



University of Pennsylvania
ScholarlyCommons

Departmental Papers (ASC)

Annenberg School for Communication

1982

Determinants of Parental Guidance of Children's Television Viewing for a Special Subgroup: Mass Media Scholars

Carl R. Bybee

Danny Robinson

Joseph Turow

University of Pennsylvania, jturow@asc.upenn.edu

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

 Part of the [Broadcast and Video Studies Commons](#), and the [Mass Communication Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Bybee, C. R., Robinson, D., & Turow, J. (1982). Determinants of Parental Guidance of Children's Television Viewing for a Special Subgroup: Mass Media Scholars. *Journal of Broadcasting*, 26 (3), 697-710. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08838158209364038>

At the time of publication, author Joseph Turow was affiliated with Purdue University. Currently, he is a faculty member in the Annenberg School for Communication at the University of Pennsylvania.

This paper is posted at ScholarlyCommons. http://repository.upenn.edu/asc_papers/393

For more information, please contact libraryrepository@pobox.upenn.edu.

Determinants of Parental Guidance of Children's Television Viewing for a Special Subgroup: Mass Media Scholars

Abstract

This study examines the level and nature of parental guidance regarding television exercised by mass media scholars. It also focuses on the relationship of that guidance to beliefs the scholars hold about the effects of television, to characteristics of their scholarship, and to basic demographic information.

Disciplines

Broadcast and Video Studies | Communication | Mass Communication

Comments

At the time of publication, author Joseph Turow was affiliated with Purdue University. Currently, he is a faculty member in the Annenberg School for Communication at the University of Pennsylvania.

Determinants of Parental Guidance of Children's Television Viewing for a Special Subgroup: Mass Media Scholars

Carl Bybee, Danny Robinson and Joseph Turow

This study examines the level and nature of parental guidance regarding television exercised by mass media scholars. It also focuses on the relationship of that guidance to beliefs the scholars hold about the effects of television, to characteristics of their scholarship, and to basic demographic information.

Since the rise of commercial television in the United States during the early 1950s, a good deal of criticism and fear has been voiced regarding the medium's harmful influence on children. In recent years, industry officials and some regulators have tended to place increasing emphasis on parental responsibility in guiding their children's viewing, and researchers have begun to explore the benefits of such guidance. However, research exploring the actual incidence, nature and predictors of parental involvement in child viewing throughout society is lacking. If public policy is to turn from media regulation to encouraging active parental (or other) guidance, systematic questions must be raised regarding the nature of such guidance, the circumstances under which it is likely to occur and its ultimate effectiveness in shaping children's viewing behavior or mediating the impact of that viewing behavior. The first two issues are the concern of the present investigation which focuses on the parental activities of mass media scholars.

One might argue that individuals who would be among the least likely to need encouragement for involving themselves in their children's television activities would be mass media scholars—academics with an active interest in the mass media. Aside from being familiar with the literature on "antisocial" as well as "prosocial" effects of television, many of them participate in classroom and public discussions about the medium on a regular basis. It seems likely that this knowledge and concern would be translated into an active involvement with their children's viewing. If media scholars do tend to guide their children, the extent to which they do, and the manner in which they do, might suggest upper limits to possible modes of parental intervention in child viewing behavior. If those most knowledgeable about and interested in the mass media are not likely to guide their children's behavior, then one may ask how realistic it is to expect that parental mediation can influence the effects of television in the public at large. At the same time, mass media scholars' guidance activities are important to study because of the potential for this group to exert opinion leadership in the larger society on the television guidance issue. At the minimum, this subgroup provides an opportunity to initiate a comprehensive look at key guidance issues. Consequently, the present investigation examines the level and nature of parental guidance regarding television exercised by mass media scholars as well as the relationship of that guidance to beliefs the scholars hold about the effects of television, to characteristics of their scholarship, and to family demographic information. The findings suggest the existence of specific dimensions of guidance, carry with them implications for social policy, and suggest new avenues for research.

