



Universiteit  
Leiden  
The Netherlands

## **Cleared for take-off: Game-based learning to prepare airline pilots for critical situations**

Kuindersma, E.C.

### **Citation**

Kuindersma, E. C. (2019, October 24). *Cleared for take-off: Game-based learning to prepare airline pilots for critical situations*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/77168>

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/77168>

**Note:** To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The following handle holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation:  
<http://hdl.handle.net/1887/77168>

**Author:** Kuindersma, E.C.

**Title:** Cleared for take-off: Game-based learning to prepare airline pilots for critical situations

**Issue Date:** 2019-10-24

# **Cleared for take-off**

**Game-based learning to prepare  
airline pilots for critical situations**



# **Cleared for take-off**

**Game-based learning to prepare  
airline pilots for critical situations**

## **PROEFSCHRIFT**

ter verkrijging van  
de graad van Doctor aan de Universiteit Leiden,  
op gezag van Rector Magnificus prof. mr. C. J. J. M. Stolker,  
volgens besluit van het College voor Promoties  
te verdedigen op donderdag 24 oktober 2019  
klokke 15.00 uur

door

**Esther Christine Kuindersma**  
geboren te Holten  
in 1977

Samenstelling van de promotiecommissie:

**Promotores:**

Prof. dr. H. J. van den Herik

Prof. dr. A. Plaat

**Copromotor:**

Dr. J. van der Pal

Netherlands Aerospace Centre (NLR)

**Promotiecommissie:**

Prof. dr. M. E. H. van Reisen

Prof. dr. ir. F. J. Verbeek

Prof. dr. J. J. G. van Merriënboer     Maastricht University

Prof. dr. E. O. Postma                     Tilburg University

Dr. G. P. H. Band

Dr. F. Bellotti                                University of Genova



The research reported in this thesis has been funded by and performed at the Netherlands Aerospace Centre (NLR), Amsterdam, the Netherlands.



The research reported in this thesis has been performed at Leiden Centre of Data Science (LCDS), hosted by Leiden Institute of Advanced Computer Science (LIACS) at the Faculty of Science, Leiden University, the Netherlands.



SIKS Dissertation Series No. 2019-28

The research reported in this thesis has been carried out under the auspices of SIKS, the Dutch Research School for Information and Knowledge Systems.

© 2019 Esther Kuindersma

Cover design: Esther Kuindersma, Sjoerd Huijg

Printed by: Gildeprint, Enschede

ISBN 978-94-6323-546-4

An electronic version of this thesis is available at <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/77168>

*Voor mijn jongens*





# Preface

The book that you are holding right now marks an era. An era of my life that I had not envisioned until September 2014. That was when I came across a vacancy, posted on Twitter. It read "serious gaming and didactics", and it was at the Netherlands Aerospace Centre (NLR). When I read it, a fire inside me ignited. Working on training methods for airline pilots. This was what I wanted to do!

It took a while before I realised the vacancy was for a PhD position. I had never considered doing a PhD or even doing research. I hesitated: I was not sure that I could do this, and it would involve a pretty steep cutback in my paycheck.

At that time, there was a song on the radio that I liked very much. It was "Geronimo" by the Australian band "Sheppard". The title of the song is a reference to the famous Apache military leader Geronimo, and the custom of yelling his name before doing a courageous act. I took it as an inspiration and decided to take the leap.

Time flies by, and now it is 2019. Finishing my thesis took a bit longer than I hoped for, but I have made it. You are holding my book in your hands. It has been fun. It has been tough. It has been an adventure.

I would like to take this opportunity to express my gratitude to everyone who contributed to the completion of this work. I received the support and help of many people. Too many to thank everyone by name.

I would like to start by expressing my gratitude to my supervisors Jaap van den Herik and Aske Plaat from the Leiden Centre of Data Science (LCDS) at Leiden University, and my co-supervisor Jelke van der Pal at the Netherlands Aerospace Centre (NLR). I am grateful to all three of them for their guidance and support, but I owe Jaap a special thank you for his unfailing drive and enthusiasm to critique my writings in order to make me a real scientist. Thank you for working through all my puzzles.

