

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. 322 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. 322 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 | INTRODUCTION | 17 |
| 1.1 | Context and Research Problem Delimitations | 17 |
| 1.2 | Research Questions and Research Objectives | 21 |
| 1.3 | Research Methodology | 24 |
| 1.4 | Thesis Statement and Claimed Contributions | 28 |
| 1.5 | Structure of the Dissertation | 29 |
| 2 | GENERAL BACKGROUND AND FUNDAMENTAL CONCEPTS . | 31 |
| 2.1 | CSCL and Scripted Collaborative Learning | 31 |
| 2.1.1 | <i>CSCL Scripts</i> | 32 |
| 2.1.1.1 | <i>Levels of Abstraction and Granularity of CSCL Scripts</i> | 34 |
| 2.1.2 | <i>Motivational Problems in the Scripted Collaborative Learning</i> . . . | 37 |
| 2.1.2.1 | <i>Amotivation and Demotivation</i> | 38 |
| 2.1.2.2 | <i>Effects of Motivational Problems on the scripted collaborative learning . .</i> | 39 |
| 2.1.3 | <i>Approaches for Dealing with Motivational Problems in a scripted collaborative learning</i> | 41 |
| 2.1.3.1 | <i>Instructional Design Models that Focus on Motivation</i> | 41 |
| 2.1.3.2 | <i>Affective Feedback Systems</i> | 42 |
| 2.2 | Gamification | 44 |
| 3 | ONTOLOGICAL STRUCTURES TO PERSONALIZE THE GAMIFICATION IN CL SCENARIOS | 45 |
| 3.1 | Overview of the Collaborative Learning Ontology | 46 |
| 3.2 | Ontological Structures to Represent Gamified CL Scenarios | 52 |
| 3.2.1 | <i>Individual Motivational Goal (I-mot goal)</i> | 53 |
| 3.2.2 | <i>Player Role</i> | 56 |
| 3.2.3 | <i>Individual Motivational Strategy (Y<=I-mot goal)</i> | 59 |
| 3.2.4 | <i>Individual Gameplay Strategy (I-gameplay strategy)</i> | 61 |
| 3.2.5 | <i>Gamified CL Scenario</i> | 63 |
| 3.3 | Formalizing an Ontological Model to Personalize the Gamification in CL Scenarios | 65 |
| 3.4 | Concluding Remarks | 72 |


| | | |
|-------------------|---|------------|
| 4 | EVALUATION OF THE ONTOLOGICAL ENGINEERING APPROACH | |
| | TO GAMIFY CL SCENARIOS | 73 |
| 4.1 | Formulation of the Empirical Studies | 74 |
| 4.1.1 | <i>Scoping</i> | 74 |
| 4.1.2 | <i>Hypothesis Formulation</i> | 80 |
| 4.1.3 | <i>Variables Selection</i> | 83 |
| 4.1.4 | <i>Selection of Subjects</i> | 84 |
| 4.1.5 | <i>Design</i> | 85 |
| 4.1.6 | <i>Instrumentation</i> | 86 |
| 4.1.7 | <i>Schedule, Timing, and Data Collection Procedure</i> | 89 |
| 4.1.7.1 | <i>Execution: Pilot Empirical Study</i> | 89 |
| 4.1.7.2 | <i>Execution: First Empirical Study</i> | 91 |
| 4.1.7.3 | <i>Execution: Second Empirical Study</i> | 92 |
| 4.1.7.4 | <i>Execution: Third Empirical Study</i> | 94 |
| 4.1.8 | <i>Validity Evaluation</i> | 95 |
| 4.1.9 | <i>Data Analysis Procedure</i> | 96 |
| 4.2 | Pilot Empirical Study: Data Analysis Results | 97 |
| 4.3 | First Empirical Study: Data Analysis Results | 105 |
| 4.4 | Second Empirical Study: Data Analysis Results | 112 |
| 4.5 | Third Empirical Study: Data Analysis Results | 118 |
| 4.6 | Interpretation and Implications of Obtained Results | 129 |
| | BIBLIOGRAPHY | 135 |
| APPENDIX A | ONTOLOGY ONTOGACLES: CONCEPTS, TERMS AND ONTOLOGICAL STRUCTURES | 155 |
| A.1 | Tree Overview of States | 155 |
| A.1.1 | <i>Motivation States</i> | 155 |
| A.1.2 | <i>Psychological Need States</i> | 156 |
| A.1.3 | <i>Individual Personality Trait States</i> | 157 |
| A.2 | Individual Motivational Goal (I-mot goal) | 158 |
| A.3 | Player Role | 159 |
| A.3.1 | <i>Player Roles based on the Bartle Model</i> | 159 |
| A.3.2 | <i>Player Roles Based on the Borges Model</i> | 160 |
| A.3.3 | <i>Player Roles Based on the Yee Model</i> | 161 |
| A.3.4 | <i>Player Roles Based on the Dodecad Model</i> | 162 |
| A.3.5 | <i>Player Roles Based on the BrainHex Model</i> | 163 |
| A.4 | Individual Motivational Strategy ($Y \leq I\text{-mot goal}$) | 165 |
| A.5 | Individual Gameplay Strategy (I-gameplay strategy) | 166 |

| | | |
|-------------------|---|------------|
| APPENDIX B | OUTLIERS DETECTION AND TREATMENT IN DATA GATHERED FROM MOTIVATION SURVEYS | 167 |
| B.1 | Removing Careless Responses | 167 |
| B.1.1 | <i>Intrinsic Motivation Inventory Data</i> | 167 |
| B.1.2 | <i>Instructional Materials Motivation Survey Data</i> | 169 |
| B.2 | Winsorizing Extreme Values | 169 |
| B.2.1 | <i>Intrinsic Motivation Inventory Data</i> | 170 |
| B.2.2 | <i>Instructional Materials Motivation Survey Data</i> | 170 |
| APPENDIX C | VALIDATION OF MOTIVATION SURVEYS | 177 |
| C.1 | Validation Procedure | 177 |
| C.1.1 | <i>Participants</i> | 177 |
| C.1.2 | <i>Instruments</i> | 177 |
| C.1.3 | <i>Data Collection Procedure</i> | 179 |
| C.1.4 | <i>Data Analysis</i> | 179 |
| C.2 | Results | 180 |
| C.2.1 | <i>Factorial Structure of the Adapted Portuguese IMI</i> | 181 |
| C.2.2 | <i>Reliability Tests of the Adapted Portuguese IMI</i> | 184 |
| C.2.3 | <i>Factorial Structure of the Adapted Portuguese IMMS</i> | 185 |
| C.2.4 | <i>Reliability Tests of the Adapted Portuguese IMMS</i> | 188 |
| APPENDIX D | IRT-BASED MODELS FOR MEASURING MOTIVATION AND LEARNING OUTCOMES | 191 |
| D.1 | Construction and Validation of IRT-based Models | 192 |
| D.1.1 | <i>Checking Assumptions</i> | 193 |
| D.1.2 | <i>Estimating Item Parameters</i> | 194 |
| D.1.3 | <i>Obtaining the Latent Trait Estimates</i> | 195 |
| D.2 | Stacking Procedure with IRT-based Models | 195 |
| D.2.1 | <i>Step 1: Data Verification</i> | 196 |
| D.2.2 | <i>Step 2: Item Splitting</i> | 197 |
| D.2.3 | <i>Step 3: Calculating Changes in Latent Trait Estimates</i> | 198 |
| D.3 | RSM-based Instrument for Measuring the Intrinsic Motivation in the Pilot Empirical Study | 198 |
| D.3.1 | <i>Checking Assumptions</i> | 198 |
| D.3.2 | <i>Item Parameters</i> | 200 |
| D.3.3 | <i>Intrinsic Motivation as Latent Trait Estimates</i> | 202 |
| D.4 | RSM-based Instrument for Measuring the Intrinsic Motivation in the First Empirical Study | 204 |
| D.4.1 | <i>Checking Assumptions</i> | 204 |
| D.4.2 | <i>Item Parameters</i> | 206 |

| | | |
|---------------|--|-----|
| <i>D.4.3</i> | <i>Intrinsic Motivation as Latent Trait Estimates</i> | 208 |
| D.5 | RSM-based Instrument for Measuring the Level of Motivation in the Second Empirical Study | 211 |
| <i>D.5.1</i> | <i>Checking Assumptions</i> | 211 |
| <i>D.5.2</i> | <i>Item Parameters</i> | 212 |
| <i>D.5.3</i> | <i>Level of Motivation as Latent Trait Estimates</i> | 214 |
| D.6 | RSM-based Instrument for Measuring the Intrinsic Motivation in the Third Empirical Study | 217 |
| <i>D.6.1</i> | <i>Checking Assumptions</i> | 217 |
| <i>D.6.2</i> | <i>Item Parameters</i> | 219 |
| <i>D.6.3</i> | <i>Intrinsic Motivation as Latent Trait Estimates</i> | 221 |
| D.7 | RSM-based Instrument for Measuring the Level of Motivation in the Third Empirical Study | 224 |
| <i>D.7.1</i> | <i>Checking Assumptions</i> | 224 |
| <i>D.7.2</i> | <i>Item Parameters</i> | 225 |
| <i>D.7.3</i> | <i>Level of Motivation as Latent Trait Estimates</i> | 227 |
| D.8 | Stacking Procedure for Estimating Gains in Skill/Knowledge of the Pilot Empirical Study | 230 |
| <i>D.8.1</i> | <i>Checking Assumptions</i> | 230 |
| <i>D.8.2</i> | <i>Item Parameters</i> | 230 |
| <i>D.8.3</i> | <i>Gains in Skill/Knowledge as Latent Trait Estimates</i> | 232 |
| D.9 | Stacking Procedure for Estimating Gains in Skill/Knowledge of the First Empirical Study | 232 |
| <i>D.9.1</i> | <i>Checking Assumptions</i> | 232 |
| <i>D.9.2</i> | <i>Item Parameters</i> | 233 |
| <i>D.9.3</i> | <i>Gains in Skill/Knowledge as Latent Trait Estimates</i> | 236 |
| D.10 | Stacking Procedure for Estimating Gains in Skill/Knowledge of the Second Empirical Study | 238 |
| <i>D.10.1</i> | <i>Checking Assumptions</i> | 238 |
| <i>D.10.2</i> | <i>Item Parameters</i> | 238 |
| <i>D.10.3</i> | <i>Gains in Skill/Knowledge as Latent Trait Estimates</i> | 241 |
| D.11 | Stacking Procedure for Estimating Gains in Skill/Knowledge of the Third Empirical Study | 243 |
| <i>D.11.1</i> | <i>Checking Assumptions</i> | 243 |
| <i>D.11.2</i> | <i>Item Parameters</i> | 243 |
| <i>D.11.3</i> | <i>Gains in Skill/Knowledge as Latent Trait Estimates</i> | 248 |
| ANNEX A | WEB-BASED QPJ-BR QUESTIONNAIRE | 252 |

| | | |
|----------------|--|------------|
| ANNEX B | DATA GATHERING INSTRUMENTS FOR MEASURING PARTICIPANTS' SKILL AND KNOWLEDGE | 254 |
| B.1 | Programming Problem: Calculate the Proper Divisors of a Number (P1') | 254 |
| B.2 | Programming Problem: Calculate the Sum of Prime Divisors of Number (P2') | 255 |
| B.3 | Programming Problem: Calculate Distance of Rebounds for an Elastic Ball (P3') | 256 |
| B.4 | Programming Problem: Calculate the Maximum Length of a Hailstone Sequence (P4') | 257 |
| B.5 | Programming Problem: Calculate Inverse Fibonacci Sequence on Base n and m (PA') | 258 |
| B.6 | Programming Problem: Calculate the Absolute Difference Between Odd and Even Numbers in an Inverse Fibonacci Sequence (PB') . | 260 |
| B.7 | Programming Problem: Calculate the i-th Prize of a Machine Slot (PC') | 261 |
| B.8 | Programming Problem: Calculate the Highest Prize of a Machine Slot (PD') | 262 |
| B.9 | Formative Evaluation: Multiple Choice Knowledge Questionnaires of Cond. Structures (provinha1a) | 263 |
| B.10 | Programming Problem: Develop a Simple Virtual Temperature Monitor (P1) | 269 |
| B.11 | Formative Evaluation: Multiple Choice Knowledge Questionnaires of Cond. Structures (provinha1b) | 270 |
| B.12 | Programming Problem: Develop a Basal Metabolic Rate (PA) | 276 |
| B.13 | Programming Problem: Develop a Diet Calculator (PB) | 277 |
| B.14 | Formative Evaluation: Multiple Choice Knowledge Questionnaires of Loop Structures (provinha2a) | 278 |
| B.15 | Programming Problem: Calculate the Proper Divisors of a Number (P2) | 283 |
| B.16 | Programming Problem: Calculate the Maximum Length of a Hailstone Sequence (P3) | 284 |
| B.17 | Formative Evaluation: Multiple Choice Knowledge Questionnaires of Loop Structures (provinha2b) | 285 |
| B.18 | Programming Problem: Calculate a Geometric Sequence (PC) | 292 |
| B.19 | Programming Problem: Calculate Global Minimum Coin Changes (PD) | 293 |
| B.20 | Programming Problem: Count Number of Semi-primes for RSA (PE) | 294 |

| | | |
|----------------|---|-----|
| B.21 | Formative Evaluation: Multiple Choice Knowledge Questionnaires of Recursion (provinha3a) | 295 |
| B.22 | Programming Problem: Calculate Fibonacci Polynomials (P4) | 304 |
| B.23 | Formative Evaluation: Multiple Choice Knowledge Questionnaires of Recursion (provinha3c) | 305 |
| B.24 | Programming Problem: Generation of Planning Poker Sequence (PF) | 314 |
| B.25 | Programming Problem: Counting Palindromes (PG) | 315 |
| B.26 | Programming Problem: Maze Solving Algorithm (PH) | 316 |
| ANNEX C | DATA GATHERING INSTRUMENTS FOR MEASURING PARTICIPANTS' MOTIVATION | 318 |
| C.1 | Web-based Questionnaire for the Adapted Portuguese IMI | 318 |
| C.2 | Paper-based Questionnaire for the Adapted Portuguese IMI | 319 |
| C.3 | Paper-based Questionnaire for the Adapted Portuguese IMMS | 320 |
| C.4 | Web-based Questionnaire for the Adapted Portuguese IMI and IMMS | 321 |



INTRODUCTION

This chapter starts presenting the delimitations of the context and the research problem addressed in this PhD thesis dissertation (section 1.1). After that, the chapter formulates the research questions and objectives (section 1.2). The research methodology is presented in section 1.3. The thesis statement and contributions are detailed in section 1.4. Finally, the chapter ends with the structure of this dissertation (section 1.5).

1.1 Context and Research Problem Delimitations

Over the last two decades or so, with the growing number of technologies that enable people to communicate and work in group activities using computers and Internet, researchers and practitioners have developed technology and software applications that facilitate and foster the Collaborative Learning (CL) (LEHTINEN *et al.*, 1999). The Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning (CSCL) is the research field that studies how this technology should link the advanced in computer science with the pedagogical approaches of collaborative learning, and it has been proved an important research field to support the instructional-learning process (STAHL; KOSCHMANN; SUTHERS, 2006). Some of the most relevant benefits of the integration between computer sciences and collaborative learning are: to facilitate the sharing and distribution of knowledge among group members (LIPPONEN, 2002; NORDIN; KLOBAS, 2010), to help the monitoring and evaluation of CL process (Rodríguez-Triana *et al.*, 2018; CABALLÉ *et al.*, 2011), and to enhance the peer interactions and work in groups (WANG, 2014; ZHAO; GAO; YANG, 2018).

The CSCL technology is more beneficial for the students when there is an adequate design of the CL process, when there is a mechanism to support and orchestrate the ways in which the students should collaborate to achieve pedagogical benefits (DILLENBOURG, 2013; HEWITT, 2005; ISOTANI *et al.*, 2009). When there is not such support, students frequently fail to act or behave in a productive way. In a CL session, the participants need to know with

whom they must work, they need to know what are their roles in the CL process, and they need to know the steps to accomplish their learning goals. Without this information, frequently, the participants will not adequately collaborate or leave to interact during the CL activities. Hence, several researchers propose the use of scripts to guide and orchestrate the collaboration in these activities (ALHARBI; ATHAUDA; CHIONG, 2014).

The scripted collaborative learning aims to engage the students in fruitful and significant interactions according to a design that has the purpose to attain a set of pedagogical objectives. Thereby, the research and practitioners of the CSCL community have proposed the use of scripts to support the well-thought-out design of the CL scenarios through computer-based systems (FISCHER *et al.*, 2013; KOBBE *et al.*, 2007). The CSCL scripts are the technology that indicates how the interactions among students will be orchestrated and structured in a group activity to increase the possibility of achieving the pedagogical objectives (WEINBERGER *et al.*, 2005). These scripts provide information that facilitates the group formation, the role distribution, and the sequencing of interaction for the participants in the CL process. Despite of its benefits, there are situations in which the scripts may cause motivational problems. For example, when the students prefer to work individually or when they do not want to play the role assigned by the scripts, they may neglect their personal behavior to get the task completed without effort, and the lack of choice over the interactions may produce in them a sense of obligation. These issues cause troubles in the group dynamic - e.g. some students may dropout the CL activity, making superficial interactions - resulting in negative and widespread learning outcomes.

The motivational problems in scripted collaborative learning make more difficult the use of this technology over time. Less motivated students prefer to spend more time in other activities instead of participated in the collaborative learning and, as consequence, the achievement of contemplated learning outcomes becomes more difficult (CROOK, 2000; FALOUT; ELWOOD; HOOD, 2009; SCHOOR; BANNERT, 2011). In this sense, motivating learners in the entire CL process is important. However, the traditional instructional design practice often assumes that the motivation is a preliminary step that occurs outside to the learning process (CHAN; AHERN, 1999; KELLER, 1987). This assumption is based in which the good quality of learning materials and content-domain can keep the students focused during the learning process, but if this process is long, there is a good chance that the students will lose their initial motivation. To avoid this motivational problem known as demotivation, some researchers and practitioners currently propose the development and use of affective feedback systems base(WOOLF *et al.*, 2009) on emotion-aware systems and learning companions to motivate students along the entire learning process. These solutions assume that the students like the content-domain and that they have the desire to learn working in groups, so that the approach of using affective feedback systems does not motivate and engage students without the desire to learn or to work in groups.

In the last years, efforts of CSCL community have been directed to finding new innovative

solutions that, beside to motivate and engage students during the entire CL process, are not completely tied to the domain-content and desired to learn working in groups. In this direction, several researchers and practitioners have pointed Gamification as a promising technology to deal with motivational problems in educational contexts (CHALLCO *et al.*, 2014; SEABORN; FELS, 2015; BORGES *et al.*, 2014). Gamification “*as the use of game design elements in non-game contexts*” (DETERDING *et al.*, 2011) aims to increase the students’ motivation and engagement by making the learning process more game-like. Through the introduction of game elements, such as points, rankings, competition, cooperation and so on, gamification intends to engage and motivate students who do not have the desire or interest in to learn the content-domain working in groups. According to (KAPP, 2012; KNUTAS *et al.*, 2014), when a learning process is gamified, the benefits of introduced game elements will strongly depend on how well these game elements will be applied, and how well they are linked with the pedagogical approaches employed in the learning process.

When CL scenarios are gamified to deal with the motivational problems that can occur in a scripted collaborative learning, the thesis author hypothesizes that the chances to achieve engagement and educational benefits will be increased if there is a proper connection between the game elements and the CL process. However, developing such well-thought-out gamified CL scenario, hereinafter called gamified CL scenarios, is a non-trivial task. The main difficulty to gamify CL scenarios as well as other non-game context is that the gamification is too context dependent (HAMARI; KOIVISTO; SARSA, 2014; RICHARDS; THOMPSON; GRAHAM, 2014). Its effects vary from individual to individual, from situation to situation, and occasionally. Gamification depends of many factors such as the individual personality traits, preferences, and current student’s emotions (NICHOLSON, 2015; PEDRO *et al.*, 2015) (e.g., a ranking of participation would motivate users who like competition but not users who want to customize their items and avatars). Also, the expected effects of the game elements vary according to the non-game context and the target behavior that is being gamified (DETERDING *et al.*, 2013; HEETER *et al.*, 2011) (e.g., gamifying a learning scenario to promote the signing-up is not the same thing as gamifying an interactive environment to maintain the student’s attention). As consequence of this context-dependency, when a CL scenario is not well gamified, instead to have a positive effect, they may cause a detrimental on the students’ motivation (ANDRADE; MIZOGUCHI; ISOTANI, 2016), cheating (NUNES *et al.*, 2016), embarrassment (OHNO; YAMASAKI; TOKIWA, 2013), and lack of credibility on badges (DAVIS; SINGH, 2015).

Another difficulty to gamify CL scenarios, as well as other non-game contexts, it is the lack of approaches to systematically represent in an unambiguous way the gamification knowledge acquired in the last years by researchers and practitioners. This knowledge, hereinafter referred to as the *knowledge from theories and practices of gamification*, is constituted by gamification practices, games design models and the theoretical psychological employed by researchers and practitioners to gamify different non-game contexts; and it lacks of a formal and common vocabulary, definitions, and representation to be easily applied. As can be appreci-

ated in the current literature of gamification (DICHEVA *et al.*, 2015; HAMARI; KOIVISTO; SARSA, 2014; MORA *et al.*, 2015; SEABORN; FELS, 2015), each author proposes his/her own definitions, classifications and representations of concepts and characteristics about how to gamify a non-game context. This fact hinders the creation of models/frameworks that formally represent the gamification and its application in a common understandable and shareable manner. To the best of the thesis author's knowledge, there is no one approach to represent the knowledge about how to gamify CL scenarios, and how through the gamification is possible to deal with motivational problems in a scripted collaborative learning.

Owed to the variety of students who can participate in CL sessions, the diversity of subjects that can be under study in a CL activity, and the range of different CSCL scripts used to orchestrate the CL process, it is necessary to personalize the gamification for each student and situation, so providing a tailored gamified CL scenario is necessary to achieve better benefits of gamification. Developing tailored gamified CL scenarios is a difficult and time-consuming task, so that a computational based-support to personalize the gamification is necessary and very helpful. In this direction, in the context of CSCL, there is only one interesting approach that proposes to personalize gamification based on individual preference profiles estimated from an interaction analysis by machine learning techniques (KNUTAS *et al.*, 2017; KNUTAS *et al.*, 2016; KNUTAS *et al.*, 2014). However, this solution is not oriented to deal with motivational problems in the scripted collaborative learning, its purpose is to increase the communication among the participants in any CL scenarios (not necessarily scripted). Furthermore, this solution does not provide a model to share theoretical knowledge of gamification obtained by its computational mechanisms and procedures to personalize the gamification. Solutions based on machine learning to personalize gamification require many data to support the personalization of gamification, and they may fall in an over-fitting or under-fitting problem with the data. A computational mechanism based only in machine learning techniques to personalize gamification will always lack of theoretical-justification to explain why a game element has been introduced in the non-game context, and why a certain configuration of game elements engages and motivates the students as participants of a CL activity to continue and adequately interact in the CL scenario.

For the reason exposed above, to deal with motivational problems in a scripted collaborative learning through the gamification, a computational support is essential to overcome the challenges and difficulties of gamification, a computational system with common and shareable structures to represent knowledge from practices and theories of gamification. In this direction, we have ontologies as the most advanced technology to support the representation of knowledge in a common understandable and shareable manner for computers and humans (ASIKRI *et al.*, 2016; DEVEDŽIC, 2006; MIZOGUCHI; BOURDEAU, 2016). Ontologies constitute an explicit mapping between the target world of interest and its representation with the purpose to delineate concepts without ambiguities providing a common way to represent the knowledge (GUARINO; OBERLE; STAAB, 2009). Taking advantages of this commonality and using the computer interconnection provided by Internet, computational mechanisms and procedures for

intelligent tools are developed to use the ontologies as a language to share the understandings and interpretations of *target world* - in this thesis dissertation, the target world is the gamification of CL scenario.

Employing ontologies to represent the knowledge from theories and practices of gamification, some interesting and practical results have been obtained by Derméval *et al.* (2016), Karkar, Ja'am and Foufou (2016), Zouaq and Nkambou (2010). However, to the best of the thesis author knowledge, there is no one ontology that, from a philosophical perspective, gives support for the systematical representation of it knowledge and how to apply it in CL scenarios to deal with motivational problems. Therefore, the general research goal in this thesis dissertation refers to the definition of this ontology from a philosophical perspective.

1.2 Research Questions and Research Objectives

The research topic explored in this PhD thesis dissertation is addressed to answer the question: “*How to deal with motivational problems in scripted collaborative learning?*”


To answer this research question, the author of this thesis proposes the gamification of CL scenarios. However, as the previous section explained the gamification is too context dependent, so that, to obtain tailored gamified CL scenarios, intelligent tools are necessary to provide support in the personalization of gamification. In this sense, it is necessary a common way to represent the knowledge extracted from practices and theories of gamification because an adequate gamification of CL scenarios should rely on this theoretical knowledge. Thus, thesis author proposed the use of ontologies to represent the knowledge from theories and practices of gamification because ontologies have been consolidated as the technology in which computers and humans use a common language to build models/frameworks about the target world that is being represented. Thereby, the overarching research question (**RQ**) addressed in this thesis is:

“*How can gamification and ontologies be used to deal with motivational problems in scripted collaborative learning?*”

To answer this research question, the ontological engineering approach to gamify CL scenarios shown in Figure 1 has been proposed by the author of this PhD thesis dissertation. This approach consists into three major stages described as follows:

1. The first stage is: the formalization of the necessary knowledge about how to gamify CL scenarios for dealing with motivational problems in scripted collaborative learning into an ontology named **OntoGaCLEs – Ontology to Gamify Collaborative Learning Scenarios**. This ontology has been developed using ontology engineering in which, by extracting concepts from the theories and practices of gamification, the thesis author defines a set of ontological structures to enable the systematic formalization and representation of knowledge to gamify CL scenarios and its theoretical foundation.

Figure 1 – Ontological engineering approach to gamify CL scenarios



Source: Elaborated by the author.

