

Games for Health Journal

Research, Development, and Clinical Applications

Name of journal and journal url

Older People's Perceptions and Experiences of a Digital Learning Game

Journal:	<i>Games for Health Journal</i>
Manuscript ID:	Draft
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Nap, Henk Herman; Smart Homes, Diaz-Orueta, Unai; Nexplora, Technology & Behavior Gonzalez, Mari; INGEMA, Lozar-Manfreda, Katja; University of Ljubljana, Facal, David; INGEMA, ; University of Santiago de Compostela, Developmental and Education Psychology Dolničar, Vesna; University of Ljubljana, Oyarzun, David; Vicomtech Research Centre, Ranga, Myrto; 50plus Hellas, De Schutter, Bob; Miami University, College of Education, Health & Society - Armstrong Institute for Interactive Media Studies - Scripps Gerontology Center
Keywords:	games, psychology, cognitive health, game technologies, research methods

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Older People's Perceptions and Experiences of a Digital Learning Game

Henk Herman Nap

Smart Homes, Torenallee 20, 5617 BC Eindhoven (The Netherlands), henkherrmannap@gmail.com – corresponding author

Unai Diaz-Orueta

Nesplora, Technology & Behavior (Spain)

Mari Feli Gonzalez

Fundación Instituto Gerontológico Matia – INGEMA (Spain)

Katja Lozar-Manfreda

University of Ljubljana (Slovenia)

David Facal

Fundación Instituto Gerontológico Matia – INGEMA; University of Santiago de Compostela (Spain)

Vesna Dolničar

University of Ljubljana (Slovenia)

David Oyarzun

Vicomtech Research Centre (Spain)

Myrto-Maria Ranga

50plus Hellas (Greece)

Bob de Schutter

Miami University (United States)

ABSTRACT

The paper describes the evaluation studies of a learning game for older adults using a multicultural European sample. The goal of the evaluation was to explore the acquisition of knowledge as a result of game play, the acceptance of two different game interaction systems by the seniors, their experiences while playing the game, and the accessibility of the game's user interface. Several qualitative and quantitative research methods were combined among older adults in the Netherlands, Spain and Greece. The tests revealed that 1) the accessibility of the game menus and interaction devices was high, 2) the player experience in digital game play with a TV remote control and 3D sensor were mostly positive, and 3) the older adults reported that they experienced learning. Overall, it can be concluded that the goals were met, offering a similar accessibility and player experience between the three different countries, and to provide a learning experience for older Europeans.

INTRODUCTION

Digital games are becoming popular among older adults. People who are 50+ years of age represent 29% of the gamer market in the United States (US); which is a 20% increase in comparison to their 1999 report¹. Digital games have become a popular activity in the lives of many older adults in Western societies and scientific studies on older adults and games go hand in hand with the increasing popularity of digital game play among older adults.

Studies trying to capture and reflect the motivational aspects facilitating older people's engagement with digital games are progressively increasing². De Schutter³ found that the most popular playing motive among the older digital game audience was challenge, while social interaction proved to be the most important predictor for the time that respondents invested in playing digital games. Nap et al.² speculate that it is possible that there is an overlap between the motivations of older people to play digital games and those of young adults. However, senior specific lifetime experiences, world knowledge, age-related changes in perception, cognition, and motor control are likely to have an influence on specific gaming preferences, motivations and needs. Furthermore, various studies addressed game design requirements that are compatible with the older adults' cognitive, motor, and perceptual abilities^{4,5,6}. As a consequence of both functional changes and a lack of technological experience, older adults are hurt more by usability problems than younger users.

Digital games – whenever compatible with older adults' needs and abilities – can provide a fun means to spend time and a way to meet others². In addition, digital games can also have a positive influence on older adults' performance in a wide-range of executive control tasks, such as short-term memory, working memory, task switching, and inhibition. For example, Basak et al.⁷ found significant benefits after 23.5 hours of strategy-based gaming on executive control functions following training. In the latest years, there is an increase of learning - or more specifically - of brain training games in the market and in our culture, like Nintendo's Brain Training by Dr. Kawashima, Big Brain Academy and the online Lumosity platform. Although brain training games are put to market, there is no evidence that these type of games make people smarter. In fact, the results from a recent study⁸ supported by BBC Lab UK suggest that improved cognitive functioning by brain training games only hold for the cognitive tasks that are trained. They found no transfer to more general tests of cognition, even when those tasks were closely related to the trained task. Moreover, brain training games lack a number of qualities that most successful commercial games do offer like narration, a story line, appealing graphics, co-and multiplayer, etc.

