

## Game Design and the Challenge-Avoiding, Self-Validator Player Type

\*Carrie Heeter, Michigan State University  
Brian Magerko, Georgia Tech University  
Ben Medler, Georgia Tech University  
Joe Fitzgerald, Michigan State University

### CONTACTS

#### **Carrie Heeter, Ph.D.**

Professor  
Department of Telecommunication, Information Studies, and Media  
Michigan State University  
2467 Funston Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94116  
415-681-6473  
heeter@msu.edu

#### **Brian Magerko, Ph.D.**

Assistant Professor, School of Literature, Communication, and Culture  
Georgia Institute of Technology  
School of Literature, Communication & Culture  
686 Cherry Street  
Atlanta, GA 30332-0165

o: 404.894.2739

f: 404.894.1287

w: <http://lcc.gatech.edu/~bmagerko6/>

e: [magerko@gatech.edu](mailto:magerko@gatech.edu)

#### **Ben Medler**

School of LCC, Georgia Institute of Technology, Skiles 340  
686 Cherry St., Atlanta, GA 30332-0165  
517-927-5616  
[benmedler@gmail.com](mailto:benmedler@gmail.com)

#### **Joseph Fitzgerald**

1105 Swather SE  
Grand Rapids, MI 49508  
[fitzgerald.jt@gmail.com](mailto:fitzgerald.jt@gmail.com)

**Carrie Heeter** is a professor of serious game design in the department of Telecommunication, Information Studies, and Media at Michigan State University. She is co-editor of *Beyond Barbie and Mortal Kombat: New Perspectives in Gender, Gaming, and Computing* and creator of *Investigaming.com*, an online gateway to research about gender and gaming. Heeter's innovative software designs have won more than 50 awards, including Discover Magazine's Software Innovation of the Year. She has directed software development for 32 projects. Her research looks at the experience and design of meaningful play. Current work includes design of learning and brain games which adapt to fit player mindset and motivation and persuasive games where the designer goal is to engender more informed decision-making on complex socio-scientific issues. Heeter also serves as creative director for MSU Virtual University Design and Technology. For the last 12 years she has lived in San Francisco and telecommuted to MSU.

-- <http://gel.msu.edu/carrie/> (vita and projects)

-- <http://seriousgames.msu.edu> (serious game design MA)

-- <http://investiGaming.com> (gateway to research about gender and gaming)

**Dr. Brian Magerko** is an Assistant Professor of Digital Media in the School of Literature, Communication, and Culture at the Georgia Institute of Technology. He received his B.S. in Cognitive Science from Carnegie Mellon University and a M.S. and Ph.D. in Computer Science and Engineering from the University of Michigan. As head of the Adaptive Digital Media Lab, his work has focused on how to create digital media experiences that create experiences tailored to individuals for pedagogical gain, entertainment value, or both. His current research focuses on adaptive games for learning; cognitive modeling of improvisational acting; and creating virtual ecosystems for scientific collaboration, education, and historical preservation. Dr. Magerko has also been a pioneer in the field of interactive narrative, working on several systems that have used an intelligent story director agent to guide a user through a narrative experience in a virtual world.

**Ben Medler** is a second year doctoral student at Georgia Institute of Technology studying Digital Media. Ben earned a B.S. in Computer Science in 2005 and an M.A. in Digital Media in 2007, both from Michigan State University. His research focus is tied to the study/production of digital games and how they impact our society. Current projects include a) studying the creative and communication skills improvisational actors use during performances in order to build digital improvisational agents for games, b) building game systems that monitor and adapts to a player's play style in order to better suit that player's needs, and c) theorizing about conflicts found in digital games and how neutral or peaceful activities can be used for gameplay. Other research interests include storytelling/interactive drama, building authoring tools, user interfaces in games, machinima production and social networks.

**Joe Fitzgerald** is a MA student in the department of Telecommunications, Information Studies & Media at Michigan State University. He received his BA in Telecommunication, Information Studies, and Media from Michigan State University with a specialization in video game design and development. He is enrolled in the Serious Games Masters Program at MSU. Joe is

currently conducting research and developing serious games for cultural heritage learning and outreach at Matrix: The Center for Humane Arts, Letters & Social Sciences Online at MSU.

## ABSTRACT

*Achiever* and *Explorer* player types are well known in MMOs and educational games. Players who enjoy being a winner but dislike hard challenges (“*Self-Validators*”) are a heretofore ignored but commonly occurring player type. *Self-Validators* worry about and are distressed by failing. They can simply avoid playing overly difficult games for entertainment. But in a required learning game, *Self-Validators*’ excessive worry about failing can interfere with learning. We consider whether and how eight very different modern games accommodate *Explorers*, *Achievers*, and *Self-Validators* and discuss implications for entertainment and learning game design and research. Seven of eight diverse games analyzed primarily served either the *Explorer* or *Achiever* player type. *Self-Validators* were partially accommodated in some *Achiever*-oriented games, through user-selectable difficulty. Design with all three types in mind would encourage inclusion of features that enable players to optimize their preferred style of play.

## KEYWORDS

Play Style, Player Type, Mindset, Motivation, Learning, Game Genres, Game Design

## INTRODUCTION

Players who play a particular game purely by choice presumably do so because they derive satisfaction from playing that game. Individual gamers differ in which games they choose to play, how often, when, and for how long (Dawson, Craig, Taylor & Toombs, 2007). Individuals’ preferred games and genres are probably associated with their enjoyment of the achievement and exploration pleasures provided by those games and genres. Many genres tend to be more closely associated with one or the other of those motivations. Achievement is the central paradigm in genres such as First-Person Shooters (FPSs), Fighting, Racing, Sports, and Action. Other genres such as Adventure, Strategy, RPG, Puzzle, and Simulation probably appeal more to *Explorers* because they interweave imagination, curiosity, and customization.

