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## SECTION I

## HIGHLIGHTS OF VIOLENCE PROFILE No. 9

Television violence dropped sharply in 1977 from the record high reached a year ago. But the evidence continues to indicate television's cumulative cultivation of viewer conceptions of danger, mistrust, and alienation. Moreover, new data suggest that heavy viewers of police and crime shows are more likely than light viewers to act on these conceptions: they report acquiring locks, dogs and guns to protect themselves.

With each of its components showing a decline, the Violence Index is close to the record low of the 1973 season. However, violence still appeared in more than two-thirds of all prime-time programs and in nine out of ten weekend morning programs at the rate of five incidents and 16 incidents per hour respectively. The "family viewing hour" lost its restraining power, with violence rising between 8 and 9 p.m. EST on both NBC and CBS. Movies sampled were also more violent. Although $A B C$ snatched the distinction of being "the least violent network" from CBS, the margins were the smallest in years.

As a scenario of social relationships and power, violence in television drama continues to demonstrate a pattern of unequal relative risks among different social groups. Major characters classified as male, middle class, settled adults, white, or American are somewhat less likely to suffer than to inflict violence as compared to major characters in other social groups.

Elderly and young women, nonwhites and male children bear particularly high risks of relative victimization in the world of television drama.

One interesting development, however, is that for the first time in 11 years of monitoring there are no female victims of lethal violence. Although this improves women characters' life chances, their overall victimization ratio is still unfavorable compared to that of men.

Figure 1 shows the violence Index and its components from 1967 through the 1977-78 fall season. After a steady, seven-year decline to its record low in 1973, the Index rose to its 1976 peak and then plunged this season to its second lowest point ever. The individual components of the Index reflect this trend, showing that the level of violence remains the same whether it is measured by prevalence across programs, rate of incidents per program, or percentage of major characters involved in violence. (The Violence Index combines these measures into a single indicator of trends.) -

The percentage of programs containing some violence has usually ranged from 80 to 90 percent; this season it is 75.5 percent. The rate of violent episodes per hour rose to a record high of 9.5 last season; this year it dropped to 6.7 episodes per hour. The same rate per program (play) fell from last year's peak of 6.2 to this season's 5.0.

Figure 2 charts violence in the time periods and types of programs included in this analysis. Children's (week-end morning) programming was still the most violent. Although violence in the 8 to 9 p.m. EST "family viewing' time slot dropped briefly in the $1975-76$ season, the amount of violence in late evening programming increased sharply in that period. Violence was not reduced in late evening programming ( 9 to 11 p.m. EST) until the present season. Violence across different program types -- including new programs -- reflected these trends. Overall, prime-time comic-tone programs were less violent than other types of programs.

Figure 3 records the level of violence on each network. For the first time since 1973, ABC is the "least violent" network, CBS a close second, and NBC the "most violent" overall, as it has been for nine of the last eleven years. However, the differences are slight compared to previous years. While CBS, a leader in the "family viewing" concept, increased violence in "family hour" (8 to 9 p.m. EST) programs for the second year in a row, all of the networks, but especially NBC, reduced the level of violence in late evening (9 to 11 p.m. EST) and cartoon programming.

The Violence Profile is based upon findings from a larger, ongoing research project called Cultural Indicators. Part of this project -- Cultivation Analysis -- is designed to identify conceptions of social reality that television tends to cultivate in child and adult viewers. Cultivation Analysis consists of asking child and adult viewers questions about social reality to which the world of television suggests certain answers.

Previous Violence Profiles have reported that heavy viewers tend to respond to many of these questions more in terms of the world of television than do light viewers in the same demographic groups. We have found that television seems to cultivate an exaggerated sense of danger and mistrust in heavy viewers compared to similar groups of light viewers. When asked about chances of encountering violence, about the percentage of men employed in law enforcement and crime detection, and about the percentage of crimes that are violent, significantly more heavy viewers than light viewers respond in terms more characteristic of the television world than of the real world. Mistrust is also reflected in responses suggesting that heavy viewers believe that most people just look out for themselves, take advantage of others, and cannot be trusted.

The current results extend these findings in important new directions. When samples of junior high school students were asked, "How often is it all right to hit someone if you are mad at them?", a significantly higher proportion of heavy than of light viewers answered, "almost always". Both child and adult heavy viewers also report being more afraid to walk alone in the city at night than light viewers in the same groups.

Adult heavy viewers revealed pessimism_and alienation when they endorsed in significantly greater proportions than light viewers the following statements: "In spite of what some people say, the lot of the average man is getting worse."; "It's hardly fair to bring a child into the world the way things look for the future."; and "Most public officials are not really interested in the problems of the average man." Television viewing seemed to be associated with these feelings most among middle class, white or female respondents.

