1-1-2010

Adults Who Play Violent Video Games and Their Normative Beliefs About Aggression (Part 1)

Ashley Kjos

Follow this and additional works at: http://commons.pacificu.edu/inter10

Adults Who Play Violent Video Games and Their Normative Beliefs About Aggression (Part 1)

Rights

Adults Who Play Violent Video Games and Their Normative Beliefs About Aggression (Part 1)

Posted on **February 1, 2010** by **Editor**

By **Ashley A. Kjos**

1. INTRODUCTION

On December 6th 2007, 16-year-old Heather Trujillo and 17 year old Lamar Roberts were babysitting Trujillo's 7 year old sister Zoe Garcia when they hit, kicked and body-slammed the child in an attempt to re-enact various scenes from the video game *Mortal Kombat*. Garcia received a broken wrist, more than 20 bruises, swelling of the brain, bleeding of her neck muscles and spine, and ultimately died from her injuries. The teens faced a possible sentence of 48 years in prison if convicted of murder (Lubich, 2007).

On April 20th, 1999, Eric Harris and Dylan Klebold entered Columbine High School in Littleton, Colorado to embark on a shooting rampage that killed 13 and left 23 others wounded before turning the guns on themselves. Although it is impossible to know what exactly caused these teens to attack others, it is possible that one contributing factor was exposure to violent video games. Both Harris and Klebold spent a great deal of time playing violent video games such as *Doom* and *Wolfenstein 3D*. Harris actually created his own video game that contained characters, weapons, and situations that were eerily similar to the events that occurred during the actual shootings at Columbine (Pooley, 1999).

Are violent video games to blame for the senseless and aggressive actions taken by Trujillo and Roberts against a 7 year old or for the actions of Harris and Klebold at Columbine High School? Although many factors may have contributed to these teens acting in aggressive and violent ways, numerous researchers have suggested that violent video games are in fact related to increases in aggressive behavior and affect (Anderson & Bushman, 2001; Anderson & Dill, 2000; Anderson & Murphy, 2003; Bartholow & Anderson, 2002; Bartholow, Sestir, & Davis, 2005; Colwell & Payne, 2000; Gentile, Lynch, Linder, & Walsh, 2004; Persky & Blaskovich, 2007; Sherry, 2001). This does not mean that playing violent video games was the only possible explanation for these teens acting aggressively but that the violent games these teens played may have been a contributing factor. These tragedies and others like them have definitely brought the spotlight to the problem of video game violence and researchers have begun to look at what effects this form of media may have on children's and adult's behaviors and feelings.

The research regarding aggression and violent video games is sparse but there are a growing number of researchers adding to the field of knowledge. As previously noted, there are numerous studies showing a positive relationship between aggression and violent video game play (Anderson & Bushman, 2001; Anderson & Dill, 2000; Anderson & Murphy, 2003). Sherry (2001) found an overall effect size ($d =.30$) suggesting there is a relationship between video game play and aggression. Although many researchers have studied actual aggressive behaviors exhibited by children and adults who play violent video games, researchers are also determining if there is a relationship between violent media and peoples' beliefs about the acceptability of aggressive behaviors.

Huesmann and Guerra (1997) created a measure to determine children's and adult's normative beliefs about aggression. These researchers found that children's normative beliefs about aggression were positively related to the actual aggressive behaviors they exhibited. Krahe and Moller (2004) studied normative beliefs about aggression and video games and found that the normative acceptance of physical aggression increased with an increase in exposure to violent video games. More research is needed to determine exactly what relationship exists between video games and beliefs about the acceptance of violence. There is also evidence that there are gender differences in the types of aggression displayed (Anderson & Huesmann, 2003), the types and length of video games played (Colwell & Payne, 2000), and beliefs about acceptance of aggression (Krahe & Moller, 2004).

Aggression

Aggression is an attribute commonly found in animals and humans and has been present since the beginning of existence. Aggression can be defined as "behavior intended to harm another individual who is motivated to avoid that harm" (Anderson & Bushman, 2001, pg 356). This definition excludes accidental acts that lead to harm but includes intentional acts to harm even if the attempt fails. For example, it is considered an aggressive action if a person attempts to fire a gun at another person but the gun jams. Violence is defined as aggression that has extreme consequences as its goal, such as death or murder. This means that all violence is aggression

but not all types of aggression are violent. Aggression can take many forms and is often used in diverse ways to achieve different outcomes. Physical aggression is the actual use of physical force upon another person to cause intentional harm, such as punching or kicking another person. Verbal aggression is the use of words to cause intentional harm, such as spreading rumors or lies about another person. Past studies have found that females are more likely to resort to verbal aggression to harm another individual while males are more likely to resort to physical aggression to harm another individual (Anderson & Huesmann, 2003). Although the definition and types of aggression can be easily understood, the mechanisms underlying aggression are still a cause of debate among psychologists and sociologists.

