

THESIS / THÈSE

MASTER IN BUSINESS ENGINEERING PROFESSIONAL FOCUS IN ANALYTICS & AMP: DIGITAL BUSINESS

Gamifcation vs satiation

Using game mechanics for a better long-term effect on engagement and motivation

Lavaux, Michael

Award date: 2019

Awarding institution: University of Namur

Link to publication

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.

- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
 You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



GAMIFICATION VS SATIATION USING GAME MECHANICS FOR A BETTER LONG-TERM EFFECT ON ENGAGEMENT AND MOTIVATION

Michael LAVAUX

Directeur : Prof. Hammedi WAFA

Mémoire présenté en vue de l'obtention du titre de Master 120 en Sciences de gestion, à finalité spécialisée

ANNEE ACADEMIQUE 2018-2019

Université de Namur, ASBL Faculté de Sciences Économiques, sociales et de gestion - Département des Sciences de gestion

Rempart de la Vierge 8, B-5000 Namur, Belgique. Tel. +32 [0]81 72 48 40

Abstract

For years now, gamification had become a more common managerial initiative, as well as a "hot topic" in literature. However, even if its definition seems to be generalized in the research community, the methods of application and design are still far from standardized, leading managers to many mistakes when they implement such initiatives. These mistakes are not without consequences, as implementing a gamified application can be costly, and can generate reactions from the company employees. Consequently, this kind of managerial decision requires a more precise knowledge of topic of gamification, to ensure that it brings the expected result.

The approach of this thesis focuses on gamification as an experience consumption for the user. It means that this process is subject to the several constraints that this implies, including the presence of a satiation effect. This is not without consequences, because it drastically limits the long-term effects of such an initiative, namely an increase of motivation and engagement from its users. In order to limit the externalities of satiation, this thesis investigates various game design elements that could potentially reduce its effects

Following an extensive review of the literature about these two topics, two hypotheses were presented:

- The context of the gamification platform has an impact on satiation. As people tend to satiate more when they consume an experience in groups than alone, they also tend to satiate less when they consume in a competitive context in comparison with a cooperative one.
- 2) The variety in reward in the game design also has an impact: the fact of having several different types of rewards can reduce the effects of satiation when compared with a context where only one type of reward is accessible to the user.

These two hypotheses were explored through experimentations with realistic gamified application inspired on several real-world gamified experiences used by companies such as Lays or Starbucks. For the most part, these hypothesis were confirmed by these experiments, although some difficulties with the context of measuring satiety effect have been problematic for measuring certain variables such as engagement.

In conclusion, with this thesis and potential future research on the subject, managers will know better how to ensure the effectiveness of their gamified platforms in the long term, by providing

its users with a less boring and more satisfying experience, thus ensuring à better engagement on their part.

Acknowledgement

First of all, I would like to thank all the people who contributed to the realization of this thesis. Namely:

- Miss Wafa HAMMEDI, my thesis supervisor for her guidance over the whole redaction of the thesis, and her insightful ideas about the theme presented in this thesis and the suggestion of several article of literature about satiation and gamification.
- Miss Nadia STEILS, for her help about the design of the several studies presented in this thesis and for her suggestions.
- Mr. Thomas LECLERQ, for his help about the design of those studies, his help on the methodology to follow, his guidance on the use of the SAS software to analyze the data, and for his enlightening doctoral thesis about satiation.

I would also like to thank all the people that have participated to the experiments presented in this study, even if most of them preferred to remain anonymous. My thanks also goes to all the academic team of the University of Namur, that have helped me a lot over the years, especially with their teachings about market studies and the methodology to follow.

TABLE OF CONTENT

CHAPTER I : AN INTRODUCTION TO GAMIFICATION

I.1) Context – The trend of Gamification and changes in companies environment	P.008
I.2) Defining Gamification	P.009
I.3) Several examples of gamification	P.010
I.4) Problem statement	P.011
I.5) Research Motivation – Gamification as a response to several managerial problems?	P.012
I.6) Academic Motivation – A better insight about the effects of gamification mechanics on satiation	P.013
I.7) Approach of the thesis	P.013

CHAPTER II : LITERATURE REVIEW

II.1) Conceptual background	P.014
II.1.1) Satiation effect & its components	P.014
A) Psychological factors	P.015
A.1) Homeostatic Component	P.015
A.2) Perceptual Component	P.016
A.3) Reflective Component	P.017
B) Consumer characteristics	P.019
B.1) Socio-demographics	P.019
B.2) Initial satisfaction level	P.019
B.3) Attitudinal dimension	P.021
C) Item characteristics	P.022
C.1) The consumed item	P.022
C.2) Alternatives to current consumption	P.023
C.3) Consumption context	P.024
D) Consequences of satiation	P.025

D.1) Drop of consumption pace	P.025
D.2) Variety-seeking behavior	P.025
E) Last notes about satiation	P.027
II.1.2) Components of gamification	P.028
A) Cooperative VS Competitive gamification	P.028
A.1) Competition	P.028
A.2) Cooperation	P.029
A.3) Coopetition	P.029
B) Gamification: mandatory fun & consent.	P.029
C) Gamification & variety	P.031
C.1) Variety in reward mechanics:	P.032
C.2) Effects of rewards on motivation	P.032
II.2) Model	P.033

CHAPTER III: RESEARCH DESIGN

III.1) Methodology	P.035
III.1.1) H1 experimentation	P.035
III.1.2) H2 experimentation	P.036
III.2) Measures	P.037
III.2.1) H1 experimentation	P.038
III.2.2) H2 experimentation	P.039

CHAPTER IV: RESULTS

IV.1) H1 Experiment	P.042
IV1.1) The sample	P.042
IV.1.2) Satisfaction rating	P.042
IV.1.3) Number of repeated experiences	P.045

IV.1.4) Timing & pace	P.046
IV.1.5) Justifications for stopping the experiment	P.047
IV.2) H2 Experiment	P.047
IV.2.1) The sample	P.047
IV.2.2) Satisfaction rating	P.048
IV.2.3) Number of repeated experiences	P.051
IV.2.4) Engagement rating	P.052
IV.2.5) Timing & pace	P.053
IV.2.6) Justification for stopping the experiment	P.054
IV.2.7) Estimated chances of winning	P.055

CHAPTER V: DISCUSSION

V.1) Cooperation & competition VS Satiation effect	P.056
V.1.1) Repetition of the experiment in solo consumption and competitive context	P.056
V.1.2) Satisfaction in savored victory	P.057
V.1.3) Weaknesses of the study	P.058
V.2) Variety in rewards & game mechanics VS Satiation effect	P.059
V.2.1) Repetition of the experiment with several types of rewards as incentives	P.059
V.2.2) Weaknesses of the study	P060

CHAPTER VI: CONCLUSION

VI.1) Short summary	P.062
VI.2) Managerial implications	P.063
VI.3) Theoretical implications	P.064

VI.4) Limitations & suggestion for further research	P.065
SOURCES & REFERENCES	P.067
APPENDIXES	P.071

CHAPTER I: AN INTRODUCTION TO GAMIFICATION

I.1) Context – The trend of Gamification and changes in companies environment

Gamification is a concept that has trendy for a few years in the marketing world, as well as in human resources and other managerial applications. The first known use of the term was in 2008, in a start-up named Conundra Ldt. Since then, this term has been used quite widely in the managerial world since mid-2010, popularized by various conferences and industries (Deterding Khaled, Nacke & Dixon - 2011). Currently, we even see possible applications in education (Zichermann - 2011) and politics (Angelovska - 2019).

This trend is not so surprising and follows the success of video games: According to the European Mobile Game Market, in 2016 there were more than 2.5 billion of gamers all over the world. Moreover, according to BestTheNews 2016, we can expect the game market to weight over 90 billion USD in 2020, a growth of at least 14.48% in a period of three years (WePC – 2019).

Also, this trend seems to impact people from most generations and gender, especially people between 21 and 35 years old which represent 35% of the total share of gamers). Female represents almost 43% of gamers in this particular sample (Statista - 2017).



In terms of platform or media used for gaming, mobile phone seems to be the most successful; smartphone games representing alone 41% of the total 2018 global game market (Newzoo's 2018 Report: Insights Into the \$137.9 Billion Global Games Market).



Crossing all these elements about the growth of gaming industry and growing interest in games among most people, we can clearly see the sheer potential of gamification. This can explain the reason why other market not linked with games or more extensively, recreational activities can find an interest or even application of games in their activity. As such, several elements, initially perceived as serious, features more and more gaming or entertaining elements. This trend is called "Gamification"; a change in product, services or design of organizational activities to make them features more game-like elements and experiences, in order to bring changes in people behavior (Navarro- 2018).

I.2) Defining Gamification

Defining Gamification is not an easy task, considering that this phenomenon is quite recent, and that there was no real consensus in its definition until a few years ago. Several definitions had come up in the academic field:

Deterding definition is maybe the most recognized, as it shares the same common idea among all definitions: "An informal umbrella term for the use of video game elements in non-gaming systems to improve user experience and user engagement." The title of his article summarizes it as the use of "Game Design Elements in Non-Gaming Contexts" (Deterding Khaled, Nacke & Dixon, 2011).

The same idea of increasing user engagement is mentioned by Zichermann in his book "Gamification by Design": "*The process of game-thinking and game mechanics to engage users* & *solve problems*" (Zichermann & Cunningham, 2011).

Several other authors mentions give more hints about how it increases user's engagement. For example, Thom mentions that it "(...) aims to create a sense of playfulness in non- game environments so that participation becomes enjoyable and desirable." (Thom, Millen & DiMicco, 2012). Therefore, enjoyment seems to be a key factor in gamification. In another study made by Huotari & Hamari, who describe gamification as "A process of enhancing a service with affordances for gameful experiences in order to support user's overall value creation.", the focus is mostly on value creation through resources, such as personal, tools, service setting or information available (Huotari & Hamari - 2012).

One of the most recurring element mentioned in literature is enjoyment, or fun. However, a distinction has to be done between "Fun in work", which focus on the enjoyment of the experience at work, such as the task and the membership in the organization, and "Fun at work" : which rather "cover" the boring or tiring aspect of the affective experience at work, in order to make it more bearable. The latter, to some extent, is one of the main goals of gamification (Mollick & Rothbard - 2014).

However, it should be said that gamification is not about building a game in itself, but more about understanding and adapting game mechanics and design to apply them in companies. (Zichermann & Cunningham, 2011). It is also quite different that a simple contest, since there is a presence of a structure and design that create, in the mind of users, a "feeling" similar to the ones in games, rather than a simple setting of rules and goals in a competition context (Mollick & Rothbard - 2014).

I.3) several examples of gamification

Such gamified applications were tried, for example, by Starbucks, through loyalty programs such as the possibility for customers to suggest new ideas, against a feedback that benefits for both parts; the company gain insights about customers' needs, while customers learn how to make better suggestions and earn some recognition by the company. It is not their only gamification mechanic, since they also rely do promotions by inciting customers to scan QR codes on Starbucks products to win coupons and promotions (Negrusa, Toader & Sophica - 2015, Leclerq – 2017).

One of the most famous gamified applications is the Nike+ program, and often mentioned in literature. This application provide customers with daily challenges & goals, the possibility to

compare results with friends and progress over time, rewards, feedback through boards and graphs and so on (Richter, Raban & Rafaeli - 2015).

I.4) Problem statement

"As Gartner stated in 2012, many gamification based solutions would fail to meet their business objectives primarily because of the absence of a clear and formal design process. The obvious conclusion of Gartner's point of view is that: a clear design strategy is the key to success in gamification.

However, as ascertained by many game designers, there is a lack of systems of design framework within which we can explain what makes gamification effective or not. Or better still, there are a lot of design frameworks available now in the literature, but each of them are characterized by different features and there is a lack of consent about their effective validity, probably due to the fact that gamification is still a relatively new and experimental strategy." (Navarro - 2018)

This sentence mentioned in this research is partially the kick start of my thesis. As mentioned by the author, elements defining under which conditions and elements gamification could work or not seems to be still lacking and requires more researches. Also, since the topic is so recent, it seems that there is again too few literature review on the long time effects of gamification.

The focus here would not be about demonstrating if gamification works or not. We know, thanks to several examples and applications that it can work. But the main problem about it is that since the effects of gamification have been proven, it is often taken for granted that applying gamification would increase the user's engagement, as if by magic. However, it seems we've forgotten that gamification is actually, in fact, a consumption of an experience. And every consumption, from physical goods such as food and drinks, to experiences such as watching movies or listening to some music, is hit by a phenomenon that generates a decrease in consumption and a search for alternatives to the current consumed items. This effect is called "satiation".

In this thesis, we will try to identify the effects of satiation concerning gamification, try to determine which elements could reduce or induce the possibilities of a satiation effect which would definitely decrease the desired effects of gamification and through which means it could be possible. As gamification can be perceived as an experience of game-element in a non-gaming context, we can fear that a repeated exposure to a gamified task could be less enjoyable and thus, less effective.

This study will be mostly based on scientific review on the marketing, management and psychological field, but also through several experiments, in order to understand which variables are significant and to which extent they contribute to satiation reduction and to the potential performance of gamification.

I.5) Research Motivation – Gamification as a response to several managerial problems?

As we know, for some years now, gamification is explored and presented in some studies through different contexts for which applications are possible directly in a company. The goal, even if quite similar, depends of the goal and type of activities in which gamification is focused on:

- With customers in a B2C context, gamification will be used in order to induce hope (A desire for an outcome which is compatible with the goals) in order to generate enhance customer engagement and thus, increase sales (Eisingerich, Marchand, Fritze & Dong 2018). I will also generate value co-creation and a positive and fun experience related to the game experience in itself (Leclerq 2017).
- With customer in a B2B context, it can also be used to some context in B2B markets, as engagement, value co-creation and spirit of competition inducer¹. This context will then work as a coopetitive gamification application.
- Inside companies, it helps to motivate its employees to engagement (or re-engagement, if people are already facing a disengagement phase in their task), increase satisfaction, improve performance at work through motivation, and support HR practices (Navarro E.C. 2018).

However, even if most of these gamification features are common in these 3 specific cases, it would be a mistake to implement gamification for employees as it would be done in the two other cases.

Also, as previously mentioned, we can easily induce that gamification is still overestimated or is still simply in lack of a clear understanding concerning its effects in the long run. Knowing which design elements could reduce a potential satiation effect could be very potent, since it would grant more long-term results and less requirement to change the design of the satiation application over time. For example, since gamification at the workplace is mentioned as a good response to boring, redundant or overly complex tasks, we can fear that satiation effect can affect management decisions concerning gamification. Therefore, it would require less cost for companies that want

¹ Contineo Labs, my previous internship company, intend to apply such a strategy in the future and is already thinking about its potential effects.

(or have already) applied gamification to their business, and it would ensure that these investments remain profitable in the long run.

I.6) Academic Motivation – A better insight about the effects of gamification mechanics on satiation

A multitude of studies and scholar articles cover separately the effects of satiety and gamification. Nevertheless, as far as can be sought, no study has placed these two subjects in parallel so far. This is a gap that must be filled in order to have a better understanding of the effects of satiation on engagement and motivation.

In order to understand its effects, we will need to analyze the relationship between several types of gamification mechanics and design elements with its effects on satiation on its several aspects (Time, satisfaction about the consumed experience), in order to see the role played by satiation in the relationship between gamification and engagement.

I.7) Approach of the thesis

In order to fulfill those objectives, since there is a lack of coverage about this particular topic, this thesis will be based on many articles and books on these two topics separately:

Literature about the satiation effect will help to get a better understanding on the elements that can influence it and its impact on consumption.

Literature about gamification will help to identify several game mechanics.

By crossing several findings about both topics, we intent to identify some of them that could have a positive or negative impact on satiation, in order to know which elements should be or not included in future gamification initiatives. The suggested hypothesis will then be explored and analyzed with experiments on individuals, in order to confirm or infirm their effects on satiation.

CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW

II.1) Conceptual background

First and foremost, it seems quite necessary to understand what satiation is, what its consequences are and what variables could induce/reduce its effects. Fortunately, satiation is a well-known effects and a lot of previous researches were done to understand its factors and patterns. These will be analyzed in the next part.

Also, now that we have defined gamification, we will further analyze what are the potential design factors used in satiation and try to understand which ones could eventually reduce or induce satiation, in order to avoid them for future applications.

II.1.1) Satiation effect & its components

First and foremost, you'll notice in this literature review that most of the models, observations and experience done on the field of satiation were done about physical goods, mostly food, as it is one of the most used stimuli in researches on that particular field. The oldest reviewed papers here mostly focus on physical goods, to give a clear definition and first insight about satiation.

In literature, the common and globally accepted definition of the satiation effect is "a drop of enjoyment with repeated or prolonged exposure to a stimulus" (Galak, Kruger & Lowenstein – 2013). This definition can be applied to food, music or experience.

Thanks to some research, we can have a clear pattern about the effects of satiation in consumption and the several dimensions that compose it. Thanks to these lecture, three large dimensions have been highlighted concerning satiation, with each of them influenced by several variables. A global presentation of thee model can be found thereafter:



Figure 3: Model summarizing the literature review about satiation effects

A) Psychological factors

These factors are regrouped here because they share a common trait by their link to psychology. They are factors that are common to every consumer and that we can find in every consumption situation and are often referred to as bias that can be commonly found in every people's habits.

Note that most of these following effects are difficult, if not impossible to avoid in themselves, since they are psychologically carved into the consumer's mind. Therefore, it seems hard at first glance to act on this factor to reduce satiation.

They were mostly explored in several studies made by Galak, Redden, Kruger & Lowenstein. One of these, made by Redden in 2014, mentioned the presence of three sub-components:

A.1) Homeostatic Component

This component considers the fact that the human body has an internal set of value and when it deviates from this value, it generates a signal showing that the stimulus doesn't satisfy a need anymore. In this case, pleasure shows the usefulness of the stimulus to reach a state of balance (Redden – 2014). In other words, in every consumption, there is the idea of an internal value that, when reached, make further consumption unable to bring anymore satisfaction, since a balance in consumption has been met.

This element is particularly true when we speak about physiological goods, such as food or drinks, also called "ingested stimuli", but also apply to non-physiological ones like boredom with a task that imply a cognitive fatigue or effort. Another point to mention is that, when the user decide himself about his own consumption rate without any external or internal imposed constraints, he will more likely satiate faster than someone with limited consumption (Galak, Kruger & Lowenstein – 2012).

However, something should be mentioned: the homeostatic component, as well as satiation in itself, is not only about the physiological limit your body has toward food, or the amount of calories your body could consume. In fact, some experiences in the past have proven that it is more linked with psychological aspects, since that even with food, flavor has a bigger impact over satiation than hunger. Therefore, satiation could take place with non-ingested consumption items, such as experiences (Redden - 2008).

A.2) Perceptual Component

This element take into account to other sub-components that are often mentioned in most of these authors reviews:

- **Habituation**; which is the reduction of attention to a stimulus if its use is repeated (Redden 2014).
- Adaptation; which is a decrease of sensory intensity of an experience, as it deviate less of a referent that rise when faced with recent exposures. (Galak, Kruger & Lowenstein 2012, Galak, Redden & Kruger 2009, Redden 2008, Redden 2014). However, this last factor seems less significant for experiences that it is for goods such as food for example. (Redden 2014)
- Inaccurate or underestimated effect of the pace of consumption over satiation: further research shows that people are often unaware of the effect of satiation, or simply don't act to oppose to its effect it in terms of their product consumption. It comes from the fact that they cannot identify to which extent a longer inter-consumption interval could reduce satiation. It is possible for long periods of time, however the effect is more unclear for smaller ones. One of the consequences of this variable is that people tend to rather choose variety for future consumption over that for the current one, inducing an effect which is called the "diversification bias". (Galak, Kruger & Lowenstein 2012).
- **Melioration**: Melioration is the fact that, when a user faces a choice, he'll tend to ignore or underestimate the effects of the current choice over the value of future options (Galak, Kruger

& Lowenstein – 2012). This effect can be opposed to maximization, as neglecting future options often lead to a lesser utility level. (Herrnstein, Lowenstein, Prelec & Vaughan - 1993). In fact, it leads people to consume more rapidly than they should, and thus induce satiation.

These effects, mentioned in different studies, can be easily considered as part of the same component since they rely mostly on consumers' perceptions over their consumption.

A.3) Reflective Component

For these following elements, you'll notice that they mainly focus on the customer cognitive aspects and thinking process. Three of them can be considered as having an impact on satiation:

- Recalling past consumption: If people are in a condition where they think about past consumption, then they will satiate more, as they'll get the impression to get or to do the same thing over and over again. The inverse phenomenon is also true, as people that are less reminded of past consumption or having less memory of it, as they'll infer that they consumed less than in reality. Being distracted during consumption will also induce a reduced effect of satiation, as people will have less focus on their consumption level. (Redden 2014)
- Variety Amnesia: Variety Amnesia mean that people, while in the context of consumption of a material good or experience, would remind only about previous consumption of this item and "forget" the existence of other alternatives. (Galak, Redden & Kruger - 2009).

This potential variety amnesia could be an explanation to the "diversification bias" described by Galak, Kruger & Lowenstein, as it was what would induce the effect of an underestimation of the effect of consumption pace over satiation. Indeed, not thinking about variety for present consumption could explain this "preference" for future variety and the auto-satiation inflicted by people. (Galak, Kruger & Lowenstein – 2012)

Recalling past variety: Variety can be perceived as a way to overcome satiation. It can be perceived as a solution (Galak, Kruger & Lowenstein – 2012), but also as a logical consequence of it (McAlister – 1982, Yu & Lang - 2017). However, it isn't necessarily something that should be considered as negative to a managerial point of view, because it also leaves doors opened to potential solutions to overcome the effects of satiation.

In a study realized by Galak, Redden & Krueger, it was proven through several researches and experiences about several stimuli and items that satiation could be reduced with a simple mind technique consisting of recalling past variety after (or even before to some extent) feeling satiated with any kind of consumption experience. These can be either physiological

(Experienced here with food), or not (Music, meeting with friends ...). The obtained results were overall quite consistent over the several studies done by these researchers, and can be easily done through the use of a "virtual" reminder, as it was done during these experiences. (Galak, Redden & Kruger - 2009).

The reduction of satiation level resulting in a reminder or past consumption seems to work in every case, but it still requires several conditions that must be met to insure its effects:

- □ *The recalled items must have been already consumed in the past*: It was observed, for example, in the study about satiation during friend meetings: the effect of satiation reduction could be observed for people already met a few weeks ago, not with celebrities.
- □ *The recalled items must be linked with the satiated item to some extent*: In the second study about satiation in music listening experience, it was shown that the effect was present only when the recalled experience was also related to listening music.
- □ *The observed effect of satiation drop only apply for the satiated item*: It doesn't take place for a whole category of stimuli.

In every case experience, it was observed that while satiation can be reduced over time, the effect is not instantaneous, meaning that their level of appreciation toward the stimuli doesn't come back at his initial level before a more or less long amount of time without consuming it. Since satiation is mentioned as being *"a fluid and contextual phenomenon"* (Galak, Redden & Kruger - 2009), it seems it is also quite logical that it would also be gradual and vary over time and through the help of moderators such as this one.

An important aspect that must be mentioned is that, in the context of this research, the goal was to find a way to recover from satiation after it is faced, and not to prevent it, as it was done in most previous studies. But still, recalling past consumption before consuming an item could still have a preventing impact (Galak, Redden & Kruger - 2009).

It is one of the few mind techniques that could be used against these psychological factors, since the insertion of a "virtual" reminder of past variety to the consumer mind would in fact, generate an opposite reaction to Variety Amnesia, by reducing satiety or, as the researchers said, *"increase satiation recovery"*. In our current context with gamification, it could therefore give us some keys to prevent satiation in a pre-consumption phase or recover from it more rapidly after satiation has occurred.

B) Consumer's characteristics

This factor should be considered separately from the first one, since the observation that were and could be done here depends on the consumer himself and in group of similar people (In segment, to stay in the managerial lingo). Here again, considering the dimensions shown, little can be done to enhance or reduce the effects of satiation. However, unlike with the psychological factors, since these characteristics can be shared or not between several consumers, a simple "segmentation \rightarrow targeting \rightarrow positioning" method could overcome this aspect, in order to only target customers that are less likely to satiate early. But even then, this method seems to remain quite limited at a first glance...

For this particular aspect, several aspects can be also considered:

B.1) Socio-demographics

The only mention of a role played by such a component is about age (Redden - 2014), as it was proven that the more people tend to getting older, the less easily they satiate. However, we can also consider other possible variables, such as gender, occupation and so on, in order to track down other potential effects.

B.2) Inherent preferences

This aspect covers several variables used by McAlister in his "Dynamic Attribute Satiation" model, based on an experiment of consumption, in that case, of sodas.

The several sodas used for his experiment were rated and measured thanks to two attributes: the level of caffeine and fruit flavor (each different for every soda) that are "inventoried" and that can drop over time, meaning that these rated attributes increase depending on the chosen soda, and decrease depending on a time period (here, the chosen hypothesis was that half of the attribute effect disappear each day).

The noticed effect is that, when an attribute (In this case, caffeine level) is at his highest level, reaching a "ideal point", the subject will rather choose a drink with much less caffeine in it (In the experiment, 7-UP), while on the other hand if an attribute is very low, he'll rather choose a drink that have a high level of this lacking attribute (In this case, Coca-Cola). The model, build with this experience and called DAS (Dynamic Attribute Satiation), is the following:

$$DAS_{Tk} = \sum_{j=1}^{J} P_{Tkj},$$

With $P_{Tkj} = w_j * (I_{Tj} + X_{kj}) - X\lambda^2(-1)$ and where $I_{Tj} = \sum_{t=1}^T \lambda_j^{T-1} X_{kj}$

This model relies on several variables:

- \Box *DAS_{Tk}*: preference for item k at time T assigned by this model
- \Box *J* : number of attributes describing the compared items
- \Box P_{Tkj} : contribution of an attribute j to the satisfaction level as a consequence of consuming an item k at time T
- \Box w_j : Importance weight of an attribute, which is a degree of disutility for the subject with being a certain given number of units from its ideal level.
- \Box I_{Tj} : Inventory of an attribute j at time t
- $\Box X_{ki}$: Level of an attribute j for the item k
- \Box λ_I : Inventory retention rate for an attribute j
- □ Ideal points: optimal level for the inventory of an attribute to the eyes of the subject.

In his study, McAlister compared this model with other where the notion of an "inventory" of attribute were not present and noticed the presence of a bias in the estimation of the ideal point by consumers (McAlister – 1982). This inventory will of course depends on of past consumption.

This experiment tend to prove that a pattern exist in consumption, depending on past consumption. The consumer tend to switch brands or rather choose a substitute products if his level of an inventoried attribute reach the ideal point (McAlister – 1982). To make it clearer, in his example, if a soda is rated according to the level of caffeine and fruity taste, and if a consumer reach the ideal point of caffeine level in his own opinion, he'll rather switch for another soda with a lesser level of soda and a bigger level of fruity taste. But the effect is also induced by the consumer preferences, which can be observed in the formula in the form of the importance weight given to an attribute (w_j)

These aspects can be linked with the homeostatic and reflective components as presented by Redden, since this "ideal point" can be considered as the internal set of value mentioned by Redden, and since only one day separate both consumption phases, the subject are able to recall their past consumption quite easily (Redden – 2014). However, it is considered as a separated effect here since the homeostatic component is a common rule to everybody, but the ideal point could differ from one consumer to another.

B.3) Attitudinal dimensions

This aspect englobe several elements such as:

- *Emotional clarity*: The fact that people can clearly distinguish the positive effect of consumption from the negative impact of satiation resulted from repeated consumption can reduce this negative effect (Redden 2014)
- Self-control and addiction: People who consider themselves as having a good sense of self-control pay more attention to the quantity of food they eat for example, and thus, are more likely to satiate earlier than other people (Redden 2014). To give a concrete example, when someone forces himself to follow a strict diet, he'll feel more the effect of satiation than other people.

However, it is true the other way round as well. A failure, or lack, of self-control can be the possible consequences of two driving forces opposing each-other:

- □ *Desire*, the drive of the user to feel pleasure right now (Galak, Kruger & Lowenstein 2012).
- □ *Willpower*, the fact of restraining himself from consuming for a better pleasure in the future (Galak, Kruger & Lowenstein 2012).

In this case, the first force overcome the second one, leading people to another result of consumption, which is mostly called "addiction"

Addictions can be considered as the opposite to satiation in this aspect that it would be another extreme result where, instead of dropping consumption pace and satisfaction with a repeated consumption process, it would accelerate, creating an inertia in the choice of an item, rather than switching items. In this case, such a consumption pattern can lead to a kind of dependence to the item, which could be perceived as a kind of vicious cycle, as people that can't control their consumption to the extent of reaching such a state are less likely to be able to stop themselves from consuming (Redden - 2014). Therefore, in this case, satiation is almost, if not totally, non-existent; the user would willingly, even if not consciously, go beyond the "ideal point" as shown in the DAS model by McAlister, up to the point that he would rather reach intoxication.

