

---

## Authors' Note

---

In the summer of 2000, the U.S. Surgeon General asked the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) to establish an expert panel of media-violence researchers charged with the task of reporting on the effects of media violence. This report was to be included as part of a larger report on youth violence. Rowell Huesmann organized the media-violence expert panel and served as its chair. The authors of this report were that expert panel.

As members of the expert panel, we met in August 2000, communicated extensively, and submitted a first draft to NIMH and the Surgeon General's staff in September. In early November, we received from NIMH a revised draft that we considered to be a distortion of the research and completely unacceptable. In consultation with the relevant federal offices, we revised our original report in an effort to preserve the report's scientific accuracy while responding to the concerns that had led to the initial revisions. Later that month, we presented and discussed our revised report with key representatives from NIMH and the Office of the Surgeon General, modified it once again, and believed we had reached agreement on this statement. However, when the final Surgeon General's Report on Youth Violence was released in January 2001, it did not contain a separate chapter on media violence; instead, the full report discussed media violence only in a section on risk factors and included a brief and substantially altered appendix on media violence. The decision to proceed this way was made by the Surgeon General's office without consent from the expert panel.

This *Psychological Science in the Public Interest* report is a modification of the subcommittee's November 2000 report. Changes include updating the literature review, altering wording to make this work more suitable for this current publication, and a host of other corrections and stylistic changes. The main structure, gist, and overall arguments remain the same.

In such a joint endeavor over a long period of time, it is impossible to accurately specify the exact contributions made by each panel member, and consequently, authorship is alphabetical. However, we should note the roles played by the various committee participants in the preparation of this report. Huesmann chaired the expert panel and was instrumental in organizing the meetings and integrating the writings. His main writing contributions were to the introduction, overview of the research, and theoretical section. Leonard Berkowitz contributed in multiple ways (telephone and e-mail discussions, the November meeting, writing and reference suggestions), particularly in regard to the introduction, overview of the research, and theoretical section. Craig Anderson initially dealt principally with the overview of the research and the theoretical, interventions, and discussion sections, but later took the lead in updating and revising the panel's report into its present form. Edward Donnerstein, Neil Malamuth, and Daniel Linz focused primarily on the sections discussing moderators and media use and content, although Malamuth also contributed to the theoretical section. James Johnson joined mainly in the preparation of the overview of the research. Ellen Wartella contributed mainly to the sections on media use and content and interventions. Generally, though, there was considerably more polishing of multiple sections by multiple people than this brief listing suggests. In other words, all made essential contributions to the entire project.

—Craig A. Anderson, Leonard Berkowitz,  
Edward Donnerstein, L. Rowell Huesmann,  
James D. Johnson, Daniel Linz,  
Neil M. Malamuth, and Ellen Wartella