THE BIG FIVE PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS OF

WORLD OF WARCRAFT PLAYERS

Jessica L. Winter, B.A.

Thesis Prepared for the Degree of MASTER OF SCIENCE

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH TEXAS

May 2009

APPROVED:

Robin Henson, Major Professor Greg Jones, Committee Member Jon Young, Committee Member and Chair of the Department of Educational Psychology Jerry R. Thomas, Dean of the College of Education Michael Monticino, Interim Dean of the Robert B. Toulouse School of Graduate Studies Winter, Jessica L. <u>The Big Five Personality Characteristics of World of Warcraft</u> <u>Players</u>. Master of Science (Educational Psychology), May 2009, 48 pp., 6 tables, references, 34 titles.

This study is a comparative analysis of the personality characteristics of a sample of World of Warcraft players (n = 147) and a large normative sample (n = 20,993). The 120-item International Personality Item Pool, based on the five factor model, is used. Independent *t*-tests were conducted and statistical significance was found for some factors; however, the effect sizes were small, indicating a limited practical difference between the two groups.

Copyright 2009

by

Jessica L. Winter

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	iv
INTRODUCTION	1
The Problem and Its Purpose	
LITERATURE REVIEW	
Online Gaming	
Five Factor Model	
The International Personality Item Pool (IPIP)	
Research Question	
METHOD	13
Sample	
Procedure	
RESULTS	
Descriptive Statistics	
Reliability Analysis	
DISCUSSION	
Limitations of the Study	
Implications for Future Research	
APPENDIX: SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS	
REFERENCES	

LIST OF TABLES

1.	Item Numbers for the 120-item IPIP and their Corresponding Scales	15
2.	Descriptive Statistics for the Online Gamer and Normative Samples	16
3.	Pearson Correlations for Online Player and Normative Samples	17
4.	Coefficient Alphas for the Online Player and Normative Groups on Each FFM Subscale	18
5.	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances	19
6.	Independent Samples <i>t</i> -Test for Equality of Variances and Cohen's d Effect Siz	~~

INTRODUCTION

It is easy to see that video games are everywhere. As the Nintendo[®] generation grows up, many are bringing their video game habits with them – the effect has been likened to that of rock and roll on baby boomers (Maney, 2004). According to a study released by Pew Internet and American Life Project in December 2008, 53% of American adults and 97% of teenagers play video games (McCoy, 2009). In fact, video games are finding new markets and increasing in popularity despite a downturn in more traditional entertainment industries like music, movies, and television. In a speech at the 2009 Consumer Electronics Show, the president and CEO of Activision Publishing, Mike Griffith, expressed his belief that video gaming is in a position to eclipse other forms of entertainment in the next 10 years (McCoy, 2009). For all their popularity, however, games and, more specifically, gamers as a group are not well understood in academia. As Bryce and Rutter (2003) stated, "The size and popularity of the games industry stands out in contrast to the relative lack of understanding of computer gaming as a serious leisure activity" (p.1).

Of course, this is not to say that researchers have ignored games – quite to the contrary. An abundance of research has been conducted regarding games and violence (Bartholow, Sestir, & Davis, 2005; Olson, Kutner, & Warner, 2008; Sherry, 2001). Social science research into video games is almost synonymous with violence and aggression. Bryce and Rutter (2003) found that:

While there is a developing body of computer gaming literature, there is still a tendency to place games and gaming within the discourses associated with the media effects debate. Within these discourses, games are predominantly understood as technological stimuli that produce measurable, and largely negative, effects in the people exposed to them (p. 1).

Some of the problems with the current literature include the use of very small sample sizes and variable methodology across studies (Sherry, 2001). Additionally, researchers tend to examine a game's effect on various research participants (who may or may not play the game in question or any games at all). In spite of some popular perceptions, virtually no empirical data are available on gamers as a group. Without this information, it is difficult to put studies on the effects of games into context.

The Problem and Its Purpose

In short, a cohesive picture of "gamers" as a group, or possible relevant subgroups, has not yet emerged. Clearly, much research has been done on games and their impact (if any) on players (Bartholow, Sestir & Davis, 2005; Bryce & Rutter, 2003; Bushman & Anderson, 2002; Myers, 2005; Olson, Kutner, & Warner, 2008; Sherry, 2001). There is no doubt that this type of research on gaming should continue, however, it may be useful to approach the problem from a different angle. Instead of studying how games impact people, it might be useful to study the people who play games.

In an attempt to provide a starting point for future research, the purpose of the present study is to examine the personality characteristics of online game players and compare this information with a large normative sample. This comparison will help establish a baseline for the future study of personality and other characteristics of gamers. I first provide context regarding the popularity of online gaming, followed by a review of the five factor model of personality and its measurement. Then, the method and results of the comparative study are provided.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Online Gaming

Video games are being propelled to the forefront of social experiences through

online gaming. As Mike Griffith, president and CEO of Activision Publishing, explained:

Gaming is no longer a solitary pursuit, as it was with 'Pac-Man', 'Pong', and most of the early games. Technology has allowed it to become a social experience, the advanced dimensions of which would probably astonish you. Online community play is becoming the norm in gaming of all sorts (McCoy, 2009).

Of particular interest is World of Warcraft, a very popular game which combines

the fun and excitement of video games with the fun and excitement of social interactions

online.

World of Warcraft

History

World of Warcraft, often abbreviated as WoW, is an immensely popular massively multiplayer online role-playing game (MMORPG). Originally released by Blizzard Entertainment on November 23, 2004, it currently holds the Guinness World Record for most popular MMORPG (Guinness World Records Limited, n. d.). Since its initial release, the game has had two expansions. The first, The Burning Crusade, was released on January 16, 2007 (Wikipedia, n. d.). It sold almost 2.4 million copies within the first 24 hours on the market, making it the fastest-selling PC game in history at that time. The Burning Crusade went on to sell 3.5 million copies within its first month (Blizzard Entertainment, n. d.). The game's second expansion, Wrath of the Lich King, released in November 2008, shattered previous sales records, selling 2.8 million copies in the first 24 hours of release (Blizzard, 2008a). Wrath of the Lich King sold over 4 million copies in the first month (Blizzard, n. d.). By the end of 2008, WoW boasted

more than 11.5 million monthly subscribers worldwide (Blizzard, 2008b), and is currently available in eight languages (Blizzard, n. d.).

