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1. Title, Abstract & Keywords

*In your abstract, please include a brief session description (not to exceed 100 words), and three to four keywords. If your proposal is accepted, this description will be printed in the conference program.*

**Learning is Fun: Enhancing Learning Experience through Gamification**

Engagement with students in learning activities has become increasingly important in Higher Education. To achieve flipped classroom, diversity in higher education, and student engagement, I reviewed the concept of gamification and designed a Personal and Professional Development course by incorporating several gamified elements that can be relatively easily incorporated into existing approaches and virtual learning environments (VLEs). Preliminary findings of the effectiveness of the gamified course were supported by evidence of student participation in learning activities. Also, opportunities and challenges of using gamification in course design are discussed.

Keywords: gamification, technology-supported learning, diversity, flipped classroom, student engagement

1. Format

Activity or exercise

X Roundtable discussion (60 minute only)

General discussion session

2a) For activities and exercises only, is yours best suited for

A traditional classroom

An online class

Either

2b) For activities and exercises only, is yours best suited for

Undergraduate students

Graduate students

Either

1. Time Requested:

30 Minutes

X 60 Minutes (*Roundtables must select 60 minutes*)

90 Minutes

1. Planning Details:

*Each room contains a white board with markers, computer (PC) with DVD capability and computer projector. Does your session require any other equipment?*

The session is divided into three parts: presentation, participant role-plays, and general discussion. In addition to white board with markers, computer and projector, it would be necessary to be in a **wifi** environment in order for participants to experience a mini-example of a gamified course. **Flipcharts** and **post-it notes** are also needed to facilitate general discussion.

1. Teaching Implications:

*What is the contribution of your session to management pedagogy/andragogy? Specifically, please include your learning objectives, and describe what management and/or teaching topics are relevant to your session, and why. Also, include theoretical, disciplinary, or theoretical foundations that will help reviewers understand how your ideas fit within the broader field of management.*

In this session, I will explain how I used a gamified course design in a course titled Personal and Professional Development to achieve the enhancement of student learning experience, with particular focuses on student engagement (Gibbs, 2014), flipped classroom, and diversity in higher education. My presentation will provide insights in terms of using gamified course design to enhance student engagement and satisfaction. Also, the gamified course and its learning activities offer diversified learning materials and autonomy in learning to students with different needs. Finally, the gamified course by using virtual learning environment (VLE) allows co-creation of knowledge and a shift from teacher-centered to student-centered learning environment (Hannafin & Land, 1997).

**Leaning Objectives: Evaluation of A Gamified Course**

There are several learning objectives in this proposed session. By the end of the session, participants will appreciate the values of using gamification as a tool of flipped classroom and an opportunity to diversify learning materials in the process of course development. Second, participants will also be able to identify key elements of a gamified course that may contribute to student psychological (e.g., engagement and satisfaction) and behavioral outcomes (e.g., participation and performance). Lastly, participants will learn to evaluate a gamified course and use principles in designing their own gamified courses.

**Enhancing Learning Experience Through Gamification**

In recent decades, the rapid growth of students with diverse learning styles and needs has posed teaching in Higher Education a challenging profession. The marketization of education and the force of ‘quality assurance’ from the Higher Education regulatory bodies further challenge lecturers to ensure that we “get as many students as possible to meet academically acceptable levels of performance at as high a level as we can” (Buckridge and Guest, 2007: 144).

The enhancement of teaching and learning experience has been approached by different ways: improvement of the curriculum design by ensuring that overall learning objectives are met; the use of learning technologies to ensure effective feedback is provided; and a shifting focus on student-centered learning and flipped classroom (Hannafin & Land, 1997). While these approaches seem to improve overall teaching and learning, it is still believed that the better learning experiences and engagement of diverse classes can hardly be fully achieved through standardized instructional materials in traditional classroom settings (Reiner and Wood, 2013). To achieve “student-centered learning,” “the flipped classroom”, and “diversity in higher education,” my approach is through ‘gamification’ of course design. In this session, I aim to introduce the concept of gamification, elaborate how I developed a gamified course through the VLE, and share challenges and opportunities I encountered in implementing a gamified system in real world higher educational context. Finally, I also aim to seek for suggestions from the participants for the improvement of my gamified course.