As digital games for entertainment expand to new audiences and playing games with a purpose beyond entertainment become required rather than voluntary, perspectives on player types must also grow. Players who play a game because they are required to (as is the case with games for the classroom or training games) or because they should (for example, physical or cognitive exercise games) are rarely afforded a choice of genre, or of which game to play, or even whether or not to play. Games for which play is required serve reluctant as well as eager players.

*Achievers* and *Explorers* are player types found in MMOs and educational games (Bartle, 2006; Heeter and Winn, 2008). *Achievers* are motivated by extrinsic rewards such as leveling up and earning high scores. *Explorers* are motivated by intrinsic factors such as curiosity, role play, and learning. Educational research on mindset and motivation reveal two distinctly different mechanisms of extrinsic motivation

(Lepper and Henderlong, 2000; Dweck, 2006). Performance-approach learners are bored by easy tasks. They enjoy the thrill of mastering hard challenges and welcome good grades and teacher approval as just rewards (Elliot and Church, 1997). Performance-avoidance learners are anxious about failing. When performance-avoidance students perform graded tasks, they aspire to prove themselves, to validate their worth rather than aspiring to learn. They prefer easy challenges where success is likely over harder challenges where they might fail.

In this manuscript we propose that Self-Validators are a heretofore ignored but commonly occurring player type. We consider whether and how eight very different modern games accommodate Explorers, Achievers, and Self-Validators and discuss implications for entertainment and learning game design.

## Motivation and Learning

### *Extrinsic Motivation and Learning*

Formal education tends to be structured to use the threat of poor grades to motivate homework and learning. At the beginning of a semester or school year, teachers describe how standardized grades will be fairly assigned. Students are expected to do what is necessary to “pass” or better yet, to excel on the exams and other kinds of performances. Report cards document standardized achievement, informing students and parents about the learner’s performance. In the context of this kind of achievement-focused education, learning scientists have looked at the impact of achievement orientation on learning. Achievement or goal orientation refers to how individuals perceive and respond to achievement situations (Dweck & Leggett, 1988). People who have a high achievement motivation enjoy challenges much more than those with a low achievement motivation (Lee, Sheldon, & Turban, 2003).

Elliot and Church (1997) considered two quite different reasons individuals might have for pursuing extrinsic, performance goals such as grades. Performance-approach goals are linked to displaying competence and earning a favorable judgment. Performance-avoidance goals focus on trying to avoid failure. Elliot and Church found positive outcomes for performance-approach goals including positive emotions and absorption in the given task. Performance-avoidance prompted efforts to escape potential consequences of failure and was associated with anxiety. Performance-avoidance interfered with mental focus, blocking the individual’s ability to concentrate and become absorbed in an activity. The performance-approach goals approach enhanced mental focus.

Dweck (2006) made similar observations. She studied how people approach or avoid challenge in a school context. She found that about 42% of students have what she calls a growth, or Mastery mindset. These people believe that intelligence is malleable; that they are capable of improving if they try. Another 42% holds a Fixed or helpless mindset. They believe that intelligence is fixed at birth and cannot improve. They avoid situations that they cannot easily do well at. Failure undermines their confidence and if they fail, they become depressed and ineffective. (The remaining 16% could not be classified as either Fixed or Mastery mindset.) Having a Fixed mindset can undo a natural love of learning. In contrast, effort and learning make mastery-motivated students feel good about their intelligence; easy tasks waste their time rather than raising their self-esteem. Dweck describes the conundrum of the Fixed mindset. “If you’re in a Fixed mindset, both positive and negative labels can mess with your mind. When you’re given a positive label, you’re afraid of losing it. When you’re given a negative label, you’re afraid of deserving it” (Dweck, 2006, pp. 75-76).

Mangels worked with Dweck and other colleagues to measure brain activation among individuals with a Fixed and Mastery mindset (Mangels et al., 2006). Participants completed a pretest that allowed researchers to classify them as one or the other mindset. They answered a series of knowledge questions, and were given feedback about whether their answers were right or wrong and what the right answer was. Brain scans revealed people with a Mastery mindset paid close attention to what the right answer was. Those with a Fixed mindset showed activation of the limbic, or emotional system, but paid much less attention to learning the right answer. In other words, Fixed mindset people focused on their own emotional response to being told they were right or wrong, whereas Mastery mindset people paid most attention to learning new information.

Fixed mindset, performance-avoidance individuals are likely to experience anxiety when faced with achievement situations. Those with a Fixed mindset might be considered Self-Validators because when called upon to perform on a test at school or in a game, they worry about how others might perceive them if they fail. This concern may motivate studying, but this preoccupation with appearing to be successful can also interfere with performance and learning.

Having a Fixed mindset is considered dysfunctional for learning because it focuses learners on performance instead of mastery. Educators who are aware of the research look for ways to ease learners out of a Fixed mindset and into a Mastery mindset. They also craft feedback to focus on ways the learner can improve, rather than on labeling the person a success or failure (Dweck, 2006, Lepper & Henderlong, 2000).

