Journal for the Child Development, Exceptionality and Education, 7(2), 47-59
December 2026 e-ISSN: 2757-7554
jcdee.com

Genc Bilge Publishing Ltd.
(Young Wise) © 2026
gencbilgeyayincilik.com

Review Article

Video and digital games: Historical controversies, benefits, and risks for children and adolescents

Hanna David[1]

Tel Aviv University (Emerita), Tel Aviv, Israel

Article Info

Received: 21 June 2026
Accepted: 12 September 2026
Online: 30 December 2026

Keywords
Adolescents
Aggression
Children
Digital games
Gaming interventions
Mood management
Moral panic
Video games
Visuospatial skills

Abstract

Video and digital games have been the focus of sustained public and scientific debate since their commercial emergence in the late 1970s, particularly regarding their effects on children and adolescents. Early public and scientific discourse frequently portrayed gaming as a source of physical injury, addiction, aggression, social isolation, academic problems, and moral decline. However, subsequent empirical research has produced a substantially more differentiated picture of both the benefits and risks of gaming. This review examines the historical foundations of controversies surrounding video and digital games and synthesizes contemporary evidence concerning their cognitive, emotional, social, therapeutic, and physical effects. . Research indicates that moderate, purposeful gaming may improve visuospatial abilities, attentional control, problem-solving, mood regulation, social connection, and selected educational outcomes. Gaming-based interventions have also demonstrated therapeutic potential, particularly for depressive symptoms and attention-related difficulties among young people. At the same time, important risks remain, especially when gaming becomes excessive, compulsive, or disruptive to everyday functioning. These include repetitive-strain injuries, sleep disruption, problematic gaming, and adverse mental-health and academic outcomes. Evidence concerning violent games and serious real-world aggression remains more contested, with recent research emphasizing relatively small effects and the importance of individual and contextual factors. Overall, the evidence suggests that the developmental consequences of gaming for children and adolescents depend less on gaming itself than on the duration, content, context, and pattern of engagement.

To cite this article

David, H. (2026 Video and digital games: Historical controversies, benefits, and risks for children and adolescents. *Journal for the Child Development, Exceptionality and Education, 7*(2), 47-59. DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.22768010

Introduction

Digital games have become an important part of children's and adolescents' everyday lives, extending beyond entertainment to encompass learning, social interaction, cognitive development, and emotion regulation. Recent research suggests that video game play may contribute positively to visuospatial skills, attention, and broader cognitive performance (Markey et al., 2020; Zhao et al., 2026), while games may also serve as tools for emotion regulation and the reduction of stress and anxiety (Pallavicini et al., 2021; Formosa et al., 2025). At the same time, problematic and excessive patterns of gaming have been associated with sleep disturbances, psychological difficulties, and impaired functioning (Khanani et al., 2025). Contemporary evidence therefore suggests that digital games cannot be understood as simply beneficial or harmful; rather, their effects depend on patterns and duration of use, as well as individual characteristics.

[1]Dr. Tel Aviv University (emirata), Israel. E-mail: hannadav@tauex.tau.ac.il ORCID: 0000-0002-7917-3152

This increasingly nuanced understanding makes it important to reconsider how concerns about video games emerged historically and how these early controversies shaped subsequent scientific and public debates.

The Historical Basis of Arguments Against Video and Computer Games

Parents, educators, and public authorities first began to view computers and computer-based technologies, particularly video games, as potential dangers to children in the early 1980s. This period coincided with the explosive popularity of arcade machines and early home consoles. Games such as *Space Invaders*, *Pac-Man*, *Asteroids*, *Donkey Kong*, and the Atari systems drew large numbers of young people into public arcades and, increasingly, into domestic settings. The resulting public reaction has been widely characterized by historians and media scholars as a classic moral panic – an episode of intense, often exaggerated societal concern in which a new cultural form is blamed for a range of social ills (Newman, 2017).

The early-to-mid 1980s panic centered on several interlocking fears. Arcades were frequently portrayed in mainstream media as "dens of vice," spaces in which teenagers risked exposure to drugs, gambling, truancy, and "bad elements." Commentators warned that the addictive quality of the games would lead children to neglect schoolwork, steal money to feed their habits, and withdraw from conventional social relationships. Contemporary newspaper and magazine coverage from 1981–1983 repeatedly claimed that video games were cultivating "mindless, ill-tempered adolescents." Opinion pieces and expert warnings asserted that the rapid, repetitive, and competitive nature of early games would foster aggression and desensitization to violence (Newman, 2017). These themes echoed earlier moral panics surrounding pinball machines (long banned in some jurisdictions as a form of gambling), comic books, television, and rock music. Video games represented the newest technology perceived as threatening children's moral and developmental well-being.

Physical harms received particular attention and were among the first concerns to receive formal medical documentation. In May 1981, T. C. McCowan published a letter in the *New England Journal of Medicine* describing "Space-Invaders wrist," a form of tenosynovitis (inflammation of the tendon sheath) caused by the rapid, repetitive joystick and button manipulations required by popular arcade and home games (McCowan, 1981). In the same issue, Neiman & Ushiroda (1981) reported "slot-machine tendinitis," a related repetitive-strain condition observed among frequent casino gamblers, situating video-game injuries within a broader category of novel, technology- or recreation-induced musculoskeletal disorders. Subsequent reports expanded the catalog of ailments. Reinstein (1983) described de Quervain's stenosing tenosynovitis linked to prolonged video-game play. Martyn (1983) contributed a tongue-in-cheek case of "Nurd knuckles" – painful metacarpophalangeal joints resulting from the forceful manipulation of a malleable stress-relief toy – in the *Canadian Medical Association Journal*. Later compilations by Griffiths (2015a) cataloged additional neuromuscular complications under playful labels such as "Pac-Man phalanx," "firing-finger syndrome," and "pseudovideoma." A 1984 United Press International report further heightened public anxiety by publicizing a neurologist's warning that certain games could produce temporary or even permanent hand paralysis through sustained pressure on peripheral nerves (Del Guercio, 1984).

These medical case reports, while often limited to single patients or small series, supplied concrete, clinically framed evidence that lent credibility to broader parental and journalistic concerns about physical damage. The press readily amplified them, and they entered popular discourse as proof that the new medium posed tangible bodily risks alongside more abstract social and moral ones.

