.27	4	0	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0
Intrinsic Motivation.Item18PT	0.28	4	0	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0
Intrinsic Motivation.Item11PT	0.11	0	0		0.00	0.00		0.00	0	0
Intrinsic Motivation.Item13EI	0.19	4	0	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0
Intrinsic Motivation.Item03EI	0.06	5	0	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0
Intrinsic Motivation.Item07EI	0.14	4	0	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0
Interest/Enjoyment.Item22IE	0.76	0	0		0.00	0.00		0.00	0	0
Interest/Enjoyment.Item09IE	0.73	0	0		0.00	0.00		0.00	0	0
Interest/Enjoyment.Item12IE	0.66	0	0		0.00	0.00		0.00	0	0
Interest/Enjoyment.Item24IE	0.61	0	0		0.00	0.00		0.00	0	0
Interest/Enjoyment.Item21IE	0.69	0	0		0.00	0.00		0.00	0	0
Interest/Enjoyment.Item01IE	0.60	0	0		0.00	0.00		0.00	0	0
Perceived Choice.Item17PC	0.69	4	0	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0
Perceived Choice.Item15PC	0.63	0	0		0.00	0.00		0.00	0	0
Perceived Choice.Item06PC	0.71	0	0		0.00	0.00		0.00	0	0
Perceived Choice.Item02PC	0.69	0	0		0.00	0.00		0.00	0	0
Perceived Choice.Item08PC	0.69	4	0	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0
Pressure/Tension.Item16PT	0.64	0	0		0.00	0.00		0.00	0	0
Pressure/Tension.Item14PT	0.65	4	0	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0

vi: number of violations; vi/ac: proportion of active pairs; maxvi: maximum violations;
sum: sum of all violations; zmax: maximum z-value; zsig: number of significant z-values; crit: critical value

Table 63 – (continued)

	ItemH	ac	vi	vi/ac	maxvi	sum	sum/ac	zmax	zsig	crit
Pressure/Tension.Item18PT	0.65	4	0	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0
Pressure/Tension.Item11PT	0.44	0	0		0.00	0.00		0.00	0	0
Effort/Importance.Item13EI	0.63	0	0		0.00	0.00		0.00	0	0
Effort/Importance.Item03EI	0.53	5	0	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0
Effort/Importance.Item07EI	0.60	0	0		0.00	0.00		0.00	0	0

vi: number of violations; vi/ac: proportion of active pairs; maxvi: maximum violations;
sum: sum of all violations; zmax: maximum z-value; zsig: number of significant z-values; crit: critical value

C.6.2 Item Parameters

Table 64 shows the estimated parameters for the RSM-based instrument used to measure the *Interest/Enjoyment* in the third empirical study. These parameters had been calculated using the MML method (BOCK; AITKIN, 1981), so that the value in row “B.Catx” and column “*i*” is the item slope $b_{i,x}$ of item *i* in the category “*x*”, and the value in the row “AXsi.Catx” and column “*i*” is the item intercept $a_{i,x}\xi$ of item *i* in the category “*x*”. According to the Infit/Outfit statistics of items, no one mean-square value is greater than 2.0 indicating that the measurement system of *Interest/Enjoyment* is not distorted or degraded by the items.

Table 64 – Estimated parameters in the RSM-based instrument for measuring the interest/enjoyment in the third empirical study

	Item01IE	Item09IE	Item12IE	Item21IE	Item22IE	Item24IE
xsi.item	0.912	0.615	0.570	0.080	0.615	0.797
B.Cat0	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
B.Cat1	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
B.Cat2	2.000	2.000	2.000	2.000	2.000	2.000
B.Cat3	3.000	3.000	3.000	3.000	3.000	3.000
B.Cat4	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000
B.Cat5	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000
B.Cat6	6.000	6.000	6.000	6.000	6.000	6.000
AXsi.Cat0	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
AXsi.Cat1	0.877	1.174	1.219	1.709	1.174	0.992
AXsi.Cat2	1.646	2.241	2.331	3.311	2.241	1.876
AXsi.Cat3	1.780	2.672	2.808	4.278	2.672	2.125
AXsi.Cat4	-0.028	1.161	1.342	3.302	1.161	0.431
AXsi.Cat5	-2.330	-0.844	-0.617	1.833	-0.844	-1.755
AXsi.Cat6	-5.473	-3.690	-3.418	-0.478	-3.690	-4.784
Outfit	1.503	0.664	1.009	0.937	0.521	1.309
Infit	1.537	0.694	0.996	0.926	0.516	1.425

Table 65 shows the estimated parameters for the measurement instrument of *Perceived Choice* in which the Infit/Outfit statistics of items indicate that no one item distorts or degrades the measurement system with mean-square greater than 2.0.

Table 65 – Estimated parameters in the RSM-based instrument for measuring the perceived choice in the third empirical study

	Item02PC	Item06PC	Item08PC	Item15PC	Item17PC
xsi.item	-0.210	-0.119	-0.393	0.192	-0.356
B.Cat0	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
B.Cat1	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
B.Cat2	2.000	2.000	2.000	2.000	2.000
B.Cat3	3.000	3.000	3.000	3.000	3.000
B.Cat4	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000
B.Cat5	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000
B.Cat6	6.000	6.000	6.000	6.000	6.000
AXsi.Cat0	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
AXsi.Cat1	2.122	2.031	2.305	1.720	2.268
AXsi.Cat2	3.359	3.177	3.725	2.555	3.652
AXsi.Cat3	4.097	3.824	4.645	2.890	4.535
AXsi.Cat4	3.435	3.071	4.166	1.826	4.020
AXsi.Cat5	2.634	2.178	3.548	0.622	3.365
AXsi.Cat6	1.261	0.714	2.357	-1.153	2.138
Outfit	1.005	0.955	0.873	1.267	0.937
Infit	1.028	0.917	0.911	1.240	0.991

Table 66 shows the estimated parameters for the measurement instrument of *Pressure/Tension* in the third empirical study in which the Infit/Outfit statistics of items indicate that no one item distorts or degrades the measurement system with mean-square greater than 2.0.

Table 66 – Estimated parameters in the RSM-based instrument for measuring the pressure/tension in the third empirical study

	Item11PT	Item14PT	Item16PT	Item18PT
xsi.item	0.123	-0.009	0.113	-0.081
B.Cat0	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
B.Cat1	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
B.Cat2	2.000	2.000	2.000	2.000
B.Cat3	3.000	3.000	3.000	3.000
B.Cat4	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000
B.Cat5	5.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
B.Cat6	6.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
AXsi.Cat0	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
AXsi.Cat1	0.222	-0.022	-0.145	0.049
AXsi.Cat2	0.418	-0.072	-0.316	0.071
AXsi.Cat3	1.149	0.415	0.048	0.628
AXsi.Cat4	1.017	0.038	-0.451	0.322
AXsi.Cat5	-1.232			
AXsi.Cat6	-0.736			
Outfit	1.530	0.747	0.778	0.744
Infit	1.583	0.819	0.910	0.866

Table 67 shows the estimated parameters for the measurement instrument of *Effort/Importance* in which the Infit/Outfit statistics of items indicate that no one item distorts or degrades the measurement system with mean-square greater than 2.0.

Table 67 – Estimated parameters in the RSM-based instrument for measuring the effort/importance in the third empirical study

	Item03EI	Item07EI	Item13EI
xsi.item	-1.278	-2.012	-2.309
B.Cat0	0.000	0.000	0.000
B.Cat1	1.000	1.000	1.000
B.Cat2	2.000	2.000	2.000
B.Cat3	3.000	3.000	3.000
B.Cat4	4.000	4.000	4.000
B.Cat5	5.000	5.000	5.000
B.Cat6	6.000	6.000	6.000
AXsi.Cat0	0.000	0.000	0.000
AXsi.Cat1	8.240	8.975	9.272
AXsi.Cat2	9.465	10.933	11.527
AXsi.Cat3	10.365	12.567	13.458
AXsi.Cat4	9.821	12.758	13.946
AXsi.Cat5	8.680	12.351	13.837
AXsi.Cat6	7.667	12.072	13.855
Outfit	1.148	0.923	0.818
Infit	1.160	0.973	0.903

C.6.3 Intrinsic Motivation as Latent Trait Estimates

Table 68 shows the latent trait estimates by the RSM-based instrument for measuring the *Intrinsic motivation* in the third empirical study.

Table 68 – Latent trait estimates and person model fit of the RSM-based instrument for measuring the intrinsic motivation in the third empirical study

UserID	Intrinsic Motivation			Interest/Enjoyment			Perceived Choice			Pressure/Tension			Elifor/Importance							
	theta	error	Outfit	Infit	theta	error	Outfit	Infit	theta	error	Outfit	Infit	theta	error	Outfit	Infit				
10169	0.455	0.163	2.935	2.794	5.357	1.439	0.082	0.087	0.808	0.387	0.502	0.507	2.258	1.137	0.144	-1.073	0.572	1.960	1.819	
10170	0.481	0.164	0.870	0.875	0.721	0.443	0.521	0.550	1.258	0.420	0.508	0.499	-0.345	0.363	2.636	2.908	-0.222	0.517	0.021	0.023
10171	1.203	0.219	0.256	0.237	2.448	0.432	0.483	0.493	1.630	0.478	0.173	0.149	-0.752	0.439	0.195	0.193	2.330	1.198	0.174	0.222
10172	-0.028	0.161	1.282	1.267	1.795	0.408	0.438	0.421	-1.085	0.424	0.263	0.263	0.498	0.411	0.878	0.972	-1.411	0.601	0.874	0.793
10174	0.124	0.160	0.770	0.753	1.116	0.430	0.972	0.972	0.087	0.394	0.204	0.204	0.498	0.411	0.878	0.972	-0.481	0.528	1.531	1.646
10175	0.857	0.183	0.700	0.702	0.512	0.443	0.056	0.057	2.181	0.619	0.786	0.940	-1.956	1.082	0.145	0.149	0.802	0.573	0.820	0.881
10176	-0.157	0.163	0.439	0.440	0.305	0.437	0.108	0.111	-0.572	0.411	0.598	0.594	0.674	0.445	0.545	0.580	-1.073	0.572	0.522	0.488
10179	0.250	0.160	1.246	1.264	0.109	0.427	1.898	2.006	-1.261	0.432	0.735	0.716	-1.244	0.630	0.355	0.367	1.124	0.635	0.419	0.328
10181	-0.264	0.166	0.870	0.907	-1.250	0.401	0.482	0.485	0.087	0.394	1.561	1.586	0.098	0.359	0.958	0.930	-1.776	0.641	0.547	0.523
10183	-0.210	0.164	0.492	0.501	-0.685	0.385	0.208	0.209	0.239	0.389	0.914	0.932	0.887	0.493	0.215	0.187	-1.073	0.572	0.919	0.864
10184	-0.002	0.160	0.269	0.265	0.305	0.437	0.212	0.212	-0.071	0.399	0.426	0.432	0.218	0.370	0.074	0.071	-1.073	0.572	0.023	0.023
10185	0.074	0.160	0.992	0.981	1.469	0.415	1.025	1.037	-0.572	0.411	1.788	1.777	0.498	0.411	0.292	0.281	-0.481	0.528	0.296	0.316
10186	0.200	0.160	1.326	1.329	0.305	0.437	3.062	3.146	0.385	0.386	0.850	0.869	1.152	0.567	0.537	0.601	2.330	1.198	0.174	0.222
10188	0.535	0.165	0.967	1.006	-0.543	0.389	0.755	0.787	1.630	0.478	0.878	0.864	-1.956	1.082	0.145	0.149	0.024	0.513	0.072	0.072
10189	-0.028	0.161	0.808	0.797	-1.405	0.416	0.537	0.560	-0.572	0.411	0.191	0.192	-0.597	0.401	0.637	0.671	0.523	0.538	0.454	0.415
10190	-0.291	0.166	0.595	0.593	-0.396	0.395	0.398	0.393	-0.912	0.418	1.482	1.470	0.674	0.445	1.164	1.371	-0.762	0.547	0.586	0.586
10191	0.023	0.160	0.952	0.964	-1.104	0.391	0.400	0.381	-0.742	0.415	0.211	0.212	-1.956	1.082	0.145	0.149	-0.222	0.517	0.323	0.344
10192	0.225	0.160	1.019	1.005	0.512	0.443	3.013	2.969	0.528	0.384	0.461	0.462	0.498	0.411	0.014	0.015	0.523	0.538	3.664	3.845
10193	0.200	0.160	2.406	2.445	-2.287	0.601	0.524	0.561	3.716	1.382	0.102	0.107	-0.233	0.355	2.258	2.442	0.024	0.513	2.149	2.043
10197	0.175	0.160	0.583	0.584	-0.072	0.416	1.626	1.626	0.668	0.384	0.926	0.923	0.098	0.359	0.473	0.459	-0.222	0.517	0.021	0.023
10198	0.074	0.160	1.088	1.079	0.512	0.443	2.179	2.148	-0.402	0.408	3.557	3.492	0.498	0.411	0.014	0.015	0.523	0.538	0.525	0.577
10199	-0.079	0.161	0.411	0.400	-0.543	0.389	0.639	0.666	-0.235	0.404	1.112	1.103	-0.014	0.353	0.212	0.207	-0.762	0.547	0.205	0.198
10200	0.326	0.161	0.902	0.869	1.116	0.430	0.521	0.497	0.528	0.384	1.087	1.095	0.887	0.493	0.390	0.351	1.542	0.765	0.184	0.130
10201	0.403	0.162	0.561	0.568	1.795	0.408	1.147	1.163	0.087	0.394	0.265	0.263	-0.124	0.351	0.208	0.204	0.024	0.513	0.258	0.245
10202	0.200	0.160	0.369	0.382	-0.543	0.389	0.077	0.071	0.808	0.387	0.845	0.861	0.098	0.359	0.153	0.164	0.523	0.538	0.021	0.020
10203	0.673	0.171	1.183	1.072	0.721	0.443	0.865	0.902	1.869	0.531	1.313	1.584	-0.014	0.353	1.566	1.531	2.330	1.198	0.174	0.222
10204	-1.007	0.205	1.102	1.272	-3.681	1.306	0.087	0.095	-2.752	0.671	0.419	0.418	2.258	1.137	0.144	0.139	0.024	0.513	1.477	1.543
10206	0.403	0.162	0.267	0.279	0.109	0.427	0.786	0.800	1.100	0.404	0.115	0.116	-0.124	0.351	0.081	0.081	0.523	0.538	0.021	0.020
10208	0.403	0.162	0.126	0.130	0.305	0.437	0.108	0.111	0.528	0.384	0.445	0.449	-0.465	0.378	0.035	0.037	0.523	0.538	0.021	0.020
10209	-0.237	0.165	1.597	1.644	-1.104	0.391	0.743	0.727	-2.752	0.671	0.419	0.418	-1.244	0.630	0.397	0.401	-0.222	0.517	0.435	0.409
10210	-0.780	0.188	1.937	2.140	-3.681	1.306	0.087	0.095	-2.752	0.671	0.419	0.418	2.258	1.137	0.144	0.139	2.330	1.198	0.174	0.222
10213	-0.079	0.161	2.095	2.075	0.305	0.437	3.401	3.535	-2.752	0.671	0.419	0.418	0.218	0.370	1.597	1.525	2.330	1.198	0.174	0.222

Table 68 – (continued)

UserID	Intrinsic Motivation				Interest/Enjoyment				Perceived Choice				Pressure/Tension				Effort/Importance			
	theta	error	Outfit	Infit	theta	error	Outfit	Infit	theta	error	Outfit	Infit	theta	error	Outfit	Infit	theta	error	Outfit	Infit
10214	-0.375	0.169	1.851	1.920	-2.722	0.762	0.275	0.329	-1.261	0.432	2.481	2.574	0.349	0.386	1.469	1.526	2.330	1.198	0.174	0.222
10215	0.377	0.161	1.305	1.319	0.512	0.443	1.219	1.216	0.951	0.394	1.433	1.442	-0.345	0.363	2.636	2.908	-0.481	0.528	2.122	2.112
10216	0.824	0.180	0.669	0.717	1.297	0.422	2.059	1.974	1.258	0.420	0.508	0.499	-1.956	1.082	0.145	0.149	0.523	0.538	0.455	0.438
10217	0.403	0.162	0.749	0.729	0.924	0.438	0.483	0.470	0.087	0.394	0.677	0.699	-1.956	1.082	0.145	0.149	-0.762	0.547	0.128	0.127
10218	-0.028	0.161	0.361	0.358	0.512	0.443	0.056	0.057	-0.402	0.408	0.301	0.299	0.349	0.386	0.621	0.685	-0.762	0.547	0.205	0.198
10219	-0.237	0.165	2.223	2.282	-1.574	0.438	1.936	1.702	-0.742	0.415	3.805	3.809	-1.956	1.082	0.145	0.149	-2.719	0.854	0.301	0.304
10220	0.562	0.166	1.539	1.641	-0.963	0.386	1.536	1.549	1.869	0.531	1.941	2.034	-1.956	1.082	0.145	0.149	0.802	0.573	0.820	0.881
10221	-0.131	0.162	0.539	0.554	-0.824	0.383	0.100	0.100	-0.912	0.418	0.933	0.923	-0.014	0.353	0.960	0.970	0.268	0.520	0.127	0.131
10223	0.275	0.160	0.574	0.546	1.634	0.410	0.165	0.162	0.087	0.394	0.204	0.204	0.098	0.359	0.463	0.438	-0.481	0.528	0.829	0.774
10224	-0.105	0.162	0.456	0.456	0.512	0.443	0.056	0.057	-0.402	0.408	0.176	0.177	0.887	0.493	0.363	0.325	-0.762	0.547	1.357	1.257
10226	-1.237	0.228	0.625	0.561	-1.994	0.519	1.113	1.469	-2.752	0.671	0.419	0.418	2.258	1.137	0.144	0.139	-2.719	0.854	0.301	0.304
10227	0.175	0.160	0.643	0.614	0.924	0.438	1.125	1.129	0.385	0.386	0.160	0.163	0.218	0.370	0.636	0.640	-0.762	0.547	0.949	1.009
10228	0.049	0.160	1.940	1.938	-2.287	0.601	0.351	0.333	1.869	0.531	0.406	0.381	0.098	0.359	1.548	1.637	0.024	0.513	2.322	2.252
10230	0.149	0.160	0.660	0.668	1.116	0.430	0.165	0.163	-0.071	0.399	0.641	0.645	0.349	0.386	1.326	1.429	-0.222	0.517	0.640	0.621
10231	0.703	0.173	1.179	1.084	1.116	0.430	0.934	0.913	1.869	0.531	0.438	0.479	-1.956	1.082	0.145	0.149	-1.073	0.572	0.700	0.652
10232	0.481	0.164	0.289	0.281	1.116	0.430	0.227	0.222	0.385	0.386	0.302	0.298	-0.233	0.355	0.496	0.538	1.124	0.635	0.408	0.398
10234	-0.613	0.179	1.334	1.408	-1.766	0.470	0.225	0.193	-2.093	0.524	0.271	0.262	-0.465	0.378	0.843	0.894	-2.719	0.854	0.301	0.304
10237	0.023	0.160	0.698	0.689	0.512	0.443	1.727	1.715	0.087	0.394	0.793	0.764	0.887	0.493	0.390	0.351	-0.222	0.517	0.323	0.344
10238	-0.105	0.162	0.666	0.673	0.305	0.437	0.108	0.111	-1.085	0.424	0.563	0.535	1.152	0.567	0.480	0.520	0.802	0.573	0.197	0.151

C.7 RSM-based Instrument for Measuring the Level of Motivation in the Third Empirical Study

C.7.1 Checking Assumptions

Test of Unidimensionality

Table 69 shows the results for the test of unidimensionality in which the goodness of fit statistics indicate a strong multidimensionality ($DETECT > 1.00$) for the *Level of Motivation* with a DETECT index of 6.634. Essential unidimensionality ($ASSI < 0.25$ and $RATIO < 0.36$) in the data structure is indicated for the level of motivation by the ASSI and RATIO indices with values of 0.242 and 0.279, respectively. The index of $AGFI = 0.980$ in the unidimensional CFA indicates an acceptable fit for measuring the *Level of Motivation*. The sub-scales of *Attention*, *Relevance*, and *Satisfaction* have a good fit indicated by the AGFI index with values greater than 0.95. A good fit with the unidimensional CFA is indicated by the TLI and CFI indices for all the sub-scales. The ASSI and RATIO indices indicate essential deviation from unidimensionality in all the sub-scales.

Table 69 – Goodness of fit statistics related to the test of unidimensionality in the RSM-based instrument for measuring the level of motivation in the third empirical study

	df	chisq	AGFI	TLI	CFI	DETECT	ASSI	RATIO
Level of Motivation	9.196	20.051	0.980	0.844	0.749	6.634	0.242	0.279
Attention	4.337	3.955	0.997	1.006	1.000	7.166	0.333	0.621
Relevance	1.762	1.090	0.997	1.063	1.000	14.903	0.333	0.529
Satisfaction	0.000	0.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	18.022	0.333	0.939

df: degree of freedom; AGFI: Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index; CFI: Comparative Fit Index; TLI: Tucker-Lewis Index;

Test of Local Independence

Results from the test of local independence in the RSM-based instrument for measuring the level of motivation in the third empirical study are summarized in Table 70. The null condition of local independence is not rejected in all the sub-scales. The Standardized Root Mean Squared Residual (SRMSR) indicates good fits (< 0.10) for all the sub-scales.

Table 70 – Item residual correlation statistics related to the test of local independence in the RSM-based instrument for measuring the level of motivation in the third empirical study

	max.chisq	maxaQ3	MADaQ3	SRMSR	p.value
Level of Motivation	138.794	0.601	0.201	0.213	0.002
Attention	282.594	0.335	0.139	0.086	0.284
Relevance	110.345	0.176	0.072	0.066	1.000
Satisfaction	62.109	0.282	0.188	0.073	0.144

aQ3: adjusted correlation of item residuals; maxaQ3: maximum aQ3;

MADaQ3: Median Absolute Deviation of aQ3;

Test of Monotonicity

Table 71 summarizes the test of monotonicity in the RSM-based instrument for measuring the level of motivation in the third empirical study. These results indicates that there are no one violation of monotonicity in the items at the significance level $\alpha = 0.05$.

Table 71 – Test of monotonicity in the RSM-based instrument for measuring the level of motivation in the third empirical study

	ItemH	ac	vi	vi/ac	maxvi	sum	sum/ac	zmax	zsig	crit
Level of Motivation.Item12A	0.53	0	0		0	0		0	0	0
Level of Motivation.Item19A	0.47	0	0		0	0		0	0	0
Level of Motivation.Item04A	0.47	0	0		0	0		0	0	0
Level of Motivation.Item20A	0.45	0	0		0	0		0	0	0
Level of Motivation.Item16A	0.51	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level of Motivation.Item01A	0.44	0	0		0	0		0	0	0
Level of Motivation.Item21R	0.24	0	0		0	0		0	0	0
Level of Motivation.Item10R	0.29	0	0		0	0		0	0	0
Level of Motivation.Item08R	0.12	0	0		0	0		0	0	0
Level of Motivation.Item13S	0.49	0	0		0	0		0	0	0
Level of Motivation.Item14S	0.52	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level of Motivation.Item17S	0.42	0	0		0	0		0	0	0
Attention.Item12A	0.68	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Attention.Item19A	0.66	0	0		0	0		0	0	0
Attention.Item04A	0.66	0	0		0	0		0	0	0
Attention.Item20A	0.59	0	0		0	0		0	0	0
Attention.Item16A	0.66	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Attention.Item01A	0.54	0	0		0	0		0	0	0
Relevance.Item15R	0.35	0	0		0	0		0	0	0
Relevance.Item21R	0.41	0	0		0	0		0	0	0
Relevance.Item10R	0.42	0	0		0	0		0	0	0
Relevance.Item08R	0.35	0	0		0	0		0	0	0
Satisfaction.Item13S	0.77	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Satisfaction.Item14S	0.75	0	0		0	0		0	0	0
Satisfaction.Item17S	0.68	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

vi: number of violations; vi/ac: proportion of active pairs; maxvi: maximum violations;
sum: sum of all violations; zmax: maximum z-value; zsig: number of significant z-values; crit: critical value

C.7.2 Item Parameters

Table 72 shows the estimated parameters for the RSM-based instrument used to measure the *Attention* in the third empirical study. These parameters had been calculated using the MML method (BOCK; AITKIN, 1981), so that the value in row “B.Catx” and column “*i*” is the item slope $b_{i,x}$ of item *i* in the category “*x*”, and the value in the row “AXsi.Catx” and column “*i*” is the item intercept $a_{i,x}\xi$ of item *i* in the category “*x*”. According to the Infit/Outfit statistics of items, no one mean-square value is greater than 2.0 indicating that the measurement system of *Attention* is not distorted or degraded by the items.

Table 72 – Estimated parameters in the RSM-based instrument for measuring the attention in the third empirical study

	Item01A	Item04A	Item12A	Item16A	Item19A	Item20A
xsi.item	0.321	0.340	0.303	-0.029	0.229	0.376
B.Cat0	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
B.Cat1	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
B.Cat2	2.000	2.000	2.000	2.000	2.000	2.000
B.Cat3	3.000	3.000	3.000	3.000	3.000	3.000
B.Cat4	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000
B.Cat5	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000
B.Cat6	6.000	6.000	6.000	6.000	6.000	6.000
AXsi.Cat0	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
AXsi.Cat1	1.292	1.274	1.311	1.643	1.384	1.237
AXsi.Cat2	1.608	1.571	1.645	2.309	1.792	1.497
AXsi.Cat3	2.891	2.836	2.946	3.943	3.167	2.725
AXsi.Cat4	1.786	1.712	1.859	3.188	2.154	1.565
AXsi.Cat5	-0.044	-0.136	0.048	1.709	0.416	-0.320
AXsi.Cat6	-1.928	-2.038	-1.817	0.176	-1.375	-2.259
Outfit	1.231	0.856	0.781	0.795	1.244	1.013
Infit	1.207	0.838	0.824	0.806	1.294	1.105

Table 73 shows the estimated parameters for the measurement instrument of *Relevance* in which the Infit/Outfit statistics of items indicate that no one item distorts or degrades the measurement system with mean-square greater than 2.0.

Table 73 – Estimated parameters in the RSM-based instrument for measuring the relevance in the third empirical study

	Item08R	Item10R	Item15R	Item21R
xsi.item	-0.953	-0.773	-0.539	-0.677
B.Cat0	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
B.Cat1	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
B.Cat2	2.000	2.000	2.000	2.000
B.Cat3	3.000	3.000	3.000	3.000
B.Cat4	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000
B.Cat5	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000
B.Cat6	6.000	6.000	6.000	6.000
AXsi.Cat0	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
AXsi.Cat1	3.925	3.745	3.511	3.649
AXsi.Cat2	4.994	4.634	4.166	4.441
AXsi.Cat3	6.466	5.925	5.223	5.636
AXsi.Cat4	6.291	5.570	4.634	5.185
AXsi.Cat5	6.096	5.195	4.024	4.713
AXsi.Cat6	5.718	4.637	3.232	4.059
Outfit	1.124	0.896	1.014	0.945
Infit	1.142	0.898	0.986	0.960

Table 74 shows the estimated parameters for the measurement instrument of *Satisfaction* in the third empirical study in which the Infit/Outfit statistics of items indicate that no one item distorts or degrades the measurement system with mean-square greater than 2.0.

Table 74 – Estimated parameters in the RSM-based instrument for measuring the satisfaction in the third empirical study

estimated	Item13S	Item14S	Item17S
xsi.item	-0.267	-0.047	-0.378
B.Cat0	0.000	0.000	0.000
B.Cat1	1.000	1.000	1.000
B.Cat2	2.000	2.000	2.000
B.Cat3	3.000	3.000	3.000
B.Cat4	4.000	4.000	4.000
B.Cat5	5.000	5.000	5.000
B.Cat6	6.000	6.000	6.000
AXsi.Cat0	0.000	0.000	0.000
AXsi.Cat1	2.315	2.095	2.426
AXsi.Cat2	4.032	3.592	4.253
AXsi.Cat3	5.337	4.677	5.669
AXsi.Cat4	4.692	3.813	5.135
AXsi.Cat5	3.596	2.496	4.149
AXsi.Cat6	1.602	0.282	2.266
Outfit	0.944	0.921	1.176
Infit	0.938	0.889	1.163

C.7.3 Level of Motivation as Latent Trait Estimates

Table 75 shows the latent trait estimates by the RSM-based instrument for measuring the *Level of Motivation* in the third empirical study.

