

Federal funding entity: IES
Grant #: R305A170376

Educational Technology Research and Development

Using the First Principles of Instruction and Multimedia Learning Principles to Design and Develop In-game Learning Support Videos

--Manuscript Draft--

Manuscript Number:	ETRD-D-20-00859R1	
Full Title:	Using the First Principles of Instruction and Multimedia Learning Principles to Design and Develop In-game Learning Support Videos	
Article Type:	Development Section (Lin)	
Keywords:	First Principles of Instruction; multimedia learning; game-based learning; learning support; modality	
Corresponding Author:	Renata Kuba florida state university Tallahassee, UNITED STATES	
Corresponding Author Secondary Information:		
Corresponding Author's Institution:	florida state university	
Corresponding Author's Secondary Institution:		
First Author:	Renata Kuba	
First Author Secondary Information:		
Order of Authors:	Renata Kuba	
	Seyedahmad Rahimi	
	Ginny Smith	
	Valerie Shute	
	Chih-Pu Dai	
Order of Authors Secondary Information:		
Funding Information:	US National Science Foundation (037988)	Dr. Valerie Shute
	US Department of Education (039019)	Dr. Valerie Shute
Abstract:	<p>Over three years, our research team has designed various learning supports for promoting content knowledge and solving game levels. In this case study, we examined the optimal design and the evaluation of learning support videos for a physics educational game. Often studies focus on investigating the effects of research-based principles without a systematic examination of the design and development processes. Thus, comprehensive design descriptions and recommendations for developing effective in-game learning supports are scarce in the literature. This study comprises two stages: design and evaluation. In the design stage, we collaborated with two physics experts to design and iteratively revise 18 learning support videos. We applied the First Principles of Instruction (Merrill, 2002) to create instructional strategies and multimedia learning principles (Mayer, 2017) to develop the videos and help learners engage in cognitive processing. In the evaluation stage, we presented the videos to 14 students to gather feedback on their perceptions and, in the following year, examined the effectiveness of the final videos with 263 students. Results revealed that, among all supports, the videos were the only support that significantly predicted posttest scores and game levels completed and viewing patterns did not affect game enjoyment. We conclude with a discussion of our experiences and recommendations to contribute to the foundation of designing in-game learning supports.</p>	
Response to Reviewers:	Dear editor and reviewers,	

Abstract

Over three years, our research team has designed various learning supports for promoting content knowledge and solving game levels. In this case study, we examined the optimal design and the evaluation of learning support videos for a physics educational game. Often studies focus on investigating the effects of research-based principles without a systematic examination of the design and development processes. Thus, comprehensive design descriptions and recommendations for developing effective in-game learning supports are scarce in the literature. This study comprises two stages: design and evaluation. In the design stage, we collaborated with two physics experts to design and iteratively revise 18 learning support videos. We applied the First Principles of Instruction (Merrill, 2002) to create instructional strategies and multimedia learning principles (Mayer, 2017) to develop the videos and help learners engage in cognitive processing. In the evaluation stage, we presented the videos to 14 students to gather feedback on their perceptions and, in the following year, examined the effectiveness of the final videos with 263 students. Results revealed that, among all supports, the videos were the only support that significantly predicted posttest scores and game levels completed and viewing patterns did not affect game enjoyment. We conclude with a discussion of our experiences and recommendations to contribute to the foundation of designing in-game learning supports.

Keywords First Principles of Instruction, multimedia learning, game-based learning, learning support, modality

Compliance with Ethical Standards

Funding: This work was supported by the US National Science Foundation [award number #037988] and the US Department of Education [award number #039019].

Conflict of Interest. The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Ethical approval. All procedures performed in studies involving human participants were in accordance with the ethical standards of the institutional and/or national research committee and with the 1964 Helsinki declaration and its later amendments or comparable ethical standards.

Informed consent. It was obtained from all individual participants included in the study.

1
2
3
4 **Using the First Principles of Instruction and Multimedia Learning Principles**
5
6 **to Design and Develop In-game Learning Support Videos**
7
8
9

10
11 **Abstract**
12

13
14 Over three years, our research team has designed various learning supports for promoting content
15
16 knowledge and solving game levels. In this case study, we examined the optimal design and the
17
18 evaluation of learning support videos for a physics educational game. Often studies focus on
19
20 investigating the effects of research-based principles without a systematic examination of the
21
22 design and development processes. Thus, comprehensive design descriptions and
23
24 recommendations for developing effective in-game learning supports are scarce in the literature.
25
26 This study comprises two stages: design and evaluation. In the design stage, we collaborated
27
28 with two physics experts to design and iteratively revise 18 learning support videos. We applied
29
30 the First Principles of Instruction (Merrill, 2002) to create instructional strategies and multimedia
31
32 learning principles (Mayer, 2017) to develop the videos and help learners engage in cognitive
33
34 processing. In the evaluation stage, we presented the videos to 14 students to gather feedback on
35
36 their perceptions and, in the following year, examined the effectiveness of the final videos with
37
38 263 students. Results revealed that, among all supports, the videos were the only support that
39
40 significantly predicted posttest scores and game levels completed and viewing patterns did not
41
42 affect game enjoyment. We conclude with a discussion of our experiences and recommendations
43
44 to contribute to the foundation of designing in-game learning supports.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55 **Keywords** First Principles of Instruction, multimedia learning, game-based learning, learning
56
57 support, modality
58
59
60
61
62

1
2
3
4 Research on game-based environments has predominantly focused on investigating the
5
6 effect of gameplay on learning without a systematic examination of the design features and the
7
8 development processes (Clark et al., 2016; Ke, 2016). To create a robust scientific foundation for
9
10 designing educational games, scholars must report comprehensive descriptions of their
11
12 development experiences by elaborating on the decisions and strategies grounded on theoretical
13
14 foundations, along with recommendations and lessons learned (Ke, 2016). Additionally,
15
16 research-based recommendations on the application of multimedia learning principles are scarce
17
18 in the literature (Churchill, 2013). To shed light on this matter, we describe the design and
19
20 evaluation processes of 18 learning support videos for an educational physics game and report
21
22 how multimedia learning (Mayer, 2017) and instructional design (Merrill, 2002) principles
23
24 facilitated the development of the videos. We conclude with the results of the effectiveness of
25
26 our final videos and recommendations for future research and practice.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 **In-game learning supports**

37
38 In-game learning supports can aid learners' cognition during gameplay, helping them
39
40 focus on important information, figure out what to do next, and generally engage in more
41
42 efficient learning (Wouters & van Oostendorp, 2013). On the other hand, poorly designed
43
44 learning supports can disrupt gameplay, demand more cognitive effort to connect content
45
46 knowledge to game tasks, and may not promote learning (Schrader & Bastiaens, 2012). Thus,
47
48 mixed results concerning in-game learning supports are found in the literature. For example, in a
49
50 math game with learning support videos, Delacruz (2010) found that learners who watched the
51
52 videos outperformed the control group in the far-transfer test controlling for pretest scores.
53
54 Wouters and van Oostendorp (2013) conducted a meta-analysis and found a moderate effect of
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 learning supports that combine visual and auditory forms (e.g., videos) on learning. Conversely,
5
6 Van Eck and Dempsey (2002) reported no effect of learning support videos in a geometry game,
7
8 showing no significant correlation between transfer scores and support usage frequency.
9

