Design for Transfer

Kuipers, Derek

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

H7: Play It Safe: A Situational Game for Occupational Safety

Abstract

This chapter describes the design choices and theoretical constructs that have led to the development of an occupational safety game, going by the name Play it Safe. Play it Safe is a tower defense game that uses situational data collected by employees, during their daily work, to impact the parameters of the video game. These data are gathered through a safety campaign named, Count Yourself Lucky (CYL) to quantify the amount of times employees used the supplied safety technique (Stop, Think, Act, Review (STAR)). Play it Safe, as a form of situational gaming and as a behavioral change support system (BCSS), through metaphorical re-contextualization attempts to create parameters for similar decision making encountered in the work environment and implicitly reinforce the training of the STAR protocol and conservative decision making. Play it Safe aims to improve employees' situational awareness, creating a shared mental model and bottom-up accountability, meant to improve and align (shared) safety behaviors.

1 Introduction

Accidents happen, however, responsible employers are constantly attempting to create safer environments by improving measures to diminish the number of mishaps and accidents. The Incident Frequency Rate (IFR), the main measure of safety in industry, varies among sectors, as do the risk factors inherent in certain jobs. Measures to maximize safety (knowledge, skills, protocols, conditional safety structures, and safety interventions) contribute to lowering IFR. Not all companies are proactive when it comes to safety or equipped with ample precautions in the work environment and culture. However, even companies at the top of the HSE culture-ladder who have taken ample precautions, have a finite effect on safety [1].

Even when equipped with all the right tools in the correct environment the human factor can be the cause of failure [2]; as routine kicks in, vigilance checks out. To bring safety awareness to the next level, serious gaming might prove to be a valuable tool in employees' toolboxes. Serious gaming offers a new and engaging way to demonstrate an adaptive interaction with the immediate relevance of situations and contexts from the work-floor. In this way, serious gaming can mix reality with an open practice environment in an emergent feedback-loop that triggers the players to have safety, which is forefront in the mind at the moments that warrant vigilance while improving the safety awareness as well as the safety environment. This all through noticing and registering lapses or slips and their probable causes.

This chapter describes the trials and tribulations of the design and development process of a serious game, named Play it Safe, with the goal of behavioral change towards occupational safety aspects inherent to dynamic high-risk jobs and environments. Part two describes a short outline of occupational safety trends and related work in the field of serious gaming, as well as a short outline of the focus of Play it Safe. Part two focuses on the design process of and implications of situational gaming, part three focuses on Behavior Change Support Systems (BCSS), Stop Think Act Review (STAR) and the surrounding safety campaign; Count Yourself Lucky. Part four describes the video game Play it Safe the involved game-play and game-mechanics as the goals of the game. The final part discusses the possibilities of situational games and the initial experiences with Play it Safe and the Count Yourself Lucky campaign.

2 Safety Matters

After physiological needs, the second step in the hierarchy of needs [3] on Maslow's pyramid is safety. Occupational safety has been a priority in the workplace since the beginning of the 19th century. Over the last decade, safety structures placed great emphasis on rule-based and behavior-based safety. This approach is described as Model 1 [4], a predominantly top-down approach. In Model 1 workers attain knowledge, skills and act as rule-based operators who follow golden rules that are strictly enforced top-down. In Model 2 these same rules apply, however they are seen as guidelines for the competent professional [4]. They are dynamic and rein-forced bottom-up, resulting in safety solutions coming from employees instead of management. Independent of the position of safety in an organization, the safety climate and culture of the company implementing the safety interventions have been found to be a key indicator for the attempted intervention [5]. In addition to the safety climate

and culture, a large part of safety science focuses on conditional safety.

Conditional safety entails making the environment as well as the equipment used as safe as possible. This is realized by providing instructions, use of warning signs and protective clothing, making the equipment and the work environment as safe as possible. The primary cause of error and (near) accidents is the human operator. Therefore in safety science, Human Error [6] modeling, based on the underlying strengths and limitations of the human operator, is used to design protocols, rules, machinery and overall resilient systems to minimize accidents. Unsafe acts can be divided into execution errors (correct plan, wrong execution) and planning errors (incorrect plan). Execution errors can be divided into slips (attention failure) and lapses (memory failure), planning errors can be either rule-based or knowledge-based mistakes (unintentional decision to act against rules or standards) and violations (deliberate decisions to act against rules or standards). To gain further understanding of human error Rasmussen [7] developed the human performance model, consisting of the following levels:

1. Skill-based behavior: an automated sensory-motor performance that one can perform without conscious control.

2. Rule-based behavior: based on stored procedures, gained through experience and learning. It works through recognition, association of state/task and then using the stored rule for the task.