2. The second stage is: the development of computational mechanisms and procedures whereby intelligent tools will provide support in the gamification of CL scenarios to deal with motivational problems in a scripted collaborative learning. Such support is given by the knowledge formalized in the ontology OntoGaCLEs during the first stage, so that the purpose for the computational mechanisms and procedures in intelligent tools is to use the ontological structures from this ontology to facilitate the tasks of instructional designer and practitioners, especially novice users, in the gamification of CL scenarios. These ontological structures contain the theoretical justification for the personalization of gamification, and they are used to obtain tailored gamified CL sessions adapted for each situation. These sessions are known as ontology-based CL sessions, and they are CL scenarios that have been gamified and instantiated at the most concrete level of CL scenarios in which the participants and the content-domain to be learned are well defined and it can be directly run in a learning environment.

3. The third stage is: the execution of empirical studies to understand the effects of ontology-based gamification on CL scenarios, and then, to validate the ontological engineering approach to gamify CL scenarios as a method to deal with motivational problems in scripted collaborative learning. This validation has carried out in ontology-based gamified CL sessions obtained by the approach, and it consists in measuring the effectiveness and

efficiency of these sessions for dealing with motivational problems.

Regarding to the formalization of knowledge about how to gamify CL scenarios for dealing with motivational problems in a scripted collaborative learning (Stage 1), the research questions answered by this dissertation are:

RQ1: *the Which concepts from theories and practices of gamification should be contemplated to deal with motivational problems in a scripted collaborative learning?, and How should these concepts be applied in the gamification of CL scenarios?*

RQ2: *What ontological structures are necessary to represent the concepts identified as relevant in the theories and practices of gamification to deal with motivational problems in scripted collaborative learning?*

Regarding the development of computational mechanisms and procedures whereby intelligent tools will provide support in the gamification of scenarios using the knowledge described in the ontology OntoGaCLeS (Stage 2), the research questions answered by this dissertation are:

RQ3: *What computational mechanisms and procedures are necessary in intelligent tools to give a helpful support in the gamification of CL scenarios? and How can the knowledge encoded in the ontology OntoGaCLeS be used by these mechanisms and procedures to deal with motivational problems in a scripted collaborative learning?*

Regarding to the validation of the ontological engineering approach to gamify CL scenarios as a method to deal with motivational problems in scripted collaborative learning (Stage 3), the research questions answered by this dissertation are:

RQ4: *What are the effectiveness and efficiency of the ontological enginnering approach to gamify CL scenarios to deal with motivational problems in scripted collaborative learning?*

The research objectives pursued to answer the research questions *RQ1* and *RQ2* are:

RO1: To review the scientific literature in order to identify the most relevant concepts from the theories and practices of gamification that should be taking into account to deal with motivational problems in scripted collaborative learning; and

RO2: To define the ontological structures to represent the concepts identified as relevant in the theories and practices of gamification to deal with motivational problems in scripted collaborative learning.

In order to answer the research question *RQ3*, the research objectives is:

RO3: To identify and define the computational mechanisms and procedures that must be implemented by intelligent tools to give a helpful support in the gamification of CL scenarios, and how these mechanisms and procedure use the knowledge encoded in the ontology OntoGaCLeS for dealing with the motivational problems in a scripted collaborative learning.

The research objective pursued to answer the research question *RQ4* is:

RO4: to analyze the effects of ontology-based gamified CL sessions on the students' motivation and learning outcomes for validating the ontology engineering approach to gamify CL scenarios in reference to the effectiveness and efficiency to deal with the motivational problems in a scripted collaborative learning.

It is out of scope in this dissertation to deal with the following objectives:

- To compare, validate or judge the theories and practices of gamification.
- To create, modify or extend the concepts described in the theories and practices of gamification.
- To create a generic and complete representation of all concepts described in the theories and practices of gamification. The thesis author concentrates only on the formalization of the minimal necessary concepts from these practices and theories to deal with the motivational problems in scripted collaborative learning.
- To validate the concepts and ontological structures formalized in the ontology OntoGaCLeS using semantic reasoner engines or formal methods based on logic and/or mathematics.

1.3 Research Methodology

As this PhD thesis dissertation is framed in the multidisciplinary field of CSCL with research questions and research objectives oriented to be answered and achieved by theoretical and empirical studies, a mixed research method needs to be employed to conduct this research. Following the research methodology framework proposed by Glass (1995), Glass, Vessey and Ramesh (2002), the mixed research method employed in this PhD thesis research consisted in four iterative phases: informational, propositional, analytical and evaluation.

Informational phase: In this phase, the thesis author identified the research problems and potential solutions based on information gathered from the scientific literature and discussions with experts in fields of CSCL, gamification and ontology engineering. The results

of this phase were an outline of the knowledge involved in this dissertation, the research questions, and the research objectives. The tasks carried out in this phase correspond to tasks extracted from the scientific (observing the world) and engineering (observing existing solutions) research methods. These tasks were:

- The search, review and analysis of scientific literature regarding to: CSCL, gamification and ontology engineering. The thesis author performed this literature review emphasizing in the subjects of scripted collaborative learning, gamification of learning and instruction, and ontology-engineering applied to Artificial Intelligence in Education (AIED).
- The participation as member of the research group in Applied Computing in Education Laboratory (CAEd-Lab, *Laboratorio de Computação Aplicada a Educação e Tecnologias Sociais Avançadas*) at the University of São Paulo. Particularly, the expertise field in CSCL and Ontologies of this research group has been very important and valuable to conduct the research and the literature reviews.
- The participation in several conferences and workshops related to the context and problem domain in which this dissertation is framed. These conferences and workshop, in chronological order, were: the III Escola de Ontologias UFAL-USP, 2014 (Workshop); the 20th International Conference on Collaboration and Technology, CRIWG, 2014 (Conference); the Summer School on Computers in Education, 2015 (Workshop); the XXVI Brazilian Symposium on Computers in Education, 2015 (Conference); the 6th Latin American School for Education, Cognitive and Neural Sciences, 2016 (Workshop); and the Higher Education for All: International Workshop on Social, Semantic, Adaptive and Gamification techniques and technologies for Distance Learning, 2017 (Workshop).
- The participation as visiting research at the Research Center for Service Science at the School of Knowledge Science in the Japan Advanced Institute of Science and Technology (JAIST) has also been significant for the informational phase. The focus of this research is to study, design and implement knowledge co-creation process in complex service systems. This research center focuses in the use of ontologies and ontology-engineering as the technology to develop and solve a broad variety of domains/tasks, and their research members have a long history working in the research field of Artificial Intelligence in Education. Particularly, the expertise of the Prof. Mitsuro Ikeda and Prof. Riichiro Mizoguchi were valuable and important for this phase resulting from their involvement in various research projects about the modeling of knowledge for the students' learning growth, CL process, and instructional design.

Propositional phase: In this phase, solutions were proposed and formulated using the information gathered in the previous phase. As results of the propositional phase, ontological

structures to represent the necessary concepts to gamify CL scenarios were identified and formalized in the ontology OntoGaCLeS. Prototypes of computational mechanisms and procedures to be used by intelligent tools to gamify CL scenario were developed for gathering instructional designers' opinions as early feedback of these systems. The tasks carried out in this phase correspond to activities extracted from the scientific (proposing theories or models) and engineering (proposing and developing solutions) research methods. These tasks were:

- The proposal of ontological structures to represent gamified CL scenarios and ontological models to personalize the gamification of CL scenarios based on player type models and need-based theories of motivation.
- The proposal of ontological structures to represent the application of persuasive game design models in gamified CL scenarios and ontological models to apply persuasive game design strategies as a method for dealing with the motivational problems.
- The proposal of a computer-based model to support the representation of the learners' growth process and the principle of good balance between the perceived challenges and skills defined in the flow theory.
- The definition of a conceptual flow to gamify CL scenarios as a procedure to use the knowledge described in the ontology OntoGaCLeS, and the definition of a reference architecture based on this flow to build intelligent tools for dealing with motivational problems in a scripted collaborative learning.

Analytical phase: This phase consists into analyze and explores the solutions formulated in the propositional phase with the purpose to identify whether the proposed solutions are understandable, how them can be deployed into practice, what are the potential problems in understanding and using them, and wether there are any omissions or gaps in these solutions. The tasks carried out in this phase correspond to activities extracted from the empirical (applying to case studies) and analytical (developing new solutions derived from the results obtained in the case studies) research methods. These tasks were:

- The formalization of an ontological models to personalize the gamification of CL scenarios. This formalization is a case study to validate in the evaluation phase the ontological structures proposed to systematically formalize ontological models to personalize the gamification of CL scenarios.
- The formalization of an ontological model to apply gamification as a persuasive technology in CL scenarios.
- The implementation of a computational mechanism (as a proof of concept) in which the knowledge encoding in the ontology is used for setting up the proper player roles and game elements for CL sessions.

- The development of an algorithm (as a proof of concept) to apply the principle of good balance between the perceived challenges and skills from the flow theory in the gamification of CL scenarios.
- The development of a computational mechanism (as a proof of concept) to apply gamification as persuasive technology in the gamification of CL scenarios.

Evaluation phase: The focus of this phase is to conduct empirical tests and evaluations for the solutions formulated in the propositional phase and for the findings found in the analytical phase. In this phase, the data gathered through the tests and evaluations aimed to assess the contributions from different perspectives. The tasks carried out during this phase correspond to activities from the empirical (validating the solutions) and analytical (analyzing the results obtained from empirical observations) research methods. These tasks were:

- The analytical evaluation of the ontological structures proposed to represent gamified CL scenarios and the ontological models to personalize the gamification of CL scenarios. This evaluation was carried out by publishing these ontological structures and the ontological models obtained from them as scientific articles in conferences and journals of the fields of CSCL, and Artificial Intelligent in Education. These articles, in chronological order, were: “*Towards an Ontology for Gamifying Collaborative Learning Scenarios*” published in the 12th International Conference on Intelligent Tutoring Systems, ITS, 2014; “*An Ontology Engineering Approach to Gamify Collaborative Learning Scenarios*” published in the 20th International Conference on Collaboration and Technology, CRIWG, 2014; and “*Personalization of Gamification in Collaborative Learning Contexts using Ontologies*” published in the journal of IEEE Latin America Transactions, 2015. During the conferences, important feedbacks to improve the ontological structures were obtained from discussions with the participants of the conferences who shared their expertise in the domain of CSCL and Artificial Intelligent in Education.
- The analytical evaluation of the ontological structures proposed to represent the application of persuasive game design models in gamified CL scenarios and the ontological models to apply persuasive game design strategies as a method for dealing with motivational problems in scripted collaborative learning. This evaluation was carried out by publishing these ontological structures and the ontological models obtained from them in the analytical phase as scientific articles scientific articles in conferences and journals related to the fields of CSCL, and Artificial Intelligent in Education. These articles, in chronological order, were: “*Steps Towards the Gamification of Collaborative Learning Scenarios Supported by Ontologies*” published in the 17th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence in Education, AIED, 2015; “*An Ontological Model to Apply Gamification as Persuasive Technology in*

Collaborative Learning Scenarios” published in the 26th Brazilian Symposium of Informatics in Education, SBIE, 2015; “*Gamification of Collaborative Learning Scenarios: Structuring Persuasive Strategies Using Game Elements and Ontologies*” published in the 1st International Workshop of Social Computing in Digital Education, SOCIALEDU, 2015; and “*An Ontology Framework to Apply Gamification in CSCL Scenarios as Persuasive Technology*” published in the Brazilian Journal of Computers in Education, 2016. During the conferences, important feedbacks to improve the ontological structures were obtained from discussions with the participants of the conferences who shared their expertise in the domain of CSCL and Artificial Intelligent in Education.

- The conduction of a pilot empirical study in which, prior to carry out the full-scale empirical studies, the activities, methods, instruments and activities that have been used in the full-scale studies were evaluated to adjust and improve the full-scale study design. This empirical study has been conducted to assess the effectiveness of *the ontological engineering approach to gamify CL scenarios* for dealing with the motivational problems in scripted collaborative learning. Such effectiveness was measured by comparing the participants’ motivation and learning outcomes in the ontology-based CL sessions against the participants’ motivation and learning outcomes in non-gamified CL sessions, and the percentage of participation by groups.
- The conduction of two full-scale empirical to evaluate the effectiveness of *the ontological engineering approach to gamify CL scenarios*. This effectiveness has been measured in the empirical studies by comparing the participants’ motivation and learning outcomes in ontology-based gamified CL sessions against the participants’ motivation and learning outcomes in non-gamified CL sessions.
- The conduction of a full-scale empirical study to evaluate the efficiency of *the ontological engineering approach to gamify CL scenarios* for dealing with motivational problems in scripted collaborative learning. Such efficiency was measured by comparing the participants’ motivation and learning outcomes in ontology-based CL sessions against the participants’ motivation and learning outcomes in CL sessions that were gamified without using the support given by the ontology OntoGaCLEs.

1.4 Thesis Statement and Claimed Contributions

The thesis statement of this PhD thesis dissertation is that:

“*For CL activities where the CSCL scripts are used as a method to orchestrate and structure the collaboration among the participants, the ontological engineering approach to gamify CL scenarios, understood from the viewpoint of an instructional designer as the gamifica-*

tion of CL scenarios in which the ontology OntoGaCLEs is used as support to personalize the gamification, constitutes an effective and efficient solution to deal with motivational problems.”

Related to this thesis statement, the claimed contributions discussed throughout this PhD thesis dissertation are:

1. The identification of relevant concepts from the theories and practices of gamification to deal with motivational problems in scripted collaborative learning (RO1).
2. Ontological structures to represent: the concepts identified as relevant in theories and practices of gamification for dealing with motivational problems in scripted collaborative learning (RO2).
 - a) Ontological structures to represent: gamified CL scenarios, and ontological models to personalize the gamification of CL scenarios based on player type models and need-based theories of motivation.
 - b) Ontological structures to represent: persuasive game design in CL scenarios, and ontological models to apply persuasive game design strategies as a method for dealing with the motivational problems in scripted collaborative learning.
3. A computer-based model to support the representation of the learners’ growth process and the principle of good balance between challenges and abilities defined in the flow theory.
4. A conceptual flow to gamify CL scenarios using the knowledge described in the ontology OntoGaCLEs, and a reference architecture based on this flow to build intelligent tools that provide theoretical support for dealing with motivational problems in scripted collaborative learning (RO3).
5. Empirical evaluations of *the ontological engineering approach to gamify CL scenarios* in which, to validate the effectiveness and efficiency of this approach to deal with motivational problems, the participants’ motivation and the learning outcomes in ontology-based gamified CL sessions are compared against the participants’ motivation and the learning outcomes in non-gamified CL sessions and in CL sessions gamified without the support given by the ontology (RO4).

1.5 Structure of the Dissertation

This PhD thesis dissertation is structured in eight chapters that are described as follow:

Chapter 1: Introduction

Chapter 2: *General Background and Fundamental Concepts* contains the background related to the research problem addressed in this dissertation. An overview related to the fields of CSCL and scripted collaborative learning, gamification and ontology engineering are presented in the chapter. The motivational problems in scripted collaborative learning and the current approaches to deal with these problems are detailed in the chapter. The concepts that were identified as relevant in the theories and practices to deal with the motivational problems through gamification of CL scenarios are presented in the chapter.

Chapter 3: *Ontological Structure to Personalize the Gamification in CL Scenarios* describes the ontological structures formalized in the ontology OntoGaCLeS to represent gamified CL scenarios. These ontological structures support the personalization of gamification in CL scenarios based on player types models and need-based theories of motivation. Therefore, the chapter also shows the procedure followed by the thesis author to build an ontological model ontological model to personalize the gamification of CL scenarios.

Chapter 4: *Ontological Structures of Persuasive Game Design in CL Scenarios* describes the ontological structures proposed to apply persuasive game design models in CL scenarios. The chapter also describes the procedure employed by the thesis author to formalize an ontological model to apply gamification as persuasive technology in Cognitive Apprenticeship scenarios.

Chapter 5: *A Unify Modeling of Learners' Growth Process and Flow Theory* presents the computational model proposed to unify the modeling of the learners' growth process and the principle of good balance between the perceived challenges and skills described in the flow theory. This model has been used in the gamification of CL scenarios to define the reward levels given in the CL process as an attempt to maintain the flow states of participants.

Chapter 6: *Computer-based Mechanisms and Procedures to Gamify CL Scenarios* describes a flow proposed to gamify CL sessions based on the knowledge described in the ontology OntoGaCLeS. Based on this flow, a reference architecture by which intelligent tools to provide support in the gamification of CL scenarios for dealing with motivational problems is presented in the chapter. The chapter also describes the computational mechanisms and procedures developed based on the reference architecture to conduct the evaluation of the ontological engineering approach to gamify CL scenarios.

Chapter 7: *Evaluation of the Ontological Engineering Approach to Gamify CL Scenarios* presents the empirical studies carried out in real situations to validate the effectiveness and efficiency of this approach to deal with motivational problems.

Chapter 8: *Conclusions and Future Work* summarizes the contributions of this PhD thesis dissertation, and the chapter also discusses possible future research directions.



GENERAL BACKGROUND AND FUNDAMENTAL CONCEPTS

This chapter presents the general background and fundamental concepts related to the domain problem that is addressed in this thesis. At the first section (section 2.1), an overview of the CSCL field and scripted collaborative learning is presented to provide a comprehensive and elucidate accord about the research context. This section also describes in detail the motivational problems in scripted collaborative learning, as well as, the current approaches to deal with them. The section 2.2 presents an overview of gamification, and the theoretical foundation of this technology. Finally, ?? presents the fundamentals of ontologies and ontology engineering.

2.1 CSCL and Scripted Collaborative Learning

Although CL has a long history in education, it is not until the early 1990s that the research field known as Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning (CSCL) had gained attention and strength (STAHL; KOSCHMANN; SUTHERS, 2006). CSCL is the field dedicated to study how to provide support for CL through computational technology and Internet. This research field is a multidisciplinary field that combines studies from the Cognitive Psychology Education and from the Computer Science to effectively enhance the CL process (HOPPE; OGATA; SOLLER, 2007).


The general aim of CSCL field is to develop technologies to support or create situations in which two or more students learn together through the interaction among them (DILLENBOURG, 1999). In these situations, the learning outcomes are a consequence of students' interactions and how these interactions affect the individual learning for each one of the students. Therefore, to enable a well-thought-out design of CL, the CSCL scripts have been proposed by the CSCL community as the technology to facilitate the social and cognitive processes of learning by delineating the way in which the learners will interact with each other in a CL scenario (HARRER;

KOBBE; MALZAHN, 2007).

2.1.1 CSCL Scripts

CSCL scripts are the technology that describes the way of student should collaborate to achieve positive learning outcomes. These scripts basically structure and orchestrate the CL process to attain pedagogical objectives usually defined by an instructional design (DILLENBOURG; JERMANN, 2007). In this sense, the CSCL scripts are prescribed instructions that indicate how to facilitate the social and cognitive processes in group activities (DILLENBOURG, 2002). In order to narrow the number of elements used to describe the CSCL scripts, and provide a common and sharable description of CSCL scripts, Kobbe *et al.* (2007) propose a framework that is currently wide accepted by the community as the common specification to delineate the CSCL scripts using natural language. This framework formalizes the CSCL scripts as a set of components and mechanisms illustrate in Figure 2.

Figure 2 – Components and mechanisms of CSCL scripts



Source: Adapted from Fischer (2007).

The structural **components** of CSCL scripts are the participants, groups, activities, roles and resources. The component of *participants* delineates the participants, such as learners, monitors, and teachers. Although this description can be abstract or concrete and simple or complex, it is often presented in a simple manner with rules that indicate conditions to participate in the CL process. The component of *activities* delineates what will be performed by the participants in the CL process to attain the learning goals defined by the instructional designers. The component of *roles* delineates the privileges, obligations and expectations of participants in the CL process. The component of *groups* of participants defines by hierarchical structures how the students are grouped according to the participants' characteristics. The component of

resources delineates the learning objects (e.g. content resources, material, and tools) that can be used by the participants during the CL process.

The **mechanisms** of CSCL scripts are the group formation, component distribution and sequencing. The mechanism of *group formation* consists in the specifications of how the participants will be distributed over the groups in the CL process. The mechanism of *task distribution* provides the specification about how the components of scripts are distributed over groups using the mapping of groups, activities, roles, and resources. The mechanism of *sequencing* consists in the definition of how the components and groups defined in scripts are distributed over time. In general, this sequencing delineates the interaction among the group members in the CL process.

Chart 1 – Components and mechanisms of social script

| Structural components: | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| Participants: | A number of participants that must be divisible by the number of case studies. |
| Groups: | Case groups |
| Activities: | (a) Applying theoretical concepts to the case study and constructing arguments (b) Critiquing initially scaffolder with prompts for eliciting clarification, identifying conflicting views and constructing counter-arguments |
| Roles: | <i>Analyst</i> and <i>Critic</i> |
| Resources: | Case studies (minimal number is three case studies) |
| Mechanisms: | |
| Group formation: | All participants are grouped by the number of case studies. Each participant becomes member of all case groups although with different roles in each. Each participant is the responsible analyst for one case study and critic for all other cases |
| Task distribution: | Each case group receives one case study, and the roles are distributed in a way that each participant assumes the role of analyst in one case group and the role of critic in all other case groups |
| Sequencing: | - the analyst writes an analysis of case study. (a) - wait for all case group analysts to be done, and writes a critique for the analysis of case study. (b) - wait for all case group critics to be done, and the analyst considers each critique and writes a reply to each. (a) - wait for all case group analysts to be done each critic in turn reads the reply and writes a second critique. (b) - wait for all case group critics to be done... the analyst considers all critiques and revises the analysis of case study (a) |

Source: Adapted from Kobbe *et al.* (2007).

Chart 1 shows the description of the *social script* (WEINBERGER *et al.*, 2005) using the framework proposed by Kobbe *et al.* (2007). In this example, the CL scenarios orchestrated by the social script foster the acquisition of knowledge through case studies (*resources*) analyzed and reviewed by the student's groups. The students in each group are equal to the number of case studies, and the ideal number is three. In the first step of sequencing, each learner playing the *analysis* role writes down an analysis of case study, and then, he critiques the analyses made by other learners playing the *critic*'s role. In the second step of sequencing, each learner revises

his/her own analysis, taking into consideration the critiques received by the other learners in the case group.

Having the description of CSCL scripts only in natural language does not allow the computers programs to interpret them, and to run a CL scenario following the instructions indicated by the scripts without human intervention. Therefore, to represent the CSCL scripts in a computer readable manner, the IMS-Learning Design¹ (IMS-LD) specification has been adopted by different tools, such as (web)COLLAGE (Hernández-Leo *et al.*, 2006; Villasclaras-Fernández *et al.*, 2013), CIAN (MOLINA; REDONDO; ORTEGA, 2012), LeadFlow4LD (Palomino-Ramírez *et al.*, 2008), NUCLEO (SANCHO; Fuentes-Fernández; Fernández-Manjón, 2008), CoLearn (STYLIANAKIS *et al.*, 2013), CeLS (RONEN; Kohen-Vacs, 2009), and LAMS (Romero-Moreno; ORTEGA; TROYANO, 2007), as the language to describe CSCL scripts.

Despite the benefits that brings the use of the IMS-LD specification to represent CSCL scripts, several researchers have indicated that this language is insufficient to fully support the modeling of CSCL scripts (ALHARBI; ATHAUDA; CHIONG, 2014; CAEIRO; ANIDO; LLAMAS, 2003). Of course, the IMS-LD specification does not provide a full support for describing CSCL scripts, the IMS-LD has been developed as a neutral, generic and flexible educational modeling language to delineate a wide range of pedagogies approaches - the teaching strategies, pedagogical goals and their associated activities (KOPER, 2005). In this sense, to support the representation of CSCL scripts in a computer-readable manner, a wide variety of extensions on the IMS-LD elements have been proposed in by several researchers (Bote-Lorenzo *et al.*, 2004; LEO; PEREZ; DIMITRIADIS, 2004; MAGNISALIS; DEMETRIADIS, 2012a; MIAO *et al.*, 2005; Vega-Gorgojo *et al.*, 2005).

Instead to provide a simple computer-readable representation of CSCL scripts, the work of Isotani (2009), Isotani *et al.* (2013) proposes the formalization of CSCL scripts in a computer-understandable manner through ontologies. This solution consists in an ontology that makes the description of CSCL scripts as ontological structures to represent CL scenarios with a semantically-rich representation, allowing the explicit specification of learning goals, purposes, and other relevant information that cannot be represented using the IMS-LD specification, i.e., learning strategies, group goals, and interaction patters from learning theories. This formalization has been used by intelligent-theory aware systems to provide advice and recommendation for supporting the modeling of learners' development (INABA; IKEDA; MIZOGUCHI, 2003), the formation of effective groups (ISOTANI; MIZOGUCHI, 2008b), and the instructional design of CL activities (ISOTANI *et al.*, 2013).

2.1.1.1 Levels of Abstraction and Granularity of CSCL Scripts

CSCL scripts have different levels of abstraction and granularity in the description of CL scenarios (DILLENBOURG, 2002; DILLENBOURG; JERMANN, 2007; Villasclaras-

¹ URL: <<http://www.imsglobal.org/learningdesign/>>

Fernández *et al.*, 2009b). The classification of CSCL scripts in two dimension, according to the level of abstraction and to the level of granularity, gives them an enormous flexibility to be reused in the instructional design process of CL scenarios, and it also allows the use of multiple scripts to describe different aspects of CL scenario in separated scripts. The levels of abstraction classify the CSCL scripts according to the completeness of elements described by them, from the most abstract to the most concrete. The levels of granularity classify the CSCL scripts according to the aggregation level of elements described by them, from the most coarser grained to the finest grained.

According to Dillenbourg and Jermann (2007), a CSCL script is classified in one of the four levels of abstraction defined as follows as:

Script Schemata: are CSCL scripts used to describe the core instructional design principles whereby is expected to trigger interactions among participants in the CL process. In this sense, these scripts are defined in a domain-content free didactic form, so that they can be used to describe patterns of CL. Examples of script schemata are the Jigsaw script (ARONSON, 1978; KORDAKI; SIEMPOS, 2010), conflict script (WEINBERGER *et al.*, 2005), and reciprocal script (KING, 2007). The *jigsaw* script describes a CL scenario in which the principle of interaction consists in the grouping and re-grouping of participants with complementary information to share their knowledge. The *conflict* script delineates a CL scenario to group learners with contradictory knowledge or opinions to instigate the discussion. The *reciprocal* script delineates a CL scenario that assigns alternate roles to the students for facilitating questioning and tutoring activities.