What is WoW?

As a massively multiplayer online game, a large number of players interact with each other in a virtual world. World of Warcraft takes place in the fantasy realm of Azeroth. This virtual world is persistent, that is, time passes and things change in the virtual world even when the player is away from the game. As a role-playing game, players create fictional characters which they use to interact with the game world. Players can advance in the game by earning experience and levels for their character. Experience can be earned through in-game activities like killing monsters or creating items.

Like all MMORPGs, social interaction is a key element of successful game play in World of Warcraft. Players network in-game to form groups of various sizes to accomplish game goals. Small teams, called "parties," may be simple and include as few as two players, whereas larger groups called "guilds" can be complex and include hundreds of players.

World of Warcraft is unique in its enduring popularity. With so many players logging on repeatedly over long periods of time, highly structured, complex, completely virtual organizations have developed and been allowed to flourish. This rich social landscape presents a wealth of opportunity to researchers in behavioral science or sociological fields. In particular, and more to the focus of the current study, the personality characteristics of WoW players may be of interest in providing some

baseline information about this group of individuals. Knowledge of WoW player personality variables could inform future behavioral science research in many areas, including social networks, analysis, online relationship development, and even the validity of many stereotypes about gamers in general.

The current study will use the five factor model of personality to explore these characteristics in a WoW sample.

Five Factor Model

The five factor model (FFM) is a way of organizing thoughts and research about personality using lexical analysis. By statistical analysis of words commonly used to describe personality, researchers have arrived at five major dimensions, or factors, of personality. The five factor model is purely descriptive, and is currently considered to be the most comprehensive data-driven theory of personality.

History

The complete history of personality research is beyond the scope of this paper, but the problem of finding a scientific approach to the study of personality was an established headache for the psychological community at the beginning of the 20th century. L.L. Thurstone laid the groundwork for the five factor model in his presidential address to the American Psychological Association in 1933. His comments, published the following year in *Psychological Review*, reflected the breakthrough nature of the five factor idea:

It is of considerable psychological interest to know that the whole list of sixty adjectives can be accounted for by postulating only five independent common

factors. It was of course to be expected that all of the sixty adjectives would not be independent, but we did not foresee that the list could be accounted for by as few as five factors. This fact leads us to surmise that the scientific description of personality may not be quite so hopelessly complex as it is sometimes thought to be. (Thurstone, 1934, p. 13-14)

Throughout the next few decades, researchers performed similar studies, gradually paring down huge descriptive lists to isolate a core of personality factors (Allport & Odbert, 1936). In the early 1960s, Tupes and Christal (1961) and Norman (1963) brought the research full-circle by arriving back at a five-factor model.

However, changing attitudes over the next two decades shifted focus away from personality research (Goldberg et al., 2006). After being ignored for 20 years, the five factor model had been largely forgotten. Then in 1981, Lewis Goldberg reexamined the five factor approach (Goldberg, 1981), and in doing so, ushered in a new era of personality research.

Perhaps the most significant contribution of the five factor model is the establishment of a common taxonomy for the field of personality research. Additionally, rather than being based on an esoteric theory, the five factor model is based on natural, everyday language. This makes it accessible and adaptable.

The Factors

Rather than being a set of criteria that people either have or don't have, all of the factors are viewed on a continuum. That is, each person will have a score for every factor and those scores demonstrate the degree to which that person exhibits the traits associated with each factor. Digman (1990) produced an excellent review of the five factor model, including a section on the interpretations of the dimensions. McCrae and

John (1992) also offer a well-informed and very readable explanation of the five factor model, with a description of the factors. What follows is a generalized description of the five factors. Examples of items for each factor are taken directly from the 120-item IPIP questionnaire used in this study.

Neuroticism

Neuroticism, sometimes called Emotional Instability, is the enduring tendency to experience negative emotional states. Individuals who score high on Neuroticism tend to respond poorly to environmental stress, and are emotionally reactive. They are more likely to feel threatened by ordinary situations and tend to become overwhelmed, hopeless, or frustrated by minor setbacks. High Neuroticism is associated with negative emotions like anxiety, anger, guilt, and depression.

Conversely, individuals who score low in Neuroticism are less emotionally reactive and calmer. They tend to be emotionally stable and are less likely to feel tense or rattled. However, freedom from negative emotions doesn't mean that low scorers on Neuroticism necessarily experience a lot of positive emotions. Frequency of positive emotions is a trait of Extraversion, a separate factor.

Some examples of Neuroticism items are:

- Worry about things
- Get irritated easily
- Feel that my life lacks direction
- Am afraid to draw attention to myself
- Go on binges

• Become overwhelmed by events

Extraversion

Extraversion is characterized by positive emotions, energy, and engagement in the world. Individuals who score high in Extraversion seek out stimulation and the social opportunities. They tend to be enthusiastic, assertive, and action-oriented.

Conversely, individuals who score low in Extraversion (sometimes called introversion) tend to need less social stimulation and more time alone. They are deliberate, quiet, and low-key.

Some examples of Extraversion items are:

- Warm up quickly to others
- Talk to a lot of different people at parties
- Like to take charge
- Do a lot in my spare time
- Love excitement
- Have a lot of fun

Openness

Openness, or Openness to Experience, is a general appreciation for art, beauty, imagination, adventure, unusual ideas, and variety of experience. Individuals who score high on Openness tend to be sensitive to beauty, imaginative, and intellectually curious. They tend to be more in touch with their feelings and are more likely to hold unconventional beliefs. By contrast, individuals who score low on Openness tend to have more conventional, traditional interests. They are conservative and prefer familiarity to novelty. They take a more pragmatic approach to life and may regard the arts and sciences as frivolous.