3. Knowledge-based behavior: when confronted with unfamiliar situations, where explicit thought is necessary to develop a plan, exercise it and see if it works. It works through identification, decision of task and planning.

The different levels of reasoning can be accessed simultaneously, but are triggered by different aspects of contexts and situations. The mental model that workers have of the situation around them, i.e. Situation Awareness (SA, Figure 1) [8], and the decisions made depending on that situation, are highly influenced by the performance levels used by the operators. SA origins from military aviation [9] but since then has been used and researched in a wide range of contexts and fields. Endsley defines SA as 'the perception of elements in the environment within a volume of time and space, the comprehension of their meaning, and the projection of their status in the near future". This process is automatic. However, perception, comprehension, and projection of how a situation will evolve, depending on the action

Fig. 1. Adapted from Endsley's Situation Awareness Model [8], Model used from www.situationawareness.nl

a worker is planning to undertake, is vital in planning and undertaking an action. When making the decision to perform a task, it is vital to base that decision on a correct state of the necessary elements in the environment around you. Therefore a review of the activities undertaken and possible deviations of the projected state of the environment around you, are relevant for vigilance and safe behaviors. Besides an individuals SA, there is also Team or Shared SA (TSA/SSA) [10,11], the understanding between team members of each other's mental model of the situation. A high level of shared SA between team members provides a work environment in which the needs and way of approaching tasks and situations of others are understood and taken into account

[10,11]. Therefore a high SA is a vital part of safety on the work floor, both individually as well as in a team [12] and will make it a safer place/increase workplace safety [13].

2.1 Simulations and Games for occupational safety

Games and simulations for occupational safety have been used in a variety of fields with a wide range of goals, including;

1. Virtual Training in Construction Plants [14],

2. Virtual Training to increase SA during Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation [15],

3. Evacuation Drills [16–18],

4. Hazard Recognition [19],

5. Intervention to reduce work-stress and raise work-engagement [20],

6. Training and education of operations on ships and off-shore platforms [21],

7. Design in Construction [22],

8. Training for working at heights for mine-sites [23].

These are predominantly simulation games for safety training, depending heavily on a match between content and context, a high level of fidelity and a low level of play (or no play at all). Problems with these simulations are that they;

1. Almost automatically create a mismatch between the desired blend of entertainment and learning [24] within the game, missing out on the positive effects of entertainment on learning [25].

2. Require extensive training needs analysis (TNA) methodologies [25,26].

3. Can only be used for specific goals and situations. A created scenario within a simulation will only be useful for a specific target group and will only encompass limited tasks and environments. In an occupational safety game it would be impossible to simulate and program every possible accident or near accident inherent to the particular task in the particular work sector.

Therefore, instead of focusing on the outcomes of specific risks of specific task-related accidents, the more practical and feasible goal might be to intervene in the mental model an employee applies to approach general tasks, environments, and situations.

2.2 Play it safe

The Play it Safe project was established to address the needs of several small and medium-sized enterprises working in high-risk and highly dynamic task-environments. Each company faces a similar dilemma; despite specific rule-based behavior and the specific task-related knowledge being available and reinforced, accidents still occurred.

Play it Safe aims at creating top of mind safety awareness for workers in the construction and maintenance industry. The workers operate in small teams with variable constitution and at varying locations. Obviously, these workers know the safety rules, but in the heat of the moment slips, lapses and errors occur. Play it Safe focuses on preventing accidents using a cognitive intervention called STAR (Stop, Think, Act, Review), for procedural tasks, focusing on the context outside the game rather than the content within the game by the use of situational data retrieved through the count yourself lucky campaign.