A failure in self-control can itself impact the vicious effect that can apply for example to obesity (Redden – 2014) or video games dependence (Dong, Wang, Du & Patenza - 2017, King, Herd & Delfabro - 2017, Yu & Lang - 2017). But even if addiction and satiation can be both mutually

opposite outcomes to consumption, addiction case are most likely exceptional while satiation is quite the common rule. As such, we'll mention it more like a possible parameter working against satiation, like some authors (Redden - 2014, Yu & Lang - 2017) rather than a possible outcome to consumption.

C) Item's characteristics

Obviously this factor is, by itself, dependent on the consumed item. The big difference with the two previous factors is that this one seems quite easy to influence, because it directly or indirectly depends on of the item himself and not of the consumer or empirical psychological rules. The possible way to avoid satiation would be then to design the item in such a way that satiation could be avoided, or at least reduced. In our current case, we could imagine that if gamification is applied and designed in a certain way, the effect of satiation could be reduced, if not completely overcome.

The several dimensions it incorporates are the following:

C.1) The consumed item

These several sub-components are mostly related to the item itself, and can englobe several things

- *Consumption outcome*: It would describe the quality of the experience around a certain context of consumption.

It was one of the several aspects analyzed by Yu and Lang in 2017 concerning their study about variety seeking in context of online video games. According to these authors, when the consumption experience is positive (For example, they earned lots of points in a particular map), they will remain on the same map or simply choose a similar map the next time (thus, a map with similar attributes), while on the other hand if their experience was negative, they would rather choose a totally different map during their next game. As such, people who have a positive consumption outcome are less likely to satiate than those with a negative outcome, that are more likely to satiate and show signs of variety seeking attitude, because they will seek for the same attribute they enjoyed from their previous consumption. As previously mentioned, in the most extreme situation, it can even lead to some forms of addictions, as it was the case for some people in their experience (Yu & Lang- 2017).

- The item's attributes: This subcomponent was mentioned in McAlister study as one of the several influencers of satiation. To be more intelligible, attributes can refer to the items characteristics such as color, flavor, design and so on (McAlister - 1982, Yu & Lang - 2017).

Attributes are what can define items and make them similar or different. Combined with individual preferences, they are what can define the Dynamic Attribute satiation (McAlister - 1982) and thus the probability of switching (Yu & Lang - 2017).

- *Categorization level:* The possibility and presence of a certain categorization level in a consumption process can reduce the pace of satiation. Indeed, people tend to satiate more on the aspects they used to categorize a consumption episode, especially if these items share common attributes. In a previous study, it was demonstrated that people can enjoy more a consumption sequence if they subcategorize the episodes, which is called the "specificity effect", and therefore, can reduce the pace of satiation. This effect occurs because, when people focus on details that differentiate the episodes of consumption, they perceive less repetition.

This effect can be even easier to observe and apply depending on of the user's degree of expertise. With wines for example, a common consumer will satiate easily, regardless of the type of wine he drinks, while on the other hand, an expert will be able to switch from one type of wine to another (For example, from a St. Amour to a Pinot Noir) to avoid satiation. This expertise can come over time thanks to repeated consumption

This strategy can be used in marketing by sub categorizing product (Create labels, narrowly define groups of product on stores shelves, and so on) in order to reduce the pace of satiation. (Redden - 2008)

Inventory: Already mentioned in a previous part, the "Inventory" is considered as a kind of retention of a specific attribute resulting from past consumption of a particular item. This aspect can also be linked with the consumer characteristic but is directly linked with the item is the inventory from previous consumption, since they are related for one item or attribute in particular (McAlister - 1982).

C.2) Alternatives to current consumption

While the previous component focused mostly about the consumed item itself, this one will focus about its possible alternatives, given these following sub-components:

Presence & ability to consume alternatives: Even if until then, no real article about satiation seems to mention it, it seems obvious that the presence of an alternative is firstly the presence of an alternative. It means that if consumer's doesn't have any other alternatives or are forced to consume the item regardless of their will, it could have an impact over the satiation effect

that has to be analyzed (Mollick & Rothbard - 2014). This will be further discussed in the gamification literature review section.

Similarity in attributes: Also, similarity in attributes was shown as a dimension that can have an impact on satiation before consumption and as a recovery mean. In Yu & Lang model, it was used in order to compare items as being similar (The fact that in a video games, two level share some common traits with each other). In case of a positive consumption experience, it could induce inertia thanks to a drop (or total absence in case of an addiction) of satiation effect. It is true the other way round as well (Yu & Lang - 2017).

C.3) Consumption context

Here, the focus is about the consumption context, such as the timing and pace related to the consumed item, but also the number of people required to consume the item. From the several studies, these are the following sub-components that can potentially influence satiation:

- Previous consumption: First of all, the fact that the item was consumed previously in the past has an indirect and neutral impact : first, it will increase the current inventory and thus, induce satiation, but also it can be a very useful asset in order to recall past variety and thus decrease satiation (McAlister - 1982, Yu & Lang - 2017).
- *Time between two consumption phases*: Also, time between two consumption phases give time for recovery and also decrease the rate of satiation. As such, the longest is the recovery time, the more satiation decrease. This variable itself depends on self-control, melioration and the estimation of the consumption pace over satiation, that were previously explained (Galak, Redden & Kruger 2009).
- *Required time for consumption*: It wasn't clearly mentioned as a component of satiation in itself, but it could be interesting to also have a look at the effect of the required time to consume the item, or the length of the consumption phase, in order to see if any effect can occur on satisfaction and satisfaction rate.
- *Solo or group consumption*: Most literature about satiation mainly focus of consumption made by one person, but little was done about context where multiple people consume the same item.

In a study realized by Barghave, Montgomery and Redden, in 2018, another aspect of consumption was explored: the context, in terms of number of user consuming the same item. This case mainly apply to experiences, such as board games, online mobile games or others.

While past studies showed that co-experiencing affect the perception of a particular stimulus, in fact, a shared experience (and attention of this particular experience) would tend to intensify the experience of a person's stimulus. However, little was known about the effect of satiation on future shared consumption in this context.

Through their study and experiences, these authors demonstrated and confirmed several hypotheses. These can apply whatever the stimulus is; auditory (Listening to a music), visual (watching a movie, a picture), or even gustatory (eating candies with friends).

- In a context of collective experience, satiation would tend to be amplified, whatever if there is a way of communication between users or not. This can be explained because since, in a context of shared attention, people will not only think about the repetition of their own tasks, but also the ones of the others sharing the same experience. This repetition seems then more present, and in the end, haste the satiation effect (Barghave, Montgomery & Redden 2018).
- This effect is also mediate by the salience of repetition over the collective satiation effect. It means that the more the experience is repeated by others, and thus induce satiation, the more the rate of satiation will be increased for the user (Barghave, Montgomery & Redden - 2018).

D) Consequences of satiation

As mentioned in the definition, a global effect of satiation is a decrease of satisfaction after consuming an item, whatever if it is physical or experiential. This drop of satisfaction can itself generate two possible reaction from the consumer:

D.1) Drop of consumption pace

At this stage, it is quite obvious that as soon as satiation occur, the "state of balance", as mentioned earlier is reached. Therefore, further consumption cannot bring anymore satisfaction and is therefore, a useless effort to the consumer. He would have to wait for some time before it's satiation level drops to consume further to bring some satisfaction (Redden – 2014).

D.2) Variety-seeking behavior

Probably the most notable effect described in literature, an often-suggested way to avoid nondesirable satiation is to switch for other products or brands, in case of consumer goods (McAlister – 1982), but also for experiences such as listening music or playing video games (Galak, Kruger & Lowenstein – 2013).

The closest reference about satiation in the online gaming industry, as well as about the variety seeking attitude was done in research by Yu and Lang in 2017, even if the focus was mostly made on consumption outcome and variety-seeking rather than satiation in itself. This research concluded with an interesting outcome that can help in this research : a positive consumption outcome can lead to inertial preference, meaning that instead of showing variety-seeking attitude, the user or consumer will stick to his current choice, or choices that shares similar attributes with his initial one, while on the other hand, a negative consumption outcome would lead to variety-seeking attitude.

Variety seeking can also be generated for these reasons mentioned in previous researches:

- **External factors:** Marketing decision taken by companies, such as price promotions suggested to the consumer (Khan, 2015) :
- Satiation on products/experiences (Khan, 2015) which is our current research topic.
- Exploration of different options to avoid future preferences uncertainties: (Khan, 2015) :

Their hypothesis was tested through the experience of online video game players. In case of poor outcome from the playing session, they would tend to switch to other maps in the game with different attributes than the previous one. In case of good quality of experience however, they would tend to remain on the same map over and over again, showing rather inertia than variety seeking (Yu & Lang - 2017).

The model developed for this research is the following:

$$P_{j|j} = \frac{exp \{\beta x_j\}}{\sum_k exp\{\beta x_k \text{ VS } d_{ki}\}} \rightarrow \text{Probability of repeating the choice of option j}$$

$$P_{j|k} = \frac{exp \{\beta x_j\}}{\sum_k exp\{\beta x_k \text{ VS } d_{ki}\}} \rightarrow \text{Probability of switching from option j to option i}$$

With:

 $VS[t] = y_0 + y_1 Log(t) + y_2 Satiation [t - 1] + y_3 Outcome [t - 1] \rightarrow Variety seeking parameter$

Satiation $[t] = \sum I_{n,j} s_n[t] \rightarrow \text{Satiation effect formula}$

And where $s_n =$

 $\lambda s_n[t-1] + 1 \rightarrow \text{if attribute n is experienced at t-1 and}$

 $\lambda s_n[t-1]$ in other cases.

This model depends on several variables :

- *i* : choice of map at time t-1
- *j* : choice of map at time t
- VS : variety seeking parameter, ∈ [-∞;+∞], positive when the player is variety seeking and negative otherwise.
- d_{ij} : distance between the previous choice i and current choice j
- s_n : Satiation effect for each attribute n
- $\hat{\lambda}$: Factor of satiation reduction
- $I_{n,i}$: Weight of the attribute, supposed identical for each attribute.

According to the authors, this model can also apply to other kinds of experiences, (Watching movies on Netflix or dining at restaurants), and can also explain brand loyalty in general. Thus, we could infer that a similar pattern could be observed in the context of gamification.

Their observations were mostly observed in their experience, but one was quite different from expected : in fact, satiation had a negative impact in this model, meaning that the more player experienced the same attribute, the more they were willing to meet them again by playing the same map or similar ones in terms of attribute, resulting thus mostly in a habituation or even addiction effect, rather than satiation (Yu & Lang - 2017).

However, no real information is given about how such an observation occurred : it could come from the sample itself, the context (online video game) or another element. So we can't be sure such an observation could be done about satiation in a gamification context.

E) Last comments about satiation

These scholar articles were mostly giving a general insight about how satiation work and the possible variables that can be taken into account in such a model. However, the focus was mostly on products and material goods, and little on experiences. However, thanks several of these studies, we know that the satiation effect can apply to every kind of consumption context, and also to experiences in particular. However, some effects are stronger or easier to measure when we are in

context of material goods, such as the homeostatic component (Redden -2014). Indeed, this "optimal level" of consumption can be easily considered with food or drinks, but is way less easy to demonstrate or quantify with experiences. But this effect is still considered nevertheless.

But the fact that not much previous research were done about experiences and none about satiation doesn't mean that satiation could not be present : Since satiation is always linked with a consumption context, we can be pretty sure it could exist in the context of gamification, since it is, to some extent, a consumption in an experiential context. Also, gaming itself can also induce satiation (Galak, Kruger & Lowenstein – 2012, Yu & Lang, 2017).

We have also previously mentioned that a common response suggested in previous reviews is to bring variety to reduce the impact of satiation. However, the goal of this thesis is to avoid people to switch to other alternatives, thus variety-seeking attitude could be perceived as a threat, as it could induce people to seek to other alternatives to gamification, and such changes in a company strategy would, induce costs.

II.1.2) Components of gamification

After a better understanding of the satiation phenomenon, the following part will mention several components of gamification that can be linked with the previous components of satiation, in order to have an insight of which ones could induce or reduce the effects or pace of satiation.

A) Cooperative VS Competitive gamification

One of the several aspects mentioned in literature is a common trait between gaming and gamification, which is the fact that a gamified context can be either cooperative, competitive or coopetitive.

A.1) Competition

In this context, each people act against each other to reach their own goal. By putting people in situations of contest, competition seems to be efficient, but also rely on the fact that one (or several) users would be winners while on the other hand, other would be losers. Indeed, the motivation of winning would have a positive impact on the user's results, since in this case, their participation would be stimulated and would lead them to do their best to provide a certain quality in order to compete with each other (Leclerq - 2018).

A.2) Cooperation

In this context, users act together to reach a common goal. This mechanism is considered as fairly potent to create social bonds between users (What is referred as "people fun"). In this case, the drive for users will be mostly linked with the application final objective and the opportunity to they have to build a community mindset around their interests (Leclerq - 2018).

A.3) Coopetition

Coopetition is a kind of hybrid form of cooperation and competition; in this case, there is a collaboration between competitor users, in the hope of a mutually beneficial result. Thus, the goal here will be a mix of both cooperation and competitions objectives in the mind of users (Leclerq - 2018).

Considering what we have previously mentioned about satiation, we can consider that a competitive gamification application would work as a solo consumer experience, while a cooperation or coopetition gamification application would be considered as a group experience (Barghave, Montgomery & Redden - 2018). As such, we can expect that the previously described effects of satiation in a context of a group would therefore impact gamification applications following a cooperative design. Since group consumption tends to increase satiation, we can expect that users will tend to satiate faster with a cooperative gamification initiative.

But another aspect has to be taken into account on this particular aspect : as presented in Leclerq study and interviews with actors on the field, the efficiency of a gamified platform will also depend of the users profile (Leclerq - 2018). Therefore, it means that we have to determine in which case gamification will be the most salient, but also which user profile is the most prone to satiate easily.

B) Gamification: mandatory fun & consent

As previously mentioned in our literature review about satiation, one of the particular suspected aspect that could influence the effect of satiation is the lack of alternative, which can take place:

- If there is a lack of alternatives in terms of choices.
- When the item is only available for a short (Sevilla & Redden, 2014)
- If the consumption of a particular item or experience is imposed by some acknowledged authority.

In the case of gamification in the context of internal platform in a company, it can be defined as a management-imposed game to the employees in order to improve their affective experience, or "fun" at work, in order to motivate them in their everyday tasks at the workplace. Overall, it seems that consent moderate the relationship between gamification and it's result, and the more the gamified application is consented, the more it increases the positive affect at work, and vice-versa.

In the case of gamification, this concept seems quite paradoxical, since the nature of the game itself is to offer "fun" to the user, while on the other hand, the fact that the gamified experience is imposed to employees generate an opposite effect. Therefore, it seems important that employees voluntarily consent to participate in the gamified platform, since gamification is, in comparison with other work games, not driven by employees themselves. So overall, the paradox comes from the fact that gamification is "top-down" rather than "bottom-up".

The concept of consent is described by Mollick & Rothbard as composed of three elements:

- A clear understanding of the rules of the gamified platform : As in games themselves, rules are present and their understanding is key for the employees to consent to them.
- A perceived sense of justice and fairness in the gamified platform : This perception is required about the managerial initiative in itself, but also required during the whole process of the gamified platform.
- An active engagement: Engagement is defined there as going from the mere attention of the employees up to active participation. In this case, since the game is imposed by the management, employees have to cooperate with this initiative, as their participation would not be predisposed like in "bottom-up" initiatives.

Several hypotheses were mentioned and tested through this study.

- First and foremost, consent act as a moderator between gamification and the employee positive affect. It was supposed that, people who consent to the game, gamification does improve employee positive affect and vice-versa (Mollick & Rothbard 2014).
- Similarly, consent moderates the relationship between gamification and employees performance. As such, consent is key for the gamification to generate a better performance in work tasks (Mollick & Rothbard 2014).
- Also, it is supposed that a greater gameplay experience outside of work increases the probability that employees will consent the gamified platform, since if they are used to games will accept them more easily (Mollick & Rothbard 2014).

 Finally, giving people enough influence about the games they chose to play increases their likelihood to consent (Mollick & Rothbard - 2014).

Another study goes in the same direction through the concept of "Hierarchy of player's needs". Similar to the Maslow model of needs, previous researchers have analyzed the hierarchy of needs for players. Moreover, the safety, belongingness and esteem needs are common in both models. But other elements are integrated in this one.

As previously mentioned, the presence of rules and the understanding of them is key for a game to be effective, as it is a key element to consent for the participation to the gaming experience.



The aesthetic needs is mostly about the appeal for good graphics and visual effects, which could be displayed, in the gamification context,

to colors on dashboards, design of badges and so on. Finally, the self-actualization is the will for the user to feel in control, and able to do as he sees fit while keeping concern about the rules (Siang & Mao, 2003).

It is an important element to take into account, since a lack of consent could potentially lead to a failure in a gamification platform implementation, design and meeting objectives. Indeed, the lack of consent could lead to a bad cooperation from employees and therefore, impact the results at the end. This result would come from the fact that the work in itself would be perceived as poorly remunerated by the employees. The suggested way to avoid it is to provide employees with a control over the choice of the game experience and a certain legitimacy behind this managerial initiative (Mollick & Rothbard - 2014).

Therefore, what could be suspected is that, if a game is imposed by managers rather than freely chosen or consent by employees, the overall experience would be rather negative and thus, induce satiation.

C) Gamification & variety

Probably the most mentioned solution, variety, in terms such as "variety-seeking attitudes", "recalling past variety", "variety amnesia" or "alternatives", is an unavoidable variable that we have to take into account to avoid or at least reduce satiation pace. As such, it seems necessary to analyze which kind of variety gamification can provide in its several dimensions.

However, we have to remind that gamification is about creation, meaning that it have to be the development of a new environment with its roots in game mechanics, but also in the existing environment (Jacobs, 2013). As such, managers would not implement gamification and add variety without having to take into account the fact that the expected result meet its objectives, because adding variety will induce some costs.

C.1) Variety in reward mechanics

The principle of variety can be applied to game mechanics, such as the task where gamification is applied (Is it in a B2B, B2C or internal to the company context ?) or rewards. We can mention a few of them: Points, Badges, Leaderboards (Also known as PBL), but also Levels, Scores, Tokens and so on.

These rewards can be classified in several types (Richter, Raban & Rafaeli - 2015):

- **Ownership**: Points, tokens and badges. These are earned and accumulated by the user.
- Achievements: A representation of an accomplishment made by the user.
- **Status**: The display of a rank or level. A higher rank is a proof of an overall better performance.
- **Collaboration:** These are challenges that can be resolved by several users collaborating in the realization of a particular task.

C.2) Effects of rewards on motivation

We have to remind that gamification isn't only about these rewards, but mostly about the positive psychological outcome, in order to improve the global experience. To have a better understanding of the effect of this collection of rewards, we have to get a better insight of how these rewards work in the mind of customers.

First, the purpose of these reward will depend of the situation where it is applied:

- In the case of a gamification platform inside a company, the goal will be to provide a reduction of fatigue, boredom, or spending time to the employees with, in return, an increase in their engagement toward their company (Navarro- 2018).
- In the case of a gamification platform in a B2C (and to some extent B2B situation²), the aim of this initiative will be a co-creation process between the company and its customers, by

² My previous internship place, Contineo Labs, intend to implement such an application in order to increase their customers' engagement by providing them an increase in reputation through a given "title", as a reward for their collaboration in data exchanges with Contineo.

providing them with recognition and a positive experience through these rewards with, in return, an increase in their engagement (Leclerq -2017).

Several other effects can be mentioned, such as repeat usage of the platform through the use of reward incentives, increase contributions (Co-creation, or engagement at work), and establish user reputations by granting them a certain status. But people can have some differences in what they consider as rewarding, depending on their intrinsic needs, values and goals : people who take interest in comparing themselves to other users will mostly fancy leaderboards, while people who are giving importance to a certain status and others recognition will take interest in levels and ranks. Collectible elements such as points and tokens and achievements will have effects on several elements; gaining recognition from others, reminding past achievements, and so on (Richter, Raban & Rafaeli - 2015, See Appendix I for more information). This can be linked with what we've seen in our review about satiation, as an item (in this case, the reward) can have different attributes weight, which is one of the components of users preferences.

So, for this variable, we have to determine if, as we have seen in the literature review about satiation, this variety of reward mechanics in a gamification program can reduce satiation by adding several types of the rewards with different attributes linked to them.

II.2) Model

Now that satiation is clearly defined on most of its components, and that we have a clear idea of which components of gamification can have an impact on satiation pace, we can make several assumptions:

- H1: Users tend to satiate more and faster if they are in a context of cooperation than in a context of competition, as it is a consumption of a gamified experience in group.

Thanks to our literature review about satiation, we know that people tend to satiate faster in a context of group consumption than in a solo consumption context. Concretely, we can expect that when the one of the users reach his limit in his own consumption, other people will tend to follow him and will see their own satiation rate increase, as the mere fact of imagining someone else in the group consuming repeatedly the same item will make them satiate faster. On the other hand, in a context of competitive gamification, a user will be against one or more users and therefore, will tend to satiate less.

- H2: The more a gamification program include different kinds of rewards, the less people tend to satiate about the gamification program and the more they are engaged in it.

As previously mentioned, variety can be used to reduce satiation pace or increase its recovery. If a gamification platform include different types of reward (such as badges, tokens, levels, achievements and so on), people will tend to satiate less than if only one kind of reward is proposed.



CHAPTER III: RESEARCH DESIGN

III.1) Methodology

In order to confirm or disprove these three hypotheses, two methods will be used in this research : experimentations for testing H1 and H2. .The use of experimentations method is quite obvious, since it's the main tool used in literature about satiation, and it will be necessary in order to verify something for which no previous literature cover directly..

The ultimate goal of this methodology would be to collect observation and post-experimentation surveys in order to analyze them

III.1.1) H1 experimentation

The design here would be pretty simple : since it will mostly be a qualitative research, it would require mostly groups of minimum 30 people per context. The goal here will be to determine if cooperation leads to an accelerated satiation pace or not As such, two groups will be required : one where people are in a situation of competition (One-on-one), and the other where they will need to work in group to win (Group-VS-Group).

In order to make sure that no other element could impact the research, it would be required that both group participate in the same experiment, which would be in this case a gamified application. The one chose for this experiment will be "Submit your idea" (<u>https://ideas.starbucks.com/</u>), where people can suggest ideas to Starbucks about their product, service, delivery and so on. The idea itself can be about a fresh new offer, improving an existing offer or simply bringing back an offer that isn't applied anymore.

The main advantage of this application is that it's already a gamified app, with all the codes commonly used in gamification. As such, it requires only a little more implementations of mechanics for this study.

The experiment will be done during a period of 10 days, in order to collect enough people and also to make sure that an effect can be observed at the end of the study. There are 3 groups in which data will be collected:

- *A control group*, in which people simply do the experiment without any incentive or further implementation. The results of the two other groups will be compared to this one.
- *A competitive group*, where people compete against each other. Each suggested idea will give the user 100 points, and the one which gives the more idea is the one who win the contest. A ranking of all participants in this group will be done at the end of the experiment.
- *A cooperative group*, where people can also win 100 points per suggestion, but these points are pooled and communicated to all users at the end of the study.

However, except for this game mechanics, no other difference will be done in the organization of the experiment, in order to make sure to isolate the effects of cooperation/competition. After suggesting an idea, each participant will have to answer to a little survey in order to have an insight of their enjoyment and appreciation of the game.

For this experiment, the sampling was done by the users themselves, since they had the choice of the kind of experiment they were willing to participate. As consent was previously mentioned as a key element in gamification, it seemed to be a good idea to leave the choice to the user himself, even though there was a risk of potential bias. The fact of participating to one experience or another gives more liberty to participants, which is a good way to induce engagement (Mollick & Rothbard - 2014)

III.1.2) H2 experimentation

The design here would also be quite simple, but yet a bit different from the first hypothesis. In this case, what we have to find out is the link between variety in rewards and satiation.

In order to determine this, we would have to organize a gamified experiment with participants, as with did for the first hypothesis. Here, we'll use an experiment that was used in the past, called "Do Us A Flavor", by Lays

(https://digital.hbs.edu/platform-digit/submission/crowdsourcing-your-next-chip-flavor-lays-dous-a-flavor-campaign/).

The objective is pretty simple: suggest a new chips flavor in order to win a prize. Here however, for the sake of this study, we'll adapt the context and the way the context works. Here, people can suggest as many possible new flavor as they want, and for each suggestion, they'll earn a reward (Except in the control group of course).

The contest had already be proven useful in terms of customer engagement, as such, it'll be quite easy to expect an impact on engagement. Also, as with the first study, the design here is very simple and redundant, as such, measuring satiation will be quite easy too. The size of the sample would need to be the same, around 30 participants per context. However, since we are not simply comparing two opposite situations, in this case, we need three groups : one where after each session, a different reward is given (For example, first a badge, then a feedback, then a certain number of points, then a token, ...), another where only one kind of reward is given (Only a feedback dashboard for example), and a last one, a control group, where no reward are given between session. The need of a control group is necessary in order to make sure if the presence of a reward have at least an impact on satiation and the engagement. The difference between the two remaining groups will just make a difference in variety of rewards, to make sure if it has an impact on the pace of satiation and the level of engagement.

- *A control group*, in which people simply do the experiment without any incentive or type of reward. The results of the two other groups will be compared to this one.
- *A non-variety group*, where people do the experiment with the incentive of a "fixed" reward (For example, only 100 points per participation, as in the first study)
- *A variety group*, where people do the experiment with the incentive of a "variable" reward (For example, points, token for some particular suggestions, dashboards and achievements).

Again, after the game session ad until a player decide to stop, data about their performance will be collected, and they'll have to respond to a survey, in order to gain some insight about their perceptions about their consumption outcome and other factors. The experiment will be done during a period of 10 days, in order to collect enough people and also to make sure that an effect can be observed at the end of the study.

One of the main difference with the previous study was that in this case, participants were attributed randomly in groups, depending on their birth month. This way of proceeding was more "academic", as it reduce the risk of potential bias. However, no real improvements over the first study were observed.

III.2) Measures

With both experiment, various questions were asked, each of them corresponding to one or more variables. All these elements will be analyzed through statistical analyzes in order to confirm or infirm these hypotheses.

III.2.1) H1 experimentation

Most of the time, satiation scales are used in the context of food. For example, one of them is a 7steps Likert scale going from "Very Hungry" to "Very Full" (Jönsso, Granfeldt, Erlanson-Albertsson & Ahrén, 2010). However, such a scale doesn't seem to fit with our experiment, since we are not analyzing satiation over a physical good such as food, but an experience. Also, measurements like the ones in the McAlister model are unfit for such an experiment, since there is no way to know its retention rate for each individual, to know the ideal point and so on.

But it is not the only way to know about it. Satiation is indeed quite complex to analyze, since it can be observed by several aspects of the experience, such as the time spent doing the experience, but also the satisfaction rating and also the comments done by the participants. Also, in order to see if several other variables such as age and gender have an impact, those aspects were asked to the participants during the survey. The four main measures are the following:

The satisfaction rating: Satiation can be perceived in a drop of enjoyment. As such, during the survey, participants are asked to rate their satisfaction toward the experience each time they repeat it. It is measured by an 11-step Likert scale, as it is the case with most perceptions measurements. In this case, the scale is indeed ordinal, but the distance between two points is always supposed as equal.

The number of step chosen was the highest possible by using Google Forms, in order to observe the smallest possible variations in satisfaction for each repeated experience, and to be able to measure the variation pace for each case with as much clarity as possible.

For this experiment, we can expect that the more an experiment is repeated, the more satisfaction will decrease.

- The number of suggestions made by the participants: To have an insight about satiation, we can also analyze the number of time the experience was willingly repeated by the 2 groups in the sample, and to compare it to the control group.
- **The timing and pace**: It was measured for each suggestion done during the experience, giving the idea of the total spent time during the experiment. If they spent more than 20 minutes without doing any suggestion, it is considered as an interruption, meaning that it could give them time to recover a bit from their previous satiation level.

- **Their justification**: Also, in order to know when they decide to stop the experience, each participant was asked to mention if they intent to suggest another idea after each suggestion. As soon as they answer "No", they have to justify why they decide to stop the experiment with a primary measurement scale. Three suggestion were possible to them, and they can choose more than one:
 - □ *They don't have any more idea to suggest*: They have exhausted all their resources and feel unable to find another idea.
 - □ *They find it boring or repetitive*: They stop the experience because they find it unsatisfactory after one or several playing sessions.
 - □ *Other suggestions*: Since other possibilities could be taken into account, they could decide to stop for another reason (They are busy doing something else or other reasons)

III.2.2) H2 experimentation

Here again, to remain coherent from one study to the other, the measure that will represent satiation will be the same that were previously analyzed, since most of them and seems to capture the concept of satiation quite well. But in this case, since we are in an experiment with rewards, it is necessary to also take a look at the level of engagement.

The issue with engagement is that it is a quite complex phenomenon that can be analyzed and observed with multiple kinds of scales, depending on of the kind of engagement we are talking about. However, in our case, we are not talking about customer engagement over a brand or a product, but engagement over the experiment, which is, in this case, a gamified experience.