Some examples of Openness items are:

- Have a vivid imagination
- Like music
- Try to understand myself
- Prefer variety to routine
- Like to solve complex problems
- Believe that there is no absolute right or wrong

Agreeableness

Agreeableness is a tendency towards compassion and cooperation. Individuals who score high on Agreeableness value social harmony and have an optimistic view of human nature. They tend to be generous, helpful, friendly, and willing to compromise their interests to get along with others.

By contrast, individuals who score low on Agreeableness are unconcerned with others' well being and prioritize their interests over those of others. They may have a cynical outlook and tend to be skeptical of others' motives.

Some examples of Agreeableness items are:

- Trust others
- Would never cheat on my taxes

- Make people feel welcome
- Can't stand confrontations
- Dislike talking about myself
- Feel sympathy for those who are worse off than myself

Conscientiousness

Conscientiousness is a tendency towards self-discipline, devotion to duty, and drive. Individuals who score high on Conscientiousness prefer planning to spontaneity. They are persistent, ambitious, and frequently successful, and may be perceived as intelligent and reliable. They may also be perceived as relentlessly perfectionist or workaholics.

Individuals who score low on Conscientiousness tend to be less organized and less driven to get things done. They tend to procrastinate and may take a more improvisational approach to life.

Some examples of Conscientiousness items are:

- Complete tasks successfully
- Like to tidy up
- Keep my promises
- Turn plans into actions
- Get to work at once
- Choose my words with care

Because of the wide popularity of the five factor model, assessment instruments for its measurement abound. Perhaps the most commonly used instruments are the NEO PI-R, a proprietary 300-item instrument published by Costa & McCrae in 1992, the shorter, 60-item NEO-FFI, revised by McCrae & Costa in 2004, and the International Personality Item Pool.

The International Personality Item Pool (IPIP)

The International Personality Item Pool, or IPIP, is a public domain personality measure based on the five factor model. It was developed by a scientific collaboration headed by Lewis R. Goldberg of the Oregon Research Institute. Goldberg and his colleagues have provided a very informative summary of the history of the IPIP and its development (Goldberg et al., 2006). Briefly, the IPIP was introduced in 1996 and has been continuously evolving since.

Essentially, the IPIP was born of a desire to accelerate the advancement of personality research. To this end, the items, scales, and scoring keys for the IPIP are available at no cost online at <u>http://ipip.ori.org/ipip/</u>. Since its inception, the IPIP has grown to well over 2000 items, with more added annually. These items are grouped into scales which measure constructs such as Empathy, Locus of Control, and Self-Monitoring. At present there are approximately 300 scales measuring roughly 175 constructs.

In personality research, it is important that the participants and researchers are in agreement regarding the meaning of items on the questionnaire. Single trait adjectives are thought to be too abstract and, without context, highly open to individual interpretation (Goldberg et al., 2006; Hendriks, 1997). Conversely, detailed, highly specific items may make a questionnaire too lengthy and arduous. The IPIP items are

comprised of short verbal phrases. These phrases are seen as a good compromise to the conflicting goals of context and brevity (Goldberg et al., 2006).

Because of the open, collaborative nature of the IPIP, the length and content of any IPIP questionnaire is not fixed; the possible combinations are quite numerous. A 300-item version, which more closely resembles the 300-item NEO PI-R, is available but takes roughly 40 minutes to complete. This study employed a shorter 120-item version, as most people can complete the 120-item IPIP in 10 to 15 minutes.

Overall, the IPIP in its various forms demonstrates both internal consistency and concurrent validity for its scores (Donnellan, Oswald, Baird, & Lucas, 2006; Goldberg, 1999; Gow, Whiteman, Pattie & Dearie, 2005). Its value and validity as an online personality inventory has also been evaluated favorably (Johnson, 2005). As such, it is well suited for this study.

Research Question

This study attempts to answer the question "How do the five factor model personality characteristics of World of Warcraft players compare to a normative sample?" The study will examine the null hypothesis that there are no statistically significant differences between the personality characteristics of MMORPG players and the characteristics of a comparison sample from the general population on each of the five domains in the five factor model.

METHOD

Sample

Participants for the online player group were 147 World of Warcraft (WoW) players between the ages of 18 and 53. The mean age for participants was 29 (*SD* = 6.8). Almost 80% of participants were male, with 31 females in the sample. They were recruited through word-of-mouth (or more specifically, email) and postings on various popular internet message boards that cater to WoW players. Participants were provided with a link to the online IPIP survey.

The comparison group (normative sample) data was derived from previous research conducted with the IPIP as provided by Johnson (2005). Permission to use these data was requested and the data were provided. The comparison group contained 20,993 participants between the ages of 10 and 99. The mean age for participants in the comparison group was 26 (SD = 10.8). In the comparison group, 37% of participants were male.

Procedure

WoW Sample

Once the WoW sample participants linked to the page, they were first presented with a Web-based informed consent form, which they could choose to print for their records. Agreeing to the form took the participants to the Perl-executed survey. Data collection took place online over the course of 3 months, between August 28, 2007 and November 28, 2007. Participants were also asked to complete a short online demographic questionnaire (age, gender, country) prior to the personality survey. As

previously discussed, this study used a 120-item form of the IPIP, which employed a 5 point Likert-scale where 5 = *strongly agree*, 4 = *somewhat agree*, 3 = *neither agree nor disagree*, 2 = *somewhat disagree*, and 1 = *strongly disagree*. After participants submitted their responses, the Perl script generated a web-based narrative report summarizing their results. This narrative report was viewable only to the participant, and they could print the report if they wished. The Perl script also appended the participants' responses to a secure, comma delimited data file, along with the computer's IP address and a timestamp. The data was then stored in a controlled location on a UNT server in the Department of Educational Psychology. The server was not publicly accessible, and was located in a secured environment on the UNT Denton campus, with limited physical and remote access. Once the data collection was complete, a server administrator securely transmitted the data file to me. The data file was then deleted from the server. At this point, the data file was imported into SPSS for analysis.