Table 75 – Latent trait estimates and person model fit of the RSM-based instrument for measuring the level of motivation in the third empirical study

UserID	Level of Motivation				Attention				Relevance				Satisfaction			
	theta	error	Outfit	Infit	theta	error	Outfit	Infit	theta	error	Outfit	Infit	theta	error	Outfit	Infit
10169	2.348	0.490	2.109	1.238	4.278	1.300	0.087	0.088	0.527	0.414	0.808	0.827	3.858	1.474	0.162	0.165
10170	0.329	0.228	0.723	0.690	0.844	0.411	0.646	0.647	0.374	0.405	1.525	1.464	0.133	0.611	0.166	0.168
10171	0.820	0.243	0.388	0.375	1.167	0.395	0.342	0.338	1.074	0.501	0.152	0.122	1.115	0.573	1.097	1.090
10172	0.226	1.159	1.121	1.167	0.395	0.285	0.284	-1.153	0.469	0.028	0.029	0.817	0.574	0.534	0.532	
10174	0.381	0.230	1.352	1.334	1.314	0.389	1.038	1.034	-0.761	0.437	0.810	0.808	0.817	0.574	0.744	0.752
10175	1.000	0.253	0.322	0.305	1.314	0.389	0.321	0.322	1.074	0.501	0.500	0.498	1.416	0.588	0.354	0.350
10176	0.025	0.222	0.287	0.288	0.470	0.421	0.296	0.296	-0.404	0.416	0.033	0.034	-0.292	0.620	0.016	0.016
10178	-0.168	0.219	0.329	0.327	0.095	0.402	0.019	0.019	-0.761	0.437	0.429	0.409	-1.049	0.571	0.940	0.943
10179	-0.073	0.220	0.504	0.507	-0.344	0.361	0.909	0.889	0.374	0.405	0.439	0.449	-0.292	0.620	0.717	0.712
10181	-0.263	0.218	1.243	1.244	0.276	0.415	0.362	0.363	-0.078	0.403	0.581	0.583	-2.532	0.669	1.000	1.031
10183	-0.876	0.228	0.138	0.148	-1.247	0.368	0.036	0.039	-1.153	0.469	0.268	0.261	-1.616	0.549	0.626	0.629
10184	-0.024	0.221	0.501	0.502	-0.068	0.387	0.788	0.786	0.075	0.400	1.426	1.410	0.499	0.588	0.888	0.897
10185	-0.168	0.219	1.030	1.007	-0.068	0.387	1.322	1.251	-0.761	0.437	1.270	1.272	0.499	0.588	0.274	0.273
10186	0.277	0.227	2.241	2.257	-0.344	0.361	2.834	2.891	0.527	0.414	1.947	1.952	2.142	0.706	1.615	1.556
10188	-0.073	0.220	0.845	0.818	-0.465	0.351	0.395	0.396	1.336	0.575	0.444	0.451	-1.343	0.553	0.021	0.021
10189	-0.927	0.231	1.131	1.219	-2.220	0.603	0.452	0.438	-0.579	0.425	3.434	3.448	-1.616	0.549	0.101	0.100
10190	0.025	0.222	0.989	0.992	1.011	0.402	0.801	0.787	-0.952	0.450	0.068	0.071	-0.704	0.599	0.282	0.285
10191	-0.216	0.218	0.673	0.648	-0.465	0.351	0.534	0.549	-0.238	0.409	1.454	1.492	0.133	0.611	0.166	0.168
10192	0.879	0.246	1.605	1.489	1.314	0.389	1.664	1.657	-0.078	0.403	1.499	1.489	2.705	0.876	0.441	0.438
10193	-0.876	0.228	2.397	2.606	-2.710	0.795	0.624	0.593	1.727	0.726	0.478	0.480	-3.028	0.827	0.650	0.632
10197	0.277	0.227	1.831	1.831	1.314	0.389	1.805	1.801	0.225	0.400	1.741	1.747	-1.049	0.571	1.104	1.087
10198	1.270	0.276	0.907	0.934	1.881	0.399	1.273	1.284	0.374	0.405	0.301	0.306	2.705	0.876	0.673	0.662
10199	-0.024	0.221	0.694	0.706	-0.344	0.361	1.124	1.177	-0.078	0.403	0.297	0.302	0.499	0.588	0.888	0.897
10200	0.762	0.241	0.348	0.343	1.167	0.395	0.295	0.296	0.374	0.405	0.052	0.050	1.745	0.628	0.774	0.741
10201	0.434	0.231	1.043	0.999	1.011	0.402	1.198	1.200	-0.761	0.437	0.892	0.883	1.416	0.588	0.126	0.128
10202	-0.121	0.220	0.530	0.531	-0.579	0.345	0.545	0.552	-0.078	0.403	0.558	0.558	0.817	0.574	0.019	0.019
10203	0.487	0.232	0.873	0.864	0.662	0.419	0.626	0.630	-0.404	0.416	0.174	0.172	2.142	0.706	1.419	1.418
10204	-1.149	0.249	1.634	1.851	-3.843	1.425	0.084	0.085	-0.238	0.409	2.292	2.289	-1.887	0.562	1.179	1.179
10206	0.434	0.231	0.250	0.253	0.662	0.419	0.572	0.566	0.075	0.400	0.058	0.057	1.115	0.573	0.141	0.140
10208	-0.541	0.218	0.598	0.605	-1.012	0.347	0.144	0.141	-0.761	0.437	0.862	0.877	0.133	0.611	1.194	1.209
10209	-0.728	0.222	0.750	0.775	-1.126	0.356	0.141	0.136	-0.238	0.409	1.818	1.867	-1.887	0.562	0.131	0.134
10210	-2.299	0.486	0.310	0.352	-3.843	1.425	0.084	0.085	-1.625	0.536	1.169	1.082	-4.077	1.394	0.168	0.171

Table 75 – (continued)

UserID	Level of Motivation				Attention				Relevance				Satisfaction			
	theta	error	Outfit	Infit	theta	error	Outfit	Infit	theta	error	Outfit	Infit	theta	error	Outfit	Infit
10213	1.198	0.269	1.590	1.767	1.596	0.387	2.625	2.640	1.727	0.726	0.418	0.432	1.745	0.628	1.948	2.012
10214	-0.681	0.220	0.506	0.500	-1.247	0.368	0.722	0.752	-0.952	0.450	0.663	0.675	-0.704	0.599	0.282	0.285
10215	-0.168	0.219	2.231	2.186	-0.689	0.341	1.659	1.682	1.074	0.501	1.300	1.425	-1.887	0.562	1.044	1.062
10216	0.434	0.231	0.834	0.844	-0.068	0.387	1.367	1.373	0.867	0.458	0.324	0.329	1.115	0.573	0.141	0.140
10217	0.025	0.222	0.121	0.123	-0.068	0.387	0.319	0.308	0.225	0.400	0.036	0.036	-0.292	0.620	0.016	0.016
10218	-0.121	0.220	0.456	0.461	0.095	0.402	0.774	0.760	-0.078	0.403	0.326	0.326	-1.049	0.571	0.217	0.213
10219	-1.211	0.255	0.704	0.677	-1.378	0.386	0.608	0.584	-0.761	0.437	0.300	0.302	-4.077	1.394	0.168	0.171
10220	-0.073	0.220	3.289	3.273	-1.919	0.507	2.147	2.032	1.074	0.501	1.300	1.425	1.745	0.628	1.948	2.012
10221	-0.587	0.218	0.671	0.671	-0.796	0.340	0.442	0.442	-1.625	0.536	0.836	0.861	-0.292	0.620	0.564	0.565
10223	0.075	0.223	0.247	0.239	-0.068	0.387	0.114	0.118	0.225	0.400	0.499	0.494	0.133	0.611	0.392	0.388
10224	0.277	0.227	0.211	0.208	0.470	0.421	0.180	0.179	-0.078	0.403	0.070	0.070	0.817	0.574	0.459	0.457
10226	-0.448	0.217	0.734	0.742	-0.344	0.361	1.402	1.306	-0.238	0.409	1.145	1.133	-1.616	0.549	0.101	0.100
10227	0.939	0.250	0.382	0.354	1.596	0.387	0.179	0.181	0.225	0.400	0.418	0.420	1.745	0.628	0.023	0.024
10228	-0.448	0.217	1.367	1.339	-1.247	0.368	1.180	1.209	0.075	0.400	1.960	1.968	-0.292	0.620	0.016	0.016
10230	0.226	0.226	0.999	0.997	0.844	0.411	1.057	1.058	0.075	0.400	0.174	0.174	-0.292	0.620	3.518	3.532
10231	0.226	0.226	0.479	0.468	0.095	0.402	0.019	0.019	-0.078	0.403	0.297	0.302	1.115	0.573	1.604	1.598
10232	0.820	0.243	0.334	0.338	1.011	0.402	0.632	0.630	0.689	0.431	0.604	0.609	1.416	0.588	0.126	0.128
10234	-0.402	0.217	2.340	2.335	-0.579	0.345	3.201	3.234	0.689	0.431	0.819	0.841	-2.532	0.669	0.353	0.353
10237	-0.024	0.221	0.495	0.488	-0.213	0.373	0.549	0.529	-0.078	0.403	0.297	0.302	0.133	0.611	1.562	1.586
10238	0.025	0.222	0.547	0.546	0.470	0.421	0.260	0.260	-0.078	0.403	0.207	0.210	-1.049	0.571	1.239	1.223

C.8 Stacking Procedure for Estimating Gains in Skill/-Knowledge of the Pilot Empirical Study

C.8.1 Checking Assumptions

Test of Unidimensionality

Table 76 shows the results for the test of unidimensionality in which the goodness of fit statistics indicate essential unidimensionality ($DETECT > 1.00$) for the *Pre-test* with a DETECT index of 0.009. Strong multidimensionality for the *Post-test* is indicated by the DETECT index with a value of 3.187. Essential unidimensionality in the data structure is indicated by the ASSI index in the *Pre-test*. The RATIO indices for the *Pre-test* and *Post-test* indicate essential deviation from unidimensionality. The index of $AGFI = 0.990$ in the unidimensional CFA indicates an acceptable fit for measuring the skill/knowledge obtained in the *Post-test*. The unidimensional CFA indicated by the TLI and CFI indices indicate unidimensionality.

Table 76 – Goodness of fit statistics related to the test of unidimensionality in the GPCM-based instrument for measuring the gains in skill/knowledge of the pilot empirical study

	df	chisq	AGFI	TLI	CFI	DETECT	ASSI	RATIO
Pre-test	2	2.591	0.548	0.912	0.971	0.009	0.167	0.998
Post-test	2	0.387	0.990	-1.852	1.000	3.187	0.333	0.582

df: degree of freedom; AGFI: Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index; CFI: Comparative Fit Index; TLI: Tucker-Lewis Index;

Test of Local Independence

Results from the test of local independence in the GPCM-based instrument for measuring gains in skill/knowledge of the pilot empirical study are summarized in Table 77. The null condition of local independence is not rejected in the *Pre-test* and *Post-test*. The Standardized Root Mean Squared Residual (SRMSR) indicates a good fit (< 0.10) in the *Pre-test* with value of 0.089, and the SRMSR index in the *Post-test* indicates acceptable good fit with value of 0.107.

Table 77 – Item residual correlation statistics related to the test of local independence in the GPCM-based instrument for measuring gains in skill/knowledge of the pilot empirical study

	max.chisq	maxaQ3	MADaQ3	SRMSR	p.value
Pre-test	5.639	0.225	0.086	0.089	1.000
Post-test	9.115	0.288	0.116	0.107	0.767

aQ3: adjusted correlation of item residuals; maxaQ3: maximum aQ3;

MADaQ3: Median Absolute Deviation of aQ3;

C.8.2 Item Parameters

Table 78 shows the estimated parameters for the GPCM-based instrument used to measure the pre-test skill/knowledge of the pilot empirical study. These parameters had been calculated

using the MML method (BOCK; AITKIN, 1981), so that the value in row “B.Cat x ” and column “ i ” is the item slope $b_{i,x}$ of item i in the category “ x ”, and the value in the row “AXsi.Cat x ” and column “ i ” is the item intercept $a_{i,x}\xi$ of item i in the category “ x ”. According to the Infit/Outfit statistics of items, no one mean-square value is greater than 2.0 indicating that the measurement system is not distorted or degraded by the items.

Table 78 – Estimated parameters in the GPCM-based instrument for measuring the pre-test skill/knowledge of the pilot empirical study

	P1s0	P2s0	P3s2	P4s0
xsi.item	-0.643	0.433	4.444	4.227
B.Cat0	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
B.Cat1	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
B.Cat2	0.000	0.000	2.000	0.000
B.Cat3	0.000	0.000	3.000	0.000
AXsi.Cat0	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
AXsi.Cat1	0.643	-0.433	-4.177	-4.227
AXsi.Cat2			-7.924	
AXsi.Cat3			-13.332	
max.Outfit	0.649	0.537	0.994	0.386
max.Infit	0.844	0.755	1.500	0.961

Table 79 shows the estimated parameters for the GPCM-based instrument used to measure the post-test skill/knowledge of the pilot empirical study. These parameters had been calculated using the MML method (BOCK; AITKIN, 1981), so that the value in row “B.Cat x ” and column “ i ” is the item slope $b_{i,x}$ of item i in the category “ x ”, and the value in the row “AXsi.Cat x ” and column “ i ” is the item intercept $a_{i,x}\xi$ of item i in the category “ x ”. According to the Infit/Outfit statistics of items, no one mean-square value is greater than 2.0 indicating that the measurement system is not distorted or degraded by the items.

Table 79 – Estimated parameters in the GPCM-based instrument for measuring the post-test skill/knowledge in the pilot empirical study

	PAs2	PBs3	PCs0	PDs0
xsi.item	-0.506	-0.040	-0.518	1.901
B.Cat0	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
B.Cat1	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
B.Cat2	2.000	2.000	0.000	0.000
B.Cat3	3.000	3.000	0.000	0.000
B.Cat4	0.000	4.000	0.000	0.000
AXsi.Cat0	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
AXsi.Cat1	2.044	1.341	0.518	-1.901
AXsi.Cat2	1.845	1.192		
AXsi.Cat3	1.518	0.708		
AXsi.Cat4		0.161		
max.Outfit	1.198	1.915	1.060	0.927
max.Infit	1.149	1.078	1.071	0.950

C.8.3 Gains in Skill/Knowledge as Latent Trait Estimates

Table 80 shows the latent trait estimates by the GPCM-based instrument for measuring the gains in skill/knowledge of the pilot empirical study.

Table 80 – Latent trait estimates and person model fit of the GPCM-based instrument for measuring gains in skill/knowledge of the pilot empirical study

UserID	Pre-test				Post-test			
	theta	error	Outfit	Infit	theta	error	Outfit	Infit
10116	3.666	0.940	0.160	0.129	0.259	0.639	0.814	1.117
10119	-1.876	1.955	0.099	0.226	-3.280	1.766	0.216	0.232
10120	4.987	1.035	0.121	0.112	-0.514	0.715	0.343	0.243
10121	3.046	1.280	0.167	0.355	-1.684	1.085	0.422	0.422
10122	3.046	1.280	0.167	0.355	0.310	0.659	1.253	0.704
10126	2.620	1.298	0.148	0.199	-1.090	0.831	0.163	0.108
10127	3.046	1.280	0.167	0.355	-1.684	1.085	0.422	0.422
10128	2.620	1.298	0.148	0.199	0.606	0.660	0.184	0.109
10129	-1.876	1.955	0.099	0.226	-0.094	0.656	0.351	0.368
10130	-0.103	1.443	0.394	0.567	-0.477	0.723	0.431	0.262
10131	-2.145	2.095	0.223	0.223	-0.052	0.668	0.581	0.226
10132	-1.876	1.955	0.099	0.226	0.606	0.660	1.016	1.429
10133	2.620	1.298	0.148	0.199	-1.921	1.050	0.377	0.405
10134	-1.876	1.955	0.099	0.226	-0.514	0.715	0.343	0.243
10135	2.620	1.298	0.148	0.199	0.259	0.639	1.477	1.865
10136	-1.876	1.955	0.099	0.226	0.606	0.660	0.482	0.531
10137	-1.874	1.962	0.131	0.228	-0.094	0.656	0.357	0.290
10138	-1.876	1.955	0.099	0.226	1.010	0.733	0.309	0.243
10139	-2.145	2.095	0.223	0.223	0.674	0.697	1.548	1.065
10140	-0.103	1.443	0.394	0.567	0.259	0.639	1.703	0.703
10141	-1.876	1.955	0.099	0.226	3.106	1.673	0.117	0.181
10143	3.046	1.280	0.167	0.355	-3.002	2.068	0.379	0.379
10144	4.271	0.903	0.300	0.360	0.606	0.660	1.102	0.605
10145	4.987	1.035	0.121	0.112	0.606	0.660	0.184	0.109
10146	-0.104	1.424	0.299	0.552	1.628	0.929	0.832	0.865
10148	-1.876	1.955	0.099	0.226	1.010	0.733	1.138	1.138
10149	-1.876	1.955	0.099	0.226	0.606	0.660	0.184	0.109
10152	4.987	1.035	0.858	1.461	-0.514	0.715	0.446	0.384
10153	-0.103	1.443	0.394	0.567	1.628	0.929	0.385	0.411
10154	-2.145	2.095	0.223	0.223	-3.002	2.068	0.379	0.379

C.9 Stacking Procedure for Estimating Gains in Skill-/Knowledge of the First Empirical Study

C.9.1 Checking Assumptions

Test of Unidimensionality

Table 81 shows the results for the test of unidimensionality in which the goodness of fit statistics indicate strong multidimensionality ($DETECT > 1.00$) for the *Pre-test* and *Post-test* with values of 33.268 and 27.559. Essential unidimensionality in the data structure is indicated

by the ASSI index in the *Pre-test* (with value of 0.056). The index AGFI in the *Pre-test* and *Post-test* indicate got fit with values greater than 0.95 A good fit with the unidimensional CFA is indicated by the TLI and CFI indices for the pre-test and post-test.

Table 81 – Goodness of fit statistics related to the test of unidimensionality in the GPCM-based instrument for measuring the gains in skill/knowledge of the first empirical study

	df	chisq	AGFI	TLI	CFI	DETECT	ASSI	RATIO
Pre-test	27	27.576	0.969	0.981	0.986	33.264	0.056	0.508
Post-test	14	16.087	0.997	0.875	0.917	27.559	0.333	0.528

df: degree of freedom; AGFI: Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index; CFI: Comparative Fit Index; TLI: Tucker-Lewis Index;

Test of Local Independence

Results from the test of local independence in the GPCM-based instrument for measuring gains in skill/knowledge of the first empirical study are summarized in Table 82. The null condition of local independence is not rejected in the *Pre-test* and *Post-test*. The Standardized Root Mean Squared Residual (SRMSR) indicates an acceptable fit (0.10s) in the *Post-test*.

Table 82 – Item residual correlation statistics related to the test of local independence in the GPCM-based instrument for measuring gains in skill/knowledge of the first empirical study

	max.chisq	maxaQ3	MADaQ3	SRMSR	p.value
Pre-test	51.415	0.370	0.126	0.251	0.176
Post-test	90.705	0.326	0.125	0.166	0.345

aQ3: adjusted correlation of item residuals; maxaQ3: maximum aQ3;

MADaQ3: Median Absolute Deviation of aQ3;

C.9.2 Item Parameters

Table 83 shows the estimated parameters for the GPCM-based instrument used to measure the pre-test skill/knowledge of the first empirical study. These parameters had been calculated using the MML method (BOCK;AITKIN, 1981), so that the value in row “B.Catx” and column “*i*” is the item slope $b_{i,x}$ of item *i* in the category “*x*”, and the value in the row “AXsi.Catx” and column “*i*” is the item intercept $a_{i,x}\xi$ of item *i* in the category “*x*”. According to the Infit/Outfit statistics of items, no one mean-square value is greater than 2.0 indicating that the measurement system is not distorted or degraded by the items.

Table 83 – Estimated parameters in the GPCM-based instrument for measuring the pre-test skill/knowledge of the first empirical study

	An3	Ap1	Ap2	Ap3	Ev1	Ev2	P1s2	Un1	Un2
xsi.item	-0.224	-0.662	-0.573	-0.196	-0.177	-0.054	-12.260	-6.086	-0.093
B.Cat0	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
B.Cat1	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
B.Cat2	2.000	2.000	0.000	2.000	2.000	2.000	2.000	2.000	2.000
B.Cat3	3.000	3.000	0.000	3.000	3.000	3.000	3.000	3.000	3.000
B.Cat4	4.000	4.000	0.000	4.000	4.000	4.000	0.000	4.000	4.000

Table 83 – (*continued*)

Table 84 shows the estimated parameters for the GPCM-based instrument used to measure the post-test skill/knowledge of the first empirical study. These parameters had been calculated using the MML method (BOCK; AITKIN, 1981), so that the value in row “B.Cat x ” and column “ i ” is the item slope $b_{i,x}$ of item i in the category “ x ”, and the value in the row “AXsi.Cat x ” and column “ i ” is the item intercept $a_{i,x}\xi$ of item i in the category “ x ”. According to the Infit/Outfit statistics of items, no one mean-square value is greater than 2.0 indicating that the measurement system is not distorted or degraded by the items.

Table 84 – Estimated parameters in the GPCM-based instrument for measuring the post-test skill/knowledge in the first empirical study

Table 84 – (continued)

	AnC	ApB	ApC	EvA	PAs3	ReB	UnB
B.Cat1	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
B.Cat2	2.000	2.000	2.000	2.000	2.000	2.000	2.000
B.Cat3	3.000	3.000	3.000	3.000	3.000	3.000	3.000
B.Cat4	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000
B.Cat5	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	0.000	5.000	0.000
B.Cat6	6.000	6.000	6.000	6.000	0.000	6.000	0.000
B.Cat7	7.000	7.000	7.000	0.000	0.000	7.000	0.000
B.Cat8	8.000	8.000	8.000	0.000	0.000	8.000	0.000
B.Cat9	9.000	9.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	9.000	0.000
B.Cat10	10.000	10.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	10.000	0.000
B.Cat11	11.000	11.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	11.000	0.000
B.Cat12	12.000	12.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	12.000	0.000
B.Cat13	13.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	13.000	0.000
B.Cat14	14.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	14.000	0.000
B.Cat15	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	15.000	0.000
B.Cat16	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	16.000	0.000
B.Cat17	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	17.000	0.000
B.Cat18	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	18.000	0.000
B.Cat19	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	19.000	0.000
B.Cat20	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	20.000	0.000
B.Cat21	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	21.000	0.000
B.Cat22	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	22.000	0.000
B.Cat23	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	23.000	0.000
B.Cat24	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	24.000	0.000
B.Cat25	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	25.000	0.000
B.Cat26	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	26.000	0.000
B.Cat27	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	27.000	0.000
B.Cat28	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	28.000	0.000
B.Cat29	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	29.000	0.000
B.Cat30	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	30.000	0.000
B.Cat31	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	31.000	0.000
B.Cat32	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	32.000	0.000
B.Cat33	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	33.000	0.000
B.Cat34	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	34.000	0.000
B.Cat35	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	35.000	0.000
B.Cat36	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	36.000	0.000
B.Cat37	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	37.000	0.000
B.Cat38	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	38.000	0.000
B.Cat39	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	39.000	0.000
B.Cat40	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	40.000	0.000
AXsi.Cat0	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
AXsi.Cat1	-6.026	63.868	-6.583	-5.856	107.842	9.246	-6.877
AXsi.Cat2	-7.906	127.595	-6.455	1.386	107.523	18.531	-7.055
AXsi.Cat3	-8.366	191.328	2.080	-5.439	107.390	27.833	-0.135
AXsi.Cat4	-7.959	258.331	3.044	-6.371	107.523	37.145	1.658
AXsi.Cat5	-6.265	329.662	-4.344	-5.216		46.459	
AXsi.Cat6	1.104	402.199	-5.207	3.951		55.736	
AXsi.Cat7	-0.006	487.428	-4.150			64.998	
AXsi.Cat8	-4.810	488.815	3.295			74.299	
AXsi.Cat9	-6.196	488.527				83.592	
AXsi.Cat10	-6.451	487.428				93.532	
AXsi.Cat11	-6.376	489.731				103.808	
AXsi.Cat12	-4.726	491.066				114.022	
AXsi.Cat13	2.491					124.364	

Table 84 – (continued)

	AnC	ApB	ApC	EvA	PAs3	ReB	UnB
AXsi.Cat14	3.696					136.479	
AXsi.Cat15						146.873	
AXsi.Cat16						159.515	
AXsi.Cat17						171.435	
AXsi.Cat18						182.746	
AXsi.Cat19						196.735	
AXsi.Cat20						217.437	
AXsi.Cat21						241.704	
AXsi.Cat22						282.662	
AXsi.Cat23						282.649	
AXsi.Cat24						281.939	
AXsi.Cat25						277.050	
AXsi.Cat26						275.453	
AXsi.Cat27						274.899	
AXsi.Cat28						274.735	
AXsi.Cat29						275.542	
AXsi.Cat30						277.779	
AXsi.Cat31						283.146	
AXsi.Cat32						284.024	
AXsi.Cat33						278.717	
AXsi.Cat34						276.796	
AXsi.Cat35						276.101	
AXsi.Cat36						275.699	
AXsi.Cat37						276.319	
AXsi.Cat38						278.569	
AXsi.Cat39						282.075	
AXsi.Cat40						285.947	
max.Outfit	1.007	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.000	1.000
max.Infit	1.007	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.000	1.000

C.9.3 Gains in Skill/Knowledge as Latent Trait Estimates

Table 85 shows the latent trait estimates by the GPCM-based instrument for measuring the gains in skill/knowledge of the first empirical study.

