

Manuscript Number: CAE-D-19-00517R5

Title: Examining the Potential Impact of Digital Game Making in Curricula Based Teaching: Initial Observations

Article Type: Research Paper

Keywords: Digital Game Making; Special Education; Engagement; Primary Education

Corresponding Author: Dr. Thomas Hughes-Roberts,

Corresponding Author's Institution: Liverpool John Moores University

First Author: Thomas Hughes-Roberts

Order of Authors: Thomas Hughes-Roberts; David Brown; Helen Boulton; Andrew Burton; Nicholas Shopland; Dominic Martinovs; Jamie Tinney

Abstract: Digital game making is becoming an increasingly common means of learning in schools due to the appeal of delivering curriculum-based learning objectives while tapping into the popularity of videogames. Indeed, research suggests that digital game making may improve cognitive and behavioral skills in learners and this may have significant impact on learners with special education needs and disabilities (SEND). However, past work in digital game making has limited involvement with learners with SEND, focuses on short-term evaluations and is utilised during extra-curricular sessions with few studies using an action-based field research approach. Furthermore, there is little quantitative data from defined methodologies that demonstrate the impact of digital game-making on learning. This paper presents results from two field trials examining the use of digital game making in two schools (one mixed ability primary and one special school) to deliver national curriculum-based content over 8-weeks. Results from a feasibility trial informed a pedagogical design and identified evaluation metrics for a subsequent longer trial. Evaluation metrics included learner engagement and collaboration with peers as suitable indicators of inclusive learning. Impact on these metrics was measured using an in-class observation tool that sampled learner behaviour yielding quantitative data and follow up interviews with teachers yielding qualitative data. Results suggest that digital game making is at least as effective in encouraging engagement and collaboration in learners when compared to traditional methods, with it being more engaging for learners with special needs. Contributions from this paper provide quantifiable evidence for the perceived benefits of using digital game making and a methodology for evaluating engagement and collaboration through classroom observation. Recommendations for further work and refinements of the pedagogical implementation that builds on these findings are presented.

Dear Editor,

We would like to thank the reviewers for taking the time to review our paper for suitability in Computers & Education. The research team appreciate the comments made throughout the process and have sought to incorporate appropriate responses within the manuscript entitled: "Examining the Potential Impact of Digital Game Making in Curricula Based Teaching: Initial Observations". Following implementation of the changes during the review stage we believe the paper to be stronger as a result.

We have summarised the responses in the following table and have updated the manuscript in the newly uploaded file to the Elsevier system. We have continued to use tracked changes to highlight revisions in the manuscript, if required a clean version can be provided. We hope these changes are suitable responses to your recommendations.

The research team look forward to your response,

Change Table

Reviewer 1	
Comment	Change/Response
<p>My only remark would be that additional information (and potentially a few photos) would help readers better understand what Pocket Code is (one or two paragraph description in section 2.4) and how the interventions were facilitated (sections 2.5 and 3.1.1).</p> <p>(Editor's note: Leave the photos in an appendix)</p>	<p>Section 2.4 expanded to explain the blocks using figure 1 with an additional figure which shows the output for this code.</p> <p>3.1 discusses facilitation of the intervention in terms of practical logistics, training, and implementation.</p> <p>Rather than include photos of all code templates, 3.1.1 has been expanded to include citations to the game templates that were ultimately produced as a result of this phase (i.e. the technical content that facilitated the lessons from a Pocket Code perspective).</p> <p>Expansion also added where appropriate.</p>
Reviewer 2	
<p>There are still some minor typos, so a careful proof-reading is necessary.</p>	<p>Paper is proofread and alterations made. Note in particular, the change to Americanized spellings throughout.</p>

Examining the Potential Impact of Digital Game Making in Curricula Based Teaching: Initial Observations

Authors

Dr Thomas Hughes-Roberts^{2,4}

Professor David Brown¹

Dr Helen Boulton¹

Dr Andrew Burton¹

Mr Nicholas Shopland¹

Mr Dominic Martinovs^{1,3}

¹Nottingham Trent University, Clifton Lane, Nottingham, NG11 8NS

{david.brown, helen.boulton, andrew.burton, nicholas.shopland}@ntu.ac.uk

²t.hughesroberts.ljmu.ac.uk

³dmartinovs@hotmail.com

⁴Corresponding Author

Present Address: Liverpool John Moores University, James Parsons Building, 3 Byrom Street, Liverpool, L3 3AF

Declarations of interest: none

Acknowledgements

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 645215 and forms part of the No One Left Behind project.

1 | **Abstract:** Digital game making is becoming an increasingly common means of learning ins schools
2 | due to the appeal of delivering curriculum-based learning objectives while tapping into the
3 |
4 | popularity of videogames. Indeed, research suggests that digital game making may improve
5 |
6 | cognitive and behavioral skills in learner's and this may have significant impact on learners with
7 |
8 | special education needs and disabilities (SEND). However, past work in digital game making has
9 |
10 | limited involvement with learners with SEND, focuses on short-term evaluations and is utilised
11 |
12 | during extra-curricular sessions with few [studies](#) using an action-based field research approach.
13 |
14 | Furthermore, there is little quantitative data from defined methodologies that demonstrate the
15 |
16 | impact of digital game-making on learning. This paper presents results from two field trials
17 |
18 | examining the use of digital game making in two schools (one mixed ability primary and one special
19 |
20 | school) to deliver national curriculum-based content over 8-weeks. Results from a feasibility trial
21 |
22 | informed a pedagogical design and identified evaluation metrics for a subsequent longer trial.
23 |
24 | Evaluation metrics included learner engagement and collaboration with peers as suitable indicators
25 |
26 | of inclusive learning. Impact on these metrics was measured using an in-class observation tool that
27 |
28 | sampled learner ~~behaviour~~[behavior](#) yielding quantitative data and follow up interviews with
29 |
30 | teachers yielding qualitative data. Results suggest that digital game making is at least as effective in
31 |
32 | encouraging engagement and collaboration in learners when compared to traditional methods, with
33 |
34 | it being more engaging for learners with special needs. Contributions from this paper provide
35 |
36 | quantifiable evidence for the perceived benefits of using digital game making and a methodology for
37 |
38 | evaluating engagement and collaboration through classroom observation. Recommendations for
39 |
40 | further work and refinements of the pedagogical implementation that builds on these findings are
41 |
42 | presented.

43 |
44 |
45 | **Keywords:** Digital Game Making, Special Education, Engagement, Collaboration, Primary Education
46 |
47 |
48 |

49 |
50 |
51 |
52 |
53 |
54 |
55 |
56 | **-1. Introduction**
57 |
58 |
59 |
60 |
61 |
62 |
63 |
64 |
65 |

1 Education has long sought to tap into the mass appeal of games to promote student learning. Digital
2 games are now an integral part of children's lives and should be utilised in schools as well (Gabriel,
3
4 2018). Digital game making can also benefit learners, by allowing them to create something that
5
6 teaches them content and literacy in a meaningful way (Kafei and Burke, 2016). As pointed out by
7
8 Gilbert (2007), students now live in a technology rich society that requires adaptations to pedagogy
9
10 and curriculum where knowledge is developed through a process and learning involves generating
11
12 new knowledge. However, there are barriers to access to utilising digital game making. For example,
13
14 it requires a degree of programming skill that would prevent some learners from being able to
15
16 generate content, particularly learners with SEND. As such, given the suggestion that digital game
17
18 making can be powerful tool for learning, this research asks what does digital game making offer,
19
20 how could it be implemented within a classroom composed of learners with a wide variety of needs
21
22 and abilities, and what kind of impact could it have within such a complex setting?
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 While not game making, Game Based Learning (GBL) is already commonplace and suggests the area
30
31 as a whole can be effective in engaging learners. Within primary education it has been implemented
32
33 across a wide range of subject areas ~~and~~ to achieve a number of learning outcomes (Hainey et al.
34
35 2016). Within wider teaching and learning, playing games can impact learner engagement, cognitive
36
37 ability and acquisition of knowledge content (Author 20XXb; Connelly et al., 2012; Foster, 2008).
38
39 Games have the potential to simulate real world complexity and make learning more connected to
40
41 what students would expect to find outside of the classroom setting (Spires et al., 2011).
42
43 Furthermore, video games can be used as therapeutic treatments for students with autism spectrum
44
45 disorder (Malinverni et al. 2016) and potentially be effective in engaging learners with special
46
47 education needs due, in part, to games being ubiquitous to children's leisure environment (Griffiths,
48
49 2002). Indeed, Buckland et al. (2013) found that serious games provide a positive learning
50
51 experience and can be an effective means of studying subject material. Researchers point out
52
53 however, that what is absent in discussions concerning the effectiveness of serious gaming is the
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 inclusion of constructionist gaming approaches, where games are designed by students themselves
2 for learning benefits (Kafai and Burke, 2015).
3
4