The other tricky aspect of this study is that most engagement scales are multi-items, which makes the survey longer, an aspect that could itself induce more satiation. Because of this, two engagement scales are needed for this study : a shorter scale, which will focus on the invested resources for one particular experience, and a longer one, which will take into account all the benefits linked with the experiment and that will consider not only one particular session, but the whole experiment in itself.

- **The repeated engagement rating:** The scale used here is a condensed version of the scale presented by Kumar & Raghavendran, which is a measure used for engagement in context of gamification. This measure consists in 4 items rated in a 7-steps Likert scale, with questions

focusing on their will to share this experiment with other people and their will to suggest more ideas for the contest (Kumar & Raghavendran - 2015)

- The overall engagement rating: Such an engagement is similar to an employee engagement to his company, as it is the engagement toward an asked task. As such, previously used scaling for this case will be the ISA engagement learning. This multi-item scale focus mostly on three aspects, which are the intellectual, social and affective engagement (Soane, Truss, Alfes, Shantz, Gatenby & Rees - 2012). Another scale which is very similar but more general, is the customer engagement measure suggested by Vivek, Daleda & Morgan (Vivek, Daleda & Morgan - 2015).

So overall, the scale that will be used to measure the engagement in this study will be very similar to these two scales, but the questions will be adapted to the context of this experiment. Both scales focus on these three dimensions:

- □ Intellectual engagement / conscious attention (3 items): This measure focuses on the extent to which people are intellectually absorbed in their task, or think hard about it.
- Social engagement / social connection (3 items): In the ISA model, this measure focuses on the degree to which people feel socially connected to their company and share its values with their co-workers. However, the problem here is that in this case, people are not colleagues with each other and the experiment is not about teamwork, but only a solo experience.

But the other model also take into account the social engagement, and can, in this specific case, be modified to get an idea about their will to share the experiment with their friends and other people.

□ *Affective engagement / enthused participation (4 items):* This measure focuses on the extent to which people experience positive and motivating feelings about their task.

For each dimension of engagement, three questions are asked to respondents. Those items were measured on a 1-5 and 1-7 step Likert scale and the average score is calculated for the three items, giving us a score for each dimension. The overall engagement itself is the average of the three dimensions. In our case, since we will calculate the variation over the repeated experiences, we will use a 1-7 as we did for the satisfaction measurement.

- **The satiation effect:** Satiation will be measured the same way it was done with the first study, so we will use these several measurements:
 - □ *Number of repeated experiences:* This is again the number of suggestions made by the participants. This measure will be compared between the control group and the two other groups.
 - □ *The satisfaction rating:* There again, we'll ask respondents to rate their satisfaction score on a 1-7 Likert scale in order to analyze the variation of their satisfaction over time.
 - □ *The timing and pace*: Like in the first study, it was measured for each suggestion done during the experience, giving the idea of the total spent time during the experiment. If they spent more than 20 minutes without doing any suggestion, it is considered as an interruption, meaning that it could give them time to recover a bit from their previous satiation level.
 - □ *Their estimated chances of winning the contest:* Another factor that can be taken into account is the perceived chances of winning of the users, in order to see if it has any effect on other variables.
 - □ *Their justification for stopping the experiment*: There again, they have several suggestions, like the boring/repetitive aspect of the experiment, the fact that they don't have any more suggestions, or other reasons.

CHAPTER IV: RESULTS

IV.1) H1 Experiment

IV.1.1) The sample

This experiment was done with 96 participants; 32 in the control group, 33 in the competitive group and 31 in the cooperative group. Two participants from the competitive and one from the control group were dropped because they were outliers. The participants had the choice of the group they were going in. Overall, the sample is mostly composed of individuals between 18 and 37 years old (90.63% of the sample), with a small majority of women (53,13%)

IV.1.2) Satisfaction rating

Satisfaction is one of the key elements of satiation, as it is based on an attitude toward the consumption process.

Comparing the average score for each group at each stage of the experiment (Which last 20 times at best). It can be seen that the average satisfaction score decreases over time with repetition, thus, confirming the general knowledge about satiation (See Appendix II for more information). Several variables linked with satisfaction, can show us several things.

- **Satisfaction rating at the first try**. It gives us information about the individuals first perception about their gamified experience in the different groups.
 - □ Descriptive statistics: First of all, when we compare their initial satisfaction level (after their first participation), we can see that overall, people from the competitive group are overall more satisfied of the experience than the average. We can observe an average rating of 8.13/10 for the control group, with a difference of +1.32 for the competitive group, and +0.48 for the control group. It means that, the simple fact of being immersed in the gamified context shows already a difference between the groups in terms of satisfaction toward the experience (See Appendix III for more information).



□ ANOVA analysis: An analysis of variance show that a difference of mean exists between those groups: this can be seen thanks to the P-value (0.33% < 5%) and the F-Value (F = 6.11 > F(2,90) = 3,098). As such, we could reject the hypothesis of equality in means.

However, this isn't enough to make sure where the difference is actually located. In order to have such information, we need to do a post-hoc test such as the Bonferroni-Dunn test, that gives a two-by-two comparison. This test shows that there is indeed a difference between the competitive group and the control group, but no other significant difference. (See Appendix IV for more information).

- □ *Linear regression:* However, when we look at the linear regression for the first-step satisfaction rating, with $\alpha < 5\%$, only the difference generated by the competitive group is significant (P-value = 0.08% < 5% for the competitive group, 20.96% > 5% for the cooperative group). As such, we can conclude that only the competitive game mechanic have a significant impact over the 1st playthrough satisfaction rating. The R² statistic show that this model can explain 6,60% of the variance in this model, which seems quite low at a first glance, but since this is a model with binary variable, it still has some explanatory power (See Appendix V for more information).
- Satisfaction APGR ("Average Periodic Growth Rate") :. The Average Periodic Growth Rate (APGR) over the whole experiment shows how much, on average, the satisfaction score drops from one playthrough to another.
 - Descriptive statistics: We can see that, on average the control group show a decrease of satisfaction of -18.56%, the competitive group show a decrease of -10.91% (+7,65%) and the cooperative group show a decrease of -16,03% (+2,53%). So overall, this decrease of the satisfaction pace over time during this experiment seems to be quite greatly reduced over time for the competitive group. (See Appendix VI for more information).



□ *ANOVA Analysis:* By doing an ANOVA analysis, we can confirm our initial thought and see that there is indeed a

difference of mean between the groups (P-value = 4,63% < 5%, F-Value = 3,18 > F(2,90) = 3,098). However, this doesn't give enough information to know where the difference

is. By doing a post-hoc test of Bonferroni, we can see that there is indeed a difference between the control and competitive group, however, the same cannot be said about the cooperative group. Therefore, we can conclude that there is a significant difference in the satisfaction APGR for a competitive group, but not for the cooperative one (See Appendix VII for more information).

- □ *Linear regression:* A linear regression summarize what we've seen in the previous analysis of variance, by showing that there is indeed a significant effect of the competitive group over the satisfaction APGR (P-value = 1.52% < 5%), but not for the cooperative group (P-value = 41.41% > 5%). The choice of group by itself can explain 6.60% of the variation of the satisfaction APGR, which is quite small, but not negligible (See Appendix VIII for more information).
- Average satisfaction score over the whole experience: These data would give us an idea about the global perception of their satisfaction for each step of the experiment.
 - ❑ Descriptive statistics: When we look at the descriptive stats, we can see that the average satisfaction score observed for the control group is 6.14/10 for the whole experiment, while it is 7.01/10 for the competitive group (+0.87), and 6.53/10 for the cooperative group (+0.39). It seems at the first glance that the competitive gamified experience generate a better satisfaction than the two other groups (See Appendix IX for more information).



- □ ANOVA Analysis: The analysis of variance show us that there is indeed a difference between the averages scores of the groups (P-value = 1.21% < 5%, F-value = 4,63 > F(2,90) = 3,098). The post-hoc test of Bonferroni show us a distinction between the control and competitive group, but doesn't gives us much information about the cooperative group (See Appendix X for more information).
- □ *Linear regression:* A linear regression summarize what we've seen in the previous analysis of variance, by showing that there is indeed a significant effect of the competitive group over the satisfaction average score (P-value = 0.32% < 5%), but not for the cooperative

group (P-value = 8.53% > 5%). The choice of group by itself can explain 9.34% of the variation of the satisfaction average score (See Appendix XI for more information).

By looking at the data, we can see that the competitive group is not only more satisfied at the beginning of the experiment, but also, their satisfaction rate decrease slower than with the control group and remain bigger over time on average. Since satisfaction is an important factor in the satiation process, we can interpret that this better satisfaction score means that their satiation pace is reduced in comparison with a cooperative gamified application. No conclusion can be said about the cooperative group, meaning that a cooperative gamified experience does not show any real difference in terms of satisfaction over the control group.

IV.1.3) Number of repeated experiences

The number of repeated experiences works as the behavioral aspect that demonstrate directly if a person satiate during the experiment or not. The same analysis done with satisfaction was done for this variable.

- **Descriptive statistics:** As expected, we can clearly see that the experiment is more repeated by the cooperative group than the two others : On average, for the control group, the experiment was repeated up to 3.90 times, while on the other hand it was repeated 8.39 times in the competitive group (+4.49) and 3.81 times in the cooperative group (-0.09). This difference with the competitive group is quite impressive, as the competitive group boast an impressive difference of 115.13% with the control group (See Appendix XII for more information).



- ANOVA analysis: An Analysis of variance analysis also show some

promising results. The single-factor ANOVA show that there is indeed a difference in mean between groups (P-value = 0% < 5%, F-value = 29,36 > F(2,90) = 3,098). The Bonferroni posthoc test make a clear distinction between the competitive group and the two other, but the same cannot be said about the cooperative and control groups (See Appendix XIII for more information).

- Linear regression: This summarizes the information given by the previous analyses : here again, the competitive group not only seems to show a higher number of repeated experiences

in comparison with the control group, but is also the only significant variable (P-value = 0% < 5% for the competitive group, 88,77% > 5% for the cooperative group). The subdivision of the sample in groups itself can explain 39,48% of the effect of the type of group over the number of repeated experiences, which is quite impressive (See Appendix XIV for more information).

This show us that, for this sample, it requires much more repeated experiences to reach satiation for the competitive group than for the others, which also confirm our initial hypothesis about a lower pace of satiation for the competitive group. No conclusion can be given for the cooperative group over the number of time that this experiment was repeated.

IV.1.4) Timing & pace

This variable was quite problematic and had to be modified for several reasons. The way those data were collected generated some problems, since the Google Form website only gives data for each time the survey was sent to the interviewer, but didn't give any information about the time when the experiment was actually started, therefore, generating a bias in the time needed to do the whole experiment (The estimated time was always shorter than in reality). This was somewhat troublesome, especially for respondents who only participated once or twice in the experiment, or for the ones who interrupted the experiment for some time and did it again later.

As such, the total time was re-estimated by adding once the average time per step for each individual, except for those who only participated once (Since the time given by Google form was 0). For those people, the estimation was the average time of their group.

- Descriptive statistics: When we take a look at the timing, we can see again that overall, in this sample, people from the competitive group remain longer in the experiment than the others (03:08 for the competitive group, 02:13 for the control group and 01:52 for the cooperative group). As such, it shows that they need more time before reaching satiation than others (See Appendix XV for more information).
- **ANOVA analysis:** The analysis of variance reveal us that there is indeed a difference between mean over the groups (P-value = 4,46% < 5%, F-value = 3,22 > F(2,90) = 3,098). The Bonferroni post-hoc test make a clear distinction between the competitive and cooperative test,

but unfortunately, it doesn't give any real information for both groups when we compare it to the control group, since its average time is between the two others (See Appendix XVI for more information).

Linear regression: The linear regression summarize what we've seen in the previous analysis. The competitive group is the only one that shows a significant difference with the control group (P-Value = 2,64% < 5%), while the other group shows, again, no significant effect (See Appendix XVII for more information).



Overall, it is not surprising to see that the estimation of the time shows

a higher result that the two other groups, since this variable is obviously highly correlated with the number of repeated playthrough (63,99%). But overall, it reinforces the confirmation of our initial hypothesis.

IV.1.5) Justifications for stopping the experiment

With such a repetitive experiment, satiation was something that has to be expected. But the reason why people stop doing the experiment can be explained by not only boredom (Mostly an emotional aspect), but also the fact of having no more idea to suggest (Which is a more cognitive) or other potential motives.

By doing logistic regressions to analyze and interpret the results, we can see that none of those dependent variables could be analyzed with the type of group as independent variables, since all P-values were way above 5%. As such, we can conclude that none of those justifications can explain difference between groups and therefore, since none of those variable has a significant impact. Therefore, those variables can't explain potential effects on satiation (See Appendix XVIII for more information).

IV.2) H2 Experiment

IV.2.1) The sample

Overall, 110 individuals have participated in this experiment. A total of 352 ideas of new tastes for potato chips were suggested.

This sample was a bit more complex to analyze, since some respondent have not finished the whole experiment. For those, some measure such as the global engagement rating, the global satisfaction

rating and some sociodemographic data were missing (around 12% of the sample). Nevertheless, at least 30 of them in each group have filled the experiment completely, meaning that there are enough significant data to run ANOVAs and linear regressions.

Another problem was the lack of repetition, especially in the control group and the group with non-variable rewards. It means that in most cases, for those groups, we had a satisfaction and engagement APGR of 0%, which can be quite problematic for some measures.

In order to solve those two problem, 14 observations were deleted of the sample, which are the ones who have not finished the whole survey. It also reduces the number of participant who didn't repeat the experiment, since 13 of those participant only played the game once.



Overall, the sample is mostly composed of individuals between 18 and 37 years old (76,47% of the sample), with a small majority of women (55,88%)

IV.2.2) Satisfaction rating

Like the first study, this one required a focus on the satisfaction rating for each step of the experiment. However, this time the result were a bit more inconsistent : even with an overall decrease of the satisfaction score over the repeated experiences (up to 36 times), we can still notice some little increase during some phases of the study (See Appendix XIX for more information).

Here again, several variables linked with satisfaction, were analyzed here.

- **Influence of short-term satisfaction over the global satisfaction:** Since we've measured the satisfaction rating for each participation and the global perceived satisfaction over the whole experience, we've to make sure of the relationship between those variables.

By doing the linear regression of the short-term satisfaction rating over the global satisfaction, we can clearly see the link between those two variables : one unit of short term satisfaction can increase the global satisfaction rating by 0.53 points. This result is significant (P-value = 0% < 5%) and the model can explain 30% of the variance in the global satisfaction rating, which is

quite impressive (See Appendix XXIX for more information). Therefore, this confirms the effect of short term relationship on long-term relationship.

- **Satisfaction rating at the first try**. As for the first study, this statistic gives us information about the individuals first perception about their gamified experience in the different groups.
 - □ Descriptive statistics: At a first glance, when we compare the initial satisfaction level (after their first participation) for each group, we can see that overall, people from both the non-variable reward and variable reward group seems more satisfied after their first playthrough. We can observe an average rating of 4.44/7 for the control group, with a difference of +1.03 points for the non-variable and +0,88 points for the variable group. It means that, the simple fact of being immersed in the gamified context shows already a difference between the groups in terms of satisfaction toward the experience. However, it is not enough to conclude anything



about the impact of variety in reward on this variable. (See Appendix XX for more information).

- ANOVA Analysis: An analysis of variance shows us that there is indeed a difference of mean between groups (P-value = 1.63% < 5%). However, the Bonferroni post-hoc test shows us quite surprising results, because the difference in mean is between the control group and non-variable reward group. Which means that in this case, there is indeed a group with a better satisfaction at the beginning, but it's the non-variable group, which seems quite contradictory with our hypothesis (See Appendix XXI for more information).</p>
- □ *Linear regression:* A linear regression summarize what we've seen in the previous analysis of variance, by showing that there is indeed a significant effect of the reward over the first-step satisfaction rating. Both P-values are below 5%, so we can assure that the presence of a reward mechanics have indeed a significant effect on the first-step satisfaction rating. (See Appendix XXII for more information).

- Satisfaction APGR ("Average Periodic Growth Rate") : As we have done during the first experiment, we can also analyze the satisfaction APGR for this study too.
 - ❑ Descriptive statistics: As with the previous variable, this one shows us also quite obvious results. The average rate for the control group was a decrease of -6,72% of the satisfaction rate, with a difference of +0,92 for the non-variable reward group and +3,40 for the variable reward group. At a first glance, we can be pretty sure that variety in reward play indeed a role in the decrease of satisfaction, however, we'll do further analysis to confirm or infirm this. (See Appendix XXIII for more information).



- ANOVA Analysis: An analysis of variance shows us that there
 is no real difference in the means between groups (P-value = 57.85% > 5%, F-value = 0.55
 < F(2;93) = 3.091). As such, we cannot see any significant difference in terms of satisfaction growth rate between groups. This is quite odd, considering the result we've observed in the descriptive statistic part (See Appendix XXIV for more information).
- □ *Linear regression:* A linear regression summarize what we've seen in the previous analysis of variance, by showing that those variables cannot explain the differences in means for the satisfaction APGR (Both P-values are above the limit of 5%). Plus, the R-square is almost non-existent (1%). As such, we can't conclude any effect of the presence nor variety in reward over the satisfaction APGR (See Appendix XXV for more information).
- □ Average satisfaction score over the whole experiment: Here again, this variable will give us an idea about the global perception of their satisfaction for each step of the experiment.
 - Descriptive statistics: The control group shows an average short-term satisfaction score of 4.20/7, with a variation of +0.96 points for the non-variable reward group and +0.73 points for the variable-reward group. This seems to indict an effect of the reward mechanics over this variable, but doesn't seem to show any real effect of variety over this satisfaction score, but this element will be covered by further analyses (See Appendix XXVI and Figure 11 for more information).
 - □ ANOVA Analysis: The ANOVA analysis shows that there is indeed a difference between groups in terms of means (P-value = 3.88% < 5%, F-value = 3.37 > F(2;93) = 3.091).

Unfortunately, as with the first variable, we also find that the difference is situated between the control group and the group with no variation in rewards, an observation that goes against our hypothesis (See Appendix XXVII for more information).

□ Linear regression: A linear regression summarize what we've seen in the previous analysis of variance, by showing that reward mechanics have indeed a significant effect over the average short-term satisfaction score in the case of an absence of variety in rewards (P-value = 1.55 < 5%). However, this effect is very debatable for the presence of variety in reward, as the P-value is slightly over the limit (5.67% > 5%) (See Appendix XXVIII for more information).

Overall, all the variables linked with the satisfaction aspect seems to be either insignificant or contradictory with our initial hypothesis. But since satisfaction only covers one part of the satiation mechanics, we will continue our analyze on other factors. These irregularities will be further explained and covered in further parts of this thesis.

IV.2.3) Number of repeated experiments

For this second experiment, we will also have a look at the number of repeated experiments for these three groups. Since it was maybe the most obvious and significant variable for the first study, we can expect that the results will be pretty similar to the ones in the first study.

- **Descriptive statistics:** As expected, we can clearly see that the experiment is more repeated by the group with variable rewards than the two others. On average, the experiment was repeated up to 1.44 times, with a difference of +0.59 for the non-variable reward group and +5.33 for the variable reward group. The gap between the groups is even more astonishing for this study, since we can observe a difference in means of almost 370% between the non-variable group and the control group (See Appendix XXX for more information).



- ANOVA analysis: The ANOVA analysis is also able to make a

clear distinction between groups (P-value =0% < 5%, F-value = 9,80 > F(2;93) = 3.091). This time, two distinction can be made thanks to the Bonferroni post-hoc test : One between the variable reward group and the control group, and one between the variable reward and non-

variable reward group. No such distinction can be made with the non-variable-group and the control group. Therefore, we can be assured that the fact of adding a reward mechanics with variety in the type of reward can make a difference in the number of repetition of this experiment (See Appendix XXXI for more information).

Linear regression: This summarizes the information given by the previous analyses : here again, we can clearly see that only one of the result is significant : the average score for the variable reward group (P-value = 0,01% < 5%). It should also be noted that for this variable, the intercept is not significantly different from zero (P-value = 13,26% > 5%). The type of group itself account for 17.41% of the total variance of the number of repeated experiences (See Appendix XXXII for more information).

These results were quite promising, since they show that the mere presence of difference in terms of game and reward mechanics have a significant impact on the number of time this experiment was repeated. It can therefore confirm the initial hypothesis.

IV.2.4) Engagement rating

Engagement from the user is maybe one of the key elements when a manager design a gamified project. But surprisingly, the results about engagement variables were quite disappointing, since none of them showed any difference between groups, and no group showed a significant impact in either the satisfaction 1st step rating, APGR or average score. Only one of the ran test seems to be able to bring at least some conclusive results:

- Influence of short-term engagement over the global engagement: we can still confirm that there is indeed a link between short-term and global engagement. By doing a linear regression, we can see that both variable can be linked : increasing the average short-term engagement score by one can, on average, increase the global engagement score by 0.55 points. This effect is proven to be significant (P-value = 0% < 5%). This single variable can explain 53.93% of the variance of the global engagement score, which is quite impressive (See Appendixes XXXIII to XLII for more information).



As such, the only real conclusion that can be done here is the fact that the average short-term engagement shares a relationship with the global one. However, it doesn't prove anything about

the effect of the type of gamified context over the engagement rating, which is quite surprising, considering that reward mechanics are considered as a potent way to increase engagement.

It should also be noticed that global engagement can be defined as the average score of the cognitive, emotional and social engagement variables, as we've seen in the literature.

IV.2.5) Timing & pace

As we did for the first experiment, we also had to adapt the timing variable in order to make it more realistic, since the way the time data has been collected seems to be defective :

Descriptive statistics: This time, the experiment was quite long to fill, as there were more questions than in the previous study. The gap between the average total timing between group is huge : the control group shows an average timing of 02:18, with a difference of +07:34 for the non-variable reward group and +16:32 for the variable reward group. As such we can easily see that people

participated for a longer period when several rewards were used(See Appendix XLIII for more information).

- ANOVA analysis: Starting with an analysis of variance, we observe a significant difference between means for at least some of the group (P-value = 0.39% < 5%, F-value = 5,90 > F(2;93) = 3.091). However, in order to locate where the difference is actually true, we have to run a Bonferroni post-hoc test. This test showed only the presence of a difference between the control group and the variable reward group (See Appendix XLIV for more information).
- Linear regression: A linear regression summarize what we've seen in the previous analysis of variance, by showing that reward mechanics have indeed a significant result over the total spent





time on this experiment (P-value = 0.09% < 5%). The intercept itself doesn't seem to be significantly different from zero (P-value = 50.76% > 5%). Therefore, it seems that only variety could explain an increase in the total spent time for this model. Overall, this model can explain 11.26% of the total variance in terms of time (See Appendix XLV for more information).

This time again, the time spent seems to actually show results that goes in the same direction as our hypothesis. This could be explained by the fact that the gap between the number of repeated experiences is way bigger for this experiment than for the first one, since both variable shares a correlation of 70.50 %.

IV.2.6) Justification for stopping the experiment

As we did for the first experiment, we also try to have an insight of the motives people mentioned for stopping the experiment.

- Chi-square test: The Chi-square test show us that there is indeed a link between type of group and the motive to stop the experiment (□² = 9,90 > □²(0,05;4) = 9,49). However, even this fact, it's not enough to see where the difference is actually located (See Appendix XLVI for more information)
- Logistic regression: By doing several logistic regressions, we can see that only one of those coefficients through the 3 regressions is significant : the coefficient of the competitive group for the "Boring/repetitive" independent variable. The interpretation of the Odd-ratio coefficient is □²= 3,57 >1, meaning that the fact of finding the experience boring or repetitive is more common in the variable group than in the two other groups. Those two variables are dependents. (See Appendix XLVII for more information)

IV.2.7) Estimated chances of winning

In this particular context, since the gamified experience was designed in a more competitive context, a suggested idea was to ask people about their perceived chances of winning the context. However, it seems that the results for this question were too inconsistent to bring any useful data:

- **Descriptive statistics:** Overall, the average chances of winning for each group are quite close to each other. The estimated score of the control group was 3.03/7, with a difference of +0.14 for the non-variable reward group and +0.23 for the variable reward group. (See Appendix XLVIII for more information)
- ANOVA analysis: As expected, the ANOVA procedure shows us that there is no real significant gap between the mean of these groups (P-value = 88,91% > 5%, F-value = 0,12 < F(2;93) = 3.091). (See Appendix XLIX for more information)



- Linear regression: The linear regression summarize the previous results by showing that none of these coefficients are significant (All p-values are above 5%) (See Appendix L for more information).

This variable doesn't seem to bring anything valuable to the study. It could have been expected that this variable could be linked or correlated with the number of participation, but even there, the correlation is almost non-existent (6,84%).

CHAPTER V: DISCUSSION

	Behavioural engagement		Perceived engagement			Percieved satisfaction			Motive to	Winning
SUMMARI	Repetition	Time	1st round	APGR	Average	1st round	APGR	Average	stop	expectations
Cooperation VS competition	Conclusive results	Conclusive results				Conclusive results	Conclusive results	Conclusive results	Unconclusive results	
Variety in reward mechanics	Conclusive results	Conclusive results	Debatable results	Unconclusive results	Debatable results	Unconclusive results	Unconclusive results	Unconclusive results	Unconclusive results	Debatable results

Figure 19: Summary of the two studies results over their several variables

V.1) Cooperation & competition VS Satiation effect

The first experiment helped us to identify that overall, people participation to a competitive gamified platform induce less satiation than with a cooperative gamified platform, since they will repeat the experiment more often, spend more time on the platform and feel more satisfied during their first experience with the platform while also showing a smaller decline in satisfaction over time.

V.1.1) Repetition of the experiment in solo consumption and competition context

As mentioned in the literature review, the context of a group consumption can induce more satiation than a context of solo consumption, since consumption in a group generates a shared attention over the task at hand, which itself makes the consumer think about not only his own consumption, but also the other participants (Barghave, Montgomery & Redden - 2018).

In some sense, these results concerning a gamified experience don't actually shows that people satiate more in a group, since most of the results about a cooperative gamified experience are insignificant and doesn't seem to show any difference with the control group. Therefore, we can't make sure that a cooperative gamified experience is actually bringing any improvement or worsening to the initial experience. However, we can clearly see that a competitive context, which isolate people and induce rivalry between them, can actually induce less satiation than in the other groups. It can be observed with the number of repeated experiences for the first group.

This particular aspect seems to confirm our initial hypothesis: A competitive gamified experience induces less satiation than a cooperative one. However, the concept of shared attention doesn't seem to be the cause of it, since we can't really see any increase in satiation for the cooperative group over the control group. As such, it seems that in fact, the competitive group has a particular aspect in its game mechanics that induce less satiation than it does not share with the two other groups. This aspect could be the motivation of winning the game, as it induce people to participate

more and more in order to be amongst the winners of the game (Leclerq - 2018). In a context of cooperation, any contributor to the experiment is a "de facto" winner; everybody can consider himself as a winner at the end of the experiment, regardless of the number of suggestions he made. But in a context of competition, there are winners and losers, and individuals, in order to be among the winners, would willingly participate more than they would in other groups.

Finally, it was also to be expected, it turns out that participants in a competitive experience participate longer since they gave overall more answers and suggestions than the others. However, we have to consider that this variable could be flawed, since the time was estimated rather than precisely measured. Moreover, even with the suggestion of doing only a few sessions per day on several days, people seemed to prefer consuming the whole experience in a few minutes rather than interrupting it. This aspect can be linked with the theory about perceptions, the effects of an underestimated effect of consumption over satisfaction and melioration. People tend to prefer current consumption, and thus underestimate the effects of satiation, making them consuming the experience faster than they should and thus, reducing the utility they derive from the experience while increasing satiation (Herrnstein, Lowenstein, Prelec & Vaughan - 1993, Galak, Kruger & Lowenstein - 2012).

V.1.2) Satisfaction in savored victory

In link with the previous aspect, these results also confirm that an overall better experience in terms of satisfaction and enjoyment induces less satiation. This element can be linked with the theory, as a positive outcome in a consumption context can reduce satiation (Yu & Lang - 2017).

People benefit directly from the fruits of their efforts in a competitive environment, while they only share a part of the merit in a cooperative experience, where everybody earns the same result at the end, which is way less clear in the player's mind. Therefore, the outcome of the gamified experience is different in both groups, and is the best perceived in a competitive context, while on the other hand, there is no real improvement for the cooperative group over the control group for which no points mechanics was generated.

Overall, this better satisfaction can be already perceived at the beginning of the experiment, where people are directly immersed in the gamified context. Also, people seem to perceive a slower pace of their satisfaction drop over the repeated experiment and overall a better average satisfaction during the experiment, therefore, confirming the initial hypothesis.

