



1969

The Television World of Violence

Klaus Krippendorff

University of Pennsylvania, kkrippendorff@asc.upenn.edu

Marten Brouwer

Cedrec C. Clark

Michael F. Eeley

George Gerbner

Follow this and additional works at: http://repository.upenn.edu/asc_papers

 Part of the [Communication Commons](#)

Recommended Citation (OVERRIDE)

Krippendorff, K., Brouwer, M., Clark, C. C., Eeley, M. F., & Gerbner, G. (1969). The television world of violence. In R. K. Baker & S. J. Ball (Eds.), *Mass media and violence* (Vol. IX, pp. 311-339). Washington DC: U.S. Government Printing Office. Retrieved from http://repository.upenn.edu/asc_papers/214

This work also includes Appendix III-J: Content Analysis Procedures and Results, pp.519-591

This paper is posted at ScholarlyCommons. http://repository.upenn.edu/asc_papers/214
For more information, please contact libraryrepository@pobox.upenn.edu.

The Television World of Violence

Disciplines

Communication | Social and Behavioral Sciences

Comments

This work also includes Appendix III-J: Content Analysis Procedures and Results, pp.519-591

Marten Brouwer, Cedric C. Clark, George Gerbner, and Klaus Krippendorff. The Television World of Violence, pages 311-339, and Content Analysis Procedures and Results, pages 519-591 in Robert K. Baker and Sandra J. Ball (Eds.). *Mass Media and Violence*, Vol. IX. A Report to the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence. Washington DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 72-604084, November 1969.

Chapter 15—The Television World of Violence	311
A. <i>Dimensions of Violence in Television Drama: Summary</i>	313
1. Challenge and Difficulties	313
2. Accomplishments	314
B. <i>A Bird's-Eye View of the Results</i>	314
1. The Extent of Violence	315
2. The Nature of Violence	315
3. The People of Violence	316
4. The World of Violence	316
C. <i>Dimensions of Violence</i>	317
1. The Extent of Violence	318
a. <i>Prevalence</i>	318
b. <i>Significance to the Story</i>	318
c. <i>Rates of Violent Episodes and Acts</i>	319
d. <i>The "Seriousness" of Violence</i>	319
2. The Nature of Violence	320
a. <i>Means and Personal Aspects</i>	320
b. <i>Group Aspects</i>	321
c. <i>Witnesses to Violence</i>	321
d. <i>Physical Consequences</i>	322
e. <i>"Good" vs. "Bad" and "Winner" vs. "Loser"</i>	322
3. The People of Violence	322
a. <i>"Violents," Killers, and their Victims</i>	323
b. <i>Males and Females</i>	323
c. <i>Age and Marriage</i>	323
d. <i>Forces of Law and of Lawlessness</i>	324
e. <i>Outcome: "Happies" and "Unhappies"</i>	324
4. The World of Violence	325
a. <i>Time of Action</i>	325
b. <i>Places and People</i>	325
c. <i>Law and Its Enforcement</i>	326
D. <i>The World of Television Entertainment: 1967 and 1968</i>	327
1. Extent of Violent Programs	327
2. The Incidence of Violence for Different Types of Programs	328
a. <i>Programs with a Comedy Tone</i>	328

b. <i>Crime-Western Action-Adventure Style Programs</i>	329
c. <i>Programs with a Cartoon Format</i>	329
3. Do Television Audiences Get What They Want?	330
a. <i>Manifold Functions of Television</i>	331
b. <i>Habitual Nature of Television Viewing</i>	331
c. <i>The TV Public's Choices</i>	331
d. <i>The Public's Views on TV Violence</i>	332
e. <i>Summary</i>	333
4. Messages for Violence Contained in TV Entertainment Programming	333
5. Research Implications	336
E. <i>Summary</i>	338

Appendix III-J—Content Analysis Procedures and Results	519
A. <i>The Recording Instrument As a Whole</i>	519
1. Recording Unit	519
2. Recording Procedure	519
B. <i>The Recording Instrument for Major Characters</i>	524
1. Recording Unit	524
2. Recording Procedure	524
3. Variables and Categories	526
4. Reliability of Variables	529
5. Current Form of Primary Data	530
C. <i>The Recording Instrument for Violent Episodes</i>	534
1. Recording Unit	534
2. Recording Procedure	534
3. Variables and Categories	537
4. Reliability of Variables	538
D. <i>The Recording Instrument for Violent Encounters and Acts and Their Justification</i>	539
1. Recording Unit	539
2. Recording Procedure	541
3. Variables and Categories	542
4. Reliability of Variables	548
5. Current Form of Primary Data	548

Chapter 15

THE TELEVISION WORLD OF VIOLENCE

Since the advent of mass communication which are owned and operated by increasingly complex and profitable corporations, there has been a growing concern on the part of citizens and public officials about the effects of mass media programming on audiences. Before these effects can be assessed in an objective and systematic way, it is necessary to know what the media are presenting to their audiences. The most effective way to determine this is through content analysis.

Analyses of mass media content vary considerably in their scope, focus, and information value for the problem of evaluation of the effects upon exposed audiences. The most common type is the familiar procedure of counting the number of times persons are shot, attacked, or killed in a given program or series of programs. However, this type of analysis provides very little information about the effects of the programming. For example, this knowledge does not tell us (a) if the killings were justified or unjustified; (b) if killers were rewarded or punished; (c) if the killings were presented in a bloodless and sanitized way, or in a "blood and guts" portrayal; and (d) whether or not the killings occurred sadistically, as a means to a desired end, or during the course of self-defense, law enforcement, or war.

The Media Task Force was directed by the Violence Commission to investigate the relationship of mass media programming and violence. Several initial decisions made by the Task Force led eventually to a contract with Dean George Gerbner and his staff at the Annenberg School of Communications. The Task Force first made the decision to concentrate on media *entertainment* programming. After a review of content analyses available, it was clear that no single or multiple research was sufficient.

The second decision concerned the selection of a mass medium for analysis. Studies of media availability, preferences, and use led to the selection of commercial television entertainment programming. Television has a virtual corner on the mass media entertainment market. No other single mass medium of communication approaches its claim on massive audiences composed of all sectors of American society.

Our findings show that 43 percent of adult Americans (eighteen years and older) picked television as the mass medium they use most of the time for entertainment. The next most chosen medium was books, a distant second with 19 percent.

At least two other considerations influenced our selection:

(1) Young children use television to an even greater extent than adults.¹ Most young children cannot read with sufficient proficiency to use newspapers, books, or magazines for daily entertainment, and they cannot or do not attend movies as a daily or weekly form of entertainment.² Radio will not hold their attention for any great length of time. Television, then, is uniquely equipped by its audiovisual properties to sustain children's attention. It is unique among the mass media for children's use because of its availability in the home and because advanced reading skills are not a prerequisite for use.

(2) Television is the only mass medium whose entertainment content at any point in time is very much the same regardless of locale. The three national networks, ABC, CBS, and NBC, through their owned stations and affiliates, are responsible for the vast majority of all entertainment broadcasting. Hence, when an analysis is made of television entertainment broadcast by these three networks, there is a high probability that audiences are being exposed to the same content.

We next had to decide what time periods to research and how to construct a content analysis that would provide useful information for the general research problem—the relationship of mass media entertainment programming and violence. The week of October 1 through 7 was selected as typical, and in order to assess possible changes in programming, the same week (October 1-7) was analyzed for both 1967 and 1968. It was further decided to analyze only prime-time viewing hours.

In the simplest of terms, the research aim was to provide an objective and reliable analysis from which the Task Force could deduce the messages about violence which were communicated to the audience. How violence is portrayed is at least as important as the amount presented. Knowledge of the incidence and intensity of violence in television programming can tell us, among other things, how often audiences are exposed to messages about violence and what opportunity audiences have to view programs which do not contain violence.

Finally, the Task Force had to decide who was best suited to perform the content analysis. We felt it essential that such an analysis should provide new and directly relevant information, and meet all the criteria of scientific objectivity and systematic thoroughness. Thus it was necessary that the task be undertaken by trained social scientists who had expertise in the methods of content analysis and mass media effects research. It was also important to find a group which had the necessary equipment (the capability to analyze video tape and film materials), and the ability to form an expert research team on extremely short notice.

We were fortunate to be able to contract the project to Dr. George Gerbner, Dean of the Annenberg School of Communications at the University of Pennsylvania. Dean Gerbner is a well-known expert on content analysis, and was keenly interested in conducting the type of research proposed by the Task Force.

It was also necessary to seek the cooperation of the three major television networks in this endeavor. The networks were most helpful in compiling and sending all the requested programs to the Annenberg School.³

The multitude of specific details involved in translating a research project aim into a viable research effort were carried out by Dr. Gerbner and his staff. In a remarkably short time, this group completed the analysis and submitted their report to the Task Force. Significant portions of the total report are presented in the following pages.

A. Dimensions of Violence in Television Drama: Summary⁴

In September of 1968, the Mass Media Task Force of the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence contacted Dr. Gerbner to inquire if a study of violence in television drama could be completed in less than two months. The study was to be based on a week's prime-time network programming from 1967. The purpose of the study was to yield objective and reliable indicators of the extent and nature of violent presentations shared by all classes of the American viewing public.

1. Challenge and Difficulties

The scope and significance of the challenge were matched by its difficulties. Some of these were conceptual. What are useful indicators of violence in fictional dramatizations? How could a study based on 1967 material reflect the impact upon television programming, if any, of the tragic series of violent events that shook the conscience of the nation and the world in 1968? It was felt that the study was worth attempting only if it could yield multiple indicators which would be useful for a variety of investigative and policy purposes, if it contained dimensions salient to problems of social communication theory and practice, and if it could include 1968 material relevant to the tendencies and dynamics of television programming.

Other difficulties were logistical. A team of research analysts had to be recruited immediately. Physical facilities and program material had to be obtained and organized. Instruments of analysis had to be constructed and tested with no opportunity for pilot studies. It was anticipated that much information would fall below acceptable standards of reliability and would have to be discarded. Therefore, several simultaneous approaches had to be employed to assure corroboration of results and sufficient useful information even after eventual elimination of much that had been assembled.

2. Accomplishments

The decision to proceed with the study was taken in the understanding that this would be a "bare bones" report, one with little interpretation. Its purpose would be to extend the factual basis for a consideration of one aspect of television programming and for the further exploration of the role of fictional violence in contemporary culture. Interpretation and analysis was to continue in a broader scope and context after the termination of the research reported here.

What follows, then, must be seen in light of these circumstances. The report overcame some of the difficulties and achieved some of the objectives, despite false starts, the elimination of much interesting material of questionable reliability, and unavoidable shortcomings. The principal lessons to be learned are (1) the confirmation of the adage that "haste makes waste," and (2) the clear conviction that if indices of mass cultural content have theoretical, social, and policy significance, only a systematic and continuous program of research will be adequate to the task.

A special debt is owed to wives and friends for many evenings and weekends of work, the ready assistance of an able clerical force, particularly Mrs. Kiki Faye, the support of the research staff of the Mass Media Task Force, and the full cooperation of the television networks.

B. A Bird's-Eye View of the Results

All network television programs transmitted during prime evening time and on Saturday morning during the weeks of October 1-7, 1967 and 1968, were monitored for this study. Regular television dramas, cartoon programs, and feature films presenting one or more plays were subjected to analysis. The analysts recorded observations about the prevalence and "seriousness" of violence in each play; rates and types of violent episodes; the role of major characters in inflicting or absorbing violence; the role different times, places, people, and "the law" play in the world of dramatic violence; the significance of violence to the plots; and, when violence was an integral part of the plot, the rates and characteristics of encounters between parties inflicting and suffering violence.

There are certain key terms used throughout this report, and they are defined as follows:

"Program" and "play" are synonymous unless otherwise noted, and denote a single fictional story presented in play or skit form. "Violence" means the overt expression of force intended to hurt or kill. A "violent episode" is a scene of any duration between the same violent parties. A story element, such as violence, "significant to the plot" is one that would be noted in a one-page general synopsis of the play. An "act of violence" or "encounter" is an action originating in a particular source and directed toward a particular receiver with no major shift in the style of action.

During the week of October 1-7, 1967, the three television networks transmitted 96 plays in 64 hours of broadcast time. During the same week in 1968 the networks transmitted 87 plays in 58½ hours. In the total of 183 plays or 122½ program hours analyzed, 455 characters played major parts, 241 of which were violent. These occurred in 149 plays (or 104.4 program hours), which contained a total of 872 violent episodes. Of all plays containing violence, 112 (or 78.9 program hours) portrayed violence significant to the plot. These plays included 1215 separate violent encounters.

1. The Extent of Violence

Some violence occurred in eight out of every ten plays. The average rate of violent episodes was five per play (ranging from three in a comedy to 7 in a cartoon or acting drama) and seven per program hour (ranging from five each comedy to twenty-four each cartoon hour).

Most violence was an integral part of the play in which it occurred. The average rate of acts of violence was eleven per play or fifteen per hour. Eight out of every ten violent episodes and acts were presented as serious rather than humorous occurrences.

There was no evidence of overall decline in the prevalence of violence from 1967 to 1968. Some indications of possible moderation come from slight and selective reductions in the rates of violent episodes per play, in the proportions of "serious" violence, and in the proportions of plays in which violence was significant to the plot. The rates of violent encounters in these plays indicated that, with some exceptions, the saturation of such programs with acts of violence remained in 1968 what it had been in 1967.

Programming on CBS generally featured the least violence, and moved in two different directions: the rate of violent episodes increased somewhat from 1967 to 1968, but the proportion of violence significant to the plots and the frequency of violent acts in such plays decreased. ABC, the most violent in many respects, maintained its share of violent programming but reduced the proportion of programs containing the most significant type and the highest rate of violent episodes. Violence on NBC, as prevalent in 1967 as on ABC, declined slightly in some respects in 1968.

2. The Nature of Violence

Violent acts were usually performed at close range. They were inflicted primarily through use of a weapon, half the time upon strangers, and, in the majority of encounters, upon opponents who could not or did not resist.

Those who committed acts of violence generally perceived them to be in self-interest rather than for some other reason. Violent encounters were usually between males, and almost as frequently between as within different national or ethnic groups. These encounters primarily engaged group leaders as initiators and group members as targets of violence.

Witnesses to scenes of violence were usually passive spectators. For every

bystander who attempted to prevent violence, there was at least one who joined to assist or encourage it.

Pain was difficult to detect except when severe or fatal. Even so, some injury was evident in half of all violent episodes. The casualty count of injured and dead was at least 790 for the two weeks, and one in every ten acts of violence resulted in a fatality.

Most violence took place between the forces of good and evil. The "good guys" inflicted as much violence as the "bad guys," suffered a little more, but triumphed in the end.

3. The People of Violence

The two weeks of dramatic programming featured 455 leading characters. Of this number, 241 committed some violence, 54 killed an opponent, and 24 died violent deaths. The dramatic lead thus inflicted violence 50 percent of the time, became a killer ten percent of the time, and was killed five percent of the time. One-third of those killed were also killers, and one out of every seven killers died a violent death. Surprisingly, nearly half of all killers suffered no consequences for their acts.

The "typical violent" actor was an unmarried young or middle-aged male. At least one out of three characters in every age group committed violence, but the adolescent and the middle-aged perpetrated more than their share. They also played nine out of every ten killers and eight out of every ten fatal victims. Those in the middle-aged group were likely to be victims.

The forces of law and of lawlessness, each numbering about one out of every ten leading characters, accounted for one-third of all violent aggressors and half of all killers. Criminals were somewhat more likely to commit violence, but, when violent, agents of the law were as likely to kill as were criminals. Members of the armed forces were less violent than the other groups, but when violent, the most deadly; every second violent soldier killed an "enemy." More criminals than soldiers and none of the agents of the law died violent deaths.

There may be as many violent "good guys" as "bad guys," but those fated for a happy outcome (mostly "good guys") were slightly less likely to be violent than were those fated for a clearly unhappy outcome (mostly "bad guys"). Even though half of all "violents" and nearly half of all killers achieved a happy ending, those who did not were more likely to commit violence, to kill, and to be killed.

4. The World of Violence

The past, the future, and the far-away loom large in the world of violence. The settings of plays without violence tended to be contemporary, domestic, and civilized. By comparison, then, the settings of violent plays was more global, more distant in time as well as in place, more mobile, and more exotic.

Foreigners and non-whites committed more than their share of violence, and, unlike white Americans, for nearly every life taken, they paid with a life of their own.

Violence rarely appeared to violate legal codes, and when it did, the law itself was likely to be violent.

To sum up—the prevalence of violence in about eight out of every ten

plays did not decline from 1967 to 1968, despite some evidence of moderation in its rate and tone. Most violence was individual, selfish, and often directed against strangers and victims who do not resist. Violence stuns, maims, and kills with little visible pain. A count of casualties may find an average of five per play injured or dead. Those who inflict violence may be "good guys" or "bad guys," but they are not as likely to reach a happy ending as non-violent types. All major characters, especially males in the prime of life, have a better than even chance to commit violence, at least one chance in ten to kill, and still reach a happy ending nearly fifty percent of the time. Foreigners and non-whites are more violent than white Americans, but pay much more dearly for their actions. Television drama projects Americans as a violent country a world of many violent strangers, with a mostly violent past and a totally violent future.

C. Dimensions of Violence

Violence in drama, as in life, is a complex matter, the full implications of which were not the subject of this study. Our subject was the extent and nature of overt violence in television plays. Our purposes were (1) to extend the factual consideration of one aspect of television programming; (2) to make a contribution to the understanding of some dimensions of the dynamics of fictional violence; and (3) to suggest certain expectations about violent behavior and consequences that these presentations might cultivate.

In the following pages, we give a descriptive account of the "bare facts" relevant to the extent of violent representations during the 1967 and 1968 study periods and to selected manifestations of violent behavior, people, and circumstances in the fictional world of television drama.⁵

Selected findings will be discussed according to their relevance to these questions:

How much violence is there in television drama? Did the prevalence, significance, frequency, and "seriousness" of violent portrayals change between the 1967 and 1968 study periods?

What is the nature of violence in television drama? What characteristics of violent behavior and of its consequences do these portrayals present to the audience?

Who are the people of violence? What is the distribution of violent roles among various groups of the fictional population? What part does violence play in the fate of "good guys" and "bad guys"?

And, finally, how does the world of violence differ from the world of non-violent drama in historical time, place of action, nationality and ethnicity of the population, and some of its recurrent themes?

The analysis included all dramatic network programs transmitted in prime evening time and Saturday mornings for the weeks of October 1-7 in 1967 and 1968. The 1967 study period contained ninety-six plays and the 1968 period eighty-seven. It should be noted again that the basic program unit analyzed was the play, and the terms "program" and "play" are used interchangeably.

To correct for differences in playing time between short plays and skits

and long plays or feature-length films, the time of a program was also measured. The 1967 study period included sixty-four hours of dramatic programming, and the 1968 period fifty-eight and one half hours.

Regular drama programs produced for television comprised 60 percent of all plays in 1967 and 63 percent in 1968, or 62 percent and 69 percent of program hours, respectively. Cartoons accounted for 33 percent of program time. Six feature films were telecast each week, accounting for six and eight percent of the plays, but twenty and 26 percent of program time.

Crime, western, and action-adventure style stories comprised about two-thirds of all television drama; comedies made up nearly half of all programs, with some changes in proportions and shifts in network share of each kind between the two study periods. Differences in the extent of violence between the 1967 and 1968 study periods and among the networks may be attributed to shifts in a few program categories, policies affecting most programs, or to a combination of both.

1. The Extent of Violence

How much violence was there in television drama? Did the three networks share equally in the amount? Did the proportions change between 1967 and 1968?

The four dimensions dealing primarily with the amount of violence are prevalence, significance to the story, rate, and extent of "seriousness."

Prevalence is the incidence of any violence on a program. It measures the number of programs in which at least one violent act occurs, regardless of frequency or other characteristics.

Significance to the story indicates the extent to which violence was an integral part of the plot.

The rate of violence was measured as the frequency of violent episodes and acts per play and program hour.

"Seriousness" involved the style and context of violent portrayals. How much violence was presented in a humorous vein, and how much was not?

a. *Prevalence*

Some violence occurred in 81 percent of all programs and 85 percent of all program hours. The prevalence of violence in dramatic programming did not decline between 1967 and 1968. If anything, there was a slight (four percent) increase.

Violence was more prevalent on ABC and NBC than on CBS. However, CBS increased its percentage of violent programming between the 1967 and 1968 study periods.

b. *Significance to the Story*

Violence may be either an incidental or integral part of the story. The measure of significance was used to ascertain the proportions of these two types of presentations. (It was also employed as a screening device to select those plays in which violent encounters and acts were to be subjected to further analysis). The criterion used to measure "significance to the plot" was whether or not the violence, regardless of type or amount, would have to be noted in a one-page summary of the story of the play.⁶

Most plays containing any violence met this criterion. Eight out of every ten violent programs in 1967 and seven out of ten in 1968 contained violence significant to the plot. Whether this slight change represents a real decline or merely reflects shifts in the proportion of different types of plays is uncertain; but at least the overall significance of violence did not increase.

c. Rates of Violent Episodes and Acts

Violent *episodes* are defined as scenes of violence involving the same parties, and violent *acts* as actions by each party in violent encounters on programs where violence was judged to be significant to the plot.

During the 1967 study week, a total of 478 violent episodes were observed. During the 1968 study week, 394 such episodes were observed. This decline of 18 percent, compared to the 10 percent decrease of all dramatic programs analyzed, indicated the possibility of a slight reduction in the overall number of violent episodes.

Violent episodes ranged from three per comedy to seven per cartoon or crime, western, and action-adventure play, and from five per hour of all comedy programming to 24 per hour of cartoons. The overall rate of violent episodes was five per play or seven per program hour. Programming which contained any violence at all contained an average of six violent episodes per play and eight per hour. Reductions in these rates by less than one point per play and per hour indicate that the frequency of violent episodes might have declined slightly from 1967 to 1968. The overall reduction, if any, was not evenly distributed.

CBS programs generally contained somewhat lower rates of violent episodes than did those of the other two networks. However, although ABC and NBC reduced their frequencies of violent episodes, CBS increased theirs.