Mental and behavioral harms were articulated with equal vigor. On 9 November 1982, U.S. Surgeon General C. Everett Koop remarked, in an informal comment following a speech on family violence at the University of Pittsburgh, that video games might be hazardous to young people's health. He stated that children were becoming addicted "body and soul" and that games such as *Missile Command* offered "nothing constructive," reducing experience to the endless imperative to "zap the enemy" (United Press International, 1982; Associated Press, 1982). Although Koop later clarified that these were personal observations unsupported by scientific evidence at the time, the statements received extensive media coverage. They reinforced the emerging narrative that electronic games constituted a public-health threat.

Addiction analogies were common: games were compared to drugs, and children were described as "mesmerized" and unable to stop playing (e.g., *The Battle for America's Youth*, 1982).

Institutional responses followed. In 1984, the American Academy of Pediatrics Task Force on Children and Television issued its first formal statement urging limits on children's exposure to television and related electronic media; subsequent policy statements expanded the caution to include computers and electronic games as home computing became more widespread (American Academy of Pediatrics, 1984; later referenced in American Academy of Pediatrics (2001). Local governments enacted zoning restrictions, age limits, and, in some municipalities, outright bans on arcades. These measures reflected a widespread parental and official perception that the new technology required active containment.

The 1980s panic did not disappear entirely as the arcade era declined. The introduction of home consoles, particularly the Nintendo Entertainment System in the mid-1980s, shifted much gaming into supervised domestic spaces and temporarily reduced the intensity of public alarm. However, the underlying interpretive framework-video games as potential agents of physical injury, addiction, aggression, isolation, and moral decay – persisted and re-emerged with greater force in subsequent decades. The early 1990s controversies surrounding *Mortal Kombat* and *Night Trap*, the 1993–1994 U.S. Senate hearings, and the intense scrutiny following the 1999 Columbine High School shooting all drew upon the rhetorical and conceptual repertoire established in the early 1980s.

In retrospective scholarly assessments, the early video-game panic is frequently analyzed as a classic instance of moral panic dynamics: extreme claims preceded robust empirical evidence; the feared object was treated as a scapegoat for wider anxieties about youth, technology, and social change; and media amplification magnified isolated medical reports and anecdotal observations into a generalized threat narrative (Newman, 2017; Markey & Ferguson, 2017). Many of the most dramatic predictions-widespread addiction comparable to narcotics, systematic academic collapse, and a generation rendered mindless and violent—failed to materialize on the scale anticipated. Nevertheless, the physical overuse injuries first documented in the early 1980s remained clinically recognizable, and the cultural template of suspicion toward interactive electronic media continued to shape both public discourse and research agendas for decades.

Thus, the historical basis of arguments against video and computer games rests on a distinctive early-1980s confluence of rapid technological diffusion, visible physical complaints, vivid media framing of social and moral dangers, authoritative (if sometimes informal) medical and public-health pronouncements, and institutional efforts at regulation. This constellation of concerns established a durable interpretive framework that subsequent generations of parents, policymakers, and researchers have repeatedly revisited, revised, and contested.

Pros of Video, Computer, and Virtual Games

Research on video, computer, and virtual games has shifted markedly over the past three decades. Whereas early scholarship and public discourse emphasized potential harms, a substantial and growing body of evidence now documents a range of cognitive, emotional, social, therapeutic, and even physical benefits associated with moderate and purposeful engagement. These positive outcomes are not automatic or universal; they depend on game genre, duration and quality of play, social context, and individual differences. Nevertheless, when play is harmonious rather than compulsive, the advantages frequently outweigh the disadvantages (Granic et al., 2014; Markey et al., 2020).

One of the most consistently replicated benefits concerns visuospatial and broader cognitive skills. Action video games, in particular, have been shown to enhance visual acuity, contrast sensitivity, spatial cognition, attentional control, and mental rotation abilities (Bejjanki et al., 2014; Choi & Feng, 2019; Green & Bavelier, 2012; Markey et al., 2020). Markey (ibid.) notes that these improvements can match the gains produced by formal spatial-training courses lasting several months (Uttal et al., 2013). A large-scale systematic review and set of meta-analyses by Zhao et al. (2026), encompassing 133 studies and 14,245 participants, confirmed a statistically significant though small positive association between video-game play and cognitive performance across memory, spatial ability, visual attention, cognitive control, and intelligence. No robust moderating effects of gender, age, health status, game type, or cultural context emerged, suggesting a relatively generalizable effect. Complementary findings by Martinez (2023) linked regular video-game play

to superior performance on measures of mental flexibility, planning, visual and verbal working memory, spatial processing, and fluid intelligence. In educational contexts, digital games that embed dynamic two- and three-dimensional environments have been shown to support visuospatial reasoning and mathematical thinking—skills that strongly predict success in STEM domains (Lowrie & Jorgensen, 2015). Boys' greater preference for action-oriented, spatially demanding games has been proposed as one contributor to observed gender differences in spatial performance. However, training studies indicate that girls and women can close much of this gap through targeted gameplay.

Beyond spatial cognition, games foster problem-solving, strategic thinking, and executive function. Strategy, role-playing, and construction-oriented titles (for example, *Minecraft*) create environments in which players must plan, adapt, and integrate visual imagery with quantitative reasoning. These experiences differ from traditional classroom instruction and can broaden numeracy practices while sustaining high levels of engagement (Lowrie & Jorgensen, 2015).