Background

Over the past several years, an increasing number of writers have emphasized that children's learning can be facilitated, channeled in certain directions, or counteracted through parental guidance of their child's viewing. There seems to be general agreement among researchers that orienting children toward prosocial programs as well as toward nontelevision activities will limit the potential harmfulness of the home tube.¹ In addition, several investigators have claimed that parental discussions with children about what they are watching can mitigate "antisocial" lessons of television shows and encourage "prosocial" learning.²

Despite the potential such research holds for increasing children's prosocial learning from television, little systematic research has been conducted on the *types*, *extent* or *determinants* of guidance. The research that does exist has tended to focus on simple linear prediction, to seldom go beyond considering demographic predictors, and to be somewhat contradictory.³ Two general kinds of guidance have received sporadic, independent attention in the literature: 1) restrictions imposed on the amount of child viewing time and on material viewed; and 2) discussions with the child about the particular material in the programs.⁴ Regarding the extent of guidance, a number of studies, employing various measures and dealing primarily with issues other than guidance, do point to one conclusion: most parents are quite unlikely to control their children's viewing—particularly their amount of viewing—in a consistent manner.⁵ While some attention has been paid to the extent of this type of restrictive guidance much less is known about the extent of parent-child discussions on television content. Research has indicated that possibilities or this type of guidance apparently exists.⁶

No research could be found on *attitudinal* factors that predict certain kinds of guidance. Comstock, et al.⁷ suggested that parental concerns about television's role in child socialization might be fundamental predictors of control over child viewing. They did not suggest the precise nature of this relationship, but it is true that concern with detrimental (rather than beneficial) effects of television is the dominant rationale groups such as Action For Children's Television present for guiding youngsters' viewing.⁸ It seems reasonable that this motivation would apply to parents generally—that is, that a professed concern about the ill effects of television would be more associated with guidance than would a professed awareness of the positive consequences of viewing.

In addition, the possibility exists that parental attitudes about television may not by themselves have a direct impact on the implementation of guidance. It may be that parental attitudes act as motivational forces for guidance only under certain circumstances. For example, parents who feel viewing television has harmful effects may nevertheless refrain from exercising guidance because they believe their children are old enough to make their own viewing, as well as their own moral, decisions. Other parents with negative attitudes about the television viewing experience may guide their female children but not their male children because those parents hold values about the differing sensitivities of the two genders. Moreover, in the specific case of mass media scholars, continual contact with literature about television may affect, reflect, or in some other way relate to the person's academic work environment. Very tentatively, it can be suggested that differences between scholars' attitudes toward television—and in the frequency and nature of their guidance—will be found to relate to differences in orientation toward teaching (concentrating on "skills" courses or "theory" courses), preferred research method (having a quantitative, empirical bias or a qualitative, "humanistic" bias) and scholarly publishing (authoring relatively many or few articles for refereed journals).

The present study examines these possibilities by investigating the nature of mass media scholars' attitudes toward television, the interrelationship of these attitudes and their relationship

to guidance. In addition, the study examines selected test variables in order to determine the extent of their direct relationship with parental guidance attitudes in predicting guidance. The test variables include the age and sex of the child, the number of television sets in the home and the three characteristics of mass media scholarship.

Method

Questionnaires were sent to mass media scholars throughout the United States. For the purpose of this study, mass media scholars were defined as all members of the Theory and Methodology Division of the Association for Education in Journalism and all members of the Mass Communication Division of the Speech Communication Association—a total population of 784 individuals. Two mailings resulted in a total response rate of 62 percent (486/784). Of the 486 respondents, 200 were parents of children 18 years or younger. This group comprised the population examined in this investigation.

Three sections of the questionnaire bore upon the issues and hypotheses raised. In the first, the academics were asked specifically about their attitudes about television's effects on children. Eighteen statements were presented that attributed to children's television viewing various commonly debated consequences (see Table II). Respondents noted whether they felt television was "the cause" of each phenomenon, an "important contributory cause," a "somewhat important contributory cause," or "not at all an important contributory cause" (or whether they didn't know). Following this section were 14 questions asking the scholars about the frequency (often, sometimes, rarely, or never) with which they use certain methods to control or guide their youngest child's television viewing behavior (see Table I). Scholars were asked to respond in terms of their youngest child in order to elicit comparable responses. The last section of the questionnaire asked a variety of demographic questions about the scholars, their youngest child and certain characteristics of their scholarship.

