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Abstract

This study identifies the effectiveness of the game-based science learning (GBSL) for improving students’ learning outcomes by conducting a literature review of the current research from 2010 to 2017. This study also explores the correlation between variation in school level and year of publication on GBSL effect size. Method: data were collected from peer-reviewed journal articles published in educational databases including ERIC (Educational Research Information Centre), Springer Link, ProQuest education journal, and A+ education. Seven inclusion criteria were used to select relevant studies. Comprehensive Meta-Analysis (CMA 2.0) was used to analyze the data. Findings: (1) GBSL intervention has a statistically significant effect on students’ learning outcomes with a higher average on the effect size of the experimental group (41.12) than the control group (37.07). The mean of the reviewed studies’ effect size is 0.667 in the medium category. (2) The implementation of GBSL in secondary school has a bigger average effect size than in elementary school. Year of publication and effect size has low positive correlation with a coefficient of correlation 0.40.
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INTRODUCTION

The young generation who was born in the 21st century is digital native or the Net generation (Bennett, Maton & Kervin, 2008). The millennial in this era also can be called game generation (Prensky, 2001). The trend of digital games’ use has been increasing in this era (McGonigal, 2011; Corbett, 2012). Millions of people have been immersed in playing digital games either for entertainment or education (Huang, Hew, & Lo, 2018). Gee (2007) reported in his study that approximately 90% of students’ mobile phone connect to digital games. Besides, many teachers use digital games as a medium of instruction in their classroom for engaging students during teaching and learning processes, or it is commonly called Digital game-based learning (DGBL) (Van, 2006; Papastergiou, 2009). Students also obtain feedbacks such as improvement and win condition after completing the goals (Okeke, 2016, p. 1). The DGBL that specifically focus on Science can be called Game Based Science Learning (GBSL).

Since 2006, the number of research investigating the effect of Digital game in education has been increasing (Chorney, 2012). Some literature has been debating the effectiveness of GBSL in the last decade (Hamari & Keronen, 2017; Quandt et al., 2015). The community of science education (physics, biology, chemistry, and general sciences) also concern with the potential of game-based learning. Some researchers investigate the effectiveness of GBSL in some science subject matter such as Newtonian mechanics (Clark et al., 2011), human immunology (Cheng, Su, Huang, & Chen, 2014), and photosynthesis (Culp, Martin, Clements & Lewis, 2015). They argue that science is challenging for some students because of abstract concepts and invisible objects. Also, some research illustrated that rote memorization and decontextualized learning have potential drawbacks in Science context (Honey & Hilton, 2011; Mayo, 2007). This issue has an impact on their learning outcomes which can be defined as skills, knowledge, and values as an outcome of students’ experiences (US Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) cited in Adam, 2004, p. 4). Learning outcomes can be knowledge, skills, or attitude. However, in this context, the learning outcome only refers to students’ learning outcomes in academic settings. Thus, GBSL is the proper solution to this issue because digital games are highly engaging and motivating (Huang, Hew, & Lo, 2018; Tsay, Kofinas, & Luo, 2018). Several researchers demonstrated empirical evidence of the potential of this educational tool to enhance students’ learning outcomes in the various context of science subjects through comparing between control and experiment group (such as Bello, Ibi & Bukar, 2016; Fan, Xiao, & Su, 2015).

However, a small number of sample of studies investigating the effect of GBSL on students’ learning outcome tended to have a more significant mean of effect sizes than studies with larger sample sizes (Cheung & Slavin, 2013). Effect size refers to a quantitative measurement of the difference between the mean score of the control group and treatment group (Nakagawa & Cuthill, 2007). Meanwhile, the small sample size of the research cannot be used to generalize the effect of GBSL. To solve this issue, it needs further investigation of the effectiveness of GBSL in students’ achievement in sciences with meta-analysis study to develop a better estimate of effect magnitude (King & He, 2005). Meta-analysis is as the process of converting the effects of several similar research into a quantitative data so that these averages of the effect size and an overall determination can be made concerning the cumulative findings of several studies (Glass, Smith & McGaw, 1981; Hattie, 2009). Meta-analysis is a kind of retrospective observational study in which researchers make data recapitulation without any experimental manipulation (Brockwell & Gordon, 2001).