Danger, mistrust, and alienation were also reflected in responses to the question, "Do you expect the United States to fight another war within the next ten years?" Heavy viewers answer "Yes" in significantly greater: proportions than light viewers, especially when respondents were under 30 or college educated. It is, therefore, not surprising that more heavy viewers in national samples also tend to agree that it would be best for the United States to stay out of world affairs.

Television viewing appears to be associated not only with heightened conceptions of danger but also the tendency to act upon them. Far more heavy than light viewers of police and crime programs report that they "bought a dog for purposes of protection," "put new locks on windows or doors for purposes of protection," and "kept a gun for purposes of protection."

The findings of the Violence Profile, set forth in greater detail in the following sections, indicate strong and stable associations between patterns of network dramatic content, viewer conceptions of danger, mistrust and alienation and the tendency to act upon these conceptions.

. FIGURE I: VIOLENCE INDEX AND MAJOR COMPONENTS FOR ALL PROGRAMS 1967-1977








FIGURE 2: VIOLENCE INDEX FOR DIFFERENT PROGRAMS 1967-1977








FIGURE 3: VIOLENCE INDEX BY NETWORK AND PROGRAM TYPE 1967-1977

Americans live much of their lives in the world of television drama. C Children and adults alike are exposed to vivid patterns of the facts of life in that world. What are those facts, especially with regard to the structure and function of violence, and what lessons do children and adults derive from their exposure to those facts?

These are the basic questions addressed in the research that yeids the Violence Profile. Trends in network television drama and the concepetions that viewing tends to cultidate in the minds of viewets are studied in a continuing project called Cultural Indicators. The research is designed to provide indicators of network televisionss dramatic content and its efs effects on child and adult viewers.

The Violence Profile is a set of multidimensional indicators reporting trends of volence in television drama and correlates in viewers' conceptions of social reality. The continuing research from which this report is drawn has investigated the extent, nature, and symbolic functions of violence in network television drama since 1967, and the conceptions of social reality television viewing cultivates since 1973.

The research began with the investigation of violence in network television drama in 1967-68 for the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence. It continued through 1972 under the sponsorship of the Surgeon Generals Scientific Advisory Committee on Television and Social

Behavior, and since then under grants from the National Institute of Mental Health, the American Medical Association, and the Office of Telecommunications Policy. The study was broadly conceived from the beginning to show the role and symbolic functions, as well as the extent, of violence in the world of television drama. A conference of research consultants to the National Institute of Mental Health in the spring of 1972 recommended that the Violence Index be further broadened to take into account social relationships and viewer conceptions. Implementing that recommendation, we, developed the Violence Profile including Risk-Ratios and viewer resonses.

The Violence Profile consists of indicators of (1) the program context in which dramatic violence occurs, (2) the prevalence, rate, and roles of violence thatmake up the Violence Index, (3) the structure of power in the world of television drama as indicated by the risks of violence and victimization for differentegroups of characters in the fictional population, and (4) the extent to which (and waysain which) television cultivates its own view of facts and aspects of social reality in the conceptions of its audiences.

The first three measures of the Violence Profile reflect trends in the content of network television drama. They come from Message System Analysis our comprehensive and periodic study of that content. The fourth measure, or "effects" indicators comes from Cultivation Analysis - our study of viewer conceptions cultivated by that content. The methods and results of our Message System and Cultivation Analyses are summarized in this section. The detailed tabulations presenting the relevant findeings of Message System Analysis and of Cultivation Analysis appear in Section III of this report.

## Message System Analysis Methods

Large and representative aggregates of television output (xather than individual selections from it) are the system of messages towhich total communities (rather than selective individuals or groups) are exposed. Message system analysis does not deal with single works, subjective perceptions, or dramatic subtieties. It focuses on the gross, unambiguous, and commonly understood facts of portrayal. These are the features that can be expected to provide bases for interaction and common assumptions and definitions (though not necessarily agreement) among large and heterogeneous mass publics.

Message System Analysis has been performed on annual sample-weeks of prime-time and weekendy daytime network dramatic programing since 1967 by trained analysts who observe and code various aspects of television content by the most reliable methods employed in any research of this kind.

The purpose of the analysis is to provide systematic, cumulative and objective observations representing relevant aspects of the world of television drama. The analysis yelds the basic data for constructing indicators of trends in the dramatic context, in the prevalence, rate, and dramatic roles involved in violence, and in the power relationships expressed by the distribution of riskstoddifferent groups in the fictional population. These indicators will be described after a discussion of definitions, units, samples, data collection procedures, and reliability tests of Messagessystem Analysisentyma

Definition of Violence

Message System Analysis isolates many different aspects of program content. The findings reported here focus primarily upon the portrayal of violence in network dramatic programming.