10
11 These mixed results regarding the effectiveness of learning supports might be due to the
12
13 varied designs of each learning support and the type of content involved (Clark et al., 2016).
14
15 Clark et al. (2016) point out that although games as a medium provide affordances, it is the
16
17 design of the medium that will determine its effect on learning. Additionally, the authors argue
18
19 that we should shift from questions such as "Can games support learning?" or "Are games better
20
21 with or without learning supports?" to explore how design decisions grounded on theoretical
22
23 foundations influence learning outcomes concerning the wide diversity of learners. Thus,
24
25 through experimentation and discourse, researchers and practitioners can develop a strong
26
27 foundation for designing effective in-game learning supports, anticipating errors, and making
28
29 efficient design decisions (Richey & Klein, 2007). To contribute to this foundation, we examined
30
31 the optimal design of in-game learning support videos for learning conceptual physics, resulting
32
33 in recommendations and suggestions for future research and practice.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 **Multimedia Learning Principles**

44
45 Over the past two decades, Mayer and colleagues have compiled a set of principles for
46
47 designing multimedia instructional materials, defined as a presentation composed of words (e.g.,
48
49 narration) and pictures (e.g., animations) developed to foster meaningful learning. According to
50
51 the Cognitive Theory of Multimedia Learning (Mayer, 2017) and Cognitive Load Theory
52
53 (Sweller et al., 2011), people have two separate information processing channels (i.e., auditory
54
55 and visual) and working memory that is resource-limited. Due to this limited capacity,
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 multimedia instructional materials must present the content without overloading the visual and
5
6 auditory channels in working memory to facilitate cognitive processing (Mayer, 2017; Swan et
7
8 al., 2018). Researchers (e.g., Mayer, 2017; Sweller, 2020) have thus explored the use of
9
10 multimedia learning principles to achieve this balance by addressing three fundamental
11
12 objectives: (a) reduce *extraneous load*, which is unnecessary cognitive processing generated
13
14 from poorly designed instruction; (b) manage *essential cognitive processing*, which refers to
15
16 constructing mental representations of the material in the working memory; and (c) foster
17
18 *generative cognitive processing*, relative to deep learning and making sense of the materials,
19
20 enabling both retention and transfer.
21
22
23
24

25
26 Within each objective, principles are identified that address the objective. For example,
27
28 the spatial contiguity principle, intended to reduce extraneous load, states that people learn better
29
30 when corresponding words and graphics are located near each other rather than far from each
31
32 other (Johnson & Mayer, 2012; Mayer, 2017). Using an eye-tracking method, Makransky et al.
33
34 (2019) found that learners engaged in more appropriate cognitive processing in lessons with the
35
36 spatial contiguity principle than without the principle, as learners spent more time looking at the
37
38 text and less time looking at irrelevant parts of the illustration. Further, the modality principle,
39
40 related to the second objective, states that people learn better from graphics with narration than
41
42 on-screen text (Mayer 2017). For instance, Swan et al. (2018) found that participants in an art
43
44 exhibition are more likely to remember the paintings when the exhibition was designed using
45
46 narration via an audio guide rather than extended written information. The modality principle
47
48 helps learners process the content using both visual and auditory channels, off-loading parts of
49
50 the cognitive processing from the visual to the auditory channel (Mayer, 2017; Moreno & Mayer,
51
52 2002; Sweller et al., 2011). For the third objective, the multimedia principle is an example of
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

principles intended to foster generative cognitive processing. The multimedia principle states that people learn better from words and graphics than words alone, helping learners connect and make sense of verbal and visual mental representations (Mayer, 2017). Studies showed that learners in multiple-representation conditions (i.e., composed of words and graphics) outperformed those who studied lessons with words alone on retention (e.g., Moreno & Mayer, 2002), transfer (e.g., Moreno & Ortegano-Layne, 2008), and recall tasks (Glaser & Schwan, 2015).

When designing multimedia instructional materials, addressing more than one objective through multiple principles can enhance cognitive processing and associated learning outcomes. Hence, this study combined multiple principles in developing in-game learning support videos. Table 1 shows our focal nine principles.

Table 1

Focal nine multimedia learning principles in this study (adapted from Mayer, 2017)

Principle	Description	Objective
<i>Coherence</i>	People learn better when extraneous elements are excluded	
<i>Signaling</i>	People learn better when important information is highlighted	
<i>Spatial contiguity</i>	People learn better when corresponding words and graphics are located near each other	Reduce extraneous load
<i>Temporal contiguity</i>	People learn better when corresponding narration and graphics are presented simultaneously	
<i>Redundancy</i>	People learn better from a combination of graphics and narration than from a combination of graphics, narration, and on-screen text	

<i>Modality</i>	People learn better from graphics with narration than with on-screen text	Manage essential cognitive processing
<i>Multimedia</i>	People learn better from words and graphics than words alone	
<i>Personalization</i>	People learn better when the narration is presented in a conversational style	Foster generative cognitive processing
<i>Voice</i>	People learn better from a friendly human voice rather than a machine-like voice	

First Principles of Instruction (FPI)

Merrill (2002) systematically reviewed various instructional system models, design theories, and research and practice related to learning and instruction to identify underlying mutual principles. To be selected, the principles had to satisfy the inclusion criteria. They needed to: promote efficient, effective, and engaging learning; be applicable in any delivery system; and be design-oriented (i.e., intended to guide the development of learning environments and products rather than explain how learners gain knowledge or skills from these environments or products). The results from his extensive review identified five principles, known as the First Principles of Instruction (see Table 2). Researchers have subsequently examined various learning environments and products designed with the First Principles of Instruction (FPI) and/or multimedia learning principles (Chiu & Churchill, 2015; Lo et al., 2018), discussed next.

1
2
3
4 **Table 2**
5

6 *First Principles of Instruction (adapted from Merrill, 2002)*
7
8

9

Principle	Learning is promoted when:
<i>Problem-centered</i>	Learners are engaged in solving real-world problems
<i>Activation</i>	Learners activate relevant prior knowledge or previous experiences
<i>Demonstration</i>	Learners observe a demonstration of what is to be learned rather than merely being told what is to be learned
<i>Application</i>	Learners apply the new knowledge or skill to solve problems
<i>Integration</i>	Learners integrate the new knowledge or skill into their everyday life

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 **Applying Research-Based Principles**

31

32 Many educational studies often focus on the effects of research-based principles without
33 a rigorous examination of the design and development processes. However, these examinations
34 serve as an important link between theory and practice by offering a more comprehensive
35 knowledge of the field and precedents to make predictions (Richey & Klein, 2007). Chiu and
36 Churchill (2015) applied several multimedia principles in developing mathematics lessons. They
37 recommended objective guidelines based on their results, such as using different colors for each
38 lesson section and placing graphs next to equations. In a later study for algebra learning, based
39 on the data from interviews with students, Chiu and Churchill (2016) recommended using color
40 matching to signal related pieces of information and adding graphics (e.g., dots) to indicate
41 important parts of a graph.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

56 Likewise, research-based recommendations for applying the FPI were also examined. Lo
57 and Hew (2017) used the FPI and multimedia learning principles in designing instructional
58
59
60
61
62

