Integrating Telemetry with Player Motivation Models

Ivan Voitovich
Kazakh-British Technical University
59 Tole Bi Street, Almaty, Republic of Kazakhstan
ivanvoitovich007@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This paper develops a theoretical framework that connects game telemetry to player motivation models in order to make analytics more interpretable for designers. Current analytics SDKs capture what players do, but they often provide limited insight into why those actions occur. In parallel, motivational frameworks such as HEXAD, RAMP, and 4 Keys 2 Fun describe engagement in meaningful terms, yet they are rarely operationalized from raw event streams. Drawing on prior work in telemetry visualization, sequential trace compression, player classification, exploration modeling, and adaptive systems, this paper synthesizes these strands into a single conceptual pipeline suggested by Bicalho, Baffa, Feijó, Murta, and Clua. The proposed framework combines event instrumentation, sequence-aware preprocessing, motivation-oriented mapping, and validation through mixed methods. Its contribution is not an empirical claim of solved prediction, but a structured research agenda and design-oriented model for explainable, motivation-aware telemetry.

Keywords

game telemetry, player motivation, theoretical framework, explainable analytics, dynamic difficulty adjustment, player modeling

INTRODUCTION

Analytics SDKs such as GameAnalytics, Unity Analytics, PlayFab, and Firebase have made event logging a normal part of game production. Teams can now track retention, progression, economy events, failures, and spatial movement at large scale. Yet this abundance of data does not automatically produce design understanding. A report may show that players abandon a level after several deaths, but the same pattern can reflect boredom, confusion, challenge-seeking, or an intentional attempt to optimize performance. In other words, telemetry captures observable behavior, while design decisions often require an interpretation of player intent and motivation. This interpretive difficulty is especially important because telemetry is often noisy and fragmented, and temporal order can be lost if traces are reduced to aggregates, said by Kohwalter, Murta, and Clua and Saas, Guitart, and Periáñez .

The project that motivates this paper starts from that gap. The project abstract and concept materials define the central claim clearly. Low-level SDK telemetry should be translated through motivational and cognitive frameworks such as HEXAD, RAMP, and 4 Keys 2 Fun so that design teams can move from raw event counts to interpretable indicators of engagement, autonomy, mastery, relatedness, and purpose. The

Proceedings of DiGRA CA 2026

presentation materials frame the same problem in pipeline terms, proposing a sequence that begins with telemetry capture and preprocessing and ends with explanation and adaptation.

THE PROBLEM SPACE

The current problem can be described as an asymmetry between measurement and interpretation. On the measurement side, modern telemetry systems are extremely effective at collecting actions, states, timestamps, locations, and session summaries. On the interpretation side, design teams still struggle to translate those logs into explanations that are meaningful in creative decision-making. The issue is not simply technical. It is epistemic. A level designer or systems designer does not only need to know that players failed. They need to know whether failure corresponded to confusion, a productive challenge, a lack of guidance, or a mismatch between the level's intended fantasy and the player's actual motivation.

The project concept materials identify three linked dimensions of this gap. First, SDK telemetry provides limited insight into why behavioral events occur. Second, many player-modeling techniques depend on narrow heuristics or domain-specific assumptions, which makes cross-game generalization difficult. Third, the interpretive burden often falls on designers who may not have the engineering background required to transform raw telemetry into actionable design changes.

Telemetry is often noisy and fragmented, with each play session producing many small events that are difficult to interpret in isolation, said by Kohwalter, Murta, and Clua . If temporal order is ignored, analysis may show how often something happened, but not how player behavior developed over time, which supports treating sessions as structured sequences rather than flattened totals, as stated by Saas, Guitart, and Periáñez.

RELATED WORK

Telemetry, noise reduction, and sequential traces

One important strand of prior work addresses the sheer density of telemetry traces. Kohwalter, Murta, and Clua argue that game-session telemetry often contains long stretches of sequential data that are redundant for analytical purposes, and they propose similarity collapses to remove irrelevant steps while preserving meaningful order (Kohwalter et al. 2018). This is particularly useful for the present framework because the aim is not to erase temporal structure, but to compress it without losing the narrative of player behavior. The presentation script directly adopts this logic in its notation for collapsing adjacent states when their feature difference stays below a threshold.

A related line of work examines clustering and comparison across gameplay traces. Saas, Guitart, and Periáñez show that time-series clustering can reveal playing patterns in free-to-play data (Saas et al. 2017). The importance of that contribution for this article lies less in the specific clustering algorithm and more in the methodological lesson: sessions should be treated as structured sequences rather than flattened totals when one seeks meaningful patterns. That insight supports the framework's claim that higher-order structure matters if telemetry is to inform interpretation rather than merely monitoring.