Gamification can be defined as “the use of game design elements and game thinking in non-game contexts (Deterding et al., 2011). This term was first used in 2008 but was not widely adopted until late in 2010. Until now, researchers in this area of research generally agree that in gamification can be thought as a system designer takes the motivational properties of games and applies them in other learning activities, while taking into account the human desire to communicate and share accomplishments through goal setting to direct the attention of learners and motivate them (Landers and Callan, 2011). Gamification is regarded as a next generation method for marketing and customer engagement from companies and commentators (Zichermann & Cunningham, 2011), mainly because it generates positive, intrinsically motivating, and “gameful” experiences (Huotari &Hamari, 2012; Ryan &Deci, 2000). Many large firms have been using gamified services in sales, customer experience, and employee training (Business News Daily, 2015; Barata et al., 2013; Landers and Callan, 2011).

With its benefits, undoubtedly, more and more academics are interested in studying, applying, and improving gamification. This is evident in the increasing number of writing on this topic over the last few years (Hamari, Koivisto, and Sarsa, 2014). From conceptual and theoretical discussions, a gamified system is believed to be able to provide faster feedback, offer a more flexible learning environment, give opportunities to compare a learner’s progress with others, co-creation of knowledge, and allow expression of individuality (Wood and Reiners, 2012). In the context of higher education, researchers claim and provide evidence that a gamified course can increase student engagement and satisfaction (Barata et al., 2013; Cruz and Penley, 2014), intrinsically motivate students to take challenging learning tasks (Wood and Reiners, 2012; Banfield & Wikerson, 2014; Cruz and Penley, 2014), and increase their self-efficacy (Banfield & Wikerson, 2014).

However, gamification is not a universal panacea for all challenges in teaching and learning and it may not be effective all the time. Review studies on “Does gamification work?” reveal that the effectiveness of a gamified system depends on *the social environment*, *the nature of the system* (hedonic or utilitarian), and *user qualities*. (Hamari, Koivisto, and Sarsa, 2014). Also, the effectiveness of gamification depends on what outcome measures are used. For example, a study of Dominguez et al. (2013) reports that while students with gamified experience received better scores in practical assignments, they performed poorly on written assignments and participated less on class activities.

**A Gamified Personal and Professional Development Course**

The gamified course is titled “Personal and Professional Development 2: Business Communication and Research.” This is one of the three Personal and Professional Development (PPD) courses offered to undergraduate students in the Business School of a post-92 university in the UK. PPD courses were designed around ten years ago in order to help students enhance employability (Yorke & Knight, 2006). To further improve student employability, the School launched the Employability Passport three years ago to document students’ extracurricular activities that are thought to directly benefit employability, such as part-time jobs, internships or placements, and volunteering. The focus of PPDs in different years varies. In this particular year 2 PPD course, topics covered include values and transferable skills, critical thinking, business communication, employability research, self-expression through building a compelling CV and online personal branding (term 1), and conducting small scale management research (term 2).

In the past few years, the course was designed in a traditional manner with lectures and seminars taking place in alternating weeks. Students attended the 50-minute lecture/seminar every week for two terms. The teaching team consists of the course leader and ten to twelve personal tutors with each tutor responsible for 12 to 16 students. Lecture materials were delivered by the course leader using PowerPoint slides in a big lecture hall; and seminar activities were led by personal tutors to reinforce students’ learning of lecture materials. In the academic year of 2015-16, the structure was changed to weekly seminars. Therefore, the new course leader decided to partially implement “flipped classroom” (Tucker, 2012) in order to enhance student-centered learning (Hannafin & Land, 1997) and also address needs of the diverse learners (Tomlinson, 2014; David, 2007). All seminars were designed to maximize student centered learning. That is, lectures were minimized and students did majority of the seminar exercises both individually and in groups.

The gamified system was designed to supplement students’ classroom learning. It was developed by using the VLE, i.e., Moodle. First, learning activities were separated into *Essential* and *Super Learning*. Essential learning activities introduce students content knowledge of topics covered in the course, in the forms of short-texts and video clips from the public domain. Students were required to complete weekly essential learning activity before attending class and their participation is a major part of their Engagement (10% of the final total mark). As to Super Learning, the goal is to encourage students to learn “above and beyond” what is essential. Students were told that participation of Super Learning is completely voluntary. Majority of these activities were post-class and pertained to different levels of difficulties following Bloom’s taxonomy (Anderson, Krathwohl, and Bloom, 2001).