Comparison Sample

Data for the comparison sample were collected from individuals who anonymously completed an online version of the 300-item IPIP. Participants were not actively recruited, but discovered the website on their own or through word-of-mouth, similar to the WoW sample. Data collection for the normative sample took place between August 6, 1999 and March 18, 2000.

Scale Creation

At the start of analysis, data from the normative sample were converted to the

120-item format by creating a new data file which contained only the data from the 300item IPIP which corresponded to the 120-item version. Missing values in the data were replaced with means for each variable in both the WoW and control groups. Reversescored items were re-coded prior to creating the five factor scores as the sums of the items. A summary of item numbers and their corresponding scales can be found in

Table 1.

Table 1

Item Numbers for the 120-item IPIP and their Corresponding Scales

<u>Scale</u>	Item Numbers
Neuroticism	1, 6, 11, 26, 31, 36, 41, 56, 61, 71, 16, 86, 91, 46, 21, 66, 76, 51*, 116*, 81*, 96*, 111*, 101*, 106*
Extraversion	2, 7, 12, 17, 22, 27, 37, 42, 47, 52, 57, 32, 77, 72, 82, 87, 67*, 102*, 107*, 112, 117, 62*, 97*, 92*
Openness	3, 8, 13, 18, 28, 33, 43, 23, 58, 63, 38, 93, 48*, 88*, 78*, 68*, 53*, 98*, 73*, 83*, 113*, 118*, 103*, 108*
Agreeableness	4, 29, 34, 59, 64, 14, 9*, 44, 24*, 89*, 39*, 19*, 54*, 94*, 74*, 49*, 84*, 79*, 119*, 69*, 109*, 114*, 99*, 104*
Conscientiousness	5, 35, 10, 15, 20, 25, 65, 45, 30*, 50, 55, 60*, 95, 40*, 75*, 70*, 105*, 85*, 90*, 100*, 80*, 115*, 120*, 110*

* indicates item is reverse-scored.

RESULTS

Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics were calculated for each factor for both groups. These descriptive statistics demonstrate that the two groups seem quite similar in terms of means and SDs across factors. These data are displayed in Table 2.

Table 2

Samples				(,		Υ.	· · ·
				Skewn	Skewness		<u>s</u>
Subscale	n	М	SD	Statistic	SE	Statistic	<u>SE</u>
Neuroticism							
Online	147	66.16		02	.20	18	.40
Normative	20,993	70.58	16.10	.11	.02	39	.03
Extraversion							
Online	147	75.13	15.16	.17	.20	66	.40
Normative	20,993	80.42	14.82	29	.02	23	.03
Openness Online	147	87.06		41	.20	.01	.40
Normative	20,993	87.12	12.31	27	.02	16	.03
Agreeablenes	ss 147	87.23	12.07	37	.20	32	.40
Normative		88.02	12.86	61	.02	.55	.03
Conscientious		81.90		.32	.20	13	.40
Normative		84.55	14.42	21	.02	25	.03
	-,						

Descriptive Statistics for the Online Gamer (n = 147) and Normative (n = 20,993) Samples

Table 3

Pearson Correlations for Online Player (n = 147) and Normative (n = 20,993)

<u>Samples</u>					
Subscale	Ν	E	0	А	<u>C</u>
Neuroticism	1.000	471**	072**	140**	406**
Extraversion	517**	1.000	.227**	.065**	.178**
Openness	022	.178*	1.000	.208**	082**
Agreeableness	226**	.239**	.267**	1.000	.283**
Conscientiousness	482**	.328**	089	.255**	1.000

Note. Online player data are below the diagonal; normative sample data are above. N = Neuroticism; E = Extraversion; O = Openness; A = Agreeableness; C = Conscientiousness. *. Correlation is statistically significant at the 0.05 level (two-tailed). **. Correlation is statistically significant at the 0.01 level (two-tailed).

Table 3 reports Pearson correlations. The most striking feature here is that correlations between factors (regardless of strength) tend also to move together between the two groups. For example, the moderately negative correlation (r = -.471) found between Neuroticism and Extraversion in the control group was also found to exist in the online player group (r = -.517). Additionally, all correlations between factors maintained their direction (positive or negative) for both groups. This result implies that the five factors relate to each other in a reasonably predictable and consistent way for both groups.

Reliability Analysis

Because the reliability of scores from an instrument can vary across different

administrations (cf. Vacha-Haase, Henson, & Caruso, 2002), internal consistency estimates were computed with coefficient alpha for the present data. Table 4 presents the alpha estimates for both groups on each five factor model subscale. The estimates are all of sufficient magnitude for research purposes (Henson, 2001) and quite consistent across the two groups. For example, Openness to Experience demonstrated the lowest reliability for its scores in both groups.

Table 4

Coefficient Alphas for the Online Player (n = 147) and Normative (n = 20,993)

Subscale	Online Player Group	Normative Group	
Neuroticism	.91	.90	
Extraversion	.91	.89	
Openness	.80	.83	
Agreeableness	.86	.86	
Conscientiousness	.90	.90	

Samples on each FFM Subscale

Group Differences

As a precursor to group mean tests, the homogeneity of variance assumption was tested with Levene's test for each factor. These results are given in Table 5. None of the scales demonstrated statistically significant differences between variances, thereby meeting the assumption. Equal variances were assumed for the following *t* tests.