This analysis is based upon data collected using the basic definition of violence as the overt expression of physical force, with or without a weapon, against self or other, cpmpelling action against one's will on pain of being hurt or killed, or actually hurting or killing.

A rigorous three to four week training period assures that ooders iso~ late all and only clear, unambiguous, overt physical violence. To be recorded at all, a violent incident must be plausible and credible, it must
i- be directed against human or human-like beings, and it must hurt or kill or threaten to do so as part of the script's plot. No idle threats, verbal abuse, or gestures without credible violent eonsequences are included. However, once an unmistakably violent incident is observed, it is recorded whether the script calls for murder or "natural" catastrophies or accidents
 "Accidents" victimize characters who fall prey to them, and the message of victimization may be a significant outcome of exposure to violence.

Violence in a realistic or "serious" context is recorded.along with violence in a fantasy or "humonaus" context (although the tone of the incident is coded separately so that trends can be tabulated and examined both separately and together). The resson for coding clear-cut violence in any context is that the social lessons of such violence may be demonstrated
(and learned) ith equal effectiveness in any context. There is evidence* to suggest, for example, that exposure to fantasy or "humonous" violence is at least as effective as any other in conveying some lessons of violence. Therefore, its exclusion, as that of "accidents" and "catastrophies, would be scientifically unacceptable.

## Units of Analysis

Observations are recorded in three types of units: the program as a whole, each specific violent action (if any) in the program, and each dramatic character appearing in the program.
"Program" means a single fictional story presented in dramatic form. This may be a play produced for television, a feature film telecast during the period of the study, of a cartoon story (of which there may be one or more in a single program). Each of these would be analyzed separately and recorded as a "program"; thus the basic unit is actually the play. All such programs tellecast during the study periods were analyzed whether or not they contained violence.

Violent action means a scene of some violence confined to the same parties. If a scene is interrupted (by flashback, or shift to another scene) but continues in "real time, it is still the same act. However.

[^0]if a new agent of violence enters the scene, that begins another act. These units are also called violent episodes.

Characters analyzed in all programs (whether violent or not) are of two types. Major characters are the principal roles essential to the story. Minor characters (subjected to a less detailed analysis) are all other speaking roles. (The findings summarized in this report include the analysis of major characters on1y.)

## Samples of programming

Because nationally distributed programs provide the most broadly shared televisionsfare, network dramatic programs transmitted in evening primetime (8 p.m. to 11 p.m. each day), and network children's dramatic puograms transmitted weekend mornings (Saturday and Sunday between 8 a.m. and 2 p.m.) comprise the analytical source material.*

Our sample of programs is videotaped and consists of all dramatic programs broadcast during one week, usually in the fall, of each yearatw When an episode of a regularly scheduled program is pre-empted by a non-dramatic special during the selected week, the next available episode of that series is videotaped. If the special is dramatic, it is inc1uded in the sample. This replacement procedure is also used for those rare occasions when videorecorder failure results in the loss of a program during the scheduled sample week.

[^1]Although the sheer numbers involved prohibit estimation of sampling error for all of the dimensions in the recording instrument, the solid-week sample is at least as generalizable to a year's programming as larger randomly drawn samples for the four basic sample dimensions -- network, program format (TV play, cartoon, feature film), type (action, etc.), and tone (humorous, serious). In a sampling experiment executed in connection with the 1967-68 study, a sample of 365 programs was constructed according to the parameters of the 1967-68 project's sample, except that it was drawn according to a one-program-per-day random sêdection procedure, for a calender year that approximately bridged the interval between the 1967 and 1968 one-week samples.* There was no significant difference between the experimental and solid-week samples in the distribution of programs by network, format, type and tone (as defined for the 1967 p68 project).