Next, I wish to thank the participants in all my experiments and every teacher and flight instructor that helped me find my participants. Without them, I would not have had anything to write about.

I thank NLR for giving me the opportunity to do this research, and I thank my colleagues at NLR for all they did for me. For helping me create the games for my research, contributing to my experiments and my data analysis, giving me feedback on my ideas and my writings, and for the great talks at the coffee machine and the fun during extra-curricular activities.

Thank you to my family and family-in-law for their continued interest in the progress of my research. Thank you to my friends for their encouragement and their patience when I needed to blow off some steam.

A special thank you to my paranymphs, Armon and Alistair.

Armon, it was good to have you as a companion during my time at NLR. I enjoyed our discussions during our carpool rides about your research and mine, and the many days that we spent sequestered in our "cave".

Alistair, I am happy to have met you as one of my new colleagues at the HvA. Our coffee conversations have saved me from quite a few panic attacks during the final stages of my PhD.

Finally, thank you and lots of love to Sjoerd, who supported my decision to quit a good job and dive into this scientific adventure, and to Jasper and Thomas, who accepted many times that I did not have much time for them, because I had to write my book. Thank you for all your love and patience. My book is done now. Let's play.

*Esther Kuindersma  
Almere, 2019*

# Contents

<b>Preface</b>	<b>vii</b>
<b>Contents</b>	<b>ix</b>
<b>List of Abbreviations</b>	<b>xv</b>
<b>List of Definitions</b>	<b>xvii</b>
<b>List of Figures</b>	<b>xix</b>
<b>List of Tables</b>	<b>xxi</b>
<b>1 Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Exploring the experience deficit . . . . .	3
1.1.1 The lack of experience . . . . .	3
1.1.2 Providing experience through training . . . . .	4
1.2 Two perspectives on game-based learning . . . . .	5
1.2.1 The suitability of games to train competencies . . . . .	6
1.2.2 The acceptance of game-based learning by airline pilots . . . . .	6
1.3 Problem statement and three research questions . . . . .	6
1.4 Research methodology . . . . .	7
1.5 Thesis structure . . . . .	8
1.6 Contributions . . . . .	9
1.7 Working environment for the research . . . . .	9
<b>2 Background</b>	<b>11</b>
2.1 Airline pilots . . . . .	12
2.1.1 A short history of the airline pilot profession . . . . .	12
2.1.2 Airline pilots of the future . . . . .	12
2.2 Airline pilot training . . . . .	13
2.2.1 Before standardised airline pilot training . . . . .	13
2.2.2 Standardised licensing and training . . . . .	14
2.2.3 The traditional approach: Airline Transport Pilot Licence . . . . .	14
2.2.4 A modern approach: Multicrew Pilot Licence . . . . .	16