Player modeling, classification, and context

Another strand of research concerns player classification. Bicalho, Baffa, and Feijó propose a production-facing dynamic difficulty adjustment approach built around generic player behavior classification (Bicalho et al. 2023). The value of this work for the current paper is that it demonstrates the relevance of interpretable behavioral groupings in live systems. At the same time, it also shows a limitation. Classification alone does not fully resolve the semantic problem. Two players may display similar surface-level behaviors while pursuing different experiential goals. This is where motivational frameworks become useful as an additional interpretive layer.

The same theme appears in work on broader player modeling and engagement. Krishnan, Williams, and Martens argue for action-model learning in player modeling, which points toward transferable representations rather than one-off heuristics. Zhao et al. show how behavior modeling can be used to support engagement in role-playing contexts. Starace and Soule similarly demonstrate the value of multi-modal approaches when behavior alone becomes ambiguous. Taken together, these studies suggest that the next step is not to abandon behavior, but to connect it to a more explicit theory of player motivation.(Krishnan et al. 2021; Zhao et al. 2021; Starace et al. 2025)

Exploration, design signals, and adaptation

Several uploaded studies are especially useful because they show how telemetry becomes valuable when tied to concrete design questions. Gómez-Maureira examine level design patterns that evoke curiosity-driven exploration, while Acevedo on procedural level design that encourages spatial exploration (Gómez-Maureira et al. 2021; Acevedo et al. 2022). These works are important because they demonstrate that spatial traces are not merely movement logs. They can serve as evidence for interpretive questions about curiosity, agency, search behavior, and level readability.

Research on adaptation completes this picture. Vardakis use in-game data to predict MOBA events, demonstrating that telemetry can support near-term forecasting while Pfau connect deep behavior modeling to automated balancing, indicating that adaptive systems can react to player traces at scale (Vardakis et al. 2026; Pfau et al. 2020). However, adaptive control without interpretability risks becoming opaque or even unfair. The project notes explicitly criticize classic performance-only difficulty adjustment for this reason, proposing instead that difficulty should move toward a target motivational alignment rather than simply toward success-rate stabilization. This design concern motivates the framework's emphasis on explainable intermediate variables.

What remains missing

Despite these advances, the literature does not provide a single model that links analytics SDKs, sequential telemetry processing, motivation constructs, and designer-facing explanation in one coherent pipeline. Existing work typically solves part of the problem. It improves trace handling, classifies behavior, predicts outcomes, or studies a specific experience construct. The gap addressed by this paper is therefore synthetic. Its task is to articulate how these components can be assembled into a theory-led framework that is understandable, adaptable, and empirically testable.

FRAMEWORK DESIGN

A conceptual architecture

The proposed framework consists of four linked layers. The first layer is instrumentation. At this stage, games record events, state changes, spatial traces, progression markers, and optional context tags. The second layer is sequence-aware preprocessing. Here the goal is to reduce noise, compress redundant steps, and preserve meaningful ordering through segmentation, event grouping, or similarity collapse. The third layer is motivational interpretation. Features or sequence patterns are translated into candidate indicators associated with models such as RAMP, HEXAD, or 4 Keys 2 Fun. The fourth layer is application. The interpreted signals can be used in designer dashboards, comparative analyses, or adaptive systems such as dynamic difficulty adjustment and pacing.

The logic of this conceptual architecture. Telemetry collection leads into preprocessing, then into feature extraction and sequence representations, then into an interpretive mapping stage, and finally into adaptation and evaluation. What distinguishes the current formulation is the insistence that the mapping layer remains explicit. The framework does not hide interpretation inside a black box. Instead, it treats interpretation as a configurable, inspectable design layer.

From raw events to interpretable constructs

A central theoretical claim of the framework is that raw telemetry should not be equated with motivation. Events are not motivations; they are behavioral traces that may or may not serve as evidence for a motivational hypothesis. A sequence of repeated failures, for instance, can indicate frustration, but it can also indicate mastery-driven persistence if the player voluntarily engages with a difficult optional challenge. Because of this ambiguity, the framework treats motivational inference as abductive rather than deterministic. It asks what interpretation is most plausible given the structure of behavior, the design context, and any available auxiliary evidence.