In terms of cognitive skills, a recent meta-analysis⁹ concluded that the spatial skills improvements derived from playing commercially available shooter video games are comparable to the effects of formal (high school and university-level) courses aimed at enhancing these same skills. These improvements can be obtained in a relatively brief period and its effects may last over an extended period of time, being the most crucial outcome their transfer to other spatial tasks outside the video game context. In terms of socialization, players seem to acquire important prosocial skills when they play games that are specifically designed to reward effective cooperation, support, and helping behaviors⁹. One study that summarized international evidence from correlational, longitudinal, and experimental studies found that playing prosocial video games consistently related to, or predicted, prosocial behaviors¹¹.

1
2
3 When it comes to make games closer and attractive to senior novel gamers, the challenge is
4 higher than with regular high-skilled, younger players. In a relatively recent study published in
5 this same journal¹² studied the key factors and motivations that would engage senior users for
6 them to show interest in playing digital games. In the focus groups conducted, the main interests
7 shared among the participants were to highlight the social aspect of the gaming experience, to
8 experience challenge in games, to combine cognitive and physical activity, and to acquire specific
9 abilities or skills. Two components were commonly agreed on in the participating countries:
10 Challenge (as a basic foundation for the game development, with participants asking for
11 challenging, fun-to-play games with increasing difficulty) and socialization (i.e., participants
12 clearly pointed that they wanted to play with others—not necessarily against others). These
13 results are in line with those reported by Whitcomb¹³, who suggested that seniors playing
14 computer games for an extended period may receive stimulation on their social interaction, and,
15 additionally, outcome benefits in eye-hand coordination and fine motor ability, as well as in basic
16 movements and reaction time, with transfer of these skills to their daily routine such as household
17 chores and automobile driving ability.
18
19
20
21

22 Based on these requisites, this paper describes the evaluations of a learning game for older adults
23 with a multicultural European sample, following requirements previously reported¹². The research
24 was performed as part of the LEAGE (LEARNING Games for older Europeans) project, partially
25 funded by the Life-Long Learning European Program, with the goal to develop of a learning
26 game for older adults.
27
28
29
30

31 METHOD

32 Participants

33
34 In total eighteen older adults participated in the experimental Beta study who individually
35 performed menu- and game play tasks. Six older adults participated in The Netherlands ($M_{age} =$
36 78.4 ; $SD_{age} = 8.4$; 5 female) six older adults in Spain ($M_{age} = 67.3$; $SD_{age} = 4.4$; 3 female) also six
37 older adults in Greece ($M_{age} = 70.7$; $SD_{age} = 7.5$; 4 female). For the selection of the participants in
38 The Netherlands, the KBO (senior organization in the province of Noord-Brabant) was
39 approached, in Spain the Senior Citizens Day Centre of Lasarte and in Greece the Senior Care
40 Centres (KAPI). Respondents were required to be being 60+ years of age and of good cognitive
41 health in order to participate in the study. The mean subjective memory ability score – measured
42 by the Memory Assessment Clinics Self-Rating Scale (MAC-S¹⁴) questionnaire on a 5-item
43 Likert scale – was 3.5 ($SD_{MAC-S} = 0.27$).
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

The LEAGE game

The evaluation study of the digital learning game for older people aims to gather data in the following domains: (1) the knowledge acquisition due to game play; (2) the perceptions and acceptance of the digital learning game and system; (3) the player experience when playing the game; and (4) the accessibility of the game user interface and interaction devices. Prior to the study presented here, the potential success of the game was theorized to be determined by two key factors:

- The continuous involvement of older adults in the game design and implementation stages.
- The implementation on devices which have a low threshold of use for older adults (because they are already familiar with them (e.g., a TV remote control), or because the device is very intuitive (e.g., a Set-Top Box (STB) & 3D sensor - Microsoft Kinect). Therefore, the LEAGE game is available in two versions, one played by means of a 3D – Microsoft Kinect sensor, and one played by means of a TV remote control on a Set-Top Box (from now on called the STB version of the game). The game aims to help older people improve their competences by practicing and expanding their knowledge on topics such as geography, history, health issues (first aid), nutrition and by motivating exercise and memory training.

The “LEAGE of European Travellers” is a game about a road trip along several European countries. The goal of the game is to visit all countries and collect souvenirs (tokens). Each country is represented by three major cities, each with an important landmark or something distinctive (e.g. a famous recipe, person, dance, etc.) that makes the city worth visiting. Each city comprises of a narration (teaching) part and several challenges, each with a different educational goal. Countries and cities are presented on a map and are unlocked as the player proceeds. The rules imply that the player must complete a challenge to proceed to the next city, but can return to previous cities (challenges) in order to achieve a higher score. Each time the player completes a challenge he/she receives a souvenir (token) as feedback. Souvenirs are of three types (bronze, silver, or gold) according to the players score in the challenge. The player’s score is based on the number of correct answers and the time (how fast a challenge is completed). Players also have the opportunity to voluntarily decide to play in pairs competing against each other in specific challenges.

