

# Chapter 21

## Study Design and Data Gathering Guide for Serious Games' Evaluation

**Jannicke Baalsrud Hauge**

*Bremer Institut für Produktion und Logistik  
(BIBA), Germany*

**Elizabeth Boyle**

*University of the West of Scotland, UK*

**Igor Mayer**

*Delft University of Technology, The Netherlands*

**Rob Nadolski**

*Open University of The Netherlands, The  
Netherlands*

**Johann C. K. H. Riedel**

*Nottingham University, UK*

**Pablo Moreno-Ger**

*Universidad Complutense de Madrid*

**Francesco Bellotti**

*Università degli Studi di Genova, Italy*

**Theodore Lim**

*Heriot-Watt University, UK*

**James Ritchie**

*Heriot-Watt University, UK*

### ABSTRACT

*The objective of this chapter is to provide an overview of the different methods that can be used to evaluate the learning outcomes of serious games. These include Randomised Control Trials (RCT), quasi-experimental designs, and surveys. Case studies of a selection of serious games developed for use in higher education are then presented along with evaluations of these games. The evaluations illustrate the different evaluation methods, along with an assessment of how well the evaluation method performed. Finally, the chapter discusses the lessons learned and compares the experiences with the evaluation methods and their transferability to other games.*

## INTRODUCTION

In the last decade higher education has taken a digital turn in the use of games and simulations for learning and training. The long and well-established tradition of using teacher-led, no-technology or low-technology simulation games in higher education is 'under the spell' of online simulations, 3-D virtual worlds and digital Serious Games (SGs). So, what have we gained and/or possibly lost with this digital turn to Game-based Learning (GBL)? To answer this question we need to have ways of evaluating the learning impact of games. This chapter sets out to review and provide examples of the different evaluation methods that can be applied to serious games.

Considerable efforts and resources are now being put into the evaluation and assessment of game-based learning. As a result, both the number and the quality of evaluations of games for learning are increasing (see for a recent overview Connolly et al., 2012). However, there are still considerable weaknesses, for example, the absence of tools for unobtrusive, 'stealth' data gathering and assessment, and good research designs other than randomized controlled trials. Here, we wish to make a contribution by looking at how different evaluation methods have been applied to some serious games and to see what has been measured and how.

This chapter will present several case studies of serious games and their evaluation methodologies. It will identify the differences in the evaluation methods, and also discuss what this means for the transferability of the evaluation methods to other types of games.

## EVALUATION METHODS FOR SG LEARNING OUTCOMES

The evaluation of games is complex and multidimensional since it involves evaluation not just of whether there is an improvement in performance on

the targeted learning outcomes, but also evaluation of the user acceptance of, engagement with, and satisfaction with the game. The introduction of a serious game into the curriculum raises similar issues to any other educational intervention, since the aim of a game is to improve performance on a specific learning outcome. Woolfson (2011) proposes a hierarchy of evidence for evaluating educational interventions:

1. Meta-analyses
2. Randomised controlled trials (RCT)
3. Quasi-experimental designs
4. Single case experimental designs – pre & post test
5. Non experimental designs – surveys, correlational, qualitative

*Meta-Analyses:* At the top of the hierarchy of evidence for the effectiveness of interventions are meta-analyses. Meta-analysis combines the results from previous studies to identify patterns in research findings, especially with respect to whether games are effective methods in learning. Meta-analysis requires a reasonable number of empirical studies as input to compare – in serious games we still have a way to go to produce the needed studies, hence it has not been included in this chapter.

*Randomised Control Trials (RCT):* The Randomised Control Trial (RCT) is considered to be the gold standard for evaluating educational interventions. In a RCT participants are randomly allocated to an experimental (game) group or a control (non-game) group and their performance on the target skill/behaviour before and after the game intervention is tested. Ideally pre-testing should confirm no existing difference between the groups, while post-testing should show whether the experimental group performs better than the control group. Improvements in the target skill/behaviour for the experimental compared with the control group in a follow-up study would

25 more pages are available in the full version of this document, which may be purchased using the "Add to Cart" button on the publisher's webpage:

[www.igi-global.com/chapter/study-design-and-data-gathering-guide-for-serious-games-evaluation/126071](http://www.igi-global.com/chapter/study-design-and-data-gathering-guide-for-serious-games-evaluation/126071)

## Related Content

---

### Does Game Quality Reflect Heuristic Evaluation?: Heuristic Evaluation of Games in Different Quality Strata

Björn Strååt, Fredrik Rutzand Magnus Johansson (2014). *International Journal of Gaming and Computer-Mediated Simulations* (pp. 45-58).

[www.irma-international.org/article/does-game-quality-reflect-heuristic-evaluation/123500](http://www.irma-international.org/article/does-game-quality-reflect-heuristic-evaluation/123500)

### Decoupling Aspects in Board Game Modeling

Fulvio Frapolli, Amos Brocco, Apostolos Malatrasand Béat Hirsbrunner (2012). *Interdisciplinary Advancements in Gaming, Simulations and Virtual Environments: Emerging Trends* (pp. 78-96).

[www.irma-international.org/chapter/decoupling-aspects-board-game-modeling/63230](http://www.irma-international.org/chapter/decoupling-aspects-board-game-modeling/63230)

### Gamification as an Engaging Approach for University Students in Distance Education

Pierluigi Muoioand Lorella Gabriele (2022). *Handbook of Research on Promoting Economic and Social Development Through Serious Games* (pp. 76-95).

[www.irma-international.org/chapter/gamification-as-an-engaging-approach-for-university-students-in-distance-education/300624](http://www.irma-international.org/chapter/gamification-as-an-engaging-approach-for-university-students-in-distance-education/300624)

### The Social Facilitation of Performance, Engagement and Affect in a Complex Videogame: Opponent Identity

Russell Blair Williams (2019). *International Journal of Gaming and Computer-Mediated Simulations* (pp. 1-17).

[www.irma-international.org/article/the-social-facilitation-of-performance-engagement-and-affect-in-a-complex-videogame/228146](http://www.irma-international.org/article/the-social-facilitation-of-performance-engagement-and-affect-in-a-complex-videogame/228146)

### Computational Literacy in Online Games: The Social Life of Mods

Constance Constance Steinkuehlerand Barbara Z. Johnson (2009). *International Journal of Gaming and Computer-Mediated Simulations* (pp. 53-65).

[www.irma-international.org/article/computational-literacy-online-games/2161](http://www.irma-international.org/article/computational-literacy-online-games/2161)