Table 5

Levene's Test for Equality of Variances

Subscale	F	p	
Neuroticism	0.03	0.86	
Extraversion	0.78	0.38	
Openness	3.07	0.08	
Agreeableness	0.25	0.62	
Conscientiousness	2.90	0.09	

An independent samples *t*-test for each factor was conducted to compare subscale means. A Cohen's *d* effect size was calculated using the formula (Cohen, 1988; see also, Henson, 2006):

$$d = \frac{\overline{X}_{Wow} - \overline{X}_{Control}}{Spooled}$$

Where s is:

$$s = \frac{\sqrt{\sum (X_{WoW} - \overline{X}_{WoW})^2 + \sum (X_{Control} - \overline{X}_{Control})^2}}{n_{WoW} + n_{Control} - 2}$$

Table 6 presents the *t*-test results and corresponding effect sizes.

Table 6

			Mean	SE	of the c	lifference	
e t	df	р	Diff.	Diff.	Lower	Upper	d
3.32	21138	.001	-4.42	1.33	-7.03	-1.81	-0.28
4.31	21138	<.001	-5.29	1.23	-7.69	-2.88	-0.36
0.05	21138	.958	-0.05	1.02	-2.05	1.94	< -0.01
0.75	21138	.455	-0.80	1.06	-2.88	1.29	-0.06
2.23	21138	.026	-2.66	1.19	-5.00	-0.32	-0.18
	3.32 4.31 0.05 0.75	3.32211384.31211380.05211380.7521138	3.32 21138 .001 4.31 21138 <.001 0.05 21138 .958 0.75 21138 .455	t df p Diff. 3.32 21138 .001 -4.42 4.31 21138 <.001	tdfpDiff.Diff. 3.32 21138.001-4.421.33 4.31 21138<.001	tdfpDiff.Diff.Lower 3.32 21138.001-4.421.33-7.03 4.31 21138<.001	tdfpDiff.Diff.LowerUpper 3.32 21138.001-4.421.33-7.03-1.81 4.31 21138<.001

95% confidence interval

Note. N = Neuroticism; E = Extraversion; O = Openness; A = Agreeableness; C = Conscientiousness; SE = Standard Error.

Based on the independent samples *t*-test results, it can be seen that the differences between the two groups on Neuroticism, Extraversion, and Conscientiousness were statistically significant, thus rejecting the null hypothesis. However, it has been eloquently argued that there is a difference between statistical significance and practical significance (Henson, 2006; Kirk, 1996). In these cases, the mean differences were small (see Table 6). Using Cohen's (1988) benchmarks for *d* from his work on statistical power analysis, which classify d = .20 as a "small effect", d = .50 as a "medium effect", and d = .80 as a "large effect", we see that while the groups exhibited a statistically significant difference on some scales, the practical difference between the groups is quite small. That is, the small effect sizes indicate considerable group overlap and therefore less distinction between group means (Henson, 2006).

Nevertheless, the online player group exhibited a consistent pattern of scoring slightly lower on each factor.

DISCUSSION

This study used the 120-item International Personality Item Pool (IPIP) to examine personality differences between World of Warcraft (WoW) players and a normative sample. While research on games has been prolific, no modern research has been conducted on the personality characteristics of gamers. This research will likely become increasingly important as games like WoW continue to grow in popularity. In what follows, I discuss the results of the research, as well as limitations of the study and implications for future research.

Although statistically significant results were obtained for three *t*-tests, the sheer size of the control group (n = 20,993) yielded considerable power to detect small effects. When effect size was taken into account, as previously discussed, the practical differences between the WoW player group and the normative sample were almost negligible. It would seem that there is very little difference in personality characteristics between these two groups given the current data.

However, as previously mentioned, one observed difference was a pattern of lower means among the WoW group. The causes and implications of this difference are not known, but the possibility that gender bias between the samples, which is discussed in Limitations of the Study, may be influencing these results must be considered. Another possible influence on this outcome is a lack of representation within the current sample.

Of course, more research, perhaps with a much larger sample of WoW players, should be conducted before any solid conclusions can be drawn, but the lack of difference in personality characteristics between the two groups is intriguing. In the

future, research on gamers may be able to assume normative values for the Big Five personality characteristics. At the very least, this data suggest that the pervasive, negative stereotypes about online gamers deserve a second look.

Limitations of the Study

The potential for bias is always present in studies which use self report data. However, despite its many flaws, the use of self-report data is standard practice in personality research, and some researchers who study self-report data feel it is not only valuable but vital in gaining a well-rounded perspective and a unique window into human personality (Oishi & Roth, 2009).

The advantages of using a web-based format for a study like this are obvious. Particularly with MMORPGers as a sample, the internet was the natural and likely only vehicle for this research. Speed, accuracy, convenience, anonymity, and the ability of participants to easily recruit others are all strong arguments for the use of online assessments in personality research. It is not without its pitfalls, however. Johnson (2005) discussed the some of the problems unique to web-based personality inventories. It would seem that chief among these concerns are careless or inattentive responding and experimental responding - changing some of one's answers to get a different result. Johnson conceded that "...the rates of certain kinds of inappropriate responding may invalidate a slightly higher percentage of unregulated, Web-based personality measures than paper and pencil measures". However, he concluded that "The much larger and potentially more diverse samples that can be gathered via the

World Wide Web more than make up for the slightly higher incidence of invalid protocols" (Johnson, 2005, p. 126).

Another interesting facet to consider about this study is the gender distribution between the two samples. The WoW player sample was largely male (almost 80%), which may or may not accurately reflect gender distribution among WoW players as a population. However, the control group of 20,993 participants representing a "normative" sample was certainly not normal in terms of gender distribution at 63% female. It is not known if gender bias had any influence on the results, but it is certainly something to take into consideration in future research.

