

**DANIEL ARANDA, JORDI SÁNCHEZ-NAVARRO, JUAN-FRANCISCO
MARTÍNEZ-CERDÀ AND JULIO MENESES**
Open University of Catalonia

The impact of digital practices on the perception of risks and benefits of digital gaming

ABSTRACT

1. This study introduces a new multivariate framework around a set of digital
2. practices such as entertainment-oriented uses, information-oriented uses, social-
3. connection uses and e-commerce uses, and shows that these digital practices are,
4. in fact, important predictors of the positive and negative perceptions of digital
5. gaming. We developed two multiple regression models on a representative sample
6. of the Spanish population. After controlling for socio-demographic factors (age,
7. gender and level of education), our models reveal that gaming-related perceptions
8. of benefits and risks are associated with people's concrete personal experiences with
9. digital games and, interestingly, to the greater or lesser development of their digi-
10. tal practices. We show that the perceptions of benefits with regard to video games
11. are related to more developed digital practices. Conversely, the perceptions of risk
12. are higher in the case of individuals who lack exposure and experiences regarding
13. digital practices.
- 14.
- 15.
- 16.
- 17.
- 18.
- 19.

KEYWORDS

digital games
game culture
media effects
media perceptions
digital practices
video games

INTRODUCTION

In a context of ubiquitous play (AEVI 2016; Asociación para la investigación de medios de comunicación [AIMC] 2018; Kerr 2017; Muriel and Crawford 2018; Zimmerman 2015), the debate about the effects of playable media emerges with force, and it has implications at many levels, from cultural to legislative, from creative to industrial. In this article we show that perceptions of benefits and risks of digital gaming among the Spanish population are directly related to how often the respondents play digital games, as well as to the frequency and characteristics of other everyday digital practices in which individuals engage. For this purpose, we carried out a survey as part of the World Internet Project (WIP) Spain study,¹ and, in order to ascertain the variables that determine the perceptions of risk and benefit of playing video games, we constructed a multivariate framework around entertainment-oriented uses, information-oriented uses, social-connection uses and e-commerce uses.

In short, given that digital gaming is increasingly ubiquitous and is distributed among practically all age groups and across a diversity of socio-demographic characteristics (Eurostat 2016; Kerr 2017; Mäyrä 2017), we investigated the subject using a multivariate approach that analyses perceptions of risks and benefits of video games beyond socio-demographic differences such as age, gender or level of education. In the following section, we examine the theoretical bases and methodologies used in recent studies that justify our multivariate approach. After that, we propose a set of research questions that seek to deepen the relationship between perceptions of risks and benefits, socio-demographic characteristics and digital practices of the Spanish population. Then we explain the method followed to carry out the fieldwork and analysis, and finally, we present the results and discuss them.

THEORETICAL CONTEXT

A huge volume of literature has explored the effects of the media and also the perceptions that people have about these effects. For our approach to the perception of the risks and benefits of digital gaming, we will summarize the scientific contributions that guide our research in two groups: the literature on the effects, that is, on the risks and benefits of digital gaming; and the literature on society's perception of those effects.

Effects: Benefits and risks of digital gaming

There is a huge body of scholarship focusing on the negative aspects of digital gaming, such as psychological disorders (Chappell et al. 2006), aggressiveness (Anderson 2002; Gentile and Gentile 2008) and racist and sexist behaviour (Burgess et al. 2011; Dickerman et al. 2008; Leonard 2003). As Griffiths (2016) asserts, there is some research that shows evidence that excessive video game playing may lead or be related to both negative psychosocial and health or medical consequences such as sacrificing of work, education, hobbies, socializing, time with partner/family, and sleep, increased stress, lower psychosocial well-being, poorer social skills, epileptic seizures, auditory and visual hallucinations, and wrist pain, neck and elbow pain.

Bushman et al. (2015), in a study on the views of media psychologists, mass communication scientists, paediatricians and parents, state that there is

1. some consensus on the causal relationship between playing video games and
 2. suffering from the negative effects that they are supposed to have. However,
 3. Bowman (2016: 32) points out that new data are challenging some findings
 4. related to factors such as isolation or lack of physical fitness among gamers,
 5. mentioning that a survey of 7000 *EverQuest II* players found players to have
 6. lower body mass index scores than the general population, and that a major
 7. motivator for their continued play was for social interaction.

8. Thus, in the study on negative effects of video games, such as aggressive-
 9. ness or negative psychosocial consequences, there is no real consensus among
 10. scholars: only 10.1 per cent of researchers recognize a relationship between
 11. the effects of digital games and aggression (Coulon and Ferguson 2016: 70).
 12. In fact, the study by Quandt et al. (2015), which examines the opinions of
 13. researchers working in game studies, evidenced that there is no clear consen-
 14. sus on the negative effects of video games, but there is some consensus on the
 15. benefits of gaming.

16. In this positive vein, some other research draws attention to how digital
 17. gaming – but also gaming in its broadest sense – has beneficial or favour-
 18. able effects in the context of culture, socialization, active participation or
 19. skills. Some research explains and describes how people obtain pleasure and
 20. fun as a fundamental tool for cultural reproduction (Huizinga 1955; Sherry
 21. 2004); others conducted research into how creative participation is promoted
 22. through video game fan communities (Consalvo 2007; Hills 2002; Wirman
 23. 2009), or into the ways players socialize and strengthen bonds with their
 24. peers and at the same time generate exchange networks (Dondi et al. 2004;
 25. Jansz and Marten 2005; Taylor 2006; Zagal 2010; Muriel and Crawford 2018).
 26. In relation to skills, some research shows to what degree video games are
 27. good tools for situated learning or beneficial practices that promote dialogue
 28. and creation (Gee 2004a, 2004b; Lacasa 2011; Mitchell and Savill-Smith 2004;
 29. Whitton 2009, 2014).

31. **Perceptions: The public debate on digital gaming**

32. As stated before, researchers have not reached a consensus on the effects
 33. of digital gaming, and there is even more debate among the general public.
 34. While the scientific debate is driven by the analysis of *evidence* of risks and
 35. benefits, public debate on digital gaming is often driven by *perception* of
 36. risks and benefits. The general public's perceptions of the effects of digi-
 37. tal gaming emerge through moral panic, third-person effects and social
 38. distance effects.
 39.

