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An institution such as broadcasting affects and is affected by the society, which encompasses the viewers and listeners it serves. The increase in crime and violence and the fear of crime may actually help explain the popularity of TV violence. Media violence has been a topic of popular interest right from the fifties, when television was still being applauded as one more of those human marvels. Therefore, for my study, I will concentrate on television, a medium that involves both the visual and hearing senses and to which young people are particularly drawn. The sample for this study involved five schools in Nashville, Tennessee.

A random sample of 210 children in the age group of 11 to 16 years were asked to answer a questionnaire designed to determine the effect of television violence on young minds. The study is an introspective one, and the questions required the young people to 'look into themselves' and speculate on why they do what they do. The study is not a laboratory analysis that involves extensive
statistical methods. Rather, it is a self-report study asking for subjective introspective guesses that will help answer the research question of whether the sample accepts or denies being affected by television violence. In addition to media violence, other factors to be considered are peer pressure, self-validation, self-identification and initiation into a group. These factors that affect human behavior have been selected as independent variables in my study on the effect of TV violence on young minds The analysis of responses will follow a "Grounded Theory" approach, which is a general methodology for developing theory that is grounded in data systematically gathered and analyzed. The theory states that the hypothesis to be developed can evolve during actual research or existing schemes can be elaborated and modified as incoming data are played against them.

I will elaborate on and modify the Social Learning theory proposed by Albert Bandura in the 60's. His theory is based on research that proves that children learn and reproduce television content under circumstances they believe are appropriate in which to reproduce the content as they have seen it. The Grounded Theory approach also suggests that the grounded theorists can utilize qualitative as well as quantitative techniques of analysis. Some of the close-ended questions will be illustrated by pie charts, and the report of some questions will include percentage tables where the percentage differences are significant.
The importance of this study seems obvious since, first, there are very few studies done at such grassroots levels on the impact of TV violence. In fact, even at the most urban and elite levels, there are very few studies made for the general readership. Here, then, is a beginning in a small but truthful way to fill the void. Second, the present study can add to already existing literature and aid future research on this topic. Future studies on media violence are necessary, due in part to the everchanging human mind and to the change in media content itself. Third, the researcher can point towards certain areas that can be undertaken for in-depth study by others. Fourth, the results could reveal interesting facts for both viewers and local television stations and, of course, college students in Broadcasting and Communication curricula. Finally, since the study is an introspective, self-report trying to present the beliefs, attitudes and the behavior of the individual as he/she perceives them, we can find out whether there is a self-fulfilling psychology at work which, in turn, sheds light on some interesting facts about human mental processes in relation to television violence.

GENERAL PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

Overall, the researcher seeks to determine the effect of television violence on the young (in the age group of 11 to 16 years) as they themselves perceive it.
SPECIFIC PURPOSES OF THE STUDY

Specifically, the study will investigate the following:

1. Whether the respondents learn and reproduce violent content viewed on TV.

2. How the people in the sample population interpret their behavior, attitudes, and beliefs as they perceive them.

3. What children feel about violence around them and whether they believe that TV does, after all, have a role to play in the violence that occurs around them and among them.

4. Whether other factors such as peer pressure, self-identity, and self-validation augment the impact of TV violence.

The results of the survey reveal that the young people considered as the sample for this study believe that they learn by watching television, but deny reproducing whatever questionable behaviors with which they become familiar. The basic findings of the present survey support the hypothesis that, in a self-report introspective study, individuals deny the influence of television violence on their behavior, while acknowledging that other effects occur.
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Television is unquestionably a major source of information and entertainment in the American society. In the forty years since television began its conquest of our vulnerable cultural environment, issues about TV and human behavior emerged that have yet to be answered. We are all embroiled in mass media environments that require improved understanding if we are to comprehend complex behavior patterns, especially among children. Television is an artifact of our society, and television fare certainly deals with the meanings, symbols and patterns of our behavior.

Children born in the United States have the potential of being exposed to television from the moment of their birth. This exposure may continue daily for the rest of their lives, and may include regular interpersonal interaction with other confirmed viewers of television. Visualize a specter of television's potential for constricting our intellectual and social horizons by converting active young minds into passive and highly influenceable ones.

According to Lucas and Britt, it seems inevitable -- that in a country where people have easy access to newspapers and an almost infinite variety of
general and special interest magazines -- that television and cable channels would be an important source of information and entertainment to influence our attitudes (Lucas and Britt, 1963, p. 16). Television viewing involves both vision and hearing. Of these, vision is usually considered to be the very last of the traditional senses which the average person would give up if he had to make a choice. Our sense of sight provides contact with the larger universe, guides our steps, and provides a variety of pleasant stimulations. The eyes operate almost continuously during our waking hours and contribute enormously to our conscious thought process.

At the same time, sense of hearing is essential to enjoy the quality of the voices of others and also to regulate one's own voices. It is impossible to think of living without the sense of hearing in a world which has so much audible stimulation to offer. Television is definitely a treat to both the senses of vision and hearing. The imagery that television provides often becomes the means for classifying and remembering all experiences. Imagery includes mental concepts of objects, events, qualities, relationships and bodily experiences.

A common idea of television's impact is that some aspect of content has
a direct and immediate influence on members of the audience leading to the assumption that the content is viewed as a necessary and sufficient condition for some effect. However, such simple models of causation seldom fit the reality of any area of human behavior, and the study of communication is no exception. For a better understanding of media effects, we must accept the notion that the consequences of exposure to media content are likely to be varied and complex, especially among children. In addition to media violence, other factors that need to be considered are peer pressure, self validation and self identification. All these factors do affect behavior and attitudinal change.

Although it is not yet possible to give a complete account of the cognitive activities necessary for understanding a televised dramatic plot, it seems likely that mature comprehension involves three tasks or phases. First, the viewer selects essential pieces of information, ignoring or paying less attention to extraneous detail. Second, these essential scenes or actions are ordered according to some scheme. Third, the viewer makes certain inferences that go beyond what has been explicitly presented in the stimulus. At its most efficient, the process may well involve continuous efforts during viewing not only to choose from the large amount of available information but also to infer the relatedness among discretely presented units of information across time.
Cognition, which represents the combination of a decision with a visual image of an ensuing outcome, is what Shant and Abelson refer to as a "script." They use the term script to designate "any specific cognitive schema or frame that represents a coherent sequence of events" (Wartella, 1979, p. 165).

As with adults, children also strive to make sense of television, both as a medium and as a social world. They develop constructs and paradigms then apply them in interpreting their television based experiences. There may be a regular course of development for these constructs and paradigms. Even if their developmental course is not regular, it is clear that for many years they are not the same as those employed by adults.

Different constructs and paradigms, when applied to television, lead to different understandings of the medium and its content. Such differences in understanding naturally mean that television viewing is a different experience for viewers of different ages. They may also mean that the effects of television viewing, where they generally exist, will differ for the variant ages of viewers so that specific effects will occur for some viewers and not for others.

Television is a mass medium that virtually everyone uses some of the
time and many use much of the time. The technological capabilities of the medium make it possible to present lifelike content in which the attractiveness and meaning to viewers can be enhanced through a variety of production techniques. Because the medium presents so many opportunities for constructing powerful messages about our physical and social world and for then distributing them to virtually every home and many schools in the nation, there is recurrent interest in evaluating these messages.

Everyone recognizes the potential of television for causing a wide range of effects. Not only can it inform, educate, enlighten, challenge, inspire and enthuse, it can also deaden and misinform. It is clear why television can be singled out. It presents lifelike experiences for viewers to enjoy and presents them with more sense of reality and immediacy than do such other communication media such as radio, newspapers, books, magazines, computers, films and comics. Television is also undeniably the most-used medium which increases its potential to influence. These characteristics make the medium important for everyone, but especially for children whose own individual characteristics make them a special audience for television.

One important characteristic of children is their limited knowledge of
virtually all aspects of the physical and social world in which they live. All of us acquire such knowledge throughout our lives, but the most important learning usually occurs during childhood. The young come in contact with television knowing less about the physical and social world than do older viewers and the adults who create television content. The children may fail to understand or may misunderstand program content. They might tend to accept program content as accurate information when other more knowledgeable viewers know it to be otherwise. There is a possibility that they may evaluate content without taking proper account of the means and motives for producing and broadcasting that content. What would be of interest is not just how they evaluate content but whether they accept it as reality and reproduce it consciously in their environment.

This analysis of processing activities suggests that children's comprehension should be examined with respect to two types of content in typical TV plots: explicit events that occur discretely in single scenes of a show and implicit information that is not explicitly mentioned or depicted, but is implied by the relation between scenes. In short, in order to comprehend the social roles, behaviors, and attitudes portrayed in typical TV dramas, children must not only select judiciously among the large number of single happenings
or events that are shown but they also must infer the relations among these discretely presented units across time. The current study goes a step further than this and tries to determine how the young perceive their behavior in relation to the impact of these discretely presented units across time.

TV has become a significant part of American life, with 98% of American homes having at least one set and with the average set turned on six hours each day. Not everyone watches intently. For some, the TV is a babysitter, an alarm clock, or a night light. In the wake of the "New York blackout" of 1966, some even noted its significance as a birth control device (O'Connor, 1983, p. 14). Two million people live alone in New York city. For many of them who are aged, infirm, and housebound, the television serves as a lifeline, their only link with the outside world. For others, reliance on the tube may be more purely psychological. They may use it to keep them company as they cook dinner or as therapy when they feel depressed. In one way or another, every American household is identified by its television habits, those without a TV set perhaps more than all the rest. To analyze these factors, thousands of studies of television and its impact on human behavior have appeared since the 1960's.
"Violence is as American as apple pie"

- Rap Brown (Blumenthal et al., 1972, p. 22)

In the early spring of 1969, a Rhode Island Senator requested the Surgeon General (then Mr. William Stewart) to appoint a committee of distinguished men and women from professions and disciplines deemed appropriate to conduct a study to establish scientifically in so far as possible what harmful effects, if any, TV programs have on children. Behind Pastore's request lay years of sporadic debates in and out of Congress about TV's possible contribution to the rising violence in the nation.

In January, 1972, the Surgeon General issued his scientific advisory committee's report, 'Television and Growing Up : The Impact of Televised Violence.' The report included 23 independent research projects and more than 40 technical papers. Initially, the committee found preliminary and "tentative" indications of a causal relation between viewing televised violence and aggressive behavior. However, the committee was unable to conclude how many children were likely to be affected or what should be done about it.

From its beginnings as an object of fascination, television soon became an object of concern. Clearly, it is an instrument of potential power and of persuasive influence. Admiration for technology's achievement in developing
this system of communication was accompanied by apprehension about the way it would be used.

Twenty years ago the National Association of Educational Broadcasters reported that drama involving crime and horror constituted 10% of programming time. In 1954, Senator Estes Kefauver, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency, conducted an investigation focusing on crime, sex, and violence in program content. The Kefauver subcommittee concluded that such programming in large doses could be potentially harmful to young viewers. TV broadcast industry spokesmen acknowledged the large amount of televised violence and indicated that something would be done about it. But subsequent surveys revealed that the amount of televised violence increased rather than decreased after the early 1960's.