Results

The Population

The great majority (86 percent) of the parent-academics who answered the questionnaire were men. The 200 respondents ranged in age from 26 to 65, the average age being 40 and the median age being 39. While 39 percent noted that they blend "theory" and "skills" courses in their teaching, 35 percent noted "theory" as their primary orientation, and 27 percent said their primary teaching load related to "skills" courses. At the same time, 30 percent of the respondents preferred a "quantitative" approach to research, another 30 percent preferred "qualitative" methods, and 40 percent indicated they could not make such a forced choice. Most were at least somewhat active in scholarly publishing. A clear majority (67 percent) had articles published in refereed scholarly journals over the course of the previous three years. Half of the sample noted that from two to five of their articles came to print during that time, while 2 percent of the respondents reported the publication of fifteen or more pieces. The academics varied widely in the ages of their youngest children. The average age was eight, and 68 percent of the youngsters were less than 13 years old. The sex of the children was nearly evenly split.

Levels of Guidance

A preliminary differentiation of the respondents by the age of their children reveals what would be expected from previous research: parents of children under age 13 guide their youngsters' viewing more often than do parents of children 13 through 18. However, the incidence of using particular kinds of guidance varied widely both within and across the two groups.

Determining the specific guidance methods most commonly used by the scholars is most accurately reported by listing the 14 items in the order of their mean values. However, since the percentages of response categories provide more interpretable figures that are more comparative with past research on guidance, these will be reported along with the mean scores. Occasional discrepancies in the two data reduction techniques will appear since a percentage rank-ordering does not allow for a weighting of all categories.

Ranking by means, then, the four guidance methods reported as most common in the population were: (1) talking to the child about a program while coviewing—44 percent said often/33 percent said sometimes, (2) encouraging the viewing of specific programs—33 percent/44 percent (3) watching with the child—32 percent/44 percent and (4) discussing with a child a program just viewed or about to be viewed—30 percent/48 percent. With the exception of the "encouragement" items, these more frequently employed methods are remarkably similar in reflecting general, unfocused guidance.

The next five most frequently used items represent a more active, directive approach to guidance. The items were (5) setting restrictions on the amount of television a child is allowed to watch—33 percent/26 percent, (6) explaining that the programs are not about real people—26 percent/30 percent, (7) specifying programs that can be watched—27 percent/25 percent, (8) setting special hours during which the child can watch—28 percent/20 percent, and (9) discussing the motivations of television characters with the child—13 percent/40 percent.

The final five items also represent an active, directive approach to guidance. However, while the above five items are weighted toward physical restrictions, the final five items share an approach characterized more by discussion of television's values. These were: (10) pointing out to the child the bad things television characters are doing—19 percent/30 percent, (11) switching the channel on objectionable programs that the child is watching—24 percent/23 percent, (12) forbidding the viewing of certain programs 23 percent/24 percent, (13) explaining the meaning of television advertisements—17 percent/30 percent, and (14) pointing out the good things that television characters are doing—14 percent/32 percent.

A comparison of the reported frequencies with which the mass media scholars use the guidance methods with reported frequencies in the general population must necessarily be limited, since previous research tended to stress only controls on viewing. With respect to the five "control" methods—restricting viewing time, setting special hours, specifying programs that can be watched, switching channels on objectionable shows, and forbidding the viewing of certain programs—Bower's⁹ national sample of parents with children under 13 years old provides one of the few opportunities for comparison, since Bower used the same items. Focusing on scholar/parents of children younger than 13 who reported using the five methods "often" reveals percentages (from 28 to 39, depending on the method) that were quite similar to the percentages of parents in Bower's sample who said they use those guidance forms "often." A bit looser interpretation of the "control" item allows comparison between academic and nonacademic parents of older children, as well. Chaffee, McLeod and Atkin¹⁰ found that 10 percent of those families reported having rules for the teens' television viewing. In this study the proportion of scholars with children 13 through 18 who reported controlling their youngsters'

television viewing "often" (a situation akin to having rules) ranged from 2 percent to 15 percent, depending on the method of control. The numbers suggest that with both younger and older children mass media scholars were quite similar to the population at large.

