

2025



AP[®] Research Academic Paper

Sample Student Responses and Scoring Commentary

Inside:

Sample G

- Scoring Guidelines**
- Student Samples**
- Scoring Commentary**

Academic Paper

5 Points

Score of 1	Score of 2	Score of 3	Score of 4	Score of 5
Report on Existing Knowledge	Report on Existing Knowledge with Simplistic Use of a Research Method	Ineffectual Argument for a New Understanding	Well-Supported, Articulate Argument Conveying a New Understanding	Rich Analysis of a New Understanding Addressing a Gap in the Research Base
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presents an overly broad topic of inquiry. • Situates a topic of inquiry within a single perspective derived from scholarly works OR through a variety of perspectives derived from mostly non-scholarly works. • Describes a search and report process. • Summarizes or reports existing knowledge in the field of understanding pertaining to the topic of inquiry. • Generally communicates the student’s ideas, although errors in grammar, discipline-specific style, and organization distract or confuse the reader. • Cites AND/OR attributes sources (in bibliography/ works cited and/or intext), with multiple errors and/or an inconsistent use of a discipline specific style. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presents a topic of inquiry with narrowing scope or focus, that is NOT carried through either in the method or in the overall line of reasoning. • Situates a topic of inquiry within a single perspective derived from scholarly works OR through a variety of perspectives derived from mostly non-scholarly works. • Describes a nonreplicable research method OR provides an oversimplified description of a method, with questionable alignment to the purpose of the inquiry. • Summarizes or reports existing knowledge in the field of understanding pertaining to the topic of inquiry. • Generally communicates the student’s ideas, although errors in grammar, discipline-specific style, and organization distract or confuse the reader. • Cites AND/OR attributes sources (in bibliography/ works cited and/or intext), with multiple errors and/or an inconsistent use of a discipline specific style. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carries the focus or scope of a topic of inquiry through the method AND overall line of reasoning, even though the focus or scope might still be narrowing. • Situates a topic of inquiry within relevant scholarly works of varying perspectives, although connections to some works may be unclear • Describes a reasonably replicable research method, with questionable alignment to the purpose of the inquiry. • Conveys a new understanding or conclusion, with an underdeveloped line of reasoning OR insufficient evidence. • Competently communicates the student’s ideas, although there may be some errors in grammar, discipline-specific style, and organization. • Cites AND attributes sources, using a discipline-specific style (in both bibliography/works cited AND intext), with few errors or inconsistencies. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focuses a topic of inquiry with clear and narrow parameters, which are addressed through the method and the conclusion. • Explicitly connects a topic of inquiry to relevant scholarly works of varying perspectives AND logically explains how the topic of inquiry addresses a gap. • Logically defends the alignment of a detailed, replicable research method to the purpose of the inquiry • Supports a new understanding or conclusion through a logically organized line of reasoning AND sufficient evidence. The limitations and/or implications, if present, of the new understanding or conclusion are oversimplified. • Competently communicates the student’s ideas, although there may be some errors in grammar, discipline-specific style, and organization. • Cites AND attributes sources, with a consistent use of an appropriate discipline-specific style (in both bibliography/works cited AND intext), with few to no errors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focuses a topic of inquiry with clear and narrow parameters, which are addressed through the method and the conclusion. • Explicitly connects a topic of inquiry to relevant scholarly works of varying perspectives AND logically explains how the topic of inquiry addresses a gap. • Logically defends the alignment of a detailed, replicable research method to the purpose of the inquiry. • Justifies a new understanding or conclusion through a logical progression of inquiry choices, sufficient evidence, explanation of the limitations of the conclusion, and an explanation of the implications to the community of practice. • Enhances the communication of the student’s ideas through organization, use of design elements, conventions of grammar, style, mechanics, and word precision, with few to no errors. • Cites AND attributes sources, with a consistent use of an appropriate discipline-specific style (in both bibliography/works cited AND intext), with few to no errors.

People on the Internet are Mean; A content analysis study on how the design of video games themselves plays a part in the most commonly used derogatory terms by its players.