Emotional and affective benefits constitute a second major domain. Drawing on Zillmann's Mood Management Theory, researchers have demonstrated that individuals selectively use media, including interactive games, to regulate arousal and affective states (Zillmann, 1988a, 1988b; Reinecke, 2017). Players choose high-arousal games when under-stimulated and calming or low-arousal content when stressed; they also prefer content whose hedonic valence and semantic affinity help terminate or diminish negative moods. Empirical studies confirm that preferred commercial games reliably elevate positive affect, reduce negative affect, and promote relaxation (Russoniello et al., 2009; Ryan, Rigby, & Przybylski, 2006). Casual puzzle games with short play sessions, such as *Bejeweled* or *Angry Birds*, are especially effective for rapid mood repair and anxiety reduction (Granic et al., 2014). Physiological evidence further supports these subjective reports: gameplay has been associated with increased heart-rate variability, decreased heart rate, and lowered cortisol levels (Wagener et al., 2025). Open-world and accessible "joyful" games have been linked to lower loneliness and higher emotional resilience, self-control, and stoicism (Hou et al., 2026). Systematic reviews indicate that casual, action, adventure, and exergames reduce stress and anxiety across age groups, even after brief sessions (Pallavicini et al., 2021; Kowal et al., 2021; Formosa et al., 2025; Ballou et al., 2025). Villani et al. (2018) concluded that commercial games often support emotion regulation more effectively than time-limited serious games precisely because of their intrinsic enjoyment and rich gameplay features.

Therapeutic applications extend these emotional benefits into clinical domains. A systematic review and meta-analysis by Townsend et al. (2022) found that gaming interventions produced a statistically significant medium-sized reduction in depressive symptoms among young people aged 12–25 years (Hedges' $g = -0.54$ in randomized controlled trials), although effects on anxiety were non-significant. Parallel work reports small-to-moderate benefits for ADHD symptoms in youth (Bryant et al., 2024, $g \approx 0.28$) and moderate reductions in depression via exergaming (Tang et al., 2026, $g = -0.40$). Fleming et al. (2012) demonstrated clinically meaningful reductions in depression among treatment-refusing adolescents using therapeutic computer games. Griffiths (2013, 2017) reviewed the extensive medical and psychological literature about video games as therapy. Serious and gamified digital therapeutics for attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder consistently improve attention, hyperactivity/impulsivity, and related executive functions across multiple systematic reviews published between 2020 and 2025. More broadly in healthcare settings, commercial and custom-designed games have been used to improve treatment adherence and train clinicians in clinical decision-making (Kato, 2010).

Social benefits are particularly evident in multiplayer and cooperative contexts. Collective play and participation in in-game communities enhance both online and offline social capital, strengthen friendships, and reduce loneliness (Scheifer & Samuel, 2025; Griffiths' extensive body of work on social interactions in massively multiplayer games, e.g., 1991, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005a, b, 2010). Player interdependence, the need to rely on others to achieve goals, drives bonding even in competitive designs (Depping et al., 2018). Longitudinal and within-person analyses show that increases in social gaming are associated with decreases in loneliness, with especially pronounced effects for boys (Lacko et al., 2025). Griffiths and colleagues have long documented that online gaming environments can foster genuine friendships and social support, countering earlier stereotypes of isolation (Cole & Griffiths, 2007; Griffiths et al., 2003, 2004).

Physical benefits accrue primarily through active video games and exergames. These titles consistently elicit light-to-moderate intensity activity and produce moderate overall effects on physical activity levels, with the strongest gains observed among older adults and individuals with overweight (Vera-Ponce et al., 2025). Meta-analyses demonstrate significant improvements in balance (Berg Balance Scale, Mini-BESTest, Timed Up-and-Go) among prefrail, frail, and nursing-home residents, with effect sizes often in the moderate-to-large range. Virtual-reality-based exercise interventions further improve physical function, cognition, and depressive symptoms in older adults (Peng et al., 2026; Liang et al., 2026).

Additional positive outcomes include educational gains, support for individuals with disabilities (Kuo et al., 2024), and contributions to surgical and clinical training. Across domains, benefits are clearest when gaming is moderate, intrinsically motivated (harmonious rather than obsessive), socially connected, and balanced with other life activities. Heavy, solitary, or compulsive play does not reliably produce the same advantages and may reverse them.

In summary, the empirical literature establishes that video, computer, and virtual games can enhance visuospatial and executive cognition, facilitate adaptive mood regulation and stress recovery, deliver measurable therapeutic effects for depression and ADHD symptoms, foster social connection, and promote physical activity and balance. Experimental, longitudinal, and meta-analytic evidence across cognitive psychology, media psychology, clinical science, and gerontology supports these benefits. Far from being uniformly detrimental, games are a versatile medium whose positive potential becomes apparent under conditions of balanced, purposeful, and often social engagement.

Cons of Video, Computer, and Virtual Games

Although a substantial body of research documents cognitive, emotional, social, and therapeutic benefits associated with video, computer, and virtual games, a parallel literature identifies genuine risks and potential harms. These adverse outcomes are neither inevitable nor uniformly distributed; they depend strongly on the quantity and quality of use, game content, social context, and individual vulnerability. The clearest and most robust risks arise from problematic or addictive patterns of play rather than from moderate, harmonious engagement. Nevertheless, physical, psychological, and behavioral concerns remain clinically and socially relevant and warrant careful consideration.

Physical health risks constitute one of the longest-standing categories of documented harm. Early medical literature from the 1980s first identified repetitive-strain injuries linked to the rapid, high-frequency movements required by arcade and early home controllers. Conditions such as “Space-Invaders wrist” (tenosynovitis of the wrist or thumb), de Quervain’s stenosing tenosynovitis, “joystick digit,” “Pac-Man phalanx,” and related neuromuscular complaints were reported in case series and letters to major medical journals (McCowan, 1981; Reinstein, 1983; Martyn, 1983; Griffiths, 2015b). Although controller ergonomics have improved, prolonged or poorly supported play continues to produce musculoskeletal strain, tendon irritation, and localized joint stress. Beyond the hands and wrists, heavy gaming (commonly defined as exceeding approximately ten hours per week) has been associated in observational studies with poorer dietary quality, elevated body-mass index, and disrupted sleep architecture. Sleep disruption, in particular, functions as a key mediating pathway for a range of secondary mental-health and cognitive effects, with adolescent girls often showing heightened vulnerability (Khanani et al., 2025). Visual strain and, in extreme cases, reports of temporary nerve-related sensory or motor disturbances have also appeared in the historical and contemporary record (Del Guercio, 1984).

