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Abstract  
Concepts utilizing applied ethics, such as responsible conduct of research (RCR), can prove difficult to teach due to the complexity of problems faced by researchers and the many underlying perspectives involved in such dilemmas. To address this issue, we created Academical, a choice-based interactive storytelling game for RCR education that enables players to experience a story from multiple perspectives. In this paper, we describe the design rationale of Academical, and present results from an initial pilot study comparing it with traditional web-based educational materials from an existing RCR course. The preliminary results highlight that utilizing a choice-based interactive story game may prove more effective for RCR education, with significantly higher engagement and comparable or better scores for tests of RCR topics.
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Introduction
Topics such as the responsible conduct of research (RCR) are difficult to teach due to the complexity of applied ethics and ethical decision-making [2], the need for moral reasoning [39], and the lack of existing educational tools that are motivating and foster critical thinking [12]. While past work has attempted to address these issues through alternative learning approaches such as group mentoring [48] and role-playing [3, 40], these issues have still remained largely unaddressed—resulting in ill-defined content, format, and goals, as well as minimal evidence for effectiveness [11]. Conversely, in the context of educational games, choice-based interactive storytelling is a popular format for narrative videogames [7, 38, 28], and this format has been shown to increase engagement/motivation as well as learning outcomes for rote STEM topics [35, 46, 49].

We hypothesized that the choice-based, role-playing nature of interactive storytelling games could also be employed to improve student engagement and learning outcomes within ethically complex topics (such as RCR education), which require learners to understand a variety of perspectives and perform ethical decision-making. As a result, we created Academical—a choice-based interactive storytelling game for RCR education that allows players to experience a story from multiple perspectives. In this paper, we discuss the design of Academical, and provide results from an initial pilot study comparing engagement and learning outcomes of our web-based game with traditional web-based educational materials from a RCR course at the University of Utah.

Background
Choice-based Interactive Storytelling
Though it is attested as far back as the sixteenth century [36, 27], choice-based interactive storytelling was made famous by the Choose Your Own Adventure book series [34, 37] and is now most prominent as a popular format for narrative videogames [7, 38, 28]. In this format, players navigate a plot graph [47] by making decisions (typically on behalf of a character) at branching points in the narrative (e.g., see Figure 2). Research in this area has typically concerned the history [7, 27, 38, 36], analysis [22, 28, 23], or generation [10, 24, 32] of works in the choice-based format.

Interactive Storytelling and Learning
Interactive storytelling has substantial potential for education and games [5, 45]. Specifically, narrative/storytelling is an important element that can be added to educational games in order to maintain and increase students’ motivation [4, 6, 31, 35], with some suggesting that integration of a good story into an educational game will determine its success or failure [8]. Interactive storytelling has been incorporated into a number of educational games focusing on topics such as history [4, 42], STEM [5, 46, 49], and bullying [1, 44]. However, the majority of research on educational interactive storytelling games has focused on adaptivity [9, 16], interactivity [42, 49], emergent narrative [1], and the game creation process [4, 43]. As a result, there is surprisingly little work examining the impact of an interactive storytelling approach on learning outcomes (exceptions being [35, 44, 46, 49]), especially for topics with ethically complex concepts that require a variety of perspectives.

Responsible Conduct of Research
Although students generally know that they should report data honestly and cite sources accurately, they might not know specific standards or obligations of RCR—such as criteria for co-authorship and maintaining confidentiality of manuscripts reviewed for publication [40]. The importance of RCR is such that many major funding agencies, such as the National Institutes of Health (NIH) and National Science Foundation (NSF), explicitly require researchers
Figure 1: A choice point from Academical’s final scenario, “Fallen Angel Y2K.” In this scene, the player controls a busy professor whose graduate student suspects that a postdoc in the lab has fabricated research results. The two highlighted text blocks represent dialogue options between which the player must select.

supported by their grants to receive RCR training [30, 33]. Currently, the NIH provides a guideline of nine core RCR topics: 1) conflict of interest, 2) human and animal subjects, 3) mentoring, 4) collaboration, 5) peer review, 6) data management, 7) research misconduct, 8) authorship and publication, and 9) scientists and society [13]. Past research on RCR education has ranged from issues teaching ethical theories underlying RCR [2] and identifying metacognitive reasoning strategies that facilitate ethical decision-making [17] to the use of group mentoring [48] and role-playing [3, 40] for improved efficacy. However, there is still a notable engagement issue within current RCR education, and a critical need for a variety of tools to improve discussion, engagement, and critical thinking [12]. As a result, an interactive storytelling approach may prove effective for increasing motivation and fostering deeper critical thinking.