Table 85 – Latent trait estimates and person model fit of the GPCM-based instrument for measuring gains in skill/knowledge of the first empirical study

UserID	Pre-test				Post-test			
	theta	error	Outfit	Infit	theta	error	Outfit	Infit
10169	-0.039	0.116	1.010	1.069	-0.181	0.103	0.285	0.243
10170	-0.063	0.112	1.271	0.855	-0.121	0.108	0.182	0.121
10171	-0.170	0.100	0.913	0.843	0.235	0.300	0.172	0.222
10174	-0.063	0.112	0.403	0.547	-0.207	0.105	0.445	0.651
10175	0.335	0.240	0.219	0.242	0.016	0.160	0.267	0.256
10176	-0.084	0.108	0.596	0.238	-0.065	0.121	1.125	0.571
10178	-0.397	0.126	2.367	1.774	-0.105	0.110	0.511	0.189
10179	0.034	0.133	0.658	0.957	0.322	0.387	0.114	0.171
10181	0.034	0.133	0.270	0.271	-0.074	0.119	1.015	0.462
10183	-0.170	0.100	1.014	1.003	-0.076	0.117	0.625	0.533
10184	0.115	0.154	0.637	0.510	0.048	0.179	1.462	0.704
10185	-0.012	0.122	0.859	1.235	0.134	0.245	0.210	0.243

Table 85 – (continued)

UserID	Pre-test				Post-test			
	theta	error	Outfit	Infit	theta	error	Outfit	Infit
10186	0.002	0.125	0.857	0.868	0.322	0.387	0.114	0.171
10187	-0.115	0.104	0.706	0.760	-0.105	0.110	0.511	0.189
10188	0.277	0.211	1.107	1.299	0.844	0.727	0.114	0.249
10189	0.234	0.195	0.429	0.302	-0.007	0.147	1.102	0.540
10190	-0.215	0.100	0.730	0.636	-0.007	0.147	1.090	0.557
10191	0.281	0.216	0.455	0.578	0.322	0.387	0.114	0.171
10192	-0.105	0.105	0.492	0.428	-0.025	0.138	0.423	0.331
10193	0.035	0.132	0.884	0.986	0.016	0.160	1.381	0.617
10195	-0.085	0.108	0.437	0.629	-0.123	0.107	0.645	1.053
10196	-0.095	0.107	0.355	0.278	0.104	0.216	0.428	0.337
10197	0.052	0.138	0.942	0.530	-0.025	0.138	0.423	0.331
10198	-0.205	0.100	0.456	0.257	-0.040	0.131	0.391	0.354
10199	-0.026	0.119	1.178	0.578	-0.025	0.138	1.337	0.582
10200	0.115	0.154	0.657	0.440	-0.076	0.117	0.545	0.294
10201	0.140	0.162	0.883	0.774	-0.040	0.131	0.391	0.354
10202	-0.124	0.103	0.637	0.872	-0.074	0.119	1.017	0.560
10203	-0.040	0.134	0.785	0.444	-0.635	0.211	0.168	0.153
10204	0.335	0.240	1.075	0.693	-0.040	0.131	0.403	0.335
10206	0.140	0.162	0.559	0.742	-0.053	0.126	1.354	0.629
10208	-0.116	0.104	0.873	0.564	-0.025	0.138	0.423	0.331
10209	-0.026	0.119	0.702	0.738	0.322	0.387	0.114	0.171
10210	-0.084	0.108	1.296	0.899	-0.138	0.105	0.425	0.108
10212	0.404	0.273	0.298	0.362	-0.172	0.103	0.384	0.513
10213	0.200	0.184	0.584	0.883	0.235	0.300	0.172	0.222
10214	0.140	0.164	0.629	0.756	-0.007	0.147	1.130	0.548
10215	-0.038	0.116	0.264	0.311	0.048	0.179	0.440	0.313
10216	-0.026	0.119	0.490	0.655	0.844	0.727	0.114	0.249
10217	-0.025	0.119	0.792	0.816	0.235	0.300	0.172	0.222
10218	0.019	0.128	0.765	0.414	-0.086	0.114	0.686	0.293
10219	-0.039	0.116	1.280	1.535	-0.021	0.142	0.408	0.382
10220	0.034	0.133	0.403	0.217	-0.002	0.152	1.267	0.573
10221	-0.116	0.104	1.133	0.643	-0.189	0.104	1.693	0.575
10222	0.052	0.138	0.752	0.484	-0.180	0.103	0.416	0.600
10223	0.002	0.125	0.751	0.795	0.134	0.245	0.210	0.245
10224	-0.196	0.100	0.810	0.797	-0.156	0.103	0.720	0.958
10226	0.199	0.182	0.321	0.511	0.322	0.387	0.114	0.171
10227	-0.161	0.100	0.381	0.324	-0.121	0.108	2.351	0.526
10230	0.200	0.184	0.988	0.772	-0.121	0.108	0.117	0.089
10231	-0.096	0.107	1.160	0.923	0.048	0.179	0.490	0.325
10232	0.052	0.138	1.198	1.570	-0.065	0.121	1.010	0.813
10233	-0.085	0.108	0.804	0.612	-0.037	0.134	0.359	0.394
10234	0.140	0.164	0.681	0.703	-0.138	0.105	1.278	1.260
10237	0.154	0.177	0.366	0.513	-0.074	0.119	0.917	1.057
10238	0.052	0.138	0.279	0.290	-0.037	0.134	0.215	0.296
10240	-0.310	0.109	2.264	2.377	-0.040	0.131	1.168	0.595

C.10 Stacking Procedure for Estimating Gains in Skill/-Knowledge of the Second Empirical Study

C.10.1 Checking Assumptions

Test of Unidimensionality

Table 86 shows the results for the test of unidimensionality in which the goodness of fit statistics indicate strong multidimensionality ($DETECT > 1.00$) for the *Pre-test* and *Post-test* with values of 126.482 and 79.021. Essential unidimensionality in the data structure is indicated by the ASSI index in the *Pre-test* (with value of 0.2). The index AGFI in the *Pre-test* and *Post-test* indicates good fit with values greater than 0.95. A good fit with the unidimensional CFA is indicated by the TLI and CFI indices for the pre-test and post-test.

Table 86 – Goodness of fit statistics related to the test of unidimensionality in the GPCM-based instrument for measuring the gains in skill/knowledge of the second empirical study

	df	chisq	AGFI	TLI	CFI	DETECT	ASSI	RATIO
Pre-test	9	8.908	0.970	1.003	1.000	126.482	0.2	0.712
Post-test	5	7.052	0.931	0.813	0.907	79.021	0.4	0.515

df: degree of freedom; AGFI: Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index; CFI: Comparative Fit Index; TLI: Tucker-Lewis Index;

Test of Local Independence

Results from the test of local independence in the GPCM-based instrument for measuring gains in skill/knowledge of the second empirical study are summarized in Table 87. The null condition of local independence is not rejected in the *Pre-test* and *Post-test*.

Table 87 – Item residual correlation statistics related to the test of local independence in the GPCM-based instrument for measuring gains in skill/knowledge of the second empirical study

	max.chisq	maxaQ3	MADaQ3	SRMSR	p.value
Pre-test	336.290	0.399	0.132	0.349	0.051
Post-test	77.018	0.303	0.136	0.309	0.397

aQ3: adjusted correlation of item residuals; maxaQ3: maximum aQ3;
MADaQ3: Median Absolute Deviation of aQ3;

C.10.2 Item Parameters

Table 88 shows the estimated parameters for the GPCM-based instrument used to measure the pre-test skill/knowledge of the second empirical study. These parameters had been calculated using the MML method (BOCK; AITKIN, 1981), so that the value in row “B.Catx” and column “*i*” is the item slope $b_{i,x}$ of item *i* in the category “*x*”, and the value in the row “AXsi.Catx” and column “*i*” is the item intercept $a_{i,x}\xi$ of item *i* in the category “*x*”. According to the Infit/Outfit statistics of items, no one mean-square value is greater than 2.0 indicating that the measurement

system is not distorted or degraded by the items.

Table 88 – Estimated parameters in the GPCM-based instrument for measuring the pre-test skill/knowledge of the second empirical study

	An3a	An3b	Ap2a	Ap2b	P2s1	Un3
xsi.item	-0.079	-0.010	-1.966	-0.013	-22.124	-0.058
B.Cat0	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
B.Cat1	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
B.Cat2	2.000	2.000	0.000	2.000	2.000	2.000
B.Cat3	3.000	3.000	0.000	3.000	0.000	3.000
B.Cat4	4.000	4.000	0.000	4.000	0.000	4.000
B.Cat5	5.000	5.000	0.000	5.000	0.000	5.000
B.Cat6	6.000	6.000	0.000	6.000	0.000	6.000
B.Cat7	7.000	7.000	0.000	7.000	0.000	7.000
B.Cat8	8.000	8.000	0.000	8.000	0.000	8.000
B.Cat9	9.000	9.000	0.000	9.000	0.000	9.000
B.Cat10	10.000	10.000	0.000	10.000	0.000	10.000
B.Cat11	11.000	11.000	0.000	11.000	0.000	11.000
B.Cat12	12.000	12.000	0.000	12.000	0.000	12.000
B.Cat13	13.000	0.000	0.000	13.000	0.000	13.000
B.Cat14	14.000	0.000	0.000	14.000	0.000	14.000
B.Cat15	15.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	15.000
B.Cat16	16.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	16.000
B.Cat17	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	17.000
B.Cat18	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	18.000
B.Cat19	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	19.000
B.Cat20	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	20.000
B.Cat21	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	21.000
B.Cat22	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	22.000
B.Cat23	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	23.000
B.Cat24	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	24.000
B.Cat25	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	25.000
B.Cat26	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	26.000
B.Cat27	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	27.000
B.Cat28	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	28.000
B.Cat29	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	29.000
B.Cat30	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	30.000
B.Cat31	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	31.000
B.Cat32	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	32.000
B.Cat33	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	33.000
B.Cat34	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	34.000
B.Cat35	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	35.000
B.Cat36	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	36.000
B.Cat37	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	37.000
B.Cat38	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	38.000
B.Cat39	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	39.000
B.Cat40	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	40.000
AXsi.Cat0	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
AXsi.Cat1	-5.616	-7.424	1.966	-6.053	44.471	-5.448
AXsi.Cat2	-5.666	-8.141		-7.940	44.248	-7.656
AXsi.Cat3	-0.287	-7.619		-8.724		-8.036
AXsi.Cat4	0.813	-2.717		-8.077		-7.771
AXsi.Cat5	-4.826	0.127		-6.069		-5.950
AXsi.Cat6	-5.910	-0.762		0.123		-1.000
AXsi.Cat7	-4.711	-7.448		-1.682		-1.025
AXsi.Cat8	1.180	-9.296		-6.004		-4.663

Table 88 – (continued)

	An3a	An3b	Ap2a	Ap2b	P2s1	Un3
AXsi.Cat9	-4.363	-9.859		-7.451		-0.310
AXsi.Cat10	-4.494	-9.344		-7.985		-0.321
AXsi.Cat11	-0.709	-7.386		-7.488		-4.996
AXsi.Cat12	1.019	0.126		-6.370		-6.747
AXsi.Cat13	-4.583			-2.806		-7.436
AXsi.Cat14	-4.845			0.186		-7.448
AXsi.Cat15	-1.408					-6.499
AXsi.Cat16	1.265					-4.881
AXsi.Cat17						-0.865
AXsi.Cat18						0.981
AXsi.Cat19						-0.262
AXsi.Cat20						-4.141
AXsi.Cat21						-5.534
AXsi.Cat22						-6.731
AXsi.Cat23						-7.145
AXsi.Cat24						-7.113
AXsi.Cat25						-6.642
AXsi.Cat26						-5.970
AXsi.Cat27						-4.529
AXsi.Cat28						-1.038
AXsi.Cat29						0.694
AXsi.Cat30						0.459
AXsi.Cat31						-3.326
AXsi.Cat32						-5.734
AXsi.Cat33						-6.869
AXsi.Cat34						-7.189
AXsi.Cat35						-7.135
AXsi.Cat36						-6.650
AXsi.Cat37						-6.214
AXsi.Cat38						-4.356
AXsi.Cat39						-0.379
AXsi.Cat40						2.319
max.Outfit	1.008	1.000	1.000	1.005	1.000	0.613
max.Infit	1.008	1.000	1.000	1.005	1.000	0.613

Table 89 shows the estimated parameters for the GPCM-based instrument used to measure the post-test skill/knowledge of the second empirical study. These parameters had been calculated using the MML method (BOCK; AITKIN, 1981), so that the value in row “B.Catx” and column “*i*” is the item slope $b_{i,x}$ of item *i* in the category “*x*”, and the value in the row “AXsi.Catx” and column “*i*” is the item intercept $a_{i,x}\xi$ of item *i* in the category “*x*”. According to the Infit/Outfit statistics of items, no one mean-square value is greater than 2.0 indicating that the measurement system is not distorted or degraded by the items.

Table 89 – Estimated parameters in the GPCM-based instrument for measuring the post-test skill/knowledge in the second empirical study

	AnC1	AnC2	ApB1	ApB2	PCs3
xsi.item	-0.119	-0.133	-2.175	-0.106	-15.226
B.Cat0	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
B.Cat1	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000

Table 89 – (continued)

	AnC1	AnC2	ApB1	ApB2	PCs3
B.Cat2	2.000	2.000	0.000	2.000	2.000
B.Cat3	3.000	3.000	0.000	3.000	3.000
B.Cat4	4.000	4.000	0.000	4.000	4.000
B.Cat5	5.000	5.000	0.000	5.000	0.000
B.Cat6	6.000	6.000	0.000	6.000	0.000
B.Cat7	7.000	7.000	0.000	7.000	0.000
B.Cat8	8.000	8.000	0.000	8.000	0.000
B.Cat9	9.000	9.000	0.000	9.000	0.000
B.Cat10	10.000	10.000	0.000	10.000	0.000
B.Cat11	11.000	11.000	0.000	11.000	0.000
B.Cat12	12.000	12.000	0.000	12.000	0.000
B.Cat13	13.000	13.000	0.000	13.000	0.000
B.Cat14	14.000	14.000	0.000	14.000	0.000
B.Cat15	15.000	15.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
B.Cat16	16.000	16.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
B.Cat17	17.000	17.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
B.Cat18	18.000	18.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
AXsi.Cat0	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
AXsi.Cat1	-5.378	-6.301	2.175	-5.704	61.918
AXsi.Cat2	-0.701	-7.422		-5.752	61.311
AXsi.Cat3	-5.803	-6.199		-1.807	61.466
AXsi.Cat4	-5.661	1.386		-1.808	60.906
AXsi.Cat5	0.696	1.792		-4.963	
AXsi.Cat6	0.918	2.194		0.613	
AXsi.Cat7	-4.952	-3.722		-0.407	
AXsi.Cat8	-6.102	-5.093		-5.151	
AXsi.Cat9	-5.226	-5.264		-7.286	
AXsi.Cat10	-0.701	-3.726		-8.101	
AXsi.Cat11	0.700	2.074		-8.113	
AXsi.Cat12	1.951	2.299		-7.278	
AXsi.Cat13	-4.933	-3.907		-5.135	
AXsi.Cat14	-6.289	-5.710		1.478	
AXsi.Cat15	-5.946	-6.251			
AXsi.Cat16	-4.969	-5.876			
AXsi.Cat17	-0.702	-3.951			
AXsi.Cat18	2.149	2.392			
max.Outfit	1.007	1.000	1.000	1.009	1.000
max.Infit	1.007	1.000	1.000	1.009	1.000

C.10.3 Gains in Skill/Knowledge as Latent Trait Estimates

Table 90 shows the latent trait estimates by the GPCM-based instrument for measuring the gains in skill/knowledge of the second empirical study.

Table 90 – Latent trait estimates and person model fit of the GPCM-based instrument for measuring gains in skill/knowledge of the second empirical study

UserID	Pre-test				Post-test			
	theta	error	Outfit	Infit	theta	error	Outfit	Infit
10169	0.009	0.067	1.001	0.908	-0.236	0.135	2.199	0.736
10170	-0.040	0.060	0.628	0.356	-0.153	0.116	2.807	0.850
10172	0.053	0.082	0.575	0.424	0.411	0.301	0.360	0.250

Table 90 – (continued)

UserID	Pre-test				Post-test			
	theta	error	Outfit	Infit	theta	error	Outfit	Infit
10174	-0.119	0.077	2.530	0.879	-0.141	0.114	0.413	0.388
10175	0.141	0.118	0.499	0.489	0.286	0.207	0.163	0.207
10176	0.012	0.068	0.300	0.406	-0.028	0.109	1.031	1.270
10178	0.005	0.066	0.600	0.700	-0.098	0.110	0.594	0.757
10179	-0.007	0.063	0.529	0.778	0.047	0.117	0.177	0.185
10181	-0.020	0.061	0.834	0.347	0.024	0.113	0.259	0.299
10183	-0.204	0.112	0.616	0.784	-0.119	0.112	0.243	0.240
10184	0.053	0.082	0.492	0.393	0.069	0.120	1.157	1.131
10185	0.148	0.121	0.418	0.498	0.300	0.222	0.142	0.190
10186	-0.013	0.065	0.344	0.201	-0.165	0.119	0.530	0.728
10187	0.009	0.067	0.673	0.681	-0.038	0.109	0.117	0.114
10188	0.307	0.205	0.301	0.196	-0.018	0.110	0.401	0.480
10189	-0.093	0.068	1.485	0.165	-0.153	0.116	0.054	0.046
10190	-0.010	0.063	0.702	0.333	0.047	0.117	0.216	0.237
10192	0.005	0.066	1.455	0.382	-0.099	0.109	0.475	0.747
10196	-0.063	0.062	0.347	0.097	0.069	0.120	0.237	0.183
10197	0.012	0.068	0.589	0.568	-0.029	0.108	0.302	0.123
10198	-0.350	0.182	0.218	0.123	-0.029	0.108	0.631	0.698
10200	-0.082	0.065	0.388	0.222	-0.218	0.129	1.676	0.180
10201	0.025	0.072	0.762	0.655	0.057	0.118	1.146	1.711
10202	-0.078	0.065	2.116	1.299	-0.049	0.108	0.585	0.636
10203	-0.195	0.108	0.366	0.301	-0.584	0.257	1.201	0.305
10204	0.126	0.111	0.595	0.632	0.109	0.129	0.493	0.356
10206	0.016	0.069	0.549	0.225	-0.049	0.108	0.606	0.970
10208	0.216	0.151	0.335	0.257	0.139	0.138	0.205	0.265
10210	-0.063	0.062	0.249	0.063	-0.019	0.109	0.634	0.810
10212	0.016	0.069	0.369	0.380	-0.018	0.110	0.545	0.708
10213	0.105	0.103	0.436	0.467	0.059	0.119	0.664	0.882
10214	0.035	0.075	0.273	0.269	-0.019	0.109	0.531	0.485
10215	-0.033	0.060	0.488	0.271	0.139	0.138	0.373	0.594
10217	0.358	0.242	0.239	0.155	0.069	0.120	0.638	0.904
10218	-0.011	0.063	0.706	0.392	-0.153	0.117	0.657	0.765
10219	-0.062	0.062	0.150	0.061	0.059	0.119	0.172	0.177
10220	-0.119	0.077	0.353	0.190	0.144	0.141	0.236	0.271
10221	-0.119	0.077	0.832	0.905	-0.253	0.140	1.873	0.237
10224	0.035	0.075	0.354	0.282	-0.009	0.109	1.109	0.894
10226	-0.051	0.061	0.787	0.328	0.144	0.141	0.236	0.271
10227	-0.059	0.061	1.654	0.122	0.023	0.112	0.768	0.870
10228	-0.010	0.063	1.958	0.321	-0.130	0.113	1.394	1.609
10230	0.032	0.074	0.185	0.292	0.139	0.138	0.530	0.746
10231	0.216	0.151	0.335	0.257	0.250	0.186	0.489	0.322
10232	-0.119	0.077	0.245	0.518	-0.049	0.108	0.730	0.877
10237	0.005	0.066	1.148	2.103	0.300	0.222	0.142	0.190
10238	-0.021	0.061	1.840	0.381	0.036	0.115	0.674	0.874
10240	-0.033	0.060	0.968	1.356	-0.088	0.109	0.326	0.220

C.11 Stacking Procedure for Estimating Gains in Skill/-Knowledge of the Third Empirical Study

C.11.1 Checking Assumptions

Test of Unidimensionality

Table 91 shows the results for the test of unidimensionality in which the goodness of fit statistics indicate strong multidimensionality ($DETECT > 1.00$) for the *Pre-test* and *Post-test*. Essential unidimensionality in the data structure is indicated by the ASSI index in the *Pre-test* with value of 0.200. The index AGFI in the *Pre-test* and *Post-test* indicates good fit with values greater than 0.95. A good fit with the unidimensional CFA is indicated by the TLI and CFI indices for the pre-test and post-test.

Table 91 – Goodness of fit statistics related to the test of unidimensionality in the GPCM-based instrument for measuring the gains in skill/knowledge of the third empirical study

	df	chisq	AGFI	TLI	CFI	DETECT	ASSI	RATIO
Pre-test	9	8.664	0.964	1.036	1	194.158	0.200	0.457
Post-test	14	9.815	0.962	2.826	1	258.820	0.429	0.645

df: degree of freedom; AGFI: Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index; CFI: Comparative Fit Index; TLI: Tucker-Lewis Index;

Test of Local Independence

Results from the test of local independence in the GPCM-based instrument for measuring gains in skill/knowledge of the third empirical study are summarized in Table 92. The null condition of local independence is not rejected in the *Pre-test* and *Post-test*.

Table 92 – Item residual correlation statistics related to the test of local independence in the GPCM-based instrument for measuring gains in skill/knowledge of the third empirical study

	max.chisq	maxaQ3	MADaQ3	SRMSR	p.value
Pre-test	285.450	0.361	0.142	0.188	0.112
Post-test	6332.263	0.342	0.141	0.179	0.402

aQ3: adjusted correlation of item residuals; maxaQ3: maximum aQ3;

MADaQ3: Median Absolute Deviation of aQ3;

C.11.2 Item Parameters

Table 93 shows the estimated parameters for the GPCM-based instrument used to measure the pre-test skill/knowledge of the third empirical study. These parameters had been calculated using the MML method (BOCK; AITKIN, 1981), so that the value in row “B.Catx” and column “*i*” is the item slope $b_{i,x}$ of item *i* in the category “*x*”, and the value in the row “AXsi.Catx” and column “*i*” is the item intercept $a_{i,x}\xi$ of item *i* in the category “*x*”. According to the Infit/Outfit statistics of items, no one mean-square value is greater than 2.0 indicating that the measurement

system is not distorted or degraded by the items.

Table 93 – Estimated parameters in the GPCM-based instrument for measuring the pre-test skill/knowledge of the third empirical study

	An3a	An3b	Ap1	Ap3	Ev2	Un2
xsi.item	0.030	0.065	-0.013	0.019	0.073	0.006
B.Cat0	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
B.Cat1	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
B.Cat2	2.000	2.000	2.000	2.000	2.000	2.000
B.Cat3	3.000	3.000	3.000	3.000	3.000	3.000
B.Cat4	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000
B.Cat5	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000
B.Cat6	6.000	6.000	6.000	6.000	6.000	6.000
B.Cat7	7.000	7.000	7.000	7.000	7.000	7.000
B.Cat8	8.000	8.000	8.000	8.000	8.000	8.000
B.Cat9	9.000	9.000	9.000	9.000	9.000	9.000
B.Cat10	10.000	10.000	10.000	10.000	10.000	10.000
B.Cat11	11.000	11.000	11.000	11.000	11.000	11.000
B.Cat12	12.000	12.000	12.000	12.000	12.000	12.000
B.Cat13	13.000	13.000	13.000	13.000	13.000	13.000
B.Cat14	14.000	14.000	14.000	14.000	14.000	14.000
B.Cat15	0.000	0.000	15.000	15.000	15.000	15.000
B.Cat16	0.000	0.000	16.000	16.000	16.000	16.000
B.Cat17	0.000	0.000	17.000	17.000	17.000	17.000
B.Cat18	0.000	0.000	18.000	18.000	18.000	18.000
B.Cat19	0.000	0.000	19.000	19.000	0.000	19.000
B.Cat20	0.000	0.000	20.000	20.000	0.000	20.000
B.Cat21	0.000	0.000	21.000	21.000	0.000	21.000
B.Cat22	0.000	0.000	22.000	22.000	0.000	22.000
B.Cat23	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	23.000
B.Cat24	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	24.000
B.Cat25	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	25.000
B.Cat26	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	26.000
B.Cat27	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	27.000
B.Cat28	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	28.000
B.Cat29	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	29.000
B.Cat30	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	30.000
B.Cat31	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	31.000
B.Cat32	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	32.000
B.Cat33	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	33.000
B.Cat34	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	34.000
B.Cat35	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	35.000
B.Cat36	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	36.000
B.Cat37	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	37.000
B.Cat38	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	38.000
B.Cat39	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	39.000
B.Cat40	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	40.000
B.Cat41	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	41.000
B.Cat42	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	42.000
AXsi.Cat0	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
AXsi.Cat1	-6.608	-6.424	-6.249	-5.083	-6.162	-6.234
AXsi.Cat2	-7.773	-8.559	-8.205	-7.157	-7.963	-7.998
AXsi.Cat3	-8.053	-9.409	-8.939	-8.177	-8.692	-8.967
AXsi.Cat4	-6.692	-8.749	-9.472	-8.725	-9.030	-9.913
AXsi.Cat5	-3.028	-6.715	-9.537	-8.919	-8.693	-10.148
AXsi.Cat6	-1.045	-1.541	-9.387	-8.781	-6.938	-9.931

Table 93 – (continued)

	An3a	An3b	Ap1	Ap3	Ev2	Un2
AXsi.Cat7	-0.593	-2.375	-8.827	-8.305	-3.495	-9.579
AXsi.Cat8	-3.026	-3.577	-7.911	-7.450	-0.672	-9.065
AXsi.Cat9	-6.673	-7.170	-6.166	-5.841	-3.510	-7.907
AXsi.Cat10	-7.543	-7.541	-1.781	-0.760	-7.131	-5.895
AXsi.Cat11	-6.507	-6.311	-6.144	-1.604	-8.700	-0.628
AXsi.Cat12	-2.311	-3.585	-7.598	-3.588	-9.521	-0.688
AXsi.Cat13	-1.889	-2.883	-8.300	-5.826	-9.563	-0.369
AXsi.Cat14	-0.423	-0.905	-8.407	-7.696	-8.974	-0.056
AXsi.Cat15			-8.270	-8.421	-8.844	-5.141
AXsi.Cat16			-7.623	-8.996	-8.289	-6.966
AXsi.Cat17			-6.085	-9.055	-6.950	-7.980
AXsi.Cat18			-3.306	-8.914	-1.306	-8.589
AXsi.Cat19			-6.316	-8.382		-8.632
AXsi.Cat20			-7.231	-7.435		-8.486
AXsi.Cat21			-5.925	-5.716		-7.945
AXsi.Cat22			0.284	-0.417		-6.822
AXsi.Cat23						-5.445
AXsi.Cat24						-2.093
AXsi.Cat25						-1.456
AXsi.Cat26						-0.586
AXsi.Cat27						0.964
AXsi.Cat28						-0.138
AXsi.Cat29						-2.046
AXsi.Cat30						-6.085
AXsi.Cat31						-7.783
AXsi.Cat32						-8.824
AXsi.Cat33						-9.423
AXsi.Cat34						-9.713
AXsi.Cat35						-9.829
AXsi.Cat36						-9.526
AXsi.Cat37						-8.816
AXsi.Cat38						-7.746
AXsi.Cat39						-5.916
AXsi.Cat40						-1.936
AXsi.Cat41						-0.577
AXsi.Cat42						-0.258
max.Outfit	1.002	1.069	1.028	1.167	0.985	0.580
max.Infit	1.002	1.069	1.028	1.167	0.985	0.580

Table 94 shows the estimated parameters for the GPCM-based instrument used to measure the post-test skill/knowledge of the third empirical study. These parameters had been calculated using the MML method (BOCK; AITKIN, 1981), so that the value in row “B.Catx” and column “*i*” is the item slope $b_{i,x}$ of item *i* in the category “*x*”, and the value in the row “AXsi.Catx” and column “*i*” is the item intercept $a_{i,x}\xi$ of item *i* in the category “*x*”. According to the Infit/Outfit statistics of items, no one mean-square value is greater than 2.0 indicating that the measurement system is not distorted or degraded by the items.