Several literature reviews of Game-Based Learning have been conducted both in the context of sciences and other subjects such as mathematics, language, history, and physical education. In 2006, Vogel et al. used meta-analysis of digital games versus traditional teaching methods. The overall result of the meta-analysis was that treatment groups were reported higher learning outcomes and better attitudes toward learning than control groups. The report also analyses some moderator categories. He reported that gender, school level, and user type showed significant statistical results. While, learner control, type of activity, and realism do not appear to be influential. In science context, Li & Tsai (2013), reviewed research articles regarding game-based science learning (GBSL) published from 2000 to 2011. The focus of the review is qualitative outcomes including research purposes and designs, the
theoretical foundations, game design, and learning focus. Based on the review, GBLS can provide effective learning in a collaborative problem-solving environment. However, the research only focused on qualitative data without discussing and analyzing the quantitative analysis of GBLS intervention and the effect size.

According to the previous research, gaps in the literature have been identified. Although several studies have explored a review of literature of GBLS, few have tested their relative influence on learning the outcome. There was also a lack of research meta-analysis of GBLS with quantitative approach. Li & Tsai (2013) who focused their research on the qualitative method suggested that quantitative content analysis of GBLS effectiveness such as students' learning outcome in Science education should be conducted in future investigations. This is because digital games that can promote students' engagement (Tsay, Kofinas, & Luo, 2018; Annetta, Minogue, Holmes & Cheng, 2009) might also enhance students' learning outcomes (Prensky, 2002). The other similar studies such as Vogel et al. (2006) also have a limitation. Although he specifically focusses on cognitive aspects in the analysis, the context of the study is in a broad context and did not specifically focus on Science education. Based on this gap, a newly proposed work focusing on a meta-analysis of the effect of the digital game on students' learning outcome in Science education or GBLS need to be conducted. Thus, two central research questions (RQs) were addressed in this study:

RQ1: Do Game-Based Science Learning (GBSL) effective to enhance students' learning outcomes compared to traditional method as reported by the current studies from 2010 to 2017?

RQ2: Do moderator categories including school level of participants (elementary and secondary school context) and year of publication has any correlation with GBLS effect size?

This research contributes to the literature in this field. First, this study reviewed recent trends in GBLS research, especially for those in the field of science education who are interested in quantitative studies of GBLS for students' learning outcomes. Meta-analysis of GBLS has been conducted by several researchers within a broader context such as mathematics, language and other subjects (Divjak & Tomic, 2011; Young et al., 2012), but lack of research conducted in science education. Second, the consistency of the result of similar studies for several years will be investigated. Therefore, consistency and inconsistency of finding of similar research will be found, and bias of one or more studies in this field could be detected (Borg & Gall, 1983). Third, meta-analysis uses a significant amount of data and applying statistical methods by organizing some information comes from a broad cross-section whose function is to complement other purposes (Glass, Smith & McGaw, 1981). By the significant number of participants, the study develops a better estimate of effect magnitude (King & He, 2005). The larger sample size in conducting a meta-analysis could be found in one study will create "greater statistical power and more precise confidence intervals" (Levine et al., 2008, p. 202). This is because the study collects several similar studies to be analyzed quantitatively. It concentrates on the effect size of this empirical discovery which is relatively better than the other methods of quantitative approaches including narrative review, descriptive review, and vote counting (Mark, Lipsey & Wilson, 2001). Also, through the substantial number of participant with different variables, the differences may exist because of differences that exist among the articles such as different subject populations, education level, gender, game type, etc. By using meta-analysis, we can investigate different moderator variables. Vogel et al., (2006) argue that analyzing moderator variables would give a clearer overview or more complex picture of reviewed studies.

METHODS

Method used should be accompanied by references, relevant modification should be explained. Procedure and data analysis technique should be emphasized to literature review article.