Two funther sampling experiments were conducted in the spring of 1975 and 1976. A week's sample from each spring's programming was analyzed and compared with the fall samples for differences in the violence measures and indices. Few differences were found and these did not seem to warrant continuing the spring sampling, Another test of our sample, using a seven-week period as its base, was conducted in 1977. The test focused only upon violencerelated content items and found no significant differences for the items that are used to calculate the measures included in the Violence Profile.*\%

The latest sample, 1977, dne uides an additional week of prime-time programs so as to continue our sampling study. Thus, it consists of two weeks of network dramatic programs broadcast during prime-time (8-11 p.m. CST ,

[^2]Monday - Saturday and 7-11 p.m. EST, Sunday) and one weekend morning (8 a.m. 2 p.m. EST Saturday and Sunday) of network dramatic children's programs. The analysis conducted for this report also combines some of the yearly samples to simplify the presentation of a large amount of information. Data from the 1967 and 1968 fall seasons have been combined, haswwewedata from the fall of 1969 and 1970. Data from the fall of 1971,1972 and 1973 are reported separately. The fall 1974 and spring 1975 samples have been combined to reflect findings fos the 1974-1975 television season, and similarlyy data from fall 1975 and spring 1976 are presented together and represent the 1975-1976 season. Data from the fall of 1976 arerreported separatelly.

## Coding and training procedures

For the analysis of each sample of programs, a staff of between 16 e6e 20 coders is recruited. The entire training period requires three fadsoumeneeks of instruction and testing. Several introductory sessions are devoted to item-by-item discussion of the recording instrument. The trainee group is subsequently split into randomly assigned coding teams of two each, and all pairs then view and code three selected programs that have previously been coded by the entire Message System Analysis staff. Each coder-pair works independently of all other pairs, and returns one joint coding for each program. In the next general meeting, the entire staff discusses difficulties encountered in the three-program exercise. When these problems have been resolved, the coder-pairs return to code seven additional programs (previously coded by the staff) selected from the video-tape archive for this training purpose. Coderpairs also meet with the staff at the end of this part of training to discuss and resolve coding problems.

The data generated by the coder-pairs on the ten training programs are keypunched and subjected to computerized agreement analysis. On the basis of these results, instructions are further discussed and perhaps revised, and idiosyncratic coder pairs are dismissed. Coder-pairs who survive this testing process proceed to analyze the season's videotaped program sample.

During both the training and data-collection phases, coder pairs monitor their assigned videotaped programs as often as necessary, re-screening portions as needed. All programs in the sample are recorded independently by two separate coder-pairs to provide double-doded reliability comparisons.
 analyse sewene soded aisceònd time.)

A final data set for subsequent analysis is compiled from the full data base by randomly selecting one of the two codings for each program. As a last check against deviant coding, reliability measures are computed for each pair before the final selection. This procedure identifies problem coders who may not have been screened out in the training and pretest phase. In such an instance, the data recorded by the questionable pair would be excluded from the selection, and the alternative coding used. (over the course of thissstudy, only two cases have been encountered.) ()

## Assessment of reliability

The purpose of reliability measures in content analysis is to ascertain the degree to which the recorded data are consistently representative of the material being studied, rather than a reflection of observer bias or instrument ambiguity. Theoretically both types of contamination can be corrected by refining the instrument and/or by intensifying coder training, or, as a last resort, by eliminating the unsalvageable variable or dismissing the incorrigible coders. Thus, measures of reliability may serve two functions:
(1) as diagnostic tools in the confirmation of the recording instrument, and (2) as arbiters of the replicability of the procedure, assuring confidence in the final data. In this project, they serve both: during the preliminary period of instrument revision and coder training, they identify. problem areas in the recording process; the final measures computed on the study's entire corpus of double-doded data determine the acceptability of information for analysis, and provide guidelines for its interpretation.

Agreement due merely to chance gives no indication that the data truly reflect the phenomena under observation. Simple percent-agreement measures are, therefor inadequate indicators of reliability, since they fail to account for the amount of agreement expected by chance. Reliability measures in the form of agreement coefficients, however, indicate the degree to which agreement among indêpendent observers is above chance. In genera1, then, Coefficient of Agreement $=1-\frac{\text { observed disagreement }}{\text { expected disagreement }}$

Values for coefficients of this form will range from plus one when agreement is perfect, to zero when agreement is purely accidental (or perfectly random), to negative values when agreement is less than that expected due to chance. These coefficients will generally give more conservative estimates of reliability than will simple percent-agreement measures.

Five computational formulas are available for calculating the agreement coefficient.* The variations are distinguished by different formulations of the disagreement function -- depending on whether the variable is considered to constitute a nominat, ordinal, interval, bipolar or ratio scale. The project's double-coded sample of data is analyzed for agreement via

[^3]these coefficients, with the aid of a computer program. wit The cumulative reliability results for both the items and the compound measures and indicators gexern the reporting of the results.

## Violence Indicators

Message System Analysis contributes three types of information to the Violence Profile. The first is the program context of which any dramatic element, such as vidience, is an integral part. The second consists of the specific indicators of violence in various program categories, and the composite Violence Index. The third type of information is in the form of Eisk ratios and scores which show how the pattern of violence and victimization works for different kinds of people that populate the world of television drama.