Of all the violent episodes on the networks for both years, 35 percent were transmitted by ABC, 37 percent by NBC, and 28 percent by CBS. Although 1967 figures show ABC leading (41 percent), NBC second (36 percent), and CBS third (23 percent), in 1968, NBC led (37 percent), CBS was second (35 percent), and ABC third (28 percent). A reduction in the number of cartoon, crime, and other action programs and perhaps in the general level of violent episodes on ABC and an increase in cartoon violence on both CBS and NBC appear to have been the major sources of these relative shifts.

The rate of violent *acts* per play was 11.1 in 1967 and 10.5 in 1968. The only substantial change was a reduction of the rate of violent acts from 10.9 to 7.1 per play on CBS programs. In other words, although CBS increased its share of dramatic violence, it reduced the frequency of violent acts on those programs.

d. The "Seriousness" of Violence

It can be argued that violence is always relevant to personal existence, well-being, and integrity. To that extent, violence is always serious. Whether presenting it in a humorous way makes it more or less acceptable or part of a given framework of knowledge are issues that measures of presentation alone cannot resolve.

Measures of "seriousness" can indicate dramatic convention, convenience,

and intent. They show that even when we include cartoons (which are saturated with violence), the great bulk of all violence occurs in a serious or sinister context.

Three-fourths of all violent programs and nearly nine out of every ten violent episodes were found in the crime, western, or action-adventure categories. Nearly all such programs contained some violence. Separate observations in all program categories showed that eight out of every ten violent episodes occurred in a serious or sinister context. Eight out of every ten violent acts were also judged as "serious." In other words, overtly humorous (slapstick, sham, satirical) intent was apparent in only two out of every ten violent episodes or acts in all program categories. However, there appeared to be a shift (of perhaps one in every ten) toward a higher proportion of "humorous" types of violence between the two study periods.

2. The Nature of Violence

What happens in violent incidents, and how? What are some personal and social characteristics and consequences of violent behavior in television drama? The portrayal of violence may be at least as relevant to the cultivation of public assumptions as the amount of violence presented. We turn, therefore, from general questions of amount to more specific questions about the nature of violent representations.

Two different approaches were focused on selected characteristics of violent behavior. One was the observation of violent episodes in all plays, concentrating on the agents and means of violence, witnesses and group relations among violent opponents. Another set of observations dealt with *acts* of violence in plays in which violence was significant to the plot (112 out of 183). The focus here was on the nature of the interaction between sources and receivers of violence.

Any reference to persons involved in violent episodes and acts is not to individuals as such, but to their participation in the incidents observed. A single individual may participate in several capacities. Participation as both source and receiver tends to equalize figures in those categories and lends greater significance to such differences as may occur.

Three-fourths of all violent episodes involved human agents (both "live" and cartoon). The rest involved "humanized" (speaking) and other animals, creatures (a robot), and "accidents" (which, in fiction, are of course not accidental). There was no "act of nature" found as an agent of violence.⁷ All violent acts involved human or human-like sources and receivers.⁸

a. Means and Personal Aspects

Weapons were used in at least six out of every ten violent episodes and acts. Small instruments were used to commit one-third of all violent acts, and more complex instruments, ranging from machine guns and explosives to elaborate devices of torture or mass destruction, were used in 26 percent of the acts.

In the majority of acts (six out of ten), those who committed violence

perceived it as in their own personal self-interest rather than as a service to some other cause.

Was it effective? In terms of immediate response, yes. Six out of ten violent acts evoked no response from their victims; they could not or did not resist. Counter-violence was the response 36 percent of the time and non-violent resistance six percent of the time.

Was it personal? In seven out of ten acts the violent opponents were close enough to speak to one another, 24 percent of the time, they were more distant but still within sight; and in four percent they were out of sight of each other.

Violent encounters occurred primarily at close range, but rarely among intimates. Half of all violent acts took place between strangers.

In at least eight out of every ten violent acts, both the source and the receiver was male. The source of violence was female in seven percent of all acts and the receiver was female six percent of the time. The rest were indeterminate or mixed as far as the sexes of sources and receivers were concerned. A sexual aspect to the relationship between sources and receivers was noted in four percent of all violent acts.

b. Group Aspects

Nationality, ethnicity, or family membership of the opponents was observed in two-thirds of all violent episodes. Approximately one-third of the time violent opponents were from the same ethnic background. Violence between different national or ethnic group members was observed in 28 percent of all violent episodes. Violence between members of the same family was rare (two percent).

An analysis of acts coded separately by sources and receivers gives an indication of the group structure of violent encounters, and of the effect of group membership upon chances of generating or suffering violence. Isolated individuals, group leaders, and groups themselves each generated about one-fifth of all violent acts, and individual group members generated more than one-third. On the receiving end, however, group leaders suffered less and group members more than their share. Group leaders generated 21 percent and received eighteen percent of all violent acts while group members committed 37 percent and suffered 40 percent of all violent acts received. If there is any pattern in these slight differences, it suggest that, among those involved in violence, there is greater safety in isolation from, leadership of, or total immersion in a group than in being an identifiable group member. Group members committed sixteen percent more of all violent acts than did the leaders, but became the targets of 22 percent more than did the leaders.

C. Witnesses to Violence

Is violence presented as acceptable in the social context of the portrayal itself? One approach is to observe witnesses and their reaction or relation to the violence.

It is difficult to pinpoint witnesses on television. Frequent closeups and medium shots tend to exclude them. The presence and reaction of witnesses in drama is not an independent occurrence, but part of the whole structure

and intent of the play. Even if witnesses are assumed to be present, showing them and their reactions adds to the cost and complicates the scene; this is done only to make a specific point in the story.

Half of all violent episodes did not show any witnesses. When witnesses were shown, they were usually passive. In thirty three percent of all violent episodes, witnesses were present but did not or could not react. In eight percent, witnesses attempted to prevent violence. In nine percent, witnesses assisted or encouraged violence. On the whole, violence is rarely overtly objected to or punished by witnesses in the world of television drama.

d. *Physical Consequences*

At least three-fourths of all violent acts had no permanent physical effects upon the victims. Some incapacity was observed in seven percent of the acts, and death in nine percent. Focusing on acts rather than on individuals tends to emphasize the more repeatable (and, therefore, less serious) consequences; a victim may suffer several acts of violence, but only one fatality.

A study of violent episodes revealed that half of all episodes resulted in physical injury or fatality. The average rate was almost two casualties per violent episode. Three-fourths of all episodes with any injury resulted in a single casualty, thirteen percent in two casualties, another eight percent in three to eight casualties, and six percent in eight or more (including mass) casualties.

Gory details of physical injury (blood and wounds) were shown in fourteen percent of all programs,

e. *“Good” vs. “Bad” and “Winner” vs. “Loser”*

In at least eight out of every ten violent acts, the opponents were clearly recognizable as “good” or “bad” and as ultimate “winners” and “losers.” On the receiving end, the “good guys” suffered in five out of every ten acts, while the “bad guys” suffered in only three out of every ten. The difference between “winners” and “losers” as targets of violence was less pronounced, but in the same direction; “winners” were subjected to violence in 35 percent and “losers” in 31 percent of all acts received.

The pattern remained the same with “good guy winners” and “bad guy losers.” Violent acts tended to engage the two combined types equally as sources, but not as receivers. Violent virtue suffered more than violent evil, but triumphed in the end.

3. The People of Violence

Violence is a form of conflict in which lives are at stake, and force governs the outcome. Who is given the power to inflict violence upon whom in television drama? What are some characteristics of the killers and their victims? What roles do the forces of law or lawlessness play in the distribution of violence? What part does violence play in the fate of the fictional characters?

These questions guided the analysis of all major characters in all plays, both violent and non-violent. A total 455 such characters were found in the

plays analyzed for both 1967 and 1968. Nearly one out of every four (23 percent) were cartoon characters; nearly nine out of every ten (89 percent) were human (both "live" and cartoon); the rest were "humanized" (speaking), other animals, and a robot.

Unmarried white males in the prime of life were cast in the majority of dramatic leads and violence was the dominant theme of life in their fictional world.

a. "Violents," Killers and their Victims

At least half of all characters inflicted some violence upon others. The proportion of these "violents" was 56 percent in 1967 and 50 percent in 1968.

At least one out of every ten leading characters (twelve percent) was a killer. More than one in every five (22 percent) of those who committed any violence was a killer. The proportion of killers remained unchanged from one study period to the other.

Widespread victimization was evident, but again difficult to specify unless resulting in death. At least five percent of all characters, eight percent of all violent characters, and fifteen percent of all killers met violent ends.

Most of those who were killed also committed violence, but most killers did not die violent deaths. Of the 25 major characters killed in all television plays, twenty inflicted violence upon others and eight were killers. Of all 54 killers, 46 did not pay for their acts with their own lives.

b. *Males and Females*

Male characters dominated the world of television drama by a four-to-one ratio, and committed six times more violence than females. Males killed eight times more frequently than females, and were killed seven times as often. To look at these figures another way, 58 percent of all male leading characters and 33 percent of all female leading characters committed some violence. 23 percent of violent males, (or, of all males, 13 percent) were killers. Finally, 6 percent of all males and 3 percent of all females suffered violent deaths.

c. *Age and Marriage*

The average character had 50 percent chance of committing some violence. The likelihood increased with age, but declined in old age. Middle-aged characters and those of indeterminate age (mostly cartoon characters) were the most probable "violents." More specifically, "violents" comprised one-third of all preschool and primary school-age characters, 45 percent of secondary school-age characters, 48 percent of young adults, 56 percent of middle-aged character, 42 percent of those in old age, and 65 percent of indeterminate or "ageless" characters.

Young adults and middle-aged characters portrayed nine of every ten killers and eight of every ten victims of fatal violence. Each of these age groups had a greater share of killings than their proportion of the total population might suggest. The adolescent was less likely than the middle-aged to play violent roles, but more likely to commit fatal violence. However, the

older characters were much more likely to be killed than the younger.

Of all violent young adults, one-third became killers, while only 24 of all violent middle-aged characters did so. However, most fatal victims (60 percent) were middle-aged. The violent fatality rate among young adults was 3.4 percent, but among middle-aged characters was 7.3 percent.

Marriage reduced the chances of violent involvement. Married characters played 29 percent of all major parts, 22 percent of "violents," nineteen percent of violent killers, and twelve percent of fatalities. The bulk of "violents," killers, and their victims came from among the unmarried characters or those whose marital status could not be determined. More single than married people engaged in violence (58 percent against 40 percent), turned killers (fourteen percent against eight percent), and died violent deaths (seven percent against two percent).

d. *Forces of Law and of Lawlessness*

The forces of law and of lawlessness together made up one-fourth of the total lead population of television drama, one-third of all violent characters, and half of all killers.

Criminals numbered 10 percent of all characters, 15 percent of violent characters, 20 percent of killers, and 24 percent of those killed. Arrayed against them were public and private agents who portrayed nine percent of the total lead populations, 11 percent of the "violents," 13 percent of the killers, and none of the killed.

Two of every ten violent acts included criminals, and one out of every ten public and private law agents. While criminals inflicted 22 percent of all violent acts and suffered in only 17 percent, the agents were equally balanced at both ends of the scale. The imbalance between virtue and evil on the receiving end may be due, in part, to the fact that criminals suffer less frequent but more lethal violence than others.

Most criminals (82 percent) engaged in some violence; 25 percent of all criminals and 31 percent of violent criminals were killers, and 14 percent of all criminals were killed.

Police and other law enforcement agents were almost as violent but they rarely, if ever, paid with their own lives. Seven of every ten agents committed violence and 20 percent of these actions resulted in a fatality. Those who committed violence were as likely to kill as were violent criminals.

Fewer private agents were violent (67 percent), and they rarely killed or were killed.

The armed forces of various nations made up six percent of the total lead population, about the same percentage of "violents," 15 percent of the killers, and 12 percent of the fatal victims.

A somewhat smaller percentage of members of the armed forces (60 percent) committed violence than did either agents or criminals. However, when they did, they killed more often and suffered fewer casualties. Half of all soldiers involved in violence killed, but only one in ten was killed.

e. *Outcome: "Happies" and "Unhappies"*

Most of the "good guys," usually also the "winners," are by definition those who achieve a happy outcome. "Bad guys—losers" come to an unhappy

end. Six of every ten major characters reached an unmistakably happy end, and two of ten an unhappy end; the rest were mixed or indeterminate. 58 percent of all characters achieved "happy" endings, while only 52 percent of "violents" did; 20 percent of the total achieved "unhappy" endings, as opposed to 25 percent of the "violents." The figures did not vary significantly for those whose ending was uncertain.

The pattern extends to killers. The proportion of "happies" among all killers declines by another six percentage points, and the proportion of "unhappies" among killers increases by 5 more percentage points.

Although more than half of all "violents" and nearly half of all killers may be destined for a happy ending, violence and killing each make a happy outcome less likely for one out of every ten major characters.

Nearly half (147 percent) of the "happies" commit violence, nearly one in ten (nine percent) turns killer and not one "happy" was killed; the proportions are only slightly below those for the total lead population. For the "unhappies," the proportions are much higher: seven of every ten commit violence, two of ten become killers, and three of ten die violent deaths.

4. The World of Violence

What is the setting of the fictional world in which violence is prevalent? What kind of people inhabit that world? How is the law enforced in that world? Dimensions of the analysis addressed to these questions compared violent and non-violent television plays with respect to the time and place of action, nationality and ethnicity of population, and aspects of law enforcement portrayed.

a. *Time of Action*

Most television plays were set in contemporary America, and 80 percent contained some violence. The "present" (the sixties) was the setting in 85 percent of the non-violent plays, but only 55 percent of the plays that contained violence. The past was the setting in only a negligible portion (three percent) of non-violent plays, but 26 percent of the violent plays. The future (the setting in ten percent of the plays) was never shown without violence, and the time of action was indeterminate in one out of ten plays regardless of violence.

Ninety-eight percent of all plays set in the past contained violence, the future was always violent, only 74 percent (less than average) of plays set in the present contained violence, and the plays set in several or no identifiable time periods contained an average share of violence (79 percent).

b. *Places and People*

Violence tended to shift the action toward other places, as well as to other times. The location was varied, indeterminate, or totally outside the United States in 38 percent of violent, but only fifteen percent of non-violent plays.

Other countries and foreign or minority groups were significant themes in four out of ten violent plays, but only two out of ten non-violent plays.

Space travel was twice as frequent in violent as in non-violent plays. Uninhabited or mobile settings provided the locales of 44 percent of violent, but only 21 percent of non-violent plays. Urban and rural settings, on the other hand, were the primary locales of the great majority of non-violent plays.

In other words, whenever the place of action was *not* limited to the United States alone or *not* localized to a city, town, or village, or whenever foreign themes or people other than majority-type Americans were significant elements in the story, violence prevailed in nine out of every ten plays.

We have noted before that intergroup violence was nearly as frequent as ingroup violence. Now we see that foreign themes and people are more frequent in the fictional world of violence than of non-violence. It is not surprising, therefore, to find that a violent world of other times and places also involved in violent action a disproportionate number of "others."

Major characters playing violent roles included half of all white Americans, six out of every ten white non-Americans, and nearly seven out of every ten non-whites.

While all "others" were more violent, white foreigners killed more, and non-whites less, than white Americans. Both foreigners and non-whites suffered proportionately higher fatalities than did white Americans. Twenty-eight percent of all violent whites inflicted fatal violence, and white killers outnumbered whites killed two-to-one, but only two of the twenty violent non-whites were killers, and for each non-white killer there was a non-white killed.

c. Law and Its Enforcement

Legality was seldom portrayed as being violated unless criminal themes were involved. Such themes were featured as significant elements in one-third of all and less than half (45 percent) of violent plays. When crime was featured, however, the plays nearly always involved violence.

Due process of law (legal apprehension or trial) was indicated as a consequence of major acts of violence in only two out of every ten violent plays. Official agents of law enforcement, (seven percent of all major characters), were thus confined to a small segment of the population of the fictional world of violence. These agents played a discernible role in one out of every ten violent episodes. When they did play a part, it was violent on two of every three occasions. The violence was initiated by agents of law 40 percent of the time. Agents of law responded to violence in a violent manner on three of every ten occasions. Police restraint in the face of violence was rare (one out of every ten such episodes), and law agents suffered violence but could make no response in two of every ten such episodes.

The level of violence employed by agents of law appeared to be no more than that necessary to accomplish their objectives on eight out of every ten occasions. Their actions were portrayed as justifiable on seven of every ten occasions.

In conclusion, television drama presents a lawless world in which due

process plays a small part. It is a wild world of many violent strangers, with a mostly violent past and a totally violent future.

D. *The World of Television Entertainment: 1967 and 1968*

This section will be devoted to interpretation of the findings reported in the previous section. The content analysis research carried out by the Gerbner research team provides us with information about the extent, nature, and presentation of violence on television. This information permits us to decipher the messages about violence being sent to television audiences on the basis of factual, objective, and reliable information. Thus, we do not have to rely on selective impressions, biased opinions, or subjective judgments about the nature and extent of violence on prime-time television.

1. Extent of Violent Programs

The first issue to be considered is the extent to which violent programs appear in the total entertainment package offered by the three major television networks during prime-time viewing hours (4 p.m. - 10 p.m. Monday through Friday and Sunday, and 8 a.m. - 11 a.m. Saturdays).

*Table 1—programs containing violence
[Percent of total programs presented] **

	All Networks		ABC		CBS		NBC	
	<i>N</i>	Percent	<i>N</i>	Percent	<i>N</i>	Percent	<i>N</i>	Percent
1967	(78)	81.3	(31)	88.6	(21)	65.6	(26)	89.7
1968	(71)	81.6	(20)	90.9	(27)	77.1	(24)	80.0
Total	(149)	81.4	(51)	89.5	(48)	71.6	(50)	84.7

**N*=Number of violent programs

The figures presented in Table 1 are conservative estimates of the extent of violent programming. This is because (a) only explicit threats or acts of violence were included, and (b) the number of programs counted by Gerbner exceeds the actual number of programs as defined by half-hour segments.

If television is compared to a meal, programming containing violence clearly is the main course being served. The total volume of violent programming on the three networks did not decrease from 1967 to 1968. ABC programming contained the second highest percentage of violent programs in 1967 (88.6 percent) and the highest in 1968 (90.9 percent). A person tuned to ABC who wished to avoid programs containing violence⁹ would have had a difficult time in 1967 and even more trouble in 1968.

CBS had the lowest percentage of programs containing violence in both 1967 (65.6 percent) and 1968 (77.1 percent). However, the percentage of violent programs increased from 1967 to 1968. Dr. Frank Stanton, president of CBS, indicated shortly after the assassination of Senator Robert Kennedy that the extent of violence in CBS programs would be reduced (in a letter to Dr. Milton Eisenhower, Chairman of the Violence Commission).

If CBS had reduced the amount of violent scenes in the following months, it would have affected the results of the 1968 content analysis. It is difficult to know how much higher the percentage of CBS programs containing

violence might have been if the 1968 content analysis had been conducted before instead of after Senator Kennedy's assassination. In any case, a regular viewer of CBS would have trouble finding non-violent programs.

NBC had the highest percentage of programs containing violence in 1967 (89.7 percent), and the second highest in 1968 (80.0 percent), and was the only network to show a decrease in the percentage of violent programs. Despite this fact, a regular NBC viewer who seeks to avoid violent programs for his or his children's viewing during prime-time is in the same situation as ABC and CBS viewers.

On the other hand, if a person seeks to watch programs containing violence, as is entirely conceivable, he would probably be able to do so during all of prime-time television. Those who wish to avoid violent programming have an extremely difficult task, while those who seek it have little trouble.

2. The Incidence of Violence for Different Types of Programs

Within the total entertainment programming package, different types of programs vary in terms of the presence or absence and frequency of violence. All entertainment programs were classified into three general categories (for the purposes of this section of the report): (1) Comedy Tone, (2) Crime-Western-Adventure Style, and (3) Cartoons Format.¹⁰

a. *Programs with a Comedy Tone*

Comedy programs constituted 45.8 percent of all entertainment programming analyzed for 1967, and 48.3 percent of that analyzed for 1968. In Table 2, the extent and intensity of violence in comedy programs in 1967 and 1968 is presented.

Table 2.—Violence in programs with a comedy tone

	1967	1968	Total
Percent containing violence	65.9	66.7	66.3
Average number of violent episodes:			
Per program	2.8	3.2	3.0
Per program containing violence	4.2	4.8	4.5

Of the three program types, we might expect to find the least violence in comedy programs. While this expectation is supported, approximately two-thirds of all comedy programs analyzed contained some violence.

A viewer of comedy programs broadcast during prime-time hours can expect to see an average of three violent episodes per show, and if he is watching a comedy program containing violence, he will see an average of four violent episodes per show. The percentage of comedy type programs did not change significantly from 1967 to 1968, although the average number of violent episodes increased slightly. Thus it appears that violence plays a significant role in television comedy.

b. *Crime-Western Action-Adventure Style Programs*

When the topic of violence on television is raised, people customarily think of the crime-western action-adventure type of program. The content analysis findings show that the majority of all television entertainment program types during prime-time hours contained violence, but the crime-western adventure style does indeed contain the highest percentage of violent programs. The findings are presented in Table 3.

Table 3.—*Violence in crime, western, action-adventure style*

	1967	1968	Total
Percent containing violence	95.3	98.1	96.6
Average number of violent episodes per program	6.5	6.3	6.4
Per program containing violence	6.9	6.4	6.7
Per hour	8.8	8.7	8.7

This kind of program constituted a large portion of the total presented during prime-time hours, in 1967 (66.7 percent), and again in 1968 (62.1 percent).

According to Table 3, crime-western, action-adventure type programs: (1) almost always contain violence; (2) did not decrease in the percentage containing violence from 1967 to 1968; and (3) have a high incidence of violent episodes, the intensity of which decreased slightly from 1967 to 1968. In other words, little change occurred in the extent of violence in these programs between 1967 and 1968.

Entire battle scenes, as well as all other instances in which a group was involved in violence, were counted as only one violent episode. In light of this fact, the methods used to count the number of violent episodes are certainly conservative. Had individual acts of violence in a war, gang fight, or other scenes been counted, the overall incidence of violent episodes would certainly have been much greater.

c. *Programs with a Cartoon Format*

Of all of the types of television entertainment, cartoon programs are the most specifically directed toward an audience of children. For example, the Saturday morning (8 a.m. - 11 a.m.) programming format, regardless of which network is being watched, is almost exclusively cartoon-type programs, and a large part of the advertising presented during cartoon programs is specifically directed toward children.