Script Classes: are specialization of CSCL scripts schemata instantiated for a specific learning context. This specialization is not absolute complete, so that script classes are CSCL scripts with an independent content-domain and without specific student data. The script classes cover a range of scripts that describe variations of a prototype with particular details for a specific learning context of a script schemata to facilitate its adoption. These details are, for example, the number of participants, and the kind of content (matter) that will be taught. In this sense, a script class is an instance of script schemata in which the elements of CSCL scripts are specified for a learning context. For instance, the Université Script (DILLENBOURG; JERMANN, 2007) is a script class based on Jigsaw schema designed to describe CL scenarios for learning contexts with different thematic groups and participants from different nations.

Script Instances: are scripts in which the content-domain is specified for a particular situation. A script instance is more concrete than a script class, and it has been instantiated from a script schema or class to be reusable almost by teachers who only need to define participants' data. These scripts are more concrete than script classes, but they are independent in the particularities of students and learning environment.

Script Sessions: are scripts in which the content-domain and participants data are specified to be directly executed in a learning environment. In this sense, these scripts detail the information of participants and content-domain in the most concrete level defining, for example, the students' names and the deadlines of activities. A CL scenario that is described by a script session is known as CL session, and when it is represented in a script session using a computer-readable formalization, it can be directly executed in a learning environment to orchestrate and conduct the CL process.

Different benefits from the use of script schemata and classes as patterns are obtained in the instructional design process of CL scenarios (ALHARBI; ATHAUDA; CHIONG, 2014; CHALLCO; BITTENCOURT; ISOTANI, 2016; MIAO *et al.*, 2005). During the design/authoring phase, repositories of script schemata and classes facilitate the sharing and reuse of these scripts in distributed learning environments (PRIETO *et al.*, 2013; PRIETO *et al.*, 2014). The structures of script schemata and classes are used as templates to create new script schemata and classes (Andreas Harrer; Ulrich Hoppe, 2007; RONEN; Kohen-Vacs, 2009).

During the instantiation/production phase, script schemata and classes provide advice and recommendation that help the CL practitioners to instantiate these scripts and to obtain CL sessions (MAGNISALIS; DEMETRIADIS, 2012b; PRIETO *et al.*, 2011; Alario-Hoyos *et al.*, 2013). Script schemata and classes facilitate the generation of computer-interpretable scripts, and they provide information to support the search of applicable learning material and tools for the CL scenario (Bote-Lorenzo *et al.*, 2004; ISOTANI; MIZOGUCHI, 2008b; Vega-Gorgojo *et al.*, 2005). The script schemata and classes indicate recommendations about how to bind individuals in groups and roles according to the knowledge described in these scripts (ISOTANI *et al.*, 2013; Villasclaras-Fernández *et al.*, 2009a).

Regarding to the level of granularity (FISCHER *et al.*, 2013), the CSCL scripts can be classified in macro-scripts and micro-scripts.

Macro-scripts: are CSCL scripts that basically describe the CL process in a courser-grained level without detailing the specific interactions among participants. A macro-script describes how to attain a set of pedagogical objective indicating the sequencing of individual and group activities that must be followed by participants. Thus, for example, in the Jigsaw macro-script, to promotes the individual accountability and positive interdependence, the sequencing of activities consists in three activities: an individual activity, expert group activity, and jigsaw group activity. In the individual activity, each student studies a particular part of a whole problem. In the expert group, the students of different groups that study the same part of the whole problem meets together for exchanging ideas. At last activity, students of each jigsaw group meet to contribute with their expertise to solve the whole problem.

Micro-scripts: are CSCL scripts that describe the CL process in a fine-grained level (WEINBERGER; FISCHER; STEGMANN, 2005). A micro-script basically indicates the dialogues that must happen among student to achieve the pedagogical objectives, and they are intended to describe the communication model between participants. Thus, to facilitate the negotiation and elaboration of a domain concepts, Weinberger *et al.* (2005) describe a micro-scripts for on-line peer discussion using a sequence of sentence openers (e.g. “my proposal for an adjustment of the analysis is...”) that prompted learners to contribute with the discussion and critique one another’s contributions.

As can be noticed above, CSCL macro-scripts and micro-scripts have a hierarchical relationship to describe the CL process. The micro-scripts delineate the communication process in a CL activity (WEINBERGER; FISCHER; STEGMANN, 2005), whereas the macro-scripts delineate groups, roles, and flow of CL activities (DILLENBOURG; HONG, 2008). Despite this explicit hierarchical relationship, there are few models and tools in which all the elements of macro-scripts and micro-scripts are combined to support the design of CL scenarios (ALHARBI; ATHAUDA; CHIONG, 2014; CHALLCO; BITTENCOURT; ISOTANI, 2016). Hernandez-Leo *et al.* (2006) propose a hierarchical model in which schemata and classes of macro-scripts and micro-scripts are used as templates to generate scripts. To support the automatic generation of unit of learning, the hierarchical relationships of macro-scripts and micro-scripts are represented as hierarchical task networks in the work of Challco *et al.* (2014a).

In the CL ontology (ISOTANI *et al.*, 2009), and therefore in the ontology OntoGaCLEs proposed in this thesis, the hierarchical relationship between the macro-scripts and micro-scripts is not explicitly described as a direct link between macro-scripts and micro-scripts. The hierarchical relationship of these scripts is implicitly described as part of the ontological structures to represent events and processes proposed by Galton and Mizoguchi (2009). Based on this conceptualization in which an event can be constituted by many distinct sub-events to describe a process, the hierarchical relationship of CSCL macro-scripts and micro-scripts can be extracted from the events used to describe the CL process.

2.1.2 Motivational Problems in the Scripted Collaborative Learning

In this PhD thesis dissertation, “*the motivational problems in scripted collaborative learning*” should be interpreted as the negative effects caused on the participants’ motivation using CSCL scripts to orchestrate and structure the CL process.

Motivation is the psychological process that prompts a person to act in a certain way (MITCHELL; DANIELS, 2003), so it is a critical factor that influences the cognitive learning process (DECI; RYAN, 1985). Indeed, better learning outcomes are associated with the motivation of participants who demonstrate better curiosity, persistence, and performance for the learning activities (DECI; RYAN, 1985; Serrano-Cámarra *et al.*, 2014). In fact, high levels of motivation

for the participants of a CL scenario are associated with the improvement of learning outcomes achieved by them (CÁMARA; VELASCO; Velázquez-Iturbide, 2012; Serrano-Cámarra *et al.*, 2014). Indeed, motivation affects the enjoyment and perception of team members' contributions with the implication that the participants who interact with interest in the CL process add value to their education so that they will experience higher-level learning outcomes (GOMEZ; WU; PASSERINI, 2010). In this sense, avoiding motivational problems is essential to entice the students to have a better participation in a CL process and to complete it.

By motivational problems, this thesis explicitly refers to the lack of motivation and the demotivation that the participants can experienced during a scripted collaborative learning. The lack of motivation, also known as "*amotivation*" (DECI; RYAN, 2010), occurs when there is an absence of motivation to behave or act, whereas the demotivation is the reduction or loss of motivation in behavioral intentions or in ongoing actions. The difference among the motivational problems can be understood, by the following example: Daniel does not want to participate in the CL activity when the group members are divided into two groups, one group with the more able ones and other group with the less able, and he is classified in the less able group. On the other hand, Gaby loses her desired to participate in a CL activity when she does not understand the instructions given by the teacher during the CL process and these instructions were given in an impatient or rude manner. Therefore, Daniel is an amotivated student who dislikes to be among the less able group, whereas Gaby is a demotivated student who once was motivated but for some reason she lost her initial desired or interest.

2.1.2.1 *Amotivation and Demotivation*

Amotivation, as was defined by Deci and Ryan (1985), refers to the relative absence of motivation caused by individual feelings of incompetence and helplessness when an individual faced with an activity. Indeed, a CL activity that occurs within participants having inability to master the collaboration becomes an amotivating situation. In this sense, the amotivation to participate in a scripted collaborative learning is to be understood hereinafter as a problem caused by general outcome expectations of CL process that is unrealistic. Thus, for example, when a participant conjectures that the use of CSCL scripts in the CL activity will force him/her to follow an unwilling sequence of interactions, he/she is an amotivated learner because he/she has the sensation of obligation, and he does not like to feel forced without being able to make his/her own decisions. The amotivation in a scripted collaborative learning can also occur if the participants have a lack of interests in the content-domain because they do not see or do not know why is important to learn about the subject under study. Also, the preference of participants to work individually instead of work in group has been observed as a factor that causes amotivation by Barros (2011). In this study, he identified that some students were not motivated to participate in a CL process because they felt that the teamwork is an obligation imposed by the teacher, showing difficulties in achieving their own goals, and demonstrating their boredom.

Demotivation is the psychological process defined as counterpart of motivation. It means that the demotivation is a process that decreases the learners' energy to move to achieve a goal. This process can lead to a general amotivation regarding the CL activity in which the motives to participate in a CL process cease to exist.

Dörnyei and Ushioda (2014) defines demotivation as specific external forces that reduce or diminish the motivational basis of a behavioral intention or an ongoing action. Based on this conceptualization and focused on external forces, the participants feel stressed and loss their initial motivation to work collaboratively, when they feel a lack of choice over the interactions of the CSCL script during the execution of CL scenario instantiated from it (ISOTANI, 2009). Over-scripting the CL process can also cause demotivation when the participants have difficulties to adapt to perform structured tasks, in specially, for highly coercive scripts in which the mechanism of sequencing indicates interactions in a very detailed and inflexible way (DILLEN-BOURG, 2002). The high level of coercion of this type of scripting collaboration forces the participants to have independent and exploratory thinking causing demotivation in participants who enjoy and prioritize their own individual decisions. Finally, as was pointed out by Schmitt and Weinberger (2018), another external force that causes the demotivation is the execution of scripted collaborative learning for an over extended time or over many CL activities.

The problem with the definition of demotivation proposed by Dörnyei and Ushioda (2014) is that it does not cover completely all factors that cause the loss of motivation. In this sense, the internal factors such as the participants' negative attitudes to a CL activity and the lack of self-confidence, factors relevant to the CL process, are not contemplated by them. This thesis considers both factors (internal and external) as source of demotivation for a scripted collaborative learning.

In summary, in the context of a scripted collaborative learning, a demotivated student/participant refers to someone who was once motivated but lost his or her initial motivation for some reason, and an amotivated student/participant refers to someone in whom there is no interest or commitment to participate in the scripted collaborative learning.

2.1.2.2 *Effects of Motivational Problems on the scripted collaborative learning*

Motivational problems of participants in a scripted collaborative learning degrade the dynamic of group members. For example, Wu *et al.* (2014) observed that, when Wiki systems are used to support the collaboration of participants in a CL process and there is no an effective mechanism in these systems to indicate task conflicts, there is low level of participation caused by the lack of motivation. The participation level was also indicated as factor affected by the lack of motivation by Mazzolini and Maddison (2003), and Hämäläinen (2008), Papadopoulos, Demetriadis and Stamelos (2009) indicate that students frequently drop out CL activities as consequence of the lack of motivation to work in groups. In relation to the demotivated, studies of Hart (2012), Grau-Valldosera and Mingüillón (2014), Hartnett, George and Dron (2011) have

shown the relation of motivational problems with the low level of persistence and high degree of dropout for CL activities. The dropping out of the CL process by motivational problems frequently causes that other learners are demotivated dropping out the scripted collaborative learning at mid term (HART, 2012; DILLENBOURG, 2013). Weinberger *et al.* (2005) indicated that the superficial interactions on scripted collaborative learning are the consequence of motivational problems.

Negative learning outcomes in peer-moderated discussions are indicated as consequences of the degradation of group dynamic by Xie and Ke (2009), Hewitt (2005). In these discussions, moderators plays the role of CSCL script by orchestrating and conducting the collaboration. Xie and Ke (2009) observed that the lack of motivation caused low level of participation, and by consequence of it, the knowledge elaboration and transfer were reduced. The lower level of participation was also indicated as factor that causes insufficient peer referencing in the peer-discussions (HEWITT, 2005).

Löfström and Nevgi (2007) indicated that the lack of motivation is one of the reasons for not participating in a CL process. Although no significant negative relationships in CL sessions were found between contributions to discourse and lack of motivation by Rienties *et al.* (2009), the study of Rienties *et al.* (2009) indicates that highly intrinsically motivated students in these session become central and prominent contributors to cognitive discourse.

Similar to the research works of Rummel and Spada (2007), Weinberger, Stegmann and Fischer (2010), this thesis dissertation argues that the scripted collaborative learning may cause motivational problems and reluctance towards a scripted collaborative learning based on the self-determination theory (DECI; RYAN, 2010) as a central element to delineate motivation. Depending of the individual characteristics of participants, they would suffer motivational problems to uphold their efforts, e.g., when students do not have an optimal fit between the external scripts (guidelines provided by the system that specifies the sequencing) and the internal script (low-structure script in the mind of students), and the external script provides scaffolds that guide procedures for which internal scripts are already represented by the learner or where a learner might even hold more effective or efficient internal script, the performance of the learner will decrease (STEGMANN *et al.*, 2011). In the same direction, negative effects on the participants' motivation have been pointed out by many researchers who have successfully applied CSCL scripts to enhance and mediate the CL process. For example, Brehm (1966) proved that, for some students, overlaying scripting produces reactance, and the work of Kollar, Fischer and Slotta (2005) indicate that the lost of motivation occurs when there is an overlaying of scripting. It indicates that, when the scripted collaborative learning is over extended for a long time and over many collaborative sessions as was shown in the studies of Hron *et al.* (1997), Schmitt and Weinberger (2018), there is more probability that the motivational problems will occur.

2.1.3 Approaches for Dealing with Motivational Problems in a scripted collaborative learning

Nowadays, to the best of the knowledge of the thesis author, there is no one specific approach to deal with motivation problems in a scripted collaborative learning. However, there are several approaches to motivate and engage the students in different learning situations (HARDRÉ, 2003; REIGELUTH; KRATHWOHL; Carr-Chellman, 1983; SPITZER, 1996). These approaches refer hereinafter as “*traditional approaches*,” and, when they are applied in scripted collaborative learning to deal with motivational problems, they are classified as: Instructional design models that focus on motivational theories, and Affective feedback systems.

2.1.3.1 Instructional Design Models that Focus on Motivation

Instructional design models are basically guidelines to develop and orchestrate learning experiences to achieve instructional goals. They are defined as a collection of activities to plan, develop, evaluate and manage events and environments that are intended to facilitate the learning (SPECTOR; OHRAZDA, 2004). Thus, these models intend to prescribe the better way in which instructional/learning activities, content, activities and resources should be developed to provide effective and efficient learning. To obtain these instructional/learning material and environments, the guidelines in these models are based on instructional/learning theories. Instructional/learning theories describe “*how to better help the people to learn*” (instructional theory) and the “*ways that theorists believe that the people learn*” (learning «Use Collegiate Phrase: theory» theory).

In addition to instructional/learning theories, theories of motivation are covered by *instructional design models that focus on motivation*. In such models, motivation is seen as the factor that determines the intensity, attention, effort and persistence the learners put to complete their learning processes. The guidelines in these instructional design models encompass strategies, principles, and suggestions to raise and maintain the learners’ motivation to learn based on theories of motivation. Thus, some of the instructional design models considered as model that focus on motivation by the author of this thesis are: The *ARCS model* proposed by Keller (2009), the *Time Continuum model* proposed by Wlodkowski and Ginsberg (2017), the *Taxonomy of Intrinsic Motivations for Learning* proposed by Malone and Lepper (1987)

In the instructional design models mentioned above, the motivation is assumed as a shared responsibility for the educational staff (instructional designers and teachers) and participants of CL process (students). Thereby, taking into account the participants’ motivation is essential in the development of instructional/learning materials or environments. However, in the instructional design models, motivating learners toward a learning process does not occur during the the instructional/learning process (execution phase). The strategies, principles and suggestions given as guidelines in these models are used outside of this process. In this sense, when the instructional designers frequently use the guidelines of instructional design models, they frequently employ an one-size-fits-all approach, they ignore the fact that the participants’ motivations vary occasionally,

in amounts and in types, and from individual to individual. Furthermore, these instructional design models are used by the instructional designers, they take the assumption that the content-domain by itself is compelling and interesting for everyone. Making this assumption is dangerous because there will be always some content-domains that the participants of CL process will like and other content-domains that they dislike. Also, some students will prefer to study individually rather than to learn collaboratively or working in group.

By the reasons exposed above, the use of instructional design models that focus on motivation is a method to deal with motivational problems in a scripted collaborative learning. However, this solution makes only the content-domain and the instructional/learning process more appealing and engaging for the participants that have the desired to learn the content-domain. It means that, even if the instructional/learning material and processes are adapted for each individual, the participants without interest in the content-domain or the participants who dislike to work in group will not adequately complete the instructions indicated by the CSCL script.

2.1.3.2 Affective Feedback Systems

In psychology, the experiences of feeling and emotions are defined as affect (HOGG; ABRAMS, 2007), so that affective states are constructors used to delineate these experiences as emotional valence, arousal and motivational intensity (Harmon-Jones; GABLE; PRICE, 2013). Emotional valence refers to the subjective evaluation of an experienced state based on emotion's consequences and emotion-eliciting circumstances (Harmon-Jones *et al.*, 2011). In others words, an emotion is the cognitive interpretation of affection that is characterized by an intense mental activity and a high degree of pleasure or displeasure (CABANAC, 2002). Arousal is the physiological and psychological state of being awoken or of sense organs stimulated to a point of perception (Wikipedia, 2018; dos Santos *et al.*, 2018). Motivation intensity refers to the intensity that prompts a person to act, and, in this context, this is considered the impulsion degree that an individual puts to move away or toward some affective state.

As the affective states influence the motivation intensity of an individual, the regulation of affective states in a scripted collaborative learning can be used as a method to deal with motivational problems. To accomplish this regulation, it is necessary to detect, represent and express affective states in computational systems because the affective states vary from individual to individual and from situation to situation and occasionally. In this sense, computational systems should be used to recognize the affective states of participants through the identification of their emotions, moods and individual personality traits. Currently, there are plenty computational systems and researches that focus on the identification of affective states based on facial expressions, emotional speeches, physiological signals and interactions with the environments and/or computational systems (PICARD, 2000; TAO; TAN, 2005; WU; HUANG; HWANG, 2016; REIS *et al.*, 2018). Having this information, affective feedbacks can be given for the participants

involved in the CL process. In this context, these feedbacks involve, not only the affective states inferred from the human-machine interactions, but also the affective stated inferred from student-student interactions. Thus, affective feedbacks are signals that indicates the current affective states of participants during the CL process, and despite of the levels of skill development and knowledge acquisition, these feedbacks provide positive or negative regulations to encourage the participants to continue or to change their ways of participation. These regulations are frequently provided by virtual agents or learning companions, and they are given in form of dialogues, but they can also include musics, animations and other ways of communication. Such regulations are *motivational dialogues* because their purpose is to affect the participants' motivations - more specifically, they affect the motivational intensity through the regulation of affective states as was explained at the begin of this subsection.

Computational systems that behave and act according to the description presented in the previous paragraph are considered by the thesis author as *Affective feedback systems*, and they are frequently based on *emotional awareness systems*² to identify and engender the regulation of affective states during the CL process. Thus, for example, in the intelligent tutoring system “*Guru*” (OLNEY *et al.*, 2012), to deal with the demotivation occurred during collaborative lectures, D’Mello *et al.* (2012) implemented an affective feedback system that intends to motivate and engage the refocusing of participants’ attention based on textual dialogues. These motivational dialogues are given by the system “*Guru*” when the affective states of boredom, disengagement and zoning-out are identified by the monitoring of participants’ eye-gaze patterns (emotional awareness system). Tian *et al.* (2014) built an emotional awareness system that identifies the learners’ emotions through the natural language process of Chinese textual interactions. Then, this system was used to support emotional-regulation recommendations in an active learning strategy where two learners interact playing the role of speaker and listener. In this scenario, the listener receives message send by the speaker with advices to regulate the speaker’s emotions when the emotional-awareness system identifies boredom, frustration or fury. The advices are obtained by case-base reasoning during the learning activities. Finally, as example of affective feedback systems, a CC-LR (Collaboratige Complex Learning Resource) developed by Caballé *et al.* (2014) provides affective feedbacks to the participants of CL sessions in form of empathic dialogues based on fuzzy rules. In this learning system, *emotcontrol* (FEIDAKIS *et al.*, 2014; FEIDAKIS *et al.*, 2013) is used as emotional-awareness system in which several visualizations of individual and group affective states are provided for both the group members and instructor.

The use of affective feedback systems seems as an effective method to deal with motivational problems in a scripted collaborative learning. More specifically, this solution intends to avoid the demotivation (disengagement) of participants during the CL process. However, the participants’ intrinsic motivation is only evoked by the motivational dialogues in the current affective feedback systems. When motivation arises from inside an individual, it is known as

² *emotional-aware* means be aware of the own or other participants’ emotions and feelings

intrinsic motivation, and it involves the engagement to participate in the CL process by an own personal desire to learn. Essentially, the motivational dialogues in affective feedback systems are oriented to maintain the intrinsic motivation of participants with messages such as: “*Please, pay attention in the example,*” “You might want to focus on me to understand the change,” and “*Let’s keep going.*” As can be appreciated on these messages, they are pure related to the learning process by itself or focused on shown the advantages of exploring and learning new things. Therefore, the affective feedback systems as well as the instructional design models do not adequately work in CL scenarios where people simply have no internal desire to learn or when people do not want to work in group.

2.2 Gamification

By looking at whether motivation comes from, in addition to the intrinsic motivation, there is the extrinsic motivation that comes from outside of an individual. While the intrinsic motivation comes from the participants’ desired to learn, the extrinsic motivation comes from the desired to avoid negative consequences (e.g. punishment, bad grades) or to obtain some external thing (e.g. tangible reward, approval from teacher/parents). Thus, to evoke the extrinsic motivation of participants, external rewards or punishments can be introduce in the CL process to raise the interest of participants in doing something when they see the working in group as an unpleasing situation or when they have no interest in the content-domain or when do not have the desire to learn. Although these rewards or punishments are extrinsic motivators, when they are properly used to make that the learners acquire new knowledge and develop new skills, they may produce in some learners a satisfaction for these accomplishments becoming then these learners more intrinsic motivate to learn in a scripted collaborative learning. Finally, these rewards and punishments can also be perceived by the learners as feedbacks, allowing the students known their performances in the CL process.

This section presents and details the theoretical foundation of a novelty approach known as Gamification in which game elements are used as extrinsic motivators to engage people to carried out a work, task or activity in which they have no internal interest. This approach also has the advantage that when the game elements are properly used, it would be a helpful tool to enhance the intrinsic motivation of participants.

In this section, before to detail what is gamification and to summarize its theoretical foundation, the differences between games, game elements and gameplay are briefly clarified. The related works of gamification in the context of CL and other educational contexts are also briefly summarized in this section. Furthermore, the rational reasons that justify the use of gamification as method to deal with motivational problems in a scripted collaborative learning are detailed.

CHAPTER
3

ONTOLOGICAL STRUCTURES TO PERSONALIZE THE GAMIFICATION IN COLLABORATIVE LEARNING SCENARIOS

This chapter presents the formalization of ontological structures proposed by the author of this thesis dissertation to represent gamified CL scenarios. These ontological structures allow us to systematically represent knowledge extracted from the player types models and needs-based theories of motivation to deal with motivation problems in scripted collaborative learning. This knowledge corresponds to concepts identified as relevant to solve the context-dependency of gamification based on the individual user characteristics, so that the ontological structures delineated in this chapter are also used to represent ontological models to personalize the gamification in CL scenarios based on player types models and need-based theories of motivation. The ontological structures to represent gamified CL scenarios have been developed as an extension of ontological structures proposed to represent CL scenarios in the CL ontology, hence the chapter starts with an overview of the CL ontology (section 3.1). The ontological structures that have been formalized in the *Ontology to Gamify Collaborative Learning Scenarios - OntoGaCLeS* to represent gamified CL scenarios based on the knowledge extracted from the player types models and needs-based theories of motivation are presented in section 3.2. To demonstrate the usefulness of this formalization, and then to validate the ontological structures as a formal representation of ontological models to personalize the gamification in CL scenarios, section 3.3 shows the procedure followed to build an ontological model to personalize the gamification of CL scenarios based on the Dodecad player type models (MARCZEWSKI, 2015b). Finally, section 3.4 presents the concluding remarks of this chapter.

Part of the work described in this chapter was published by the author of this PhD thesis dissertation in the scientific articles:

- “*Towards an Ontology for Gamifying Collaborative Learning Scenarios*” published in the

12th International Conference on Intelligent Tutoring Systems, ITS 2014, held in Honolulu, HI, USA (CHALLCO *et al.*, 2014b).

- “*An Ontology Engineering Approach to Gamify Collaborative Learning Scenarios*” published in the 20th International Conference on Collaboration and Technology, CRIWG 2014, held in Santiago, Chile (CHALLCO *et al.*, 2014).
- “*Personalization of Gamification in Collaborative Learning Contexts using Ontologies*” published as Volume 13, Issue 6, in the journal of IEEE Latin America Transactions, 2015 (CHALLCO *et al.*, 2015).

3.1 Overview of the Collaborative Learning Ontology

The CL ontology has been developed for a long time by the contributions of many researchers. Initially, the CL ontology was conceived to support the opportunistic group formation (IKEDA; GO; MIZOGUCHI, 1997), so that, to identify situations in which an individual shifting from individual learning mode to CL mode, the CL ontology formalizes the agreement in the negotiation process for group formation as ontological structures to describe individual and group learning goals. Employing this formalization, intelligent agents have been developed to help students to find group members for establishing group learning activities in which they should participate. These agents check the individual and group learning goals, and then they initiate a negotiation process to establish an agreement for the participants in group learning activities. This first version of the CL ontology has been demonstrated to be useful in the development of agent-based systems that provide helpful support for the group formation (INABA *et al.*, 2001; SUPNITHI *et al.*, 1999).

