

Running head: VIDEO GAMES AND CIVIC ENGAGEMENT

Let the Games Begin: Civic Playing in High Tech Consoles

Marina Umaschi Bers

Tufts University

Send Correspondence to: Marina U. Bers, PhD Department of Child Development, Tufts
University, 105 College Ave, Medford, MA 02155. Phone: (617) 627-4490. E-mail:
marina.bers@tufts.edu

Abstract

This paper presents an overview of an emerging field that looks at the impact of video games in civic engagement. While some video games have explicit civics related content and engage players in simulations of civically-related projects, most others don't. However, research has shown that video game playing engages players in civically oriented experiences that previous research has found to promote civic outcomes in classroom-based programs. These include helping and guiding others, learning about problems in society, exploring social, moral or ethical issues, organizing groups and making decisions about how a community, city or nation should be run.

Key words: Civic Engagement; Computer Games; Internet; Adolescence; Young Adulthood

Let the Games Begin: Civic Playing in High Tech Consoles

Playing video games is a popular activity amongst young people with a potential to promote social and civic engagement. The term “video game” actually encompasses a gamut of human/machine experience including computer-based games, online games played on the Internet, and console games (such as XBOX360, PlayStation, and Wii). Simply put, any game with a user interface and a monitor screen may be considered a video game.

A report from the Pew Internet & American Life project (Lenhart et al, 2008), the first nationally representative study of youth video game play, examined data from a survey of 1,102 youth between the ages of 12 and 17 and found that 97 percent of American teens — 99 percent of boys and 94 percent of girls — play some kind of video game, with most players dividing their time between at least five categories of games such as racing, puzzles, sports, action, adventures, role playing or other games. Approximately 76 percent of these youth play games with others at least some of the time. As such, available data suggest that video game playing is pervasive and universal among youth. In the Pew study, at least 38% of teen boy gamers and 22% of teen girl gamers play some sort of video games daily; and boy gamers tend to report playing for a longer period of time than girls, with 34% of boys and 18% of girls playing for more than 2 hours a day. This trend seems to be shared by teens of all ages. Of all teens in the study who reported playing video games on a regular basis, 54% of them were younger teens (12-14 years) and 46% were older teens (15-17 years).

Although recent trends point to a rise in computer-based games, console games remain to be most popular. The Pew survey reported that 83% of the teens in the study played console games, while 73% of them play computer-based games. Handheld and mobile devices are becoming popular as video gaming platforms, with 60% of surveyed teens owning a handheld device, and 48% reporting having played a game on their cell phone. Certainly, these numbers overlap as some teens play video games on multiple platforms.

Game play on these platforms do not indicate ownership of these systems as many teens (65%) play video games in groups and with peers in the same room together. There are no found differences regarding the type of platform teens play on with respect to SES, gender, or age. One exception is with regard to cell phone games. 53% of girls reported having played games on cell phones in contrast to 43% of boys. African Americans and low income teens are more likely to play cell phone games. Again, not all teen players of cell phone games own cell phones, as approximately 21% of teens who play games on cell phones do not own a cell phone and thus are likely using a friend's phone to play.

Besides playing on multiple platforms, teens reported playing many different genres of games. More than half of all teen gamers (52%) play between five to eight different genres of games. Game genres include racing, puzzle, sports, action, adventure, rhythm/music, strategy, simulation, fighting, first-person shooter, role-playing, MMOGs, virtual words, and others. Of these genres, racing games are the most popular (74%). Ethnic differences are found most significantly in choice of game genre played. African American teens are more likely to play racing games than white or Hispanic teens and they are more likely to play sports and adventure games than white teens. Fighting games

seem to be more popular among African American and Hispanic teens than in white teens. But white and Hispanic teens are more likely to play rhythm games such as Dance Revolution. In the category of MMOGs, white teens seem to have a stronger preference than African American teens. Lower-SES teens are more likely than higher-income teens to play racing games (80% vs. 70%), adventure games (72% vs. 63%), or survival horror games (40% vs. 28%).

Only a few years ago gaming was mostly viewed, in the best case scenario, as a waste of time, and most commonly as a risky activity that might lead to anti-social behavior, aggression and violence (Grüsser, Thalemann, & Griffiths, 2007; Sherry, 2001) as well as reinforced gender stereotypes (National Institute on Media and the Family, 2008). More recently, a growing body of research is starting to focus on “serious games” that might have a positive impact in young people (Squire et al, 2003). For example, there is an increasing interest and expertise in developing and evaluating computer games for promoting health outcomes (Kato, Cole, Bradlyn, Pollock, 2008; Lieberman, 2001) and educational experiences (Gee, 2007; Shaffer, 2007). Lately, researchers, policy-makers and educators have also started to pay attention to the impact that video games might have on civic engagement. That is the focus of this paper.