In almost every public or governmental expression of concern about the effects of television entertainment programming, a primary focus is on the possible effects upon children. Recent studies of childrens' media habits show strong indications that children are viewing more and more prime-time programming.¹¹ Thus, the decision was made not to do separate content

analyses of child and adult programming. However, the extent and intensity of violence contained in cartoon programs can give a clear indication of how often and how much violence is presented when the known and expected audience is almost exclusively composed of children. We can thus get a reasonably clear indication of the emphasis placed upon violence for child audiences by network personnel.

Table 4—Violence in programs with a cartoon format

	1967	1968	Total
Percent containing violence	94.3	92.8	93.5
Per program	4.7	6.5	5.5
Per program containing violence	5.0	6.7	5.8
Per hour	21.6	23.5	22.5

The findings in Table 4 are underestimates of the extent and intensity of violence occurring in a fifteen-minute or half-hour cartoon show, because a cartoon program, as defined for purposes of this content analysis, means a single cartoon story (e.g., one "Bird Man" cartoon).

Cartoon programs made up 33 percent of all programming analyzed for 1967, and 29 percent for 1968. Though there is a decrease in the percentage of cartoon programs from 1967 to 1968, the largest increase in intensity of violence occurred in cartoon programming. Violence was pervasive and intense in cartoon programs broadcast in prime time hours for the periods studied.

Some observers may discount these findings on the grounds that: (1) cartoon programs are fantasy, not reality; (2) children know the difference between fantasy and reality; and (3) fantasy programs can have no harmful effect upon child viewers.

Without going into the crucial question of the messages being sent via cartoon and other program types, the following points should be made in regard to the real or potential effects of violence presented in cartoons and other programs which are thought to fall within the realm of fantasy.

1. There is no conclusive evidence that children can differentiate between fantasy and reality in television programs.
2. It remains to be proven that fantasy programs have no effect upon child viewers—harmful or otherwise.
3. Some psychologists suggest that television, with its capacity to stimulate audiovisual senses, has properties of perceptual reality which blur the distinction between fantasy and reality.¹²
4. For many children, the first contact with violence probably occurs while viewing television. For many children, their only contact with several types of violence may be from exposure to television programs.

3. Do Television Audiences Get What They Want?

For many years the claim has been made that the extent and nature of violence in television entertainment programming prevails because it is what the public wants. In support of this claim, the television networks point to

studies of audience size. It is not easy to determine just how these studies are carried out, thereby making it difficult to assess the scientific validity of the sampling process.

Two important points should be made which bear directly on audience preferences:

a. *Manifold Functions of Television*

Social scientists have noted that the mass media do more than merely fulfill the desire for acquisition of information and entertainment. In the case of radio, soap operas give many female listeners¹³ lessons in family-related problem-solving; lower income persons often think they are learning the style and etiquette of middle-class society from television programs.¹⁴

Television also serves as a baby-sitter. Almost all American families own a television set. It is a fair guess that many harried parents are relieved when their children are busy watching television, and some parents encourage this so that parental work and other activities may be accomplished in relative peace and quiet.

Television also serves a "companion function." For many persons who are alone for long periods of time, television can act as a substitute for the presence of loved ones or the company of other people.

The point to be made is that many persons may not watch television solely for the inherent appeal of its entertainment or informational content. For them, television viewing may result directly from a variety of factors essentially unrelated to program content.

b. *Habitual Nature of Television Viewing*

Television viewing, like newspaper reading, may be a habitual activity. When some subscribers do not receive their newspaper, they become irritated and upset.¹⁵ The irritation does not result solely from the inability to keep up with current events, but also from the disruption of a habitual daily routine. Given the numbers of hours of television that Americans watch daily, it appears reasonable to speculate that television viewing, regardless of the content, may be a habitual activity for some Americans. This hypothesis could be tested by measuring people's reactions when their set is out of order, or by systematically preventing some communities from watching television for various lengths of time.

c. *The TV Public's Choices*

Regardless of the merits of audience appeal studies, network officials claim that these studies represent what the viewing public chooses to watch from what is available.

What are these choices? First of all, the public can decide whether or not to watch television at all. We know that most American families have at least one set, and that most of them watch some television. The question remains, however, as to why these persons choose to become members of the television viewing public.

One obvious reason is that it seems wasteful not to use a television once it has been purchased. Many may choose to watch television simply because it is an inexpensive form of entertainment. Sports and news programs, which were not included in the content analysis, often provide the viewer with a better vantage point than persons who are actually on the scene.

Another possible factor may be termed the "Jones' effect": "If everyone else is watching television, why should we be different?" Sometimes, a television serial becomes a topic of discussion at social gatherings or even a full-fledged fad. In these instances, some persons, especially children, may watch that program in order to know what people are talking about or to be able to participate in discussions related to the program.

In any case, many factors probably affect the decisions of persons to become members of the viewing public.

The television public also makes choices about which channels and programs to watch. For the viewer whose criterion is the absence of violence, choice is limited to less than nineteen percent of all programs broadcast during prime-time hours, according to our study. By way of contrast, viewers, seeking to watch programs containing violence have little difficulty.

d. *The Public's Views on TV Violence*

In view of the above discussion, it is important to know how Americans view the amount and kinds of violence they find available in television entertainment programming. Two items bearing directly on this question were included in the Violence Commission National Survey. The first inquired:

How do you feel about the amount of violence portrayed in television programs today, not including news programs—do you think that there is too much, a reasonable amount, or very little violence?

A representative sample of adult Americans gave the following responses to this question: (1) fifty-nine percent said there was *too much* violence, (2) thirty-two percent said there was a *reasonable amount*, (3) four percent said there was *very little*, and (4) four percent were not sure.

Thus a majority of adult Americans think there is too much violence on television.

A second item was asked of the same sample:

Apart from the *amount* of violence, do you generally approve or disapprove of the *kind* of violence that is portrayed on TV?

	Responses (Percent)
Approve	25
Disapprove	63
.	<u>12</u>
	100

Americans may not be getting what they want in television programming when the issue is the kind of violence portrayed.¹⁶

e. *Summary*

Whether audiences get the programming they want is an issue which should be assessed in light of all the relevant factors associated with television viewing and program selection. It has been suggested that the inherent appeal of television programming is not the only factor affecting conscious or unconscious decisions to watch television in general or a given program in particular.

With regard to violence, our findings indicate that a majority of adults are not getting what they want with respect to the amount and kind of violence on television. In addition, to the extent that the two weeks of entertainment programming analyzed are typical, the entertainment choices available to the viewing public appear to be reduced either to watching programs containing violence or watching very little television.

Major findings of the analysis include the following:

1. Violence is pervasive, occurring in eighty-one percent of all 1967 programs analyzed and eighty-two percent in 1968.
2. The extent of violence varies by type of program, but a majority of *all* types of programs contain violence. Programs with a crime-western-action adventure style have the highest proportion containing violence, with cartoons a close second, and comedies third.
3. Networks vary in the proportion of their schedule allocated to given types of programs. This largely accounts for the differences between networks, and changes from 1967 to 1968. However, no network had less than seventy-seven percent of all its programming (prime time, October 1-7) containing violence in 1968.
4. The majority of adult Americans not only think there is too much violence on television, but also disapprove of the kind of violence portrayed.

4. Messages for Violence Contained in TV Entertainment Programming

In order to investigate the real or potential effects of television violence, it is not sufficient to know only the extent of violence; these effects are most directly determined by the *messages* sent to the viewing public. To use a medical analogy, we might say that the extent of violence is the dosage given and the message sent is the medication. So far we know the "dosage" is very high, but we need to know the nature of the medication.

Each of the norms for violence listed below has been inferred from one or more of the findings summarized in the preceding pages. This process involves identification of the substantive meaning of an event on the basis of incomplete information. For example, when a boy has received three consecutive refusals for a date from a girl, he may draw the inference that the girl is not interested in ever dating him. Although she has not categorically stated that she is not interested, her actions imply this meaning. Thus the boy "gets the message," and makes an inference made on the basis of incomplete information.

This procedure was involved in deciphering some of the norms for violence which are implied by television messages. The problem is to infer what the substantive meanings of these messages of violence could be (e.g., norms). It is likely that more than one norm could be inferred from the same message, and it is conceivable that an inference made by one investigator would not be made by another, or that contradictory inferences could be drawn from the same message.

The fact that inference does involve judgments means that there can be legitimate differences in judgment between two or more investigators within reasonable limits.

We can return to the boy-girl situation to illustrate this point. The boy who receives three consecutive refusals may make the inference that the girl is not interested in him. On the basis of exactly the same facts, he could also draw the inference that the girl is very popular, so that if he keeps trying, eventually he will get a date with her. However, there are practical, if not logical, limits to the inferences which he can make: for example, he could not infer that she has been eagerly waiting by the phone just for him to call and ask for a date.

Inference, then is not haphazard or whimsical. It is a process of attributing meaning on the basis of factual, but incomplete, data within the confines of logic and trained judgment.

The most frequent and relevant messages about violence contained in the programs studied are abstracted below. Accompanying each message are one or more norms for violence which have been inferred from that message. Messages are ordered from the most specific to the most general.

1. Message: Unmarried young to middle-aged males are usually violent.

Norm: Expect unmarried young to middle-aged males to be more violent than others.

2. Message: Non-whites and foreigners are disproportionately more violent than whites and Americans.

Norm: Expect violence more from non-whites or non-Americans than from whites and Americans.

3. Message: The vast majority of violence occurs between strangers who are within talking distance of one another.

Norm: When anticipating violence, be wary of situations in which you encounter strangers at close physical range.

Norm: Violence is to be expected more from strangers than from friends, acquaintances, or family members.

Norm: If you want to avoid being involved in or the victim of violence, avoid strangers.

Combining Messages 1-3: In the U.S., expect violence from unmarried young to middle-aged male strangers; if outside of the U.S., expect violence from non-white or foreign unmarried young to middle-age male strangers.

4. Message: Non-whites kill less often than do whites, but are killed more often.
Message: Violent young males are more likely to kill than are violent middle-aged males, but less likely to be killed.
Norm: The violent people, including killers, who should be the most concerned about getting killed are middle-aged men and non-whites.
5. Message: Law enforcement officers are frequently involved in violent encounters with segments of the American public.
Message: A law enforcement officer's response to violence is more often violent, than non-violent.
Norm: It is to be expected that law enforcement officers will be as violent as the most violent citizens.
6. Message: The future is pervasively violent.
Norm: Although the past and present are heavily saturated with violence, the future will be more extensively so.
7. Message: Although violence can lead to death, physical injuries are not often accompanied by visible gore.
Norm: Physical injury caused by violence can kill, but is sanitized and does not hurt.
8. Message: When there are witnesses to violence, the most typical reaction is non-reaction or passivity.
Norm: If you are a witness to a violent episode, do not get directly involved by intervening, and do not publicly disapprove; just watch quietly.
9. Message: The use of violence, even killing, often goes unpunished by formal means of due process of law or by informal means of public or private expression of disapproval.
Norm: If you use violence, do not be too concerned about being formally or informally punished.
10. Message: "Good guys" and "winners" use as much violence as "bad guys" and "loser."
Norm: The use of violence has nothing to do with the distinction between "good guys" and "bad guys" and "winners" and "losers."
Message: Violence is used by "good guys" and "bad guys" as means to an end, and "good guys" generally attain their goals.
Norm: Violence is a legitimate and successful means of attaining a desired end.
Norm: There is no inconsistency between achieving a desired goal through violence and being a "good guy."

The above messages and norms have been selected as the most relevant for the present discussion. The overall impression is that violence, employed as a means of conflict resolution or acquisition of personal goals, is a predominant characteristic of life. Cooperation, compromise, debate, and other non-violent means of conflict resolution are notable for their relative lack of prominence.

A general impression gleaned from the selected messages and implicit norms presented above is that violence often accompanies conflict, is a successful means of reaching personal ends (especially for individuals cast in the role of "good guy"), and is not usually punished. These findings are consistent with those obtained by Larsen, Grey, and Fertis in a content analysis of popular television programs.¹⁷

5. Research Implications

Even though findings and inferences from content analysis may give rise to serious concerns about the effects of exposure to television violence, they do not provide conclusive evidence about them. Exposure alone does not automatically mean that the viewer will be affected. The degree to which exposure is likely to have a direct effect depends, in large part, upon the type of effect being considered.

If our concern is solely to determine whether or not persons have an *emotional reaction* to television violence research shows that they do. We are dealing with a relatively direct and simple effect of exposure.¹⁸ In this case, messages and implicit norms for violence have little, if any, bearing.

However, if we wish to determine what persons can and do learn from their exposure to television portrayals of violence, range of messages and norms for violence which can be inferred are a salient concern.

In chapter 12, experimental studies provide consistent evidence that people, especially children, can and do learn complex and novel acts of aggression from observation of television and film portrayals.¹⁹ However, learning novel acts of aggression is less complex than the process involved in acquiring *implied norms* for violence. If a group was exposed to the same series of messages about violence for the same length of time, we would expect different individuals to perceive the portrayals of violence in relatively different ways. This expectation is based upon the well-established principle of selective perception.

In some respects, the implications of selective perception are greater when the issue is learning norms rather than acts. Learning norms requires a complex symbolic process of attributing normative meaning to an observed event. To the extent that people differ in their perceptions of a television portrayal of violence, we would expect different normative inferences to be made. Differences in inferred norms would probably lead to differences in the nature of probable effects.

The inferral of the same norms by a group still does not prove that the process of making a normative inference has an effect. If audiences were to draw similar inferences, under what conditions will they incorporate the norms implied in that television program as their own norms for violence? The next question is: What are the behavioral implications for persons who incorporate television norms for violence as their own?

The questions which must be answered before we can definitively assess

the effects of exposure to messages about violence on television are: (1) under what conditions does learning of norms for violence occur from exposure to television?; (2) under what conditions are inferred norms for violence adopted, once they are learned?; and (3) under what conditions are the norms for violence, when learned and adopted, acted upon?

Studies cited in Chapter 12 point to the following conditions in which learning of aggressive acts is demonstrated: (a) when a situation is encountered similar to the portrayal situation in which aggressive acts were learned; (b) when there is an expectation of being rewarded for performing the learned aggression or escaping detection;²⁰ and (c) when no disapproval of the portrayed behavior is shown by another person who is exposed to the same portrayal.²¹

These three conditions are by no means the only ones which must be considered, but they lend themselves most easily to evaluation through content analysis.

The likelihood that viewers who were exposed to the two weeks of TV programming analyzed would face similar situations is somewhat reduced by the fact that only fifty-five percent of all programs containing violence were set in the 1960's. Time of action, of course, is only one aspect of a portrayal situation. Thus, a different time of action does not remove the possibility that the portrayal situation could be quite similar to those encountered by persons in the 1960's.

For example, the portrayal of a teenage boy in frontier times encountering a situation where he must decide whether or not to resolve conflict with another teenager by the use of violence may influence a teenage boy living in the 1960's who encounters a similar situation.

To the degree that portrayal situations are different from those the viewing audience are likely to encounter, learning of violent acts and norms may occur, but are less likely to be acted upon than when such situations are similar.

The content analysis findings bear directly upon the second research condition; there is an increase in the likelihood that subjects in experiments will act upon their learning of aggressive acts when subjects expect to be or see actors in television portrayals rewarded for aggressive behavior. One of the clearest content analysis findings is that violent characters in television portrayals are often rewarded for their behavior. Reward comes most directly to "good guys," who often achieve success through violence. In addition, the use of violence is not often punished in the television world. Thus, if viewers infer from their exposure that violence not only goes largely unpunished but is rewarded, they may be more likely to transfer this inference into an expectation that they might be rewarded or go unpunished for using violence.

Although the rewarding and non-punishment condition does occur in the programs analyzed, it is not known whether this condition will have the same effect (significantly increasing the probability that learned aggression will be performed) on audiences who are not subjects in a laboratory experiment. In other words, we cannot assume that the effects occurring under the controlled setting of an experiment will also occur in home settings.

The importance of considering the social contexts in which television viewing typically takes place is pointed up in the third condition—whether or not approval or disapproval is expressed by one viewer in another viewer's

presence. The content analysis research does not provide any information on the degree to which children view television in the presence of others, or how often others, when present, verbally approve or disapprove of portrayals of violent acts. Future research is required before we will know if the effect of this condition will be the same in a home as in laboratory experiments—i.e. increasing the probability of learned acts of aggression being performed.

Future research is also required to determine if the conditions which are found to increase the probability of persons performing learned aggression also increase the probability of persons acting in accordance with norms for violence learned from exposure to television programs. The present assumption is that it will, but future research is needed to corroborate or disprove the hypothesis.

E. Summary

The world of television violence is a place in which severe violence is commonplace. The main characters are unmarried young to middle-age males who became involved in violent encounters with strangers. Violent encounters are often unwitnessed, but when they are, the predominant reaction is passive observation and non-intervention. Violence, regardless of the identity of the initiator, goes largely unpunished. The central role played by violence in this cold world of strangers and passive observers is to provide a successful means for individuals or groups to resolve conflicts in their favor or self-interest. Forces of law enforcement are undistinguishable from others insofar as they also use violence as the predominant mode of conflict resolution. Legality, in many instances, is not a relevant dimension or concern.

An examination of some of the most frequent messages being sent to mass audiences and norms for violence inferred from these messages leads to a serious concern about the effects upon audiences of television entertainment programs. At the very least, it can be said that the messages being sent about violence are inconsistent with a philosophy of social behavior based upon involved cooperation, non-violent resolution of conflict, and non-violent means of attaining personal ends.

The next series of questions which needs to be addressed is (1) Are the messages which are sent actually received by TV audiences? (2) Are these messages learned? (3) Can norms for violence implied in these messages be learned and adopted as the audience's norms for violence? This series of questions lies at the crux of the issue of the social and psychological effects of mass media portrayals of violence.

REFERENCES

1. See Bradley Greenberg, "The Content and Context of Violence in The Mass Media," paper submitted to the Violence Commission, Fall, 1968. This paper can be found in Appendix II C.
2. Jack Lyle, "Contemporary Functions of the Mass Media," paper submitted to the Violence Commission, Fall, 1968.
3. We would like to thank ABC, CBS, and NBC for their cooperation.
4. A study of network programs transmitted October 1-7, 1967 and 1968, conducted in October and November 1968 for the Mass Media Task Force, National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence.

Associate investigators: Marten Brouwer, visiting professor of communications; Cedric C. Clark, post-doctoral fellow in Communications; Supervisor of data processing: Klaus Krippendorff, Assistant Professor of Communications. Administrative Assistant and Staff Supervisor: Michael F. Eeley.

Technical Director: Vernon J. Wattenberger, Director of Facilities and Engineering Assistants: Barry Hampe, Supervisor of Film Laboratory Services; John Massi, Supervisor of Broadcasting Laboratory Services

5. Appendix K describes the selection of programs, terms, units, and other conditions of analysis, and the methods used to control and measure the extent to which unreliable observations or prior judgements might affect the usefulness of the results in providing a basis for fresh judgment. The structures of interpretation noted should be kept in mind in reading and using the results.
6. In other words, an accurate and meaningful capsule statement of the story requires one or more references to violent acts.
7. A category for an act of nature as the agent of violence was included, but none were observed.
8. Three-fourths of all sources and receivers were human beings, and one fourth were human-like (animals or human-like cartoon characters that can and did speak, and one robot who also could speak).
9. It is difficult to know how many viewers actually include the violent or non-violent nature of television programs as a criterion of program selection. However, if this criterion were employed, the range of available non-violent programs is quite limited.
10. In Appendix K, analysis is made of more detailed program types. Note that one program can be classified as one, two, or three types; e.g., a cartoon format with a comedy tone.
11. See Eleanor Macoby, "Effects of Mass Media," in M. L. and L. W. Hoffman, (eds.), *Review of Child Development Research* (Russell Sage Foundation, 1964), pp. 323-348.
12. See Alberta Siegal, "Effects of Mass Media Violence on Inter-Personal Relations," paper submitted to the Violence Commission, Fall, 1968.
13. Herta Herzog, "What Do We Really Know About Daytime Serial Listeners?" in P. F. Lazarsfeld and F. N. Stanton (eds.), *Radio Research* (New York: Duell, Sloan & Pearce, 1942), pp. 3-33.
14. W. M. Gerson, "Social Structure and Mass Media Socialization," Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Washington, 1963.
15. Bernard Berelson, "What 'Missing the Newspaper' Means," in Wilbur Schramm (ed.), *The Process and Effects of Mass Communications* (Urban, Illinois: Univ. of Illinois Press, 1954), pp. 36-47.
16. Social desirability could have affected these responses—i.e., some respondents may have felt that the expected or desirable response was to say that they disapproved of the kind of violence or that there is too much violence in television entertainment programming.
17. Otto Larsen, Louis Grey, and J. Fortas, "Achieving Goals Through Violence on Television," in O. N. Larsen (ed.), *Violence and the Mass Media* (New York: Harper & Row 1968), pp. 97-111.
18. For example, see Leonard Berkowitz, "The Effects of Observing Violence," *Scientific American*, vol. 210 (Feb. 1964), pp. 2-8.
19. See Chapter 12, for a review of research concerning observational learning from exposure to audiovisual portrayals of aggression.
20. See Chapter 12.
21. *Ibid.*

Appendix III-J

CONTENT ANALYSIS PROCEDURES AND RESULTS

A. The Recording Instrument for Programs as a Whole

1. Recording Unit

The unit of observation for which this instrument is developed is the *program*, but it might more appropriately be called the play or story. Most dramatic television presentations (e.g., feature films) contain a single play or story and are therefore regarded as one program. When a cartoon show contains several separate stories or when general entertainment consists of several dramatic skits then each of these separate stories and skits is considered a separate program.

A "program" as listed in a television log or "program" schedule is not to be confused with the program as a recording unit in this instrument.

The duration is not a defining characteristic of the recording unit. Rather, the program length is considered as a variable of this unit.

Commercials are not subjected to the recording procedure described below; a log of commercials, however, is kept for further analysis.