Word count: 4964

Literature Review:

Video games are becoming more and more prevalent as time goes on. According to Exploding Topics, there are approximately 3.32 billion active video game players worldwide (Duarte, 2025). In other words, roughly 40% of the entire world plays video games. With something as popular as this, there needs to be a better understanding of how toxic communication starts in order to make video games a safe space for everyone. To start us off, what even are video games? My definition of a video game is a game played on an electronic device of some sort. As technology continues to evolve, so too does the amount of video games that exist in the world, so with that in mind, more research is needed on video games in general in order to keep up with their evolution and ensure they remain a healthy way for people to spend time. While there have been many studies over the last few decades with different results, such as video games making kids more violent (Greitemeyer, 2019), or that they actually don't do that at all (Przybylski & Weinstein, 2019), it is safe to say that research into the field of video games is highly debated and varied. Growing up on video games myself, I was always confused by the news headlines that said video games made kids more violent/aggressive because I was one of said kids and I did not feel any rise in either category. As I got older, I saw more papers come out about how there is actually very little evidence to support this fact, and that while small increases have been observed, it is nothing substantial (Przybylski & Weinstein, 2019). When thinking about a research topic about video games, this whole field came to mind first because of its prevalence in my childhood, but after doing the research I realize it's already been explored by much better technology than a highschooler could feasibly acquire. So, I want to focus my paper on a different, but very similar topic. Rather than video games causing kids to take violent action in real life, I want to study how (if any) do video games impact the behaviors taken in the game itself by the players. Specifically, in multiplayer games with communication methods such as voice chat and text messaging. Being around video games all my life, I've seen first hand the people who go out of their way to insult somebody because of the sound of their voice, or their perceived gender/race. Since they believe that there are no consequences to these actions, they just hurl whatever hurtful things they can think of to make themselves feel better. Seeing these actions online really rubbed me the wrong way, and when I heard we could do research on whatever we want I knew I wanted to do research that had implications of helping others. So, after thinking about it, why not combine my love for video games with research on how to make

Research Sample G 3 of 13

everyone feel comfortable playing video games. Because at the end of the day, that's what video games are, games, and no one should feel unsafe or discriminated against in such an enjoyable pastime that teaches many skills needed in life. Now you may be wondering, why do people even say these hurtful things in the first place online? My research aims to find out why this is, is it due to the video games themselves? An example being the story mode of the video game having oversexualisation of characters which leads to the player base being more sexist. Or even the game featuring lots of characters from a specific minority group which leads people to use derogatory terms associated with those characters in the game. Or rather is it due to other factors such as seeing people do it and not get punished? Through this research, I hope to provide solutions/understanding to this problem in order to make our ever evolving digital landscape safe for everyone to enjoy and feel comfortable being who they are. This problem is significant because it is not just video games that are growing and growing as time goes on, other such digital inventions like virtual reality are evolving to emulate the real world even more and provide escape to people who want a break from real responsibilities. Another part of my significance for this study is the fact that virtual reality becomes more developed by the day. As I have stated already, technology will continue to evolve (presumably) and inventions like virtual reality need to be safe places for everyone to be comfortable being who they are or what's the point in even having them in the first place? Will virtual reality just turn into another life where people are made fun of and called derogatory terms based on whatever they feel comfortable as? I simply will not let this happen and that is why we need to start tackling this issue of derogatory terms in video games now. I say this because in these digital worlds, even if people don't think they are real and that there are no consequences for saying whatever they want, we need to dispel that idea and ensure these spaces are safe and welcoming for everyone who joins them. Even putting aside digital aspects such as video games and virtual reality, many other aspects of digital communication suffer from people thinking they can say whatever they want with zero consequences. Some of these digital communication methods include comments on somebody's post, where since they aren't saying what they are saying to the posts creator in real life, they feel like they can get away with saying whatever they want. Usually this takes the form of insults on whatever the person did, and as a society we cannot allow these poor communication behaviors to continue, no matter the digital landscape they are used in, in order to properly evolve with the evolution of digital communication methods.

Method:

Moving onto what my actual research question is, I decided to go with “How do people playing video games and the video games themselves spin society's acceptance/indifference towards people being openly discriminatory towards minority groups in video games?” So, why did I choose this question? Let's break it down. To start, we have how do people playing video games spin society's acceptance/indifference about discriminatory terms being used. I chose this wording because humans are very social creatures, and in that sense we tend to mimic others behaviors that we think are good traits (even when they aren't morally good). For example, if someone sees a person say a derogatory term in a video game and get lots of laughs from the people around them, they are likely to copy that term or even use a different one because they want validation. Next, let's talk about the video games themselves spinning society's acceptance/indifference towards people using derogatory terms in video games. As I stated earlier, I hypothesize that game design and more importantly character design has a huge impact on the words people call others in the game. This is because when you are playing online with people you do not know, the only thing another person knows about you is your username and what character you are. So, they either call you the characters name or your given username. Now, if the other person is heated enough they might start trying to insult you, or at least what they perceive you to be. Also known as what character you are playing at that time, which is why I hypothesize that characters have a massive effect on what derogatory words people use to try and be mean to others. The last thing I want to mention in my research question is the acceptance/indifference bit because as I have mentioned, I play games all the time and see people say the craziest things to zero reaction from others, almost like it is normal. I want to try and find out why people are so desensitized to these obviously hurtful words and if both, neither, or either the players playing the games and the games themselves play into this. Anyways back to the actual research question answering, I plan to attempt to answer this question in a few different ways. Firstly, I am going to use the content analysis method to analyze past papers that have looked at certain discriminatory behaviors (such as sexism or racism) in certain games and then put them in comparison with each other to glean any patterns or connections. I also plan to look at papers that talk about the actual make of the games themselves and the different morals portrayed to see to what extent those ideas can play on user communication behavior. Through

this method, I can start building an understanding of why these hurtful behaviors exist across all video games with these chats, not just one game in specific. A possible flaw in this method is that there are so many video games that exist with multiplayer capabilities, so it would be unreasonable to think I would be able to study them all. But even with that being said, many games are similar with genres so, with that in mind, I plan to study games from different genres/archetypes in order to get as broad of a variety as possible. By studying these different games I can get as close as possible without actually studying every game ever made with chat capabilities to find out any patterns that exist in hurtful communication behaviors. The second part of my method is to actually run my own tests by watching unedited gameplay footage of people playing multiplayer games on Youtube in order to try and find out the frequency of how often people say derogatory things about minority groups. The coding mechanism I have come up with is to code any communication into one of two categories. Either a neutral comment, or negative comment. There is no need to code for positive comments as that is not what the paper is trying to answer, and we don't have much use for anything in the neutral category. On the contrary, the negative category is very important to my research. First off, how do I decide if something is "negative?" I define negative as putting down others through insults or hurtful comments. So once I have classified something as negative, I then move into seeing if it is a derogatory comment or not. To do this, I used Urban Dictionary. For those unfamiliar, Urban Dictionary is an online dictionary that stays up to date with all the slang and code words people use because it allows anyone to make an account and edit/create definitions for words. By having anyone be able to make these definitions, they are much more up to date and have many different entries for slang insults used in games. With the fact that anyone can make these definitions, the question is how do we know if that person is telling the truth about a word's definition (AKA are they credible)? With that in mind, when looking up words to see if it was considered derogatory towards a minority group, I used the top five most popular definitions to make sure they all lined up. If they all said the same thing and all had definitions saying that they were a derogatory term towards a minority group, then it would go in a different category within the negative category. Another part of my coding mechanism I am using is that I will be keeping track of the most commonly used derogatory terms, and comparing it to a list of the most common derogatory terms used today. The main benefit of doing this is by keeping track of all the different derogatory terms I see/hear, I can then see if there are any patterns in derogatory term usage in

Research Sample G 6 of 13

video games compared to in general life. For example, perhaps the list is outdated and new derogatory terms have come up that people now commonly use, or perhaps people are more likely to say certain derogatory terms only in video games due to fear of consequences in real life. This is significant to measure as in order to try and best contain or deal with the issue of people throwing around derogatory words in video games with no disregard for others feelings, we need to know what words they are using the most. If we know what words they are using the most, we can target the roots of the issues by implementing education policies for young kids on why these words should not under any circumstances be said, or even get the game companies to implement policies banning the most common words. A limitation to the latter half of that sentence is that people will always find workarounds to any chat filters, by putting things like special characters in words (Examples being \$,!,#,) to bypass them. Or, people will just come up with new words to spread their hate or get people to laugh in video games due to thinking there are no consequences to their words online. With all that being said, it would still be worth it to know the top words in order for the education policies to work, but also to show that game companies will not stand by while people use derogatory terms and will start cracking down on people who use them. By running these tests, I am able to see the prevalence of hurtful communication behaviors in specific games, and compare that to a study on the game itself to see if any correlation exists. As these videos are depicting an online interaction, I expect to see lots of negative responses from people just to get laughs in game. A limitation to this experiment though is that communication is not guaranteed at fixed intervals, so it will be hard to quantify exact numbers of hurtful communication behaviors in these games. Even with that being said, I am using this method in order to show that there is an alarming hurtful communication behavior rate, not necessarily trying to find the exact statistic. By proving that this statistic exists, and just how bad it is compared to normal real life communication, I establish that my problem is real and can also use the different prevalence levels to make inferences on how the game itself was designed. The combination of these two methods is the best way to answer my research question because of the gap in knowledge surrounding online multiplayer communication in video games and why it has become as toxic as it has. Through studying both the games themselves and players of said games, we can determine different influential factors on why they say what they do. The reason both methods are needed is to determine if the games themselves and other people's actions have a say in the players actions, or just one, or even neither (which is very