Table 94 – Estimated parameters in the GPCM-based instrument for measuring the post-test skill/knowledge in the third empirical study

Table 94 – (continued)

	AnC1	AnC2	ApA	ApC	EvB	PGs3	ReB
B.Cat51	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	51.000
B.Cat52	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	52.000
B.Cat53	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	53.000
B.Cat54	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	54.000
B.Cat55	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	55.000
B.Cat56	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	56.000
AXsi.Cat0	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
AXsi.Cat1	-6.016	-7.630	-6.477	-6.260	-6.520	64.180	-4.373
AXsi.Cat2	-7.797	-8.765	-7.520	-8.031	-8.764	63.710	0.942
AXsi.Cat3	-7.643	-7.791	-6.599	-9.035	-8.893	63.710	-4.505
AXsi.Cat4	-6.231	-3.055	-3.183	-8.561	-8.163	64.046	-6.208
AXsi.Cat5	-2.360	-1.946	-5.662	-6.585	-6.520		-7.275
AXsi.Cat6	-1.411	-0.336	-0.720	-2.792	-3.627		-7.471
AXsi.Cat7	-1.231	-2.351	-5.722	-3.472	-3.532		-7.537
AXsi.Cat8	-3.054	-3.051	-3.191	-1.023	-1.395		-7.057
AXsi.Cat9	-6.343	-8.386	-6.700	-3.552	-2.948		-6.357
AXsi.Cat10	-6.866	-9.280	-7.405	-7.056	-3.666		-4.146
AXsi.Cat11	-6.217	-8.264	-6.479	-8.584	-7.352		0.181
AXsi.Cat12	-3.074	-1.661	-3.165	-9.695	-9.256		-0.127
AXsi.Cat13	-2.980	-8.117	-5.683	-10.164	-10.319		0.008
AXsi.Cat14	-0.435	-1.946	-0.511	-10.467	-10.722		-4.277
AXsi.Cat15				-10.173	-10.519		-6.159
AXsi.Cat16				-9.278	-9.662		-6.911
AXsi.Cat17				-7.619	-7.857		-7.021
AXsi.Cat18				-1.702	-2.132		-6.176
AXsi.Cat19							-4.458
AXsi.Cat20							1.042
AXsi.Cat21							0.490
AXsi.Cat22							-3.616
AXsi.Cat23							-5.390
AXsi.Cat24							-6.193
AXsi.Cat25							-6.436
AXsi.Cat26							-6.284
AXsi.Cat27							-5.316
AXsi.Cat28							-3.471
AXsi.Cat29							0.672
AXsi.Cat30							-3.567
AXsi.Cat31							-5.196
AXsi.Cat32							-5.974
AXsi.Cat33							-6.083
AXsi.Cat34							-6.261
AXsi.Cat35							-5.425
AXsi.Cat36							-3.647
AXsi.Cat37							-0.202
AXsi.Cat38							1.827
AXsi.Cat39							0.003
AXsi.Cat40							-3.899
AXsi.Cat41							-5.746
AXsi.Cat42							-6.678
AXsi.Cat43							-6.958
AXsi.Cat44							-6.454
AXsi.Cat45							-5.064
AXsi.Cat46							-3.569
AXsi.Cat47							1.232

Table 94 – (continued)

	AnC1	AnC2	ApA	ApC	EvB	PGs3	ReB
AXsi.Cat48							0.582
AXsi.Cat49							-3.531
AXsi.Cat50							-5.357
AXsi.Cat51							-6.125
AXsi.Cat52							-6.413
AXsi.Cat53							-6.322
AXsi.Cat54							-5.461
AXsi.Cat55							-3.401
AXsi.Cat56							2.922
max.Outfit	1.008	1.000	1.004	1.205	1.166	1.000	0.674
max.Infit	1.008	1.000	1.004	1.205	1.166	1.000	0.674

C.11.3 Gains in Skill/Knowledge as Latent Trait Estimates


Table 95 shows the latent trait estimates by the GPCM-based instrument for measuring the gains in skill/knowledge of the third empirical study.

Table 95 – Latent trait estimates and person model fit of the GPCM-based instrument for measuring gains in skill/knowledge of the third empirical study

UserID	Pre-test				Post-test			
	theta	error	Outfit	Infit	theta	error	Outfit	Infit
10169	-0.083	0.058	0.414	0.320	0.074	0.062	0.458	0.359
10170	0.017	0.048	1.122	0.975	-0.020	0.043	0.436	0.215
10172	-0.026	0.049	1.002	1.593	-0.080	0.057	0.695	0.573
10174	0.110	0.680	1.375	1.965	-0.026	0.043	1.006	0.375
10175	0.034	0.049	1.066	0.894	0.210	0.085	0.834	0.913
10176	0.078	0.054	0.718	0.627	-0.016	0.053	0.790	1.114
10178	-0.023	0.055	1.477	1.851	0.011	0.048	0.492	0.313
10179	0.068	0.049	0.224	0.249	-0.011	0.043	0.395	0.399
10181	-0.059	0.053	0.479	0.647	0.015	0.049	0.850	0.642
10183	-0.026	0.049	1.056	1.013	-0.020	0.043	0.180	0.111
10184	0.055	0.051	0.618	0.482	-0.020	0.043	0.867	1.210
10185	0.021	0.048	1.222	1.580	-0.010	0.043	0.772	0.970
10186	0.013	0.048	0.217	0.185	0.007	0.047	0.672	0.260
10187	-0.023	0.055	1.477	1.851	-0.003	0.045	0.449	0.728
10188	0.007	0.048	1.188	0.961	0.161	0.073	1.386	1.198
10189	-0.110	0.066	0.177	0.150	-0.041	0.044	2.318	0.626
10190	-0.052	0.050	0.310	0.215	-0.088	0.061	0.475	0.428
10191	0.086	0.056	1.119	0.949	-0.021	0.043	0.732	0.247
10192	0.017	0.048	0.884	0.697	0.127	0.069	1.557	1.476
10193	0.011	0.048	0.375	0.319	-0.029	0.043	1.621	0.877
10197	0.021	0.048	0.678	0.582	-0.269	0.081	24.053	20.830
10198	-0.057	0.052	0.505	0.698	0.032	0.053	0.339	0.234
10200	-0.052	0.050	0.453	0.630	-0.012	0.045	0.534	0.426
10201	0.034	0.049	1.010	0.796	-0.015	0.043	0.890	0.286
10202	-0.077	0.056	0.616	0.885	0.113	0.067	0.631	0.796
10203	0.549	0.104	1025.437	224.121	-0.082	0.058	0.317	0.126
10204	-0.025	0.065	0.312	0.374	0.020	0.050	1.124	0.787
10206	0.015	0.048	1.215	0.961	0.003	0.046	0.572	0.199
10209	0.045	0.050	0.663	0.387	0.181	0.077	0.563	0.383
10210	0.017	0.048	0.943	1.178	0.023	0.051	1.055	0.601

Table 95 – (continued)

UserID	Pre-test				Post-test			
	theta	error	Outfit	Infit	theta	error	Outfit	Infit
10213	-0.003	0.048	1.373	1.118	0.003	0.046	0.597	0.732
10214	-0.110	0.066	0.686	0.674	0.002	0.046	1.450	1.251
10215	-0.101	0.262	2.793	3.233	0.536	0.138	926.235	194.704
10216	0.110	0.680	0.722	0.846	0.067	0.061	1.006	0.783
10217	0.041	0.050	1.181	0.970	0.128	0.069	0.449	0.316
10218	0.009	0.048	0.940	0.939	-0.015	0.043	0.911	1.083
10219	0.023	0.050	0.624	0.398	-0.012	0.045	0.863	0.319
10220	-0.052	0.050	0.831	0.846	-0.012	0.045	1.429	0.402
10221	-0.092	0.060	0.516	0.321	-0.205	0.070	5.678	11.765
10223	0.007	0.048	1.188	0.961	-0.011	0.043	1.210	0.812
10226	-0.049	0.051	0.406	0.324	0.004	0.046	0.493	0.643
10227	0.013	0.048	0.706	0.642	-0.264	0.075	9.201	6.981
10228	-0.149	0.082	0.787	0.551	-0.264	0.075	8.157	12.257
10230	0.060	0.052	0.525	0.478	-0.079	0.056	1.086	0.678
10231	0.477	0.083	144.754	74.848	0.036	0.054	1.624	1.293
10232	0.050	0.051	0.573	0.424	-0.024	0.043	0.171	0.061
10237	0.005	0.048	0.854	0.673	0.021	0.051	0.567	0.507
10238	-0.003	0.447	1.172	1.195	-0.015	0.043	0.662	0.259
10240	-0.003	0.447	0.677	0.614	-0.041	0.046	0.737	0.285



WEB-BASED QPJ-BR QUESTIONNAIRE

Questionário inicial: Identificando qual é sua preferência e opinião

Por favor, responda as seguintes perguntas com a primeira resposta que vier à sua mente.

Page 1

- 1 *** Responda, qual é a importância de:

	Nada importante	Pouco importante	Tanto faz	Importante	Muito importante
... estar em vantagem em relação aos outros jogadores?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
... que a aparência do seu personagem seja diferente da aparência de outros personagens?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
... derrotar outros jogadores?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
... competir com outros jogadores?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
... tornar-se muito bom em um jogo?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
... observar seu desempenho em relação a outros jogadores?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
... que estejam combinando em cor e estilo as armadura ou roupas de seu personagem ou que as peças do jogo tenham uma aparência interessante?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

- 2 *** Responda, você gosta de:


	Não gosto nenhum pouco	Não gosto muito	Tanto faz	Gosto um pouco	Gosto muito
... conhecer outros jogadores?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
... estar imerso em um mundo de fantasia?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
... ajudar outros jogadores?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
... fazer coisas que incomodam outros jogadores?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
... conversar com outros jogadores?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

- 3 *** Responda, com que frequência:

	Nunca	Raramente	Não sei ao certo	Frequentemente	Sempre
... outros jogadores (on-line) te ofereceram ajuda quando você teve um problema na vida real?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
... procura fazer parte de um grupo em jogos?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
... pensa em itens ou características que poderiam ser mudadas para customizar a aparência do seu personagem ou o jogo em si?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
... conversa com outros jogadores (on-line) sobre seus problemas/questões pessoais?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
... tenta provocar ou irritar de propósito outros jogadores?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
... tem conversas significativas com outros jogadores?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

- 4 *** Quanto tempo você passa customizando seu personagem durante a criação dele?

Pouquíssimo tempo Pouco tempo Não sei ao certo Frequentemente Sempre



DATA GATHERING INSTRUMENTS FOR MEASURING PARTICIPANTS' SKILL AND KNOWLEDGE

B.1 Programming Problem: Calculate the Proper Divisors of a Number (P1')

Divisores próprios

Requested files: user.c, input.txt (Download)

Type of work: Individual work

Grade settings: Maximum grade: 10 **Hidden**

Run: Yes **Evaluate:** Yes **Evaluate just on submission:** Yes

Automatic grade: Yes

Divisores próprios de um número positivo n são todos os divisores inteiros positivos de n , exceto o próprio n . Por exemplo, os divisores próprios do número $n=6$ são 1, 2 e 3; para $n=30$, os divisores próprios são 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 10 e 15.

Escreva um programa para imprimir os divisores próprios de um número n .

Dicas:

- O operador de resto em C é %, assim para calcular o resto de um número x entre 2 na variável *resto*, deve ser escrita a linha:

```
resto = x % 2;
```

Entrada e Saída:

A entrada será constituída por um número inteiro positivo n que é maior do que 1. Cada linha no arquivo "input.txt" representará uma entrada para o programa. Como saída você deve imprimir a lista dos divisores próprios do número n , separados pela quebra de linha.

<u>Exemplos de entrada</u>	<u>Saída para os exemplos de entrada</u>
6	1 2 3
30	1 2 3 5 6 10 15
16	1 2 4 8

B.2 Programming Problem: Calculate the Sum of Prime Divisors of Number (P2')

Soma dos divisores próprios

Requested files: user.c, input.txt (Download)

Type of work: Individual work

Grade settings: Maximum grade: 10 **Hidden**

Run: Yes **Evaluate:** Yes **Evaluate just on submission:** Yes

Automatic grade: Yes

Escreva um programa para calcular a soma dos divisores próprios de um número n . Divisores próprios de um número positivo n são todos os divisores inteiros positivos de n , exceto o próprio n . Por exemplo, os divisores próprios do número $n=30$ são 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 10 e 15. Assim, a soma dos divisores próprios será $42=1+2+3+5+6+10+15$

Dicas:

- O operador de resto em C é %, assim para calcular o resto de um número x entre 2 na variável resto deve ser escrita a linha:

```
resto = x % 2;
```

Entrada e Saída:

A entrada será constituída por um número inteiro positivo n que é maior do que 1. Cada linha no arquivo "input.txt" representará uma entrada para o programa. Como saída você deve imprimir dois números, o valor de n , e a soma de seus divisores próprios, ambos os números separados por um espaço em branco.

Exemplos de entrada

6	6 6
30	30 42
16	16 15
45	45 33

Saída para os exemplos de entrada

Requested files

user.c

```
1 #include <stdio.h>
2
3 int main() {
4     int n;
5     scanf("%d",&n);
6     // escreva seu código aqui
7
8     return 0;
9 }
```

input.txt

```
1 6
2 30
3 16
4 45
```

B.3 Programming Problem: Calculate Distance of Rebounds for an Elastic Ball (P3')

Distância dos rebates da bola de elástico

Requested files: user.c, input.txt (Download)

Type of work: Individual work

Grade settings: Maximum grade: 10 Hidden

Run: Yes **Evaluate:** Yes **Evaluate just on submission:** Yes

Automatic grade: Yes

Quando uma bola de elástico é jogada de uma altura de n metros, ela rebate até dois terços da altura n mais 1 metro, se n é divisível por 3. Se a altura n da qual cai é par (divisível por 2), ela rebate até a metade da altura n mais 1. Caso contrário ela rebate até uma altura que é a soma dos divisores próprios de n . O processo é repetido com o novo valor da altura n alcançada pelo último rebate, sendo que o processo termina no momento em que n é menor do que 10 metros ($n < 10$).

Escreva um algoritmo que, dados um número n , calcule a distância total percorrida pelos rebates da bola de elástico. Por exemplo, se a seguinte sequência 447, 299, 37, 1 corresponde à sequência de rebates que é gerada para a caída da altura $n=669$, a distância total de repiques será $784=447+299+37+1$.

Dicas:

- O operador de resto em C é %, assim para calcular o resto de um número x entre 2 na variável resto deve ser escrita a linha:
resto = $x \% 2$;
- Divisores próprios de um número positivo n são todos os divisores inteiros positivos de n exceto o próprio n . Por exemplo, os divisores próprios do número 30 são 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 10 e 15.

Entrada e Saída:

A entrada será constituída por um número inteiro n que representam a altura inicial da caída da bola de elástico, sendo que n é sempre maior que 10. Cada linha no arquivo "input.txt" representará uma entrada para o programa. Como saída você deve imprimir dois números separados por um espaço em branco, os quais são: o valor de n e a distância percorrida pelos repiques da bola de elástico.

<u>Exemplos de entrada</u>	<u>Saída para os exemplos de entrada</u>
669	669 784
750	750 693
1043365513	1043365513 1924216

Requested files

user.c

```

1 #include <stdio.h>
2
3 int main() {
4     int n;
5     scanf("%d", &n);
6     // escreva seu código aqui
7
8     return 0;
9 }
```

B.4 Programming Problem: Calculate the Maximum Length of a Hailstone Sequence (P4')

Máximo comprimento das sequências de números granizo

Requested files: user.c, input.txt (Download)

Type of work: Individual work

Grade settings: Maximum grade: 10 Hidden

Run: Yes **Evaluate:** Yes **Evaluate just on submission:** Yes

Automatic grade: Yes

A sequência de números granizo é a sequência que começa com um número inteiro n . Se n é par, o seguinte número na sequência é resultado de dividir n por 2. Se n é ímpar, o seguinte número na sequência é resultado de multiplicar n por 3 e adicionar 1. O processo é repetido com o novo valor de n , terminando no momento em que $n=1$. Por exemplo, a seguinte sequência de números granizo serão gerados para $n=22$:

22, 11, 34, 17, 52, 26, 13, 40, 20, 10, 5, 16, 8, 4, 2, 1

Para uma sequência de números granizo iniciado em n , o ciclo de comprimento de n é a quantidade de números gerados até 1 (incluindo o 1). No exemplo acima, o comprimento da sequência de número granizo iniciada em 22 é 16.

Escreva um algoritmo que, dados dois números i e j , determine o máximo ciclo de comprimento das sequências de números granizo iniciadas nos números pertencentes ao intervalo i e j (incluindo os números i e j). Por exemplo, dados os valores $i=10$ e $j=13$, o máximo ciclo de comprimento das sequências de números granizo iniciados em 10, 11, 12 e 13 será 15 como é mostrado abaixo.

- Para $n=10$, a sequência de números granizo é 10, 5, 16, 8, 4, 2, 1 com comprimento 8.
- **Para $n=11$, a sequência de números granizo é 11, 34, 17, 52, 26, 13, 40, 20, 10, 5, 16, 8, 4, 2, 1 com comprimento 15.**
- Para $n=12$, a sequência de números granizo é 12, 6, 3, 10, 5, 16, 8, 4, 2, 1 com comprimento 10
- Para $n=13$, a sequência de números granizo é 13, 40, 20, 10, 5, 16, 8, 4, 2 com comprimento 10.

Entrada e Saída:

A entrada será constituída por pares de números inteiros i e j separados por um espaço em branco. Todos os inteiros serão números menores que 10000 e maiores do que 0, assim como sempre i será menor que j . Cada linha no arquivo "input.txt" representará uma entrada para o programa. Como saída você deve imprimir três números: os valor de i , o valor de j e o máximo ciclo para todas as sequências de números granizos iniciadas com valores no intervalo i e j .

<u>Exemplos de entrada</u>	<u>Saída para os exemplos de entrada</u>
1 10	1 10 20
100 200	100 200 125
201 210	201 210 89
900 1000	900 1000 174

Requested files

B.5 Programming Problem: Calculate Inverse Fibonacci Sequence on Base n and m (PA')

Sequência inversa Fibonacci de base n e m

Requested files: user.c, input.txt (Download)

Type of work: Individual work

Grade settings: Maximum grade: 10

Run: Yes **Evaluate:** Yes

Automatic grade: Yes

A sequência de números Fibonacci é a sequência de números inteiros positivos na qual cada termo subsequente corresponde à soma dos dois números anteriores. Normalmente, a sequência de Fibonacci é definida inicialmente pelos números $n=1$ e $m=1$. Entretanto, ela pode iniciar com quaisquer outros dois valores inteiros positivos para n e m .

Definimos a sequência inversa Fibonacci de base n e m , denotada por " $\text{inv}(F_{n,m})$ " como a sequência de números inteiros positivos na qual cada termo sub-seguente corresponde à diferença dos dois números anteriores. Por exemplo, a sequência inversa Fibonacci de base 81 e 50 " $\text{inv}(F_{81,50})$ " é a sequência de números:

81, 50, 31, 19, 12, 7, 5, 2, 3

A sequência inversa Fibonacci é iniciada pelos números n e m , sendo n sempre maior do que m ($n > m$) e ela termina quando a diferença dos dois números anteriores n e m é menor ou igual do que 0. No exemplo acima, termina quando $2-3=-1$.

Escreva um programa usando a linguagem de programação C, que dados os valores n e m , imprima a sequência inversa Fibonacci de base n e m .

Entrada e Saída:

A entrada será constituída por pares de números inteiros n e m separados por um espaço em branco. Todos os inteiros serão números maiores do que 0, assim como sempre n será maior do que m . Cada linha no arquivo "input.txt" representará uma entrada para o programa. Como saída você deve imprimir a sequência inversa Fibonacci de base n e m (incluindo os números n e m).

<u>Exemplos de entrada</u>	<u>Saída para os exemplos de entrada</u>
81 50	81 50 31 19 12 7 5 2 3
34 21	34 21 13 8 5 3 2 1 1

B.6 Programming Problem: Calculate the Absolute Difference Between Odd and Even Numbers in an Inverse Fibonacci Sequence (PB')

Diferença absoluta entre os números pares e ímpares na sequência inversa Fibonacci

Requested files: user.c, input.txt (Download)

Type of work: Individual work

Grade settings: Maximum grade: 10

Run: Yes **Evaluate:** Yes

Automatic grade: Yes

Definimos a sequência inversa Fibonacci de base n e m , denotada por " $\text{inv}(F_{n,m})$ " como a sequência de números inteiros positivos na qual cada termo sub-seguente corresponde à diferença dos dois números anteriores. Por exemplo, a sequência inversa Fibonacci de base 81 e 50 " $\text{inv}(F_{81,50})$ " é a sequência de números:

81, 50, 31, 19, 12, 7, 5, 2, 3

A sequência inversa Fibonacci é iniciada pelos números n e m , sendo n sempre maior do que m ($n > m$) e ela termina quando a diferença dos dois números anteriores n e m é menor ou igual do que 0. No exemplo acima, termina quando $2-3=-1$.

Escreva um programa usando a linguagem de programação C, que dados os valores de n e m , determine a diferença absoluta entre os números pares e ímpares na sequência inversa Fibonacci de base n e m . Por exemplo, para a sequência acima, o resultado do programa será $82 = (81+31+19+7+5+3) - (50+12+2)$.

Dicas:

- Para calcular o valor absoluto de um número x , uma solução básica é multiplicar o número por -1 se x é menor do que 0 (zero).

Entrada e Saída:

A entrada será constituída por pares de números inteiros n e m separados por um espaço em branco. Todos os inteiros serão números maiores do que 0, assim como sempre n será maior do que m . Cada linha no arquivo "input.txt" representará uma entrada para o programa.

Como saída você deverá imprimir três números, os valores de n , m e a diferença absoluta entre os números pares e ímpares na sequência inversa Fibonacci de base n e m (na sequência são incluídos os números n e m).

Exemplos de entrada	Saída para os exemplos de entrada
81 50	81 50 82
34 21	34 21 0
1189 360	1189 360 1658
832040 514229	832040 514229 0

Requested files

user.c

B.7 Programming Problem: Calculate the i-th Prize of a Machine Slot (PC')

O i-ésimo prêmio da caça-níquel

Requested files: user.c, input.txt (Download)

Type of work: Individual work

Grade settings: Maximum grade: 10

Run: Yes **Evaluate:** Yes

Automatic grade: Yes

Para cada rodada i , uma caça-níquel tem o seguinte programa de premiação:

- Se é apostado um número n ímpar de moedas, elas serão duplicadas;
- Se a quantidade de moedas n é um número par, então:
 - O valor total obtido do prêmio será a diferença absoluta dos números pares e ímpares na sequência inversa Fibonacci de base n e $n-i$ " $\text{inv}(F_{n,n-i})$ " se $n-i$ é maior do que 0;
 - Caso contrário, se $n-i$ é menor ou igual do que 0, o valor do prêmio será a metade das moedas.

Nas seguintes rodadas, o comportamento de premiação será repetido com n sendo todo o montante acumulado de moedas. No entanto, se n é um múltiplo de 5 ou ele for maior do que 10000 moedas na rodada, todo o montante será perdido na próxima rodada. Assim, para uma aposta inicial de $n=20$, a seguinte sequência de premiação da caça-níquel será obtida: 18, 50, 0, 0, ...

Escreva um programa, que dado dois números inteiros n e i , determine o prêmio da i -ésima rodada na caça-níquel para uma aposta inicial com n moedas. No máximo, podem ser efetuadas 100 rodadas por jogo ($i \leq 100$). Assim, para $n=13$ e $i=3$, o prêmio da i -ésima rodada será 68.

Detalhando a sequência de premiação para $n=13$: 26, 74, 68, ...

- Na rodada $i=1$ com a aposta $n=13$, o prêmio é $26=13*2$
- Na rodada $i=2$ com a aposta $n=26$, o prêmio é 74 devido a que a sequência inversa Fibonacci para $n=26$ e $m=24$ " $\text{inv}(F_{26,24})$ " é 26, 24, 2, 22, assim $74=26+24+2+22$.
- Na rodada $i=3$ com a aposta $n=74$, o prêmio é 68 devido a que a sequência inversa Fibonacci para $n=74$ e $m=71$ " $\text{inv}(F_{74,71})$ " é 74, 71, 3, 68, assim $68=(74+68)-(71+3)$.
- ...

Dicas:

- A sequência inversa Fibonacci de base n e m " $\text{inv}(F_{n,m})$ " é a sequência de números inteiros positivos na qual cada termo subsequente corresponde à diferença dos dois números anteriores. Por exemplo, para $n=81$ e $m=50$, a sequência inversa Fibonacci é 81, 50, 31, 19, 12, 7, 5, 2, 3.
- Para calcular o valor absoluto de um número x , uma solução básica é multiplicar o número por -1 se x é menor do que 0 (zero).

Entrada e Saída:

A entrada será constituída por dois números inteiros n e i , n maior do que 0 e menores a 10000, i maior do que 0 e menor ou igual a 100. Cada linha no arquivo "input.txt" representará uma entrada para o programa.

Como saída, você deve imprimir três números, o valor de n , i e o prêmio da i -ésima rodada na máquina caça-níquel. Veja abaixo alguns exemplos de entrada/saída:

Exemplos de entrada

13 5	13 5 186
20 8	20 8 0
18 2	18 2 44

Saída para os exemplos de entrada

B.8 Programming Problem: Calculate the Highest Prize of a Machine Slot (PD')

Ganhando o prêmio maior da caça-níquel

Requested files: user.c, input.txt (Download)

Type of work: Individual work

Grade settings: Maximum grade: 10

Run: Yes **Evaluate:** Yes

Automatic grade: Yes

Para cada rodada i , uma caça-níquel tem o seguinte programa de premiação:

- Se é apostado um número n ímpar de moedas, elas serão duplicadas;
- Se a quantidade de moedas n é um número par, então:
 - O valor total obtido do prêmio será a diferença absoluta dos números pares e ímpares na sequência inversa Fibonacci de base n e $n-i$ " $\text{inv}(F_{n,n-i})$ " se $n-i$ é maior do que 0;
 - Caso contrario, se $n-i$ é menor ou igual do que 0, o valor do prêmio será a metade das moedas.

Nas seguintes rodadas, o comportamento de premiação será repetido com n sendo todo o montante acumulado de moedas. No entanto, se n é um múltiplo de 5 ou ele for maior do que 10000 moedas na rodada, todo o montante será perdido na próxima rodada. Assim, para uma aposta inicial de $n=13$, a seguinte sequência de premiação da caça níquel será obtida:

26, 74, 68, 196, 186, 546, 532, 1580, 0, 0,

Escreva um programa, que dado dois números inteiros min e max , os quais representam respectivamente o mínimo e máximo de moedas que podem ser apostadas no início do jogo, determine: o valor de n no intervalo de min e max (incluindo min e max) que devemos apostar no início do jogo para ganhar o prêmio maior, o número i de iterações (rodadas) necessárias para ganhar esse prêmio e o valor do prêmio maior. No máximo podem ser feitas 100 rodadas por jogo ($i \leq 100$), a rodada 101 não existe.

Importante:

- O prêmio maior é o máximo benefício que podemos sacar da caça-níquel com o programa de premiação detalhado acima.

Dicas:

- A sequência inversa Fibonacci de base n e m " $\text{inv}(F_{n,m})$ " é a sequência de números inteiros positivos na qual cada termo sub-seguente corresponde à diferença dos dois números anteriores. Por exemplo, para $n=81$ e $m=50$, a sequência inversa Fibonacci é 81, 50, 31, 19, 12, 7, 5, 2, 3.
- Para calcular o valor absoluto de um número x , uma solução básica é multiplicar o número por -1 se x é menor do que 0 (zero).

Entrada e Saída:

A entrada será constituída por dois números inteiros min e max , ambos maiores do que 0 e menores que 10000. A entrada min será sempre menor do que max e cada linha no arquivo "input.txt" representará uma entrada para o programa.

Como saída, você deve imprimir cinco números, os valor de min , o valor de max , o valor n a ser apostado para ganhar o prêmio maior, a iteração na qual devemos parar para ganhar o prêmio maior e o valor do prêmio maior. Veja abaixo alguns exemplos de entrada/saída:

<u>Exemplos de entrada</u>	<u>Saída para os exemplos de entrada</u>
5 13	5 13 13 8 1580
8 20	8 20 17 8 2228
2 18	2 18 17 8 2228

B.9 Formative Evaluation: Multiple Choice Knowledge Questionnaires of Cond. Structures (provinha1a)

CATALOG

SSC0600 - Introdução à Ciência de Computação I
Tópico: Estruturas Condicionais

Provinha 1(a) - Parte 1 de 2
30 de março de 2017

N.º USP:

0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2
3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3
4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4
5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5
6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6
7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7
8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8
9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9

← Por favor codifique seu Número USP na esquerda e escreva seu nome abaixo.

Nome e sobrenome:

.....
.....

Question [remember-unistructural] ♣ Marque (X) nas opções que são usadas para representar as **estruturas condicionais** em pseudocódigo, fluxogramas ou código na Linguagem C.

- if (*condição*) { ... }
- if (*condição*) { ... } else { ... }
- if-not (*condição*) { ... }
- if-not (*condição*) { ... } else { ... }
- while (*condição*) { ... }
- while (*condição*) { ... } other-case { ... }
- se *condição* então ...
- se *condição* então ... senão ...
- senão *condição* então ...
- senão *condição* então ... senão ...
- enquanto *condição* ...
- enquanto *condição* ... em-outros-casos ...
- A representação (d) na Figura 1
- As representações (d) e (f) na Figura 1
- As representações (a), (b), (c), (d) e (e) na Figura 1
- A representação (f) na Figura 1
- Nenhuma das alternativas está correta

CATALOG

Question [remember-multistructural] ♣ Em relação ao trecho de código em Linguagem C apresentado na Listagem 1, Marque (X) nas afirmativas verdadeiras

- existem 7 estruturas condicionais
- existem 10 estruturas condicionais
- 4 estruturas condicionais são simples
- 3 estruturas condicionais são compostas
- 4 estruturas condicionais são compostas
- 7 estruturas condicionais são simples
- 7 estruturas condicionais são compostas
- 3 estruturas condicionais são simples
- as linhas 9 até a 12 são parte do bloco FALSE (não) para a condição definida na linha 6
- as linhas 2 até a 16 são parte do bloco TRUE (sim) para a condição definida na linha 1
- as linhas 5 até a 15 são parte do bloco FALSE (não) para a condição definida na linha 1
- as linhas 6 até a 13 não são parte do bloco TRUE (sim) para a condição definida na linha 5
- Nenhuma das alternativas está correta

Question [understand-unistructural] ♣

Marque (X) nas opções que apresenta a descrição narrativa do trecho de código apresentado na Listagem 2. As opções marcadas em conjunto irão descrever todo o código da Listagem 2.