Diagram of the Research Process

Figure 1 shows a diagram of the research process including an identification of reviewed studies.
Search strategies and Data Collection

The search of the literature was conducted from June to July 2017. Data were collected from journal articles published from educational sources including ProQuest education journal, Springer Link, A+ education and ERIC (Educational Research Information Centre). The databases provide a high impact and a high-quality journal article. The keywords are “digital game, Sciences, Physics, Biology, chemistry, secondary, high school, elementary.” The Boolean operator, “AND” or “OR”, was used to combine all key terms. Following the keywords, the researchers read the abstract and full-text. We use some inclusion and exclusion criteria as the evaluation to choose appropriate journal articles. Seven inclusion and exclusion criteria were applied in screening the eligible article that will be included in this study including publication year, unit, participant, game intervention, research design, participant, outcome type, and language. These detail of inclusions and exclusions are explained as follows.

1. Publication year: All of the articles are peer-reviewed journal article which was published in the last seven years from January 2010 to June 2017.
2. Unit: The unit in elementary and secondary education in this study is science subject including biology, physics, chemistry, and general sciences. Other units such as technical subjects in vocational high school are excluded. Also, unrelated subject matters that have similar keywords, but they are not related to science subject such as physical education are excluded.
3. Game/ intervention: Digital games in this study is defined as a digital experience where participant use game of computer software and they receive feedback to achieve the goals in the form of a score, progress and win condition. However, learning intervention that focused on creating a digital game for students is not included. The studies compared digital games in science instruction and traditional methods.
4. Research design: All of Journal articles included in this meta-analysis must use experimental and control groups or game versus non-game condition. The studies must have a sample size, standard deviation, and mean. However, studies that do not have the data were excluded. The studies included used an experimental method to make sure that the included studies have data compared in the statistical analysis. Studies are considered experimental if individual students are randomly assigned to an instructional condition.
5. Participant: the participants of the research in the included studies are Elementary and Secondary school students. Students with specific clinical criteria such as disability are excluded from this study.
6. Outcome type: The data that will be extracted in this study is only quantitative data (numerical data) specifically students' learning outcome or cognitive aspect. Other research outcomes or qualitative data such as behavior, activity, participation, collaboration, engagement, and motivation are not extracted.
7. Language: The study included is an only article published in English without considering the country where the studies are conducted.

The full text that is related to the inclusion criteria of the topic was evaluated by annotating each article to extract some necessary information. This step was conducted using note-card contained eligibility criteria evaluation rubric recommended by Mertens (2015) including research question, the design of research, data analysis, results, conclusion, and research evaluation. During the preliminary selection of eligibility occurred in 137 articles were identified. Then, after the articles were screened for eligibility to exclude some non-eligible full text by applying inclusion criteria, 12 journal articles are carefully selected although this amount is a small number relative to some meta-analyses in this field.

The data from the selected studies is then extracted for further analysis. First, the data of the characteristics of the reviewed studies that includes the year of publication, country of origin, school level of participants, science domain, game name, and the purpose of the study were noted in Microsoft Excel. The data
were extracted through manual search in each article. The data is important to provide an overview of the characteristics of the reviewed studies. Second, the key information which corresponds to the research questions were also extracted for each study. The information which is needed to answer the research questions is only quantitative data (numerical data) that was used in the statistical analysis. The quantitative data extracted are student’s achievement mean, standard deviation, the number of participants of the control and treatment group.

Data Analysis Method

Microsoft Excell and Comprehensive Meta-Analysis (CMA 2.0) were used for statistical analysis after the quantitative data were extracted. The former, the demographic characteristics of the reviewed studies are analyzed with descriptive statistics using Microsoft Excell which present data such as mean, percentage, and frequencies. The data will also be presented with visual techniques such as a column, bar chart, and histogram. The latter, CMA 2.0 was also used. Several researchers verified the accuracy of the analysis method (Ones, Viswesvaran, & Schmidt, 1993; Hülsheger, Anderson & Salgado, 2009). CMA 2.0 is used to analyze hedges’ g effect size, the lower limit (LL), the upper limit (UL), p-Value, the Relative weight of all studies (Borenstein, Hedges, Higgins, & Rothstein, 2005). To give a clearer overview of the overall effect size, the forest plot to compare the effect of digital games over traditional methods was used (Sutton et al., 2000). Two kinds of effect model in a meta-analysis are fixed effect model and random effect model (Borenstein, Hedges, Higgins & Rothstein, 2010). The decision to select the effect model to analyze data is an essential factor in the meta-analysis (Hedges & Vevea, 1998). Improper determination of the model will cause inefficient estimation and incorrect conclusion (Nickell, 1981). However, in this study, we use the random effect model because all twelve studies used in this research are drawn from different population, such as different populations in different countries. The similar condition of research is conducted by Sacks et al. (1987). Moreover, the studies report varies the effect size (ES). In the random-effects model, the true effect size might differ from study to study (Olejnik & Algina, 2000). In addition to the estimation of the primary effect, secondary analyses were conducted to take advantage of the coded study characteristics and test the moderating effects. Specifically, secondary analysis tested the influence of grade level (elementary and secondary school) and year of publication. The data from statistical analysis from CMA 2.0 were used to address the research questions with the following method of interpretation.