5 Digital ~~g~~Game ~~m~~Making could add to the aforementioned benefits of GBL and serious games by also
6
7 generating knowledge through the creation of the game itself. Utilisation of digital game making
8
9 platforms is an increasingly viable option for teachers due to the increased popularity of visual
10
11 programming languages such as Scratch (Resnick et al., 2009) and Pocket Code (Slany, 2014). A
12
13 number of studies have demonstrated that the use of such platforms can “engage the disengaged”
14
15 with learning (Thumlert et al., 2018). However, few studies have focussed on the creation of an
16
17 inclusive environment composed of complex, large sized cohorts found in most modern classrooms.
18
19 Furthermore, only a few studies have focussed on deploying digital game making to tackle learning
20
21 for students with special educational needs, but those that have, [have](#) demonstrated encouraging
22
23 results. For example, Munoz et al. (2018) saw improvements in computational thinking for students
24
25 on the autistic spectrum when using a Scratch based intervention. Similarly, in a separate study, the
26
27 use of Scratch over an 8-week period saw learners with autism improve their social skills as
28
29 demonstrated by observing their interactions with each other (Eiselt and Carter, 2018). However,
30
31 there is a need to broaden these approaches and study the use of digital game making in fostering
32
33 inclusion amongst the complex classrooms commonly encountered by teachers, which include
34
35 students with special educational needs, potentially also in a mixed ability cohort.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 This research therefore examines the utilisation of digital game making as a process for learning
45
46 within everyday classroom teaching in non-STEM (science, technology, engineering, and
47
48 mathematics) subjects with a focus on learners at risk of exclusion; specifically, those with assessed
49
50 SENDs. The non-STEM subjects used in this study were identified as being relevant ~~to the study~~
51
52 through discussion with teachers. This included utilisation of digital game making to teach history
53
54 and key life skills, with teachers specifying that these topics would benefit most from novel methods
55
56 of learning within the context of the study. The following section outlines past work in deploying
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 digital game making in learning and highlights some studies that suggest benefits in fostering
2 inclusive learning environments. The digital game making platform, Pocket Code, is introduced and
3
4 the outline of two new studies that analyse its deployment presented. A feasibility trial analyses the
5
6 method of using Pocket Code in the classroom and assesses the needs of learners for improved
7
8 accessibility, whilst the full trial provides quantitative analysis of engagement [and collaboration](#) in
9
10 the classroom when digital game making is used as a teaching tool compared with a control
11
12 condition, supplemented with qualitative data derived from unstructured interviews with teachers.
13
14
15
16 Conclusions and recommendations are made based on the findings.
17
18

19 **2 Background**

22 **2.1 Game Creation & Digital Game Making**

23
24
25
26 Game creation as a concept provides a flexible approach to learning; it can be applied to a complex
27
28 system of modelling in the design of fully-fledged games or just the creation and utilisation of simple
29
30 game assets. This is due, in part, to the “creation of knowledge” that forms through the process of
31
32 creating a game (Kangas, 2009) and enables [creativity](#) while also making outcomes of learning
33
34 tangible and personal to learners. We also know from research on game play how important
35
36 collaborations are to motivate and sustain player's efforts to move ahead in the game (Kafai and
37
38 Burke, 2015), and that teams can be productive learning groups (Ching & Kafai, 2008). Game
39
40 creation provides a “shared goal” allowing learners to co-create the game and related artefacts
41
42 strengthening group-based learning (Kangas, 2009). As such, digital game making could provide a
43
44 lens through which to improve inclusion in learning within classroom settings by engaging learners
45
46 and providing opportunities for collaboration toward a common goal.
47
48
49
50
51

52
53 Visual Programming Languages (VPLs), such as Scratch and Pocket Code, provide a platform for
54
55 creating digital games and interactive media through simplification of programming concepts using
56
57 representational building blocks and integration with pre-made templates. By removing the
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 requirement to implement complex, text-based programming languages the cognitive barriers to
2 accessible game creation are addressed. The goal of such platforms is to encourage the development
3 of programming skills and to allow students to create content that is related to their interests
4
5 (Resnick et al., 2009).
6
7
8
9

10 **2.2 Digital Game Making & Skill Development**

11
12 Scratch for digital game making has been utilised in several research studies within education to
13 promote development of skills and cognition. In a series of sessions over 21-days, Baytak and Land
14 (2011), utilised Scratch within a fifth-grade classroom focussing on the process of asset creation.
15
16 Results suggest that the creation of artefacts promoted scientific knowledge while making
17 programming knowledge “need-to-know” in the pursuit of goals. As stated earlier, this demonstrates
18 the flexibility of the approach in providing multiple pathways to learning and provides ownership of
19 learning outcomes.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 A number of studies have focussed on the development of problem-solving skills through digital
32 game making ~~deployment~~. Fesskis et al. (2013), for example, proposed that Scratch could improve
33 problem-solving skills in children; their study suggested improved enjoyment in the learning process.
34
35
36
37
38 Kalmpourtzis (2019), utilised a comparative experiment based methodology and found that digital
39 game making, when supported by appropriate teaching interventions, can have a positive impact on
40 the development of problem-solving skills. Ke (2013) noted that digital game making increased
41 positive dispositions towards mathematics in a study involving 64 participants over 6 weeks.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Tackling computational thinking is a common problem domain in research and while results suggest
the games created only had moderate levels of complexity with regard to computational concepts

1 there is a suggestion that such approaches may support the development of computational thinking
2 (Wing, 2006; Kafai et al., 2014). Similar to computational thinking and problem solving, critical
3
4 analysis skills may also be improved by learning through digital game making. Lye and Koh (2018)
5
6 used a narrative approach to explore the challenges learners faced when using [programming](#)
7
8 [basedprogramming-based](#) approaches and Akcaoglu and Green (2019) suggest an improvement in
9
10 critical thinking when exposed to game design based learning.
11
12
13

14 **2.3 Digital Game Making for Inclusion**

15
16
17 In this section, the use of digital game making in encouraging inclusion in learning is discussed. Due
18
19 to the scarcity of projects that focus on special education specifically, our focus is more broadly on
20
21 any groups that can be defined as “at risk” from exclusion, ~~and t~~ [The case is](#) made that the concepts
22
23 studied are transferable since those with special education needs form a subset of this group.
24
25 Students' confidence with digital technology is linked to the actual activities in which they are
26
27 engaged, with children at lower income and predominantly minority schools receiving less access to,
28
29 and engagement with computing activities that focus on actual creation of digital content (see
30
31 Margolis, Estrella, Goode, Holme, & Nao, 2008; Warschauer & Matuchniak, 2010 in Kafai and Burke,
32
33 2015). However, when access is provided, research suggests positive outcomes on engagement with
34
35 learning.
36
37
38
39
40
41

42
43 Maloney et al. (2008), for example, found that the use of Scratch was effective in increasing
44
45 engagement in programming for urban youth, [citing the benefits of a simplified, multimedia-based](#)
46
47 approach. Here, engagement can be defined as a persistence in learning and a desire to continue to
48
49 learn new concepts over time. Similarly, Gabriel (2018), suggests that student motivation and
50
51 engagement increase when game design concepts are introduced into schools according to self-
52
53 reported data gathered from teachers. It is notable that when discussing inclusion, studies often
54
55 highlight engagement, and this seems to be a priority for teachers when assessing their students'
56
57 [behaviourbehavior](#). Indeed, further work has suggested that such techniques can be used to engage
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 the disengaged through self-directed modes of inquiry, where actors collaboratively construct new
2 knowledge (Thumlert et al., 2018) by working together to research and co-construct new knowledge
3 through production. Here the authors implement a “production pedagogy” which posits that people
4 learn best through the development of artefacts that have value to them as makers. This mirrors
5
6
7
8
9 points made previously dealing with asset creation and its ability to provide an engaging learning
10 experience. However, there remains a need to expand on such work to examine and quantify the
11 extent of such engagement when compared to traditional teaching methods and to examine the
12 applicability of such approaches in the typical mixed ability classrooms commonly found in schools.
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 Such constructionist approaches to learning, as provided by digital game making, allow learners to
20 better connect to each other and addresses issues of access by fostering a collaborative learning
21 environment (Kafai & Burke, 2016). Here, in a review of over 55 studies, various methods of
22 observing collaboration were evident in the works examined. Specifically, a broad definition of the
23 term is used “whether it is working with others on the design or ... sharing and exchanging designs”
24 (Grimes and Fields, 2015).
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 Fisher and Jenson (2017) note that access to game and game culture is often restricted for girls but
35 with game making they are active in the construction of their own subjectivities which in turn lifts
36 barriers and provides ownership of learning. Furthermore, Denner et al. (2011) proposed that the
37 creation of games in the classroom could improve the understanding of computational problems;
38 particularly in female learners who may experience a lack of inclusion in such teaching sessions.
39 Hence, the approaches described appear to provide learners with tangible outcomes to their study
40 and an ownership of the process which promotes engagement. Indeed, engagement in particular,
41 has been described as the single best indicator of learning, without which there is no deep learning
42 (Iovannone et al., 2003; Hargreaves, 2006) and has been used to assess inclusion in special
43 education in previous studies (Author, 20XXg) where it is defined as time focussed on task.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

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
61
62
63
64
65

However, there is little work that seeks to quantify the impact of such approaches when utilised in everyday teaching. This is particularly the case in mixed ability and special education classrooms that hold higher numbers of students at risk from exclusion. Indeed, while there are recent moves to make gameplay more accessible (e.g. Able Gamers Foundation and the Game Accessibility Guidelines) there is little research that intends to examine the use of digital game making tools and their accessibility for learning. As mentioned in the introduction, there are few studies that have focussed on digital game making and SENDs (Munoz et al., 2018; Eiselt and Carter, 2018); an area that requires further work.

Studies presented thus far suggest that digital game making can provide numerous improvements in cognition and engagement through collaborative approaches to learning. However, there is little data representing its effect on student engagement and collaboration in the classroom itself. Indeed, it has been pointed out that such affordances are often not used as a metric for evaluation (Kafai and Burke, 2015). In addition, while some studies have looked at the use of such technologies and practices when applied to learners at risk of exclusion, few have sought to explore impact when applied to special education and classrooms of mixed ability. Furthermore, studies assessing technology enhanced interventions in special education often lack robust evaluations, are small, or do not include a comparison or control group (Author, 20XXa) and lack a clarity of methods that require a longer-term application (Denner et al., 2019), limitations which this [project-research](#) seeks to address.