40. Put briefly, moral panics (Cohen 1972; Goode and Ben-Yehuda 1994; Hall
 41. et al. 1978; McRobbie and Thornton 1995; Thompson 1998) are disproportion-
 42. ate reactions to perceived threats or fears that are not rooted in science. As
 43. stated by Cohen,

44.
 45. Societies appear to be subject, every now and then, to periods of moral
 46. panic. A condition, episode, a person or group of persons emerges to
 47. become defined as a threat to societal values and interests; its nature is
 48. presented in a stylized and stereotypical fashion by the mass media; the
 49. moral barricades are manned by editors, bishops, politicians and other
 50. right-thinking people; socially accredited experts pronounce their diag-
 51. noses and solutions.

(1972: 9)

Critcher points out that moral panics are 'reaction to changes: bad things are happening which didn't used to' (2006: 7). On the other side, the third-person perception phenomenon (Davison 1983) states that negative perceptions vary with social distance. In this sense, Davison asserts that

We are all experts on those subjects that matter to us, in that we have information not available to other people. This information may not be of a factual or technical nature; it may have to do with our own experiences, likes, and dislikes. Other people, we reason, do not know what we know. Therefore, they are more likely to be influenced by the media.

(1983: 9)

In relation to social distance, Ivory and Kalyanaraman (2009) state that the research on perceptions of negative effects points out that social distance plays also an important role: the relationship with, or the knowledge about, a concrete social practice may have an impact on how it is perceived. In the case of video gaming, Przybylski (2013) states that those less experienced with video games are more likely to fear them. The study by Przybylski shows that perception of violence is not due merely to individual defensiveness or social identity bias caused by moral panics (Critcher 2006; McRobbie and Thornton 1995) or the third-person effect (Davison 1983). Instead, the author states that 'those who grew up in a world without electronic games, or lack experience with games, are most likely to endorse the idea that violent games are a material source of society's ills' (Przybylski 2014: 233).

Taking into account the research by Ivory and Kalyanaraman (2009), we can establish that one of the main factors that influence perceptions, and thus our judgements, is the abstraction in the content. The perceptions of negative media effects vary depending on the closeness or vagueness in terms of the available information we have in practice (Cohen et al. 1988; Hoffner et al. 2001; McLeod et al. 1997). As a general rule, the less a person plays video games or is in contact with others who play them, the more likely s/he is to perceive video games as risky. To put it another way, the lack of knowledge of a specific practice has implications for the perception thereof, especially as regards the risks and benefits that the practice entails (Holtz 2014).

In summary, there is a great number of studies that examine perceptions of the risks and benefits in digital gaming. Many studies (Bushman et al. 2015; Chappell et al. 2006; Griffiths 2016; Quandt et al. 2015; Aranda et al. 2017) have identified relationships between perceptions of risks and benefits and socio-demographic variables such as gender (male-female), education (low vs high education levels) or age (young vs adults).

Other studies (Ivory and Kalyanaraman 2009; Przybylski 2014) go further and show that these perceptions vary according to people's personal experience or abstract knowledge of video games and not only because of basic socio-demographic variables. As stated by Przybylski, knowledge of video games, or thinking about games in purely theoretical terms, is associated with the perception of risk in the playing video games (2014). From this point of view, we can consider that what unifies a group in terms of their perceptions, abilities, skills, tastes or practices relating to digital culture and video games are not only the classic socio-demographic factors such as age, level of education and gender, but also 'certain attributes and experiences related to how they interact with information technologies, information itself, one another, and other people and institutions' (Palfrey and Gasser 2008: 246).

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The aim of this article is to analyse the relationship between some digital practices and the perceptions of risks and benefits of playing video games. To do so, our study is guided by three research questions (RQs):

- RQ1: What perceptions does the Spanish population have about video games in terms of their risks and benefits?
- RQ2: What is the relationship between the perceptions of risks and benefits of video games and the participants' socio-demographic characteristics?
- RQ3: What is the role of related digital practices (entertainment, information, social connection and e-commerce) in the perceptions of risks and benefits of video games apart from the socio-demographic differences observed?

In order to answer these questions, we have designed a construct to define the variables orbiting around digital experience or competence, bearing in mind that they are all part of a wider social practice that could be defined as 'digital practice', according to the definition by Reckwitz:

A routinized type of behaviour that consists of several elements, interconnected to one another: forms of bodily activities, forms of mental activities, 'things' and their use, a background knowledge in the form of understanding, know-how, states of emotion and motivational knowledge.

(2002: 249)

The definition of variables around digital experience, and not necessarily around playing video games, enables us to investigate whether there is a significant relationship between this digital experience and perceptions of risks and benefits, bearing in mind that that perception can be observed not only through the information available on the specific practice, but also through the context of which the practice is a part. Based on the administered questionnaire, we have determined that entertainment-oriented uses, information-oriented uses, social-connection uses and e-commerce uses are directly related to individuals' competence in the digital context, and have a direct impact in terms of playing video games.

METHOD

WIP Spain

The source for the data used in this research is the Spanish chapter of the WIP, an international project that originated at the UCLA Center for Communication Policy (now the USC Annenberg School Center for the Digital Future) and was founded with the School of Communication Studies in Singapore (Nanyang Technological University) and the *Osservatorio Internet Italia* at Bocconi University in Milan, Italy. The *WIP Spain* is working with data from a biennial survey of a representative sample of the Spanish population. In our research, we specifically considered the data for the year 2013, with the overall aim of producing a diagnosis of the use, knowledge and assessment of the use of the Internet in Spain, at a time when the use of new technologies is increasing in all areas of society.

Sample

This article uses data gathered through a survey using a nationally representative random sample of 1600 people aged 16 and older in Spain. The sampling procedure followed a three-stage selection process with proportional allocation to avoid biases: (1) primary sampling units, municipalities, were randomly selected taking into account the population distribution of the seventeen autonomous communities in Spain; (2) secondary sampling units, households from all the provinces belonging to each Autonomous Community, were randomly selected by phone number; and (3) individuals within households were selected taking into account the population distribution regarding sex, age and size of the municipality. Data were gathered by computer-assisted telephone interviewing (CATI) in December 2013. The margin of error for the total sample is ± 2.45 per cent. Table 1 shows the almost even distribution between men and women in the sample (47 per cent of the respondents were men) with an average age of the respondents of 45.18 years and a standard deviation of 17.61, and an average level of education close to completion of post-secondary education ($M=1.83$, with a standard deviation of 1.03).