We address the first research question by comparing the experimental group and the control group. There will be no difference between the control and experimental group when the mean of the sample is equal. However, when the experimental group's means score is higher than the control group, it means that GBSL intervention is more effective through looking at the mean difference between the experiment and control group. The second research question is answered by investigating the effect of moderator categories including year and school level, to the GBSL effectiveness, we use descriptive analysis through comparing the mean of effect size in each category. We compare the average effect size in each school level (elementary and secondary school) to determine which school level more effective of game intervention. Then, to analyze whether or not publication year has any correlation with game effectiveness, we use inferential statistics because it strives to make inferences and predictions (Bryman, 2016). The statistical method would improve the previous research that only looks at the pattern of effect size across the years. The data will be presented as scatterplot to illustrate the relationship between two variables (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2007, p. 507). It will also count the Spearman’s rank correlation coefficient (r) because both variables are ordinal to see the linear trend using Microsoft Excel. The interpretation to assess the degree of the correlation coefficient are categorized into very high (0.9 to 1.0), high (0.7 to 0.9), moderate (0.5 to 0.3), low (0.3 to 0.5), and negligible correlation (0 to 0.3).

Detection of Publication Bias

Detection of publication bias of reviewed studies is crucial in meta-analysis study (Rothstein, Sutton & Borenstein, 2006). Publication bias is the tendency of researchers to screen article for publication based on the statistical significance of effects than the quality of the study (Rothstein, Sutton, & Borenstein,
Several pieces of evidence show that some research that has higher effect size is more likely to be published (Peters, Sutton, Jones, Abrams & Rushton, 2006). Consequently, it will affect the review process. So, it is possible that the meta-analysis is overestimated effect size because it uses a biased sample or target of the population. So, to avoid this concern or minimizing this bias in this study, it needed a model to know which study is missing. One of the proper models is the funnel plot (Sterne et al., 2011). In the funnel plot, the effect size is plotted in X-axis, and the number of participants is plotted in Y-axis (Sterne & Egger, 2001). Also, asymmetry easily detected in the funnel plot. The studies will be distributed symmetrically when the publication bias is absent (Schmidt & Hunter, 2014). The next problem is whether the observed overall effect is robust. To solve this issue, some researchers use Rosenthal’s Fail-safe N (Becker, 2005). Orwin (1983) suggested that Rosenthal’s Fail-safe N compute the number of studies that should be incorporated in the analysis.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Overview of the Reviewed Studies

The publication years range from 2010 to 2017. The purpose is to know the development of research in this area in the last eight years. The highest number of publication is in 2015 with three publications (Figure 2). Then, the presence of international studies is reflected in the sample. However, 50% of the studies included were conducted within Asia continent especially in Taiwan, while the others were conducted internationally. There are two countries including Taiwan and Singapore from Asia. Within this international group, Spain is well represented by two studies. While the other research is from the U.S and Nigeria, Africa (Figure 3). Based on the school level, elementary and secondary education has an almost equal number. Eight studies are from elementary school and four studies from high school (Figure 4). Subject areas are also well represented with three in the context of biology, seven general sciences, while each physics and chemistry are only one study (Figure 5).

The studies included are shown in table 1. Table 1 outlines the characteristics of the included studies meeting all the eligibility criteria.
How effective Game-Based Science Learning (GBSL) does to enhance students' learning outcomes in sciences compared to the traditional method as reported by the current studies from 2010 to 2017?