- Se bmi é maior que 25 então é impresso OW
- Se bmi é menor que 18.5 então é impresso UW
- Se bmi estiver no intervalo fechado de 18.5 a 25 não é impresso nada
- Se bmi é maior ou igual a 25 então é impresso OW
- Se 25 é menor ou igual a bmi então é impresso OW
- Se bmi é menor ou igual a 18.5 então é impresso UW
- Se 18.5 é maior ou igual a bmi então é impresso UW
- Se bmi é maior que 18.5 e menor que 25 não é impresso nada
- Nenhuma das alternativas está correta

CATALOG

Question [understand-multistructural] ♣

Marque (X) nas opções que apresenta a descrição narrativa do trecho de código em Linguagem C apresentado na Listagem 1.

- Se bmi é menor que 40 e bmi é maior ou igual a 35 então imprimir OBS-2. Se bmi é maior ou igual a 18.5 e bmi é menor que 25 então imprimir NW. Se bmi é maior que 25 e bmi é menor ou igual a 30 então imprimir OW. Se bmi é menor que 18.5 então imprimir UW. Se bmi é maior ou igual a 30 e bmi é menor que 35 então imprimir OBS-1. Se bmi é maior ou igual a 40 então imprimir OBS-3
- Se bmi é maior ou igual a 40 então imprime na tela do computador OBS-3 e fim. Se bmi é menor que 40 e bmi é maior ou igual a 35 então imprime OBS-2 e fim, caso contrário, as seguintes duas instruções irão acontecer: (1) Na primeira instrução, se bmi é maior ou igual a 18.5 e bmi é menor que 25 então imprime NW, se bmi é maior que 25 e bmi é menor ou igual a 30 então imprime OW, se bmi é menor que 18.5 então imprime UW; (2) Na segunda instrução, se bmi é maior ou igual a 30 então imprime OBS-1
- Se bmi é maior ou igual a 40 então imprime na tela do computador OBS-3 e fim. Se bmi é menor que 40 e 35 é menor que bmi então imprime OBS-2 e fim, caso contrário, as seguintes duas instruções irão acontecer: (1) Na primeira instrução, se bmi é maior ou igual a 18.5 e bmi é menor que 25 então imprime NW, se bmi é maior que 25 e bmi é menor ou igual a 30 então imprime OW, se bmi é menor que 18.5 então imprime UW; (2) Na segunda instrução, se bmi é menor que 30 é menor que bmi então imprime OBS-1
- Se bmi é menor que 40 e bmi é maior que 35 então imprimir OBS-2. Se bmi é maior ou igual a 18.5 e bmi é menor que 25 então imprimir NW. Se bmi é maior que 25 e bmi é menor ou igual a 30 então imprimir OW. Se bmi é menor que 18.5 então imprimir UW. Se bmi é maior que 30 e bmi é menor que 40 então imprimir OBS-1. Se bmi é maior ou igual a 40 então imprimir OBS-3
- Nenhuma das alternativas está correta

Question [apply-unistructural] ♣ Em relação ao trecho de código em Linguagem C apresentado na Listagem 1, Marque (X) nas afirmativas verdadeiras

- Quando o valor de bmi é 40 ($bmi=40$), OBS-3 é impresso como saída do programa
- Quando o valor de bmi é 40 ($bmi=40$), OBS-3 não é impresso como saída do programa
- Quando o valor de bmi é 30 ($bmi=30$), OBS-3 não é impresso como saída do programa
- Quando o valor de bmi é 30 ($bmi=30$), OBS-3 é impresso como saída do programa
- Nenhuma das alternativas está correta

Question [apply-multistructural] ♣ Em relação ao trecho de código em Linguagem C apresentado na Listagem 1, Marque (X) nas afirmativas verdadeiras

- Quando o valor de bmi é 25 ($bmi=25$), NW é impresso como única saída do programa
- Quando o valor de bmi é 25 ($bmi=25$), OW é impresso como única saída do programa
- Quando o valor de bmi é 25 ($bmi=25$), OBS-1 é impresso como única saída do programa
- Quando o valor de bmi é 30 ($bmi=30$), OW é impresso como única saída do programa
- Quando o valor de bmi é 30 ($bmi=30$), OBS-1 é impresso como única saída do programa
- Quando o valor de bmi é 30 ($bmi=30$), OBS-2 é impresso como única saída do programa
- Nenhuma das alternativas está correta

CATALOG

Question [apply-relational] ♣

Em relação ao trecho de código em Linguagem C, Marque (X) nos intervalos de valores da variável *bmi* para o programa imprimir como única saída na tela OBS-1 e UW.

- Para imprimir UW como única saída, *bmi* deve estar no intervalo aberto: $] -\infty, 18.5[$
- Para imprimir UW como única saída, *bmi* deve estar no intervalo semi-aberto: $] -\infty, 18.5]$
- Para imprimir UW como única saída, *bmi* deve estar no intervalo aberto: $] 18.5, 25[$
- Para imprimir OBS-1 como única saída, *bmi* deve estar no intervalo aberto: $] 30, 35[$
- Para imprimir OBS-1 como única saída, *bmi* deve estar no intervalo fechado: $[30, 35]$
- Nenhuma das alternativas está correta*

Question [evaluate-unistructural] ♣

Em relação ao trecho de código em Linguagem C apresentado na Listagem 1, Marque (X) nas afirmativas verdadeiras

- Quando o valor de *bmi* é 40 (*bmi*=40), o valor de *bmi* é avaliado uma única vez nos testes condicionais
- Quando o valor de *bmi* é 40 (*bmi*=40), o valor de *bmi* é avaliado menos que duas vezes nos testes condicionais
- Quando o valor de *bmi* é 40 (*bmi*=40), o valor de *bmi* é avaliado mais de uma única vez nos testes condicionais
- Quando o valor de *bmi* é 60 (*bmi*=60), o valor de *bmi* é avaliado uma única vez nos testes condicionais
- Quando o valor de *bmi* é 60 (*bmi*=60), o valor de *bmi* não é avaliado uma única vez nos testes condicionais
- Quando o valor de *bmi* é 60 (*bmi*=60), o valor de *bmi* é avaliado mais de uma única vez nos testes condicionais
- Nenhuma das alternativas está correta*

Question [evaluate-multistructural] ♣

Em relação ao trecho de código em Linguagem C apresentado na Listagem 1, Marque (X) nas afirmativas verdadeiras

- Quando o valor de *bmi* é 25 (*bmi*=25), o valor de *bmi* é avaliado 7 vezes nos testes condicionais
- Quando o valor de *bmi* é 25 (*bmi*=25), o valor de *bmi* é avaliado 5 vezes nos testes condicionais
- Quando o valor de *bmi* é 25 (*bmi*=25), o valor de *bmi* é avaliado 6 vezes nos testes condicionais
- Quando o valor de *bmi* é 30 (*bmi*=30), o valor de *bmi* é avaliado 7 vezes nos testes condicionais
- Quando o valor de *bmi* é 30 (*bmi*=30), o valor de *bmi* é avaliado 6 vezes nos testes condicionais
- Quando o valor de *bmi* é 30 (*bmi*=30), o valor de *bmi* é avaliado 8 vezes nos testes condicionais
- Nenhuma das alternativas está correta*

CATALOG

SSC0600 - Introdução à Ciéncia de Computação I
Tópico: Estruturas Condicionais

Provinha 1(a) - Parte 2 de 2
30 de março de 2017

N.º USP:

<input type="checkbox"/> 0							
<input type="checkbox"/> 1							
<input type="checkbox"/> 2							
<input type="checkbox"/> 3							
<input type="checkbox"/> 4							
<input type="checkbox"/> 5							
<input type="checkbox"/> 6							
<input type="checkbox"/> 7							
<input type="checkbox"/> 8							
<input type="checkbox"/> 9							

← Por favor codifique seu Número USP
na esquerda e escreva seu nome abaixo.

Nome e sobrenome:

.....
.....

Question [analyse-relational] ♣ O trecho de código em Linguagem C apresentado na Listagem 1 tem sido proposto como parte de um programa que indica o grau de obesidade de um indivíduo. Assim, para os seguintes intervalos de índice de massa corporal (*bmi* - *body mass index*), as seguintes saídas únicas do programa deveriam ser obtidas:

<i>bmi</i>	Saída esperada
< 18.5	UW - (<i>underweight</i> - magreza)
18.5 a < 25	NW (<i>normalweight</i> - saúdavel)
25 a < 30	OW (<i>overweight</i> , sobrepeso)
30 a < 35	OBS-1 (<i>obesity</i> - <i>class 1</i> , obesidade grau 1)
35 a < 40	OBS-2 (<i>obesity</i> - <i>class 2</i> , obesidade grau 2)
>= 40	OBS-3 (<i>obesity</i> - <i>class 3</i> , obesidade grau 3)

No entanto, o programa não funciona adequadamente com os valores de 25 (*bmi*=25) e 30 (*bmi*=30). Marque (X) nas modificações necessárias no código para fazer ele funcionar adequadamente.

- O código na linha 5 deve ser mudado para: if (*bmi* < 30)
- O código na linha 9 deve ser mudado para: if (*bmi* >= 25)
- O código na linha 6 deve ser mudado para: if (*bmi* >= 18.5 && *bmi* <= 25) {
- O código na linha 6 deve ser mudado para: if (18.5 <= *bmi* && *bmi* <= 25) {
- O código na linha 9 deve ser mudado para: if (25 < *bmi*)
- O código na linha 9 deve ser mudado para: if (*bmi* > 25 && *bmi* == 25)
- O código na linha 14 deve ser mudado para: if (*bmi* > 30)
- O código na linha 14 deve ser mudado para: if (*bmi* >= 30 && *bmi* < 35)
- Nenhuma das alternativas está correta




Figura 1: Imagens de Fluxogramas

```

1  if (bmi < 40) {
2      if (35 <= bmi) {
3          printf("OBS-2");
4      } else {
5          if (bmi <= 30)
6              if (bmi >= 18.5 && bmi < 25) {
7                  printf("NW");
8              } else {
9                  if (bmi > 25)
10                     printf("OW");
11                 if (bmi < 18.5)
12                     printf("UW");
13             }
14             if (30 <= bmi)
15                 printf("OBS-1");
16         }
17     } else {
18         printf("OBS-3");
19     }

```

Listagem 1: Trecho de Código em Linguagem C (if-else)

```

1  if (bmi > 25)
2      printf("OW");
3  if (bmi < 18.5)
4      printf("UW");

```

Listagem 2: Trecho de Código em Linguagem C (if-else)

B.10 Programming Problem: Develop a Simple Virtual Temperature Monitor (P1)

Monitor de Temperatura

Requested files: user.c (Download)

Type of work: Individual work

Grade settings: Maximum grade: 10

Dissable external file upload, paste and drop external content: Yes

Run: Yes **Evaluate:** Yes

Automatic grade: Yes

Problema:

O monitoramento da temperatura central do corpo em pacientes é muito importante nos centros de saúde. Assim, dada a temperatura em graus Celsius ($^{\circ}\text{C}$) ou Fahrenheit ($^{\circ}\text{F}$), escreva um programa de monitoramento de temperatura que funcione de acordo com a tabela seguinte.

Temperatura ($^{\circ}\text{C}$)	Temperatura ($^{\circ}\text{F}$)	Saída na tela do monitor
< 35	< 95	Hipotermia
de 35 a < 36.5	de 95 a < 97.7	Em risco
de 36.5 a 37.5	de 97.7 a 99.5	Normal
de > 37.5 a 40	de > 99.5 a 104	Em risco
> 40	> 104	Hipertermia

Entrada e Saída:

A entrada será constituída por um número racional e um caractere separados por espaços em branco, os quais irão representar: a temperatura (*temp*) e sua *unidade* da medida ('c' - Celsius e 'f' - Fahrenheit). Como saída você deve imprimir na tela do monitor o estado de monitoramento da temperatura.

Exemplos de entrada	Saída para os exemplos de entrada
34 c	Hipotermia
95 f	Em risco
36.5 c	Normal
99.5 f	Normal
40 c	Em risco
105 f	Hipertermia

Dicas:

- Programa exemplo de como ler e comparar uma variável "unidade" de tipo caractere, o programa imprime na tela Celsius se o valor do caractere é c

```
char unidade;
scanf("%c", &unidade);
if (unidade == 'c') {
    printf("Celsius");
}
```

Note-se o uso de aspas simples ' ' na expressão lógica do teste condicional

Requested files

B.11 Formative Evaluation: Multiple Choice Knowledge Questionnaires of Cond. Structures (provinha1b)

CATALOG

SSC0600 - Introdução à Ciéncia de Computação I
Tópico: Estruturas Condicionais

Provinha 1(b) - Parte 1 de 2
17 de abril de 2017

N.º USP:

<input type="checkbox"/> 0							
<input type="checkbox"/> 1							
<input type="checkbox"/> 2							
<input type="checkbox"/> 3							
<input type="checkbox"/> 4							
<input type="checkbox"/> 5							
<input type="checkbox"/> 6							
<input type="checkbox"/> 7							
<input type="checkbox"/> 8							
<input type="checkbox"/> 9							

← Por favor codifique seu Número USP na esquerda e escreva seu nome abaixo.

Nome e sobrenome:

.....
.....

Question [remember-unistructural] ♣ Marque (X) nas opções que são usadas para representar as estruturas condicionais em pseudocódigo, fluxogramas ou código na Linguagem C.

- if (*condição*) { ... }
- if (*condição*) { ... } else { ... }
- if-not (*condição*) { ... }
- if-not (*condição*) { ... } else { ... }
- while (*condição*) { ... }
- while (*condição*) { ... } other-case { ... }
- se *condição* então ...
- se *condição* então ... senão ...
- senão *condição* então ...
- senão *condição* então ... senão ...
- enquanto *condição* ...
- enquanto *condição* ... em-outros-casos ...
- As representações (a) e (e) na Figura 1
- As representações (a) e (f) na Figura 1
- As representações (a), (b), (c), (d) e (e) na Figura 1
- A representação (f) na Figura 1
- Nenhuma das alternativas está correta

CATALOG

Question [remember-multistructural] ♣ Em relação ao trecho de código em Linguagem C apresentado na Listagem 1, Marque (X) nas afirmativas verdadeiras

- existem 8 estruturas condicionais
- existem 12 estruturas condicionais
- 4 estruturas condicionais são simples
- 4 estruturas condicionais são compostas
- 8 estruturas condicionais são compostas
- 6 estruturas condicionais são simples
- 6 estruturas condicionais são compostas
- 8 estruturas condicionais são simples
- as linhas 10 até a 19 são o bloco FALSE (não) para a condição definida na linha 5
- as linhas 3 até a 23 são o bloco FALSE (não) para a condição definida na linha 1
- as linhas 6 até a 9 são parte do bloco TRUE (sim) para a condição definida na linha 1
- as linhas 12 até a 17 são parte do bloco TRUE (sim) para a condição definida na linha 5
- Nenhuma das alternativas está correta

Question [understand-unistructural] ♣

Marque (X) nas opções que apresentam a descrição narrativa do trecho de código apresentado na Listagem 2. As opções marcadas em conjunto irão descrever todo o código da Listagem 2.

- Se iq é menor ou igual a 120 então é impresso HA
- Se iq é maior ou igual a 140 então é impresso VS
- Se iq estiver no intervalo aberto de 120 a 140 (120 e 140 não são parte do intervalo) então não é impresso nada
- Se 120 é maior ou igual a iq então é impresso VS
- Se 140 é menor ou igual a iq então é impresso HA
- Se iq não é menor ou igual a 120 então é impresso HA
- Se iq não é maior ou igual a 140 então é impresso VS
- Se iq estiver no intervalo fechado de 120 a 140 (120 e 140 são parte do intervalo) então não é impresso nada
- Nenhuma das alternativas está correta

CATALOG

Question [understand-multistructural] ♣

Marque (X) nas opções que apresentam a descrição narrativa do trecho de código em Linguagem C apresentado na Listagem 1.

- Se iq é menor que 70 então imprimir EL. Se iq é maior ou igual a 80 e iq é menor que 90 então imprimir LA. Se iq é maior ou igual a 80 e iq é menor ou igual a 110 então imprimir Avg. Se iq é maior que 110 e iq é menor ou igual a 120 então imprimir HA. Se iq é maior ou igual a 140 então imprimir VS. Se iq é maior ou igual a 120 e iq é menor que 140 então imprimir S. Se iq é maior ou igual a 70 e iq é menor que 80 então imprimir BL
- Se iq é menor que 70 então imprime na tela do computador EL e fim, caso contrario se iq é maior ou igual a 70 e iq é menor 80 então imprime BL e fim. Se 80 é menor ou igual a iq e iq é menor que 90 então imprime LA e fim. Se iq é maior ou igual a 90 e iq é menor que 110 então imprime Avg e fim. Se iq não é menor que 110 e iq é maior que 110 então as seguintes três instruções irão acontecer: (1) Na primeira instrução, se iq é menor ou igual a 120 então imprime HA, (2) Na segunda instrução, se iq é maior ou igual a 140 então imprime VS, e (3) Na terceira instrução, se iq é maior ou igual a 120 e iq é menor que 140 então imprime S
- Se iq é menor que 70 então imprimir EL. Se iq é menor que 90 então imprimir LA. Se iq é maior ou igual a 80 e iq é menor ou igual a 110 então imprimir Avg. Se iq é menor ou igual a 120 então imprimir HA. Se iq é maior ou igual a 140 então imprimir VS. Se iq é maior ou igual a 120 e iq é menor que 140 então imprimir S. Se iq é maior ou igual a 70 e iq é menor que 80 então imprimir BL
- Se iq é menor que 70 então imprime na tela do computador EL e fim, caso contrario se iq é maior ou igual a 70 e iq é menor ou igual a 80 então imprime BL e fim. Se iq é maior ou igual a 80 e iq é menor que 90 então imprime LA e fim. Se iq é maior que 90 e iq é menor que 110 então imprime Avg e fim. Se iq é maior que 110 então as seguintes três instruções irão acontecer: (1) Na primeira instrução, se iq é menor ou igual a 120 então imprime HA, (2) Na segunda instrução, se iq é maior ou igual a 140 então imprime VS, e (3) Na terceira instrução, se iq é maior ou igual a 120 e iq é menor que 140 então imprime S
- Nenhuma das alternativas está correta

Question [apply-unistructural] ♣ Em relação ao trecho de código em Linguagem C apresentado na Listagem 1, Marque (X) nas afirmativas verdadeiras

- Quando o valor de iq é 60 ($iq=60$), EL é impresso como saída do programa
- Quando o valor de iq é 60 ($iq=60$), EL não é impresso como saída do programa
- Quando o valor de iq é 70 ($iq=70$), EL não é impresso como saída do programa
- Quando o valor de iq é 70 ($iq=70$), EL é impresso como saída do programa
- Nenhuma das alternativas está correta

Question [apply-multistructural] ♣ Em relação ao trecho de código em Linguagem C apresentado na Listagem 1, Marque (X) nas afirmativas verdadeiras

- Quando o valor de iq é 70 ($iq=70$), BL é impresso como única saída do programa
- Quando o valor de iq é 80 ($iq=80$), LA é impresso como única saída do programa
- Quando o valor de iq é 90 ($iq=90$), Avg é impresso como única saída do programa
- Quando o valor de iq é 110 ($iq=110$), HA é impresso como única saída do programa
- Quando o valor de iq é 120 ($iq=120$), HA é impresso como única saída do programa
- Quando o valor de iq é 140 ($iq=140$), VS é impresso como única saída do programa
- Nenhuma das alternativas está correta

CATALOG

Question [apply-relational] ♣

Em relação ao trecho de código em Linguagem C apresentado na Listagem 1, Marque (X) nos intervalos de valores da variável *iq* para o programa imprimir como única saída na tela Avg e HA.

- Para imprimir Avg como única saída, *iq* deve estar no intervalo semi-aberto: [90, 110[
- Para imprimir Avg como única saída, *iq* deve estar no intervalo semi-aberto: [80, 110[
- Para imprimir Avg como única saída, *iq* deve estar no intervalo fechado: [90, 110]
- Para imprimir HA como única saída, *iq* deve estar no intervalo aberto:]110, 120[
- Para imprimir HA como única saída, *iq* deve estar no intervalo fechado: [110, 120]
- Nenhuma das alternativas está correta

Question [evaluate-unistructural] ♣

Em relação ao trecho de código em Linguagem C apresentado na Listagem 1, Marque (X) nas afirmativas verdadeiras

- Quando o valor de *iq* é 60 (*iq*=60), o valor de *iq* é avaliado uma única vez nos testes condicionais
- Quando o valor de *iq* é 60 (*iq*=60), o valor de *iq* é avaliado duas vezes nos testes condicionais
- Quando o valor de *iq* é 70 (*iq*=70), o valor de *iq* é avaliado mais de uma única vez nos testes condicionais
- Quando o valor de *iq* é 70 (*iq*=70), o valor de *iq* é avaliado uma única vez nos testes condicionais
- Nenhuma das alternativas está correta

Question [evaluate-multistructural] ♣

Em relação ao trecho de código em Linguagem C apresentado na Listagem 1, Marque (X) nas afirmativas verdadeiras

- Quando o valor de *iq* é 110 (*iq*=110), o valor de *iq* é avaliado 4 vezes nos testes condicionais
- Quando o valor de *iq* é 110 (*iq*=110), o valor de *iq* é avaliado 6 vezes nos testes condicionais
- Quando o valor de *iq* é 140 (*iq*=140), o valor de *iq* é avaliado 7 vezes nos testes condicionais
- Quando o valor de *iq* é 140 (*iq*=140), o valor de *iq* é avaliado 6 vezes nos testes condicionais
- Quando o valor de *iq* é 90 (*iq*=90), o valor de *iq* é avaliado 4 vezes nos testes condicionais
- Quando o valor de *iq* é 90 (*iq*=90), o valor de *iq* é avaliado 6 vezes nos testes condicionais
- Nenhuma das alternativas está correta

CATALOG

SSC0600 - Introdução à Ciência de Computação I
Tópico: Estruturas Condicionais

Provinha 1(b) - Parte 2 de 2
17 de abril de 2017

N.º USP:

<input type="checkbox"/>									
<input type="checkbox"/>									
<input type="checkbox"/>									
<input type="checkbox"/>									
<input type="checkbox"/>									
<input type="checkbox"/>									
<input type="checkbox"/>									
<input type="checkbox"/>									
<input type="checkbox"/>									
<input type="checkbox"/>									
<input type="checkbox"/>									

← Por favor codifique seu Número USP
na esquerda e escreva seu nome abaixo.

Nome e sobrenome:

.....
.....

Question [analyse-relational] ♣ O trecho de código em Linguagem C apresentado na Listagem 1 tem sido proposto como parte de um programa que avalia o quociente de inteligência de um indivíduo. Assim, para os seguintes intervalos de quociente de inteligência (*iq* - *intelligence quotient*), as seguintes saídas únicas do programa deveriam ser obtidas:

<i>bmi</i>	Saída esperada
< 70	EL (<i>Extremely Low</i> - Extremamente baixo)
70 a < 80	BL (<i>Borderline</i> - No limite do defeituoso)
80 a < 90	LA (<i>Low Average</i> , Baixa média)
90 a < 110	Avg (<i>Average</i> , Média ou normal)
110 a < 120	HA (<i>High Average</i> , Média alta)
120 a < 140	S (<i>Superior</i> , Superior)
>= 140	VS (<i>Very Superior</i> , Muito superior)

No entanto, o programa não funciona adequadamente com os valores de 110 (*iq*=110) e 120 (*bmi*=120). Marque (X) nas modificações necessárias no código para fazer ele funcionar adequadamente.

- O código na linha 11 deve ser mudado para: if (*iq* >= 110) {
- O código na linha 12 deve ser mudado para: if (*iq* < 120)
- O código na linha 11 deve ser mudado para: if (*iq* > 110 && *iq* == 110) {
- O código na linha 11 deve ser mudado para: if (110 < *iq*) {
- O código na linha 12 deve ser mudado para: if (*iq* < 120 || *iq* == 120)
- O código na linha 12 deve ser mudado para: if (120 >= *iq*)
- O código na linha 16 deve ser mudado para: if (*iq* < 120 && *iq* < 140)
- O código na linha 16 deve ser mudado para: if (*iq* > 120 && *iq* < 140)
- Nenhuma das alternativas está correta*




Figura 1: Imagens de Fluxogramas

```

1 if (iq < 70) {
2     printf("EL");
3 } else {
4     if (80 <= iq) {
5         if (iq < 110) {
6             if (iq < 90)
7                 printf("LA");
8             else
9                 printf("Avg");
10        } else {
11            if (iq > 110) {
12                if (iq <= 120)
13                    printf("HA");
14                if (iq >= 140)
15                    printf("VS");
16                if (120 <= iq && iq < 140)
17                    printf("S");
18            }
19        }
20    } else {
21        printf("BL");
22    }
23 }
```

Listagem 1: Trecho de Código em Linguagem C (if-else)

```

1 if (iq <= 120)
2     printf("HA");
3 if (iq >= 140)
4     printf("VS");
```

Listagem 2: Trecho de Código em Linguagem C (if-else)

B.12 Programming Problem: Develop a Basal Metabolic Rate (PA)

TMB - Taxa Metabólica Basal

Requested files: user.c (Download)

Type of work: Individual work

Grade settings: Maximum grade: 10

Dissable external file upload, paste and drop external content: Yes

Run: Yes **Evaluate:** Yes

Automatic grade: Yes

Problema:

Escreva um programa para calcular a Taxa Metabólica Basal (TMB) de uma pessoa, utilizando as seguintes fórmulas:

- Para pessoas do género feminino (f), TMB = 10 * peso (kg) + 6.25 * altura (cm) - 5 * idade (anos) - 161
- Para pessoas do género masculino (m), TMB = 10 * peso (kg) + 6.25 * altura (cm) - 5 * idade (anos) + 5

Dicas:

- Programa exemplo de como ler e comparar uma variável "genero" de tipo caractere, o programa imprime na tela *Masculino* se o valor do carácter é m e imprime *Femenino* se o valor do carácter é f.

```
char genero;
scanf("%c", &genero);
if (genero == 'm') {
    printf("Masculino");
}

if (genero == 'f') {
    printf("Femenino");
}
```

Note-se o uso de aspas simples ' ' na expressão lógica do teste condicional

Entrada e Saída:

A entrada será constituída por três números inteiros e um caractere separados por espaços em branco, os quais irão, respectivamente, representar: peso em quilogramas, altura em centímetros, idade em anos, e género ('f' - feminino e 'm' - masculino). O peso, altura e idade serão números inteiros positivos maiores que 0. O género será representado por um caractere 'm' para género masculino e um caractere 'f' para género feminino. Como saída você deve imprimir a Taxa Metabólica Basal (TBM).

Exemplos de entrada	Saída para os exemplos de entrada
70 174 31 m	1637.5
45 150 23 f	1111.5
95 182 35 m	1917.5
81 168 25 f	1574.0

B.13 Programming Problem: Develop a Diet Calculator (PB)

Calculadora de dieta

Requested files: user.c (Download)

Type of work: Individual work

Grade settings: Maximum grade: 10

Dissable external file upload, paste and drop external content: Yes

Run: Yes **Evaluate:** Yes

Automatic grade: Yes

Problema:

O Colégio de Medicina leva os requisitos da TMB - Taxa Metabólica Basal seriamente por causa dos perigos potenciais de ingestão calórica insuficiente. Assim, uma entrada calórica diária mínima é de 1200 calorias para mulheres e de 1800 calorias para homens.