Measures

Socio-demographics and individual-level information

Participants were asked to provide socio-demographic information regarding gender, age and educational level. Age was recorded using a six-level ordinal scale (i.e., 16–18, 19–24, 25–34, 35–49, 50–64 and 65 and over) in order to provide a meaningful interpretation of the observed effects and to being able to compare different life stages. The highest level of education successfully completed was recorded according to ISCED 2011 (UNESCO 2012), using a four-level ordinal scale that includes primary education, secondary education, post-secondary non-tertiary education and tertiary education (i.e., Bachelor's, Master's, doctoral or equivalent degrees).

Digital practices

The participants in the research provided information about the frequency of their Internet use for thirteen activities. To that end, an ad hoc Likert scale was used with the following six response alternatives: 'never', 'less than once a month', 'every month', 'every week', 'every day' and 'several times a day'. The activities involving the use of the Internet were divided into the following four areas:

Principal Component Analysis (PCA) showed an acceptable four-component structure for these thirteen variables ($KMO=0.837$ and a significant Bartlett's test, $p<0.001$), explaining 65.56 per cent of the total variance. The Oblimin rotation method with Kaiser normalization provided component loadings ranging from 0.730 to 0.868 (Entertainment-oriented uses), from 0.631 to 0.864 (Information-oriented uses), from 0.712 to 0.862 (Social-connection uses) and from 0.750 to 0.795 (E-commerce uses). Finally, the reliability analysis of the compounded factors showed a Cronbach's α of 0.745 for Entertainment-oriented uses, 0.708 for Information-oriented uses, 0.830 for Social-connection uses and 0.676 for E-commerce uses.

Frequency of video game playing

Interviewees provided information about the frequency of their use of video games. This was measured using an ad hoc Likert scale according to the following three levels: 'never', 'sometimes' and 'habitually'. The question specifically

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7.
8.
9.
10.
11.
12.
13.
14.
15.
16.
17.
18.
19.
20.
21.
22.
23.
24.
25.
26.
27.
28.
29.
30.
31.
32.
33.
34.
35.
36.
37.
38.
39.
40.
41.
42.
43.
44.
45.
46.
47.
48.
49.
50.
51.
52.

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.	Entertainment-oriented uses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • downloading or watching videos, • downloading or listening to music, • searching for amusing and entertaining content
6. 7. 8. 9. 10. 11.	Information-oriented uses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • looking for the definition or meaning of a word, • looking for or checking a fact, • finding information about a product (a car, a book, technology, etc.)
12. 13. 14. 15. 16. 17. 18. 19. 20.	Social-connection uses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • posting messages or comments on social media, • posting user-created content (videos, photos, text, etc.), • re-posting and sharing links and content (videos, photos, text, etc.) created by others, • posting messages and comments in discussion forums
21. 22. 23. 24.	E-commerce uses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • online banking, • paying bills, • shopping online

26.
27.
28.
29.
30.

included the possibility of playing video games using various types of digital devices. The question in the questionnaire was therefore, 'Do you play or have you played video games on a console, computer, or mobile phone, or games on social media?'.
31.

32. *Perceived benefits and risks of digital gaming*

33. Interviewees reported their level of agreement on a Likert-type scale with five levels ranging from 'strongly disagree' to 'strongly agree' with eight statements related to the benefits and risks of digital games. Four of these statements presented perceived benefits including 'video games stimulate memory and attention', 'learning through play is a natural way to learn', 'video games can release stress' and 'useful things are learned with video games'. Another four statements presented perceived risks including 'video games cause anxiety and nervousness', 'video games make players isolated', 'video games cause addiction' and 'violent video games make those who play them behave violently'.
34.
35.
36.
37.
38.
39.
40.
41.

42. PCA showed an acceptable two-component structure for these eight items (KMO=0.785 and a significant Bartlett's test, $p < 0.001$), explaining 62.09% of the total variance in perceived benefits (25.84%) and perceived risks (36.25%). The rotated component solution (Varimax with Kaiser normalization) provided component loadings ranging from 0.665 to 0.816, and from 0.690 to 0.890, respectively. Both components also showed an acceptable reliability, with a Cronbach's α of 0.718 and 0.845.
43.
44.
45.
46.
47.
48.
49.

50. **Analysis**

51. In order to answer the research questions, we began with a descriptive analysis and by exploring the correlations of our measures. To that end, we calculated
52.

various indices based on the scales of the constituent items and the meaning of its theoretical construct. Various tests of statistical significance were used depending on the scale of the variables considered in the analysis: Pearson's r for continuous variables, Spearman's rho (r_s) for ordinal variables and pairs of continuous and ordinal variables, the point-biserial correlation (r_{pb}) for continuous and dichotomous variables, and phi (r) for dichotomous variables and pairs of ordinal and dichotomous variables. These correlation coefficients are shown in Table 1.

We then carried out two multiple linear regressions in order to determine the relationship between the perceptions of benefits and risks of video games, as dependent variables, and the other independent variables considered in the models. The ordinal variables were recoded (dummy coded) for inclusion in the models. Table 2 shows the results, and presents the regression coefficients (B), standard errors (SE), t -tests of significance and their corresponding standardized versions (Beta), which are useful for determining the relative importance of the different variables in the models. F -tests and R^2 values served to evaluate the significance and the overall fit of the two multiple linear regression models.

RESULTS

Descriptive and bivariate analyses

Table 1 shows that Spaniards appear to have a fairly neutral opinion regarding the benefits of video games ($M=3.10$, with a standard deviation of 0.95) and appear to be in slight agreement as regards their risks ($M=3.81$, with a standard deviation of 1.04). As regards digital practices, most respondents use the Internet several times a month, although they do not do so weekly, for Information-oriented uses ($M=3.41$, with a standard deviation of 1.03), followed by several times a month for Entertainment-oriented uses ($M=2.84$, with a standard deviation of 1.33) and for Social-connection uses ($M=2.51$, with a standard deviation of 1.35). Finally, E-commerce uses are performed in a frequency of slightly less than once a month ($M=1.97$, with a standard deviation of 0.91). Moreover, Spaniards generally play video games, although they report doing so sporadically or infrequently ($M=0.64$, with a standard deviation of 0.73).