Implications for Future Research

Moving forward, a more robust understanding of personality in groups like WoW players will be useful as these games become even more mainstream. With 11.5 million monthly subscribers worldwide, WoW players themselves represent a significant group that regularly convene on the internet. Handled correctly, this could make acquiring a very large sample easy with little effort. Additionally, greater insight into how networking and social organization occurs in games like WoW could inform everything from distance education to geriatric care, by improving the immediacy and "realness" of online social experiences. In other words, if normative values for personality can be assumed for online gaming groups like WoW players, conclusions from future research with these populations could possibly be generalized to other groups.

If conclusions from gaming research can indeed be generalized to some extent, another fascinating possibility for conducting research with online gaming groups like

WoW players is the ability to overcome some ethical constraints on research which are neither necessary nor relevant in a virtual environment. Currently, computer models are used to simulate things like epidemics and natural disasters, but these models can never truly predict the uniqueness of human response. Naturally, recreating these conditions in the real world for the purpose of studying them is unethical or impossible; but, in a socially robust virtual environment like WoW, these events can be directly orchestrated and manipulated by the researcher with no threat to human life. For example, some researchers have already proposed using WoW as a model for human behavior during disease outbreaks (Lofgren & Fefferman, 2007).

The internet is not going away, and neither are online games. From BlackBerrys[®] to Facebook, we are increasingly utilizing online communication in our personal and professional relationships. As our world becomes more wired, researchers in the behavioral sciences need to continue to investigate online interactions to maintain a balanced and accurate perspective.

APPENDIX

SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS

Permissions Email

from: John A. Johnson to: Jessica Martin cc: Lew Goldberg date: Tue, May 9, 2006 at 2:11 PM subject: RE: IPIP questions... mailed-by: psu.edu

Jessica, I'm tickled that you are studying WOW gamers for your thesis. I would like to know what you uncover with your research.

To create norms from a large data set, you can download from the Internet an SPSS file containing item responses to the sample described in my paper,

Johnson, J. A. (2005). <u>Ascertaining the validity of web-based personality inventories</u>. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *39*, 103-129.

The file contains data from the final sample, after all duplicate and possibly invalid protocols were removed. The final N is 20,993. It is downloadable from: <u>http://www.personal.psu.edu/~j5j/IPIP20993.sav</u>

The item responses listed under variable labels i1-i300 are coded with the reverse scored items already transformed (1=5) (2=4) (4=2) (5=1). If you want the raw, untransformed data, these exist under labels tmp1-tmp300.

From this data set you can compute norms for males and females by any range of ages you wish to define.

You also might find useful an Excel file containing the scoring keys for the IPIP-NEO at: <u>http://www.personal.psu.edu/~j5j/IPIP20993iteminfo.xls</u>

Finally, if you want to use the HTML and CGI files that I use to administer the IPIP on line, you can find them at http://www.personal.psu.edu/~i5i/ipipcqis.zip

Please feel free to modify these files in any way that suits you. If you are not familiar with the Perl programming language used in the CGI files, you'll have to find some help locally or get yourself a copy of Chris Fraley's outstanding, easy-to-understand book, <u>How to Conduct Behavioral Research over the Internet : A Beginner's Guide to HTML and CGI/Perl</u>.

Hope things go well for you; let me know if you have any questions.

Best wishes, John A. Johnson Consent Form

Informed Consent

Principal Investigator: Jessica L. Martin, a graduate student in the University of North Texas (UNT) Department of Technology and Cognition

This research project has been approved by the UNT Institutional Review Board (IRB).(940) 565-3940. Contact the UNT IRB with any questions about your rights as a research subject.

Please read the following carefully before continuing.

Hi! Thanks for helping me out. I am a UNT graduate student studying the personality characteristics of World of Warcraft gamers for my Master's thesis. To participate in my study, I'd like you to take a short personality survey.

Participation is entirely voluntary. You can withdraw your consent at any time by simply exiting the website, and have the results of the participation returned to you, removed from the experimental records, or destroyed. You will have a opportunity to decline to take the survey if you choose. Here are some things to keep in mind while completing the survey:

- You must be at least 18 to participate.
- The inventory does NOT reveal hidden, secret information about you, NOR does it assess serious psychological disorders.
- The report is designed to be objective, not pleasing or flattering.
- Measurement error, misunderstandings, carelessness, and mischievous responding can invalidate the report. Please be honest.
- If knowledgeable acquaintances disagree with the test results, then the results are wrong.
- Your report is visible only to you. As a researcher, I do not have access to your narrative report.
- As a research participant, you have certain rights. There are no foreseeable risks involved in this study.

About 10-15 minutes of your time is all that is needed for you to complete the survey.

You may print this consent form directly from your browser and keep it for your records.

The results of this participation will be confidential and will not be released in any individually identifiable form unless required by law.

If you have any questions or concerns, you may contact me at (redacted), or Dr. Robin Henson, my faculty advisor, at (redacted).

Thank you for your time and effort to make this study successful!

Jessica L. Martin University of North Texas March 1, 2007

I Agree

Ipip Online Personality Survey

Instructions for Completing the IPIP Short Form

The following pages contain phrases describing people's behaviors. Please use the rating scale next to each phrase to describe how accurately each statement describes you. Describe yourself as you generally are now. Describe yourself as you honestly see yourself, in relation to other people you know of the same sex as you are, and roughly your same age. So that you can describe yourself in an honest manner, your responses will be kept in absolute confidence. Please read each statement carefully, and then click the circle that corresponds to the accuracy of the statement.

Answer every item. Failing to answer items will return an invalid narrative report. If you make a mistake or change your mind, simply click the circle you wish to choose. After you have answered the first 60 items, press the send button at the bottom of this page. This will take you to a page with the next 60 questions. After you complete all 120 questions, pressing the send button will return an interpretive report to you.

All responses to this inventory from all respondents are completely confidential and will <u>**not**</u> be associated with you as an individual. Responses are, however, automatically entered into a database. To ensure confidentiality of your responses to the inventory, **DO NOT** enter your real name in the box below. Please create a nickname or made-up name. If you do not enter a nickname with at least one letter or numeral in it, a random nickname will be generated for you.