V.1.3) Weaknesses of the study

Several of the analyzed variable haven't shown the expected results:

- Time and number of playthroughs were maybe the most obvious evidences of satiation in this experiment. However, even if those variables are significant, several other elements could have altered the results, such as the device used to fill the survey (Phone, tablet or smartphone), the possibility for the user to cheat (Only filling the survey and not the company platform, which would be impossible for the experimenter to verify) or even other potential variable. This fact should be considered and these results have to be considered with caution.
- The satisfaction variable showed us the expected results. However, we have to take into account that there is a potential bias about the satisfaction measures: since most people did the whole experiment in one seance in a short period, there is a possibility that there is an influence of the previous response. For example, if the first step was a good experience for the user, and that we observe a small decrease of satisfaction during the second step, it could be either a really less good perceived satisfaction or a much less good experience, but where people give willingly a false answer in order to remain coherent with their first experience. However, we could consider that it is not the case and that their answers remain honest, since people voluntarily chose to willingly continue the experiment nevertheless. Also, it was measured through a single item scale, which capture fewer dimensions of the variable, even if in this case, variations and satisfaction during the first playthrough were taken into account.
- The justification for stopping the experiment didn't really explain if people satiate or not, but could provide some insights about the source of the satiation itself, the motive for stopping the consumption process, either emotional (Perceived as redundant and boring), or cognitive (no more idea to suggest). However, there was no real difference from one group to another, which is rather odd considering the differences with other variables in the competitive group. One possible suggestion is that since they enjoy the game more, they will only find it repetitive after many more suggestions, and since they put much more effort in it, they can think about and suggest more idea. This possible change in attitude and behavior induced by the context of the game could actually counterbalance the "normal effect" of the gamified experience itself, and therefore, would not show any real perceived difference to them.

To get a better idea of the participants' perception about the experiment, some qualitative feedback was collected after the study. Overall, they enjoyed the fact that the study was pretty short and easy to fill, but regret that they had to give their ID, age and gender during each game, and to switch from the gamified application to the survey each time. Those elements could have induced more satiation about the survey itself, and not the game, which could be quite problematic if only one group had the problem, however, since all groups were submitted to the same rule, it doesn't seem to be a problem. Thanks to this feedback, most of those issues were corrected when designing the second study.

V.2) Variety in rewards & game mechanics VS Satiation effect

With the second experiment, we can make sure that variety has indeed an impact on satiation, since the experiment was much more repeated for the group with multiple reward than for the other group. However, we still have to investigate on some theoretical elements for this study.

V.2.1) Repetition of the experiment with several types of rewards as incentives

As we have seen in the results, the experiment was much more repeated in the variable reward group, which can be linked with the theory about gamification and engagement. Rewards are considered as a very potent way to increase engagement toward a company or a brand, in a B2C as well as in a B2B context. In the current context, it can be measured by the number of times the experiment was repeated (It would therefore be a form of behavioral engagement). Not only that, but rewards are recognized as a good way to increase the repeated usage of the gamified platform and contributions (Leclerq - 2017) which are in this case the number of participation and idea suggestions from the users.

However, this particular statement could be confirmed if a significant effect had been observed for both the non-variable reward and variable reward group, but only the latter show such an effect. However, it seems enough to conclude that there is indeed a slower satiation pace and better longterm behavioral engagement when several types of reward are accessible. In this case it was points, badges as form of achievement, and an open-access dashboard where they can see their score and achievements.

An alternative suggestion could be the preferences for specific goals or reinforcers, an element that can apply to games in general, which is the need to "do something", such as the need to go farther in the game or level, to complete or to finish something. It is one of the few elements that

can be observed in the gaming addiction literature (King, Herd & Delfabbro - 2017). Since the variable group had points and badge that can be considered as a form of achievement, as they were "titles" for fulfilling a particular task, we could consider that they find the game more interesting and play it until they reach at least some achievements.

It is also quite interesting to see the huge gap of time spent on this experiment between groups. Such observations are quite similar with such experiments with video games, as people seems to lose track of time over the repeated experiences, which is a rather positive sign, as it is mostly observed in cases of addictions (Mollick & Rothbard - 2014)

V.2.2) Weaknesses of the study

Even if most of the weaknesses of the previous study were corrected in this one, several other problems appeared:

- First of all, the engagement measurement was flawed for this study. This could come from the fact that this variable relied on multi-item scales, which are indeed very potent for more "classical" experiment, but is less effective in order to measure engagement during a repeated experimentation. When one is designing a study such as this one, he has to take into account the length of the study and the amount of time such a survey could require to be filled. If the survey is too long, a person's answers will be less accurate and it would generate even more satiation than the experience that the expert is trying to analyze.
- This problem of satiation induced by the survey itself could also impact the number of people that only did the experiment once, which could cause issues when trying to analyze the drop of satisfaction or engagement. It can also explain the number of unfinished surveys, which limit the number of data for any individual and lead to a drop of several individuals in the sample.
- The same reasoning could also explain the lack of significant impact over the satisfaction measurements. Considering that there is more variety in reward, individuals should find the game more interesting, since they can find more easily a reward that fit their expectation, whatever if it's a way to compare themselves to others or reach a certain status through badges and past achievements. But it was not the case for the variety group.

All in all, by following a more classical academic approach, this test suffered from an increase in length over the first one, but it's not the only result that was surprising. Considering the rule of the game, two strategies of playing were expected from the player: either he could suggest more

numerous ideas in order to earn more points, even if those ideas were pretty simple and unoriginal, or he could also suggest less idea, but more creative ones, which would grant him better bonuses. However, most of the winners have actually played both strategies, earning them huge amounts of points. Most of the players in the middle of the ranking seem to have played the strategy of giving more original ideas, but the top 3 have reached all the achievements and are only separated by their number of participation. This kind of study could also be considered with other types of rewards, such as levels or progress bars, in order to determine if one particular type of reward could induce more (or less) satiation than the others.

CHAPTER VI: CONCLUSION

VI.1) Short summary

Since the first implementation of gaming elements in managerial initiatives, its effects over its users satisfaction and motivation are often taken for granted by managers, and the relationship between those variable is still not fully understood by the experts in this field. However, it is often forgotten that using a gamified application is a form of consumption of an experience, which means that it is subject to the constraints of satiation, which could overcome the benefits provided by such applications in the long run. Indeed, this constraint could lead consumers to a drop of their consumption pace, since they don't derive that much satisfaction over the consumption process, or to switch their consumption to alternatives, which are items with different attributes than the previous one.

Satiation is a phenomenon that has been repeatedly analyzed in the literature from all angles, be it the psychological factors, the characteristics of the consumer or those of the consumed item. Some solutions, limiting the pace of satiation have been suggested in studies, such as recalling past variety, relying on categorization levels, bringing a more positive outcome and so on. The literature review on gamification has shown several game mechanics on which managers could rely to reduce the satiation pace, such as the game context (Cooperative, cooperative or competitive), the mechanics of reward (One or more types of rewards), or even many others that weren't explored in this thesis.

All in all, it was proven through experimentation than the most potent way to avoid satiation of a gamified application was to rely on a competitive context, as it motivate people to participate more to the experiment through rivalry. People showed a better behavioral engagement, by participating more often, and were overall more satisfied with the gamified task than with a cooperative context.

This study also showed that variation in game mechanics such as rewards can have an impact on behavioral engagement, as its users will mostly look specific goals or reinforcers such as achievement, a reward type for which users will try to reach higher standards in the competition. Even though the desired type of reward could depend on other parameters, such as the context of the game, users' preferences, their characteristics, and so on.

VI.2) Managerial implications

Overall, thanks to those studies, reviews and experimentation, we now have a better insight about the relationship between gamification and engagement. We can now confirm the presence of a satiety effect that would greatly affect the long-term results of such managerial initiative for a company, and give some insights to make it more successful in order to avoid useless costs and a loss of investments.

With all the elements explored in this thesis, we know that a competitive gamified experience would induce less satiation for its users than a cooperative one. However, it doesn't actually mean that a cooperative one would be useless. All in all, it would depend on of the desired managerial objectives for the company and the context and environment in which it operates. While a cooperative experience would induce strengthened social bond between users and would bring a less negative impact in a losing situation, a competitive one would induce rivalry that would increase motivation, but would generate a higher drop of enjoyment and engagement in a losing situation (Leclerq -2017). In such situations, competition would be very positive for the best users, but more unfavorable for the others, which can induce a drop of motivation for these individuals. Therefore, the best choice would be very situational.

We can also confirm that variety in the game mechanics have also an impact on satiation. Bringing variety induce people to repeat much more their participation in the experiment. Therefore, we could say that managers should indeed implement a reward mechanic in their gamified application, but also bring more than one type of them. However, some advice are required considering rewards:

- Even if adding rewards does indeed generate more engagement and fun for the user, rewards should not be the ultimate goal for them, as gamification is, in fact, a tool to generate joy and increase users engagement when doing a redundant or complex task. Nevertheless, even if rewards can help, they remain fragile and does not necessarily take the first place in the user's mind (King, Herd & Delfabbro 2017).
- The choice of a mechanic such as badges as form of achievement was proven useful in the second experiment. However, we have to consider that since the experience was rather short, a fact that doesn't poke on the issue of recalling past consumption on satiation. However, for the use of a gamified platform during month, or even years, the fact of relying on achievement

could also be counterproductive, as titles or badges as a reminder of past achievement could also remind past consumption of the experiment.

- Reward should be linked with a particular context, such as a certain achievement, reaching a certain level of efficiency for a particular task and so on. Their distribution should also be fair, which means that when a user deserve it, he has to receive it. It was one of the reasons why the type of reward should not be distributed randomly, as we suspected that it would not bring any desired result.

Finally, it has to be mentioned that even if these solutions are an efficient way to reduce satiation, it doesn't actually overcome it. Over time, satiation will still appear, and updating the gamified platform will become necessary. For example, it is possible that people lose interest over times, as the required tasks will surely become easier, as people will tend to plan their way to interact with the gamified platform more carefully. After all, such observations were made with video games (Mollick & Rothbard - 2014). Over time, changes in the gamified program will be necessary, in order to still surprise its users and pick their interest once again.

Managers should be aware of those conditions when they decide to implement a gamified platform in the daily activity of their users, whether they involve consumers, employees of their company or other individuals.

VI.3) Theoretical implications

The literature on gamification continues to praise its merits when it comes to the positive effects on commitment and motivation of the users it generates. However, even though these initiatives have proven successful in some companies and sectors, some experts and analysts remain skeptical about its long-term effectiveness. The reasons mentioned are often a rather poor design of the application, however, one can also consider that the relationship gamification-commitment is often quite poorly understood. Also, gamification can, and should, be considered as a consumption phase, with all the consequences that it implies.

As gamification is indeed a consumption of an experience, satiation functions as a mediator between the gamified platform and its outcomes on engagement, satisfaction and motivation. As such, the obvious solution would be to find a way to reduce its pace. Since relying on of psychological aspects and consumers characteristics seems difficult, considering the lack of control a manager or expert could have on them, the only viable solution (in terms of monetary costs as well as efficiency) would be to work on the item characteristics, namely the gamification mechanics that could induce less satiation.

In conclusion, this thesis brings a new approach of the topic of gamification, by providing a new angle of approach and providing some clues on mechanics that could be used to provide a better long term output of such managerial initiatives.

VI.4) Limitations & suggestion for further research

Unfortunately, as many other studies on this field, it has its own flaws. Measuring satiation on a particular experience without actually inducing more satiation can be very tricky. When designing a study for such a topic, an expert has to restrict himself on only a few variables to analyze, and ask as few questions as possible. However, this is a double-edged problem, as too few variable would limit the results and the interest of a particular experiment. The two experiments designed and presented for this thesis are no exception, as we've seen. Designing a survey for such an experiment would often require a specially designed scale, which summarize as many factors as possible without being too long. It also requires very clear objectives and precise design elements, otherwise, it may confuse the user.

Overall, finding a way to measure satiation is a problem in itself. Many literature articles covers the topic, but most of them only focus on physical good, not on experiences. The only formula that was found in all the covered literature for this thesis was in Yu & Lang review, and this particular formula was applied in the context of gaming, even if according to those authors, other applications were possible. However, the formulas were quite difficult to understand and many variables or coefficients were rather poorly detailed, making it rather impractical to use without being able to verify all the necessary elements.

Also, the sample choice could be a real issue, especially when attributing a particular user to a particular game mechanic. The first study relied on a free choice from the user (Choosing between a "neutral", "cooperative" or "competitive" experience and sticking to it until the end), as consent was mentioned in some literature as a key element for people to willingly engage in a managerial initiative (Mollick & Rothbard - 2014). On the other hand, the second study was a more "classical" approach to sampling, where a question that doesn't matter is used as a way to randomly attribute a user to a particular group (In this case, birth month). Without further researches, it is impossible to say which procedure is the best, but we can suspect, thanks to those results and the literature on the topic that the first method is the best way to proceed.

The sample size, while remaining valid, was quite limited, as each group required 30 people, for a total of 90 people per study. This comes from the fact that, contacting people in order to run such experiences was a tricky process, as it was done in order to avoid that people that participated in the first study could participate in the second one. With such way to proceed, it was possible to avoid that people that satiated of the first experiment and did not fully recover from it over time could participate in the second one and pollute the sample. Therefore, for both studies, it was necessary to find at least 180 different people.

That being said, this first study on the topic of the effects of satiety in a gamified experiment is a real opportunity for future research, as many other game mechanics can be explored in order to find other ways to slow down satiation pace:

- For example, other types of rewards, such as progress bars, virtual goods or levels can be tested.
- Coopetition could also be further explored, as it could be a good way to find a more balanced solution to more complex managerial issues.

Further research should also focus on the effect of consent in gamification over satiation. Such a study was impossible to design in the context of a master thesis, as consent in linked with a certain authority from the expert, something that a master student lack of on his study participants. However, someone with a status of authority (A professor, a manager ,...) could do such experiment, in order to confirm or reject the hypothesis of a link between satiation and consent. However, such studies also requires a certain respect of ethics, as people could be, in this case "forced" to participate in an experiment...

Finally, as a more general advice for scholars, in order to find more clues to overcome satiation, they should rely on literature about addiction, as satiation and addiction work as quite opposite effects. For example, since there are so many articles about addictions on video games, one could find some inspiration and potential clues in gaming design to use on satiation applications, with the ultimate goal to reduce drastically the externalities of satiation.

SOURCES & REFERENCES

SCIENTIFIC REVIEWS

- BARGHAVE, MONTGOMERY & REDDEN Collective Satiation: How Co-Experience Accelerates a Decline in Hedonic Judgments – Management Department, The Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania, April 2018.
- DETERDING S, KHALED R., NACKE L.E. & DIXON D Gamification, Toward a Definition – CHI Vancouver, BC, Canada, May 2011.
- DETERDING S, SICART M., NACKE L., O'HARA K. & DIXON D. Gamification: Using Game Design Elements in Non-Gaming Contexts – Conference: Proceedings of the International Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, CHI Vancouver, BC, Canada, May 2011.
- DONG, WANG, DU & PATENZA Gaming Increases Craving to Gaming-Related Stimuli in Individuals With Internet Gaming Disorder - Biological Psychiatry : Cognitive Neuroscience and Neuroimaging, p404-412, July 2017.
- EISINGERICH, MARCHAND, FRITZE & DONG *Hook VS Hope; How to enhance customer engagement through gamification* International Journal of Research in Marketing, June 2018.
- GALAK, KRUGER & LOWENSTEIN Insensitivity to Rate of Consumption Leads to Avoidable Satiation Journal of Consumer Research, Vol. 39, p993-1009, June 2012.
- GALAK, REDDEN & KRUGER, Variety Amnesia: Recalling Past Variety Can Accelerate Recovery from Satiation - Journal of Consumer Research, Vol. 36, p575-584, December 2009.
- HERRNSTEIN, LOWENSTEIN, PRELEC & VAUGHAN Utility Maximization
 & Melioration, Internalities in Individual Choice Journal of Behavioral Decision making,
 Vol. 6, p149-185, March 1993.
- HUOTARI, HAMARI *Defining Gamification, A Service Marketing Perspective* MindTrek '12 Proceeding of the 16th International Academic MindTrek Conference, p17-22, October 2012
- JACOBS Gamification, Moving from "Addition" to "Creation" CHI 2013: Changing Perspectives, Association for Computing Machinery, May 2013.
- KING, HERD & DELFABBRO Tolerance in Internet gaming disorder: A need for increasing gaming time or something else? - Journal of Behavioral Addictions, , p525–533, July 2017

- KUMAR & RAGHAVENDRAN Gamification, the finer art: fostering creativity and employee engagement Journal of Business Strategy, Vol. 36, Iss 6, p3-12, November 2015
- LECLERQ Essays on the engagement mechanisms in the value co-creation process: The case of gamification Doctoral dissertation, Louvain Research Institute in Management and Organizations, October 2017.
- McALISTER A Dynamic Attribute Satiation Model of Variety-Seeking Behavior Journal of Consumer Research, Vol. 9, p. 141-150, September 1982.
- MOLLICK, ROTHBARD Mandatory Fun, Consent, Gamification and the Impact of Games at Work The Wharton School Research Paper Series, September 2014
- NAVARRO E.C. *Fostering HR practices through gamification* Master thesis, Academic year 2017-2018.
- NEGRUSA, TOADER & SOPHICA Exploring Gamification Techniques and Applications for Tourism - Department of Hospitality Services, Faculty of Business, Babeş-Bolyai University (Cluj-Napoca), August 2015.
- **REDDEN** *Reducing Satiation: The Role of Categorization* Journal of Consumer Research, Vol. 34, p624-634, August 2007.
- **REDDEN** *Desire Over Time, The Multi-Faceted Nature of Satiation* The psychology of desire, p82-103, February 2014.
- **RICHTER, RABAN, RAFAELI** *Studying gamification: the effect of rewards and incentives on motivation* Gamification in Education and Business, p 21-46, October 2015.
- SEVILLA & REDDEN *Limited Availability Reduces the Rate of Satiation* Journal of Marketing Research, Vol. 51, p205–217, April 2014.
- SIANG & RAO Theories of learning: A computer game perspective Theories of learning: A computer game perspective. Proceedings of the IEEE Fifth International Symposium on Multimedia Software Engineering, p239–245. Taichung, Taiwan, December 2003.
- SOANE, TRUSS, ALFES, SHANTZ, GATENBY & REES Development and Application of a New Measure of Employee Engagement: the ISA Engagement Scale - Human Resource Development International, 15 (5). pp. 529-547, October 2012.
- VIVEK, DELELA & MORGAN A Generalized Multidimensional Scale for measuring *Customer Engagement* - Article in The Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice - October 2014.
- YU & LANG The Effect of Consumption Outcomes on Variety: Seeking in Online Video Games Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania, June 2017.

 ZICHERMANN G & CUNNINGHAM C. - Gamification by Design: Implementing Game Mechanics in Web and Mobile Apps – Book published by O'Reilly Media, Inc, August 2011.

PRESS RELEASES

 ANGELOVSKA N. – Forbes – "Gamification Trends For 2019: Making Room For Game-Elements In Politics" – 20th of January 2019 (<u>https://www.forbes.com/sites/ninaangelovska/2019/01/20/gamification-trends-for-2019-</u> making-room-for-game-elements-in-politics/#5b1531fb2a77)

COURSES

- STEILS & DESSART Market Research 2015-2016
- VERARDI Econometrics & Multivariate analysis 2015-2016

VIDEOS

• ZICHERMANN – TEDxKids @ Brussels – Gamification – 9th of June 2011 (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=O2N-5maKZ9Q)

GAMIFIED PLATFORMS USED FOR EXPERIMENTS

- What's your Starbucks idea? (<u>https://ideas.starbucks.com/</u>)
- "Do Us A Flavor" by Lays (<u>https://digital.hbs.edu/platform-digit/submission/crowdsourcing-your-next-chip-flavor-lays-do-us-a-flavor-campaign</u>)

SURVEY LINKS

- Experiment 1 (<u>https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSesdOciqJActD-qr0ZI3-</u> 206hAtHE6bmlhZ9U7Ji5Byci3F_Q/viewform)
- Experiment 2

 (https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSdaN8_kv-XoCq2dxqsX7dpDuW6V6S2aIf_Wh91NbEU4HMHRVw/viewform?fbzx=80333535080190 724)

OTHER RESOURCES

- Gamified.uk The Hype is Over Gamification is Here to Stay (https://www.gamified.uk/2015/08/21/the-hype-is-over-gamification-is-here-to-stay/)
- Newzoo's 2018 Report: Insights Into the \$137.9 Billion Global Games Market (<u>https://newzoo.com/insights/articles/newzoos-2018-report-insights-into-the-137-9-billion-global-games-market/</u>)
- Statista Distribution of video gamers worldwide in 2017, by age group and gender (https://www.statista.com/statistics/722259/world-gamers-by-age-and-gender/)
- WePC.com 2019 Video Game Industry Statistics, Trends & Data (<u>https://www.wepc.com/news/video-game-statistics/</u>)
- YourTrainingEdge.com Gamification and the Hype Cycle (https://www.yourtrainingedge.com/gamification-and-the-hype-cycle/)

APPENDIXES

Motivation theory	Incentives/rewards	Role			
Self efficacy	Audio/verbal/visual/music/ sounds effect	Feedback			
	Progress bar	Feedback, achievements			
Self-efficacy, goal-setting, PIT, expectancy value,	Points/bonus/divident	Feedback, reward, status, achievements, competition, progression, ownership			
need achievement	Mini games/challenges/quests	Reward, status, competition, achievements			
Self-efficacy, goal-setting, PIT, expectancy value,	Badges	Status and reputation, achievements and past accomplishments, collection, competition, ownership			
social comparison	Virtual goods	Reward, social, status, achievements, ownership, self-expression			
	Leaderboard	Status and reputation, achievements, competition			
	Rewards-choosing colors, power	Achievements			
Self-efficacy, goal-setting, PIT,	Achievements	Collection, status, competition, discovering, progression			
expectancy value, need achievement, social comparison	Levels	Feedback, status and reputation, achievements, competition, moderate challenge			
Social comparison, personal investment theory, expectancy value	Avatar	Social, self-expression, ownership			

Appendix I : Theoretical base of incentives and rewards (Richter, Raban & Rafaeli - 2015)


	Means and Descriptive Statistics																	
	Categ	ory	Me	ean of '	Std. Dev.	of 1	Std. E	ггог	of 1	Numbe	r of i	non-i valu	nissi es fo	ing or 1				
			8.731	1827957	7 1.588954	9816	0.164	7669	9561					93				
	Comp	etitive	9.451	612903	2 0.809885	1638	0.145	4596	6694					31				
	Contr	ol	8.129	032258	1 1.927726	3894	0.346	2298	8804					31				
	Coop	erative	8.612	9032258	3 1.563701	1512	0.280	18490	J175					31				
	Ge App satis:	enerated endix faction	by the III: n rat	SAS S Des ting p	ystem ('Loca criptive per grou	il', X64 sta p	4_SR∨1 tistic	2) or S O	n 12 : of th	août 2019 I e 1st j	9 at 3 play	:56:1 yth	o PN	۸ Igh				
					The ANC	I AV	Proced	lure	•									
					Depende	ent V	/ariabl	e: 1										
	Source		DDL	Som	ne des ca	rrés	Moye	nne	qua	dratiqu	e Va	aleur	r F	Pr >	> F			
-	Model		2		27.7634	409	-		13	.881720	4	6.	11	0.00	133			
	Error		90		204.5161	290			2	.272401	4							
	Corrected	l Total	92		232.2795	699												
L						- D		uer			_							
			Г-0 П 11	9526	2001 de va 17 2651	и г к а 1	acine i 1.507	M SE 7449	2 1 1 2 1	лоуеппа в 731183	e 3							
		Sourco			202.11 22 svor/	Mov	onno i	 nua	drati	auo Va	lour	FF)r S	E				
		Catenor	v	2 27	76344086	woy	enne (13.8	88172	902 V0 2043	6 1	11 O	003	33				
		categoi	y	2 21.	10044000			10.0	50112	.040	0.1							
	Gene	rated by	the S	SAS Sy	stem ('Loc	al', X8	64_SR\	V12)) on 1	12 août 1	2019	at 3	:56:	10 P	PM			
Note: This test	t controls f	the Type	l exp	Tes	ts t de Bo twise error	n ferr rate,	oni (D) but it g	unn gene) ροι erally	ur 1 has a hi	igher	r Тур	e	error	r rate	e thar	I RE(GWQ.
			Δ	Inha						0.05	Т							
				apria	do libortó	do l'	orrour			0.00								
			E	rour e	ue inserie madration	ue i o mo	wonne		2	272/01	-							
			- V	alour	nanianda Di annitire	e inc	yenne	•		2 //3955								
			n	iffóron	co signific	ative	a minii	mal	0	0.93/1	-							
				Les i	noyennes sont nas	ave:	c la mé différ	ème	e letti	re ne								
			B	lon Gr	oupement	Mo	venne	N	Cate	aorv								
					A	9	9,4516	31	Com	petitive								
					A						1							
			В		A	1	8.6129	31	Coop	perative	1							
			В]							
			В			1	8.1290	31	Cont	rol								
	Gener	ated by	the S	AS Sy	stem ('Loca	1', X6	4_SRV	(12)	on 13	2 août 2	019	at 3:	56:1	0 PN	м			
App post	oendix t-hoc to	IV: I est of	H1 e î the	exper type	riment e of gro	: A	NOV on	VA the	r pr sa	oced tisfac	ure tio	e & on r	Bo ati	onf	fer at	ron the	i e 1s	t
play	throug	,h		21	0	1								0				

		Mo	odèl \	Pr e : Lir /ariab	océdur 1ear_Ri le dépe	e REC egress endan	6 sion te :	_Model 1			
			NE	o d'obs	servatio	ons lu	es	93			
			NE	o d'obs	s. utilisi	ees		93			
				Anal	yse de	varia	nce				
Source Somme des carrés Moyenne quadratique Valeur F Pr > F											
Modèle				2	27.3	76344		13.88172	! 6	.11	0.0033
Erreur				90	204.(51613		2.27240	1		
Total somn	nes co	orrigé	es	92	232.2	27957					
I	Root N	dSE			1.5	0745	R ca	arré	0.1195	Ī	
1	Moyer	nne d	épe	ndante	e 8.7	3118	R ca	ar. ajust.	0.1000		
	Coeff	Var			17.2	6511					
		R	ácul	Itate o	etimós	doe na	аган	nàtros			
			Va	leur e	stimée	Frr	ана	10000			
Variable		DDL	des	s para	mètres	ty	pe	Valeur d	u test t	Pr	> t
Intercep	it	1		8	12903	0.270	075		30.02	<.0	001
Compet	itive	1		1	.32258	0.382	289		3.45	0.0	008
Coopera	ative	1		0	.48387	0.382	289		1.26	0.2	096

Generated by the SAS System ('Local', X64_SRV12) on 12 août 2019 at 4:05:23 PM

Appendix V: H1 experiment: linear regression of the type of group on the satisfaction rating at the 1st playthrough

	Means and Descriptive Statistics											
Category Name	Mean of TCPM	Std. Dev. of TCPM	Std. Error of TCPM	Number of non-missing values for TCPM								
	(15.17%)	12.46%	1.29%	93								
Competitive	(10.91%)	6.23%	1.12%	31								
Control	(18.56%)	17.85%	3.21%	31								
Cooperative	(16.03%)	9.33%	1.68%	31								
Generated Appendix per group	by the SAS Syste	m ('Local', X64_SRV1 ptive statistics	2) on 31 juillet s of the sa	2019 at 4:17:58 PM								





	Moo	Pro dèle : Lin Variable o	océdu ear_R dépen	re REG egress dante	ion_Model : MEAN								
		Nb d'obs Nb d'obs	ervati . utilis	ons lue ées	s 93 93								
		Analy	/se de	varian	ce								
Source		DDL	Somm (e des carrés	Moyen: quadratiqu	ie Ie Vale	ur F	Pr > F					
Modèle		2	11.	85151	5.925	76	4.63	0.0121					
Erreur 90 115.08416 1.27871													
Total somme	s corrigée	s 92	126.	93567									
Ro	ot MSE oyenne dé off Var	pendante	1.1 6.5	3080 F 9280 F 5208	l carré l car. ajust	0.093	14 12						
	Rés	sultats est	imés (Jalour	des pai	ramétres			_					
		est	timée des	Erre	ur Valeur	du test							
Variable	DDL	param	iètres	typ	e	t	Pr >	t					
Intercept	1	6.1	13581	0.2031		30.21	<.00	01					
Competit	IVE 1	0.8	87129 400co	0.2872	22	3.03	0.00	52					
Cooperat	ive	U.4	49968	0.2872	22	1.74	0.08	53					
Generated by t	he SAS Sy	stem ('Loc	al', X6	4_SRV	12) on 31 ju	illet 201	9 at 5	5:18:50 PM					

Appendix XI: H1 experiment: linear regression of the type of group on the average satisfaction score

	Means and Descriptive Statistics												
Category Name	Mean of 'N° Participations'	Std. Dev. of 'N° Participations'	Std. Error of 'N° Participations'	Number of non-missing values for 'N° Participations'									
	5.3655913978	3.4192070853	0.3545552582	93									
Competitive	8.3870967742	4.0222499454	0.7224174163	31									
Control	3.9032258065	1.9892182503	0.3572741446	31									
Cooperative	3.8064516129	1.2495160353	0.2244197049	31									
Gen Appendiz experimen	erated by the SAS System (Lo x XII: Descriptive s nt per group	cal', X64_SRV12) tatistics of 1	on 31 juillet 2019 a	at 4:30:29 PM of repeated									