As for relationships between pairs of variables, we first observed that the socio-demographic variables have no significant relationship with the perceived benefits of video games. On the contrary, the other variables considered in the study present significant positive correlations in all cases. Specifically, Entertainment-oriented uses have the highest association ($r=0.21$, $p<0.001$), which is higher than Information-oriented uses ($r=0.11$, $p<0.001$), Social-connection uses ($r=0.10$, $p<0.01$) and E-commerce uses ($r=0.09$, $p<0.01$). In this regard, the frequency of playing video games has the same relationship ($r_s=0.21$, $p<0.001$) as digital practices oriented towards consuming media content.

All the variables considered in the analysis show a statistically significant correlation for the opinion on the risks of video games. The most risks are therefore perceived by older people ($r=0.21$, $p<0.001$), a view that is shared by the women interviewed ($r_{pb}=-0.16$, $p<0.001$) and those with a lower educational level ($r_s=-0.10$, $p<0.001$). All the other variables have values that indicate that the lower the frequency of Internet use, the greater the sensitivity to the risks of video games. In specific terms, the frequency of Entertainment-oriented uses has the strongest association ($r=-0.28$, $p<0.001$), which is stronger than Social-connection uses ($r=-0.18$, $p<0.001$), E-commerce

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7.
8.
9.
10.
11.
12.
13.
14.
15.
16.
17.
18.
19.
20.
21.
22.
23.
24.
25.
26.
27.
28.
29.
30.
31.
32.
33.
34.
35.
36.
37.
38.
39.
40.
41.
42.
43.
44.
45.
46.
47.
48.
49.
50.
51.
52.

	M	SD	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
Benefits of video games (1)	3.10	0.95	-									
Risks of video games (2)	3.81	1.04	-0.13***									
Digital practices												
Entertainment-oriented uses (3)	2.84	1.33	0.21***	-0.28***	-							
Information-oriented uses (4)	3.41	1.03	0.11***	-0.14***	0.44***							
Social-connection uses (5)	2.51	1.35	0.10**	-0.18***	0.49***	0.35***	0.20***					
E-commerce uses (6)	1.97	0.91	0.09**	-0.16***	0.15***	0.30***						
Frequency of video game playing (7)	0.64	0.73	0.21***	-0.33***	0.43***	0.19***	0.31***	0.06*				
Gender (8)	0.47	0.50	0.05	-0.16***	0.16***	0.06*	0.01	0.11***	0.08**			
Age (9)	45.18	17.61	-0.04	0.21***	-0.52***	-0.32***	-0.44***	-0.05	-0.41***	-0.04		
Education (10)	1.83	1.03	0.02	-0.10***	-0.04	0.17***	0.04	0.32***	-0.02	0.06*	-0.11***	

Notes: Benefits of video games (1)={1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neutral, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly agree}. Risks of video games (2)={1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neutral, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly agree}. Entertainment-oriented uses (3)={1=Never, 2=Less than once a month, 3=Every month, 4=Every week, 5=Every day, 6=Several times a day}. Information-oriented uses (4)={1=Never, 2=Less than once a month, 3=Every month, 4=Every week, 5=Every day, 6=Several times a day}. Social-connection uses (5)={1=Never, 2=Less than once a month, 3=Every month, 4=Every week, 5=Every day, 6=Several times a day}. E-commerce uses (6)={1=Never, 2=Less than once a month, 3=Every month, 4=Every week, 5=Every day, 6=Several times a day}. Frequency of video game playing (7)={0=Never, 1=Sometimes, 2=Habitually}. Gender (8)={0=Female, 1=Male}. Age (9)={0=16-18 years, 1=19-24 years, 2=25-34 years, 3=35-49 years, 4=50-64 years, 5=65 and over}. Education (10)={0=Primary, 1=Secondary, 2=Post-secondary non-tertiary education, 3=Tertiary}. * $p<0.05$; ** $p<0.01$; *** $p<0.001$.

Table 1. Means, standard deviations and correlations between the observed variables in WIP Spain 2013 (N=1600).

uses ($r=-0.16$, $p<0.001$) and Information-oriented uses ($r=-0.14$, $p<0.001$). Meanwhile, we also found that people who play video games are less aware of their risks ($rs=-0.33$, $p<0.001$), as are those with positive perceptions of their benefits ($r=-0.13$, $p<0.001$).

The analysis also shows some other interesting relationships. Men have more highly developed digital practices related to Entertainment-oriented uses ($rpb=0.16$, $p<0.001$) and E-commerce uses ($rpb=0.11$, $p<0.001$). Age also seems to be a determining factor with regard to digital practices, as the youngest respondents consume more entertainment ($r=-0.52$, $p<0.001$), use social media to a greater extent, make more Social-connection uses ($r=-0.44$, $p<0.001$), and more Information-oriented uses ($r=-0.32$, $p<0.001$). Similarly, they also report playing more video games ($rs=-0.41$, $p<0.001$). As regards the level of education, a higher educational level is associated with the development of more advanced digital practices in terms of E-commerce uses ($rs=0.32$, $p<0.001$) and Information-oriented uses ($rs=0.17$, $p<0.001$).

Finally, taking into account the interrelationships between digital practices and the use of video games, high values were observed for the correlations between all the variables ranging between 0.19 and 0.43 ($p<0.001$), except for the relationship between E-commerce uses and the use of video games ($rs=0.06$, $p<0.05$).

Multivariate analyses

Table 2 shows the result of the two multiple linear regression models considered in this investigation. It includes model (1), in which the dependent variable analysed is the perceptions about the benefits of using video games, and model (2), which uses perceptions about the risks of using video games as the dependent variable. The two models are statistically significant ($F=7.445$ and 15.280 , $p<0.001$, respectively), although they have different overall levels of fit. The model developed to study the perceptions of the risks shows a greater explained variation with an R^2 of 0.164, while the model analysing perceptions of the benefits has an R^2 of 0.088.