Your Nickname

This inventory will not be scored unless valid values for sex, age, and country are entered.

Do you	u current	ly play World of Warcraft?	es No
Sex:	Male ©	Female	
Age:			

When selecting your country, please indicate the country to which you feel you belong the most, whether by virtue of citizenship, length of residence, or acculturation.

Country:	•

1.	Worry about things.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate Nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
2.	Make friends easily.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate Nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
3.	Have a vivid imagination.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate Nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
4.	Trust others.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate Nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
5.	Complete tasks successfully.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate Nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
6.	Get angry easily.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate Nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
7.	Love large parties.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate Nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
8.	Believe in the importance of art.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate Nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate

9.	Use others for my own ends.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate Nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
10.	Like to tidy up.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate Nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
11.	Often feel blue.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate Nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
12.	Take charge.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate Nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
13.	Experience my emotions intensely.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate Nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
14.	Love to help others.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate Nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
15.	Keep my promises.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate Nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
16.	Find it difficult to approach others.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate Nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate

17.	Am always busy.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate Nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
18.	Prefer variety to routine.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate Nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
19.	Love a good fight.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate Nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
20.	Work hard.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate Nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
21.	Go on binges.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate Nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
22.	Love excitement.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate Nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
23.	Love to read challenging material.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate Nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
24.	Believe that I am better than others.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate Nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
25.	Am always prepared.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate Nor	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate

				Inaccurate		
26.	Panic easily.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate Nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
27.	Radiate joy.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate Nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
28.	Tend to vote for liberal political candidates.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate Nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
29.	Sympathize with the homeless.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate Nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
30.	Jump into things without thinking.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate Nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
31.	Fear for the worst.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate Nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
32.	Feel comfortable around people.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate Nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
33.	Enjoy wild flights of fantasy.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate Nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate

34.	Believe that others have good intentions.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate Nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
35.	Excel in what I do.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate Nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
36.	Get irritated easily.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate Nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
37.	Talk to a lot of different people at parties.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate Nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
38.	See beauty in things that others might not notice.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate Nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
39.	Cheat to get ahead.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate Nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
40.	Often forget to put things back in their proper place.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate Nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
41.	Dislike myself.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate Nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
42.	Try to lead others.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate Nor	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate

				Inaccurate		
43.	Feel others' emotions.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate Nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
44.	Am concerned about others.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate Nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
45.	Tell the truth.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate Nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
46.	Am afraid to draw attention to myself.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate Nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
47.	Am always on the go.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate Nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
48.	Prefer to stick with things that I know.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate Nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
49.	Yell at people.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate Nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
50.	Do more than what's expected of me.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate Nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate

51.	Rarely overindulge.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate Nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
52.	Seek adventure.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate Nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
53.	Avoid philosophical discussions.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate Nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
54.	Think highly of myself.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate Nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
55.	Carry out my plans.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate Nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
56.	Become overwhelmed by events.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate Nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
57.	Have a lot of fun.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate Nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
58.	Believe that there is no absolute right or wrong.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate Nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
59.	Feel sympathy for those who are worse off than myself.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate Nor	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate

				Inaccurate		
60.	Make rash decisions.	, ,	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate Nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate

Next Page

IPIP Short Form Items 61-120

61.	Am afraid of many things.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
62.	Avoid contacts with others.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
63.	Love to daydream.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
64.	Trust what people say.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
65.	Handle tasks smoothly.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
66.	Lose my temper.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate

				0		
67.	Prefer to be alone.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
68.	Do not like poetry.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
69.	Take advantage of others.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
70.	Leave a mess in my room.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
71.	Am often down in the dumps.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
72.	Take control of things.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
73.	Rarely notice my emotional reactions.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
74.	Am indifferent to the feelings of others.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate

75.	Break rules.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
76.	Only feel comfortable with friends.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
77.	Do a lot in my spare time.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
78.	Dislike changes.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
79.	Insult people.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
80.	Do just enough work to get by.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
81.	Easily resist temptations.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
82.	Enjoy being reckless.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
83.	Have difficulty understanding abstract ideas.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate nor	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate

				Inaccurate		
84.	Have a high opinion of myself.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
85.	Waste my time.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
86.	Feel that I'm unable to deal with things.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
87.	Love life.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
88.	Tend to vote for conservative political candidates.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
89.	Am not interested in other people's problems.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
90.	Rush into things.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
91.	Get stressed out easily.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate

92.	Keep others at a distance.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
93.	Like to get lost in thought.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
94.	Distrust people.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
95.	Know how to get things done.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
96.	Am not easily annoyed.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
97.	Avoid crowds.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
98.	Do not enjoy going to art museums.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
99.	Obstruct others' plans.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
100.	Leave my belongings around.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate nor	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate

				Inaccurate		
101.	Feel comfortable with myself.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
102.	Wait for others to lead the way.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
103.	Don't understand people who get emotional.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
104.	Take no time for others.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
105.	Break my promises.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
106.	Am not bothered by difficult social situations.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
107.	Like to take it easy.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
108.	Am attached to conventional ways.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate

109.	Get back at others.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
110.	Put little time and effort into my work.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
111.	Am able to control my cravings.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
112.	Act wild and crazy.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
113.	Am not interested in theoretical discussions.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
114.	Boast about my virtues.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
115.	Have difficulty starting tasks.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
116.	Remain calm under pressure.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
117.	Look at the bright side of life.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate nor	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate

				Inaccurate		
118.	Believe that we should be tough on crime.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
119.	Try not to think about the needy.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate
120.	Act without thinking.	Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither Accurate nor Inaccurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate

PLEASE NOTE: Your results should appear on your screen within moments after clicking the Send button. If nothing happens, something has gone wrong. Clicking the button again and again will not help.