2. Recording Procedure

The recording presupposes the viewing of the program as a whole, making necessary observations and, where necessary to complete the data sheets, reviewing of the details. A log of commercials is kept separately from the data sheets and any acts of products relevant to violence, weapons, war, etc., are noted.

The observer is instructed to record all items on the basis of explicit clues, clear verbal or other behavior, or other evidence. In order to decide on the category assignments of each program, evidence is to be obtained from the program itself, rather than from speculation.

Cover Page for Card No. 1

<i>Column</i>	<i>Code</i>	<i>Description</i>
1-3	2 5 5	Project number (bin number)
4	1	Deck number (unit = program)
5		Extent of violence

<i>Column</i>	<i>Code</i>	<i>Description</i>
6		Network
7		Year
8-9	0 1	Card number
10-12		Program identification
13		(Blank)
14-15		Coder identification
16		Month
17-18		Day
19		Audience
20		Format
21		Type
22		Duration
23-24		Program description

Variables and Categories

- Program tone (25) (1) The program is a comedy
 (2) The program is serious, tragic or other; comic touch, if any, plays minor role
- Time (26) of major action (1) Before 1900
 (2) Turn of century to World War II
 (3) WW II to the 1960's
 (4) The 1960's or general "present"
 (i.e., contemporary with time of production)
 (5) Future
 (9) Other (explain)

Note: State year if known on the coding sheet.

- Location (27): Geographical location of major action.
 (1) In U.S. (state location, if known)
 (2) In a country outside of the U.S. (describe)
 (9) Other (describe)
- Setting (28) of major action (1) Urban or suburban setting
 (2) Small town, provincial place, village, farm, rural
 (3) Generally uninhabited area; desert, ocean, etc.
 (4) Mainly mobile (ship, plane, train, etc.)
 (5) Other planets
 (9) Other or mixed (explain)
- Religion (29) (1) Religion, church, clergy; also religious customs, rituals or any single term in the theme or aspect of life was part of the subject matter of the program *as a significant element*.
 (0) Theme or aspect of life is not relevant to the subject or story.

Note: Use the following criteria of significance: code it (1) only if the theme or aspect would have to be noted in a one-page summary. This criterion applies to the following seven themes.

- Animals-nature (30) (1) Animals, nature (jungle, mountains, ocean, rivers), forces of nature and the elements; exploration, discovery, and natural catastrophes; also

agriculture, breeding, conservation of natural resources are significant elements of the program's subject or story.

- (0) Theme is not relevant.
- Mental illness (31) (1) Mental illness, deficiency, abnormality, serious mental disorder; amnesia, phobias; cure, therapy, rehabilitation is significant to the subject or story.
- (0) Theme is irrelevant.
- Science (32) (1) Science and scientist (including social science); technology is significant to the subject or story.
- (0) Theme is not relevant.
- Minorities (33) (1) Minority groups and people; foreign countries and people; non-white religious and ethnic minorities are significant to the subject or story.
- (0) Theme is not relevant.
- Armed forces (34) (1) Armed forces are significant to the subject or story.
- (0) Theme is not relevant.
- Crime (35) (1) Crime, corruption, rackets, "fixes," crime detection is significant to the subject or story.
- (0) Theme is not relevant.
- Education (36) (1) Schools, education, training, study, self-development are significant to the subject or story.
- (0) Theme is not relevant.
- Violence (37) (1) No violence.
- (2) Violence incidental to the plot.
- (3) Violence significant to the plot (defined as violence so germane that it would have to be noted in a brief [one-page] summary of the story).
- (9) Other (explain).

Note: Violence is defined to include physical or psychological injury, hurt, or death, addressed to living things. Violence is explicit and overt. It can be verbal or physical. If verbal, it must express intent to use physical force and must be plausible and credible in the context of the program. IDLE, DISTANT, OR VAGUE THREATS; MERE VERBAL INSULTS, QUARRELS, OR ABUSE; OR COMIC THREATS WITH NO VIOLENT INTENT BEHIND THEM ARE *NOT* TO BE CONSIDERED VIOLENT.

- Pleasure (38) (1) The program as a whole clearly supports or includes the proposition: there is pleasure, satisfaction derived from violence.
- (0) The proposition is irrelevant to the program.

Note: In the following description of variables the theme is listed. It should be coded (1) if the program as a whole clearly supports or includes the proposition. Otherwise it should be coded (0).

CODING SHEETS

Part I

23-24. Write your answer to question 23-24 on this page.

Answer questions 25 through 55 on reverse side

25.	31.	37.	43.	49.
26.	32.	38.	44.	50.
27.	33.	39.	45.	51.
28.	34.	40.	46.	52.
29.	35.	41.	47.	53.
30.	36.	42.	48.	54.
				55.

- Wealth (39) (1) Desire for money, wealth results in violence.
(0) Irrelevant.
- Poverty (40) (1) Poverty, hunger, misery results in violence.
(0) Irrelevant.
- Power (41) (1) Desire for power leads to violence.
(0) Irrelevant.
- Alternatives (42) (1) There is an attempt to try alternative methods
before resorting to violence; argument,
negotiations, other ways are tried.
(0) Irrelevant.
- Hero-ethnicity (43) (1) Features of enemy or villain are or resemble
those of a race or ethnic group other than
white Caucasian.
(0) Irrelevant.
- Wounds (46) (1) Blood, wounds are actually shown on the screen.
(0) Irrelevant.
- L. enf.-incompetence (47) (1) Agent of law enforcement is shown as incompetent,
bungling, or inefficient.
(0) Irrelevant.
- L. enf.-corruption (48) (1) Agent of law enforcement is shown as venal,
corrupt, or criminal.
(0) Irrelevant.
- Legal consequences (49) (1) Due process of law (legal apprehension or trial
or both) is indicated as a consequence of major
act(s) of violence.
(0) Irrelevant.
- Negro-police (50) (1) An agent of law enforcement is American Negro.
(0) Irrelevant.
- Negro-criminal (51) (1) A criminal or alleged criminal is American Negro.
(0) Irrelevant.
- “Police brutality”-used (52) (1) The phrase “police brutality” is explicitly used
in the program (regardless of context).
(0) Irrelevant.

“Police brutality” ridiculed (53)	(1) (0)	The phrase “police brutality” is ridiculed in the program. Irrelevant.
Nonenclosed spaces (54)	(1) (0)	Violence occurs in the streets or in nonenclosed spaces. Irrelevant.
Enclosed spaces (55)	(1) (0)	Violence occurs inside of a building or vehicle. Irrelevant.

Reliability of Variables

In the following the results of the final reliability estimates are listed for all variables that survived the pretest. The reliability is assessed on the basis of a random sample of 30 programs out of a total of 183 programs.

The information is listed in the following order:

- Name of variable
- Type of scale (*N*=nominal, *I*=interval)
- Recoding whenever report differs from primary data
- Reliability coefficient (1=perfect agreement and 0=chance)
- Inclusion in the report (Yes=included, No=rejected)

Program tone (25)	<i>N</i>		0.861	Yes
Time (26)	<i>N</i>	(1, 2, 3) 4, 5, 9	.771	Yes
Location (27)	<i>N</i>		1.0	Yes
Setting (28)	<i>N</i>	1, 2 (3, 4, 5, 9)	.693	Yes
Religion (29)	<i>N</i>		.630	No
Animals-nature (30)	<i>N</i>		.788	Yes
Mental illness (31)	<i>N</i>		1.0	Yes
Science (32)	<i>N</i>		.856	Yes
Minorities (33)	<i>N</i>		.722	Yes
Armed forces (34)	<i>N</i>		1.0	Yes
Crime (35)	<i>N</i>		.931	Yes
Education (36)	<i>N</i>		.423	No
Violence (37)	<i>I</i>		.969	Yes
Pleasure (38)	<i>N</i>		.509	No
Wealth (39)	<i>N</i>		.583	No
Poverty (40)	<i>N</i>		-.017	No
Power (41)	<i>N</i>		.346	No
Alternatives (42)	<i>N</i>		.667	Yes
Hero-ethnicity (43)	<i>N</i>		.489	No
War (44)	<i>N</i>		1.0	Yes
Villain-ethnicity (45)	<i>N</i>		.255	No
Wounds (46)	<i>N</i>		0	No
Law enforcement-incompetence (47)	<i>N</i>		0	No
Law enforcement-corruption (48)	<i>N</i>		0	No
Legal consequences (49)	<i>N</i>		.760	Yes
Negro-police (50)	<i>N</i>		1.0	Yes
Negro-criminal (51)	<i>N</i>		.649	No
“Police brutality”-used (52)	<i>N</i>		0	No
“Police brutality” -ridiculed (53)	<i>N</i>		0	No
Nonenclosed spaces (54)	<i>N</i>		.700	Yes
Enclosed spaces (55)	<i>N</i>		.520	No

B. The Recording Instrument for Major Characters

1. Recording Unit

The unit of observation recorded by this instrument is a major character. Major characters are defined here as all leading roles representing the principal types essential to telling the story. This criterion applies equally to living and cartoon characters. How each character is portrayed in the context of the program as a whole, the role he assumes in the episodes of the play is the subject of detailed recording described below.

2. Recording Procedure

Observers must be familiar with the way each major character is portrayed in the play. They therefore must see the program at least once and may re-screen details if necessary.

In the first step, both observers in the pair must agree on which characters to record, and then record the characters' full names, with brief verbal descriptions of each.

In the second step, both observers *jointly decide* on the category assignments along the first 21 variables.

In the third step, each observer fills out a separate sheet, both sheets containing 27 identical semantic differential scales. For this, the observers are instructed as follows:

Place an X in the space closer to the end of each scale which fits the character better than the opposite. If one end of the scale seems *very closely associated* with the character, you would mark the first scale, for example, like this:

old X : : : : : : young or old : : : : X young

If one end of the scale seems *quite closely related* to the character, you would mark the scale like this:

old : X : : : : : young or old : : : X : young

If one end of the scale is *only slightly related* to the character, you would mark the scale like this:

old : : X : : : : young or old : : X : : young

If both sides are *equally associated* with the character, or if you cannot decide which is more related to the character, or if the scale does not apply to the character, mark the center space. Mark each scale.

Cover Page for Card Number (1st Semantic Differential)

Column	Code	Description
1-3	2 5 5	Project number
4-5		Total number of characters
6-9		Character ID for this card
10-11		Card number
12-13		Coder identification
14-15		(Blank)

(16-63)=Basic character data plus Semantic Differential for First Coder.

Cover Page for Card Number (2d Semantic Differential)

Column	Code	Description
1-3	2 5 5	Project number
4-5		Total number of characters
6-9		Character ID for this card
10-11		Card number
12-13		Coder identification
14-36		(Blank)

(37-63)=Semantic Differential Data for Second Coder.

Program
Names of codes
Today's date

Part II: Character Analysis

- | | |
|-----|-----|
| 16. | 27. |
| 17. | 28. |
| 18. | 29. |
| 19. | 30. |
| 20. | 31. |
| 21. | 32. |
| 22. | 33. |
| 23. | 34. |
| 24. | 35. |
| 25. | 36. |
| 26. | |

B-5

Do Not Write in Boxes

old	:	:	:	:	young
tall	:	:	:	:	short
unusual	:	:	:	:	usual
emotional	:	:	:	:	unemotional
dull	:	:	:	:	sharp
honest	:	:	:	:	dishonest
feminine	:	:	:	:	masculine
happy	:	:	:	:	sad
repulsive	:	:	:	:	attractive
tough	:	:	:	:	delicate
moral	:	:	:	:	immoral
predictable	:	:	:	:	unpredictable
wholesome	:	:	:	:	unwholesome
irrational	:	:	:	:	rational
sensitive	:	:	:	:	insensitive
bungling	:	:	:	:	efficient
kind	:	:	:	:	cruel
learned	:	:	:	:	ignorant
dirty	:	:	:	:	clean
free	:	:	:	:	restrained
intuitive	:	:	:	:	logical
bold	:	:	:	:	timid
sociable	:	:	:	:	unsociable
humble	:	:	:	:	proud
rich	:	:	:	:	poor
good	:	:	:	:	bad
violent	:	:	:	:	non-violent

Column	Code
37	
38	
39	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
45	
46	
47	
48	
49	
50	
51	
52	
53	
54	
55	
56	
57	
58	
59	
60	
61	
62	
63	

Each analyst is to code scales independently

Coding Sheet

B-6

Do Not Write in Boxes

old	:	:	:	:	young
tall	:	:	:	:	short
unusual	:	:	:	:	usual
emotional	:	:	:	:	unemotional
dull	:	:	:	:	sharp
honest	:	:	:	:	dishonest
feminine	:	:	:	:	masculine
happy	:	:	:	:	sad
repulsive	:	:	:	:	attractive
tough	:	:	:	:	delicate
moral	:	:	:	:	immoral
predictable	:	:	:	:	unpredictable
wholesome	:	:	:	:	unwholesome
irrational	:	:	:	:	rational
sensitive	:	:	:	:	insensitive
bungling	:	:	:	:	efficient
kind	:	:	:	:	cruel
learned	:	:	:	:	ignorant
dirty	:	:	:	:	clean
free	:	:	:	:	restrained
intuitive	:	:	:	:	logical
bold	:	:	:	:	timid
sociable	:	:	:	:	unsociable
humble	:	:	:	:	proud
rich	:	:	:	:	poor
good	:	:	:	:	bad
violent	:	:	:	:	non-violent

Column	Code
37	
38	
39	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
45	
46	
47	
48	
49	
50	
51	
52	
53	
54	
55	
56	
57	
58	
59	
60	
61	
62	
63	

Each analyst is to code scales independently

3. Variables and Categories

Full name of the character and a one sentence description is required

(a) Demographic Characteristics and Relation to Violence

- Sex (16) (1) Male.
- (2) Female.
- (9) Other (explain).

- Humanity (17) (1) Human.
- (2) Humanized (speaking) animal.
- (3) Animal (not "humanized").
- (9) Uncertain, other.

- Age (18) (1) Infant, preschool age.
- (2) Primary school age.
- (3) Secondary school age; teens; adolescent.
- (4) Young adult.
- (5) Middle age (may play romantic part).
- (6) Old.
- (9) Ageless, several, other, cannot specify
(explain on Coding sheet).

- Marital status (19) (1) Unmarried or unknown, uncertain, other.
 (2) Married, or has been married.
 (3) Marries in story or expects to marry.
- Occupation (20) (1) Housewife.
 (2) Illegal (code for criminals, outlaws).
 (3) Armed forces; militia.
 (4) Entertainment, arts, mass media.
 (5) Official law enforcement: police, FBI, T-men; marshal, sheriff.
 (6) Agent working for private "client" in occupation that usually involve crime or violence; private detective, etc.
 (9) Professional, other, uncertain, no visible means of support (explain on Coding sheet).

Note: If the character has several occupations simultaneously, consider only the major one.

- Ethnicity (21) (1) White, Anglo-Saxon, native American.
 (2) White, non-Anglo-Saxon, native American.
 (3) White foreign-born American (speaks with accent, etc.).
 (4) White non-American (other nationality).
 (5) Non-white American.
 (6) Non-white non-American.
 (9) Uncertain, other.

Note: The nationality and ethnicity of the character must be judged as apparent on the screen.

- Soc./Econ. status (22) (1) Upper, elite, executive.
 (2) Middle, average common, other, uncertain, mixed.
 (3) Lower, poor.
- Victim (23) (1) Not subjected to violence.
 (2) Subjected to violence, not fatal.
 (3) Dies violent death.
 (9) Subjected, other.

Note: If several categories are appropriate for situations at different points in time consider the highest degree of violence to which he is subjected.

- Aggressor (24) (1) Does not subject another to violence.
 (2) Subjects another to violence, not fatal.
 (3) Commits fatal violence.
 (9) Subjects, other.

Note: If several categories are appropriate for situations at different points in time consider the highest degree of violence involved.

- Final outcome (25) (1) Clearly happy, unambiguous success.
 (2) Clearly unhappy; unambiguous failure.
 (3) Mixed, unclear, ambiguous.

(b) Values Held by the Character

- Sexual or amorous goals (26) . (0) If it was not explicitly desired or sought by the character at any time in the program (whether achieved or not).

	(1)	If it was explicitly desired or sought by the character at any time in the program.
Family, home (27)	(0) (1)	As above.
Respect for legality (28) . . .	(0) (1)	As above.
Money, material goods (29) . .	(0) (1)	As above.
Ambition, will for power (30)	(0) (1)	As above.
Religious (31)	(0) (1)	As above.
Scientific (32)	(0) (1)	As above.
Artistic (33)	(0) (1)	As above.
Self-preservation (34)	(0) (1)	As above.
Vengeance (35)	(0) (1)	As above.
Evil, destructive, wanton goals (36)	(0) (1)	As above.

(c) Personality Characteristics of the Character

old	:	:	:	:	:	:	young
tall	:	:	:	:	:	:	short
unusual	:	:	:	:	:	:	usual
emotional	:	:	:	:	:	:	unemotional
dull	:	:	:	:	:	:	sharp
honest	:	:	:	:	:	:	dishonest
feminine	:	:	:	:	:	:	masculine
happy	:	:	:	:	:	:	sad
repulsive	:	:	:	:	:	:	attractive
tough	:	:	:	:	:	:	delicate
moral	:	:	:	:	:	:	immoral
predictable	:	:	:	:	:	:	unpredictable
wholesome	:	:	:	:	:	:	unwholesome
irrational	:	:	:	:	:	:	rational
sensitive	:	:	:	:	:	:	insensitive
bungling	:	:	:	:	:	:	efficient
kind	:	:	:	:	:	:	cruel
learned	:	:	:	:	:	:	ignorant
dirty	:	:	:	:	:	:	clean
free	:	:	:	:	:	:	restrained
intuitive	:	:	:	:	:	:	logical
bold	:	:	:	:	:	:	timid
sociable	:	:	:	:	:	:	unsociable
humble	:	:	:	:	:	:	proud
rich	:	:	:	:	:	:	poor
good	:	:	:	:	:	:	bad
violent	:	:	:	:	:	:	non-violent

4. Reliability of Variables

Below are listed the final reliability estimates for all those variables that survived the pretest. The reliability is assessed on the basis of a random sample of 30 programs out of a total of 183 and contained 66 characters out of a total of 455. In the case of personality characteristics, the scale values of the two observers were summed.

The information is listed in the following order:

Name of variable
 Type of scale (*N*=nominal, *I*=interval)
 Recoding whenever the report differs from primary data
 Reliability coefficient (1=perfect agreement and 0=chance)
 Inclusion in the report (Yes=included, No=rejected)

(a) Demographic Characteristics and Relation to Violence

Sex (16)	<i>N</i>		.904	Yes
Humanity (17)	<i>N</i>		.903	Yes
Age (18)	<i>N</i>		.686	Yes
Marital status (19)	<i>N</i>		.939	Yes
Occupation (20)	<i>N</i>		.893	Yes
Ethnicity (21)	<i>N</i>	(1, 2, 3), 4, (5, 6), 9	.722	Yes
Soc./Econ status (22)	<i>I</i>		.651	No
Victim (23)	<i>N</i>	(1,2),3	.792	Yes
Aggressor (24)	<i>N</i>		.734	Yes
Final outcome (25)	<i>N</i>		.721	Yes

(b) Values Held by the Character

Sexual/amorous goals (26)	<i>N</i>		.482	No
Family/home (27)	<i>N</i>		.754	Yes
Respect for law (28)	<i>N</i>		.665	No
Money, goods (29)	<i>N</i>		.450	No
Ambition (30)	<i>N</i>		.573	No
Religious (31)	<i>N</i>		.484	No
Scientific (32)	<i>N</i>		.631	No
Artistic (33)	<i>N</i>		1.0	Yes
Self-preservation (34)	<i>N</i>		.624	No
Vengeance (35)	<i>N</i>		.573	No
Evil, destructive goals (36)	<i>N</i>		.716	Yes

(c) Personality Characteristics of the Character

Old-young (37)	<i>I</i>		.709	Yes
Tall-short (38)	<i>I</i>		.678	Yes
Unusual-usual (39)	<i>I</i>		.591	No
Emotional-unemotional (40)	<i>I</i>		.525	No
Dull-sharp (41)	<i>I</i>		.434	No
Honest-dishonest (42)	<i>I</i>		.789	Yes
Feminine-Masculine (43)	<i>I</i>		.778	Yes
Happy-sad (44)	<i>I</i>		.652	No
Repulsive-attractive (45)	<i>I</i>		.565	No
Tough-delicate (46)	<i>I</i>		.572	No
Moral-immoral (47)	<i>I</i>		.760	Yes
Predictable-unpredictable (48)	<i>I</i>		.516	No
Wholesome-unwholesome (49)	<i>I</i>		.747	Yes
Irrational-rational (50)	<i>I</i>		.589	No
Sensitive-insensitive (51)	<i>I</i>		.657	No
Bungling-efficient (52)	<i>I</i>		.564	No

Kind-cruel (53)	<i>I</i>	.773	Yes
Learned-ignorant (54)	<i>I</i>	.567	No
Dirty-clean (55)	<i>I</i>	.252	No
Free-restrained (56)	<i>I</i>	.358	No
Intuitive-logical (57)	<i>I</i>	.484	No
Bold-timid (58)	<i>I</i>	.372	No
Sociable-unsociable (59)	<i>I</i>	.438	No
Humble-proud (60)	<i>I</i>	.253	No
Rich-poor (61)	<i>I</i>	.824	Yes
Good-bad (62)	<i>I</i>	.581	No
Violent-nonviolent (63)	<i>I</i>	.783	Yes

5. Current Form of Primary Data

Data are available in the form of IBM punchcards.

Card No. 1

<i>Column</i>	<i>Variable</i>	<i>Code</i>
1-3	Project number	225.
4	Recording unit	2=character.
5	Number of character in program	Exact number.
6		Blank.
7-9	Character identification	For a list, see the end of this appendix.
10-12	Program identification .	For a list, see the end of this appendix.
13	Card number	1.
14-15	Coder identification . .	For a list, see the end of this appendix.
16	Sex	(1) Male. (2) Female. (3) Other.
17	Humanity	(1) Human. (2) Humanized (speaking) animal. (3) Animal (not "humanized"). (9) Uncertain, other.
18	Age	(1) Infant, preschool age. (2) Primary school age. (3) Secondary school age; teens; adolescent. (4) Young adult. (5) Middle age (may play romantic part). (6) Old. (9) Ageless, several, other, cannot specify.
19	Marital status	(1) Unmarried or unknown, uncertain, other. (2) Married, or has been married. (3) Marries in story or expects to marry.