A second and more consequential domain concerns problematic use and gaming disorder. Internet Gaming Disorder (IGD) or Gaming Disorder is now formally recognized in major diagnostic systems. Prevalence estimates among adolescents and young adults typically range between 5% and 8%, with higher rates observed among male and highly engaged players. Longitudinal research demonstrates bidirectional associations: problematic gaming predicts subsequent increases in depressive symptoms, emotional dysregulation, and reduced life satisfaction, while pre-existing depression, anxiety, loneliness, and low well-being also elevate the risk of later problematic play. Effect sizes are generally small to medium. Critically, the cognitive and functional impairments linked to gaming are concentrated among individuals who exhibit loss of control, continued play despite harm, and prioritization of games over occupational, academic, or social responsibilities. In contrast, high but non-addictive volumes of play often show neutral or even

positive cognitive associations (e.g., Nuyens et al., 2017, 2018). Thus, the distinction between harmonious and compulsive engagement is central to understanding risk.

Mental-health correlates extend beyond formal gaming disorder. Problematic gaming trajectories, especially when combined with heavy social-media use, are associated with elevated rates of depression, anxiety, suicidal ideation and behaviors, sleep disturbance, and externalizing problems. By comparison, total screen time yields weaker and less consistent associations once addictive patterns are statistically controlled. Social media platforms frequently demonstrate more reliable negative links across mental-health domains than gaming itself. Sleep disruption again emerges as a prominent mechanism, particularly for girls. These findings underscore that the medium is less decisive than the pattern of use and the broader digital ecology in which gaming is embedded (Khanani et al., 2025).

The most publicly salient and scientifically contested risk involves aggression and violence. The comprehensive meta-analysis by Anderson et al. (2010), synthesizing 136 studies and more than 130,000 participants from Eastern and Western cultures, reported significant effects of violent-game exposure on aggressive behavior, cognition, and affect, as well as reductions in empathy and prosocial behavior. The authors interpreted these results as evidence of a causal risk factor. Subsequent critiques, however, have substantially qualified these conclusions. Ferguson (2007) and Ferguson & Kilburn 2009, 2010) identified publication bias, reliance on weak or unstandardized laboratory proxies (noise blasts, hot-sauce paradigms, reaction-time tasks), and over-generalization from minor laboratory aggression to serious real-world violence. Even after these methodological concerns, the overall effect size remained small (approximately $r = .15$). Ferguson's (2011) prospective longitudinal study of adolescents found that violent-game exposure did not predict later serious aggression or violence once depressive symptoms and antisocial traits were controlled; mental-health factors proved far more predictive. Multiple re-evaluations and real-world analyses (Ferguson, 2008, 2010; Markey & Ferguson, 2017; Drummond et al., 2020; Ferguson et al., 2020) have similarly failed to establish a meaningful causal link between violent games and serious violent crime, homicide, or mass shootings. School-shooter risk assessments have likewise found that perpetrators do not consume unusually high levels of violent media relative to peers. Contemporary scientific consensus therefore distinguishes small, short-term effects on mild aggressive affect or cognition from any substantial contribution to serious societal violence. Attribution of mass violence to video games continues to function more as a cultural scapegoat than as an evidence-based causal account (Markey & Ferguson, 2017; Final Report of the Federal Commission on School Safety, 2018).

Additional concerns include potential interference with academic performance and social development under conditions of excessive, solitary use. Early moral-panic claims of widespread isolation and scholastic collapse have not been borne out for moderate players; many multiplayer environments demonstrably foster social capital. Nevertheless, when gaming displaces sleep, physical activity, face-to-face interaction, or schoolwork to a significant degree, negative academic and social sequelae can appear. These effects are again dose- and context-dependent rather than inherent to the medium.

In aggregate, the risks associated with video, computer, and virtual games are real but patterned. Physical overuse injuries, sleep disruption, and metabolic correlates accompany heavy or ergonomically poor play. Problematic or addictive use shows bidirectional links with poorer mental health and functional impairment. Claims of strong causal effects on serious aggression or societal violence, by contrast, rest on weaker and more contested evidence and have been repeatedly challenged by methodological critiques and real-world data. The scientific literature increasingly converges on the principle that harms are maximized under conditions of loss of control, social isolation, sleep deprivation, and pre-existing vulnerability, while remaining modest or absent under conditions of moderate, socially embedded, and intrinsically motivated play. Recognizing these contingencies is essential to move beyond polarized moral-panic framings toward evidence-based guidance for parents, clinicians, and policymakers.

Conclusion

The scientific and cultural debate surrounding video, computer, and virtual games has evolved considerably since the early 1980s. However, it remains marked by persistent tension between alarmist interpretations and accumulating

empirical evidence. This paper traces the historical foundations of anti-game arguments, reviews the principal benefits documented in contemporary research, and examines the principal risks and limitations. The resulting picture is one of complexity rather than polarity: games are neither an unalloyed social good nor an inherent public-health menace. Their effects depend on content, dose, context, and individual vulnerability.

The historical record demonstrates that organized parental and institutional concern emerged rapidly with the arcade boom of the late 1970s and early 1980s. Contemporary media framed arcades as dens of vice that exposed youth to drugs, gambling, truancy, and undesirable social influences. Parallel fears encompassed academic decline, social isolation, and the cultivation of "mindless, ill-tempered adolescents." Physical complaints received early clinical attention: McCowan's 1981 description of "Space-Invaders wrist" (tenosynovitis caused by repetitive joystick and button use), together with related reports of slot-machine tendinitis, de Quervain's tenosynovitis, Nurd knuckles, Pac-Man phalanx, and other neuromuscular syndromes, supplied concrete medical anchors for broader anxiety (McCowan, 1981; Neiman & Ushiroda, 1981; Reinstein, 1983; Martyn, 1983; Griffiths, 2015a). Surgeon General C. Everett Koop's 1982 informal remarks linking games to addiction "body and soul" and to a lack of constructive content further amplified public alarm, even though he later acknowledged the absence of supporting scientific evidence at the time. The American Academy of Pediatrics' 1984 statement on children and television, subsequently extended to electronic media, marked an early institutional formalization of caution. These early arguments established a durable interpretive template—games as agents of physical injury, addiction, aggression, isolation, and moral decay—that subsequent decades repeatedly reactivated, most notably during the early-1990s controversies over *Mortal Kombat* and *Night Trap* and in the aftermath of the 1999 Columbine shootings.