The 2008’s Pew Internet & American Life project’s report found that 44 percent of youth play games that teach them about a problem in society, while 52 percent play games that cause them to think about moral and ethical issues. The report also suggests that youth who have these kinds of civic gaming experiences are more likely to be civically engaged in the offline world, and are also more likely to go online to get

information about current events, try to persuade others how to vote in an election, become committed to civic participation, and raise money for charity.

Although public debate often frames video games as either good or bad, research shows that the context in which the video games are played and the content of the video games matter more than the amount of play time. For example, researchers such as Williams (2006) suggest that the backdrop for the rise of social gaming is a decline in civic shared spaces for people to meet and converse face to face. Echoing Oldenburg's (1997) account of how third places—which are neither home nor work, and cross-nationally might include social clubs, tabernas, piazzas, pubs, and public squares—are vital for community formation and maintenance, researchers propose that gaming, in particular virtual multi-player games, come to satisfy the human need for community and social interaction (Steinkuehler, 2006).

However, the need for community and social interaction doesn't always lead to civic participation and civic engagement. Although in recent years there has been a surge of work on the positive power of computer gaming, as this special issue focuses on, the focus on video games and civic engagement is quiet novel.

Youth and civic engagement

Recent youth participation in the 2008 U.S. electoral campaign has sparked new interest and debate regarding youth engagement with civic and political activities. According to the Center for Information & Research on Civic Learning and Engagement (CIRCLE, 2008), youth voter turnout was estimated between 52 and 53 percent of all youth, an increase of more than 10 percentage points over the last decade. This is a new

trend that brings good news as, until this election, youth were often described as lacking in civic participation and involvement in political life (Andolina, Jenkins, Keeter, Zukin, 2002; The Grant Maker Forum on Community & National Service, 2000; Keeter Middaugh, & Evans, 2002; Michelsen, Zaff, & Hair, 2002).

This recent change in youth engagement trends might be related to the emergence of new forms of youth civic activities that are not necessarily recognized by the public. Levine (2007) cites political blogs, “boycott” movements, and transnational youth networks facilitated by new technologies as new venues and opportunities for youth to engage and lead. Yet, he contends that amidst all these new activities, many young people still lack the skills and know-how to carry debates and dialogues beyond their social networks to participate in politics and address public problems.

Research indicates that young people are more likely to engage in localized, smaller scale activities, such as volunteering and community work (Andolina et al., 2002; Galston, 2001) as opposed to longer-term national-level activities. These findings come hand in hand with research showing that adults are more likely to vote and be engaged in civic life if, as youth, they were involved in community-based organizations, extracurricular activities and civic education programs in schools (Torney-Purta, 2002; Verba, Scholzman, & Brady, 1995; Youniss, McClellan, & Yates, 1997).

Psychologists suggest that young people are at a developmental stage in which they start thinking about how they can relate as individuals to society and they begin to form their own sociopolitical orientations (Erikson, 1968; Yates & Youniss, 1998). If that is the case, how is this developmental need funneled into promoting civic engagement?

Thus researchers ask the question: "What are the ways that people under the age of 18 get engaged in civic behaviors and what other opportunities besides electoral politics do they have to experience themselves as members of a polity?" (Sherrod, Flanagan, & Youniss, 2002).

Engaging with new technologies such as video games might provide some of these civic experiences. This is a particularly appealing option given that in the last thirty years there is a growing trend for withering away of civic education in schools. Civic classes in the United States have declined and, when offered, the curriculum is limited to knowledge instruction and provides few opportunities for students to communicate about politics and share personal opinions on their own terms (Bennett, 2008). For example, a massive International Education Association survey of 90,000 14 year olds in 28 nations suggested that civic education programs limit themselves to imparting textbook knowledge without immersing students in experiencing civic life (Torney-Purta, Rainer, Oswald, & Schulz, 2001).

Video games offer the opportunity to bring civic education back to life by engaging young people in simulations of political processes and immersing them in experiences in which making civic-based decisions are highly rewarded. For example, researchers such as Squire and Barab (2004) have studied the positive learning impact of playing historical simulation games such as Civilization. In the next sections, examples of such video games and research-based programs will be presented. However, as mentioned earlier, although video games might provide new opportunities for engagement, they might also obscure some of the intricacies of political decision making, which are hidden in the decisions made by game designers when conceiving game

models that might be simple enough for simulations to work, but do not take into consideration the complexities of political systems. In this sense, authoring kits that enable children to produce their own video games by modeling their own decision making processes, might prove to yield better educational results in the long term, as research has shown that people learn better by making their own personally meaningful computationally-rich projects (Bers, 2006; Papert, 1980; Resnick, Bruckman, & Martin, 1996).