|  |
| --- |
|  |

In term 1 (twelve weeks), there were 8 essential learning activities and 27 super learning activities. Several motivational properties were offered, including *challenges*, *badges*, *leaderboard*, and *quick feedback*. First, students were rewarded with badges for activity completion (see Appendix 1). Four types of badges were designed. Those who finished essential learning receive an essential learning badge. There are three super learning badges, Bronze, Silver, and Gold, which were awarded for completion of tasks, depending on the challenging levels of tasks. Gold badges were designed for higher-level learning tasks involving evaluation and analysis; Silver badges were designed for intermediate level tasks associated with feedback and application, and Bronze badges were developed for comprehension and understanding types of tasks (Anderson, Krathwohl, and Bloom, 2001). In addition, tasks were designed to allow students to co-create knowledge and express individuality (Wood & Reiners, 2012). For one example, students posted answers on a forum, so they could see other people’s posts. For another example, students were invited to edit their user profiles, introducing themselves and talking about personal experiences. In addition to their voluntary nature, most Super Learning activities were not time-bound, thus allowing students to experience autonomy and flexibility of learning (i.e., they can choose when, where, and what to participate in Super Learning). The time-bound activities (8 activities) were restricted only for feedback type of tasks and tasks that required students to submit evidence from their classroom learning. Second, *leaderboard* was used to let students know their and their peers’ learning progresses (see Appendix 2): the first leaderboard was announced at the end of week 3, the second at the end of week 8, and the third is planned to be announced at the beginning of Term 2. Finally, the feedback mechanism was provided with simple texts after activity completion, such as “thank you for participating in Essential Learning.” Students also received correct answers from tasks with multiple choice and true/false questions right after activity completion. Furthermore, the course leader regularly monitored students’ posts on forum and provided feedback.

**Preliminary Findings**

Table 1 shows participation of 171 undergraduate students in PPD 2 Essential Learning activities. Although these learning activities had deadlines, students could still get access to these activities after the deadlines. Among the eight activities, the average number of student completion is 81.5 and the average completion rate is 48%. However, on average, only about 47 students completed Essential Learning before deadline, resulting a before-deadline completion rate of 27%.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Week of Activity | Activity Code | Number of Completion | Completion Rate (%) | Number of Completion Before Deadline | Completion Rate Before Deadline (%) |
| Week 2 | A1 | 116 | 68 | 94 | 55 |
| Week 3 | A4 | 111 | 65 | 45 | 26 |
| Week 4 | A7 | 100 | 58 | 61 | 36 |
| Week 5 | A12 | 103 | 60 | 66 | 39 |
| Week 6 | A15 | 97 | 57 | 68 | 40 |
| Week 9 | A23 | 57 | 33 | 0 | 0 |
| Week 11 | A29 | 40 | 23 | 19 | 11 |
| Week 12 | A33 | 28 | 16 | 20 | 12 |
| **Average** |  | **81.5** | **48** | **46.63** | **27** |

Table 1. Student Participation in Essential Learning (*n*=171)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Week of Activity | Title of Activity | Activity Code | Type of Task | Number of Completion | Completion Rate (%) |
| Week 2 | What am I like? | A2 | Bronze | 93 | 54 |
| Week 2 | What am I like (suggested questions) | A3 | Bronze | 43 | 25 |
| Week 3 | What job(s) am I interested in? | A5 | Silver | 18 | 11 |
| Week 3 | Recommended videos | A6 | Bronze | 76 | 44 |
| Week 4 | Feedback on Week 4 Transferable Skills | A8 | Silver | 26 | 15\* |
| Week 4 | Evidence-based learning | A9 | Bronze | 13 | 8\* |
| Week 4 | Additional resources | A10 | Bronze | 63 | 37 |
| Week 4 | Edit your user profile and earn a Gold badge! | A11 | Gold | 10 | 6\* |
| Week 5 | Types of arguments & how to make arguments stronger | A13 | Bronze | 66 | 39 |
| Week 5 | Feedback on Week 5 Critical Thinking 1 | A14 | Silver | 23 | 13\* |
| Week 6 | Quiz on recognising false premises | A16 | Silver | 66 | 39 |
| Week 6 | Quiz on identifying underlying assumptions | A17 | Gold | 64 | 37 |
| Week 6 | Additional slides on underlying assumptions | A18 | Bronze | 30 | 18 |
| Week 6 | Evaluating your own written arguments | A19 | Gold | 5 | 3 |
| Week 7 | Watch the BSEO Placement Video | A20 | Bronze | 59 | 35 |
| Week 8 | Evidence-based learning | A21 | Silver | 26 | 15\* |
| Week 8 | High Flier Research- The Graduate Market in 2015 | A22 | Bronze | 21 | 12 |
| Week 9 | Email correspondence guide | A24 | Silver | 12 | 7 |
| Week 9 | Feedback on Week 9 Email etiquette | A25 | Silver | 0 | 0 |
| Week 10 | Feedback on Week 10 Thinking like a manager | A26 | Silver | 12 | 7\* |
| Week 10 | Video lectures on persuasive writing & feedback | A27 & A28 | Gold | 15 | 9 |
| Week 11 | Recommended articles and videos | A30 | Bronze | 15 | 9 |
| Week 11 | Feedback on Week 11 Are you using the right medium for the message? | A31 | Silver | 21 | 12\* |
| Week 12 | Comparing CVs | A32 | Gold | 7 | 4 |
| Week 12 | Tips for an engaging LinkedIn profile in your sector | A34 | Gold | 27 | 6 |
| **Average** |  |  |  | **32. 12** | **18.8** |