Para manter peso, a ingestão calórica de um homem não deve ser maior que 500 calorias acima da TMB e não deve ser menor que 400 calorias abaixo da TMB. Para manter peso, a ingestão calórica de uma mulher não deve ser maior que 400 calorias acima da TMB e não deve ser menor que 500 calorias abaixo da TMB.

Para perder peso, a ingestão calórica de um homem deve ser menor que 400 calorias abaixo da TMB. Para perder peso, a ingestão calórica de uma mulher deve ser menor que 500 calorias abaixo da TMB.

Para ganhar peso, a ingestão calórica de um homem deve ser maior que 500 calorias acima da TMB. Para ganhar peso, a ingestão calórica de uma mulher deve ser maior que 400 calorias acima da TMB.

Dado três valores referidos como *TMB*, ingestão calórica diária e sexo do indivíduo, escreva um programa de calculadora de dieta que funcione de acordo com a tabela seguinte de ingestão calórica diária.

Masculino (m)	Feminino (f)	Saída do programa
< 1800 calorias	< 1200 calorias	Perigo
de 1800 a < TMB-400 calorias	de 1200 a < TMB-500 calorias	Perder peso
de TMB-400 a TMB+500 calorias	de TMB-500 a TMB+400 calorias	Manter peso
> TMB+500 calorias	> TMB+400 calorias	Ganhar peso

Entrada e Saída:

A entrada será constituída por dois números inteiros e um caractere separados por espaços em branco, os quais representam: *TMB*, ingestão calórica diária e gênero do indivíduo ('m' - Masculino e 'f' - Feminino).

Como saída você deve imprimir na tela do computador o resultado da calculadora de dieta estabelecida de acordo com a tabela mostrada acima.

Exemplos de entrada	Saída para os exemplos de entrada
1700 1100 f	Perigo
2400 1900 m	Perder peso
2000 1499 f	Perder peso
2000 1500 f	Manter peso
2000 2500 m	Manter peso
2000 2501 m	Ganhar peso

Dicas:

- Programa exemplo de como ler e comparar uma variável "genero" de tipo caractere, o programa imprime na tela *Masculino* se o valor do caracter é *m*

B.14 Formative Evaluation: Multiple Choice Knowledge Questionnaires of Loop Structures (provinha2a)

CATALOG

SSC0600 - Introdução à Ciéncia de Computação I
Tópico: Estruturas de Repetição e Tipos de Dados
Compostos (Strings e Vetores)

Provinha 2(a)

25 de abril de 2017

N.º USP:

<input type="checkbox"/>									
<input type="checkbox"/>									
<input type="checkbox"/>									
<input type="checkbox"/>									
<input type="checkbox"/>									
<input type="checkbox"/>									
<input type="checkbox"/>									
<input type="checkbox"/>									
<input type="checkbox"/>									
<input type="checkbox"/>									
<input type="checkbox"/>									
<input type="checkbox"/>									

← Por favor codifique seu Número USP na esquerda e escreva seu nome abaixo.

Nome e sobrenome:

.....
.....

Question [remember-unistructural] ♣ Marque (X) nas opções que são usadas para representar as estruturas de repetição (*loops*) em pseudocódigo ou na Linguagem C.

- while (*expressão*) { ... }
- for (*expressão*; *expressão*; *expressão*) { ... }
- do { ... } while (*expressão*);
- if (*expressão*) { ... }
- if (*expressão*) { ... } else { ... }
- if-not (*expressão*) { ... }
- if-not (*expressão*) { ... } else { ... }
- while (*expressão*) { ... } other-case { ... }
- do { ... } until (*expressão*) { ... }
- PARA *expressão* ATÉ *expressão* PASSO *expressão* FAÇA ... FIMPARA
- ENQUANTO *expressão* FAÇA ... FIMENQUANTO
- REPITA *expressão* ATÉ *expressão*
- SE *expressão* ENTÃO ...
- SE *expressão* ENTÃO ... SENÃO ...
- SENÃO *expressão* ENTÃO ...
- SENÃO *expressão* ENTÃO ... SENÃO ...
- PARA *expressão* ATÉ *expressão* FAÇA ... FIMPARA
- ENQUANTO *expressão* FAÇA ... EMOUTROSCASOSFAÇA ... FIMENQUANTO
- Nenhuma das alternativas está correta

CATALOG

Question [understand-relational] ♣ Marque (X) nas afirmativas verdadeiras em relação aos trechos de código em Linguagem C apresentados nas Listagem 1, 2, 3 e 4

- Observação: `arr[n][n]` é a matriz n*n de números inteiros

- Listagem 1 gira 180 graus no sentido horário ou antihorário a matriz `arr[n][n]`
- Listagem 2 gira 90 graus no sentido horário a matriz `arr[n][n]`
- Listagem 3 gira 360 graus no sentido horário ou antihorário a matriz `arr[n][n]`
- Listagem 4 gira 90 graus no sentido anti-horário a matriz `arr[n][n]`
- Listagem 1 gira 360 graus no sentido horário ou antihorário a matriz `arr[n][n]`
- Listagem 2 gira 270 graus no sentido horário a matriz `arr[n][n]`
- Listagem 4 gira 270 graus no sentido anti-horário a matriz `arr[n][n]`
- Listagem 2 gira 90 graus no sentido anti-horário a matriz `arr[n][n]`
- Listagem 4 gira 90 graus no sentido horário a matriz `arr[n][n]`
- Listagem 1 gira 90 graus no sentido horário a matriz `arr[n][n]`
- Listagem 2 gira 360 graus no sentido horário ou antihorário a matriz `arr[n][n]`
- Listagem 3 gira 90 graus no sentido anti-horário a matriz `arr[n][n]`
- Listagem 4 gira 360 graus no sentido horário ou antihorário a matriz `arr[n][n]`
- Nenhuma das alternativas está correta

Question [apply-multistructural-1] ♣ Marque (X) na saída do programa apresentado na Listagem 6.

- 0 1 2
0 1 2
0 1 2
0 0 0
- 1 1 1
2 2 2
- 2 1 0
2 1 0
2 1 0

2 2 2
2 2 2
2 2 2

Nenhuma das alternativas está correta

Question [apply-multistructural-2] ♣ Marque (X) nas afirmativas verdadeiras em relação ao programa da Listagem 7.

- Depois que o código for executado, `x` contém os valores: {5, 4, 3, 4, 2, 0}
- Depois que o código for executado, `x` contém os valores: {5, 4, 2, 3, 2, 0}
- Depois que o código for executado, `x` contém os valores: {10, 8, 6, 2, 1, 0}
- Depois que o código for executado, `x` contém os valores: {10, 8, 2, 3, 1, 0}
- Depois que o código for executado, `y` contém os valores: {5, 2, 6, 4, 4, 0}
- Depois que o código for executado, `y` contém os valores: {5, 2, 4, 3, 4, 0}
- Depois que o código for executado, `y` contém os valores: {5, 1, 6, 4, 8, 0}
- Depois que o código for executado, `y` contém os valores: {5, 1, 2, 6, 8, 0}
- Nenhuma das alternativas está correta

CATALOG

Question [evaluate-multistructural] ♣ Marque (X) nas afirmativas verdadeiras em relação ao programa da Listagem 7.

- A condição $i1 < j1$ da Linha 9 é avaliada 4 vezes
- A condição $i1 < j1$ da Linha 9 é avaliada 3 vezes
- A condição $i1 < j1$ da Linha 9 é avaliada 6 vezes
- A condição $j2 > j2$ da Linha 16 é avaliada 4 vezes
- A condição $j2 > j2$ da Linha 16 é avaliada 3 vezes
- A condição $j2 > j2$ da Linha 16 é avaliada 6 vezes
- O código na estrutura de repetição externa (*outer loop*), linhas 10 até 25, é repetido 3 vezes
- O código na estrutura de repetição externa (*outer loop*), linhas 10 até 25, é repetido 4 vezes
- O código na estrutura de repetição externa (*outer loop*), linhas 10 até 25, é repetido 6 vezes
- O código na estrutura de repetição interna (*inner loop*), linhas 17 até 21, é repetido 3 vezes
- O código na estrutura de repetição interna (*inner loop*), linhas 17 até 21, é repetido 4 vezes
- O código na estrutura de repetição interna (*inner loop*), linhas 17 até 21, é repetido 6 vezes
- Nenhuma das alternativas está correta

Question [analyse-relational-1] ♣ Marque (X) nas modificações que, de maneira independente umas das outras, façam com que o programa apresentado na Listagem 6 imprima:

```
0 0 0
1 1 1
2 2 2
```

- A linha 14 deve ser mudada para: `printf("%d ", m[j][i]);`
- A linha 9 deve ser mudada para: `m[row][col] = row;`
- A linha 9 deve ser mudada para: `m[col][row] = col;`
- A linha 12 deve ser mudada para: `for (i=2; i>=0; i--) {`
- A linha 13 deve ser mudada para: `for (j=2; j>=0; j--) {`
- A linha 13 deve ser mudada para: `for (j=2; j>=0; j--) {`
 A linha 14 deve ser mudada para: `printf("%d ", m[j][i]);`
- A linha 12 deve ser mudada para: `for (i=2; i>=0; i--) {`
 A linha 14 deve ser mudada para: `printf("%d ", m[j][i]);`
- Nenhuma das alternativas está correta

Question [analyse-relational-2] ♣ O trecho de código apresentado na Listagem 5 tem sido proposto para efetuar a ordenação ascendente (de menor a maior) de um vetor de inteiros `arr[n]` (array `arr` de tamanho `n`). No entanto, o programa não funciona adequadamente. Marque (X) nas modificações necessárias que, em conjunto, façam o programa funcionar adequadamente.

- A linha 5 deve ser mudada para: `if (arr[j] < arr[m]) {`
- A linha 5 deve ser mudada para: `if (arr[j] > arr[m]) {`
- A linha 5 deve ser mudada para: `if (arr[j] >= arr[m]) {`
- A linha 4 deve ser mudada para: `while (j < n) {`
- A linha 4 deve ser mudada para: `while (j < n-1) {`
- A linha 4 deve ser mudada para: `while (j > n) {`
- A linha 4 deve ser mudada para: `while (j >= n-1) {`
- Nenhuma das alternativas está correta

```

1 for(j=n-1; j>=0; j--) {
2     for(k=n-1; k>=0; k--) {
3         printf("%d ", arr[j][k]);
4     }
5     printf("\n");
6 }
```

Listagem 1: Trecho de código para girar uma matriz n*n

```

1 for (j=0; j<n; j++) {
2     for(k=n-1; k>=0; k--) {
3         printf("%d ", arr[k][j]);
4     }
5     printf("\n");
6 }
```

Listagem 2: Trecho de código para girar uma matriz n*n

```

1 for(j=0; j<n; j++) {
2     for(k=0; k<n; k++) {
3         printf("%d ", arr[j][k]);
4     }
5     printf("\n");
6 }
```

Listagem 3: Trecho de código para girar uma matriz n*n

```

1 for(j=n-1; j>=0; j--) {
2     for(k=0; k<n; k++) {
3         printf("%d ", arr[k][j]);
4     }
5     printf("\n");
6 }
```

Listagem 4: Trecho de código para girar uma matriz n*n

```

1 for (i = 0; i < n-1; i++) {
2     m = i;
3     j = i+1;
4     while (n-1 > j) {
5         if (arr[m] < arr[j]) {
6             m = j;
7         }
8         j++;
9     }
10    if (i != m) {
11        aux = arr[i];
12        arr[i] = arr[m];
13        arr[m] = aux;
14    }
15 }
```

Listagem 5: Trecho de código para ordenar um vetor de inteiros arr[n]

```

1 #include <stdio.h>
2
3 int row, col, i, j;
4 int m[3][3];
5
6 int main() {
7     for (row = 0; row <= 2; row++) {
8         for (col = 0; col <= 2; col++) {
9             m[row][col] = col;
10        }
11    }
12    for (i=0; i<3; i++) {
13        for (j=0; j<3; j++) {
14            printf("%d ", m[i][j]);
15        }
16        printf("\n");
17    }
18    return 0;
19 }
```

Listagem 6: Código de programa na linguagem C

```

1 #include <stdio.h>
2
3 int x[6] = {0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5};
4 int y[6] = {5, 4, 3, 2, 1, 0};
5 int i1 = 0, j1 = 5, i2 = 0, j2 = 5;
6 int temp;
7
8 int main() {
9     while (i1 < j1) {
10         temp = x[i1];
11         x[i1] = x[j1];
12         x[j1] = 2*temp;
13
14         i2 = i1+1;
15         j2 = j1-1;
16         while (j2 > i2) {
17             temp = y[j2];
18             y[j2] = y[i2];
19             y[i2] = 2*temp;
20             i2++;
21             j2--;
22         }
23
24         i1++;
25         j1--;
26     }
27     return 0;
28 }
```

Listagem 7: Código de programa na linguagem C

B.15 Programming Problem: Calculate the Proper Divisors of a Number (P2)

Divisores próprios

Requested files: user.c (Download)

Type of work: Individual work

Grade settings: Maximum grade: 10

Dissable external file upload, paste and drop external content: Yes

Run: Yes **Evaluate:** Yes

Automatic grade: Yes

Problema:

Divisores próprios de um número positivo n são todos os divisores inteiros positivos de n , exceto o próprio n . Por exemplo, os divisores próprios do número $n=6$ são 1, 2 e 3; para $n=30$, os divisores próprios são 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 10 e 15.

Escreva um programa para imprimir os divisores próprios de um número n .

Entrada e Saída:

A entrada será constituída por um número inteiro positivo n que é maior do que 1. Como saída do programa você deve imprimir a lista dos divisores próprios do número n , separados pela quebra de linha "\n".

Exemplos de entrada	Saída para os exemplos de entrada
6	1 2 3
30	1 2 3 5 6 10 15
16	1 2 4 8
45	1 3 5 9 15

B.16 Programming Problem: Calculate the Maximum Length of a Hailstone Sequence (P3)

Máximo comprimento das sequências de números granizo

Requested files: user.c (Download)

Type of work: Individual work

Grade settings: Maximum grade: 10

Dissable external file upload, paste and drop external content: Yes

Run: Yes **Evaluate:** Yes

Automatic grade: Yes

Problema:

A sequência de números granizo é a sequência que começa com um número inteiro n . Se n é par, o seguinte número na sequência é resultado de dividir n por 2. Se n é ímpar, o seguinte número na sequência é resultado de multiplicar n por 3 e adicionar 1. O processo é repetido com o novo valor de n , terminando no momento em que $n=1$. Por exemplo, a seguinte sequência de números granizo serão gerados para $n=22$:

22, 11, 34, 17, 52, 26, 13, 40, 20, 10, 5, 16, 8, 4, 2, 1

Para uma sequência de números granizo iniciado em n , o ciclo de comprimento de n é a quantidade de números gerados até 1 (incluindo o 1). No exemplo acima, o comprimento da sequência de número granizo iniciada em 22 é 16.

Escreva um algoritmo que, dados dois números i e j , determine o máximo ciclo de comprimento das sequências de números granizo iniciadas nos números pertencentes ao intervalo i e j (incluindo os números i e j). Por exemplo, dados os valores $i=10$ e $j=13$, o máximo ciclo de comprimento das sequências de números granizo iniciados em 10, 11, 12 e 13 será 15 como é mostrado abaixo.

- Para $n=10$, a sequência de números granizo é 10, 5, 16, 8, 4, 2, 1 com comprimento 8.
- Para $n=11$, a sequência de números granizo é 11, 34, 17, 52, 26, 13, 40, 20, 10, 5, 16, 8, 4, 2, 1 com comprimento 15.
- Para $n=12$, a sequência de números granizo é 12, 6, 3, 10, 5, 16, 8, 4, 2, 1 com comprimento 10.
- Para $n=13$, a sequência de números granizo é 13, 40, 20, 10, 5, 16, 8, 4, 2 com comprimento 10.

Entrada e Saída:

A entrada será constituída por pares de números inteiros i e j separados por um espaço em branco. Todos os inteiros serão números menores que 10000 e maiores do que 0, assim como sempre i será menor que j . Como saída você deve imprimir o máximo ciclo para todas as sequências de números granizos iniciadas com valores no intervalo i e j .

<u>Exemplos de entrada</u>	<u>Saída para os exemplos de entrada</u>
1 10	20
100 200	125
201 210	89
900 1000	174

Dicas:

B.17 Formative Evaluation: Multiple Choice Knowledge Questionnaires of Loop Structures (provinha2b)

CATALOG

SSC0600 - Introdução à Ciência de Computação I
Tópico: Estruturas de Repetição e Tipos de Dados
Compostos (Strings e Vetores)

Provinha 2(b)

8 de maio de 2017

N.º USP:

0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2
 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3
 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4
 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5
 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6
 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7
 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8
 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9

← Por favor codifique seu Número USP na esquerda e escreva seu nome abaixo.

Nome e sobrenome:

.....
.....

Question [remember-unistructural] ♣ Marque (X) nas opções que são usadas para representar as estruturas de repetição (*loops*) em pseudocódigo ou na Linguagem C.

- while (*expressão*) { ... }
- for (*expressão*; *expressão*; *expressão*) { ... }
- do { ... } while (*expressão*);
- if (*expressão*) { ... }
- if (*expressão*) { ... } else { ... }
- if-not (*expressão*) { ... }
- if-not (*expressão*) { ... } else { ... }
- while (*expressão*) { ... } other-case { ... }
- do { ... } until (*expressão*) { ... }
- PARA *expressão* ATÉ *expressão* PASSO *expressão* FAÇA ... FIMPARA
- ENQUANTO *expressão* FAÇA ... FIMENQUANTO
- REPITA ... ATÉ *expressão*
- SE *expressão* ENTÃO ...
- SE *expressão* ENTÃO ... SENÃO ...
- SENÃO *expressão* ENTÃO ...
- SENÃO *expressão* ENTÃO ... SENÃO ...
- ENQUANTO *expressão* FAÇA ... EMOUTROSCASOSFAÇA ... FIMENQUANTO
- Nenhuma das alternativas está correta

CATALOG

Question [understand-relational] ♣ Sejam os quatro tipos de pirâmides: (a) pirâmide completa, (b) pirâmide completa invertida, (c) meia pirâmide e (d) meia pirâmide invertida (Figura 1), Marque (X) nas afirmativas verdadeiras em relação as Listagem 1, 2, 3 e 4.

- *Observação:* n é a altura (ou número de filas) das pirâmides

- Listagem 1 imprime uma meia pirâmide
 Listagem 1 imprime uma meia pirâmide invertida
 Listagem 1 imprime uma pirâmide completa
 Listagem 1 imprime uma pirâmide completa invertida
 Listagem 2 imprime uma pirâmide completa invertida
 Listagem 2 imprime uma pirâmide completa
 Listagem 2 imprime uma meia pirâmide
 Listagem 2 imprime uma meia pirâmide invertida
 Listagem 3 imprime uma meia pirâmide invertida
 Listagem 3 imprime uma meia pirâmide
 Listagem 3 imprime uma pirâmide completa
 Listagem 3 imprime uma pirâmide completa invertida
 Listagem 4 imprime uma pirâmide completa
 Listagem 4 imprime uma pirâmide completa invertida
 Listagem 4 imprime uma meia pirâmide
 Listagem 4 imprime uma meia pirâmide invertida
 Nenhuma das alternativas está correta

Question [apply-multistructural-1] ♣ Marque (X) na saída do programa apresentado na Listagem 5.

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 0 3 6
1 4 7
2 5 8
0 1 2 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 4 5
6 7 8
0 1 2 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 1 2 3
2 3 4 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 0 3 6
1 4 5
2 7 8 |
- Nenhuma das alternativas está correta

CATALOG

Question [apply-multistructural-2] ♣ Marque (X) nas afirmativas verdadeiras em relação ao programa da Listagem 6.

- Depois que o código for executado, x contém os valores: {5, 2, 4, 3, 4, 0}
- Depois que o código for executado, x contém os valores: {5, 1, 2, 3, 4, 0}
- Depois que o código for executado, x contém os valores: {5, 1, 2, 6, 8, 0}
- Depois que o código for executado, x contém os valores: {5, 4, 4, 3, 8, 0}
- Depois que o código for executado, y contém os valores: {10, 2, 4, 6, 8, 0}
- Depois que o código for executado, y contém os valores: {0, 8, 6, 2, 1, 5}
- Depois que o código for executado, y contém os valores: {0, 8, 6, 2, 2, 10}
- Depois que o código for executado, y contém os valores: {5, 2, 4, 6, 8, 0}
- Nenhuma das alternativas está correta

Question [evaluate-multistructural] ♣ Marque (X) nas afirmativas verdadeiras em relação ao programa da Listagem 6.

- A condição $i1 > 0$ da Linha 10 é avaliada 3 vezes
- A condição $i1 > 0$ da Linha 10 é avaliada 2 vezes
- A condição $i1 > 0$ da Linha 10 é avaliada 4 vezes
- A condição $i2 < j2$ da Linha 17 é avaliada 7 vezes
- A condição $i2 < j2$ da Linha 17 é avaliada 5 vezes
- A condição $i2 < j2$ da Linha 17 é avaliada 6 vezes
- O código na estrutura de repetição externa (*outer loop*), linhas 11 até 26, é executado 2 vezes
- O código na estrutura de repetição externa (*outer loop*), linhas 11 até 26, é executado 3 vezes
- O código na estrutura de repetição externa (*outer loop*), linhas 11 até 26, é executado 4 vezes
- O código na estrutura de repetição interna (*inner loop*), linhas 18 até 22, é executado 5 vezes
- O código na estrutura de repetição interna (*inner loop*), linhas 18 até 22, é executado 4 vezes
- O código na estrutura de repetição interna (*inner loop*), linhas 18 até 22, é executado 6 vezes
- Nenhuma das alternativas está correta

Question [analyse-relational-1] ♣ Marque (X) nas modificações que, de maneira independente umas das outras, façam com que o programa apresentado na Listagem 5 imprima:

8 5 2
7 4 1
6 3 0

- A linha 13 deve ser mudada para: `for (i=2; i >= 0; i--) {`
e a linha 14 deve ser mudada para: `for (j=2; j >= 0; j--) {`
- A linha 13 deve ser mudada para: `for (i=2; i >= 0; i--) {`
- A linha 14 deve ser mudada para: `for (j=2; j >= 0; j--) {`
- A linha 10 deve ser mudada para: `m[j][i] = k;`
e a linha 13 deve ser mudada para: `for (i=2; i >= 0; i--) {`
e a linha 14 deve ser mudada para: `for (j=2; j >= 0; j--) {`
e a linha 15 deve ser mudada para: `printf("%d ", m[j][i]);`
- A linha 10 deve ser mudada para: `m[j][i] = k;`
- A linha 15 deve ser mudada para: `printf("%d ", m[j][i]);`
- A linha 10 deve ser mudada para: `m[2-i][2-j] = k;`
- A linha 10 deve ser mudada para: `m[2-j][2-i] = k;`
- Nenhuma das alternativas está correta

CATALOG

Question [analyse-relational-2] ♣ O trecho de código apresentado na Listagem 7 tem sido proposto para efetuar a ordenação descendente (de maior a menor) de um vetor de inteiros $\text{arr}[n]$ de tamanho n . No entanto, o código não funciona adequadamente. Marque (X) nas modificações necessárias que, em conjunto, façam o programa funcionar adequadamente.

- A linha 1 deve ser mudada para: `for (i = 0 ; i < n-1 ; i++) {`
- A linha 1 deve ser mudada para: `for (i = 1 ; i < n-1 ; i++) {`
- A linha 1 deve ser mudada para: `for (i = n-2 ; i >= 0; i--) {`
- A linha 2 deve ser mudada para: `j = i+1;`
- A linha 2 deve ser mudada para: `j = i-1;`
- A linha 3 deve ser mudada para: `while (j > 0 && arr[j] > arr[j-1]) {`
- A linha 3 deve ser mudada para: `while (j > 0 && arr[j] < arr[j-1]) {`
- A linha 3 deve ser mudada para: `while (j > i && arr[j] > arr[j-1]) {`
- Nenhuma das alternativas está correta*




Figura 1: Exemplos de tipos de pirâmides com altura $n=7$

```

1 for (i=0 ; i < n ; i++) {
2     for (j=0 ; j <= i ; j++) {
3         printf("* ");
4     }
5     printf("\n");
6 }
```

Listagem 1: Trecho de código para imprimir uma pirâmide

```

1 for (i=0; i < n; i++) {
2     for (k=0; k < i; k++) {
3         printf(" ");
4     }
5     for (k=0 ; k < n-i; k++) {
6         printf("* ");
7     }
8     printf("\n");
9 }
```

Listagem 2: Trecho de código para imprimir uma pirâmide

```

1 for (i=n ; i > 0 ; i--) {
2     for (j=0 ; j < i ; j++) {
3         printf("* ");
4     }
5     printf("\n");
6 }
```

Listagem 3: Trecho de código para imprimir uma pirâmide

```

1 for (i=0; i < n; i++) {
2     for (k=0; k < (n-i)-1; k++) {
3         printf(" ");
4     }
5     for (k=0 ; k < i+1; k++) {
6         printf("* ");
7     }
8     printf("\n");
9 }
```

Listagem 4: Trecho de código para imprimir uma pirâmide

```

1 #include <stdio.h>
2
3 int m[3][3];
4 int row, col, i, j, k;
5
6 int main() {
7     for (k = 0; k < 9; k++) {
8         i = k % 3;
9         j = k / 3;
10        m[i][j] = k;
11    }
12
13    for (i=0; i < 3; i++) {
14        for (j=0; j < 3; j++) {
15            printf("%d ", m[i][j]);
16        }
17        printf("\n");
18    }
19    return 0;
20 }
```

Listagem 5: Código de programa na linguagem C

```

1 #include <stdio.h>
2
3 int x[6] = {5, 4, 3, 2, 1, 0};
4 int y[6] = {0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5};
5
6 int i1 = 2, j1 = 3;
7 int i2, j2, temp;
8
9 int main() {
10    while (i1 > 0) {
11        temp = x[i1];
12        x[i1] = x[j1] * 2;
13        x[j1] = temp;
14
15        i2 = i1 - 1;
16        j2 = j1 + 1;
17        while (i2 < j2) {
18            temp = y[j2];
19            y[j2] = y[i2];
20            y[i2] = 2 * temp;
21            i2++;
22            j2--;
23        }
24
25        i1--;
26        j1++;
27    }
28    return 0;
29 }
```

Listagem 6: Código de programa na linguagem C

```
1 for (i = 1 ; i < n-1 ; i++) {  
2     j = i;  
3     while (j > 0 && arr[j-1] > arr[j]) {  
4         aux = arr[j];  
5         arr[j] = arr[j-1];  
6         arr[j-1] = aux;  
7         j--;  
8     }  
9 }
```

Listagem 7: Trecho de código para ordenar um vetor de inteiros `arr[n]`

B.18 Programming Problem: Calculate a Geometric Sequence (PC)

Sequências de potências

Requested files: user.c (Download)

Type of work: Individual work

Grade settings: Maximum grade: 10

Dissable external file upload, paste and drop external content: Yes

Run: Yes **Evaluate:** Yes

Automatic grade: Yes

Problema:

Escreva um programa que, dado dois números inteiros positivo b e n , imprima a sequencia de potências de base b e comprimento n . Isso é sequências:

$$b^0, b^1, b^3, \dots, b^{(n-1)}$$

Entrada e Saída:

A entrada será constituído por dois números inteiros b e n separados por um espaço em branco. Todos os inteiros serão números positivos maiores que 0. Como saída, você deve imprimir a sequência de comprimento n das potências de base b .

Exemplos de entrada	Saída para os exemplos de entrada
2 6	1 2 4 8 16 32
3 3	1 3 9
4 5	1 4 16 64 256
10 5	1 10 100 1000 10000

B.19 Programming Problem: Calculate Global Minimum Coin Changes (PD)

Caixa eletrônico

Requested files: user.c (Download)

Type of work: Individual work

Grade settings: Maximum grade: 10

Dissable external file upload, paste and drop external content: Yes

Run: Yes **Evaluate:** Yes

Automatic grade: Yes

Problema:

Imagine que você deve fazer um programa para liberar moedas de um caixa eletrônico de quaisquer país do mundo. O caixa fornece somente moedas com denominações entre 1 e 9. Considere que o usuário faz a solicitação de uma determinada quantidade indicando o valor a ser retirado, o número " n " dos tipos de moedas disponíveis no país, e a denominação de cada uma das moedas. Como resultado, o seu programa deve indicar quantas moedas de cada denominação devem ser liberadas.