2.4. Pocket Code

Pocket Code is an Android tablet-based, visual programming language environment built to allow the creation of simple to relatively complex games, stories and animations (Catrobat, 2017[a](#)). Pocket Code can be downloaded from the Google Play store and used on Android tablets and mobile phones.




Figure 1 - Pocket Code (from Google Play Store)

The interface provides a variety of pre-defined bricks that can be joined together to develop animations and games. (see figure 1). Each block is a programming statement represented as a visual description using common language, e.g. from figure 1, “When program start” sets the initial state of the game on execution, in this case loading the spaceship and its parameters including starting position. Complexity can vary from storytelling and animations using simple sequences of steps through to the use of far more complex programming concepts such as branching and loops **enabling** (all represented by color coded, descriptive blocks) **enabling** creation of interactive games.

Furthermore, users can download, edit and re-upload programs allowing the opportunity for peer-learning and collaboration through game sharing and remixing. Through the use of the camera functionality on tablets and a separate companion program, Pocket Paint, users can design and create their own assets for use in their programs. Pocket Code therefore offers an adaptive means of engaging with digital game making varying from constructing complex games to simply

1 concentrating on asset creation, the focus of which can be the subject matter at hand in a teaching
2 session. Learners therefore have multiple avenues for engaging with learning and can tailor their
3
4 approach depending on their needs and abilities.
5
6

7 **2.5. Research Aims**

8
9
10 This paper examines the impact of digital game making using Pocket Code to teach UK national
11 curriculum content to two cohorts of students in place of their usual teaching sessions. One of the
12
13 two cohorts is taken from a primary school and can be described as a mixed ability classroom
14
15 containing both neuro-typically developing students and those who have recorded individual
16
17 educational needs; this represents a typical class of students found in a UK classroom. The second
18
19 cohort is taken from a special education school and holds a group of students who all have recorded
20
21 individual educational needs and are not learning at a national curriculum level due to their level of
22
23 cognitive impairment. We define a game as an interactive experience that conforms to some rule
24
25 base which includes narrative driven interactive stories with branching story choices. Broadly, the
26
27 research questions are as follows:
28
29
30
31
32
33

34
35 RQ1. What are the pedagogical implications for implementing digital game making in
36
37 classroom teaching when delivering to mixed ability and special needs classrooms?
38
39

40 RQ2. What is the impact of digital game making on classroom behavior with regard to
41
42 engagement and collaboration?
43
44

45
46 This study differs from others in its use of defined metrics and methods for gathering quantitative
47
48 data exhibited by learners when interacting with digital game making tools. Furthermore, this paper
49
50 provides observations on usability and the lessons learned from such teaching sessions that are
51
52 relevant to both practitioners and the research community at large for conducting further work in
53
54 this area. Such observations are made through an action research-based approach that collected
55
56 data from real world teaching sessions delivered under a national curriculum. The aforementioned
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 feasibility trial was designed to explore RQ1 and guides the approach to implementing the
2 intervention into a full trial to explore RQ2.
3

4
5 Engagement and collaboration are used as indicators for learning inclusion due to their pervasive
6 use in past studies as discussed previously.
7
8
9

10 **3. Feasibility Trial**

11 The feasibility trial aimed to evaluate the deployment of Pocket Code as a new method of learning
12 curriculum content with a view to making adaptations to both the platform of Pocket Code (e.g.
13 improved accessibility), and the method of utilising it as a learning tool for the students in this study.
14
15
16
17

18 In order to evaluate the pedagogical implications for implementing digital game making into a
19 coherent curriculum-based teaching strategy (RQ1), the feasibility trial aimed to determine the
20 requirements and adaptations needed to be made to the original code base (Pocket Code) to make it
21 suitable for use by SEND students, and thus produce the intervention required to enable the full trial
22 to answer RQ2. We aimed to use this stage of the project to evaluate the means with which teachers
23 would utilise digital game making and how this approach could be integrated into lesson plans. For
24 example, it was not clear if pre-defined templates for games would be required and, if so, what
25 game genres (e.g., Quiz, Adventure) would suit which subjects and which students.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 **3.1 Overview**

42 The feasibility trial took place in two classes within two schools situated in the United Kingdom; the
43 first, a mainstream school for primary education containing a mix of typically developing students
44 aged 9-10 years ~~and those with individual learning needs aged 12-18;~~ ^{the} the second a special school
45 supporting students with ~~SENDPMLD~~, a subset of learners, aged 12-18, that exhibit a wide range of
46 individual needs and where learning goals vary widely. Two teachers and one teaching assistant
47 were involved in the trial; none had prior experience in programming. One day of training was
48 completed prior to the study to familiarise all relevant parties with Pocket Code. This day was also
49 used to define lesson plans and potential Pocket Code implementations in collaboration with the
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 participating teachers to ensure our implementation's suitability in teaching to achieve [national](#)
2 curriculum learning outcomes.
3
4

5 It is notable that the two schools chosen for this project differ in purpose and their students differ in
6 ability considerably. [Their](#) inclusion in the project allows for the impact of digital game making to be
7 assessed across multiple contexts and real-world teaching scenarios.
8
9

10 Each school was provided with tablets pre-loaded with Pocket Code. Tablets were numbered and
11 individually assigned to learners to utilise throughout the trial; hence within each session each
12 learner worked on their own tablet to tackle the tasks at hand.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 A class of 30 in the primary school and a class of 12 students from the special school took part in the
22 feasibility trial; within this first feasibility trial, no control condition was utilised. The purpose of this
23 initial trial was to determine the pedagogical requirements for implementing digital game making
24 into mixed ability and special needs classrooms. This included examining the teaching methodology
25 and assessing the accessibility requirements of the original code base (Pocket Code) customising it to
26 more formal learning environments.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 **3.1.1 Curriculum Development**

37

38 The trial consisted of a weekly session spread over 6-weeks, each an hour in length and taking place
39 within a typical classroom session. A standard session topic (e.g. history), learning objectives and
40 content were converted into a digital game making session aimed at achieving the same outcomes.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

61 For the history session, the learning objective was derived from the UK's national curriculum
62 assessment objectives, specifically HA01 that deals with historical knowledge and fact/knowledge
63 retention. A Pocket Code session was derived from content teaching the Roman Games; typically,
64 students would keep a portfolio of work built up over a number of sessions which may include
65

1 artwork, quiz activities, and complete teacher derived worksheets. Two implementations of Pocket
2 Code teaching sessions were derived to deliver the same learning objectives. First, a bingo style
3 interactive game that was teacher led and was used to convey concept identification by associating
4 random definitions with their associated pictures; [resources generated as part of this process can be](#)
5 [found on the Catrobat website \(Catrobat, 2017b\)](#). Here, students developed the game by creating
6 assets and ~~some~~ basic algorithmic design to add random [asset item](#) selection ~~to~~ [creating](#) the rule
7 set of the game. Teachers then led a session playing a version of the created game using the assets
8 as discussion points to test knowledge of the topics. [For example, when a particular historical object](#)
9 [was selected by the game the class provided a definition/discussion as well as completing their bingo](#)
10 [card on a companion application also created in Pocket Code](#). Secondly, students developed their
11 own interactive story that dealt with an ~~appropriate~~ topic; for example, a competitor's
12 experience during the Games. This would involve designing assets for use in scenes and generating
13 basic logic to add animations, decisions and transitions within and between scenes. Teachers would
14 aid in the creation of assets, help with programming concepts and ensure the created narratives
15 were consistent with learning objectives. [Pocket Code templates for interactive stories are also](#)
16 [accessible through the Catrobat website \(Catrobat, 2017c\)](#).

17 For the life-skills session, [these](#) students ~~here~~ were typically operating below the national curriculum
18 levels due to their individual needs and the focus ~~was~~ instead on general skills and aptitudes
19 necessary for independent living. A typical teaching session may include reinforcing routines through
20 repetition and practical demonstrations. The Pocket Code session included the development of
21 interactive odd-one-out and quiz games with a focus on asset development (through practical
22 application) [\(Catrobat, 2017d\)](#). For example, students may develop questions dealing with a morning
23 routine and present their game to their peers for collaborative play. ~~For example~~ [Hence](#), students
24 would create a series of assets that may be related to a morning routine and the player would select
25 the order in which they must be performed or select the odd one out from the range of options.