3 Situational Gaming

Situational games [27] are games in which real-life data is used to affect the parameters of the game, often by the use of cross-

and transmedial applications. The idea is to gather situational data and play the game in close proximity or on the location and in the context where the initial problems arose. The basic assumption of the effectiveness of a situational game for serious purposes is that situation provides an authentic setting that engages a player, helps to realize the logic, and triggers the player into action. The authenticity provides the necessary meaning and appreciation. The situation plays a role in multiple dimensions of persuasion, i.e., striving to persuade players

Fig. 2. This model describes the desired transfer model of the game and the reality outside the game as experienced by the player.

to change their behavior. The framework helps to make the role and possibly the impact of situation explicit during the design of serious games. Situation contributes in a positive way in reaching the underlying objective of the game. For Play it Safe situational gaming was used to attempt to increase safety awareness amongst workers. Eventing, thus taking real-life events into the gameplay, is suggested to be a good starting point for any situational game [27]. Situation and context determine the effect of a trigger. Triggers, when carefully timed and chosen, provide the spark to activate a change in behavior [28]. By adhering to a person's situation, triggers become authentic and actions become meaningful [29]. The player can identify itself with the matter. The use of situational data in Play it Safe reflects the belief that transfer should be considered as a design parameter. Kuipers et al. [30] argue that core principles (in this case the STAR protocol) in a game should be carefully designed in conjunction with a specific transfer type in mind, aligning the players' needs and abilities, including sociocultural aspects, serious goals, and topic characteristics. The process of translating situational data into game elements is called recontextualization, defining the pinnacle of serious game design: the subjective soundness and recognizability of the recontextualization is essential for transfer of safety awareness.

By introducing real-life data in the game they link the target context to the learning context (the game), enabling transfer between similar, but not identical contexts.

Near transfer can be categorized under literal transfer: transfer by the means of similarity, as opposed by figural transfer: transfer as a result of using some part of existing world knowledge for thinking about a particular problem. The game transfer model projects a game as a conceptual continuity in a continuum, stretching from mimetic simulation to abstract gameplay (see Figure 2). Within boundaries, the position of the game on the Game Transfer Model [30] has to correspond with design choices dedicated to facilitate transfer in a situational game aiming at raising safety awareness among employees through re-contextualization of the STAR-protocol and situational input.

4 Behavior Change Support System; Count yourself lucky with STAR and Play it Safe.

A Behavior Change Support System (BCSS) was defined by Oinas-Kukkonen [30–32] as: "a socio-technical information system with psychological and behavioral outcomes designed to form, alter or reinforce attitudes,

Fig. 3. Shows the ubiquitous workings of the STAR-protocol as a) situational safety detection tool b) a game-mechanic and c) the textual intervention.

behaviors or an act of complying without using coercion or deception". The computer game Play it Safe is not a stand-alone intervention, to be a BCSS, it needed a transmedial function [33] as a trigger to create the situational input and a complementary tool for assessment and participation to gather this input. Through the project, state of the art sensors and other elaborative options were proposed, however, they proved to be infeasible in a highly dynamic high-risk work environment. Many companies, for instance, did not allow smartphones because the digital disruptions could prove dangerous during working hours. Therefore an analog solution was found.

4.1 STAR: Stop, Think, Act, Review

Play it Safe uses the safety intervention STAR combined with situational aspects, i.e. events from the work floor are integrated to have effect in the game. STAR (Stop, Think, Act, Review) is a mental protocol to facilitate safety awareness. This mental protocol attributes the creation of awareness of a situation to three entangled processes: perception, comprehension, and projection. These processes attribute the enclosing environment, the physical context. The mental model is completed with a decision making process and effectuation of an intended action. The action obviously affects the state of the immediate environment. STAR is being and has been used in several fields [34–36] and is closely modeled on SA (see Figure 5). STAR has different modes of use (see Figure 3);

1. As a standard protocol to be used with every task (Skill-based behavior)

2. As a critical task protocol to be used only with tasks that are deemed to be a risk and require full attention (Rule-based behavior)

3. As an emergency protocol to be used when something goes wrong and one finds him/herself in an unfamiliar situation (Knowledge-based behavior)

4.2 Count yourself lucky with STAR

In the implementation of Play it Safe, STAR was utilized and integrated into all of the aforementioned modes. STAR was also used to detect deviations from the projected outcome of situations and record these with a tally counter (CYL), that amount was then used as an in-game reward. During the play it safe campaign STAR was used as a safety protocol and detection tool in the workplace; (see Figure 3);

1. A safety protocol to use while performing critical tasks and after some practice become part of skill-based, rule-based and knowledge-based behavior. This was attempted through mere learning on a leaflet and demonstrations.
2. A detection tool for situations that deviated from the projected outcome of action (through the Review in STAR), of oneself or others. These deviations were used as the input of the CYL score, keeping score daily on a tally counter.