<i>Column</i>	<i>Variable</i>	<i>Code</i>
20	Major occupation	(1) Housewife. (2) Illegal (criminals, outlaws). (3) Armed forces; militia. (4) Entertainment, arts, mass media. (5) Official law enforcement: police, FBI, T-men; marshal, sheriff. (6) Agent working for private "client" in occupation that usually involves crime or violence; private detective, etc. (9) Professional, other, uncertain, no visible means of support.
21	Ethnicity	(1) White, Anglo-Saxon, native American. (2) White, non-Anglo-Saxon, native American. (3) White foreign-born American (speaks with accent, etc.) (4) White non-American (other nationality). (5) Non-white American. (6) Non-white non-American. (9) Uncertain, other.
22	Socio-economic status	(1) Upper, elite, executive. (2) Middle, average, common, other, uncertain, mixed. (3) Lower, poor.
23	Victim	(1) Not subjected to violence. (2) Subjected to violence, not fatal. (3) Dies violent death. (9) Subjected, other.
24	Aggressor	(1) Does not subject another to violence. (2) Subjects another to violence, not fatal. (3) Commits fatal violence. (9) Subjects, other.
25	Final outcome	(1) Clearly happy, unambiguous success. (2) Clearly unhappy; unambiguous failure. (3) Mixed, unclear, ambiguous.
26	Sexual or amorous	0=not explicitly desired. 1=explicitly desired.
27	Family, home	0=not explicitly desired. 1=explicitly desired.
28	Respect for legality	0=not explicitly desired. 1=explicitly desired.
29	Money, material goods	0=not explicitly desired. 1=explicitly desired.
30	Ambition, will for power	0=not explicitly desired. 1=explicitly desired.
31	Religion	0=not explicitly desired. 1=explicitly desired.

<i>Column</i>	<i>Variable</i>	<i>Code</i>
32	Scientific	0=not explicitly desired. 1=explicitly desired.
33	Artistic	0=not explicitly desired. 1=explicitly desired.
34	Self-preservation	0=not explicitly desired. 1=explicitly desired.
35	Vengeance	0=not explicitly desired. 1=explicitly desired.
36	Evil, destructive goals	0=not explicitly desired. 1=explicitly desired.
37	Old-young	(Columns 37-63: score range from 1-7; 1 is assigned to the left term and 7 is assigned to its polar opposite on the right.)
38	Short-tall	
39	Unusual-usual	
40	Emotional-unemotional	
41	Dull-sharp	
42	Dishonest-honest	
43	Feminine-masculine	
44	Sad-happy	
45	Repulsive-attractive	
46	Delicate-tough	
47	Immoral-moral	
48	Unpredictable-predictable	
49	Unwholesome-wholesome	
50	Irrational-rational	
51	Insensitive-sensitive	
52	Bungling-efficient	
53	Cruel-kind	
54	Ignorant-learned	
55	Dirty-clean	
56	Restrained-free	
57	Intuitive-logical	
58	Bold-timid	
59	Unsociable-sociable	
60	Humble-proud	
61	Poor-rich	

<i>Column</i>	<i>Variable</i>	<i>Code</i>
62	Bad-good	
63	Violent-non-violent . .	
	<i>Card No. 2</i>	
<i>Column</i>	<i>Variable</i>	<i>Code</i>
1-3	Project number	225.
4	Recording unit	2-character.
5	Number of character in program	Exact number.
6		Blank.
7-9	Character identification	For a list, see the end of this appendix.
10-12	Program identification	For a list, see the end of this appendix.
13	Card number	2.
14-15	Coder identification . .	For a list, see the end of this appendix.
16-36		Blank.
37	Old-young	Columns 37-63: score ranges from 1-7; 1 is assigned to the left term and 7 is assigned to its polar opposite on the right.)
38	Short-tall	
39	Unusual-usual	
40	Emotional-unemotional	
41	Dull-sharp	
42	Dishonest-honest	
43	Feminine-masculine . .	
44	Sad-happy	
45	Repulsive-attractive . .	
46	Delicate-tough	
47	Immoral-moral	
48	Unpredictable-predictable	
49	Unwholesome-wholesome	
50	Irrelational-rational . .	
51	Insensitive-sensitive . .	
52	Bungling-efficient	
53	Cruel-kind	
54	Ignorant-learned	

<i>Column</i>	<i>Variable</i>	<i>Code</i>
55	Dirty-clean	
56	Restrained-free	
57	Intuitive-logical	
58	Bold-timid	
59	Unsociable-sociable	
60	Humble-proud	
61	Poor-rich	
62	Bad-good	
63	Violent-nonviolent	

C. The Recording Instrument for Violent Episodes

1. Recording Unit

The unit of recording for which this Instrument is designed is called a *violent episode*. A program may contain many violent episodes and in order to identify these units two definitions have been advanced as follows:

Violence is defined to include physical or psychological injury, hurt, or death, addressed to living things. Violence is explicit and overt. It can be verbal or physical. If verbal, it must express intent to use physical force and must be plausible and credible in the context of the program. Idle, distant, or vague threats; mere verbal insults, quarrels, or abuse; or comic threats with no violent intent behind them are not to be considered violent.

A violent *episode* is defined as a scene of whatever duration which concerns the same agent and the same receiver. Thus, a battle scene would be one episode; a chase scene with a posse pursuing a man would be one episode, even if interrupted by flashbacks to other scenes; an attack by one person on a second, in the course of which a third person attacks the first, would be two episodes.

2. Recording Procedure

The recording of violent episodes presupposes viewing the program as a whole, making necessary observations and, when necessary to complete the data sheets, a reviewing of the details.

A log containing notes pertaining to observed acts concerned with violence, weapons, war, etc., is compiled during the viewing. This record then provides the basis for identifying the program's set of violent episodes. Their actual number in the program is to be listed in the appropriate space on the data sheet. Then each violent episode (working across the respective rows on the data sheet) is to be judged independently according to the specified variables.

Cover Page for Card No. 3

<i>Column</i>	<i>Code</i>	<i>Description</i>
1-3	2 5 5	Project number
4	1	Deck number
5		Extent of violence
6-7		(Blank)
8-9	0 3	Card number
10-12		Program ID
13		(Blank)
14-15		Coder ID

<i>Column</i>	<i>Code</i>	<i>Description</i>
16-17		Number of violent episodes:
18-29		Episode 1
30-41		Episode 2
42-53		Episode 3
54-65		Episode 4
66-67		Episode 5

Cover Page for Card No. 4

<i>Column</i>	<i>Code</i>	<i>Description</i>
1-3	2 5 5	Project number
4	1	Deck number
5		Extent of violence
6-7		(Blank)
8-9	0 4	Card number
10-12		Program identification
13		(Blank)
14-15		Coder identification
16-17		Number of violent episodes:
18-29		Episode 6
30-41		Episode 7
42-53		Episode 8
54-65		Episode 9
66-77		Episode 10

Cover Page for Card No. 5

<i>Column</i>	<i>Code</i>	<i>Description</i>
1-3	2 5 5	Project number
4	1	Deck number
5		Extent of violence
6-7		(Blank)
8-9	0 5	Card number
10-12		Program identification
13		(Blank)
14-15		Coder identification
16-17		Number of violent episodes:
18-29		Episode 11
30-41		Episode 12
42-53		Episode 13
54-65		Episode 14
66-77		Episode 15

Cover Page for Card No. 6

<i>Column</i>	<i>Code</i>	<i>Description</i>
1-3	2 5 5	Project number
4	1	Deck number
5		Extent of violence
6-7		(Blank)
8-9	0 6	Card number
10-12		Program identification
13		(Blank)
14-15		Coder identification
16-17		Number of violent episodes:
18-29		Episode 16
30-41		Episode 17

3. Variables and Categories

Number of episodes	Exact number of violent episodes that occur in the program.
Agent (a)	(1) Human (live or cartoon) individual(s). (2) Humanized (speaking) animal (e.g. in cartoons). (3) Animal (live or cartoon). (4) "Thing," creature. (5) Act of nature (widespread effect; not merely an accident). (6) Accident (mechanical or other; mishap; chance). (9) Other.
Weapons (b)	(1) None; carried out by verbal or bodily means only. (2) Weapon is used. (9) Other.
Context (c)	(1) Violence which occurs in serious or sinister contexts. (2) Comic or sham violence.
Double context (d)	(1) If the context is "1" above <i>and</i> if there is a comic element built into the presentation, despite its serious surface appearance. For example, canned (or real) audience laughter on soundtrack despite apparently real injury. Mark only if there is clear evidence of comic effect <i>in the context of serious presentation</i> . (0) If no such double context is present or if irrelevant.
Witnesses (e)	(1) The witnesses are passive; they do not or cannot react. (2) The witnesses assist or encourage violence. (3) The witnesses attempt to prevent, restrain, or seek alternatives to violence. (9) Other, or no witnesses.
L.-enf. violent role (f)	(1) They play a non-violent role. (2) They commit violence in the course of official duties. (3) They commit violence, but not in the course of official duties. (9) Other, or they play no role.
<i>Note:</i> Law enforcement agencies include only police, sheriff, marshal, official, deputies and detectives—not private detectives, agents, spies, armed forces, etc.	
L.-enf. violence justified (g)	(1) If violence is committed by law enforcement agencies, their actions are portrayed on the screen as justified. (2) Their actions are portrayed on the screen as unjustified. (3) Their actions are portrayed on the screen as both justified and unjustified (i.e., "mixed"). (9) Irrelevant (i.e., violence is not committed).
L.-enf. initiation/response (h)	(1) If the agents of law enforcement play a role in violence, they initiate violence. (2) They respond to violence in a violent manner.

- (3) They respond to violence in a non-violent manner.
 (4) They become victims of violence.
 (9) Irrelevant (i.e., they do not play a role).
- L.-enf.-viol. necessary (i) . . . (1) If the agents of law enforcement play a role in violence, they commit only that level of violence which appears necessary to accomplish their objective(s).
 (2) They commit violence which appears to go beyond what is necessary (i.e., brutality, and recognized as such on screen).
 (3) Both, mixed.
 (9) Irrelevant (i.e., they do not play a role).
- Relations-opponents (j) . . . (1) Group relations among violent opponents are in the family.
 (2) Violent opponents are members of the same national or ethnic groups (but not in family).
 (3) Violent opponents are members of different national or ethnic groups.
 (9) Other.
- Non-fatal casualties (k) . . . (0) None
 (1) One
 (2) Two
 (3) Three
 (4) Four
 (5) Five
 (6) Six
 (7) Seven
 (8) Eight or more, but can be counted
 (9) Mass casualties; cannot be counted

Note: Count the number of persons or humanized animals hurt in the scene.

- Fatal casualties (l) (0) None
 (1) One
 (2) Two
 (3) Three
 (4) Four
 (5) Five
 (6) Six
 (7) Seven
 (8) Eight or more, but can be counted
 (9) Mass casualties; cannot be counted

Note: Count the number of fatal casualties (bodies) in the scene. Include victims who are shown dead or who die as a consequence of injury in the scene.

4. Reliability of Variables

Below are listed the final reliability estimates for all those variables that survived the pre-test. The reliability is assessed on the basis of a random sample of 30 programs out of a total of 183 and contained 52 violent episodes out of a total of 873.

The information is listed in the following order:

- Name of variable
- Type of scale (*N*=nominal, *I*=interval)
- Recoding whenever the report differs from primary data
- Reliability coefficient (1=perfect agreement and 0=chance)
- Inclusion in the report (Yes=included, No=rejected)

Content Analysis Procedures and Results

No. of episodes	I		Not accessible
Agent (a)	N		.731 Yes
Weapons (b)	N	1 (2, 9)	.799 Yes
Context (c)	N		.736 Yes
Double context (d)	N		.729 Yes
Witnesses (e)	N		.677 Yes
L. enf.-violence role (f)	N		.819 Yes
L. enf.-violence justified (g)	N		.866 Yes
L. enf.-initiation/response (h)	N		.761 Yes
L. enf.-violence necessary (i)	N		1.0 Yes
Relations-opponents (j)	N		.915 Yes
Nonfatal casualties (k)	I		.995 Yes
Fatal casualties (l)	I		.514 No
Casualties, (k) and (l) summed	I		.710 Yes

D. The Recording Instrument for Violent Encounters and Acts and their Justification

1. Recording Unit

The units in terms of which violent encounters are transcribed are acts of violence. One TV program may have many acts of violence. Each has to be recorded as a separate entity. Acts of violence have to meet the following two defining criteria:

1. People, human groups or living things (including animals with human characteristics) are physically harmed, forcefully restrained or barely escape death, injury, pain, etc.
2. The harm is caused by or explained in terms of the behavior of other people. (Intention and motivation do not enter as defining criteria and entirely verbal threats are also excluded).

The two criteria for identifying acts of violence may be *distributed over a whole program*. Thus if an event is explained initially as an accident but linked to the behavior of another person at a later point in the drama it qualifies as an act of violence.

If harm, injury or physical confinement cannot be linked to individuals or groups of individuals then, by definition, it does not constitute an act of violence. Violence is a *form of interaction* involving at least two individuals or groups. The armed pursuit of a person constitutes an act of violence even though the bullet may miss its target. Forcing a person at gun point is an act of violence but just pointing a gun at someone may merely be regarded a threat and is therefore excluded as an act of violence. Acts of violence must have actual or potentially harmful consequences for their receivers. If one party physically attacks another party and the latter does not return the violence in defense, then the violent encounter has to be recorded as a single act. Acts of violence are distinguished on the number of bullets fired or how severe the kick may have been. Acts of violence mediate between a source of violence and a receiver.

However, if the receiver in turn *responds* with violence then the encounter has to be characterized by two acts of violence with the parties being interchangeably source and receiver of violence, though perhaps for different reasons. Lengthy shooting duels, fist fights and large-scale battle scenes would have to be regarded as two acts of violence provided that the exchange is actually shown (and not merely present in the fantasies of one party) and that this interaction is continuous, i.e., without significant interruptions and without significant changes in the way violence is exchanged.

If a prolonged exchange of violence is not continuous in the sense that major shifts in the style of interactions occur (e.g., a change in the means of fighting, a change in initiative or aims pursued, the introduction of a third party or a change in the original parties involved), then the violence has to be represented by more than two acts of violence. Shifts in the basic dimensions of violent interaction are indicative of transitions from one encounter to the next, differentiating between the acts (or pairs of acts) of violence to be recorded.

Two violent encounters may occur simultaneously on the screen. For example, two parties—who are relatively independent of each other, and whose behavior is not significantly coordinated, and hence cannot be considered a single group—may interact with different portions of a joint enemy. Or, when a third party becomes a source of violence without significantly affecting the nature of violent interaction between the first two parties, then the first encounter may be said to continue while a second encounter may have started at the point of the third party's entry.

For the purpose of analysis several basic components of an act of violence are distinguished each of which is subsequently characterized along several more specific variables.

By definition of an act of violence, the following three components must occur:

1. The *source* of violence, or that person or group which behaves in such a way that some second party is physically affected by it, whether intentionally or not.

2. The *receiver* of violence, or that person or group which is either directly harmed by the source's behavior or put in the immediate danger of being so affected regardless of whether the person or group is aware of the consequences of the encounter. Note that receivers are sometimes merely the vehicles through which an ultimate target is intended to be affected.

3. The *act* of violence, a causal link between the source's behavior and the receiver's harm or danger.

Moreover, there may be:

4. The *beneficiary* of the act or that individual, group or abstract idea in behalf of, or for the benefit of which the violent act is performed. The beneficiary need not appear on the screen but may appear in the source's justification of his behavior or may be asserted in the plot in order to

make his behavior consistent. Source and beneficiary may or may not coincide.

Sometimes the parties of violent encounters are single individuals (e.g., the lone hero or victim). But more often the role of the source and/or receiver of violence is assumed by a small group or an organization (e.g., a gang or an army). If a set of characters is referred to as a whole (e.g., the dynamic duo, Garrison's Gorillas, Charlie), if their behavior is highly coordinated (e.g., division of labor, the existence of formal organization) or if they lack individuality in the plot (e.g., same uniform, never shown isolated from others) then they should be regarded as one group. Conversely, if the characters are carefully distinguished, their behavior is relatively independent of each other and differences among their personalities is emphasized, they should be regarded as individuals. However, the recording of acts of violence should consider the fact that characters may act as individuals at one point in time and join a group as indistinguishable members at some other point in time. The witness of a violent encounter is always regarded as one component regardless of how many members it contains.

Beneficiaries are often perceived in terms of a hierarchy of increasing generality. A particular police officer may be seen as a member of a patrol and this patrol could be taken as an incident of the police in general which in turn is part of everything that is concerned with the preservation of law and order. Law enforcement agencies may have to fight on all levels. However, if it is the declared purpose of a detective to fight *his own* enemy then the beneficiary is the source itself. Generally, the beneficiary should be identified as that person, group or abstract idea which is thought to be gaining *most directly* from the acts of violence or which is *most explicitly* asserted in the source's justification for the act. The observer should avoid long chains of reasoning and describe the most obvious beneficiary and ultimate target.

2. Recording Procedure

The observer must *see the whole program* at least once (during which he may make informal notes regarding the acts of violence involved).

One cover sheet is provided for each program and one data sheet for each act of violence with cells into which the required information is to be inserted. No cell should be left blank.

The first step of the recording procedure is to *isolate the acts of violence* occurring in the program. The two defining criteria must be met in each case. It seems to be helpful to note the beginning and the end of the act of violence and to write this down on the data sheet for further reference. Then assign a serial number to this act, beginning with "01."

The second step of the recording procedure is to *identify the components* for describing the act in detail. The principal characters and groups involved in the violent encounter are to be assigned identification numbers. These are to be inserted in the appropriate cells for the source and the receiver on the data sheet together with a short description of the character or group.

The third step of the procedure is to *record* more detailed information along several variables. A set of questions are formulated that require an

answer in terms of predefined *categories* and may call for a short *verbal description*.

TV - Violence/Part C - F/Programs

	2	1
	5	2
	5	3
	9	4
	columns 5 through 9	BLANK
Program	10	
	11	
	12	
	column 13	BLANK
Coders	14	
	15	

3. Variables and Categories

(a) The *Source* of Violence

The verbal description of the source is required:

- Ethnicity (0) Not identifiable.
 (1) Identifiable.

If the source's ethnicity is identifiable give a verbal description (e.g., Negro, German, American Indian. Do not forget to include American white).

- Sex (0) Indeterminate (like some cartoon characters).
 (1) Male individual or group of males.
 (2) Female individual or group of females.
 (3) Mixed (if it is a group with both males and females).

- Stardom (0) No visible role (only indirectly referred to).
 (1) Minor part (role neither central nor extensive).
 (2) Medium part (in between minor and major).
 (3) Major part (role central and/or very extensive).

Note: Only the role in the plot has to be taken into account, not some actor's general fame.

- Serial (0) Program is not a serial.
 (1) Regular part (mostly announced as such).
 (2) Guest part (mostly announced as such).

- Group-belongingness (1) Isolated individual (no clear cut co-operation with or close ties to other individuals in the dramatic plot. *Note:* disregard information on ties to individuals not actually shown on screen).
 (2) Group-leader (someone who actually has or shares the highest authority in the group he belongs to).
 (3) Group member.
 (4) Group (non-individualized collectivity).

- Good-bad (0) Irrelevant (not clearly portrayed as good or bad; neutral).

- (1) Good (portrayed as belonging basically to the right side, even though he may on occasion act wrongly).
 - (2) Bad (portrayed as belonging basically to the wrong side, even though he may on occasion act in the right way).
 - (3) Good-bad (someone who switches from the right side to the wrong side, or the other way around; or someone with a complex role, as in Greek tragedy).
- Relation to law (0) No special relation to the law portrayed (e.g., ordinary citizen).
- (1) Law enforcement officer (e.g., policeman, national guard, etc., if portrayed in that role).
 - (2) Semilaw enforcement (e.g., private detective working closely together with police; prison guard, executioner).
 - (3) Criminal (if portrayed in that role).
- Final outcome (0) Neither gain nor loss shown; irrelevant; if a person or group does not appear in latest part of show, and is not by implication there, code 0 is appropriate.
- (1) Clear winner (e.g., gangster who gets away with the loot, the sheriff who killed the outlaw, etc.).
 - (2) Winner - but (e.g., the man who got away, but lost a close friend; i.e., Pyrrhic victory).
 - (3) Loser - but (e.g., the man who lands in jail but has a treasure hidden somewhere).
 - (4) Clear loser (e.g., killed, or imprisoned without compensation).

(b) The Beneficiary of the Violence as Perceived by the Source

- Beneficiary (0) A designated individual.
- (1) A designated leader of a group.
 - (2) A small group, a team.
 - (3) An organization.
 - (4) A large collectivity and/or an abstract idea as represented by the convictions and beliefs of many people.
- Relation source-beneficiary . (0) Identity (the source is the beneficiary).
- (1) Family ties and friendship, affection, communion and informal relations.
 - (2) Formal social, occupational and economical grounds, on relations between well defined roles (e.g., employer-employee, officer-soldier or formal authority).
 - (3) Ideological, ethnic and religious grounds or stems merely from possessing certain common or contrasting properties such as race, convictions, age groups, etc.
 - (4) General rules of social conduct in public places, cutting across familial, formal social and ideological boundaries. (The encounter is typically accidental, e.g., with a stranger, but social norms are not absent.)

(c) The Act of Violence

A verbal description is required of both the act of violence and the instruments used by the source during the violent encounter.