To provide theoretical and pedagogical justification in the group formation, the CL ontology has been extended to represent CL scenario that compliant with instructional and learning theories (INABA; MIZOGUCHI, 2004; ISOTANI *et al.*, 2013). In this extension, concepts, such as interaction patterns, group goals, individual goals, CL roles and so on, have been formalized from different instructional/learning theories, so that, in addition to support the group formation (ISOTANI; MIZOGUCHI, 2008a), the ontological structures to represent CL scenarios have been successfully applied in: the modeling of learners’ development (INABA; IKEDA; MIZOGUCHI, 2003) the interaction analysis (INABA *et al.*, 2002), and the design of CL process (ISOTANI *et al.*, 2013).

Figure 3 shows the terms, concepts and relations defined in the CL ontology. These concepts are defined as follows as:

I-goal is the individual learning goal that represents what the participant in focus (*I*) is expected to acquire, and it is described as a change in his/her learning stage.

I-role is the CL role played by the participant in focus (*I*).


You-role is the CL role played by the participant (*You*) who is interacting with the participant in focus (*I*).

$Y \leq I\text{-goal}$ is the learning strategy employed by the participant in focus (*I*) to interact with the participant (*You*) in order to achieve his/her individual learning goals (*I-goal*).

W(L)-goal is the common learning goal for the group members in the CL scenario.

W(A)-goal is the rational arrangement of the group activity used to achieve the common learning goal (*W(L)-goal*) and the individual learning goals (*I-goal*).

Figure 3 – Concepts, terms and relations defined in the CL Ontology




Source: Isotani (2009).

To express the relationship of concepts delineated above, the CL Ontology employs the ontological structures shown in Figure 4 to represent CL scenarios. In these ontological structures, a CL scenario is represented by three parts defined as: the *Group structure benefit* (*W(S)-goal*) to describe the expected benefits of the structured collaboration (i.e. positive interdependence, individual accountability, promotive interactions); the *Learning strategy* (*$Y \leq I\text{-goal}$*) to describe the learning strategies employed by the group members in the CL scenario; and (3) the *CL process* to describe the rational arrangement of the group activity (*W(A)-goal*).

- The **Learning strategies** (*$Y \leq I\text{-goal}$*) are guidelines that specify how the participants should interact with others members of group to achieve their individual goals. These guidelines help the group members to externalize a desired behavior to play a given CL role more adequately. Therefore, the Learning strategy is represented as an ontological structure composes by: the participant in focus (*I*) who plays the CL role “*I-role*”; the participant (*You*) who interacts with the participant in focus (*I*) playing the CL role “*You-role*;” and the individual learning goals (*I-goal*) that are expected to be achieved by the participant in focus (*I*) at the end of CL scenario. The *behavioral role* as part of the CL roles “*I-role*” and “*You-role*” is used to describe the behaviors externalized by the participants “*I*” and “*You*” when they interact in the CL scenario employing the learning strategy (*$Y \leq I\text{-goal}$*).

Figure 4 – Ontological structure to represent CL scenarios



Source: Isotani (2009).

- (b) The **CL role** describes functions, goals, duties and responsibilities that must be taken by members of group to achieve the common and individual learning goals. Thus, the ontological structure to represent a CL role is composed by: the *necessary condition* and *desired conditions* to play the CL role; the description of *how to collaborate* when a group member plays the CL role; and the description of *benefits for playing the role*. In this ontological structure, *Cognitive/Knowledges states* are used to define the necessary and desired conditions for a group member to play the CL role, *behaviors* are used to describe *how to collaborate* playing the CL role, and *individual learning goals (I-goal)* is employed to describe the expected *benefits for playing the role*.
- (c) The **CL process** is the *rational arrangement of group activity (W(A)-goal)* whereby the common and individual learning goals are achieved by the group members. This arrangement is represented by the *common learning goals (W(L)-goal)* as result of the negotiation process in the group formation, and by the *Interaction Pattern* as the sequencing mechanism followed by the participants to achieve their individual learning goals (*I-goal*). The interaction pattern is represented as a set of *necessary* and *desired interactions* in which the interaction for the group members is described as influential Instructional-Learning events (*Influential I_L events*).
- (d) The **Influential I_L event** represents the interaction among the group members and the benefits obtained by the interaction from two viewpoints: from the viewpoint of participants who play a role of instructor, and from the viewpoint of participants who




play a role of learner. The influential I_L event describes group members performing actions that influence other members with the purpose to change their own learning states by helping others to achieve their individual learning goals. Therefore, the ontological structure to represent an influential I_L event is composed by two events: a *learning event* and an *instructional event* in which the participants are represented as actors of CL scenario playing CL roles and performing a set of actions to achieve their individual learning goals (*I-goal*). For a group member acting as *instructor*, the influential I_L event describes his/her interaction with other group member who acts as *learner* through instructional actions, and the expected *benefits for the instructor* (*I-goal*). For a group member acting as *learner*, the influential I_L event describes his/her interaction with other group member who acts as *instructor* through learning actions, and the expected *benefits for the learner* (*I-goal*).

As it was said before, the ontological structures shown in Figure 4 are used to delineate CL scenarios that compliant with instructional and learning theories. To illustrate this, Figure 5 shows the representation of a CL scenario based on the Cognitive Apprentice theory. According to this theory, the CL activities should incorporate situations that are familiar to those who are using these activities, and these situations must lead the participants to act and interact acquiring skills in a specific context, and then generalizing these skills to other situations. Therefore, the CL scenarios based on the Cognitive Apprentice theory focuses on supporting a more skilled participant (known as *master*) to teach a familiar situation for the lesser skilled participants (known as *apprentices*) who learn by observing the skilled participant's behaviors and mimic him/her in other similar situations. From the viewpoint of the more skilled participant: he/she is supported by the learning strategy “*learning by guiding*” (a1); his/her role (*I-role*) is the *Master role* with a behavioral role of *Guider*; and his/her individual learning goals is the *development of cognitive or meta-cognitive skills* at the levels of *Autonomous stage*. From the viewpoint of a lesser skilled participant: he/she is supported by the learning strategy “*learning strategy by guiding*” (a2) to interact with the master; his/her role (*I-role*) is the *Apprentice role* with the behavioral role of *Imitator*; and his/her individual goals are the *development of cognitive and/or meta-cognitive skills* at the levels of *Cognitive stage* and *Associative stage*.

According to the cognitive apprentice theory, the more skilled participant who plays the master role must have knowledge and/or experience in using the target cognitive or metacognitive skill. Therefore, the necessary conditions to play the *Master role* as shown in Figure 5 (b1) are: *having the knowledge how to use the target cognitive skill*; *having experience in using the target cognitive skill*; and *having experience in using the target metacognitive skill*. When a participant adequately plays the master role, he/she acts *Guiding* others participants, and as consequence of this behavior, he/she is benefited with the *Development of cognitive or metacognitive skill* at the *Autonomous stage*.

The cognitive apprenticeship theory indicates that the participants without any knowledge

Figure 5 – Ontological structures to represent a CL scenario based on the cognitive apprenticeship theory




Source: Elaborated by the author.

or experience in how to use the target skill should play the apprentice role. Therefore, there are not necessary conditions in the ontological structure shown in Figure 5 (b2) to represent the *Apprentice role*, and the desired conditions for this role are: *not having the knowledge how to use target metacognitive or cognitive skill*; and *not having experience in using the target metacognitive or cognitive skill*. When a participant adequately plays the *Apprentice role*, he/she acts *Imitating* the behavior of the master and obtaining the benefits in the *Development of metacognitive or cognitive skill* at the levels of *Cognitive* and *Associative* stages.

When the two learning strategies, *Learning by Guiding* and *Learning by Apprenticeship*, are simultaneously employed to structure the interactions among the participants in the CL scenario, a positive synergy is created among them producing a *Spread of skills*. This arrangement is formalized by the ontological structure shown in Figure 5 (c), where the *CL process* is defined as a *Cognitive Apprenticeship type CL session*, the *Common goal* of this session is the *Spread of skill*, and the *Teaching-Learning Process* is an *Interaction Pattern* defined by the sequencing mechanism of a CSCL script inspired by the Cognitive Apprenticeship theory. This sequencing mechanism defines the necessary and complementary interactions showed in Figure 6.

Figure 6 – Necessary and complementary interactions defined by the sequencing mechanism of a CSCL script inspired by the cognitive apprenticeship theory



Source: Adapted from Isotani (2009).


The necessary and desired interactions defined by the sequencing mechanism shown in Figure 6 are formalized as *Influential I_L event* in the *Teaching-Learning Process* of *Cognitive*

Apprenticeship type CL session showed in Figure 5 (c). The ontological structure to represent the interaction “*Setting up learning context type CA*” is shown in detail in Figure 5 (d). In this interaction, the instructional event “*Giving Information*” delineates the action “*Explain*” as an instructional action performed by the participant who plays the *Master role* to *develop the metacognitive skill* at the level of *Autonomous stage*. The learning event “*Receiving information*” delineates the action “*Identify the context*” as a learning action performed by the participant who plays the *Apprentice role* to *develop the cognitive skill* at the level of *Rough-Cognitive stage*.

3.2 Ontological Structures to Represent Gamified Collaborative Learning Scenarios

The concepts, terms and relations shown in Figure 7 have been formalized in the ontology OntoGaCLeS to represent gamified CL scenarios. These elements employ an independent vocabulary from any theory and practice, and they are described as follows as:

Figure 7 – Concepts, terms and relations defined in the ontology to represent gamified CL scenarios



Source: Elaborated by the author.

Y<=I-mot goal is the *individual motivational strategy* used to enhance the learning strategy (*Y<=I-goal*) employed by the participant in focus (*I*).

I-mot goal is the *individual motivational goal* for the participant in focus (*I*), and it represents what is expected to happen in his/her motivational stage when an individual motivational strategy (*Y<=I-mot goal*) is applied in the CL scenario to enhance the learning strategy (*Y<=I-goal*) employed by him/her to interact with other member of group (*You*).

I-player role is the *player role* for the participant in focus (*I*).

You-player role is the *player role* for the participant (*You*) who interacts with the participant in focus (*I*).

I-gameplay is the *individual gameplay strategy* for the participant in focus (*I*), and it indicates the implementation of the individual motivational strategy (*Y<=I-mot goal*) when this strategy corresponds to the gamification.

In the following subsections, the formalization of concepts, terms and relations briefly introduced here are detailed.

3.2.1 Individual Motivational Goal (*I-mot goal*)

The *individual motivational goal (I-mot goal)* has been formalized in the ontology OntoGaCLeS to represent the reason why is necessary to apply an individual motivational strategy in a CL scenario. Thus, for the participant in focus (*I*), the individual motivational goal (*I-mot goal*) represents what is expected to happen in his/her motivational stage when a motivational strategy is applied in the CL scenario to enhance the learning strategy employed by him/her to interact with others. Thus, the individual motivational goal indicates the motivational stages that must be reached by a person to be motivated to interact with other.

Figure 8 shows the ontological structure that has been formalized in the ontology OntoGaCLeS to represent an individual motivational goal (*I-mot goal*), where: the *initial stage* and *goal stage* are stages used to represent the expected change in the motivational stage of the person in focus (*I*).

Figure 8 – Ontological structures to represent individual motivational goal (*I-mot goal*). At the bottom, the “*Satisfaction of psychological need*” (left) and the “*Internalization of motivation*” (right)




Source: Elaborated by the author.

Two types of individual motivational goals have been currently formalized in the ontology OntoGaCLeS to represent the individual motivational *goals (I-mot goal)* of gamification as individual motivational strategy. The former, known as *Satisfaction of psychological needs*, has been formalized based on the conceptualization of motivation as internal psychological process to satisfy human needs (PRITCHARD; ASHWOOD, 2008); and the latter, known as *Internalization of motivation*, has been formalized based on the form in which an individual regulates his/her own choices to behave and act (DECI; RYAN, 2010). Figure 8 shows the representation for these two types of individual motivational goals. The initial and goal stages for the *Internalization of motivation* are defined by the self-determination stage, whereas the initial and goal stages for the *Satisfaction of psychological need* are defined by the *psychological need stages*. In the articles

(CHALLCO *et al.*, 2015; CHALLCO *et al.*, 2014; CHALLCO *et al.*, 2014b), the thesis author used the concept of “*Phychological need*” to refer the concept of “*Psychological need stage*,” and he used the concept of “*Without need*” to refer the stages indicated as “\$1 need satisfied” where \$1 is substituted by psychological needs (e.g. *Mastery need satisfied*).

As it was mentioned before, in the Chapter 2, motivation is an internal psychological process associated with three general components of arousal, direction and intensity in which the arousal component is caused by needs (also called *wants* or *desires*). These needs cause that a person behaves and acts to satisfy needs (MITCHELL; DANIELS, 2003). So, motivation is a constructor that delineates why a person chooses to allocate time and energy for different behaviors and actions to maximize the satisfaction of his/her own needs (PRITCHARD; ASHWOOD, 2008). It means that, in a CL scenario, a motivation problem in a scripted collaborative learning occurs when the participant believes that this scenario will not lead him/her to satisfy his/her individual needs. Therefore, the motivational strategy is applied in the CL scenario to change this perception. Based on this assumption, the individual motivational goals (*I-mot goal*) for the person in focus (*I*) have been formalized in the ontology OntoGaCLeS as the satisfaction of needs. More specifically, in gamified CL scenarios, the individual motivational goal is described as *Satisfaction of psychological needs* because game elements do not satisfy all human needs, they satisfy only part of these needs that are referred by the thesis author as *psychological needs*. The psychological needs are the human needs that are classified in the groups of relatedness and growth needs according to the ERG (Existence, Relatedness and Growth) theory (ALDERFER, 1972).

Figure 9 – Ontological structures to represent “*Satisfaction of psychological need*.” At the top right, the ontological structure to represent “*Satisfaction of autonomy*.”




Source: Elaborated by the author.

Figure 9 shows the ontological structures formalized to represent the *Satisfaction of psychological need*. These ontological structures represent the satisfaction of innate psychological needs, and they comprise what is intended to evoke in minds of users by most experts when non-game contexts are gamified (MORA *et al.*, 2015; SEABORN; FELS, 2015). According to

the SDT theory (RYAN; DECI, 2000; DECI; RYAN, 2010), the well-being of an individual is reached when the psychological needs of autonomy, competence and relatedness are satisfied (DECI; RYAN, 1985; DECI; RYAN, 2010). According to the Dan Pink's theory (PINK, 2011), a person is motivated and engagement in a cognitive, decision-making, creative or higher-order thinking task when he/she is given with autonomy, mastery and purpose. At the top right of Figure 9, the ontological structure to represent the *Satisfaction of autonomy* is detailed in which, based on an unipolar scale from an unsatisfied need stage to a satisfied need stage, the roles for the initial and goal stages are played by the *Autonomy unsatisfied* and the *Autonomy satisfied*, respectively. Employing the same unipolar scale, and the need-theories of motivation, SDT theory (DECI; RYAN, 2010) and Dan Pink motivation theory (PINK, 2011), a set of individual motivational goals as satisfactions of psychological needs have been formalized in the ontology OntoGaCLEs, and they are detailed in section A.2.

Figure 10 – Ontological structures to represent “*Internalization of motivation*.” At the top right, the ontological structure to represent the “*Internalization from amotivation to intrinsic motion*.”



Source: Elaborated by the author.

The *internalization of motivation* is the process by which “*values, attitudes or regulatory structures, such that the external regulation of a behavior is transformed into an internal regulation, so no longer requires the presence of an external contingency*” (GAGNÉ; DECI, 2005). Thus, the internalization of motivation for the satisfaction of needs refers to changes in the motivation from a non-free choice to a free choice of needs satisfied by oneself. According to the SDT theory (DECI; RYAN, 1985; RYAN; DECI, 2000), this change happens from the extrinsic motivation to intrinsic motivation when motivation is changed from a non-self-determined form (*non-freely choice*) to a self-determined form (*freely choice by oneself*). Here, the extrinsic motivators employed by the game elements must be configured as an attempt to transform the current motivation stages of participants from amotivation and extrinsic motivation into intrinsic motivation. Based on these definitions, the ontological structures shown in Figure 10 have been

formalized to represent the *Internalization of motivation*. These ontological structures employ the continuum ranging of stages from *amotivation* (not internalized behave) into *external motivation* (not at all internalized behave) to *introjected motivation* (partially internalized behave) to *identify motivation* (fully internalized behave) to *intrinsic motivation* (automatically internalized behave). At the top right of Figure 10 is detailed the formalization for the change from *Amotivation stage (initial stage)* to *Intrinsic motivation stage (goal stage)* defined as “*Internalization from amotivation to intrinsic motivation*.” The detailing of all ontological structures to represent the internalization of motivation is presented in section A.2.

3.2.2 Player Role

The identification of homogeneous people group that differs from other groups in a significant way is essential to define the personalization in any system. In game design, this segmentation is established by player types models in which typologies are used to categorize the users in different groups according to their geographic location (Ben Judd *et al.*, 2016; CHAKRABORTY *et al.*, 2015), their demographic situation (GREENBERG *et al.*, 2010; SHAW, 2012), their psychological characteristics (TSENG, 2011; YEE, 2006), and their behavioral characteristics (BARTLE, 2004; LAZZARO, 2009). These player type models aim to help the game designers to identify the necessary features that make a game fun, enjoyable and desirable for a particular audience.

The player type models cannot be directly extrapolated to others context for which they are not intended. Thus, the concept of *Player role* formalized in the ontology OntoGaCLEs to define typologies of player types in the context of CL scenarios. Player roles delineate the functionality, responsibilities and requirements whereby participants of a group become players in a gamified CL scenario. This segmentation is based on individual characteristics of participants that establish a segmentation of participants using necessary and desired conditions. In this sense, the *Player role* has been formalized by the ontological structure shown in Figure 11. This structure defines the conditions that a participant must satisfy in the CL scenario to play the player role as *necessary condition* and *desire condition*. Thus, a participant of CL scenario cannot play a player role when he/she does not fulfill the necessary conditions, and when the participant fulfills the necessary and desired conditions has more probability to obtain the expected *benefits for playing the role*.

The necessary and desire conditions in the ontological structure to represent *Player role* are represented by: *motivation state*, *psychological need state*, and *individual personality trait state*. A tree overview for these states is detailed in section A.1, where:

- The *motivation state* is an internal state that indicates the temporal attitudinal state of a person about his/her desire to be a participant in the CL session. These stages can be *Not motivated* and *Motivated*. The state of motivated is also divided in two types: “*Intrinsic*


motivated" and "*Extrinsic motivated*" (DECI; RYAN, 2010). It is important to notice here that the concept of motivation state is not the same as the concept of motivation stage. Although both concepts represent changes in the participant's motivation, the motivation state represents a specific point in the whole process of being motivated, whereas the motivation stage represents an interval in a participant's motivation process.

- The *psychological need state* represents the current psychological need of a person in which the states for each one of the psychological needs are formalized through the representation of pair states: "*Having need of \$I*" and "*Not having need of \$I*" in which "\$I" is replaced by the name of the need that is being defined as prerequisite. For instance, to represent the states about the psychological need of competence, the states of "*Having need of competence*" and "*Not having need of competence*" have been formalized as psychological need state in the ontology OntoGaCLeS.
- The *individual personality trait state* indicates states of the individual personality traits, such as introversion, extroversion, openness to experience, and conscientiousness. The individual personality trait states delineate the characteristics that make a person unique by indicating his/her habitual patterns of thought, emotion and behavior for different situations (MATTHEWS; DEARY; WHITEMAN, 2003). These states express whether a participant either has or does not have the individual personality trait. In the ontology OntoGaCLeS, the formalized individual personality traits states are: the *big five personality traits* (COSTA; MACCRAE, 1992), the *MBTI personality traits* (BRIGGS, 1976), the *game-playing style preferences* described in the Bartle's player type model (BARTLE, 2004), and the *game-playing liking preferences* described in the Yee's motivation components (YEE, 2006).

Beside the necessary and desired conditions that an individual should satisfy, the ontological structure to represent *Player role* shown in Figure 11 indicate the information about: how the participant with the player role is expected to interact with the game elements (*how to interact*); and the expected benefits for playing the player role (*benefits for playing the role*). Thus, concepts delineated as *behaviors* represent the possible manners in which a participant should interact to other, and concepts delineated as individual motivational goals (I-mot goal) represent the expected *benefits for playing the role*.

At the bottom of Figure 11, the *Creator role* is shown as example of the formalization of a player role using the ontological structure proposed in this section. According to this structure, participants who have a greater liking for customization-components instead of the liking for other game components are classified as creators. This segmentation is represented by the necessary condition of "*having a non-negative liking for customization-components*," and the desired conditions of "*having a positive liking for customization-components*," "*having a non-positive liking for achievement-component*," "*having a negative liking for achievement-*

Figure 11 – Ontological structure to represent “*Player role*” (At the top). At the bottom, the ontological structure to represent the player role “*Dreamer role*.”



Source: Elaborated by the author.

component,” “having a non-positive liking for social-component,” and “having a negative liking for social-component.” The desired conditions for the behavioral characteristics of participants to act as a player role are: “*having preference for interacting on the system*,” and “*having need of autonomy*.” The expected behaviors to obtain benefits for playing the creator role are: “*Creating*,” “*Tweaking*,” “*Building*,” “*Customizing*,” “*Transforming*,” “*Adapting*,” “*Inventing*” or “*Crafting*.” As consequence to behave as creator, the participants attain the *Satisfaction of autonomy*, and the *Internalization to intrinsic motivation (I-mot goal)*.

In the ontology OntoGaCLeS, based on the information extracted from five different player type models, twenty-six players roles have been formalized and represented using the ontological structure proposed in this section. These player roles, their conditions, expected behaviors and benefits for the person who plays the role are detailed in section A.3.

3.2.3 Individual Motivational Strategy ($Y \leq I\text{-mot goal}$)

In the context of CL scenarios, an *individual motivational strategy* is the guidelines to motivate a participant to interact with other group members using a learning strategy. These guidelines are independent of any technology, so that the individual motivational strategy basically indicates what motivate a participant to act and behave in certain way. For example, consider the following guidelines extracted from the Model-driven Persuasive Game in which:

“... cooperation is only a significant motivator of behaviour change for achievers and socializers... This is in line with the gaming style of socializers, who enjoy helping others. Achievers would also prefer to cooperate because they are inherently more altruistic ... achievers do often co-operate with one another, usually to perform some difficult collective goal, and from these shared experiences can grow deep, enduring friendships which may surpass in intensity those commonly found among individuals other groups.” Orji (2014).

When these two guidelines are applied in a CL scenario by providing a situation in which the participants must cooperate to achieve a group goal (e.g. obtain a especial reward based on the collective performance of group members), these guidelines become an individual motivational strategy that could be applied to motivate participant who fall in the category of socializer or achiever because they are motivated by the desired to accomplish the group goal and the desired to help others, respectively.


The ontological structure showed in Figure 12 represent the formalization of individual motivational strategies whose guidelines are extracted from gamification models or game design models. According to this structure, an *individual motivational strategy* ($Y \leq I\text{-mot goal}$) is composed by:

I-player role to indicate the player role for the participant in focus (I) who becomes a *player role holder* when he/she is motivated by the motivational strategy. This player role also indicates the *behavioral roles* whereby the participant in focus (I) is motivated to interact with other participant (You) employing the learning strategy ($Y \leq I\text{-goal}$).

You-player role to indicate the player role for the participant (You) who interacts with the participant in focus (I). The *behavioral roles* whereby the *player role holder* of this role supports the interaction of participant in focus (I) are also indicated in this structure.

I-mot goal (I) to indicate the individual motivational goals ($I\text{-mot goal (I)}$) whereby the participant in focus (I) is motivated to interact with other participant (You) employing a learning strategy ($Y \leq I\text{-goal}$). In this sense, these individual motivational goals represent the reasons why the guidelines in the motivational strategy are applied in the CL scenario to enhance the learning strategy ($Y \leq I\text{-goal}$) employed by the participant in focus (I) to interact with other participant (You).

Figure 12 – Ontological structure to represent “*Individual motivational strategy*” (at the left). At the right, the motivational strategies “*Gamifying for Consumer and Dodecad Achiever*” (right-top) and “*Gamifying by COOP*” (right-bottom).



Source: Elaborated by the author.

To exemplify the formalization of the individual motivational strategies using the ontological structure proposed in this section, Figure 12 also shows two examples in which the attribute “*based on*” indicates the gamification models in which these motivational strategies are based. The individual motivational strategy showed at the top-right of Figure 12 is known as “*Gamifying for Consumer and Dodecad Achiever*,” and it has been formalized based on guidelines of the Dodecad model (MARCZEWSKI, 2015a) and 5 Groups of fun framework (MARCZEWSKI, 2015b). According to these guidelines, the consumers and achievers are motivated by the need to obtain a reward that demonstrates for other participants their accomplishments. Hence, the *Accomplisher* and *Social-comparer* are *behavioral roles* whereby a participant in focus (*I*) playing the *Consumer role* is motivated to interact with the participant (*You*) who plays the *Achieve role*.

Playing this role, the *Satisfaction of mastery* and the *Internalization from extrinsic to intrinsic motivation* are individual motivational goals whereby the participant in focus (*I*) as consumer is motivated to interact with other participant (*You*) who acts as achiever. Behaving as accomplisher and social-comparer, the participant in focus (*I*) has two individual motivational goals that are: to demonstrate his/her mastery represented as “*Satisfaction of mastery*;” and to internalize his/her current extrinsic motivation stage into intrinsic motivation stage represented as “*Internalization from extrinsic to intrinsic motivation*.”