1
2
3
4 videos for mathematical learning. They recommended limiting the videos' duration to six
5
6 minutes and presenting a brief review of key concepts. Further, Gardner et al. (2020) applied the
7
8 FPI in designing digital materials and recommended including realistic examples from various
9
10 contexts for novice students and creating multiple practice opportunities. Also, Lo et al. (2018)
11
12 and Klein and Mendenhall (2018) suggested considering time constraints for developing
13
14 instructional videos. Moreover, Tu and Snyder (2017) and Lo et al. (2018) warned that using the
15
16 FPI to create well-designed materials does not guarantee learning outcomes if students lack
17
18 motivation. Therefore, motivational strategies should also be considered in the design process.
19
20
21
22

23
24 Practical recommendations from research are essential to blur the line between
25
26 practitioners and researchers. However, recommendations on applying research-based principles
27
28 for designing effective in-game learning support videos are scarce in the literature. Thus, the
29
30 objectives of this study were to (a) examine the optimal design of applying the First Principles of
31
32 Instruction and multimedia learning principles to develop in-game learning support videos for
33
34 learning conceptual physics; (b) evaluate the effectiveness of the videos on learning content
35
36 knowledge, solving game levels, and game enjoyment; and (c) propose recommendations for
37
38 future practice and research.
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 46 Method

47 48 Design

49
50 We used a case study method to explore the in-depth application of First Principles of
51
52 Instruction and multimedia learning principles on our design decisions and evaluate the final
53
54 product. A case study is one of the various methods of design and development research, which
55
56 aims to construct knowledge based on scientific evidence obtained from practical experiences
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 and includes a systematic analysis of the design, development, and evaluation processes (Richey
5
6 & Klein, 2007).
7
8
9

10 11 **Participants** 12 13

14 This study comprised two stages: design and evaluation. In the design stage, the research
15 team included: (a) two faculty members in Educational Technology responsible for creating the
16 instructional strategies for the videos and, along with one faculty in Measurement and Statistics,
17 revising all videos biweekly to guarantee they followed the design parameters; (b) two Subject
18 Matter Experts (SME) in physics responsible for ensuring the content was clear, concise, and
19 accurate; and (c) five graduate research assistants responsible for editing the videos. Two
20 graduate assistants reported having basic to intermediate video-editing skills, and the other three
21 had no prior experience. The former provided training to the latter, targeting skills such as
22 overlaying text and working with keyframes. After the training, all five graduate assistants
23 independently produced in-game learning support videos, which we call *physics videos* in the
24 current context.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 In the evaluation stage, we included data from 14 middle school students from a charter
41 school and 263 high school students from a large K-12 school, both selected through
42 convenience sampling in the southeastern United States. All students completed the pretest,
43 posttest, and satisfaction survey, and submitted their signed parental consent and assent forms.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50


51 52 **Procedure** 53 54

55 Figure 1 summarizes our research procedure. In the design stage, we applied the First
56 Principles of Instruction (Merrill, 2002) to create instructional strategies such as presenting
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 demonstrations of failed and successful attempts on game levels. Next, we used various
5
6 multimedia learning principles (Mayer, 2017) to make design decisions (e.g., removing
7
8 extraneous graphics) to help learners engage in cognitive processing. In the evaluation stage, we
9
10 conducted: (a) alpha testing with internal tests to iteratively revise the videos, (b) beta testing to
11
12 test the initial seven videos with 14 students and gather feedback on their perceptions, and (c)
13
14 user-acceptance testing to examine the effectiveness of the final videos on learning content
15
16 knowledge, solving game levels, and game enjoyment with 263 students. We spent two months
17
18 developing the initial seven videos, and, after the beta testing, we spent six months revising and
19
20 developing all 18 videos. To obtain in-depth information on how designers used the FPI and
21
22 developing all 18 videos. To obtain in-depth information on how designers used the FPI and
23
24 multimedia learning principles in designing the physics videos, we analyzed all notes
25
26 documented between 2017–2019, including the usability reports, and reflected on our
27
28 experiences to produce recommendations for researchers and practitioners.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 **Figure 1**

37
38 *Research procedure in this study*



53 **Data Source**

54
55
56 We employed qualitative techniques to collect data through two sources: (a) content
57
58 analysis of detailed notes from the research team meetings and (b) observations and reports from
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 usability testing. We also included quantitative techniques (i.e., satisfaction survey, physics
5
6 understanding test, and log files) to gather feedback on students' perceptions and examine the
7
8 effectiveness of the physics videos. The physics understanding tests included illustrative
9
10 multiple-choice items split between two equivalent forms for a pretest and posttest. The
11
12 satisfaction surveys included 5-point Likert scale items about game satisfaction ranging from
13
14 strongly disagree to strongly agree (e.g., "I enjoyed the game very much"). The log files were
15
16 recorded while students played the game, and we parsed the log files and computed variables
17
18 such as the frequency of accessing the learning supports and the levels completed for each
19
20 student.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 **Educational Game**

29
30
31 *Physics Playground* is a 2-dimensional computer-based game designed to help students
32
33 learn conceptual physics such as Newton's laws of force and motion, torque, and energy
34
35 (Authors, 2019). The game consists of two types of game levels: sketching and manipulation. In
36
37 both level types, the goal is to move a green ball to hit a red balloon. To solve *sketching* levels,
38
39 students draw simple machines (i.e., ramps, levers, pendulums, and/or springboards) directly on
40
41 the computer screen that interact with the game environment according to Newtonian mechanics
42
43 (Figure 2). To solve *manipulation* levels, students adjust different sliders to change physics
44
45 parameters (i.e., gravity, air resistance, mass, and bounciness of the ball) and interact with
46
47 external forces such as puffers and blowers (Figure 3).
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 **Figure 2**


5
6 *Sketching level – to solve the level, learners can draw a springboard*



24 *Note.* See <https://youtu.be/5mJGI7ty2Wk>

25
26
27
28 **Figure 3**

29 *Manipulation level – to solve the level, learners have to manipulate the air resistance slider*



50 *Note.* See <https://youtu.be/KQ9ACpqLxCU>

Results

First, we report the alpha testing results regarding the optimal design of applying the FPI and multimedia learning principles in developing in-game learning support videos. Next, we present the beta and user-acceptance testing results concerning students' perceptions and the effects of the videos on learning content knowledge, solving game levels, and game enjoyment. We conclude with a discussion of recommendations for future practices and research.

Alpha testing

Alpha testing includes internal tests with content experts to identify all possible issues before releasing a product (Mohd & Shahbodin, 2015). Over three years, we used an iterative process to create and validate several learning supports in Physics Playground. Results from our first two studies (Authors, 2019b) and researchers' observations revealed the need for a new type of learning support to more closely connect how students solve a level to the physics involved in the solution. Thus, we decided to create the physics videos to connect each intersection of solution (e.g., ramp) to the relevant competency (e.g., Newton's 1st Law) occurring in game levels (see an example: <https://youtu.be/cewsive2D0U>).