Entrada e Saída:

O programa irá solicitar $n+1$ entradas ao usuário. A primeira entrada será constituídas por dois números inteiros separados por um espaço em branco que representam a quantidade solicitada (*value* - maior que 1) e o número dos tipos de moedas disponíveis no país (n - maior que 0 e menor que 10). As seguintes n entradas serão constituídas pelas denominações de cada moeda. Como saída você deve imprimir n linhas indicando na i -ésima linha a quantidade de moedas a serem liberadas correspondente à i -ésima denominação.

Exemplos de Entrada	Exemplos de Saída
123 3 5 2 1	24 1 1
73 4 5 3 2 1	14 1 0 0
10 3 3 2 1	3 0 1

- A última fila na tabela dos exemplos de entrada e saída significa que o usuário solicita uma quantidade de 10 em um país com 3 tipos de moedas: uma de valor 3, outra de valor 2 e uma de valor 1. A saída do exemplo significa que são necessárias: 3 moedas de valor 3, 0 moedas de valor 2, e 1 moeda de valor 1.

Requested files

B.20 Programming Problem: Count Number of Semi-primes for RSA (PE)

Contagem de semi-primos para o algoritmo RSA

Requested files: user.c (Download)

Type of work: Individual work

Grade settings: Maximum grade: 10

Dissable external file upload, paste and drop external content: Yes

Run: Yes **Evaluate:** Yes

Automatic grade: Yes

Problema:

Parte do algoritmo de criptografia de chave pública RSA consiste em calcular um número semi-primo n , o qual é o produto de dois números primos p e q .

$$n = p \cdot q$$

Escreva um programa que, dado o intervalo de números inteiros i e j , determine a contagem de números semi-primos existentes em um intervalo de inteiros i e j (i e j são incluídos neste intervalo). Por exemplo, dados os valores $i=50$ e $j=100$, o resultado será 17 devido a que os números semi-primos no intervalo de 50 até 100 são:

51, 55, 57, 58, 62, 65, 69, 74, 77, 82, 85, 86, 87, 91, 93, 94, 95

Entrada e Saída:

A entrada será constituído por dois números inteiros i e j separados por um espaço em branco. Todos os inteiros serão números positivos maiores que 1 e i será sempre menor ou igual a j . Como saída, você deve imprimir a quantidade de semi-primos no intervalo $[i, j]$. Veja abaixo alguns exemplos de entrada/saída:

Exemplos de entrada	Saída para os exemplos de entrada
1 25	9
50 100	17
101 200	28
200 300	32

Dicas:

- O operador de resto em C é %, assim para calcular o resto de um número x entre 2 na variável resto deve ser escrita a linha:
`resto = x % 2;`
- Números primos são os números que têm apenas dois divisores: 1 e ele mesmo. Lembre-se que 1 não é primo.

Requested files

user.c

B.21 Formative Evaluation: Multiple Choice Knowledge Questionnaires of Recursion (provinha3a)

CATALOG

SSC0600 - Introdução à Ciência de Computação I
Tópico: Recursão

Provinha 3(a)
25 de maio de 2017

N.º USP:

0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2
3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3
4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4
5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5
6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6
7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7
8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8
9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9

← Por favor codifique seu Número USP na esquerda e escreva seu nome abaixo.

Nome e sobrenome:

.....
.....

Questão [remember-multistructural] ♣ Em relação ao trecho de código em Linguagem C apresentado na Listagem 1, Marque (X) nas afirmativas verdadeiras

- foo é uma função recursiva
- foo1 é uma função recursiva
- foo2 é uma função recursiva
- foo3 é uma função recursiva
- foo4 é uma função recursiva
- foo5 é uma função recursiva
- foo6 é uma função recursiva
- foo não é uma função recursiva
- foo1 não é uma função recursiva
- foo2 não é uma função recursiva
- foo3 não é uma função recursiva
- foo4 não é uma função recursiva
- foo5 não é uma função recursiva
- foo6 não é uma função recursiva
- Nenhuma das alternativas está correta

CATALOG

Question [understand-multistructural] ♦ Marque (X) nas afirmativas verdadeiras em relação as funções da Listagem 2

Observações:

- n e b são inteiros positivos maiores que 0 para as funções foobar1, foobar2 e foobar3.
- Os múltiplos de 3 são: 0 * 3, 1 * 3, 2 * 3, 3 * 3, ...

- foobar1 calcula a soma do n-ésimo termo da sequência fibonacci e o valor da variável b
- foobar1 calcula o n-ésimo termo da sequência fibonacci
- foobar1 retorna o valor da variável b incrementado em 1 quando n é 1 e ela retorna a soma dos resultados das funções foobar(n-1, b) e foobar(n-2, b) em outros casos
- foobar1 é a função que retorna o valor da variável b quando n é menor que 2 e retorna a soma do resultado da função foobar(n-1, b) e foobar(n-2, b) em outros casos
- foobar1 é a função que calcula a soma dos n+1 primeiros múltiplos de b
- foobar1 é a função que calcula a soma dos n primeiros múltiplos de b
- foobar1 é a função que calcula a soma dos n-1 primeiros múltiplos de b
- foobar2 é a função que calcula $b * 0 + b * 1 + b * 2 + \dots + b * n$
- foobar2 é a função que calcula $b * 0 + b * 1 + b * 2 + \dots + b * n + b * (n + 1)$
- foobar2 é a função que calcula $b * 0 + b * 1 + b * 2 + \dots + b * (n - 2) + b * (n - 1)$
- foobar2 é a função que calcula o n+1 éssimo múltiplo de b
- foobar2 é a função que calcula o n éssimo múltiplo de b
- foobar2 é a função que calcula o n-1 éssimo múltiplo de b
- Se n é ímpar então foobar3 é a função que calcula a soma da sequência: $\frac{n}{\text{foobar1}(n,b)}$, $\text{foobar2}(n-1,b), \dots, \text{foobar2}(2,b), \frac{1}{\text{foobar1}(1,b)}$; e se n é par então foobar3 é a função que calcula a soma da sequência: $\text{foobar2}(n,b), \frac{n-1}{\text{foobar1}(n-1,b)}, \dots, \text{foobar2}(2,b), \frac{1}{\text{foobar1}(1,b)}$
- Se n é ímpar então foobar3 é a função que calcula a soma da sequência: $\text{foobar2}(n,b), \frac{n-1}{\text{foobar1}(n-1,b)}, \dots, \text{foobar2}(2,b), \frac{1}{\text{foobar1}(1,b)}$; e se n é par então foobar3 é a função que calcula a soma da sequência: $\frac{n}{\text{foobar1}(n,b)}, \text{foobar2}(n-1,b), \dots, \text{foobar2}(2,b), \frac{1}{\text{foobar1}(1,b)}$
- Se n é par então foobar3 é a função que calcula a soma da sequência: $\frac{n}{\text{foobar1}(n,b)}, \text{foobar2}(n-1,b), \dots, \text{foobar2}(2,b), \frac{1}{\text{foobar1}(1,b)}$; e se n é ímpar então foobar3 é a função que calcula a soma da sequência: $\text{foobar2}(n,b), \frac{n-1}{\text{foobar1}(n-1,b)}, \dots, \text{foobar2}(2,b), \frac{1}{\text{foobar1}(1,b)}$
- Nenhuma das alternativas está correta

Question [apply-unistructural] ♦ Marque (X) nas afirmativas verdadeiras em relação à função zoo da Listagem 3

- | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> retorna 13 quando n é 17
<input type="checkbox"/> retorna 11 quando n é 17
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> retorna 16 quando n é 17
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> retorna 16 quando n é 22
<input type="checkbox"/> retorna 15 quando n é 22
<input type="checkbox"/> retorna 12 quando n é 22 | <input type="checkbox"/> retorna 12 quando n é 17
<input type="checkbox"/> retorna 15 quando n é 17
<input type="checkbox"/> retorna 17 quando n é 17
<input type="checkbox"/> retorna 17 quando n é 22
<input type="checkbox"/> retorna 11 quando n é 22
<input type="checkbox"/> retorna 13 quando n é 22 |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

Nenhuma das alternativas está correta

CATALOG

Question [apply-relational] ♣ Marque (X) nas afirmativas verdadeiras em relação ao programa da Listagem 4.

- Depois que o código for executado, $v1$ contém os valores: {5, 6, 8, 7, 9, 10, 4, 3, 2, 1}
- Depois que o código for executado, $v1$ contém os valores: {5, 6, 7, 8, 4, 3, 2, 1}
- Depois que o código for executado, $v1$ contém os valores: {1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10}
- Depois que o código for executado, $v1$ contém os valores: {1, 2, 3, 4, 10, 9, 7, 8, 6, 5}
- Depois que o código for executado, $v1$ contém os valores: {1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 7, 6, 5}
- Depois que o código for executado, $v1$ contém os valores: {10, 9, 8, 7, 6, 5, 4, 3, 2, 1}
- Depois que o código for executado, $v2$ contém os valores: {4, 65, 2, -31, 0, 1, 2, 83, 2, 99}
- Depois que o código for executado, $v2$ contém os valores: {4, 65, 2, -31, 0, 1, 2, 2, 83, 99}
- Depois que o código for executado, $v2$ contém os valores: {0, -31, 2, 1, 2, 2, 99, 4, 83, 65}
- Depois que o código for executado, $v2$ contém os valores: {99, 2, 83, 2, 1, 0, -31, 2, 65, 4}
- Depois que o código for executado, $v2$ contém os valores: {99, 83, 2, 2, 1, 0, -31, 2, 65, 4}
- Depois que o código for executado, $v2$ contém os valores: {65, 83, 4, 99, 2, 2, 1, 2, -31, 0}
- Nenhuma das alternativas está correta

Question [evaluate-multistructural] ♣ Marque (X) nas afirmativas verdadeiras em relação ao programa da Listagem 4.

- A chamada para a função `foo` é efetuada 24 vezes
- A chamada para a função `foo` é efetuada 23 vezes
- A chamada para a função `foo` é efetuada 22 vezes
- A chamada para a função `foo` é efetuada 21 vezes
- A chamada para a função `foo` é efetuada 20 vezes
- A chamada para a função `bar` é efetuada 20 vezes
- A chamada para a função `bar` é efetuada 21 vezes
- A chamada para a função `bar` é efetuada 22 vezes
- A chamada para a função `bar` é efetuada 23 vezes
- A chamada para a função `bar` é efetuada 24 vezes
- Nenhuma das alternativas está correta

CATALOG

Question [analyse-relational-1] ♣ Marque (X) nas modificações que, de maneira independente umas das outras, façam com que a função `max_div_comum` apresentada na Listagem 5 calcule o máximo divisor comum de dois números `n1` e `n2` (maiores que 0).

- A linha 2 deve ser mudada para: `if (n2 == 0)`
a linha 3 deve ser mudada para: `return n1;`
a linha 5 deve ser mudada para: `return max_div_comum(n2, n1%n2);`
- A linha 2 deve ser mudada para: `if (n2 == 0)`
a linha 3 deve ser mudada para: `return n1;`
a linha 5 deve ser mudada para: `return max_div_comum(n2, n2%n1);`
- A linha 2 deve ser mudada para: `if (n2 == 0)`
a linha 3 deve ser mudada para: `return n1;`
a linha 5 deve ser mudada para: `return max_div_comum(n2, n1/n2);`
- A linha 2 deve ser mudada para: `if (n2 == 0)`
a linha 3 deve ser mudada para: `return n1;`
a linha 5 deve ser mudada para: `return max_div_comum(n2, n2/n1);`
- A linha 2 deve ser mudada para: `if (n1 == 0)`
a linha 3 deve ser mudada para: `return n2;`
a linha 5 deve ser mudada para: `return max_div_comum(n2%n1, n1);`
- A linha 2 deve ser mudada para: `if (n1 == 0)`
a linha 3 deve ser mudada para: `return n2;`
a linha 5 deve ser mudada para: `return max_div_comum(n1%n2, n1);`
- A linha 2 deve ser mudada para: `if (n1 == 0)`
a linha 3 deve ser mudada para: `return n2;`
a linha 5 deve ser mudada para: `return max_div_comum(n2/n1, n1);`
- Nenhuma das alternativas está correta

CATALOG

Question [analyse-relational-2] ♣ A função count apresentada na Listagem 6 tem sido proposta para efetuar a contagem do número de vezes que um elemento e aparece num vetor v de tamanho n . Os elementos do vetor v sempre estão em ordem ascendente ou descendente - e o algoritmo funciona para ambos os casos. Marque (X) nas modificações que, de maneira independenteumas das outras, façam a função count funcionar adequadamente para vetores em ordem ascendente ou descendente.

- A linha 12 deve ser mudada para: `if (v[i] <= v[j])`
a linha 13 deve ser mudada para: `if (v[k] > e)`
a linha 18 deve ser mudada para: `if (v[k] < e)`
- A linha 12 deve ser mudada para: `if (v[i] <= v[j])`
a linha 13 deve ser mudada para: `if (v[k] < e)`
a linha 18 deve ser mudada para: `if (v[k] > e)`
- A linha 12 deve ser mudada para: `if (v[i] <= v[j])`
a linha 13 deve ser mudada para: `if (v[k] > e)`
a linha 18 deve ser mudada para: `if (v[k] > e)`
- A linha 12 deve ser mudada para: `if (v[i] <= v[j])`
a linha 13 deve ser mudada para: `if (v[k] < e)`
a linha 18 deve ser mudada para: `if (v[k] < e)`
- A linha 12 deve ser mudada para: `if (v[i] >= v[j])`
a linha 13 deve ser mudada para: `if (v[k] < e)`
a linha 18 deve ser mudada para: `if (v[k] > e)`
- A linha 12 deve ser mudada para: `if (v[i] >= v[j])`
a linha 13 deve ser mudada para: `if (v[k] > e)`
a linha 18 deve ser mudada para: `if (v[k] < e)`
- A linha 12 deve ser mudada para: `if (v[i] >= v[j])`
a linha 13 deve ser mudada para: `if (v[k] > e)`
a linha 18 deve ser mudada para: `if (v[k] > e)`
- A linha 12 deve ser mudada para: `if (v[i] >= v[j])`
a linha 13 deve ser mudada para: `if (v[k] < e)`
a linha 18 deve ser mudada para: `if (v[k] < e)`
- Nenhuma das alternativas está correta*

```

int foo6(int a, int b) {
    ...
    if (b < a) {
        return foo4(a+b);
    } else {
        return 24;
    }
}

int foo5(int a, int b) {
    if (a > b) {
        return foo6(a+a, b*b);
    } else {
        return foo6(a/2, b/2);
    }
}

int foo4(int a) {
    ...
    return foo5(a, a*a);
}

int foo3(int a, int b) {
    ...
    if (a != 0) {
        return foo3(a-1, b+1);
    } else {
        return b+1;
    }
}

int foo2(int b) {
    return foo3(foo4(b), b+1);
}

int foo1(int a, int b) {
    ...
    if (a > b) {
        return foo1(b, a);
    } else {
        return foo2(b);
    }
}

int foo() {
    ...
    int v1 = foo1(23, 10);
    int v2 = foo2(10);
    int v3_v4 = foo3(34, 12) + foo4(34-12);
    return v1+v2+v3_v4;
}

```

Listagem 1: Trecho de código para as funções foo na Linguagem C

```

1 int foobar1(int n, int b) {
2     if (n < 2) {
3         return n + b;
4     } else {
5         return foobar1(n-1, b) + foobar1(n-2, b);
6     }
7 }
8
9 float foobar2t(int n, int b, float resp) {
10    if (n < 1) {
11        return resp;
12    } else {
13        return foobar2t(n-1, b, resp + (b*n));
14    }
15 }
16
17 float foobar2(int n, int b) {
18     return foobar2t(n, b, 0);
19 }
20
21 float foobar3t(int n, int b, float resp) {
22     if (n < 1) {
23         return resp;
24     } else {
25         if (n % 2 != 0) {
26             return foobar3t(n-1, b, resp + n/foobar1(n, b));
27         } else {
28             return foobar3t(n-1, b, resp + foobar2(n, b));
29         }
30     }
31 }
32
33 float foobar3(int n, int b) {
34     return foobar3t(n, b, 0);
35 }

```

Listagem 2: Trecho de código para as funções foobar na Linguagem C

```

1 int zoot(int n, int resp) {
2     if (n == 1) {
3         return resp+1;
4     } else {
5         if (n %2 == 0)
6             return zoot(n/2, resp+1);
7         else
8             return zoot((n*3)+1 , resp+1);
9     }
10 }
11
12 int zoo(int n) {
13     return zoot(n, 0);
14 }

```

Listagem 3: Função zoo na Linguagem C

```

1 #include <stdio.h>
2
3 void foo(int v[], int i, int j);
4 int bar(int v[], int value, int i, int j);
5
6 int bar(int v[], int value, int i, int j) {
7     if (i >= j) {
8         return i;
9     } else {
10         if (v[i] > value && v[j] <= value) {
11             int temp = v[i];
12             v[i] = v[j];
13             v[j] = temp;
14         }
15         if (v[i] <= value) i++;
16         if (v[j] > value) j--;
17         return bar(v, value, i, j);
18     }
19 }
20
21 void foo(int v[], int i, int j) {
22     if (i <= j) {
23         int value = v[(i+j)/2];
24         int k = bar(v, value, i, j);
25         foo(v, i, k-1);
26         foo(v, k+1, j);
27     }
28 }
29
30 int main (void) {
31     int v1[] = {10, 9, 8, 7, 6, 5, 4, 3, 2, 1};
32     int v2[] = {4, 65, 2, -31, 0, 99, 2, 83, 2, 1};
33
34     foo(v1, 0, 5);
35     foo(v2, 5, 9);
36
37     return 0;
38 }
```

Listagem 4: Código de programa na Linguagem C

```

1 int max_div_comum(int n1, int n2) {
2     if (n1 == 0)
3         return n2;
4     else
5         return max_div_comum(n1%n2, n2/n1);
6 }

```

Listagem 5: Função que calcula o máximo divisor comum de n1 e n2

```

1 int count_aux(int v[], int e, int i, int j) {
2     if (i > j)
3         return 0;
4     int k = (i+j)/2;
5     if (v[k] == e) {
6         i = k;
7         j = k;
8         while (v[i] == e) i--;
9         while (v[j] == e) j++;
10        return j-(i+1);
11    } else {
12        if (v[i] != v[j])
13            if (v[k] > e)
14                return count_aux(v, e, i, k-1);
15            else
16                return count_aux(v, e, k+1, j);
17        else
18            if (v[k] > e)
19                return count_aux(v, e, i, k-1);
20            else
21                return count_aux(v, e, k+1, j);
22    }
23 }
24 }
25
26 int count(int v[], int e, int n) {
27     return count_aux(v, e, 0, n-1);
28 }

```

Listagem 6: Função count que calcula o número de vezes que o elemento e aparece no vetor v[n] (v pode estar ordenado de maneira ascendente ou de maneira descendente - o algoritmo funciona para ambos casos)

B.22 Programming Problem: Calculate Fibonacci Polynomials (P4)

Polinômios de Fibonacci

Requested files: user.c (Download)
Type of work: Individual work
Grade settings: Maximum grade: 10
Disable external file upload, paste and drop external content: Yes
Run: Yes **Evaluate:** Yes
Automatic grade: Yes

Problema:

A sequência de Polinômios de Fibonacci é definida mediante a seguinte função recursiva:

$$F_n(x) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } n = 0 \\ 1, & \text{if } n = 1 \\ xF_{n-1}(x) + F_{n-2}(x), & \text{if } n \geq 2 \end{cases}$$

Assim, os primeiros elementos da sequência são:

$$\begin{aligned} F_0(x) &= 0 \\ F_1(x) &= 1 \\ F_2(x) &= x \\ F_3(x) &= x^2 + 1 \\ F_4(x) &= x^3 + 2x \\ F_5(x) &= x^4 + 3x^2 + 1 \\ F_6(x) &= x^5 + 4x^3 + 3x \end{aligned}$$

Escreva um programa recursivo que dado dois números n e x imprima os $n+1$ primeiros elementos da série de polinômios de Fibonacci para $F_n(x)$.

Entrada e Saída:

A entrada será constituída por dois números inteiros maiores que 0 separados por um espaço em branco, onde o primeiro número é n e o segundo número é x . Como saída você deve imprimir na tela do computador os $n+1$ primeiros números da sequência de Polinômios de Fibonacci.

Exemplos de Entrada	Exemplos de Saída
6 2	0 1 2 5 12 29 70
5 3	0 1 3 10 33 109
9 2	0 1 2 5 12 29 70 169 408 985

Requested files

user.c

```
1 #include<stdio.h>
2
3 int main() {
4     int n, x;
5     scanf("%d %d", &n, &x);
6     // escreva seu código aqui
7     return 0;
8 }
```

Execution files

vpl_run.sh

```
1#!/bin/bash
2# $Id: c_run.sh,v 1.3 2012-07-25 19:02:20 juanca Exp $
3# Default C language run script for VPL
4# Copyright (C) 2014 Juan Carlos Rodriguez-del-Pino
5# License http://www.gnu.org/copyleft/gpl.html GNU GPL v3 or later
6# Author Juan Carlos Rodriguez-del-Pino <jcrodiguez@dis.ulpgc.es>
7
8#load common script and check programs
9. common_script.sh
10 check_program gcc
11
12 #compile
13 SOURCE_FILES="user.c"
14 eval gcc -fno-diagnostics-color -o vpl_execution -std=c99 $SOURCE_FILES -lm -lutil
```

vpl_debug.sh

vpl_evaluate.sh

B.23 Formative Evaluation: Multiple Choice Knowledge Questionnaires of Recursion (provinha3c)

CATALOG

SSC0600 - Introdução à Ciência de Computação I
Tópico: Recursão

Provinha 3(c)
27 de junho de 2017

N.º USP:

0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2
 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3
 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4
 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5
 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6
 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7
 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8
 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9

← Por favor codifique seu Número USP na esquerda e escreva seu nome abaixo.

Nome e sobrenome:

.....
.....

Questão [remember-multistructural] ♣ (1 ponto) Em relação ao trecho de código em Linguagem C apresentado na Listagem 1, Marque (X) nas afirmativas verdadeiras

- foo0 é recursivo
- foo1 é recursivo
- foo2 é recursivo
- foo3 é recursivo
- foo4 é recursivo
- foo5 é recursivo
- foo6 é recursivo
- foo0 não é recursivo
- foo1 não é recursivo
- foo2 não é recursivo
- foo3 não é recursivo
- foo4 não é recursivo
- foo5 não é recursivo
- foo6 não é recursivo
- Nenhuma das alternativas está correta

CATALOG

Question [understand-multistructural] ♣ (3 pontos) Marque (X) nas afirmativas verdadeiras em relação as funções da Listagem 2

Observações:

- A função `pow(a, b)` calcula a potência de base a e expoente b : a^b
 - Os n primeiros números potência base a são: $a^1, a^2, a^3, \dots, a^{n-1}, a^n$
 - Um número quadrado é um número inteiro cuja raiz quadrada é um outro número inteiro
- bar1 calcula a soma dos n primeiros números potências de base 2
 bar1 calcula a soma dos n primeiros números quadrados
 bar2 calcula b dividido entre o produto dos n primeiros números quadrados
 bar2 calcula b dividido entre a soma dos n primeiros números quadrados
 bar2 calcula b dividido entre o produto dos n primeiros números potência de base 2
 bar2 calcula b dividido entre a soma dos n primeiros números potência de base 2
 bar1 é a função que calcula $0 + 2^0 + 2^1 + 2^2 + \dots + 2^{n-1} + 2^n$
 bar1 é a função que calcula $0 + 0^2 + 1^2 + 2^2 + \dots + (n - 1)^2 + n^2$
 bar2 é a função que calcula $\frac{b}{n^2 * (n-1)^2 * (n-2)^2 * \dots * 4 * 2 * 1}$
 bar2 é a função que calcula $\frac{b}{n^2 + (n-1)^2 + (n-2)^2 + \dots + 4 + 2 + 1}$
 bar2 é a função que calcula $\frac{b}{2^{n-1} * 2^{n-2} * \dots * 4 * 2 * 1}$
 bar2 é a função que calcula $\frac{b}{2^n + 2^{n-1} + 2^{n-2} + \dots + 4 + 2 + 1}$
 Se n é ímpar então bar3 calcula a soma da sequência:
 $\text{bar2}(1), \text{bar2}(3), \text{bar2}(5), \dots, \text{bar2}(n - 2), \text{bar2}(n)$
 Se n é par então bar3 calcula a soma da sequência:
 $\text{bar1}(2), \text{bar1}(4), \text{bar1}(6), \dots, \text{bar1}(n - 2), \text{bar1}(n)$
 Se n é ímpar então bar3 calcula a soma da sequência:
 $\text{bar1}(1), \text{bar1}(3), \text{bar1}(5), \dots, \text{bar1}(n - 2), \text{bar1}(n)$
 Se n é par então bar3 calcula a soma da sequência:
 $\text{bar2}(2), \text{bar2}(4), \text{bar2}(6), \dots, \text{bar2}(n - 2), \text{bar2}(n)$
 Se n é ímpar então bar3 calcula a soma da sequência:
 $\text{bar2}(1), \text{bar1}(2), \text{bar2}(3), \dots, \text{bar2}(n - 2), \text{bar1}(n - 1), \text{bar2}(n)$
 Se n é par então bar3 calcula a soma da sequência:
 $\text{bar1}(1), \text{bar2}(2), \text{bar1}(3), \dots, \text{bar1}(n - 2), \text{bar2}(n - 1), \text{bar3}(n)$
 Nenhuma das alternativas está correta

Question [apply-unistructural] ♣ (1.5 ponto) Seja o vetor $v[6]=\{1, 7, 3, 9, 7, 5\}$. Marque (X) nas afirmativas verdadeiras em relação à chamadas para a função `zoo(v, 5)` e `zoo(v, 4)` da Listagem 3.

- | | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | retorna 3 quando é <code>zoo(v, 5)</code> | <input type="checkbox"/> | retorna 2 quando é <code>zoo(v, 5)</code> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | retorna 1 quando é <code>zoo(v, 5)</code> | <input type="checkbox"/> | retorna 4 quando é <code>zoo(v, 5)</code> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | retorna 3 quando é <code>zoo(v, 4)</code> | <input type="checkbox"/> | retorna 4 quando é <code>zoo(v, 4)</code> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | retorna 2 quando é <code>zoo(v, 4)</code> | <input type="checkbox"/> | retorna 1 quando é <code>zoo(v, 4)</code> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Nenhuma das alternativas está correta | | | |

CATALOG

Question [apply-relational] ♣ (2 pontos) Marque (X) nas afirmativas verdadeiras em relação ao conteúdo dos vetores $v1$ e $v2$ após a execução do programa da Listagem 4.

- Depois que o código for executado, $v1$ contém os valores: {10, 7, 9, 6, 2, 8, 5, 3}
- Depois que o código for executado, $v1$ contém os valores: {9, 7, 8, 6, 3, 2, 5, 10}
- Depois que o código for executado, $v1$ contém os valores: {2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10}
- Depois que o código for executado, $v1$ contém os valores: {10, 9, 7, 6, 2, 8, 5, 3}
- Depois que o código for executado, $v1$ contém os valores: {10, 9, 8, 7, 6, 5, 3, 2}
- Depois que o código for executado, $v2$ contém os valores: {6, 4, 3, -3, 0, 2, 2, 5}
- Depois que o código for executado, $v2$ contém os valores: {6, 5, 3, 4, 0, 2, 2, -3}
- Depois que o código for executado, $v2$ contém os valores: {-3, 0, 2, 5, 4, 2, 3, 6}
- Depois que o código for executado, $v2$ contém os valores: {6, 4, 3, 0, -3, 2, 2, 5}
- Depois que o código for executado, $v2$ contém os valores: {6, 5, 4, 3, 2, 2, 0, -3}
- Nenhuma das alternativas está correta

Question [evaluate-multistructural] ♣ (1 ponto) Marque (X) nas afirmativas verdadeiras em relação a chamadas às funções `foo` e `bar` no programa da Listagem 4.