"What is at stake," Senator Pastore wrote, "is no less than our most valuable and trusted resource - the minds and hearts of our young people" (Carter and Strickland, 1975, p. 17). The 1964 Senate Subcommittee Report warned that such TV content produced antisocial behavior among juveniles and repeated the charge of psychiatrist Frederic S. Wertham, from his book Seduction of the Innocent, that TV was becoming a school for violence. The
debate over TV's effects on children is now over 20 years old. Yet, the
obvious need for concentrated, long-range attention to the issue has been met
in only a limited way. Relatively few behavioral scientists have recognized the
importance of the issue or tried to gain a better understanding of its
implications. Violence on TV - even on programs aimed at children -
continues. Television's impact on society demands a significant and long-term
investment by government, research foundations, and the media. Another
important requirement is that people ought to be aware of their behavior and
analyze it to see if they are being influenced to reproduce what they watch on
the small screen.

The concept of violence is complex, and any attempt to define it seems
to lead to dispute. However, some aspects of violence are usually discussed in
most definitions. Violence is frequently conceived in terms of the intensity of
the perpetrator's behavior. The term violence is often employed when the
behavior is viewed as excessive, with the implication of violent activity as
being unrestrained. People tend to regard behavior as violent when they
believe it is harmfully employed for evil or antisocial ends. Instrumental
violence is done to achieve some goal. Expressive violence occurs without
planning in a state of rage or hate. Intentional violence acts purposely to harm
another. Unintentional violence involves an aggressor who does not know that his behavior harms someone else.

Aggressiveness refers to antagonistic or injurious behavior. Buss (1961) defined aggression as "a response that delivers obnoxious stimuli to another organism" (Wolfgang, 1982, p. 84). The term violence is reserved for the more extreme forms of aggressive behavior that are likely to cause significant injuries to the victim. Although violence typically refers to physical aggression, it can also be applied to psychological stress that causes suffering and trauma. Criminal violence, a subcategory of violence refers to extreme aggressive behavior that is prohibited by the statutes enforced in the particular culture or society.

According to Webster's New World Dictionary, violence "is a physical force used so as to injure, damage, or destroy. It is an extreme roughness of action" (Webster's Dictionary, 1994, p. 1490). Aggression "is an unprovoked attack or warlike act" (Webster's, 1994, p. 25). Relatedly, we note that Webster defines adolescence as "the time of life between puberty and maturity; youth" (Webster's, 1994, p. 18).
In a Self-fulfilling psychology, people may not truly know what is behind their behaviors, but they will act on what they believe is behind them. Their beliefs may be found to be wrong if analyzed by psychiatrists or anthropologists. However, the young people themselves believe that their assumptions are truly the right explanation for their behavior and they will try and live it out.

A committee of Stanford University scholars recently concluded that America was in a crisis of violence. NBC and KRON-TV in San Francisco were sued for $11 million after four teenagers sexually attacked a 9-year-old girl, allegedly after one of them "got the idea" from a scene in a television feature-length program Born Innocent (Blumenthal et al., 1972, p 40). The case was subsequently dismissed after the trial judge ruled that the plaintiff would have to demonstrate that the network had intentionally incited the act. In 1993, a 13-year-old teenager from Nashville shot a classmate while trying to meddle with the gun inside the classroom. In an incident that occurred at Clarksville, Tennessee, another teenager shot himself to death while trying to play Russian Roulette with his friends. Even though the boys involved in these incidents did not mention watching such acts on TV, there are many causal effects involved, and TV-viewing could be one of them.
In October 1994, a Nashville public high school teenager was arrested for stabbing his classmate in the back just a few feet away from an officer on guard in the school corridor. Around the same period of time, two teenagers from another Nashville public high school were arrested for possessing a gun inside school property. Even though the gun was unloaded at the time, the two boys showed it around to some of their friends before hiding it in a locker. The fact that these incidents occurred at the same time my survey was underway asserts that there is an escalation in 'school violence' and there are influences that work on these young vulnerable minds.

We have generations of young people who have spent a good share of their lives before a TV screen. Even though no dire and earthshaking results directly attributable to TV have been identified, children's exposure to the medium is still a matter for serious consideration. Nearly all American children have easy access to TV, and it has come to be an important factor in their lives. They accept it as a normal part of their living rather than as a great marvel. "It holds tremendous fascination for them and it has become their major source of recreation. They have respect for TV and regard it almost as a third parent in terms of affection and trust"(Christensen, 1967, p. 3). What this researcher is attempting to determine is whether they acknowledge the impact
of television in their everyday life.

Urgent questions continue to be raised as to the part TV plays in the lives of children and the effect it has on the many aspects of their development. The cumulative effect of children's TV habits may have an impact on the larger society. The present study is a reflection of a common perspective and is offered in the hope that it may stimulate others toward a better understanding of television and social behavior.

The young have a mind of their own and the way they perceive imagery, reality, and behavior is an interesting aspect of research. The current study tries to find out how the young perceive their behavior in relation to television violence. Usually, we do have a tendency to deny any effect of negative influence on our behavior, even though we know it is otherwise. There is a possibility that the young deny any impact of television violence on their behavior even though they unconsciously might feel like reproducing certain acts they see on TV. This possibility is based on the fact that on an average a teenager spends at least four to five hours viewing television.

It is hardly necessary to point out that an institution like broadcasting affects and is affected by society, which encompasses the viewers and listeners
it serves. This study is a self-report where I probe for subjective, introspective guesses from the sample population. I am trying to learn whether there is a self-fulfilling prophecy at work here. Even though the beliefs of the respondents may be wrong, what is important is that the young people themselves believe that their answers are truly the right explanation for their behavior. In turn the young people will try to live out those scripts or directions or examples - as if they were compelled to - as if these influences were forces beyond their control. I will not try to analyze their behavior or predict what they will do next. Rather, I will try to locate and present their thinking and why they predict that they are or are not affected by mass media. Nashville is one of the large cities in the state of Tennessee, and this study conducted within that area would definitely be of interest to the community, educational institutions involved, local TV channels and the students themselves who may desire to find out about the extent to which TV violence does have an impact on their lives.

The significance of this study is that, first, there are very few studies in America done at such grass root levels on the impact of TV violence. In fact, even at the most urban and elite levels, there are very few studies made for the general readership. Here, then, is a minor beginning in a small but truthful way
to fill the void.

Second, the study can add to already existing literature and aid future research on this topic. Third, the researcher can point toward certain areas which can be undertaken for in-depth study. Fourth, the results may reveal interesting facts for viewers, local television stations, and - of course - the students of broadcasting and communication. Finally, this being an introspective study, even the more personal and subjective findings might provide helpful insights into human psychology and behavior.
CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The decade of the 1960's was one of shocking violence in the United States. There was a wave of political assassinations, beginning with that of John F. Kennedy and followed by those of Robert F. Kennedy, Martin Luther King, Medgar Evans and Malcolm X. The effects of generations of discrimination, disadvantage and poverty exploded in a series of civil disorders that culminated, in the summer of 1967, in riots in more than 23 American cities. Also, protest against the war in Vietnam climaxed in the demonstrations and riots accompanying the August 1968 Democratic National Convention in Chicago, Illinois.

In response to these events, the National Commission on Civil Disorders - more widely known as the Kerner Commission - was established in July 1967. Its report was issued in March 1968, and President Lyndon Johnson responded by executive order to establish the National Commission on the causes and prevention of violence, to be headed by Dr. Milton Eisenhower. One of the volumes of the commission report, released in November 1969, under the editorship of Robert K. Baker and Sandra J. Ball, constituted an
extensive examination of what was then known about the relationship between media practices and violence in society.

While the commission hearings were in progress, Senator John O. Pastore of Rhode Island, chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Communications, issued a call to the Surgeon General to conduct an investigation into the effects of TV, similar to the one carried out for smoking and health in 1962. That investigation culminated in 1972 in what has come to be known as the "Surgeon General's Report on TV and Social Behavior," consisting of five volumes of findings from newly-commissioned research and the interpretative report of a special advisory committee.

Thus, the climate of the 1960's - characterized by violence, protest and investigative response - led to a substantial increase in research on the role of TV as a possible contributor to violence. From the beginning of television, there has been concern about the possible harmful effects, particularly on children. In the late 50's, research by Himmelwert (1958) and Schramm (1961) found very little to justify such concern. But, in the early 1960's, laboratory experiments on TV's impact on aggressive behavior by Bandura, Ross and
Ross (1961), plus by Berkowitz and Rawlings (1963) provided some evidence of negative effects. When congressional hearings were held about increasing violent crime in this country, academic researchers pointed to this experimental evidence as supporting the possibility of a link between TV violence and social violence.

When Feshbach reported his first results to the joint committee in 1967, they seemed to favor what became known as the "catharsis hypothesis": viewing television's programs containing violence was associated with an actual drop in aggression, while boys viewing the non-violent fare becoming even more aggressive (Milavsky et al., 1982, p. 3). It became evident, however, that this result was questionable because of problems that had occurred in the conduct of the experiment. Indeed, the Feshbach study indicated that even the best designed and most realistic experiments could encounter problems in execution.

Both the Feshbach study and the Wells replication alerted researchers to another basic problem with experiments in natural settings that try to alter normal viewing patterns. Almost nonexistent are people who do not watch television and among whom the experimental treatment can be instituted
randomly. The application of the treatment involves depriving some viewers of their normal television fare. Accordingly, deprivation results in side effects that invalidate the experimenter's results. In both the Feshbach and Wells studies, boys in the control group who were assigned the nonviolent programs became resentful and hostile as a result of their chance deprivation of programs they preferred to watch. Milavsky et al. believe that laboratory experiments produced ambiguous results (Milavsky et al., 1982, pp. 4-5).

In the Surgeon General's report (1972), all but one of the studies were laboratory experiments or cross-sectional surveys. The experiments provided evidence similar to that obtained by previous experiments, which do not answer questions of long-term effects of real life exposure. The surveys provided rather consistent evidence for the existence of cross-sectional correlations between television exposure and aggression. This evidence, of course, does not address the causal issue, since correlations can be produced by effects of aggression on viewing behavior or by third variables that antecede both viewing and aggression.

The one exception to these studies in the Surgeon General's report was that of Lefkowitz, Eron, Walder and Huesmann (1972) which assessed long-
term developmental effects of the sort my study is designed to detect. That study documented a statistically significant relationship between preference for violent television programs and aggression measured ten years later (Lefkowitz et al., 1972). However, the Surgeon General's Report regarded its findings 'not conclusive' by virtue of several methodological problems with the data collected. In fact, in its recommendations for future research, the report called attention to the gap in longitudinal research on the effects of TV programs on children.

Milavsky et al. conducted a longitudinal multiwave panel study taking the cue from the Surgeon General's Report. They measured young people's aggressive behavior and TV exposure under natural conditions in the context of their family and other social environments. To accomplish this objective, data were collected for a period of over three years beginning in May 1970 and ending in December 1973. The study consisted of two parts: an elementary school sample of second through sixth grade boys and girls, and a sample of teenage boys. When the study began, the younger respondents ranged in age from seven through twelve years old and the older respondents from twelve through sixteen. Over the three year period, the data reflected the behavior of children and adolescents ranging in age from seven through nineteen. Different
data gathering techniques were used, and information was obtained for each sample to take into account the respondents age differences and the resulting disparities in maturity and skills (Milavsky et al., 1982, p. 13).

The results showed that there is no consistent, statistically significant relationship between violent TV exposure and later aggression. At the same time, two patterns in the data suggest the possibility of a small association between TV and aggression. Further, the study suggested that TV does not affect every child in the same way and that - consequently - a thorough investigation of TV's effects should examine such effects among specific groups of children.