### *Intrinsic Motivation and Learning*

Intrinsic goals internal to the act of learning can motivate learning, such as the pleasure of mastering a new topic, prior personal experiences related to the subject matter, or the sense of expertise as knowledge grows. Experimental schools such as Montessori nurture intrinsic motivation to drive learning. Rather than structuring a learning progression through standardized curriculum and standardized grades, Montessori tries to instill an internal sense of purpose. They avoid setting learners up to compete for the highest grade in the class. According to Montessori president Tim Seldin, “Students learn not to be afraid of making mistakes; they come to see them as natural steps in the learning process.” (Seldin, 2008, p. 2).

Beswick (1971, 1974) found that intrinsically motivated individuals need time to explore. He explains that intrinsically motivated individuals “tend [to] be more aware of a wide range of phenomena, while giving careful attention to complexities, inconsistencies, novel events and unexpected possibilities. They need time and freedom to make choices, to gather and process information...” (Beswick, 2007, p.1).

### *Motivation, Play Style and Games*

Player types were initially studied in the realm of commercial games. Intrinsic explorers and extrinsic achievers consistently show up in these studies, but Self-Validators have either not been studied (perhaps because they weren't playing the games) or else they have not been noticed. Richard Bartle was one of first researchers to observe players inside Multi-User Dungeon (MUD) games (Bartle, 1996) in order to create a set of player types. Based on personal observations of game players he classified players into four categories: *Achievers*, who strive for prestige in the game by leveling up and winning and *Explorers*, who seek to understand the game's environment. Two other types were unique to multiplayer games: *Socializers*, who interact with other players and *Killers*, who interfere with other players' experiences (e.g. killing new users, etc.).

Nick Yee's Daedalus Project surveyed thousands of massively multiplayer online (MMO) game players and asked what motivated them to play MMO games (Yee, 2006; Yee, 2008). Although the surveys are based on self-reported responses, the resulting information found many confirmations and some contrasts with Bartle's original player types. Yee also discovered that these dimensions were not necessarily mutually exclusive. Statistically, the factors were not orthogonal. Players were not necessarily either achievement or exploration oriented but might also be motivated by both kinds of goals.

Yee's (2008) analysis of MMO play motivation based on player surveys identified three motivation domains: achievement, social, and immersion. Subcategories within Yee's *Achievement* construct included Advancement (progress, power accumulation, and status), Mechanics (numbers optimization, templating, and analysis), and Competition (challenging others, provocation, and domination). *Immersion* included Discovery (exploration, lore, finding hidden things), Role-Playing (story line, character history, roles, fantasy), Customization (appearances, accessories, style, color scheme), and Escapism (relax, escape from real life, avoiding real-life problems). Like Bartle, Yee also found a *Social* motivation included Socializing (casual chat, helping others, making friends), Relationship (personal, self-disclosure, find and give support), and Teamwork (collaboration, groups, group achievement).

Neither Bartle's nor Yee's description of Achievement include Self-Validation. Self-Validators, like Achievers, are motivated by extrinsic rewards. Like their mastery-oriented counterparts, Self-Validator players seek prestige and like to win. However, Self-Validators particularly dislike losing, so much so they would prefer an easy victory to a challenge where the probability of failing is high. Perhaps such were not interested in playing the MMOs these researchers studied. Or perhaps they did not discuss their fear of failure.

### *Self-Validators and Other Player Types in Serious Games*

Learning games and other serious games tend to be single player. They lack the social dimension found in multiplayer games. Even within the more narrow range of available interactions in a single player learning game, researchers have observed systematic variations in play styles. Heeter and Winn (2008) proposed learning game play styles based on speed of play and problem-solving success. Adopting Ko's (2002) random-guesser and problem solver player types, successful problem-solvers were classified as either *Achievers* or *Explorers*. Achievers played quickly, paying attention to what was necessary to succeed and hurrying to complete the game. Explorers took their time playing, checking out necessary as well as extra in-game content. Random-guessers who played quickly and made many mistakes were considered *Careless* players. Random-guessers who played slowly yet made many mistakes were labeled *Lost*. Players classified as Careless and Lost probably includes many Self-Validators. These players did not seem to make any effort to play well. Failing without trying to succeed might be less devastating to a Self-Validator than trying hard and risking failure.

Heeter, Winn, Winn, and Bozoki (2008) found empirical evidence of Self-Validator play behavior in a memory game. When players were given complete control over the difficulty level, about 4 out of 10 opted for easy victories over and over again, never advancing to more challenging play. The easy victory players averaged higher performance (93% perfect scores) than their challenge-seeking counterparts (82% perfect scores). Self-Validator players adjusted the amount of challenge they faced to consistently earn high scores, while challenge-seeking Achiever players opted to forego near-perfect scores to strive for more difficult memory goals. Self-Validator is a dysfunctional play style for cognitive exercise games. To receive cognitive benefits, players need to stretch a little beyond what is already comfortable and easy (Mahncke, H. et al., 2006). Limiting play to easy brain game challenges minimizes the games' benefits.

### *Game Design and Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation*

Learning research has shown that under some circumstances, extrinsic and intrinsic motivations can coexist. In a review of 25 years of research on intrinsic versus extrinsic motivation, Lepper and Henderlong (2000) conclude that offering extrinsic rewards reduces intrinsic motivation, particularly if the extrinsic rewards are unrelated to the learning task. However, extrinsic rewards can complement intrinsic motivation when the rewards provide information about competence (such as offering encouraging feedback about positive aspects of player performance or suggesting ways to improve) but rewards undermine intrinsic motivation when they serve only to assign status (such as grades or points).