Preliminary studies have shown the potential of computational tools to engage young people in online civic life (Blumler & Coleman, 2001). Researchers such as Bers (2008), Earl and Schussman (2008), Montgomery (2008), Rheingold (2008), and Cassell (2002; Cassell et al., 2006) contend that the Internet can be a venue for helping young people develop a sense of volunteerism and activism, for engaging in new forms of civic activities such as online petitioning and civic dialogues, and for promoting traditional types of civic activities such as voting. While several efforts have been put forth for understanding the potential of youth as E-Citizens (Montgomery et al., 2004), the challenge remains in how to promote participation not only in the virtual world, but also in the face-to-face world.

Some research is starting to tap into this challenge. For example, TakingITGlobal (Rayes-Goldie & Luke, 2008) is a popular online community “that connects youth to find inspiration, access information, get involved, and take action in their local and global communities”. TakingITGlobal, as other similar virtual communities, puts effort into using virtual worlds to make a difference in the face-to-face world. Along the same line, programs such as "Student Voices" explore the potential of the Internet for connecting

young voters to the electoral process by providing access to web-based information about candidates and politics (Woodard & Schmitt, 2002).

The Internet provides a new way for youth to create communities that extend beyond geographic boundaries, to engage in civic and volunteering activities across local communities and national frontiers, to learn about political life and to experience the challenges of democratic participation (Bers, 2001; Bers, 2008; Bers & Chau, 2006). Video games tap into this potential by providing opportunities for young people to contribute to “participatory cultures” with low barriers to artistic expression and civic engagement (Jenkins, 2009).

Video games

In this paper, video games are defined as software, supported by any type of computer, console, mobile or virtual platform that involves interaction with a user interface to generate visual feedback on any display device by manipulating an input device, such as a game controller, joystick, keyboard or mouse. Video games usually involve the use of different media such as animations, three dimensionality, sound, etc.

Different taxonomies of games take into consideration things such as quantity of players, technological infrastructure, goal and structure of the game. Traditionally, games are defined as goal-directed and competitive activities conducted within a framework of agreed rules. This ample definition makes room for different genres of games, which might include:

1. Ludic games, in which players win by taking action and developing strategies;
2. Narrative games, in which players solve conflicts by choosing different paths of action;
3. Simulations, in which players set themselves to observe emerging behavior patterns to understand how a particular system functions in different circumstances.

While most video games are primarily designed for entertainment, a new kind of games is starting to emerge, serious games. Serious games are software applications developed with game design principles for a primary purpose other than pure entertainment. For example, in 2004 a network of non-profit directors, game developers, artists and academics committed to social change through gaming came together to form the Games for Change (G4C) movement, a branch of serious games focused on social issues and social change. Since then, G4C organizes a yearly event dedicated to showcase video games for social change – games about poverty, global conflict, climate change – and for bringing together "socially-responsible game-makers".

Research on civic engagement has not yet produced research studies to find out if serious games, and most specifically games for change, have more of an impact on civic engagement than entertainment games. However, in the future, as the game industry evolves and more games are developed to engage youth with civic content and processes, a study of this kind will be of interest. However, before embarking on such an endeavor it is necessary to articulate the overarching construct of civic engagement.

Civic engagement

Some conceive civic engagement as simply being a good neighbor, obeying rules and participating in the community, while others think of it as engagement with political processes, such as voting. In this paper, the construct of civic engagement goes beyond a focus solely on the procedural aspects of democracy to one that embraces the many facets of a deliberative democracy. One commonly used definition of civic engagement that is given by the American Psychological Association is the following: “individual and collective actions designed to identify and address issues of public concern” (<http://www.apa.org/ed/slce/civicengagement.html>). Civic engagement can take many forms, from individual voluntarism to organizational involvement to electoral participation. It can include efforts to directly address an issue, work with others in a community to solve a problem or interact with the institutions of representative democracy. Civic engagement encompasses a range of specific activities such as working in a soup kitchen, serving on a neighborhood association, writing a letter to an elected official or voting. A civically engaged citizen has the ability, agency and opportunity to participate in one or many of these activities while engaging in "civic conversation" (Putnam, 2000), to develop civic knowledge, skills, attitudes and behaviors, and to participate in community service, activism and advocacy.