2.2.5	Innovations in training delivery . . . . .	19
2.3	Critical situations . . . . .	21
2.3.1	Normal and non-normal situations . . . . .	21
2.3.2	Defining critical situations . . . . .	21
2.4	Competencies . . . . .	22
2.4.1	Defining competencies and competency development . . . . .	22
2.4.2	Training design for competency development . . . . .	23
2.4.3	Competency-based training . . . . .	25
2.5	Game-based learning . . . . .	26
2.5.1	Defining game-based learning and serious games . . . . .	27
2.5.2	Serious games research . . . . .	29
2.5.3	The voluntariness of gaming . . . . .	32
2.5.4	Game-based learning for aviation . . . . .	33
2.6	Chapter conclusion . . . . .	34
<b>3</b>	<b>Towards a design model</b>	<b>37</b>
3.1	Three requirements for competency development . . . . .	38
3.2	Translating 4C/ID into game characteristics . . . . .	39
3.3	Authentic learning tasks . . . . .	42
3.4	Identifying the elements of serious games . . . . .	44
3.4.1	Eleven elements for gameplay . . . . .	45
3.4.2	Ten elements for learning . . . . .	45
3.5	SG4CD model: Serious Games for Competency Development . . . . .	49
3.6	Chapter conclusion . . . . .	50
3.6.1	Answering research question 1 (RQ 1) . . . . .	50
3.6.2	Outlook . . . . .	51
<b>4</b>	<b>The CloudAtlas game: Voluntary play in serious games</b>	<b>53</b>
4.1	Measuring the effect of voluntariness . . . . .	54
4.1.1	The outcomes of serious games . . . . .	54
4.1.2	Expectations . . . . .	56
4.1.3	General set-up of the experiments . . . . .	57
4.1.4	Comparing the experiments . . . . .	59
4.2	Experiment 1: Informal setting . . . . .	61
4.2.1	Design . . . . .	61
4.2.2	Participants . . . . .	62
4.2.3	Procedure . . . . .	62
4.2.4	Materials . . . . .	63
4.2.5	Results . . . . .	67
4.2.6	Discussion . . . . .	71
4.2.7	Section conclusion . . . . .	72
4.3	Experiment 2: Formal setting . . . . .	73
4.3.1	Design . . . . .	73
4.3.2	Participants . . . . .	74
4.3.3	Procedure . . . . .	76

4.3.4	Adaptations to the materials . . . . .	76
4.3.5	Results . . . . .	78
4.3.6	Discussion . . . . .	82
4.3.7	Section conclusion . . . . .	84
4.4	Experiment 3: Formal setting with mandatory participation . . . . .	84
4.4.1	Design . . . . .	85
4.4.2	Participants . . . . .	86
4.4.3	Procedure . . . . .	87
4.4.4	Adaptations to the materials . . . . .	88
4.4.5	Results . . . . .	89
4.4.6	Discussion . . . . .	94
4.4.7	Section conclusion . . . . .	97
4.5	Overall discussion of the experiments . . . . .	97
4.6	Limitations . . . . .	98
4.6.1	Number of participants . . . . .	98
4.6.2	Mandatory participation . . . . .	98
4.7	Chapter conclusion . . . . .	98
4.7.1	Answering research question 2 (RQ 2) . . . . .	98
4.7.2	The implications of the outcomes . . . . .	99
4.7.3	Future research . . . . .	100
<b>5</b>	<b>Creating Shuttle to Mars: a game to provide experience</b>	<b>101</b>
5.1	Competencies for critical situations . . . . .	102
5.1.1	Airline pilot competencies . . . . .	102
5.1.2	A job analysis to identify the essential competencies . . . . .	102
5.2	The Shuttle to Mars game . . . . .	106
5.2.1	Beta versions . . . . .	106
5.2.2	Game description . . . . .	106
5.3	Game design based on the SG4CD model . . . . .	109
5.3.1	Designing the elements of Shuttle to Mars . . . . .	110
5.3.2	Meaningful events . . . . .	113
5.4	Playtesting Shuttle to Mars . . . . .	114
5.4.1	The purpose of playtesting . . . . .	114
5.4.2	Shuttle to Mars playtest . . . . .	114
5.4.3	Results . . . . .	118
5.4.4	Playtest conclusion . . . . .	118
5.5	Chapter conclusion . . . . .	118
5.5.1	Outcomes of the playtest . . . . .	119
5.5.2	Improvements to the game . . . . .	119
<b>6</b>	<b>Measuring the Shuttle to Mars experience</b>	<b>121</b>
6.1	Evaluating the Shuttle to Mars game experience . . . . .	121
6.2	Research set-up . . . . .	123
6.2.1	Methodology . . . . .	123
6.2.2	Participants . . . . .	123