At the bottom-right of Figure 12, it is shown the ontological structure formalized to represent the application of the guidelines extracted from the Model-driven persuasive game for the cooperation strategy (ORJI; VASSILEVA; MANDRYK, 2014). These guidelines indicate cooperation as significant motivator for a participant who plays the socializer or achiever role because a participant who plays these roles enjoys to help others and cooperate with others to accomplish a difficult collective goal. Based on this, the motivational strategy of “*Gamifying by COOP*” defines the *BrainHex Socializer role* and *Brainhex Achiever role* as player roles that would be played by the participant in focus (*I*) and the participant (*You*) who gives support to the participant in focus. Playing these roles, the participants (*I* and *You*) act as *Helper* and *Accomplisher*. When the participant in focus (*I*) has the desire to accomplish the difficult collective goal, his/her individual motivational goal is the *Satisfaction of competence*, and when the participant in focus (*I*) has the desire to help others, his individual motivational goal is the *Satisfaction of relatedness*. The ontological structure also indicates the consequence of the application of the motivational strategy, it is expected changes in the motivational state for the participant in focus (*I*) from the amotivation or extrinsic motivated state to the intrinsic motivated state (*Internalization to intrinsic motivation*).


The individual motivational strategies based on gamification models currently defined in the ontology OntoGaCLeS, their player roles, their behavioral roles, and their individual motivational goals are detailed in section A.4.

3.2.4 Individual Gameplay Strategy (*I-gameplay strategy*)

The guidelines extracted from the literature of gamification, game design and serious games are implemented through the design of way in which the users will experience their interactions with the game-like system (FABRICATORE; LÓPEZ, 2014; NACKE; DRACHEN; G"OBEL, 2010; SCHELL, 2008). Such design in gamification is frequently called as gameful design (DETERDING *et al.*, 2011; DICHEV *et al.*, 2014), and it has been formalized under the concept of *individual gameplay strategy* (*I-gameplay strategy*). Thus, the gameplay of a gamified CL scenario is the way in which the interactions between the participants and the game elements could occur. When a participant interacts with the game elements, the rules defined in the gamified CL scenario process his/her inputs causing changes in the game elements, and these modifications are communicated to the participant. These rules and changes are related to the

individual motivational goals that must be achieved by the participants, so that each participant has his/her own strategy to interact with the gamified CL scenario to achieve these goals. This strategy of interaction is the individual gameplay strategy, and it has been formalized by the ontological structure shown in Figure 13.

Figure 13 – Ontological structure to represent “*Individual gameplay strategy*” (at the top). At the bottom, the “*Coop. CMPT gameplay strategy*” (bottom-left), and the “*Achievement fun gameplay strategy*” (bottom-right)



Source: Elaborated by the author.

The individual gameplay strategy depends of the player roles assigned for the participants of CL scenario, the motivational strategies employed to gamify the CL scenario, and the game elements introduced in the CL scenario. Thus, the ontological structure to represent an individual gameplay strategy is defined as a rational arrangement of these elements, where:

Primary focus (P) indicates the *Player role holders* who are in the primary focus (P) of individual gameplay strategy. These player role holders are the participants who use the individual gameplay strategy (*I-gameplay strategy*) to interact with the game elements indicated in the attribute “*What to use*.”

Secondary focus (S) indicates the *Player role holders* who are in the secondary focus (S) of individual gameplay strategy. These player role holders are the participants who provide support for the player role holders in the primary focus (P) through the game elements

indicated in the attribute “*What to use*.” It means that the individual gameplay strategy (*I-gameplay strategy*) is unnecessary for the participants in secondary focus (S) to interact with the game elements, but their interactions in the gamified CL scenario produce changes in the state of game elements indicated in the attribute “*What to use*.”

S<=I-mot goal indicates the motivational strategies employed in the gamified CL scenario to motivate the player role holders who are in the primary focus (P).

P<=S-mot goal indicates the motivational strategies employed in the gamified CL scenario to motivate and engage the player role holders who are in the secondary focus (S).


What to use indicates the game elements needed to act according to the individual gameplay strategy. Thus, the game elements defined in this attribute are the ones that are used to process the interactions of participants who are in the primary focus (P).

Currently, in the literature of gamification and game design, there is no one set of gameplay strategies established that could be directly formalized as individual gameplay strategies employing the ontological structure (*I-gameplay strategy*) proposed here. Therefore, the thesis author has inferred some individual gameplay strategies employing the guidelines of gamification and game design models. Figure 13 shows two examples of this formalization in which the guidelines from the Yee’s model (YEE, 2006) have been used to develop the cooperative competition gameplay strategy (*Coop. CMPT gameplay strategy*) shown at the bottom-left of figure. According to this structure, a cooperative competition gameplay strategy is beneficial for participants who are holders of Yee’s Socializer role, Primary focus (P), when the motivational strategy “*Gamifying for Yee Socializer*” is applied in a CL scenario to motivate these group of participants to interact with other participants who are also holders of Yee’s Socializer role, Secondary focus (S). In the attribute “*What to use*,” this structure also indicates that game challenges for groups/teams, game level/progression systems for groups/teams, game point system for groups/teams, game leaderboard system with groups/teams rankings, game achievement system for groups/teams, and game badge systems are necessary to implement the cooperative competition gameplay strategy. t

3.2.5 **Gamified CL Scenario**

A gamified CL scenario is a CL scenario in which the concepts earlier presented in this section have been properly applied to gamify it. In this sense, to represent a gamified CL scenario in the ontology OntoGaCLeS, the ontological structures proposed in the CL ontology to represent a CL scenario (Figure 4) has been extended by adding the representation of motivational strategies (*Y<=I-mot goal*) and gameplay strategies (*I-gameplay strategy*) at the same level that the learning strategies (*Y<=I-goal*). The proper connection of these elements represents a “*Gamified CL Scenario*” by the ontological structures shown in Figure 14.

Figure 14 – Ontological structures to represent a “Gamified CL Scenario”



Source: Elaborated by the author.

As was explained in previous subsections, the individual motivational strategy ($Y \leq I\text{-mot goal}$) indicates the guidelines used to enhance the learning strategy employed by the participant in focus (I), and the individual gameplay strategy ($I\text{-gameplay strategy}$) indicates the strategy used to implement the guidelines of individual motivational strategies. Based on these definitions, in the ontological structures to represent a gamified CL scenario (Figure 14), the connection of these elements has been represented by the two relational-concepts: “*enhanced_by*” and “*implemented_by*.” The relational-concept “*enhanced_by*” indicates what individual motivational strategy ($Y \leq I\text{-mot goal}$) is used to enhance a learning strategy ($Y \leq I\text{-goal}$), and the relational-concept “*implemented_by*” indicates what individual gameplay strategy ($I\text{-gameplay strategy}$) is used to implement the guidelines of an individual motivational strategy ($Y \leq I\text{-mot goal}$).


To illustrate the use of the ontological structures proposed in Figure 14, a gamified CL scenario for participant who plays the Dodecad Socializers has been formalized as shown in Figure 15, where the learning strategies ($Y \leq I\text{-goal}$) of participants are *enhanced* by the individual motivational strategy “*Gamifying for Dodecad Socializer*.” According to this motivational strategy:

“... Socializers are motivated by relatedness. They want to interact with others and create social connections ... Socializers are the ones who want to interact with others. They like to be connected to others. They are interested in parts of the system that help them do this. These are the ones will evangelize your internal social networks. Most motivated by the social connections aspects of relatedness ... Socializer and Networkers will wish to interact with people. Neither will be after anything from people directly. In the case of a networker, their reward comes from being connected; whereas the socialiser’s reward is knowing you and interacting with you ...” Marczewski (2015c).

Based on these guidelines, the individual motivational strategy “*Gamifying for Dodecad*

Socializer” indicates that a participant who plays the Dodecad Socializer role (*I-player role*) interacts with other socializer (*You-player role*) acting as *Helper* to achieve the *Satisfaction of relatedness (I-mot goal)*. Thus, the motivational strategy is *implemented by* a *Social fun gameplay strategy (I-gameplay strategy)* in which, to support the communication and cooperation of participants, the game social-status and game social-connections were inferred as necessary game elements to support the social fun gameplay strategy. This inference pertains to the thesis author, and it consists in that participants who play the socializer role are interesting into help others by looking for social connections and status to satisfy his/her need of relatedness.

Figure 15 – Ontological structures to represent a “*Gamified CL Scenario for Dodecad Socializers*”



Source: Elaborated by the author.

3.3 Formalizing an Ontological Model to Personalize the Gamification in Collaborative Learning Scenarios

Through the ontological structures presented in the previous section, the thesis author expects to facilitate the systematic formalization of gamified CL scenarios based on concepts extracted from player types models and need-based theories of motivation. With this formalization, it is possible to build ontological models to personalize the gamification in CL scenario. These models consist in a set of gamified CL scenarios formally represented as the ontological structures proposed in Figure 14. The building of these structures to define an ontological model comprises the following steps: (1) to identify the player roles that can be assigned for the participants of CL scenario when they are playing a CL role, (2) to identify the restriction and elements of motivational strategies for each pair of identified player roles, and (3) to define individual gameplay strategies for the identified pairs of player roles.

In this section, following these steps, the building of an ontological model to personalize the gamification in CL scenario is detailed in this section. This model has been built to gamify CL scenarios based on the Peer-tutoring theory (ENDLSEY, 1980) in which the Dodecad player type model(MARCZEWSKI, 2017; MARCZEWSKI, 2015b) has been used as source of information.

Step (1): Identifying Player Roles for CL Scenarios

The identification of player roles to gamify a CL scenario is carried out by analyzing the expected behaviors to be externalized for these roles and the CL roles. Possible counterproductive behaviors indicate why player roles cannot be assigned to a participant when he/she plays the CL role. Chart 2 shows the result of this step (1) for the CL roles of “*Peer-Tutor*” and “*Peer-Tutee*” defined in CL Scenarios based on the Peer-tutoring theory. Counterproductive behaviors of player roles are avoided to not interfere with the expected behaviors of CL roles. Thus, for example, participants who are playing the CL roles of Peer-tutor and Peer-tutee cannot play the *Griefer roles* because they want to negatively affect other users.

Chart 2 – Dodecad player roles that can be assigned for participants of a Peer-tutoring scenario

| | Peer-Tutor (explaining) | Peer-Tutee (passive learning) |
|---|--|--|
| Achiever (accomplishing, comparing) | Yes | Yes |
| Free-Spirit (creating, exploring) | No (don't want to be restricted) | No (don't want to be restricted) |
| Socializer (helping) | Yes | Yes |
| Philanthropist (giving, helping, sharing) | Yes | Yes |
| Consumer (accomplishing, comparing) | Yes | Yes |
| Exploiter (creating, exploring) | No (don't want to be restricted) | No (don't want to be restricted) |
| Networker (helping) | Yes | Yes |
| Self-Seeker (giving, helping, sharing) | Yes | Yes |
| Destroyer (hacking) | No (hacking to ruin experience of others) | No (hacking to ruin experience of others) |
| Improver (hacking, exploring, fixing) | No (hacking to change the system) | No (hacking to change the system) |
| Influencer (commenting) | No (requiring changes in the system) | No (requiring changes in the system) |
| Griefer (troublemaking, defying) | No (negatively affect to others) | No (negatively affect to others) |

Source: Elaborated by the author.

Step (2): Identifying Restrictions and Elements of Motivational Strategies

To identify the restrictions and elements of individual motivational strategies ($Y \leq I$ -*mot goal*), guidelines for the pairs of player roles identified in the step (1) are crossed. These guidelines are extracted from the player type models for the building of ontological models to personalize the gamification in CL scenarios. When these guidelines related to a pair of

player roles are crossed, counterproductive behaviors are avoided to not interfere with the expected benefits that can be achieved by the participants playing these roles and performing these behaviors. The expected benefits are expressed as individual motivational goals (*I-mot goals*) based on interpretation of these benefits using need-based theories of motivation.

Chart 3 shows the result obtained in this step for the definition of individual motivational strategies in the ontological model to personalize the gamification in Peer-tutoring CL scenarios. The rows indicate the player roles (*I-Player role*) for the participant in focus (*I*), and the columns indicate the player roles (*You-Player role*) for the participant (*You*) who interacts with the participant in focus (*I*). The individual gameplay strategies and their elements are indicated in the crossed cells. These strategies were defined from common guidelines for each pair of player roles. Thus, an individual gameplay strategy has been formalized in the ontological model when there are commonly expected behaviors indicated in the guidelines of player roles “*I-Player role*” and “*You-Player role*.”

Chart 3 – Individual motivational strategies identified for the building of an ontological model to personalize the gamification in Peer-tutoring scenarios

| | Achiever (accomplishing, comparing) | Socializer (helping) | Philanthropist (giving, helping, sharing) | Consumer (accomplishing, comparing) | Networker (helping) | Self-seeker (giving, helping, sharing) |
|---|---|---|---|--|--|---|
| Achiever (accomplishing, comparing) | <i>Gamifying for Dodecad Achievers</i> • Satisfaction of mastery | | | <i>Gamifying for Dodecad Achievers and Consumer</i> • Satisfaction of mastery • Internalization from extrinsic to intrinsic motivation | | |
| Socializer (helping) | | <i>Gamifying for Dodecad Socializers</i> • Satisfaction of relatedness | | | <i>Gamifying for Dodecad Socializer and Networker</i> • Satisfaction of relatedness • Internalization from extrinsic to intrinsic motivation | |
| Philanthropist (giving, helping, sharing) | | | <i>Gamifying for Philanthropists</i> • Satisfaction of purpose | | <i>Gamifying for Philanthropist and Self-seeker</i> • Satisfaction of purpose • Internalization from extrinsic to intrinsic motivation | |
| Consumer (accomplishing, comparing) | | | | <i>Gamifying for Consumers</i> • Satisfaction of mastery | | |
| Networker (helping) | | | | | <i>Gamifying for Networkers</i> • Satisfaction of relatedness | |
| Self-seeker (giving, helping, sharing) | | | | | | <i>Gamifying for Philanthropists</i> • Satisfaction of purpose |

Source: Elaborated by the author.

To illustrate the identification of restrictions and elements in the individual motivational strategy ($Y \leq I\text{-mot goal}$), let us see the “*Gamifying for Dodecad Achiever and Conqueror*” indicated in Chart 3, this strategy was identified from the guidelines of Dodecad model in which the behaviors of *accomplishing* and *comparing* are indicated as adequate to motivate achievers and consumers. In this case, the expected benefits to accomplish a goal, and then, compare it against the accomplishments of others is enjoyable for achievers. This benefit is represented as the individual motivational goal “*Satisfaction of mastery*” ($I\text{-mot goal}$) based on the Dan Pink motivation theory (PINK, 2011). According to this theory, mastery is an inherit human need that love to get better at stuff enjoying satisfaction from personal achievement and progress.

Step (3): Defining Individual Gameplay Strategies

Individual gameplay strategies ($I\text{-gameplay strategy}$) are inferred from the individual motivational strategies ($Y \leq I\text{-mot goal}$) identified in the step (2). Game elements support the behaviors indicated in the guidelines of individual motivational strategies to accomplish the expected benefits indicated as individual motivational goals. Chart 4 shows the results of this step for the ontological model to personalize the gamification in Peer-tutoring scenarios.

Chart 4 – Individual gameplay strategies to gamify Peer-tutoring scenarios

| Achievement fun | Social fun | Facilitated-personal fun |
|--|---|--|
| <p>Primary focus (P):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gamifying for Dodecad Achiever • Gamifying for Consumer <p>Secondary focus (S):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gamifying for Consumer • Gamifying for Dodecad Achiever | <p>Primary focus (P):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gamifying for Dodecad Socializer • Gamifying for Networker <p>Secondary focus (S):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gamifying for Networker • Gamifying for Dodecad Socializer | <p>Primary focus (P):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gamifying for Philanthropists • Gamifying for Self-seekers <p>Secondary focus (S):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gamifying for Self-seekers • Gamifying for Philanthropists |
| <p>What to use:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Challenges • Certificates • Levels/progression system • Point system (levels/progression) • Physical-reward system (certificates) • Leaderboard system (levels/progression) • Badge system (level/progression) • Virtual-economy system • Lottery system | <p>What to use:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social-status • Point system (social status) • Physical-reward system (social status) • Leaderboard system (social status) • Badge system (social status) • Virtual-economy system • Lottery system | <p>What to use:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meaning/purpose • Access system • Collect/trade system • Gifting/sharing system • Point system (meaning/purpose) • Physical-reward system (meaning/purpose) • Leaderboard system (meaning/purpose) • Badge system (meaning/purpose) • Virtual economy system • Lottery system |

Source: Elaborated by the author.

The individual gameplay strategies indicated in the Chart 4 are:

- *Achievement fun gameplay strategy*: is an individual motivational strategy in which the system recognizes achievements through game challenges, certificates and level/progression. To satisfy the mastery need, the system must try to produce in the participants the feel that they are achieving something by performing the interactions indicated by the Peer-tutoring scripts. Thus, the system would use a point system to indicate the levels/progression in the CSCL script, and when the CL scenario is completed as a game challenge, a certificate would be given by a physical-reward system. The leaderboard system would indicate the level/progression of the script. Badges would be obtained by the participants at the end of CL scenario according to the level/progression in the script. Finally, virtual-economy and lottery systems would establish the relation between the levels/progression of the script and the points, ranking in the leaderboard and badges.
- *Social fun gameplay strategy*: is an individual motivational strategy in which social status is used to support the feeling of relatedness. In this sense, the system should provide some form of social network/group to indicate and/or create group/collective game elements. Thus, the system would use a point system with a social status system to indicate points gathered by the participant as group. When the CL scenario is completed, the system would give a physical reward for the groups. A leaderboard would provide rankings by groups to indicate the social status of groups. Badges for groups with a social status would be given by the system to groups when the CL scenario is completed. Finally, virtual-economy and lottery systems would establish the relation between the social status of groups in CL scenarios, and the points, physical-rewards, leaderboards, and badges.
- *Facilitated-personal fun gameplay strategy*: is an individual motivational strategy in which the excitement from changing the system satisfies the need of purpose. This satisfaction comes from collection of trading valuable things. So when participants help to others, game elements are collected to be converted into something that has an important value. Thus, meaning/purpose should be given to game elements such as points, physical-rewards, leaderboards, and badges, so that the system provides a collect/trade system to change these element for gifting and/or sharable elements (such as elements to customize the avatars, elements to change part of the system).

Employing the information of Chart 4, twelve ontological structures to represent gamified Peer-tutoring scenarios have been formalized in the ontology OntoGaCLEs to define the model to personalize the gamification in Peer-tutoring scenarios based on the Dodecad model (MARCZEWSKI, 2015b). These structures in the ontological model are: *Gamified Peer Tutoring Scenario for Achievers*, *Gamified Peer Tutoring Scenario for Achiever/Consumer*, *Gamified Peer Tutoring Scenario for Consumer/Achiever*, *Gamified Peer Tutoring Scenario for Consumers*, *Gamified Peer Tutoring Scenario for Socializers*, *Gamified Peer Tutoring Scenario for Socializer/Networker*, *Gamified Peer Tutoring Scenario for Networker/Socializer*, *Gamified*

Peer Tutoring Scenario for Networkers, Gamified Peer Tutoring Scenario for Philanthropists, Gamified Peer Tutoring Scenario for Philanthropist/Self-seeker, Gamified Peer Tutoring Scenario for Self-seeker/Philanthropist, and Gamified Peer Tutoring Scenario for Self-seekers.

Figure 16 – Ontological structure to represent “Gamified Peer Tutoring Scenario for Achiever/Consumer”



Source: Elaborated by the author.


Figure 16 shows as example the formalization of *Gamified Peer Tutoring Scenario for Achiever/Consumer* in which the motivational strategy to enhance the learning strategy “*Learning by Teaching*” is “*Gamifying for Dodecad Achiever*,” and the motivational strategy to enhance the learning strategy “*Learning by being Taught*” is “*Gamifying for Consumer*.” These both motivational strategies are implemented by the gameplay strategy “*Achievement fun gameplay strategy*,” where the participants in the primary focus (P) are holders of *Achiever/Peer Tutor* roles, and the participants in the secondary focus (S) are holders of *Consumer/Peer Tutee* roles. As can be appreciated in the motivational strategy “*Gamifying for Dodecad Achiever and Consumer*,” the potential player for the *Dodecad Achiever role* has been defined as a *Peer Tutor*, and in the motivational strategy “*Gamifying for Consumer and Dodecad Achiever*,” the *Peer Tutee* has been defined as the potential player for the *Consumer role*.

3.4 Concluding Remarks

In this chapter, concepts extracted from player type models and need-based theories of motivation have been formalized in the ontology OntoGaCLeS to solve the context-dependency related to the individual characteristics of participants when a CL scenario is been gamified to deal with motivation problems in a scripted collaborative learning. The formalization of these concepts consists in ontological structures to represent individual motivational goals, player roles, motivational strategies, individual gameplay strategies, and gamified CL scenarios.

Through ontological structures proposed in this chapter, it is possible the systematic building of ontology-based models to personalize gamification in CL scenarios based on player types models. This usefulness is demonstrated through an example in which information from the Dodecad player type model is employed to develop an ontological model to personalize the gamification in Peer-tutoring scenarios. Employing the same formalization, it is possible to obtain ontological models to personalize the gamification in CL scenarios based on other player type models, such as the Yee’s model (YEE, 2006), Borges’ player type model (BORGES *et al.*, 2016), and BrainHex player type (NACKE; BATEMAN; MANDRYK, 2014).

With the ontological structures proposed in this chapter, computational mechanisms and procedures could be built to set player roles and game element for each participant in CL sessions. These mechanisms will use the ontological structures formalized here as a knowledge-base that provides theoretical justification in an algorithm that help the users to gamify CL scenarios. ?? shows a computational mechanism developed by the thesis author as proof of concept to set player roles for students in the Moodle platform.



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*), 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 without the support given by the ontology OntoGaCLEs (*w/o-gamified*).

The chapter starts by presenting the formulation of the empirical studies in section 4.1 in which the scoping, hypothesis, subjects, instruments and data collection procedure of the empirical studies are detailed. Then, section 4.2 (Pilot Empirical Study: Data Analysis Results), section 4.3 (First Empirical Study: Data Analysis Results), section 4.4 (Second Empirical Study: Data Analysis Results), and section 4.5 (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 4.6.

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 (??).

4.1 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.


4.1.1 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 17 and Figure 18.

Figure 17 – Graphical representation of pilot and first empirical studies



Source: Elaborated by the author.

Figure 18 – Graphical representation of second and third empirical studies



Source: Elaborated by the author.

The graphical representation for the empirical studies shown above (in Figure 17 and Figure 18) is an adaptation of the Evaluand-oriented Responsive Evaluation Model (CSCL-EREM) diagram proposed by Jorfián-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*” (Chapter 2), 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.

4.1.2 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.*”

4.1.3 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 without using the support given by the ontology OntoGaCLEs).

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 |

4.1.4 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 17 and Figure 18 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.

4.1.5 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 (2008b); 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 (2008b). 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.

4.1.6 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 palindromos</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 Figure 6 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.

4.1.7 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.


4.1.7.1 Execution: Pilot Empirical Study

The pilot empirical study was executed over three weeks with the schedule, timing, and data collection procedure showed in Figure 19.

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



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, 2008b). 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.

4.1.7.2 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 20.

Figure 20 – 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, 2008b). 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.

4.1.7.3 Execution: Second Empirical Study

The second empirical study was executed over four weeks with the schedule, timing, and data collection procedure shown in Figure 21.

Figure 21 – Diagram of the schedule, timing and data collection procedure in the second empirical study



Source: Elaborated by the author.

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.

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, 2008b). 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.

4.1.7.4 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 22.

Figure 22 – 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, 2008b). 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 had liking for social-components was 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*.

4.1.8 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 guarantee 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 ????, 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 C. Prior to perform this validation, the inconsistent responses (careless and exaggerated responses) were detected and treated as outliers as it is detailed in Appendix B.

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 (????). 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 D 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 D 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.

4.1.9 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 D) 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 form the pre-test and post-test phases using GPCMs. Appendix D 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.

4.2 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 | * |
| 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 | |

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

Table 3 – (continued)

| | Sum Sq | Df | F value | Pr(>F) | Sig |
|-------------------------------|--------|----|---------|--------|-----|
| 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 | lwr: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 | 0.048 | 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 | 0.069 | 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 | 0.366 | 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 | 0.774 | 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 | 0.674 | 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 | 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 | 0.833 | 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 | | |
| Effectives:non-gamified | 8 | 2.535 | 2.196 | 0.686 | 17 | 0.749 | 3.644 | | | | | | |
| Effectives:ont-gamified | 13 | 3.392 | 3.010 | 0.536 | 17 | 1.880 | 4.140 | | | | | | |
| Effectives:non-gamified - ont-gamified | 21 | -0.858 | -0.814 | 0.871 | | -2.639 | 0.924 | -0.935 | 0.363 | 0.324 | -0.346 | | |
| Effectives:non-gamified.Apprentice | 5 | 3.550 | 3.550 | 0.840 | 17 | 1.776 | 5.323 | | | | | | |
| Effectives:ont-gamified.Apprentice | 8 | 4.666 | 4.666 | 0.664 | 17 | 3.264 | 6.068 | | | | | | |
| Effectives: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 | | |
| Effectives:non-gamified.Master | 3 | 0.843 | 0.843 | 1.085 | 17 | -1.446 | 3.132 | | | | | | |
| Effectives:ont-gamified.Master | 5 | 1.355 | 1.355 | 0.840 | 17 | -0.419 | 3.128 | | | | | | |
| Effectives: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.

4.3 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 | lsmean | SE | df | lwr: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 | 56 | -0.777 | -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 | 56 | -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 | 56 | -1.078 | 0.097 | -2.212 | 0.031 | 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 | 52 | -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 | 52 | -0.906 | 1.143 | 0.307 | 0.760 | 0.760 | 0.990 | 0.106 | |
| 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 | 52 | -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 | 56 | -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 | 56 | -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 | 56 | -1.565 | 0.145 | -2.198 | 0.032 | 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 | 56 | -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 | 56 | 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 | 56 | -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 | 56 | -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 | 56 | -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 | 56 | -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 | 56 | -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 | lsmean | SE | df | lwr.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 | 0.532 | 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.

