**Analyses on the Video Game Evaluations**

Factor Analysis:

To assess whether the games differed on any theoretically relevant variables, a16-item questionnaire assessed participant’s evaluations of the game they had just played (e.g., “The game was difficult to play”, “The game was exciting”, “The game was boring”, “The game was frustrating”). Participants used a 1 (*strongly agree*) to 10 (*strongly disagree*) scale (cf. Anderson & Dill, 2000). Exploratory factor analyses were conducted on 15 video game evaluation dimensions (excluding the violence item) to observe whether there is an underlying pattern for all of these video game dimensions. Varimax (orthogonal) and Harris-Kaiser (oblique) exploratory factor analyses were conducted. Both factor analyses generated the same two factor pattern, the same as in our prior studies with these items. The rotated factor pattern suggested one factor based on 11 items and another factor based on 4 items. Factor 1 related to how fun, exciting, involving, and enjoyable the game was (the “fun” factor). Factor 2 related to how difficult or frustrating the game was (the “difficulty” factor). The mean for the eleven-item fun composite was *M* =4.82, alpha = .92. The mean for the four-item difficulty composite was *M* =6.98, alpha = 0.70. These two scales were not significantly correlated with each other (*r* = 0.06). This pattern replicates several prior studies (e.g., Anderson & Dill, 2000).

Video Game Effect on Video Game Evaluations:

A one-way ANOVA was conducted on each of these two composites. In Experiment 1, neither the game type main effect nor any of the game contrasts yielded a significant effect on either dimension, *F*s (2,201) < 1, p > .20 (see Table 1). Similarly, in Experiment 2, neither the game type main effect nor any of the contrasts yielded a significant effect on either video game evaluation dimension, *F*s (2,250) < 1, p > .20 see Table 2).

Table 1. Means and standard deviations for the video game evaluations for each of the games in Experiment 1.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Experiment 1 | |
| Game Type | Ns | Fun Factor Eval. Means & SD | Difficulty Factor Eval. Means & SD |
| Arab-Terrorists | 70 | 4.90(2.27) | 6.96 (1.80) |
| Russian-Terrorists | 72 | 4.80(1.98) | 7.16 (1.69) |
| Neutral Golf | 62 | 4.75(2.13) | 6.67 (1.71) |

Table 2. Means and standard deviations for the video game evaluations for each of the games in Experiment 2.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Experiment 2 | |
| Game Type | Ns | Fun Factor Eval. Means & SD | Difficulty Factor Eval. Means & SD |
| Arab-Terrorists | 49 | 5.73(2.59) | 6.40 (2.14) |
| Russian-Terrorists | 51 | 5.13(2.04) | 6.67 (1.51) |
| Neutral Golf | 51 | 5.42(2.41) | 6.32 (1.75) |
| Arabian Lord | 54 | 5.81(2.99) | 6.25 (2.03) |
| Unreal Tournament | 54 | 5.17(2.75) | 6.06 (2.43) |

**Video Game Effect on Violence Evaluations**

A one-way ANOVA was conducted on the violence item. This item asked participants to rate to what extent they agree with this statement regarding the game they played, “The game was violent” on a scale from 1 (strongly disagree) – 10 (strongly agree). The tables below present the means and standard deviations on this violent measure for study 1 and study 2 games.

Table 3. Means and standard deviations for the violence evaluation item for each of the games in Experiment 1.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Experiment 1 | |
| Game Type | Ns | Violence Eval. Means | SD |
| Arab-Terrorists | 70 | 7.54a | 2.49 |
| Russian-Terrorists | 72 | 7.59a | 2.46 |
| Neutral Golf | 62 | 1.14b | 0.40 |

Within each table, means that do not share a superscript are significantly different at *p*<.05.

Table 4. Means and standard deviations for the violence evaluation item for each of the games in Experiment 2.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Experiment 2 | |
| Game Type | Ns | Violence Eval. Means | SD |
| Arab-Terrorists | 49 | 7.20a | 2.53 |
| Russian-Terrorists | 51 | 6.62a | 2.57 |
| Neutral Golf | 51 | 1.08b | 0.59 |
| Arabian Lord | 54 | 1.57b | 1.59 |
| Unreal Tournament | 54 | 7.19a | 2.30 |

Within each table, means that do not share a superscript are significantly different at *p*<.05.

**Contrasts and Pooled Error Term Approach Used in Experiment 2**

As described in the main article, the five video game conditions used in Experiment 2 can be conceived as being a 2 x 2 factorial design, plus 1 additional control group. The most appropriate error terms for all *F-*tests in such a design is the pooled error term derived from all five groups. Table 5 shows the specific contrasts that constitute the traditional main effects and interaction of the 2 x 2 ANOVA, and the additional contrasts involving tests of the 5th additional group (Unreal Tournament, which is violent but without either a terrorist theme or Arab characters).

Table 5. Contrast weights used in Experiment 2.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Effect being tested | Arab-terrorists | Russian-terrorists | Arabian Lord | 3D Ultra Mini-Golf | Unreal Tournament |
| Main effect of terrorism theme (T) | +1 | +1 | -1 | -1 | 0 |
| Main effect of Arab character (A) | +1 | -1 | +1 | -1 | 0 |
| Interaction (T x A) | +1 | -1 | -1 | +1 | 0 |
| Unreal Tournament vs. Terrorist games | +1 | +1 | 0 | 0 | -2 |
| Unreal Tournament vs. nonviolent games | 0 | 0 | +1 | +1 | -2 |
| Arab-terrorist vs. Arabian Lord | +1 | 0 | -1 | 0 | 0 |
| Arabian Lord vs. Mini-Golf | 0 | 0 | +1 | -1 | 0 |