Two interesting patterns emerge from the above discussion of levels of guidance. The first is that the most frequently employed guidance methods are the least focused and probably require the least physical or psychological effort from the parent. The second is that there seems to be some conceptual commonality among various items evidenced in their groupings by frequency of use. This second observation is put to a more rigorous test in the next stage of analysis.

The Nature of Parental Guidance

Factor analysis was used to empirically examine the dimensionality of the 14 guidance items. A principal components solution with varimax rotation was employed. The conceptual commonality of items loading on the first factor (see table I) suggested the label Restrictive Guidance.

Loading on the second factor were methods of guidance through which the parents helped the child evaluate the meaning, morality and characterization of television programs. This factor was labeled Evaluative Guidance. The third factor's label, Unfocused Guidance, derives from the relatively general nature of the interactions it subsumes.

The dimensionality of the three factors is surprisingly consistent with past research. The presence of a Restrictive Guidance dimension provides some empirical validation of past conceptualizations of this guidance form as a distinct approach. The differentiation of an Evaluative from an Unfocused dimension lends support to LoSciuto¹¹ and others who have noted that parents' viewing with their children does not necessarily imply that specific, directive guidance is taking place. In addition, inspecting these dimensions in terms of the levels of guidance discussed above, it is seen that the Unfocused Guidance dimension represents the collection of most frequently employed items. This supports the impression gleaned from comparing various studies¹² that Unfocused Guidance is more common than Restrictive Guidance. For the present study these three dimensions of parental guidance constitute the primary dependent variables.

TABLE I			
Factor Loadings of Parental Guidance of Child Television Viewing Items			
	F ₁	F ₂	F ₃
Restrictive Guidance			
How often do you...			
forbid certain programs?	<u>.76</u>	.28	.17
restrict child viewing?	<u>.82</u>	.14	.17
set specific viewing hours?	<u>.78</u>	.21	.10
specify programs?	<u>.83</u>	.25	.14
switch channel on objectionable program?	<u>.70</u>	.28	.13
Evaluative Guidance			
explain meaning of TV ads?	.27	<u>.68</u>	.28
discuss TV character motivations?	.11	<u>.67</u>	.39
point out good things actors do?	.33	<u>.74</u>	.26
point out bad things actors do?	.34	<u>.82</u>	.22
explain TV programs/people are not real?	.45	<u>.62</u>	.23
Unfocused Guidance			
watch TV with child?	.06	.22	<u>.65</u>
encourage specific programs?	.39	.13	<u>.61</u>
talk about show while viewing?	.18	.24	<u>.84</u>
discuss a show just viewed or about to be viewed?	.09	.37	<u>.69</u>
Percent of Total Variance Accounted For	48	11	6

N = 200. A principle components solution with varimax rotation was used.
Coefficients underlined represent primary loadings on the factor.

Nature of Perceived Effects

Before turning to an analysis of the determinants of parental guidance, it is first necessary to develop a better understanding of the interrelationship of the various perceptions mass media scholars hold concerning the effects of television on children. In the present study scholars were asked to indicate the causal importance of television for 18 various behavioral and psychological states found in children. The 18 states were selected to represent the many possible effects television has been charged and credited with.

These 18 items were factor analyzed to empirically examine any underlying dimensionality. A principal components solution with varimax rotation was again used. Two factors emerged with one item ("reinforces social values") seriously split between the two dimensions. This item was eliminated and the remaining items reanalyzed. Two fairly distinct factors emerged accounting for 45 percent of the total variance. From a post hoc perspective the items loaded on the two factors in a simple, understandable pattern. The two factors were labeled Antisocial and Prosocial Effects.

Although the dimensionality of perceived effects makes sense in an intuitive sense, it is somewhat different than anticipated. It was expected that Antisocial and Prosocial perceived effects would represent bipolar endpoints of attitudes toward television. Instead, the present analysis portrays these two perspectives as independent. This suggests that scholars hold a sophisticated view of television effects. That is, television is viewed as simultaneously good and bad. The differential impact of these two perspectives on parental guidance will be examined.

The two dimensions of perceived effects are included as independent variables in the predictive model for each of the three dimensions of parental guidance.