Each country comprises of specific challenges. In all countries challenges are of the same type, to enable a seamless experience to players regardless of their own country. More specifically, each country comprises three locations, and each location has three challenges which all start from the village/city square (see Figure 1.), in total nine per country, i.e. three sight-seeing, two recipes, two emergencies (first aid), and two exercises/dances. In Table 1, the various challenges per country are listed. A sightseeing challenge consisted of first a narration part with a video (both 3D graphics and images) about the sightseeing place (see Figure 1.) about the history of the particular location. After this, the player receives a number of multiple choice questions (see Figure) about the narration part (e.g., When was the Mill Network built? 1. 1421; 2. 1740; 3. 1997). The recipe challenge consisted of an animated instruction about how a certain recipe should be prepared with the right ingredients (e.g., prepare Tzatziki at the Athens sight). The game could also be played by means of the 3D motion sensor Kinect, and then the actual

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

movements of stirring, cutting, etc. had to be made. The emergency challenge is also a trivia game, yet, without a narration part. The exercise/dance consisted of an instruction video for the exercise and 3D animated person for the dance to train the player how to perform the actions. After that, players had to try it themselves and the Kinect monitored their behaviours and translated these into actual game behaviours.

[INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE]

[INSERT FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE]

Procedure

The participants were welcomed and an introduction was given by one of the experimenters to introduce the digital learning game under study (UI, controls etc.) and to provide information about the study procedure. After this, participants were asked to read and sign an informed consent form. The informed consent stated what was being studied, ensured anonymous analysis, announced that audio and image recordings were going to be made, and made clear to the participants that they could withdraw their consent and cooperation at any given point in time during or after the session. If necessary, the participants were supported by the experimenters in filling in the forms. Then, they filled a general questionnaire to gather the age, gender, etc. of the participants. The MAC-S was administered to ensure that all participants had sufficient abilities to (learn to) play the game. The game and controls were introduced the first time they started a game and they also received a manual. The participants had to perform game UI- and game play tasks with the purpose of testing the usability of the interface, player experience, user acceptance, and learning. The participants filled in the IBM usability questions after they performed the UI tasks and after the game tasks. Then, an interview took place with each participant after he/she had finished the game. The interview provided users with means to ‘step outside the box’ of pre-constructed questionnaires. The focus of the interview was about the preferences and user acceptance of the digital learning (LEAGE) game. The interviews lasted approximately 15 minutes for the experimental session and the whole experiment took about 1.5 hours. At the end of all sessions there was a gift for participation. See Figure 2 for the various experimental sessions at the 3 pilot sites.

[INSERT FIGURE 2 ABOUT HERE]

Game menu- and play tasks

As it has been said, the digital learning game is composed by a series of activities and puzzles that the player has to solve. The activities and puzzles are grouped, and each group takes place *virtually* in a European city, immersing the player in its historical and geographical context. Moreover, during the starting of the game, it includes some screens to configure the avatar of the player, specify his/her language, etc. The whole game script follows the schema that is shown in the Figure 3.

The participants performed game menu tasks with the purpose of testing the usability of the interface and user acceptance. An example of a game menu task: “Create a new player”. In addition, they performed and game-play tasks to gather an insight into older adults’ player experience, user acceptance, and learning with the game. An example of a game play task: “Go to Greece, then to Athens (Acropolis), go to the monument and play the game.” Tasks were provided on separate sheets of paper.

Location & Equipment

The experimental sessions took place in a specific room in the designated institutions in the

1
2
3 Netherlands (KBO Heeze, Computerhulp Geldrop and/or Ananz Geldrop), Spain (Ingema's lab),
4 and Greece (KAPI Day Center in Ilioupoli). Due to technical difficulties with the Microsoft
5 Kinect in The Netherlands, the Kinect version of the game could not be tested there. Due to
6 technical difficulties with the LEAGE STB in Spain and Greece, the STB version of the game
7 could not be tested in these countries¹.
8
9

10 In The Netherlands, the experimental sessions were conducted on an all-in-one PC (MSI Wind
11 Top AE210) with an AMD Athlon dual core 3250e processor and with a 20.0" wide screen
12 (1600x900-pixel resolution). To ensure the compatibility with the developed design of the game,
13 the 20.0" screen was set to 1280x768-pixel resolution. The LEAGE STB was used as the
14 platform on which the participants performed the UI and game tasks. For the STB version of
15 LEAGE, a standard Microsoft Mediacenter IR remote and receiver was used. The tasks were
16 written on paper. A stopwatch was used to measure task time. All instructions were read from
17 pre-made printed cards. Audio and image recordings were made with a HTC Legend smartphone.
18
19