First, the physics experts examined all 81 game levels and identified 18 appropriate intersections for the physics videos. Afterward, we reviewed the FPI (Table 2) to define instructional strategies for the videos. For example, based on the activation principle, we opted to use the tutorial levels to capture the gameplay footage, as seeing these levels in the physics videos could activate students' prior knowledge about the referenced game mechanics. This prior knowledge can act as the foundation for building the formal physics knowledge students are acquiring through gameplay, highlighted in the physics videos. Moreover, instead of explaining

1
2
3
4 the physics concepts in a direct way (e.g., presenting the definition of a concept), we
5
6 demonstrated the physics concepts by showing a failed attempt (non-example) followed by a
7
8 successful attempt (example). The successful attempt models the correct action or behavior
9
10 (Merrill, 2002), an important aspect of the demonstration principle. Thus, each physics video
11
12 followed the same format: (a) introduction of the physics competency (e.g., "*Here you are going*
13
14 *to see how to transfer energy to the ball using a pendulum*"); (b) definition of terms (e.g.,
15
16 "*Kinetic energy is the energy of motion...*"); (c) failed attempt to solve the level (e.g., "*The*
17
18 *pendulum does not have enough angular height...*"); and (d) correct action (i.e., changing the
19
20 height of the pendulum) to show a successful attempt to solve the level. Another strategy, based
21
22 on the application principle, was to embed the relevant physics video in each corresponding
23
24 level, so students have the opportunity to apply what they learned immediately after watching the
25
26 video. The relevancy of the physics videos to their associated game levels enables the immediate
27
28 and purposeful application of the new knowledge.
29
30
31
32
33
34

35
36 After planning the strategies, the development of the physics videos followed five stages:
37

38 **Scripting.** In previous studies (Authors, 2019b), students had access to a set of Hewitt
39
40 videos that consist of animations explaining general physics competencies such as Newton's
41
42 Laws, created by Paul Hewitt. Based on researchers' observations, most students did not watch
43
44 the whole Hewitt video. When asked why they didn't finish, students mentioned that the videos
45
46 were too long. One student was even surprised to learn that the Hewitt video was only around 2
47
48 minutes long. Thus, for the physics videos, we limited the length of each video to one minute.
49
50
51 With that in mind, the physics experts created a script for each physics video. They included
52
53 concise narration for the competency definition, the failed and successful attempt, and direction
54
55 for the game footage needed to illustrate the narration. In addition, based on the personalization
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 principle, the narration addressed the player using "you" and "we," for example, when
5
6 introducing the physics concept (e.g., "*Here you are going to see how mass affects the*
7
8 *equilibrium of a lever*") or when providing explanations (e.g., "*You need to draw another*
9
10 *pendulum with more mass*").
11

12
13
14 **Storyboarding.** The graduate assistants created storyboards for each video based on the
15
16 scripts. They first created slides presenting the game footage for each segment of the narration
17
18 with the proposed text or graphics overlays. Each storyboard had to be approved by the faculty
19
20 members and physics experts before starting the video editing. Since video editing is the longest
21
22 step in developing the videos, revising and approving the storyboards were essential to optimize
23
24 the process and avoid significant revisions in editing the videos.
25
26

27
28 **Audio recording.** Once the storyboard was approved, we recorded the narration. Our
29
30 decision to use narration rather than on-screen text was based on the modality principle – people
31
32 learn better from graphics with narration than graphics with on-screen text (Mayer 2017). Also,
33
34 extensive research on the modality principle contributed to uncovering boundary conditions (i.e.,
35
36 specific conditions under which the principle is effective) (Mayer, 2017). For example, we opted
37
38 to use narration to deliver the verbal information along with on-screen text only when
39
40 introducing/defining physics concepts (e.g., kinetic energy), following studies that suggested
41
42 using on-screen text to present unfamiliar or technical words (e.g., Harskamp et al. 2007).
43
44
45
46
47

48
49 Although multimedia principles can serve as heuristic guidelines to make reasonably
50
51 rapid theoretically-driven design decisions, the principles are not valid for all the wide variety of
52
53 settings, learners, and contents. Thus, designers must consult the validated boundary conditions
54
55 to identify when to use and when to violate the principles. For example, one team member
56
57 recorded all narrations to guarantee consistency and alignment with the voice principle – people
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 learn better from a friendly human voice rather than a machine-like voice. However, examining
5
6 the content analysis, we noted the absence of discussion on intonation, rhythm, pace, and pitch
7
8 due to the lack of boundary conditions regarding these features for the voice principle. Although
9
10 we used an instructive tone and rhythm of speech to offer verbal cues, the decision was not
11
12 methodically discussed. We concluded the decision was based on the previous instructional
13
14 experience of the team member who recorded the audios.
15
16
17

18
19 **Video editing.** We synchronized the narration with the gameplay footage and on-screen
20
21 text following the temporal contiguity principle. Instead of displaying the complete formula
22
23 "momentum = time \times velocity" after the narration, we displayed each word as it was spoken.
24
25 When the narration is presented before words or graphics, learners must hold the narration in
26
27 their working memory until the words or graphics are presented, which reduces the cognitive
28
29 capacity to make sense of both information sources (Mayer, 2017).
30
31
32

33
34 We also limited the amount of on-screen text to align with the redundancy principle --
35
36 people learn better from a combination of graphics and narration than from a combination of
37
38 graphics, narration, and on-screen text (Mayer, 2017). We used narration alone rather than
39
40 narration and on-screen text, except when presenting unfamiliar words (i.e., physics concepts).
41
42 For example, when introducing "Kinetic Energy," learners would hear and see the physics term
43
44 simultaneously. This decision aligns with studies that found redundancy can promote learning
45
46 when on-screen text is reduced to a few words (e.g., Harskamp et al. 2007). Hence, we only used
47
48 on-screen text to present unfamiliar terms that would otherwise not be fully processed by the
49
50 auditory channel alone (Figure 4).
51
52
53


54
55 Since our game is responsive (i.e., the layout automatically adjusts to different screen
56
57 sizes), we noticed the need to record gameplay footage using the same type of device and web
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 browser to ensure consistency in footage aspect ratio and resolution. We used the game's tutorial
5
6 levels to capture gameplay footage for the videos. Tutorial levels contain only essential graphic
7
8 elements, as opposed to other levels with elaborative drawings. Thus, we employed the
9
10 coherence principle by omitting extraneous graphics to help learners focus on the physics
11
12 explanations. We applied the spatial contiguity principle demonstrating the change in physics
13
14 variables (e.g., kinetic energy) during gameplay. We first prototyped animations of meters that
15
16 would fill and empty according to the ball's movements. However, we noticed a potential split-
17
18 attention effect, meaning that learners would be forced to split their attention between the meters
19
20 and the physics variables and mentally integrate the two sources of information (Chandler &
21
22 Sweller, 1992; Johnson & Mayer, 2012). Thus, to present how the physics variables change
23
24 according to the ball's movements, we animated the on-screen text to move with the ball, and the
25
26 font size would increase or decrease to represent the change in magnitude (Figure 5). We also
27
28 applied the visual design principle of similarity (i.e., elements with common characteristics are
29
30 perceived as related) to enhance the connection between on-screen text and game elements. For
31
32 example, the color of the text would be green when related to the green ball (Lauer & Pentak,
33
34 2011) (Figure 6).
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 Lastly, we noticed the need to use the signaling principle to move learners' attention from
44
45 the ball to the mouse movements interacting with the blower. This design decision was necessary
46
47 because, otherwise, learners would pay attention to the ball, the protagonist in our game, while
48
49 the physics explanation focused on manipulating the blower. We created a hue contrast by
50
51 placing a semi-transparent black layer on the screen, leaving a spotlight where students should
52
53 focus (Figure 7).
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65


1
2
3
4 **Figure 4**

5
6
7 *On-screen text was limited to physics concepts and placed near the related part of the graphic*



29
30 **Figure 5**


31
32 *Sequential images showing the application of the spatial contiguity principle*



50
51 *Note.* GPE = Gravitational Potential Energy, KE = Kinetic Energy.