Against this historical backdrop, a substantial body of research has documented meaningful benefits. Cognitive gains are among the most robust. Action and certain other genres reliably improve visuospatial skills, including mental rotation, spatial attention, contrast sensitivity, and attentional control; these improvements can rival those produced by formal spatial-training programs (Green & Bavelier, 2012; Markey et al., 2020; Uttal et al., 2013). Large-scale meta-analytic work confirms small but consistent positive associations with memory, cognitive control, and broader intellectual performance (Zhao et al., 2026). Educational applications further suggest that dynamic spatial environments can support mathematical reasoning and problem-solving (Lowrie & Jorgensen, 2015).

Emotional and regulatory benefits are equally well attested. Drawing on Mood Management Theory, players selectively employ games to optimize arousal and affect (Zillmann, 1988; Reinecke, 2017). Short-to-moderate sessions of casual, immersive, or open-world games elevate positive affect, reduce negative affect and stress, and produce measurable physiological relaxation (Granic et al., 2014; Russoniello et al., 2009; Pallavicini et al., 2021; Wagener et al., 2025). Therapeutic applications extend these effects into clinical territory: gaming interventions have yielded a medium-sized reduction in depressive symptoms among young people (Hedges' $g \approx -0.54$ in randomized trials; Townsend et al., 2022), with additional small-to-moderate benefits reported for ADHD symptoms and for depression via exergaming (Bryant et al., 2024; Tang et al., 2026). Socially, multiplayer and cooperative play can enhance social capital, strengthen friendships, and reduce loneliness, particularly when interdependence is required to achieve shared goals (Cole & Griffiths, 2007; Depping et al., 2018; Lacko et al., 2025). Exergames further contribute to light-to-moderate physical activity and measurable improvements in balance and function, especially among older adults.

These advantages, however, coexist with genuine risks. Physical overuse injuries first identified in the 1980s remain clinically relevant under conditions of prolonged or ergonomically poor play. Heavy use is associated with poorer diet quality, elevated body-mass index, and sleep disruption—the latter serving as a key mediating pathway for secondary mental-health effects. The most consistent psychological risks attach to problematic or addictive patterns of use rather than to moderate engagement. Gaming disorder affects an estimated 5–8 % of adolescents and young adults and shows bidirectional longitudinal links with depression, anxiety, reduced life satisfaction, and functional impairment. When play involves loss of control and displacement of sleep, schoolwork, or face-to-face relationships, negative academic, social, and emotional sequelae become more probable.

The aggression debate illustrates the hazards of over-interpretation. Anderson et al. (2010) reported significant effects of violent-game exposure on aggressive cognition, affect, and behavior, together with reduced empathy and prosocial responding, across experimental, cross-sectional, and longitudinal designs. Subsequent critiques (Ferguson & Kilburn, 2010; Ferguson, 2011; Markey & Ferguson, 2017) have highlighted publication bias, reliance on weak laboratory proxies, small effect sizes, and the absence of meaningful prediction of serious real-world violence or mass shootings once appropriate controls are applied. Prospective data indicate that depressive symptoms and antisocial traits are far stronger predictors of later aggression than violent-game exposure. Real-world analyses and school-shooter risk assessments similarly fail to support a causal role for games in serious societal violence. The contemporary scientific consensus therefore distinguishes modest, short-term laboratory effects from any substantial contribution to homicide or mass violence; continued attribution of the latter to games functions more as cultural scapegoating than as evidence-based explanation.

Taken together, the evidence supports several overarching conclusions. First, the early moral-panic framing exaggerated both the prevalence and the severity of harms while underestimating adaptive potentials. Many of the most dramatic 1980s predictions—systematic academic collapse, widespread narcotic-like addiction, and a generation rendered violent and mindless—did not materialize at the anticipated scale. Second, benefits and risks are both real and strongly moderated by patterns of use. Harmonious, moderate, often social engagement is associated with cognitive enhancement, mood regulation, therapeutic gains, and social connection; compulsive, solitary, sleep-disrupting engagement is associated with the opposite. Third, games are not unique among media: social-media use frequently shows more consistent negative mental-health associations than gaming itself, and offline risk factors (depression, family environment, peer delinquency, antisocial traits) remain more powerful predictors of serious outcomes than media exposure. Fourth, policy and parental guidance are most effective when they move beyond categorical prohibition or uncritical endorsement toward differentiated, evidence-based recommendations that emphasize sleep hygiene, ergonomic practices, content awareness, balance with offline activities, and attention to pre-existing vulnerabilities.

Future research should prioritize longitudinal designs with well-validated measures of both exposure and serious real-world outcomes, greater attention to within-person processes, and clearer differentiation between harmonious and disordered play. Clinicians and educators would benefit from assessment tools that identify loss of control rather than mere hours of play. Parents and policymakers, finally, are best served by recognizing that video, computer, and virtual games constitute a versatile medium whose net contribution to development and well-being is shaped far more by how, how much, and in what context they are used than by their mere presence in children's lives. The historical record of panic and the contemporary record of nuanced evidence together counsel neither complacency nor alarmism, but informed, proportionate attention to the conditions under which games help or hinder.

Recommendations

Based on the historical trajectory of concern and the contemporary empirical record reviewed in this paper, the following recommendations are offered for parents, educators, clinicians, policymakers, and researchers.

For parents and caregivers

- Prioritize patterns of use over absolute prohibitions.
- Encourage moderate, socially embedded, and intrinsically motivated play while monitoring for signs of loss of control: continued play despite negative consequences, displacement of sleep, schoolwork, or face-to-face relationships.
- Establish consistent sleep hygiene practices, as sleep disruption is a key pathway linking heavy gaming to secondary mental-health and cognitive effects.
- Promote ergonomic setups and regular movement breaks to reduce musculoskeletal strain.
- Balance gaming with offline physical activity, outdoor time, and non-digital social interaction.
- Pay special attention to pre-existing vulnerabilities such as depression, anxiety, or ADHD, which elevate risk for problematic use.