Procédure REG Modèle : Linear_Regression_Model Variable dépendante : Timing															
	Nb d'observations lues93Nb d'obs. utilisées93														
Analyse de variance															
Source				DDL	Somn	ne des carrés	qu	Moyenne adratique	Vale	ur F	Pr > F				
Modèle				2	1	09698		54849		4.70	0.0115				
Erreur				90	10	051019		11678							
Total som	mes co	rrigée	s	92	11	60716									
	Root M	SE			108	.06474	Rс	arré	0.094	5					
	Moyeni	ne dép	oen	dante	lante 120		Rc	ar. ajust.	0.074	4					
	Coeff V	аг			89	.61231									
		Rés	sult	ats es	timés	des pa	ran	nètres							
				\ es	/aleur timée										
March 1					des	Erro	eur	Valeur d	u test	n	141				
Varian		JUL		400	nonne	10.400	he		E AG	2.00	14				
Coone	rativo	1		-18	00220 29032	77.40	247		-0.67	<.uc	nea				
Comp	Competitive 1 61.9672 27.44847 60.07 0.0005 Competitive 1 61.96774 27.44847 2.26 0.0264														

Generated by the SAS System ('Local', X64_SRV12) on 31 juillet 2019 at 5:01:53 ${\rm PM}$

Appendix XVII: H1 experiment: linear regression of the type of group on the total estimated time

SUMMARY OUTPUT							Boring	
Regression Statistics								
Chi Square	0,7755							
Residual Dev.	128,0530							
# of iterations	4,0000							
Observations	93,0000							
	Coefficients	Standard Error	P-value	Odd Ratio	Lower 95%	Upper 95%	Lower 95%	Upper 95%
Intercept	-0,1942	0,3609	0,5906	0,8235	0,4060	1,6706	0,4060	1,6706
Competitive	0,3883	0,5104	0,4468	1,4745	0,5422	4,0095	0,5422	4,0095
Cooperative	0,0000	0,5104	1,0000	1,0000	0,3677	2,7193	0,3677	2,7193
SUMMARY OUTPUT							No more ide	eas
Regression Statistics								
Chi Square	1,0632							
Residual Dev.	125,4322							
# of iterations	4,0000							
Observations	93,0000							
	Coefficients	Standard Error	P-value	Odd Ratio	Lower 95%	Upper 95%	Lower 95%	Upper 95%
Intercept	0,5978	0,3754	0,1112	1,8182	0,8712	3,7945	0,8712	3,7945
Competitive	-0,2724	0,5229	0,6024	0,7615	0,2733	2,1220	0,2733	2,1220
Cooperative	-0,5333	0,5197	0,3048	0,5867	0,2119	1,6246	0,2119	1,6246
SUMMARY OUTPUT							Other reaso	ns
Regression Statistics								
Chi Square	0,4937							
Residual Dev.	32,5022							
# of iterations	5,0000							
Observations	93,0000							
	Coefficients	Standard Error	P-value	Odd Ratio	Lower 95%	Upper 95%	Lower 95%	Upper 95%
Intercept	-2,6741	0,7311	0,0003	0,0690	0,0165	0,2890	0,0165	0,2890
Competitive	-0,7270	1,2521	0,5615	0,4833	0,0415	5,6242	0,0415	5,6242
Cooperative	-0,7270	1,2521	0,5615	0,4833	0,0415	5,6242	0,0415	5,6242

Appendix XVIII: H1 experiment: logistic regressions of the type of group over the motive to stop the experiment



Appendix XIX: H1 experiment: evolution of the average satisfaction rate over the repeated gamified experience

	N	leans and Descript	tive Statistics	
Group	Mean of '1st step sbs satisfaction'	Std. Dev. of '1st step sbs satisfaction'	Std. Error of '1st step sbs satisfaction'	Number of non-missing values for '1st step sbs satisfaction'
	5.07	1.56	0.16	96
Control	4.44	1.50	0.27	32
Non-variable	5.47	1.38	0.25	30
Variable	5.32	1.63	0.28	34
G Ar sat	enerated by the SAS opendix XX: isfaction ratin	System (Local', X64_SF Descriptive stati 1g per group	RV12) on 12 août 2019 at istics of the 1st j	12:07:56 PM playthrough

ed Total ed Total source Group ated by the	DDL Somme de 2 19. 93 212. 95 232. ef de Var Racin 29.81735 1.4 20.19.70574000 2.19	s carrés M 7067402 7828431 4895833 4895833 e MSE 19 512610 19	oyenne q st step sb:	uadratique 9.8533701 2.2879876	Valeur F 4.31	Pr > F 0.0163	
ed Total r-carré Coe D84764 Source DE Group ated by the	ODL Somme de 2 19. 93 212. 95 232. ef de Var Racin 29.81735 1.4 20.19.70574000 2.9	s carrés M 7067402 7828431 4895833 e MSE 1 512610	oyenne q st step sb:	uadratique 9.8533701 2.2879876	Valeur F 4.31	Pr > F 0.0163	
ed Total r-carré Coe D84764 Source DE Group ated by the	2 19. 93 212. 95 232. ef de Var Racin 29.81735 1.)L Anova SS 2 19.70574020	7067402 7828431 4895833 ie MSE 1: 512610	st step sb:	9.8533701 2.2879876	4.31	0.0163	
ed Total r-carré Coe D84764 Source DE Group ated by the	95 232. ef de Var Racin 29.81735 1.4 JL Anova SS 2 19.70574020	4895833 e MSE 1: 512610	st step sb:				
r-carré Coe D84764 Source DE Group ated by the	ef de Var Racin 29.81735 1.9 DL Anova SS 2 19.70574000	e MSE 1: 512610	st step sb:				
Source DE Group ated by the	DL Anova SS			s satisfactio	n Moyenr 5.07291	n e 17	
ated by the	21 10.70074020	Moyenne	quadratiq 9.85337(jue Valeur 010 4.3	F Pr > F 31 0.0163		
	SAS System ('Lo	cal', X64_SF	₹V12) on 1	2 août 2019) at 11:57:0	AM OC	
		Page Break	[
Tes	tst de Bonferro	ni (Dunn) p	our 1st st	ep sbs satis	sfaction		
ls the Type	l experimentwise	error rate, b	ut it gener	ally has a hi	igher Type	II error rate t	han Tu
	all	pairwise co	mparisons	3.			
	Alpha			0.05			
	Degrés de	liberté de	l'erreur	93			
	Erreur qua Valeur crif	igue de t	oyenne	2.287988			
Comes	araisons signific	atives au n	iveau 0.04	5 indiquées	nar ***		
compa	n algoria arginitta	Différenc	e	marquees	pui .	-	
	Group	Entr	e Simula	anó 05⊯ Int	topyalla		
Cor	nparaison	moyenne	es cimult	ane 90% m le confianc	e		
Non-vari	able - Variable	0.143)1 -0).7806	1.0669		
Non-var	iable - Control	1.029	12 0).0920	1.9664 *	**	
Variable	- Non-variable	-0.143	11 -1	.0669	0.7806		
Variab	le - Control	0.888	i0 -0).0223	1.7943		
Control	- Non-variable	-1.029	(2 -1	.9664	-0.0920 *	**	
Control	- Variable	-0.888	i0 -1	.7943	0.0223		
XI: AN	IOVA proc e 1st step s Modèle Variable dépe	edure & atisfacti : Linear_F	2 Bonf ion sco Regressions	erroni p bre on_Model	post-ho	oc test o	f the
,	vallable depe	nuante .	ist step :	ana addaid	ICOU		
	Nb d	l'observat	ions lues	s 96			
	Nb d	'obs. utili	sées	96			
	ļ	Analyse do	e variano	ce			
		Som	ne des	Moyen	ne		
се	D	DL	carrés (quadratiq	ue Valeu	ırF Pr≻l	F
èle		2 19	.70674	9.853	37 4	1.31 0.016	3
ur 🛛		93 212	.78284	2.287	99		
l sommes	corrigées	95 232	.48958				
D	AMOT					 T	_
Roc	ICMSE	1.	51261 R	carre	0.0848	1	
Moy	venne dépend	ante 5.	07292 R	car. ajust.	. 0.0651	_	
Coe	ett Var	29.	81735				
	Récultat	ts estimée	des nar	amètres			
	Vale	ur estimé:	e Errei	anieues			
riable	DDL des p	aramètre	s typ	e Valeur	du test t	Pr > It	
	1	4,43750	0.2673	39	16.60	<.0001	
tercent	I I	1.401.00		-	.0.00	0.0000	
tercept un variabl	P 1	1 02913	7 0 3844	u II			
tercept on-variabl oriable	e 1	1.02917	7 0.3844 3 0.3725	10 15	2.68	0.0000	
tercept on-variabl oriable ed by the	e 1 1 SAS System (1	1.0291; 0.8860; Local' X64	7 0.3844 3 0.3725 SRV12)	iU i5 Lon 12 ao(2.68 2.38 it 2019 et	0.0000 0.0194	РМ
tercept on-variable oriable ed by the	I I SAS System (1	1.0291; 0.88603 Local', X64	7 0.3844 3 0.3725 _SRV12)	10 55 1 on 12 aoû	2.68 2.38 it 2019 at	0.0000 0.0194 12:10:43 F	PM
	Compa Cor Non-vari Non-vari Variable Control Control Control rated by th CXI: AN tp On th CXI: AN tp On th Control Con	Is the Type Texperimentwise all Alpha Degrés de Erreur qua Valeur criti Comparaisons signific: Group Comparaison Non-variable - Variable - Variable - Variable - Variable - Control Variable - Control - Non-variable Control - Non-variable Control - Non-variable rated by the SAS System (I CXI: ANOVA proc tp on the 1st step s Modèle : Variable dépe Nb de N	Is the Type Lexperimentwise error rate, b all pairwise co all pairwise co Alpha Degrés de liberté de Erreur quadratique m Valeur critique de t Comparaisons significatives au n Différence Entr Group te Comparaison moyenne Non-variable - Variable 0.143 Non-variable - Control 1.029 Variable - Non-variable -0.143 Variable - Control 1.029 Control - Non-variable -1.029 Control - Non-variable -1.029 Control - Variable -0.886 Control - Variable -0.886	Is the Type Lexperiment/wise error rate, but it gener all pairwise comparisons Alpha Degrés de liberté de l'erreur Erreur quadratique moyenne Valeur critique de t Comparaisons significatives au niveau 0.00 Différence Entre Group les Simult Comparaison moyennes of Non-variable - Variable 0.1431 -C Non-variable - Control 1.0292 CC Variable - Non-variable 0.1431 -C Non-variable - Control 0.8860 -C Control - Non-variable 0.1431 -C Control - Non-variable 0.8860 -1 trated by the SAS System (Local', X64_SRV12) on CXI: ANOVA procedure & Bonf tp on the 1st step satisfaction sco Modèle : Linear_Regressi Variable dépendante : 1st step s Nb d'obs. utilisées Nb d'obs. utilisées	is the Type Lexperimentwise error rate, but it generally has a hi all pairwise comparisons. Alpha 0.05 Degrés de liberté de l'erreur 93 Erreur quadratique moyenne 2.287988 Valeur critique de t 2.43805 Comparaisons significatives au niveau 0.05 indiquées Différence Entre Group les Non-variable - Variable 0.1431 On-variable - Control 1.0292 Variable - Non-variable -0.1431 Variable - Control 0.8860 Variable - Non-variable -1.0292 Control -Nesson Variable - Control 0.8860 Control -Non-variable -1.0292 1.9664 Control -Variable -0.8860 -1.7943	is the Type Lexperimentwise error rate, but it generally has a higher Type all pairwise comparisons. Alpha 0.05 Degrés de liberté de l'erreur 93 Erreur quadratique moyenne 2.287988 Valeur critique de t 2.43805 Comparaisons significatives au niveau 0.05 indiquées par ***. Différence Group les Simultané 95% Intervalle Comparaison moyennes de confiance Non-variable - Variable 0.1431 -0.7806 1.0669 Non-variable - Variable 0.1431 -1.0669 0.7806 Variable - Non-variable -0.1431 -1.0669 0.7806 Variable - Control 0.8860 -0.0223 1.7943 Control - Non-variable -0.8860 -0.0223 1.7943 Control - Non-variable -0.8860 -1.7943 0.0223 erated by the SAS System (Local', X64_SRV12) on 12 août 2019 at 11:57 CXI: ANOVA procedure & Bonferroni post-hoc p on the 1st step satisfaction score Modèle : Linear_Regression_Model Variable dépendante : 1st step sbs satisfaction Mb d'observations lues 96 Nb d'obs. utilisées 96 Analyse de variance rce DDL Carrés quadratique Valeu èle 2 19.70674 9.85337 4 ur 93 212.78284 2.28799 I sommes corrigées 95 232.48958 1 Root MSE 1.51261 R carré 0.0848 Moyenne dépendante 5.07292 R car. ajust. 0.0651 Coeff Var 29.81735 1	is the lype Lexperimentwise error rate, but it generally has a higher lype II error rate t all pairwise comparisons. Alpha 0.05 Degrés de liberté de l'erreur 93 Erreur quadratique moyenne 2.287988 Valeur critique de t 2.43805 Comparaisons significatives au niveau 0.05 indiquées par ***. Group 18 Comparaison moyennes de confiance Non-variable - Variable 0.1431 -0.7806 1.0669 Non-variable - Control 1.0292 0.0920 1.9664 *** Variable - Non-variable 0.1431 -1.0669 0.7806 Variable - Non-variable 0.1431 -1.0669 0.7806 Control - Non-variable -1.0292 1.9664 -0.0920 *** Control - Non-variable -1.0292 1.9664 -0.0920 *** Control - Variable 0.8860 -1.7943 0.0223 Prated by the SAS System (Local', X64_SRV12) on 12 août 2019 at 11:57:00 AM CXI: ANOVA procedure & Bonferroni post-hoc test of p on the 1st step satisfaction score Modèle : Linear_Regression_Model Variable dépendante : 1st step sbs satisfaction Modèle : Linear_Regression_Model Variable dépendante : 1st step sbs satisfaction Modèle 2 19.70674 9.85337 4.31 0.016 ur 93 212.78284 2.28799 I sommes corrigées 95 232.48958 <u>Root MSE 1.51261 R carré 0.0848</u> Moyenne dépendante 5.07292 R car. ajust. 0.0651 Coeff Var 29.81735

	Means and Descriptive Statistics											
Group	h	lean of "	Satsisf /	action APGR'	Std. Dev	of 'Satsis	faction APGR'	Std. 'Sats	Error of isfaction APGR	Nun valu	nber of non-missing es for 'Satsisfaction APGR'	
			(5	5.23%)			13.58%		1.39%		96	
Control			(8	6.72%)			19.01%		3.36%		32	
Non-varia	able		(5	5.80%)			12.07%		2.20%		30	
Variable			(3	3.32%)			7.57%		1.30%		34	
Appen	Ge I dix X	nerated by	y the S	AS Syst cripti Th	em ('Loca ve sta e ANOVA	al', X64_SR\ tistics c Procedure	√12) on of the	12 aoû sati:	it 2019 at	12:15: on A	^{44 PM} PGR per group	
			De	pendent	Variable	: Satsisfacti	ion APG	R				
ļ	Source		DDL S	Somme o	les carrés	s Moyenne	quadra	tique \	/aleur F	Pr > F		
	Model		2	0	.02050815	5	0.0102	25408	0.55	0.5785		
	Error		93	1	.73232759	9	0.0186	52718				
	Correct	ed Lotal	95	1	./52835/4	•						
		r-carré	Coef	le Var F	Racine MS	SE Satsisf	action A	PGR M	loyenne			
		0.011700	-26	1.0364	0.1364	B1		-0	0.052284			
	L	Courses	DDI	A	C Marray			Jawa F	Des E			
		Source	2 0	Anova S	5 Moyen	ne quadrat 0.0100	aque va 5408	D 55	Pf > F 0.6786			
		Group	2 0	1.0205001	0	0.0102	.0400	0.55	0.0700			
Note: This	test con	itrols the T	Test Type I er	ts t de B o xperiment	onferroni twise error all pair	Page Break (Dunn) pou rate, but it (wise compa	r Satsis qenerally risons.	faction has a l	APGR higher Typ	e II erro	rrate than Tukey's for	
				Alnha				0.05	T			
				Dearé	' is de libe	rté de l'erre	ur	93				
				Erreu	r quadrat	iaue mover	nne 0.0	018627				
				Valeu	r critique	de t	2	.43805				
										•		
		0	Compar	aisons si	ignificativ	es au nive:	au 0.05 i	indiqué	es par ~	~ .		
						Entre						
				Group		les	Simulta	ané 95%	% Interva	le		
			Con	nparaiso	n	moyennes	d	e confi	ance			
		Va	riable	- Non-A	variable	0.02484	-0.0	05851	0.108	19		
			Variab	le - Co	ontrol	0.03401	-0.(04794	0.115	97		
		N	on-vari	able - Va	ariable	-0.02484	-0.1	10819	0.058	51		
		r	ion-var	Table - C	ontrol	0.00917	-0.0	J/539	0.093	74		
		Co	conuol entrel	- vai Non-	variable	-0.03401	-0.	11097	0.047	34		
		Generated	by the	SAS Svs	stem ('Loca	-0.00917 al', X64 ISRV	-0.0 /12) on 1	2 août :	2019 at 11	2:15:44	PM	
Anne	endix	XXIV	• 112		imont		_,	1		Donf	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
			· •	CALLEL	IIII ein	ANUV	A nro	ocedi	nre a	вош	erroni post-noc	

				Lin	ear R	egressio	on F	Resul	ts			
				Modèl	P le : Li	rocédure l near_Regi	REG ressi	ion_Mo	odel	_		
			Vari	iable	dépen	idante : Sa	atsis	faction	n APGF	ł		
				N	b d'ob	servations	lue	s 96				
				N	b d'ob	s. utilisée:	\$	96				
					Ana	lyse de va	rian	ice Mai				
	9	Sour	ce		DDL	Somme c car	ies rés	quadr	yenne atique	Valeur F	Pr > F	
	1	Modè	le		2	0.020)51	0	01025	0.55	0.5785	
	E	Erreu	r		93	1.732	233	0	.01863			
		Fotal	sommes corri	gées	95	1.752	284					
			Root MSE			0.136	48 F	R carré	!	0.0117		
			Moyenne o	lépen	dante	-0.052	28 F	R car. a	ajust.	-0.0096		
			Coeff Var			-261.036	35					
				D	óculta	te octimóe	doe	naran	nàtrae			ſ
				T.	Vale	ur estimée	e E	Erreur	icuca			
			Variable	DDL	des p	aramètres	s	type	Valeu	r du test t	Pr > t	
			Intercept	1		-0.06720) ().	02413		-2.79	0.0065	
			Variable Nan wasiable	1		0.03401	0.	03361		1.01	0.3142	
			Non-variable	I		0.00917	U.	03460		0.20	0.7920	
	(Gene	rated by the SA	S Sys	tem ('l	Local', X64_	SR	/12) on	12 ao	ût 2019 at	12:42:45	PM
A	ppen	dix	XXV : H2	exp	oerin	nent: L	ine	ear re	egres	sion o	f the	type of
g	roup	on	the satisfa	ctio	n Al	PGR			-			
			М	eans	and	Descript	tive	Stati	stics			
		1	Mean of 'AVG s	bs S	td. De	v. of 'AVG	Sto	1. Erro	r of 'AV	G Numl	per of no	n-missing
Gr	oup		satisfafctio	on's	bs sat	isfafction'	s	bs satis	fafctio	n'	value sbs sa	s for 'AVG tisfafction'
			4.	76		1.57			0.	16		96
Co	ntrol		4.	20		1.65			0.3	29		32
Va	riahle	ie	э. 4	10 93		1.50			U	29 74		30
	Ge	nerat	ed by the SAS	Syster	n ('Loc	ar, x64_SF	RV12	2) on 12	2 août 1	2019 at 12	:49:12 PI	M
A	ppen	dix	XXVI: D	escr	iptiv	ve statis	tic	s of	the s	atisfac	tion a	verage
s	core p	er g	group		-							0

			The	ANOVA Pro	cedure							
		Depen	ident Va	riable: AVG	sbs satisfa	fction						
	Source	DDL So	mme de	s carrés Mo	venne qua	ndratique	Valeur F	Pr > F				
	Model	2	15.	7997803	7	.8998901	3.37	0.0388				
	Error	93	218.	3155430	2	2.3474790)					
	Corrected Total	95	234.	1153233								
	r-carré	Coef de V	/ar Rac	ine MSE 🛛 A	VG sbs sa	tisfafctio	n Moyenn	9				
	0.067487	32.180)99	1.532148			4.76103	5				
	Source		22 svor	Movenne	wadratiou	o Valou		[
	Group	2 15.7	9978027	woyenne	7 8998901	3 3	37 0.0388					
	o.oup											
	0						0 40-40-					
	Generated by t	ne SAS Sy	stem (Lo)cal, X64_SR	v12) on 12	aout 201	9 at 12:49:	12 PIVI				
				Page Break								
	Т	ests t de B	onferror	ni (Dunn) no	ur AVG she	s satisfaf	ction					
		363 (40 D	omenoi	n (bann) bo	AT AY 0 30.	Judardi	caon					
Numera This is									ит			
Note: This tes	st controls the Type	i experimei	ntwise er all n	ror rate, but r	t generally i arisons	nas a nigi	ner type II	error rate	than Tu	кеузтс		
			on p	annioe eerrip	anoono.							
		Alash				0.05						
		Dea	a rés de li	herté de l'er	reur	93						
		Erre	ur auadı	ratique mov	enne 23	47479						
		Vale	ur critia	ue de t	2.	43805						
					0.05.1			-				
	Lom	paraisons	significa	tives au niv	eau 0.05 ii	idiquees	раг	-				
				Entre								
		Group		les	Simultan	é 95% Int	ervalle					
	C	omparaiso	n	moyennes	de	confianc	e					
	Non-va	riable - Va	riable	0.2322	-0.70)35	1.1679	-				
	Non-Va	ariable - U Non i	ontrol	0.9602	0.01	109	1.9095 **					
	Varia	hlo Co	ntrol	-0.2322	-1.10	979 920	1.6481	-				
	Control	- Non-v	ariable	-0.9602	-1.90	195	-0.0109 **	*				
	Contr	ol - Var	iable	-0.7280	-1.64	181	0.1920	-				
								-				
	Generated by t	ne SAS Sy	(Stem ('L	осаг, хь4_Sн	(V12) on 12	aout 201	19 at 12:49:	12 PM				
4.00.00	die VVVII.	110				a a a du		anfar		nost h		
Арреп		H2 exp	bernne	ent: ANC	JVA pi	ocedi	lie & E	onter	rom	post-ne		
test of	the type of g	roup oi	n the	satisfacti	ion ave	rage s	core					
Γ		Modé	èle : Lii	near Regre	ssion Mo	del						
		Variable	dépend	lante : AVG	sbs satis	fafction						
			h d'ob	servations l	ues 96							
		i i	Nh d'ob	s, utilisées	96							
		•			00							
			Anal	lyse de vari	ance							
	-			Somme de	s Moy	enne						
	Source		DDL	Carré	s quadra	iuque V	aleur F	1 > F				
	Modele		2	15.7997	8 7.5	59989	3.37 0	1.0388				
	Erreur		93	218.3155	4 Z. 2	34748						
	Total sommes	corrigees	95	234.1153	2							
	Root	t MSE		1.53215	R carré	0.0	0675					
	Moy	enne dép	endant	e 4.76104	R car. a	ust. 0.0	0474					
	Coet	ff Var		32,18099	1							
		Résultats estimés des paramètres										
	Variable		ab II	naramètres	type	Valour	du toet t	Pr > Itl				
	Intercer	nt Du	1	4 20312	0.27085	varcul	15 52	< 0001				
	Variable	B	1	0 72803	0.37736		1.93	0.0567				
	Non-var	iable	1	0,96021	0.38937		2.47	0.0155				
	Tot var		<u> </u>	2.00021	0.00001	1	2 . 11	3.0100				
	Generated b	y the SAS	System	n ('Local', X6	4_SRV12)	on 12 a	oût 2019 a	t 12:54:0	09 PM			
	Annond	iv VVV	/ TTT •	Ц2 аме	arimar	t · 1im	Ant to	moori	on			
	Аррена		v 111:	nz exp	ermer	n . III	lear re	sressi	on			
	of the ty	pe of g	group	on the	averag	ge sati	sfactio	on sco	ore			
L					<u> </u>	·						

		Nk	d'ob	servations lu	ies 96							
		Nk) d'ob	s. utilisées	96							
Analyse de variance												
Source			וחח	Somme des	s Moy	enne	Valour E	Dr.S.E				
Modèle			1	66 85265	quatra 66.6	1996 1997 1997	41.86	< 0001				
Freur			94	150 13693	1 1 4	5205 59720	41.00	<.0001				
Total som	mes corrige	ies	95	216 98958	/ 1 	.5120						
				210.0000								
	Root MSE			1.26380	R carré		0.3081					
	Moyenne o	lépe	ndant	e 5.01042	R car. aj	ust.	D.3007					
	Coeff Var			25.22354								
		Résul	ltats e	stimés des p	aramètre	es						
			Val	eur estimée	Erreur							
Variable		DDL	des	paramètres	type	Vale	ur du tes	tt Pr> t				
Intercept		1		2.46625	0.41386		5.9	96 <.0001				
AVG sbs sat	isfafction	1		0.53437	0.08260		6.4	47 <.0001				
Generated b Append the aver	y the SAS S dix XXI rage sati	^{Syste} X: sfa	m ('Lo H2 (ctio	cal', X64_SR\ experime n over th	/12) on 12 ent: lin ne glot	2 août lear bal s	2019 at 2 regres atisfac	:46:02 PM sion o tion				

Group	Mean of 'Nb Paricipations'	Std. Dev. of 'Nb Paricipations'	Std. Error of 'Nb Paricipations'	Number of non-missing values for 'Nb Paricipations'
	3.5104166667	5.8345518777	0.5954864574	96
Control	1.4375	0.7156093726	0.12650306	32
Non-variable	2.033333333	1.3256965205	0.2420379629	30
Variable	6.7647058824	8.883279573	1.5234698782	34