unlikely due to us being a creature that learns from others actions). An example of needing the player study aspect of this method is if someone sees someone says something mean in a game and hears that person get the group laughing and complimented for how funny they are, that spectator now perceives whatever the person said as okay and would likely try to make similar comments/jokes in order to also get the so called “reward”, compliments and laughs. This shows that communication behavior is learned from others, but the other half of the paper tries to target the root of this issue. That root being how the first person who made the hurtful joke/comment learned it was okay/good to say due to it getting laughs and compliments. Was it perhaps the same situation as the second person in the hypothetical situation? Just hearing it and repeating it because it got laughs? Or was it due to the actual design of the game they were playing, and seeing it in the game made the person think it was okay. While there are a lot of confounding variables to this study, such as not being able to control for household experiences that could also play apart in gamers behavior online, using a combination of these two methods gives the most complete picture possible of how toxicity in video games is inherent to the video games themselves and the players of said games.

Content Analysis of Past Papers:

Moving onto the actual content analysis, an important paper to reference is the *Understanding Toxicity in Online Gaming: A Focus on Communication-Based Behaviours towards Female Players in Valorant* paper. In the video game community, Valorant is known for having one of the most toxic player bases of all time and they put down minority groups in a number of ways. For example, making their usernames into not nice words, sending hurtful messages, saying hurtful things, etc. This paper is important because it intends to do the same thing my paper does, but for a specific game and specific issue. In this case, the issue being talked about is sexism and how male gamers will instantly put down female gamers if they hear their voice in game. The study found a “reluctance among female players to use voice communication due to fear of harassment.” This is important because it establishes this issue actually exists, and when I put this source in comparison with others, I can use it to spot commonalities between them. Such commonalities I look for are if another game also has a known prevalence of sexism in its players communications, is there a correlation between the two games designs. Such as genre of game or moral themes, or even if they are made by the

same game development company. Additionally, this source brings up another aspect of video game communication that is worth talking about, sexual harassment. When hearing a woman's voice in game, some men are inclined to, instead of insulting, say very inappropriate things in order to intimidate the women. This cannot be allowed to continue so we must find the source, do people see others online say these things and repeat them? Is it the environment they are raised in? Or does it have to do with the over sexualization of women in the video game industry itself? Finally, a key piece to mention about this paper is how all of this toxic (not nice) behavior happened in the ranked gamemode of valorant. To explain what that is, ranked is basically where you go to see how you stack up against other people and get put into a rank (such as iron, silver, diamond) based on your skill level. This creates an competitive atmosphere where winning, and therefore going up the ranks, is something that players take super seriously which is unlike unrated games that are just for fun. This hyper need to win makes players mad when they lose due to their rank going down, and makes for a more toxic environment overall. It is important to note this difference because I plan to look mainly at communication behaviors in these competitive archetypes of game modes if the game offers them as that is where the most communication happens. In unranked games, people are less likely to talk because they are just there to have fun and don't care if they win or lose, which is the exact opposite in ranked games. For example, people talk and call out enemy positions and such to move up the ranks. The perceived value of a video game rank is especially interesting to me because at the end of the day, the rank really doesn't mean anything and is pixels on a screen. So with that in mind, why is it that something as fictional and valueless as a rank in a not real game causes people to say such hurtful things to others? That question is another question I hope to answer through my study, and my main hypothesis is that since the people communicating aren't actually seeing the person who they are communicating with in real life, there is a detachment from actually caring about the consequences of what they say, so they say whatever will get a rise out of the other person or even make themselves feel better about themselves.