2. THEORIES OF AGGRESSION

There are numerous models and theories to explain how aggression develops within children and adults. Although an exhaustive discussion of all these theories is beyond the scope of this paper (see Anderson & Huesmann, 2003 and Anderson & Bushman, 2002a for more detailed information regarding theories of aggression), three theories that have been well documented in the study of aggression will be examined specifically social learning theory, script theory, and the general aggression model (GAM).

Social Learning Theory

Bandura's (1973) social learning theory suggests that people learn from one another through observational learning, imitation, and modeling. This means that people learn through observing others' behaviors and outcomes of behaviors. For example, if a child observes a parent being physically aggressive with another individual and that parent is reinforced for this action, the child may deem this behavior as acceptable and may later be aggressive due to observing aggressive models. Bandura's infamous bobo doll experiment (1961) demonstrated that if children witnessed an aggressive display by an adult model, they imitated the aggressive behavior when given the opportunity. In this experiment, 36 boys and 36 girls witnessed an adult act either aggressively or non-aggressively towards a bobo doll and were then observed playing with numerous toys including a bobo doll to determine what behaviors the children would imitate. The results suggested that children who viewed an aggressive model made more aggressive responses toward the bobo doll than children who viewed a non-aggressive model. Also, boys made more aggressive responses than girls overall. These results support Bandura's social learning theory by showing that children can learn aggression through the process of observational learning which is watching the behavior of another person.

Although most studies of the social learning theory involve determining how children develop and learn, some studies have determined how the theory applies to adult behaviors. Anderson et al. (2004) suggest that observational learning remains a powerful mechanism for acquisition of new social behaviors throughout maturity and into old age. Phillips (1974) found that the national level of suicides increased for brief periods following suicide stories being publicized in the newspaper. He concluded that suicide rates increased following publicized suicide stories because people are imitating the publicized suicide story. Phillips (1979) also showed that daily California motor vehicle

fatalities increased significantly following front-page suicide stories and these results were replicated by Bollen and Phillips (1981) in Detroit. Another study by Phillips (1982) found that suicides, motor vehicle deaths, and nonfatal motor vehicle accidents all show significant increases just after a character on a soap opera commits suicide. All of the results from the previous studies cited suggest that adults may use the social learning theory to imitate aggressive acts and suicidal behaviors publicized in the media. Other theories also include observation as means of learning aggressive behaviors and thoughts.

Script Theory

Script theory suggests that aggressive scripts are learned through observing violent acts (Huesmann, 1986). The violent acts that lead to the formation of scripts can be executed by various people in various situations such as parents at home, strangers in public, or all forms of mass media. A script can be defined as a sequence of expected behaviors for a certain situation (Abelson, 1981). Behavioral scripts are subroutines the brain executes in a way that enables it to accomplish predictable tasks without thinking too much about them. By rehearsing and practicing a script, the brain begins to form stronger links between situations and behaviors which enables a person to generalize this behavior to various conditions and circumstances. In other words, aggressive scripts can be learned through the observation and replication of a behavior which then becomes a well practiced routine. Aggression then becomes the reaction behavior to many types of situations and circumstances. For example, violent video games are a type of stimulus that can teach aggressive scripts which in turn develop into aggressive and reactive behavior in everyday circumstances. Laboratory evidence suggests that scripts for social behaviors are often encoded from patterns of behaviors that are observed. Just as individuals may encode a motor program for throwing a football from observing others, individuals may encode a script for hitting or kicking those who victimize them from observing video games that depict this type of aggression (Huesmann, 1988).

The General Aggression Model

The general aggression model (GAM) appears to be the most unifying theory, acquiring applications from previous ideas and putting them together in a concise model. The model has four main advantages over past theories of aggression: it is more parsimonious, it is a better explanation of multiple causes for aggressive actions, it aids in the creation of interventions for aggression, and it adds insight into child development and child rearing practices (Anderson & Bushman, 2002a). GAM focuses on the person in the situation, meaning GAM explains how situational and personal variables interact to affect a person's internal state. The internal state includes thoughts, feelings, and physical arousal. All of these influence each other and each will have an effect on an individual's interpretation of an aggressive or violent act (Anderson et al., 2004).

GAM research has focused on what biological, environmental, psychological, and social factors influence aggression and cause aggressive behavior (Anderson & Bushman, 2002a). Researchers

have found that various personal and situational factors play a role in aggressive behavior. Person factors include all characteristics a person brings to the situation such as beliefs, values, long-term goals, attitudes, personality traits, and certain genetic predispositions which can all play a role in the aggressive preparedness of an individual (Anderson & Huesmann, 2003). Situational factors include important features of the situation such as presence of provocation or an aggressive cue (Anderson & Bushman, 2001). Aggressive cues are objects that prime aggressive related concepts in memory, making aggressive actions more likely. Provocation, frustration, pain, discomfort, drugs, and incentives are all situational factors that have been shown to play a role in aggressive actions of individuals (Carnagey & Anderson, 2005). These two variables, person factors and situation factors, influence the final outcome of behavior by effecting a person's cognitions, affect, and arousal. Although there are many situational and personal factors that can influence a person's behavior, Huesmann, Lagerspetz, and Eron (1984) have suggested the most aggressive children will have certain characteristics. According to these researchers, aggressive children will have parents with lower education and social status, have a more aggressive mother, perform poorly in school, and will be unpopular with peers. These aggressive children will also watch more violent television programs, believe these programs portray real life, and strongly identify with the aggressive characters in the shows. The previous cited research points to numerous situational and personal factors that can influence children's and adult's amount of aggressive behavior.