Factor	1	2
Antisocial Effects		
Increases stereotyping of sex roles.	<u>.52</u>	.21
Increases interest in sex.	<u>.58</u>	.21
Decreases reading.	<u>.53</u>	.13
Increases desire for immediate gratification.	<u>.65</u>	.11
Decreases creativity.	<u>.67</u>	.13
Increases aggressive behavior.	<u>.75</u>	.10
Increases alienation.	<u>.66</u>	.02
Decreases physical activity.	<u>.57</u>	.02
Breaks down social values.	<u>.61</u>	.05
Increases buying behavior.	<u>.54</u>	.27
Distorts perceptions of the political system.	<u>.51</u>	.03
Increases stereotyping of ethnic groups.	<u>.47</u>	.12
Decreases attention span.	<u>.61</u>	.02
Prosocial Effects		
Increases knowledge and awareness of the world.	.03	<u>.65</u>
Increases verbal ability.	.10	<u>.71</u>
Increases prosocial behavior.	.05	<u>.59</u>
Increases curiosity.	.02	<u>.69</u>
Percent of Total Variance Accounted For	33	12
Note: N = 200. A principle components solution with varimax rotation was used.		
Coefficients underlined represent primary loadings on the factor.		

Predictors of Parental Guidance

Hierarchical multiple regression was used to analyze the relationship of the family demographics, perceived effects, dimensions of scholarship and interaction variables to the three dimensions of parental guidance. The first block in the regression model involved a test for and control of scholar's age, scholar's sex and age of the youngest child (for whom parental guidance measures were gathered). The second block contained the two dimensions of television's perceived effects. The results of these two steps are shown in Table III. While scholar's age appears to be unrelated to any of the guidance dimensions, scholar's sex and child's age show significant yet varying patterns of parental guidance. Female scholars are more likely than their male counterparts to engage in Restrictive and Unfocused guidance, although scholar's sex is unrelated to Evaluative Guidance. Consistent with previous research, scholars are more likely to exert guidance for younger children; however, this applies only to Restrictive Guidance. Unfocused Guidance shows a positive significant relationship to child's age. This may be the

result of greater coviewing due to mutual interest with older children. Child's age, like scholar's age and scholar's sex, does not seem related to Evaluative Guidance.

The dimensions of the perceived television effects were similar to the above family demographics in showing high degree of selectivity in relation to the three dimensions of parental guidance. As anticipated, perception of negative effects was more related to guidance than was perception of positive effects—but only in the number (not strength) of significant relationships. The Antisocial dimension was significantly related to Restrictive and Evaluative Guidance only. The Prosocial dimension, although related to Evaluative Guidance, exhibited a substantially stronger relationship.

TABLE III
Three Dimensions of Parental Guidance: Standard Regression Coefficients of Demographic and Perceived Effects Variables

	Dimensions of Parental Guidance		
	Restrictive	Evaluative	Unfocused
Demographics			
Scholar's Age	-.02	-.02	-.01
Scholar's Sex (Male + 1)	-.42 ^c	-.10	-.47 ^b
Age of Youngest Child	-.09 ^a	.00	-.06 ^b
R ²	.20 ^a	.02	.08 ^a
Perceived Television Effects			
Antisocial (A)	-.20 ^b	.17 ^b	-.08
Prosocial (P)	-.04	.28 ^a	.06
Incremental R ²	.02 ^c	.07 ^a	.01

Note: The incremental R² indicates the added variance accounted for by the two dimensions of perceived effects over and above the variance accounted for by scholar's age, scholar's sex and age of youngest child. Significance is indicated at the 0.10 level by the letter c, at the .05 level by b and at the .01 level by a. N = 200.

The third block in the multiple regression looked at the simple, additive relationship to parental guidance of certain other family demographics (age of youngest child, sex of youngest child and number of television sets in the house) and of the three dimensions of scholarship (teaching orientation, research orientation and number of refereed publications in academic journals).¹³ None of these variables was strongly related to the three guidance dimensions. Also contributing little to the prediction of guidance was the fourth block of the multiple regression, which looked at whether interaction of the two perceived dimensions with the variables noted in the third block related to Restrictive, Evaluative, or Unfocused Guidance. Only four of the 36 standardized regression coefficients for the interaction terms were significant, and one of these was at a marginal ($p < .10$) level. In view of the large number of interaction terms examined and found insignificant, it is quite possible that these three significant terms were due to chance.