6.2.3	Procedure . . . . .	124
6.2.4	Materials . . . . .	125
6.3	Results . . . . .	128
6.3.1	Start session results . . . . .	128
6.3.2	Block 1 results . . . . .	129
6.3.3	Block 2 results . . . . .	132
6.3.4	Block 3 results . . . . .	134
6.3.5	Repeating questions . . . . .	135
6.3.6	Interviews . . . . .	137
6.4	Discussion . . . . .	139
6.4.1	Motivation . . . . .	139
6.4.2	Game experience . . . . .	140
6.4.3	Games as a training method for competencies . . . . .	141
6.4.4	Quality of the Shuttle to Mars game . . . . .	141
6.5	Chapter conclusion . . . . .	142
6.5.1	Answering research question 3 (RQ 3) . . . . .	143
6.5.2	Future research . . . . .	143
<b>7</b>	<b>Conclusions and discussion</b>	<b>145</b>
7.1	Answers to the research questions . . . . .	145
7.1.1	Answer to research question 1 . . . . .	145
7.1.2	Answer to research question 2 . . . . .	146
7.1.3	Answer to research question 3 . . . . .	147
7.2	Addressing the problem statement . . . . .	148
7.2.1	The suitability of games to train competencies . . . . .	148
7.2.2	The acceptance of game-based learning by airline pilots . . . . .	148
7.2.3	Answer to the problem statement . . . . .	149
7.2.4	Conclusions . . . . .	150
7.3	Limitations and outlook . . . . .	150
7.3.1	The difficulty of game design . . . . .	150
7.3.2	The number of participants . . . . .	151
7.3.3	Outlook . . . . .	151
7.3.4	The future of game-based learning for airline pilots . . . . .	153
	<b>References</b>	<b>155</b>
	<b>Appendix A Background</b>	<b>167</b>
A.1	Training delivery methods . . . . .	169
	<b>Appendix B The CloudAtlas game: Voluntary play in serious games</b>	<b>171</b>
B.1	CloudAtlas pre-experiment questionnaire (Q1) . . . . .	173
B.2	CloudAtlas post-experiment questionnaire (Q2) . . . . .	176
B.3	CloudAtlas final questionnaires (Q3) . . . . .	188
B.4	CloudAtlas written materials . . . . .	193

<b>Appendix C Creating Shuttle to Mars: a game to provide experience</b>	<b>207</b>
C.1 Semi-structured interview scheme for job analysis . . . . .	209
C.2 ICAO core competencies and behavioural indicators . . . . .	211
C.3 Shuttle to Mars Playtest protocol (Dutch) . . . . .	214
C.4 Shuttle to Mars Playtest questionnaire (Dutch) . . . . .	217
<b>Appendix D Measuring the Shuttle to Mars experience</b>	<b>221</b>
D.1 Questionnaire 1: StM Start . . . . .	223
D.2 Questionnaire 2: StM Block 1 . . . . .	227
D.3 Questionnaire 3: StM Block 2 . . . . .	230
D.4 Questionnaire 4: StM Block 3 . . . . .	233
D.5 StM semi-structured interview . . . . .	237
<b>Summary</b>	<b>239</b>
<b>Samenvatting</b>	<b>243</b>
<b>Curriculum Vitae</b>	<b>247</b>
<b>List of publications</b>	<b>249</b>
<b>SIKS Dissertation Series</b>	<b>251</b>





# List of Abbreviations

4C/ID	Four Components for Instructional Design (model)
AFPM-A	Aircraft Flight Path Management - Automation (ICAO core competency)
AFPM-M	Aircraft Flight Path Management - Manual (ICAO core competency)
AP	Application of Procedures (ICAO core competency)
AR	Augmented Reality
ATPL	Airline Transport Pilot Licence
BI	Behavioural Indicator
CBE	Competency-Based Education
CBT	Computer-Based Training
CBTA	Competency-Based Training and Assessment
CEGE	Core Elements of Gaming Experience
CEGEQ	Core Elements of Gaming Experience Questionnaire
COM	Communication (ICAO core competency)
CPL	Commercial Pilot Licence
EASA	European Aviation Safety Agency
EBT	Evidence-Based Training
FAA	Federal Aviation Administration
GBL	Game-Based Learning
IATA	International Air Transport Association
ICAO	International Civil Aviation Organization
IFALPA	International Federation of Airline Pilots Associations
IMI	Intrinsic Motivation Inventory