Appendix XXX: Descriptive statistics of the number of repeated experiences



Mean of 'ts step she engagement' step she she engagement' step she engagement' step she eng				Means and	Descripti	ve Statistics	1				
Control 4.32 1.72 0.18 96 Non-variable 4.45 1.55 0.28 30 Variable 4.60 1.69 0.29 34 Generated by the SAS System (Local', X64_SRV12) on 12 août 2019 at 2.13.33 PM Appendix XXXIII: Descriptive statistics of the average engagement rate at the first playthrough per group. The ANOVA Procedure Dependent Variable: 1st step sbs engagement Source DDL Somme des carrés Moyenne quadratique Valeur F Pr > F Model 2 9.3428462 4.6714231 1.60 0.2064 Corrected Total 95 200.0305990 2.9106210 4.315104 Source DDL Source DDL Anova SS Moyenne quadratique Valeur F Pr > F Corrected Total 95 200.0305990 2.9106210 4.315104 Source DDL Source DDL Anova SS Moyenne quadratique Valeur F Pr > F Generated by the SAS System (Local', X64_SRV12) on 12 août 2019 at 2.13.33 PM Page Breat	Group	Mean of sbs enga	'1st ster gement	o Std. Do ' step sbs enga	ev. of '1st agement'	Std. Erro step sbs engag	or of '1st gement'	Number o step sbs	f non-missing values for '1st engagement'		
Control 3.88 1.66 0.33 32 Veriable 4.45 1.55 0.28 34 Generated by the SAS System (Local', X64_SRV12) on 12 août 2019 at 2:13:33 PM Appendix XXXIII: Descriptive statistics of the average engagement rate at the first playthrough per group. The ANOVA Procedure Dependent Variable: 1st step sbs engagement Source DDL Somme des carrés Moyenne quadratique Valeur F Or F Source DDL Somme des carrés Moyenne quadratique Valeur F Or F Source DDL Somme des carrés Moyenne quadratique Valeur F Or F Source DDL Somme des carrés Moyenne quadratique Valeur F Or F Carrected Total 95 O 0.2064 Source DDL Anova SS Moyenne quadratique Valeur F O 0.2064 Source DDL Anova SS Moyenne quadratique Valeur F O 0.2064 Generated by the SAS System (Local', X64_SRV12) on 12 août 2019 at 2:13:33 PM Dege Break Tests t de Bonferroni (Dun) pour 1st step sbs engagement <td au="" colspan="2" nivea<="" sinificatives="" td=""><td></td><td></td><td>4.32</td><td>2</td><td>1.72</td><td></td><td>0.18</td><td></td><td>96</td></td>	<td></td> <td></td> <td>4.32</td> <td>2</td> <td>1.72</td> <td></td> <td>0.18</td> <td></td> <td>96</td>				4.32	2	1.72		0.18		96
Non-variable 445 1.55 0.28 30 Variable 4.60 1.69 0.29 34 Generated by the SAS System (Local', X64_SRV12) on 12 août 2019 at 213:33 PM Appendix XXXIII: Descriptive statistics of the average engagement rate at the first playthrough per group. The ANOVA Procedure Dependent Variable: 1st step sbs engagement Note: Colspan="2">Source DDL Source DDL Source Colspan="2">Source DDL Source DDL Source DDL Source DDL Source DDL Anova SS Moyenne quadratique Valeur F Pr > F Source DDL Source DDL Anova SS Moyenne quadratique Valeur F Pr > F Carrected Total 93/2206/2016/210 Source DDL Anova SS Moyenne quadratique Valeur F Pr > F Carrected Total 93/2200 A 6714/231 1.60 Colspan="2">Source DDL Anova SS Moyenne quadratique Valeur F Pr	Control		3.88	3	1.86		0.33		32		
Variable 4.60 1.69 0.29 34 Generated by the SAS System (Local', X64_SRV12) on 12 août 2019 at 2:13:33 PM Appendix XXXIII: Descriptive statistics of the average engagement rate at the first playthrough per group. The ANOVA Procedure Dependent Variable: 1st step sbs engagement Source DDL Source as a straight of the average engagement Note: Source at the first playthrough per group. The ANOVA Procedure Dependent Variable: 1st step sbs engagement Note: Source DDL Source for de Var Racine MSE Source 1000000000000000000000000000000000000	Non-variable		4.45	5	1.55		0.28		30		
Appendix XXXIII: Descriptive statistics of the average engagement at at the first playthrough per group. The ANOVA Procedure Dependent Variable: 1st step shs engagement Nodel 2 9 3428462 46714231 160 0.2064 Corrected Total 95 280.0305990 Nodel 2 9 3428462 46714231 160 0.2064 Corrected Total 95 280.0305990 Nodel 2 9 3428462 46714231 160 0.2064 Corrected Total 95 280.0305990 Nodel 2 9 34284620 4.6714231 160 0.2064 Source DOL Anova SS Moyenne quadratique Valeur F Pr > F Group 2 9.34284620 4.67142310 1.60 0.2064 Source DOL Anova SS Moyenne quadratique Valeur F Pr > F Group 2 9.34284620 4.67142310 1.60 0.2064 Source DOL Anova SS Moyenne quadratique Valeur F Pr > F Group 2 9.34284620 4.67142310 1.60 0.2064 Source DOL Anova SS Moyenne quadratique Valeur F Pr > F Group 2 9.34284620 4.67142310 1.60 0.2064 Source DOL Anova SS Moyenne quadratique Valeur F Pr > F Group 2 9.34284620 4.67142310 1.60 0.2064 Source DOL Anova SS Moyenne quadratique Valeur F Pr > F Group 2 9.34284620 4.67142310 1.200129 at 2:13:33 PM Page Break Tests t de Bonferroni (Dunn) pour 1st step shs engagement the: This test controls the Type I experimentwise error rate, but it generally has a higher Type II error rate than Tuke all pairwise comparisons. Mayha 0.005 Negress de liberté de I'erreur 993 Freuer quadratique moyenne 2.91052 Valeur critique de t 2.43005 Non-variable 0.1529 0.08990 1.1948 Variable - Control 0.1529 0.08990 1.1948 Variable - Control 0.1529 0.08990 1.1948 Variable - Control 0.05672 0.4899 1.1548 Variable - Control 0.05672 0.4899 1.6242 Control - Non-variable 0.1529 0.8999 1.1548 Variable - Control 0.05672 0.4899 1.6242 Non-variable - Variable 0.05672 0.4899 1.6242 Non-variable - Variable 0.05672 0.4899 1.6242 Non-variable - Variable 0.05672 0.162	Variable		4.60	ו	1.69		0.29		34		
The ANOVA Procedure Dependent Variable: 1st step shs engagement Source DDL Somme des carrés Moyenne quadratique Valeur F Pr > F Model 2 9.3429462 4.6714231 1.60 0.2064 Error 93 270.6877528 2.9106210 0 0.02064 Model 2 9.34294620 4.67142310 1.60 0.2064 Model 2 9.34294620 4.67142310 1.60 0.2064 Source DDL Anova SS Moyenne quadratique Valeur F Pr > F Generated by the SAS System (Local', X64_SRV12) on 12 août 2019 at 2:13:33 PM Page Break Tests t de Bonferroni (Dunn) pour 1st step shs engagement Moyenne quadratique moyenne 2910621 Valeur critique de t 2.43005 Ontop Error quadratique moyenne 2910621 Valeur critique de t 2.43005 Comparaison significatives au niveau O.05 Différence Errer Simultané 95% Intervalle Comparaison significatives du niveau O.05 1.1948 0.8800 <	Appen rate at t	dix XX	XIII: play	Descriptiv through pe	ve statist r group	tics of the	avera	ge enga	gement		
Source DDL Somme des carrés Moyenne quadratique Valeur F Pr > F Model 2 9.3426462 4.6714231 1.60 0.2064 Fror 39 230.0305990 2.9106210 1.60 0.2064 Corrected Total 95 280.0305990 4.315104 4.315104 Source DDL Anova SS Moyenne quadratique Valeur F Pr > F 0.033364 39.53680 1.706054 4.315104 4.315104 Source DL Anova SS Moyenne quadratique Valeur F Pr > F Group 2 9.34284620 4.67142310 1.60 0.2064 Generated by the SAS System (Local', X64_SRV12) on 12 août 2019 at 2:13:33 PM Page Break Fests t de Bonferroni (Dunn) pour 1st step sbs engagement Tests t de Bonferroni (Dunn) pour 1st step sbs engagement Simultané 95% Intervale all pairwise comparisons. Mogene 2.910621 Comparaisons significatives au niveau 0.05 indiquées par ***. Group Entre Entre Issuer 1 Group Issuer 1 audratique moyenne 2.910621 Is			Depe	The ANO	VA Proced	ure os engagemen	t				
Source DDL Somme des carrés Moyenne quadratique Valeur F Pr > F Model 2 9.3428462 4.6714231 1.60 0.2064 Error 93 270.6877528 2.9106210			Dobo		Tot otop or	is engugemen					
indet 2 9.34284b2 4.6714231 1.60 0.2064 Error 93 270.6877528 2.9106210 0 0 Corrected Total 95 280.0305990 0 0 0 Incarré Coef de Var Racine MSE 1st step sbs engagement Moyenne 0.033364 39.53680 1.706054 4.315104 Source DDL Anova SS Moyenne quadratique Valeur F Pr > F Group 2 9.34284620 4.67142310 1.60 0.2064 Generated by the SAS System (Local', X64_SRV12) on 12 août 2019 at 2:13:33 PM Page Break Tests t de Bonferroni (Dunn) pour 1st step sbs engagement Degrés de liberté de l'erreur 93 Erreur quadratique moyenne 2.910621 Valeur critique de t 2.43805 Comparaisons significatives au niveau 0.05 indiquées par ***. Group les Simultané 95% Intervalle Comparaison novariable 0.1529 -0.8890 1.1948 Valeur critique de 1.1948 0.3043 1.7446 Non-variable -0.1529 -1.1948 0.3890	Sourc	e	DDL 9	Somme des car	rés Moyen	ine quadratiqu	ie Valeu	rF Pr>F			
Image: corrected Total 95 2/0.067/5/28 2.9106/210 Image: corrected Total 95 280.03059/20 1.7006/4 4.315104 Image: corrected Total 95 280.03059/20 1.7006/4 4.315104 Image: corrected Total 95 280.03059/20 1.7006/4 4.315104 Image: corrected Total 95 29.34284620 4.67142310 1.60 0.2064 Generated by the SAS System (Local', X64_SRV12) on 12 août 2019 at 2.13:33 PM Page Break Page Break Page Break Tests t de Bonferroni (Dunn) pour 1st step shs engagement ter: This test controls the Type I experimentwise error rate, but it generally has a higher Type II error rate than Tuke all pairwise comparisons. Comparaison significatives au niveau 0.05 Value critique de t 2.43805 Comparaison significatives au niveau 0.05 indiquées par ***. Comparaison significatives au niveau 0.05 Value / 1.1948 Variable - Non-variable Ontoto / Nariable Variable - Non-variable Variable - Control Non-variable Non	Model		2	9.34284	462 TOO	4.671423	31 1 IO	.60 0.2064			
Connected Total 30 2000000000 Interview of the second s	Error	ated Tatel	93	2/0.68/75	20	2.910621	U				
Ist step sbs engagement Moyenne 0.033364 39:53800 1.708054 4.315104 Source DDL Anova SS Moyenne quadratique Valeur F Pr > F Group 2 9:34284620 4.67142310 1.60 0.2064 Generated by the SAS System (Local', X64_SRV12) on 12 août 2019 at 2:13:33 PM Page Break Tests t de Bonferroni (Dunn) pour 1st step sbs engagement test to Experimentwise error rate, but it generally has a higher Type II error rate than Tuke all pairwise comparisons. Comparaisons significatives au niveau 0.05 Différence Entre Group 1.948 Ofference Comparaison significatives au niveau 0.05 indiquées par ***. Différence Entre Group Les Simultané 95% Intervalle Non-variable - Non-variable = 0.1529 - 0.8890 1.1746 Non-variable - Control 0.5672 0.4899 Comparaison moyenes de confiance Variable - Non-variable 0.1529 - 0.8890	Corre	cted lotal	95	280.03055	390						
0.033364 39.53680 1.706054 4.315104 Source DDL Anova SS Moyenne quadratique Valeur F Pr > F Group 2 9.34284620 4.67142310 1.60 0.2064 Generated by the SAS System (Local', X64_SRV12) on 12 août 2019 at 2:13:33 PM Page Break Tests t de Bonferroni (Dunn) pour 1st step sbs engagement Ottom is the Type I experimentwise error rate, but it generally has a higher Type II error rate than Tuke all pairwise comparisons. Àlpha 0.05 Degrés de liberté de l'erreur 93 Erreur quadratique moyenne 2.910621 Valeur critique de t 2.43805 Comparaisons significatives au niveau 0.05 indiquées par ***. Différence Intervalle Variable - Non-variable 0.1629 - 0.3043 1.7446 Non-variable - Control 0.7201 - 0.3043 1.7446 Non-variable - Control 0.5672 - 0.4899 1.6242 Outrol - Non-variable - 0.5672 - 1.6242 0.4899 Control - Non-variable - 0.5672 - 1.6242 0		r-carré (Coef de '	Var Racine MS	E 1st ste	p sbs engagen	nent Moy	/enne			
Source DDL Anova SS Moyenne quadratique Valeur F Pr > F Group 2 9.34284620 4.67142310 1.60 0.2064 Generated by the SAS System ("Local", X64_SRV12) on 12 août 2019 at 2:13:33 PM Page Break Tests t de Bonferroni (Dunn) pour 1st step sbs engagement other interval de Bonferroni (Dunn) pour 1st step sbs engagement tests t de Bonferroni (Dunn) pour 1st step sbs engagement other interval de Bonferroni (Dunn) pour 1st step sbs engagement tests t de Bonferroni (Dunn) pour 1st step sbs engagement tests t de Bonferroni (Dunn) pour 1st step sbs engagement Simultané 95% Intervale all pairwise comparisons. Alpha 0.05 Degrés de liberté de l'erreur 93 Erreur quadratique moyenne 2.910621 Valeur critique de t 2.43805 Comparaisons significatives au nive u 0.05 indiquées par ***. Other force Group Issimultané 95% Intervalle Comparaison Other force Compariaison Issimultané 95% Intervalle <td></td> <td>0.033364</td> <td>39.53</td> <td>680 1.70605</td> <td>54</td> <td></td> <td>4.3</td> <td>15104</td> <td></td>		0.033364	39.53	680 1.70605	54		4.3	15104			
Group 2 9.34284620 4.67142310 1.60 0.2064 Generated by the SAS System (Local', X64_SRV12) on 12 août 2019 at 2:13:33 PM Page Break Tests t de Bonferroni (Dunn) pour 1st step sbs engagement tit generally has a higher Type II error rate than Tuke all pairwise comparisons. Alpha 0.05 Degrés de liberté de l'erreur 93 Erreur quadratique moyenne 2.910621 Valeur critique de t 2.43805		Source	DDL	Anova SS Mo	yenne qua	dratique Vale	ur F 🛛 Pr	> F			
Generated by the SAS System (Local', X64_SRV12) on 12 août 2019 at 2:13:33 PM Page Break Tests t de Bonferroni (Dunn) pour 1st step sbs engagement tet: This test controls the Type I experimentwise error rate, but it generally has a higher Type II error rate than Tuke all pairwise comparisons. Àlpha 0.05 Degrés de liberté de l'erreur 93 Erreur quadratique moyenne 2.910621 Valeur critique de t 2.43805 Comparaisons significatives au niveau 0.05 indiquées par ***. Différence Entre Comparaison moyennes 5% Intervalle Variable - Non-variable 0.1529 Non-variable 0.1529 - 0.8890 1.1948 Non-variable - 0.7201 - 0.3043 1.7446 Non-variable - 0.5672 - 0.4899 1.6242 Control - Variable - 0.5672 - 1.6242 0.4899 Generated by the SAS System (Local', X64 SRV12) on 12 août 2019 at 2:13:33 PM		Group	2	9.34284620	4.6	57142310	1.60 0.2	064			
Page Break Tests t de Bonferroni (Dunn) pour 1st step sbs engagement stet: This test controls the Type I experimentwise error rate, but it generally has a higher Type II error rate than Tuke all pairwise comparisons. Àlpha 0.05 Degrés de liberté de l'erreur 93 Erreur quadratique moyenne 2.910621 Valeur critique de t 2.43805 Comparaisons significatives au niveau 0.05 indiquées par ***. Ofference Entre Group les Simultané 95% Intervalle Variable - Non-variable 0.1529 -0.8890 Variable - Control 0.7201 -0.3043 1.7446 Non-variable 0.1529 -0.8890 Non-variable - Control 0.5672 -0.4899 Non-variable - Control 0.5672 -0.4899 Non-variable - Control 0.5672 -0.4899 Compariable - Control 0.5672 -0.4899 Non-variable -0.5672 -1.6242 0.4899 Control - Variable -0.5672 -1.6242 0.4899 Control - Non-variable -0.5672 -1.6242 0.4899 <	Ge										
Tests t de Bonferroni (Dunn) pour 1st step sbs engagement ote: This test controls the Type I experimentwise error rate, but it generally has a higher Type II error rate than Tuke all pairwise comparisons. Alpha 0.05 Degrés de liberté de l'erreur 93 Erreur quadratique moyenne 2.910621 Valeur critique de t 2.43805 Comparaisons significatives au niveau 0.05 indiquées par ***. Différence Entre Comparaison moyennes Variable - Non-variable Variable - Ontrol 0.7201 - 0.3043 Non-variable - 0.7201 Non-variable - 0.7201 Non-variable - 0.5672 Control - Non-variable 0.529 - 1.6242 Outrol - Non-variable 0.5672 - 0.4899 0.6124 - 0.7201 Control - Non-variable 0.5672 - 0.4899 0.61242 - 0.4899 Control - Non-variable 0.5672 - 0.4899 0.61242 - 0.4899 Control<	00	enerated by	the SAS	S System ('Local'	, X64_SRV1	12) on 12 août 2	2019 at 2:	13:33 PM			
Comparaisons significatives au niveau 0.05 indiquées par ***. Différence Entre Différence Group les Simultané 95% Intervalle Comparaison moyennes de confiance Variable - Non-variable 0.1529 -0.8890 1.1948 Variable - Control 0.7201 -0.3043 1.7446 Non-variable - Ontrol 0.7529 -1.1948 0.8890 Non-variable - Control 0.5672 -0.4899 1.6242 Control - Variable -0.7201 -1.7446 0.3043 Control - Non-variable -0.5672 -1.6242 0.4899 Generated by the SAS System ('Local', X64 SRV12) on 12 août 2019 at 2:13:33 PM Appendix XXXIV: ANOVA procédure & Bonferroni post-hoc test of the		enerated by	the SAS Tests to	S System ('Local' P le Bonferroni (E	', X64_SR∨1 age Break)unn) pour	12) on 12 août 2 1st step sbs e	2019 at 2: ngagem	13:33 PM ent			
Group ComparaisonDifférence Entre les moyennesSimultané 95% Intervalle de confianceVariable- Non-variable0.1529-0.88901.1948Variable- Control0.7201-0.30431.7446Non-variable- Variable- 0.1529-1.19480.8890Non-variable- Control0.5672-0.48991.6242Control- Variable-0.7201-1.74460.3043Control- Non-variable-0.5672-1.62420.4899Generated by the SAS System ('Local', X64SRV12) on 12 août 2019 at 2:13:33 PMAppendix XXXIV: ANOVA procédure & Bonferroni post-hoc test of the	ote: This test co	ntrols the T	the SAS	S System ('Local' P le Bonferroni (D perimentwise erro all pa Alpha Degrés de lib Erreur quadra Valeur critiqu	', X64_SRV1 age Break Dunn) pour or rate, but ir irwise comp erté de l'er rtique moya e de t	2) on 12 août 2 1st step sbs e t generally has arisons. 0.0 reur 9 enne 2.91062 2.4380	2019 at 2: ngagem a higher ⁻ 15 13 15 15 15	13:33 PM ent Type II error	rate than Tuke		
Comparison moyenes de confiance Variable Non-variable 0.1529 -0.8890 1.1948 Variable - Control 0.7201 -0.3043 1.7446 Non-variable - Variable -0.1529 -1.1948 0.8890 Non-variable - Variable -0.1529 -1.1948 0.8890 Non-variable - Control 0.5672 -0.4899 1.6242 Control - Variable -0.7201 -1.7446 0.3043 Control - Non-variable -0.5672 -1.6242 0.4899 Generated by the SAS System ('Local', X64 SRV12) on 12 août 2019 at 2:13:33 PM Appendix XXXIV: ANOVA procédure & Bonferroni post-hoc test of the	ote: This test co	ntrols the T	Tests t o ype I exp	S System ('Local' P le Bonferroni (D perimentwise erro all pa Alpha Degrés de libo Erreur quadra Valeur critiqu isons significati	', X64_SR∨1 age Break Dunn) pour or rate, but i irwise comp erté de l'er rtique moy e de t ives au niv	2) on 12 août 2 1st step sbs e t generally has arisons. 0.0 reur \$ enne 2.91062 2.4380 eau 0.05 indig	2019 at 2: ngagem a higher 33 21 25 95 95 94 95 95 94 95 95	13:33 PM ent Type II error	rate than Tuke		
Variable Non-variable 0.1529 -0.8890 1.1948 Variable Control 0.7201 -0.3043 1.7446 Non-variable Variable -0.1529 -1.1948 0.8890 Non-variable Control 0.5672 -0.4899 1.6242 Control Variable -0.7201 -1.7446 0.3043 Control Non-variable -0.5672 -1.6242 0.4899 Generated by the SAS System ('Local', X64 SRV12) on 12 août 2019 at 2:13:33 PM Appendix XXXIV: ANOVA procédure & Bonferroni post-hoc test of the state o	ote: This test col	ntrols the T	the SAS Tests t o ype exp ompara	S System ('Local' P le Bonferroni (I perimentwise erro all pa all pa Alpha Degrés de libh Erreur quadra Valeur critiqu isons significati	, X64_SRV1 age Break Dunn) pour or rate, but in inwise comp erté de l'er titique moy, e de t ives au niv Différenc: Entri In	2) on 12 août 2 1st step sbs e t generally has arisons. 0.0 reur 9 enne 2.91062 2.4380 eau 0.05 indig e s s Simultané 9	2019 at 2: ngagem a higher 15 13 14 15 15 16 16 16 16 16 17 17 16 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17	13:33 PM ent Type II error	rate than Tuke		
Variable - Control 0.7201 -0.3043 1.7446 Non-variable - Variable -0.1529 -1.1948 0.8890 Non-variable - Control 0.5672 -0.4899 1.6242 Control - Variable -0.7201 -1.7446 0.3043 Control - Non-variable -0.5672 -1.6242 0.4899 Generated by the SAS System ('Local', X64 SRV12) on 12 août 2019 at 2:13:33 PM Appendix XXXIV: ANOVA procédure & Bonferroni post-hoc test of the state	ote: This test col	ntrols the T	the SAS Tests t o ype exp ompara	S System ('Local' P le Bonferroni (I perimentwise erro all pa Alpha Degrés de libh Erreur quadra Valeur critiqu isons significati Group paraison	', X64_SRV1 age Break Dunn) pour or rate, but in inwise comp erté de l'er tique moy, e de t ives au niv Différenc: Entrn le moyenne	2) on 12 août 2 1st step sbs e t generally has arisons. 0.0 reur \$ enne 2.91062 2.4380 eau 0.05 indig e s Simultané 9 s de coi	2019 at 2: ngagem a higher 5 15 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16	13:33 PM ent Type II error r ****. valle	rate than Tuke		
Non-variable - Variable -0.1529 -1.1948 0.8890 Non-variable - Control 0.5672 -0.4899 1.6242 Control - Variable -0.7201 -1.7446 0.3043 Control - Non-variable -0.5672 -1.6242 0.4899 Generated by the SAS System ('Local', X64 SRV12) on 12 août 2019 at 2:13:33 PM Appendix XXXIV: ANOVA procédure & Bonferroni post-hoc test of the state of the st	ote: This test col	ntrols the T	the SAS Tests t o ype exy ompara Com iable	S System ('Local' P le Bonferroni (I perimentwise erro all pa Alpha Degrés de libh Erreur quadra Valeur critiqu isons significati Group paraison - Non-variable	, X64_SRV1 age Break	2) on 12 août 2 1st step sbs e t generally has arisons. 0.0 reur 9 enne 2.91062 2.4380 eau 0.05 indig e s Simultané 9 s de coi 9 -0.8890	2019 at 2: ngagem a higher 5 15 16 15 16 16 17 17 17 18 10 19 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	13:33 PM ent Type II error r ****. valle	rate than Tuke		
Non-variable - Control 0.5672 -0.4899 1.6242 Control - Variable -0.7201 -1.7446 0.3043 Control Non-variable -0.5672 -1.6242 0.4899 Generated by the SAS System ('Local', X64 SRV12) on 12 août 2019 at 2:13:33 PM Appendix XXXIV: ANOVA procédure & Bonferroni post-hoc test of the set of the se	ote: This test co	ntrols the T	ompara compara compara com iable variable	S System ('Local' P le Bonferroni (E perimentwise erro all pa Alpha Degrés de libh Erreur quadra Valeur critiqu isons significati Group paraison - Non-variable - Control	, X64_SRV1 age Break Dunn) pour or rate, but in inwise comp erté de l'er tique moy e de t ives au niv Différenci e moyenne 0.152 0.720	2) on 12 août 2 1st step sbs e t generally has arisons. 0.0 reur 9 enne 2.91062 2.4380 eau 0.05 indig e s Simultané 9 s de coi 9 -0.8890 1 -0.3043	2019 at 2: ngagem a higher 33 21 35 uées par 5% Inter nfiance 3 1 3 1 1 3 1	13:33 PM ent Type II error r	rate than Tuke		
Control - Variable -0.7201 -1.7446 0.3043 Control - Non-variable -0.5672 -1.6242 0.4899 Generated by the SAS System ('Local', X64 SRV12) on 12 août 2019 at 2:13:33 PM Appendix XXXIV: ANOVA procédure & Bonferroni post-hoc test of the set o	ote: This test co	ntrols the T	ompara ompara compara com iable variable on-varia	S System ('Local' P le Bonferroni (E perimentwise erro all pa Alpha Degrés de libh Erreur quadra Valeur critiqu isons significati Group paraison - Non-variable e - Control ble - Variable	, X64_SRV1 age Break Dunn) pour or rate, but in inwise comp erté de l'er tique moy e de t ives au niv Différenc: Entr le moyenne 0.152 0.720 -0.152	2) on 12 août 2 1st step sbs e t generally has arisons. 0.0 reur 9 enne 2.91062 2.4380 eau 0.05 indiq e s Simultané 9 s de coi 9 -0.8890 1 -0.3043 9 -1.1948	2019 at 2: ngagem a higher 33 21 55 uées par 5% Inter nfiance 0 1 3 1 3 0	13:33 PM ent Type II error valle 1948 .7446 .8890	rate than Tuke		
Control Non-variable -0.5672 -1.6242 0.4899 Generated by the SAS System ('Local', X64 SRV12) on 12 août 2019 at 2:13:33 PM Appendix XXXIV: ANOVA procédure & Bonferroni post-hoc test of the set	ote: This test co	ntrols the T	ompara ompara compara com iable Variable on-varia on-varia	S System ('Local' P le Bonferroni (E perimentwise erro all pa Alpha Degrés de libh Erreur quadra Valeur critiqu isons significati Sroup paraison - Non-variable e - Control ble - Variable able - Control	, X64_SRV1 age Break Dunn) pour or rate, but in inwise comp erté de l'er tique moy e de t ives au niv Différenc: Entr le moyenne 0.152 0.720 -0.152	2) on 12 août 2 1st step sbs e t generally has arisons. 0.0 reur 9 enne 2.91062 2.4380 eau 0.05 indiq e s Simultané 9 s de co 9 -0.8890 1 -0.3043 9 -1.1948 2 -0.4895	2019 at 2: ngagem a higher 33 21 55 uées par 5% Inter 6% Inter 6% Inter 1 1 3 1 1 5 5 1 1 5 1 1 5 1 1 5 1 1 5 1 1 5 1 1 5 1 1 5 1 1 5 1 1 5 1 1 5 1 1 5 1 1 1 5 1 1 1 5 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	13:33 PM ent Type II error valle .1948 .7446 .8890 .6242	rate than Tuke		
Generated by the SAS System ('Local', X64 SRV12) on 12 août 2019 at 2:13:33 PM Appendix XXXIV: ANOVA procédure & Bonferroni post-hoc test of th	ote: This test co	ntrols the T	ompara ompara ompara com iable Variable on-varia control	S System ('Local' P le Bonferroni (E perimentwise erro all pa Alpha Degrés de libi Erreur quadra Valeur critiqu isons significati Sroup paraison - Non-variable e - Control ble - Variable able - Control - Variable	, X64_SRV1 age Break Dunn) pour or rate, but in invise comp erté de l'er tique moy e de t Ves au niv Différenc: Entr le moyenne 0.152 0.720 -0.152 0.567 -0.720	2) on 12 août 2 1st step sbs e t generally has arisons. 0.0 reur 9 enne 2.91062 2.4380 eau 0.05 indiq e s Simultané 9 s de co 9 -0.8890 1 -0.3043 9 -1.1946 2 -0.4895 1 -1.7446	2019 at 2: ngagem a higher 33 21 55 uées par 5% Inter 6% Inter 6% Inter 1 3 3 1 3 1 3 1 3 0 3 1 3 1 3 0 3 1 1 5 5 5 5 6 6 6 7 1 1 5 5 1 1 5 5 1 1 5 1 1 5 5 1 1 5 5 1 1 5 5 1 1 5 1 1 5 1 1 5 1 1 5 1 1 5 1 1 5 1 1 5 1 1 5 1 1 1 3 1 1 1 3 1 1 1 3 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	13:33 PM ent Type II error valle .1948 .7446 .8890 .6242 .3043	rate than Tuke		
Appendix XXXIV: ANOVA procédure & Bonferroni post-hoc test of th	ote: This test co	ntrols the T	ompara ompara ompara com iable Variable on-varia on-varia control ntrol	S System ('Local' P le Bonferroni (E perimentwise erro all pa Alpha Degrés de libi Erreur quadra Valeur critiqu isons significati Sroup paraison - Non-variable e - Control ble - Variable able - Control - Variable - Non-variable	, X64_SRV1 age Break Dunn) pour or rate, but if invise comp erté de l'er tique moy e de t ves au niv Différenc: ent noyenne 0.152 0.720 -0.152 0.567 -0.720 -0.567	2) on 12 août 2 1st step sbs e t generally has arisons. 0.0 reur 9 enne 2.91062 2.4380 eau 0.05 indiq e s Simultané 9 s de co 9 -0.8890 1 -0.3043 9 -1.1946 2 -0.4893 1 -1.7446 2 -1.6242	2019 at 2: ngagem a higher 33 21 55 uées par 5% Inter 6 5% 1 3 1 3 1 3 1 3 1 3 0 9 1 3 1 3 0 9 1 1 3 0 9 1 1 3 0 1 3 1 1 5 5 1 1 5 1 1 5 1 1 5 1 1 5 1 1 5 1 1 1 5 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	13:33 PM ent Type II error valle 1948 7446 8890 6242 3043 4899	rate than Tuke		
	ote: This test co	ntrols the T C Var N N C Generated	the SAS Tests t o ype exp ompara Com iable Variable on-varia on-varia Control ntrol by the S	S System ('Local' P le Bonferroni (I perimentwise erro all pa <u>Alpha</u> <u>Degrés de libu</u> <u>Erreur quadra</u> Valeur critiqu isons significati sons significati <u>sons significati</u> <u>- Non-variable</u> <u>- Control ble - Variable</u> <u>- Non-variable</u> <u>- Non-variable</u> SAS System ('Lo	, X64_SRV1 age Break Dunn) pour or rate, but if irwise comp erté de l'er rtique moy e de t ves au niv Différence Entre le moyenne 0.152 0.720 -0.152 0.567 -0.720 -0.567 -0.720 -0.567	2) on 12 août 2 1st step sbs e t generally has arisons. 0.0 reur 9 enne 2.91062 2.4380 eau 0.05 indiq e s Simultané 9 9 -0.8890 1 -0.3043 9 -1.1946 2 -0.4899 1 -1.7446 2 -1.6242 R√12) on 12 ao	2019 at 2: ngagem a higher b b c s s nfiance b 1 3 1 3 0 1 3 0 1 3 0 1 3 0 2 0 1 3 0 0 1 3 0 0 1 3 0 0 1 3 0 0 1 3 0 0 1 1 0 0 1 1 0 0 1 1 0 0 1 1 0 0 1 1 0 0 1 1 0 0 1 1 0 0 1 1 0 0 1 1 0 0 1 1 0 0 1 1 0 0 1 1 0 0 1 1 0 0 1 1 0 0 1 1 0 0 1 1 0 0 1 1 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	13:33 PM ent Type II error valle 1948 .7446 .8890 .6242 .3043 .4899	rate than Tuke		