For educators and schools

- Recognize that well-designed digital games can support visuospatial skills, problem-solving, and engagement with STEM-related reasoning.
- Integrate educational and serious games thoughtfully rather than treating all gaming as inherently distracting.
- Avoid policies that treat hours of play as a simple proxy for harm; instead, focus on functional impairment and displacement of academic responsibilities.
- Provide guidance to students and families on healthy digital habits without resorting to moral-panic framing.

For clinicians

- Screen for gaming disorder by assessing loss of control, prioritization of gaming over other life domains, and continued use despite harm, rather than relying solely on total hours played.
- Differentiate harmonious from compulsive engagement when evaluating associations with depression, anxiety, or functional difficulties.
- Consider evidence-based gaming interventions, including certain commercial and serious games, as adjunctive tools for mood regulation, ADHD symptom management, and engagement with treatment-refusing adolescents, while remaining attentive to risks of overuse.
- Address sleep, diet, and physical activity as part of a holistic assessment.

For policymakers

- Move beyond categorical restrictions or uncritical endorsement.
- Support evidence-based public-health messaging that distinguishes moderate, purposeful play from problematic patterns.
- Encourage research funding for longitudinal studies that track both exposure and serious real-world outcomes, with clearer differentiation between harmonious and disordered use.
- Avoid attributing serious societal violence primarily to video games; such claims lack robust causal support once appropriate controls are applied and function more as cultural scapegoating than as an effective prevention strategy.

For researchers

- Prioritize longitudinal and within-person designs that examine bidirectional relationships between gaming patterns and mental-health outcomes.
- Employ well-validated measures of both exposure: content, context, and quality of engagement. and meaningful real-world outcomes rather than weak laboratory proxies for aggression.
- Distinguish clearly between harmonious and compulsive play in analyses.
- Continue to investigate boundary conditions – genre, social context, dose, and individual differences – under which benefits or risks emerge.
- Greater attention to understudied populations and to the comparative effects of gaming versus other digital media, especially social media, will further refine the evidence base.

In summa: These recommendations reflect the central conclusion of the present review: video, computer, and virtual games are a versatile medium whose developmental and well-being effects are shaped far more by how, how much, and in what context they are used than by their mere presence. Informed, proportionate guidance that emphasizes balance, sleep, social connection, and attention to vulnerability offers a more productive path than either alarmism or complacency.

Biodata of Authors

Hanna David received her PhD, "magna cum laude", from Ludwig Maximilians Universität, München and was a college lecturer in Psychology and literature. Dr. David began her undergraduate studies at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, where she majored in Physics and mathematics and also graduated in Hebrew Literature. She received her Master's degree from the Jewish Theological Seminary in New York at age 22. She is currently a counselor for gifted students and their families; a well-known lecturer at national and international conferences on psychology, education, and giftedness; and an expert evaluator of research proposals for the European Commission. David has published widely in English, Hebrew, French, and German, she has authored 18 books and 200+ papers. Dr. David is a licensed Pilates instructor and practices yoga. Research interests: Mathematical education, giftedness, educational psychology, creativity, counseling, feminism. **Affiliation**: Tel Aviv University (Emerita), Israel. **E-mail:** hannadav@tauex.tau.ac.il **ORCID:** 0000-0002-7917-3152 AcademicEdu ResearchGate GoogleScholar

References

Anderson, C. A., Shibuya, A., Ihori, N., Swing, E. L., Bushman, B. J., Sakamoto, A., Rothstein, H. R., & Saleem, M. (2010). Violent video game effects on aggression, empathy, and prosocial behavior in Eastern and Western countries: A meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin, 136*(2), 151–173. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0018251

Associated Press. (1982, November 10). Around the nation; Surgeon General sees danger in video games. *The New York Times*. https://www.nytimes.com/1982/11/10/us/around-the-nation-surgeon-general-sees-danger-in-video-games.html

Ballou, N., Hakman, T., Vuorre, M., Magnusson, K., & Przybylski, A. K. (2025). How do video games affect mental health? A narrative review of 13 proposed mechanisms. *Technology, Mind, and Behavior, 6*(2), 123–143. https://doi.org/10.1037/tmb0000152

Bejjanki, V. R., Zhang, R., Li, R., Pouget, A., Green, C. S., Lu, Z. L., & Bavelier, D. (2014). Action video game play facilitates the development of better perceptual templates. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 111*(47), 16961–16966. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1417056111

Bryant, B. R., Sisk, M. R., & McGuire, J. F. (2024). Efficacy of gamified digital mental health interventions for pediatric mental health conditions: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *JAMA Pediatrics, 178*(11), 1136–1146. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapediatrics.2024.3139

Choi, H., & Feng, J. (2019). Using video games to improve spatial skills. In R. Zheng & M. Gardner (Eds.), *Handbook of research on serious games for educational applications* (pp. 93–95). IGI Global. https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-5225-0513-6.ch005

Cole, H., & Griffiths, M.D. (2007). Social interactions in Massively Multiplayer Online Role-Playing gamers. *CyberPsychology & Behavior,* 10(4), 575–583. https://doi.org/10.1089/cpb.2007.9988

Del Guercio, G. (1984, July 4). *Video games may cause paralysis*. United Press International. https://www.upi.com/Archives/1984/07/04/Video-games-may-cause-paralysis/1380457761600

Depping, A. E., Johanson, C., & Mandryk, R. L. (2018). Designing for friendship: Modeling properties of play, in-game social capital, and psychological well-being. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Annual Symposium on Computer-Human Interaction in Play* (pp. 87–100). Association for Computing Machinery. https://doi.org/10.1145/3242671.3242702

Drummond, A., Sauer, J. D., & Ferguson, C. J. (2020). Do longitudinal studies support long-term relationships between aggressive gameplay and youth aggressive behavior? A meta-analytic examination. *Royal Society Open Science, 7*(7), Article 200373. https://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.200373

Ferguson, C. J. (2007). Evidence for publication bias in video game violence effects literature: A meta-analytic review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 12*(4), 470–482. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2007.01.001

Ferguson, C. J. (2008). The school shooting/violent video game link: Causal relationship or moral panic? *Journal of Investigative Psychology and Offender Profiling, 5*(1–2), 25–37. https://doi.org/10.1002/jip.76