The first model of the perception of the benefits of using video games shows no significant effect in relation to gender or the level of education attained. Some of the levels show a statistically significant effect for age, with adults aged between 35 and 49 years ($Beta=0.147$, $p<0.05$) and people aged over 64 years ($Beta=0.138$, $p<0.01$) having a greater perception of the benefits of using video games. Likewise, and as would be expected, people who play video games most frequently also have a positive opinion of their benefits ($Beta=0.091$, $p<0.05$, and $Beta=0.221$, $p<0.001$, for people who play sometimes and habitually, respectively). Interestingly, after statistically controlling for all these effects, Entertainment-oriented uses ($Beta=0.161$, $p<0.001$) have an effect that is to a certain extent comparable to the frequency of use of video games.

As to perceptions of the risks in the use of video games, the level of education does not show any statistically significant effect either, but it is possible to observe a significant relationship with regard to gender, which means that after controlling for other effects in the model, women ($Beta=-0.111$, $p<0.001$) have a more sensitized opinion on the risks of using video games. Age also shows some statistically significant effects, with those aged between 35 and 49 years ($Beta=0.153$, $p<0.05$) and between 50 and 64 years ($Beta=0.155$, $p<0.01$) having the most sensitive perception to the risks of using video games. By contrast, and as seen above, people who play video games more often observe fewer

	Benefits of video games				Risks of video games			
	B	SE	Beta	t	B	SE	Beta	t
Intercept	2.294	0.196	–	11.727***	4.286	0.201	–	21.367***
Gender								
Female	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Male	–0.009	0.053	–0.005	–0.169	–0.223	0.055	–0.111	–4.020***
Age (years)								
16–18	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
19–24	0.165	0.137	0.061	1.205	0.164	0.141	0.056	1.164
25–34	0.156	0.134	0.071	1.166	0.210	0.137	0.088	1.531
35–49	0.297	0.136	0.147	2.177*	0.339	0.140	0.153	2.421*
50–64	0.172	0.146	0.071	1.179	0.409	0.150	0.155	2.726**
65 and over	0.416	0.156	0.138	2.665**	0.288	0.160	0.089	1.801
Education								
Primary	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Secondary	–0.115	0.112	–0.049	–1.020	0.120	0.116	0.048	1.030
Post-secondary non-tertiary	–0.071	0.106	–0.037	–0.668	–0.027	0.110	–0.013	–0.249
Tertiary	0.002	0.108	0.001	0.022	–0.067	0.112	–0.032	–0.565
Digital practices								
Entertainment-oriented uses	0.112	0.027	0.161	4.143***	–0.092	0.028	–0.122	–3.296**
Information-oriented uses	0.027	0.030	0.029	0.881	0.032	0.031	0.032	1.007
Social-connection uses	–0.017	0.023	–0.024	–0.720	0.001	0.024	0.002	0.061
E-commerce	0.046	0.032	0.045	1.413	–0.134	0.034	–0.121	–3.969***
Frequency of video game playing								
Never	0.173	0.062	0.091	2.796**	–0.322	0.064	–0.156	–5.006***
Sometimes	0.519	0.081	0.221	6.408***	–0.616	0.085	–0.239	–7.251***
Habitually								
Model summary								
R2 (Adjusted R2)	0.088 (0.076)				0.164 (0.153)			
F for the model	7.445***				15.280***			
Sample size	1.173				1.187			

Notes: * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$.

Table 2: Models of the perceived benefits and risks of digital gaming in Spain.

risks (Beta=–0.156, –0.239, $p < 0.001$ in both cases) than people who play sometimes and habitually, respectively. Finally, after controlling for all these effects in the model, Entertainment-oriented uses (Beta=–0.122, $p < 0.01$) and to a lesser extent E-commerce uses (Beta=–0.121, $p < 0.001$) show a statistically significant inverse relationship: the lesser the use, the greater the perceived risk.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

As we have reviewed previously, scientific research on the perceptions of risks and benefits of digital gaming is frequently controversial and most of the

times related to social-demographic variables. In this regard, there is plenty of research focusing, for instance, on age, where young people are perceived as a population at risk, or male individuals are seen as having more racist and sexist behaviours through playing video games.

Instead, we offer an approach to the study of perceptions that provides us with a more complex perspective and gives us the initial framework for interpretation that we have organized according to three research questions.

For RQ1, 'What perceptions does the Spanish population have about video games in terms of their risks and benefits?', we found that although the Spanish population has a neutral opinion regarding the perceived benefits of video games, they agreed to a slightly greater extent about the risks.

We found contradictory opinions that could give us clues about where to look in order to clarify what activates both negative and positive perceptions. To that end, we asked RQ2: 'What is the relationship between the perceptions of risks and benefits of video games and the participants' socio-demographic characteristics?'

In overall terms, and comparing the results obtained, it is possible to establish some differences according to the analysis carried out. A bivariate analysis, which only gives us an initial and most common approximation, shows that there is no statistically significant relationship between individuals' age and level of education and their perceptions regarding the benefits of using video games. However, the multivariate analysis shows a different situation. After statistically controlling for the effects of each variable considered in the model, we find that people aged 35 and above perceive video games as having some degree of risk but also as having some benefits. While there is no significant relationship between the perception of risks or benefits among those under the age of 35, both perceptions are higher among those over 35 years old in comparison with the reference group (i.e., 16–18 years old). Meanwhile, the bivariate analysis shows a significant relationship between having a lower level of education and perceiving a greater risk for video games, although this relationship is not observed in the multivariate analysis.

In the bivariate analysis, the variable of 'playing video games or not' provides data that confirm the results obtained in other studies (Ivory and Kalyanaraman 2009; Przybylski 2013, 2014): contact with video games is directly related to a lower perception of risk and vice versa.

Regarding the multivariate analysis, we found that the Entertainment-oriented uses have an effect that is comparable to the frequency of use of video games. To sum up, not only playing video games but also entertainment-oriented practices such as watching videos, downloading or listening to music, and searching for amusing and entertaining content are directly related to a lower perception of risk.

Regarding RQ3, 'What is the role of digital practices in the perceptions of risks and benefits of video games apart from the socio-demographic differences observed?', the bivariate analysis shows significant relationships between the increased development of the different digital practices considered in this study, and the perceived benefits of video games. However, the multivariate analysis shows that after statistically controlling for the independent effects of each of these digital practices, the relationship is limited to Internet uses oriented towards entertainment and playing video games.