TV Violence I Part C-F 1 Acts

Source		Receiver
<p>21</p> <p>1</p> <p>(nature of act)</p> <p>21</p> <p>3</p> <p>(instrument)</p> <p>(ethnicity)</p>	<p>21</p> <p>4</p> <p>(ethnicity)</p>	<p>21</p> <p>4</p> <p>(ethnicity)</p>
<p>22</p> <p>5</p> <p>23 ethnicity</p> <p>24 sex</p> <p>25 stardom</p> <p>26 serial</p> <p>27 group-belongingness</p> <p>28 good-bad</p> <p>29 law</p> <p>30 outcome</p> <p>31 beneficiary</p> <p>32 relation source-beneficiary</p>	<p>33 complexity of instrument</p> <p>34 degree of seriousness</p> <p>35 distance source-receiver</p> <p>36 prior relation source-receiver</p> <p>37 amount of non-violent interaction</p> <p>38 sexual aspect</p>	<p>39 ethnicity</p> <p>40 sex</p> <p>41 stardom</p> <p>42 serial</p> <p>43 group-belongingness</p> <p>44 good-bad</p> <p>45 law</p> <p>46 outcome</p> <p>47 cognitive preparation</p> <p>48 immediate response</p> <p>49 consequences</p>

- Complexity of instruments . (1) No instruments (e.g., fists).
 (2) Small devices, objects from everyday life (e.g., furniture, cars, small concealable firearms) including natural forces (e.g., leaving receiver in desert).
 (3) Somewhat more sophisticated and specialized machinery (e.g., torture chambers, specially prepared traps, machine guns, plastic explosives).
 (4) Elaborate organization and/or complex and specialized machinery (e.g., mass destruction devices, acts of James Bond's enemies).

Note: In the case of instruments of a mixed type, (e.g., fist fighting as well as shooting with a gun), always record the more complex of the instruments involved.

- Seriousness (1) Violence appears as an integral part of slapstick, (e.g., The Three Stooges, pie fights, cartoons).
 (2) Violence appears in the context of self satire, high camp.
 (3) Violence appears as scrimmage, friendly competition.
 (4) Violence appears as a real fight, serious combat.

Note: To decide how serious the violence is meant, consider the overall climate in which the violent acts take place. If removed from its contextual setting, the degree of seriousness may be distorted. If more than one category is appropriate, take the first one on this list.

- Perceptual distance (1) Direct, interpersonal, and of closest proximity, i.e., within natural talking distance (e.g., violence within a small room or small area).
 (2) Mediated in face-to-face contact, i.e., involving distances beyond the limits of natural conversation (e.g., sniper, cannon).
 (3) Mediated without sight (e.g., poisoning without observing the effects, sending the receiver into a fatal situation, dynamiting with a fuse).
 (4) Global and/or undirected (e.g., killing by push button, nuclear missiles, etc.) directed indiscriminately against a large population.

(d) Relations Between Source and Receiver

- Prior relation (0) None (strangers).
 (1) Husband and wife.
 (2) Direct family (parents, children, brothers, sisters).
 (3) Family, other.
 (4) Friends.
 (5) Neighbors.
 (6) Job colleagues, coworkers.
 (7) Competitors.
 (8) Enemies.
 (9) Other.

Note: Here the relationship between source and receiver, as existing prior to their first violent encounter, has to be coded. This applies also when entering the code for the second, third, etc., violent encounter.

- Non-violent int* (0) No other than violent interaction.
 (1) Minor (only on one or two occasions, of short duration).
 (2) Medium (in between minor and major).

- (3) Major (very frequent and/or of long duration).
- Sexual aspect (0) No sexual aspect.
 (1) Sex explicitly present (kissing, necking and other overt behavior).
 (2) Sex implicitly present (as indicated by relevant verbal statements; by relationship husband-wife lovers, boy friend-girl friend, or by flirtation).

(e) The Receiver of Violence

A verbal description of the receiver is required:

- Ethnicity (0) Not identifiable.
 (1) Identifiable.

If the receiver's ethnicity is identifiable give a verbal description (e.g., Negro, German, American Indian. Do not forget to include American white).

- Sex (0) Indeterminate (like some cartoon characters).
 (1) Male individual or group of males.
 (2) Female individual or group of females.
 (3) Mixed (if it is a group with both males and females).
- Stardom (0) No visible role (only indirectly referred to).
 (1) Minor part (role neither central nor extensive).
 (2) Medium part (in between minor and major).
 (3) Major part (role central and/or very extensive).

Note: Only the role in the plot has to be taken into account, *not* some actor's general fame.

- Serial (0) Program is not a serial.
 (1) Regular part (mostly announced as such).
 (2) Guest part (mostly announced as such).
- Group-belongingness . . . (1) Isolated individual (no clear cut co-operation with or close ties to other individuals in the dramatic plot. *Note:* disregard information on ties to individuals not actually shown on screen.)
 (2) Group-leader (someone who actually has or shares the highest authority in the group he belongs to).
 (3) Group member.
 (4) Group (non-individualized collectivity).
- Good-bad (0) Irrelevant (not clearly portrayed as good or bad; neutral).
 (1) Good (portrayed as belonging basically to the right side, even though he may on occasion act wrongly).
 (2) Bad (portrayed as belonging basically to the wrong side, even though he may on occasion act in the right way).
 (3) Good-bad (someone who switches from the right side to the wrong side, or the other way around; or someone with a complex role, as in Greek tragedy).
- Relation to law (0) No special relation to the law portrayed (e.g., ordinary citizen).
 (1) Law enforcement officer (e.g., policeman, national guard, etc., if portrayed in that role).
 (2) Semi-law enforcement (e.g., private detective

- working closely together with police; prison guard, executioner).
- (3) Criminal (if portrayed in that role).
- Final outcome (0) Neither gain nor loss shown; irrelevant if a person or group does not appear in latest part of show, and is not by implication there, code 0 is appropriate.
- (1) Clear winner (e.g., gangster who gets away with the loot, the sheriff who killed the outlaw, etc.).
- (2) Winner - but (e.g., the man who got away, but lost a close friend; i.e., Pyrrhic victory).
- (3) Loser - but (e.g., the man who lands in jail but has a treasure hidden somewhere).
- (4) Clear loser (e.g., killed, or imprisoned without compensation).

(f) State of and Consequences for the Receiver

- Cognitive preparation . . . (1) The receiver is totally unaware, violence is not perceived prior to occurrence (e.g., shooting from back).
- (2) Recognizes the violence spontaneously, i.e., immediately before occurrence (e.g., stranger draws gun on sheriff).
- (3) Anticipates the violence in general outline, i.e., expects violence before encounter takes place, is warned.
- (4) Anticipates the violence in great detail (e.g., when elaborate plans of attack are known to receiver).
- Immediate response (2) Physically unable to respond (e.g., completely confined, unconscious, dead), not responding or the response is not clearly recognizable.
- (3) Withdraws from encounter, disengages.
- (4) Submits unconditionally.
- (5) Submits conditionally (e.g., intends to escape, plans counter-violence or other measures of retaliation).
- (6) Resists by other than violent means.
- (7) Responds with violence.

Note: All responses that are demanded by the source and are *willingly* executed by the receiver should be regarded as “unconditional submission.” If the receiver submits to the source’s demands in view of subsequent resistance or as a tactical means to counter violence, the response should be considered “conditional submission.”

- Consequences (0) Are not shown or are not evident on the screen.
- (1) Are shown not to exist, i.e., the receiver remains unaffected in the long run.
- (2) Somewhat impaired.
- (3) Severely incapacitated.
- (4) Dead or annihilated.

Note: Do not make long chains of inference. If someone is shown to be hurt and subsequently disappears from the screen, ultimate consequence may not be known, hence category “0” is appropriate.

Again note: If the receiver is a small group, an organization or a nation, judgments should consider the severity of the permanent consequences. Thus, if a settler’s raid on an Indian tribe leaves half of its members dead, the tribe might be said to be

“severely incapacitated” though not “dead.” If only a few are killed without significantly affecting the tribe’s ability to defend itself, the permanent consequence might be “somewhat impaired.”

4. Reliability of Variables

In the following the results of the final reliability estimates are listed for all those variables that survived the pre-test. The reliability is assessed on the basis of a random sample of 17 programs out of a total of 183 and contained 156 acts of violence out of a total of 1215. Where both the source and the receiver of violence are characterized by the same variables the observations are taken together.

The information is listed in the following order:

Name of variable
 Type of scale (N=nominal, I=interval)
 Recording whenever the report differs from primary data
 Reliability coefficient (1=perfect agreement and 0=chance)
 Inclusion in the report (Yes=included, No=rejected)

(a) The Source of Violence and (e) the Receiver of Violence

Ethnicity	<i>N</i>	0, (1, 2)	.656	No
Sex	<i>N</i>		.915	Yes
Stardom	<i>I</i>	(0, 1), 2, 3	.652	No
Serial	<i>N</i>		.875	Yes
Group-belongingness	<i>N</i>		.844	Yes
Good-bad	<i>I</i>	1, (0, 3), 2	.886	Yes
Relation to law	<i>N</i>		.784	Yes
Final outcome	<i>I</i>	1, 2, 0, 3, 4	.792	Yes

b. The Beneficiary of Violence

Beneficiary	<i>N</i>	(0, 1), (2, 3, 4)	.650	No
Relation source-beneficiary	<i>N</i>	0, (1, 2, 3, 4)	.704	Yes

(c) The Act of Violence

Complexity of instruments	<i>I</i>	1, 2, (3, 4)	.678	Yes
Seriousness	<i>N</i>	(1, 2), (3, 4)	.827	Yes
Perceptual distance	<i>N</i>	1, 2, (3, 4)	.728	Yes

(d) Relations Between Source and Receiver

Prior relation	<i>N</i>	0, (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9), (7, 8)	.460	No
Non-violent interaction	<i>I</i>		.753	Yes
Sexual aspect	<i>N</i>	0, (1, 2)	1.00	Yes

(f) State of and Consequences for the Receiver

Cognitive preparation	<i>I</i>		.616	No
Immediate response	<i>N</i>	(2, 3, 4, 5), 6, 7	.752	Yes
Consequences	<i>N</i>	0, (1, 2, 3, 4)	.473	No
Consequences	<i>I</i>	1, (2, 3), 4	.853	Yes

5. Current Form of Primary Data

Data are available in the form of IBM punchcards.

Content Analysis Procedures and Results

<i>Column</i>	<i>Variable</i>	<i>Code</i>
1-3	Project number	255
4	Recording unit	9=act of violence
5		Blank
6	Network	1=ABC 2=CBS 3=NBC
7-9		Blank
10-12	Serial number of program	For a list, see the end of this appendix.
13		Blank
14-15	Observer identification	For a list, see the end of this appendix
16-18		Blank
19-20	Serial number of the act of violence	01 to 0.99 depending on the number of acts observed
21		Blank
22	Card Number	5
23	Ethnicity	0=not identifiable 1=identifiable
24	Sex	0=indeterminate 1=male 2=female 3=mixed
25	Stardom	0=no visible role 1=minor part 2=medium part 3=major part
26	Serial	0=program is not a serial 1=regular part 2=guest part
27	Group-belongingness	1=isolated individual 2=group leader 3=member of a group 4=group, collectivity
28	Good-bad	0=neutral, irrelevant 1=good 2=bad 3=good-bad
29	Relation to law	0=none 1=law enforcement officer

<i>Column</i>	<i>Variable</i>	<i>Code</i>
		2=semi-law enforcement 3=criminal
30	Final outcome	0=neither gain nor loss shown 1=clear winner 2=winner - but 3=loser - but 4=clear loser
31	Beneficiary	0=a designated individual 1=a leader of a group 2=a small group or a team 3=an organization 4=a large collectivity
32	Relation source-receiver . . .	0=identity, self 1=family and friendship 2=formal social 3=an organization 4=rules of conduct in public
33	Complexity of instruments	1=no instruments 2=small devices 3=somewhat sophisticated machinery 4=elaborate organization
34	Seriousness	1=slapstick 2=self satire, high camp 3=scrimmage, friendly competition 4=fight, serious combat
35	Perceptual distance	1=direct interpersonal 2=mediated in face to face combat 3=mediated without sight 4=global and/or undirected
36	Prior relation	0=none 1=husband 2=direct family 3=family, other 4=friends 5=neighbors 6=job colleagues, co-workers 7=competitors 8=enemies 9=others
37	Non-violent interaction . . .	0=none prior to violence 1=minor 2=medium 3=major
38	Sexual aspect	0=no 1=explicitly present 2=implicitly present

<i>Column</i>	<i>Variable</i>	<i>Code</i>
39	Ethnicity	0=not identifiable 1=identifiable
40	Sex	0=indeterminate 1=male individual or group of males 2=female individual or group of females 3=mixed
41	Stardom	0=no visible role 1=minor part 2=medium part 3=major part
42	Serial	0=program is not a serial 1=regular part 2=guest part
43	Group-belongingness	1=isolated individual 2=group-leader 3=group member 4=group
44	Good-bad	0=irrelevant 1=good 2=bad 3=good-bad
45	Relation to law	0=no special relation to the law portrayed 1=law enforcement officer 2=semi-law enforcement 3=criminal
46	Final outcome	0=neither gain nor loss shown 1=clear winner 2=winner - but 3=loser - but 4=clear loser
47	Cognitive preparation	1=unaware 2=spontaneously recognized 3=anticipated without detail 4=anticipated in great detail
48	Immediate response	2=unable to respond 3=withdrawal 4=unconditional submission 5=conditional submission 6=active non-violent resistance 7=counter violence
49	Consequences	0=not shown 1=do not exist 2=somewhat impaired 3=severely incapacitated 4=dead or annihilated
50-80		Blank

List of Observers Using the Instruments

<i>Column</i>	<i>Variable</i>	<i>Code</i>
14-15	Observer identification . .	01=Cauley-Meadow 02=Christianson-Hastrup 03=Hastrup-Bryer 04=Cauley-Javoronok 05=Marcy-Hastrup 06=Cauley-Bryer 07=Cauley-Hastrup 08=Travis-Gilbert 09=Christianson-Fabian 10=Meadow-Hastrup 11=Gough-Meadow 12=Bryer-Fulton 13=Fabian-Gough 14=Gandy-Fulton 15=Belsky-Cauley 16=Cauley-Fabian 17=Fabian-Hastrup 18=Gilbert-Cauley 19=Christianson-Javoronok 20=Christianson-Rothenberg 21=Gough-Marcy 22=Marcy-Javoronok 23=Gough-Bryer 24=Gough-Christianson 25=Marcy-Belsky 26=Bryer-Rothenberg 27=Fabian-Burns 28=Gilbert-Hastrup 29=Christianson-Gilbert 30=Cauley-Marcy 31=Cauley-Christianson

List of Program Recorded by This Instrument

<i>Column</i>	<i>Variable</i>	<i>Code</i>
10-12	Serial number of program (1967)	004=Felony Squad 006=Off to See the Wizard 007=Ironsides 008=The Virginian 010=Daktari 011=Journey to the Center of the Earth 014=Star Trek 015=Man From U.N.C.L.E. 016=Voyage to the Bottom of the Sea 017=Hondo 018=Custer 020=Daniel Boone 021=Maya 022=Lost in Space 023=The Invaders 024=Bonanza 030=Gunsmoke 033=Super 6-Matzonuts 034=Super 6-Man From TRASH

*Column**Variable**Code*

046=Gentle Ben
 037=Magilla Gorilla I
 038=Casper
 039=Casper
 040=Casper
 042=Smother's Brothers
 043=Super President
 044=Super President
 045=Super President
 049=Fantastic 4
 050=Fantastic 4
 054=Spiderman I
 055=Second Time Around
 056=Tarzan
 057=NYPD
 059=Cimarron Strip
 060=Dragnet
 063=Garrison's Gorillas
 064=Walt Disney's World of, etc.
 065=Wild, Wild West
 069=Trouble with Harry
 071=Iron Horse
 074=Shazzan!
 075=Frankenstein, Jr.
 076=Frankenstein, Jr.
 077=Frankenstein, Jr.
 078=Flintstones
 079=Space Ghost I
 080=Herculoids
 081=Herculoids
 082=Samson and Goliath I
 083=Danny Thomas
 084=The FBI
 085=The Beagles II
 087=Get Smart
 088=Rat Patrol
 089=Guns of Will Sonnet
 090=Whatever Happened to Baby Jane
 091=Magilla Gorilla II
 092=Magilla Gorilla III
 093=Spiderman II
 094=Samson and Goliath II
 095=Space Ghost II
 096=Space Ghost III

Serial number of program (1968) 103=Ugliest Girl in Town
 104=Outcasts
 107=The Mod Squad
 108=NYPD
 109=The Avengers
 111=Lancer
 112=Ironside
 113=The FBI
 114=Cat Ballou
 118=Spiderman II
 119=Spiderman I
 121=Gunsmoke
 122=Hawaii 5-0
 123=A Man Could Get Killed

*Column**Variable**Code*

124=Daktari
 127=Land of the Giants
 134=Wild, Wild West
 138=Bonanza
 140=Doris Day Show
 145=Get Smart
 148=Lassie
 150=The Name of the Game
 151=Felony Squad
 155=Go-Go-Gophers Pt. I
 156=Go-Go-Gophers Pt. II
 157=Go-Go-Gophers Pt. III
 158=Underdog
 159=Wacky Races, Pt. I
 160=Wacky Races, Pt. II
 162=The Rare Breed
 163=Batman/Superman II
 [9 Lives of Batman]
 164=Batman/Superman II
 [Can a Luthor Change His Spots]
 165=Batman/Superman III
 [Superham Forget Me Not Superdog]
 166=Batman/Superman IV
 [In and Out Again Penguin]
 167=High Chaparral
 168=Fantastic Voyage
 169=Super Six I [Thunder-8-Ball]
 170=Super Six II [Ruin & Board]
 171=Super Six II [Nurse Capers]
 172=Herculoids I
 [Tiny World of Terror]
 173=Herculoids II
 [Invasion of the Electrode Men]
 174=Daniel Boone
 175=Guns of Will Sonnett
 176=Khartoum
 177=Fantastic Four
 178=Topcat
 180=The Virginian
 182=Banana Splits - "The Wizard
 Ramizer"
 183=Banana Splits - "Danger Island"
 184=Banana Splits - "The Plot of
 the Puppetmaster"

Table 1. - Programs analyzed, 1967

	Total		ABC		CBS		NBC	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
All programs (Percent of total)	96 (100.0)	100.0	35 (36.5)	100.0	32 (33.3)	100.0	29 (30.2)	100.0
Program format:								
Cartoons (Percent of total)	32 (100.0)	33.3	13 (40.6)	37.1	10 (31.3)	31.3	9 (28.1)	31.0
TV plays (Percent of total)	58 (100.0)	60.4	20 (34.5)	57.1	20 (34.5)	62.5	18 (31.0)	62.1
Feature films (Percent of total)	6 (100.0)	6.3	2 (33.3)	5.7	2 (33.3)	6.3	2 (33.3)	6.9
Program style:								
Crime (Percent of total)	10 (100.0)	10.4	6 (60.0)	17.1	0 (0.0)	0.0	4 (40.0)	13.8
Western (Percent of total)	9 (100.0)	9.4	4 (44.4)	11.4	3 (33.3)	9.3	2 (22.2)	6.9
Action-adventure (Percent of total)	45 (100.0)	46.9	15 (33.3)	42.9	15 (33.3)	46.9	15 (33.3)	51.7
Other (Percent of total)	32 (100.0)	33.3	10 (31.3)	28.6	14 (43.8)	43.8	8 (25.0)	27.6
Program tone:								
Comedy (Percent of total)	44 (100.0)	45.8	13 (29.5)	37.1	16 (36.4)	50.0	15 (34.1)	51.7
Other (Percent of total)	52 (100.0)	54.2	22 (42.3)	62.9	16 (30.8)	50.0	14 (26.9)	48.3

Table 2. —Programs analyzed, 1968

	Total		ABC		CBS		NBC	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
All programs (Percent of total)	87 (100.0)	100.0	22 (25.3)	100.0	35 (40.2)	100.0	30 (34.5)	100.0
Program format:								
Cartoons (Percent of total)	25 (100.0)	28.7	4 (16.0)	18.2	13 (52.0)	37.1	8 (32.0)	26.7
TV plays (Percent of total)	55 (100.0)	63.2	16 (29.1)	72.7	20 (36.4)	57.1	19 (34.5)	63.3
Feature films (Percent of total)	7 (100.0)	8.1	2 (28.6)	9.1	2 (28.6)	5.8	3 (42.8)	10.0
Program style:								
Crime (Percent of total)	8 (100.0)	9.2	4 (50.0)	18.2	1 (12.5)	2.9	3 (37.5)	10.0
Western (Percent of total)	11 (100.0)	12.6	4 (36.4)	18.2	3 (27.2)	8.6	4 (36.4)	13.3
Action-adventure (Percent of total)	35 (100.0)	40.2	8 (22.9)	36.4	14 (40.0)	40.0	13 (37.1)	43.4
Other (Percent of total)	33 (100.0)	38.0	6 (18.2)	27.2	17 (51.5)	48.5	10 (30.3)	33.3
Program tone:								
Comedy (Percent of total)	42 (100.0)	48.3	6 (14.3)	27.2	21 (50.0)	60.0	15 (35.7)	50.0
Other (Percent of total)	45 (100.0)	51.7	16 (35.6)	72.8	14 (31.1)	40.0	15 (33.3)	50.0

Table 3.—Programs analyzed, 1967 and 1968 totals

	Total	ABC		CBS		NBC	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N
All programs (Percent of total)	183 (100.0)	100.0	57 (31.1)	100.0	67 (36.6)	100.0	59 (32.3)
Program format:							
Cartoons (Percent of total)	57 (100.0)	31.1	17 (29.8)	29.8	23 (40.4)	34.3	17 (29.8)
TV plays (Percent of total)	113 (100.0)	61.7	36 (31.9)	63.2	40 (35.4)	59.7	37 (32.7)
Feature films (Percent of total)	13 (100.0)	7.2	4 (30.8)	7.0	4 (30.8)	6.0	5 (38.4)
Program style:							
Crime (Percent of total)	18 (100.0)	9.8	10 (55.6)	17.5	1 (5.6)	1.5	7 (38.8)
Western (Percent of total)	20 (100.0)	10.9	8 (40.0)	14.0	6 (30.0)	9.0	6 (30.0)
Action-adventure (Percent of total)	80 (100.0)	43.7	23 (28.8)	40.4	29 (36.2)	43.3	28 (35.0)
Other (Percent of total)	65 (100.0)	35.5	16 (24.6)	28.1	31 (47.7)	46.2	18 (27.7)
Program tone:							
Comedy (Percent of total)	86 (100.0)	47.0	19 (22.1)	33.3	37 (43.0)	55.2	30 (34.9)
Other (Percent of total)	97 (100.0)	53.0	38 (39.2)	66.7	30 (30.9)	44.8	29 (29.9)

