

Comm. 597C — Video Game Effects

Dr. Mike Schmierbach
mgs15@psu.edu
Mobile #: 814-933-9934

M 1:25-4:25

Office hours: MW 11:30-1 & appt.
Office: 217 Carnegie
Office #: 814-865-9582

Course overview: This class explores research into a variety of gaming effects, including influences on aggression, enjoyment, learning, computer skills, cognitive ability, and social connectedness. In addition, it considers the role of potential moderating variables, including gender, experience, and player motivations. Students assess existing theories from communications, psychology, and related disciplines as well as evaluating a variety of research techniques employed in the study of video games.

Objectives: Students who successfully complete assigned coursework should develop the following skills:

- Familiarity with key theories of video game effects
- Ability to connect video game research to broader theories of mass communication
- Increased understanding of research methodology, specifically in the context of games

Policies: You're grad students. Act like it. Do the reading, attend class, participate, respect your peers, and let me know if anything is keeping you from doing the above.

Note to students with disabilities: Penn State welcomes students with disabilities into the University's educational programs. If you have a disability-related need for reasonable academic adjustments in this course, contact the Office for Disability Services (ODS), located in 116 Boucke Building, at 814-863-1807 (V/TTY). For further information regarding ODS, please visit their Web site at <http://www.equity.psu.edu/ods/>. Please notify me as early in the semester as possible regarding the need for reasonable academic adjustments.

Academic integrity: Academic integrity is the pursuit of scholarly and creative activity in an open, honest and responsible manner, free from fraud and deception, and is an educational objective of the College of Communications and the university. Cheating, including plagiarism, falsification of research data, using the same assignment for more than one class, turning in someone else's work, or passively allowing others to copy your work, will result in academic penalties at the discretion of the instructor, and may result in the grade of "XF" (failed for academic dishonesty) being put on your permanent transcript. In serious cases it could also result in suspension or dismissal from the university. As students studying communication, you should understand and avoid plagiarism (presenting the work of others as your own). A discussion of plagiarism, with examples, can be found at:

<http://tlt.its.psu.edu/suggestions/cyberplag/cyberplagstudent.html>. The rules and policies regarding academic integrity should be reviewed by every student, and can be found online at: <http://www.psu.edu/ufs/policies/47-00.html#49-20>, and in the College of Communications document, "Academic Integrity Policy and Procedures." Any student with a question about academic integrity or plagiarism is strongly encouraged to discuss it with his or her instructor.

Grades: Course grades are based on several elements. Each element is graded and converted to a percentage scale; for elements with multiple assignments, each portion will be averaged (more important elements will be weighted as necessary):

Participation & discussion questions	25%
Outside article summaries.....	10%
Response papers.....	30%
Final paper	35%

Grading scale: Final grades are assigned based on percentage scores using this scale:

93-100+	A
90-92.9	A-
87-89.9	B+
83-86.9	B
80-82.9	B-
77-79.9	C+
70-76.9	C
60-69.9	D
0-59.9	F

I may employ a more lenient scale as course grade distributions warrant. That is, you might receive a higher grade than your numerical score would merit. You will never receive a lower score than your final numerical score would receive based on this scale.

Participation/discussion questions: As graduate students, I expect you to play an active role in the class, and will assess both the quantity and quality of your in-class contributions. I recognize that your individual ability to contribute will vary, but I expect to see a consistent good-faith effort to be a part of a thoughtful, intellectual discussion of the readings and underlying course concepts.

In addition to your in-class efforts, a significant portion of your grade is based upon your submission of weekly discussion questions that will then aid in directing our in-class conversation. You are required to submit one discussion question *for each assigned reading*. Questions are due by 6 p.m. on the Sunday prior to the date the reading is assigned and should be submitted via e-mail. Good questions are meant to promote discussion, and I will select from your questions in helping develop the day's lesson. Thus, questions might reflect elements of the reading you felt were confusing or flawed and that warrant further scrutiny, or elements of the reading you found fascinating and worth further exploration, including possible applications and comparisons between the reading and other scholarship. You are free to submit questions on matters that genuinely puzzle you or that propose topics you feel well-equipped to discuss.