Moving on, another source of utmost importance to answering my research question is *What Are the Morals of Video Game Stories? A Content Analysis of the Most Popular Video Games* by Marina A. Klimenko, Kevin Kapadiab, and Gaillot Jr Andrec. This paper is important because while the paper above talks about user behavior in a specific game, this paper helps

answer the other half of my research question. That being to what extent, if any, do the design of video games themselves play a part in communication behavior of players in said games. A limitation of this paper though is that they studied games that were singleplayer or did not have much communication between players. While that may seem useless to my question, it actually isn't because many single player games are designed in the same ways in multiplayer. So, through using a study on a single player game, we can draw the conclusion of whether or not the design of the video games themselves play a larger role in player decisions, specifically when it comes to communicating with other players. While we will talk about what the paper found in regards to specific morals portrayed in the video games they studied, I first want to talk about something I hadn't considered before that this paper brought to light. The authors found that between 1996 and 2021, there was a steady increase in individualized morals portrayed in the type of video games they studied. They believe this to be because of the evolution of technology, and I would agree with that fact. I bring this whole discovery up to reinforce the importance of this study. As technology continues to evolve, our society needs to know how to combat toxic behavior online and if the video game industry itself is part of the blame for people's not nice behavior. While all moral content has increased in games there are two types that have seen the highest increase over the years. "The researchers found that the binding and global domains have increased more so than the individualizing moral themes. Binding domain is also the most popular, with group loyalty as its most frequent theme in our sample." This fact is almost expected given that many of the game's settings and characters involve many different characters all either working together or against each other which is where the loyalty aspect comes in. This paper also found that there was a connection between the culture the video game company is from and the moral themes displayed. For example, they found that "more violations of individualizing moral values led to explicit negative evaluations. Since the majority of video games in our sample was produced by companies that are located, predominantly, in Western and/or individualistically oriented countries (e.g., the United States of America, Canada, England, Germany, France), this confirms the idea that morality in video games stories is told through the lens of their culture." This is an important fact to consider because it goes even further to the root of video game design, past the individual designers themselves and into the cultures they are from and the ideas/beliefs said cultures instill in them which they then put in games they make. Also, this fact shows that while some games portray morals that are similar to

their cultures, they can also portray different morals like the quote above stated with group loyalty being super important even though a lot of those games were made by game companies from individualistic cultures. Finally, this paper shows that morals are portrayed in video games to begin with, which is needed for my research method to even make sense. I plan to use the coding mechanism the authors used in their paper to encode for different moral themes portrayed specifically in multiplayer games. A limitation of this study is that single player games portray much more moral themes because they are linear stories and have an end. Whereas multiplayer games are designed to be played as much as the player wants, and only have limited story options such as a campaign mode. (a mode in which instead of playing with real life players online, you instead play through a story version of the game with computers controlling other characters. It is important to note that the mechanics of the game stay mostly the same). Campaign modes are what I plan to mainly study as multiplayer games don't really have any other story/moral portrays aside from promotional advertisements to get people to download the game. By studying the campaign modes, which are prevalent with moral themes and decisions the player has to make, I can see what morals/ideas the developers used to make the mode and then apply that to the actual multiplayer gamemode as well. For example, if there is a prevalence of oversexualization in the campaign mode of a specific game, I would look to see if there is any overlap between that statistic and the level of sexism displayed in the multiplayer communication features. By comparing the two, we can see the extent, if any, that the design of a video game influences players communications behaviors, specifically in saying hurtful things to others.

Results:

Firstly, let's start with the results for the first part of my method. I had two main papers that I was able to put in contrast with one another based on specific minority issues. Firstly, I used Understanding Toxicity in Online Gaming: A Focus on Communication-Based Behaviours towards Female Players in Valorant. Like I mentioned earlier, Valorant is notorious for its overly sexist community so I chose this paper to help understand why that is. Second, I chose a paper called What Are the Morals of Video Game Stories? While this paper used a lot of different games and didn't focus on just one, the main category of the games chosen were story games where they were primarily singleplayer. Specifically, I want to focus on the researcher's inclusion

of Call of Duty due to it having both multiplayer and single player game modes. To answer my question, it is important to include because people can play the story of Call of Duty and then move right into the multiplayer game, which portrays different morals/ideals that could influence players' communication behaviors. Now, what did I actually notice when I put these two sources together? The biggest thing I noticed was that for the paper on morals in video games, they talked about how games do in fact show morals. And even though they used a story game aspect of Call of Duty, those morals still overlap into gameplay in the actual multiplayer version of the game. That information shows that morals in these games can be portrayed without story modes so games like Valorant, who don't have one, can still influence players through things like animated advertisements about the game's story. By showing this, this reveals that there is at least some correlation between the design of a video games story and the actual behavior of players in that game.