Table 4.—Program hours analyzed, 1967

	Total		ABC		CBS		NBC	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
All hours (Percent of total)	64.0 (100.0)	100.0	23.0 (35.9)	100.0	20.5 (32.0)	100.0	20.5 (32.0)	100.0
Program format:								
Cartoons (Percent of total)	7.0 (100.0)	10.9	3.0 (42.9)	13.0	2.0 (28.5)	9.8	2.0 (28.5)	9.8
TV plays (Percent of total)	44.0 (100.0)	68.8	15.0 (34.0)	65.2	14.5 (33.0)	70.7	14.5 (33.0)	70.7
Feature films (Percent of total)	13.0 (100.0)	20.3	5.0 (38.5)	21.7	4.0 (30.8)	19.5	4.0 (30.8)	19.5
Program style:								
Crime (Percent of total)	9.0 (100.0)	14.1	5.3 (58.9)	23.0	0.0 (0.0)	0.0	3.7 (41.1)	18.0
Western (Percent of total)	9.5 (100.0)	14.8	3.5 (36.8)	15.2	3.5 (36.8)	17.1	2.5 (26.3)	12.2
Action/adventure (Percent of total)	27.3 (100.0)	42.7	10.5 (38.5)	45.7	7.0 (25.6)	34.1	9.8 (35.9)	47.8
Other (Percent of total)	18.2 (100.0)	28.4	3.7 (20.3)	16.1	10.0 (54.9)	48.8	4.5 (24.7)	22.0
Program tone:								
Comedy (Percent of total)	24.8 (100.0)	38.8	6.0 (24.2)	26.1	8.0 (32.3)	39.0	10.8 (43.5)	52.7
Other (Percent of total)	39.2 (100.0)	61.2	17.0 (43.4)	73.9	12.5 (31.9)	61.0	9.7 (24.7)	47.3

Table 5. - Program hours analyzed, 1968

	Total		ABC		CBS		NBC	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
All hours (Percent of total)	58.5 (100.0)	100.0	17.5 (29.9)	100.0	20.0 (34.2)	100.0	21.0 (35.9)	100.0
Program format:								
Cartoons (Percent of total)	6.9 (100.0)	11.8	1.5 (21.7)	8.6	3.0 (43.5)	15.0	2.4 (34.8)	11.4
TV plays (Percent of total)	36.6 (100.0)	62.6	12.0 (32.8)	68.6	13.0 (35.5)	65.0	11.6 (31.7)	55.3
Feature films (Percent of total)	15.0 (100.0)	25.6	4.0 (26.7)	22.8	4.0 (26.7)	20.0	7.0 (46.6)	33.3
Program style:								
Crime (Percent of total)	6.5 (100.0)	11.1	3.5 (53.8)	20.0	1.0 (15.4)	5.0	2.0 (30.8)	9.5
Western (Percent of total)	13.3 (100.0)	22.7	4.5 (33.8)	25.7	3.0 (22.6)	15.0	5.8 (43.6)	27.6
Action-adventure (Percent of total)	19.4 (100.0)	33.2	4.5 (23.2)	25.7	5.0 (25.8)	25.0	9.9 (51.0)	47.2
Other (Percent of total)	19.3 (100.0)	33.0	5.0 (25.9)	28.6	11.0 (57.0)	55.0	3.3 (17.1)	15.7
Program tone:								
Comedy (Percent of total)	20.2 (100.0)	34.5	6.0 (29.7)	34.3	7.9 (39.1)	39.5	6.3 (31.2)	30.0
Other (Percent of total)	38.3 (100.0)	65.5	11.5 (30.0)	65.7	12.1 (31.6)	60.5	14.7 (38.4)	70.0

Table 6.—Program hours analyzed, 1967 and 1968 totals

	Total		ABC		CBS		NBC	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
All hours (Percent of total)	122.5 (100.0)	100.0	40.5 (33.1)	100.0	40.5 (33.1)	100.0	41.5 (33.8)	100.0
Program format:								
Cartoons (Percent of total)	13.9 (100.0)	11.3	4.5 (32.4)	11.1	5.0 (36.0)	12.3	4.4 (31.6)	10.6
TV plays (Percent of total)	80.6 (100.0)	65.8	27.0 (33.5)	66.7	27.5 (34.1)	67.9	26.1 (32.4)	62.9
Feature films (Percent of total)	28.0 (100.0)	22.9	9.0 (32.1)	22.2	8.0 (28.6)	19.8	11.0 (39.3)	26.5
Program style:								
Crime (Percent of total)	15.5 (100.0)	12.7	8.8 (56.8)	21.7	1.0 (6.5)	2.5	5.7 (36.7)	13.7
Western (Percent of total)	22.8 (100.0)	18.6	8.0 (35.1)	19.8	6.5 (28.5)	16.0	8.3 (36.4)	20.0
Action/adventure (Percent of total)	46.7 (100.0)	38.1	15.0 (32.1)	37.0	12.0 (25.7)	29.6	19.7 (42.2)	47.5
Other (Percent of total)	37.5 (100.0)	30.6	8.7 (23.2)	21.5	21.0 (56.0)	51.9	7.8 (20.8)	18.8
Program tone:								
Comedy (Percent of total)	45.0 (100.0)	36.7	12.0 (26.7)	29.6	15.9 (35.3)	39.3	17.1 (38.0)	41.2
Other (Percent of total)	77.5 (100.0)	63.3	28.5 (36.8)	70.4	24.6 (31.7)	60.7	24.4 (31.5)	58.8

Table 7.—Programs containing violence, 1967, 1968, and totals

	Total		ABC		CBS		NBC	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
All programs, 1967 (Percent of total)	96 (100.0)	100.0	35 (36.5)	100.0	32 (33.3)	100.0	29 (30.2)	100.0
Incidence of violence, 1967:								
No violence (Percent of total)	18 (100.0)	18.8	4 (22.2)	11.4	11 (61.1)	34.4	3 (16.7)	10.3
Programs containing violence (Percent of total)	78 (100.0)	81.3	31 (39.7)	88.6	21 (26.9)	65.6	26 (33.3)	89.7
All programs, 1968 (Percent of total)	87 (100.0)	100.0	22 (25.3)	100.0	35 (40.2)	100.0	30 (34.5)	100.0
Incidence of violence, 1968:								
No violence (Percent of total)	16 (100.0)	18.4	2 (12.5)	9.1	8 (50.0)	22.9	6 (37.5)	20.0
Programs containing violence (Percent of total)	71 (100.0)	81.6	20 (28.2)	90.9	27 (38.0)	77.1	24 (33.8)	80.0
All programs, 1967 and 1968 totals (Percent of total)	183 (100.0)	100.0	57 (31.1)	100.0	67 (36.6)	100.0	59 (32.3)	100.0
Incidence of violence 1967 and 1968:								
No violence (Percent of total)	34 (100.0)	18.6	6 (17.6)	10.5	19 (55.9)	28.4	9 (26.5)	15.3
Programs containing violence (Percent of total)	149 (100.0)	81.4	51 (34.2)	89.5	48 (32.2)	71.6	50 (33.6)	84.7

Table 8. — Program hours containing violence, 1967, 1968, and totals

	Total		ABC		CBS		NBC	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
All hours, 1967 (Percent of total)	64.0 (100.0)	100.0	23.0 (35.9)	100.0	20.5 (32.0)	100.0	20.5 (32.0)	100.0
Incidence of violence, 1967:								
No violence (Percent of total)	10.5 (100.0)	16.4 (19.0)	2.0 (19.0)	8.7	5.8 (55.2)	28.3	2.7 (25.7)	13.2
Program hours containing violence (Percent of total)	53.5 (100.0)	83.6 (39.3)	21.0 (39.3)	91.3	14.7 (27.5)	71.7	17.8 (33.2)	86.8
All hours, 1968 (Percent of total)	58.5 (100.0)	100.0	17.5 (29.9)	100.0	20.0 (34.2)	100.0	21.0 (35.9)	100.0
Incidence of violence, 1968:								
No violence (Percent of total)	7.6 (100.0)	13.0 (13.2)	1.0 (13.2)	5.7	4.0 (52.6)	20.0	2.6 (34.2)	12.4
Program hours containing violence (Percent of total)	50.9 (100.0)	87.0 (32.4)	16.5 (32.4)	94.3	16.0 (31.4)	80.0	18.4 (36.2)	87.6
All hours, 1967, 1968 totals (Percent of total)	122.5 (100.0)	100.0	40.5 (33.1)	100.0	40.5 (33.1)	100.0	41.5 (33.8)	100.0
Incidence of violence, 1967, 1968 totals:								
No violence (Percent of total)	18.1 (100.0)	14.8 (16.6)	3.0 (16.6)	7.4	9.8 (54.1)	24.2	5.3 (29.3)	12.8
Program hours containing violence (Percent of total)	104.4 (100.0)	85.2 (35.9)	37.5 (35.9)	92.6	30.7 (29.4)	75.8	36.2 (34.7)	87.2

Table 9.—Numbers and rates of violent episodes, 1967, 1968, and totals

	Total	ABC	CBS	NBC
Number of violent episodes, 1967 (Percent of total)	478 (100.0)	195 (40.8)	111 (23.2)	172 (36.0)
Rates per program, 1967:				
Average for all programs	5.0	5.6	3.5	5.9
Average for programs containing violence	6.1	6.3	4.3	6.6
Rates per hour, 1967:				
Average for all hours	7.5	8.5	5.4	8.4
Average for hours containing violence	8.9	9.3	7.5	9.7
Number of violent episodes, 1968 (Percent of total)	394 (100.0)	111 (28.2)	127 (34.8)	146 (37.0)
Rates per program, 1968:				
Average for all programs	4.5	5.0	3.9	4.9
Average for programs containing violence	5.5	5.5	5.1	6.1
Rates per hour, 1968:				
Average for all hours	6.7	6.3	6.9	7.0
Average for hours containing violence	7.7	6.7	8.6	7.9
Number of violent episodes, 1967, 1968 totals (Percent of total)	872 (100.0)	306 (35.1)	248 (28.4)	318 (36.5)
Rates per program, 1967, 1968 totals:				
Average for all programs	4.8	5.4	3.7	5.4
Average for programs containing violence	5.9	6.0	5.2	6.4
Rates per hour, 1967 and 1968 totals:				
Average for all hours	7.1	7.6	6.1	7.7
Average for hours containing violence	8.4	8.2	8.1	8.8

Table 10.—All violence, violence significant to the plot, and rate of violent episodes, 1967, 1968, and totals

	All net programs			ABC programs			CBS programs			NBC programs		
	1967	1968	Both	1967	1968	Both	1967	1968	Both	1967	1968	Both
All programs (N)	96	87	183	35	22	57	32	35	67	29	30	59
All hours (N)	64.0	58.5	122.5	23.0	17.5	40.5	20.5	20.0	40.5	20.5	21.0	41.5
All violence:												
Percent of programs containing violence	81.2	81.6	81.4	88.6	90.9	89.5	65.6	77.1	71.6	89.0	80.0	84.7
Percent of hours containing violence	83.6	87.0	85.2	91.3	94.4	92.6	71.7	80.0	75.8	86.8	87.6	87.2
Violence significant to the plot:												
Percent of all programs	65.6	56.3	61.2	74.3	63.6	70.2	50.0	48.6	49.2	72.4	60.0	66.1
Percent of programs containing violence	80.8	69.0	75.2	83.9	70.0	78.4	76.2	63.0	68.7	80.1	75.0	78.0
Percent of all program hours	67.9	61.4	64.7	80.9	63.9	73.1	44.9	40.0	42.5	75.5	79.5	77.5
Percent of program hours containing violence	81.2	70.1	75.9	88.6	66.7	78.9	62.6	50.0	56.0	87.2	90.8	88.9
Network share of violence:												
Network share of all programs (Percent)				36.5	25.3	31.1	33.3	40.2	36.6	30.2	34.5	32.2

Table 10.—All violence, violence significant to the plot, and rate of violent episodes, 1967, 1968, and totals (continued)

	All net programs			ABC programs			CBS programs			NBC programs		
	1967	1968	Both	1967	1968	Both	1967	1968	Both	1967	1968	Both
Network share of programs containing violence (Percent)	39.7	28.2	34.4	26.9	38.0	32.2	33.3	33.8	33.5			
Network share of all hours (Percent)	35.9	29.9	33.1	32.0	34.3	33.1	32.0	35.9	33.8			
Network share of hours containing violence (Percent)	39.3	32.4	35.9	27.5	31.4	29.4	33.2	36.1	34.7			
Violent episodes:												
Number of violent episodes (N)	478	394	873	195	111	306	111	137	248	172	146	318
Network share of all violent episodes (Percent)	40.7	28.2	35.0	23.2	34.8	28.4	36.0	37.0	36.5			
Average number of violent episodes per program	5.0	4.5	4.8	5.6	5.0	5.4	3.5	3.9	3.7	5.9	4.9	5.4
Average number of violent episodes per hour	7.5	6.7	7.1	8.5	6.3	7.6	5.4	6.9	6.1	8.4	7.0	7.7

Table 11:—Violence by all programs and selected program types; all networks

	All programs		Cartoons		Crime, western, action—adventure		Comedy		Both	
	1967	1968	1967	1968	1967	1968	1967	1968		
Programs analyzed (N)	96	87	183	Both	57	118	86	Both	86	
Programs containing violence (N)	78	71	149	30	24	54	53	29	57	
Percent containing violence	81.2	81.6	81.1	93.7	96.0	94.7	95.3	98.1	96.6	66.3
Program hours analyzed (N)	640	58.5	122.5	7.0	6.9	13.9	47.6	39.1	86.8	45.0
Hours containing violence (N)	53.5	50.9	104.4	6.6	6.4	13.0	44.8	38.7	83.5	26.4
Percent containing violence	83.6	87.0	85.2	94.3	92.8	93.5	94.1	98.7	96.2	58.7
Number of violent episodes (N)	479	394	873	151	162	313	419	341	760	256
Average per program	5.0	4.5	4.8	4.7	6.5	5.5	6.5	6.3	6.4	3.0
Average per hour	7.5	6.7	7.1	21.6	23.5	22.5	8.8	8.7	8.7	5.7
Percentage share of program type out of all programs				33.3	28.7	31.1	66.7	62.1	64.5	47.0
Percentage share of program type containing violence out of all programs containing violence				38.5	33.8	36.2	78.2	74.6	76.5	38.3
Percentage share of violent episodes in each program type out of all violent episodes				31.5	41.1	35.8	87.5	86.5	87.1	29.3

Table 12:—Violence by all programs and selected program types, ABC

	All programs		Cartoons		Crime, western, action-adventure		Comedy		Both
	1967	1968	1967	1968	1967	1968	1967	1968	
Programs analyzed (N)	35	22	13	4	25	16	13	6	19
Programs containing violence (N)	31	20	13	4	25	16	10	6	16
Percent containing violence	88.5	90.9	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	76.9	100.0	84.2
Program hours analyzed (N)	23.0	17.5	3.0	1.5	18.6	12.5	6.0	6.0	12.0
Hours containing violence (N)	21.0	16.5	3.0	1.5	18.6	12.5	3.5	6.0	9.5
Percent containing violence	91.2	94.4	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	58.3	100.0	79.2
Number of violent episodes (N)	195	111	70	26	170	99	452	77	
Average per program	5.6	5.0	5.4	6.5	6.8	6.2	3.5	5.3	4.1
Average per hour	8.5	6.3	23.3	17.3	9.1	7.9	7.5	5.3	6.4
Percentage share of program type out of all programs			37.1	18.2	71.4	72.7	37.1	27.3	33.3
Percentage share of program type containing violence out of all programs containing violence			41.9	12.9	80.6	51.6	32.3	19.4	31.4
Percentage share of violent episodes in each program type out of all violent episodes			35.9	23.4	87.2	89.2	23.1	28.8	25.2

Table 13—Violence by all programs and selected program types, CBS

	All programs		Cartoons		Crime, western, Action-adventure		Comedy		Both
	1967	1968	1967	1968	1967	1968	1967	1968	
Programs analyzed (N)	32	35	67	13	18	18	16	21	37
Programs containing violence (N)	21	27	47	13	17	17	7	13	20
Percent containing violence	65.6	77.1	70.1	100.0	94.4	94.4	43.8	61.9	54.1
Program hours analyzed (N)	20.5	20.0	40.5	3.0	11.0	9.0	8.0	7.9	15.9
Hours containing violence (N)	14.7	16.0	30.7	3.0	10.8	8.5	3.0	3.9	6.9
Percent containing violence	71.7	80.0	75.8	100.0	97.7	94.4	37.5	49.4	43.4
Number of violent episodes (N)	111	137	248	77	99	107	16	61	77
Average per program	3.5	3.9	3.7	5.9	5.5	5.9	1.0	2.9	2.1
Average per hour	5.4	6.9	6.1	25.7	9.0	11.9	2.0	7.7	4.8
Percentage share of program type out of all programs				31.3	56.3	51.4	50.0	60.0	55.2
Percentage share of program type containing violence out of all programs containing violence				42.9	81.0	63.0	33.3	48.1	42.6
Percentage share of violent episodes in each program type out of all violent episodes				39.6	89.2	78.1	14.4	44.5	31.0

Table 14—Violence by all programs and selected program types, NBC

	All programs		Cartoons		Crime, western, action-adventure		Comedy		Both	
	1967	1968	1967	1968	1967	1968	1967	1968		
Programs analyzed (N)	29	30	Both	Both	Both	Both	Both	Both	Both	
Programs containing violence (N)	26	24	59	8	7	15	19	20	39	21
Percent containing violence	86.2	80.0	84.7	88.9	87.5	88.2	90.5	100.0	95.1	70.0
Program hours analyzed (N)	20.5	21.0	41.5	2.0	2.4	4.4	18.0	17.7	35.7	17.1
Hours containing violence (N)	17.8	18.4	34.7	1.8	1.9	3.7	15.5	17.7	33.2	10.0
Percent containing violence ...	86.8	87.6	87.2	90.0	79.2	84.1	86.1	100.0	93.0	58.5
Number of violent episodes (N) ..	173	146	319	37	59	96	150	135	285	102
Average per program	6.0	4.9	5.4	4.1	7.4	5.6	7.1	6.8	7.0	3.4
Average per hour	8.4	7.0	7.7	18.5	24.6	21.8	8.3	7.6	8.0	6.0
Percentage share of program type out of all programs			28.8	31.0	26.7	28.8	72.4	66.7	69.5	50.8
Percentage share of program type containing violence out of all programs containing violence			30.0	30.8	29.2	30.0	73.1	83.3	78.0	42.0
Percentage share of violent episodes in each program type out of all violent episodes			30.1	21.4	40.4	30.1	86.7	92.5	89.3	32.0

Table 15—Selected aspects of violent episodes, 1967, 1968, and totals

	1967	1968	Both years
Total number of violent episodes	478	394	872
Agents of violence:	Percent	Percent	Percent
Human (Whether live or cartoon character) .	75.7	77.7	76.6
"Humanized" (speaking) animal character ..	4.0	2.0	3.1
Animal character (live or cartoon)	3.8	5.3	4.5
Other creature or "thing"	6.7	4.8	5.9
Act of nature	0.0	0.0	0.0
Accident	5.0	7.9	6.3
Uncertain, other	4.8	2.3	3.7
Means of violence:			
Weapon is used	58.8	47.0	53.4
No weapon is used or uncertain	41.2	53.0	46.6
Seriousness of context:			
Violence occurs in serious or sinister context	87.0	73.9	81.1
Violence occurs in comic or sham context ..	13.0	26.1	18.9
Witnesses to violence:			
None; no evidence of any witnesses to violence	50.4	44.7	47.8
There are witnesses but they are passive; they do not or cannot react to violence ..	33.5	37.3	35.2
Witnesses attempt to prevent violence	7.7	7.4	7.6
Witnesses assist or encourage violence	8.4	10.7	9.4
Group relations among violent opponents:			
Members of the same family	2.5	2.0	2.3
Members of the same national or ethnic group	28.0	43.9	35.2
Members of different national or ethnic groups	29.9	26.1	28.2
Uncertain, other	39.5	27.9	34.3

Table 16—Casualties in violent episodes, 1967, 1968, and totals

	1967		1968		Both years	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
All violent episodes	478	100.0	394	100.0	872	100.0
Violent episodes in which—						
Nobody appears to be physically injured or killed	250	52.3	202	51.3	454	51.8
Somebody appears to be physically injured or killed	228	47.7	192	48.7	420	48.2
Total number of casualties in all violent episodes was more than*	433		357		790	
Average number of casualties per violent episodes in which there were casualties was more than*	1.9		1.9		1.9	
Percent of violent episodes which the casualty count was—						
1		74.1		73.0		73.6
2		13.3		13.0		13.2
3		4.3		4.5		4.4
4		0.0		2.5		1.5
5		1.2		0.0		0.7
6		1.6		0.0		0.9
7		0.0		0.0		0.0
8 or more, including mass casualties		4.7		7.0		5.7

*For episodes in which there were 8 or more casualties, including mass casualties, only 8 were recorded.

Table 17—Major characters analyzed in 1967 programs

	All characters			Humans			Non-humans*		
	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female
Cartoon	63	58	3	39	37	2	24	21	1
TV drama	158	124	34	147	117	30	11	7	4
Feature film	19	9	10	18	9	9	1	0	1
Crime	32	22	10	27	18	9	5	4	1
Western	24	24	0	24	24	0	0	0	0
Action/adventure	108	94	12	88	78	10	20	16	2
Other	76	51	25	65	43	22	11	8	3
Comedy	108	80	26	88	65	23	20	15	3
Other	132	111	21	116	98	18	16	13	3
Total	240	191	47	204	163	41	36	28	6

*Including "humanized" (speaking) animals, other animals, and other nonhuman characters (such as a robot).