20 In Spain, the experimental and open sessions were conducted on a PC (Acer Aspire Revo) with
21 an Intel Atom processor D525 and with a 20.0" wide screen (1600x900-pixel resolution). The
22 Kinect version of the LEAGE game was presented on a 51" wide screen TV. To ensure the
23 compatibility with the developed design of the game, the screen was set to 1280x768-pixel
24 resolution and to 1280x800-pixel resolution for the Kinect version of the game. The LEAGE
25 Kinect game was used as the platforms on which the participants performed the UI and game
26 tasks. For the Kinect version of LEAGE, an XBOX 360 USB Kinect was used. The tasks were
27 written on paper. A stopwatch was used to measure task time. All instructions were read from
28 pre-made printed cards. Audio and image recordings were made with a Samsung Galaxy
29 smartphone.
30
31
32

33 In Greece, the sessions were conducted with the use of a laptop computer (TURBO-X) with an
34 Intel processor, a beamer as well as an XBOX 360 USB Kinect. The projection on the wall was
35 about 70" wide with a 1280x768 pixel resolution on a crème-white wall. Instructions were written
36 on paper and read to the participants from the researchers. Image recordings and videos were
37 made with a SAMSUNG Galaxy smartphone.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55 ¹ It should be noted that the LEAGE game was in a Beta stage during the evaluations, a stage in which
56 technical problems are common.
57
58
59
60

Measurements

Learning

Learning was assessed with qualitative data on perceived learning / knowledge acquisition from semi-structured interviews. In-game scores were also collected via log-files. Yet, a number of the log-files could not be identified and therefore the in-game scores were not used in the analyses.

Player experience

The *player experience* of the users was measured by the Game Experience Questionnaire (GEQ), which probes the players' feelings and thoughts while playing the game¹⁵. The questionnaires assess game experience as scores on seven components: Immersion (e.g., *'I could use my fantasy in the game'*), Flow (e.g., *'While playing, I forgot everything around me'*), Competence (e.g., *'I was good at it'*), Positive Affect (e.g., *'Playing the game was fun'*), Negative Affect (e.g., *'I found it boring'*), Annoyance (e.g., *'I felt irritable'*) and Challenge (e.g., *'I had to put a lot of effort in the game'*). The GEQ was administered during the experimental session where participants received it after a predefined play time (e.g., 5 minutes). Reliability is measured using Cronbach's alpha as a measure of internal consistency which is one possible dimension of scale reliability¹⁶. Cronbach's alpha scores for the seven components of the game experience are shown in Table 2.

[INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE]

A Cronbach's alpha is used to measure the internal consistency reliability of the used questionnaire. A reliability of .70 or higher is considered good, .60 or higher as acceptable¹⁷. As can be seen above, in our user studies at the various sites sometimes alpha scores were lower than this target value. This may be due to the relatively small sample sizes and/or the fact that some participants scored unreliably. Especially the latest was probably the case, as the GEQ was developed for young adults and also used on children samples^{18,19,20}, however a special version for older adults was not available. It is possible that some senior participants did not understand the items as were supposed to be understood. However, since we employed the in-game version of the GEQ, which only has two items per scale, deleting items was not an option. Moreover, the scales employed here have been validated based on studies with large sample sizes (N>250). We therefore decided to stick with the original scales. Results on the scales with zero internal consistencies (negative affect and annoyance) were removed from the analysis.

In the FUGA project (EU FP6 project), player experience data was gathered per game genre, platform, etc. of about 400 younger to older players²⁰. This data can be used to compare or benchmark the player experience of the user groups in the Beta tests of the LEAGE game. The LEAGE game on both end-devices should rather provide a similar player experience for a specific game genre to the player experience FUGA threshold. The game genres of which player experience data is available from the FUGA project are: First Person Shooters (FPS), Role Playing Games (RPG), Sports/Racing Games, Puzzle & Quiz Games, Action Adventures, and Strategy Games. The LEAGE game is closest to a puzzle and quiz game, and therefore the FUGA data of the Puzzle & Quiz games were used to benchmark the LEAGE Beta player experience.

1
2
3
4
5 **User acceptance, perceived usability, preferences, and errors** were gathered through
6 interviews.
7

8
9 An appropriate method to study user acceptance is by means of interviews to elicit in-depth
10 information of the perceptions, opinions, beliefs, and attitudes. Key questions that were asked –
11 among others: *“Please share your learning experiences with the LEAGE game”*; *“What were*
12 *your feelings while playing the game”*; *“What are your opinions about playing the games*
13 *together”*. Probing questions followed to gather additional insight information.
14
15

16 17 18 **Accessibility of the UI**

19
20 The accessibility of the UI was studied using the interviews and by means of the IBM usability
21 questionnaire²¹. The IBM usability questionnaire was delivered in the language of participants
22 (Greek, Spanish or Dutch) and assess usability experience as scores on three components (system
23 usefulness, information quality, and interface quality). The questionnaire contained nineteen
24 usability items that had to be rated on a 7-item Likert scale. It measures system usefulness (e.g. ‘It
25 is simple to use this system.’), information quality (e.g. ‘The organization of information on the
26 system screens is clear.’), and interface quality (e.g., ‘This system has all the functions and
27 capabilities I expect it to have’). The interviewees could also comment on specific UI flaws, but
28 also on their likes about certain aspects of the functionality of the system. Cronbach’s alpha’s
29 were calculated (see, Table 3), and although one of the alpha’s could not be calculated and one
30 was negative, all components were used for the analyses since in general the internal consistency
31 was high (Overall Usability had a Cronbach’s alpha of .97).
32
33