Social learning theory, script theory, and the general aggression model all describe various ways in which aggressive behaviors may be learned and acted upon by an individual. These theories however do not necessarily take into account what an individual believes is acceptable behavior towards another individual. In order to determine what people believe are acceptable behaviors and what behaviors are intolerable and overly aggressive, researchers need to assess normative beliefs about aggression.

3. NORMATIVE BELIEFS ABOUT AGGRESSION

Although aggression itself can be a physical or verbal behavior that can be easily observed and assessed, peoples' normative beliefs about the acceptability of aggression may not be as explicit. A normative belief can be defined as an individual's cognition about the acceptability or unacceptability of a behavior (Huesmann & Guerra, 1997). Normative beliefs serve as guides for action, meaning they provide shortcuts in deciding how to behave in given situations. Although a person's normative beliefs may differ from what others believe is an acceptable behavior, there is usually considerable overlap between an individual's normative beliefs and the normative beliefs of relevant peers, family members, social groups, and societal institutions (Huesmann, Guerra, Zelli, & Miller, 1992; Souweidane & Huesmann, 1999). Therefore, normative beliefs about aggression are beliefs about the acceptability or unacceptability of aggression in situations, and these beliefs are influenced by a person's family, peers, and culture.

Although normative beliefs about aggression are usually stable and consistent once developed, these beliefs are in a great state of flux when we are children. Huesmann and Guerra (1997) found that there appears to be no stability in children's normative beliefs between the first and

second grade and found moderate stability in the fourth grade. However, these researchers did find that even in the first grade, children's normative beliefs about aggression and their actual aggressive behavior were highly correlated. Even though children's beliefs may change rapidly, their behaviors reflect what beliefs they are endorsing at the time. So if a child accepts that aggression is a normal response, he or she will act more aggressively, but if later that same child believes that aggression is not an acceptable response, his or her aggressive behavior will decrease. There is also evidence that in elementary classrooms where peers and teachers discourage aggression, children behave less aggressively which is possibly because they have learned that aggression is an unacceptable response (Henry et al., 2000). Although normative beliefs about aggression are unstable and in flux in children, by the time adolescence is reached these beliefs are more firm and stable but still adjustable. Werner and Nixon (2005) found that adolescents who endorsed aggression as an appropriate response reported more aggressive behavior in comparison to those who believed aggression was not an acceptable behavior. It has also been shown that high levels of anger and strong beliefs supporting aggression significantly contribute to the frequency of physical aggression as well as lower endorsement of the belief that aggressive behaviors and antisocial acts are wrong (Sukhodolsky & Ruchkin, 2004). Little research has been conducted regarding adult normative beliefs about aggression but one study has found a positive correlation between adults' aggressive behaviors and their endorsement of aggression as an appropriate response (Sigurdsson, Gudjonsson, Bragason, Kristjansdottir, & Sigfusdottir, 2006). Due the instability of the normative beliefs in children and the insufficient number of studies conducted with adults, more research needs to be conducted in order to determine what the relationship is between adults' aggressive behaviors and their normative beliefs about aggression.

Just as normative beliefs about aggression can vary depending on the age of the individual, these beliefs can also vary depending on gender of the individual. Boys and girls appear to hold differing standards when it comes to what they believe is appropriate in aggressiveness of behavior. It has been shown that the correlation between normative beliefs supporting aggression and the use of aggressive behavior is significantly higher in boys than in girls (Huesmann & Guerra, 1997; Huesmann et al., 1992). Some researchers have suggested that the gender differences seen in the attitudes related to aggression are associated with the type of aggression exhibited. Females tend to view relational and verbal aggression as a normative aggressive response while males tend to view physical aggression as a normative aggressive response (Crick, Bigbee, & Howes, 1996; Krahe & Moller, 2004). This provides additional support to the differences between males and females in not only beliefs about aggression but also in aggressive behaviors.

So far what has been discussed has been primarily concerned with what aggression is, some theories about how aggression is produced, and some of the beliefs about aggression. There are many aspects of daily existence that can perpetuate aggressive behaviors and beliefs, some of which include the various types of media which display aggressive language, actions, affects, and behaviors and the ability to access these forms of media.