This is why the framework privileges contextualization. It recommends recording intent hints when possible, such as whether an encounter was part of a tutorial, an optional boss, a side objective, or the main quest. It also encourages light triangulation through short questionnaires or designer coding sessions during playtests. In that sense, the motivational layer is not presented as a replacement for qualitative inquiry. It is a way to organize and scale interpretive hypotheses so that telemetry becomes more meaningful without pretending that meaning can be extracted from behavior alone.

Borrowed methodological insights

Source area	Representative study	Borrowed insight	Role in the framework
Sequential telemetry	Kohwalter et al. 2018	Redundant adjacent states can be collapsed while preserving order.	Supports preprocessing that reduces noise

			without flattening play into totals.
Trace clustering	Saas et al. 2017	Sessions should be analyzed as structured sequences, not only as aggregates.	Supports higher-order behavioral representations.
Player classification	Bicalho et al. 2023	Behavioral groups can support adaptive systems if the features remain interpretable.	Supports designer-facing mapping and adaptation logic.
Exploration studies	Gómez-Maureira et al. 2021; Acevedo et al. 2022	Spatial and progression traces can be read as design signals tied to curiosity and exploration.	Supports the translation of movement data into motivational hypotheses.
Adaptive analytics	Vardakis et al. 2026; Pfau et al. 2020	Telemetry can drive prediction and balancing, but intervention needs clear rationale.	Supports the move from dashboard interpretation to explainable adaptation.

Table 1: Prior studies do not directly validate the proposed model, but they provide the methodological building blocks it synthesizes.

Table 1 clarifies the paper's theoretical stance. The framework is not invented from nothing, but neither is it a simple summary. It is assembled from several methodological insights that previously appeared in partial and disconnected form.

An illustrative adaptation formula

A complementary visualization concerns spatial concentration. Density-style movement maps can reveal hesitation, congestion, repeated traversal, or unexpected player interest, which makes them useful for connecting telemetry to level design interpretation. In the context of this framework, such visualizations do not prove motivation directly. Instead, they provide designer-readable evidence that can support later interpretive mapping.

$$\rho(x, y) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathcal{N}\left((x, y); \mu_i, \sigma^2\right)$$

Figure 1: Illustrative density-field.

Also propose a deliberately simple control expression for motivation-aware adaptation in which difficulty at the next time step is adjusted by the gap between target and observed motivation. The value of this expression is not mathematical novelty. Its value is conceptual. It makes the adaptation policy legible. Instead of merely saying that a machine-learning system adjusts the game, the framework insists that the reason for the adjustment should remain understandable to the designer and open to revision during playtesting.

$$D_{t+1} = D_t + \alpha (M_{\text{target}} - M_{\text{observed}})$$

Figure 2: Conceptual motivation-aware adaptation loop

VALIDATION AGENDA

Because this is a theoretical framework r, the appropriate question is not whether the model has already been fully proven, but how it should be validated. The project materials consistently describe a mixed-method agenda. First, the framework should be tested as a designer-facing interpretive tool. One can compare conventional telemetry dashboards with dashboards augmented by motivational indicators and measure whether designers identify probable causes more quickly or produce better supported design recommendations. Second, the framework should be tested at the construct level. Telemetry-derived indicators should be compared against short self-reports, contextual annotations, or behavioral outcomes in controlled playtest settings. Third, the framework should be evaluated as a basis for adaptation, for example by comparing a standard performance-driven policy with a motivation-aware policy in A/B conditions.

This validation agenda is already present in the project abstract and presentation materials, where telemetry analysis, designer workflow studies, surveys, and A/B tests are presented as complementary rather than competing forms of evidence. The important implication is that validity cannot be reduced to prediction accuracy alone. If the framework is to remain useful for design, it must be judged by interpretability, actionability, and construct plausibility in addition to numerical performance.

A further implication concerns scope. The framework is unlikely to transfer unchanged across genres. A mastery-related signal in a tactics game may look different from a mastery-related signal in a narrative adventure or a social sandbox. For this reason, the project notes explicitly state that cross-genre transfer requires calibration of feature definitions and weights, and that construct validity remains one of the core risks. The present paper therefore treats transferability as an empirical question for future testing rather than as an assumption.

DISCUSSION

Rewriting the article as a theoretical framework paper has an important consequence for how contribution is stated. The paper does not claim that motivation can be read directly or perfectly from event logs. It claims something more modest and, arguably, more valuable for current design practice. Telemetry can become more interpretable when it is reorganized through explicit motivational constructs, sequence-aware representations, and mixed-method validation.

This position also answers a recurring tension in analytics-driven game design. On one side lies the desire for scalable, automated analysis. On the other lies the need for explanations that creative teams can trust. The framework proposed here is an attempt to mediate between those poles. It accepts the productivity of telemetry and machine-assisted modeling, but resists the idea that good design decisions can emerge from opaque signals alone. It therefore treats explainability not as an optional visualization feature, but as a core design requirement.