The motivation to use one's tally counter in the CYL campaign (besides bottom-up accountability and communication culture) is to gain an in-game advantage. Through the use of an EMP in the game that makes it possible to progress with more ease in the game.

The EMP, however, is a re-contextualized STAR protocol that lets the players do two essential things, in the game;

1. Assess when the in-game situation becomes too dynamic to project a clear outcome, i.e. being unable to project the situation state after the action is undertaken.

2. While using the EMP players are forced to Review the situation and reorder the elements in the situation and the appropriate actions that can resolve it.

The ubiquitous implementation of STAR (see Figure 3) trains players outside of the game to use a mental protocol to integrate into their daily working behavior, while at the same time acting as a detection tool for situations that deviate from their projected outcome. This facilitates the players to take a closer look at their daily working environment and the boundaries to work safely within them, as well as noticing the limitations or shortcomings of conditional safety structures. The CYL campaign is motivated by the in-game reward system while in the game the STAR reinforces the already learned protocol in unrealistic situations that train the players SA.

Fig. 4. Shows a screenshot of Play it Safe being played.

Because the video game is played during lunch-breaks in the workplace, the situations become more tangible and the implementation of the CYL score can become a trigger to discuss workplace safety amongst colleagues. Furthermore, because all colleagues are using the same protocol the Shared/Team SA is trained and barriers in individual SA can be discussed as requirements for a high Team SA, creating an open communication culture where bottom-up initiatives are harnessed.

5 Play it safe; The Computer Game

Play it Safe (see figure 4) is a touch-screen tablet-based video game of the Tower Defense genre, the objective of a tower defender is to protect one's base against an enemy that wants to steal the supplies stored in that base. To succeed in this objective the player builds towers, tactically placed around the area to kill the stream of enemies. Play it Safe differs from traditional tower defense games, with the addition of workers that build and fix the towers and the possibility to use an Electro Magnetic Pulse (EMP) as a strategic advantage. The story behind the game is that a spaceship has crashed upon a distant planet that is inhabited by bug-like aliens who are attracted to energy cores that you need to power and repair the ship. To defend the crew and ship against the bug-like aliens, guard towers are built that automatically shoot the bug-like mechanized aliens.

5.1 Gameplay

When the player starts the game he/she can build as many towers as time allows, before a first wave of enemies arrives. The arrival of enemies is usually preceded by an alarm but as with any action in the game, there are exceptions that keep players on their toes. Towers are built by workers, when chosen workers have a primary objective to build, towers will be finished quicker. When towers are built, workers can be placed in the towers so that alien robots will not hurt them. After or during these attacks they can be directed to fix broken towers, however, there is a risk they will get hurt. Enemies approach in waves, so usually, there is time after a first wave to regroup and fix or build extra towers. During waves pressure builds and it gets harder and harder to keep control over workers while keeping track of the states of the environment as well as enemies. It is possible to use the EMP mechanic to regain control over the game environment and regain situational leadership over the workforce. If the player keeps the energy cores in the game, he/she wins, if the player loses all of them he/she loses. Extra points and badges can be won for using workers for their primary objectives, using the EMP and not letting your workforce get hurt.

5.2 Game Objects

Energy Cores
The energy cores are the main assets in the game. Workers try to defend them and the enemies attempt to steal them. They are kept in the base spaceship.

Base
The home base of the game avatars is a spaceship wherein the energy cores are stashed. Members from the workforce enter the game through the base when the player starts to build towers.

Enemies
There are two kinds of mechanized bug-like aliens. Both types can steal energy cores, however, the Eaters will attack towers and workers on their way to steal the cores, whereas the collectors will go straight for the energy cores.

1.   Eaters, their main objective is to destroy towers, by gnawing on them.

2.   Collectors, their main objective is to walk into the base pick up an energy core and walk away with it, towards their own base.

Workers
To create towers it is necessary to have workers to built and restore the before mentioned towers. There are three types of workers.