1
2
3
4 **Figure 6**

5
6 *Application of the similarity principle*



28
29 **Figure 7**

30
31 *Spotlight to signal where students should focus*



52 **Revisions.** The research team iteratively revised each new video. As we developed more
53 videos, we gained more insight for improvement. At times, these insights applied to previously
54 developed videos. Hence, all videos went through several rounds of revisions. Additionally,
55 although we discussed and documented the design parameters for editing the videos, designers
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 used different approaches to follow the parameters. For example, two designers used bitmap
5
6 images for on-screen text, while others used the actual font, causing the text resolution to look
7
8 slightly different from one video to another. To avoid further redesigns, we recommend using a
9
10 template file from the outset to serve as a demonstration of how to perform tasks instead of
11
12 written parameters that merely say what to do. After this design cycle, the videos were ready for
13
14 beta and user-acceptance testing, discussed next.
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 **Beta testing**

22
23 Beta testing implies using the complete product by a few representative users in a real
24
25 environment to gather feedback on product quality (Mohd & Shahbodin, 2015). We conducted
26
27 the testing with 14 middle school students (6 seventh graders, 8 eighth graders) in a charter
28
29 school in the southeastern United States (Authors, 2020b). Participants were recruited through a
30
31 convenience sample and played the same game with 30 sketching levels and seven physics
32
33 videos for 75 minutes. Students had access to the videos at any time during gameplay, and, at the
34
35 end of some levels, a popup window would appear to present a physics video. All students
36
37 completed a pretest, posttest, and satisfaction survey and were compensated with a \$10 gift card
38
39 upon completing the study. A total of 5 researchers observed the students and took various notes
40
41 on students' reactions, commentaries, and gameplay.
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 Despite the limitations (i.e., small sample size and short gameplay time), we obtained
49
50 useful insights to improve the game and physics videos. For example, results (e.g., from
51
52 observations of user experience and pretest and posttest) helped us improve the game interface,
53
54 identify test item reliabilities, and revise problematic test items for the user-acceptance testing.
55
56
57 Additionally, we looked at the satisfaction survey to see how students felt about physics videos
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

(Table 3). In general, students found the videos satisfying and useful ($M = 3.99$, $SD = 0.51$) and believed the videos helped them learn physics ($M = 3.79$, $SD = 1.19$). Table 4 shows selected commentaries from students. One student indicated liking the videos for not showing the exact solution, and another student pointed out the videos helped solve multiple levels. Four students mentioned that the videos were not related to the levels they just played, and three students reported preferring to watch the videos at the beginning of the level. Based on the feedback, the physics experts revisited each game level's connection to the physics competencies in the game to ensure all levels had the appropriate physics video embedded. For the interaction, we removed the popup window presenting the videos and preserved free access to the videos. Additionally, researchers noted that most students watched the entire video when accessing the physics videos. Based on these results, we continued developing the remaining physics videos following the same process.

Table 3

Learning support satisfaction scale (n = 14)

5-point Likert scale item	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>SD</i>
The "physics supports" helped me learn physics	3.79	1.19
The supports were NOT generally annoying	4.14	1.23
The supports were pretty easy to use	4.21	.70
The supports DID help me	3.79	1.05
I'd rather solve levels with supports	3.64	1.50
Learning support satisfaction scale	3.99	.51

1
2
3
4 **Table 4**

5
6 *Examples of students' commentaries and design modifications*

7

Students' commentaries	Modifications
"It was more helpful if I saw the video before I solve the level."	We only preserved the free access to the videos.
"The video was helpful, but it was better if I saw it in the beginning."	We revised all levels and their corresponding physics competencies to ensure they had the appropriate physics video.
"The video was OK but not really related to the level just played."	NA
"It was helpful. The video was clear and kind of related to the level just played."	
"Not really about the specific level, not directly related, but it is helpful in general for gameplay."	
"It was helpful. I like how it has all of the terms and things in it."	
"The video is helpful to solve multiple levels."	
"They kind of showed the solution but not the exact solution, and I liked them for that reason."	

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 **User-acceptance testing**

35
36
37 User-acceptance testing is performed by the end-users, and it is intended to verify
38 whether the desired goals were met before launching the product into the audience's life (Mohd
39 & Shahbodin, 2015). We conducted the user-acceptance testing with 263 high school students
40 from a large K-12 school in the southeastern United States (Authors, 2020). Participants played
41 the game with 81 game levels (sketching and manipulation) and all seven supports (Table 5),
42 including the 18 physics videos, across six days in 50-min sessions per day. They also completed
43 a pretest, a posttest, and a satisfaction survey and received a \$30 gift card.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 We computed regression analyses predicting posttest scores with each learning support
55 frequency as the predictor, controlling for pretest. Results revealed that, among all supports, the
56 physics videos were the only support that significantly predicted posttest scores ($F(2, 198) =$
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 97.46; $p < .001$, $\beta = .11$; $t = 2.11$, $p = .04$) and game level completion ($F(2, 198) = 40.63$; $p <$
5
6
7 $.001$, $\beta = .32$; $t = 5.14$, $p < .001$) (Table 6 and 7). In addition, we found no significant difference
8
9 in game enjoyment between students who did not watch, watched a few, or more than five
10
11 physics videos ($F(2, 192) = 1.89$, $p = .15$, partial $\eta^2 = .02$). Based on the log files, we found that
12
13 students watched the same physics videos multiple times, showing that they could perceive the
14
15 value of watching physics videos. These findings suggest that the physics videos were effective
16
17 in promoting learning and game performance without disrupting gameplay or reducing
18
19 enjoyment.
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 **Table 5**

27 *Description of the seven learning supports in the game*
28
29

Support	Description
Glossary	Brief explanations of physics terms
Formulas	Presented when a physics concept has an associate formula or equation, includes a description of each formula component
Definitions	Composed of a short animation about a physics term (e.g., "gravitational force") and a drag-and-drop quiz, in which students drag phrases to fill in the blanks to form the definition of a physics term
Hewitt Videos	Cartoon animations developed by Paul Hewitt explaining different physics concepts
Physics Videos	Short animations presenting the connection between physics concepts and game solutions
Solution Videos	Complete solution for the game level at hand
Hints	Partial solutions that direct students to the correct path (e.g., "Try drawing a springboard") without revealing the complete solution

1
2
3
4
5
6 **Table 6**

7 *Coefficients table of regression analysis with posttest score as the dependent variable*

8
9

	Unstandardized B	SD	Standardize β	<i>t</i>	Sig.
(Constant)	3.47	.69		5.05	< .001
Pretest	.73	.06	.66	12.46	< .001
Physics Videos	.09	.04	.11	2.10	.04

10
11
12
13
14
15
16

17
18
19 **Table 7**

20 *Coefficients table of regression analysis with game levels completion as the dependent variable*

21
22

	Unstandardized B	SD	Standardize β	<i>t</i>	Sig.
(Constant)	22.90	3.38		6.78	< .001
Pretest	1.56	.29	.34	5.44	< .001
Physics Videos	1.15	.22	.32	5.14	< .001

23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30
31
32
33 **Discussion**