The first research question will be answered by comparing the average Mean of the reviewed studies. The result of data extraction is presented in table 1 which compares the twelve studies with treatment group and control group. The number of participant in the twelve studies are 954 students. Most of the studies have an equal number of participant in the treatment and control group, although some of them have a slightly higher participant in one group than the other group. There are 489 students in a total of the control group and 465 students from the experimental group. The number of participant in the studies is varied from 38 to 180 students. The standard deviation of all of the studies is also varied from the lowest 0.93 to the highest 23.54. The detail of the data for each study is shown in table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Year of publication</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Game name</th>
<th>School level</th>
<th>Science domain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bello, Ibi &amp; Bukar</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chee &amp; Tan</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Alkhimia</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrzesien &amp; Alcañiz Raya</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Supercharged Elementary</td>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson &amp; Barnett</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Supercharged Secondary</td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sung &amp; Hwang</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>Alien Invasion</td>
<td>Elementary Sciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jui-Mei, Chun-Ming, Hwang &amp; Yueh-Chiao</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>Nutrition Supplement Battle</td>
<td>Elementary Biology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chu &amp; Hung</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>Kodu</td>
<td>Elementary Sciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Su &amp; Cheng</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>Alien Invasion</td>
<td>Elementary Sciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chen &amp; Hwang</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>Alien Invasion</td>
<td>Elementary Sciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fan, Xiao, &amp; Su</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>The MMBCLS</td>
<td>Secondary Biology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furió, Juan, Seguí, &amp; Vivó</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>iPhone game</td>
<td>Elementary Sciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Author (year)</th>
<th>Experiment class</th>
<th>Control Class</th>
<th>N total</th>
<th>Mean difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bello (2016)</td>
<td>66.23</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chee (2012)</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrzesien (2010)</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson (2013)</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jui (2011)</td>
<td>16.94</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chu, 2015</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>23.54</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>71.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Su (2014)</td>
<td>82.94</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>75.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chen (2017)</td>
<td>86.78</td>
<td>9.15</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>82.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fan (2015)</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furió (2015)</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chen (2016)</td>
<td>18.51</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>16.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.12</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>37.07</td>
<td>456</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on table 2, the average learning outcome mean from the overall studies of the experimental group (40.82) is higher than the control group (36.82). The mean difference analysis shows that one study, Chu (2015), has a negative mean difference between experimental and control group compared to the other ten studies that have a positive mean difference. The highest mean difference between the studies is 19.63 while the lowest mean different is -15.03. The experimental and control group’s standard deviation shows a variation.

The Analysis Result of Standardized Mean Difference Effect Size, Variance, Weight, and confidence interval (CI)