Huesmann et al. in late 1975 proposed a three-year longitudinal study to be carried out in the Chicago area. Huesmann took primary responsibility for designing the field study, obtaining funding for it, and implementing it. In 1976, the National Institute of Mental Health awarded a three year grant for the study, and data - collection began in 1977. With the help of grants from various institutions, the study was replicated in as many other countries as possible in as similar a manner as possible. A unique investigation of aggressive behavior in children was also carried out in five countries between
1977 and 1983. The United States was one of the countries participating in the study. In each county, substantial samples of children and their parents were interviewed and tested repeatedly over three years. A sample of 758 children in the US was interviewed and tested in each of three years in an overlapping longitudinal design. For girls and boys, TV violence viewing was significantly related to concurrent aggression and significantly predicted future changes in aggression. The strength of the relation depended as much on the regularity with which violence was viewed as on the seriousness of the violence (Huesmann et al., 1986, p. 5).

Longitudinal regression analyses suggested a bidirectional causal effect in which violence viewing engenders aggression and aggression leads to violence viewing. No evidence was found that those children predisposed to aggression or those with aggressive parents are more strongly affected by TV violence. However, other variables were found to be correlates of both aggression and violence viewing. The child most likely to be aggressive would be one who watches violent programs most of the time TV is on and who believe these shows portray life "just like it is," who identifies strongly with the aggressive characters in the shows, and who frequently has aggressive fantasies. A plausible model to explain these findings seems to be a multi-
process, reciprocal action model, in which violence viewing and aggression mutually facilitate each other.

In one study, Albert Bandura subjected three groups of children to adult models in real life, on film, and in cartoons attacking a large inflatable toy usually known as a Bobo doll. The children were mildly annoyed preceding the observations. At the end of ten-minute periods, their behavior was recorded. A control group was utilized. The results leave little doubt that exposure to violence heightens aggressive tendencies in children. Such an experience, it was claimed, reduces inhibitions and "helps to shape the form of the child's aggressive behavior." Moreover, it was established that a person displaying violence in film is as influential on these children as was one displaying it in real life (Bandura, 1963, pp. 46-48).

In a second study, one group of children saw a program in which aggression behavior was rewarded, while another viewed the same program with an ending showing that aggression does not bring rewards. It was concluded that if children see the bad guy punished, they are not likely to imitate his behavior spontaneously, but that they do retain information about how to behave aggressively (which the punishment of the bad guy does not
eliminate). With adequate provocation, they may put this knowledge into practice on future occasions (Bandura, 1963).

There have been several well-designed experiments in which young minds have been exposed daily over an extended time either to commercially televised aggression or to nonviolent offerings. Bandura lists a few studies done in this manner. Steuer, Appelfield, and Smith (1971) found that repeated exposure to aggressive cartoons increased children's physical assaultiveness, whereas nonviolent contents produced no change in interpersonal aggression (Bandura, 1973, p. 143). Frederich and Vondracek (1972) Employed a similar design, where nonaggressive children showed no behavioral effects of viewing violent cartoons over a four week period but where those above average in aggressiveness were more physically and verbally aggressive when exposed to televised violence than to neutral or socially positive programs. A follow-up assessment disclosed that television heightened aggressiveness persisted after the violent programs were discontinued (Bandura, 1973). Other studies (Ellis and Sekyra, 1972; Liebert and Baron, 1972) showed that even short exposure to violent scenes can increase interpersonal aggression among the young, which lends further weight to the instigative potential of television aggression (Bandura, 1973).
As a part of a large field study exploring the social determinants of aggression, Eron (1963), correlated children's television viewing habits with their tendency to behave aggressively, as rated by their peers. Boys who preferred television programs containing a high level of violence displayed significantly more interpersonal aggression than those who regularly viewed programs low in violence. Not surprisingly, the overall findings reveal that the critical factor is the content being viewed and not the sheer amount of exposure to televised simulation. No consistent relationships were noted between the viewing habits of girls and their aggressive conduct.

Other studies, however, have yielded somewhat different results. For example, Seymour Feshbach studied certain school students who were randomly assigned to an insult condition in which they were subjected to unwarranted derogatory remarks by an experimenter and to a control group condition in which they were treated in a neutral, standard manner. Half of the insulted subjects and half of the control subjects then witnessed an aggressive fight film, while the remaining half of each group witnessed a neutral film. It was reported that the insult group exposed to the fight film was significantly less aggressive on both the word association and the questionnaire measures
than was the insult group that witnessed the neutral film (Arons and May, 1963).

In a British study sponsored by the Nuffield Foundation, data are reported for 4,500 children (Hess and Goldman, 1962). According to 'Time' magazine, Dec 29, 1958, this study disclosed that even heavy viewing does not necessarily make children more aggressive or listless, or discourage them from reading or studying. Robert D. Heiss and Harriet Goldman concluded that

1. In the majority of families, the young child watches almost as much as he wishes and - for the most part - views programs of his own choice;
2. In majority of families, mothers make little effort to supervise either programs selection by the child or the total amount he watches;
3. In most families, the father has little voice in determining the TV behavior of his child.

One hundred and thirty six children - half of whom were boys and half girls, divided approximately into five or six year olds and eight or nine year olds - participated in the experiment which Liebert and Baron designed (Carter and Strickland, 1975, p. 35). One group of children was allowed to watch a television program for six and one half minutes, containing two and
one half minutes of commercials, and three and one half minutes of a program from "the Untouchables." Meanwhile, the children in a control group saw the same commercials, but instead of the violent sequence, witnessed a videotaped sports event with competitions in races, hurdles, and high jumps. Just before the end of the television sequences, the experimenter entered the room and said to a participating child that the experiment in which he or she was going to help or hurt was ready.

The experimenter explained that in the adjacent room another child was going to play a game which required turning a handle. There were three lights in front of the child. One light - when pressed - was supposed to hurt the other child, while the other was going to help the child in the adjacent room to win. Actually, there was no other child in the adjacent room, but each child in the experiment thought there was and was given twenty opportunities to help or hurt that child. The result: the children who saw the violent film sequences subsequently were more likely to act aggressively toward the unseen child than were those who viewed the neutral film.

Further, the researchers noted that the results emerged despite the brevity of the aggressive sequences (less than four minutes), the absence of a
strong prior instigation to aggression, and the clear availability of an alternative helping response. In this Liebert and Baron lab experiment, exposure to only three and one half minutes of a violent TV sequence caused children from five to nine years old to behave more aggressively immediately afterwards. Given most children's regular viewing habits, the question becomes whether constant exposure to televised violence over long periods of time produces equally predictable and undesirable results.

In the late 60's, The Columbia Broadcasting System (CBS) commissioned two major pieces of research, both of which have been published. The first, by Milgram and Shotland (1973), was a field study designed to measure whether viewers would imitate, in real life, an antisocial act portrayed on a television program. The results provided no clear evidence of imitation. The authors concluded that it was a "scotch verdict"- that is, not proven (Palmer and Dorr, 1980, pp. 118-120).

In a later study by Belson (1978), an even more complex and comprehensive examination was made of the relationship between heavy viewing of televised violence and antisocial behavior. The author concluded that the viewing of television violence was related to antisocial behavior. The
Belson study identified - *albeit through retrospective self-reporting* - actual acts which could be called juvenile delinquency, including property damage and bodily harm to others (Howitt and Cumberbatch, 1975).

The American Broadcasting Company (ABC) and National Broadcasting Company (NBC) also sponsored similar studies to determine the relation, if any, between television violence and aggressive behavior among the young. A study by Heller and Polsky in the early 70's sponsored by ABC supported the relationship between television violence and aggressive behavior. The authors, however, seemed to be biased in the direction of finding television to be only a minor contributor to stimulating aggression in children.

A comprehensive review of the literature by Kaplan and Singer (1976) have come to the conclusion that the research does not prove a relationship between television and aggressive behavior. In both reviews, each of the published reports purporting to show such a relationship was found to be flawed in methodology, in measurements used, or in statistical analyses. In each instance, the conclusions reached by the researcher are therefore questioned by the reviewers and held invalid. These reviewers thus discount any importance which might be given to the cumulative weight of all this
evidence and conclude that the case against television violence has not been proven (Kaplan, 1972, pp. 968-969).

There is an enormous sociological literature on peer group influences on behavior, particularly adolescent behavior. A study conducted by Wolfgang in 1958 showed that the largest category of relationship between victim and offender was that of relatively close friendships. Of all homicides, 28% were in this category, surpassing even the category of family relationships, which comprised 25% of the cases.

Wass, Raup, and Sisler, in 1989, analyzed the television viewing habits of gifted children and adolescents and evaluated their perceptions of violence and death as presented in television programs (Wass et al., 1989, pp. 161-173). It was found, overall, that a third of the students preferred action/detective programs and that they rated them as high in violence as they rated television news shows. Respondents were about evenly divided as to whether younger children should view violent programs, and a large majority seldom or never discussed or wanted to discuss death with their parents or friends.

Wass et al. conducted another study designed as an extension of the
previous one to determine if consistent or divergent findings would be obtained when a different student population was sampled. The results turned out to be consistent for both the groups of students surveyed. However, their views about violence and death varied with age, sex and area of residence.

Collins, Berndt, and Hess measured behavioral differences which they confirmed occurred after watching violent TV (Wartella, 1979, p. 44). And these differences seem to be reported to age differences in comprehension and evaluation. In this work, real TV programs were edited to vary the ease with which the action of an aggressive model could be related to cues about the actor's motives and the consequences to him. Third, sixth and tenth graders either saw a TV program in which negative motives and consequences scenes were separated from aggression by commercials (separation condition) or they saw the negative modifying cues in "Contiguity with the aggression (no separation)."

The measure of aggression was a self-report instrument in which children were asked to indicate how they would behave in response to a series of hypothetical situations. For the separation third graders, the separating commercials interfered with comprehension of aggression in terms of negative
motives and consequences, so that the aggression stood alone - unmodified - as a model for behavior. Older viewers, apparently, could handle the cognitive difficulties caused by separation, so that their comprehensions of the act when commercials were inserted were essentially the same as those formed when the important scenes were close together in time.

It is stated in one study: From ages three through 16, the average child spends more total time on TV than on school. In these years, he devotes about one - sixth of all his waking hours to TV. In fact, he is likely to devote more time to TV than to any other activity except sleep and perhaps play, depending on how play is defined! We know from investigations and observations made over a period of years that TV tastes and habits vary with children and are determined by such factors as age, sex, intelligence, parents, attitudes, amount and kind of programming available.

For over two decades now, Gerbner and his team at the University of Pennsylvania have monitored the image of American prime time television fiction and mapped the vision of social and moral order that it presents (Gerbner and Gross, 1976, p. 173). Their analysis demonstrates beyond doubt that violence is absolutely central to popular drama's demonstration of the
"rules of the game of power." For Gerbner, these messages about violence are also always messages about social power, and - as such - they carry different lessons for different groups of viewers.

Two of the effects Gerbner has been particularly interested in are the heightened sense of fear and increased demands for security and protection. His basic procedure is to divide his samples into 'high' and 'low' television viewers (usually defined as those who watch four or more hours a day and those who watch less than two) and to compare their perceptions on a range of dimensions. The result appear to show consistent differences between the two groups, with avid viewers tending to overestimate their chances of being involved in violence and expressing more fear about being out alone at night (Gerbner and Gross 1976).