KNVvL	Royal Netherlands Aeronautical Association
KSA	Knowledge, Skills and Attitudes
L&T	Leadership & Teamwork (ICAO core competency)
MG	Mandatory Gameplay (experiment condition)
MP	Mandatory Participation (experiment condition)
MPL	Multicrew Pilot Licence
MPMG	Mandatory Participation, Mandatory Gameplay (experiment group)
MPVG	Mandatory Participation, Voluntary Gameplay (experiment group)
NG	No Gameplay (experiment condition)
NLR	Netherlands Aerospace Centre
PPL	Private Pilot Licence
PS&DM	Problem Solving & Decision Making (ICAO core competency)
SA	Situation Awareness (ICAO core competency)
SG4CD	Serious Games for Competency Development (model)
SOP	Standard Operating Procedure
StM	Shuttle to Mars (game)
UEQ	User Experience Questionnaire
VG	Voluntary Gameplay (experiment condition)
VP	Voluntary Participation (experiment condition)
VPMG	Voluntary Participation, Mandatory Gameplay (experiment group)
VPVG	Voluntary Participation, Voluntary Gameplay (experiment group)
VR	Virtual Reality
WM	Workload Management (ICAO core competency)

# List of Definitions

1.1	Suitable training method . . . . .	2
1.2	Viable training method . . . . .	2
1.3	Game-based learning . . . . .	5
2.1	Airline pilot . . . . .	12
2.2	Serious games . . . . .	19
2.3	Augmented reality . . . . .	20
2.4	Virtual reality . . . . .	20
2.5	Critical situation . . . . .	21
2.6	Competency . . . . .	22
2.7	Competency development . . . . .	23
2.8	Competency-based training . . . . .	25
2.9	Games . . . . .	28
2.10	Purpose . . . . .	28
2.11	Goal . . . . .	28
2.12	Objective . . . . .	28
2.13	Voluntariness . . . . .	32
3.1	Playable . . . . .	38
3.2	Attractive . . . . .	38
3.3	Transfer . . . . .	40
3.4	Near transfer . . . . .	41
3.5	Far transfer . . . . .	41
3.6	Behavioural indicator . . . . .	42
3.7	Working condition . . . . .	42
3.8	Task characteristic . . . . .	43
4.1	Learning objective . . . . .	54
4.2	Learning outcome . . . . .	54
4.3	Learning effect . . . . .	54
4.4	Effective training method . . . . .	55
4.5	Motivation . . . . .	55
4.6	Enjoyment . . . . .	55

4.7 Engagement . . . . . 55

4.8 Utility . . . . . 60

# List of Figures

2.1	Four Components for Instructional Design (4C/ID)	25
3.1	Six characteristics that support competency development	39
3.2	Competency development and (far) transfer through a game	41
3.3	Competency and behavioural indicators	42
3.4	Working conditions and task characteristics to match game and job	43
3.5	Matching meaningful game events with job tasks	44
3.6	Game elements - elements that make the game playable and attractive	45
3.7	Elements <i>inside</i> the game that support learning	45
3.8	Elements <i>outside</i> the game that provide instruction support	46
3.9	The Serious Games for Competency Development model (SG4CD model)	49
4.1	Structure and number of participants of Exp. 1	58
4.2	Structure and number of participants of Exp. 2	58
4.3	Structure and number of participants of Exp. 3	59
4.4	Schematic representation of the procedure and corresponding materials	63
4.5	CloudAtlas screenshot	66
4.6	Screenshot of CloudAtlas test item: application question	67
4.7	Means and SE for Time spent playing the game in Exp. 1	69
4.8	Means and SE for Enjoyment in Exp. 1	70
4.9	Means and SE for Test score in Exp. 2	78
4.10	Means and SE for Time spent playing the game in Exp. 2	80
4.11	Means and SE for Enjoyment in Exp. 2	80
4.12	Means and SE for Motivation in Exp. 2	82
4.13	CloudAtlas screenshot: feedback on dangerous action	89
4.14	Means and SE for Test score in VP and MP conditions in Exp. 3	91
4.15	Means and SE for Time spent playing the game in Exp. 3	92
4.16	Means and SE for Enjoyment in Exp. 3	92
5.1	Shuttle to Mars screenshot: cockpit	107
5.2	Shuttle to Mars screenshot: on-screen instructions in tutorial	108
5.3	Shuttle to Mars screenshot: flight path shown as blue bubble trail	109
5.4	Shuttle to Mars playtest set-up	117