There are clear limitations. The framework depends on instrumentation quality, contextual tagging, and careful construct design. It may encourage false certainty if designers treat motivational indicators as facts rather than hypotheses. It also risks overfitting if weights and mappings are tuned on narrow datasets. These weaknesses are not reasons to reject the model. They define the conditions under which the model should be studied responsibly.

CONCLUSION

This paper is positioned as a theoretical and synthetic contribution rather than a completed empirical investigation. It proposes a framework that brings together analytics SDKs, sequential telemetry processing, motivational models, and explainable adaptation within a single conceptual structure. Its central argument is that telemetry should not be treated as a collection of raw behavioral traces alone, but translated into interpretable signals that can inform design reasoning. By combining event logging, sequence-aware preprocessing, explicit motivational mapping, and mixed-method validation, the framework offers a practical direction for making game analytics more meaningful for designers and more transparent in adaptive systems. Although empirical testing remains the next step, the present contribution is already significant: it clarifies the structure of the problem, shows how existing methods can be assembled into a coherent model, and defines the kinds of evidence needed for a fair evaluation of that model.

REFERENCES

Acevedo, Pedro, Minsoo Choi, Huimin Liu, Dominic Kao, and Christos Mousas. 2022. “"Procedural Game Level Design to Trigger Spatial Exploration".” Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction. https://doi.org/10.1145/3555858.3563272.

Bicalho, Luís Fernando, Augusto Baffa, and Bruno Feijó. 2023. “"A Dynamic Difficulty Adjustment Algorithm With Generic Player Behavior Classification Unity Plugin in Single Player Games".” https://doi.org/10.1145/3631085.3631286.

Feng, Zezheng, Fang Zhu, Hongjun Wang, Jianing Hao, Shuang-Hua Yang, Wei Zeng, and Huamin Qu. 2024. “HoLens: A Visual Analytics Design for Higher-Order Movement Modeling and Visualization.” Computational Visual Media 10 (6): 1079-1100. https://doi.org/10.1007/s41095-023-0392-y.

Gómez-Maureira, Marcello Andres, Isabelle Kniestedt, Max J. van Duijn, Carolien Rieffe, and Aske Plaat. 2021. “"Level Design Patterns That Invoke Curiosity-Driven Exploration": An Empirical Study Across Multiple Conditions.” Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction (CHI PLAY). https://doi.org/10.1145/3474698.

Kohwalter, Troy, Leonardo Murta, and Esteban Clua. 2018. “"Filtering Irrelevant Sequential Data out of Game Session Telemetry through Similarity Collapses".” Future Generation Computer Systems. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.future.2018.03.004.

Krishnan, Abhijeet, Aaron Williams, and Chris Martens. 2021. “"Towards Action Model Learning for Player Modeling".” arXiv:2103.05682. https://arxiv.org/abs/2103.05682.

Pfau, Johannes, Antonios Liapis, Georg Volkmar, Georgios N. Yannakakis, and Rainer Malaka. 2020. “"Dungeons & Replicants: Automated Game Balancing via Deep Player Behavior Modeling".”

Saas, Alain, Anna Guitart, and África Periáñez. 2017. “"Discovering Playing Patterns": Time Series Clustering of Free-To-Play Game Data.” arXiv:1710.02268. https://arxiv.org/abs/1710.02268.

Starace, Jason, and Terence Soule. 2025. “A Systematic Evaluation of Multi-modal Approaches to Complex Player Profile Classification.” arXiv:2509.05624. https://arxiv.org/abs/2509.05624.

Vardakis, Michail, George Margetis, Ioannis Chatzakis, Konstantinos C. Apostolakis, and Constantine Stephanidis. 2026. “"Prediction of MOBA Game Events Based on In-Game Data".” Entertainment Computing. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.entcom.2026.101091.

Zhao, Sha, Yizhi Xu, Zhiling Luo, Jianrong Tao, Shijian Li, Changjie Fan, and Gang Pan. 2021. “"Player Behavior Modeling for Enhancing Role-Playing Game Engagement".” IEEE Transactions on Computational Social Systems 8 (2). https://doi.org/10.1109/TCSS.2021.3052261.

Öztürk, Savaş. 2025. “Analyzing Maintainability Factors in Open-Source Game Engines: Implications for Game Developers.” Multimedia Tools and Applications 84: 43929-43957. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11042-025-20899-8.