4. VIOLENT MEDIA

Media can be viewed in many forms including newspapers, magazines, music, art, the Internet, television, movies, and video games, all of which have genres that are aggressive and violent. Exposure to violent media can increase the likelihood of aggressive behavior occurring and can influence the development of aggression related knowledge structures and aggressive personalities (Anderson & Bushman, 2001; Bartholow et al., 2005; Eron, Huesmann, Lefkowitz, & Walder, 1972; Huesmann, Moise-Titus, Podolski, & Eron, 2003). Each time a violent movie or television show is watched or a violent video game is played, aggressive scripts are rehearsed that teach and reinforce vigilance for enemies, aggressive actions against others, expectations that others will behave aggressively, positive attitudes towards the use of violence, and beliefs that violent solutions are effective and appropriate (Bushman, 1998). It has also been shown that repeated exposure to violent video games can increase players' aggressive outlook, perceptual biases, attitudes, beliefs, and behavior (Anderson & Dill, 2000). The effects of violent media on aggressive behavior and affect have been studied for many years beginning with the popularity and accessibility of television people's daily lives.

Television.

The television was first introduced to Americans in 1928 and since that time almost every American home has at least one television. Just as the popularity of the television has grown over time, the programming being broadcast on the networks has become increasing violent and aggressive since the introduction of television. Researchers began to notice an increase in the aggressive behaviors of children and launched research to determine whether viewing media violence had any effect on these behaviors. Television was not introduced to all communities at the same time so researchers took advantage of this to determine what differences existed between aggression in communities with or without television. Hennigan et al. (1982) compared crime rates in numerous American cities in which television was introduced and in cities where television was not yet available. He found that the presence or absence of television did not significantly affect violent crime rates. Centerwall (1989a, 1989b, 1992) examined the relationship between homicide rates and the introduction of television in South Africa, Canada, and the United States. The results suggested that 15 years after the introduction of television, homicide rates for Caucasians increased dramatically in the United States and Canada. It was concluded from these various studies that the introduction of television, combined with frequent portrayals of violence, increased interpersonal violence in the United States and Canada. Although these studies attempted to determine if the introduction of television created any differences in crime rates, various researchers have also attempted to determine what relationship television viewing has on aggressive behaviors and thoughts.

Eron, Huesmann, Lefkowitz, and Walder (1972) wanted to determine if children's preferences for violent television at age eight would be positively related to adulthood aggressiveness. The researchers found that the more violent television programming preferred and viewed by males at age eight, the more aggressive their behavior was at that time and ten years later. These same effects were not found for females. These results suggest that the influence of watching violent television is not confined to only short-term effects but can influence a person's behavior for a life-time. Another study by Huesmann, Lagerspetz, and Eron (1984) found a positive relationship

between viewing violent television and aggressive behavior among boys in both Finland and the United States and among girls in the United States only. They also found that a boy's violence viewing and identification with a character is a good predictor of later aggression, while a boy's initial level of aggression is not a good predictor of viewing violent television and identification with characters. These results suggest that children's viewing of violent television programs is related to aggressive behavior but aggressive children do not necessarily watch more violent television. Since the beginning of violent television research, investigators have repeatedly found that viewing violent television is positively related to increased aggressive behavior and affect among children and adults (Anderson, 1997; Bushman & Green, 1990; Bushman & Huesmann, 2001; Comstock, 1980; Huesmann et al., 2003; Josephson, 1987).

There have also been longitudinal studies conducted to determine what the long-term effects of violent television viewing are. Huesmann and Eron (1986) studied the effects of television violence in five countries: Austria, Poland, Finland, Israel, and the United States. They examined children at three times as they grew from ages 6 to 8 or from 8 to 11 years of age. The results suggested that there was a small to moderate relationship between aggression and overall exposure to television violence in all five nations. The extent to which earlier viewing of television violence predicted later aggression varied substantially between genders and among countries. A 15 year follow-up of 300 American participants suggested a delayed effect of media violence on serious physical aggression (Huesmann et al., 2003). The researchers found a significant relationship between television violence viewing during childhood and aggressive behaviors as adults in both men and women. Another longitudinal study by Johnson, Cohen, Smailes, Kasen, and Brook (2002) assessed the total amount of time people spent watching television and amount of physical aggression displayed from age 14 to age 22. The results suggested that television viewing at age 14 significantly predicted assault and fighting behavior at age 16 and age 22. The researchers concluded that television watching may have long-term aversive effects lasting into adulthood. In fact in a meta-analysis conducted across 42 tests involving almost 5,000 participants, Anderson and Bushman (2002b) suggested that high levels of violent television viewing in childhood could promote aggression in later childhood, adolescence, and adulthood.

Although there are scores of studies suggesting that viewing violent television is related to increases in aggressive affect and behavior, other forms of media have not been as extensively researched. Additional categories of media such as music, video games, magazines, and the Internet have been implicated as media that increase the aggressive behavior and affect of those who consume them. Besides television, video games have received the most attention from researchers among all forms of violent media.

Video games.