34
35
36
37 [INSERT TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE]
38
39

40 41 **RESULTS**

42 43 **Qualitative Data**

44
45 Results from the interviews are presented per discussion topic and interview question. The
46 interviews were held in the mother language of the participant. The quotes have been translated
47 into English for the purpose of this article. To prevent distortion of the original messages, the
48 quotes have not been modified to create full sentences. Clarifications are presented above the
49 quotes and between brackets within the quotes.
50

51 52 **Learning**

53 *Please share your learning experiences with the LEAGE game.*
54

55 Overall, most participants reported that they learned new facts about different cultures and
56 history, and that they experienced the game play as a learning experience:
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

"I really liked the fact that I learn about history and culture of other countries. It is a game for grown-ups!" (P1, Greece)

I liked it. You learn something from it. Stuff is coming back to you [experiences/knowledge] (P6, The Netherlands)

"Yes, [I learned about] a couple of recipes. Certainly the information from Spain. The knowledge from The Netherlands was already in my head. It was certainly a learning experience." (P2, The Netherlands)

However, some of the participants (especially from Spain) reported that although the game was informative, it was also fast paced with small fonts. Because of this, they perceived learning as difficult or limited:

"It is useful because it shows you things that you didn't know. The game is very fast and has a lot of text so it is difficult to remember the dates and places. At the end, you are not able to know the answers unless you are lucky. It's not possible to remember all the things [facts presented in the game]. (P7, Spain)

What were your feelings and thoughts while playing the game?

Some of the participants reported that they did not experience a game or playfulness, but rather memory training:

"Simple game, [it is] no game. It is more memory training that is how I see it. In a game you need to get to certain levels and it becomes more difficult. That is not the case here. Old-fashioned way." (P1, The Netherlands)

"At the second or third time, you know how to use it. There is no motivation to lay alone with the remote control. There should be the option to practice more physical activity, it lacks something more playful." (P7, Spain)

Some of the participants experienced fun and had a positive player experience, yet, they did report that the text that was shown in the Trivia game was too fast and the font sizes too small:

"Good, it is easy. You do need to read the text very well. Sometimes a fact is double. Need to look carefully at the text." (P3, The Netherlands)

"Cooking was fun. Text too fast. New screen, new sentence. Sometimes I missed something. Not synchronous. A lot of information in a short time. The Netherlands and Spain, general knowledge." (P4, The Netherlands)

"[The game] is fun. Next time the results will be higher. It was very fast." (P5, The Netherlands)

"At the beginning you feel a little bit clumsy, but at the second or third time it [the game] is more easy to use. When you hit the answer you feel a little joy. When you play with another person it is more fun because you can compete with him. It is easier to play with

1
2
3 *the remote control because you know where the buttons are.” (P15, Spain)*
4
5

6 **User acceptance - replayability**
7

8 ***Did you keep playing LEAGE until the end of the pilot? If yes/no, why? Would you***
9 ***keep playing LEAGE after the pilot if possible?***
10
11

12
13 Overall, most participants reported that they would play it again if additional content would be
14 provided:
15

16 *“I would want to extend my knowledge. Every time a new version. Would play it at least*
17 *one more time. New cities, extend it.” (P4, The Netherlands)*
18

19 *“Would like to continue playing with it if it would have more countries, cities more*
20 *dynamic games (famous painters, agriculture, people, cities, sports, literature, etc.). I*
21 *would like to have the same game with more contents.” (P7, Spain)*
22
23

24 *“Yes I would. Because I think it is interesting. Three cities, etc. more countries.” (P6,*
25 *The Netherlands)*
26

27 *“I would play with it if I would have it and if it would include more contents and*
28 *activities” (P15, Spain).*
29
30

31
32
33 One participant reported that she would not play it again, since she experienced little challenge.
34 However, increasing the difficulty level and adding more countries could enhance replayability:
35

36 *“One time and another time [playing it twice] and that is it. There is no challenge.*
37 *Having read the text three times and that is it. [The game should be] more difficult, more*
38 *countries, more time.” (P1, The Netherlands)*
39
40

41
42 **Social Play**
43

44 What are your opinions about playing the games together (turn based, social play)?

45 A considerable group of participants reported that they would play the LEAGE game together
46 with other people and reported positively about this possibility:
47
48

49 *“Playing together would be fun/ [a] laugh. [Would like] One time to try. Interesting, but*
50 *no.” (P1, The Netherlands)*
51