Table 18—Major characters analyzed in 1968 programs

	All characters			Humans			Non-humans*		
	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female
Cartoon	43	36	5	35	30	5	8	6	0
TV drama	145	113	32	140	109	31	5	4	1
Feature film	27	16	11	27	16	11	0	0	0
Crime	20	18	2	20	18	2	0	0	0
Western	38	32	6	38	32	6	0	0	0
Action/adventure	77	63	13	71	58	13	6	5	0
Other	80	52	27	73	47	26	7	5	1
Total	215	165	48	202	155	47	13	10	1

*Including "humanized" (speaking) animals, other animals, and other nonhuman characters (such as a robot).

Table 19—Major characters analyzed in 1967 and 1968 programs

	All characters			Humans			Non-humans*		
	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female
Catcoon	106	94	8	74	67	7	32	27	1
TV drama	303	237	66	287	226	61	16	11	5
Feature film	46	25	21	45	25	20	1	0	1
Crime	52	40	12	47	36	11	5	4	1
Western	62	56	6	62	56	6	0	0	0
Action/adventure	185	157	25	159	136	23	26	21	2
Other	156	103	52	138	90	48	18	13	4
Comedy	189	137	49	159	114	45	30	23	4
Other	266	219	46	247	204	43	19	15	3
Total	455	356	95	406	318	88	49	38	7

*Including "humanized" (speaking) animals, other animals, and other nonhuman characters (such as a robot).

Table 20.—"Violents," "killer," and "killed," 1967, 1968, and selected characteristics for both years

Age	Total		All "violents"		Those who commit violence against others "Violent killers" only		Those who die violent death	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
All characters-1967	240	52.7	134	55.6	30	55.6	17	68.0
All characters-1968	215	47.3	107	44.4	24	44.4	8	32.0
Both years	455	100.0	241	100.0	54	100.0	25	100.0
								of total
								7.1
								3.7
								5.5

(Continued)

*Selected characteristics for
both 1967 and 1968*

	Total		Those who commit violence against others "Violent killers" only				Those who die violent death					
	N	Percent	N	Percent	Percent of total	Percent of total	N	Percent	Percent of total			
Sex:												
Males	358	78.7	206	85.5	57.5	48	88.9	13.4	23.3	22	88.0	6.1
Females	93	20.4	31	12.9	33.3	6	11.1	6.5	17.6	3	12.0	3.2
Other uncertain	4	.9	4	1.7		0	.0	.0		0	.0	.0
	455		241	100.0		54	100.0		25	100.0		
Age:												
preschool and primary	9	2.0	3	1.3	33.3	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0
secondary school age	20	4.4	9	3.7	45.0	1	1.8	5.0	11.1	0	.0	.0
Young adult	145	31.9	70	29.0	48.3	21	38.9	14.5	30.0	5	20.0	3.4
Middle age	206	45.3	116	48.1	56.3	28	51.9	13.5	24.1	15	60.0	7.3
Old age	26	5.7	11	4.6	42.3	1	1.8	3.8	9.1	2	8.0	7.7
Ageless, intermediate	47	10.7	32	12.3	65.3	3	5.6	6.4	9.4	3	12.0	6.4
	455	100.0	241	100.0		54	100.0			25	100.0	
Marital status:												
Unmarried, unknown	325	71.4	189	78.4	58.1	44	81.5	13.5	23.3	22	88.0	6.7
Married, marries	130	28.6	52	21.6	40.0	10	18.5	7.7	19.2	3	12.0	2.3
	455	100.0	241	100.0		54	100.0			25	100.0	

Mass Media and Violence

(Continued)

	Total		All "violents"		Those who commit violence against others "Violent killers" only		Those who die violent death	
	N	Percent	N	Percent of total	N	Percent of total	N	Percent of total
<i>Outcome for character:</i>								
Happy	266	58.5	126	52.3	25	46.3	0	0.0
Unhappy	89	19.6	61	25.3	16	29.6	25	100.0
Uncertain	100	22.0	54	22.4	13	24.1	0	.0
other	455	100.0	241	100.0	54	100.0	25	100.0
<i>Fatal victimization</i>								
Do not die	430	94.5	221	91.7	46	85.2		20.8
Die violent death	25	5.5	20	8.3	8	14.8		40.0
	455	100.0	241	100.0	54	100.0		

Table 21—Time of action as a story element in violent and nonviolent TV drama: 1967, 1968, and totals

Story element and year	Occurrence of story element in—				percent of programs which—		Percent of violent programs out of all programs in which element occurs
	all programs	contain no violence	contain violence				
Time of action, 1967:	(N 96)	(N 18)	(N 78)				
Past	N 21 Percent 21.9	N 0 Percent 0.0	N 21 Percent 26.9				
Contemporary (1960's)	N 52 Percent 54.2	N 15 Percent 83.3	N 37 Percent 47.4				
Future	N 8 Percent 8.3	N 0 Percent 0.0	N 8 Percent 10.3				
Several, other	N 15 Percent 15.6	N 3 Percent 16.7	N 12 Percent 15.4				
Time of action, 1968:	(N 87)	(N 16)	(N 71)				
Past	N 19 Percent 13.8	N 1 Percent 6.3	N 18 Percent 25.4				
Contemporary (1960's)	N 59 Percent 67.8	N 14 Percent 87.5	N 45 Percent 63.4				
Future	N 5 Percent 5.7	N 0 Percent 0.0	N 5 Percent 7.0				
Several, other	N 4 Percent 4.6	N 1 Percent 6.3	N 3 Percent 4.2				
Time of action, 1967 and 1968 total	(N 183)	(N 34)	(N 149)				
Past	N 40 Percent 21.9	N 1 Percent 2.9	N 39 Percent 26.2				
Contemporary (1960's)	N 111 Percent 60.7	N 29 Percent 85.3	N 82 Percent 55.0				
Future	N 13 Percent 7.1	N 0 Percent 0.0	N 13 Percent 8.7				
Several, other	N 19 Percent 10.3	N 4 Percent 11.8	N 15 Percent 10.1				

Table 22—Place of action as a story element in violent and nonviolent TV drama: 1967, 1968, and totals

Story Element and year	All programs		Occurrence of story element in—		Percent of programs which—		Percent of violent programs out of all programs in which element occurs	
	N	Percent	Contain no violence	Percent	Contain violence	Percent	Percent	
Place of action, 1967:								
United States only	61	63.5	15	83.3	46	59.0	75.4	
Several indeterminate, or outside United States	35	36.5	3	16.7	32	40.8	91.4	
Urban setting	31	32.3	8	44.4	23	29.5	74.2	
Small town, rural	21	21.9	7	38.9	14	17.9	66.7	
Uninhabited, mobil, etc.	44	45.8	3	16.7	41	52.6	93.2	
Place of action, 1968:								
United States only	60	69.0	14	87.5	46	64.8	76.7	
Several indeterminate, or outside United States	27	31.0	2	12.5	25	35.2	92.6	
Urban setting	29	33.3	6	37.5	23	32.4	79.3	
Small town, rural	30	34.5	6	37.5	24	33.8	80.0	
Uninhabited, mobil, etc.	28	32.3	4	25.0	24	33.8	85.7	
Place of action, 1967 and 1968 total:								
United States only	121	66.1	29	85.3	92	61.7	76.0	
Several indeterminate, or outside United States	62	33.9	5	14.7	57	38.3	91.9	
Urban setting	60	32.8	14	41.2	46	30.9	76.7	
Small town, rural	51	27.9	13	38.2	38	25.5	74.5	
Uninhabited, mobil, etc.	72	39.3	7	20.6	65	43.6	90.3	

Table 23—Crime, science, and minority and foreign themes as significant story elements* in violent and nonviolent TV drama: 1967, 1968, and totals

Story element and year	All programs		Occurrence of story element in—		Percent of violent programs out of all programs in which element occurs
	N	Percent	Contain no violence	Contain violence	
1967	(N 96)	(N 18)	(N 78)		
Crime, corruption	31	32.3	2	29	93.6
Science, scientist	29	30.2	3	26	90.7
Minority, foreign	30	31.2	2	28	93.3
1968:	(N 87)	(N 16)	(N 71)		
Crime, corruption	39	44.8	1	38	97.4
Science, scientist	24	27.6	3	21	87.5
Minority, foreign	39	44.8	5	34	87.2
1967 and 1968:	(N 183)	(N 34)	(N 149)		
Crime, corruption	70	38.3	3	67	95.7
Science, scientist	53	28.0	6	47	88.7
Minority, foreign	69	37.7	7	62	89.9

*Significant element was defined as necessary for a 1-page plot description; i.e., of all programs containing violence in 1967, 37.2 percent featured crime, 33.3 percent featured science or scientists, and 35.9 percent featured minority of foreign groups or people as significant themes or aspects.

Table 24—Law and law enforcement as story elements in violent and nonviolent TV drama: 1967, 1968, and totals

Story element and year	All programs		Occurrence of story element in—				Percent of violent programs out of all programs in which element occurs
	N	Percent	Contain no violence	Percent	Contain violence	Percent	
1967:							
Due process of law (legal apprehension or trial) is indicated as a consequence of major act(s) of violence	18	18.7	0	0.0	18	23.1	100.0
Agent of law enforcement is American Negro	2	2.1	0	0.0	2	2.6	100.0
1968:							
Due process of law (legal apprehension or trial) is indicated as a consequence of major act(s) of violence	17	19.5	0	0.0	17	23.9	100.0
Agent of law enforcement is American Negro	4	4.6	0	0.0	4	5.6	100.0
1967 and 1968:							
Due process of law (legal apprehension or trial) is indicated as a consequence of major act(s) of violence	35	19.2	0	0.0	35	23.5	100.0
Agent of law enforcement is American Negro	6	3.3	0	0.0	6	4.0	100.0

Table 25.—Aspects of law enforcement in violent episodes

	1967	1968	Both years
Total number of violent episodes	478	394	872
Law enforcement agents or agencies play no role or no clearly identifiable role in connection with violent episodes	<i>Percent</i> 87.4	<i>Percent</i> 87.8	<i>Percent</i> 87.6
When they do play a role—			
It is nonviolent	40.0	27.1	34.3
They commit violence in course of duty	53.3	64.6	58.3
When they are involved in violence—			
They initiate violence	44.4	43.2	43.8
They respond to violence in violent manner	28.9	38.6	33.7
They respond in nonviolent manner	6.7	9.1	7.9
They become victims of violence	20.0	9.1	14.6
They employ only the level of violence necessary to accomplish their objectives	79.5	83.8	81.6
They commit violence that appears to go beyond that necessary to accomplish objective	5.1	16.2	10.5
Both, uncertain	15.4	.0	7.9
Their actions are portrayed as—justified	81.6	56.8	69.3
Unjustified	5.3	29.7	17.3
Both, uncertain	13.2	13.5	13.3

Table 26. — *Ethnicity in violent and nonviolent TV drama: 1967, 1968, and totals*

Story element and year	Occurrence of story element in—		percent of programs which—		Percent	Percent of violent programs out of all programs in which element occurs
	All programs	Contain no violence	Contain violence	Percent		
1967:	(N 96)	(N 18)	(N 78)			
Place of action partly or wholly outside United States	N 35	3	32	16.7	40.8	91.4
Minority groups, people, or foreign countries, people, play significant role	30	2	28	11.1	35.9	93.3
Agent of law enforcement is American Negro	2	0.0	2	2.1	2.6	100.0
1968:	(N 87)	(N 16)	(N 71)			
Place of action partly or wholly outside United States	N 17	1	16	6.3	22.5	94.1
Minority groups, people, or foreign countries, people, play significant role	39	5	34	44.8	47.9	87.2
Agent of law enforcement is American Negro	4	0	4	4.6	5.6	100.0
1967-1968 totals:	(N 183)	(N 34)	(N 149)			
Place of action partly or wholly outside United States	N 52	4	48	28.4	32.2	92.3
Minority groups, people, or foreign countries, people, play significant role	69	7	62	37.7	41.6	89.9
Agent of law enforcement is American Negro	6	0	6	3.3	4.0	100.0

Table 27. — Whites and non-whites among the "violents," "killers," and "killed"

	Totals		Whites		Nonwhites		Uncertain	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
All characters	455	100.0	351	100.0	30	100.0	74	100.0
Percent of total	(100.0)		(77.1)		(6.6)		(16.3)	
Those who commit violence:								
All "violents"	241	53.0	176	50.1	20	66.7	45	60.8
(Percent of total)	(100.0)		(73.0)		(8.3)		(18.7)	
"Killers" only	54	11.9	49	14.0	2	6.7	3	4.0
(Percent of total)	(100.0)		(90.7)		(3.7)		(5.6)	
(Percent of "violents")		(22.4)		(27.8)		(10.0)		(6.7)
Those who die violent death	25	5.5	18	5.1	2	6.7	5	6.7
(Percent of total)	(100.0)		(72.0)		(8.0)		(20.0)	

Table 28.—Frequencies of violent acts in 112 plays in which violence was significant to the plot

	1967	1968	Total
ABC	281	186	467
CBS	175	121	296
NBC	245	207	452
Total	701	514	1,215

Table 29.—Average number of violent acts per play

	1967	1968	Total
ABC	10.8	13.3	11.7
CBS	10.9	7.1	9.0
NBC	11.7	11.5	11.6
Total	11.1	10.5	10.8

*Table 30.—Average number of violent acts recomputed per full program**

	1967	1968	Total
ABC	14.1	14.3	14.2
CBS	15.9	12.1	14.1
NBC	14.4	14.8	14.6
Total	14.6	13.9	14.3

* "Full program" includes all plays on a multiplay program in a single unit.

Table 31. --Reliability Coefficients and Frequency Distributions of Violent Acts

Categories	Relia- bility*	Totals	ABC 1967	1968	CBS 1967	1968	NBC 1967	1968
Complexity of instruments	.68 I	494	122	87	47	44	105	89
No instruments		400	82	58	59	42	85	74
Simple instruments		321	77	41	69	35	55	44
Complex instruments		1,215	281	186	175	121	245	207
Total								
Seriousness	.83 N	249	42	74	22	38	43	30
Humorous aspect present		966	239	112	153	83	202	177
Serious violence		1,215	281	186	175	121	245	207
Total								
Distance source receiver	.73 N	875	222	139	79	81	187	167
Close proximity		287	54	36	93	37	37	30
Far, but within sight		53	5	11	3	3	21	10
Without sight		1,215	281	186	175	121	245	207
Total								
Beneficiary and source	.70 N	712	168	91	113	72	154	114
Identical		503	113	95	62	49	91	93
Not identical		1,215	281	186	175	121	245	207
Total								

(Continued)

Table 31.—Reliability Coefficients and Frequency Distribution of Violent Acts (Continued)

Categories	Relia- bility*	Totals	ABC 1967	1968	CBS 1967	1968	NBC 1967	1968
Immediate response	.75 <i>N</i>	711	174	97	93	84	150	113
No resistance		72	18	17	7	5	15	10
Nonviolent resistance		432	89	72	75	32	80	84
Violent resistance		1,215	281	186	175	121	245	207
Total								
Permanent con- sequences	.85 <i>I</i>	83	16	9	9	4	24	21
Not evident		935	219	146	130	97	192	151
No consequences								
Somewhat impaired or severely incapacitated		83	20	13	13	11	9	17
Dead or annihilated		114	26	18	23	9	20	18
Total		1,215	281	186	175	121	245	207
Amount of nonviolent interaction	.75 <i>I</i>	595	155	66	112	62	93	107
None		311	65	70	31	26	83	36
Minor		144	22	35	13	15	35	24
Medium		165	39	15	19	18	34	40
Major		1,215	281	186	175	121	245	207
Total								
Evaluative portrayal of Source	.89 <i>I</i>	515	129	80	75	49	94	88
Good		183	39	30	16	15	49	34
Neutral, in between		517	113	76	84	57	102	85
Bad		1,215	281	186	175	121	245	207
Total								

(Continued)

Table 31. —Reliability Coefficients and Frequency Distribution of Violent Acts (Continued)

Categories	Relia- bility*	Totals	ABC 1967	1968	CBS 1967	1968	NBC 1967	1968
Evaluative portrayal of receiver	.89 I	610	140	95	90	57	121	107
Good		187	37	37	13	15	52	33
Neutral, in between		418	104	54	72	49	72	67
Bad		1,215	281	186	175	121	245	207
Total								
Relation of source to law	.78 N	120	34	18	13	16	34	5
Law enforcement officer		94	13	29	14	10	13	15
Semi-law-enforcement officer		269	23	60	58	29	44	55
Criminal		732	211	79	90	66	154	132
No special relation		1,215	281	186	175	121	245	207
Total								
Relation of receiver to law	.78 N	92	24	19	13	12	18	6
Law enforcement officer		113	16	33	16	8	23	17
Semi-law-enforcement officer		209	21	47	51	28	27	35
Criminal		801	220	87	95	73	177	149
No special relation		1,215	281	186	175	121	245	207
Total								
Outcome for source	.79 I	401	94	71	65	36	63	72
Winner		122	29	10	15	15	30	23
Winner but		199	56	29	16	11	57	30
Neither, irrelevant		133	12	11	33	14	21	22
Loser but		380	90	65	46	45	74	60
Loser		1,215	281	186	175	121	245	207
Total								

(Continued)

Table 31.—Reliability Coefficients and Frequency Distribution of Violent Acts (Continued)

Categories	Reliability*	ABC			CBS			NBC		
		Totals	1967	1968	1967	1968	1967	1968	1967	1968
Outcome for receiver	.79 <i>I</i>	423	97	83	71	32	65	75		
Winner		157	38	19	15	20	44	21		
Winner but Neither, irrelevant		165	35	19	15	8	60	28		
Loser, but Loser		97	9	5	31	19	15	18		
Total		373	102	60	43	42	61	65		
		1,215	281	186	175	121	245	207		
Sexual aspect	1.00 <i>N</i>	1,168	273	176	175	121	227	196		
Not present		47	8	10	0	0	18	11		
Present		1,215	281	186	175	121	245	207		
Sex of source	.92 <i>N</i>	118	22	15	51	17	8	5		
Indeterminate		983	241	148	117	92	208	177		
Male(s)		86	15	18	3	7	23	20		
Female(s)		28	3	5	4	5	6	5		
Mixed group		1,215	281	186	175	121	245	207		
Sex of receiver	.92 <i>N</i>	81	16	9	43	8	5	0		
Indeterminate		993	238	149	115	97	209	185		
Male(s)		72	21	20	5	6	15	5		
Female(s)		69	6	8	12	10	16	17		
Mixed group		1,215	281	186	175	121	245	207		
Serial classification of source	.88 <i>N</i>	161	16	22	0	0	51	72		
Program no serial		402	102	50	66	63	72	49		
Regular part in serial		652	163	114	109	58	122	86		
Other part in serial		1,215	281	186	175	121	245	207		
Total										

(Continued)

Table 31. —Reliability Coefficients and Frequency Distribution of Violent Acts (Continued)

Categories	Relia- bility*	Totals	ABC 1967	1968	CBS 1967	1968	NBC 1967	1968
Serial classification of receiver	.88 <i>N</i>	161	16	22	0	0	51	72
Program no serial		476	115	68	84	70	82	57
Regular part in serial		578	150	96	91	51	112	78
Other part in serial		1,215	281	186	175	121	245	207
Total								
Group belongingness of source	.84 <i>N</i>	242	72	39	32	17	45	37
Isolated individual		258	51	25	35	36	79	32
Group leader		446	96	91	55	40	74	90
Group member		269	62	31	53	28	47	48
Group		1,215	281	186	175	121	245	207
Total								
Group belongingness of receiver	.84 <i>N</i>	228	66	33	30	16	43	40
Isolated individual		219	40	26	32	28	75	18
Group leader		487	112	90	70	44	74	97
Group member		281	63	37	43	33	53	52
Group		1,215	281	186	175	121	245	207
Total								

*Coefficient, and whether nominal (*N*) or interval (*I*). See description of reliability tests in section on methodology.

Table 32. — Associations between evaluative portrayals and outcome for sources and receivers of violent acts

	Good	In-between	Bad	
Sources (total of 1,215 acts):				
Winner	363	35	3	
Winner, but ...	77	16	29	
Neither	42	87	70	Kendall's
Loser, but	24	9	80	tau _c =+.72
Loser	9	36	335	
Receivers (total of 1,215 acts):				
Winner	394	28	1	
Winner, but ...	117	19	21	
Neither	48	74	43	Kendall's
Loser, but ...	29	12	56	tau _c =+.70
Loser	22	54	297	

Table 33: - Violence in Commercials*

	ALL 1967		Both		ABC 1968		Both		CBS 1968		Both		NBC 1968		Both	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
All commercials (N)	441	5.6	995	7.6	194	9.3	154	3.3	348	5.7	142	7.0	187	3.2	213	7.9
Violence in commercials (N)	45	31	76	18	18	2	2	20	13	13	9	9	16	16	16	25
Percent of total	10.2	5.6	7.6	9.3	9.3	1.3	1.3	5.7	7.0	12.7	9.4	8.6	7.5	7.5	7.5	7.9
Categories of commercials containing violence (in percents of all commercials containing violence):	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent
Breakfast cereals, chewing gum, foods	24.4	48.4	34.2	16.7	16.7	.0	.0	15.0	53.8	38.9	45.2	11.1	50.0	50.0	36.0	36.0
Automobiles	2.2	16.1	7.9	.0	.0	100.0	10.0	10.0	23.1	.0	9.7	11.1	.0	.0	4.0	4.0
Toys	4.4	9.7	6.6	5.6	5.6	.0	5.0	5.0	.0	5.6	3.2	.0	18.8	18.8	12.0	12.0
Tobacco	11.1	3.2	7.9	5.6	5.6	.0	5.0	5.0	7.7	16.7	12.9	11.1	.0	.0	4.0	4.0
Promotional announcements	46.7	19.4	35.5	61.1	61.1	.0	55.0	55.0	15.4	33.3	25.8	24.4	25.0	25.0	32.0	32.0
Others	11.1	3.2	7.9	11.1	11.1	.0	10.0	10.0	.0	5.6	3.2	22.2	6.2	6.2	12.0	12.0

*These are the results of an informal tally of commercial and public service announcements observed on the programs. No reliability tests were performed. Furthermore, the 1967 commercials attached to tapes and films used were not necessarily those transmitted during the initial airing of these programs, and commercials for five 1968 programs were omitted because of mechanical recording difficulties.