In relation to the perception of risks, the bivariate analysis associates the perception of risks with a lower level of digital practices oriented towards entertainment, information, sociability and e-commerce, in contrast to the

1. results of the multivariate analysis, in which the less people are immerse in
 2. Entertainment-oriented uses (and E-commerce uses as a secondary practice)
 3. the greater they perceive risk. These results are consistent with the results
 4. obtained by Cohen et al. (1988), Hoffner et al. (2001) and McLeod et al. (1997),
 5. who argue that the perception of risk is directly related to the information
 6. about a particular practice we have at our disposal.

7. As we have explained in the results section, the significant achievement of
 8. the analysis carried out is that after controlling for the effect of socio-demo-
 9. graphic variables, the differences in the digital practices studied (use oriented
 10. towards information, entertainment, social connection, e-commerce and the
 11. practice of playing video games itself) significantly affect the perception of
 12. risks and benefits of digital gaming.

13. What is relevant, therefore, is that the perception of risks and benefits
 14. is influenced not only by the frequency of playing video games, but also by
 15. other uses and digital practices. Thus, this study supposes an initial empir-
 16. ical verification of the idea of Palfrey and Gasser (2008) or White and Le
 17. Cornu (2011), when, discussing the concept of digital natives, they affirm
 18. that perceptions, abilities and skills related to digital culture are not defined
 19. strictly by socio-demographic characteristics, but by attributes and experi-
 20. ences related to how people interact with information technologies. What
 21. these authors state for digital culture in general, we confirm in relation to
 22. digital games. The fact that entertainment-related practices affect the percep-
 23. tion of risks and benefits of digital gaming would suggest that the act of
 24. playing (or, in general, the game culture) should not be seen as something
 25. isolated, but as part of a system of practices. In this sense, Muriel and
 26. Crawford (2018: 19) have pointed out that game culture is a system of mean-
 27. ing and a set of social practices located within a wider social and cultural
 28. context. This study is a first step into how game culture has to be understood
 29. in context. This approach implies that not only the people who study digital
 30. games must embrace other entertainment practices to fully understand game
 31. culture, but also researchers and policy practitioners connected to media
 32. literacy must integrate digital gaming or ludoliteracy into their programmes
 33. and proposals, as it has been previously suggested in other works (Aranda et
 34. al. 2015, 2016).

35. **FUTURE RESEARCH AND LIMITATIONS**

36.
 37. The study of the impact of digital practices on the perception of risks and
 38. benefits of digital gaming has to take into account many variables that have
 39. not been analysed in this research. This situation needs to be improved in
 40. future studies by adding new variables to the current digital practices studied,
 41. such as skills for managing new digital tools and frameworks, digital identi-
 42. ties, finding experts, trust in digital resources, using and identifying of power
 43. existing in different agents, reusing digital content, understanding political
 44. actions, using avatars and interactive media and transmedia, and in liminal
 45. physical/virtual spaces/places and times/moments.

46. From another more conceptual point of view, one limitation of this
 47. research has to do with its low statistical significance (explained variation of
 48. R^2). Nonetheless, it is important to note that this research is related to social
 49. sciences, where there are many interconnected variables and it is impossi-
 50. ble to try to always have high statistical significance in exploratory studies.
 51. Furthermore, the main focus of the research model was not the prediction, but
 52.

trying to explore, find and show some of the main variables that are important for benefit and risk perception of digital games.

Moreover, this research only considers digital gaming in general, which means that further research must take into account different genres and platforms such as mobile, PC, console and different styles of gaming such as casual and hard-core. It is reasonable to think that each of these different gaming conditions will influence the perception of risks and benefits of using video games. Taking into account the specific conditions of the gaming will further reveal complexities in how experience is related to the perception of risks and benefits.

In addition, this exclusively quantitative study needs a qualitative complementary study to provide more nuanced results and complement the results obtained here. In this sense, focus groups and personal interview should improve the current study, by using its results.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The research presented in this paper is part of the project LUDOLITERACY – Ludic Culture, Digital Literacies and Learning: CSO2014-57302-P, funded by the Spanish Government (Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad).

REFERENCES

- AEVI (2016), *Anuario de la industria del videojuego*, Madrid: Asociación española de videojuegos.
- Asociación para la investigación de medios de comunicación (AIMC) (2018), *Estudio General de Medios, Año móvil abril 2017 – marzo 2018*, Madrid: AIMC.
- Anderson, C. (2002), 'Violent video games and aggressive thoughts, feelings, and behaviors', in S. Calvert, A. Jordan and A. Cocking (eds), *Children in the Digital Age: Influences of Electronic Media on Development*, Westport, CT and London: Praeger, pp. 101–19.
- Aranda, D., Sánchez-Navarro, J. and Martínez-Martínez, S. (2015), *Ludoliteracy: Informe sobre la alfabetización mediática en el juego digital. Experiencias en Europa*, Barcelona: UOC, <http://hdl.handle.net/10609/58365>. Accessed 14 December 2017.
- Aranda, D., Estanyol, E., Montaña, M. and Planells, A. (2017), *Jóvenes y juego digital. Hábitos de uso y percepciones de los jóvenes sobre la imagen de los videojuegos en los medios de comunicación*, Barcelona: UOC, <http://hdl.handle.net/10609/66246>. Accessed 14 December 2017.
- Aranda, D., Sánchez-Navarro, J., Martínez-Martínez, S. and Whitton, N. (2016), *Ludoliteracy: The Unfinished Business of Media Literacy*, Barcelona: UOC, <http://hdl.handle.net/10609/58365>. Accessed 14 December 2017.
- Bowman, N. (2016), 'The rise (and refinement) of moral panic', in R. Kowert and T. Quandt (eds), *The Video Game Debate: Unravelling the Physical, Social, and Psychological Effects of Digital Games*, New York: Routledge, pp. 22–38.
- Burgess, M., Dill, K., Stermer, S. P., Burgess, S. R. and Brown, B. P. (2011), 'Playing with prejudice: The prevalence and consequences of racial stereotypes in video games', *Media Psychology*, 14:3, pp. 289–311.
- Bushman, B., Gollwitzer, M. and Cruz, C. (2015), 'There is broad consensus: Media researchers agree that violent media increase aggression in children, and pediatricians and parents concur', *Psychology of Popular Media Culture*, 4:3, pp. 200–14.