Ferguson, C. J. (2010). Blazing angels or resident evil? Can violent video games be a force for good? *Review of General Psychology, 14*(2), 68–81. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0018941

Ferguson, C. J. (2011). Video games and youth violence: A prospective analysis in adolescents. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 40*(4), 377–391. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-010-9610-x

Ferguson, C. J., & Kilburn, J. (2009). The public health risks of media violence: A meta-analytic review. *The Journal of Pediatrics, 154*(5), 759–763. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpeds.2008.11.033

Ferguson, C. J., & Kilburn, J. (2010). Much ado about nothing: The misestimation and overinterpretation of violent video game effects in Eastern and Western nations: Comment on Anderson et al. (2010). *Psychological Bulletin, 136*(2), 174–178. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0018566

Ferguson, C. J., Copenhaver, A., & Markey, P. (2020). Reexamining the findings of the American Psychological Association's 2015 Task Force on Violent Media: A meta-analysis. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 15*(6), 1423–1443. https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691620927666

Final Report of the Federal Commission on School Safety. (2018). Presented to the President of the United States. https://www.ed.gov/sites/ed/files/documents/school-safety/school-safety-reportpdf.pdf

Fleming, T. M., Dixon, R. S., & Merry, S. N. (2012). "It is mean!" The views of young people alienated from mainstream education on depression, help-seeking, and computerized therapy. *Advances in Mental Health, 10*(2), 195–203. https://doi.org/10.5172/jamh.2011.10.2.195

Formosa, J., Türkay, S., Mandryk, R. L., & Johnson, D. (2025). A qualitative exploration of the role of video games during difficult times: An emotion regulation perspective. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction, 9*(6), 953–975. https://doi.org/10.1145/3748628

Granic, I., Lobel, A., & Engels, R. C. M. E. (2014). *The benefits of playing video games. American Psychologist, 69*(1), 66–78.

Green, C. S., & Bavelier, D. (2012). Learning, attentional control, and action video games. *Current Biology, 22*(6), R197–R206. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2012.02.012

Griffiths, M. D. (1991). Amusement machine playing in childhood and adolescence: A comparative analysis of video games and fruit machines. *Journal of Adolescence,* 14(1), 53–73. https://doi.org/10.1016/0140-1971(91)90045-s.

Griffiths, M. D. (2002). The educational benefits of video games. *Education and Health Journal, 20*(3), 47–51.

Griffiths, M. D. (2003). The therapeutic use of video games in childhood and adolescence. *Clinical Child Psychology and Psychiatry,* 8(4), 547–554. https://doi.org/10.1177/13591045030084012

Griffiths, M. D. (2004). Can video games be good for your health? *Journal of Health Psychology*, 9, 339–344.

Griffiths, M. D. (2005a). Video games and health. *British Medical Journal,* 331(7509), 122–123. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.331.7509.122.

Griffiths, M. D. (2005b). The therapeutic value of video games. In J. Goldstein & J. Raessens (Eds.), *Handbook of Computer Game Studies* (pp. 161–171). Boston: MIT Press.

Griffiths, M. D. (2010). Adolescent video game playing: Issues for the classroom. *Education Today: Quarterly Journal of the College of Teachers, 60*(4), 32–34.

Griffiths, M. (August 25, 2013). Care in the (gaming) community: Social responsibility and the video game industry. Retrieved from https://drmarkgriffiths.wordpress.com/2013/08/25/care-in-the-gaming-community-social-responsibility-and-the-videogame-industry/

Griffiths, M. (2015a, September 30). *'New syndrome' syndrome*. *Psychology Today*. Retrieved from https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/in-excess/201509/new-syndrome-syndrome

Griffiths, M. D. (2015b). Making play while the sun shines: Online games can be a great environment for friendship and social support. Retrieved from https://drmarkgriffiths.wordpress.com/category/online-addictions

Griffiths, M. D., Davies, M. N. O., & Chappell, D. (2003). Breaking the stereotype: The case of online gaming. *CyberPsychology and Behavior*, 6(1), 81–91. https://doi.org/10.1089/109493103321167992.

Griffiths, M. D., Davies, M. N. O., & Chappell, D. (2004). Online computer gaming: A comparison of adolescent and adult gamers. *Journal of Adolescence*, 27(1), 87–96. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2003.10.007.

Griffiths, M. D., Kuss, D. J., & Ortiz de Gortari, A. (2013). Videogames as therapy: A review of the medical and psychological literature. In I. M. Miranda & M. M. Cruz-Cunha (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on ICTs for Healthcare and Social Care* (pp. 43–68). Pennsylvania: IGI Global.

Griffiths, M. D., Kuss, D.J., & Ortiz de Gortari, A. (2017). Video games as therapy: An updated selective review of the medical and psychological literature. *International Journal of Privacy and Health Information Management*, 5(2), 71–96. https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-4666-3990-4.ch003

Hou, C., Tam, W., Rahmadianty, A. A., Rajendra, P., & Eisingerich, A. B. (2026). The effects of open-world and fun, accessible games on perceived loneliness and stoicism in adults: Cross-sectional survey study. *JMIR Serious Games, 14*(1), Article e89304. https://doi.org/10.2196/89304

Kato, P. M. (2010). Video games in health care: Closing the gap. *Review of General Psychology, 14*(2), 113–121. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0019441

Khanani, M. I., Khan, M. R., Farooqi, M. F., Fazal, J., Aabideen, Z., & Alkuwaiti, N. S. (2025). Digital media use and screen time exposure among youths: A lifestyle-based public health concern. *Cureus, 17*(7), Article e88373. https://doi.org/10.7759/cureus.88373

Kowal, M., Conroy, E., Ramsbottom, N., Smithies, T., Toth, A., & Campbell, M. (2021). Gaming your mental health: A narrative review on mitigating symptoms of depression and anxiety using commercial video games. *JMIR Serious Games, 9*(2), Article e26575. https://doi.org/10.2196/26575

Lacko, D., Kyslík, F., Smahel, D., & Machackova, H. (2025). Gaming together, feeling better – or feeling worse? How social video gaming impacts loneliness and depressive mood differently for boys and girls. *Computers in Human Behavior, 172*, Article 108752. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2025.108752

Liang, Y., Ding, X., Zhu, M., Ma, J., Li, Z., & Zhang, H. (2026). Effects of VR exercise interventions on cognitive function and physical function in older adults: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Geriatric Nursing, 69*, Article 103917. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gerinurse.2026.103917

Lowrie, T., & Jorgensen (Zevenbergen), R. (Eds.). (2015). *Digital Games and Mathematics Learning: Potential, Promises and Pitfalls*. Springer.