There are quite a few qualitative studies that are done using a survey instrument. For example, most clinical researchers collect data and analyze it quantitatively. Dr. Ford used a survey to identify patients with low self-esteem and back pain and then conducted focus group interviews, with these patients, seeking to answer the question, 'what is the experience of back pain in patients reporting feelings of low self-esteem?' As the question explores what is
happening in patients' narrative lives, the operating paradigm is constructivist inquiry. Such research is also referred to as multimethod research, often requiring both qualitative and quantitative analytical approaches (Denzin and Lincoln, 1994, pp. 342-345).

The wealth of research data on all aspects of children's television experience has led to the development of various theoretical interpretations and explanations within both the communication literature and within the psychological and developmental literature. Social Learning Theory is one of the first to be used to explain television's impact on children. Most of the early work in this area, spearheaded by Albert Bandura in 1960's, pointed to observational learning and imitation of modelled behavior as the critical components of television's impact. A considerable amount of research done since then, much of it on the relationship between viewing violent television and increased aggressive behavior, has replicated and extended Bandura's findings (Bobo doll experiment).

Social learning theory has been used most effectively to interpret the short-term effects that have been demonstrated in the many laboratory experiments. Clearly, the elements of observational learning, modeling,
vicarious reinforcement, and imitation are essential components of a child's viewing experience. But they are mediated by a host of other factors (Evra, 1990, pp. 162-177).

The Cultivation Theory proposed by Gerbner, Gross, Morgan and Signorielli (1980, 1982, 1986) asserts that for heavy viewers television cultivates reality perceptions of the world that are consistent with television's portrayals, and that this leads to homogeneity of perceptions. The more time spent viewing television, the more likely the viewer is to accept television's version of things.

According to this theory, the amount of viewing or exposure is a very important variable in television's impact on thought and behavior. Moreover, television's impact is greatest when it functions as the only information source and when it is relevant to the person. The theory assumes that heavy viewers are also less selective in their viewing, engage in habitual viewing, and experience a good deal of similarity in content. However, Rubin and other researchers in 1988 pointed out that cultivation studies omitted attention to antecedent and intervening variables (Evra, 1990).

Uses and Gratification Theory deals with the actual motivations of
viewers, the uses they make of television and the actual needs they have that are satisfied by the media. Further, the model addresses the functional alternatives to one's use of the media, the social and psychological environments of viewers, and their communication behavior and its consequences. According to Katz et al., one of the major aims of such research is to see audience requirements or needs as intervening variables in studies of media effects. The theory offers a basis for specifying which children will be effected by which content. It emphasizes that children actively choose the experiences in which they will engage (Evra, 1990).

Cognitive Neo-Associationism, espoused by Berkowitz (1962, 1973), proposes that seeing violence or aggression on television loosens controls a viewer holds on his or her aggression. In other words, it disinhibits aggression. Once disinhibited, aggressive acts are more likely to be performed in everyday life, but there is no expectation these acts will be exact imitations of the acts seen on television (Television and Children, 1986, pp. 90-91). Lastly, Catharsis Theory (Feshbach 1955, 1961; Feshbach and Singer 1971) proposes that viewing a drama in which powerful emotions are represented and acted upon serves to decrease the reservoir of such emotions in the viewer (Television and Children, 1986).
As most children spend more time watching television than on any other single activity, television's impact on their cognitive, social, and affective development cannot be overemphasized. Discerning the major components and determinants of that impact can facilitate both our understanding of how children process television information and our understanding of the extent to which television programming actually affects children of diverse age, gender, and background groups. The topic is volatile and needs longitudinal studies as well as discrete studies that are repeated over a period of time by different researchers to observe the increase or decline of influence television has over all of us, irrespective of age and gender.
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

Concern about the possible harmful effects of television violence on children and youth has been a focus for researchers since the 1950's. When Congressional hearings were held about increasing violent crime in the United States, academic researchers pointed to the experimental evidence of connections between television violence and social violence.

This present work is an introspective study designed to relate patterns of normal television viewing behavior to changes in aggression or violent behavior in the context of social environments. It is focused on the steady diet of television violence on the development of violent behavior patterns among the preadolescents and adolescents surveyed. However, the study design cannot uncover effects of specific program segments in triggering unusual or rare acts of violence. The data central to the study pertaining to aggression and television exposure to violence were obtained directly from the students through questionnaires administered in classrooms.
The survey was conducted in a large southeastern American city, Nashville, Tennessee, the capital city of the state with an economy that will soon make it one of the financial growth centers of the United States. A sample of 210 pre-high schoolers and high schoolers attending different schools were surveyed. Students from six schools were selected randomly from five grades (6-10) to constitute the sample. Teachers from each grade coordinated the random selection of fourteen students as the sample from that grade and then distribute and administer questionnaires at sessions during normal school hours.

This research was conducted in the Fall of 1994. The basic objective of this introspective study is to find if the respondents see any relation between television violence they view and their own subsequent violent behavior or whether they deny that such a relation exists. Respondents belong to the age group of 11 to 16 years and were considered as representative of their age groups in the Nashville area. Since Nashville is the only city involved, the sample cannot be representative of all children in these age groups throughout the United States. However, the results can be used to generalize that similar interpretations are likely to be found in similar mid-south urban areas if
further studies were done there by other scholars. The hypothesis states that preadolescent and adolescents deny that their behavior is affected by television violence. However, my hypothesis links television viewing and aggression by suggesting that program content (i.e., violence) affects behavior. Only through constant testing, evaluation, rejection and support of related hypothesis can behavioral principles be developed to provide meaningful insights into psychological and environmental factors that influence violent behavior among the young.

This study is an ex post facto research. It is a systematic, empirical inquiry in a context where the independent variable is inherently not manipulable. Television violence is the independent variable that is not manipulable whereas the change in behavior is the dependent variable which might be affected by the independent variable. A questionnaire will be the tool used for data collection. Some of the ideas for the questions in the questionnaire were inspired by a study done by Walter and Bandura on adolescent aggression in 1959. A survey of this kind seems to be the most logical technique when the investigator has a good idea of how to solicit what he wishes to measure and when he believes that a questionnaire can be designed in a way that will avoid bias. A random selection of the salient
provides an adequate and representative sample which may be validly
projected as applicable to the stipulated universe of the inquiry. The
questionnaire used for the collection of data has simple, specific questions in
order to encourage cooperation. It is a combination of close-ended questions
and open-ended questions.

The sequence of questions has also been given importance in order to
avoid the likelihood of prejudicing some responses through the close proximity
of related questions. Proper separation of related questions may enhance the
investigator's attempt to gain considerable insights into the attitudes and beliefs
of the individuals and how they comprehend their own behavior. Accurate
reporting about existing facts depends upon the abilities and willingness of the
respondents. However, we recognize that most of us are incapable of analyzing
our own motives and behavior, since we prefer to think of ourselves as being
nearly perfect.

AREA OF STUDY

To define the area of work and specify its geographical limits as closely
as possible, this study has been restricted to schools in the Nashville area.
Compared to other big cities, Nashville has the reputation of being the 'good
big city,' with a moderate crime rate. Even though there are only sporadic
incidents of violence on school campuses, they are reasons for growing concern among parents, school administrations and, most important of all, the students themselves who ought to have a secure environment in which to live and learn. Further, Nashville has a large selection of television programming.

**SAMPLING**

Sample selection involved two stages

1. selection of the study location

2. selection of respondents

The schools were randomly selected from a list of high schools and middle schools. The sixth, seventh, eight grades are considered middle school, while ninth and tenth grade came under early high school. The schools selected for the study were David Lipscomb High School (9th & 10th grades), David Lipscomb Middle School (6th, 7th, & 8th grades), Brentwood High School (9th & 10th grades), Grassland Middle School (6th, 7th, & 8th grades), John Overton High School (9th & 10th grades), and Cameron Middle School (6th grade). The last two being public schools, the author was required to gain permission of the Department of Research and Evaluation at the Metropolitan Board of Education, Nashville before students could be approached with this study.
Because the study design called for data collection from students currently in school, classrooms were the sampling units. Fourteen students each from the sixth through tenth grades from six schools were selected to be the respondents. Of each set of fourteen, seven were boys and the other seven girls. With the framework of this design, the sampling plan produced an equal number of girls and boys in sizeable numbers. The teachers responsible for each of the grades selected the respondents randomly using the attendance list. The questionnaire was filled out by the respondents during class hours with the teacher being present inside the classroom. If the students needed to be contacted by the researcher for any clarification of a response, he/she would be approached through the administering teacher.

**QUESTIONNAIRE**

210 questionnaires were distributed to students in the age group of 11 to 16 years old, belonging to six schools. Three high schools and three middle schools were randomly selected from a list of schools that had sixth, seventh, eighth, ninth and the tenth grades.

Since the study is basically an introspective study, the questionnaire asks young people to analyze their own thoughts, attitudes, beliefs and related
behavior. In other words, the questions give them an opportunity to look into themselves and to reveal how they suppose they interact with the media environment. Specifically, the questionnaire asks them for information that relates mass media exposure to their own reasoning about whether such programming affects their attitudes and behaviors. There are also questions related to other independent variables such as peer pressure and self-validation that try to determine if there are factors that contribute to the change in behavior due to TV violence.

None of us can predict or be certain of what motivates our behaviors. But we all guess nevertheless or have definite notions about how our minds work. My study asks young people to make guesses about how their minds work as the result of being exposed to certain kinds of mass media material. They may be wrong in their interpretation of their behavior; however, they may, as the self-fulfilling prophecy indicates, indeed behave in a manner consistent with what they think. Therefore, their answers may be wrong when viewed objectively, yet reveal their best guesses about why they do what they do. And, since they believe strongly about what they write as questionnaire responses, even such subjective information will be valuable as revelations about the view of life that fills the young minds as 'directions' about how they
should behave.

The survey instrument was developed specifically for the purpose of this study. Most of the questions provide two choices, whereas some allow multichoice answers. The questionnaire is divided into five parts to facilitate easy reading and smooth transition from one section to another. This partitioning also allows a classification scheme that is useful later during analysis. The survey instrument includes items about antisocial behavior, aggressiveness toward friends and teachers, friendship patterns and amount of exposure to TV violence. Most questions not only solicit additional information but also serve to deflect attention from the central topic of discussion or measure. The questionnaire begins with a statement of confidentiality to assure respondents that the information provided by them is secured purely for academic purposes. This assurance is followed by instructions for students filling out the questionnaire as accurately as possible.

Below is a brief explanation of the five sections of the questionnaire, each section serving a specific purpose of the study. Each section provides a focus that facilitates the analysis of data obtained. The average time taken by the respondent to fill out the questionnaire was between 15 to 20 minutes.
PART A:

This section collects information about the respondent's age, sex, race, and grade as antecedent variables vital to the final analysis of all responses obtained. Age becomes important when one considers the fact that age differences correspond directly to how images on TV are comprehended.

PART B:

This part begins with questions pertaining to the respondent's daily television viewing habits and programs of preference. For instance, how many hours he/she spends watching television, for what purpose do they watch TV (education, entertainment or information), and to specify his/her favorite programs. The second half of this part relates to questions about television violence and tries to find out how the students rate violence on television and whether they consider it as portrayals of real life as it is.