This paper organizes the umbrella construct of civic engagement in four different dimensions of civic experiences that game players might encounter: civic knowledge, civic conversations, civic attitudes and civic behaviors. This typology is similar to the kinds of youth civic engagement identified by Flanagan and Faison (2001). In the next sections each dimension will be described and examples of video gaming experiences

will be presented.

Civic knowledge. Civic knowledge refers to the set of content and processes that people must know in order to become informed citizens such as understanding how the government and the political system work as well as their own rights and responsibilities. Although there is disagreement about the level of civic knowledge that people should have in order to be effective citizens (Carpini & Keeter, 1996), there is shared agreement that information is power; and thus, leading to the inclusion of diverse forms of civics education in public schools. Video games provide another venue for gaining civic knowledge. For example games such as the 1987's On the Campaign Trail developed at Kent State University's political campaign management program, engages students in decision-making regarding the campaigns for United States Senate elections between 1970 and 1986.

Other games allow players to familiarize themselves with the processes involved in democratic societies, such as the government simulation game Democracy, first developed by Positech Games in 2005, with a sequel released in December 2007. The player becomes the president or prime minister of a democratic government and introduces or alters policies in seven areas (tax, economy, welfare, foreign policy, transport, law and order and public services), as well as solves situations affecting factors such as crime, air quality, protests and homelessness. Democracy2 extends the game by introducing an *Encyclopedia*, which provides background reading, statistical data and other information for making informed policy choices (<http://positech.co.uk/democracy2/educational.html>).

Other games, such as Power Politics, President Forever 2008 + Primaries, and Doonesbury Election, focus on domestic United States political campaigns. The players steer a candidate through an election cycle, developing policies and tailoring media appearances. Some of these games use real-time feedback to show how campaign strategies impact polling numbers.

Other games such as Civilization first developed in 1991, and now converted into a series with several sequels such as *Civilization II*, *Civilization III*, *Civilization IV* and *Civilization Revolution*, present players with the goal to "...build an empire to stand the test of time". The game begins in 4000 BC, and the players attempt to expand and develop their empires through the ages until modern and future times by taking the role of rulers of a civilization and competing with other already existing civilizations. For example, players need to explore far lands, judge when to engage on war or diplomacy, make decisions regarding when and where to build new cities, and decide which scientific and engineering advances should be made to transform the cities to their maximum potential (Edwards, 2007). Later versions of this game allow for head-to-head play against other players.

Although games of this kind provide opportunities to situate players in a simulation role to make informed decisions, it is important to keep in mind that they are still simulations of civic processes with underlying rules pre-set by game designers. Thus, one of the challenges of utilizing these games for promoting civic knowledge is to contextualize the rules of the games and the simulation parameters. For example, when games are played in social studies or government classes, the teacher's role involves

providing the socio-cultural and political context so students can critically understand the differences and similarities with real life civic processes.

Civic conversations. Civic conversations are defined as the ability to initiate or participate in a respectful exchange of ideas about civic life, by taking into consideration the moral dimension and articulating a personal vision or set of values around civic life (Bers & Chau, 2006). Video games that involve multiple players interacting around issues involving civic processes are very likely to engage players in civic conversations. For example, games such as SimCity, a city building simulation game first released in 1989, allow for multiple players in some of its releases and platforms. Thus players engage in conversations about how to add buildings, adjust tax rates, build the city's transportation systems and other infrastructure and, at the same time, provide responses to natural disasters such floods and tornadoes. Other games such as Europa Universalis offer similar kinds of experiences for players (<http://www.europauniversalis3.com/>).

Civic conversations through video games are facilitated by the rapid development of platforms that involve synchronous and a-synchronous multiple players. Some of these games are web-based and do not include sophisticated three-dimensional graphics. For example, forum-based role playing games of government and nation simulations, such as Superpower, put the players in the role of leaders of real-world nations (<http://itake.se/spcoldwar/>). Players interact online in a dynamic forum and shape the world through actions passed through the administrators.

Civic attitudes. Civic attitudes are defined as the predisposition to engage in reflection and informed judgment about civic issues and to move beyond one's individual

point of view and self-interest in order to commit to the well being of some larger group. Perspective-taking or the ability to appreciate someone else's point of view is an essential component for developing civic attitude (Selman, 1980). Government or political simulation games engage players in considering geopolitical situations and the creation of domestic political policies. One of the earliest titles in this genre was *Balance of Power*, published in 1985, which engages players in considering policy decisions, rather than warfare, to shape outcomes at the height of the Cold War. Other similar video games such as *Conflict: Middle East Political Simulator* and *Crisis in the Kremlin* also encourage players to assume civic attitudes conducive to peace. Other games such as *Superpower*, and its sequel, *Superpower 2*, put the player in the seat of a state leader whose goal is to produce economic stability and prosperity. The game mainly evolves around decisions on foreign policies, and players are given real-life treaties so they can understand their influences on different countries.