Random effects model was used to know the composite effect size with Comprehensive Meta-Analysis (CMA). The summary of the final analysis for all studies is presented in table 3. We calculate Hedges’s g for each study separately to maintain consistency of measurement. In addition to the individual effects, we also present 95% confidence interval (lower and upper limit) around each study and the relative weight (W). The overall effect size of the twenty studies is $g = 0.661$, $p < .001$; with a 95% confidence interval between 0.223 and 1.090. This indicates a moderate overall effect for the synthesized GBSL interventions that is statistically different from a null effect. The largest effect size influencing this study is Bello, Ibi & Bukar (2016) of 2.338. In contrast, the study contributing the smallest overall influence is Chu & Hung (2015) with an effect size of -0.637. The comparison of the SMD effect size of all studies is presented in a forest plot in figure 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Name</th>
<th>Hedges’s g</th>
<th>Lower limit</th>
<th>Upper limit</th>
<th>p-Value</th>
<th>Relative weight (W)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bello (2016)</td>
<td>2.338</td>
<td>1.959</td>
<td>2.716</td>
<td>0.000000</td>
<td>8.738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chee (2012)</td>
<td>0.571</td>
<td>0.123</td>
<td>1.020</td>
<td>0.012552</td>
<td>8.502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrzesien (2010)</td>
<td>0.233</td>
<td>-0.325</td>
<td>0.792</td>
<td>0.413325</td>
<td>8.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson (2013)</td>
<td>0.886</td>
<td>0.536</td>
<td>1.237</td>
<td>0.000001</td>
<td>8.821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sung (2013)</td>
<td>0.898</td>
<td>0.381</td>
<td>1.414</td>
<td>0.000657</td>
<td>8.253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jui (2011)</td>
<td>0.624</td>
<td>0.136</td>
<td>1.113</td>
<td>0.012277</td>
<td>8.358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chu, 2015</td>
<td>-0.637</td>
<td>-1.153</td>
<td>-0.120</td>
<td>0.015714</td>
<td>8.252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Su (2014)</td>
<td>0.741</td>
<td>0.255</td>
<td>1.228</td>
<td>0.002799</td>
<td>8.367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chen (2017)</td>
<td>0.402</td>
<td>-0.134</td>
<td>0.938</td>
<td>0.141517</td>
<td>8.177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fan (2015)</td>
<td>1.112</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>1.724</td>
<td>0.000368</td>
<td>7.873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furi (2015)</td>
<td>0.121</td>
<td>-0.503</td>
<td>0.744</td>
<td>0.704539</td>
<td>7.826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chen (2016)</td>
<td>0.520</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>0.896</td>
<td>0.006825</td>
<td>8.743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Random effect model</td>
<td>0.661</td>
<td>0.232</td>
<td>1.090</td>
<td>0.002538</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do moderator categories including school level of participants (elementary and secondary school context) and year of publication has any correlation with GBSL effect size?

Based on our analysis of moderating variables as the addition to the overall effect size, subsequent analyses of some moderating...
variables were run by school level and year of journal article’s publication which is presented in table 4.

Table 4. Mean Effect Size of GBSL based on Moderator Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moderator</th>
<th>Number of studies</th>
<th>Percentage of study</th>
<th>Mean d (N-1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed studies by School level of participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58.33%</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41.67%</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed studies by year of publication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>0.892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Firstly, we made two comparisons by school level including elementary and secondary schools. Seven studies are in the context of an elementary school setting with the mean of effect size 1.08. Other five studies tested on secondary school setting with an effect size mean of 0.34. This number shows that effect size of GBSL on secondary school context nearly two and a half time higher than elementary school students sample effect size. So, the implementation of GBSL in secondary school tend to have a larger effect size than in elementary school context. Secondly, according to the correlational analysis between the year of publication and effect size shows that the variable has a low correlation with the r = 0.40 (r² = 0.16). Figure 7 illustrates a scatter plot that shows the relationship between year of publication (X-axis) and effect size (y-axis). Figure 7 shows that from 2010 the effect size average is 0.23 followed by approximately double to 0.55 in 2011. Five years later in 2016, the effect size significantly increased again to 2.54.

Analysis for Publication Bias

According to the analysis of Rosenthal’s Fail-safe N (Orwin, 1983). Among the various methods for assessing bias, Rosenthal’s Fail-safe N has the advantage of focusing on the potential impact any unpublished or unidentified studies may have on the current estimated effect size. It provides an estimate for the number of hypothetical missing studies that must be identified to bring the calculated overall effect below a level of researcher-imposed substantive significance (Easterbrook, Berlin, Gopalan, & Matthews, 1991). This assumes that those missing studies have negligible effects. Based on the analysis 307 more studies are needed to make p-value to be alpha (Z for alpha= 1.959). The other method to analysis publication bias is the Funnel Plot which has two diagonal lines that represent the 95% confidence interval, and a vertical central line. The x-axis represents the study sample size, and the y-axis represents the effect size. Figure 8 illustrates the Funnel plot of Standard error (SE) by hedges' g effect size.
According to figure 8, the nine studies fall around the two horizontal lines or a confidence interval of 95%. However, three studies fall outside the funnel plot, indicating that these studies were not as significant as the other nine studies.