Table 2. Student Participation in Super Learning (*n*=171)

\* activity with a completion deadline

Table 2 shows student participation in Super Learning activities. Among 27 Super Learning activities, number of student completion (completion rate) ranges from 0 (0%) to 93 (54%), with an average of around 33 student completions (18.8%).

**Opportunities and Challenges**

Students’ participation in both Super and Essential Learning indicated a future possibility of using technology to flip classroom. The evidence that students involved in Super Learning or in Essential Learning even after deadlines suggest that ongoing learning took place outside classroom and students experienced more autonomy and flexibility in the process of learning. In fact, anecdotal feedback from students who participated in Super Learning was positive. One student explicitly told the course leader she felt motivated to learn. Another direct-entry student said he really enjoyed learning on the VLE.

However, several challenges remain. As seen in both Table 1 and 2, activity completion rates and timeliness of activity completion dropped from the mid-term. This may be due to several reasons. First, student might feel pressured by other course assignments and thereby spent less time in this course or chose to focus on the summative assignment of this course. Second, individual tutors’ attitudes toward the gamified course might also influence students’ participation. Some tutors held a suspicious attitude towards flipped classroom and some were reluctant to spend extra time preparing for materials that were not taught in class. Anecdotal evidence suggested that not all tutors supported the idea of technology-supported learning and one tutor even told his group of students that he would not use any teaching material provided by the course leader. In addition, Moodle analytics showed that half of the teaching team did not check some Essential or most Super Learning activities on the VLE. Third, as suggested by Hamari et al. (2014), user qualities influence the effectiveness of gamification. Some students explicitly told the course leader they would not spend time on activities that did not come with tangible rewards (e.g., grades). I used the study process questionnaire to collect data on students’ attitudes towards surface versus deep-level learning (Biggs, Kember, & Leung, 2001). A rough scanning of data showed that students in this course were neither low on surface-level learning nor deep-level learning, leaving the course leader several puzzles. Since this is a course with two terms, I as the course leader, would really like to know what else can be done to maintain student engagement in learning activities.

1. Session Description and Plan:

*What will you actually do in this session? If appropriate, please include a timeline estimating the activities will you facilitate: how long will they take, and how will participants be involved? Please remember that reviewers will be evaluating how well the time request matches the activities you’d like to do, and the extent you can reasonably accomplish the session’s goals. Reviewers will also be looking for how you are engaging the participants in the session.*

This session will be divided into three parts: presentation, role-play exercise, and guided discussion. The first part is a 20 minutes presentation, in which I will explain the design and context of the gamified PPD 2 course and report statistics of students’ activity participation and learning outcomes. Meanwhile, opportunities and challenges of using gamification in course design will also be outlined.

In the next 25 minutes, I will provide participants a “taster” to experience the gamified course. Participants will be provided with excerpted Essential and Super Learning exercises and try to complete these tasks. Since the effectiveness of a gamified course depends on the social environment and user qualities (Hamari et al., 2014). I will distribute role information sheets to participants in each round table and ask them to role-play users of different characteristics (e.g., four typical types of users in a gamified system) and simulate their experiences in the gamified course.