The questions follow a particular sequence by beginning with general questions and moving onto more specific information about television violence. The basic idea behind this section is to find out how much the respondent views, enjoys and imitates television imagery in real life.
PART C:

Peer pressure is a widely-discussed subject of research and psychology, because it also affects communication and behavioral patterns. In the current study, I consider peer pressure, self validation and self identification as augmenting factors that help form the relationship between aggressive behavior and television violence. Therefore, this section concentrates on the respondents' interactions with friends, getting along with them, "hanging out" and trying to prove themselves in order to be accepted into the "gang."

Intertwined with these questions are inquiries into any kind of violence the respondent has witnessed or participated in along with friends either in school or in the neighborhood. The sequence of these questions tries to prevent the respondents from identifying a particular end that would then influence their answers. In other words, the questions are arranged as they are in an attempt to bring out a spontaneous response to avoid any bias.

PART D:

Parents and teachers are major sources of knowledge for any child. Friends also play a vital role, but it is ultimately the school and home that still tend to be responsible for forming the essence of whatever one is. These
institutions lay the basic foundation to values in life and help us figure out what exactly we need to seek from our environment. They influence our interaction with our surroundings and protect us from them. Part D, accordingly, seeks information about how much the respondents depend, confide, look up to and fear their parents and teachers.

I wanted to find out if parents of the respondents monitor their child's television viewing to shield their young minds from being overly exposed to violence, sex, vulgar talk and outrageous talk shows. Apart from the restrictions themselves, it is important to know whether the respondent trusts, depends, confides and respects his or her parents.

PART E:

This final section of the questionnaire consists of mostly open-ended questions to gain insights into the perceptions and solutions of the students themselves. Most previous investigators draw conclusions based upon their observations and results obtained through experiments, statistical analysis and observation. I thought it would be interesting to find out what the respondents themselves think should be done about violence on campus and in their neighborhood. Since this section includes questions asking for anecdotal
responses, it will definitely add personal elements to make my findings more interesting.

**ANALYSIS**

The current study is not a laboratory analysis that would require extensive statistical methods. Rather, it is a self-report/introspective study. The questionnaire elicited subjective, introspective guesses from the sample population. I am trying to learn whether a self-fulfilling psychology motivates their responses and their behavior. Self-fulfilling prophecy is a concept based on the fact that many of us do not know what is actually behind our behavior, but we continue to act on what we "believe" is behind our behavior. Our beliefs, if analyzed by psychiatrists or anthropologists, may prove to have been wrong. Yet, young people believe that their answers are the right explanation for their behavior and they may then live out those sets of directions or expectations as if the influence were forces beyond their control.

In short, the study represents an attempt to survey media-influenced behavioral factors as self-perceived by the respondents. Their behavior is necessarily based on their insights, even though these insights may be wrong. The analysis is not focused on how to analyze the respondents' behaviors or to
predict what they will do next. Rather, I will try to locate and present their thinking as they themselves describe it and why they themselves predict that they are or are not affected by mass media.

Since the study is subjective, the best way to report results is not through statistical formulae. Instead, data collected using the questionnaire will be analyzed qualitatively with the help of the Grounded Theory approach proposed by Anselm Strauss and Juliet Corbin. Grounded theory is a general methodology for developing theory that is grounded in data systematically gathered and analyzed. Grounded Theory provides for theory to be generated initially from data or by elaborating and modifying existing theories as incoming data are played against them.

My analysis of data will elaborate and modify upon the Social Learning Theory (also known as modelling theory) which proposes that viewing any content leads one to reproduce this content when there seems to be good reason to reproduce it in their environment. The resulting reproductions may be broad generalizations, exact copies, or reasonable facsimiles. Social Learning theory was proposed by Albert Bandura in the 1960's, since much of the early work in this area was spearheaded by him with the popular Bobo doll
experiment that revealed a media connection with violent behavior.

To elaborate on the social learning theory, I will have to present the respondents' perspective as based on self-evaluation of what they believe together with the notions expounded by social learning theory. If the respondents believe that their behavior is affected by what they view on television, then the expounded theory would show how introspective analysis of behavior regarding television violence confirms that the violent content viewed is reproduced consciously by the individual. However, if the responses indicate that the respondents deny their behavior being related to television violence viewed, then the expounded theory will show how the theory cannot be applied in relation to an introspective study where the individual denies learning and reproducing any violent content viewed on TV.

The Grounded theory approach specifically points out that the interpretation of findings must include the perspectives and voices of the people being studied. This approach further explains that the interpretations are sought for the purpose of understanding the actions of individuals. Even though the design of my analysis does not allow my biases nor my interpretation of the responses to interfere in the analysis of data, I will give
voice to my reactions in the last chapter which lists my conclusions based on the analysis.

The Grounded Theory approach can be further analyzed through analytical methods such as noting recurring patterns and themes, finding intervening variables, noting relation among variables, and then assembling a coherent understanding of the data collected. Gender differences could be a recurring theme for different questions, and there could be a relation between independent variables such as television violence, peer pressure, and family interaction.

Age, sex and race form the antecedent variables that might point toward a particular trend in the self-analysis of behavior, attitudes, and beliefs of the individual. Also, interesting anecdotes sighted in the questionnaire will be a part of the analysis. These excerpts of anecdotal information could be accounts that the respondents may volunteer as responses to certain questions in the questionnaire. Often such anecdotes point toward interesting facts about human psychology.

Since the approach also says that grounded theorist can utilize both qualitative and quantitative techniques of analysis, I will illustrate some of the
close-ended and multiple choice questions with pie charts or bar graphs and include percentage tables for some of the questions where the percentage difference appears to be significant. The basic tabulations may present what the various questionnaire items reveal.
CHAPTER FOUR: ANALYSIS

In an introspective study, the analysis does not require extensive statistical methods. Rather, a self-report survey of the type used here elicits subjective, introspective speculations from the sample population. Based on this survey of behavioral factors as self-perceived by the respondents, the researcher attempts to present their thinking and whether they predict that they are or are not affected by television.

The data presented will be analyzed based on the Grounded Theory approach, proposed by Anselm Strauss and Juliet Corbin. As discussed before, this theory is a general methodology for developing theory or elaborating existing theories as incoming data are played against them. For this study, Albert Bandura's Social Learning Theory is the grounded theory against which data will be analyzed. This theory, also known as the modelling theory, proposes that viewing any content leads one to reproduce the content when there is "a good reason" to reproduce it in a personal environment.

In the Social Learning Theory, after data is presented as it was
collected, it is then related to the core idea that the theory expounds. If the respondents believe that their behavior is affected by what they view on television, then the elaborated theory will show how introspective analysis of behavior regarding television violence confirms that the violent content viewed is consciously reproduced by the individual. However, if the responses indicate that respondents deny the impact of television violence on their behavior, then the theory will predict that the individual does not consciously reproduce any violent content viewed on television. In other words, the subject does not relate the viewing of the content to the act that he or she reproduces.

The sample consisted of academically heterogenous students from sixth through tenth grades. The total sample population to be surveyed was 210, of which nine sets of responses could not be used. Of the 192 properly sampled respondents, there were 98 boys and 94 girls.

The first section of the questionnaire inquires about the television viewing habits, the quality of television programs, their portrayal of real life and the impact of violent content as perceived by the respondents. The questions were arranged in a particular sequence to avoid the responses being influenced by any evident patterning. The responses in this section indicated a
influenced by any evident patterning. The responses in this section indicated a contradictory trend where most of the respondents agreed that people do "learn" from television, even though they denied the tendency to imitate what they learn. Another recurring correlation was that in all age groups considered for this study, adolescent boys showed a greater inclination towards watching and liking violent content on television than did girls who were the same age.

There is no doubt that the majority of those polled agree on the assertion that they watch television mainly for entertainment and not so much for information or education. The middle school students watch television every day on an average of two to three hours, whereas the high school students watch it on an average of one to two hours every day. Respondents were asked to rate violence portrayed in television programs watched by marking a rating scale that listed five choices ranging from "extremely violent" to "not violent at all." Car chases, gang fights, terrorism, homicides and other violence-oriented programs appeared to be the favorites of the boys, while the girls preferred light romance and family-oriented programs. This trend was significant for all the age groups between 11 to 16 years. The idea of a channel devoted only to violent programs appealed to the boys, while it was very unpopular with the girls. Yet if television bans all kinds of violence from
television programs, both boys and girls indicate that they would still watch television just as much as they always have.

Viewing television does influence young people to learn, according to what an overwhelming majority of the respondents think. However, they also assert that learning from television does not necessarily influence them to imitate what they learn. Indeed, both girls and boys considered themselves as being "neutral" to the effects of television violence. However, few boys, in the age group of fourteen to sixteen years, did admit becoming more aggressive after viewing violent content. These boys who indicated as being made more aggressive by television also confessed that given a choice, they would carry a weapon for self-protection. However, a majority of the responses indicated that the students did not cherish the idea of carrying weapons to school or any other place, except as a "last resort."

Both boys and girls could enumerate violent acts that they witnessed in their school and neighborhood. They wrote about seeing friends "cussing" one another, gang fights, fist fights, knife fights, shooting, boys trying to corner girls, and bullying. One girl witnessed a shooting incident in one of the public schools in Nashville that resulted in the killing of one middle school boy. But,
when it came to rating their school on a rating scale that ranged from extremely violent to not violent at all, most of the respondents rated their schools as "not so violent." Most respondents were unsure of whether or not television is to blame for the violence around them in real life. Even though some of the responses to this question were ambiguous, most of the young people thought that parents need to control their children instead of blaming all bad behavior on television.

Throughout section B, the respondents continued to deny being influenced by television, which supports the hypothesis that preadolescents and adolescents would be reluctant to fault their favorite entertainments. The point here is that even though the respondents deny being influenced by television violence, other responses by the same people contradict their denial implicitly. For instance, the majority of those queried accept that they do "learn" by watching television, in one item, but then deny being influenced in another response. While considering television programs as "violent enough," the boys still would like a channel devoted only to violence-oriented serials involving gang fights, car chases, homicides, fist fights etc. This contradiction indicates confusion in the minds of young viewers as to whether or not television plays an important perceptual role in their lives. There is a self-fulfilling prophecy at
work here. The respondents consider that being totally independent and highly
decisive is what other people respect, as shown by television shows.
Accordingly, that is how they try to behave in order to conform to that popular
belief. Ironically, then, even though the respondents readily accept that they do
learn from television content, they continue to deny reproducing any of that
content.

The third section tries to determine among other things whether a
causal factor like peer pressure affects one's behavior. A large number of the
respondents feel that they share common tastes with their friends when it
comes to television programs. Also, both girls and boys, between 11 to 16
years, like watching television mostly with their friends more so than with
their families. The few who did prefer watching television with their families
were mostly middle school girls. Getting good grades was more the main
concern for the sixth, seventh and eighth graders than it was for the high
school students, who cared more for social success. Most of the older
adolescents care immensely about what other friends think about them, and
they all indicated that they could go to quite an extent - some say to any
extent - to be accepted by their peers. The majority of the respondents were
willing to change some of their ways only because they were not agreeable to
their friends.

Both boys and girls admitted that they do get into conflicts with their peers and that if someone acted "too smart" most of the respondents would either confront the individual or warn him/her rather than just ignore the matter. Another interesting fact is that a major percentage of both girls and boys have physically struck another child. Some male respondents even indicated that they had been in a fight and had hit someone only hours before filling out the questionnaire. Some could recall specific dates and time when they last hit someone. A ninth grader responded that she felt justified in slapping her boyfriend only after he slapped her. Both boys and girls also admitted to being verbally aggressive toward their peers, though there was a significant difference on part of the boys who were verbally aggressive and the girls who were engaged in that behavior. Still, the percentage calculated indicated that the girls who were verbally aggressive toward their peers outnumbered those who were not.