You will be allowed to skip a total of three discussion questions (representing three readings) without penalty. Questions submitted late can also count against this total, but will not have as great an effect on your final grade as missing questions, so in general I would encourage you to submit late rather than not at all unless you are sure you won't exceed your "skip quota." Additional missed questions will adversely affect your participation score unless you communicate with me regarding valid circumstances for the omission.

Outside article summaries: On the last day of the class, we will read articles selected by members of the class based on your individual research interests. (Needless to say, we won't necessarily be able to read an article chosen by each student.) To help with this process and further your review of the literature, you will provide PDF copies of two outside articles along with a roughly one-page summary of each. One of these articles may come from the list of supplemental readings included along with the required reading list posted on ANGEL, but at least one article must be one you located on your own. Articles should present empirical research into the effects of video games. Details are posted in a separate document on ANGEL.

Response papers: During the semester, you will complete two response papers of approximately 5-7 pages, reflecting on a specific course topic and integrating a small amount of outside material. (Some of this outside research can subsequently be used to fulfill your outside article summary requirement and for your final term paper.) Starting in week 4, I will post options for response paper topics along with assignment details; papers are due roughly two weeks after completing material connected to the topic, and options generally address the material from one or two classes. Posted topics will include due dates and submission guidelines. You are free to select topics that best fit your interest and schedule, and you may propose an alternative topic on a given week's material but must receive instructor approval before you write the paper and you cannot write on a topic that excessively duplicates your final paper. The absolute latest due date will be the last week of class, and you cannot submit more than one paper for a single due date, so it is in your best interest to complete papers early in the semester. Students will have the option of revising papers meeting certain criteria.

Final paper: The key "capstone" for this course is a research proposal, in which you will present a complete literature review (as if written for a scholarly journal article) and provide the necessary IRB paperwork to thoroughly describe a proposed study to test the ideas laid out in that review. Full details of this paper and its preliminary stages are provided in a separate document. The key initial stages are briefly listed below:

- Proposal & annotated bibliography. The initial step of the paper process is to lay out your proposed area of study, identifying the central research questions you would want to answer, giving a rough explanation of how you might tackle these, and explaining why such a project would be important and relevant for media effects. In addition, you will begin the process of developing your final literature review by providing a list of potentially relevant articles and giving a short summary of each.
- Presentation. Each student will present their basic study proposal and research objectives in a relatively brief (approximately 10-minute) presentation toward the end of the semester. (We are not doing presentations on the very last day because the goal is to give you time to integrate and respond to peer feedback and suggestions.) Your focus should be on your thoughts regarding study design and measurement, more than on matters of theory and literature. In addition to the actual presentation time, students should solicit feedback from peers, using appropriate "discussion-prompting" techniques as necessary, so that the total time allotted to each student will be roughly 20 minutes.
- Final paper. Each student will present a complete literature review that outlines the media effects topic they propose to explore, integrating the literature and presenting a clear set of research questions and/or hypotheses that would be tested using their proposed methodology. In addition, you will complete the necessary IRB forms with sufficient detail to show exactly how you would go about testing these questions/hypotheses. You should not actually submit the paperwork to the IRB, but the goal of this format is to

position you to be able to move forward with your proposed study in a timely fashion based on feedback and personal interest.

Course schedule: The following lists topics by day. A complete bibliography by day, along with supplemental readings, is posted separately. All assigned readings (and some supplemental readings) can be found on ANGEL. This schedule is subject to change as circumstances might warrant – I will always notify the class via ANGEL of any changes.