Game designers who want to accommodate both Achievers and Explorers can try to include something for everyone, but sometimes Achievers' and Explorers' needs are incompatible, forcing design choices that privilege one or the other form of preferred play. For example, Squire and Steinkuehler (2006) describe tensions between players with opposing goals when they posted feature requests about how to improve Star Wars Galaxy. Players with power-leveling, achievement goals wanted more pre-set story and clearly stated, fairly enforced standards for advancement. Players with a role play goal valued emergent play and freedom to invent their characters and actions.

Self-Validators and Achievers share an interest in extrinsic rewards, but are very different in their tolerance for failure. The mantra "easy to learn, hard to master" describes one of the holy grails of game design (Playyoo, 2008). This tenet could serve Self-Validators well and yet also satisfy Achievers. Much of the time, though, game designs to satisfy Self-Validators' desire for easy victory are incompatible with Achievers' desire to try to overcome impossible odds.

## METHODS

We were curious about how well today's games are designed to serve Achievers, Self-Validators, and Explorers. Do games tend to specialize in a single player type? Are Self-Validators' needs accommodated? Eight games available in single player mode (shown in Table 1) were chosen to represent a range of genres and to include a mix of games likely to appeal to intrinsically and extrinsically motivated players. Genres covered include first person shooters (FPS), play along, brain games, puzzle/role play games (RPG), virtual life, sensory experience, current events, and budget simulation. Four of the games (Bioshock, Guitar Hero, Keep It In Mind and Puzzle Quest) offer extrinsic rewards to the player. The other four games (Animal Crossing, Budget Hero, FLOW, and Play the News) mainly offer intrinsic rewards. Each of the four co-authors analyzed two games. A second co-author reviewed and edited their analysis.

We provide a short synopsis of each game and its main mechanics. We discuss which player types are served by the game mechanics and conclude by envisioning specific additions or subtractions that might make the game more appealing for each player type. At the beginning of each game section, beneath the game title, a figure graphical summarizes how much each game promotes or focuses on the three player types (A = Achiever, S = Self-Validator, and E = Explorer). A black circle means that player type is highly focused upon by the game. A half black half white circle means the player type is some-what focused upon and the white circle means the game focuses very little on that player type.

## RESULTS

### Individual Game Analyses

#### *Animal Crossing: Wild World (DS)*



*Animal Crossing: Wild World (DS)* is a life/garden simulation game. The player takes charge of an embodied character in a small, contained game world. The player is given a home and then has to earn money to pay back a mortgage by planting trees, fishing, searching for treasure, talking with NPCs, creating clothing, buying and selling items, and so forth. There is no ending; the game continues for as long as the player plays.

*Animal Crossing* contains intrinsically motivated gameplay. The game has very few goals to achieve, leaving players to create their own goals. Explorers can enjoy playing at their own pace while discovering how the world works. When players discover how to perform certain actions the game opens up related rewards. For example, learning to fish allows players to collect all available fish. Self-Validators can easily achieve the game's main goal of paying off a mortgage while facing minimal challenge. Achievers are likely to find the lack of clear goals and hard challenges uninteresting.

*Animal Crossing* could be adapted to please Achievers by providing more overt goals, increasing the difficulty level, and allowing NPCs to compete with players. Providing a series of goals (such as you must pay off half your mortgage within a week) would allow Achievers to experience continuous progression. Self-Validators would enjoy less stressful goals than Achievers, but would benefit from more recognition of their accomplishments. Unlike Achievers, Self-Validators would enjoy subtle hints given by the game's NPCs to improve their performance. The game already provides myriad discovery activities for Explorers.

#### *Bioshock*



*Bioshock* is an FPS that incorporates RPG game mechanics. The story takes place in a huge underwater city where the player gets caught up in a civil war. Players must fight their way through multiple levels using different types of weapons to win the game. Standard firearms with genetic modifiers give players unique powers (such as the ability to create fire). Players must figure out effective way to use these weapons alone or in combination to progress through the game.

*Bioshock* mostly offers extrinsically motivated play. The main point is to gather weapons and complete levels as quickly and efficiently as possible. An Explorer may enjoy the storyline (told through in-game journal entries) and learning how to upgrade weapons; however, these features of the game primarily exist to help the player progress through each level. The game continuously rewards Achievers for progressing. *Bioshock*'s dynamic difficulty system presents all players with ever tougher challenges. This ideally suits Achievers, but may turn away Self-Validators who take more pleasure in success than in challenge.

Adapting *Bioshock* for Explorers would call for less of an exclusive focus on combat and more emphasis on storyline. Explorers would enjoy more choice as to when, where and whether to enter combat. Other mechanisms to victory such as out-smarting rather than out-fighting enemies could also broaden appeal.



The preferences of Achievers and Self-Validators are incompatible. Curbing the difficulty of the game and quickly offering help might please Self-Validators but would alienate Achievers.

### *Budget Hero*



Budget Hero challenges players to set a new budget for the U.S. government. The player chooses which departmental policies to fund, such as the military or educational policies, as well as which tax plans to use. Players lay out their spending plans by choosing policy cards which equate to spending or cutting funding of specific policies. Players then submit the budget and see simulated results of their budget over the next two decades. The game provides extra information on each policy card to aid their decision and to allow the player to search through archived player budgets to see how their choices compare to other players' based on everyone's demographics.

This small serious game teaches provides few extrinsic rewards. Explorers would enjoy Budget Hero because of its rich, abundant information. Each time a policy card is selected the user may read the card's summary, pros and cons, or the impact a certain policy will have on the country. When a policy card is added to a player's budget, the effects that the policy has on the budget are shown, giving the player a clear picture of how each policy affects their budget. The game is very forgiving. Players can change their minds as often as they want before submitting a final budget. Self-Validators will enjoy the instant feedback; however both Self-Validators and Achievers will be bored by the lack of extrinsic rewards.