While getting good grades made a girl respected, being tough was what mattered among boys in all age groups (11-16). The number of dates one had was also significant factor for both girls and boys as a way to gain the respect of their peers. Given a choice, most boys preferred talking about fights and car
chases, while girls preferred conversing about grades and courses. "Hanging out with friends" was preferred by both sexes to going out for dinner with the family. Asked whether they would change their physical appearance, the majority of the respondents indicated that they definitely would, though the girls outnumbered the boys in this instance.

In summary, this section of the questionnaire, revealed a definite trend that supports the assumption that peer pressure affects behavior and is one of the causal factors operating on the sample population. Most respondents willingly agree that they can change behavior for the sake of keeping their friends and would prefer hanging out with them than going out with their family. The responses also indicate both physical and verbal aggressiveness of respondents toward their peers. Being tough counts high on the boys' list along, with their physical and verbal aggressiveness. But, the surprising fact is that girls, compared to findings in others' previous research, show an increase in both physical and verbal aggressiveness toward their peers.

The responses in this section point out that the young people in the age group of 11 to 16 years do give a great deal of importance to their friends and that their behavior is definitely affected by factors affecting peer acceptance -
and that goes for both boys and girls. During the period of this study, Aisha Glenn, a Nashville middle school student, brought a gun to school because she did not like the way her peers talked about her, complaining that this distress affected her studies and social interactions. She was suspended from the school.

The next section of the questionnaire tried to find out how much the respondents depend on their teachers for discipline at school and whether parents control television viewing habits at home. Most students indicated that they do not do things openly in school for which they know they might be punished, although more boys than girls indicated that they might. Still, there was an equal distribution of boys and girls who considered teachers as being sincerely interested in helping them out with their problems. However, getting angry with parents seems quite a popular trend among adolescents and pre-adolescents, according to their responses. However, most of them said that they try to "make up," whether or not they are truly sorry about what happened.

Girls and boys between 11 and 14 years felt that their parents had, in general, laid out many rules for them. As far as television viewing habits were
concerned, the tenth grade students did not consider having too many rules to follow. However, the sixth through ninth grade students felt that their parents restricted the kind of programs they watched. Both sexes agree on the fact that the type of programs they watch are restricted more than the number of hours they watch. The tenth graders once again denied being subject to any such restrictions regarding either programs or number of hours of television viewing.

Although resisting pressure by authority figures, when the respondents were asked to select a person who they most wanted to be like in the future, they did not hesitate to select someone related to them, like an uncle, father, mother, and sisters. As expected, some even referred to their football coaches as role models, while a few others did not wish to be like anyone other than themselves. When respondents were asked about what they would like to change in their lives, their responses made it obvious that these young minds have plenty more going on in their minds than just algebra. A sixth-grader, for instance, wanted to bring his divorced parents back together, and a ninth-grader wanted her dad to stop drinking, while an eighth-grader wanted to be taller and more athletic.
In sum, the responses in this section indicate that many parents do attempt to control television viewing habits of their children. There were, however, quite a few who stated that their parents simply did not care about anything they did. At the other extreme was the indication that there were too many rules laid down by parents.

The final section consists predominantly of open-ended questions in an attempt to elicit responses about what the young perceive as important for their safety at schools and what kind of programs they prefer watching most of the time. Most respondents felt strongly negative about the possession of weapons inside school property and suggested implementing more stringent rules to prevent such incidents. Just as this survey was going on, at least five students were arrested for possessing weapons illegally on school property in Nashville. There were a handful of respondents who considered that they should be allowed to carry weapons to school for self-protection. One ninth-grader admitted that he possesses an AK 47 which he would like to carry to school if he were allowed to do so.

All respondents agreed that punishment for students carrying a weapon and being involved in violence should include dismissal from school, being
tried as an adult in the court of justice, and having to pay a heavy compensation to any victim and a fine to the school for tarnishing its reputation. The respondents also insisted on having metal detectors in the corridors and checking the student lockers everyday. They also wanted teachers to bring about an awareness of how violent acts are more harmful in real life than on screen and that they are not something "cool" to be involved in. The respondents of both sexes felt strongly about real-life violence and listed many rules that they would implement if they were put in charge of preventing violence in their schools.

A few middle school respondents felt that to bring about more order in schools, uniforms should be introduced as required attire. Some suggested learning "karate" for self-protection, rather than using lethal weapons. Most respondents suggested that animal documentaries (Discovery Channel), cartoons, comedy, and real-life stories are among some of the programs that are both educative and entertaining without teaching destructive tendencies. Surprisingly, there were quite a few respondents who wrote "none" to this question asking for suggestions about what would be beneficial as viewing choices.
One of the most interesting suggestions made regarding measures to curb violence was that parents and teachers should inculcate important values in their children. Some respondents insisted that the students should be more religious in order to deal with any temptation to be involved in violent acts or carrying weapons to school. Responses in the final section of the questionnaire point toward the potential of these students to make rules for themselves and their peers to prevent violence in their schools.

The respondents continued to prefer to believe that their behavior is not influenced by viewing television violence. Most respondents indicate this belief in answering the questionnaire, even though they contradict themselves with inconsistencies that rise from some of their responses. These inconsistencies contradict their belief that they are not influenced by either television or peer pressure. The respondents explicitly deny being influenced by television violence, even though they accept that they learn various other behaviors and values by viewing television content. The survey results support the hypothesis that - in a self-report study - preadolescents and adolescents deny any influence of television violence on their behavior.

The Social learning theory proposes that viewing any content leads one
to reproduce this content when there is a "good reason" to reproduce it in a personal environment. Based on the Grounded Theory approach, in the context of the data systematically collected and analyzed, the expounded Social Learning Theory states that, "viewing any violent content leads one to reproduce this content when there is a good reason to reproduce it in his/her environment, without the conscious knowledge of reproducing it on the part of the individual." In other words, research by Bandura proves that one does have a tendency to reproduce what one views, but that the individual denies such reproduction of content viewed. The current study confirms that the respondents accept having learned from what they view on television, but deny that they reproduced any violent learnings. This contradiction leads to the conclusion that the young learn from the content they view, then perform some of it without the knowledge or acknowledgement that he/she is, after all, reproducing the content viewed.

Another important factor involved in this denial is the age variable. Pre-adolescence and adolescence is that phase of life where people begin to assert independence and like to believe that they are capable of making their own decisions without being influenced by anyone, including the mass media. The one causal factor they do accept at this stage of life as being of tremendous
importance is the need for establishing their identity among their peers. Hence, peer pressure is a very important causal factor which affects the behavior of the young including perhaps their tendency having common likings regarding television programs. Their choice to watch television with their friends shows that their interaction with peers does affect what they watch on TV and by what programs they are influenced.

Another important finding is the apparent difference among male and female categories. Violence definitely appears more popular among boys, while the girls prefer more "mushy" stuff when it comes to television programs. Boys rank higher than girls in being more aggressive, both physically and verbally. This finding supports previous research findings that show a significant difference in violence-proneness among boys and girls.

PERCENTAGE TABLES, PIE CHARTS, AND BAR GRAPHS:

The television viewing habits and perceptions of television violence of 192 academically heterogeneous students, grades sixth through tenth, from three high schools and three middle schools in Nashville, were surveyed using a questionnaire designed for this study. The survey indicated that adolescents watch television mainly for entertainment and that more than 30% believe that television programs are indeed violent. Also, approximately 70% of them
contend that one does indeed "learn" from television content. However, the respondents also deny any influence of television violence on their own behavior, even though the percentage calculated shows that an overwhelming majority of them admit learning other things by watching television content.

The percentage tables list some of the questions where both age and sex appear to be significant variables affecting responses. Behavioral patterns traced through maturity and into retirement age levels may be initiated and sustained by basic forces learned early and which may be permanent. Basic attitudes change little after adulthood is reached. Accordingly, studies of causal influences on the young are inherently valuable. Young people are more eager, active and attracted by opportunities to try out the new. They are cautious and conforming, yet venturesome and daring.

All respondents selected for the present survey were 11 to 16 year-olds. Their level of understanding, comprehending and analyzing their own behavior varies with age as would be expected. Previous research done on this topic provides ambiguous conclusions about the effect of age differences in exposure to televised violence. However, there is evidence that preadolescent and early adolescent youth are likely to view more violence than are late adolescent
youth, thus are likely to be affected more.

The arcane sex difference which is significant to the researchers consists of the interest patterns which develop around each behavior pattern studied. Girls have interests which boys look upon with disdain. Of the several published studies of television violence which measured aggressive behavior, many measured direct aggressive behavior in boys to be more aggressive than girls over-all. All of these patterns are dynamic and need to be discovered and identified in greater detail by future research.

The percentage tables included below are arranged in such a manner that the antecedent variables, age and sex, form the row variables and the answers form the column variables. The age variable is classified into five groups: 11-12, 12-13, 13-14, 14-15, and 15-16. The sex variable was classified into male and female categories. Responses of each of the 192 students were marked at both the age variable and the sex category.

The pie charts and bar graphs illustrate responses to questions which did not necessarily need connection to the age variable. The charts and graphs show significant differences in media-influenced attitudes in relation to the sex variable. The bar graphs illustrate percentage differences for "yes" and "no"
questions only. The pie charts illustrate percentage differences between male
and female categories for multiple choice answers.

Of the 210 questionnaires distributed, 192 constituted the final sample
population used for collection and analysis of data. Of these 192, 98 were
boys and 94 were girls. The sample numbers for each age group and sex
category against which percentages were calculated are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE GROUPS</th>
<th>RESPONDENTS REPRESENTED IN SAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-13</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-14</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-15</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-16</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEX CATEGORIES</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For each age and/or sex category, percentage responses appear in the
chart cells. The statistical illustrations are included in Appendix A.
CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

If there is one thing that both girls and boys unanimously agree on, it is
the assertion that they watch television purely for entertainment. However,
more than 70% of them will then also reveal that they believe that they "learn"
by watching television, but deny reproducing whatever questionable behaviors
with which they become familiar. The basic findings of the present survey
support the hypothesis that, in a self-report introspective study, individuals
deny the influence of television violence on their behavior, while
acknowledging that other effects occur.

The expounded Social Learning Theory based on these findings, states
that viewing any violent content leads one to reproduce that content when
there is a good reason to reproduce it in his/her environment, without the
conscious knowledge of reproducing it on the part of the individual. This
feature of the Social learning Theory was confirmed by the results reported
above.

Most respondents view television programs as violent but do not totally
blame television for the violence around them. The respondents appear to be confused regarding the role television plays in their lives. Some partly blame television and some partly blame parents. For this researcher, the alarming part was that most of the respondents, both boys and girls, were witnesses to violent acts inside their school and in their neighborhood. The casual manner in which they list some of the violent acts makes one wonder whether they accept these as a normal part of their school life. Most respondents consider their school not so violent, which might seem to contradict their listing of witnessed violent acts.

Another interesting finding was related to which programs were watched most. The favorite programs of girls were mainly evening prime time programs, such as Melrose Place, Beverley Hills 90210 and some comedy serials like Seinfeld, Mad About You and Fresh Prince of Bel-Air. The boys agreed with girls on the comedy serials, but their uniquely favorite prime time programs were the violent X Files, Homicide - Life on New York Streets, etc.