While most of these games share similar characteristics with some of the games mentioned earlier when referring to civic knowledge, in particular with government simulation games that put players in the role of decision makers by teaching them about civic processes, a profound difference is that games in this category favor players to assume multiple perspectives to understand a conflict.

Civic behaviors. Civic behaviors support and further self, family, community and civil society by promoting the common good and the formation of institutions and systems of social justice, equity and democracy. Community service, activism and advocacy can be examples of civic behavior. Currently there are several Internet-based

projects that encourage civic behaviors, such as on-line petitioning, grassroots community organizations, social networking and fundraising sites. For example, programs such as DOTCOM (<http://dotcom.ph-int.org/>) engage Armenian, American and Azerbaijani youth in creating socially conscious media that will impact communities across the U.S. and the Caucasus. The program is sponsored by the U.S. Department of State, and supported by a global network of youth media organizations. Other times, technology enables large and sustained political networks, as in the formation of Indymedia, a global political information network that began in the Seattle protests against the World Trade organization in 1999 for protesters to communicate among themselves and produce their own news coverage (Bennett, 2008).

Organizations such as Global Kids created a division of its organization called Online Leadership Program that utilize multiplayer virtual environments and simulation video gaming platforms to facilitate civic engagement in after-school or informal learning experiences. (<http://www.globalkids.org/?id=5>).

No popular video games yet tap into the potential of linking game playing with real-life civic behaviors and community participation. Yet in the virtual world, both realms of experience have been successfully integrated. For example, there have been reports of political protest in game environments. The popular multi-player game World of Warcraft was disrupted by demonstrations over vaguely defined class issues facing the warriors, resulting in protesters being banned from the game (Bennett, 2008) and “tax revolts” occurred in Second Life (Benkler, 2006).

Research suggests that there is evidence of young people adapting on-line

behaviors from social movements when pressuring entertainment corporations regarding management and distribution of on-line products (Earl & Schussman, 2008). And work has examined the link between Internet behavior and voluntary group membership suggesting that certain forms of Internet use may sustain and encourage community participation (Glavin, 2007). In the future, as the gaming industry evolves and serious games take on a more prevalent role in society it will be very likely that new games that promote face to face civic behaviors will start to emerge.

The multifaceted framework of civic engagement provides grounds for developing a rich understanding of the role that video games could play in civic engagement and for developing interventions and programs that provide educational opportunities beyond the traditional pathways of community service or volunteering activities.

In which ways do video games can promote civic engagement?

Recent research has found that playing video games, even if they are not specially designed with the purpose of promoting social change, might have a positive impact on civic engagement. For example, the recent survey conducted by the Pew Internet and American Life Project research found that more than four in ten youth say that video games have taught them about a societal problem (Lenhart, 2008) and that game-playing youth were found to be more likely to search for information about current events online, advocate for political candidates and raise money for charity. Even more, Khane, Middaugh, & Evans (2008) found that “the stereotype of the antisocial game” was not

reflected in the data from their study as “youth who play games frequently are just as civically and politically active as those who play games infrequently” (p. 27)

Although some research looks at the potentially isolating effect of playing video games, the Pew report shows that more than seven in ten youth, ages 12 to 17, play video games with others, and more than seven in 10 youth say they have helped others while playing video games. Thus, playing video games provides opportunities for socializing, an important element of civic engagement. Kahne et al. (2008) examined civic gaming experiences in relation to civics outcomes and found that the quantity of game play is not strongly related to civic and political engagement but that some aspects of the social context of game play are related to civic outcomes, specifically playing games with others.

Research has found that several aspects of video game play parallel the kinds of civic learning opportunities found to promote civic engagement in other settings. For example, research has found that video games that engage youth in simulations of civic and political action, consideration of controversial issues and participation in groups of shared interests, all activities that are done in school settings as part of civics education programs, are effective in encouraging civic participation (Kahne et al, 2008). While some games have content that is directly relevant to civics, such as SimCity and Civilization that engage players in simulations of civic processes, other video games lack explicit relevant civic content but still might promote habits of mind that are critical for civic life. For example, multiplayer games on the virtual world such as World of Warcraft and Everquest, engage players in governance, team building, leadership and

organizational processes.