1. Chappell, D., Eatough, V., Davies, M. and Griffiths, M. (2006), 'EverQuest: It's just a computer game right? An interpretative phenomenological analysis of online gaming addiction', *International Journal of Mental Health and Addiction*, 4:3, pp. 205–16.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
5. Cohen, J., Mutz, D. C., Price, V. and Gunther, A. (1988), 'Perceived impact of defamation: An experiment on third-person effect', *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 52:2, pp.161–73.
- 6.
- 7.
8. Consalvo, M. (2007), *Cheating: Gaining Advantage in Videogames*, Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- 9.
10. Coulon, M. and Ferguson, C. (2016), 'The influence of digital games on aggression and violent crime', in R. Kowert and T. Quandt (eds), *The Video Game Debate: Unravelling the Physical, Social, and Psychological Effects of Digital Games*, New York: Routledge, pp. 54–73.
- 11.
- 12.
- 13.
14. Critcher, C. (2006), *Critical Readings: Moral Panics and the Media*, Berkshire: McGraw-Hill Education.
- 15.
16. Davison, W. (1983), 'The third-person effect in communication', *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 47:1, pp. 1–13.
- 17.
18. Dickerman, C., Christensen, C. and Kerl-Mcclain, S. B. (2008), 'Big breasts and bad guys: Depictions of gender and race in video games', *Journal of Creativity in Mental Health*, 3:1, pp. 20–29.
- 19.
- 20.
21. Dondi, C., Edvinsson, B. and Moretti, M. (2004), 'Why choose a game for improving learning and teaching processes?', in M. Pivec, A. Koubek and C. Dondi (eds), *Guidelines for Game-Based Learning*, Lengerich: Pabst Science Publishers, pp. 54–73.
- 22.
- 23.
- 24.
25. Eurostat (2016), 'Digital economy and society statistics - households and individuals', http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php/Digital_economy_and_society_statistics_-_households_and_individuals.
- 26.
- 27.
28. Accessed 14 February 2018.
29. Gee, J. P. (2004a), *Lo que nos enseñan los videojuegos sobre el aprendizaje y el alfabetismo (What Video Games Have to Teach Us About Learning and Literacy)*, Málaga: Aljibe.
- 30.
- 31.
32. — (2004b), *Situated Language and Learning: A Critique of Traditional Schooling*, New York: Routledge.
- 33.
34. Gentile, D.A. and Gentile, J. R. (2008), 'Violent video games as exemplary teachers: A conceptual analysis', *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 37:2, pp. 127–41.
- 35.
36. Griffiths, M. D. (2016), 'Gaming addiction and Internet gaming disorder', in R. Kowert and T. Quandt (eds), *The Video Game Debate : Unravelling the Physical, Social, and Psychological Effects of Digital Games*, New York: Routledge, pp. 74–93.
- 37.
- 38.
- 39.
40. Hills, M. (2002), *Fan Cultures*, London: Routledge.
41. Hoffner, C., Plotkin, R. S., Buchanan, M., Anderson, J. D., Kamigaki, S.-K., Hubbs, L. A., Kowalczyk, L., Silberg, K. and Pastorek, A. (2001), 'The third-person effect in perceptions of the influence of television violence', *Journal of Communication*, 51:2, pp. 283–99.
- 42.
- 43.
- 44.
45. Holtz, G. (2014), 'Generating social practices', *Journal of Artificial Societies and Social Simulation*, 17:1, pp. 1–17.
- 46.
47. Huizinga, J. (1955), *Homo Ludens: A Study of the Play-Element in Culture*, Boston: Beacon.
- 48.
49. Ivory, J. and Kalyanaraman, S. (2009), 'Video games make people violent: Well, maybe not that game: Effects of content and person abstraction on perceptions of violent video games' effects and support of censorship', *Communication Reports*, 22:1, pp.1–12.
- 50.
- 51.
- 52.

- Jansz, J. and Marten, L. (2005), 'Gaming at a LAN event: The social context of playing video games', *New Media & Society*, 7:3, pp. 333–55. 1.
- Kerr, Aphra (2017), *Global Games: Production, Circulation, and Policy in the Networked Era*, London: Routledge. 2.
- Lacasa, P. (2011), *Los videojuegos, aprender en mundos reales y virtuales (Video Games, Learn in Real and Virtual Worlds)*, Madrid: Morata. 3.
- Leonard, D. (2003), "'Live in your world, play in ours": Race, video games, and consuming the other', *Studies in Media & Information Literacy Education*, 3:4, pp.1–9. 4.
- Mäyrä, Frans (2017), 'Pokémon GO: Entering the ludic society', *Mobile Media & Communication*, 51:pp. 1–4. 5.
- McLeod, D. M., Eveland, W. P. and Nathanson, A. I. (1997), 'Support for censorship of violent and misogynic rap lyrics: An analysis of the third-person effect', *Communication Research*, 24:2, pp. 153–74. 6.
- McRobbie, A. and Thornton, S. (1995), 'Rethinking "moral panic" for multi mediated social worlds', *British Journal of Sociology*, 46:4, pp. 559–74. 7.
- Mitchell, A. and Savill-Smith, C. (2004), *The Use of Computer and Video Games for Learning: A Review of the Literature*, Cambridge: Learning and Skills Development Agency, <http://www.lsda.org.uk/files/PDF/1529.pdf>. 8.
- Accessed 15 January 2018. 9.
- Muriel, D. and Crawford, G. (2018), *Video Games as Culture. Considering the Role and Importance of Video Games in Contemporary Society*, London: Routledge. 10.
- Palfrey, J. and Gasser, U. (2008), *Born Digital: Understanding the First Generation of Digital Natives*, New York: Basic Books. 11.
- Przybylski, A. K. (2013), *Americans Skeptical of Link Between Mass Shootings and Video Games. YouGov Report*, <https://today.yougov.com/news/2013/10/17/americans-skeptical-link-between-mass-shootings-an>. 12.
- Accessed 15 January 2018. 13.
- (2014), 'Who believes electronic games cause real world aggression?', *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, 17:4, pp. 228–34. 14.
- Quandt, T. et al. (2015), 'Digital games research: a survey on an emerging field and its prevalent debate', *Journal of Communication*, 65:6, pp. 975–96. 15.
- Reckwitz, A. (2002), 'Toward a theory of social practices', *European Journal of Social Theory*, 5:2, pp. 243–63. 16.
- Sherry, J. L. (2004), 'Flow and media enjoyment', *Communication Theory*, 14:4, pp. 328–47. 17.
- Taylor, T. L. (2006), *Play between Worlds: Exploring Online Game Culture*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. 18.
- UNESCO (2012), *International Standard Classification of Education (ISCED) 2011*, Montreal: UNESCO Institute for Statistics, <http://dx.doi.org/10.15220/978-92-9189-123-8-en>. Accessed 30 December 2017. 19.
- White, D. and Cornu, A. Le (2011), 'Visitors and residents: A new typology for online engagement', *First Monday*, 16:9. 20.
- Whitton, N. (2009), 'Learning and teaching with computer games in higher education', in T. Connolly, M. Stansfield and L. Boyle (eds), *Games-Based Learning Advancements for Multi-Sensory Human Computer Interfaces*, Hershey: IGI Global. 21.
- (2014), *Digital Games and Learning: Research and Theory*, New York: Routledge. 22.
- Wirman, H. (2009), 'Sobre la productividad y los fans de los videojuegos' ('About productivity and video game fans'), in D. Aranda and J. Sánchez-Navarro (eds), *Aprovecha el tiempo y juega (Take advantage of your time and play)*, Barcelona: Editorial UOC, pp. 145–84. 23.