Most boys admitted belonging to some gang or a group, while a majority of the girls denied belonging to any group. A major finding was that
there was a tremendous influence of peer pressure on the respondents' attitudes about changing their ways to please friends, wanting to change their appearance and respecting the girls with good grades and the boys who were tough and had many dates. The respondents also admitted that they preferred the company of their friends to their families while watching television, the reason being that they share common tastes for television programs with their friends. Also, boys and girls in all the five age groups exhibited that they were both physically and verbally aggressive toward their peers. The percentage of boys being aggressive is higher than the percentage for girls. This response is the only one that indicates the girls being inclined toward any degree of violence. All the other responses show a definite trend that girls are more sober than boys when it comes to viewing violence on television and far less likely to be involved in violent acts.

Most respondents showed respect toward their parents and teachers. Yet, while the girls feared doing things openly in school for which they might be punished, the boys admitted that they might do things openly, even knowing the consequences of such acts. Except for the tenth grade students, the others were controlled by their parents regarding programs they watch on television. The number of hours of viewing did not really seem as important as did the
kind of programs watched. Once again, the tenth graders did not feel as restricted by their parents as did the other four age groups. Ages 11 to 15 years felt that their parents had, in general, laid out many rules of conduct for them. What might come as a pleasant surprise for parents is that most respondents admitted to being honest to their parents.

The respondents reacted strongly to the open-ended questions that asked for their suggestions on how to prevent violence in schools. A majority of them suggest rigorous punishment to those who violate the law. Not only do they suggest dismissal from schools but also being tried as an adult in the court system. The respondents do not believe in carrying weapons to school and suggest prevention through the use of metal detectors placed at different places inside schools. The students show great potential for seeing ways to prevent violence and some of them do have really good ideas about implementing them. Another important observation made in this section indicates that the respondents are serious about violence that occurs around them, and that they would like to change things away from conditions as they are now. During this survey, there was a surge of violence in a few schools in Nashville. The strong reaction of the respondents might be attributed to the violent incidents that occurred around the same time as this survey.
Needless to say, the viewing habits of the young presents a goldmine to scholars for future research possibilities. Since the present study involves behavioral changes, a follow up longitudinal study is important to find out whether there is a change in the way respondents perceive their behavior as they grow up. For instance, the sixth grade students might have a completely different attitude two years from now. Due to technological advances, the young have more access to new inventions which in turn provides more exposure to violent contents on screen. For instance, one important area of related study is the exposure of the young to highly violent video games that lure many at their most vulnerable age.

Another topic touched on here that might be considered for more thorough future study is the possibility of peer pressure and television violence being concomitant factors that influence behavior. Most studies relating to television violence and aggressive behavior are quantitative studies. However, additional self-reporting introspective studies similar to the present one would be insightful to the extent that behavior is considered subjective. Follow up studies of such a nature may help provide insight into processes of interest to students of communication and psychology.
A final possible area of research related to this field is the study of the influence of violent television content on a multi-cultural sample population in a major city in America, where such a sample would be easily found for comparative analysis of attitudes and beliefs. Overall, then, this thesis could spur other students to the study of a field so rich with possibilities.
Dear respondents,

Quite surely you watch television programs. If you answer the questions enclosed, based on that viewing and give your reactions, you will help prepare a graduate thesis. Information provided will be used for academic purposes only. Spare a few minutes, will you?
INSTRUCTIONS

1. Please answer all the questions.

2. Mark the answer you choose.

3. You can mark only one answer for every question, unless it is specified that you need to give more than one answer for a particular question.

4. Please feel free to write any comments or suggestions related to the questions asked.

5. If you need to talk to me about anything you were not able to write about, contact me at ______.

6. Any information you provide here is used only for academic purposes. So, be as honest as you can.

7. If you have anything extra to add, attach a page to the questionnaire.
PART A

1. Sex:

2. Age:

3. White()  Black()  Asian()  Hispanic()  
   Native American()  Other()

4. Grade:

PART B

1. On an average, how much time do you spend watching television everyday? 
   One hour( )  Two hours( )  Three hours( )  four and more hours( )

2. Why do you watch television? (mark any one)
   For information( )  For education( )  For entertainment( )

3. Specify three of your favourite programs in order of preference.
   (1) (2) (3)

4. How would you rate the quality of television programs telecast at present?
   Like very much( )  Like somewhat( )  Neutral( )
   Dislike somewhat( )  Dislike very much( )

5. How would you rate violence portrayed on television?
   Extremely violent( )  Very violent( )  Violent( )
   Not so violent( )  Not violent at all( )

6. Specify the category you like most; 
   TV programs with:
   a. Car chases( )  b. Light romance ( )  c. Educative ( )
   Fights  No violence  Science
   Stunts  Sentimental  History
   Violence  Family oriented  Children oriented

7. Do you believe that TV portrays real life as it is? 
   YES( )  NO( )

8. Do you think you learn by watching TV? 
   YES( )  NO( )

9. Do you like watching TV, 
   alone( )  with family( )  with friends( )

10. Do you and your friends have common likings when it comes to TV programs? 
    YES( )  NO( )

11. If television bans all kinds of violence from programs, would you still watch? 
    YES( )  NO( )
12. Would you like a channel devoted only to high packed action oriented serials involving homicides, rapes, shooting, fighting, terrorism, car chases, gang fights etc?
   YES()             NO()

13. Specify from the list above three categories you like most. If you like none then just write none.
   (1)               (2)               (3)

14. Do you feel like imitating any of the violent acts you watch on TV?
   YES()             NO()

15. Has TV made you,
   more aggressive()  less aggressive()  neutral()

16. Do you like to possess any kind of weapons for
   self protection ()
   to impress friends ()
   to bully someone you do not like ()
   to feel accepted among friends ()
   do not like to carry any weapon ()

17. Do you blame TV for the violence around you?
   YES()             NO()

18. How would you rate violence in your school?
   Extremely violent() Very violent() Violent()
   Not so violent()  Not violent at all()

19. Mention any kind of violent acts you have noticed in your school or neighborhood?

PART C

1. Do you get along with your friends?
   YES()             NO()

2. Do you belong to any kind of group or gang in your school or neighborhood?
   School()  Neighborhood()  None()

3. Do you like to belong to a gang?
   YES()             NO()

4. Did your gang ever get into fights?
   YES()             NO()

5. Are you angry when your friend outsmarts you in anything?
   YES()             NO()

6. How important do you think it is to get good grades?
   Very Important()  Important()  Not so important()
7. Do you think a person should have any kind of reward for good work or good behavior?
   YES( )  NO( )

8. What reward would you suggest?

9. How would you deal with the kind of guy/girl who likes pushing his/her weight around, if he/she starts on you, would you.....
   confront him/her( )  just warn him/her( )  ignore him/her( )

10. Do you care very much what other guys or girls think about you?
    YES( )  NO( )

11. How often have you got into a fight with your friends?
    Very Often( )  Sometimes( )  Never( )

12. When did you last hit another guy/girl? (Write 'never' if you have not)

13. If your friends do not like some of your ways, do you change for their sake?
    YES( )  NO( )

14. Among the friends you go out with, what sorts of things make a guy/girl respected and looked up to?
    grades( )  number of dates( )  being tough( )

15. If you disagree with your friends,
    do you go along with them( )
    express your opinions and do what you want( )

16. Suppose someone plays a dirty trick on you, do you
    complain to the principal/teacher( )
    tell your gang and get even( )
    get even all by yourself( )
    complain to your parents( )

17. Have you ever been verbally aggressive toward your friends?
    YES( )  NO( )

18. Have there been times when you felt you were not wanted by your friends?
    YES( )  NO( )

19. How much do you think you can trust your friends and confide in them?
    Completely( )  Often( )  Occasionally( )
    Rarely( )  Never( )

20. What is the topic you like most when you talk to your friends?
    gangs, fights( )  course, grades( )  family, religion( )
21. Given a choice, would you prefer
    going out for dinner with family( )
    hanging out with friends( )

22. Do you prefer spending time
    alone( ) with friends( )

23. To what extent can you go to be accepted by your friends?
    Any extent( ) Quite an extent( ) Some extent( ) None at all( )

24. How do you suppose you compare physically with other guys/girls of your age?
    Very well( ) To some extent( ) Not at all( )

25. If you could change your appearance in any way, would you want to do so?
    YES( ) NO( )

**PART D**

1. Are there teachers you dislike and find it difficult to get along with?
    YES( ) NO( )

2. If you dislike a teacher, do you try to get back at him/her?
    YES( ) NO( )

3. Have you ever,
    struck or thrown anything at a teacher( )
    sworn at them( )
    answered them back( )
    ever got mad at a teacher( )

4. Do you sometimes do things openly in school for which you know you will get told off or punished?
    YES( ) NO( )

5. Do you go to a teacher or counselor to talk over problems?
    very often( ) sometimes( ) never( )

6. Do you think teachers are interested in helping you with any problems you have?
    YES( ) NO( )

7. Do you talk to your parent(s) about your problems.
    YES( ) NO( )

8. Do you enjoy going out with your family to movies or for other entertainment?
    YES( ) NO( )

9. Do your parents restrict your watching television at home regarding,
    programs( ) number of hours( ) both( )
10. Do your parents dislike any of your friends?
   YES()            NO()

11. Do you use bad language in front of your parents?
   YES()            NO()            Sometimes()

12. Suppose you could change anything in your life, what would you first like to change?

13. Do your parents know if you
   smoke
   drink
   have had sex
   DO YOU   DO THEY KNOW
   ______   ______

14. Do you ever get angry with your parents?
   YES()            NO()

14. Do you feel sorry later and make up?
   YES()            NO()

16. Of all the people you know, whom do you most want to be like when you get older?

17. Do you feel that your parents have laid out a lot of rules for you?
   YES()            NO()

18. Do you ever feel your parents are partial toward your brother or sister?
   YES()            NO()

19. How honest are you with your parents?
   Extremely honest()  Very honest()  Honest()
   Not so honest()  Not honest at all()

20. How often do you fight with your parents?
   Often()  Very rarely()  Never()

21. How do you get along with your brothers and sisters?
   Very well()  Moderately well()  Do not get along at all()  Only child()
PART E

1. What would you like to watch on TV most of the time?

2. Do you think you or your friends should be able to carry weapons to school?
   YES( )   NO( )

3. What would you do for self protection?

4. What measures do you think the school should take to curb violence?

5. What do you think parents should do to curb violence inside and outside school?

6. If you were incharge of making rules to control violence in school, what would you do?
   (1)   (2)   (3)

7. Are there any other suggestions you have about school gangs and violence on television?

8. What kind of programs would you like to watch more often which are both entertaining and educative?

Thankyou for spending your time on this questionnaire.
APPENDIX B: STATISTICAL ILLUSTRATIONS

PART B

QUESTION # 1

On an average, how much time do you spend watching television?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE GROUPS</th>
<th>One hour</th>
<th>Two hours</th>
<th>Three hours</th>
<th>Four and more hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11 - 12</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>48.72</td>
<td>30.77</td>
<td>5.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 - 13</td>
<td>25.64</td>
<td>30.77</td>
<td>25.64</td>
<td>17.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - 14</td>
<td>29.73</td>
<td>35.14</td>
<td>21.62</td>
<td>13.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 - 15</td>
<td>25.64</td>
<td>38.46</td>
<td>20.51</td>
<td>15.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 16</td>
<td>28.95</td>
<td>36.84</td>
<td>26.32</td>
<td>7.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>One hour</th>
<th>Two hours</th>
<th>Three hours</th>
<th>Four and more hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>27.55</td>
<td>33.67</td>
<td>29.59</td>
<td>9.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>22.34</td>
<td>42.55</td>
<td>20.21</td>
<td>14.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**QUESTION # 2**