Finally, the last 15 minutes will be used for general discussion based on the presentation and the taster role-play. Some guided questions will be provided. However, the questions can be changed, depending on the interests of participants.

**Sample discussion questions**

1. Research shows that the effectiveness of gamification may be due to the “novelty effect” (Koivisto & Hamari, 2014). As seemed in the presentation, essential learning completion rate drops after Week 7, what are possible explanations and how to improve in the future?
2. Some people argue that the idea of flipped classroom does not work for undergraduate students. What’s your view?
3. As identified, there are challenges of the gamified PPD2 course. Can you make some suggestions?
4. Application to Conference theme:

How does your session fit with the overall OBTC theme of *United in Service*?

This session fit with the overall OBTC theme of *United in Service* for two main reasons. First, part of the gamified course is designed to create a climate of co-creation of knowledge through student experience sharing, and therefore in line with the conference theme of uniting students to serve each other. Second, online Essential and Super Learning is also a response to using technology to enhance teaching and learning and addressing needs of diverse learners, thus potentially unite and serve non-traditional students. Also, gamification has been applied in service teaching courses, such as service marketing (Huotari &Hamari, 2012), and it would be beneficial for participants to learn about using gamification in their course design to achieve more of united in service.

1. Unique Contribution to OBTC:

*Have you presented the work in this proposal before? If so, how will it be different? Is this proposal under current review somewhere else? If so, please explain. How will your proposal be different for the OBTC conference?*

The work in this proposal has not been presented before. A keyword search of “gamification” in one of the OBTS sponsored journals, i.e., Journal of Management Education, does not show any related results. Although gamification is a newly emerged area of research in management education, it has gained increasing popularity in education at all levels. This is evident by doing search in large academic databases such as Google Scholar and Scopus. Therefore, it is significant to talk about this concept and its application in the OBTC conference. Furthermore, I have collected data around student experience of the gamified course and their participation of learning activities, this session will help me get feedback and insights from participants to further develop my work and potentially the research can contributes to OBTS publications.
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**Appendices**

**Appendix 1 Essential and Super Learning badges**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Essential Leaning Badge** | **Super Learning- Bronze Badge** | **Super Learning- Silver Badge** | **Super Learning- Gold Badge** |
| **Macintosh HD:Users:crystaltsay:Dropbox:Greenwich:Teaching:2015-2016:BUSI 1316 PPD 2:Gamification:Moodle badges:essential-award.png** | **Macintosh HD:Users:crystaltsay:Dropbox:Greenwich:Teaching:2015-2016:BUSI 1316 PPD 2:Gamification:Moodle badges:super-bronze.png** | **Macintosh HD:Users:crystaltsay:Dropbox:Greenwich:Teaching:2015-2016:BUSI 1316 PPD 2:Gamification:Moodle badges:super-silver.png** | **Macintosh HD:Users:crystaltsay:Dropbox:Greenwich:Teaching:2015-2016:BUSI 1316 PPD 2:Gamification:Moodle badges:super-gold.png** |

**Appendix 2**

BUSI1316 Super Learning Leader Board

Congratulations to the 10 students! They achieved well on super learning.

This leader board result is based on students’ activity completion from 28th September to 18th Oct (7.30 PM). Note that this is not the final result. If you have not completed super learning activities in previous weeks, many badges are still open to be awarded. The next leader board will keep accumulating total badges earned and it will be announced between the end of Wk 8 and the beginning of Wk 9.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Bronze Count** | **Silver Count** | **Gold Count** | **Accumulated score\*** | **Rank** |
| xxx | 5 | 2 | 1 | 20 | 1 |
| xxx | 4 | 2 | 1 | 19 | 2 |
| xxx | 4 | 2 | 1 | 19 | 2 |
| xxx | 3 | 2 | 1 | 18 | 4 |
| xxx | 4 | 1 | 1 | 16 | 5 |
| xxx | 2 | 1 | 1 | 14 | 6 |
| xxx | 4 | 2 | 0 | 10 | 7 |
| xxx | 4 | 2 | 0 | 10 | 7 |
| xxx | 4 | 2 | 0 | 10 | 7 |
| xxx | 4 | 2 | 0 | 10 | 7 |

\* 1 Gold = 3 Silver; 1 Silver = 3 Bronze