Week 1 (Jan. 10) — Introductions

Note that there is no class on Jan. 17 because of Martin Luther King Jr. Day

Week 2 (Jan. 24) — Player characteristics

Week 3 (Jan. 31) — Player motivations & gratifications

Week 4 (Feb. 7) — Aggression I

Week 5 (Feb. 14) — Aggression II

Week 6 (Feb. 21) — Addiction

Week 7 (Feb. 28) — Social interaction — *final paper topic proposal/bibliography due*

Note that there is no class on March 7 because of Spring Break

Week 8 (March 14) — Enjoyment I

Week 9 (March 21) — Enjoyment II

Week 10 (March 28) — Cognitive skills

Week 11 (April 4) — Education

Week 12 (April 11) — Advertising — *outside article summaries due*

Week 13 (April 18) — Presentations

Week 14 (April 25) — Student-selected readings

Final paper due during finals week, date TBD.

Comm. 597C — Video game effects. Readings list.

This document lists the required readings by week, followed by a list of supplemental readings that are generally relevant to the course. Required readings are posted in the required readings folder and labeled by date. Supplemental readings are posted in a separate, supplemental readings folder and sorted alphabetically by first author.

Citations do not include DOIs and may have other mistakes. Please check original sources when formatting citations for class submission or other purposes.

Week 2 (Jan. 24) — Player & game characteristics

Ogletree, S.M. & Drake, R. (2007). College students' video game participation and perceptions: Gender differences and implications. *Sex Roles, 56*, 537-542.

Williams, D., Martins, N., Consalvo, M., & Ivory, J.D. (2009). The virtual census: Representations of gender, race and age in video games. *New Media & Society, 11*, 815-834.

Williams, D., Yee, N., & Caplan, S.E. (2008). Who plays, how much, and why? Debunking the stereotypical gamer profile. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 13*, 993-1018.

Wood, R.T.A., Griffiths, M.D., Chappell, D., & Davies, M.N.O. (2004). The structural characteristics of video games: A psycho-structural analysis. *Cyber-Psychology & Behavior, 7*, 1-10.

Week 3 (Jan. 31) — Player motivations & gratifications

Greenberg, B.S., Sherry, J., Lachlan, K., Lucas, K., & Holmstrom, A. (2010). Orientations to video games among gender and age groups. *Simulation Gaming, 41*, 238-259.

Peng, W., Liu, M., & Mou, Y. (2008). Do aggressive people play violent computer games in a more aggressive way? Individual difference and idiosyncratic game-playing experience. *CyberPsychology & Behavior, 11*, 157-161.

Przybylski, A.K., Rigby, C.S., & Ryan, R.M. (2010). A motivational model of video game engagement. *Review of General Psychology, 14*, 154-166.

Ryan, R.M., Rigby, C.S., & Przybylski, A.K. (2006). The motivational pull of video games: A self-determination theory approach. *Motivation and Emotion, 30*, 347-363.

Yee, N. (2006). Motivations for play in online games. *CyberPsychology & Behavior, 9*, 772-775.

Week 4 (Feb. 7) — Aggression I

Anderson, C.A. et al. (2010). Violent video game effects on aggression, empathy, and prosocial behavior in Eastern and Western countries: A meta-analytical review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 136, 151-173.

Bushman, B.J., Rothstein, H.R., & Anderson, C.A. (2010). Much ado about something: Violent video game effects and a school of red herring: Reply to Ferguson and Kilburn (2010). *Psychological Bulletin*, 136, 182-187.

Ferguson, C.J. (2007). Evidence for publication bias in video game violence effects literature: A meta-analytic review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 12, 470-482.

Ferguson, C.J. & Kilburn, J. (2010). Much ado about nothing: The misestimation and overinterpretation of violent video game effects in Eastern and Western nations: Comment on Anderson et al. (2010). *Psychological Bulletin*, 136, 174-178.

Markey, P.M., & Markey, C.N. (2010). Vulnerability to violent video games: A review and integration of personality research. *Review of General Psychology*, 14, 82-91.