Discussion

In terms of theory and research in parental guidance the present study has provided some support for previous research into demographic predictors of parental guidance. It has also

clarified and extended the conceptualization of the nature of guidance (to a multidimensional concept) and the determinants of guidance (to include attitudinal and interactive effects). Specifically, three distinct dimensions of guidance were discovered: Restrictive, Evaluative and Unfocused. Consistent with past research the child's age was found to be significantly, although differentially, related to guidance. Restrictive Guidance was more likely to be employed for younger children than older children and Unfocused Guidance was more likely to be employed for older children than younger children. The research did not find a significant direct effect for child's sex or for number of television sets in the home.

The introduction of the parent/scholars' perceptions about the effects of television proved fruitful in logically extending predictors of guidance beyond family demographics. Using a conservative hierarchical test, three of the six standardized regression coefficients relating "perceived effects" to guidance were significant. The perception of antisocial effects for television was linked to Restrictive and Evaluative Guidance and the perception of prosocial effects was linked to Evaluative Guidance. Overlaying these findings with those regarding family demographic variables exhibits a striking contrast: the family demographics showed strong relationships to Unfocused Guidance (with respect to female scholars and older children), moderate relationship to Restrictive Guidance (with respect to female scholars and younger children), and no relationship to Evaluative Guidance. On the other hand, the two "perceived effects" dimensions exhibited a nearly opposite configuration. They were strongly related to Evaluative Guidance, moderately related to Restrictive Guidance, and showed no relationship to Unfocused Guidance.

Sense can be made of this pattern in view of the finding that Unfocused Guidance is the most frequently employed approach and Evaluative Guidance is the least used form. The three guidance dimensions can be seen as forming a continuum of activities associated with increasing physical and psychological costs. Unfocused Guidance may be exercised merely in response to opportunity for guidance provided by the particular age of the child and/or the sex of the parent. Unfocused methods of guidance such as joint parent/child viewing and general discussions about television are naturally more likely as the child grows older, since parent-child abilities and interests coincide more. Similarly, such guidance could be most easily carried out by the mother as opposed to the father because of the primary emphasis on the female in traditional American child rearing.¹⁴ Restrictive Guidance, by contrast, would seem to require greater psychological and physical commitment from parents than does Unfocused Guidance. Consequently, opportunity becomes less important as a determinant of guidance and perceived need to guide becomes more important. Restrictive Guidance is therefore exercised more with younger than older children, presumably out of greater general parental tendency to control younger children. That kind of guidance is also related to parental belief that television exerts a significant social impact, particularly a negative impact. Restrictive Guidance does not, however, require as great a commitment to influencing children's viewing experiences as does Evaluative Guidance. Therefore, it stands to reason that using Evaluative Guidance would relate not to demographic variables (which seem to imply opportunity to guide more than overriding concern regarding television and children) but, rather, to strongly held beliefs about television's effects, whether they be positive or negative.

In terms of the policy implications that can be derived from studying mass communication scholars, the results of this investigation point to several important issues. Approximately 60 percent of the scholars in this investigation reported using at least one of the 14 guidance methods "sometimes" or "often." This appears to be an optimistic finding. However,

caution in interpreting this result is required for two reasons. While the overall exercise of guidance was relatively high, the most frequently used form of guidance was Unfocused. The effectiveness of this form of guidance, as well as the other two dimensions, must be assessed in future research. The second reason for caution comes from a close inspection of the extent to which guidance is predicted by the variables included in this study. The total variance accounted for in any dimension of guidance by the 18 multiple regression solutions never exceeded 25 percent and averaged about 15 percent. The distinction between social significance and statistical significance must be emphasized. While an average of 15 percent of variance accounted for is substantial in helping to understand the process of guidance, whether it represents a high enough degree of prediction to place the final responsibility for mediating the potentially harmful effects of television on parents is open to question.¹⁵

Somewhat disturbing was the finding that Evaluative Guidance—the method that implies the most purposive, critical and potentially most effective approach to guidance—had the least likelihood of being predicted by the variables in the present model. In addition, Evaluative Guidance had the smallest possibility of being carried out by the mass media scholars in this population, no matter what their teaching, research, or publishing orientation.