Why do you watch television?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE GROUPS</th>
<th>For information</th>
<th>For education</th>
<th>For entertainment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11 - 12</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>94.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 - 13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>97.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - 14</td>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>91.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 - 15</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>89.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 16</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>97.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>For information</th>
<th>For education</th>
<th>For entertainment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>96.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>91.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QUESTION # 5

How would you rate violence portrayed on television?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE GROUPS</th>
<th>Extremely violent</th>
<th>Very violent</th>
<th>Violent</th>
<th>Not so violent</th>
<th>Not violent at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11 - 12</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>56.41</td>
<td>23.08</td>
<td>5.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 - 13</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>35.90</td>
<td>28.21</td>
<td>15.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - 14</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>10.81</td>
<td>59.46</td>
<td>21.62</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 - 15</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>56.41</td>
<td>17.95</td>
<td>5.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 16</td>
<td>7.89</td>
<td>10.53</td>
<td>39.47</td>
<td>34.21</td>
<td>7.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>Extremely violent</th>
<th>Very violent</th>
<th>Violent</th>
<th>Not so violent</th>
<th>Not violent at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>13.27</td>
<td>47.96</td>
<td>21.43</td>
<td>12.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>7.45</td>
<td>10.64</td>
<td>51.06</td>
<td>28.72</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you think you "learn" by watching television?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE GROUPS</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11 - 12</td>
<td>87.18</td>
<td>12.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 - 13</td>
<td>76.92</td>
<td>23.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - 14</td>
<td>91.89</td>
<td>8.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 - 15</td>
<td>84.62</td>
<td>15.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 16</td>
<td>60.53</td>
<td>39.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>81.63</td>
<td>18.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>78.72</td>
<td>21.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QUESTION # 11

If television bans all kinds of violence from programs, would you still watch?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE GROUPS</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11 - 12</td>
<td>64.10</td>
<td>35.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 - 13</td>
<td>61.54</td>
<td>38.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - 14</td>
<td>72.97</td>
<td>27.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 - 15</td>
<td>69.23</td>
<td>30.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 16</td>
<td>71.05</td>
<td>28.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>56.12</td>
<td>43.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>79.79</td>
<td>20.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QUESTION # 14

Do you feel like imitating any of the violent acts you watch on television?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE GROUPS</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11 - 12</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>87.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 - 13</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>89.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - 14</td>
<td>16.22</td>
<td>83.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 - 15</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>87.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 16</td>
<td>10.53</td>
<td>89.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>20.41</td>
<td>79.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>95.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QUESTION # 17

Do you blame television for the violence around you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE GROUPS</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11 - 12</td>
<td>28.21</td>
<td>71.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 - 13</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>66.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - 14</td>
<td>40.54</td>
<td>59.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 - 15</td>
<td>35.90</td>
<td>64.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 16</td>
<td>34.21</td>
<td>65.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>31.63</td>
<td>68.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>37.23</td>
<td>62.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QUESTION # 18

How would you rate violence in your school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE GROUPS</th>
<th>Extremely violent</th>
<th>Very violent</th>
<th>Violent</th>
<th>Not so violent</th>
<th>Not violent at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11 - 12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>53.85</td>
<td>35.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 - 13</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>48.72</td>
<td>46.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - 14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>64.86</td>
<td>32.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 - 15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25.64</td>
<td>51.28</td>
<td>23.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 16</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>7.89</td>
<td>7.89</td>
<td>44.74</td>
<td>36.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>Extremely violent</th>
<th>Very violent</th>
<th>Violent</th>
<th>Not so violent</th>
<th>Not violent at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>10.20</td>
<td>51.02</td>
<td>35.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>8.51</td>
<td>54.26</td>
<td>34.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART C

QUESTION # 2

Do you belong to any kind of group or gang in your school or neighborhood?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE GROUPS</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11 - 12</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>79.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 - 13</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>69.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - 14</td>
<td>24.32</td>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>67.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 - 15</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>76.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 16</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>13.16</td>
<td>81.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>13.27</td>
<td>15.31</td>
<td>71.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>17.02</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>78.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QUESTION # 9

How would you deal with the kind of guy who likes pushing his weight around, if he starts on you, would you....

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE GROUPS</th>
<th>confront him/her</th>
<th>just warn him/her</th>
<th>ignore him/her</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11 - 12</td>
<td>20.51</td>
<td>43.59</td>
<td>35.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 - 13</td>
<td>23.08</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>64.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - 14</td>
<td>29.73</td>
<td>27.03</td>
<td>43.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 - 15</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>28.21</td>
<td>38.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 16</td>
<td>39.47</td>
<td>28.95</td>
<td>31.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>confront him/her</th>
<th>just warn him/her</th>
<th>ignore him/her</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>35.71</td>
<td>31.63</td>
<td>32.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>22.34</td>
<td>24.47</td>
<td>53.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QUESTION # 10

Do you care very much what other guys or girls think about you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE GROUPS</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11 - 12</td>
<td>46.15</td>
<td>53.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 - 13</td>
<td>58.97</td>
<td>41.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - 14</td>
<td>70.27</td>
<td>29.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 - 15</td>
<td>53.85</td>
<td>46.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 16</td>
<td>47.37</td>
<td>52.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>57.14</td>
<td>42.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>53.19</td>
<td>46.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QUESTION # 11

How often have you got into a fight with your friends?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE GROUPS</th>
<th>Very often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11 - 12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>56.41</td>
<td>43.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 - 13</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>79.49</td>
<td>17.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - 14</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>75.68</td>
<td>21.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 - 15</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td>28.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 16</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>52.63</td>
<td>44.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>Very often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>64.29</td>
<td>31.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>68.09</td>
<td>30.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**QUESTION # 25**

If you could change your appearance in any way, would you want to do so?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE GROUPS</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11 - 12</td>
<td>48.72</td>
<td>51.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 - 13</td>
<td>61.54</td>
<td>38.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - 14</td>
<td>72.97</td>
<td>27.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 - 15</td>
<td>61.54</td>
<td>38.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 16</td>
<td>60.53</td>
<td>39.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>72.34</td>
<td>27.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART D

QUESTION # 4

Do you sometimes do things openly in school for which you know you will get told off or punished?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE GROUPS</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11 - 12</td>
<td>38.46</td>
<td>61.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 - 13</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>66.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - 14</td>
<td>37.84</td>
<td>62.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 - 15</td>
<td>51.28</td>
<td>48.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 16</td>
<td>47.37</td>
<td>52.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>51.02</td>
<td>48.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>31.91</td>
<td>68.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**QUESTION # 9**

Do your parents restrict your watching television at home regarding,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE GROUPS</th>
<th>programs</th>
<th>number of hours</th>
<th>both</th>
<th>none</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11 - 12</td>
<td>38.46</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>28.21</td>
<td>23.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 - 13</td>
<td>35.90</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>23.08</td>
<td>25.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - 14</td>
<td>32.43</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>18.92</td>
<td>48.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 - 15</td>
<td>30.77</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>30.77</td>
<td>25.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 16</td>
<td>18.42</td>
<td>21.05</td>
<td>7.89</td>
<td>52.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>programs</th>
<th>number of hours</th>
<th>both</th>
<th>none</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>32.65</td>
<td>15.31</td>
<td>22.45</td>
<td>29.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>29.79</td>
<td>10.64</td>
<td>21.28</td>
<td>38.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QUESTION # 19

How honest are you with your parents?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE GROUPS</th>
<th>Extremely honest</th>
<th>Very honest</th>
<th>Honest</th>
<th>Not so honest</th>
<th>Not honest at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11 - 12</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>38.46</td>
<td>38.46</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 - 13</td>
<td>20.51</td>
<td>17.95</td>
<td>28.21</td>
<td>28.21</td>
<td>5.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - 14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29.73</td>
<td>43.24</td>
<td>18.92</td>
<td>8.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 - 15</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>23.08</td>
<td>46.15</td>
<td>17.95</td>
<td>7.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 16</td>
<td>18.42</td>
<td>23.68</td>
<td>44.74</td>
<td>7.89</td>
<td>5.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>Extremely honest</th>
<th>Very honest</th>
<th>Honest</th>
<th>Not so honest</th>
<th>Not honest at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>28.57</td>
<td>38.78</td>
<td>19.39</td>
<td>8.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>15.96</td>
<td>24.47</td>
<td>41.49</td>
<td>13.83</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QUESTION # 17

Do you feel that your parents have laid out a lot of rules for you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE GROUPS</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11 - 12</td>
<td>35.90</td>
<td>64.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 - 13</td>
<td>48.72</td>
<td>51.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - 14</td>
<td>70.27</td>
<td>29.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 - 15</td>
<td>61.54</td>
<td>38.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 16</td>
<td>47.37</td>
<td>52.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>51.02</td>
<td>48.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>54.26</td>
<td>45.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you think you or your friends should be able to carry weapons to school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE GROUPS</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11 - 12</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>97.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 - 13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - 14</td>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>91.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 - 15</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>92.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 16</td>
<td>7.89</td>
<td>92.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>9.18</td>
<td>90.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>98.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part B: # 4

How would you rate the quality of TV programs telecast at present?

**Male**

- Like very much: 25.5%
- Like somewhat: 1.0%
- Neutral: 4.1%
- Dislike somewhat: 34.7%
- Dislike very much: 34.7%

**Female**

- Like very much: 18.1%
- Like somewhat: 7.4%
- Neutral: 2.1%
- Dislike somewhat: 35.1%
- Dislike very much: 37.2%
Part B: # 9

How do you like watching TV?

**Male**

- Alone: 33.7%
- With family: 56.1%
- With friends: 10.2%

**Female**

- Alone: 31.9%
- With family: 55.3%
- With friends: 12.8%
Part B: # 19
Have you witnessed any kind of violent acts in your school or neighborhood?

**Male**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Female**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part C: # 12

Have you ever hit another guy/girl?

Male

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X-Axis</th>
<th>Y-Axis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Female

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X-Axis</th>
<th>Y-Axis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data A
Part C: # 13
If your friends do not like some of your ways, do you change for them?

Male

Female
Part C: # 14
Among the friends you go out with, what sorts of things make a guy/girl looked up to?

Male

- Grades: 26.5%
- Number of Dates: 15.3%
- Being tough: 26.5%
- None of the above: 13.3%

Female

- Grades: 48.9%
- Number of Dates: 25.5%
- Being tough: 8.5%
- None of the above: 17.0%
Part C: # 17
Have you ever been verbally aggressive towards your friends?

**Male**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X-Axis</th>
<th>Y-Axis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Female**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X-Axis</th>
<th>Y-Axis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part C: #24
How do you suppose you compare physically with other guys/girls of your age?

Male

Female

(40.8%)

(8.2%)

(51.0%)

(25.5%)

(7.5%)

(67.0%)
Part D: # 7

Do you talk to your parents about your problems?

Male

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Female

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part D: # 20
How often do you fight with your parents?

**Male**

- Often: 26.5%
- Very rarely: 61.2%
- Never: 12.2%

**Female**

- Often: 31.9%
- Very rarely: 57.5%
- Never: 10.6%
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