1. Zagal, J. P. (2010), *Ludoliteracy: Defining, Understanding, and Supporting Games Education*, Pittsburgh: ETC Press.
- 2.
3. Zimmerman, E. (2015), 'Manifesto for a ludic century', in S. P. Walz and
4. S. Deterding (eds), *The Gameful World: Approaches, Issues, Applications*,
5. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, pp. 19–22.
- 6.

7. SUGGESTED CITATION

8. Aranda, D., Sánchez-Navarro, J., Martínez-Cerdà, J-F. and Meneses, J. (2018),
9. 'The impact of digital practices on the perception of risks and benefits of
10. digital gaming', *Catalan Journal of Communication & Cultural Studies*, 10:2,
11. pp. 247–64, doi: 10.1386/cjcs.10.2.247_1
- 12.
- 13.

14. CONTRIBUTOR DETAILS

15. Daniel Aranda is a senior lecturer in the Faculty of Information and
16. Communication Sciences at the Universitat Oberta de Catalunya (UOC).
17. His current line of research focuses on the study of forms of consumption,
18. cultural practices and social dynamics related to leisure and digital entertain-
19. ment of young people and adults. He was the co-editor of the journal *Anàlisi.*
20. *Quaderns de comunicació i cultura* (2015–17). He is author of *Game & Play*
21. (2015), 'Ludoliteracy: Report on media literacy in the digital game. Experiences
22. in Europe' (2015), 'The impact of digital on communication and adolescent
23. relationships' (2015), 'Messenger and social network sites as tools for sociabil-
24. ity, leisure and informal learning for Spanish young people' (2013).
- 25.

26. Contact: Faculty of Information and Communication Sciences, Open University
27. of Catalonia, Spain.

28. E-mail: darandaj@uoc.edu

30. Jordi Sánchez-Navarro is a senior lecturer in the Faculty of Information and
31. Communication Sciences at the UOC. His research interests include social
32. and cultural impacts of new media, citizens' media practices, and changes
33. in entertainment content and consumption. He is author of 'Messenger
34. and social network sites as tools for sociability, leisure and informal learn-
35. ing for Spanish young people' (2013), 'The fruits of my own labour: A case
36. study on clashing models of co-creativity in the new media landscape'
37. (2014), 'Up close and personal: Exploring the bonds between promoters and
38. backers in audiovisual crowdfunded projects' (2015) and 'Creative crowds.
39. Crowdsourcing as a model for collective audiovisual production in the film-
40. making field' (2017).
- 41.

42. E-mail: jsancheznav@uoc.edu

44. Juan-Francisco Martínez-Cerdá is a Ph.D. candidate researcher at the UOC
45. in Barcelona. Previously, he worked as a postgraduate researcher at the
46. Autonomous University of Barcelona (UAB). His main research interests are
47. linked to e-learning, employability skills, co-innovative sources and socio-
48. technical systems. He is author of 'Formal lifelong e-learning for employability
49. and job stability during turbulent times in Spain' (2017), 'Promoting collabo-
50. rative skills in online university. Comparing effects of games, mixed reality,
51. social media, and other tools for ICT-supported pedagogical practices' (2018)
52. and 'Opening the black-box in lifelong e-learning for employability: A frame-

work for a socio-technical e-learning employability system of measurement (STELEM)' (2018).

Contact: Faculty of Psychology and Education Sciences, Open University of Catalonia, Spain.

E-mail: jmartinezcer@uoc.edu

Julio Meneses is associate professor of research methods in the Faculty of Psychology and Education Sciences at the OUC and researcher of the GenTIC research group at the Internet Interdisciplinary Institute (IN3). His current research interests lie in survey design and multivariate analysis, digital inequality, students' dropout and retention, and the use of technology by children and young people. He is author of 'Approaches to teaching online: Exploring factors influencing teachers in a fully online university' (2017), 'Problematic uses of ICT among young people in their personal and school life' (2018), 'Operationalizing and conceptualizing quality in mixed methods research: A multiple case study of the disciplines of education' (2018).

Contact: Faculty of Psychology and Education Sciences, Internet Interdisciplinary Institute (IN3), Open University of Catalonia, Spain.

E-mail: jmenesesn@uoc.edu

Daniel Aranda, Jordi Sánchez-Navarro, Juan-Francisco Martínez-Cerdà and Julio Meneses have asserted their right under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act, 1988, to be identified as the authors of this work in the format that was submitted to Intellect Ltd.

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.
- 6.
- 7.
- 8.
- 9.
- 10.
- 11.
- 12.
- 13.
- 14.
- 15.
- 16.
- 17.
- 18.
- 19.
- 20.
- 21.
- 22.
- 23.
- 24.
- 25.
- 26.
- 27.
- 28.
- 29.
- 30.
- 31.
- 32.
- 33.
- 34.
- 35.
- 36.
- 37.
- 38.
- 39.
- 40.
- 41.
- 42.
- 43.
- 44.
- 45.
- 46.
- 47.
- 48.
- 49.
- 50.
- 51.
- 52.