Achievers would need more goals and constraints if Budget Hero were modified to serve them. Anonymous budgets could be replaced by nicknames and leader boards, allowing players to be recognized for their achievements. Awards could be given, such as an award for building a balanced budget with the fewest cards. Adding extra constraints that affect how the player builds their budget, such as declaring that the military spending must be cut in half, could provide extra challenges. Self-Validators share the desire for more goals and recognition, but not for harder goals. Self-Validators (because it would help them succeed) and Explorers (because they are curious) would both enjoy more information on how policy cards interact with one another.

### *Flow*



In Flow, the player is a free-floating, free-flowing creature in the abyss of a fluid and deep space. The goal of the game is to eat and evolve by devouring smaller entities to help your creature become larger and more complex. The game contains an embedded dynamic difficulty system which gives the player intuitively customized gameplay based on their skill. Play occurs at the player's own pace. Players can customize the appearance of their organism.

Flow is Explorer oriented because of the immersion of the game. The main extrinsic reward is evolution. Players evolve when they eat other organisms. Each evolutionary step changes the game play because the organism is different. Players wander each level discovering new creatures to eat and battle. The adaptive difficulty allows Self-Validators to progress through the game at a challenge level they are comfortable with. However, battling does not accrue reward points or awards which both Self-Validators and Achievers like to receive. Players can set their own goals such as trying to unlock all of the evolutionary forms or speeding through the levels as fast as they can. Because there are few performance metrics, Achievers and Self-Validators have no way to measure their success.

Adapting Flow to Achievers by adding points, distinct levels, boss battles, and rewards would transform the game into a traditional arcade game and would potentially drive away Explorers. Constraints such as a health bar or timer would also increase Achiever enjoyment. Self-Validators would need a more helpful version of the player interface, perhaps including a map showing them the locations of other creatures. Making larger creatures easier to kill or allow players to replay levels would also help Self-Validators. Explorers could be allowed to switch evolutionary form freely or even to combine evolutionary forms.

### *Guitar Hero*



In Guitar Hero the player is a guitarist in a rock band who plays songs on a special guitar-like peripheral device. Playing through a list of increasingly difficult songs earns the title of “rock god.” Songs are played by pressing down multiple buttons to simulate guitar finger positions while hitting another button in rhythm with the song to simulate strumming guitar strings. Difficulty settings alter the complexity and tempo of the music. Players play alone or against one another. Successful play unlocks extra songs, characters, or guitar models.

Playing Guitar Hero is all about earning points and unlocking content. Players earn points for each note played correctly and gain bonuses for a succession of correct notes. Achievers enjoy the rewards and challenges that Guitar Hero offers and Self-Validators probably like being able to play through most of the songs on the difficulty setting of their choosing. Explorers will find the game unsatisfying because of the very linear and repetitive play that is required.

When adapting for Explorers, players would need more freedom to move about the game, especially within songs. Taking away the point-oriented mechanics in the songs would allow other mechanics to be implemented such as song recording, improvisation, and practice modes. Explorers also may enjoy the chance to learn about the songs that they play (such as the history of the song writers or the cultural relevance of the song). Self-Validators may need practice modes and the ability to slow down songs or to forgive more mistakes. The negative feedback that accompanies mistakes could also be removed for both Self-Validators and Explorers, taking away the audience meter and booing which can force a song to end in failure.

### *Keep it in Mind*



Keep it in Mind is a short term memory game. Players select the category of items with wish to remember (numbers, letters, words, patterns, objects) and the difficulty level. The player is initially shown two items from their selected category and is asked to remember them, in the order shown. When trying to remember the items in a round the player is then shown 8 items for easy rounds and 16 items for medium and hard rounds which include the items they are trying to remember. The player picks out the items they remember. After each round players have the option of repeating the current number of items, advancing to try to remember one more item, or starting over at 2 items.

Of the 8 games, Keep It In Mind is the most oriented to Self-Validators because of it combines extrinsic rewards and complete player control over the challenge level. Achievers and Self-Validators can both enjoy the frequent extrinsic rewards of genius percent (accuracy) and speed that are shown after every challenge. Achievers can choose advanced difficulty level and work to remember all 7 items. Self-

Validators can stick with challenges they succeed at easily. Explorers' needs are met only by being able to try a variety of cognitive domains and subcategories of items to remember.

Keep it in Mind could adapt to Explorers by allowing more customization and player generation of content. Players could add their own set of items to remember or allow them to mix and match sets of items to play with. For Achievers the game could include more awards and goals during gameplay.

### *Play the News*



Play the News players become more informed about issues of the day. A player selects an issue to play, for example election coverage or regional skirmishes, and is presented with background information about the issues. Once players have examined the background information they are asked a question about the outcome of that issue. They are asked what outcome they believe *should* happen and they are asked to predict what outcome *will* happen. Each player is ranked as to how whether her or his “should” votes match the votes of other players (popular opinion). The game keeps statistics on player prediction accuracy. (This cannot be tabulated until the issue is resolved in real life, usually one to a few weeks after game play.) Players can also generate content in the form of creating their own games (based around a current event) and by writing or responding to other players' comments about the news.