- A chamada para a função `foo` é efetuada 9 vezes
- A chamada para a função `foo` é efetuada 8 vezes
- A chamada para a função `foo` é efetuada 7 vezes
- A chamada para a função `foo` é efetuada 10 vezes
- A chamada para a função `foo` é efetuada 11 vezes
- A chamada para a função `bar` é efetuada 15 vezes
- A chamada para a função `bar` é efetuada 14 vezes
- A chamada para a função `bar` é efetuada 13 vezes
- A chamada para a função `bar` é efetuada 12 vezes
- A chamada para a função `bar` é efetuada 11 vezes
- Nenhuma das alternativas está correta

CATALOG

Question [analyse-relational-1] ♣ (2 pontos) Marque (X) nas modificações que, de maneira independente umas das outras, façam com que a função parcheck apresentada na Listagem 5 funcione adequadamente. A função devolve 0 se a cadeia de caracteres s [] de comprimento n tiver a mesma quantidade de parênteses de abertura e de fechamento (balanceamento de parênteses). Caso contrário, ele retorna um outro número diferente de 0.

- A linha 2 deve ser mudada para: if (n < 1) {
a linha 6 deve ser mudada para: return parcheck_t(s, n-1, nOpens+1);
a linha 8 deve ser mudada para: return parcheck_t(s, n-1, nOpens-1);
a linha 10 deve ser mudada para: return parcheck_t(s, n-1, nOpens);
- A linha 2 deve ser mudada para: if (n < 1) {
a linha 6 deve ser mudada para: return parcheck_t(s, n-1, nOpens-1);
a linha 8 deve ser mudada para: return parcheck_t(s, n-1, nOpens+1);
a linha 10 deve ser mudada para: return parcheck_t(s, n-1, nOpens);
- A linha 2 deve ser mudada para: if (n < 1) {
a linha 6 deve ser mudada para: return parcheck_t(s, n-1, nOpens);
a linha 8 deve ser mudada para: return parcheck_t(s, n-1, nOpens+1);
a linha 10 deve ser mudada para: return parcheck_t(s, n-1, nOpens-1);
- A linha 2 deve ser mudada para: if (n < 1) {
a linha 6 deve ser mudada para: return parcheck_t(s, n-1, nOpens);
a linha 8 deve ser mudada para: return parcheck_t(s, n-1, nOpens-1);
a linha 10 deve ser mudada para: return parcheck_t(s, n-1, nOpens+1);
- A linha 2 deve ser mudada para: if (n < 0) {
a linha 6 deve ser mudada para: return parcheck_t(s, n-1, nOpens+1);
a linha 8 deve ser mudada para: return parcheck_t(s, n-1, nOpens-1);
a linha 10 deve ser mudada para: return parcheck_t(s, n-1, nOpens);
- A linha 2 deve ser mudada para: if (n < 0) {
a linha 6 deve ser mudada para: return parcheck_t(s, n-1, nOpens-1);
a linha 8 deve ser mudada para: return parcheck_t(s, n-1, nOpens+1);
a linha 10 deve ser mudada para: return parcheck_t(s, n-1, nOpens);
- A linha 2 deve ser mudada para: if (n < 0) {
a linha 6 deve ser mudada para: return parcheck_t(s, n-1, nOpens);
a linha 8 deve ser mudada para: return parcheck_t(s, n-1, nOpens+1);
a linha 10 deve ser mudada para: return parcheck_t(s, n-1, nOpens-1);
- A linha 2 deve ser mudada para: if (n < 0) {
a linha 6 deve ser mudada para: return parcheck_t(s, n-1, nOpens);
a linha 8 deve ser mudada para: return parcheck_t(s, n-1, nOpens-1);
a linha 10 deve ser mudada para: return parcheck_t(s, n-1, nOpens+1);
- Nenhuma das alternativas está correta

CATALOG

Question [analyse-relational-2] ♣ (2 pontos) Seja $v[]$ o vetor utilizado para representar um conjunto ordenado de n números inteiros (a ordem dos elementos no conjunto é ascendente). A função `lower_bound` apresentado na Listagem 6 tem sido proposto para calcular a posição do limitante inferior dos números maiores que um número inteiro `value`. Isso é calcular a posição do menor número entre os números maiores que `value`. Por exemplo:

- Para $v[7] = \{1, 2, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10\}$, a posição do limitante inferior de `value=7` é 4 devido a que o $v[4]=8$ é o menor entre os números maiores que 7 ($v[4]=8$, $v[5]=8$ e $v[6]=8$).
- Para $v[7] = \{1, 2, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10\}$, a posição do limitante inferior de `value=10` é -1 devido a que não há elemento maior que 10 no conjunto $v[]$.

Marque (X) nas modificações que, de maneira independente umas das outras, façam a função `lower_bound` funcionar adequadamente.

- A linha 9 deve ser mudada para: `if (v[m] <= value)`
 a linha 10 deve ser mudada para: `return lower_bound_t(v, m+1, j, value);`
 a linha 12 deve ser mudada para: `return lower_bound_t(v, i, m-1, value);`
- A linha 9 deve ser mudada para: `if (v[m] <= value)`
 a linha 10 deve ser mudada para: `return lower_bound_t(v, i, m-1, value);`
 a linha 12 deve ser mudada para: `return lower_bound_t(v, m+1, j, value);`
- A linha 9 deve ser mudada para: `if (v[m] < value)`
 a linha 10 deve ser mudada para: `return lower_bound_t(v, m+1, j, value);`
 a linha 12 deve ser mudada para: `return lower_bound_t(v, i, m-1, value);`
- A linha 9 deve ser mudada para: `if (v[m] < value)`
 a linha 10 deve ser mudada para: `return lower_bound_t(v, i, m-1, value);`
 a linha 12 deve ser mudada para: `return lower_bound_t(v, m+1, j, value);`
- A linha 9 deve ser mudada para: `if (v[m] > value)`
 a linha 10 deve ser mudada para: `return lower_bound_t(v, i, m-1, value);`
 a linha 12 deve ser mudada para: `return lower_bound_t(v, m+1, j, value);`
- A linha 9 deve ser mudada para: `if (v[m] > value)`
 a linha 10 deve ser mudada para: `return lower_bound_t(v, m+1, j, value);`
 a linha 12 deve ser mudada para: `return lower_bound_t(v, i, m-1, value);`
- A linha 9 deve ser mudada para: `if (v[m] >= value)`
 a linha 10 deve ser mudada para: `return lower_bound_t(v, i, m-1, value);`
 a linha 12 deve ser mudada para: `return lower_bound_t(v, m+1, j, value);`
- A linha 9 deve ser mudada para: `if (v[m] >= value)`
 a linha 10 deve ser mudada para: `return lower_bound_t(v, m+1, j, value);`
 a linha 12 deve ser mudada para: `return lower_bound_t(v, i, m-1, value);`
- Nenhuma das alternativas está correta

```

1 int foo6(int a, int b) {
2     if (foo4(a, b) > a+b) {
3         return b*a;
4     } else {
5         return a+b;
6     }
7 }
8
9 int foo5(int a, int b) {
10    if (a > b) {
11        return foo6(b, a);
12    } else {
13        return foo6(a, b);
14    }
15 }
16
17 int foo4(int a, int b) {
18    return foo6(b*a, a/b);
19 }
20
21 int foo3(int a, int b) {
22    int a = foo5(b, a);
23    int b = foo5(a, fool(a-b, b-a))
24    return a+b;
25 }
26
27 int foo2(int b) {
28    return foo3(b*b, b+1);
29 }
30
31 int fool(int a, int b) {
32    if (a - b > 0) {
33        return foo2(b);
34    }
35    return foo3(a, b);
36 }
37
38 int foo0(int a, int b) {
39    if (a != 0) {
40        return fool(a*a, foo0(a%b, b-1));
41    } else {
42        return b;
43    }
44 }

```

Listagem 1: Trecho de código para as funções foo na Linguagem C

```

1 int bar1t(int n, int resp) {
2     if (n < 0) {
3         return resp;
4     } else {
5         return bar1t(n-1, pow(2,n)+resp);
6     }
7 }
8
9 int bar1(int n) {
10    return bar1t(n, 0);
11 }
12
13 float bar2(float n, float b) {
14     if (n < 1) {
15         return b;
16     } else {
17         return (1/pow(n, 2)) * bar2(n-1, b);
18     }
19 }
20
21 float bar3(float n) {
22     if (n >= 1) {
23         if (n % 2 == 0) {
24             return bar1(n) + bar3(n-2);
25         } else {
26             return bar2(n) + bar3(n-2);
27         }
28     }
29     return 0;
30 }
```

Listagem 2: Trecho de código para as funções bar na Linguagem C

```

1 int zoo(int v[], int n) {
2     int k;
3     int c = 1;
4     for (k = n-1 ; k >= 0 ; k--) {
5         if (v[k] <= v[n]) {
6             int d = zoo(v, k);
7             if (d+1 > c) {
8                 c = d+1;
9             }
10        }
11    }
12    return c;
13 }
```

Listagem 3: Função zoo na Linguagem C

```

1 #include<stdio.h>
2
3 void bar(int v[], int i, int n) {
4     int l = (2*i)+1;
5     int r = (2*i)+2;
6     int m = i;
7     if (l < n && v[l] > v[m]) {
8         m = l;
9     }
10    if (r < n && v[r] > v[m]) {
11        m = r;
12    }
13    if (m != i) {
14        int aux = v[i];
15        v[i] = v[m];
16        v[m] = aux;
17        bar(v, m, n);
18    }
19 }
20
21 void foo(int v[], int k, int n) {
22     if (k >= 0) {
23         bar(v, k, n);
24         foo(v, k-1, n);
25     }
26 }
27
28 int main() {
29     int v1[8] = {2,3,5,6,7,8,9,10};
30     int v2[8] = {4,6,2,-3,0,2,3,5};
31
32     foo(v1, 3, 8);
33     foo(v2, 2, 8);
34
35     return 0;
36 }
```

Listagem 4: Código de programa na Linguagem C

```

1 int parcheck_t(char s[], int n, int nOpens) {
2     if (n > 0) {
3         return nOpens;
4     } else {
5         if (s[n-1] == '(') {
6             return parcheck_t(s, n+1, nOpens);
7         } else if (s[n-1] == ')') {
8             return parcheck_t(s, n+1, nOpens);
9         } else {
10            return parcheck_t(s, n+1, nOpens);
11        }
12    }
13 }
14
15 int parcheck(char s[], int n) {
16     return parcheck_t(s, n, 0);
17 }
```

Listagem 5: Calcula se uma string s[] tem平衡amento de parênteses

```

1 int lower_bound_t(int v[], int i, int j, int value) {
2     if (i > j) {
3         return -1;
4     } else {
5         int m = (i+j)/2;
6         if (v[m-1] <= value && v[m] > value) {
7             return m;
8         } else {
9             if (v[m] == value)
10                 return lower_bound_t(v, i, j, value);
11             else
12                 return lower_bound_t(v, i, j, value);
13         }
14     }
15 }
16
17 int lower_bound(int v[], int n, int value) {
18     lower_bound_t(v, 0, n-1, value);
19 }
```

Listagem 6: Calcula a posição do limitante inferior dos números maiores que value para os números inteiros ordenados no vetor v[] de comprimento n

B.24 Programming Problem: Generation of Planning Poker Sequence (PF)

Planning Poker

Requested files: user.c (Download)
Type of work: Individual work
Grade settings: Maximum grade: 10
Disable external file upload, paste and drop external content: Yes
Run: Yes **Evaluate:** Yes
Automatic grade: Yes

Problema:

Em engenharia de software, o *Planning Poker* consiste em que todos os membros da equipe de desenvolvimento (programadores, testadores, design e analistas) participem colocando a sua visão de complexidade em tempo e esforço do desenvolvimento do software utilizando um baralho com cartas numeradas em uma sequência similar a encontrada nos números de *Fibonacci*. O valor de uma carta $f(n)$ é calculado a partir da soma dos valores das duas cartas anteriores $f(n-1) + f(n-2)$.

O número de cartas que cada integrante tem a sua disposição em seu baralho é igual ao número " n " de membros da equipe. Cada baralho sempre tem uma carta 0 que é usada para indicar que o participante não está apto a estimar e o valor mínimo "v" da carta seguinte é definido pelo chefe do projeto de software. No há cartas repetidas no baralho, assim a carta seguinte tem uma xícara de café para o participante fazer uma sugestão de pausa (usaremos x para representar a xícara de café).

Dessa forma, se no equipe de desenvolvimento há dez membros ($n=10$) e o chefe de projeto define o valor mínimo de estimativa como dois ($v=2$) então o baralho é composto das seguintes cartas:

0 2 x 4 6 10 16 26 42 68

Escreva um programa recursivo que dado um número n e v imprima o baralho para o planning poker.

Entrada e Saída:

A entrada será constituída por dois números inteiros n e v , onde o valor n é positivo maiores que 2 e v é positivo maior que 0 separados por um espaço em branco. Como saída você deve imprimir na tela do computador o baralho para o planning poker com seus valores separados por um espaço em branco.

Exemplos de Entrada	Exemplos de Saída
5 6	0 x 6 12 18
6 7	0 x 7 14 21 35
10 2	0 x 2 4 6 10 16 26 42 68

Requested files

user.c

```
1 #include<stdio.h>
2
3 int main() {
4     int n, v;
5     scanf("%d", &n, &v);
6     // escreva seu código aqui
7     return 0;
8 }
```

Execution files

vpl_run.sh

```
1#!/bin/bash
2# $Id: c_run.sh,v 1.3 2012-07-25 19:02:20 juanca Exp $
3# Default C language run script for VPL
4# Copyright (C) 2014 Juan Carlos Rodriguez-del-Pino
5# License http://www.gnu.org/copyleft/gpl.html GNU GPL v3 or later
6# Author Juan Carlos Rodriguez-del-Pino <jcrodriguez@dis.ulpgc.es>
7
8#load common script and check programs
9. common_script.sh
10 check_program gcc
11
12 #compile
13 SOURCE_FILES="user.c"
14 eval gcc -fno-diagnostics-color -o vpl_execution -std=c99 $SOURCE_FILES -lm -lutil
```

vpl_debug.sh

vpl_evaluate.sh

B.25 Programming Problem: Counting Palindromes (PG)

Contagem de palíndromos

Requested files: user.c (Download)

Type of work: Individual work

Grade settings: Maximum grade: 10

Dissable external file upload, paste and drop external content: Yes

Run: Yes **Evaluate:** Yes

Automatic grade: Yes

Problema:

Um palíndromo é uma palavra que pode ser lida tanto da direita para a esquerda como da esquerda para a direita. Escreva um programa totalmente recursivo que calcule a quantidade de palavras palíndromo que existem entre duas palavras de tamanho " n " escritas em minúscula sem acentuação nem caracteres especiais. Por exemplo, se $n=3$ há 5 palavras palíndromo entre as palavras "aba" e "afa", as palavras palíndromo para o intervalo são:

"aba", "aca", "ada", "aea" e "afa"

A ordem das palavras são definidas de acordo com seu código ASCII (<http://ascii.cl>). A seguinte palavra de uma palavra "x" é aquela que difere em seu último caractere em uma unidade a mais quando convertida em um vetor de decimais. Quando seu último valor é "z" o seguinte valor no vetor será incrementado em uma unidade e o valor "z" é convertido em "a". Assim, o seguinte exemplo mostra como é gerada a sequência de palavras para o intervalo "aby" e "aca":

- "aby" em código ASCII como um vetor de decimais é {97,98,121}
- "abz" em código ASCII como um vetor de decimais é {97,98,122}
- "aca" em código ASCII como um vetor de decimais é {97,99,97}

Entrada e Saída:

A entrada será constituída por dois linhas, a primeira linha com o tamanho " n " das palavras e a segunda linha com as duas palavras "x" e "y" separadas por um espaço em branco. Como saída você deve imprimir na tela do computador a quantidade de palavras palíndromo entre o intervalo fechado da palavra "x" e "y".

Exemplos de Entrada	Exemplos de Saída
3	5
aba afa	
2	3
ei hl	
4	28
msqe nuqe	

Dicas:

- Para comparar se duas palavras "x" e "y" são iguais use a função "strcmp":

```
if (strcmp(x,y) == 0) {
    // as duas palavras são iguais
}
```

- A seguinte função recursiva gera a próxima palavra da palavra "x" de tamanho "n" atualizando os valores do vetor de caracteres "x"

```
void next_word(char x[], int n) {
    if (n > 0) {
        if (x[n-1] == 'z') {
            x[n-1] = 'a';
            next_word(x, n-1);
        } else {
            x[n-1] = x[n-1]+1;
        }
    }
}
```

Requested files

user.c

```
1 #include<stdio.h>
2 #include<string.h>
3
4 int main() {
5     int n;
6     scanf("%d", &n);
7     char x[n];
8     char y[n];
9     scanf("%s %s", x, y); // não use outras funções para ler as palavras
10    // escreva seu código aqui
11    return 0;
12 }
13
```

Execution files

vpl_run.sh

B.26 Programming Problem: Maze Solving Algorithm (PH)

A saída do labirinto

Requested files: user.c (Download)

Type of work: Individual work

Grade settings: Maximum grade: 10

Disable external file upload, paste and drop external content: Yes

Run: Yes **Evaluate:** Yes

Automatic grade: Yes

Problema:

Escreva um programa recursivo para determinar se há saída de um labirinto (Maze em inglês) de tamanho " $n \times n$ ". O seu programa deve imprimir 1 se há saída e ele deve imprimir 0 se não há saída. O labirinto é representado por uma matriz de caracteres onde os muros são representados pela letra 'X' e os corredores são representados pela letra 'O' (não confunda com o número 0 - é a letra maiúsculo O). A entrada do labirinto sempre está na posição superior esquerda da matriz (maze[0][1] ou maze[1][0]) enquanto a saída sempre está na posição inferior direita (maze[n-1][n-2] ou maze[n-2][n-1]). A seguir, mostramos um exemplo de labirinto de tamanho $n=17$, o processo de busca pela saída e o resultado esperado do seu programa.

- Labirinto $n=17$:

```
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
000000X000000000X
XXXXXOXOXOXXXXXXO
X000X000XOX000X0X
X0XXXXXXXOXOXOXOX
XOX00000XOX0000X
XOX0XXXOXOXOXXXX
X000X000XOX0000X
XXXXXXOXOXOXXXXOX
X00000XOX0000X0X
XOX0XXXXOXOXOXOX
XOX0X000XOX0000X
X0XXXOXOXOXOXOX
X000X0X000XOX000X
XOX0XXXXXXOXOXOX
XOX000000000X0000
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
```

- Processo de busca pela saída: (O caminho percorrido é representado pelo símbolo "*");

```
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
*****X*****
XXXX*X*XOXXXX*X
X***X***XOX***X*X
X*XXXXXXOX***X*X
X*X*****OX*X***X
X*X*XXX*XOX*XXXX
X***X***XOX*****X
XXXX*X*XOXXXX*X
X***X*XOX***X*X
X*XXXXXXXOX***X*X
X*X*X000XOX*X***X
X*XXXOXOXOX*X**XXX
X***XOX000X*X***X
X*XXXXXXX*X**X*X
X*X*****X00**X
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
```

- Resultado esperado do seu programa: "1"

Entrada e Saída:


A entrada será constituída por $n+1$ linhas, a primeira linha com o tamanho " n " do labirinto e as linhas de 1 até $n+1$ com a cadeia de carateres que representa o labirinto. Como saída você deve imprimir na tela do computador 1 se há saída do labirinto e 0 se não há saída.

Dicas:

- Para leitura do labirinto de tamanho " n ", pode usar a seguinte função recursiva:

```
void read_maze(char maze[][], int k, int n) {
    if (k < n) {
        scanf("%s", maze[k]);
        read_maze(maze, k+1, n);
    }
}
```

Requested files



DATA GATHERING INSTRUMENTS FOR MEASURING PARTICIPANTS' MOTIVATION

C.1 Web-based Questionnaire for the Adapted Portuguese IMI

Questionário de satisfação

1 * Para cada uma das afirmativas embaixo, julgue falso ou verdadeiro usando a seguinte escala:

- 1: Nada verdadeira para mim
- 4: Mais o menos verdadeira para mim
- 7: Totalmente verdadeira para mim

	Nada verdadeira	2	3	Mais o menos verdadeira	5	6	Totalmente verdadeira
Foi muito descontraído realizar a atividade	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Senti como se eu tivesse sido obrigado a fazer a atividade	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Me esforcei muito na realização da atividade.	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Para mim foi importante realizar bem a atividade	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Fiz a atividade porque eu quis	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Realmente não tive escolha para realizar (ou não) a atividade	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Não coloquei muita energia (esforço) na atividade	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Senti que não fiz a atividade por vontade própria	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Gostei muito de fazer a atividade	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Tive que me esforçar muito na atividade	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Não me senti nervoso ao realizar a atividade	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
A atividade foi divertida	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Não me esforcei muito para realizar bem a atividade	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Eu me senti muito tenso ao realizar a atividade	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Fiz a atividade porque eu tinha que fazer	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Eu me senti ansioso enquanto trabalhava na atividade	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Fiz a atividade porque eu não tinha outra escolha	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Senti-me pressionado enquanto fazia a atividade	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Achei que a atividade seria chata	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
A atividade não chamou minha atenção	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Descreveria a atividade como muito interessante	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Achei a atividade muito agradável	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Eu senti que tive escolha para realizar a atividade	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Enquanto estava fazendo a atividade, refleti o quanto eu gostei	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

[Close this window](#)

C.2 Paper-based Questionnaire for the Adapted Portuguese IMI

Questionario da atividade colaborativa 01

N. USP:

Nome e sobrenome:

Estamos interessados em conhecer sua opinião pessoal sobre a atividade colaborativa 01. Não há respostas certas ou erradas - estamos apenas interessados em sua opinião pessoal. Por favor, responda às perguntas com a primeira resposta que vier à sua mente.

Para cada uma das afirmativas embaixo, marque (X) na opção mais adequada que julgamento usando a seguinte escala:

- 1: Nada verdadeira para mim
- 4: Mais o menos verdadeira para mim
- 7: Totalmente verdadeira para mim

Item		1: Nada verdadeira	2	3	4: Mais o menos verdadeira	5	6	7: Totalmente verdadeira
01	Foi muito descontraido realizar a atividade							
02	Senti como se eu tivesse sido obrigado a fazer a atividade							
03	Me esforcei muito na realização da atividade.							
04	Para mim foi importante realizar bem a atividade							
05	Fiz a atividade porque eu quis							
06	Realmente não tive escolha para realizar (ou não) a atividade							
07	Não coloquei muita energia (esforço) na atividade							
08	Senti que não fiz a atividade por vontade própria							
09	Gostei muito de fazer a atividade							
10	Tive que me esforçar muito na atividade							
11	Não me senti nervoso ao realizar a atividade							
12	A atividade foi divertida							
13	Não me esforcei muito para realizar bem a atividade							
14	Eu me senti muito tenso ao realizar a atividade							
15	Fiz a atividade porque eu tinha que fazer							
16	Eu me senti ansioso enquanto trabalhava na atividade							
17	Fiz a atividade porque eu não tinha outra escolha							
18	Senti-me pressionado enquanto fazia a atividade							
19	Achei que a atividade seria chata							
20	A atividade não chamou minha atenção							
21	Descreveria a atividade como muito interessante							
22	Achei a atividade muito agradável							
23	Eu senti que tive escolha para realizar a atividade							
24	Enquanto estava fazendo a atividade, refleti o quanto eu gostei							

C.3 Paper-based Questionnaire for the Adapted Portuguese IMMS

Questionário da atividade colaborativa 02

Estamos interessados em conhecer sua opinião pessoal sobre a atividade colaborativa 02. Não há respostas certas ou erradas - estamos apenas interessados em sua opinião pessoal.

Nro USP:

Nome:

Para cada uma das afirmativas embaixo, julgue falso ou verdadeiro usando a seguinte escala de: (1) Falso até (7) Verdadeiro

	1: Não é verdadeira	2	3	4: Mais o menos verdadeira	5	6	7: Totalmente verdadeira
1. Houve algo interessante no início desta atividade que chamou minha atenção.							
2. Completar as tarefas da atividade me deu uma sensação satisfatória de realização							
3. Foi claro para mim como as tarefas da atividade estiveram relacionadas com coisas que eu já conheço							
4. O ambiente e tarefas da atividade foram atraentes							
5. Houveram coisas que me mostraram como [o ambiente e tarefas da atividade] podem ser importantes para algumas pessoas							
6. Completar a atividade com sucesso foi importante para mim							
7. A qualidade de como as tarefas foram definidas na atividade ajudou a prender minha atenção							
8. A atividade foi tão abstrata que foi difícil manter minha atenção							
9. Eu gostei tanto da atividade que eu gostaria de saber mais sobre este tópico							
10. O ambiente em que foi executada a atividade pareceu sem graça e desagradável							
11. As tarefas da atividade foram relevante para os meus interesses							
12. A forma como a informação foi organizada no ambiente da atividade ajudou a manter a minha atenção							
13. A atividade teve coisas que estimularam minha curiosidade							
14. Eu realmente gostei de participar na atividade							
15. A quantidade de tarefas repetitivas na atividade me causou tédio algumas vezes							
16. As tarefas e sua organização na atividade transmitiram a impressão de que valia a pena realizá-la							
17. Aprendi algumas coisas que foram surpreendentes e/ou inesperadas							
18. A atividade não foi relevante para minhas necessidades pois eu já sabia grande parte dela							
19. O feedback ou outros elementos fornecidos na atividade, me ajudou a me sentir recompensado pelo meu esforço							
20. A variedade de tarefas e coisas no ambiente, ajudou a manter minha atenção na atividade							
21. O ambiente e as tarefas da atividade foram chatos ou entediantes							
22. Eu poderia relacionar as tarefas da atividade com coisas que eu vi, fiz ou pensei durante a minha vida							
23. Houve, no ambiente de execução da atividade, muitas coisas que o tornaram irritantes							
24. Foi bom concluir com êxito a atividade							
25. As tarefas da atividade serão úteis para mim							
26. Foi um prazer trabalhar em uma atividade tão bem planejada							

C.4 Web-based Questionnaire for the Adapted Portuguese IMI and IMMS

Questionário de satisfação

Page 1

- 1 *** Para cada uma das afirmativas embaixo, julgue falso ou verdadeiro usando a seguinte escala:

 - 1: Nada verdadeira para mim
 - 4: Mais o menos verdadeira para mim
 - 7: Totalmente verdadeira para mim

Page 2

2 * Para cada uma das afirmativas embaixo, julgue falso ou verdadeiro usando a seguinte escala:

- 1: Nada verdadeira para mim
- 4: Mais o menos verdadeira para mim
- 7: Totalmente verdadeira para mim

	Nada verdadeira	2	3	Mais o menos verdadeira	5	6	Totalmente verdadeira
Foi muito descontraído realizar a atividade	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Foi bom concluir com êxito a atividade	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Senti como se eu tivesse sido obrigado a fazer a atividade	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Me esforcei muito na realização da atividade.	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Para mim foi importante realizar bem a atividade	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Foi claro para mim como as tarefas da atividade estiveram relacionadas com coisas que eu já conheço	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Fiz a atividade porque eu quis	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
A atividade não chamou minha atenção	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Realmente não tive escolha para realizar (ou não) a atividade	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Não coloquei muita esforço na atividade	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Senti que não fiz a atividade por vontade própria	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Gostei muito de fazer a atividade	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Tive que me esforçar muito na atividade	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Não me senti nervoso ao realizar a atividade	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
A atividade foi divertida	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Houve algo interessante no início desta atividade que chamou minha atenção.	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Completar as tarefas da atividade me deu uma sensação satisfatória de realização	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
O ambiente e as tarefas da atividade foram atraentes	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Completar a atividade com sucesso foi importante para mim	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Como as tarefas foram definidas na atividade ajudou a prender minha atenção	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
A atividade foi muito abstrata que foi difícil manter minha atenção	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Eu gostei tanto da atividade que eu gostaria de saber mais sobre este tópico	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
O ambiente em que foi executada a atividade pareceu sem graça e desagradável	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
As tarefas da atividade foram relevante para os meus interesses	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
A forma como a informação foi organizada no ambiente da atividade ajudou a manter a minha atenção	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

[Close this window](#)