				Nb d'o Nb d'o	bserva bs. util	tions lu isées	es 9 9	6 6			
				An	alvse d	le varia	nce				T
					Som	me des	M	oyenne			-
	Source			DD	L	carrés	quad	Iratique	Valeur I	Pr > F	
	Modèle				2	9.34285		4.67142	1.60	0.2064	
	Erreur			9:	3 27	0.68775		2.91062			_
	Total so	mmes c	orrigé	es 9:	5 28	0.03060					
		Root	MSE		1	.70605	R carr	é	0.0334		
		Moye	nne de	épendai	nte 4	.31510	R car.	ajust.	0.0126		
		Coeff	Var		39	.53680		-			
			D.	águltata	ootimá	a daa ni		troo			
			R	Valour	esume	suespa	arame	ues			
	Varia	hle	וחם	des pa	ramètri	es t	vne V	/aleur d	u test t P	r > Iti	
	Inter	cent	1		3.8828	31 0.30	159	diour a	12.87 <	0001	
	Non-	variable	. 1		0.567	19 0.43	356		1.31 0	1940	
	Varia	ble	1		0.720	13 0.42	019		1.71 0	.0899	
~							2	40	2040 -4 2		
G	enerated	by the S	AS SY	stem (Lo	осаг, хь	4_SRV1	2) on	12 aout	2019 at 2	:20:34 PI	VI
Appen	ıdix X	XXV	: H2	expe	rime	nt: lir	ıear	regre	ession	of the	e type of
oroin	over t	the av	erao	e eno	agen	nent r	ate	durin	o the	lst nla	avthrough
group		ine av	erug	e eng	agen	ient i	are	uum	Suite	ist ph	iyunougn
			N	/leans :	and D	escript	ive St	tatistics	S		
Group	Mean	of 'Engag	jement APGR'	Std. D	ev. of 'E	ngagem AP	ient GR' 'E	S Engagen	itd. Error nent APG	of Numl R' Value	per of non-missing s for 'Engagement APGR'
		(1.02%)			4.3	39%		0.45	%	96
Control		(0.32%)			3.3	34%		0.591	%	32
Non-variable	•	(0.92%)			4.4	17%		0.82	%	30
		(1 76%)			5.1	4%		0.881	%	34



Group			Mea	ans and E	Descrip	otive	Statist	ics				
Group	M	ean of 'A engag	WG sbs Jement'	Std. Dev. sbs enga	of 'AVG gement	Std sbs	. Error o s engage	f 'AVG ement'	Number sb	of non-r values fo s engag	nissin or 'AV(emen	g G ť
			4.21		1.67			0.17			9	6
Control			3.87		1.85	i		0.33			3	2
Non-varia	able		4.40		1.57	·		0.29			3	0
Variable			4.37		1.58	}		0.27			3	4
Appe engag	Generate ndix (emen	ed by the XXXI (t score	SAS S) X: De e per	escriptiv group	a", x64_8 ve sta	sr∨12 tisti	?) on 12 : cs of	août 201 the av	9 at 1:55:0 verage	step-	by-s	step
				The A	NOVA P	roced	ure					
			Depe	endent Vari	able: AV	/G sbs	engage	ment				
	Source		DDL S	iomme des	carrés	Moyen	nne quad	Iratique	Valeur F	Pr > F		
	Model		2	5.60	366293		2.8	8033147	1.00	0.3703		
	Error		93	259.63	338506		2.3	7917618				
	Correcte	ed Total	95	265.24	404799							
		r-carré	Coef de	Var Racin	670857	AVG s	sbs enga	igement	Moyenne	•		
		5.021130	00.0	A COL	010001				4.214510	<u>'</u>		
		Source		Anova SS I	Moyenno	e quac ວອ	Iratique	Valeur 1 O	F Pr>F			
		Group		.000025511		2.0	0001400	1.0	0.3703			
	Gener	rated by th	ne SAS (System ('Loo	cal', X64_	SRV12	2) on 12 :	août 2019	9 at 1:55:0	3 PM		
					Page Bre	eak ·····						
ata: This tast		Tes	ststde	Bonferroni	(Dunn) p	our A	VG shs 6	endaden	nent			
ote: This test	controls f	the Type I	experim	nentwise erro all pai	ır rate, bu rwise col	ut it gei mparis	nerally ha ons.	as a high	er Type II e	error rate	than Tu	ukey's '
ote: This test	controls f	the Type I	experim	nentwise erro all pai pha	ır rate, bu rwise cor	ut it gei mparis	nerally ha ons.	as a high 0.05	er Type II a	error rate	than Tu	ukey's i
iole: This test	controls t	the Type I	experim Alı De	nentwise erro all pai pha grés de libe	orrate, bu rwise con erté de l	ut it ger mparis 'erreu i	nerally ha ons. r	as a high 0.05 93	er Type II e	error rate	than Tu	ukey's :
ore: This test	controls t	the Type I	experim Alı De Err	nentwise erro all pai grés de libe reur quadra	or rate, bu rwise con erté de l tique mo	ut it ger mparis 'erreu n oyenn	nerally ha ons. r e 2.791	as a high 0.05 93 1762	er Type II e	error rate	than Tu	ukey's :
ure: mis test	controls t	the Type	experim Alı De Err Va	nentwise erro all pai ogrés de libe reur quadra ileur critiqu	or rate, bu rwise con erté de l tique mo e de t	ut it gel mparis 'erreu l oyenn	nerally ha ons. r e 2.791 2.43	as a high 0.05 93 1762 3805	er Type II (error rate	than Tu	ukey's '
ure: mis test	controls t	the Type Comp	experim Alı De Err Va araison	nentwise erro all pai grés de libe reur quadra leur critiqu s significati	errate, bu inwise cou erté de l tique mo e de t ves au r	ut it gen mparis 'erreun oyenn niveau	nerally ha ons. r e 2.791 2.43 0.05 ind	0.05 93 1762 3805	er Type II e par ^{***} .	error rate	than Ti	ukey's 1
ule: Inis test	controls t	the Type Comp	experim Alı De Err Va araison Groui	nentwise erro all pai ngrés de libe reur quadra lleur critiqu s significati	errate, bu irwise col erté de l tique mu e de t ves au r Différen Er	it it gen mparis 'erreun oyenn niveau niveau ntre les S	nerally ha ons. r e 2.791 2.43 0.05 ind	0.05 93 1762 1805 1995% In	er Type II e par ***. tervalle	error rate	than Tu	ukey's :
ule: Inis test	controls t	the Type Comp	experim Alı De Err Va araison Grou ompara	nentwise erro all pai ngrés de libe reur quadra leur critiqu s significati p nison	or rate, bu invise col erté de l tique mu e de t ves au r Différei Er moyen	it it gen mparis 'erreun oyenn niveau niveau niveau niveau niveau niveau niveau niveau	nerally ha ons. r e 2.791 2.43 0.05 ind imultane de o	0.05 93 1762 1805 1998 1995 1995% Int confianc	er Type II e par ****. tervalle e	error rate	than Tu	Jkey's
ule: Inis test	controls t	Comp Comp C Non-va	experim Alı De Err Va araison Grou ompara ariable	nentwise erro all pai ngrés de libe reur quadra leur critiqu s significati p ison - Variable	or rate, bu invise con erté de l tique mo e de t ves au r Différen Er moyen 0.0	it it ger mparis 'erreur oyenn niveau niveau ntre les S nes 338	nerally ha ons. r e 2.791 2.43 0.05 ind imultané de c -0.96	0.05 93 1762 1805 11quées 95% In confianc	par ****. tervalle e 1.0542	error rate	than Tu	ukey's
ule: Inis test	controls t	Comp Comp Comp Non-va Non-va	experim Alı De Erri Va araison Grouy ompara ariable ariable	nentwise erro all pai grés de libe reur quadra leur critique s significati s significati p ison - Variable - Control	er rate, bu invise col arté de l tique mo e de t ves au r Différen Er moyen 0.0	it it ger mparis 'erreur oyenn niveau nce les S 338 298	nerally ha ons. r e 2.791 2.43 0.05 ind imultand de 0 -0.96 -0.50	0.05 93 1762 3805 11quées 6 95% Int confianc 366	er Type II a par ***. tervalle e 1.0542 1.5650	error rate	than Tu	ukey's
ure: mis test	controls t	Comp Comp C Non-va Variable	experim Alj De Ern Va araison Grouj ompara ariable ariable e - No	nentwise erro all pai ogrés de libe reur quadra leur critique s significati s significati p ison - Variable - Control on variable	er rate, bu invise col arté de l tique mo e de t ves au r Différen Er moyen 0.0 0.5 -0.0	it it ge mparis 'erreur oyenn nce ntre les S 338 298 338	nerally ha ons. r e 2.791 2.43 0.05 ind imultand de 0 -0.96 -0.50 -1.06	0.05 93 1762 3805 11quées 95% In confianc 366 155	er Type II a par ***. tervalle e 1.0542 1.5650 0.9866	error rate	than Tu	ukey's
ure: mis test	controls t	Comp Comp Con-va Non-va Variable Varia	experim Alı De Ern Va araison Grou ompara ariable ariable e - No able	nentwise erro all pai grés de libe reur quadra leur critique s significati s significati s significati variable - Control on variable - Control	er rate, bu invise col arté de l tique mo e de t ves au r Différen Er moyen 0.0 0.5 -0.0	it it ge mparis 'erreur oyenn nce ntre les 338 298 338 960	nerally ha ons. r e 2.791 2.43 0.05 ind imultand de 0 -0.96 -0.50 -1.05 -0.50	0.05 93 1762 3805 iiquées iiquées 595% Int confianc 366 955 542 173	er Type II a par ***. tervalle e 1.0542 1.5650 0.9866 1.4993 0.5555	error rate	than Tu	ukey's
ure: mis test	controls t	Comp Comp C Non-va Variable Varia Control	experim All De Err Va araison Grou ompara ariable ariable e - No able - No	nentwise erro all pai grés de libe reur quadra leur critique s significati s significati s significati variable - Control on-variable Nariable	errate, bu invise col arté de l tique me e de t ves au r Différen Er moyen 0.0 0.5 -0.0 0.4 -0.5	it it gen mparis 'erreul oyenn itveau nce les S nes 338 298 338 960 298 960	nerally ha ons. r e 2.791 2.43 0.05 ind imultand de 0 -0.96 -0.50 -1.05 -0.50 -1.58 -0.50 -1.58	0.05 93 1762 3805 iiquées iiquées 555 542 173 550	er Type II e par ***. tervalle e 1.0542 1.5650 0.9866 1.4993 0.5055 0.5055	error rate	than Tu	ukey's
ule: Inis test	controls t	Comp Comp C Non-vz Non-v Variable Varia Control Control	experim All De Errory araison Group ompara ariable ariable e - No able - No col - 1	nentwise erro all pai ogrés de libd reur quadra leur critiqu s significati s significati s control n-variable Control on-variable Variable	er rate, bu irwise col arté de l tique me e de t ves au r Différen 0.0 0.5 -0.0 0.4 -0.5 -0.4	it it gen mparis 'erreun oyenn itre les S nes 338 298 338 298 960 298 960	nerally ha ons. r e 2.791 2.43 0.05 ind imultand de 0 -0.96 -0.50 -1.05 -0.50 -1.56 -1.45	0.05 93 1762 1805 11quées 95% In confianc 165 542 173 550 193	er Type II e par ***. tervalle 1.0542 1.6650 0.9866 1.4993 0.5055 0.5073	error rate	than Ti	ukey's
Annei	Gene	Comp Comp C Non-va Variable Variable Control Control Control Control Control Control Control	experim All De Ern Va araison Grou ompara ariable e - No able - No tol - he SAS	nentwise erro all pai grés de libe reur quadra leur critique s significati s significati s significati p - Variable - Control on-variable Variable Variable System ("Loo	errate, bu invise col tique me e de t ves au r Différee Er moyen 0.0 0.5 -0.0 0.4 -0.5 -0.4 col, X64_ ANO	ti ti gen mparis 'erreun oyenn ntre les S 338 298 338 298 338 960 298 338 960 298 338	nerally ha ons. r e 2.791 2.43 0.05 ind imultané de 0 -0.96 -0.56 -0.56 -1.05 -1.56 -1.58 2) on 12 DIOCE	0.05 93 1762 3805 iiquées iiquées 6 95% Int confianc 366 055 542 173 550 993 août 201 cdure	er Type II a par ***. tervalle e 1.0542 1.5650 0.9866 1.4993 0.5055 0.5073 9 at 1:55:0 & Bon	error rate 13 PM	than Ti	ukey's
Apper hoc tes	Gene adix X st of t	Comp Comp C Non-va Non-va Variable Vari	experim All Definition Erriva ariaison Group ompara ariable e - No rol - V he SAS con para ble - No rol - V he SAS	nentwise erro all pai grés de libe reur quadra leur critiqu s significati s significati s significati s control on-variable Control on-variable Variable System ('Lo criment: group oi	erté de l tique me e de t ves au r Différen Er moyen 0.0 0.5 -0.0 0.4 -0.5 -0.4 cal', X64_ ANO 1 the a	it it gei ivereun ve	nerally ha ons. r e 2.791 2.43 0.05 ind imultant de 0 -0.98 -0.98 -0.98 -0.50 -1.05 -1.05 -1.05 2) on 12 proce age st	0.05 93 1762 1805 1762 1805 193 1762 1762 1762 1805 1762 1805 1762 1805 1762 1805 1762 1866 1955 1866 1955 1875 1875 1875 1875 1875 1875 1875 18	er Type II a par ***. tervalle e 1.0542 1.5650 0.9866 1.4993 0.5055 0.5073 9 at 1:55:0 & Bon r-step e	B PM Iferroi engage	ni po	ost- ut

	Va	Mo riable	dèle e dé	e : Lin penda	iear_Reg ante : Al	jressi /G sb	on_M s eng	lodel Jagem	ent		
		парте	e ue	penua	ante . A	10 50	s eng	Jagenn	GIIL		
			Nh	d'obs	envation	s luo	e qu	3			
			Nb	d'obs	. utilisé	s ruc.	96	5			
				A I.							
				Analy	yse de v Sommo	arian doc	Ce M	ovonne			
Source				DDL	Ca	rrés i	quad	ratique	Valeur	FP	r >
Modèle				2	5.60	663	-	2.80331	1.	00 0.	370
Erreur				93	259.63	385		2.79178	ì		
Total som	mes co	rrigée	es	95	265.24	048					
	Root M	SE			1.670)86 <mark>R</mark>	carré	é	0.0211		
	Moyen	ne dé	épen	idante	4.21	191 <mark>R</mark>	car.	ajust.	0.0001		
	Coeff \	/ar 👘			39.64	58					
		R	ésul	tats e	stimés d	es pa	ramè	tres			
			Va	leur e	estimée	Erre	eur				
Variab	le	DDL	des	s para	mètres	ty	pe V	aleur)	du test t	Pr >	t
Interce	pt	1		3	3.87370	0.295	537		13.11	<.00	01
Non-Va Variah	riable	1		۔ ر	0.52977 D 40507	0.424	62 53		1.25	0.21	53
											12
Benerated b Be ndix X p on the	iy the SA LI: H e ave	AS Sy H2 e rage	^{yster} exp e st	m ('Loo erin ep-l	^{cal', X64} _ nent: 1 by-ste	sr∨ı line p eı	2) on ar r nga	12 aoi egres geme	at 2019 a ssion ent sc	t 2:07 of t ore	ine he pe
Generated b e ndix X p on the	y the S, ILI: H e ave: v	AS Sy H2 e rage Mo /ariabl	exp exp e st dèle le dé	m ('Loo erin ep-l Pro : Lind épenda	nent: 1 nent: 1 by-ste océdure 1 ear_Regi ante : Gl	SRV1 inea p en REG ression obal e	2) on ar r nga; n_Moo engag	12 aoû egres geme del jement	at 2019 a ssion ent sc	t 2:07 of t ore	ine he pe
Generated b e ndix X p on the	v the S LI: H e ave v	AS Sy H2 e rage Mo /ariabl	exp exp est dèle le dé	m ('Loo perin tep-l Pro s : Lin épenda s lues	cal', X64_ nent: 1 by-ste bcédure 1 ear_Regi ante : Gl	SRV1 ine: p en REG ression obal e	2) on ar r ngaş n_Mor engaş	12 ao(egres geme del jement	at 2019 a ssion ent sc	t 2:07 of t ore	ine he pe
Generated b endix X p on the	y the S, ILI: H e ave: v Nb d'ol Nb d'ol	AS Sy H2 e rage Mo 'ariabl oserva oserva	exp est dèle le dé lisée	m ('Loo erin ep-l Pro s : Lin épenda s lues es	cal', X64_ nent: 1 by-ste océdure 1 ear_Regi ante : Gl	SRV1 inea p en REG ression obal e	2) on ar r ngag n_Mod engag	12 ao(egres geme del jement	it 2019 a ssion ent sc 96 95	t 2:07 of t ore	in the pe
Generated b endix X p on the	y the S ILI: H e ave V Nb d'ot Nb d'ot Nombro	AS Sy H2 e rage Mo 'ariabl oserva oserva os. util e d'ob	exp exp est dèle le dé ation lisée	m ('Loo perin rep-l Pro s : Lin s lues s s lues s rations	cal', X64_ nent: 1 by-ste océdure 1 ear_Regi ante : Gl s avec va	SRV1 inea p en REG ression obal e	2) on ar ru ngay n_Mou engag manq	12 ao(egres geme del jement	it 2019 a ssion ent sc 96 95 1	t 2:07 of t ore	the pe
Generated b endix X p on the	y the S ILI: H e ave: v Nb d'of Nombri	AS Sy H2 e rage Mo 'ariabl oserva os. util e d'ob	vster exp est dèle le dé lisée serv	m ('Loo perin ep-l Pro e : Lin épenda s lues es rations Analy	cal', X64_ nent: 1 by-ste océdure 1 ear_Reg ante : GI s avec va	SRV1 ine: p en REG ression obal e	2) on ar r nga n_Mo engag manq	12 ao(egres geme del jement	it 2019 a ssion ent sc 96 95 1	t 2:07 of t ore	he pe
Generated b endix X p on the	y the S (LI: H e ave) v Nb d'ol No d'ol No d'ol	AS Sy H2 e rage /ariabl /ariabl /ariabl /ariabl /ariabl /ariabl	yster exp e st dèle dé le dé serv	m (Loo erin ep-l Pro : Lin s lues s vations Analy	cal', X64_ nent: 1 by-ste océdure 1 ear_Regi ante : Gl s avec va s avec va sse de va	SRV1 pen REG ression obal e	2) on ar r nga; n_Mod manq e Moy	12 aoú egres geme del jement juantes	it 2019 a ssion ent sc 96 95 1	of t ore	the pe
Generated b endix X p on the Source Modèle	y the S LI: H e ave: v Nb d'ot Nb d'ot Nombre	AS Sy H2 e rage Mo Variabl oserva os. util e d'ob	yster exp e st dèle le dé ntion lisée serv	m (Loo erin ep-l Pro : Lin épenda s lues es rations Analy DDL	cal', X64_ nent: 1 by-ste bear_Regi ante : Gl s avec va se de va Somme o car 82.419	SRV1 per REG ession obal e	2) on ar r nga n_Mog engag mang e Moy uadra 82.4	12 aoú egres geme del jement uantes enne tique V	it 2019 a ssion ent sc 96 95 1 'aleur F 108.85	t 2:07 of t ore <u>Pr></u> <.000	the pe
Generated b endix X p on the Source Modèle Erreur	y the S ILI: F e ave: V Nb d'ot Nb d'ot Nombro	AS Sy H2 e rage Mo 'ariabl oserva os. util e d'ob	vster exp e st dèle le dé ntion lisée serv	m (Loo erin ep-l Pro : Lin épenda s lues es rations Analy DDL 1 93	cal', X64_ nent: 1 by-ste océdure 1 ear_Regi ante : Gl s avec va s avec va se de va Somme o car 82.419 70.418	SRV1 line: p en REG ession obal e riance riance sés qu 96 888	2) on ar r nga; n_Mog manq e Moy uadra 82.4 0.7	12 ao(egres geme gement uantes tique V 41996 75717	it 2019 a ssion ent sc 96 95 1 'aleur F 108.85	t 2:07 of t ore <u>Pr</u> >	ritz the pe
Source Modèle Erreur Total sor	y the S ILI: H e ave: V Nb d'ol Nombro	AS Sy H2 e rage Mo 'ariabl oserva os. util e d'ob	vster exp e st dèle le dé ntion lisée serv	m (Loo erin ep-l Pro e : Lin épenda s lues s vations Analy DDL 1 93 94	cal', X64_ nent: by-ste océdure l ear_Reg ante : Gl s avec va se de va Somme o car 82.419 70.416 152.836	SRV1 ine p en REG ression obal e leurs riance les qu 96 88 88 88	2) on ar r nga; n_Mog e Moy uadra 82.4 0.7	12 ao(egres geme gement uantes tique V 11996 75717	it 2019 a ssion ent sc 96 95 1 /aleur F 108.65	t 2:07 of t ore Pr >	ritz the pe
Generated b endix X p on the Source Modèle Erreur Total son	y the S ILI: H e ave: v Nb d'of Nombro nmes co	AS Sy H2 e rage Mo /ariabl bserva bs. util e d'ob	vster exp dèle le dé ation lisée serv	m (Loo erin ep-l Pro e : Lin épenda s lues s vations Analy DDL 1 93 94	cal', X64_ nent: i by-ste océdure i ear_Regi ante : Gi s avec va se de va Somme o car 82.419 70.410 152.830	SRV1 ines p en REG ression obal e leurs riance les es es es es es es es es es es es es e	2) on ar r nga; n_Mog e Moy uadra 82.4 0.7	12 ao(egres geme del jement uantes tique V 11996 75717	it 2019 a ssion ent sc 96 95 1 1 Valeur F 108.85 5393	t 2:07 of t ore <u>Pr ></u>	rite the pe
Source Modèle Erreur Total sor	y the S/ ILI: H e ave: V Nb d'ol Nombro nmes co Root N Moyer	AS Sy H2 e rage Mo fariabl oserva os. util e d'ob	yster exp est dèle dé le dé serv es	m (Loo erin ep-l Pro : Lind penda s lues s rations Analy 93 94 94	cal', X64_ nent: by-ste by-ste océdure l ear_Regi ante : Gl s avec va se de va Somme c car 82.419 70.416 152.836 0.870 4.1473	SRV1 ine: p en REG ession obal e leurs riance les qu 96 88 88 84 6 R c 77 R c	2) on ar r nga; n_Mog e Moy uadra 82.4 0.7 0.7 arré iar. aj	12 ao(egres geme gement uantes tique 57717 0. ust. 0.	it 2019 a ssion ent sc 96 95 1 'aleur F 108.85 5393 5343	t 2:07 of t ore Pr >	F
Generated b endix X p on the Source Modèle Erreur Total son	y the S LI: H e ave: V Nb d'ol Nb d'ol Nombro nmes co Root M Moyer Coeff V	AS Sy H2 e rage Mo ariabl oserva os. util e d'ob orrigée ASE nne dé Var	yster exp e st dèle le dé le dé serv es	m (Loo erin ep-l Pro : Lin épenda s lues es rations Analy DDL 1 93 94	s avec va s avec	SRV1 line: p en REG ession obal e riance leurs riance les qu 96 88 88 84 6 R c 27 R c 21	2) on ar r nga; n_Mog engag manq e Moy uadra 82,4 0,7	12 ao(egres geme gement uantes tique V 41996 75717 0. ust. 0.	it 2019 a ssion ent sc 96 95 1 7aleur F 108.85 5393 5343	t 2:07 of t ore <u>Pr ></u> <.000	F
Generated b endix X p on the Source Modèle Erreur Total son	y the S ILI: H 2 AVC: V Nb d'ol Nombro nmes co Root N Moyer Coeff V	AS Sy H2 e rage Mo /ariabl oserva os. util e d'ob orrigée ASE me dé Var Ré	yster exp est dèle dé le dé ation lisée sserv	m (Loo erin ep-l Pro s : Lin épenda s lues es rations DDL 1 93 94 dante	cal', X64_ nent: by-ste océdure l ear_Reg ante : Gl s avec va se de va Somme o car 82.419 70.416 152.836 0.870 4.1473 20.9809 timés de	SRV1 inea p en REG ression obal e leurs riance les es qu 96 88 88 84 6 R cc 77 R c 11 5 para	2) on ar r nga; n_Moy e Moy uadra 82.4 0.7 arré arré arré arré arré	12 ao(egres geime geiment uantes vanne van vanne va van vanne vanne van v v vanne va v v v v v v v v v v v v v v	it 2019 a ssion ent sc 96 95 1 /aleur F 108.85 5393 5343	t 2:07 of t ore Pr > <.000	F
Generated b endix X p on the Source Modèle Erreur Total son	y the S ILI: H e ave: v Nb d'ol Nombro nmes co Root M Moyer Coeff V	AS Sy H2 e rage Mo /ariabl bserva bs. util e d'ob orrigée ASE nne dé Var	yster expest dèle le dé ation lisée serv	m (Loo erin ep-l Pro e : Lin épenda s lues s vations Analy DDL 1 93 94 dante tats es Vale	cal', X64_ nent: by-ste océdure l ear_Reg ante : Gl s avec va se de va Somme o car 82.419 70.410 152.830 0.870 4.1473 20.9803 timés de our estimo	SRV1 innes p en REG ression obal e leurs riance les qu 96 88 88 84 6 R c 37 R c 31 5 para s para	2) on ar r nga; mang a Moy uadra 82.4 0.7 arré ar. aj amètra rreur	12 ao(egres geme uantes uantes tique V 11996 75717 0. ust. 0. ust. 0.	it 2019 a ssion ent sc 96 95 1 /aleur F 108.85 5393 5343	r 2:07 of t ore Pr > <.000	F 1
Generated b endix X p on the Source Modèle Erreur Total son	y the S/ ILI: H e ave: v Nb d'ol No d'ol	AS Sy H2 e rage Mo 'ariabl oserva os. util e d'ob orrigée ASE nne dé Var Ré	yster expest dèle le dé ation lisée serv es épen ésult	m (Loo erin ep-l Pro : Lin épenda s lues s vations Analy DDL 1 93 94 0DL 1 93 94 vatas es Vale des p	cal', X64_ nent: by-ste by-ste bear_Reg ante : Gl s avec va se de va Somme of car 82.419 70.410 152.830 0.870 4.147 20.9809 timés de sur estimo aramètr 1 700	SRV1 ines p en REG ression obal e leurs riance les es 88 88 84 6 R c 37 R c 38 38 38 38 38 39 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30	2) on ar r nga; n_Mou engag manq e Moy uadra 82.4 0.7 ar. aj arré type 20214	12 ao(egres geme uantes uantes renne tique Valeu valeu	it 2019 a ssion ent sc 96 95 1 1 'aleur F 108.85 5393 5343	t 2:07 of t ore Pr> <.000	F 1
Generated b endix X p on the Source Modèle Erreur Total son	y the S/ ILI: H e ave: v Nb d'ol Nombro nmes co Root N Moyer Coeff 1	AS Sy H2 e rage Mo 'ariabl oserva os. util e d'ob orrigée ASE me dé Var Ré	yster exp e st dèle le dé ation lisée serv es épen 2DL 1 1	m (Loo erin ep-l Pro : Lind penda s lues s vations Analy 0DL 1 93 94 0DL 1 93 94 vale des p	cal', X64_ nent: by-ste by-ste océdure l ear_Reg ante : Gl s avec va se de va Somme o car 82.419 70.410 152.830 0.870 4.1473 20.9809 timés de var estimo oaramètr 1.799 0.558	SRV1 ines peression obal e leurs riance les es es es fo a s para ée es co s a a a a b a b a b a b a b a b a b a b	2) on al' f' nga; n_Moo engag manq 82.4 0.7 arré type 24214 05354	12 ao(egres geme uantes uantes tique Valeu	it 2019 a ssion ent sc 96 95 1 7 108.85 5393 5343 r du test 7.4 10.43	t 2:07 of t ore <.000	F 1 1 101 101
Generated b endix X p on the Source Modèle Erreur Total son	y the S (LI: H e ave: v Nb d'ol Nb d'ol Nombro nmes co Root M Moyer Coeff 1 ngagem	AS Sy H2 e rage Mo ariabl oserva os. util e d'ob orrigée MSE ne dé Var Re ent	yster exp e st dèle le dé ation lisée serv ésult DDL 1 1	m (Loo erin ep-l Pro : Lin s lues s lues s ations Analy 93 94 dante tats es Vale des p	cal', X64_ nent: by-ste by-ste océdure l ear_Regu ante : Gl s avec va se de va Somme o car 82.419 70.416 152.830 0.870 4.147 20.9809 timés de or aramètr 1.799 0.558	SRV1 ines peression obal e leurs riance les es es es es 10 0.2 58 0.0	2) on at th nga; n_Mog engag manq e Moy uadra 82.4 0.7 arré arré iarré irreur type 24214 05354	12 ao(egres geme uantes tique 57717 0. ust. 0. ust. 0. es Valeu	it 2019 a ssion ent sc 96 95 1 7 108.85 5393 5343 r du test 7.4 10.43	t 2:07 of t ore <.000	112 115 15 16 10 1 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10
Generated b endix X p on the Source Modèle Erreur Total son Variable Intercept AVG sbs en Generated	y the S (LI: H e ave: v Nb d'ol Nb d'ol Nombro nmes co Root M Moyer Coeff ngagem by the S.	AS Sy H2 e rage Mo ariabl oserva os. util e d'ob orrigée MSE nne dé Var Re AS Sy	yster exp est dèle dé le dé ation lisée serv ésult DDL 1 1	m ('Loca erin e : Lin s lues s lues s rations DDL 1 93 94 dante dante das s	cal', X64_ nent: by-ste océdure l ear_Reg ante : Gl s avec va se de va Somme o car 82.419 70.416 152.836 0.870 4.147 20.9809 timés de our estimo oaramètr 1.799 0.558 al', X64_S	SRV1 inea p en REG ression obal e leurs riance les es 88 84 6 R c 7 R c 7 R c 10 0.2 88 80 80 10 0.2 88 0.0 88 0.0 80 0.0	2) on al T n n manq manq e Moy uadra 82.4 0.7 e arré type 24214 05354 on 12	12 aoû egres geime uantes tique V 11996 75717 0. ust. 0. es Valeu 2 août 2	it 2019 a ssion ent sc 96 95 1 /aleur F 108.85 5393 5343 r du test 7.4: 10.4: 019 at 3:0	t 2:07 of t ore Pr > <.000 t Pr:> <.000	F 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
Generated b endix X p on the Source Modèle Erreur Total son Variable Intercept AVG sbs er Generated Append	y the S ILI: H e ave: v Nb d'ol Nombro nmes co Root N Moyer Coeff v ngagem by the S. ix XI	AS Sy H2 e rage Mo /ariabl bserva bs. util e d'ob	vster exp e st dèle le dé ation lisée serv ésult 1 1 rster H2	m (Loc erin ep-l Pro e : Lin épenda s lues s vations Analy DDL 1 93 94 dante dante des p	cal', X64_ nent: by-ste océdure l ear_Reg ante : Gl s avec va se de va Somme o car 82.419 70.410 152.830 0.870 4.147; 20.9803 timés de our estimo oaramètr 1.799 0.558 al', X64_S erime:	SRV1 iine; p en REG ression obal e es 88 84 6 R c 37 R c 37 R c 37 R c 37 R c 37 R c 38 38 4 30 0.1 38 0.1 88 38 4 30 0.1 38 0.1 10 0.1	2) on ar r nga; n_Moy arrá 82.4 0.7 arrá ar. aj arré type 24214 05354 on 12 nea	12 aoû egres geime uantes uantes tique V 1996 75717 0. ust. 0. ust. 0. es Valeu 2 août 2 r regi	it 2019 a ssion ent sc 96 95 1 /aleur F 108.85 5393 5343 r du test 7.4. 10.42 019 at 3.0 ressio	t 2:07 of t ore <.000 t Pr:> <.000	F 1 F 1 PM C th
Generated b endix X p on the Source Modèle Erreur Total son Variable Intercept AVG sbs en Generated Append average	y the S ILI: H e ave: v Nb d'ol Nombro nmes co Root N Moyer Coeff 1 ngagem by the S ix XL step-1	AS Sy H2 e rage Mo /ariabl bserva bs. util e d'ob	vster exp e st dèle le dé ation lisée serv éserv éserv 1 1 1 2 stern H2 tep	m (Local erin ep-l Pro e : Line penda s lues s vations Analy DDL 1 93 94 dante des p dante des p	cal', X64_ nent: i by-ste océdure l ear_Regi ante : Gl s avec va se de va Somme o car 82,419 70,410 152,830 0.870 4,147; 20,980 timés de varamètr 1.799 0.558 al', X64_S erimet	SRV1 lines p en REG ression obal e leurs riance les es 88 84 6 R c 77 R c 88 84 6 R c 77 R c 71 88 88 84 84 6 R c 77 R c 71 88 88 88 88 84 84 86 88 88 84 84 86 88 88 88 88 88 88 88 88 88 88 88 88	2) on al' I' nga; n_Moy emang ag ag ag arré ar. aj ar. aj carré car. aj carré car. aj carré car. aj carré car. aj carré car. aj carré car. a carré car. a car. a car. a car. a car. a car. a car. a carré car. a car. a	12 aoû egres geme uantes uantes tique V 1996 75717 0. ust. 0. ust. 0. es Valeu 2 août 2 r reg	it 2019 a ssion ent sc 96 95 1 7 108.85 5393 5343 r du test 7.4 10.43 019 at 3:0 ression er the	t 2:07 of t ore Pr ><	F 1 F 1 F 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
Senerated b endix X p on the Source Modèle Erreur Total sor Variable Intercept AVG sbs er Generated Append average	y the S ILI: H e ave: v Nb d'ol Nombro nmes co Root N Moyer Coeff is XI step-la prace	AS Sy H2 e rage Mo ariabl bserva bs. util e d'ob ASE ME ME Var Ré AS Sy LII: 1 by-Si	yster exp e st dèle le dé stion lisée serv ésult 1 1 yster H2 tep	m (Loc erin ep-l Pro : Lin penda s lues s rations Analy DDL 1 93 94 DDL 1 93 94 dante des p dante des p	cal', X64_ nent: i by-ste océdure l ear_Regu ante : Gl s avec va se de va Somme o car 82.419 70.416 152.830 0.870 4.147(20.9809 timés de var estimo oaramètr 1.799 0.558 al', X64_S erime: sagemo	SRV1 ines p en REG riance leurs riance les q 10 6 R c 7 R c 11 58 88 88 88 88 88 88 88 88 88	2) on al' fi nga; n_Mor engag manq e Moy uadra 82.4 0.7 0.7 0.7 0.7 0.7 0.7 0.7 0.7 0.7 0.7	12 aoû egres geme uantes tique Valeu 2 août 2 r regi 2 ove	it 2019 a ssion ent sc 96 95 1 7 108.85 5393 5343 r du test 7.4 10.4 019 at 3:0 ression er the	t 2:07 of t ore	112 115 115 115 110 101 101 101 101