Week 5 (Feb. 14) — Aggression II

Anderson, C.A., et al. (2008). Longitudinal effects of violent video games on aggression in Japan and the United States. *Pediatrics*, 122, 1067-1072.

Fischer, P., Kastenmuller, A., & Greitemeyer, T. (2010). Media violence and the self: the impact of personalized gaming characters in aggressive video games on aggressive behavior. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 46, 192-195.

Greitemeyer, T. & Osswald, S. (2009). Prosocial video games reduce aggressive cognitions. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 45, 896-900.

Ivory, J.D. & Kalyanaraman, S. (2007). The effects of technological advancement and violent content in video games on players' feelings of presence, involvement, physiological arousal, and aggression. *Journal of Communication*, 57, 532-555.

Williams, D., & Skoric, M. (2005). Internet fantasy violence: A test of aggression in an online game. *Communication Monographs*, 72, 217-233.

Week 6 (Feb. 21) — Addiction

Chou, T-J., & Ting, C-C. (2003). The role of flow experience in cyber-game addiction. *CyberPsychology & Behavior*, 6, 663-675.

Peters, C.S., & Malesky, L.A. (2008). Problematic usage among highly-engaged players of massively multiplayer online role playing games. *CyberPsychology & Behavior, 11*, 481-484.

Salguero, R.A.T., & Moran R.M.B. (2002). Measuring problem video game playing in adolescents. *Addiction, 97*, 1601-1606.

Skoric, M.M., Teo, L.L.C., & Neo, R.L. (2009). Children and video games: Addiction, engagement, and scholastic achievement. *CyberPsychology & Behavior, 12*, 567-572.

Smahel, D., Blinka, L., & Ledabyl, O. (2008). Playing MMORPGs: Connections between addiction and identifying with a character. *CyberPsychology & Behavior, 11*, 715-718.

Week 7 (Feb. 28) — Social interaction

Eastin, M.S. (2007). The influence of competitive and cooperative group game play on state hostility. *Human Communication Research, 33*, 450-466.

Ravaja, N., Saari, T., Turpeinen, M., Laarni, J., Salminen, M., & Kivikangas, M. (2006). Spatial presence and emotions during video game playing: Does it matter with whom you play? *Presence, 15*, 381-392.

Williams, D. (2006). Groups and goblins: The social and civic impact of an online game. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 50*, 651-670.

Williams, D., Caplan, S., & Xiong, L. (2007). Can you hear me now? The impact of voice in an online gaming community. *Human Communication Research, 33*, 427-449.

Week 8 (March 14) — Enjoyment I

Brockmyer, J.H., Fox, C.M., Curtiss, K.A., McBoon, E., Burkhart, K.M., & Pidruzny, J.N. (2009). *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 45*, 624-634.

Juul, J. (2009). Fear of failing? The many meanings of difficulty in video games. In M.J.P. Wolf & B. Perron (eds.), *The Video Game Theory Reader 2*, pp. 237-252. New York: Routledge.

Sherry, J.L. (2004). Flow and media enjoyment. *Communication Theory, 14*, 328-347.

Wood, R.T.A., Griffiths, M.D., & Parke, A. (2007). Experiences of time loss among videogame players: An empirical study. *CyberPsychology & Behavior, 10*, 38-44.

Week 9 (March 21) — Enjoyment II

Barendregt, W., Bekker, M.M., Bouwhuis, D.G., & Baauw, E. (2006). Identifying usability and fun problems in a computer game during first use and after some practice. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies, 64*, 830-846.

Klimmt, C., Hartmann, T., & Frey, A. (2007). Effectance and control as determinants of video game enjoyment. *CyberPsychology & Behavior, 10*, 845-847,

Klimmt, C., Rizzo, A., Vorderer, P., Koch, J., & Fischer, T. (2009). Experimental evidence for suspense as determinant of video game enjoyment. *CyberPsychology & Behavior, 12*, 29-31.