1 Given the skill level of students, teaching assistants would provide prompts for what assets could be
2 created and generate some of the basic logic for the games.
3

4
5 While a rigorous lesson plan was produced for each session, at this stage of the trial no pre-made
6 content was produced for the coding elements of Pocket Code itself meaning participants started
7 the lesson with a blank canvas in Pocket Code.
8
9

10
11 Sessions were delivered by a Pocket Code specialist in conjunction with the usual class teacher to
12 refine the approach. Furthermore, within the special school, teaching assistants were present as
13 would be the case in typical teaching sessions at this site.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 **3.1.2 Data Collection**

22 The impact of the feasibility sessions was measured through the following means:
23

- 24 • qualitative observations during sessions to assess interaction with Pocket Code; an observer
25 attended each session taking notes.
26
- 27 • teacher feedback following the sessions through un-structured interviews and semi-
28 structured focus groups [interviews](#).
29
30
31
32
33

34
35 At the feasibility stage, an ethnographic approach was adopted enabling reflection on practice to
36 identify changes to the teaching implementation in future trials. As such, teacher feedback was
37 utilised to verify reflections from the practice reflection. Feedback concerning usability was analysed
38 using a thematic approach using themes identified in similar work (Author, 20XXc).
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 The project was fully ethically approved, and parental consent obtained for each participant.
48
49

50 **3.2 Observations and Teacher Feedback**

51
52 The introduction of digital game making within the Primary school appeared to be mainly positive
53 with teachers noting less instances of disruptive [behaviourbehavior](#) occurring which would typically
54 require their removal from the class; “they don’t want to risk not being in the class when using the
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 tablets". Furthermore, individual students appeared to react differently to the teaching medium
2 compared to how they usually would; "one student, who usually gets very upset when making
3 mistakes, seemed much more willing to have a go and experiment with the code". The more able
4 students, having picked up the initial concepts earlier in the sessions, were observed helping less
5 able students; the teacher suggested these students could become "digital leaders" as per similar
6 schemes present in the school.
7
8
9

10
11
12
13
14
15 Within the school focussing on students with [PMLD-SEND](#) teachers commented that the students
16 appeared engaged, despite their low literacy levels which teachers identified as a potential barrier to
17 [their](#) use of Pocket Code. Participants appeared "calmer" (teaching assistant) in comparison to
18 typical classroom sessions. Furthermore, there appeared to be obvious pride in the work achieved
19 with participants exchanging tablets with each other to demonstrate their [gameswork](#). Participants
20 "particularly enjoyed using the camera and paint program to create assets to use in the game"
21 (teacher). This highlights that participants with SEND, who may struggle with more complex coding
22 tasks, can still engage with Pocket Code based sessions through asset creation thus providing some
23 degree of ownership over the work produced.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 From this informal observation and feedback opportunity, Pocket Code as an everyday teaching tool
38 could provide a potentially engaging and collaborative learning experience. However, aspects of the
39 delivery required some alteration. For example, starting with a blank template for game creation led
40 to an increased amount of time working on the basics of program development rather than the
41 intended subject matter. Teachers expressed concern that students were spending too much time
42 learning programming rather than the curriculum material required. While student engagement with
43 coding literacies are beneficial, the topics delivered here are non-STEM and have subject specific
44 learning outcomes that may not be being addressed through programming-oriented activities. In
45 response to this, lesson templates have since been integrated with pre-made game templates which
46 can be downloaded and altered to fit a session. For example, a generic quiz game template can be
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 adapted within the classroom with subject matter images, questions and answers. This would put
2 learners into the role of multimedia designers which research suggests can also have a positive
3
4 impact on motivation and cognitive development (Liu and Hsiao, 2002).
5
6

7 **3.3 Accessibility & Usability Challenges**

8
9
10 The variation in individual needs across the participants utilised in this feasibility trial provided a
11 means of assessing the usability and accessibility of the Pocket Code intervention within a
12 heterogeneous population.
13
14
15
16

17
18
19 The use of programming in game making holds significant challenges which must be overcome if it is
20 to be a tool utilised in everyday teaching; particularly for learners with individual needs. [As noted,](#)
21
22 [Teachers](#) within this trial were concerned that their students spent time learning to code rather
23 than learning the curriculum specific subject knowledge.
24
25
26

27
28
29 “The students did not have the ability to remember what we did last session; we had to revisit what
30 the bricks do so we could carry on”.

31
32
33
34
35 “Between sessions they couldn’t remember how to use Pocket Code... some cannot recall the
36 correct ordering or what individual blocks [bricks] do”.

37
38
39
40
41 This would perhaps suggest that several participants within this sample struggled with the abstract
42 ideas of programming inhibiting its use as a tool for subject learning. This suggests a need for careful
43 adaptation of the User Interface (UI) to enable those with [a](#) cognitive disability to tackle the
44 concepts found within programming (and to an extent digital game making). Conversely, these
45 observations may be indicative of issues caused by time between sessions impacting knowledge
46 retention; however, many SEND students also experience issues with memory and this was
47 highlighted by teachers in the study. Similarly, possible institutional barriers may be evident [here](#)
48 with teachers [prioritising](#) ~~on~~ the curriculum requirements placed upon them and the competencies
49 provided by digital game making given a lower priority. Further studies should assess the impact of
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 session timings on technical skill acquisition and seek to understand school/institutional barriers to
2 digital game making adoption.
3

4
5 However, to produce an intervention suited to more formal educational environments and the
6 needs of SEND students ~~through the adaptation of Pocket Code~~, teachers stated ~~students with~~
7 ~~SEND~~ such students would perhaps benefit from software adaptations to the Pocket Code UI:
8
9

10
11
12
13 “There are too many categories [of bricks] within each script type; our students need less choice”.
14
15

16
17 Again, this would suggest that participants with a cognitive disability find it difficult to tackle the
18 higher-level concepts that the bricks represent and the range of options available to these
19 participants further hinders their ability to understand and apply the functionality offered. A solution
20 could be found through personalisation of the Pocket Code environment through the provision of
21 User Profiles where, based on the cognitive needs of the learner, only certain categories and their
22 bricks are available. Indeed, Werner et al. (2014) suggest four levels of computational thinking
23 related to the concepts of programming which can be used to evaluate understanding. However,
24 such personalisation should be continually adaptable such that the full capabilities are available to
25 students at appropriate moments in their learning pathway. Adaptations proposed are intended to
26 be tailored towards students’ capabilities and not their limitations. Care should be taken in such
27 implementations to avoid limiting what students can accomplish with in the development
28 environment, particularly in relation to their local classroom peers.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 Identifying the computational concept each brick represents is a further challenge to these students
47 due to the vocabulary and labelling used within the environment:
48
49
50

51 “The wording to describe the blocks is not appropriate for our learners”.
52
53

54
55 The use of words such as “forever” (to describe a loop) or “broadcast” (send parameters between
56 objects) do not aid learners with cognitive disabilities in grasping the concept the brick represented
57 preventing the application of that brick within a game. Teachers within the special school, where this
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 observation was most prevalent, suggested [ed](#) that their students' reading abilities ~~were at as at a~~
2 levels ~~which made ere~~ it ~~is~~ difficult for them to simply understand the words.
3
4

5 Teachers suggested replacing the text with symbols, such as Makaton, as utilised in their other
6 learning material. This would enable the students with SEND to begin to grasp the concepts
7 represented by the bricks. Similarly, the UI could be adapted to combine text, symbols and colours
8 allowing eventual association between language and concepts. However, programming may require
9 cognitive skills that some of these participants do not yet have preventing them from engaging with
10 the session at all. As suggested in ~~the~~ section 3.2, the use of game templates could provide a
11 solution. Students could then interact with the session by creating assets related to the subject being
12 taught and ~~to~~ perform only minor changes to the coding blocks.
13
14

15 Various issues with physical disability were also identified which were often unique to subsets of
16 participants; understandable, given the heterogeneous nature of classroom education. For example,
17 some students found the text too small in formula editors, the use of colour in labelling the bricks
18 confusing and the interaction when placing a brick difficult where a drag and drop [action](#) would be
19 easier ~~than the currently implemented user interface~~. Whilst these usability issues are common, the
20 range of issues observed across individual participants in this study highlighted the need for
21 personalisation within the [technology interventions software](#) to achieve a more inclusive learning
22 experience. Future developments of digital game making applications could focus on adaptation of
23 the UI on a user-by-user basis that addresses the requirements of both cognitive and physical
24 disability. Issues identified here are consistent with those found in similar work (Misbahu et al, 2018).
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 **3.4 Considerations for Full Trial**

50 Initial observations would suggest that digital game making tools can provide an engaging and
51 potentially collaborative learning experience such that it could form a useful part of a teacher's
52 toolkit. Hence, the following two hypotheses were proposed for the full trial:
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- The use of digital game making in the classroom will increase learner engagement within a teaching session;session.
- The use of digital game making in the classroom will increase learner collaboration within a teaching session.

The feasibility trial concluded that changes to the implementation of digital game making as a teaching tool were required in order to cater for the unique cognitive, physical and sensory needs of the target students. Pre-made game templates were thus created that minimise the difficult task of coding during the session (Author, 20XXe) and instead allow participants to focus on curriculum learning through development of their own game assets. Efforts from the feasibility trial fed into a broader game making pedagogy that was part of the major project deliverables (Author, 20xxf). This outlined a teaching framework using game templates that was then utilised as a teacher training and user guide for implementing digital game making for learning in the full trial and beyond.

4. Full Trial

4.1 Full Trial Overview

Following the feasibility trial, a full-scale module of teaching utilising digital game making principles was implemented within each school as summarised in Table 1:

Table 1 - Participant Overview

	Curriculum Topic	Class Size	Age	Number of Sessions	Comparative Control
Primary education School	History (Roman Games)	25	9-10 years	8	2 sessions with the same group.
Special School	Life Skills (variety)	5	12-18 years	4	5 sessions with similar ability group

As per the feasibility trial, Pocket Code sessions utilised lesson plans developed from the usual curriculum-based plans provided by teachers which included additional sections to include

1 computational thinking learning outcomes as well as subject discipline learning outcomes. However,
2 based on the outcomes from the initial trial, pre-developed game templates were created to aid in
3 the delivery of the sessions to ensure focus on the learning material rather than solely on
4 programming itself. Two templates were designed for the full trial in relation to the session outlines
5 provided in section 3.1; the first of these offered an outline of a quiz. Here, the template provided a
6 single “look” or scene consisting of a question and a set of potential answers that took the form of
7 graphics and/or audio. Default interactions were coded into the template for the quiz logic. Learners
8 were required to add their own content to form the questions and answers and add additional looks
9 for further questions thus expanding the quiz logic. Advanced features for more able students would
10 include the addition of points, scores and timers.

11 The second template provided the framework for constructing interactive, choice driven narratives.
12 Here, the template consisted of a look with placeholders for images and the logic for a branching
13 choice, each option leading to a further look (i.e. if the user answers yes, go to screen one and no to
14 the alternative screen). Learners were required to provide subject specific content to fill in the
15 placeholders and drive the narrative. Advanced users were able to create more complex branching
16 and additional looks.