There are also examples of research-based projects that use specifically developed virtual worlds to purposefully provide civic engagement opportunities for students. For example Quest Atlantis (Barab et al, 2005) embeds civic learning opportunities in the quest for students to find solutions to the problems faced by the fictional world Atlantis. Zora provides an authoring toolkit for students to create, inhabit and regulate their own virtual cities while engaging in discussions of moral values and finding personally relevant role models that can inform their decisions. The Zora virtual world provides a safe “social laboratory” for youth to experiment with some of the skills and attitudes needed to become good citizens (Bers, 2008). For example, Zora has been used in the ACT (Active Citizenship through Technology) freshman orientation program at Tufts University to encourage incoming students to explore the civic responsibility of a college campus and the relationship to its neighbors (Bers, 2008; Chau, Mathur, & Bers, 2006).

ACT engages students in civic dialogue early in their academic experience, while fostering a long-term peer support network. It leverages youth’s interest in Internet technologies to engage them in civic discussions and activities. In this three day pre-orientation program, participants use the Zora 3D virtual environment to design and inhabit a *Virtual Campus of the Future* to express concerns and ideas about community issues that interest them. ACT provided program participants a space for civic discussion, simulated electoral activities and deliberations, and collaborative construction of virtual exhibits and an imagined ideal campus to express their ideas. In addition, they participate in face-to-face activities to promote civic skills and learn about their college community. The ACT program was conducted over two consecutive years. During their freshman

year students reported a higher likelihood than non-participating freshmen to increase engagement in activities that express their political and social viewpoints in face-to-face settings. Results suggested that regardless of participant's level of comfort with technology and their degree of engagement in civic life, students of various backgrounds benefited from the program. Findings indicated that participants showed an increased level of civic engagement regarding political voice by the end of the academic year and had a significant impact on their attitudes about political and civic issues. In contrast, our results indicated that ACT participants did not differ significantly in their development of civic and electoral indicators throughout the year when compared to control participants. This may be due to the specific focus on civic discussions and deliberations in Zora activities, while a lesser effort was put into the ACT curriculum regarding electoral and volunteering activities in real life throughout the year. (Bers & Chau, under review).

Conclusions

Today's youth are fascinated by new technologies and are avid video game players. While a new trend in video game design focuses on developing serious games for social change, there is still a large market of video games that favor violence and anti-social behavior. However, studies have shown that, even in the case of youth playing with general purpose entertainment video games that involves them in a range of experiences from strategy games to first person shooter games, there appears to be some positive relationships between video game playing and civic engagement. However it is crucial to understand the social context of video game play in order to understand the potential of the gaming experience with respects to civic engagement, as well as the design aspects of the game itself as displaying features that might encourage civic

engagement.

Thus the need to further advance a research agenda that addresses questions such as: which games are better than others and in which socio-cultural contexts should they be played to have an impact on civic engagement. What kinds of civic interactions should games invite from players? What are the psychosocial characteristics of young players, in particular their attitudes, predispositions and previous knowledge about civics, that can be hindered or fostered by playing games? What is the role of parents, teachers and other adults when children are playing computer games in terms of supporting long lasting civic engagement? How do we purposefully design programs that leverage youth interest on technology and foster new ways of civic engagement and participation? How does one successfully integrate these technologies into existing educational programs so they can be scalable and sustainable? What kinds of games are most effective in encouraging youth interest and discussions of governance processes, rule-making, community involvement, and other civic issues?

The potential of video games goes beyond the four walls of the classroom, thus making civics education more widely available, in particular during these times in which there is a decrease of civics curriculum in schools. Video games can go beyond providing knowledge and information, as they afford opportunities for learners to engage in civic discourse and action, supporting students to construct experiential knowledge through which they can become effective citizens.

References

- Andolina, M., Jenkins, K., Keeter, S., and Zukin, C. (2002). Searching for the meaning of youth civic engagement: Notes from the field. *Applied Developmental Science, 6*(4),189-195.
- Barab, S. A., Thomas, M., Dodge, T., Carteaux, R., and Tuzun, H. (2005). Making learning fun: Quest Atlantis, a game without guns. *Educational Technology Research and Development, 53*(1), 86–107
- Bennet, L. (2008). Changing citizenship in the digital age. In W. L. Bennett (Ed.), *Civic Life Online: Learning How Digital Media Can Engage Youth*. The John D. and Catherine T. Macarthur Foundations Series on Digital Media and Learning (pp. 1-24). Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Benkler, J. (2006). *The Wealth of Networks: How Social Production Transforms Markets and Freedom*. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press.
- Bers, M. (2001). Identity construction environments: Developing personal and moral values through the design of a virtual city. *Journal of the Learning Sciences, 10*(4), 365-415.
- Bers, M., & Chau, C. (2006). Fostering civic engagement by building a virtual city. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 11*(3), article 4.
- Bers, M. (2008). Civic identities, online technologies: From designing civic curriculum to supporting civic experiences. In W. L. Bennett (Ed.), *Civic life online: Learning how digital media can engage youth*. The John D. and Catherine T. Macarthur