The game oriented to Explorers. Play the News requires players to understand the ideas behind each issue they are presented with in order to do well in the game. Thus, being able to predict the outcomes with a high accuracy is a by-product of learning about the issues being presented. Explorers likely enjoy generating games and discussing the issues with other players. The game does include extrinsic rewards in the form of badges and awards such as Predictor of the Week or Streak (correctly predicting 3 issues in a row). Achievers may end up playing every issue in order to level up and become known winner. Self-Validators will be deterred by having their performance be public. They will not enjoy being wrong so will probably stick to issues that they know a lot about.

Play the News could be adapted to appeal more to Self-Validators by allowing players the option of hiding their prediction accuracy. This would allow those players to give out information when they feel comfortable doing so. For Achievers, adding gambling style mechanics to the game could add more risk, for instance letting players state how sure they are about their answer or letting players vote without seeing any information.

### *Puzzle Quest: Challenge of the Warlords (DS)*



Puzzle Quest is a RPG/puzzle game that takes place in a fantasy world. Players choose a class (profession) and must improve their skill statistics throughout the game in order to succeed at harder challenges as the story progresses. Players' skills are enhanced by items players can purchase and magic spells players can learn. All fighting and research is performed using a Bejeweled-style gameplay where players competitively match gems on a game-board to receive related points. The puzzles are one shot endeavors: the player either wins or loses. They earn money and experience points for each puzzle based on their success.

As is common in RPG games, Puzzle Quest is strongly oriented to extrinsic rewards for a wide variety of player actions. All battles eventually reward players with money or general experience points. Achievers will enjoy continually harder challenges. Self-Validators may not enjoy the game because rewarding success with a harder challenge is not their idea of a good reward. Explorers may enjoy the game much more than Self-Validators since they will get pleasure from the storyline, the many items and spells, and the ability to create their own items. Since Explorers by nature will explore and learn about what the game provides they will be better at solving challenges than Self-Validators who are not as curious.

Since Self-Validators have the roughest time playing Puzzle Quest the game could adapt to this player type by providing tailored help. For example, Self-Validators would benefit from practice turns in battle where they can see how their next move or spell will affect their enemy. The game could also list items and spells that the player has not seen yet along with hints about how to acquire the ones they need. Battles would also need to be rewarded by more than just money and experience; items and spells given automatically after battle could equip Self-Validators face future challenges. To appeal more to Explorers, Puzzle Quest could add new game mechanics (such as managing a cities or trading) so long as those mechanics do not hinder the progress of achievement-oriented players.

## Across Game Synthesis

### *Design for Individual Player Types*

There are commonalities between the games that we have analyzed above that can lead us to make general prescriptions for games designed for each of the three player types. Each player type affords different design decisions and examples of what can be provided for each player type include:

Achievers need an increasing set of challenges and strict goals to follow. This includes: building dynamic difficulty systems, having specific points in the game that are extremely challenging, and performance metrics that rank players. Achievers should also be provided with goal-specific and unique constraints to overcome, and should be rewarded as they complete those goals.

Self-Validators need easier challenges where the game adapts to the skills players like to use most and rewards players implicitly as they make progress through the game. Self-Validators also need forgiving games, ones that give them gameplay hints, allow practice sessions, avoid negative feedback and enable them to hide bad performances.

Explorers do not necessarily need challenge, but if challenge is included it should revolve around in-depth game content. This can include more storyline information and greater number of mechanic choices. Explorers also enjoy having the means to test hypotheses and study the game-world through customization and free access to more game content.

Table 1 shows the complete set of games and how well each currently serves Achievers, Self-Validators, and Explorers.

Table 1  
*Games, their genre and well-served player types*

Game	Genre	Player Motivation
Bioshock	FPS	

Guitar Hero	play along	
Keep It In Mind	brain game	
Puzzle Quest	puzzle/RPG	
Animal Crossing	virtual life	
Budget Hero	budget simulation	
FIOW	sensory experience	
Play The News	current events	

Considering the games we have analyzed, games tend to primarily serve either the Explorer or Achiever player type. Focusing on one of these player types (e.g. Explorers) often means that a game serves the opposite player type (e.g. Achievers) less well. In terms of how well games serve the three player types,

we tend to see either or else . Self-Validators are often supported to some extent within each game, through user-selectable difficulty settings and other challenge monitoring adaptive features. However, not every game we analyzed supported our player types in this order. Puzzle Quest, Keep it in Mind, and Play the News either focused on the Self-Validator type as their main player type or as their weakest type.

### *Overlap between Player Types*

In addition to understanding how each game serves one or another player, developers also can consider how these player types connect to one another. In the sections below these connections and the mutual traits of each player type pair are discussed.

#### *Achievers and Explorers*

Both of these player types enjoy learning as much as they can about a game, just for different reasons. Achievers learn as much as they can about a game to help them achieve more. If that learning does not connect back to achievement, Achievers will lose interest. Explorers learn as much as they can about a game because they are curious and like learning. A pure Explorer (one who is not also an Achiever) has no need for goals or achievement in a game. Puzzle Quest, an RPG, serves Achievers and Explorers by giving them a large content set and many goals to reach or explore. This leaves Self-Validators lost because they are faced with a game that has enormous depth, which the player must dive into in order to succeed, without sufficient help.

#### *Achievers and Self-Validators*

These two player types have extrinsic motivations in common. They both work towards rewards and judgments of their performance. They are also similar because Achievers, while they wish to perform as

best as they can, have to start somewhere, usually at the challenge level that Self-Validators enjoy. Therefore, games like Bioshock and Guitar Hero can provide a spectrum of difficulty where both player types can enjoy playing the game. This can alienate Explorers because they have to play through the same redundant challenges as the other two player types which restrain them from exploring.