The video game industry has grown significantly since the introduction of *Pong*, a nonviolent game of table tennis, in 1972. Although the first video game was not violent, it did not take the industry long to determine that violent games led to increased sales. The first violent video game was *Death Race* and was released in 1976 (Gentile & Anderson, 2006). The goal of the game was to run over stick-figured pedestrians who would then scream and turn into gravestones. The

public was outraged by the violent content of this game and some communities even banned its use, but the controversy surrounding this game actually increased sales tenfold (Kent, 2001). This was the first indication to game developers that violence sells and this began the creation of numerous violent games. With technological advancements during the 1980s and early 1990s, video games became increasingly violent and realistic. First-person shooter games were developed at this time which enabled the player to "see" the video game through the eyes of the character being controlled making the games more realistic and making the player feel more involved in the game (Kent, 2001). Video games also began to depict more violent images when characters were injured or killed in the game with splatters or pools of blood and extremities being removed.

Not only has the amount of violence increased in the gaming industry, the overall value of the industry has increased significantly. In less than 30 years the video game industry has grown into a multi-billion dollar industry with annual sales totaling $20 billion worldwide and almost half of these sales ($9.4 billion per year) are in the United States (Carnagey & Anderson, 2004). In a recent survey of over 600 8th and 9th grade students, children averaged nine hours of video game play per week, with boys averaging thirteen hours per week and girls averaging five hours per week (Gentile et al., 2004). Due to the amount of money spent annually and the amount of time per week people spend playing video games, this form of media requires much more research in order to determine what effects these games may be having on behavior and affect. One way to determine these effects maybe to look at the differences and similarities between viewing television and playing video games.

Although television and video games have some similarities in terms of content and graphics, the differences between these forms of media are extensive and they may explain how aggressive behavior may result from certain types of media. One main difference between television and video games is that television is viewed in the third person, meaning that the viewer does not have a viewpoint from a character within the show and does not actively participate in the events taking place in the show. Most video games on the other hand can be viewed in the first person, meaning the player actually sees the activities of the game through the eyes of a character. This first person point of view that video games utilize creates many differences between television and video games. Players of video games are active in the game having control over the actions of the characters whereas viewers of television are passive and have no control over what happens to the characters in the shows being viewed. This also means that players can control the amount of violence they see and the amount of violent actions the characters exhibit in the games; in television the viewers have no control over the amount of violence involved. Television can present real people who are acting out scenes and behaviors while video games only portray animated characters whose behaviors are controlled by the player. Despite these characters being animated, the graphics on video games are becoming much more realistic every year which may increase a players involvement with the characters. Players can even create their own characters that can look identical to themselves so that players truly feel like they are in the game.

Another difference between television and video games is that viewers of television are passive spectators of the events being portrayed and are not rewarded when characters act more aggressively, but players of video games are rewarded for the violent actions of characters. For example, most shooter and first-person games score how many hits or kills a player has and in most games players cannot advance until they conquer a certain character or group of characters which requires using aggressive behaviors. These rewards combined with the realism of the graphics and characters in the games could help to explain how aggression may develop and how beliefs about the acceptability of aggressive behaviors increase in video game players.

The previously discussed theories of aggression show how playing violent video games could potentially lead to aggressive behaviors of individuals. Social learning theory would suggest that while playing violent video games, players are learning aggressive behaviors through observing in the first person how the characters behave and how the characters are rewarded for violent actions. Players are more likely to repeat these behaviors because the characters in the game were not punished for the actions but were actually rewarded and the player felt rewarded by being able to continue to another level of the game therefore reinforcing the belief that aggressive behaviors are acceptable. After playing many violent games, players may begin to form scripts around what types of behaviors are appropriate for certain situations and because most video games are played in the first person these scripts have been well rehearsed while playing the game so script theory would suggest that players are more likely to react aggressively in various situations in their lives. Although theories of aggression appear to explain what effects playing video games could have on behavior, researchers are still trying to determine exactly what effects playing violent video games have on aggressive behavior and affect.

The final part of this analysis will be posted in March 2010 in _Interface_.

This reference list includes sources related to the forthcoming Part II of this article.

5. REFERENCES

Abelson, R. P. (1981). Psychological status of the script concept. _American Psychology_, 36, 715-729.

Anderson, C. A. (1997). Effects of violent movies and trait hostility on hostile feelings and aggressive thoughts. _Aggressive Behavior_, 23, 161-178.

Anderson, C. A., & Bushman, B. J. (2001). Effects of violent video games on aggressive behavior, aggressive cognition, aggressive affect, physiological arousal, and prosocial behavior: A meta-analytic review of the scientific literature. _Psychological Science_, 12, 353-359.

Anderson, C. A., & Bushman, B. J. (2002a). Human aggression. _Annual Review of Psychology_, 53, 27-51.

Anderson, C.A., & Bushman, B.J. (2002b). Media violence and the American public revisited.

American Psychologist, 57, 448-450.

Anderson, C. A., Carnagey, N. L., Flanagan, M., Benjamin, A. J., Eubanks, J., & Valentine, J. C. (2004). Violent video games: Specific effects on violent content on aggressive thoughts and behavior. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 36, 199-248.