1.   Builders build and repair towers.

2.   Firemen extinguish towers when they are on fire.

3.   Mechanics fix mechanical damage in the towers.

The player can distinguish between the three types by the visual appearance of the workers. Their entire workforce has a single primary objective as well as a fitting suit to perform this primary task. It is possible to assign tasks to avatars that are not their primary objectives; the avatars will, however, be slower and less successful in performing these non-primary tasks and thus in more danger. When either fire, radiation from a tower or an enemy hurts a worker, their health state declines and they eventually die. To heal workers they can be directed into an undamaged tower, where they will be healed.

Towers

Before building a tower the integrity of the ground to be built on must be checked. The higher the integrity of the ground, the more resilient the tower will be against enemy attacks. Towers can be placed anywhere on the map and shoot intruding enemies on sight. Whenever enemies damage towers, their states deteriorate and markers (electricity sparks or fire) are visible before they eventually collapse or are repaired. The workers can hide in the tower from enemies closing in on them.

5.3 Game Mechanics

Count yourself lucky score

The player is asked to fill in the day score of the previous working day on the start screen of the game. This score is used to determine the amount of EMPs available to the player in the game.

Ground inspection

To build towers the integrity of the ground can be checked with a special option to use a looking glass that gives the percentage of the ground-integrity. This influences the towers deterioration process.

Electro Magnetic Pulse (EMP)

The EMP can be used either to freeze all enemies as well as workers or to just freeze their enemies, depending on successfully using the touch screen hold mode on the intended icon. In either situation, it gives the player time to use STAR and gain a new oversight in the game, which can be lost due to the pace in the game.

5.4 Transformational Learning

Through the use of metaphorical recontextualization [30] Play it Safe uses near transfer to create a metaphorical low-fidelity game-world in which less explicit and extensive parameters apply in comparison to the workplace. In the Game-world there are observable (enemies) and non-observable (ground-integrity) threats as well as simulated time-pressure, which forces the players to keep reassessing their plans and actions with regard to the ever changing the environment. Not to recognize specific or realistic threats, but to gain insight and perspective on the need for oversight into the aspects of a situation, i.e. situation awareness and the necessity of conservative decision making within a dynamic environment.

Mitgustsch [37] distinguishes three stages of learning through serious games aligning with Bateson [38] stages of learning; 1) in, 2) through and 3) beyond the game. In the case of Play it Safe the transformational learning process is;

1. In the game learning: the player carries out random tasks at hand and leads a workforce that can change into various states. Through trial and error, the player reacts to the game environment and learns to play the game.
2. Through the game learning: the player will learn what the limits and barriers of their situational awareness are and when they reach these parameters.

3. Beyond the game learning: at this stage, is expanded to real-life contexts outside of the game. The player recognizes the barriers for high situation awareness in their daily working environment. And is continuously training the use of STAR in skill- rule- and knowledge-based behaviors to reduce errors, slips and lapses, and ultimately the companies IFR.

SA and STAR are used to overcome the in-game challenges without being explicitly taught, creating an implicit training tool. Play it safe the computer game combined with CYL and the explicit STAR-training, together function as a transmedial BCSS that attempts to abide by the dynamic demands of the socio-technical environment.

6 Discussion

Because of the ubiquitous nature and trans-medial character of the BCSS, a schematic breakdown of the active elements is given. Play it Safe implements four modes of use [39] of one BCSS through situational gaming:

As an intervention; STAR is implemented to attempt to improve individual SA and Team SA. Through the use in and outside of the game the recognition of a loss of overview or cognitive overload in working situations is trained and reinforced.

As a trigger; through the use of the CYL campaign. Wherein the employee through the use of a tally counter, keeps track of the situations in which he/she lost the overview of the situation.

As an assessment; for employees and safety leaders through the scores of the game, as well as the individual or shared CYL scores. Which both act as a self-assessment and give feedback about the number of unsafe events on the work floor.

As a tool for participation; through the CYL campaign empowering users to inform safety managers about unsafe practices, equipment, behaviors or specific situations or context.

This transmedial BCSS aims to impact compliance towards safety rules, lasting behavior change through creating a Team SA by using the mental protocol STAR and ultimately an attitude change in creating a bottom-up safety culture, making safety a tangible concept that all members of a team are involved in and feel accountable for.