17 Each of these templates can be found in the appendices to this paper [and are available through the
18 Catrobat website \(Catrobat, 2017bcd\).](#)

19 Intervention sessions took place once per week replacing lessons that would have otherwise taught
20 that topic in curriculum time.

21 To assess the impact of digital game making sessions, a bespoke observation tool, designed for the
22 project, provided in-class [behaviourbehavior](#) data. Each session was observed live by a trained
23 researcher. Data gathered from typical teaching sessions serving as controls provided a basis for
24 comparison. These control sessions were [devised—identified](#) in discussion with [teachers at](#)

1 participating schools based on what was possible for further observation without disrupting the
2 school day; for the Primary School, this was two further sessions with the same group of participants
3 and teacher on a topic that was suggested (by the teacher) as being similar in delivery and learning
4 outcomes: study of politics. For the special school, the control group consisted of six sessions with a
5 separate group of students from the same class also studying life skills within sessions that would
6 otherwise have been delivered. The activities in these controls mirrored the digital game making
7 sessions, for example, students would storyboard their narratives or draw pictures for a paper-based
8 quiz. It is noted that treating separate teaching sessions as controls potentially introduced some
9 variability that cannot be accounted for and as such comparisons served as general indicator of
10 impact.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 While there has been much consideration of measuring engagement in education (e.g. Fredricks and
25 McColsky, 2012) no psychometrically robust measures exist for children with intellectual disabilities
26 (Hedgecock et al, 2014). We use time on task and time collaborating as effective measures of
27 quantifying behavior to measure the study's impact in these sessions guided by previous research to
28 determine how humanoid robots can support learning in children with profound and multiple
29 disabilities.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 This approach was deemed appropriate given the requirement to sample from a class of up to 30
40 students in order to gain a suitable measure of classroom activity over the session length. Other
41 global measures are available to measure engagement, such as the scale developed by the Special
42 Schools and Academies Trust (2011) as part of a classroom tool for teachers of children with
43 complex disabilities. This use of this scale was not deemed appropriate for our study as it was not
44 originally designed as an outcome measure but to encourage teachers to focus on the child's
45 engagement as a learner and create personalised learning pathways, and requires rating of pupils in
46 seven areas (awareness, curiosity, investigation, discovery, anticipation, initiation and persistence).
47 Its use was not therefore appropriate for the simultaneous observation of up to 30 pupils.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

4.2 Instruments

A [behaviourbehavior](#) observation tool, referred to above, was developed for the purposes of this study that focussed on capturing target [behaviourbehavior](#) that occur over fixed intervals (Alessi, 1980). This in-class observation tool defines a variety of [behaviourbehavior](#) codes relating to teacher and student [behaviourbehavior](#), derived from the STROBE classroom observation tool (O'Malley et al., 2003; Kelly et al., 2005). The tool provides a means of sampling and classifying [behaviourbehavior](#) throughout a session using a momentary time sampling approach; chosen as it is more likely to capture changes in [behaviourbehavior](#) when compared to partial sampling (Rapp et al., 2008). Each session is split into 5-minute intervals within which several groups of observations take place. The first group deal with the structure of the class (e.g. whole class, or group work), the activity being conducted (instructional, procedural, inquisitorial etc.) and a general assessment of engagement for the class (half or less engaged, more than half, almost all etc.).

Following the group observation, the tool provided opportunity to record the teacher's [behaviourbehavior](#) from a possible six codes (see table 2) and the student's [behaviourbehavior](#) from a possible eight codes (see table 3).

Table 2 - Teacher [BehaviourBehavior](#) Codes

Code	Teacher BehaviourBehavior
1	Talking to entire class while all the students are passive receivers
2	Starting a discussion with the whole class or talking through a learning activity that students should be following step-by-step
3	Starting or conducting a discussion with groups
4	Monitoring groups of students (as they work independently)-
5	Monitoring the entire class (as they work independently)-
6	Asking class or individuals to show their work (during or at the end of sessions)-

A record of the teacher [behaviourbehavior](#) enables future analysis of whether the teaching style within the sessions differed to the control, and how the teacher [behaviourbehavior](#) affected student [behaviourbehavior](#)/interactions.

Table 3 - Student ~~Behaviour~~Behavior Codes

Code	Learner Behaviour Behavior
1	Off-task – engaged with another behaviour behavior e.g. looking at phone or other material.
2	Off-task - disruptive to peer or peers.
3	Reading, writing, typing, listening – could be following the session but difficult to determine, could be waiting for the next instruction.
4	Following along with instructor or with learning material – e.g. off slides, from a book, in response to a request for help etc.
5	Receiving personal tutoring or interacting with teacher; demonstrating work to them etc.
6	Demonstrating work to another student. Receiving demonstration from a peer.
7	Working with another student or groups of peers to solve problems.
8	Wanting to participate/speak/demonstrate (arm raised) or actively participating - answering questions or demonstrating work to the class.

Within each 5-minute interval, measures were taken from four participants one after the other with each individual observation lasting 20 seconds. As mentioned, momentary sampling was utilised whereby the ~~behaviour~~behavior observed at the end of the 20-second window was recorded on the observation sheet. A potential limitation of this approach is the under-representation of behavior, particularly where behavior length is shorter than the interval being used (Ary & Sun, 1983). However, a ~~behaviour~~behavior of “engaged” as described in this paper should not have this issue as it is a more persistent behavioral state.

Using this tool, quantitative behavioral data is recorded during observation based on the activity being observed by a trained observer. Inter-rater reliability was considered as observers compared notes on a session observed as a group to ensure agreement on application of the broad behavioral codes. Furthermore, the study uses a mixed-method approach to validate and expand on the behavioral observations using teacher perceptions. As such, data gathering also included qualitative observations noted during the session as well as teacher feedback collected throughout the trial through unstructured interviews.

4.3 Data Analysis

To evaluate the research questions, observational data was recoded as follows; an observed code of one or two is “not engaged”, any other code is “engaged” with a further possible recode of six, seven or eight as “engaged” and performing “collaborative ~~behaviour~~behavior”.

Data were then analysed using statistical software package SPSS 20. Descriptive statistics for engagement and collaboration were calculated from student observations as percentage of time those ~~behaviour~~behavior were observed. A Chi-Square test for association was then utilised to compare the observations between the two treatments using a significance level of $P < 0.05$.

Qualitative feedback was used to explore the data further and justify findings where appropriate.

5. Results

5.1 Data Summary

The observation tool deployed provided several intervals within a session (variable depending on session length) with each interval holding one teacher observation and four participant observations.

Table 4 provides an overview of the number of intervals and observations gathered among the two schools for both intervention and control groups.

Table 4 - Observation Data Overview

	PE School	Special School
Intervention Sessions	8	4
Intervention Intervals	100	55
Intervention student observations	500	220
Control Sessions	2	5
Control Intervals	24	60
Control student observations	120	300

5.2 Engagement

Table 5 summarises the data following re-coding of the student observation to ascertain learner engagement.

Table 5 - Engagement Statistics

	Intervention		Control		Chi-Square Value
	Engaged	Not-engaged	Engaged	Not-engaged	
Primary School	86.7%	13.3%	81.5%	18.5%	P = 0.201
Special School	91.3%	8.7%	78.3%	21.7%	P < 0.001

Descriptive statistics suggest significantly more engagement within Pocket Code game making sessions compared to the control within the special school (Chi-Square $P < 0.001$). This finding was not, however, confirmed with the primary school which despite holding a higher level of observed engagement, this was not a statistically significant increase.

Figure 2 provides a breakdown of engagement within each session at the special school; also illustrated are the running averages (small dash) and final average (long dash) from the sessions conducted.




Figure 2 - Special School per Session Engagement

In comparison, figure 3 illustrates the breakdown for the primary school.




Figure 3 - Primary School per Session Engagement

5.3 Collaboration

The final three codes (see table 3) in the observation protocol determine potential collaborative ~~behaviour~~behavior among peers; where student-to-teacher interaction is not counted as collaborative. The recoded collaborative ~~behaviour~~behaviors are summarised in table 6 along with ~~an~~ analysis of ~~a~~ difference with the control ~~condition~~.

Table 6 - Collaboration Statistics

	Intervention		Control		Chi-Square Value
	Collab'	Not-Collab'	Collab'	Not-Collab'	
Primary School	12.8%	87.2%	6.5%	93.5%	P = 0.093
Special School	12.6%	87.4%	6.2%	93.8%	P = 0.021

Intervention sessions within the special school in this study found significantly increased observations of collaboration among participants compared to the control sessions (Chi-Square P=0.021). Although the primary school held a greater percentage in observed ~~intervention~~ collaboration, this was not statistically significant (P=0.093).

5.4 Discussion & Teacher Feedback

Table 5 highlights statistically significant results for the special school but not the primary school on both engagement and collaborative ~~behaviour~~ behaviors. The discrepancy between the two schools may be due to the simpler learning objectives within the sessions created for the special school. A higher-level focus on actual programming was deemed to be too advanced for these participants; and, from the feasibility trial, issues with cognitive disability were identified requiring tailoring of the digital game making material, via the use of templates, to the needs of these students. As such, intervention sessions within the special school tended to focus on asset creation ~~within~~ for the games being made; for example, taking pictures for storyboards, recording sounds etc. Observations within these sessions suggested that this focus provided students with a clear sense of ownership over their work while the relatively simple use of digital game making principles allowed the students to focus on the tangible tasks at hand. Indeed, the participating teacher noted that while the students needed help creating the games, they were fully engaged in playing them when the session outcomes were achieved. Digital game making therefore encouraged participation in the construction of learning material and utilises the strength of gameplay to encourage engagement, ~~also~~ as noted by Author (20XXd) where gameplay can provide a successful intervention for where students with intellectual disabilities ~~are concerned~~. Engagement, for SEND learners, is often considered the single best predictor of learning (Iovannone, 2003), and so these results are ~~therefore~~ encouraging for the adoption of digital game making as a teaching and learning tool.