Anderson, C. A., & Dill, K. E. (2000). Video games and aggressive thoughts, feelings, and behavior in the laboratory and in life. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78, 772-790.

Anderson, C. A., & Huesman, L. R. (2003). Human aggression: A social-cognitive view. In Hogg, M. A. & Cooper, J. (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Social Psychology* (pp. 296-323). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Anderson, C. A., & Murphy, C. R. (2003). Violent video games and aggressive behavior in young women. *Aggressive Behavior*, 29, 423-429.

Archer, J., & Latham, M. (2004). Variation in beliefs about aggression as a function of relationship to the opponent. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 37, 33-41.

Arriaga, P., Esteves, F., Carneiro, P., & Monteiro, B. (2006). Violent computer games and their effects on state hostility and physiological arousal. *Aggressive Behavior*, 32, 358-371.

Bandura, A. (1973). *Aggression: A social learning theory analysis*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Bandura, A., Ross, D., & Ross, S. A. (1961). Transmission of aggression through imitation of aggressive models. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 63, 575-582.

Bartholow, B. D., & Anderson, C. A. (2002). Effects of violent video games on aggressive behavior: Potential sex differences. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 38, 283-290.

Bartholow, B. D., Sestir, M. A., & Davis, E. B. (2005). Correlates and consequences of exposure to video game violence: Hostile personality, empathy, and aggressive behavior. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 31, 1573-1586.

Bollen, K. A., & Phillips, D. P. (1981). Suicide motor vehicle fatalities in Detroit: A replication. *American Journal of Sociology*, 87, 404-412.

Bushman, B. J. (1998). Priming effects of violent media on the accessibility of aggressive constructs in memory. *Personal and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 24, 537-545.

Bushman, B. J., & Green, R. G. (1990). Role of cognitive-emotional mediators and individual differences in the effects of media violence on aggression. *Journal of Personality and Social*

Psychology, 58, 156-163.

Bushman, B.J., & Huesmann, L.R. (2001). Effects of televised violence on aggression. In D. Singer & J. Singer (Eds.), *Handbook of children and the media* (pp. 223-254). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Buss, A. H., & Perry, M. (1992). The aggression questionnaire. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 63, 452-459.

Carnagey, N. L., & Anderson, C. A. (2004). Violent video game exposure and aggression: A literature review. *Minerva Psichiatrica*, 45, 1-18.

Carnagey, N. L., & Anderson, C. A. (2005). The effects of reward and punishment in violent video games on aggressive affect, cognition, and behavior. *Psychological Science*, 16, 882-889.

Centerwall, B.S. (1989a). Exposure to television as a cause of violence. In G. Comstock (Ed.), *Public communication and behavior* (Vol. 2, pp. 1-58). New York: Academic Press.

Centerwall, B.S. (1989b). Exposure to television as a risk factor for violence. *American Journal of Epidemiology*, 129, 643-652.

Centerwall, B.S. (1992). Television and violence: The scale of the problem and where to go from here. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 267, 3059-3063.

Colwell, J., & Kato, M. (2005). Video game play in British and Japanese adolescents. *Simulation and Gaming*, 36, 518-530.

Colwell, J., & Payne, J. (2000). Negative correlates of computer game play in adolescents. *British Journal of Psychology*, 91, 295-310.

Comstock, G. (1980). New emphases in research on the effects of television and film violence. In E.L. Palmer & A. Dorr (Eds.), *Children and the faces of television: Teaching, violence, selling* (pp. 129-148). New York: Academic Press.

Crick, N. R., Bigbee, M. A., & Howes, C. (1996). Gender differences in children's normative beliefs about aggression: How do I hurt thee? Let me count the ways. *Child Development*, 67, 1003-1014.

Deselms, J. L., & Altman, J. D. (2003). Immediate and prolonged effects of videogame violence. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 33, 1553-1563.

Entertainment Software Association (2006). Entertainment Software Rating Board (ESRB). Retrieved January 26th, 2008 from http://www.esrb.org

Eron, L. D., Huesmann, L. R., Lefkowitz, M. M., & Walder, L. O. (1972). Does television violence cause aggression? *American Psychologist*, 27, 253-263.

Farrar, K. M., Krcmar, M. & Nowak, K. L. (2006). Contextual features of violent video games, mental models, and aggression. *Journal of Communication*, 56, 387-405.

Ferguson, C. J. (2007). Evidence for publication bias in video game violence effects literature: A meta-analytic review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 12, 470-482.

Fleming, M. J., & Rickwood, D. J. (2001). Effects of violent versus nonviolent video games on children's arousal, aggressive mood, and positive mood. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 31, 2047-2071.

Funk, J. B., Flores, G., Buchman, D. D., & Germann, J. N. (1999). Rating electronic games: Violence is in the eye of the beholder. *Youth and Society*, 30, 283-312.

Funk, J. B., Hagan, J., Schimming, J., Bullock, W. A., Buchman, D. D., & Myers, M. (2002). Aggression and psychopathology in adolescents with a preference for violent electronic games. *Aggressive Behavior*, 28, 134-144.