34
35 We examined the use of research-based principles in developing learning support videos
36 and evaluated the effectiveness of these videos in promoting learning and game performance
37 without disrupting gameplay. The results of our iterative design process suggest the following
38 recommendations for future research and practice.
39
40
41
42
43
44

45
46
47 **Recommendations for designing instructional strategies**

48
49 In-game learning support videos should present the connection between targeted content
50 knowledge and game mechanics. The physics videos were the only support designed to target
51 both physics concepts and gameplay. Accordingly, physics videos were the only type of support
52 that significantly predicted posttest scores and game level completion, controlling for pretest.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60 This finding is consistent with Delacruz (2010), who created tutorial videos targeting math
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 concepts within the game mechanics and found a positive effect on far-transfer test scores. This
5
6 finding also supports Ke's (2016) arguments for blending learning and gameplay intrinsically
7
8 when designing games and learning supports.
9

10
11 In line with Gardner et al. (2020), who suggested creating multiple practice opportunities
12
13 in digital settings, we recommend integrating the relevant video in each game level to give
14
15 students the opportunity to apply what they learned right after watching the video. However, the
16
17 most beneficial timing to present the videos is still unclear (e.g., before or after playing the level,
18
19 or when stuck in a level). Future research is needed to identify the appropriate time to present the
20
21 videos. Researchers may also consider exploring an adaptive delivery of learning supports, such
22
23 as predicting when and how students need to watch the videos according to their gameplay
24
25 progress.
26
27
28
29

30
31 Further, in-game learning support videos should be limited to one minute to increase the
32
33 chances of students watching the entire video and minimize gameplay interruption. Based on
34
35 reports from previous studies, students did not watch the whole Hewitt videos because they were
36
37 too long (about 2 minutes). Although the Hewitt videos' content is different from the physics
38
39 videos, we observed that students finished watching the physics videos limited to one minute in
40
41 the beta testing. In addition, during the user acceptance testing, we found students watched the
42
43 same physics videos multiple times, suggesting video length was not an issue. This
44
45 recommendation supports Nielsen's (2014) findings that a 2-minute demonstration video can be
46
47 too long and does not add substantial value over a 1-minute video.
48
49
50
51

52
53 We also recommend designing learning support videos with the same look and feel as the
54
55 game to help activate students' prior knowledge. For example, use tutorial levels as the setting to
56
57 activate prior knowledge about the referenced game mechanics. Additionally, like Lo and Hew
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 (2017), we suggest adding a brief review of the targeted concepts to activate prior knowledge.
5
6
7 Next, we suggest adding demonstrations of a non-example and example of how game or content
8
9 variables impact the solution. Showing a common failed attempt followed by a successful
10
11 attempt illuminates what factors lead to failure and what factors lead to success, a possible
12
13 reason why the physics videos were effective for solving levels.
14
15
16
17
18

19 **Recommendations for developing in-game learning support videos**

20
21 We recommend placing on-screen text (e.g., GPE) next to graphics (e.g., ball) and
22
23 maintain their proximity throughout the animation (i.e., animate the on-screen text to move with
24
25 the ball). This recommendation corresponds with Chiu and Churchill's (2015) suggestion to place
26
27 graphs next to equations. However, in contrast to their materials, the graphics in the physics
28
29 videos were in constant motion. Thus, for animations, designers can set various keyframes for
30
31 time and position to synchronize the on-screen text with graphics, following the spatial
32
33 contiguity principle. Additionally, when moving the on-screen text, we recommend changing the
34
35 font size to represent the change in the variables' magnitude. Scaling font to illustrate variations
36
37 relates to data visualization techniques (e.g., word cloud), and it is widely applied in real-world
38
39 situations to facilitate semantic understanding (Yang et al., 2020). Future research may look at
40
41 additional data visualization techniques such as variation in color tones and weight to
42
43 demonstrate how physics variables change for students.
44
45
46
47
48
49

50
51 Further, we recommend using a visual cue, such as a spotlight (i.e., graying out
52
53 unimportant parts at a particular moment) to signal where students should focus during a video,
54
55 especially when attention to a specific detail is the critical part of the animation. In alpha testing,
56
57 we noted that even we missed part of the animation without highlighting and directing our
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 attention. This suggestion is consistent with Chiu and Churchill's (2016) recommendation of
5
6 adding graphics to indicate key parts of a graph and supports Alpizar et al.'s (2020) results in a
7
8 meta-analysis of signaling principle showing a moderate effect ($d = .31$) of using color contrast
9
10 to highlight information.
11
12

13
14 To optimize the development process and reduce redesigns, we recommend creating and
15
16 validating a storyboard before editing the videos. Revising the content during the storyboarding
17
18 phase is faster than altering content in video editing, which could demand new audio recordings
19
20 and gameplay footage. We also recommend using a file template in addition to documentation of
21
22 design decisions (i.e., design parameters) to ensure consistency across videos edited by different
23
24 designers and minimize redesigns (Farrell, 2015). A template serves as a demonstration of design
25
26 methods – an approach related to the demonstration principle (Merrill, 2002).
27
28
29
30

31 Consulting boundary conditions for each multimedia principle is a key component of
32
33 many design decisions since the principles are not valid for all types of settings and learners.
34
35 These conditions (e.g., modality is effective for familiar words, but not for technical words)
36
37 helped identify when to use and when to violate the principles. However, our reports noted a lack
38
39 of boundary conditions for the voice principle, resulting in scarce discussions about additional
40
41 features such as intonation and pace. Thus, future research might consider exploring the
42
43 boundary conditions regarding the voice principle to inform designers on decisions regarding
44
45 intonation, rhythm, pace, and pitch. For example, Davis et al. (2019) found that other factors
46
47 such as prosodic elements (i.e., rhythm and sound) might have a greater effect on the voice
48
49 principle rather than just categorizing into human and machine voices. Also, Craig and Schoeder
50
51 (2017) found no significant difference when the machine-voice is generated from modern text-
52
53 to-speech engines that resemble human voices.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 Finally, the log data indicated that students accessed the physics videos multiple times,
5
6 suggesting that students could perceive the value of watching physics videos. According to Ryan
7
8 and Deci (2000), this perceived value is known as identified regulation, a level of extrinsic
9
10 motivation. Identified regulation is different from intrinsic motivation since the latter refers to
11
12 performing a task because it is enjoyable, while identified regulation refers to doing the task
13
14 because it will be beneficial. In other words, watching the physics videos enabled students to
15
16 exert effort toward solving levels. These findings support Moreno and Mayer's (2007) discussion
17
18 that learning is also mediated by motivational factors that increase or decrease cognitive
19
20 engagement. Also, the repeated access of physics videos backs the discussion on maintained
21
22 situational interest (i.e., when interest is held, and people start to connect with the content).
23
24

25
26 Aligned with Dousay's (2016) findings on the impact of modality and redundancy on maintained
27
28 situational interest, the right balance of animations, narration, and on-screen text in the videos
29
30 might have helped students maintain situational interest, helping them manage intrinsic
31
32 processing and engage with the content. Moreover, we found no difference in game enjoyment
33
34 between students who watched a few or many videos, suggesting that the physics videos did not
35
36 disrupt gameplay and enjoyment. Future research may further examine the effects of the various
37
38 design principles on motivation and situational interest concerning learners' prior knowledge and
39
40 other characteristics.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 **Limitations and conclusion**