While a statistically significant result was not found in the primary school, figure 3 suggests an upward trend in engagement following session 5 with a final session engagement observation of 95%. This upward trend would suggest also that any initial engagement observed due to a novelty factor may eventually translate into more persistent engagement that is the product of the strengths inherent in digital game making as a teaching tool. Indeed, the participating teacher noted a gradual adaption to the learning material: "The children are becoming more and more confident with taking

1 risks ... having a go at aspects of the lessons they are not 100% sure on” and “The children have
2 started the sessions more settled ... this may be due to the familiarity they now have with pocket
3 code”. Interestingly, this may suggest an increase in learning persistence as learners appear willing
4 to take risks and not be deterred by errors when they occur but instead see them as part of the
5 learning process. Indeed, the participating teacher highlighted one particular student with individual
6 needs: “This was particularly evident with [student] who is unable to focus for longer than a few
7 minutes in most lessons. Throughout this whole lesson he was engaged in what he was doing, taking
8 his time and making sure it was of a good standard which is something he can struggle to do at times
9 in class”.

10
11
12 Interestingly, figure 2 exhibits a downward trajectory in engagement despite the statistically
13 significant increase overall; however, there are fewer sessions and it is also worth noting that the
14 final session 4 is around the point where engagement began to increase again in the mainstream
15 primary school. An increase in the number of sessions is required to examine if the same pattern of
16 engagement is ~~apparent~~ consistently consistent.

17
18
19 As in the primary school, teacher feedback was also positive suggesting that the narrower focus on
20 asset creation enabled learning, but it was the tangible outcomes from the sessions that provided
21 the most positive classroom experience, that is the final created games: “They are loving playing the
22 games and increasing their scores”. Furthermore, the alterations to the delivery appeared to aid in
23 overcoming the usability issues identified in the feasibility trials; “The students were working at
24 looking at the coloured blocks and trying to make the game look the same as the example [template].
25 I think they were using the shapes and colours of the blocks as he can’t read”.

26
27
28 Collaboration in the special school held a statistically significant increase as illustrated in table 6.
29 Feedback from sessions suggest that students spent time demonstrating the assets they created to
30 each other and how they work within their created games. This would further suggest that there

1 were potentially increased amounts of learner satisfaction within digital game making sessions
2 which ~~perhaps~~ should be explored further in future studies.
3

4
5 For the primary school, despite a seemingly similar percentage difference between the two
6 conditions, it was not statistically significant suggesting that digital game making sessions are equally
7 as collaborative as the typical teaching sessions used as controls. However, teacher feedback was
8 positive and, again, suggest a persistence in learning that goes beyond the sessions: “~~T~~he children
9 are meeting their aims at the moment and the teamwork they have shown as a class is starting to
10 now be used in other lessons. This is being modelled well during these sessions and recently we have
11 started to see this behavior in both English and Maths lessons”. Due to the range of developing
12 levels within this class, collaboration through teamwork has often been a problem; however, within
13 the intervention session a potentially more inclusive environment was observed: “~~D~~during the
14 sessions this week I noticed teamwork between members of the class, which is something this class
15 struggle with on a whole. Children who were progressing well used their initiative and went around
16 the class to help members of the class which were struggling”. This feedback may suggest that the
17 quality of collaborative ~~behaviour~~behavior is improved in the intervention sessions.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 **6.1 Limitations ~~and~~ & Further Work**

38
39
40 Data has been provided to measure engagement and collaboration in mixed ability learners when
41 engaging with digital game making in traditional curriculum-based teaching from two sample test
42 sites. Each test site reported benefits, although only one site held statistically significant results. This
43 could be due to the differences between the two samples and the content delivered to each of them.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

1 that has very heterogeneous populations. Past work by the research team has used matched pair
2 control groups (Author, 20xxb); however, this approach has the challenge of finding suitable
3 matches for complex students. As such, approaches subsequently were developed using within-
4 group designs (Author, 20xxg) that allowed the experiment design to have a formal control in
5 challenging research environments. Future studies should broaden the sample size and, using the
6 approaches developed here that build on past work, seek to validate the results further.
7
8
9

10
11
12
13
14
15 The methodology and the instruments deployed do not highlight learner satisfaction or the quality
16 of engagement/collaboration beyond the qualitative observations provided by the involved teachers.
17
18
19
20 The coding scheme utilised in the observation tool should be adapted in subsequent studies to
21 include a wider variety of “learner states” for measuring more contextual impact. Although this work
22 evaluates digital game making over a longer period of time and within a real setting, the
23 implementation of the discussed teaching practices should be expanded to include more testing
24 sites and increased exposure to digital game making to improve the generality of the results
25 obtained. Furthermore, outputs from this phase of the project include game templates that require
26 further evaluation to determine their long-term effect on learner engagement and to continue the
27 co-design of digital game making as a rigorous pedagogy for utilisation within everyday classroom
28 teaching.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 Findings based on teacher feedback require further examination; this should be expanded on in
42 future experimental iterations. For example, persistence in learning was apparent from a teacher’s
43 perspective however, classes not involved in the trial would need to be evaluated to determine the
44 extent of this persistence. Similarly, the methods employed in this study do not provide insight into
45 the potential competencies digital game making encourages. These could include, for example,
46 promoting creative thinking and artistic skill, improving literacy ability through scripting games and
47 providing avenues to developing computational thinking through programming.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58

59 **6.2 Summary and Conclusions**

60
61
62
63
64
65

1 This paper has provided initial results from two trials examining digital game making using visual
2 programming languages as a teaching tool in a mixed ability classroom and a school focussing on
3 special education. Based on the research questions posed; the feasibility trial developed a
4 pedagogical approach and identified metrics (engagement and collaboration) for measuring impact
5 based on teacher recommendations. This approach ~~identified~~ suggested the need for pre-made
6 content in the form of game templates that place the focus of sessions on the creation of digital
7 ~~subject~~ asset content while still providing access to broader digital game making principles for
8 relevant students. The need for learner profiles that ensured participants could access the platform
9 depending on their capabilities was also identified.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 A full trial then assessed Pocket Code using these metrics through a mixed methods approach to
23 demonstrate the potential impact digital game making could have on classroom learning within two
24 sample classrooms. This work has therefore provided both a methodology and initial
25 ~~quantitative~~ usable data examining the levels of engagement and collaboration exhibited in two
26 typical classroom sessions finding that such methods are at least as useful as comparable methods in
27 the sample taken in this study. Findings also suggest means of implementing digital game making
28 such that learners with individual needs are able to engage and benefit from the teaching sessions.
29 These include the use of game templates that enable learners with cognitive impairments to focus
30 on asset creation while still creating tangible outcomes from the teaching sessions giving clear
31 ownership over the learning process. As noted in the limitations section, these do require further
32 evaluation and development in subsequent works that should increase the sample across a wider
33 variety of classrooms at varying school levels. This research therefore offers initial evidence for the
34 potential of digital game making to enrich the learning experience within mixed ability classrooms
35 and include and engage learners with special education needs by utilising the adaptability of digital
36 game making.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56

57 **References**

58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 Akcaoglu, M. and Green, L.S., 2019. Teaching systems thinking through game design. *Educational*
2 *Technology Research and Development*, 67(1), pp.1-19.

3
4
5 Alessi, G.J., (1980). Behavioral observation for the school psychologist: Responsive-discrepancy
6 model. *School Psychology Review*.

7
8
9
10
11 Ary, D. and Suen, H.K., (1983). The use of momentary time sampling to assess both frequency and
12 duration of behavior. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment*, 5(2), pp.143-150.

13
14
15
16
17 Backlund, P. and Hendrix, M., (2013), September. Educational games-are they worth the effort? A
18 literature survey of the effectiveness of serious games. In *2013 5th international conference on*
19 *Games and virtual worlds for serious applications (VS-GAMES)* (pp. 1-8). IEEE

20
21
22
23
24 Baytak, A., & Land, S. M. (2011). An investigation of the artifacts and process of constructing
25 computers games about environmental science in a fifth grade classroom. *Educational Technology*
26 *Research and Development*, 59(6), 765-782.

27
28
29
30
31 Author (20xxb). To be added following double-blind review.

32
33
34
35
36 Catrobat. (2017a). Free educational apps for children and teenagers. [ONLINE] Available at:
37 <https://www.catrobat.org/>. [Accessed 20 June 2017].

38
39
40
41 [Catrobat. \(2017b\). Bingo Template \[ONLINE\] Available at:](#)

42 <https://share.catrob.at/pocketcode/program/12117> [Accessed 17 Jun. 2020].

43
44
45
46 [Catrobat. \(2017c\). Moving Backgrounds \[ONLINE\] Available at:](#)

47 <https://share.catrob.at/pocketcode/program/11386> [Accessed 17 Jun. 2020].

48
49
50
51 [Catrobat. \(2017d\). Morning Routine \[ONLINE\] Available at:](#)

52 <https://share.catrob.at/pocketcode/program/12124> [Accessed 17 Jun. 2020].
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

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
61
62
63
64
65

Connolly, T.M., Boyle, E.A., MacArthur, E., Hainey, T. and Boyle, J.M., (2012). A systematic literature review of empirical evidence on computer games and serious games. *Computers & Education*, 59(2), pp.661-686

Denner, J. (2011). What predicts middle school girls' interest in computing? *International Journal of Gender, Science and Technology*, 3(1)

Denner, J., Campe, S. and Werner, L., 2019. Does Computer Game Design and Programming Benefit Children? A Meta-Synthesis of Research. *ACM Transactions on Computing Education (TOCE)*, 19(3), p.19.