### *Explorers and Self-Validators*

Since Self-Validators do not like extreme challenges (unless they succeed) and Explorers like to explore content at their choosing, games that provide easier means of progression through the game can work for both player types. Also, Explorers like to study and play with the mechanics provided within games, including customization. This feature also helps Self-Validators to set the difficulty of the game's challenges to a level that is comfortable. This leaves Achievers unfulfilled because players can progress through the game and earn rewards without any significant skill or mastery. It is not a fair competition when the same goals are made easier for players who want them to be easy.

### *Must Players Be A Single Type?*

As we already discussed, motivation research on learning and game research on play style show that extrinsic and intrinsic rewards are not necessarily mutually exclusive (Lepper and Henderlong, 2000, Yee, 2008). Among the four co-authors of this manuscript, one is a pure Explorer and the other three are self-described Achiever-Explorers. In different games and at different times when playing the same game a player may orient more towards one primary type. Self-Validator and Achiever motivations are the least likely to coexist. It would be contradictory for a player to prefer easy successes and hard challenges.

### *Changing How Players Play*

Finally, another way that games may use player types is to introduce ways to change a player's motivation into a different one. The most logical instance of this would be to subtly nudge a Self-Validator into being more of an Achiever. Dweck's (2006) research has shown that mindsets can be changed. Since Self-Validators focus on whether they are being judged favorably or unfavorably rather than on whether they are learning, an adaptive system might be designed to nudge them to focus more on mastery. This could include giving them hints throughout the game about how learning from failure can greatly increase players' chances of future success. Focusing players' attention more on nuanced strategies and context and giving feedback that helps players improve could move them towards playing as an Achiever rather than a Self-Validator. Also, enabling them to review their progress and to replay content would improve understanding and encourage them try new ideas and techniques.

## DISCUSSION

### Implications for Learning and Other Serious Game Design

Games for learning are more likely to be played by Self-Validators than are games for entertainment because players are often forced to play and because success in the game tends to be linked to sensitive constructs such as intelligence, ability, and real world advancement. Unlike entertainment games in which a player's performance can be private, the teacher or supervisor may monitor in-game achievement. All of these factors encourage potentially susceptible players to adopt a Self-Validator approach. The Self-Validator Fixed mindset interferes with classroom learning and with learning in games. Rather than "lowering the stakes" and offering easy challenges, learning game designers may instead want to dampen the sting of failure. This can be done by careful attention to the tone and content of player feedback for both success and failure. Feedback that focuses on player performance (for example, in Budget Hero, "you completed the Health and Wellness and the Competitive Advantage budget badges but did not complete the Energy Independence badge") rather than feedback that evaluates the player (for example, in

Budget Hero, “you’re almost a budget hero”) can help nudge Self-Validators towards a mastery orientation.

Games and learning scholar James Gee writes that “good computer and video games are complex, challenging, and long; they can take 50 or more hours to finish” (p. 45). Gee points out that failing is part of playing a video game. Failure in video games “allow[s] players to take risks and try out hypotheses...” (p. 153). In fact, failing is a key mechanism in games by which players learn and improve. Self-Validator seems to be a dysfunctional player type for learning games. Gee’s celebration of the gamer ethic of learning from failure works well for Achievers but not for Self-Validators. Similarly, the benefits from cognitive games can best be realized if the player can be enticed into taking on hard challenges.

Thus, game designers want to discourage players adopting a Self-Validator play style, without driving players away. Careful crafting of feedback might help nudge players into an Achiever style. If players are seriously concerned about their cognitive health, the feedback can be quite prescriptive. Here is a hypothetical example of feedback designed to entice Self-Validators to play like Achievers. “You correctly remembered 3 items (quartz, tiger eye, and granite) and missed two (azurite and jade). Trying hard challenges helps keep brains healthy. Repeat the 5 item challenge and earn two-for-one points or go back to the easier challenge of 4 items.” Serious games can also add content and depth to interest Explorers and to encourage players to experience intrinsic rewards from playing and learning.

### Implications for Game Design

A main take away from this work is that it is likely helpful for designers to be aware of the commonalities and differences between (as well as simply the existence of) the discussed player types. While it is not an exhaustive review of all player motivations (e.g. social or physical health goals are not taken into account), it does offer a clear picture of the kinds of game mechanics in various game genres that map to these player types.

This illumination can be put to use in two different ways. The first is simply to help designers and producers make a more informed decision on how to make games for target audiences. Further research needs to be done on exploring the distribution of these player types in different populations (e.g. what percentage of 18-25 year old males are Achievers?); however, having a clearer idea of the motivations of a target audience can influence the design process for a given game. Inversely, understanding how a game’s design relates to the motivations of different audiences can help a team understand which audiences are likely to play it.

The second use of this work is in the application of our knowledge of player types to the intelligent adaptation of games. As described by Magerko (2008), games have the potential to be intelligently adapted based on models of the player interacting with it. Designers do not have to necessarily build incredibly large or complex games that have something for everyone (e.g. World of Warcraft arguably has game features for most player types) in order to target multiple player types. The deconstruction of multiple games done earlier in the paper illustrates of how games have multiple possible versions of the core game idea that can appeal to multiple types of players. Therefore, games have the potential to be designed as flexible media experiences that adapt based on the type of player interacting with it. For example, if an Explorer is playing Guitar Hero, then it may alter the gameplay to incorporate the kinds of recommendations we make above (e.g. including music history content to explore about the songs in the game). This adaptive approach to games has the potential to provide a powerfully individualized experience to game players. Our current work on designing games that provide this kind of adaptivity is described in Magerko et al. (2008).