Gentile, D. A., & Anderson, C. A. (2006). Violent video games: The effects on youth and public policy implications. In Dowd, N., Singer, D. G., & Wilson, R. F. (Eds.), *Handbook of Children, Culture, and Violence* (pp. 225-246). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Gentile, D. A., Lynch, P. J., Linder, J. R., & Walsh, D. A. (2004). The effects of violent video game habits on adolescent hostility, aggressive behaviors, and school performance. *Journal of Adolescence*, 27, 5-22.

Haninger, K. & Thompson, K. M. (2004). Content and ratings of teen-rated video games. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 291, 856-865.

Hartmann, T., & Klimmt, C. (2006). Gender and computer games: Exploring females' dislikes. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 11, 910-931.

Hennigan, K.M., Del Rosario, M.L., Heath, L., Cook, T.D., Wharton, J.D., & Calder, B.J. (1982). Impact of the introduction of television on crime in the United States: Empirical findings and theoretical implications. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 42, 461-477.

Henry, D., Guerra, N., Huesmann, R., Tolan, P., VanAcker, R., & Eron, L. (2000). Normative influences on aggression in urban elementary school classrooms. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 28, 59-81.

Huesman, L. R. (1986). Psychological processes promoting the relation between exposure to

media violence and aggressive behavior by the viewer. *Journal of Social Issues*, 42, 125-140.

Huesmann, L. R. (1988). An informational processing model for the development of aggression. *Aggressive Behavior*, 14, 13-24.

Huesmann, L. R., & Eron, L. D. (1986). *Television and the aggressive child: A cross-national comparison*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Huesmann, L. R., & Guerra, N. G. (1997). Children's normative beliefs about aggression and aggressive behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 72, 408-419.

Huesmann, L. R., Guerra, N. G., Zelli, A., & Miller, L. (1992). Differing normative beliefs about aggression for boys and girls. In Bjorkqvist, K. & Niemela, P. (Eds.). Of Mice and Women: Aspects of Female Aggression (pp. 77-87). San Diego, CA: Academic Press, Inc.

Huesmann, L. R., Lagerspetz, K., & Eron, L. D. (1984). Intervening variables in the TV violence-aggression relation: Evidence from two countries. *Developmental Psychology*, 20, 746-775.

Huesmann, L. R., Moise-Titus, J., Podolski, C. L., & Eron, L. D. (2003). Longitudinal relations between children's exposure to TV violence and their aggressive and violent behavior in young adulthood: 1977-1992. *Developmental Psychology*, 39, 201-221.

Johnson, J.G., Cohen, P., Smailes, E.M., Kasen, S., & Brook, J.S. (2002). Television viewing and aggressive behavior during adolescence and adulthood. *Science*, 295, 2468-2471.

Josephson, W. L. (1987). Television violence and children's aggression: Testing the priming, social script, and disinhibition predictions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53, 882-890

Kent, S. (2001). *The ultimate history of video games*. Roseville, CA: Prima.

Krahe, B., & Moller, I. (2004). Playing violent electronic games, hostile attributional style, and aggression-related norms in German adolescents. *Journal of Adolescence*, 27, 53-69.

Lubich, M. (2007, December 26). Vigil finds 'little girl lost' amid chaos of death. The Johnstown Breeze. Retrieved from www.johnstownbreeze.com/modules/php?name=news&file=article&sid=2499

Olson, C. K., Kutner, L. A., Warner, D. E., Almerigi, J. B., Baer, L., Nicholi, A. M., & Beresin, E. V. (2007). Factors correlated with violent video game use by adolescent boys and girls. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 41, 77-83.

Oser, K. (2004). Moms are unsung players in gaming world. *Advertising Age*, 75, 56-57.

Persky, S., & Blascovich, J. (2007). Immersive virtual environments versus traditional platforms: Effects of violent and nonviolent video game play. *Media Psychology*, 10, 135-156.

Phillips, D. P. (1974). The influence of suggestion on suicide: Substantive and theoretical implications of the Werther Effect. *American Sociological Review*, 39, 340-354.

Phillips, D. P. (1979). Suicide, motor vehicle fatalities, and the mass media: Evidence toward a theory of suggestion. *American Journal of Sociology*, 84, 1150-1174.

Phillips, D. P. (1982). The impact of fictional television stories on the U.S. adult fatalities: New evidence on the effect of the mass media on violence. *American Journal of Sociology*, 87, 1340-1359.

Pooley, E. (1999). Portrait of a deadly bond. *Time*, May, 26-32.

Sherry, J. L. (2001). The effects of violent video games on aggression: A meta-analysis. *Human Communication Association*, 27, 409-431.

Sigurdsson, J. F., Gudjonsson, G. H., Bragason, A. V., Kristjansdottir, E., & Sigfusdottir, I. D. (2006). The role of violent cognition in the relationship between personality and the involvement in violent films and computer games. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 41, 381-392.