Eiselt, K. and Carter, P., 2018, October. Integrating Social Skills Practice with Computer Programming for Students on the Autism Spectrum. In *2018 IEEE Frontiers in Education Conference (FIE)* (pp. 1-5). IEEE.

Estrella, R., Goode, J., Holme, J.J. and Nao, K., 2008. Stuck in the Shallow End.

Fessakis, G., Gouli, E., & Mavroudi, E. (2013). Problem solving by 5–6 years old kindergarten children in a computer programming environment: A case study. *Computers & Education*, 63, 87-97.

Fisher, S. and Jenson, J., 2017. Producing alternative gender orders: a critical look at girls and gaming. *Learning, Media and Technology*, 42(1), pp.87-99.

Foster, A. (2008). Games and motivation to learn science: Personal identity, applicability, relevance and meaningfulness. *Journal of Interactive Learning Research*, 19(4), 597.

Fredricks, J.A. and McColskey, W., (2012). The measurement of student engagement: A comparative analysis of various methods and student self-report instruments. In *Handbook of research on student engagement* (pp. 763-782). Springer, Boston, MA.

1 Gabriel, S., 2018, October. We Make Games: An Evaluation of Introducing Game Design Concepts in
2 Schools. In *ECGBL 2018 12th European Conference on Game-Based Learning* (p. 117). Academic
3 Conferences and publishing limited.
4

5
6
7 Gilbert, J., 2005. *Catching the knowledge wave?: The knowledge society and the future of education*.
8 Wellington: Nzcer Press.
9

10
11
12 Griffiths, M., (2002). The educational benefits of videogames. *Education and Health*, 20(3), pp.47-51
13

14
15
16 Grimes, S. and Fields, D.A., (2015). Children's media making, but not sharing: The potential and
17 limitations of child-specific DIY media websites. *Media International Australia*, 154(1), pp.112-122.
18

19
20
21
22 GÜLBAHAR, Y. and KALELIOĞLU, F., (2014). The effects of teaching programming via Scratch on
23 problem solving skills: A discussion from learners' perspective. *Informatics in Education-An*
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
61
62
63
64
65

66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

999
1000
1001
1002
1003
1004
1005
1006
1007
1008
1009
1010
1011
1012
1013
1014
1015
1016
1017
1018
1019
1020
1021
1022
1023
1024
1025
1026
1027
1028
1029
1030
1031
1032
1033
1034
1035
1036
1037
1038
1039
1040
1041
1042
1043
1044
1045
1046
1047
1048
1049
1050
1051
1052
1053
1054
1055
1056
1057
1058
1059
1060
1061
1062
1063
1064
1065
1066
1067
1068
1069
1070
1071
1072
1073
1074
1075
1076
1077
1078
1079
1080
1081
1082
1083
1084
1085
1086
1087
1088
1089
1090
1091
1092
1093
1094
1095
1096
1097
1098
1099
1100
1101
1102
1103
1104
1105
1106
1107
1108
1109
1110
1111
1112
1113
1114
1115
1116
1117
1118
1119
1120
1121
1122
1123
1124
1125
1126
1127
1128
1129
1130
1131
1132
1133
1134
1135
1136
1137
1138
1139
1140
1141
1142
1143
1144
1145
1146
1147
1148
1149
1150
1151
1152
1153
1154
1155
1156
1157
1158
1159
1160
1161
1162
1163
1164
1165
1166
1167
1168
1169
1170
1171
1172
1173
1174
1175
1176
1177
1178
1179
1180
1181
1182
1183
1184
1185
1186
1187
1188
1189
1190
1191
1192
1193
1194
1195
1196
1197
1198
1199
1200
1201
1202
1203
1204
1205
1206
1207
1208
1209
1210
1211
1212
1213
1214
1215
1216
1217
1218
1219
1220
1221
1222
1223
1224
1225
1226
1227
1228
1229
1230
1231
1232
1233
1234
1235
1236
1237
1238
1239
1240
1241
1242
1243
1244
1245
1246
1247
1248
1249
1250
1251
1252
1253
1254
1255
1256
1257
1258
1259
1260
1261
1262
1263
1264
1265
1266
1267
1268
1269
1270
1271
1272
1273
1274
1275
1276
1277
1278
1279
1280
1281
1282
1283
1284
1285
1286
1287
1288
1289
1290
1291
1292
1293
1294
1295
1296
1297
1298
1299
1300
1301
1302
1303
1304
1305
1306
1307
1308
1309
1310
1311
1312
1313
1314
1315
1316
1317
1318
1319
1320
1321
1322
1323
1324
1325
1326
1327
1328
1329
1330
1331
1332
1333
1334
1335
1336
1337
1338
1339
1340
1341
1342
1343
1344
1345
1346
1347
1348
1349
1350
1351
1352
1353
1354
1355
1356
1357
1358
1359
1360
1361
1362
1363
1364
1365
1366
1367
1368
1369
1370
1371
1372
1373
1374
1375
1376
1377
1378
1379
1380
1381
1382
1383
1384
1385
1386
1387
1388
1389
1390
1391
1392
1393
1394
1395
1396
1397
1398
1399
1400
1401
1402
1403
1404
1405
1406
1407
1408
1409
1410
1411
1412
1413
1414
1415
1416
1417
1418
1419
1420
1421
1422
1423
1424
1425
1426
1427
1428
1429
1430
1431
1432
1433
1434
1435
1436
1437
1438
1439
1440
1441
1442
1443
1444
1445
1446
1447
1448
1449
1450
1451
1452
1453
1454
1455
1456
1457
1458
1459
1460
1461
1462
1463
1464
1465
1466
1467
1468
1469
1470
1471
1472
1473
1474
1475
1476
1477
1478
1479
1480
1481
1482
1483
1484
1485
1486
1487
1488
1489
1490
1491
1492
1493
1494
1495
1496
1497
1498
1499
1500
1501
1502
1503
1504
1505
1506
1507
1508
1509
1510
1511
1512
1513
1514
1515
1516
1517
1518
1519
1520
1521
1522
1523
1524
1525
1526
1527
1528
1529
1530
1531
1532
1533
1534
1535
1536
1537
1538
1539
1540
1541
1542
1543
1544
1545
1546
1547
1548
1549
1550
1551
1552
1553
1554
1555
1556
1557
1558
1559
1560
1561
1562
1563
1564
1565
1566
1567
1568
1569
1570
1571
1572
1573
1574
1575
1576
1577
1578
1579
1580
1581
1582
1583
1584
1585
1586
1587
1588
1589
1590
1591
1592
1593
1594
1595
1596
1597
1598
1599
1600
1601
1602
1603
1604
1605
1606
1607
1608
1609
1610
1611
1612
1613
1614
1615
1616
1617
1618
1619
1620
1621
1622
1623
1624
1625
1626
1627
1628
1629
1630
1631
1632
1633
1634
1635
1636
1637
1638
1639
1640
1641
1642
1643
1644
1645
1646
1647
1648
1649
1650
1651
1652
1653
1654
1655
1656
1657
1658
1659
1660
1661
1662
1663
1664
1665
1666
1667
1668
1669
1670
1671
1672
1673
1674
1675
1676
1677
1678
1679
1680
1681
1682
1683
1684
1685
1686
1687
1688
1689
1690
1691
1692
1693
1694
1695
1696
1697
1698
1699
1700
1701
1702
1703
1704
1705
1706
1707
1708
1709
1710
1711
1712
1713
1714
1715
1716
1717
1718
1719
1720
1721
1722
1723
1724
1725
1726
1727
1728
1729
1730
1731
1732
1733
1734
1735
1736
1737
1738
1739
1740
1741
1742
1743
1744
1745
1746
1747
1748
1749
1750
1751
1752
1753
1754
1755
1756
1757
1758
1759
1760
1761
1762
1763
1764
1765
1766
1767
1768
1769
1770
1771
1772
1773
1774
1775
1776
1777
1778
1779
1780
1781
1782
1783
1784
1785
1786
1787
1788
1789
1790
1791
1792
1793
1794
1795
1796
1797
1798
1799
1800
1801
1802
1803
1804
1805
1806
1807
1808
1809
1810
1811
1812
1813
1814
1815
1816
1817
1818
1819
1820
1821
1822
1823
1824
1825
1826
1827
1828
1829
1830
1831
1832
1833
1834
1835
1836
1837
1838
1839
1840
1841
1842
1843
1844
1845
1846
1847
1848
1849
1850
1851
1852
1853
1854
1855
1856
1857
1858
1859
1860
1861
1862
1863
1864
1865
1866
1867
1868
1869
1870
1871
1872
1873
1874
1875
1876
1877
1878
1879
1880
1881
1882
1883
1884
1885
1886
1887
1888
1889
1890
1891
1892
1893
1894
1895
1896
1897
1898
1899
1900
1901
1902
1903
1904
1905
1906
1907
1908
1909
1910
1911
1912
1913
1914
1915
1916
1917
1918
1919
1920
1921
1922
1923
1924
1925
1926
1927
1928
1929
1930
1931
1932
1933
1934
1935
1936
1937
1938
1939
1940
1941
1942
1943
1944
1945
1946
1947
1948
1949
1950
1951
1952
1953
1954
1955
1956
1957
1958
1959
1960
1961
1962
1963
1964
1965
1966
1967
1968
1969
1970
1971
1972
1973
1974
1975
1976
1977
1978
1979
1980
1981
1982
1983
1984
1985
1986
1987
1988
1989
1990
1991
1992
1993
1994
1995
1996
1997
1998
1999
2000
2001
2002
2003
2004
2005
2006
2007
2008
2009
2010
2011
2012
2013
2014
2015
2016
2017
2018
2019
2020
2021
2022
2023
2024
2025
2026
2027
2028
2029
2030
2031
2032
2033
2034
2035
2036
2037
2038
2039
2040
2041
2042
2043
2044
2045
2046
2047
2048
2049
2050
2051
2052
2053
2054
2055
2056
2057
2058
2059
2060
2061
2062
2063
2064
2065
2066
2067
2068
2069
2070
2071
2072
2073
2074
2075
2076
2077
2078
2079
2080
2081
2082
2083
2084
2085
2086
2087
2088
2089
2090
2091
2092
2093
2094
2095
2096
2097
2098
2099
2100
2101
2102
2103
2104
2105
2106
2107
2108
2109
2110
2111
2112
2113
2114
2115
2116
2117
2118
2119
2120
2121
2122
2123
2124
2125
2126
2127
2128
2129
2130
2131
2132
2133
2134
2135
2136
2137
2138
2139
2140
2141
2142
2143
2144
2145
2146
2147
2148
2149
2150
2151
2152
2153
2154
2155
2156
2157
2158
2159
2160
2161
2162
2163
2164
2165
2166
2167
2