52 *“Playing turns is always more fun.” (P4, The Netherlands)*
53

54 *“With my wife, taking turns. We always play together. IQ, dictation, etc.” (P5, The*
55 *Netherlands)*
56

57 *“The game is thought to play with other people. One of the strengths is that is good to*
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

compete with other people.” (P7, Spain)

“I guess playing it together with others would be more fun, as we will laugh with at each other’s mistakes or movements” (P2, Greece)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Quantitative Data

Usability

The results from the IBM usability questionnaires of the older adults in experimental sessions in respect to usability and player experience for the devices and countries, see Table 4 for means and standard deviations per country and usability component. Ideally, usability should be above the scale mid-point of 4, should not differ between the countries, and should be similar on both end-devices. Multiple comparisons were run with a Bonferroni correction to account for chance capitalization. No significant differences were found between the devices and countries on the usability components.

[INSERT TABLE 4 ABOUT HERE]

Player Experience

Positive player experience should rather be above the GEQ scale mid-point of 2. The end-devices should not significantly differ in their player experience scores, as for the scores between the participating countries. See Table 5 for the player experience scores per country and device. From the data it seems that both the player experience for both devices and countries do not differ, except possibly Challenge and Flow which both seem to differ between the countries. Again, multiple comparisons were run with a Bonferroni correction to account for chance capitalization. No significant differences were found between the devices and countries on the player experience components.

[INSERT TABLE 5 ABOUT HERE]

Benchmark

In respect to the benchmark scores, it is interesting to note that Immersion was rated higher on the LEAGE game than the benchmark. Both negative player experiences Annoyance and Negative Affect scored lower than the benchmark, which implies that the LEAGE game was less boring and frustrating than the benchmark. Yet, competence scores were lower for LEAGE than the benchmark. For an overview of the scores, see Table 5.

DISCUSSION & CONCLUSION

The evaluations of a digital learning game for older people provided rich in-depth data about older people's perception and experiences from a multi-cultural sample from The Netherlands, Spain, and Greece. From the evaluations, both qualitative and quantitative data was gathered and the qualitative results showed that most older adults learned new facts about different cultures and history and experienced the game play as a learning experience. Although the digital learning game intended to provide game play, some of the participants experienced the game as memory training; however they did experience fun and enjoyment. The findings indicate that learning games in potential be a valuable and enjoyable tool for memory training purposes among older people. Overall, most participants would play the game again and found the game content interesting. One of the major achievements of the developed learning game is the ease-of-use of the game menu and input devices, although the narration text could be enlarged and the narration part is somewhat fast paced, which should be enhanced in a future version of the game. In The Netherlands, the Set-Top-Box (with remote control) to operate the game was perceived as easy, as the Kinect in Greece. The older adults further reported that they would play the game together with other people, indicating a positive social play possibility for digital learning games as LEAGE. Finally, older adults from The Netherlands, Spain, and Greece were positive about the design, usability and player

1
2
3 experience of the game and suggestions for improvements were reported (e.g., slower
4 game speed, enhanced Kinect responsiveness, larger fonts).
5
6

7 The quantitative usability results showed – per country and device – that the satisfaction,
8 information quality, interface quality, and system usefulness of the game menus and
9 interaction devices were scored positively – above the scale mid-point of 4. No
10 significant differences were found on usability and player experience between the devices
11 and countries. In respect to the player experience compared to the benchmark, the
12 developed learning game seems to be competitive compared to existing puzzle and quiz
13 games. Future evaluations will provide more insight in the player experience of the
14 LEAGE game compared to exemplar games.
15
16

17 Possible limitations of the study were the small sample size, unbalanced study design,
18 and most importantly, the current stage of the game design. The game still needs to be
19 polished in respect to usability issues (e.g., small fonts, narration speed, etc.), and the
20 game mechanics, dynamics and aesthetics should be enhanced. In addition, the Kinect
21 and STB technology needs to be further improved to ensure stability of the software.
22 Furthermore, social and cooperative play should be made possible. Overall, the player
23 results represent data of a game at a Beta stage.
24
25
26

27 In conclusion, the experimental evaluations provided us with a number of valuable and
28 in-depth results. The usability of the game menus and interaction devices and the player
29 experience in digital game play with the STB and Kinect were high. Older adults reported
30 that they experienced learning and overall we can conclude that the game provided
31 accessible and attractive game play for older Europeans. Research results also indicate
32 that the learning game holds the potential to improve older people's quality of life by
33 enhancing social interactions and enriching their leisure time. As stated in a recent
34 review²², caution is warranted for any gamified intervention in the health and education
35 sciences, as very few of the games developed to improve health and learning outcomes
36 are scientifically evaluated. Also in the case of LEAGE, we lack a control group to assure
37 that the benefits can be implemented in a long term and, most important, transfer them to
38 the daily life routine of senior gamers. As a result, for many games and also for LEAGE,
39 further work is needed to examine how much more effective it can be to change
40 behavioural and health outcomes than are conventional approaches. As any game, the
41 developed learning game is still open for improvements, yet, shows potential for
42 entertaining and accessible means to learning by digital game play for an older audience.
43
44
45
46