REFERENCES

- Allport, G. W. & Odbert, H. S. (1936). Trait names: A psycholexical study. *Psychological Monographs*, *47*, 211.
- Bartholow, B. D., Sestir, M. A., & Davis, E. B. (2005). Correlates and consequences of exposure to video game violence: Hostile personality, empathy, and aggressive behavior. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 31*, 1573–1586.
- Blizzard Entertainment. (n. d.) *Company Profile*. Retrieved February 18, 2009 from http://www.blizzard.com/us/inblizz/profile.html.
- Blizzard Entertainment. (2008a) *World of Warcraft: Wrath of the Lich King shatters 1day sales record.* Retrieved February 18, 2009 from http://www.blizzard.com/us/press/081120.html.
- Blizzard Entertainment. (2008b) *World of Warcraft subscriber base reaches 11.5 million worldwide.* Retrieved February 18, 2009 from http://www.blizzard.com/us/press/081121.html.
- Bryce, J. & Rutter, J. (2003). Gender dynamics and the social and spatial organization of computer gaming. *Leisure Studies*, *22*, 1-15.
- Bushman, B. & Anderson, C. (2002). Violent video games and hostile expectations: A test of the general aggression model. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin,* 28, 1679-1686.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Hilldale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Costa, P. & McCrae, R. (1992). *NEO PI-R professional manual*. Odessa, FL. Psychological Assessment Resources, Inc.
- Digman, J. (1990). Personality structure: Emergence of the five factor model. *Annual Review of Psychology, 41*, 417-440.
- Donnellan, M. B., Oswald, F. L., Baird, B. M., & Lucas, R. E. (2006). The mini-IPIP scales: Tiny-yet-effective measures of the Big Five factors of personality. *Psychological Assessment, 18*, 192-203.
- Goldberg, L. R. (1981). Language and individual differences: The search for universals in personality lexicons. In Wheeler (Ed.), *Review of personality and social psychology* (*Vol. 1*, pp. 141-165). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Goldberg, L. R. (1999). A broad-bandwidth, public-domain, personality inventory measuring the lower-level facets of several five factor models. In I. Mervielde, I. Deary, F. De Fruyt, & F. Ostendorf (Eds.), *Personality psychology in Europe (Vol. 7,* pp. 7-28). Tilburg, The Netherlands: Tilburg University Press.

- Goldberg, L. R., Johnson, J. A., Eber, H. W., Hogan, R., Ashton, M. C., Cloninger, C. R. et al. (2006). The International Personality Item Pool and the future of publicdomain personality measures. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *40*, 84-96.
- Gow, A. J., Whiteman, M. C., Pattie, A., & Deary, I. J. (2005). Goldberg's 'IPIP' Big Five factor markers: Internal consistency and concurrent validation in Scotland. *Personality and Individual Differences, 39*, 317-329.
- Guinness World Records Limited 2009. (n.d.). *Gamers edition: PC gaming records*. Retrieved February 18, 2009, from <u>http://gamers.guinnessworldrecords.com/records/pc_gaming.aspx</u>.
- Henson, R. K. (2001). Understanding internal consistency reliability estimates: A conceptual primer on coefficient alpha. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 34*, 177-189.
- Henson, R. K. (2006). Effect-size measures and meta-analytic thinking in counseling psychology research. *Counseling Psycholgoist, 34,* 601-629.
- Johnson, J. A. (2005). Ascertaining the validity of Web-based personality inventories. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 39, 103-129.
- Kirk, R. E. (1996). Practical significance: A concept whose time has come. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 56*, 746-759.
- Lofgren, E.T. & Fefferman, N. H. (2007). The untapped potential of virtual game worlds to shed light on real world epidemics. *Lancet Infectious Diseases*, *7*, 625-629.
- Maney, K. (2004, November 17). Halo 2 reveals new generation gap: Boomers vs. gamers. *USA Today*, B.3.
- McCoy, Cara. (2009, January 9). CES2009: CEO: Video game popularity tied to social experiences. *Las Vegas Sun*. Retrieved February 24, 2009 from http://www.lasvegassun.com/news/2009/jan/09/ceo-video-game-popularity-tied-social-experiences/.
- McCrae, R. & Costa, P. (2004). A contemplated revision of the NEO Five Factor Inventory. *Personality and Individual Differences, 36*, 587-596.
- McCrae, R. & John, O. (1992). An introduction to the five factor model and its applications. *Journal of Personality, 60*, 175-215.
- Myers, D. (2005). Guest editorial: Video games: Issues in research and learning. *Simulation & Gaming, 36*, 442-446.
- Norman, W. T. (1963). Toward an adequate taxonomy of personality attributes: Replicated factor structure in peer nomination personality ratings. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 66, 574-583.

- Oishi, S. & Roth, D. (2009). The role of self-reports in culture and personality research: Is it too early to give up on self-reports? *Journal of Research in Personality, 43,* 107-109.
- Olson, C. K., Kutner, L. A., & Warner, D. E. (2008). The role of violent video game content in adolescent development: Boys' perspectives. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, *23*, 55 75.
- Sherry, J. L. (2001). The effects of violent video games on aggression. A meta analysis. *Human Communication Research*, *2*7, 409-431.

Thurstone, L. L. (1934). The vectors of the mind. Psychological Review, 41, 1-32.

- Tupes, E. C., & Christal, R. E. (1961). *Recurrent personality factors based on trait ratings*. USAF ASD Tech. Rep. No. 61-97, Lackland Airforce Base, TX: U. S. Air Force.
- Vacha-Haase, T., Henson, R. K., & Caruso, J. (2002). Reliability Generalization: Moving toward improved understanding and use of score reliability. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 62, 562-569.
- Wikipedia. (n.d.) *World of Warcraft*. Retrieved February 18, 2009 from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/World_of_Warcraft#cite_note-Crusade_Release_Date-4.