





Thank you very much for agreeing to participate in this survey. The information provided by you in this questionnaire will be used for research purposes and improvements. It will not be used in a manner, which would allow identification of individual responses. To the best of our ability, your answers in this study will remain confidential. We will minimize any risks by the GDPR rules within ARU.

SUDS Resilience Planning Simulation- SRPSim Engagement Questionnaire (EQ):

Please choose your answer to the best of your knowledge. You could use the provided spaces for additional comments.

Male		Fema	ale		Prefe	r not to say	
2. Age Range:							
20-35		36-51	36-51 5			52+	
3. I felt compete	ent as I learn	ned mo	re about the \$	SRPSi	m		
4. Strongly agree	3. agree		2. Neutral	1. di	sagree	0. Strongly disagree	
			<u> </u>	1			
I. The SRPSim	had a positi	ve effe	ct on me; I fe	It cont	ent, and	парру	
I. The SRPSim 4. Strongly agree	had a positi	ve effe	ct on me; I fe		ent, and l	nappy 0. Strongly disagree	
4. Strongly		ve effe			<u> </u>	0. Strongly	
4. Strongly		ve effe			<u> </u>	0. Strongly	
4. Strongly	3. agree		2. Neutral	1. dis	sagree	0. Strongly disagree	

1

Author: Esfahlani et al 2020

4. Strongly agree	3. agree	2. Neutral	1. disagree	0. Strongly disagree
. It was challe	nging but stimul	ating		
4. Strongly agree	3. agree	2. Neutral	1. disagree	0. Strongly disagree
. I was fully ab	osorbed by the S	RPSim		
4. Strongly agree	3. agree	2. Neutral	1. disagree	0. Strongly disagree
. I enjoyed pla	ying the SRPSin	1		
4. Strongly agree	3. agree	2. Neutral	1. disagree	0. Strongly disagree
				•
	a about resilions	o and its avalua	ition as a result	of playing the
0. I learnt mor RPSim	e about resilient	e and its evalua	anon do a roodin	or playing the
RPSim 4. Strongly	3. agree	2. Neutral	1. disagree	0. Strongly disagree
RPSim			1	0. Strongly
A. Strongly agree		2. Neutral	1. disagree	0. Strongly
A. Strongly agree	3. agree	2. Neutral	1. disagree	0. Strongly

4. Strongly agree	3. agree	2. Neutral	1. disagree	0. Strongly disagree
3. I think SRPS	Sim is an effecti	ve for resilience	-informed SuDS	S planning tool
4. Strongly agree	3. agree	2. Neutral	1. disagree	0. Strongly disagree
4 The SDDSim	holped me to e	rain mara knawl	adaa ahaut tha	SUDe
rrangement an		gain more knowl	euge about the	3005
4. Strongly agree	3. agree	2. Neutral	1. disagree	0. Strongly disagree
			•	
5. I would like t	to continue play	ving the SRPSim	and interacting	a with the virtu
nvironment un	til I get a better	ying the SRPSim		_
nvironment un erformance ba	til I get a better	Suds planning black I receive)	Total Score (im	prove my
nvironment un erformance ba 4. Strongly	til I get a better	Suds planning		_
nvironment un erformance ba	til I get a better	Suds planning black I receive)	Total Score (im	0. Strongly
nvironment un erformance ba 4. Strongly	til I get a better	Suds planning black I receive)	Total Score (im	0. Strongly
environment un performance ba 4. Strongly agree	til I get a better sed on the feed 3. agree	Suds planning black I receive)	1. disagree	0. Strongly
environment un performance ba 4. Strongly agree	til I get a better sed on the feed 3. agree	Suds planning black I receive) 2. Neutral	1. disagree	0. Strongly
environment unperformance bate 4. Strongly agree 6. The influence 4. Strongly	til I get a better sed on the feed 3. agree	Suds planning lback I receive) 2. Neutral m was as deep a	1. disagree s a real life	0. Strongly disagree 0. Strongly
environment underformance bate 4. Strongly agree 6. The influence 4. Strongly	til I get a better sed on the feed 3. agree	Suds planning lback I receive) 2. Neutral m was as deep a	1. disagree s a real life	0. Strongly disagree 0. Strongly
nvironment unerformance ba 4. Strongly agree 6. The influence 4. Strongly agree	til I get a better sed on the feed 3. agree	Suds planning black I receive) 2. Neutral m was as deep a 2. Neutral	1. disagree s a real life	0. Strongly disagree 0. Strongly
4. Strongly agree 4. Strongly agree 4. Strongly agree	til I get a better sed on the feed 3. agree se of the SRPSir 3. agree	Suds planning black I receive) 2. Neutral m was as deep a 2. Neutral	1. disagree s a real life	0. Strongly disagree 0. Strongly

18. I felt bored								
4. Strongly agree	3. agree	2. Neutral	1. disagree	0. Strongly disagree				
19. I was engros	sed forgot everyth	ning around n	ne					
4. Strongly agree	3. agree	2. Neutral	1. disagree	0. Strongly disagree				
	e-driven multi-obj d planning proces		in SPRSim could	transform				
4. Strongly agree	3. agree	2. Neutral	1. disagree	0. Strongly disagree				
EQ-part two- Plea	ase answer the qu	uestions belo	w in your terms:					
1. What do you think about the relevance of the SRPSim to improving flood resilience?								
2. How long	2. How long did it take you to familiarise yourself with the SRPSim?							

3. During the SRPSim playing session, did you focus on the remaining time? Please tell us more about your experience.

4.	What didn't you like about the SRPSim?
5.	How did you find the feedback on the scoring system, quality of life index, and cost calculation in addition to Resilience in the SRPSim and how would you change it?
6.	What addition would you like to see implemented to make it more interactive, interesting and user friendly?
7.	Between the SRPSim play features and visual features which one do you find more compelling and which one was lacking?
8.	Please, give your recommendation on how we can improve the training tool.

9. What effects do you think it can have on educational environment?

_				