**Hypotheses pertaining to demographics.** Due to the methods of data collection and participant recruitment, some skew in the sample was expected. Hypotheses one through five describe the expected distribution of demographic results in the sample. Hypotheses six through ten describe the expected outcomes on the preferred percent correct scores of the high and low game usage groups.

***Hypothesis 1.*** The sample will contain significantly more males than females.

Result: percent male of sample = 20/37 = 54%. (p=.22, not supported)

***Hypothesis 2.*** The sample will be younger on average than the population as a whole.

Result: mean = 24.1, se = .548 (need to rerun to compare medians only)

***Hypothesis 3.*** The sample will include a higher percentage of Whites than the population as a whole.

Result: percent white only = 77.8% (vs. 63% of USA, p = .019, supported)

***Hypothesis 4.*** The sample will be more affluent than the population as a whole.

Result: median income < 25k (p = 1.00, not supported)

***Hypothesis 5***. The sample will contain a higher percentage of heavy video game users than the population as a whole.

Result: percent high game usage = 60.8% vs. 14% of population (p = .00, supported)

***Hypothesis 6.*** There will be no relationship between game-usage and IPPC.

Result: F = .77, p = .38 (not supported)

***Hypothesis 7.*** There will be no difference in APPC between the high-game-usage and low-game-usage groups.

High: .6986073 .7901552

Low: .7305228 .8436202 (supported)

***Hypothesis 8.*** For each game usage group & task combination, there will be no difference in IPPC and APPC.

Low: Visual: APPC: .7870715 SE .0279089

Low: Visual: IPPC: .7446309 SE .0270274 (supported: CI [-0.034295 to 0.120295])

Low: Verbal: APPC: .655 SE .0255601

Low: Verbal: IPPC: .6292725 SE .032928 (supported: CI[-0.05698677, 0.10898677 ])

Low: Kinesthetic: APPC: .5755604 SE .0349186

Low: Kinesthetic: IPPC: .5628356 SE .0431595 (supported: CI[-0.0978019,0.1232019])

High: Visual: APPC: .7443812 SE .0228588

High: Visual: IPPC: .7113754 SE .0251418 (supported)

High: Verbal: APPC: .6209924 SE .0239399

High: Verbal: IPPC: .6264578 SE .0288084 (supported)

High: Kinesthetic: APPC: .5927458 SE .0322361

High: Kinesthetic: IPPC: .5767068 SE .0367325 (supported)

***Hypothesis 9.*** Mean IPPC score for each game-usage group will be in the 80%-95% range.

Low: Visual: IPPC: .7446309 SE .0270274 (not supported, p = .049)

Low: Verbal: IPPC: .6292725 SE .032928 (not supported)

Low: Kinesthetic: IPPC: .5628356 SE .0431595 (not supported)

High: Visual: IPPC: .7113754 SE .0251418 (not supported)

High: Verbal: IPPC: .6264578 SE .0288084 (not supported)

High: Kinesthetic: IPPC: .5767068 SE .0367325 (not supported)

***Hypothesis 10.*** APPC score for each game-usage group will be in the 80%-95% range.

Low: Visual: APPC: .7870715 SE .0279089 (possibly supported, p = .6438)

Low: Verbal: APPC: .655 SE .0255601(not supported)

Low: Kinesthetic: APPC: .5755604 SE .0349186 (not supported)

High: Visual: APPC: .7443812 SE .0228588 (not supported)

High: Verbal: APPC: .6209924 SE .0239399 (not supported)

High: Kinesthetic: APPC: .5927458 SE .0322361 (not supported)

**Hypotheses pertaining to neuroticism.** Neuroticism was expected to relate to frustration tolerance and aversion to negative stimuli. Because of increased desire to escape frustration and negative stimuli, this study expected there to be a significant increase in preferred percent correct for those individuals with higher neuroticism scores.

***Hypothesis 11.*** Higher levels of neuroticism will correlate with higher IPPC.

VIS\_IPPC on NEUROTICISM: -.0503492 SE .031048 (not supported)

VERB\_IPPC on NEUROTICISM: .0377197 SE .0367071(not supported)

K\_IPPC on NEUROTICISM: .1039417 SE .0464285 (supported, p = .03)

***Hypothesis 12.*** The set of participants with the highest neuroticism scores will produce a higher APPC than the set with the lowest neuroticism scores.

VIS\_APPC: N > 3: .7392823 SE .0654456

VIS\_APPC: N <= 3: .7692192 SE .0430124 (not supported)

VERB\_APPC: N > 3: .7512195 SE .0380128

VERB\_APPC: N <= 3: .58 SE .0408485 (supported, p = .012, but need to check again)

K\_APPC: N > 3: .6131554 SE .0593657

K\_APPC: N <= 3: .5485182 SE .0450328 (not supported)

**Hypotheses pertaining to task modalities.** Three task modalities were included in the study. Due to the relatively weak link in literature between preferred learning modality and performance on modality-related tasks, this study expected no relationship between task type and preferred percent correct.

***Hypothesis 13.*** There will be no significant difference between IPPC scores for the verbal, visual, and kinesthetic tasks.

ANOVA: F=11.24 p = 0.0000 (not supported)

VIS\_IPPC: .7168874 .0185793 (VIS\_IPPC > K\_IPPC supported)

VERB\_IPPC: .6302644 .0224359 (VIS > VERB, p = .0033)

K\_IPPC: .5667854 .0286452 (VERB > K not supported, p = .0829)

***Hypothesis 14.*** There will be no significant difference between APPC scores of the data sets for verbal, visual, and kinesthetic tasks.

VIS\_APPC: .7611968 SE .0176308 (VIS > VERB, p = .0001)

VERB\_APPC: .6354603 SE .0176867 (VERB > K not supported, p = .088)

K\_APPC: .5848723 SE .0236232 (VIS > K supported)

***Hypothesis 15.*** For each task modality, there will be no significant difference between IPPC and APPC scores.

VIS: CI [-0.0948014 to 0.0061814]

***Hypothesis 16.***  Mean IPPC score for each task will be in the 80%-95% range.

See above

***Hypothesis 17.*** APPC score for each task will be in the 80%-95% range.

See above

**Hypotheses pertaining to overall data.** The APPC and IPPC scores are computed in very different ways, but should have been measuring the same value. This study expected that these numbers would be similar over the entire data set.

***Hypothesis 19.*** Overall mean IPPC score will be in the 80%-95% range.

IPPC .6405561 SE .0137694 (not supported)