The Violence Index is composed of theee sets of direct observational data. They show the extent to which violence occurred at all in the program samples, the frequency and rate of violent episodes, and the number of roles calling for characterization as violents, victims, or both. These data sets are called prevalence, rate, and role, respectively.

Prevalence: The percent of programs containing any violence indicates the prevalence (as compared to frequency or rate) of violence in a particular program sample. Rrevalence is calculated both as percent of progxams (\%P) and as percent of program hours containing violence, but only \%P is included in the Index.

Rate: As measures of prevalence indicate the proportion of program units in which one or more acts of violence occur, so rate expresses the

Krippendorff, Klaus, "A Computer Program for Agreement Analysis of Reliability Data, Version 4," Philadelphia: The Annenberg School of Communications, July 1973 (mimeo).
frequency of these acts in units of programming and in units of time. The acts themselves are called "violent episodes" and defined as scenes of some violence confined to the same characters. The number of such episodes divided by the total number of programs (violent or not) yields the rate per program (R/P). The rate per hour ( $R / H$ ) is the number of episodes divided by the number of program hours in the sample. The latter measures the concentration or saturation of violence in time, and compensates for the difference in rates between a long program unit, such as a movie, and a short one, such as a 10 -minute cartoon.

Role: The portrayal of characters as violents (committing violence) or victims (subjected to violence), or both, yields several measures. They are: percent of violents out of all characters in a sample; percent of victims out of all characters in a sample; all those involved as violents or as victims or both (\%V); percent of killers (those committing fatal violence); percent of killed (victims of lethal violence); and all those involved in killing, either as killers or as killed (\%K).

Composite Scores and the Violence Index

The preceeding measures of violence are based on analysts' observations. They are provided in all tabulations and should be used as the basic indicators of trends. However, for ease of illustration and comparison, they are combined to form summary scores and an index. These are statistical findings in themselves, and should not bettreated as such. Rathery they illustrate the basic findings and facilitate gross comparisons.

The two scores are based on selected measures showing qualities of programs and of characterizations, respectively. Prevalence (\%P), rate per program ( $R / P$ ), and rate per hour ( $R / H$ ) are reflected in the program score
(PS) which is computed as:

$$
P S=(\% P) \neq 2(R / P)+2(R / H)
$$

In the formula, \%P is the percent of programs containing violence, $R / P$ is the rate of violent episodes per play, and $R / H$ is the rate per hour. The rates $R / P$ and $R / H$ are doubled in order to raise their relatively low numerical value to the importance that the concepts of fregigencyeana satumation. in of violence deserve. Nevertheless, the program score gives the greatest weight to the extent to which violence prevails at all in the programs. Secondary weight is given to the frequency of violence and the saturation of the programs with violent actions.

Roles involving characters in any violence, weighted by roles involveds in killing, axe expressed in the character score (CS). The formula

$$
C S=(\% V)+(\% K)
$$

represents the percent of all leading characters committing violence, suffering violence, or both (\%V), with added weight given to the precent of those involved in killing either as killers or as fatal victims, or both (\% ). Finally, the Violence Index is obtained by adding the program score to the character score. Prevalence, rate, and role are thus reflected in the Index, with program information usually weighing slightly more heavily in the balance than information derived from character analysis. All these measures and indicators are tabulated for all years by different program types in Tables 1 through 44 of Section III.

## Trends in Violence: Message System Findings

Tables A through I in Section III of this report describe the Cultural Indicators Project Message System Analysis data base from 1967 through 1977 on a number of program and action characteristics. Table $J$ presents a sumary of the demographic characteristics of the entire population of wafo major characters analyzed for 1976 and 1977, as well as the totals from 1969 through 1977.

Table A presents the distribution of programs by network for each of the samples. Examinationnoffthisstable reveals that CBS tends to have a larger precentage of programs than the other two networks. For example, in the latest sample, 30.7 percent of all programs are broadcast by ABC , 41.7 bercbstand 27.6 on NBC. Network differences in the number of programs in the sample result from differences in the lengths and types of programs. CBS tends to broadcast more half-hour programs than ABC or NBC, while NBC has more programs that are 90 minutes or longer in length. CBS also broadcasts more programs for children during the weekend morning hours included in the sample. Finally, the abGgprogram line-up has more variety, or nondramatic, pprogeans that are not included in this analysis. When we compare the actual amount of time in each network's program sample show on Tables 24,31 , and 38 , we find that $A B C$ has 42.1 hours of programming ( 29.3 percent), CBS 54.2 hours (37.7 percent), and NBC 47.4 hours ( 33.0 percent).