While the results for my other half of the method were much more interesting, this one is a little more confusing. When I was looking for unedited videos of people playing multiplayer games on YouTube, I could not come across any that had any derogatory terms towards minority groups being used by its players. While I found this a little concerning, I thought about it and came up with a hypothesis for why this is. If I am someone who uploads content to YouTube, I do not want my content to be taken down by the website. And according to YouTube's terms of service, hate speech of any kind is not allowed so even if someone recorded somebody saying a derogatory term, they wouldn't post it out of fear of channel termination. While this does make half my method void, I felt it important to include due to it being a point of future research and also shows how hard it is to really get concrete statistics on frequency of derogatory term usage.

Limitations/Points for Future Research:

Moving onto limitations/points for future research, the main point for future research that I talked about in the last paragraph would be running your own tests to find frequency of derogatory terms towards minorities used. In order to do this, you'd have to either play your own games or have other volunteers do it for you and basically use the same coding mechanism I used, except you have direct access to people saying things that would get videos taken down on a platform like YouTube. Additionally, a limitation of my study was my lack of foresight with

Research Sample G 12 of 13

implementing my method and not understanding how YouTube works. Finally, with the results I actually have from the half of my method that wasn't made void, I would say further research should aim to further explore the effect of portrayed morals in video games effects on people's communication behaviors in those games. While I did do that, I used two unrelated papers that were talking about different games to come to my understanding, so it could be helpful to this field if further research was done using just one game for both moral analysis and communication behavior.

Research Sample G 13 of 13

Works Cited:

1. Duarte, F. (2025, March 28). How many gamers are there? (new 2025 statistics). Exploding Topics. <https://explodingtopics.com/blog/number-of-gamers>
2. Greitemeyer T. (2019). The contagious impact of playing violent video games on aggression: Longitudinal evidence. *Aggressive behavior*, 45(6), 635–642. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.21857>
3. Przybylski, A., & Weinstein, N. (2019, February 13). *Violent video game engagement is not associated with adolescents' aggressive behaviour: Evidence from a registered report* | *Royal Society Open Science*. Royal Society Open Science. <https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/10.1098/rsos.171474>
4. Maharani, A., Puspita, V., Aurora, R. A., & Wiranito, N. (2024, May 22). *Understanding toxicity in online gaming: A focus on communication-based behaviours towards female players in valorant*. *Jurnal Syntax Admiration*. <https://www.jurnalsyntaxadmiration.com/index.php/jurnal/article/view/1137>
5. Klimenko, M. A., Kapadia, K., & Andre, G., Jr. (2023). What Are the Morals of Video Game Stories? A Content Analysis of the Most Popular Video Games. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 67(4), 553–573. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08838151.2023.2226280>

Academic Paper

Note: Student samples are quoted verbatim and may contain spelling and grammatical errors.

Overview

NEW for 2025: The question overviews can be found in the *Chief Reader Report on Student Responses on AP Central*.

Sample: G Score: 2

This paper earns a score of 2. The broad initial topic on p. 2 “I want to study how (if any) do video games impact the behaviors taken in the game itself by the players...in multiplayer games with communication methods such as voice chat and text messaging” narrows and changes focus on p. 4 “How do people playing video games and the video games themselves spin society’s acceptance/indifference towards people being openly discriminatory towards minority groups in video games?” This scope is not carried through the entirety of the paper and continues to waver. For example, on p. 5 “analyze past papers that have looked at certain discriminatory behaviors (such as sexism or racism) in certain games and then put them in comparison with each other to glean any patterns or connections.”

The content analysis method of comparing two papers regarding discriminatory behaviors in video games (e.g., Valorant) on pp. 4-7 is not replicable and the analysis of the papers on pp. 7-10 is largely a report of information from the papers. However, the paper does present evidence of an attempt to provide an analysis which suggests the described content analysis method was used. For example, on p. 11: “what did I...notice when I put these two sources together?...they talked about how games do in fact show morals...shows that morals in these games can be portrayed...” The second method of coding discriminatory behaviors within the discussion between players in online games was not conducted, as described on p.11. As such, the results on pages 7-11 are largely a report on existing knowledge. The paper does not earn a score of 1, because there is a topic of inquiry with a narrowing scope. Additionally, there are descriptions of methods which the paper attempts to use.

The paper does not earn a score of 3, because there are a limited number of scholarly sources represented in the literature review. The paper provides multiple research methods that are not replicable. For example, on pp. 4 and 5, the paper says they will use a content analysis that will study games, but does not provide the parameters of which games. The results of the content analysis are a description of the content of the two papers analyzed. Therefore, the paper does not convey a new understanding/ conclusion.