Group	ħ	lean of T	otal e	stimated S timing' e	td. Dev. stimated	of 'Total I timing'	Std. Error of estimated	f 'Total timing'	Number e:	r of non-missin values for 'Tota stimated timing
			0	:10:31.45	0:3	20:34.34	0:0	2:05.98		9
Control			0	:02:18.17	0:0	05:08.87	0:00	0:54.60		3
Non-varial	ble		0	:09:52.16	0:1	19:44.89	0:03	3:36.33		3
/ariable			0	:18:50.37	0;:	26:42.76	0:04	4:34.87		3
4.000	Gei	nerated by	the S.	AS System	('Local', X	64_SRV	12) on 14 août the total c	t 2019 at 3):16:35 F	
Apper	uaix	ALIII:	Des	The	Statist	ICS OI		sumau		le per grou
			De	pendent Var	iable: To	ital estim	ated timing			
	Sourc	e	DDL	Somme de	s carrés	Moyenne	e quadratique	Valeur F	Pr > F	
	Mode	l	2	162	95779.3		8147889.7	5.90	0.0039	
	Error		93	1284	44617.6		1381124.9			
	Corre	cted Total	95	1447	40396.9					
		r-carré	Coef	de Var Raci	ne MSE	Total es	timated timing	g Moyenne	в	
		0.112586	18	86.1144 1	175.213			631.446	5	
		Source	DDL	Anova SS	Moyenn	ne quadra	atique Valeur	F Pr > F		
	Ger	Source Group herated by t	DDL 2 he SA	Anova SS 16295779.33 S System ('Lo	Moyenr	n e quadra 8147(_SRV12) (atique Valeur 889.66 5.9 on 14 août 2019	F Pr > F 90 0.0039 9 at 3:16:3	5 PM	
ote: This te	Ger st cont	Source Group nerated by t	DDL 2 he SA Fests t	Anova SS 16295779.33 S System ("Lo de Bonferro perimentwise all	Moyenr ocal', X64_ Page I oni (Dunn error rate nainvise	ne quadra 8147(_SRV12) (Break) pour To , but it gel comnaris	atique Valeur 889.66 5.9 on 14 août 2019 otal estimated nerally has a hi	F Pr > F 30 0.0039 9 at 3:16:3 timing igher Type	5 PM Il error ra	ate than Tukey's
ote: This te	Ger st cont	Source Group nerated by t	DDL 2 he SA Tests t	Anova SS 16295779.33 S System ("Lo de Bonferro perimentwise all	Moyenr Docal', X64_ Page I Doni (Dunn error rate pairwise	ne quadra 8147(_SRV12) (Break)) pour To , but it gel comparis	atique Valeur 889.66 5.9 on 14 août 2019 otal estimated nerally has a hi ons.	F Pr > F 30 0.0039 9 at 3:16:3: timing tipher Type	5 PM	ate than Tukey's t
ote: This te	Ger est cont	Source Group nerated by t	DDL 2 he SA Fests t	Anova SS 16295779.33 S System ('Lo de Bonferro perimentwise all Alpha	Moyenr Page I Page I oni (Dunn error rate pairwise	ne quadra 8147(_SRV12) (Break) pour To , but it ger comparis	atique Valeur 889.66 5.9 on 14 août 2019 otal estimated nerally has a hi ons. 0.05	F Pr > F 30 0.0039 9 at 3:16:3: timing tipher Type	5 PM	ate than Tukey's t
ote: This te	Ger st cont	Source Group nerated by t	DDL 2 he SA Fests t	Anova SS 16295779.33 S System ('Lo de Bonferro perimentwise all Alpha Degrés de	Moyenr Docal', X64_ Page I Page I Pag	ne quadra 8147(_SRV12) (Break) pour To , but it ger comparis	atique Valeur 889.66 5.9 on 14 août 2019 otal estimated nerally has a hi ons. 0.05 ir 93	F Pr > F 30 0.0039 9 at 3:16:3: timing igher Type	5 PM	ate than Tukey's t
ote: This te	Ger st cont	Source Group nerated by t	DDL 2 he SA Tests t	Anova SS 16295779.33 S System ('Lo de Bonferro perimentwise all Alpha Degrés de Erreur qua	Moyenr Docal', X64_ Page I Page I Pag	ne quadra 8147(_SRV12) (Break) pour To , but it ger comparis le l'erreu moyenn	atique Valeur 889.66 5.9 on 14 août 2019 otal estimated nerally has a hi ons. 0.05 or 93 ne 1381125 o 4990	F Pr > F 30 0.0039 9 at 3:16:3: timing igher Type	5 PM	ate than Tukey's
ote: This te	Ger	Source Group nerated by t	DDL 2 he SA Tests t	Anova SS 16295779.33 S System ('Lo de Bonferro perimentwise all Alpha Degrés de Erreur qua Valeur cri	Moyenr Docal', X64_ Page I Page I oni (Dunn error rate pairwise liberté d adratique tique de	ne quadra 8147(_SRV12) (Break) pour To , but it gen comparis le l'erreu moyenn t	atique Valeur 889.66 5.9 on 14 août 2019 otal estimated nerally has a hi ons. 0.05 ur 93 ue 1381125 2.43805	F Pr > F 30 0.0039 9 at 3:16:3 timing igher Type	5 PM	ate than Tukey's
ote: This te	Ger st cont	Source Group herated by t rols the Typ	DDL 2 he SA Tests t be I ex	Anova SS 16295779.33 S System ('Lo de Bonferro perimentwise all Alpha Degrés de Erreur qua Valeur cri	Moyenr Page I Page I pni (Dunn error rate pairwise liberté d adratique tique de catives a	ne quadra 8147(SRV12) (Break) pour To , but it gen comparis le l'erreu moyenn t u niveau ence	atique Valeur 889.66 5.9 on 14 août 2019 otal estimated nerally has a hi ons. 0.05 ur 93 12 2.43805 0.05 2.43805	F Pr > F 30 0.0039 9 at 3:16:3 timing igher Type	5 PM	ate than Tukey's t
ote: This te	Ger •st cont	Source Group nerated by t rols the Typ	DDL 2 he SA Fests t be ex mpara	Anova SS 16295779.33 S System ('Lo de Bonferro perimentwise all Alpha Degrés de Erreur qua Valeur cri tisons signifi	Moyenr Page I Page I Pa	ne quadra 8147(_SRV12) (Break) pour To , but it ger comparis le l'erreu moyenn t u niveau ence Entre les Sin nnee	atique Valeur 889.66 5.9 on 14 août 2019 otal estimated nerally has a hi ons. 0.05 or 93 re 1381125 2.43805 r 0.05 indiquée multané 95% hi	F Pr > F 30 0.0039 9 at 3:16:3 timing igher Type es par ***.	5 PM	ate than Tukey's t
ote: This te	Ger •st cont	Source Group nerated by t rols the Typ	DDL 2 he SA Fests t be ex mpara Gi Comp	Anova SS 16295779.33 S System ('Lo de Bonferro perimentwise all Alpha Degrés de Erreur qua Valeur cri tisons signifi	Moyenr Docal', X64_ Page l Page l	ne quadra 8147(_SRV12) (Break) pour To , but it ger comparis le l'erreu moyenn t u niveau ence Entre les Sin nnes 538 2	atique Valeur 889.66 5.9 on 14 août 2019 otal estimated nerally has a hi ons. 0.05 or 93 te 1381125 2.43805 to 0.05 indiquée multané 95% In de confian -179.5	F Pr > F 30 0.0039 9 at 3:16:3 timing igher Type es par ***. ntervalle ice 1255 9	5 PM	ate than Tukey's t
ote: This te	Ger •st cont	Source Group nerated by t rols the Typ Co Varial Vai	DDL 2 he SA Fests t De ex mpara Gi Comp ble riable	Anova SS 16295779.33 S System ('Lo de Bonferro perimentwise all Alpha Degrés de Erreur qua Valeur cri tisons signifi tisons signifi toup araison - Non-variab - Control	Moyenr Page l Page l Pa	ne quadra 8147(_SRV12) (Break) pour To , but it ger comparis in pour To comparis le l'erreu moyenn t u niveau ence les Entre les Sin nnes 538.2	atique Valeur 889.66 5.9 on 14 août 2019 otal estimated nerally has a hi ons. 0.05 or 93 re 1381125 2.43805 r 0.05 indiquée multané 95% li de confian -179.5 286.5	F Pr > F 30 0.0039 9 at 3:16:3 timing igher Type es par ***. ntervalle ice 1255.9 1625.9	5 PM	ate than Tukey's t
ote: This te	Ger •st cont	Source Group nerated by t rols the Typ Co Varial Var Non-	DDL 2 he SA Tests t De ex mpara Gi Comp ble riable variab	Anova SS 16295779.33 S System ('Lo de Bonferro perimentwise all Alpha Degrés de Erreur qua Valeur cri tisons signifi toup araison - Non-variab - Control ble - Variable	Moyenr Page l Page l Pa	ne quadra 8147(_SRV12) (Break) pour To , but it ger comparis in gour To comparis le l'erreu moyenn t u niveau ence les Entre les Sin nnes 538.2 538.2	atique Valeur 889.66 5.9 on 14 août 2019 otal estimated nerally has a hisons. 0.05 u 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.65 -1255	F Pr > F 30 0.0039 9 at 3:16:3 timing igher Type es par ***. ntervalle ice 1255.9 1697.9 179.5	5 PM	ate than Tukey's t
ote: This te	Ger	Source Group herated by t rols the Typ Varial Var Non- Non	DDL 2 he SA Fests t be ex mpara Gi Comp ble riable variab	Anova SS 16295779.33 S System ('Lo de Bonferro perimentwise all Alpha Degrés de Erreur qua Valeur cri tisons signifi tisons signifi tisons signifi tisons signifi tisons control - Non-variab - Control ble - Control	Moyenr Page l Page l Pa	ne quadra 8147(_SRV12) (Break) pour To , but it ge; comparis t u niveau ence Entre les Sin nnes 538.2 538.2 538.2	atique Valeur 889.66 5.9 on 14 août 2019 otal estimated nerally has a hi ons. 0.05 u 0.05 0.05 0.05 1286.5 1255.9 2286.5 2286.5 2286.5 228.5 228.5 <td>F Pr > F 30 0.0039 9 at 3:16:3 timing igher Type es par ^{***}. ntervalle ice 1255.9 1697.9 179.5 1182.1</td> <td>5 PM</td> <td>ate than Tukey's t</td>	F Pr > F 30 0.0039 9 at 3:16:3 timing igher Type es par ^{***} . ntervalle ice 1255.9 1697.9 179.5 1182.1	5 PM	ate than Tukey's t
ote: This te	Ger	Source Group herated by t rols the Typ Varial Var Non- Non Cor	DDL 2 he SA Tests t be ex mpara Gi Comp ble riable variab trol	Anova SS 16295779.33 S System ('Lo de Bonferro perimentwise all Alpha Degrés de Erreur qua Valeur cri tisons signifi tisons signifi tisons signifi - Non-variab - Control ble - Control - Variable	Moyenr Page l Page l Pa	ne quadra 8147(_SRV12) (Break) pour To , but it ge; comparis t u niveau ence Entre les Sin nnes 538.2 538.2 538.2 538.2	atique Valeur 889.66 5.9 on 14 août 2019 otal estimated nerally has a hisons. 0.05 u 93 1381125 2.43805 0.05 indiquée multané 95% li de confian -179.5 286.5 -1255.9 -274.2 -1697.9	F Pr > F 30 0.0039 9 at 3:16:3 timing igher Type es par ^{***} . ntervalle ice 1255.9 1697.9 179.5 1182.1 -286.5	5 PM	ate than Tukey's t
ote: This te	Ger	Source Group herated by t rols the Typ Varial Var Non- Non Cort	DDL 2 he SA Tests t be ex mpara Gi Comp ble riable variab -variab ntrol ol	Anova SS 16295779.33 S System ('Lo de Bonferro perimentwise all Alpha Degrés de Erreur qua Valeur cri isons signifi isons signifi roup araison - Non-variab - Control ble - Control - Variable Non-variab	Moyenr Page l Page l Pa	ne quadra 8147(_SRV12) (Break) pour To , but it ge; comparis t u niveau ence Entre les Sin nnes 538.2 538.2 538.2 538.2 454.0 992.2	atique Valeur 889.66 5.9 on 14 août 2019 otal estimated nerally has a hi ons. 0.05 u 1381125 2.43805 0.05 u 179.5 286.5 -1255.9 -274.2 -1697.9 -1182.1	F Pr > F 90 0.0039 9 at 3:16:3 timing igher Type es par ***. ntervalle ce 1255.9 1697.9 179.5 1182.1 -286.5 274.2	5 PM	ate than Tukey's t

	Procédure REG Modèle : Linear_Regression_Model Variable dépendante : Total estimated timing													
				Nb	d'ob	servati	ons lu	es (96					
	Nb d'obs. utilisées 96													
	Analyse de variance													
						Somn	ne des	N	loyenne					
	Sour	Ce			DUL	101	Carres	qua	01 47000	Valeur				
	Erren	10			2	128/	144618		1381125	5.9	0.003	2		
	Total	somme	es corria	ées	95	1447	40397		1301123			-		
	Total	connic	oung		00	1-1-41						_		
		Roo	ot MSE			1175	.21271	Rca	rré	0.1126				
		Mo	yenne d	épen	dante	631	.44650	Rca	ır. ajust.	0.0935				
		Coe	eff Var			186	.11438							
				Résul	ltats e	stimés	des pa	агат	ètres					
				Val	eur es	timée	Ēr	reur						
	Var	iable	DDL	des	paran	ramètres typ		type	Valeur	du test t	Pr > t			
	Inte	rcept	1		138.	8.17338 207.7		5022		0.67	0.5076			
	Var	iable	1		992.	19239	289.4	5030		3.43	0.0009			
	Nor	1-Variab	le 1		453.	98929	298.6	5976		1.52	0.1319			
	App the	pendi type c	x XLV of grou	7:H 1p 0	2 exp	perin the to	nent: otal e	line stin	ear reg nated t	ression iming	n of			
BSE	RVATIO	NS	Boring/	(repe	titive	No n	nore id	leas	0	Other		TOT		
С	control			7			22			3		32		
Coo	perative	э		8			20			2		30		
Con	npetitive	Э		18			16			0		34		
Т	OTAL			33			58			5		96		
			34	38%		6	0,42%		5	,21%				

	34,38%	60,42%	5,21%	
TH. FREQUENCIES	Boring/repetitive	No more ideas	Other	TOTAL
Control	11,0000	19,3333	1,6667	32,0000
Cooperative	10,3125	18,1250	1,5625	30,0000
Competitive	11,6875	20,5417	1,7708	34,0000
TOTAL	33,0000	58,0000	5,0000	96,0000
CHI ² TABLE	Boring/repetitive	No more ideas	Other	TOTAL
Control	1,4545	0,3678	1,0667	2,8890
Cooperative	0.5196	0.4040	0.4005	
	0,5160	0,1940	0,1225	0,8350
Competitive	3,4094	1,0041	1,7708	0,8350 6,1844
Competitive TOTAL	3,4094 5,3825	1,0041 1,5659	0,1225 1,7708 2,9600	0,8350 6,1844 9,9085
Competitive TOTAL	3,4094 5,3825	0,1940 1,0041 1,5659	0,1225 1,7708 2,9600	0,8350 6,1844 9,9085
Competitive TOTAL Chi ²	3,4094 5,3825 9,9085	0,1940 1,0041 1,5659	0,1225 1,7708 2,9600 DDL	0,8350 6,1844 9,9085 4

Appendix XLVI: H2 experiment: Chi² test of the type of group over the motive to stop

SUMMARY OU	TPUT							Boring
Regression Sta	tistics							
Chi Square	6,66							
Residual Dev.	115,55							
# of iterations	5,00							
Observations	96,00							
	Coefficients	Standard Error	P-value	Odd Ratio	Lower 95%	Upper 95%	Lower 95%	Upper 95%
Intercept	-1,27	0,43	0,00	0,28	0,12	0,65	0,12	0,65
Non-variable	0,26	0,59	0,66	1,30	0,41	4,16	0,41	4,16
Variable	1,27	0,55	0,02	3,57	1,22	10,46	1,22	10,46

SUMMARY OU	TPUT							No more idea
Regression Sta	tistics							
Chi Square	3,49							
Residual Dev.	126,20							
# of iterations	4,00							
Observations	96,00							
	Coefficients	Standard Error	P-value	Odd Ratio	Lower 95%	Upper 95%	Lower 95%	Upper 95%
Intercept	0,79	0,38	0,04	2,20	1,04	4,65	1,04	4,65
Non-variable	-0,24	0,54	0,65	0,79	0,27	2,25	0,27	2,25
Variable	-0,91	0,51	0,08	0,40	0,15	1,11	0,15	1,11
SUMMARY OU	TPUT							
Degraceion Sta	tistics							

SUMMARY OUT	PUT							
Regression Statis	stics							
Chi Square	4,68							
Residual Dev.	34,61							
# of iterations	19,00							
Observations	96,00							
	Coefficients	Standard Error	P-value	Odd Ratio	Lower 95%	Upper 95%	Lower 95%	Upper 95%
Intercept	-2,27	0,61	0,00	0,10	0,03	0,34	0,03	0,34
Non-variable	-0,37	0,95	0,70	0,69	0,11	4,45	0,11	4,45
Variable	-19,72	6 185,82	1,00	0,00	0,00	infinity	0,00	infinity

Appendix XLVII: H2 experiment: logistic regression of the type of group over the motives to stop the experiment

Means and Descriptive Statistics

Group	Mean of 'Est# chances of winning'	Std. Dev. of 'Est# Std. Error of 'Est chances of winning' chances of winning		Number of non-missing values for 'Est# chances of winning'		
	3.1578947368	1.9147567451	0.196449897	95		
Control	3.0322580645	1.7978481762	0.3229030647	31		
Non-variable	3.16666666667	1.9666764075	0.3590643439	30		
Variable	3.2647058824	2.0197333087	0.3463814048	34		

Generated by the SAS System ('Local', X64_SRV12) on 14 août 2019 at 3:54:06 PM

Appendix XLVIII: Descriptive statistic of the estimated chances of winning per group

				The	ANOVA	Procedure					
		Dep	ender	nt Vari	able: Est	# chances of v	vinning				
Sour	ce	DDL	Som	me de	s carrés	Moyenne qua	dratique	Valeur F	Pr > F		
Model		2	0.8795233			0.	0.12	0.8891			
Error		92	343.75		7520557	3.7364354			-		
Corrected Total		94	344.6315789		6315789						
r-carré Coef de Va				Racine MSE		Est# chances of winning Moyenne					
	0.002552 61.2112		21123	3 1.932986		3.157895					
Source Group		DDL	Ano	va SS Moyenr		e quadratique	Valeur F	Pr > F			
		2	0.87952329		and a state of the	0 43976164	0.12	0.8891			

Page Break

Tests t de Bonferroni (Dunn) pour Est# chances of winning

Note: This test controls the Type I experimentwise error rate, but it generally has a higher Type II error rate than Tukey's for all pairwise comparisons.

Alpha	0.05					
Degrés de lit	92					
Erreur quadr	Erreur guadratique moyenne					
Valeur critiqu	2.43854					
Comparaisons significat	ives au nive	au O.	05 indiquée	s par 🚟.		
Group	Différence Entre les	Sim	imultané 95% Intervalle de confiance			
Comparaison	moyennes		de confia	nce		
Variable - Non-variable	moyennes 0.0980		de confia -1.0827	nce 1.2788		
Variable - Non-variable Variable - Control	0.2324		de confia -1.0827 -0.9381	nce 1.2788 1.4030		
Variable - Non-variable Variable - Control Non-variable - Variable	moyennes 0.0980 0.2324 -0.0980		de confia -1.0827 -0.9381 -1.2788	nce 1.2788 1.4030 1.0827		
Variable - Non-variable Variable - Control Non-variable - Control Non-variable - Control	moyennes 0.0980 0.2324 -0.0980 0.1344		de confia -1.0827 -0.9381 -1.2788 -1.0728	nce 1.2788 1.4030 1.0827 1.3416		
Variable - Non-variable Variable - Control Non-variable - Variable Non-variable - Control Control - Variable	moyennes 0.0980 0.2324 -0.0980 0.1344 -0.2324		de confia -1.0827 -0.9381 -1.2788 -1.0728 -1.4030	nce 1.2788 1.4030 1.0827 1.3416 0.9381		
Variable - Non-variable Variable - Control Non-variable - Variable Non-variable - Control Control - Variable Control - Non-variable	moyennes 0.0980 0.2324 -0.0980 0.1344 -0.2324 -0.1344		de confia -1.0827 -0.9381 -1.2788 -1.0728 -1.4030 -1.3416	nce 1.2788 1.4030 1.0827 1.3418 0.9381 1.0728		

Generated by the SAS System ('Local', X64_SRV12) on 14 août 2019 at 3:54:06 PM

Appendix XLIX: H2 experiment: ANOVA procedure & Bonferroni posthoc test of the type of group over the estimated chances of winning

		Vai	Mc riable	dèle dépe	Pro : Lin endan	icéduri ear_Re te : Es	e RE egres t# ch	G sion anci	_Model es of win	ning	li.		
	N	Nh d'observations lues										1	
	N	b d'o	bs. uti	lisée	S						95		
	N	lombr	e d'ol	serv	ations	avec	avec valeurs manquante					1	
					Analy	se de	varia	nce					
s	ource				DDL	Sommo	e des arrés	qu	Moyenno adratique	e e Va	leur	F	Pr > F
M	odèle				2	0.8795		1	0.43976	6	0.12		0.8891
E	rreur				92	343.7	5206		3.73644				
T	otal somr	nes co	orrigé	es	94	344.8	3158			1			
	Root MSE					1.93	299	R ca	rré	0.0	026	É	
	1	Moyer	nne de	épen	dante	3.15	789	R ca	l car. ajust.		191		
		Coeff	Var			61.21	123						
			R	ésult	ats es	timés o	les p	arar	nètres				1
	Variable DDL de Intercept 1 Variable 1			Val des	leur estimée s paramètres		Erreur type		Valeur du test t		st t	Pr	> t
					3.03226 0.23245		0.34717		8.73		.73	<.	0001
							0.48	003	0.48		.48	0.	6294
	Non-var	iable	1		0.13441		0.49505			0.27		0.	7866

Appendix L: H2 experiment: linear regression of the type of group over the estimated chances of winning