Play it Safe harnesses the motivating and rewarding aspects of in-game appraisal for out-game actions (CYL), as well as im-plicitly reinforcing the actions outside of the game, in the game itself. Thereby Play it Safe can be considered a recursive BCSS, not to create high vigilance at all time, but to recognize the barriers inherent to an incom-plete view of a situation. Performing knowl-edge-based behavior while wrapped up in other tasks can be dangerous at any time [40]; therefore an insight in the precursors of cognitive overload can be a powerful tool for safety awareness.

In the preliminary trials, safety-leaders, on site of the respective companies, noticed an increase in interactions and respective tally counters scores when group activities took place than when solitary tasks were performed. The CYL campaign seemed to increase the communication culture con-cerning safety matters during these group activities. The simple task of making a conscious note can be a tangible trigger to enhance situated cognition through situated play [41]. As a situational game Play It Safe makes the environment the trigger in and outside of the game, utilizing safety on the work floor through the game.

Acknowledgments

References

1. DePasquale JP, Geller ES. Critical Success Factors for Behavior-Based Safety: A Study of Twenty Industry-wide Applications. J Safety Res. 1999;30: 237–249.
2. Reason J. The contribution of latent human failures to the breakdown of complex systems. Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci. 1990;327: 475–484.
3. Maslow AH. A theory of human motivation. Psychol Rev. American Psychological Association; 1943;50: 370.
4. Hale A, Borys D. Working to rule, or working safely? Part 1: A state of the art review. Saf Sci. 2013;55: 207–221.
5. Hale AR, Guldenmund FW, van Loenhout PLCH, Oh JIH. Evaluating safety management and culture interventions to improve safety: Effective intervention strategies. Saf Sci. 2010;48: 1026–1035.
6. Reason J. Human Error. Cambridge University Press; 1990.
7. Rasmussen J. Skills, rules, and knowledge; signals, signs, and symbols, and other distinctions in human performance models. IEEE Trans Syst Man Cybern. 1983;SMC-13: 257–266.
8. Endsley MR. Toward a Theory of Situation Awareness in Dynamic Systems. Hum Factors. SAGE Publications Inc; 1995;37: 32–64.
9. Endsley MR. Situation awareness in aircraft systems: Symposium abstract. Proceedings of the Human Factors Society Annual Meeting. SAGE Publications Sage CA: Los Angeles, CA; 1988. pp. 96–96.
10. Prince C, Baker DP, Shrestha L, Salas E. Situation awareness in team performance. Hum Factors. 1995;37: 123–136.
11. Salmon PM, Stanton NA, Walker GH, Baber C, Jenkins DP, McMaster R, et al. What really is going on? Review of situation awareness models for individuals and teams. Theoretical Issues in Ergonomics Science. Taylor & Francis; 2008;9: 297–323.
12. Leonard M, Graham S, Bonacum D. The human factor: the critical importance of effective teamwork and communication in providing safe care. Qual Saf Health Care. 2004;13 Suppl 1: i85–90.
13. Stanton NA, Chambers PRG, Piggott J. Situational awareness and safety. Saf Sci. 2001;39: 189–204.
14. Guo H, Li H, Chan G, Skitmore M. Using game technologies to improve the safety of construction plant operations. Accid Anal Prev. 2012;48: 204–213.
15. Creutzfeldt J, Hedman L, Felländer-Tsai L. Using Virtual World Training to Increase Situation Awareness during Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation. Stud Health Technol Inform. 2014;196: 83–85.
16. Chittaro L. Passengers' safety in aircraft evacuations: Employing serious games to educate and persuade. International Conference on Persuasive Technology. Springer; 2012. pp. 215–226.
17. Maruejouls S, Chopinaud C. IMOSHION: A Simulation Framework Using Virtual Intelligent Agents for Workplace Evacuation in Case of Emergency Situation. Advances on Practical Applications of Agents and Multi-Agent Systems. Springer Berlin Heidelberg; 2013. pp. 304–307.
18. Silva JF, Almeida JE, Rossetti RJF, Coelho AL. Gamifying evacuation drills. 2013 8th Iberian Conference on Information Systems and Technologies (CISTI). 2013. pp. 1–6.
19. Mayer I, Wolff A, Wenzler I. Learning efficacy of the "hazard recognition"serious game. International Conference on Serious Games Development and Applications. Springer; 2013. pp. 118–129.
20. Wiezer N, Roozeboom MB, Oprins E. Serious gaming used as management intervention to prevent work-related stress and raise work--engagement among workers. International Conference on Digital Human Modeling and Applications in Health, Safety, Ergonomics and Risk Management. Springer; 2013. pp. 149–158.
21. Bruzzone AG, Massei M, Solis AO, Poggi S, Bartolucci C, Capponi LD. Serious games as enablers for training and education on operations on ships and off-shore platforms. Proceedings of the 2013 Summer Computer Simulation Conference. Vista, CA: Society for Modeling & Simulation International; 2013. p. 36.
22. Dawood N, Miller J, Yabuki N. Incorporating H&S into Design and Construction: The Case for Integrating Serious Games Engines Technologies and 4D Planning for Collaborative Work. Cooperative Design, Visualization, and Engineering. Springer Berlin Heidelberg; 2012. pp. 255–263.
23. Stothard P, van den Hengel A. Development of serious computer game based training module and its integration into working at heights mine site induction—Part I. Inst Mining Metall Trans Sect A Mining Technol. Taylor & Francis; 2010;119: 68–78.
24. Ritterfeld U, Weber R. Video games for entertainment and education. Playing video games: Motives, responses, and consequences. Erlbaum Mahwah, NJ; 2006; 399–413.
25. Gee JP. What Video Games Have to Teach Us About Learning and Literacy. Comput Entertain. New York, NY, USA: ACM; 2003;1: 20–20.
26. Bee F, Bee R. Learning needs analysis and evaluation. Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development; 2003.
27. van Dijk HW, Voigt EH. Situational games; a white paper. Techreport, NHL University of Applied Sciences, URL http://www mediafutureweek nl/wp-content/uploads/2012/05/whitepaper-Situational-Games-NHL pdf, invited white paper for Media Future Week. 2012;
28. Fogg BJ. A Behavior Model for Persuasive Design. Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on Persuasive Technology. New York, NY, USA: ACM; 2009. pp. 40:1–40:7.
29. Salen K, Zimmerman E. Game design and meaningful play. Handbook of computer game studies. The MIT Press Cambridge, MA; 2005;59: 79.
30. Kuipers DA, Wartena BO, Dijkstra A, Prins JT, Pierie J-PEN. Design for Transfer. Serious Games Development and Applications. Springer Berlin Heidelberg; 2013. pp. 239–246.