Ravaja, N., Saari, T., Salminen, M., Laarni, J., & Kallinen, K. (2006). Phasic emotional reactions to video game events: A psychophysiological investigation. *Media Psychology, 8*, 343-367.

Skalski, P., Tamborini, R., Shelton, A., Buncher, M., & Lindmark, P. (In press). Mapping the road to fun: Natural video game controllers, presence, and game enjoyment. *New Media & Society*. [Published online: Oct. 12, 2010.]

Week 10 (March 28) — Cognitive skills

Barlett, C.P., Vowels, C.L., Shanteau, J., Crow, J., & Miller, T. (2009). The effect of violent and non-violent computer games on cognitive performance. *Computers in Human Behavior, 25*, 96-102.

Boot, W.R., Kramer, A.F., Simons, D.J., Fabiani, M., & Gratton, G. (2008). The effects of video game playing on attention, memory, and executive control. *Acta Psychologica, 129*, 387-398.

Cherney, I.D. (2008). Mom, let me play more computer games: They improve my mental rotation skills. *Sex Roles, 59*, 776-786.

Sun, D-L., Ma, N., Bao, M., Chen, X-C., Zhang, D-R. (2008). Computer games: A double-edged sword? *CyberPsychology & Behavior, 11*, 545-548.

Week 11 (April 4) — Education

Annetta, L.A., Minogue, J., Holmes, S.Y., & Cheng, M-T. (2009). Investigating the impact of video games on high school students' engagement and learning about genetics. *Computers & Education, 53*, 74-85.

Ke, F. (2008). Computer games application within alternative classroom goal structures: cognitive, metacognitive, and affective evaluation. *Education Technology Research & Development, 56*, 539-556.

Kebritchi, M., & Hirumi, A. (2008). Examining the pedagogical foundations of modern educational computer games. *Computers & Education, 51*, 1729-1743.

Thompson, D. et al. (2010). Serious video games for health: How behavioral science guided the development of a serious video game. *Simulation Gaming, 41*, 587-606.

Week 12 (April 11) — Advertising

Lewis, B., & Porter, L. (2010). In-game advertising effects: examining player perceptions of advertising scheme congruity in a massively multiplayer online role-playing game. *Journal of Interactive Advertising, 10*, 46-60.

Nelson, M.R., Keum, H., & Yaros, R.A. (2004). Advertainment or adcreep: Game players' attitudes toward advertising and product placements in computer games. *Journal of Interactive Advertising, 5*, 3-21.

Nicovich, S.G. (2005). The effect of involvement on ad judgment in a video game environment: The mediating role of presence. *Journal of Interactive Advertising, 6*, 29-39.

Yang, M., Roskos-Ewoldsen, D.R., Dinu, L. & Arpan, L.M. (2006). The effectiveness of "in-game" advertising: Comparing college students' explicit and implicit memory for brand names. *Journal of Advertising, 35*, 143-152.

Supplemental readings.

These readings did not fit within the regular class structure for one reason or another but are still quite relevant. Since I already had the PDFs, I have posted them online as well. You are free to draw upon these readings for all written assignments, but note that certain restrictions apply when completing the outside article summary task (namely, at least one of those articles must not come from this list).

Anderson, C.A. & Carnagey, N.L. (2009). Causal effects of violent sports video games on aggression: Is it competitiveness or violent content? *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *45*, 731-739.

Baranowski, T., Buday, R., Thompson, D.I., & Baranowski, J. (2008). Playing for real: Video games and stories for health-related behavior change. *American Journal of Preventative Medicine*, *34*, 74-82.

Barlett, C.P. & Harris, R.J. (2008). The impact of body emphasizing video games on body image concerns in men and women. *Sex Roles*, *59*, 586-601.

Barlett, C.P., Harris, R.J., & Baldassaro, R. (2007). Long you play, the more hostile you feel: Examination of first person shooter video games and aggression during video game play. *Aggressive Behavior*, *33*, 486-497.