4.4 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 | lwr.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 | lsmean | SE | df | lwrCI | uprCI | 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 | 53 | -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 | 53 | -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 | 53 | -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 | 0.005 | 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:non-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

4.5 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

| | N | mean | Ismean | SE | df | lwr:CI | upr:CI | t.ratio | p.value | p-adj. | g | sig | mag |
|--|----|--------|--------|-------|----|--------|--------|---------|---------|--------|--------|-----|--------|
| Intrinsic Motivation:ont-gamified | 24 | 0.286 | 0.349 | 0.129 | 47 | 0.090 | 0.607 | | | | | | |
| Intrinsic Motivation:w/o-gamified | 27 | -0.146 | -0.126 | 0.129 | 47 | -0.384 | 0.133 | | | | | | |
| Intrinsic Motivation:ont-gamified - w/o-gamified | 51 | 0.431 | 0.474 | 0.182 | 47 | 0.087 | 0.775 | 2.610 | 0.012 | 0.015 | 0.682 | * | medium |
| Intrinsic Motivation:ont-gamified.Apprentice | 15 | 0.096 | 0.096 | 0.157 | 47 | -0.221 | 0.412 | | | | | | |
| Intrinsic Motivation:w/o-gamified.Apprentice | 19 | -0.175 | -0.175 | 0.140 | 47 | -0.456 | 0.106 | | | | | | |
| Intrinsic Motivation:ont-gamified.Apprentice - w/o-gamified.Apprentice | 34 | 0.271 | 0.271 | 0.211 | 47 | -0.291 | 0.832 | 1.284 | 0.205 | 0.577 | 0.431 | | |
| Intrinsic Motivation:ont-gamified.Master | 9 | 0.602 | 0.602 | 0.203 | 47 | 0.193 | 1.011 | | | | | | |
| Intrinsic Motivation:w/o-gamified.Master | 8 | -0.076 | -0.076 | 0.216 | 47 | -0.510 | 0.358 | | | | | | |
| Intrinsic Motivation:ont-gamified.Master - w/o-gamified.Master | 17 | 0.678 | 0.678 | 0.296 | 47 | -0.111 | 1.468 | 2.289 | 0.027 | 0.115 | 1.065 | | |
| Interest/Enjoyment:ont-gamified | 24 | 0.237 | 0.355 | 0.247 | 47 | -0.142 | 0.851 | | | | | | |
| Interest/Enjoyment:w/o-gamified | 27 | -0.071 | -0.082 | 0.247 | 47 | -0.579 | 0.414 | | | | | | |
| Interest/Enjoyment:ont-gamified - w/o-gamified | 51 | 0.308 | 0.437 | 0.349 | 47 | -0.353 | 0.969 | 1.252 | 0.217 | 0.353 | 0.255 | | |
| Interest/Enjoyment:ont-gamified.Apprentice | 15 | -0.117 | -0.117 | 0.302 | 47 | -0.725 | 0.491 | | | | | | |
| Interest/Enjoyment:w/o-gamified.Apprentice | 19 | -0.055 | -0.055 | 0.269 | 47 | -0.596 | 0.485 | | | | | | |
| Interest/Enjoyment:ont-gamified.Apprentice - w/o-gamified.Apprentice | 34 | -0.062 | -0.062 | 0.404 | 47 | -1.139 | 1.015 | -0.154 | 0.879 | 0.999 | -0.049 | | |
| Interest/Enjoyment:ont-gamified.Master | 9 | 0.827 | 0.827 | 0.390 | 47 | 0.042 | 1.612 | | | | | | |
| Interest/Enjoyment:w/o-gamified.Master | 8 | -0.109 | -0.109 | 0.414 | 47 | -0.942 | 0.724 | | | | | | |
| Interest/Enjoyment:ont-gamified.Master - w/o-gamified.Master | 17 | 0.936 | 0.936 | 0.569 | 47 | -0.579 | 2.451 | 1.645 | 0.107 | 0.364 | 0.862 | | |
| Perceived Choice:ont-gamified | 24 | 0.481 | 0.554 | 0.244 | 47 | 0.064 | 1.045 | | | | | | |
| Perceived Choice:w/o-gamified | 27 | -0.399 | -0.435 | 0.244 | 47 | -0.925 | 0.055 | | | | | | |
| Perceived Choice:ont-gamified - w/o-gamified | 51 | 0.880 | 0.989 | 0.345 | 47 | 0.227 | 1.532 | 2.870 | 0.006 | 0.009 | 0.752 | ** | medium |
| Perceived Choice:ont-gamified.Apprentice | 15 | 0.262 | 0.262 | 0.299 | 47 | -0.339 | 0.862 | | | | | | |
| Perceived Choice:w/o-gamified.Apprentice | 19 | -0.346 | -0.346 | 0.265 | 47 | -0.879 | 0.188 | | | | | | |
| Perceived Choice:ont-gamified.Apprentice - w/o-gamified.Apprentice | 34 | 0.607 | 0.607 | 0.399 | 47 | -0.456 | 1.671 | 1.521 | 0.135 | 0.434 | 0.482 | | |
| Perceived Choice:ont-gamified.Master | 9 | 0.847 | 0.847 | 0.385 | 47 | 0.071 | 1.622 | | | | | | |
| Perceived Choice:w/o-gamified.Master | 8 | -0.524 | -0.524 | 0.409 | 47 | -1.347 | 0.298 | | | | | | |
| Perceived Choice:ont-gamified.Master - w/o-gamified.Master | 17 | 1.371 | 1.371 | 0.562 | 47 | -0.125 | 2.868 | 2.440 | 0.019 | 0.083 | 1.324 | | |

Signif. codes: 0 ‘***’ 0.01 ‘**’ 0.05

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 | 0.943 | -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 | 0.987 | 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 | 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 | 0.007 | 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 | 0.081 | 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 | 0.410 | 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 | 0.507 | 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 | 0.990 | 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 | 0.911 | 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-adj. | 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 | Pressure/ Tension | Effort/ Importance | Level of Motivation | 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 (0.12) | 0.0545 (0.90) | -0.0091 (0.98) | 0.5964 (0.15) | -0.2883 (0.53) | 0.0901 (0.84) | 0.2342 (0.61) | -0.4220 (0.34) | -0.3784 (0.40) |
| 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 (0.82) | -0.2286 (0.33) | -0.0169 (0.94) | 0.0253 (0.91) | 0.2093 (0.37) | -0.0309 (0.89) | -0.0911 (0.70) | 0.0057 (0.98) | 0.1789 (0.45) |
| EffectivePs:w/o-gamified.Master | -0.4638 (0.35) | 0.0000 (1.00) | 0.2794 (0.59) | 0.4459 (0.37) | -0.7537 (0.08) | 0.0580 (0.91) | -0.6765 (0.91) | -0.0580 (0.14) | -0.0580 (0.91) |
| EffectivePs:ont-gamified.Master | 0.8286 (0.05) | -0.0857 (0.91) | 0.8857 (0.03) | -0.8697 (0.02) | 0.5798 (0.22) | -0.0857 (0.91) | -0.6377 (0.17) | 0.7714 (0.10) | 0.1160 (0.82) |
| 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.

4.6 Interpretation and Implications of Obtained Results

Previous sections emphasize, in an independent way, the results obtained in each one of the empirical studies conducted in this dissertation. However, nothing in reference to the global contribution, the ontological engineering approach to gamify CL scenarios as an effective and efficient solution to deal with motivational problems in scripted collaborative learning, has been carried out. In this section, a cross-analysis is undertaken to revise the relationships across the results obtained in the empirical studies, and to demonstrate the effectiveness and efficiency. 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 23 shows the graphical representation of the cross-analysis carried out with the significant differences and correlations found in the empirical studies for the participants' motivation and learning outcomes. Taking into account that 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 on this 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 ont-gamified CL sessions as the final product obtained by this approach significantly have better participants' perceived choice and intrinsic motivation than non-gamified CL sessions.

As was indicated by Challco *et al.* (2014), Isotani (2009), in CL activities where the CSCL scripts are used as a method to orchestrate and structure the collaboration among the participants, the motivational problems can occur when the participants have a sense of obligation to complete an unwilling activity by the lack of choice over the sequence of interaction. In this sense, increasing the participants' perceived choice in CL sessions instantiated from CSCL scripts avoids the motivational problems, and the ont-gamified CL sessions obtained through the ontological engineering approach to gamify CL sessions have been demonstrated to be an efficient method to accomplish this task. The pilot and first empirical studies demonstrated this effectiveness 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, this change should occur to avoid the motivational problems because, when the participants act following the interaction defined by scripts in a non-freely choice, they will be led to a demotivation stage, which makes more difficult to participate in CL sessions instantiated from CSCL scripts 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

intend to avoid the motivational problems 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 were greater than in non-gamified CL sessions with large and medium effect sizes.

Figure 23 – Cross-analysis of significant differences and correlations found in empirical studies for the participants' motivation and learning outcomes



Source: Elaborated by the author.

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 in ont-gamified CL sessions have better perceived choice, intrinsic motivation and effort/importance 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 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 because the internalization of motivation requires that the participant to be intrinsic motivated.

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 CL sessions instantiated from CSCL scripts because the participants' gains in skill/knowledge as measurement of learning outcomes were not significantly different 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 (BÉNABOU; TIROLE, 2003; FREY; JEGEN, 1999), it is likely that game elements would undermine the participants motivation' towards their participation in CL sessions instantiated from CSCL scripts, which in turn can cause unintended negative learning outcomes. In this direction, the pilot and second empirical studies demonstrated that there were 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 were significantly greater than the effort/importance of participants in non-gamified CL session. This fact can be assumed as an 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 sessions has a 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 are 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 the method to gamify CL scenarios without the support given by the ontology OntoGaCLEs. In ont-gamified CL session, by increasing the perceived choice of master students, their gains in skill/knowledge will be likely increased due to 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 due to the fact that the participants' perceived choice were 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 4 to 5 members in ont-gamified CL sessions instantiated from a CSCL script based on the Cognitive Apprenticeship theory have better percentages of participations 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) were 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.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- 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 192.
- 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 192.
- Alario-Hoyos, C.; Bote-Lorenzo, M. L.; Gómez-Sánchez, E.; Asensio-Pérez, J. I.; Vega-Gorgojo, G.; Ruiz-Calleja, A. GLUE!: An architecture for the integration of external tools in Virtual Learning Environments. **Computers & Education**, v. 60, n. 1, p. 122–137, Jan. 2013. ISSN 0360-1315. Citation on page 36.
- ALDERFER, C. **Existence, Relatedness, and Growth: Human Needs in Organizational Settings**. [S.l.]: Free Press, 1972. Citation on page 54.
- ALFONS, A. **robustHD: Robust Methods for High-Dimensional Data**. [S.l.: s.n.], 2016. R package version 0.5.1. Citation on page 170.
- ALHARBI, N. M.; ATHAUDA, R. I.; CHIONG, R. A survey of CSCL script tools that support designing collaborative scenarios. In: **2014 International Conference on Web and Open Access to Learning (ICWOAL)**. [S.l.: s.n.], 2014. p. 1–8. Citations on pages 18, 34, 36, and 37.
- ANDRADE, F.; MARQUES, L.; BITTENCOURT, I. I.; ISOTANI, S. QPJ-BR: Questionário para Identificação de Perfil 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 86.
- ANDRADE, F. R. H.; MIZOGUCHI, R.; ISOTANI, S. The Bright and Dark Sides of Gamification. In: MICARELLI, A.; STAMPER, J.; PANOURGIA, K. (Ed.). **Intelligent Tutoring Systems**. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2016. v. 9684, p. 176–186. ISBN 978-3-319-39582-1 978-3-319-39583-8. Citation on page 19.
- Andreas Harrer; Ulrich Hoppe. Visual Modeling of Collaborative Learning Processes. In: **Handbook of Visual Languages for Instructional Design: Theories and Practices: Theories and Practices**. [S.l.]: Information Science Reference, 2007, (Gale virtual reference library). p. 281–298. ISBN 978-1-59904-731-7. LCCB: 2007023444. Citation on page 36.
- ARONSON, E. **The Jigsaw Classroom**. [S.l.]: SAGE Publications, 1978. (A SageView edition). LCCB: 78000583. ISBN 978-0-8039-0997-7. Citation on page 35.
- ASIKRI, M. E.; LAASSIRI, J.; KRIT, S. d; CHAIB, H. Contribution to ontologies building using the semantic web and web mining. In: **2016 International Conference on Engineering MIS (ICEMIS)**. [S.l.: s.n.], 2016. p. 1–5. Citation on page 20.

BARROS, E. H. Collaborative learning in the translation classroom: Preliminary survey results. **The Journal of Specialised Translation**, v. 16, p. 42–60, 2011. Citation on page 38.

BARTLE, R. A. **Designing Virtual Worlds**. [S.l.]: New Riders, 2004. Citations on pages 56 and 57.

Ben Judd; Chris Avellone; Hideo Kojima; Keiji Inafune. **Game Design East vs. West**. 2016. <Http://www.criticalpathproject.com/playlist/game-design-east-vs-west/>. Citation on page 56.

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 131.

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 193, 194, 200, 206, 212, 219, 225, 231, 233, 234, 238, 240, 243, and 245.

BORGES, S. S.; DURELLI, V. H. S.; REIS, H. M.; ISOTANI, S. A Systematic Mapping on Gamification Applied to Education. In: **Proceedings of the 29th Annual ACM Symposium on Applied Computing**. [S.l.]: ACM, 2014. (SAC '14), p. 216–222. ISBN 978-1-4503-2469-4. Citation on page 19.

BORGES, S. S.; MIZOGUCHI, R.; DURELLI, V. H. S.; BITTENCOURT, I. I.; ISOTANI, S. A Link Between Worlds: Towards a Conceptual Framework for Bridging Player and Learner Roles in Gamified Collaborative Learning Contexts. In: KOCH, F.; KOSTER, A.; PRIMO, T.; GUTTMANN, C. (Ed.). **Second International Workshop on Social Computing in Digital Education**. Zagreb, Croatia: Springer, 2016. p. 19–34. ISBN 978-3-319-52039-1. Citation on page 72.

Bote-Lorenzo, M. L.; Vaquero-González, L. M.; Vega-Gorgojo, G.; DIMITRIADIS, Y. A.; Asensio-Pérez, J. I.; Gómez-Sánchez, E.; Hernández-Leo, D. A Tailorable Collaborative Learning System That Combines OGSA Grid Services and IMS-LD Scripting. In: VREEDE, G.-J. de; GUERRERO, L. A.; RAVENTÓS, G. M. (Ed.). **Groupware: Design, Implementation, and Use**. [S.l.]: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2004, (Lecture Notes in Computer Science, 3198). p. 305–321. ISBN 978-3-540-23016-8 978-3-540-30112-7. Citations on pages 34 and 36.

BREHM, J. W. **A Theory of Psychological Reactance**. Oxford, England: Academic Press, 1966. (A theory of psychological reactance). Citation on page 40.

BRIGGS, K. C. **Myers-Briggs Type Indicator**. [S.l.]: Consulting Psychologists Press Palo Alto, CA, 1976. Citation on page 57.

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 180 and 193.

CABALLÉ, S.; DARADOUMIS, T.; XHAFA, F.; JUAN, A. Providing effective feedback, monitoring and evaluation to on-line collaborative learning discussions. **Computers in Human Behavior**, v. 27, n. 4, p. 1372–1381, 2011. ISSN 0747-5632. Citation on page 17.

CABALLÉ, S.; MORA, N.; FEIDAKIS, M.; NÁN, D. G.; CONESA, J.; DARADOUMIS, T.; PRIETO, J. CC-LR: Providing interactive, challenging and attractive Collaborative Complex Learning Resources. **Journal of Computer Assisted Learning**, v. 30, n. 1, p. 51–67, Feb. 2014. ISSN 1365-2729. Citation on page 43.

- CABANAC, M. What is emotion? **Behavioural Processes**, v. 60, n. 2, p. 69–83, 2002. ISSN 0376-6357. Citation on page 42.
- CAEIRO, M.; ANIDO, L.; LLAMAS, M. A Critical Analysis of IMS Learning Design. In: WASSON, B.; LUDVIGSEN, S.; HOPPE, U. (Ed.). **Designing for Change in Networked Learning Environments: Proceedings of the International Conference on Computer Support for Collaborative Learning 2003**. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands, 2003. p. 363–367. ISBN 978-94-017-0195-2. Citation on page 34.
- CÁMARA, L. M. S.; VELASCO, M. P.; Velázquez-Iturbide, J. A. Evaluation of a Collaborative Instructional Framework for Programming Learning. In: **Proceedings of the 17th ACM Annual Conference on Innovation and Technology in Computer Science Education**. Haifa, Israel: ACM, 2012. (ITiCSE '12), p. 162–167. ISBN 978-1-4503-1246-2. Citation on page 38.
- CHAKRABORTY, J.; NORCIO, A. F.; VEER, J. J. V. D.; ANDRE, C. F.; MILLER, Z.; REGELS-BERGER, A. The Human–Computer Interaction of Cross-Cultural Gaming Strategy. **Journal of Educational Technology Systems**, v. 43, n. 4, p. 371–388, Jun. 2015. ISSN 0047-2395. Citation on page 56.
- CHALLCO, G. C.; BITTENCOURT, I. I.; ISOTANI, S. Computer-based systems for automating instructional design of collaborative learning scenarios: A systematic literature review. **IJKL**, v. 11, n. 4, p. 273–297, 2016. Citations on pages 36 and 37.
- CHALLCO, G. C.; GEROSA, M. A.; BITTENCOURT, I. I.; ISOTANI, S. Automated instructional design for CSCL: A hierarchical task network planning approach. **Expert Systems with Applications**, v. 41, n. 8, p. 3777–3798, 2014. ISSN 0957-4174. Citation on page 37.
- CHALLCO, G. C.; MOREIRA, D.; MIZOGUCHI, R.; ISOTANI, S. Towards an Ontology for Gamifying Collaborative Learning Scenarios. In: Trausan-Matu, S.; BOYER, K. E.; CROSBY, M.; PANOURGIA, K. (Ed.). **12th International Conference on Intelligent Tutoring Systems**. [S.I.]: Springer, 2014, (Lecture Notes in Computer Science, 8474). p. 404–409. ISBN 978-3-319-07221-0. Citations on pages 46 and 54.
- CHALLCO, G. C.; MOREIRA, D. A.; BITTENCOURT, I. I.; MIZOGUCHI, R.; ISOTANI, S. Personalization of Gamification in Collaborative Learning Contexts using Ontologies. **IEEE Latin America Transactions**, v. 13, n. 6, p. 1995–2002, 2015. ISSN 1548-0992. Citations on pages 46 and 54.
- CHALLCO, G. C.; MOREIRA, D. A.; MIZOGUCHI, R.; ISOTANI, S. An Ontology Engineering Approach to Gamify Collaborative Learning Scenarios. In: BALOIAN, N.; BURSTEIN, F.; OGATA, H.; SANTORO, F.; ZURITA, G. (Ed.). **20th International Conference on Collaboration and Technology**. [S.I.]: Springer, 2014, (Lecture Notes in Computer Science, 8658). p. 185–198. ISBN 978-3-319-10165-1 978-3-319-10166-8. Citations on pages 19, 46, 54, and 129.
- CHAN, T. S.; AHERN, T. C. Targeting motivation-adapting flow theory to instructional design. **Journal of Educational computing research**, v. 21, n. 2, p. 151–164, 1999. 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. **Academic Medicine: Journal of the Association of American Medical Colleges**, v. 84, n. 11, p. 1505–1509, Nov. 2009. ISSN 1938-808X. Citation on page 187.

COSTA, P. T.; MACCRAE, R. R. **Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO PI-R) and NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI): Professional Manual.** [S.l.]: Psychological Assessment Resources, Incorporated, 1992. Citation on page 57.

CROOK, C. Motivation and the ecology of collaborative learning. **Rethinking collaborative learning**, p. 161–178, 2000. Citation on page 18.

DAVIS, K.; SINGH, S. Digital badges in afterschool learning: Documenting the perspectives and experiences of students and educators. **Computers Education**, v. 88, p. 72 – 83, 2015. ISSN 0360-1315. Citation on page 19.

DECI, E. L.; RYAN, R. M. **Intrinsic Motivation and Self-Determination in Human Behavior.** New York: Plenum Press, 1985. ISBN 978-0-306-42022-1. Citations on pages 37, 38, and 55.

_____. **Self-Determination.** [S.l.]: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2010. (The Corsini Encyclopedia of Psychology). ISBN 978-0-470-47921-6. Citations on pages 38, 40, 53, 55, and 57.

DERMEVAL, D.; VILELA, J.; BITTENCOURT, I. I.; CASTRO, J.; ISOTANI, S.; BRITO, P.; SILVA, A. Applications of ontologies in requirements engineering: A systematic review of the literature. **Requirements Engineering**, v. 21, n. 4, p. 405–437, Nov. 2016. ISSN 1432-010X. Citation on page 21.

DETERDING, S.; BJÖRK, S. L.; NACKE, L. E.; DIXON, D.; LAWLEY, E. Designing Gamification: Creating Gameful and Playful Experiences. In: **CHI '13 Extended Abstracts on Human Factors in Computing Systems.** Paris, France: ACM, 2013. (CHI EA '13), p. 3263–3266. ISBN 978-1-4503-1952-2. Citation on page 19.

DETERDING, S.; DIXON, D.; KHALED, R.; NACKE, L. From game design elements to gamefulness: Defining gamification. In: **Proceedings of the 15th International Academic MindTrek Conference: Envisioning Future Media Environments.** [S.l.]: ACM, 2011. p. 9–15. Citations on pages 19 and 61.

DEVEDŽIĆ, V. **Semantic Web and Education.** [S.l.]: Springer, 2006. ISBN 978-0-387-35417-0. Citation on page 20.

DICHEV, C.; DICHEVA, D.; ANGELOVA, G.; AGRE, G. From gamification to gameful design and gameful experience in learning. **Cybernetics and Information Technologies**, v. 14, n. 4, p. 80–100, 2014. Citation on page 61.

DICHEVA, D.; DICHEV, C.; AGRE, G.; ANGELOVA, G. Gamification in Education: A Systematic Mapping Study. **Journal of Educational Technology Society**, v. 18, n. 3, p. 75–88, 2015. ISSN 11763647, 14364522. Citation on page 20.

DILLENBOURG, P. What do you mean by collaborative learning? In: DILLENBOURG, P. (Ed.). **Collaborative-Learning: Cognitive and Computational Approaches.** Oxford: Elsevier, 1999. p. 1–19. Citation on page 31.

_____. Over-scripting CSCL: The risks of blending collaborative learning with instructional design. In: KIRSCHNER, P. A. (Ed.). **Three Worlds of CSCL. Can We Support CSCL?** Nederland: Open Universiteit Nederland, 2002. p. 61–91. ISBN 978-90-358-2047-0. Citations on pages 32, 34, 35, and 39.

_____. Design for classroom orchestration. **Computers Education**, v. 69, p. 485 – 492, 2013. ISSN 0360-1315. Citations on pages 17 and 40.

- DILLENBOURG, P.; HONG, F. The mechanics of CSCL macro scripts. **International Journal of Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning**, v. 3, n. 1, p. 5–23, Mar. 2008. ISSN 1556-1615. Citation on page 37.
- DILLENBOURG, P.; JERMANN, P. Designing Integrative Scripts. In: FISCHER, F.; KOLLAR, I.; MANDL, H.; HAAKE, J. (Ed.). **Scripting Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning**. New York, NY, USA: Springer, 2007, (Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning, v. 6). p. 275–301. ISBN 978-0-387-36947-1. Citations on pages 32, 34, and 35.
- DIMITROV, D. M.; RUMRILL, P. D. Pretest-posttest designs and measurement of change. **Work (Reading, Mass.)**, v. 20, n. 2, p. 159–165, 2003. ISSN 1051-9815. Citation on page 195.
- D’MELLO, S.; OLNEY, A.; WILLIAMS, C.; HAYS, P. Gaze tutor: A gaze-reactive intelligent tutoring system. **International Journal of Human-Computer Studies**, v. 70, n. 5, p. 377–398, May 2012. ISSN 1071-5819. Citation on page 43.
- DÖRNYEI, Z.; USHIODA, E. **Teaching and Researching: Motivation**. [S.l.]: Routledge, 2014. (Applied Linguistics in Action). ISBN 978-1-138-83555-9. Citation on page 39.
- dos Santos, W. O.; BITTENCOURT, I. I.; ISOTANI, S.; DERMEVAL, D.; MARQUES, L. B. a.; SILVEIRA, I. F. Flow Theory to Promote Learning in Educational Systems: Is it Really Relevant? **Brazilian Journal of Computers in Education**, v. 26, n. 02, p. 29, 2018. ISSN 2317-6121. Citation on page 42.
- ENDLSEY, W. R. **Peer Tutorial Instruction**. Englewood Cliffs, N.J: Educational Technology Pubns, 1980. ISBN 978-0-87778-148-6. Citation on page 66.
- 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 169.
- FABRICATORE, C.; LÓPEZ, X. Using gameplay patterns to gamify learning experiences. In: **Proceedings of the 8th European Conference on Game Based Learning**. [S.l.: s.n.], 2014. p. 110–117. Citation on page 61.
- FALOUT, J.; ELWOOD, J.; HOOD, M. Demotivation: Affective states and learning outcomes. **System**, v. 37, n. 3, p. 403–417, 2009. ISSN 0346-251X. Citation on page 18.
- FEIDAKIS, M.; CABALLÉ, S.; DARADOUMIS, T.; JIMÉNEZ, D. G. n.; CONESA, J. Providing emotion awareness and affective feedback to virtualised collaborative learning scenarios. **International Journal of Continuing Engineering Education and Life Long Learning**, v. 24, n. 2, p. 141–167, 2014. Citation on page 18.
- FEIDAKIS, M.; DARADOUMIS, T.; CABALLE, S.; CONESA, J.; NÁN, D. G. A Dual-Modal System that Evaluates User’s Emotions in Virtual Learning Environments and Responds Affectively. **j-jucs**, v. 19, n. 11, p. 1638–1660, 2013. Citation on page 43.
- FEIDAKIS, M.; DARADOUMIS, T.; CABALLÉ, S.; CONESA, J. Embedding emotion awareness into e-learning environments. **International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning (iJET)**, v. 9, n. 7, p. 39–46, Apr. 2014. ISSN 1863-0383. Citations on pages 18 and 43.
- FISCHER, F. **Keynote Talk**. Lausanne, Switzerland: [s.n.], 2007. Citation on page 32.