## REFERENCES

- Bartle, R. (1990). *Interactive multi-user computer games*. MUSE Ltd, British Telecom, December.
- Bartle, R. (2006). Hearts, clubs, diamonds, spades: Players who suit MUDs. In K. Salen and E. Zimmerman (Eds.), *The Game Design Reader* (pp. 754-787). Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Casual Games Market Report (2007). All about casual. Retrieved July 9, 2007, from Casual Connect Web site: [http://www.casualconnect.org/newscontent/11-2007/CasualGamesMarketReport2007\\_Summary.pdf](http://www.casualconnect.org/newscontent/11-2007/CasualGamesMarketReport2007_Summary.pdf)
- Dawson, C. R., A. Cragg, Taylor, C. & Toombs, B. (2007). *Video Games: Research to improve understanding of what players enjoy about video games, and to explain their preferences for particular games*, British Board of Film Classification (BBFC).
- Dweck, C. (2000). *Self-Theories: Their role in motivation, personality, and development*. Philadelphia, PA: Taylor & Francis.
- Dweck, C. (2006). *Mindset: The new psychology of success*. New York: Random House.
- Dweck, C. S., & Leggett, E. L. (1988). A social-cognitive approach to motivation and personality. *Psychological Review*, 95, 256-273.
- Elliot, E. S., & Church, M. A. (1997). A hierarchal model of approach and avoidance achievement motivation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 72, 218-232.
- Gee, J. (2007). *Good Video Games + Good Learning: Collected Essays on Video Games, Language, and Learning*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Heeter, C., & Winn, B. (2008). Implications of gender, player type and learning strategies for the design of games for learning. In Y. Kafai, C. Heeter, J. Denner, & J. Sun (Eds.), *Beyond Barbie and Mortal Kombat: New perspectives on gender and gaming*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Heeter, C., Winn, B., Winn, J., & Bozoki, A. (2008). "The challenge of challenge: Avoiding and embracing difficulty in a memory game," Meaningful Play Conference, East Lansing, Michigan, October.
- Ko, S. (2002). An Empirical Analysis of Children's Thinking and Learning in a Computer Game Context. *Educational Psychology*, 22:2 pp. 219-233.
- Lazzaro, Nicole (2007). The 4 Most Important Emotions of Game Design. Game Developers Conference, San Francisco.
- Lee, F. K., Sheldon, K. M., & Turban, D. B. (2003). Personality and the goal striving process: The influence of achievement goal patterns, goal level, and mental focus on performance and enjoyment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 256-265.
- Lepper, M. R., Aspinwall, L. G., Mumme, D. L., & Chabay, R.W. (1990). Self-perception and social perception processes in tutoring: Subtle social control strategies of expert tutors. In J. Olson & M. P. Zanna (Eds.), *Self inference processes: The Sixth Ontario Symposium in Social*



*Psychology* (pp. 217-237). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Lepper, M. R., & Henderlong, J. (2000). Turning “play” into “work” and “work” into “play”: 25 years of research on intrinsic versus extrinsic motivation. In C. Sansone & J. M. Harackiewicz (Eds.), *Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation: the search for optimal motivation and performance* (pp 257-307). San Diego: Academic Press.

Magerko, B. (2008). Adaptation in Digital Games. Entertainment Computing Column, *IEEE Computer Magazine*, 41(6), pp. 87-89.

Magerko, B., Heeter, C., Medler, B., & Fitzgerald, J. (2008). *Intelligent Adaptation of Digital Game-Based Learning*. FuturePlay conference, Toronto.

Mangels, J. A., Butterfield, B., Lamb, J., Good, C.D., & Dweck, C.S. (2006). Why do beliefs about intelligence influence learning success? A social-cognitive-neuroscience model. *Social, Cognitive, and Affective Neuroscience*, 1, 75-86.

Mahncke, H. et al. (2006). “Memory enhancement in healthy older adults using a brain plasticity-based training program: A randomized, controlled study,” Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, Aug 15, 103:33.

Playyoo (2008). *Snacking on casual games*. Retrieved July 9, 2008, from Playyoo Blog: <http://blog.playyoo.com/tags/casual-games/>

PopCap Games (2006). Press Release: *Study: Women Choose 'Casual' Videogames Over TV; 100 Million+ Women Now Play Regularly, for Different Reasons than Men*. Retrieved October 2, 2008, from Popcap Games Web site: <http://www.popcap.com/press/release.php?gid=2006-10-02>

Seldin, T. (2008). “Montessori 101: Some basic information that every Montessori parent should know.” Retrieved June 11, 2008 from Montessori Web site: [http://www.montessori.org/sitefiles/Montessori\\_101\\_nonprintable.pdf](http://www.montessori.org/sitefiles/Montessori_101_nonprintable.pdf)

Squire, K., & Steinkuehler, C. (2006). Generating CyberCulture/s: The case of Star Wars Galaxies. In D. Gibbs & K. Krause (Eds.), *Cyberlines2: Languages and cultures of the Internet (2nd edition)*. Albert Park, Australia: James Nicholas Publishers.

Yee, N. (2007). Motivations of Play in Online Games. *Journal of CyberPsychology and Behavior*, 9, 772-775.

Yee, N. (2008). “Maps of Digital Desires: Exploring the Topography of Gender and Play in Online Games,” in Y. Kafai, C. Heeter, J Denner, and J. Sun (Eds.), *Beyond Barbie and Mortal Kombat: New perspectives in gender and gaming*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.