47 **Acknowledgements**

48 The authors thank the older adults who participated in the studies, Vivian Vergouwen
49 from ANANZ (Geldrop, The Netherlands), KBO (Province of Noord-Brabant, The
50 Netherlands), Senior Citizens Day Centre (Lasarte, Spain), and in Greece the Senior Care
51 Centres (KAPI). We gratefully acknowledge support from the European Commission's
52 Lifelong Learning Programme (LLP). In particular, the work reported here has been
53 supported by the LEAGE project (part of the GRUNDTVIG Subprogramme Education
54 and Culture DG).
55
56
57
58
59
60

REFERENCES

1. Entertainment Software Association (ESA). Essential Facts About the Computer and Video Game Industry: Sales, Demographics, and Usage data; 2011. Accessed February 7, 2014: http://www.theesa.com/facts/pdfs/ESA_EF_2011.pdf
2. Nap HH, de Kort YAW, IJsselsteijn WA (2009). Senior Gamers: Preferences, Motivations & Needs. *Gerontechnology* 2009; 8: 247-62.
3. De Schutter B. Never Too Old to Play: The Appeal of Digital Games to an Older Audience. *Games and Culture* 2010; 6: 155-70.
4. Gerling KM, Schulte F, Smeddinck J, Masuch M. Game Design for Older Adults: Effects of Age-Related Changes on Structural Elements of Digital Games. Proceedings of the International Conference on Entertainment Computing (ICEC '12). Bremen, Germany; 2012.
5. De Schutter B, Abeele V Vanden. Meaningful Play in Elderly Life. Proceedings of ICA 2008, Communication for social impact. Montreal: Quebec; 2008.
6. IJsselsteijn WA, Nap HH, de Kort YAW, Poels K. Digital Game Design for Elderly Users, Proceedings of Futureplay 2007. Toronto, Canada, 14-18 November 2007: 17-22.
7. Basak C, Boot WR, Voss MW and Kramer AF. Can Training in a Real-Time Strategy Video Game Attenuate Cognitive Decline in Older Adults?. *Psychol Aging* 2008; 23: 765-77.
8. Owen AM, Hampshire A, Grahn JA, Stenton R, Dajani S, Burns AS, Howard RJ, Ballard CG. Putting brain training to the test. *Nature*, 20 April 2010.
9. Uttal DH, Meadow NG, Tipton E, Hand LL, Alden AR, Warren C, Newcombe NS (2013). The malleability of spatial skills: A meta-analysis of training studies. *Psychol Bull* 2013; 139: 352-402.
10. Ewoldsen DR, Eno CA, Okdie BM, Velez JA, Guadagno RE, DeCoster J. Effect of playing violent video games cooperatively or competitively on subsequent cooperative behavior. *Cyberpsychol Behav Soc Netw* 2012; 15: 277-80.
11. Gentile DA, Anderson CA, Yukawa S, Ihori N, Saleem M, Ming LK, Sakamoto A. The effects of prosocial video games on prosocial behaviors: International evidence from correlational, longitudinal, and experimental studies. *Pers Soc Psychol Bull* 2009; 35: 752-63.
12. Diaz-Orueta U, Facal D, Nap HH, Ranga MM. What is the key for older people to show interest in playing digital learning games? Initial qualitative findings from the LEAGE project on a multicultural European sample. *Games for Health Journal* 2012; 1: 115-23.
13. Whitcomb GR. Computer games for the elderly. *Acm Sigcas Computers and Society* 1990; 20: 112-15.
14. Crook T, Larrabee H, Glenn J. A self-rating scale for evaluating memory in everyday life. *Psychol Aging* 1990; 5: 48-57.
15. IJsselsteijn WA, de Kort YAW, Poels K. The Game Experience Questionnaire: Development of a self-report measure to assess the psychological impact of digital games; 2008.
16. Kline P. The handbook of psychological testing (2nd ed.). London: Routledge; 1999.
17. George D, Mallery P. SPSS for Windows step by step: A simple guide and reference. 11.0 update (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon; 2003.
18. Gajadhar BJ, de Kort YAW, IJsselsteijn WA. Rules of Engagement: Influence of Co-Player Presence on Player Involvement in Digital Games. *Int J Gaming Med Simul* 2009; 1: 14-27.
19. Nacke LE, Drachen A, Kuikkaniemi K, Niesenhaus J, Korhonen HJ, van den Hoogen WM, Poels K, IJsselsteijn WA, de Kort YAW. Playability and Player Experience Research.