- foundations series on digital media and learning (pp. 139-160). Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Bers, M. (2008). Virtual worlds as digital playgrounds. *EDUCAUSE Review*, 43(5), 80-81.
- Bers, M. (2006). The role of new technologies to foster positive youth development. *Applied Developmental Science*, 10(4), 200-219.
- Blumler, J. G., and Coleman, S. (2001). Realizing democracy online: A civic commons in cyberspace. *IPPR/Citizen Online Research Publication*, 2.
- Chau, C., Mathur, A., & Bers, M. (2006). Active Citizenship through Technology: Collaboration, connection, and civic participation. In *Proceedings of the International Conference of the Learning Sciences*. (Eds. S. Barab, K. Hay, & D. Hickey). LEA Publishing, 904-905.
- CIRCLE. (2008). *Civic and Political Health of the Nation Survey*. New York: Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement.
- Cassell, J. (2002). "We Have these Rules Inside": The effects of exercising voice in a children's online forum. In S. Calvert, R. Cocking and A. Jordan (Eds.), *Children in the Digital Age*. NY: Praeger Press.
- Cassell, J, Huffaker, D, Tversky, D., and Ferriman, K. (2006). The Language of online leadership: Gender and youth engagement on the Internet. *Developmental Psychology*, 42(3), 436-449.
- Carpini, M. X. and Keeter, S. (1996). *What American Know About politics and Why it*

- Matters*. New Heaven: Connecticut, Yale University Press.
- Earl, J. and Schussman, A. (2008). Contesting cultural control: Youth culture and online petitioning. In W. L. Bennett (Ed.), *Civic Life Online: Learning How Digital Media Can Engage Youth*. The John D. and Catherine T. Macarthur Foundations Series on Digital Media and Learning (pp. 71-95). Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Edwards, B. (2007, July 18). The history of Civilization. *Gamasutra*.
- Erikson, E. (1968). *Identity: Youth & Crisis*. New York: Norton.
- Flanagan, C.A. and Faison, N. (2001). Youth civic development: Implications of research for social policy and programs. *Social Policy Reports*, 15(1), 3–14.
- Galston, W.A. (2001). *Liberal Purposes: Goods, Virtues, and Diversity in the Liberal State*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Cambridge University Press.
- Gee, J. P. (2007). *Good Video Games and Good Learning: Collected Essays on Video Games, Learning and Literacy*, New York: Peter Lang Publishers Inc.
- Glavin, P. (2007, August 11). Catalyzing civic engagement online: Examining the link between Internet behavior and voluntary group membership. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the *American Sociological Association*, New York, New York City.
- Grüsser, S. M., Thalemann, R., and Griffiths, M. (2007). Excessive computer game playing: Evidence for addiction and aggression? *CyberPsychology & Behavior*, 10(2), 290-292.

- Jenkins, H., (2009). *Confronting the Challenges of Participatory Culture: Media Education for the 21st Century*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Kahne, J., Middaugh, E., Evans, C. (2008). *The Civic Potential of Video Games*. White Paper. The John D. and Catherine T. Macarthur Foundations.
- Kato, P., Cole, S., Bradlyn, A., and Pollock, B. (2008). A video game improves behavioral outcomes in adolescents and young adults with cancer: A randomized trial. *Pediatrics*, 122, 305-317.
- Keeter, S., Zukin, C., Andoline, M., and Jenkins, K. (2002). *The Civic and Political Health of the Nation: A Generational Portrait*. Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement.
- Lenhart, A., Kahne, J., Middaugh, E., MacGill, A., Evans, C., and Vitak, J. (2008). *Teens, Video Games, and Civics*. Pew Internet & American Life Project Report. Washington, DC.
- Lieberman, D. (2001). Management of chronic pediatric diseases with interactive health games: Theory and research findings. *Journal of Ambulatory Care and Management*, 24(1), 26-38.
- Levine, P. (2007). *The Future of Democracy: Developing the Next Generation of American Citizens*. Medford, MA: Tufts University Press.
- Michelsen, E., Zaff, J., and Hair, E. C. (2002). Civic engagement programs and youth development: A synthesis. *Child Trends*. Washington, DC.
- Montgomery, K. (2008). Youth and digital democracy: Intersections of practice, policy,

