

Persistent online games

[Sociology](#)



Online gaming can involve both technological and social risks, which may cause harm to the subscribers by expending cost as well as time. Various online gaming hazards are related to computer users, but the users are not aware of the harms caused to the computer. Online gaming raises technological risks such as ‘malicious software’, ‘viruses and worms’, ‘insecure game coding’ and ‘insecure games servers’ among others. In addition, online gaming raises social issues that include ‘identity theft’, ‘virtual mugging’, ‘cyber prostitution’, ‘social engineering’ and ‘virtual sweatshop’ among others (Hayes, 2008).

The Designers of Persistent Online Games Bear Some Moral Responsibility for This Problem Based On Ethical Theories

The designers should give some support to the people by the help of general security practices and by gaming-specific security practices. The moral responsibility of designers is to ensure security in terms of privacy and traffic safety. Additionally, the designers are required to ascertain that online gaming violence is not involved in the games. However, the social risks as witnessed by users depend on individual grounds, as playing online games is based on their perceptions and actions (Hayes, 2008; Sicart, 2005).

Conclusion

From the above discussion, it can be comprehended that online gaming is popular amid youths. Online gaming is also identified to cause certain harm to subscribers in relation to technological and social risks. It has been recognized that subscribers have certain moral responsibilities in terms of maintaining privacy and minimizing violence. On social grounds, the users are accountable for their individual responsibility considering health and social well-being.

References

Hayes, E. J. (2008). Playing it safe: Avoiding online gaming risks. Retrieved from <https://www.us-cert.gov/sites/default/files/publications/gaming.pdf>

Sicart, M. (2005). The game, player, ethics: A virtue ethics approach to computer games. *International Review of Information Ethics*, 4, 13-18.