1
2 Kafai, Y.B. and Burke, Q., (2015). Constructionist gaming: Understanding the benefits of making
3 games for learning. *Educational psychologist*, 50(4), pp.313-334.

4
5 Kafai, Y. B., Lee, E., Searle, K., Fields, D., Kaplan, E., & Lui, D., (2014). A crafts-oriented approach to
6 computing in high school: Introducing computational concepts, practices, and perspectives with
7 electronic textiles. *ACM Transactions on Computing Education (TOCE)*, 14(1), 1
8
9

10
11
12
13 Kalmpourtzis, G., (2019). Connecting game design with problem posing skills in early childhood.
14
15 *British journal of educational technology*, 50(2), pp.846-860.

16
17
18
19 Kangas, M. (2010). Creative and playful learning: Learning through game co-creation and games in a
20 playful learning environment. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 5(1), 1-15.
21
22

23
24
25 Ke, F. (2014). An implementation of design-based learning through creating educational computer
26 games: A case study on mathematics learning during design and computing. *Computers & Education*,
27
28 73, 26-39.
29
30

31
32
33 Kelly, P.A., Haidet, P., Schneider, V., Searle, N., Seidel, C.L. and Richards, B.F., (2005). A comparison
34 of in-class learner engagement across lecture, problem-based learning, and team learning using the
35 STROBE classroom observation tool. *Teaching and learning in medicine*, 17(2), pp.112-118.
36
37
38

39
40
41 Liu, M., & Hsiao, Y. P. (2002). Middle school students as multimedia designers: A project-based
42 learning approach. *Journal of interactive learning research*, 13(4), 311.
43
44

45
46
47 Lye, S.Y. and Koh, J.H.L., 2018. Case Studies of Elementary Children's Engagement in Computational
48 Thinking Through Scratch Programming. In *Computational Thinking in the STEM Disciplines* (pp. 227-
49 251). Springer, Cham.
50
51

52
53
54 Malinverni, L., Mora-Guiard, J., Padillo, V., Valero, L., Hervás, A., & Pares, N. (2016). An inclusive
55 design approach for developing video games for children with autism spectrum disorder. *Computers
56 in Human Behavior*
57
58
59

60
61
62
63
64
65

1 Maloney, J. H., Peppler, K., Kafai, Y., Resnick, M., & Rusk, N. (2008). *Programming by choice: Urban*
2 *youth learning programming with scratch* ACM
3

4
5 Author (20XXf). To be added following double-blind review.
6

7
8
9 Munoz, R., Villarroel, R., Barcelos, T.S., Riquelme, F., Quezada, A. and Bustos-Valenzuela, P., 2018.
10 Developing computational thinking skills in adolescents with autism spectrum disorder through
11 digital game programming. *IEEE Access*, 6, pp.63880-63889.
12
13

14
15
16 O'Malley, K.J., Moran, B.J., Haidet, P., Seidel, C.L., Schneider, V., Morgan, R.O., Kelly, P.A. and
17 Richards, B., 2003. Validation of an observation instrument for measuring student engagement in
18 health professions settings. *Evaluation & the health professions*, 26(1), pp.86-103.
19
20

21
22
23 Rapp, J.T., Colby-Dirksen, A.M., Michalski, D.N., Carroll, R.A. and Lindenberg, A.M., 2008. Detecting
24 changes in simulated events using partial-interval recording and momentary time sampling.
25 *Behavioral Interventions*, 23(4), pp.237-269.
26
27

28
29
30 Resnick, M., Maloney, J., Monroy-Hernández, A., Rusk, N., Eastmond, E., Brennan, K., et al. (2009).
31 Scratch: Programming for all. *Communications of the ACM*, 52(11), 60-67.
32
33

34
35
36 Slany, W., (2014). Tinkering with Pocket Code, a Scratch-like programming app for your smartphone.
37 *Proc. of Constructionism*.
38
39

40
41
42 Author (20XXe). To be added following double-blind review.
43
44

45
46
47 Spires, H. A., Rowe, J. P., Mott, B. W., & Lester, J. C. (2011). Problem solving and game-based
48 learning: Effects of middle grade students' hypothesis testing strategies on learning outcomes.
49 *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 44(4), 453-472
50
51

52
53
54 Author (20XXd). To be added following double-blind review.
55
56

57
58
59 Author (20XXa). To be added following double-blind review.
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 Thumlert, K., de Castell, S. and Jenson, J., (2018), October. Learning through Game Design: A
 2 Production Pedagogy. In *European Conference on Games Based Learning* (pp. 704-XXV). Academic
 3 Conferences International Limited.
 4
 5

6
 7
 8 Warschauer, M. and Matuchniak, T., (2010). New technology and digital worlds: Analyzing evidence
 9 of equity in access, use, and outcomes. *Review of research in education*, 34(1), pp.179-225.
 10



11
 12
 13 Werner, L., Denner, J. and Campe, S., (2014), January. Using computer game programming to teach
 14 computational thinking skills. In *Learning, education and games* (pp. 37-53). ETC Press.
 15

16
 17
 18 Wing, J. M. (2006). Computational thinking. *Communications of the ACM*, 49(3), 33-35.
 19

20
 21
 22 Author (20XXc). To be added following double-blind review.
 23

24
 25 **Appendices**

26
 27 **Appendix 1 – Quiz Game Template**

	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Create@School</td> <td>game</td> <td>Quiz</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">created:</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">ID: 9992</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Description:</td> <td colspan="2">Question/answer with text and images (audio). Provide content per the questions.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Gameplay:</td> <td colspan="2">Tap on one of the answers (1, 2 or 3). After answering the question, you get additional content. Switch to the next question by tapping.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Enhancements by users:</td> <td colspan="2">Add looks and more questions.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Learning goal:</td> <td colspan="2">Define questions to a certain subject/topic.</td> </tr> </table>	Create@School	game	Quiz	created:			ID: 9992			Description:	Question/answer with text and images (audio). Provide content per the questions.		Gameplay:	Tap on one of the answers (1, 2 or 3). After answering the question, you get additional content. Switch to the next question by tapping.		Enhancements by users:	Add looks and more questions.		Learning goal:	Define questions to a certain subject/topic.	
Create@School	game	Quiz																				
created:																						
ID: 9992																						
Description:	Question/answer with text and images (audio). Provide content per the questions.																					
Gameplay:	Tap on one of the answers (1, 2 or 3). After answering the question, you get additional content. Switch to the next question by tapping.																					
Enhancements by users:	Add looks and more questions.																					
Learning goal:	Define questions to a certain subject/topic.																					
																						

28
 29
 30
 31
 32
 33
 34
 35
 36
 37
 38
 39
 40
 41
 42
 43
 44
 45
 46
 47
 48
 49
 50
 51 **Appendix 2 – Story Game Template**
 52
 53
 54
 55
 56
 57
 58
 59
 60
 61
 62
 63
 64
 65

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
61
62
63
64
65



Create@School game created:		Adventure
ID: 9995		
Description:	Storytelling with linear choices.	
Gameplay:	Listen to a question and decide "Yes" or "No". It is a linear game so one question will also lead you to the end of the game.	
Enhancements by users:	Add content and sound files. Define more levels.	
Learning goal:	For retelling a book. E.g. Help the characters to escape to a safe place (refugee stories) or answer subject related questions during the adventure.	

Highlights

- Data from two trials examining the use of game making in mixed ability and special classrooms.
- A feasibility trial highlights usability issues and recommends the use of game templates for inclusive teaching.
- A full trial suggests game making is at least as engaging as traditional methods and more so in some cases.
- Game making can be particularly useful when tailored to learners with profound and multiple learning disabilities.

CRedit Author Statement

T Hughes-Roberts: Methodology, Investigation, Validation, Formal Analysis, Data Curation, Writing – Original Draft, Writing – editing.

D Brown: Conceptualisation, Funding Acquisition, Supervision, Project Administration, Writing – Review & Editing.

H Boulton: Conceptualisation, Methodology, Funding Acquisition.

A Burton: Investigation, Resources, Data Curation

N. Shopland: Investigation, Resources, Data Curation

D. Martinovs: Resources, Methodology.

J. Tinney: Methodology, Resources, Investigation.