The Performance of the result of this study with similar research

The performance of this study aligns with similar studies of literature reviews using meta-analysis on gamification across various context such as mathematics, language, and physical education, over a decade which have consistently found that games-based learning outperform traditional-based learning (Divjak & Tomić, 2011; Vogel et al., 2006; Young et al., 2012). However, there are some notable differences regarding the statistical analysis. First, the fail-safe number (\(N_f\)) that we found in this research, 307 studies, is much lower than the previous meta-analysis. The fail-safe number is only approximately a fifth than the findings of Vogel (2006) with \(N_f\) 1465. Second, the number of studies in this meta-analysis is only twelve which lower than similar research in this field such as Divjak (2011) with 32 studies and Young (2012) with more than 300 articles. Also, the findings of this research support the finding of Li & Tsai (2013) regarding the potential of GBSL to promote students’ learning. Li & Tsai (2013) found that GBSL can promote students’ engagement. Therefore, students’ engagement and motivation might lead to an improvement in students’ learning outcomes in Science.

CONCLUSION

Based on the result and discussion, we are going to conclude and recommend some possible topic that can be explored in the area of research as the implications of these studies. First, based on the investigated studies conducted from 2010 to 2017, the use of GBSL is statistically significant to improve students’ learning outcomes in elementary and secondary school. The learning outcome of the experimental group of the overall studies is higher than the control group which is 41.12 against 37.07 respectively. The mean of hedges’ \(g\) random effect size of the reviewed studies is 0.667 which can be classified into medium effect size. Second, moderator categories or variation of school level of the study have any correlation on digital game effectiveness where the implementation of GBSL in secondary school have a greater effect size than in elementary school context. Also, the year of publication and effect size has low positive correlation with \(r=0.40\).

RECOMMENDATION FOR FUTURE STUDIES

The result of this study has implications for future studies. Experimental research of GBSL in Science education across various of context is still needed. This is supported by the result of detection publication bias which showed that at least 237 studies in this area of research are needed that would bring \(p\)-value to be alpha. This research is complex, but the description of the process and result has been presented. Furthermore, we use Comprehensive Meta-Analysis 2.0 as trusted software for quantitative meta-analysis. However, our study has some limitations. The study only includes a small number of research. This might be caused by the topic used is too specific where it only includes the effect of GBSL in a subject (Science) and the outcomes only specifically focus on cognitive aspects. There are many potential studies in of GBSL in Science education and in the timeframe (2010-2017), but they were not included in this study because they were not eligible in the screening process.
with the seven inclusion and exclusion criteria which is determined in the research design. Some research has no complete data to be extracted, or the topic is not suitable for this research. For example, the research use case study which only has experimental group does not have a control group (Echeverría et al., 2011; Spires, Rowe, Mott & Lester, 2011). Other studies are not eligible because they focus on other outcomes such as collaboration and problem-solving (Sánchez & Olivares, 2011), and developing serious games (Nilsson & Jakobsson, 2011; Khalili et al., 2011; Ting, 2010). So, future studies should not only focus on the cognitive or quantitative outcome but also affective or qualitative outcomes such as students’ engagement, motivation, self-efficacy, participation, collaboration, communication, and problem-solving skills. The research to review the qualitative outcome can be conducted with a systematic review, narrative review or descriptive review (For example, Li & Tsai, 2013; Kim, Munson & McKay, 2012).

The limited number of research identified might also due to the restricted criteria of the year of publication, sources of databases, context, and moderator categories. First, the included studies were conducted from 2010 to 2017. So, the result of this study does not capture the studies outside this period. Second, the review only includes some databases including ERIC, Springer Link, ProQuest, and A+ Education. Future studies can also be conducted by extending the literature to other educational databases such as ISI Web of Sciences or sources like Google scholar, conference proceeding, and dissertation. There many articles related to GBSL. Third, regarding context, investigating the effectiveness in different context/country and expanded educational level such as preschool could also be explored in future studies. This is because we found that most of the research included in this meta-analysis was conducted within Asia and educational level in the preschool context has not been explored. The last, for moderator categories, our research only focused on school level of participants and year of publication of the study. Therefore, future research can explore different moderator such as gender (Tsai, Kofinas, & Luo, 2018; Vogel et al., 2006), game genre (individual, peers, or groups), stream type or typical games (Sjöblom, Törhönen, Hamari & Macey, 2017), learner control, and type of activity (Vogel et al., 2006).
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