FISCHER, F.; KOLLAR, I.; STEGMANN, K.; WECKER, C.; ZOTTMANN, J. Collaboration scripts in computer-supported collaborative learning. **The international handbook of collaborative learning**, p. 403–419, 2013. Citations on pages 18 and 36.

FREY, B. S.; JEGEN, R. **Motivation Crowding Theory: A Survey of Empirical Evidence**. [S.l.: s.n.], 1999. Citation on page 131.

GAGNÉ, M.; DECI, E. L. Self-determination theory and work motivation. **Journal of Organizational Behavior**, v. 26, n. 4, p. 331–362, Jun. 2005. ISSN 1099-1379. Citation on page 55.

GALTON, A.; MIZOGUCHI, R. The Water Falls but the Waterfall Does Not Fall: New Perspectives on Objects, Processes and Events. **Appl. Ontol.**, v. 4, n. 2, p. 71–107, Apr. 2009. ISSN 1570-5838. Citation on page 37.

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 96.

GLASS, R.; VESSEY, I.; RAMESH, V. Research in software engineering: An analysis of the literature. **Information and Software Technology**, v. 44, n. 8, p. 491–506, 2002. ISSN 0950-5849. Citation on page 24.

GLASS, R. L. A structure-based critique of contemporary computing research. **Journal of Systems and Software**, v. 28, n. 1, p. 3–7, Jan. 1995. ISSN 0164-1212. Citation on page 24.

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 195.

GOMEZ, E. A.; WU, D.; PASSERINI, K. Computer-supported team-based learning: The impact of motivation, enjoyment and team contributions on learning outcomes. **Computers & Education**, v. 55, n. 1, p. 378–390, 2010. ISSN 0360-1315. Citation on page 38.

Grau-Valldosera, J.; MINGUILLÓN, J. Rethinking dropout in online higher education: The case of the Universitat Oberta de Catalunya. **The International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning**, v. 15, n. 1, 2014. Citation on page 39.

GREENBERG, B. S.; SHERRY, J.; LACHLAN, K.; LUCAS, K.; HOLMSTROM, A. Orientations to Video Games Among Gender and Age Groups. **Simulation & Gaming**, v. 41, n. 2, p. 238–259, Apr. 2010. ISSN 1046-8781. Citation on page 56.

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 179.

GUARINO, N.; OBERLE, D.; STAAB, S. What Is an Ontology? In: STAAB, S.; STUDER, R. (Ed.). **Handbook on Ontologies**. [S.l.]: Springer, 2009, (International Handbooks on Information Systems). p. 1–17. ISBN 978-3-540-70999-2. Citation on page 20.

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 196.

- HÄMÄLÄINEN, R. **Designing and Investigating Pedagogical Scripts to Facilitate Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning.** [S.l.]: Finnish Institute for Educational Research. University of Jyväskylä, 2008. ISBN 978-951-39-3443-9. Citation on page 39.
- HAMARI, J.; KOIVISTO, J.; SARSA, H. Does Gamification Work?—A Literature Review of Empirical Studies on Gamification. In: **47th International Conference on System Sciences.** Hawaii, USA: IEEE Computer Society, 2014. (HICSS '14), p. 3025–3034. ISBN 978-1-4799-2504-9. Citations on pages 19 and 20.
- 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 194.
- HARDRÉ, P. L. Beyond Two Decades of Motivation: A Review of the Research and Practice in Instructional Design and Human Performance Technology. **Human Resource Development Review**, v. 2, n. 1, p. 54–81, 2003. Citation on page 41.
- Harmon-Jones, E.; GABLE, P. A.; PRICE, T. F. Does Negative Affect Always Narrow and Positive Affect Always Broaden the Mind? Considering the Influence of Motivational Intensity on Cognitive Scope. **Current Directions in Psychological Science**, v. 22, n. 4, p. 301–307, 2013. Citation on page 42.
- Harmon-Jones, E.; Harmon-Jones, C.; AMODIO, D. M.; GABLE, P. A. Attitudes toward emotions. **Journal of Personality and Social Psychology**, v. 101, n. 6, p. 1332–1350, 2011. ISSN 1939-1315(Electronic),0022-3514(Print). Citation on page 42.
- HARRER, A.; KOBBE, L.; MALZAHN, N. Conceptual and computational issues in the formalization of collaboration scripts. In: **Proceedings of the 8th International Conference on Computer Supported Collaborative Learning.** [S.l.]: International Society of the Learning Sciences, 2007. p. 280–282. Citation on page 32.
- HART, C. Factors associated with student persistence in an online program of study: A review of the literature. **Journal of Interactive Online Learning**, v. 11, n. 1, 2012. Citations on pages 39 and 40.
- HARTNETT, M.; GEORGE, A. S.; DRON, J. Examining motivation in online distance learning environments: Complex, multifaceted and situation-dependent. **The International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning**, v. 12, n. 6, p. 20–38, 2011. Citation on page 39.
- 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 193.
- HEETER, C.; LEE, Y.-H.; MEDLER, B.; MAGERKO, B. Beyond Player Types: Gaming Achievement Goal. In: **Proceedings of the 2011 ACM SIGGRAPH Symposium on Video Games.** Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada: ACM, 2011. (Sandbox '11), p. 43–48. ISBN 978-1-4503-0775-8. Citation on page 19.
- Hernández-Leo, D.; Villasclaras-Fernández, E. D.; Asensio-Pérez, J. I.; DIMITRIADIS, Y.; Jorrín-Abellán, I. M.; Ruiz-Requies, I.; Rubia-Avi, B. COLLAGE: A collaborative Learning Design editor based on patterns. **Journal of Educational Technology and Society**, v. 9, n. 1, p. 58, 2006. Citation on page 34.

Hernandez-Leo, D.; Villasclaras-Fernandez, E. D.; Asensio-Perez, J. I.; DIMITRIADIS, Y. A.; RETALIS, S. CSCL Scripting Patterns: Hierarchical Relationships and Applicability. In: **Sixth IEEE International Conference on Advanced Learning Technologies (ICALT'06)**. [S.l.: s.n.], 2006. p. 388–392. Citation on page 37.

HEWITT, J. Toward an Understanding of How Threads Die in Asynchronous Computer Conferences. **Journal of the Learning Sciences**, v. 14, n. 4, p. 567–589, 2005. Citations on pages 17 and 40.

HOGG, M. A.; ABRAMS, D. Social cognition and attitudes. In: MARTIN, G. N.; CARLSON, N. R.; BUSKIST, W. (Ed.). **Psychology. Third Edition**. [S.l.]: Pearson Education Limited, 2007. p. 684–721. Citation on page 42.

HOPPE, H. U.; OGATA, H.; SOLLER, A. **The Role of Technology in CSCL**. 1. ed. [S.l.]: Springer US, 2007. (Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning Series, v. 9). ISBN 978-0-387-71135-5. Citation on page 31.

HRON, A.; HESSE, F. W.; REINHARD, P.; PICARD, E. Strukturierte Kooperation beim computerunterstützten kollaborativen Lernen. **Unterrichtswissenschaft**, v. 25, p. 56–69, 1997. Citation on page 40.

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 180.

HUANG, B.; HEW, K. Measuring learners' motivation level in massive open online courses. **International Journal of Information and Education Technology**, 2016. Citation on page 187.

IKEDA, M.; GO, S.; MIZOGUCHI, R. Opportunistic Group Formation. In: **Artificial Intelligence and Education, Proceedings of AIED**. [S.l.: s.n.], 1997. v. 97, p. 167–174. Citation on page 46.

INABA, A.; IKEDA, M.; MIZOGUCHI, R. What learning patterns are effective for a learner's growth. In: **Proc. of the International Conference on Artificial Intelligence in Education, Sydney**. [S.l.: s.n.], 2003. p. 219–226. Citations on pages 34 and 46.

INABA, A.; MIZOGUCHI, R. Learners' Roles and Predictable Educational Benefits in Collaborative Learning. In: **Intelligent Tutoring Systems**. [S.l.]: Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2004. p. 285–294. Citation on page 46.

INABA, A.; OHKUBO, R.; IKEDA, M.; MIZOGUCHI, R.; TOYODA, J. An Instructional Design Support Environment for CSCL Fundamental Concepts and Design Patterns. In: **Proceedings of AIED'01**. [S.l.: s.n.], 2001. Citation on page 46.

INABA, A.; OHKUBO, R.; IKEDA, M.; MIZOGUCHI, R. An interaction analysis support system for CSCL: An ontological approach to support instructional design process. In: **International Conference on Computers in Education, 2002. Proceedings**. [S.l.: s.n.], 2002. p. 358–362 vol.1. Citation on page 46.

ISOTANI, S. **An Ontological Engineering Approach to Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning**. Phd Thesis (PhD Thesis) — Osaka University, Japan, 2009. Citations on pages 34, 39, 47, 48, 51, and 129.

ISOTANI, S.; INABA, A.; IKEDA, M.; MIZOGUCHI, R. An Ontology Engineering Approach to the Realization of Theory-Driven Group Formation. **International Journal of Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning**, v. 4, n. 4, p. 445–478, 2009. ISSN 1556-1615 1556-1607. Citations on pages 17 and 37.

ISOTANI, S.; MIZOGUCHI, R. Adventures in the Boundary between Domain-Independent Ontologies and Domain Content for CSCL. In: LOVREK, I.; HOWLETT, R. J.; JAIN, L. C. (Ed.). **Knowledge-Based Intelligent Information and Engineering Systems: 12th International Conference, KES 2008, Zagreb, Croatia, September 3-5, 2008, Proceedings, Part III**. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2008. p. 523–532. ISBN 978-3-540-85567-5. Citation on page 46.

_____. 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 34, 36, 85, 86, 90, 91, 93, and 94.

ISOTANI, S.; MIZOGUCHI, R.; ISOTANI, S.; CAPELI, O. M.; ISOTANI, N.; de Albuquerque, A. R. P. L.; BITTENCOURT, I. I.; JAQUES, P. A Semantic Web-based authoring tool to facilitate the planning of collaborative learning scenarios compliant with learning theories. **Computers & Education**, v. 63, p. 267–284, 2013. ISSN 0360-1315. Citations on pages 34, 36, and 46.

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 77.

KAPP, K. M. **The Gamification of Learning and Instruction: Game-Based Methods and Strategies for Training and Education**. San Francisco, CA: Pfeiffer, 2012. Citation on page 19.

KARKAR, A.; JA’AM, J. M. A.; FOUFOU, S. A Survey on Educational Ontologies and Their Development Cycle. In: BOURAS, A.; EYNARD, B.; FOUFOU, S.; THOBEN, K.-D. (Ed.). **Product Lifecycle Management in the Era of Internet of Things: 12th IFIP WG 5.1 International Conference, PLM 2015, Doha, Qatar, October 19-21, 2015, Revised Selected Papers**. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2016. p. 649–658. ISBN 978-3-319-33111-9. Citation on page 21.

KELLER, J. M. Development and use of the ARCS model of instructional design. **Journal of instructional development**, v. 10, n. 3, p. 2–10, 1987. Citation on page 18.

_____. **Motivational Design for Learning and Performance: The ARCS Model Approach**. [S.I.]: Springer Science & Business Media, 2009. Citations on pages 41, 79, 178, and 179.

KING, A. Scripting Collaborative Learning Processes: A Cognitive Perspective. In: FISCHER, F.; KOLLAR, I.; MANDL, H.; HAAKE, J. M. (Ed.). **Scripting Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning: Cognitive, Computational and Educational Perspectives**. Boston, MA: Springer US, 2007. p. 13–37. ISBN 978-0-387-36949-5. Citation on page 35.

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 179.

KNUTAS, A.; IKONEN, J.; MAGGIORINI, D.; RIPAMONTI, L.; PORRAS, J. Creating Student Interaction Profiles for Adaptive Collaboration Gamification Design. **Int. J. Hum. Cap. Inf. Technol. Prof.**, v. 7, n. 3, p. 47–62, Jul. 2016. ISSN 1947-3478. Citation on page 20.

KNUTAS, A.; IKONEN, J.; NIKULA, U.; PORRAS, J. Increasing Collaborative Communications in a Programming Course with Gamification: A Case Study. In: **Proceedings of the 15th International Conference on Computer Systems and Technologies**. New York, NY, USA: ACM, 2014. (CompSysTech '14), p. 370–377. ISBN 978-1-4503-2753-4. Citations on pages 19 and 20.

KNUTAS, A.; van Roy, R.; HYNNINEN, T.; GRANATO, M.; KASURINEN, J.; IKONEN, J. Profile-Based Algorithm for Personalized Gamification in Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning Environments. In: **Profile-Based Algorithm for Personalized Gamification in Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning Environments. CEUR Workshop Proceedings**. [S.l.: s.n.], 2017. Citation on page 20.

KOBBE, L.; WEINBERGER, A.; DILLENBOURG, P.; HARRER, A.; HÄMÄLÄINEN, R.; HÄKKINEN, P.; FISCHER, F. Specifying computer-supported collaboration scripts. **International Journal of Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning**, v. 2, n. 2-3, p. 211–224, 2007. ISSN 1556-1607. Citations on pages 18, 32, and 33.

KOLLAR, I.; FISCHER, F.; SLOTTA, J. D. Internal and External Collaboration Scripts in Web-based Science Learning at Schools. In: **Proceedings of Th 2005 Conference on Computer Support for Collaborative Learning: Learning 2005: The Next 10 Years!** Taipei, Taiwan: International Society of the Learning Sciences, 2005. (CSCL '05), p. 331–340. ISBN 978-0-8058-5782-5. Citation on page 40.

KOPER, R. An Introduction to Learning Design. In: KOPER, R.; TATTERSALL, C. (Ed.). **Learning Design: A Handbook on Modelling and Delivering Networked Education and Training**. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2005. p. 3–20. ISBN 978-3-540-27360-8. Citation on page 34.

KORDAKI, M.; SIEMPOS, H. The Jigsaw Collaborative Method within the Online Computer Science Classroom. In: **CSEDU (2)**. [S.l.: s.n.], 2010. p. 65–72. Citation on page 35.

LAZZARO, N. Why we play: Affect and the fun of games. **Human-Computer Interaction: Designing for Diverse Users and Domains**, p. 155, 2009. Citation on page 56.

LEHTINEN, E.; HAKKARAINEN, K.; LIPPONEN, L.; RAHIKAINEN, M.; MUUKKONEN, H. Computer supported collaborative learning: A review. **The JHGI Giesbers reports on education**, v. 10, 1999. Citation on page 17.

LEO, D. H.; PEREZ, J. I. A.; DIMITRIADIS, Y. A. IMS learning design support for the formalization of collaborative learning patterns. In: **IEEE International Conference on Advanced Learning Technologies, 2004. Proceedings**. [S.l.: s.n.], 2004. p. 350–354. Citation on page 34.

LI, C.-H. Confirmatory factor analysis with ordinal data: Comparing robust maximum likelihood and diagonally weighted least squares. **Behavior Research Methods**, v. 48, n. 3, p. 936–949, Sep. 2016. ISSN 1554-3528. Citation on page 180.

- LIPPONEN, L. Exploring Foundations for Computer-supported Collaborative Learning. In: **Proceedings of the Conference on Computer Support for Collaborative Learning: Foundations for a CSCL Community**. Boulder, Colorado: International Society of the Learning Sciences, 2002. (CSCL '02), p. 72–81. Citation on page 17.
- LÖFSTRÖM, E.; NEVGI, A. From strategic planning to meaningful learning: Diverse perspectives on the development of web-based teaching and learning in higher education. **British Journal of Educational Technology**, v. 38, n. 2, p. 312–324, 2007. Citation on page 40.
- 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 187.
- 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 195.
- _____. Further problems in the measurement of growth. **Educational and Psychological Measurement**, v. 18, n. 1, p. 437–451, 1958. Citation on page 195.
- MAGNISALIS, I.; DEMETRIADIS, S. Extending IMS-LD Capabilities: A Review, a Proposed Framework and Implementation Cases. In: DARADOUMIS, T.; DEMETRIADIS, S. N.; XHAFA, F. (Ed.). **Intelligent Adaptation and Personalization Techniques in Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning**. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2012. p. 85–108. ISBN 978-3-642-28586-8. Citation on page 34.
- MAGNISALIS, I. D.; DEMETRIADIS, S. N. Orchestrating Adaptive and Complex CSCL Scenarios through a Choreography among IMS-LD and External Services. In: **Proceedings of the 2012 Fourth International Conference on Intelligent Networking and Collaborative Systems**. Bucharest, Romania: IEEE, 2012. p. 89–96. ISBN 978-1-4673-2281-2 978-1-4673-2279-9 978-0-7695-4808-1. Citation on page 36.
- MALONE, T. W.; LEPPER, M. R. Making learning fun: A taxonomy of intrinsic motivations for learning. In: SNOW, R. E.; FARR, M. J. (Ed.). Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum, 1987. v. 3, p. 223–253. Citation on page 41.
- MARCZEWSKI, A. **Even Ninja Monkeys Like to Play: Gamification, Game Thinking & Motivational Design**. 1 edition. ed. [S.l.]: Gamified UK, 2015. Citation on page 60.
- _____. **Gamification User Types Dodecad – The HEXAD Expansion Pack!** 2015. [Https://www.gamified.uk/2015/12/16/gamification-user-types-dodecad-christmas/](https://www.gamified.uk/2015/12/16/gamification-user-types-dodecad-christmas/). Citations on pages 45, 60, 66, and 70.
- _____. **A Player Type Framework for Gamification Design**. 2015. [Https://www.gamified.uk/user-types/](https://www.gamified.uk/user-types/). Citation on page 64.
- _____. **A Revised Gamification Design Framework**. 2017. [Https://www.gamified.uk/2017/04/06/revised-gamification-design-framework/](https://www.gamified.uk/2017/04/06/revised-gamification-design-framework/). Citation on page 66.
- MARKLAND, D.; HARDY, L. On the factorial and construct validity of the Intrinsic Motivation Inventory: Conceptual and operational concerns. **Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport**, v. 68, n. 1, p. 20–32, Mar. 1997. ISSN 0270-1367. Citation on page 184.

MASTERS, G. N.; WRIGHT, B. D. The Partial Credit Model. **Handbook of Modern Item Response Theory**, p. 101, 1996. Citation on page 195.

MATTHEWS, G.; DEARY, I. J.; WHITEMAN, M. C. **Personality Traits**. [S.l.]: Cambridge University Press, 2003. Citation on page 57.

MAZZOLINI, M.; MADDISON, S. Sage, guide or ghost? The effect of instructor intervention on student participation in online discussion forums. **Computers & Education**, v. 40, n. 3, p. 237–253, 2003. ISSN 0360-1315. Citation on page 39.

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 184.

MIAO, Y.; HOEKSEMA, K.; HOPPE, H. U.; HARRER, A. CSCL Scripts: Modelling Features and Potential Use. In: **Proceedings of Th 2005 Conference on Computer Support for Collaborative Learning: Learning 2005: The Next 10 Years!** Taipei, Taiwan: International Society of the Learning Sciences, 2005. (CSCL '05), p. 423–432. ISBN 0-8058-5782-6. Citations on pages 34 and 36.

MITCHELL, T. R.; DANIELS, D. Motivation. In: **Handbook of Psychology**. [S.l.]: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2003. ISBN 978-0-471-26438-5. Citations on pages 37 and 54.

MIZOGUCHI, R.; BOURDEAU, J. Using Ontological Engineering to Overcome AI-ED Problems: Contribution, Impact and Perspectives. **International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education**, v. 26, n. 1, p. 91–106, Mar. 2016. ISSN 1560-4306. Citation on page 20.

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 194.

MOLINA, A. I.; REDONDO, M. A.; ORTEGA, M. Assessing CIAN as modeling language of collaborative learning activities. In: **International Symposium on Computers in Education**. Andorra la Vella, Andorra: IEEE, 2012. p. 1–6. Citation on page 34.

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. **Psicología: Reflexão e Crítica**, v. 28, n. 3, p. 434–443, Sep. 2015. ISSN 0102-7972. Citations on pages 178 and 184.

MORA, A.; RIERA, D.; GONZALEZ, C.; Arnedo-Moreno, J. A Literature Review of Gamification Design Frameworks. In: **2015 7th International Conference on Games and Virtual Worlds for Serious Applications (VS-Games)**. [S.l.: s.n.], 2015. p. 1–8. Citations on pages 20 and 54.

NACKE, L. E.; BATEMAN, C.; MANDRYK, R. L. BrainHex: A neurobiological gamer typology survey. **Entertainment Computing**, v. 5, n. 1, p. 55–62, Jan. 2014. ISSN 1875-9521. Citation on page 72.

NACKE, L. E.; DRACHEN, A.; G"OBEL, S. Methods for Evaluating Gameplay Experience in a Serious Gaming Context. **International Journal of Computer Science in Sport**, v. 9, n. 2, 2010. Citation on page 61.

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 193.

NICHOLSON, S. A RECIPE for Meaningful Gamification. In: REINERS, T.; WOOD, L. C. (Ed.). **Gamification in Education and Business**. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2015. p. 1–20. ISBN 978-3-319-10208-5. Citation on page 19.

NORDIN, N. M.; KLOBAS, J. Wikis as collaborative learning tools for knowledge sharing: Shifting the education landscape. In: ABAS, Z. W.; JUNG, I.; LUCA, J. (Ed.). **Proceedings of Global Learn 2010**. Penang, Malaysia: Association for the Advancement of Computing in Education (AACE), 2010. p. 331–340. Citation on page 17.

NUNES, T. M.; BITTENCOURT, I. I.; ISOTANI, S.; JAQUES, P. A. Discouraging Gaming the System Through Interventions of an Animated Pedagogical Agent. In: VERBERT, K.; SHARPLES, M.; KLOBÚCAR, T. (Ed.). **Adaptive and Adaptable Learning: 11th European Conference on Technology Enhanced Learning, EC-TEL 2016, Lyon, France, September 13-16, 2016, Proceedings**. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2016. p. 139–151. ISBN 978-3-319-45153-4. Citation on page 19.

OHNO, A.; YAMASAKI, T.; TOKIWA, K. I. A discussion on introducing half-anonymity and gamification to improve students' motivation and engagement in classroom lectures. In: **2013 IEEE Region 10 Humanitarian Technology Conference**. [S.l.: s.n.], 2013. p. 215–220. Citation on page 19.

OLNEY, A. M.; D'MELLO, S.; PERSON, N.; CADE, W.; HAYS, P.; WILLIAMS, C.; LEHMAN, B.; GRAESSER, A. Guru: A Computer Tutor That Models Expert Human Tutors. In: CERRI, S. A.; CLANCEY, W. J.; PAPADOURAKIS, G.; PANOURGIA, K. (Ed.). **Intelligent Tutoring Systems**. [S.l.]: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2012. (Lecture Notes in Computer Science), p. 256–261. ISBN 978-3-642-30950-2. Citation on page 43.

ORJI, R. **Design for Behaviour Change: A Model-Driven Approach for Tailoring Persuasive Technologies**. Phd Thesis (PhD Thesis) — University of Saskatchewan, 2014. Citation on page 59.

ORJI, R.; VASSILEVA, J.; MANDRYK, R. L. Modeling the efficacy of persuasive strategies for different gamer types in serious games for health. **User Modeling and User-Adapted Interaction**, v. 24, n. 5, p. 453–498, Jul. 2014. ISSN 0924-1868, 1573-1391. Citation on page 61.

Palomino-Ramírez, L.; Bote-Lorenzo, M. L.; Asensio-Pérez, J. I.; DIMITRIADIS, Y. A. Lead-Flow4LD: Learning and Data Flow Composition-Based Solution for Learning Design in CSCL. In: BRIGGS, R. O.; ANTUNES, P.; VREEDE, G.-J. de; READ, A. S. (Ed.). **Groupware: Design, Implementation, and Use**. Omaha, NE, USA: Springer, 2008, (LNCS, 5411). p. 266–280. ISBN 978-3-540-92830-0 978-3-540-92831-7. Citation on page 34.

PAPADOPOULOS, P. M.; DEMETRIADIS, S. N.; STAMELOS, I. G. Analyzing the Role of Students' Self-organization in a Case of Scripted Collaboration. 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. 487–496. ISBN 978-1-4092-8598-4. Citation on page 39.

PEDRO, L. Z.; LOPES, A. M. Z.; PRATES, B. G.; VASSILEVA, J.; ISOTANI, S. Does Gamification Work for Boys and Girls?: An Exploratory Study with a Virtual Learning Environment. In: **Proceedings of the 30th Annual ACM Symposium on Applied Computing**. Salamanca, Spain: ACM, 2015. (SAC '15), p. 214–219. ISBN 978-1-4503-3196-8. Citation on page 19.

PICARD, R. W. **Affective Computing**. [S.I.]: MIT press, 2000. Citation on page 42.

PINK, D. H. **Drive: The Surprising Truth About What Motivates Us**. [S.I.]: Riverhead Books, 2011. ISBN 978-1-59448-480-3. Citations on pages 55 and 69.

PRIETO, L. P.; Asensio-Pérez, J. I.; DIMITRIADIS, Y.; Gómez-Sánchez, E.; Muñoz-Cristóbal, J. A. GLUE!-PS: A Multi-language Architecture and Data Model to Deploy TEL Designs to Multiple Learning Environments. In: KLOOS, C. D.; GILLET, D.; GARCIA, R. M. C.; WILD, F.; WOLPERS, M. (Ed.). **Towards Ubiquitous Learning: 6th European Conference of Technology Enhanced Learning, EC-TEL 2011, Palermo, Italy, September 20-23, 2011. Proceedings**. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2011. p. 285–298. ISBN 978-3-642-23985-4. Citation on page 36.

PRIETO, L. P.; Asensio-Perez, J. I.; Munoz-Cristobal, J. A.; DIMITRIADIS, Y. A.; Jorrin-Abellán, I. M.; Gomez-Sánchez, E. Enabling Teachers to Deploy CSCL Designs across Distributed Learning Environments. **IEEE Transactions on Learning Technologies**, v. 6, n. 4, p. 324–336, Oct. 2013. ISSN 1939-1382. Citation on page 36.