Markey, P. M., & Ferguson, C. J. (2017). *Moral combat: Why the war on violent video games is wrong*. BenBella Books.

Markey, P. M., Ferguson, C. J., & Hopkins, L. I. (2020). Video game play: Myths and benefits. *American Journal of Play, 13*(1), 87–106.

Martyn, J. B. (1983). Nurd knuckles. *Canadian Medical Association Journal, 129*(3), 228–229.

Martinez, L., Gimenes, M., & Lambert, E. (2023). Video games and board games: Effects of playing practice on cognition. *PLoS ONE, 18*(3), Article e0283654. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0283654

McCowan, T. C. (1981). Space-Invaders wrist. *New England Journal of Medicine, 304*(22), 1368. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJM198105283042228

McLean, L., & Griffiths, M. D. (2018). Moral Disengagement Strategies in Videogame Players and Sports Players. *International Journal of Cyber Behavior, Psychology and Learning, 8*(4), 1–25. https://doi.org/10.4018/IJCBPL.2018100101

Neiman, R., & Ushiroda, S. (1981). Slot-machine tendinitis. *New England Journal of Medicine, 304*(22), 1368. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJM198105283042229

Newman, M. Z. (2017, May 15). Children of the '80s never fear: Video games did not ruin your life. *Smithsonian Magazine*. https://www.smithsonianmag.com/history/children-80s-never-fear-video-games-did-not-ruin-your-life-180963452

Nuyens, F., Kuss, D. J., Lopez-Fernandez, O., & Griffiths, M. D. (2017). The experimental analysis of problematic video gaming and cognitive skills: A systematic review. *Journal de Thérapie Comportementale et Cognitive, 27*(3), 110–117. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtcc.2017.05.001

Nuyens, F., Kuss, D. J., Lopez-Fernandez, O., & Griffiths, M. D. (2018). The empirical analysis of nonproblematic video gaming and cognitive skills: A systematic review. *International Journal of Mental Health and Addiction, 17*, 389–414. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11469-018-9946-0

Pallavicini, F., Pepe, A., & Mantovani, F. (2021). Commercial off-the-shelf video games for reducing stress and anxiety: Systematic review. *JMIR Mental Health, 8*(8), Article e28150. https://doi.org/10.2196/28150

Peng, Y., Wang, Y., Zhang, L., Zhang, Y., Sha, L., Dong, J., & He, Y. (2024). Virtual reality exergames for improving physical function, cognition, and depression among older nursing home residents: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Geriatric Nursing, 57*, 31–44. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gerinurse.2024.02.032

Reinecke, L. (2017). Mood management. In P. Rössler (Ed.), The International Encyclopedia of Media Effects (pp. 1271–1284). Wiley-Blackwell.

Reinstein, L. (1983). De Quervain's stenosing tenosynovitis in a video game player. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, 64*(9), 434–435.

Russoniello, C. V., O'Brien, K., & Parks, J. M. (2009). The effectiveness of casual video games in improving mood and decreasing stress. *Journal of Cybertherapy and Rehabilitation, 2*(1), 53–66.

Scheifer, G. R., & Samuel, R. (2025). Massively multiplayer online games and social capital: A systematic literature review. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open, 12*, Article 101833. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2025.101833

Tang, D., Liu, C., Liu, J., Liu, T., Ma, R., & Sum, K. W. R. (2026). Effectiveness, acceptability, adherence, and safety of exergaming for depressive symptoms: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *npj Digital Medicine, 9*, Article 279. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41746-026-02479-8

Townsend, C., Humpston, C., Rogers, J., Goodyear, V., Lavis, A., & Michail, M. (2022). The effectiveness of gaming interventions for depression and anxiety in young people: Systematic review and meta-analysis. *BJPsych Open, 8*(1), Article e25. https://doi.org/10.1192/bjo.2021.1078

United Press International. (1982, November 11). Surgeon General C. Everett Koop says he was making... https://www.upi.com/Archives/1982/11/11/Surgeon-General-C-Everett-Koop-says-he-was-making/9037405838800/yy

Uttal, D. H., Meadow, N. G., Tipton, E., Hand, L. L., Alden, A. R., Warren, C., & Newcombe, N. S. (2013). The malleability of spatial skills: A meta-analysis of training studies. *Psychological Bulletin, 139*(2), 352–402. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0028446

Vera-Ponce, V. J., Ballena-Caicedo, J., Zuzunaga-Montoya, F. E., & Gutiérrez de Carrillo, C. I. (2025). Effectiveness of active video games for promoting physical activity: An umbrella review. *Frontiers in Sports and Active Living, 7*, Article 1706145. https://doi.org/10.3389/fspor.2025.1706145

Villani, D., Carissoli, C., Triberti, S., Marchetti, A., Gilli, G., & Riva, G. (2018). Video games for emotion regulation: A systematic review. *Games for Health Journal, 7*(2), 85–99. https://doi.org/10.1089/g4h.2017.0108

Wagener, G. L., Schulz, A., & Melzer, A. (2025). A plague(d) tale: Are violent video games effective in reducing stress levels? *International Journal of Psychophysiology, 209*, Article 112518. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpsycho.2025.112518

Zhao, R., Pang, K., Yu, J., Zhang, W., Kong, X., Wang, J., Haidabieke, A., Ding, X., & Li, J. (2026). The association between video game play and cognitive ability: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Acta Psychologica, 267*, Article 107110. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2026.107110

Zillmann, D. (1988a). Mood management through communication choices. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *31*(3), 327–340. https://doi.org/10.1177/000276488031003005

Zillmann, D. (1988b). Mood management: Using entertainment to full advantage. In L. Donohew, H. E. Sypher & E. T. Higgins (Eds.), *Communication, Social Cognition, and Affect* (pp. 147–171). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.