- and the marketplace. In W. L. Bennett (Ed.), *Civic Life Online: Learning How Digital Media Can Engage Youth*. The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundations Series on Digital Media and Learning (pp. 25-49). Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Montgomery, E., Gottlieb-Robles, B., Larson, G. (2004). Youth as E-citizens: Engaging the digital generation. Report. *Center for Social Media*. School of Communication. American University.
- National Institute on Media and the Family. (2008). *Fact sheet: effects of video game playing on Children*. National Institute on Media and the Family. Minneapolis, Minnesota.
- Papert S. (1980). *Mindstorms: Children, Computers and Powerful Ideas*. New York: Basic Books.
- Oldenburg, R. (1997). *The Great Good Place: Cafés, Coffee Shops, Community Centers, Beauty Parlors, General Stores, Bars, Hangouts, and How They Get You Through the Day*. New York: Marlowe & Company.
- Putnam, R. (2000). *Bowling Alone*. New York, New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Raynes-Goldie, K. and Walker, L. (2008). Our space: Online civic engagement tools for youth. In W. L. Bennett (Ed.), *Civic Life Online: Learning How Digital Media Can Engage Youth*. The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundations Series on Digital Media and Learning (pp. 161-188). Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Rheingold, H. (2008). Using participatory media and public voice to encourage civic

- engagement. In W. L. Bennett (Ed.), *Civic Life Online: Learning How Digital Media Can Engage Youth*. The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundations Series on Digital Media and Learning (pp. 97-118). Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Resnick, M., Bruckman, A., and Martin, F. (1996). Planos not stereos: Creating computational construction kits. *Interactions*, 3(6).
- Selman, R. L. (1980). *The Growth of Interpersonal Understanding*. New York: Academic Press.
- Shaffer, D. W. (2007). *How Computer Games Help Children Learn*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Sherry, J. (2001). The effects of violent video games on aggression: A meta-analysis. *Human Communication Research*, 27, 409-431.
- Squire, K. and Barab, S. (2004). Replaying history: Engaging urban underserved students in learning world history through computer simulation games. In *Proceedings of the International Conference of the Learning Sciences*.
- Squire, K. and the Games-to-Teach Research Team. (2003). Design principles of next-generation gaming for education. *Educational Technology*, 43(5), 17-23.
- Sherrod, L., Flanagan, C., and Youniss, J. (2002). Dimensions of citizenship and opportunities for youth development: The what, why, when, where, and who of citizenship development. *Applied Developmental Science*, (6)4, 264 -272.
- Steinkuehler, C. (2006). The new third place: Massively multiplayer online gaming in

- American youth culture. *Tidskrift Journal of Research in Teacher Education*, 3, 17-32.
- The Grant Maker Forum on Community & National Service. (2001). *From Inspiration to Participation. A review of Perspectives on Youth Civic Engagement*. Report. The Philanthropy for Active Civic Engagement.
- Torney-Purta, J., Lehman, R., Oswald, H., and Schulz, W. (2001). *Citizenship and Civic Education in Twenty-Eight Countries: Civic Knowledge and Engagement at Age Fourteen*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: IEA.
- Verba, S., Schlozman, K., and Brady, H. (2000). *Voice and Equality: Civic Voluntarism in American Life*. Cambridge: MA: Harvard university press.
- Williams, D. (2006). Why Game Studies Now? Gamers Don't Bowl Alone. *Games & Culture*, 1(1), 13-16.
- Woodard IV, E. H., & Schmitt, K. L. (2002). Political socialization in the Digital Age: The 'Student Voices' program. In S. L. Calvert, A. B. Jordan & R. R. Cocking (Eds.), *Children in the Digital Age: Influences of Electronic Media on Development*, (pp. 83-99). Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Xenos, D. and Moy, P. (2007). Direct and differential effects of the Internet on political and civic engagement. *Journal of Communication*, 57(4), 704-718.
- Yates, M. and Youniss, J. (1999). *Roots of Civic Identity: International Perspectives on Community Service and Activism in Youth*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Bers, M (accepted for publication – publishing date June 2010) Let the Games Begin: Civic Playing in High Tech Consoles" **Review of General Psychology**

Youniss, J., McClellan, J. A., and Yates, M. (1997). What we know about engendering civic identity. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 40, 620-631.