5.5	Means and SE for playtest questionnaire results . . . . .	118
6.1	Kirkpatrick's four levels of training evaluation . . . . .	122
6.2	Procedure of the small-scale qualitative study for Shuttle to Mars (StM) .	124
6.3	Importance of ICAO core competencies: comparing instructors with pilots	130
6.4	Shuttle to Mars' average UEQ scores per subscale with error bars . . . .	131
6.5	Shuttle to Mars comparison to UEQ benchmark . . . . .	132
6.6	After Start session and StM Block 3: Purpose, Control, Graphics . . . . .	136
6.7	After each StM Block: Players feelings about completing the StM block .	137
6.8	After each StM Block: Motivation, Look forward, Frustrated, Commercial	138

# List of Tables

- 1.1 Research methods for answering the research questions . . . . . 8
- 1.2 Overview of relations between chapters and the PS and RQs . . . . . 9
  
- 2.1 ICAO licence requirements for ATPL and MPL . . . . . 18
- 2.2 ICAO core competencies . . . . . 18
- 2.3 Advantages and disadvantages of Multicrew Pilot Licence (MPL) . . . . . 19
  
- 3.1 Connecting 4C/ID components to competency development characteristics 40
- 3.2 Examples of working conditions and task characteristics . . . . . 43
- 3.3 Description of serious games elements for gameplay and learning . . . . . 46
  
- 4.1 Comparing the experiments . . . . . 61
- 4.2 Means and SD of results for VG and MG conditions . . . . . 68
- 4.3 Subsets in Voluntary and Mandatory Gameplay groups . . . . . 69
- 4.4 Subsets in Voluntary Gameplay group . . . . . 69
- 4.5 Participation and Gameplay conditions in Exp. 2 . . . . . 74
- 4.6 Distribution of participants for Participation and Gameplay in Exp. 2 . . . . 75
- 4.7 IMI subscales and items . . . . . 76
- 4.8 Means and SD of results for Participation and Gameplay conditions in Exp. 2 79
- 4.9 Actual gameplay versus reported willingness to play the game voluntarily . 81
- 4.10 Significance levels of between-subject effects for the IMI subscales . . . . . 81
- 4.11 Participation and Gameplay conditions in Exp. 3 . . . . . 85
- 4.12 Distribution of participants for Participation and Gameplay in Exp. 3 . . . . 87
- 4.13 Assignment of registered participants to Gameplay condition in Exp. 3 . . . 87
- 4.14 Means and SD of results for Participation and Gameplay conditions in Exp. 3 90
- 4.15 Levels of Motivation separated for the Participation conditions in Exp. 3 . 93
- 4.16 Significance levels of between-subject effects for the IMI subscales in Exp. 3 94
- 4.17 Means and SD of Engagement for Participation and Gameplay conditions 94
- 4.18 Outcomes significantly correlating with Age . . . . . 96
  
- 5.1 Combining handling guidelines with ICAO core competencies . . . . . 104
- 5.2 Shuttle to Mars events . . . . . 109
- 5.3 Meaningful events matched with job tasks . . . . . 115

5.4 Playtest protocol . . . . . 117

6.1 Categorisation of User Experience Questionnaire (UEQ) scales . . . . . 126

6.2 Votes for most suitable training method per ICAO core competency . . . 131