Design of Academical
Academical is a work of choice-based interactive storytelling [22, 23, 18] that was developed using the Twine authoring framework [7, 38]. Figure 1 shows a screenshot taken during gameplay, which occurs in a web browser. The
game comprises nine playable scenarios, each pertaining to a specific issue in RCR [13]. These scenarios are adapted (with permission) from a series of existing educational RCR role-playing prompts [3, 40].

Each playable scenario in Academical centers on a conversation between two stakeholders in the RCR issue at hand, one of whom is controlled by the player—in the sense that they select dialogue options for that character. By virtue of these choices, the player will ultimately reach one of several possible endings, a subset of which represent successful navigations of the situation. Upon reaching a good ending for one character, the player unlocks the other interlocutor and may replay the scenario from that person’s viewpoint. In turn, reaching a good ending for the second character in a given scenario unlocks the next scenario, and the game concludes upon completion of the final scenario. Generally, the scenarios become more complex (and difficult to navigate) as the game proceeds, as Figure 2 illustrates.

At the outset of the project, it was decided that the format of choice-based interactive storytelling—which allows a player to experience a story from multiple perspectives, and to replay scenes to see how different actions play out—would demonstrate the complicated nature of RCR to students in a compelling way. In adapting the role-playing prompts, we sought to show how seemingly obvious answers around questions of research ethics can be complicated by factors such as power dynamics and marginalized identities and experiences. Instead of cleanly delineating right and wrong answers, Academical showcases complexity and uncertainty to provoke questions around how courses of action could have unexpected consequences. In turn, while all successful paths through the game’s scenarios represent the player character acting responsibly, not all of the situations reach clear resolutions. Specifically, many scenarios feature paths that appear to represent obvious solutions, but ultimately lead to bad outcomes. Through replaying and selecting new options, the player explores the social concerns encompassing a given RCR scenario, which may lead to a richer understanding of the ethical complications that one can encounter while conducting research.

Pilot Study
RCR is a complicated topic to teach that requires understanding a variety of perspectives and dilemmas that impact research ethics [14, 41]. As a result, we wanted to evaluate whether a choice-based interactive storytelling design, such as the one employed in Academical, could prove more effective than traditional approaches for teaching ethically complex topics. We hypothesized that the choice-based, role-playing nature of Academical—which is specifically designed to highlight how research ethics can be complicated by many factors such as power dynamics and marginalized identities—would be 1) more engaging and 2) as effective as traditional RCR educational materials. In order to explore these hypotheses, we conducted a between-subjects pilot study comparing our choice-based interactive storytelling game approach with existing web-based educational materials from an RCR course at the University of Utah. The pilot study consisted of two conditions: 1) a group that read through two modules of the web-based educational RCR materials covering peer review and authorship; and 2) a group that played two chapters/levels of Academical covering peer review and authorship content.

Procedure
Participants were told that the study was to explore different approaches to RCR education, and that they would either play a game or read materials teaching selected RCR concepts. They then completed an online survey collecting demographic information (age, prior gaming experience,
prior RCR experience, and so forth). Upon completing the survey, participants were randomly assigned to one of the two conditions (web materials or Academical). After completing the RCR training for peer review and authorship, participants were then asked to complete a post-test that assessed their engagement with the training material and knowledge of peer review and authorship RCR concepts.

Participants
A convenience sample of 28 university graduate and undergraduate students—the target populations for RCR training—were recruited for the study (age: $\mu$=24.8, $\sigma$=7.6). There were 10 female, 14 male, and 3 non-binary participants, with 1 declining to disclose gender. During the study, participants were randomly assigned to one of the two conditions: web materials (14 total; 3 female, 2 non-binary, 8 male, 1 decline to answer) and Academical game (14 total; 7 female, 1 non-binary, 6 male). None of the participants reported prior RCR training within the past 2 years.

Measures
Temple Presence Inventory, Engagement Subscale
Engagement is an critical aspect of the learning process [15], drastically influencing a learner’s motivation to continue interacting with a system and the educational content [29]. In order to assess participant engagement with the two educational RCR tools employed, we utilized the Engagement subscale of the Temple Presence Inventory (TPI) [19]. The TPI is an instrument that has been validated for use with games [20], and measuring game engagement [21].

Peer Review and Authorship RCR Quizzes
To assess and compare how effective the two RCR tools were for teaching peer review and authorship concepts, we utilized two quizzes from an existing online RCR course at the University of Utah. Each quiz consists of three questions around a respective topic, and each question is either true/false, yes/no, or multiple choice (see Tables 1 and 3).