31. van Gemert-Pijnen JEWC, Reitberger W, Langrial S, Ploderer B, Oinas-Kukkonen H. Expanding the research area of behavior change support systems. 2013. Available: http://eprints.qut.edu.au/93528/

32. Oinas-Kukkonen H. A Foundation for the Study of Behavior Change Support Systems. Pers Ubiquit Comput. London, UK, UK: Springer-Verlag; 2013;17: 1223–1235.

33. Dena C. Transmedia practice: Theorising the practice of expressing a fictional world across distinct media and environments. University of Sydney Sydney. 2009.

34. Paradies M. Positive vs. negative enforcement: Which promotes high reliability human performance. Human Factors and Power Plants and HPRCT 13th Annual Meeting, 2007 IEEE 8th. IEEE; 2007. pp. 185–188.

35. Yates GR, Bernd DL, Sayles SM, Stockmeier CA, Burke G, Merti GE. Building and sustaining a systemwide culture of safety. Jt Comm J Qual Patient Saf. 2005;31: 684–689.

36. Dickerson JM, Koch BL, Adams JM, Goodfriend MA, Donnelly LF. Safety coaches in radiology: decreasing human error and minimizing patient harm. Pediatr Radiol. 2010;40: 1545–1551.

37. Mitgutsch K. Serious learning in serious games. Serious games and edutainment applications. Springer; 2011. pp. 45–58.

38. Bateson G. Steps to an Ecology of Mind: Collected Essays in Anthropology, Psychiatry, Evolution, and Epistemology. University of Chicago Press; 2000.

39. Wartena B, Kuipers D, van Dijk H. Ludo Modi Varietas: A Game-architecture inspired design approach for BCSS. Proceedings of the Second International Workshop on Behavior Change Support Systems (BCSS 2014), Padua, Italy. 2014. pp. 77–84.

40. Verwey WB. Psychologische functieleer en cognitieve ergonomie: een Siamese tweeling? Psychol Rev. researchgate.net; 2004;4: 27–53.

41. Rambusch J. The embodied and situated nature of computer game play. Workshop on the cognitive science of games and game play. Citeseer; 2006.