Table B reveals that children's programing (weekend am. makes up 27.6 percent of the sample while 33.9 percent of the programs are aired during the early evening hour ( $8-9 \mathrm{p} . \mathrm{m}$. ) and 38.5 percent from $9-11 \mathrm{p} . \mathrm{m}$. EST. Table C shows that the 1977 sample also contains a larger percentage (41.7 percent) of new programs than the 1976 sample ( 37.3 percent).

The proportion of cartoons (Table D) in the 1977 sample is at the lowest level since 1967 because the networks have increased the number of non-antmated children's weekend morning programs. This may at least partiy account for the fact that the percentage of clearly comic or clearly serious programs has declined, giving way to an increase in the mixed tone category, as shown on Table E. However, the proportion of action (particularly crime) programs increased somewhat (Table F). Finally, as has been the usual finding, most of the programs take place in the present day, in the United States, and have an urban-suburban setting (Tables G, H and I).

Table J presents the distribution ofmmajor characters for 1976,1977 and in the entire Cultural Indicators Message System Analysis Data Archive (1969-1977). Examination of this table reveals that although the percentage of women has increased from 1976 to 1977 , women stil1 make up a smali portion of the major character population ( 28.7 percent). As compared to 1976 , more characters in 1977 are portrayed as being young and there are a small number of major characters classified as elderly.

As has been the case over the past nine years, most characters are white, not married, middle class, Americam, and "good". The 1977 sample contains almost one-third fewer characters classified as "bad" than did the 1976 sample (10.8 percent in 1977 against 14.8 percent in 1976).

## Violence Indicators

The present analysis indicates that the amount of violence in network dramatic programming has decreased atmost across the board in the 1977 rase
television season. Table 1 reveals that each of the components that make
up the Violence Index is down from 1976. The percentage of programs
with violence went from 89.1 percent in 1976 to 75.5 percent in 1977; the

Table 1
Violence Index Components (1967-1977)

|  | $67-68$ | $69-70^{1}$ | 1971 | 1972 | 1973 | $74-75{ }^{2}$ | $75-76^{2}$ | 1976 | $1977{ }^{3}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A11 Programs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Programs w/violence | 81.4 | 80.6 | 80.6 | 79.0 | 72.7 | 80.7 | 77.4 | 89.1 | 75.5 |
| Rate per program | 4.8 | 4.9 | 4.7 | 5.4 | 5.3 | 5.4 | 5.2 | 6.2 | 5.0 |
| Rate per hour | 7.2 | 8.1 | 6.9 | 7.5 | 7.0 | 6.9 | 7.7 | 9.5 | 6.7 |
| Program Score | 105 | 106 | 104 | 105 | 97. | 105 | 104. | 121 | 99 |
| \% involved in violence | 69.5 | 65.1 | 61.5 | 58.3 | 55.7 | 64.6 | 64.2 | 74.8 | 60.9 |
| Character Score | 85 | 72 | 71 | 68 | 63 | 78 | 73 | 83 | 67 |
| Violence Index | 190 | 178 | 175 | 173 | 160 | 183 | 177 | 204 | 166 |

## Prime-Time

| \% Programs w/violence | 75.2 | 66.4 | 75.8. | 71.7 | 59.7 | 72.2 | 68.7 | 80.3 | 69.8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rate per program | 4.5 | 3.5 | 3.9 | 4.9 | 4.5 | 5.6 | 5.3 | 5.6 | 5.0 |
| Rate per hour | 5.2 | 3.9 | 4.3 | 5.2 | 4.9 | 5.4 | 6.0 | 6.1 | 5.5 |
| Program Score | 95 | 81 | 92. | 92 | 78 | 94 | 91 | 104 | 91 |
| \% involved in violence | 64.4 | 49.4 | 55.0 | 53.0 | 41.1 | 60.5 | 55.0 | 67.4 | 55.5 |
| Character Score | 82 | 59 | 69 | 66 | 53 | 80 | 69 | 80 | 63 |
| Violence Index | 176 | 140 | 161 | 158 | 132 | 174 | 160 | 183 | 154 |

Weekend A.M.

| \% Programs w/violence | 93.5 | 97.2 | 87.8 | 90.0 | 94.6 | 93.5 | 90.2 | 100.0 | 90.6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rate per program | 5.2 | 6.5 | 6.0 | 6.1 | 6.7 | 5.1 | 5.1 | 6.9 | 4.9 |
| Rate per hour | 22.3 | 25.5 | 16.2 | 15.8 | 13.2 | 12.2 | 14.2 | 22.4 | 15.6 |
| Program Score | 148 | 161 | 132 | 134 | 134. | 128 | 129 | 159 | 132 |
| \% involved in violence | 84.3 | 89.7 | 74.7 | 72.3 | 77.2 | 71.7 | 81.1 | 85.6 | 77.2 |
| Character Score | 94 | 92 | 76 | 73 | 77 | 73 | 82 | 88 | 77 |
| Violence Index | 242 | 253 | 208 | 207 | 212 | 201 | 211 | 247 | 209 |

[^4]rate of violent actions decreased from 6.2 per program to 5.0 per program and 9.5 per hour to 6.7 per hour. The overa 11 program score went from its al1-time high of 121 in 1976 to 99.