PRIETO, L. P.; TCHOOUNIKINE, P.; Asensio-Pérez, J. I.; SOBREIRA, P.; DIMITRIADIS, Y. Exploring teachers' perceptions on different CSCL script editing tools. **Computers Education**, v. 78, n. Supplement C, p. 383 – 396, 2014. ISSN 0360-1315. Citation on page 36.

PRITCHARD, R.; ASHWOOD, E. **Managing Motivation: A Manager's Guide to Diagnosing and Improving Motivation**. 1 edition. ed. [S.I.]: Routledge, 2008. ISBN 978-1-84169-789-5. Citations on pages 53 and 54.

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 195.

R Core Team. **R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing**. Vienna, Austria, 2017. Citations on pages 170, 180, 193, 194, and 195.

REIGELUTH, C.; KRATHWOHL, D.; Carr-Chellman, A. **Instructional-Design Theories and Models: An Overview of Their Current Status**. [S.I.]: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1983. (Instructional-design Theories and Models, v. 1). ISBN 978-0-89859-275-7. Citation on page 41.

REIS, R. C. D.; ISOTANI, S.; RODRIGUEZ, C. L.; LYRA, K. T.; JAQUES, P. A.; BITTENCOURT, I. I. Affective states in computer-supported collaborative learning: Studying the past to drive the future. **Computers & Education**, v. 120, p. 29–50, May 2018. ISSN 03601315. Citation on page 42.

REVELLE, W. **Psych: Procedures for Psychological, Psychometric, and Personality Research**. Evanston, Illinois, 2017. R package version 1.7.8. Citation on page 180.

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 180.

RICHARDS, C.; THOMPSON, C. W.; GRAHAM, N. Beyond Designing for Motivation: The Importance of Context in Gamification. In: **Proceedings of the First ACM SIGCHI Annual Symposium on Computer-Human Interaction in Play**. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: ACM, 2014. (CHI PLAY '14), p. 217–226. ISBN 978-1-4503-3014-5. Citation on page 19.

RIENTIES, B.; TEMPELAAR, D.; den Bossche, P. V.; GIJSELAERS, W.; SEGERS, M. The role of academic motivation in Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning. **Computers in Human Behavior**, v. 25, n. 6, p. 1195–1206, 2009. ISSN 0747-5632. Citation on page 40.

ROBITZSCH, A. **Sirt: Supplementary Item Response Theory Models**. [S.l.: s.n.], 2018. R package version 2.6-9. Citation on page 193.

ROBITZSCH, A.; KIEFER, T.; WU, M. **TAM: Test Analysis Modules**. [S.l.: s.n.], 2018. R package version 2.10-24. Citations on pages 194 and 195.

Rodríguez-Triana, M. J.; PRIETO, L. P.; Martínez-Monés, A.; Asensio-Pérez, J. I.; DIMITRI-ADIS, Y. Monitoring Collaborative Learning Activities: Exploring the Differential Value of Collaborative Flow Patterns for Learning Analytics. In: **2018 IEEE 18th International Conference on Advanced Learning Technologies (ICALT)**. [S.l.: s.n.], 2018. p. 155–159. Citation on page 17.

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 195.

Romero-Moreno, L. M.; ORTEGA, F. J.; TROYANO, J. A. Obtaining Adaptation of Virtual Courses by Using a Collaborative Tool and Learning Design. In: **Proceedings of the 2007 Euro American Conference on Telematics and Information Systems**. New York, NY, USA: ACM, 2007. (EATIS '07), p. 42:1–42:7. ISBN 978-1-59593-598-4. Citation on page 34.

RONEN, M.; Kohen-Vacs, D. Designing and Applying Adaptation Patterns Embedded in the Script. In: **The International Conference on Intelligent Networking and Collaborative Systems**. Barcelona, Spain: IEEE, 2009. p. 306–310. ISBN 978-1-4244-5165-4. Citations on pages 34 and 36.

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 180 and 193.

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 179.

RUMMEL, N.; SPADA, H. Can People Learn Computer-Mediated Collaboration by Following A Script? In: **Scripting Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning**. [S.l.]: Springer, Boston, MA, 2007, (Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning). p. 39–55. ISBN 978-0-387-36947-1 978-0-387-36949-5. Citation on page 40.

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 55, 79, 129, and 178.

SANCHO, P.; Fuentes-Fernández, R.; Fernández-Manjón, B. NUCLEO: Adaptive Computer Supported Collaborative Learning in a Role Game Based Scenario. In: **The 8th IEEE International Conference on Advanced Learning Technologies**. Santander, Spain: IEEE, 2008. p. 671–675. ISBN 978-0-7695-3167-0. Citation on page 34.

SCHELL, J. **The Art of Game Design: A Book of Lenses**. 1 edition. ed. Amsterdam ; Boston: CRC Press, 2008. ISBN 978-0-12-369496-6. Citation on page 61.

SCHMITT, L. J.; WEINBERGER, A. Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning: Mediated and Co-Present Forms of Learning Together. In: **Second Handbook of Information Technology in Primary and Secondary Education**. [S.l.]: Springer, Cham, 2018, (Springer International Handbooks of Education). p. 1–15. ISBN 978-3-319-53803-7. Citations on pages 39 and 40.

SCHOOR, C.; BANNERT, M. Motivation in a computer-supported collaborative learning scenario and its impact on learning activities and knowledge acquisition. **Learning and Instruction**, v. 21, n. 4, p. 560–573, 2011. ISSN 0959-4752. Citation on page 18.

SEABORN, K.; FELS, D. I. Gamification in theory and action: A survey. **International Journal of Human-Computer Studies**, v. 74, p. 14–31, 2015. Citations on pages 19, 20, and 54.

Serrano-Cámara, L. M.; Paredes-Velasco, M.; ALCOVER, C.-M.; Velazquez-Iturbide, J. A. An evaluation of students' motivation in computer-supported collaborative learning of programming concepts. **Computers in Human Behavior**, v. 31, p. 499–508, 2014. ISSN 0747-5632. Citations on pages 37 and 38.

SHAW, A. Do you identify as a gamer? Gender, race, sexuality, and gamer identity. **New Media & Society**, v. 14, n. 1, p. 28–44, Feb. 2012. ISSN 1461-4448. Citation on page 56.

SPECTOR, J. M.; OHRAZDA, C. Automating Instructional Design: Approaches and Limitations. In: **Handbook of Research on Educational Communications and Technology**. [S.l.: s.n.], 2004. p. 685–699. ISBN 978-0-8058-4145-9. Citation on page 41.

SPITZER, D. R. Motivation: The Neglected Factor in Instructional Design. **Educational Technology**, v. 36, n. 3, p. 45–49, 1996. ISSN 00131962. Citation on page 41.

STAHL, G.; KOSCHMANN, T.; SUTHERS, D. Computer-supported collaborative learning: An historical perspective. **Cambridge handbook of the learning sciences**, v. 2006, 2006. Citations on pages 17 and 31.

STEGMANN, K.; MU, J.; Gehlen-Baum, V.; FISCHER, F. The myth of over-scripting: Can novices be supported too much. In: **Connecting Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning to Policy and Practice: CSCL2011 Conference Proceedings**. [S.l.: s.n.], 2011. v. 1, p. 406–413. Citation on page 40.

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 193.

- STYLIANAKIS, G.; ARAPI, P.; MOUMOUTZIS, N.; CHRISTODOULAKIS, S. CoLearn: Real time collaborative learning environment. In: **Second International Conference on E-Learning and E-Technologies in Education**. Lodz, Poland: IEEE, 2013. p. 13–18. ISBN 978-1-4673-5094-5 978-1-4673-5093-8. Citation on page 34.
- SUPNITHI, T.; INABA, A.; IKEDA, M.; MIZOGUCHI, R. Learning Goal Ontology Supported by Learning Theories for Opportunistic Group Formation. In: **Proc. of AIED99**. [S.I.]: Press, 1999. p. 67–74. Citation on page 46.
- TAO, J.; TAN, T. Affective Computing: A Review. In: TAO, J.; TAN, T.; PICARD, R. W. (Ed.). **Affective Computing and Intelligent Interaction**. [S.I.]: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2005. (Lecture Notes in Computer Science), p. 981–995. ISBN 978-3-540-32273-3. Citation on page 42.
- TIAN, F.; GAO, P.; LI, L.; ZHANG, W.; LIANG, H.; QIAN, Y.; ZHAO, R. Recognizing and regulating e-learners' emotions based on interactive Chinese texts in e-learning systems. **Knowledge-Based Systems**, v. 55, p. 148–164, Jan. 2014. ISSN 0950-7051. Citation on page 43.
- TSENG, F.-C. Segmenting online gamers by motivation. **Expert Systems with Applications**, v. 38, n. 6, p. 7693–7697, Jun. 2011. ISSN 0957-4174. Citation on page 56.
- Van der Ark, L. A. Mokken Scale Analysis in R. **Journal of Statistical Software**, v. 20, n. i11, 2007. Citation on page 194.
- _____. 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 194.
- Vega-Gorgojo, G.; Bote-Lorenzo, M. L.; Gómez-Sánchez, E.; DIMITRIADIS, Y. A.; Asensio-Pérez, J. I. Semantic Description of Collaboration Scripts for Service Oriented CSCL Systems. **Artificial Intelligence in Education**, v. 125, p. 935–937, 2005. Citations on pages 34 and 36.
- Villasclaras-Fernández, E.; Hernández-Leo, D.; Asensio-Pérez, J. I.; DIMITRIADIS, Y. Web Collage: An implementation of support for assessment design in CSCL macro-scripts. **Computers & Education**, v. 67, p. 79–97, Sep. 2013. ISSN 0360-1315. Citation on page 34.
- Villasclaras-Fernández, E. D.; Hernández-Gonzalo, J. A.; LEO, D. H.; Asensio-Pérez, J. I.; DIMITRIADIS, Y. A.; Martínez-Monés, A. InstanceCollage: A Tool for the Particularization of Collaborative IMS-LD Scripts. **Educational Technology & Society**, v. 12, n. 4, p. 56–70, 2009. ISSN 1436-4522. Citation on page 36.
- Villasclaras-Fernández, E. D.; ISOTANI, S.; HAYASHI, Y.; MIZOGUCHI, R. Looking Into Collaborative Learning: Design from Macro-and Micro-Script Perspectives. In: **Proceedings of the 2009 Conference on Artificial Intelligence in Education: Building Learning Systems That Care: From Knowledge Representation to Affective Modelling**. Amsterdam, The Netherlands, The Netherlands: IOS Press, 2009. p. 231–238. ISBN 978-1-60750-028-5. Citations on pages 34 and 35.
- WANG, Y.-C. Using wikis to facilitate interaction and collaboration among EFL learners: A social constructivist approach to language teaching. **System**, v. 42, p. 383–390, Feb. 2014. ISSN 0346-251X. Citation on page 17.

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 193 and 195.

WEINBERGER, A.; ERTL, B.; FISCHER, F.; MANDL, H. Epistemic and social scripts in computer-supported collaborative learning. **Instructional Science**, v. 33, n. 1, p. 1–30, Jan. 2005. ISSN 1573-1952. Citations on pages 18, 33, 35, 37, and 40.

WEINBERGER, A.; FISCHER, F.; STEGMANN, K. Computer-supported Collaborative Learning in Higher Education: Scripts for Argumentative Knowledge Construction in Distributed Groups. In: **Proceedings of Th 2005 Conference on Computer Support for Collaborative Learning: Learning 2005: The Next 10 Years!** Taipei, Taiwan: International Society of the Learning Sciences, 2005. (CSCL '05), p. 717–726. ISBN 0-8058-5782-6. Citation on page 37.

WEINBERGER, A.; STEGMANN, K.; FISCHER, F. Learning to argue online: Scripted groups surpass individuals (unscripted groups do not). **Computers in Human Behavior**, v. 26, n. 4, p. 506–515, Jul. 2010. ISSN 0747-5632. Citation on page 40.

WIGFIELD, A. Expectancy-value theory of achievement motivation: A developmental perspective. **Educational Psychology Review**, v. 6, n. 1, p. 49–78, Mar. 1994. ISSN 1040-726X, 1573-336X. Citation on page 79.

Wikipedia. **Arousal**. 2018. [Https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Arousal](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Arousal). Citation on page 42.

WLODKOWSKI, R. J.; GINSBERG, M. B. **Enhancing Adult Motivation to Learn: A Comprehensive Guide for Teaching All Adults**. [S.l.]: Wiley, 2017. ISBN 978-1-119-07800-5. Citation on page 41.

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 74.

WOOLF, B.; BURLESON, W.; ARROYO, I.; DRAGON, T.; COOPER, D.; PICARD, R. Affect-aware tutors: Recognising and responding to student affect. **International Journal of Learning Technology**, v. 4, n. 3-4, p. 129–164, Jan. 2009. ISSN 1477-8386. 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 96 and 195.

WU, C.-H.; HUANG, Y.-M.; HWANG, J.-P. Review of affective computing in education/learning: Trends and challenges. **British Journal of Educational Technology**, v. 47, n. 6, p. 1304–1323, Nov. 2016. ISSN 1467-8535. Citation on page 42.

WU, K.; VASSILEVA, J.; SUN, X.; FANG, J. Motivating Wiki-Based Collaborative Learning by Increasing Awareness of Task Conflict: A Design Science Approach. In: BALOIAN, N.; BURSTEIN, F.; OGATA, H.; SANTORO, F.; ZURITA, G. (Ed.). **Collaboration and Technology**. [S.l.]: Springer International Publishing, 2014. p. 365–380. ISBN 978-3-319-10166-8. Citation on page 39.

XIE, K.; KE, F. How Does Students' Motivation Relate to Peer-moderated Online Interactions? 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. 242–251. ISBN 978-1-4092-8598-4. Citation on page 40.

- YEE, N. Motivations for Play in Online Games. **CyberPsychology & Behavior**, v. 9, n. 6, p. 772–775, Dec. 2006. ISSN 1094-9313. Citations on pages 56, 57, 63, and 72.
- 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 179, 184, and 187.
- 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 193.
- ZHAO, N.; GAO, F.; YANG, D. Examining student learning and perceptions in social annotation-based translation activities. **Interactive Learning Environments**, v. 26, n. 7, p. 958–969, Oct. 2018. ISSN 1049-4820. Citation on page 17.
- ZOUAQ, A.; NKAMBOU, R. A Survey of Domain Ontology Engineering: Methods and Tools. In: NKAMBOU, R.; BOURDEAU, J.; MIZOGUCHI, R. (Ed.). **Advances in Intelligent Tutoring Systems**. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2010. p. 103–119. ISBN 978-3-642-14363-2. Citation on page 21.

APPENDIX

A

ONTOLOGY ONTOGACLES: CONCEPTS, TERMS AND ONTOLOGICAL STRUCTURES

A.1 Tree Overview of States

A.1.1 *Motivation States*

- ▼ **w** Any
- ▼ **w** Common world
 - **w** Universal
 - **w** equivalence
- ▼ **w** Particular
 - **w** substrate
 - **w** entity
 - ▼ **w** physical
 - ▼ **w** occurrent
 - ▼ **w** stative
 - ▼ **w** stative_2
 - ▼ **w** state
 - ▼ **w** object state
 - ▼ **w** internal state
 - **w** hunger state
 - **w** life state
 - ▼ **w** Internal agent state
 - **w** Attitudinal state
 - **w** Affective state
 - ▼ **w** Temporal attitudinal state
 - **w** Future condition state
 - ▼ **w** Current condition state
 - **w** Aspiration
 - **w** Relevance
 - ▼ **w** Motivation state
 - **w** Motivated
 - **w** Intrinsic motivated
 - **w** Extrinsic motivated
 - **w** Not motivated
 - **w** Confidence


A.1.2 Psychological Need States

- ▼ **w state**
- ▼ **w object state**
- ▼ **w internal state**
 - **w hunger state**
 - **w life state**
 - ▼ **w Internal agent state**
 - **w Attitudinal state**
 - **w Progression state**
 - **w Developmental state**
 - **w Cognitive process state0**
 - ▼ **w Human need state**
 - **w Existence need state**
 - ▼ **w Psychological need state**
 - ▼ **w Relatedness need state**
 - **w Love/belonging need state**
 - ▼ **w Power need state**
 - Having need to demonstrate power
 - Not having need to demonstrate power
 - **w Display status need state**
 - **w Feel admiration need state**
 - ▼ **w Social-esteem need state**
 - ▼ **w Social status need state**
 - Having need to demonstrate his/her social status
 - Not having need to demonstrate his/her social status
 - Having need of relatedness
 - Not having need of relatedness
 - ▼ **w Growth need state**
 - ▼ **w Self-actualization need state**
 - **w Individuality need state**
 - **w Creativity need state**
 - ▼ **w Autonomy need state**
 - Having need of autonomy
 - Not having need of autonomy
 - ▼ **w Purpose need state**
 - Having need of purpose
 - Not having need of purpose
 - ▼ **w Self-esteem need state**
 - ▼ **w Mastery need state**
 - Having need of mastery
 - Not having need of mastery
 - ▼ **w Competence need state**
 - Having need of competence
 - Not having need of competence
 - ▼ **w Self-confidence need state**
 - Having need of self-confidence
 - Not having need of self-confidence
 - **w Ind. personality trait state**
 - **w Internal non-agent state**

A.1.3 Individual Personality Trait States

- Ind. personality trait state
- Game style preference state
 - Having preference for acting on the system
 - Having preference for interacting on the system
 - Having preference for acting with others users
 - Having preference for interacting with others users
- Users/System state
- Interacting/Acting state
- MBTI personality traits state
 - Introversion/Extraversion
 - Having introversion orientation
 - Having extraversion orientation
 - Intuition/Sensing
 - Having intuition orientation
 - Having sensing orientation
 - Feeling/Thinking
 - Having feeling orientation
 - Having thinking orientation
 - Perception/Judging
 - Having perception orientation
 - Having judging orientation
- Game liking preference state
 - Liking to help others to orient themselves in new situations
 - Liking to share my knowledge
 - Liking to put effort according to the reward
 - Liking achievement-components
 - Liking social-components
 - Liking immersion-components
 - Liking discovery-components
 - Liking customization-components
 - Liking competition-components
 - Liking advancement-components
 - Liking mechanics-components
 - Having a non-positive liking for mechanics-components
 - Having a negative liking for mechanics-components
 - Having indifference liking for mechanics-components
 - Having indifference liking for mechanics-components
 - Having a non-negative liking for mechanics-components
 - Having a positive liking for mechanics-components
 - Having indifference liking for mechanics-components
- Big five personality traits state
 - Openness state
 - Conscientiousness state
 - Extraversion state
 - Agreeableness state
 - Neuroticism state
 - Having sensitive/nervous orientation
 - Having secure/confident orientation

A.2 Individual Motivational Goal (I-mot goal)




A.3 Player Role


A.3.1 Player Roles based on the Bartle Model




A.3.2 Player Roles Based on the Borges Model



A.3.3 Player Roles Based on the Yee Model




A.3.4 Player Roles Based on the Dodecad Model




A.3.5 Player Roles Based on the BrainHex Model




A.4 Individual Motivational Strategy ($Y \leq I$ -mot goal)



A.5 Individual Gameplay Strategy (I-gameplay strategy)





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 B.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 B.2).

B.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).

B.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 | ... |

B.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 | ... |

B.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).

B.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.

B.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 | 7->5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 7->6 | 1 | 1 | |
| > | pilot | 10130 | 4 | 3 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 5 | |
| > | pilot | 10131 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 4 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 7 | 3 | 1 | 7 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 1 | 7 | |
| > | pilot | 10132 | 1 | 7 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 6 | |
| > | pilot | 10134 | 2 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 2 | |
| > | pilot | 10135 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 2 | |
| > | pilot | 10136 | 1 | 7 | 3 | 1->3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 7->6 | 4 | 6 | |
| ... | pilot | 10137 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 6 | |
| ... | pilot | 10139 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 7 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 7->6 | 4 | 6 | |
| > | pilot | 10140 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 2->3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | |
| > | pilot | 10141 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 6 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 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 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | |
| > | 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 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 6 | |
| > | 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 | 6 | 7 | 4 | 7->6 | 1 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 2 | |
| pilot | 10153 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 7 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | |
| > | pilot | 10154 | 3 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 6 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 6 | 6 | 3 | 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 | 1 | 2 | 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 | 1 | 2 | 3 | |
| ... | first | 10201 | 5 | 2 | 7 | 7 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 7->5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | |
| > | first | 10202 | 4 | 7 | 1 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 7 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | |
| first | 10203 | 7 | 1 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 7 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | |
| ... | 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 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 3 | |
| > | first | 10210 | 4 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 3 | 7 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 2 | |
| first | 10211 | 7 | 7 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 3 | 2 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 6 | |
| first | 10212 | 5 | 3 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 7 | |

Table 28 – (continued)


| @@ | Study | UserID | Item01 | Item02 | Item03 | Item04 | Item05 | Item06 | Item07 | Item08 | Item09 | Item10 | Item11 | Item12 | Item13 | Item14 | Item15 | Item16 | Item17 | Item18 | Item19 | Item20 | Item21 |
|-------|-------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| ... | first | 10221 | 4 | 3 | 6 | 6 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 4 | 5 | |
| > | first | 10222 | 1 | 7 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 6 | 4 | 7>6 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 1 | |
| first | 10223 | 6 | 2 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 7 | 7 | |
| first | 10224 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 7 | 7 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 2 | 4 | |
| first | 10226 | 2 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 2 | |
| ... | first | 10238 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 7 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 2 | 4 | |
| first | 10240 | 4 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 7 | |
| first | 10169 | 7 | 4 | 5 | 7 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 2 | |
| third | 10170 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 2 | |
| third | 10171 | 5 | 2 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 6 | |
| third | 10172 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 7 | |
| third | 10174 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 1 | |
| third | 10175 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | |
| third | 10176 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | |
| third | 10179 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | |
| third | 10181 | 2 | 5 | 1->2 | 2->3 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | |
| third | 10183 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2->3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | |
| third | 10184 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 1 | |
| ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | |
| ... | ... | 10189 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 1 | |
| third | 10190 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 | |
| third | 10191 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | |
| third | 10192 | 4 | 3 | 7 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 1 | |
| third | 10193 | 1 | 1 | 1->2 | 1->3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| third | 10197 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | |
| ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | |
| ... | ... | 10203 | 5 | 1 | 7 | 7 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 1 | |
| third | 10204 | 1 | 7 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 4 | |
| third | 10206 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | |
| third | 10208 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | |
| third | 10209 | 2 | 7 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 6 | |
| third | 10210 | 1 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 4 | |
| third | 10213 | 1 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 3 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 4 | |
| third | 10214 | 1 | 6 | 7 | 4 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 6 | |
| ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | |
| ... | ... | 10218 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 | |
| ... | ... | 10219 | 4 | 1 | 1->2 | 1->3 | 1 | 4 | 7>6 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 1 | |
| third | 10220 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 7 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 4 | |

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 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 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 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 4 | ... | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | |
| > | third | 10234 | 1 | 7 | 1->2 | 5 | 3 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 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 | 4 | 4 | 4 | |

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

Table 29 – (*continued*)



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 C.1, and the results of this procedure is detailed in section C.2.

C.1 Validation Procedure

C.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.

C.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*).

C.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).

C.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/>>

C.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.

C.2.1 Factorial Structure of the Adapted Portuguese IMI

Figure 24 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 24 – 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.

C.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 |

C.2.3 Factorial Structure of the Adapted Portuguese IMMS

Figure 25 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 25 – 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];

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

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

D.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).

D.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/>>

D.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/>>

D.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/>>

D.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/>>

D.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 D.1.1).

D.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.

D.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.

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

D.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

D.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 |

D.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 |

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

D.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

D.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.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 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 |

D.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 | | |
| 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 |

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

D.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

D.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 |

D.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 |

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

D.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

D.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 |

D.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 | -1.1261 | 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 |

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

D.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

D.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 |

D.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 |

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

D.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;

D.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 |

D.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 |

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

D.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;

D.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 |

D.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 |

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

D.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;

D.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 |

D.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 |

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

D.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;

D.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 |

D.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"/> |

← 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 $arr[n]$ 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 12 quando n é 17 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | retorna 11 quando n é 17 | <input type="checkbox"/> | retorna 15 quando n é 17 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | retorna 16 quando n é 17 | <input type="checkbox"/> | retorna 17 quando n é 17 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | retorna 16 quando n é 22 | <input type="checkbox"/> | retorna 17 quando n é 22 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | retorna 15 quando n é 22 | <input type="checkbox"/> | retorna 11 quando n é 22 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | retorna 12 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:
 $bar2(1), bar2(3), bar2(5), \dots, bar2(n - 2), bar2(n)$
 Se n é par então bar3 calcula a soma da sequência:
 $bar1(2), bar1(4), bar1(6), \dots, bar1(n - 2), bar1(n)$
 Se n é ímpar então bar3 calcula a soma da sequência:
 $bar1(1), bar1(3), bar1(5), \dots, bar1(n - 2), bar1(n)$
 Se n é par então bar3 calcula a soma da sequência:
 $bar2(2), bar2(4), bar2(6), \dots, bar2(n - 2), bar2(n)$
 Se n é ímpar então bar3 calcula a soma da sequência:
 $bar2(1), bar1(2), bar2(3), \dots, bar2(n - 2), bar1(n - 1), bar2(n)$
 Se n é par então bar3 calcula a soma da sequência:
 $bar1(1), bar2(2), bar1(3), \dots, bar1(n - 2), bar2(n - 1), bar3(n)$
 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 type="checkbox"/> | retorna 1 quando é <code>zoo(v, 5)</code> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | retorna 4 quando é <code>zoo(v, 5)</code> |
| <input checked="" 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> |
- 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*OXXXX*X
X***X**XOX***X*X
X*XXXXXXOX***X*X
X*X*****OX*X***X
X*X*XXX*XOX*XXXX
X***X***OX*****X
XXXX*X*OXXXXX*X
X****X*XOX***X*X
X*XXXXXXXOX***X*X
X*X*X000XOX***X
X*XXXOXOXOX***XXX
X***XOX000X***X*X
X*XXXXXXX*XXX*X
X*X*****X00**
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

Questionario 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](#)