Souweidane, V., & Huesmann, L. R. (1999). The influence of American urban culture on the development of normative beliefs about aggression in Middle-Eastern immigrants. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 27, 239-253.

Sukhodolsky, D. G., & Ruchkin, V. V. (2004). Association of normative beliefs and anger with aggression and antisocial behavior in Russian male juvenile offenders and high school students. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 32, 225-236.

Thompson, K. M., & Haninger (2001). Violence in E-rated video games. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 286, 591-598.

Werner, N. E., & Nixon, C. L. (2005). Normative beliefs and relational aggression: An investigation of the cognitive bases of adolescent aggressive behavior. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 34, 229-243.

This entry was posted in Uncategorized by **Editor**. Bookmark the **permalink [http://bcis.pacificu.edu/interface/?p=3737]** .

10 THOUGHTS ON "ADULTS WHO PLAY VIOLENT VIDEO GAMES AND THEIR NORMATIVE BELIEFS ABOUT AGGRESSION (PART 1)"

Editor
on **February 1, 2010 at 11:50 AM** said:

Poster Name: Chris Pruett

Message: Ashley, Thank you for the extremely through treatment. I noticed that you referenced research from Olson and Kutner. I am interested in what you thought of their fairly major study in 2008 that found, "that the 'big fears' bandied about in the press — that violent video games make children significantly more violent in the real world; that they will engage in the illegal, immoral, sexist and violent acts they see in some of these games — are not supported by the current research, at least in such a simplistic form." (This is from Grand Theft Childhood, their extensive report on the subject). I ask because, as a regular game player and a (former) member of the game industry, the findings of Olson and Kutner echo conclusions that many of my peers consider common sense: that people (kids included) understand the difference between fantasy and reality. Olson says in an interview: "One disturbing finding was the correlation between playing M-rated games and bullying. Boys who had more M-rated titles on their most-played lists were more likely to report bullying other kids. But even so, most boys who play M-rated games are not bullies. And this was only a correlation; it's impossible to show cause and effect from a one-time survey." This quote in particular rings true to me: "If your child is doing well in school, has friends, does his chores without too much fuss… he probably needs few restrictions on his game play. If he stops spending time on other activities, has a drop in grades, is increasingly isolated, plays games instead of sleeping… this needs looking into. The video game play may be the cause of problems, a symptom of problems (such as depression), or a bit of both. Talk to a pediatrician or mental health professional." Since you clearly have a broad understanding of the current research in this area, I am very interested in your take on Olson and Kutner's findings. They seemed down to earth and realistic to me, and when their report was published it was hailed as significantly more through than some of its counterparts (though I don't know if that's actually true). Here are a couple of interesting articles about this research, including an interview: http://www.openeducation.net/2008/03/16/shoot-em-up-video-games-the-cause-of-greater-anti-social-behaviors-in-teens/ http://www.openeducation.net/2008/03/17/author-reveals-the-surprising-truth-about-violent-video-games/ http://www.openeducation.net/2008/03/18/experts-state-do-not-banish-instead-manage-violent-video-game-play/

Editor
on **February 1, 2010 at 11:52 AM** said:

Poster Name: indian escort north

Message: Truly cool site to spend some time on reading it as for me. The only question I have, why don't you place this article to social media? It can bring lots of traffic to this blog.

dating
on **January 30, 2014 at 11:34 AM** said:

Thank you to your beneficial writeup. It actually was a amusement account it. Appear advanced to far added agreeable from you! However, how can we communicate?

Lódz
on **February 1, 2014 at 2:15 AM** said:

What a funny blog! I genuinely enjoyed watching this comic video with my loved ones in addition to for example my mates.

nigeria entertainment news
on **February 4, 2014 at 10:31 AM** said:

I like what you guys are up to. These kinds of intelligent work and reporting! Keep up the superb works guys. I've incorporated you guys to my blogroll. I think it will improve the importance of my site.

nigeria dating
on **February 5, 2014 at 12:18 AM** said:

I haven't noticed the movie but, given the focus of this site, I discovered this quote from an Indiewire article interesting:

monish
on **February 5, 2014 at 1:55 AM** said:

I remembered the blog of your site , it was nice , or also want to say that not too good
or not too bad.
hanks.

โปรแกรมฟุตบอล วันนี้
on **February 5, 2014 at 8:07 AM** said:

Hi, I do believe this is a great website. I stumbledupon it 🙂
I am going to return once again since i have saved as a favorite it.

Money and freedom is the best way to change, may you be rich and continue to help
other people.

cork board ideas
on **February 5, 2014 at 12:56 PM** said:

You are so cool! I do not think I've truly read anything like this before. So wonderful to
discover someone with some original thoughts on this subject. Really.. thanks for starting
this up. This website is something that is required on the internet, someone with a bit of
originality!

world net daily
on **February 6, 2014 at 10:37 AM** said:

Buildings will all ultimately fall to the ground. Step three: Arrive Early Show up at the
meeting early and set up your gear.