While almost three-quarters of the major characters in the 1976 sample are involved in violence (thaters, they either vcomitionolenceror arectretomized), only slightly more than six out of ten major characters are so classified in the 1977 sample. Finally, the Violence Index itself went from its 1976 record high of 204 to 166 , its second lowest level in our eleven years of tracking the portrayal of violence in network dramatic programming.

Programs aired during the prime-time hours and during weekend morning hours also have similar decreases in violence. Weekend morning programming shows a particularly important decrease: the rate of violent episodeper hour went from a high of 22.4 in 1976 to 15.6 in 1977.

Table 2 presents asummary of the Violence Index for different program types and networks. The final column shows the decline ( - ) or increase (+) from 1976 to 1977.

The sharpest reduction in violence was achieved in NBC cartoons and late evening (9-11 p.m. EST) programs, in comic violence in general, in the ABC Vfamily viewing' (8-9 p.m. EST) line-up, and in new programs introduced in the fall of 1977.

Movies, cartoons, most types of weekend morning programs and programs that are serious are the most violent. Prime-time comic programs are the least vio1ent. Despite its reductions, NBC is still the most violent network, just as it was last year. CBS reduced its violence the least, taking second place and losing its long-standing "least violent" status. ABC cut violence the most and became the "Least violent" network (by a small margin) for the


[^5]first time since 1973.

There are a few exceptions to the general decline in violence. Movies and NBC "family viewing" time increased the most, making both reach record or near-record levels. CBS, which pioneered the "family viewing" concept and scored a record low of 46 points in $1975-76$, jumped to 102 in the fall of 1976, and further increased its level of violence in early evening to 123, but that is still below the other two networks even with their reductions. CBS also boosted its violence in action programs.

In feneral, NBC was themost violent overall and in prime-time. CBS was second overall but highest in actim and eartoon programs. $A B C$ was the least violent in prime-time but the most violent in weekend daytime programming.

Similar findings are revealed in Table 3, a summary table focusing upon the number of violent actions per hour of programming. The rate of vielent actions per hour decreased fiost for cartoons in all networks, all comic tone programs, NBC weekend morning programs, and NBC cartoon programs. For NBC cartoons the rate of violence per hour plunged from 59.5 acts per hour in 1976 to 18.7 in 1977. Violence saturation increasedbbymone than one act per hour for only four program types and all of them on CBS: "family viewing" programs, late evening programs, prime-time programs and action programs.

Table 4 presents the percentage of major characters who are involved in violence in these general program classifications. This table indicates the percentage of characters who commit violence (hurt or kill other characters), are victimized (are hurt or killed), or both commit and suffer violence. The most important decreases in violence-related characterizations are found for $A B C$ early evening programs (8-9 p.m. EST), NBC late evening programming (9-11 p.m. EST), all comic tone programs, new programs, and most types of prime-time programming. Increases in the percentage of maior characters portrayed as being involved in violence are found for movies,