1
2
3 DiGRA 2009, Breaking New Ground: Innovation in Games, Play, Practice and Theory,
4 Brunel University, West London, United Kingdom, Tuesday 1st September - Friday 4th
5 September 2009.

- 6
7 20. Poels K, IJsselsteijn W.A. de Kort YAW. Development of the Kids Game Experience
8 Questionnaire. Poster presented at the Meaningful Play Conference, East Lansing, USA,
9 October 2008. Abstract in proceedings; 2008.
- 10 21. Lewis JR. IBM Computer Usability Satisfaction Questionnaires: Psychometric Evaluation
11 and Instructions for Use. IJHCI 1995; 7: 57-78.
- 12 22. Granic I, Lobel A, Engels RC. The Benefits of Playing Video Games; 2013. Accessed
13 February 9, 2014: <http://www.apa.org/pubs/journals/releases/amp-a0034857.pdf>
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1. The four game challenges in LEAGE, described per country and sightseeing place.

		Sightseeing/Trivia	Recipe	Emergency	Dance / Exercise
Greece	Athens	Acropolis	Tzatziki	NA	Syrtaki dance
	Epidavros	Ancient theatre, history of theatre	Cheese pie	Skin burn	NA
	Santorini	Akrotiri, wall paintings, Volcano	NA	Earthquake	Swimming
Netherlands	Amsterdam	Ring of Canals, Anne Frank's house	Pepernoten	Fire in Hotel	NA
	Kinderdijk-Elshout	The Mill Network	NA	Insect Bite - mite	Turn cap of windmill
	Delta Works	Eastern Scheldt storm surge barrier	Zeeland mussels	NA	Cycling
Spain	Bilbao	Guggenheim museum	Peppers stuffed with cod	Sun burn	NA
	Santiago de Compostella	Saint James Cathedral	Saint James Cake	Food poisoning	NA
	Barcelona	Sagrada Familia Cathedral	Mongetes seques con botifarra	NA	Sardana dance

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60



Figure 1. Screens from the LEAGE game: top-left the village square where players can select a challenge, top-right the narration part of the trivia game, center a multiple choice question of the trivia game, bottom-left the recipe/cooking instructions, and on the bottom-right the recipe game to select the right ingredients. 140x138mm (96 x 96 DPI)

Distribution



Figure 2. Participant in The Netherlands playing the STB (left) LEAGE game in the experimental session, and participant in Spain (center) and Greece (right) playing the Kinect version of the LEAGE game.
150x31mm (96 x 96 DPI)

Table 2: Cronbach’s alpha scores for seven components of game experience (the components Annoyance and Negative Affect with a zero score for a certain country – in bold with an asterisk – were removed from the analyses).

	The Netherlands	Spain	Greece
Positive Affect	.97	.79	.86
Competence	.92	.92	.94
Challenge	.86	.40	.86
Annoyance	.89	.00*	.00*
Negative Affect	.00*	.36	.00*
Immersion	.64	.79	.78
Flow	.75	.55	1.00

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Review ONLY/Not for Distribution

Table 3: Cronbach's alpha scores for three components of usability

	The Netherlands	Spain	Greece
System Usefulness	.93	.97	.92
Information Quality	-	.95	.62
Interface Quality	.82	-.31	.93

Table 4. Usability Means (M) with Standard Deviations (SD) by Country & End-Devices, and Benchmark.

		Country		
		NL (STB)	ES (Kinect)	GR (Kinect)
Overall Usability	<i>M</i>	6.19	5.11	6.21
	<i>SD</i>	0.93	1.62	0.73
Information Quality	<i>M</i>	5.96	5.14	6.24
	<i>SD</i>	1.22	1.67	0.67
Interface Quality	<i>M</i>	6.29	4.96	6.08
	<i>SD</i>	0.75	1.27	0.96
System Usefulness	<i>M</i>	6.33	5.12	6.26
	<i>SD</i>	0.81	1.86	0.77

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

View ONLY/Not for Distribution

Table 5: Player Experience Means (M) with Standard Deviations (SD) by Country & End-Devices, and Benchmark.

		Country			Benchmark
		NL (STB)	ES (Kinect)	GR (Kinect)	
Competence	<i>M</i>	1.58	1.83	2.42	3.00
	<i>SD</i>	0.97	0.93	0.80	0.85
Positive Affect	<i>M</i>	2.42	2.50	3.17	3.14
	<i>SD</i>	1.11	0.89	0.68	0.76
Immersion	<i>M</i>	2.58	2.67	2.92	1.69
	<i>SD</i>	0.97	0.98	0.58	0.72
Flow	<i>M</i>	1.75	2.83	2.83	2.22
	<i>SD</i>	0.99	0.82	0.75	1.12
Challenge	<i>M</i>	2.00	1.33	0.83	2.33
	<i>SD</i>	1.10	0.83	0.41	0.82