Rough comparisons with previous studies¹⁶ suggest that the mass media scholars are not much different from the general population in their use of Restrictive Guidance. Future research should investigate whether this similarity extends to all three guidance methods. In addition research should also investigate the comparative success of the various guidance methods in mediating the impact of television viewing behavior.

Notes:

- 1 George Comstock, Steven Chaffee, Natan Katzman, Maxwell McCombs and Donald Roberts, *Television and Human Behavior* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1978), p. 284.
- 2 David J. Hicks, "Effects of Co-observer's Sanctions and Adult Presence on Imitative Aggression," *Child Development* 38:303-309 (March 1968); Samuel Ball and Gerry A. Bogatz, *The First Year of Sesame Street: An Evaluation* (Princeton, NJ: The Educational Testing Service, 1970); Charles Atkin and Walter Gantz, "How Children Use Television News Programs: Patterns of Exposure and Effects" (paper presented at the meeting of the International Communication Association, 1974); and Charles Atkin and Bradley Greenberg, "Parental Mediations of Children's Social Behavior: Learning From Television" (unpublished manuscript, Michigan State University, 1977).
- 3 Robert Bower, *Television and the Public* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1973); Robert O. Blood, "Social Class and Family Control of Television Viewing," *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly* 7:205-222 (July 1961); also Lynne S. Gross and R. Patricia Welsh, "Factors Affecting Parental Control Over Children's Television Viewing: A Pilot Study," *Journal of Broadcasting* 24:411-419 (Fall 1980).
- 4 Brian Coates and Willard W. Hartup, "Age and Verbalization in Observational Learning," *Development Psychology* 1:556-562 (September 1969); and Lynette K. Friedrich and Aletha H. Stein, "Prosocial Television and Young Children: The Effects of Verbal Labeling and Role Playing on Learning and Behavior," *Child Development* 46:27-38 (March 1975).
- 5 Jack Lyle and Heidi R. Hoffman, "Children's Use of Television and other Media," in *Television and Social Behavior, Volume 4*, ed. Eli A. Rubinstein, George A. Comstock and John P. Murray (Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office, 1972); also Bower, *op. cit.*
- 6 Lyle and Hoffman, *op. cit.*; Bower, *op. cit.*; Charles Allen, "Photographing the TV Audience," *Journal of Advertising Research* 5:2-8 (1965); Leonard A. LoSciuto, "A National Inventory of Television Viewing Behavior," in *Television and Social Behavior, Volume 4*, ed. Eli A. Rubinstein, George A. Comstock and John P. Murray (Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office, 1972); Bradley Greenberg, Philip M. Ericson and Martha Vlahos, "Children's Television Behaviors as Perceived by Mother and Child," in *Television and Social Behavior, Volume 4*, ed. Eli A. Rubinstein, George A. Comstock and John P. Murray (Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office, 1972); P. J. Mohr, "Television, Children and Parents" (unpublished report, Department of Speech Communication, Wichita State University, 1978); and Atkin and Greenberg, *op. cit.*
- 7 Comstock, Chaffee, Katzman, McCombs and Roberts, *op. cit.*
- 8 Evelyn Kaye, ed. *The Family Guide to Children's Television* (New York: Pantheon, 1974).
- 9 Bower, *op. cit.*
- 10 Steven H. Chaffee, Jack M. Mcleod and Charles K. Atkin, "Parental Influences on Adolescent Media Use," *American Behavioral Scientist* 14:323-40 (January/February 1971).
- 11 LoSciuto, *op. cit.*
- 12 Atkin and Greenberg, *op. cit.*; Bowers, *op. cit.*; and Lyle and Hoffman, *op. cit.*
- 13 A table presenting these findings is available from the authors.
- 14 This interpretation is bolstered by a near-significant correlation ($r = -.11$, $p < .10$) between scholar's sex and the similarity of parent-child viewing. That is, female scholars and their children exhibited a higher correspondence of viewing habits (as reported by the scholars) than did male scholars and their children.

15 One final qualification to the study must be included. Throughout the results and discussion sections terms implying causality have been used. While the nature of the independent variables selected for the study logically suggest time-order, the final issue of causality is still open to question.

16 Bower, *op. cit.*; and Chaffee, McLeod, and Atkin, *op. cit.*