51
52
53 Research-based recommendations for designing game features based on comprehensive
54
55 examinations of design experiences and grounded on theoretical foundations are needed (e.g.,
56
57 Moreno & Mayer, 2007; Clark et al., 2016; Ke, 2016). To address this need, the current study
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 reported a detailed description of our design and evaluation processes for developing in-game
5
6 learning support videos for physics learning. Our examination resulted in several
7
8 recommendations for future practice and research. However, the study has limitations to consider
9
10 when applying our recommendations, such as a small sample size and short gameplay time in
11
12 beta testing and the lack of a control group to confirm the effects of each design element on
13
14 learning (e.g., show the video with the same look as the game environment) in the user-
15
16 acceptance testing. In summary, our recommendations include (a) showing the connection
17
18 between how students solve a level to the learning content involved in the solutions, (b)
19
20 demonstrating a failed and successful attempt, (c) intrinsically integrating support videos in the
21
22 game environment, (d) delivering the relevant video in its connected level to relate to students
23
24 immediate challenge, and (e) consulting boundary conditions to apply principles aimed to reduce
25
26 extraneous load, manage cognitive processing, engage in generative cognitive processing, and
27
28 maintain situational interest. Such careful designing and developing of learning support in
29
30 educational games can help overcome the challenge many game-based researchers have been
31
32 facing—maximizing learning without sacrificing the fun (Authors, 2020).
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

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

Compliance with Ethical Standards

Conflict of Interest. The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Ethical approval. All procedures performed in studies involving human participants were in accordance with the ethical standards of the institutional and/or national research committee and with the 1964 Helsinki declaration and its later amendments or comparable ethical standards.

Informed consent. It was obtained from all individual participants included in the study.

1
2
3
4 **References**
5

- 6
7 Alpizar, D., Adesope, O.O. & Wong, R.M. (2020) A meta-analysis of signaling principle in
8
9 multimedia learning environments. *Educational Technology Research and Development*,
10
11 68, 2095–2119. doi:10.1007/s11423-020-09748-7
12
13
14 Authors (2019). Information removed for anonymous review.
15
16 Authors (2019b). Information removed for anonymous review.
17
18 Authors (2020). Information removed for anonymous review.
19
20 Authors (2020b). Information removed for anonymous review.
21
22
23 Chandler, P., & Sweller, J. (1992). The split-attention effect as a factor in the design of
24
25 instruction. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 62, 233–246. doi:10.1111/j.2044-
26
27 8279.1992.tb01017.x
28
29
30
31 Chiu, T. K. F., & Churchill, D. (2015). Exploring the characteristics of an optimal design of
32
33 digital materials for concept learning in mathematics: Multimedia learning and variation
34
35 theory. *Computers & Education*, 82, 280-291.
36
37
38 Chiu, T. K. F., & Churchill, D. (2016). Design of learning objects for concept learning: Effects
39
40 of multimedia learning principles and an instructional approach. *Interactive Learning*
41
42 *Environments*, 24(6), 1355-1370.
43
44
45 Churchill, D. (2013). Conceptual model design and learning uses. *Interactive Learning*
46
47 *Environments*, 21(1), 54-67. doi:10.1080/10494820.2010.547203
48
49
50 Clark, D. B., Tanner-Smith, E. E., & Killingsworth, S. S. (2016). Digital games, design, and
51
52 learning: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Review of educational research*, 86(1),
53
54 79-122. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654315582065>
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4 Craig, S. D., & Schroeder, N. (2017). Reconsidering the voice effect when learning from a
5
6 virtual human. *Computers & Education, 114*, 193-205.
7
8
9 doi:10.1016/j.compedu.2017.07.003.
10
11 Davis, R., Vincent, J., & Park, T. (2019). Reconsidering the voice principle with non-native
12
13 language speakers. *Computers & Education, 140*, 103605.
14
15
16 doi:10.1016/j.compedu.2019.103605.
17
18
19 Delacruz, G. C. (2010). *Games as formative assessment environments: Examining the impact of*
20
21 *explanations of scoring and incentives on math learning, game performance, and help*
22
23 *seeking* (Publication No. 3446784) [Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los
24
25 Angeles]. ProQuest Dissertation Publishing.
26
27
28 Dousay, T.A. (2016). Effects of redundancy and modality on the situational interest of adult
29
30 learners in multimedia learning. *Educational Technology Research and Development, 64*,
31
32 1251–1271. doi:10.1007/s11423-016-9456-3
33
34
35
36 Farrell, S. (2015, October 11). *Which Comes First? Layout or Content?* Nielsen Norman Group.
37
38 <https://www.nngroup.com/articles/layout-vs-content/>
39
40
41 Gardner, J., Barclay, M., Kong, Y., & LeVally, C. (2020). Designing an accelerated graduate
42
43 evaluation course using the first principles of instruction and interactive media. *Journal*
44
45 *of Educational Technology Systems*. doi:10.1177/0047239519893049.
46
47
48 Glaser, M., & Schwan, S. (2015). Explaining pictures: How verbal cues influence processing of
49
50 pictorial learning material. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 107*(4), 1006–1018.
51
52
53 doi:10.1037/edu0000044
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4 Harskamp, E., Mayer, R. E., & Suhre, C. (2007). Does the modality principle for multimedia
5
6 learning apply to science classrooms? *Learning and Instruction, 17*, 465-477.
7
8 doi:10.1016/j.learninstruc.2007.09.010.
9
- 10
11 Johnson, C.I., & Mayer, R. (2012). An eye movement analysis of the spatial contiguity effect in
12
13 multimedia learning. *Journal of Experimental Psychology, 18*(2), 178-191.
14
15 doi:10.1037/a0026923
16
17
- 18
19 Klein, J. D.; Mendenhall, A. (2018). Applying the First Principles of Instruction in a short-term,
20
21 high volume, rapid production of online professional development modules. *Journal of*
22
23 *Computing in Higher Education, 30*, 93–110. doi:10.1007/s12528-017-9166-9
24
25
- 26
27 Ke, F. (2016). Designing and integrating purposeful learning in game play: A systematic review.
28
29 *Educational Technology Research and Development, 64*(2), 219-244.
30
31 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-015-9418-1>
32
- 33
34 Lauer, D. A., & Pentak, S. (2011). *Design basics* (8th edition). Boston, MA: Wadsworth.
35
- 36
37 Lo, C. K., & Hew, K. F. (2017). Using "First Principles of Instruction" to Design Secondary
38
39 School Mathematics Flipped Classroom: The Findings of Two Exploratory Studies.
40
41 *Educational Technology & Society, 20* (1), 222–236.
42
- 43
44 Lo, C.K., Lie, C.W., & H, K.F. (2018). Applying "First Principles of Instruction" as a design
45
46 theory of the flipped classroom: Findings from a collective study of four secondary
47
48 school subjects. *Computers & Education, 118*,150–165.
49
- 50
51 Makransky, G., Terkildsen, T. S., & Mayer, R. E. (2019). Role of subjective and objective
52
53 measures of cognitive processing during learning in explaining the spatial contiguity
54
55 effect. *Learning and Instruction, 61*, 23–34. doi:10.1016/j.learninstruc.2018.12.001
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4 Mayer, R.E. (2017). Using multimedia for e-learning. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*,
5
6
7 33(5), 403-423. doi:10.1111/jcal.12197
8
- 9 Merrill, M. D. (2002). First Principles of Instruction. *Educational Technology Research and*
10
11 *Development*, 50(3), 43–59
12
- 13
14 Mohd, C. K. N. C. K., & Shahbodin, F. (2015). Personalized learning environment: Alpha
15
16 testing, beta testing & user acceptance test. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*,
17
18 195, 837-843. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.06.319
19
- 20
21 Moreno, R., & Mayer, R. E. (2002). Learning science in virtual reality multimedia environments:
22
23 Role of methods and media. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 94, 598–610
24
- 25
26 Moreno, R., & Mayer, R. E. (2007). Interactive multimodal learning environments. *Educational*
27
28 *Psychology Review*, 19, 309–326.
29
- 30
31 Moreno, R., & Ortegado-Layne, L. (2008). Do classroom exemplars promote the application of
32
33 principles in teacher education? A comparison of videos, animations, and narratives.
34
35 *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 56, 449-465. doi:10.1007/s11423-
36
37 006-9027-0
38
- 39
40
41 Nielsen, J. (2014, September 1). *Demonstrate thinking aloud by showing users a video*. Nielsen
42
43 Norman Group. <https://www.nngroup.com/articles/thinking-aloud-demo-video/>
44
- 45
46 Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation: Classic definitions and
47
48 new directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25, 54-67.
49
- 50
51 Richey, R. C., & Klein, J. D. (2007). *Design and development research*. Routledge.
52
- 53
54 Schrader, C., & Bastiaens, T. (2012). Learning in educational computer games for novices: The
55
56 impact of support provision types on virtual presence, cognitive load, and learning
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 outcomes. *International Review of Research in Open & Distance Learning*, 13(3), 206–
5
6 227. <https://doi-org.proxy.lib.fsu.edu/10.19173/irrodl.v13i3.1166>
7
8