Bers, M.U. (2010). Let the games begin: Civic playing on high-tech consoles. *Review of General Psychology*, *14*, 147-153.

Carnagey, N.L., & Anderson, C.A. (2005). The effects of reward and punishment in violent video games on aggressive affect, cognition and behavior. *Psychological Science*, *16*, 882-889.

Choi, D., Kim, H., & Kim, J. (1999). Toward the construction of fun computer games: Differences in the views of developers and players. *Personal Technology*, *3*, 92-104.

Cowley, B., Charles, D., Black, M., & Hickey, R. (2008). Toward an understanding of flow in video games. *ACM Computers in Entertainment*, *6*, article 20.

Dill, K.E. & Thill, K.P. (2007). Video game characters and the socialization of gender roles: Young people's perceptions mirror sexist media depictions. *Sex Roles*, *57*, 851-864.

Farrar, K.M., Krcmar, M., & Nowak, K.L. (2006). Contextual features of violent video games, mental models, and aggression. *Journal of Communication*, *56*, 387-405.

Ferguson, C.J. (2007). The good, the bad and the ugly: A meta-analytic review of positive and negative effects of violent video games. *Psychiatric Quarterly*, *78*, 309-316.

Gentile, D.A. & Gentile, J.R. (2008). Violent video games as exemplary teachers: A conceptual analysis. *Journal of Youth & Adolescence*, *37*, 127-141.

Glass, T. (2007). The effectiveness of product placement in video games. *Journal of Interactive Advertising*, 8, 23-32.

Greitemeyer, T., Osswald, S., & Brauer, M.P. (2010). Playing prosocial video games increases empathy and decreases schadenfreude. *Emotion*, 10, 796-802.

Hartmann, T. & Vorderer, P. (2010). It's okay to shoot a character: Moral disengagement in violent video games. *Journal of Communication*, 60, 94-119.

Ivory, J.D., & Magee, R.G. (2009). You can't take it with you? Effects of handheld portable media consoles on physiological and psychological responses to video game and movie content. *CyberPsychology & Behavior*, 12, 291-297.

Kenny, R.F., & McDaniel, R. (2009). The role teachers' expectations and value assessments of video games play in their adopting and integrating them into their classrooms. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 1-17.

Konijn, E.A., Bijvank, M.N., & Bushman, B.J. (2007). I wish I were a warrior: The role of wishful identification in the effects of violent video games on aggression in adolescent boys. *Developmental Psychology*, 43, 1038-1044.

Lewis, M.L., Weber, R., & Bowman, N.D. (2008). "They may be pixels, but they're MY pixels": Developing a metric of character attachment in role-playing games. *CyberPsychology & Behavior*, 11, 515-518.

Lucas, K., & Sherry, J.L. (2004). Sex differences in video game play: A communication-based explanation. *Communication Research*, 31, 499-523.

Norris, K.O. (2004). Gender stereotypes, aggression, and computer games: An online survey of women. *CyberPsychology & Behavior*, 7, 714-727.

Polman, H., de Castro, B.O., & van Aken, M.A.G. (2008). Experimental study of the differential effects of playing versus watching violent video games on children's aggressive behavior. *Aggressive Behavior*, 34, 256-264.

Przybylski, A.K., Weinstein, N., Ryan, R.M., & Rigby, C.S. (2009). Having to versus wanting to play: Background and consequences of harmonious versus obsessive engagement in video games. *CyberPsychology & Behavior*, 12, 485-492.

Schneider, E.F., Lang, A., Shin, M., & Bradley, S.D. (2004). Death with a story: How story impacts emotional, motivational, and physiological responses to first-person shooter video games. *Human Communication Research*, 30, 361-375.

Thompson, K.M., Teptchin, K., & Haninger, K. (2006). Content and ratings of mature-rated video games. *Archives of Pediatric and Adolescent Medicine*, 160, 402-410.

Williams, D. (2005). Bridging the methodological divide in game research. *Simulation & Gaming*, 36, 447-463.