Table 1: The post-test RCR peer review quiz questions. Questions were taken from an existing RCR course at the University of Utah.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RCR Peer Review Questions</th>
<th>1. &quot;According to the study materials, peer reviewers are asked to make judgements about the quality of a proposed or completed project. This certainly includes all EXCEPT the following:&quot; (Multiple Choice)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. &quot;If you can figure out the authors of a paper you are peer reviewing after conflicts of interest are disclosed, should you still review the paper?&quot; (Yes/No)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. &quot;There is no simple solution to the problem of bias in peer review. However, researchers can lessen the impact of bias by writing transparent reviews.&quot; (True/False)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Post-Test Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Web</th>
<th>Game</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>ES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TPI Engagement</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Review Test</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authorship Test</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Post-test results for the TPI Engagement subscale, Peer Review test, and Authorship test. The table contains mean scores, standard deviations, t-test scores for significance, and effect size—which is medium to large for significant differences.

Results

Prior Knowledge and Experience
According to a series of independent samples t-tests, participants in the two conditions did not differ with respect to age, prior game experience, or prior interactive story experience (all p values >= .12). Similarly, no participants reported prior RCR training in the past 2 years. Therefore, we can assume that participants in both groups had similar prior RCR, game, and interactive story experience.

Engagement with RCR Training Tools
We first examine participant engagement between the different RCR educational tools. In order to analyze differences between the web materials and Academical game conditions, we used an independent samples t-test. The first row of Table 2 shows descriptive statistics for scores on the TPI Engagement subscale, as well as significant differences and effect sizes. Results found a significant difference in favor of Academical increasing participant engagement ($p = .029, r = .4$), suggesting that a choice-based
interactive story game is a more engaging experience for RCR training than traditional web reading materials.

**RCR Authorship Questions**

1. "When should authorship for a paper be discussed?" (Multiple Choice)
2. "Which of the following is NOT considered a contribution to a paper?" (Multiple Choice)
3. "There is disagreement over whether authorship should be limited to individuals who contributed to all phases of a publication or whether individuals who made more limited contributions deserve authorship credit." (True/False)

**Table 3:** The post-test RCR authorship quiz questions. Questions were taken from an existing RCR course at the University of Utah.

**RCR Learning Outcomes**

To better understand participants’ learning outcomes, we analyzed post-test scores on the RCR peer review and authorship quizzes. Descriptive statistics, statistical significance, and effect sizes for the two measures are shown in the bottom two rows of Table 2. A series of independent samples t-tests showed that participants in the *Academical* condition scored significantly higher on the peer review test (p = .001, r = .56) and comparable to the web materials for the authorship test, with no statistically significant difference between scores (p = .23). This suggests that, in terms of short-term learning, a choice-based interactive story approach can be more effective or comparable to traditional educational RCR materials for certain RCR topics.

**Discussion**

Results from our pilot study highlight the potential of choice-based interactive storytelling games for improving student engagement and learning outcomes within RCR education.

First, the independent samples t-test for the TPI Engagement subscale showed that *Academical* was significantly more engaging than traditional web-based RCR educational materials (p=.029, r=.4). This confirmed our first hypothesis, and also falls in line with existing claims [4, 6, 16, 31, 42] and findings [35, 44, 46, 49] that interactive storytelling designs can improve learner engagement and motivation. Additionally, we further extend these findings to illustrate that interactive storytelling games can also increase motivation when learning more ethically complex topics—beyond the current rote STEM [35, 49] and history [4] examples.

Second, we found that short term learning outcomes for RCR education were comparable (authorship; p=.23) or significantly better for *Academical* (peer review; p=.001, r=.56). This serves to extend current findings on the learning outcomes of educational interactive storytelling games [35, 44, 46, 49] by providing evidence for the efficacy of such games in teaching concepts that require ethical decision-making and multiple perspectives. Furthermore, given that a choice-based interactive storytelling design approach is both more engaging than traditional RCR materials and equally/more effective for learning outcomes, *Academical* is ultimately a useful tool to address the engagement and critical thinking needs of current RCR education [12].

**Conclusion, Limitations, and Future Work**

In this paper we described the design of *Academical*, a choice-based interactive storytelling game for RCR education that enables players to experience a story from multiple perspectives. We also presented results from an initial pilot study comparing *Academical* with traditional web-based RCR educational materials. The pilot study results highlighted that a choice-based interactive story game design may prove to be an effective RCR education tool, with significantly higher engagement and comparable or better scores for tests of RCR topics. However, the sample size is notably small for sufficiently evaluating the efficacy of an educational game [25]. Therefore, future work will need to further validate these results with a larger sample size to fully prove the hypotheses, e.g., [26]. A longitudinal study also needs to be done to examine long term learning outcomes and improvements to RCR practices over time. Furthermore, prior work has demonstrated that traditional education approaches may increase students’ RCR knowledge, but not their moral reasoning [39]. Given that *Academical* enables a more direct exploration of ethics-based decisions, future work should also explore if a choice-based interactive story design can have a more substantial impact on learners’ moral reasoning.
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