9 Schwan, S., Lutz, S., & Dreier, F. (2018). Multimedia in the wild: Testing the validity of
10
11 multimedia learning principles in an art exhibition. *Learning and Instruction*, 55, 148-
12
13 157. doi:10.1016/j.learninstruc.2017.10.004
14
15

16 Sweller, J., Ayres, P., & Kalyuga, S. (2011). *Cognitive load theory*. New York: Springer.
17
18


19 Sweller, J. (2020). Cognitive load theory and educational technology. *Educational Technology*
20
21 *Research and Development*, 68, 1–16. doi:10.1007/s11423-019-09701-3
22
23


24 Tu, W., & Snyder, M. M. (2017). Developing conceptual understanding in a statistics course:
25
26 Merrill's First Principles and real data at work. *Educational Technology Research and*
27
28 *Development*, 65, 579–595. doi:10.1007/s11423-016-9482-1
29
30


31 Van Eck, R., & Dempsey, J. (2002). The effect of competition and contextualized advisement on
32
33 the transfer of mathematics skills in a computer-based instructional simulation game.
34
35 *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 50(3), 23–41.
36
37
38 <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02505023>
39
40


41 Wouters, P., & van Oostendorp, H. (2013). A meta-analytic review of the role of instructional
42
43 support in game-based learning. *Computers & Education*, 60(1), 412-425.
44
45
46 doi:10.1016/j.compedu.2012.07.018.
47


48 Yang, L., Li, J., Lu, W., Chen, Y., Zhang, K., & Li, Y. (2020) The influence of font scale on
49
50 semantic expression of word cloud. *Journal of Visualization*, 23, 981–998.
51
52
53 doi:10.1007/s12650-020-00678-3
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

















Table 1

Focal nine multimedia learning principles in this study (adapted from Mayer, 2017)

Principle	Description	Objective
<i>Coherence</i>	People learn better when extraneous elements are excluded	
<i>Signaling</i>	People learn better when important information is highlighted	
<i>Spatial contiguity</i>	People learn better when corresponding words and graphics are located near each other	Reduce extraneous load
<i>Temporal contiguity</i>	People learn better when corresponding narration and graphics are presented simultaneously	
<i>Redundancy</i>	People learn better from a combination of graphics and narration than from a combination of graphics, narration, and on-screen text	
<i>Modality</i>	People learn better from graphics with narration than with on-screen text	Manage essential cognitive processing
<i>Multimedia</i>	People learn better from words and graphics than words alone	
<i>Personalization</i>	People learn better when the narration is presented in a conversational style	Foster generative cognitive processing
<i>Voice</i>	People learn better from a friendly human voice rather than a machine-like voice	

Table 2

First Principles of Instruction (adapted from Merrill, 2002)

Principle	Learning is promoted when:
<i>Problem-centered</i>	Learners are engaged in solving real-world problems
<i>Activation</i>	Learners activate relevant prior knowledge or previous experiences
<i>Demonstration</i>	Learners observe a demonstration of what is to be learned rather than merely being told what is to be learned
<i>Application</i>	Learners apply the new knowledge or skill to solve problems
<i>Integration</i>	Learners integrate the new knowledge or skill into their everyday life

Table 3*Learning support satisfaction scale (n = 14)*

5-point Likert scale item	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>SD</i>
The "physics supports" helped me learn physics	3.79	1.19
The supports were NOT generally annoying	4.14	1.23
The supports were pretty easy to use	4.21	.70
The supports DID help me	3.79	1.05
I'd rather solve levels with supports	3.64	1.50
Learning support satisfaction scale	3.99	.51

Table 4*Examples of students' commentaries and design modifications*

Students' commentaries	Modifications
"It was more helpful if I saw the video before I solve the level." "The video was helpful, but it was better if I saw it in the beginning."	We only preserved the free access to the videos.
"The video was OK but not really related to the level just played." "It was helpful. The video was clear and kind of related to the level just played." "Not really about the specific level, not directly related, but it is helpful in general for gameplay."	We revised all levels and their corresponding physics competencies to ensure they had the appropriate physics video.
"It was helpful. I like how it has all of the terms and things in it." "The video is helpful to solve multiple levels."	NA
"They kind of showed the solution but not the exact solution, and I liked them for that reason."	

Table 5*Description of the seven learning supports in the game*

Support	Description
Glossary	Brief explanations of physics terms
Formulas	Presented when a physics concept has an associate formula or equation, includes a description of each formula component
Definitions	Composed of a short animation about a physics term (e.g., "gravitational force") and a drag-and-drop quiz, in which students drag phrases to fill in the blanks to form the definition of a physics term
Hewitt Videos	Cartoon animations developed by Paul Hewitt explaining different physics concepts
Physics Videos	Short animations presenting the connection between physics concepts and game solutions
Solution Videos	Complete solution for the game level at hand
Hints	Partial solutions that direct students to the correct path (e.g., "Try drawing a springboard") without revealing the complete solution

Table 6*Coefficients table of regression analysis with posttest score as the dependent variable*

	Unstandardized B	SD	Standardize β	<i>t</i>	Sig.
(Constant)	3.47	.69		5.05	< .001
Pretest	.73	.06	.66	12.46	< .001
Physics Videos	.09	.04	.11	2.10	.04

Table 7*Coefficients table of regression analysis with game levels completion as the dependent variable*

	Unstandardized B	SD	Standardize β	<i>t</i>	Sig.
(Constant)	22.90	3.38		6.78	< .001
Pretest	1.56	.29	.34	5.44	< .001
Physics Videos	1.15	.22	.32	5.14	< .001