|  | ${ }^{11}$ | $69-70^{1}$ | 1971 | 1972 | 1973 | $74-75^{2}$ | 75-76 ${ }^{2}$ | 1976 | $1977^{3}$ | Change $1976 \text { to } 1977$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A11 Programs | 7.2 | 8.1 | 6.9 | 7.5 | 7.0 | 6.9 | 7.7 | 9.5 | 6.7 | - 2.8 |
| Prime-Time | 5.2 | 3.9 | 4.3 | 5.2 | 4.9 | 5.4 | 6.0 | 6.1 | 5.5 | - 0.6 |
| Weekend Morning | 22.3 | 25.5 | 16.2 | 15.8 | 13.2 | 12.2 | 14.2 | 22.4 | 15.6 | -6.8 |
| 8-9 P.M. EST | 6.4 | 3.9 | 4.4 | 5.2 | 5.1 | 3.9 | 4.1 | 4.7 | 5.3 | $+0.6$ |
| 9-11 P.M. EST | 3.8 | 3.9 | 4.3 | 5.2 | 4.7 | 6.6 | 6.9 | 6.8 | 5.7 | - 1.1 |
| Cartoons | 22.5 | 26.3 | 19.6 | 17.1 | 14.7 | 14.5 | 18.7 | 34.0 | 19.8 | -14.2 |
| TV Plays | 5.9 | 4.3 | 4.4 | 5.2 | 4.7 | 4.9 | 5.5 | 6.7 | 4.4 | - 2.3 |
| Movies | 3.4 | 3.4 | 4.7 | 5.4 | 5.3 | 6.5 | 7.3 | 6.2 | 8.3 | $+2.1$ |
| Comic Tone Programs | 6.3 | 13.5 | 10.8 | 8.6 | 9.3 | 11.4 | 11.0 | 20.3 | 9.1 | -11.2 |
| Prime-Time | 3.2 | 2.0 | 2.3 | 1.9 | 1.1 | 3.2 | 3.1 | 4.0 | 4.3 | $+0.3$ |
| Weekend A.M. | 19.9 | 28.4 | 17.0 | 17.4 | 15.7 | 18.1 | 19.4 | 31.8 | 25.1 | - 6.7 |
| Serious Tone Programs | - | 5.4 | 4.8 | 5.9 | 6.8 | 6.2 | 7.1 | 7.3 | 6.9 | - 0.4 |
| Prime-Time | - | 4.7 | 4.7 | 6.0 | 6.7 | 6.3 | 6.9 | 6.8 | 6.7 | - 0.1 |
| Weekend A.M. | - | 17.4 | 6.0 | 3.1 | 8.0 | 5.2 | 8.6 | 12.2 | 9.2 | - 3.0 |
| Continued Programs | 6.8 | 6.6 | 8.2 | 7.9 | 6.5 | 6.9 | 8.1 | 9.1 | 6.9 | - 2.2 |
| Prime-Time | 5.3 | 4.1 | 4.4 | 5.3 | 5.0 | 5.1 | 6.3 | 6.3 | 6.0 | - 0.3 |
| Weekend A.M. | 20.5 | 24.4 | 20.5 | 18.7 | 13.6 | 13.0 | 14.0 | 23.1 | 17.2 | - 5.9 |
| New Programs | 7.8 | 11.1 | 5.3 | 6.5 | 8.0 | 6.8 | 7.0 | 10.4 | 6.3 | - 4.1 |
| Prime-Time | 5.0 | 3.4 | 4.2 | 5.1 | 4.5 | 6.4 | 5.3 | 5.5 | 4.5 | - 1.0 |
| Weekend A.M. | 23.8 | 26.4 | 9.9 | 10.5 | 12.8 | 8.5 | 15.1 | 21.7 | 14.3 | - 7.4 |
| Action Programs | 9.1 | 11.1 | 8.7 | 8.7 | 9.1 | 7.5 | 8.2 | 9.2 | 8.4 | - 0.8 |
| $\therefore$ Prime-Time | 6.7 | 5.8 | 5.2 | 7.3 | 7.3 | 6.9 | 7.2 | 8.1 | 7.5 | - 0.6 |
| Weekend A.M. | 24.4 | 27.1 | 22.9 | 14.3 | 14.0 | 10.7 | 12.1 | 14.8 | 13.9 | -0.9 |
| ABC | 7.7 | 7.8 | 5.0 | 8.5 | 6.1 | 7.1 | 8.4 | 8.9 | 6.0 | - 2.9 |
| CBS | 6.3 | 8.0 | 8.5 | 6.8 | 7.8 | 7.2 | 6.4 | 8.3 | 7.4 | - 0.9 |
| NBC | 7.7 | 8.5 | 6.9 | 7.1 | 7.1 | 6.5 | 8.4 | 11.1 | 6.4 | - 4.7 |
| Prime-Time |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ABC | 6.0 | 3.7 | 3.9 | 5.7 | 3.9 | 6.0 | 7.2 | 6.5 | 4.5 | $-2.0$ |
| CBS | 3.7 | 3.4 | 5.3 | 4.0 | 5.7 | 5.7 | 4.5 | 4.7 | 6.4 | $+1.7$ |
| NBC | 5.8 | 4.5 | 3.7 | 5.8 | 5.2 | 4.6 | 6.1 | 6.9 | 5.3 | - 1.6 |
| 8-9 P.M. EST 5 - 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ABC | 7.5 | 3.3 | 4.0 | 5.4 | 4.7 | 5.6 | 5.1 | 7.0 | 4.5 | - 2.5 |
| CBS | 5.3 | 3.9 | 6.3 | 2.7 | 5.9 | 3.9 | 2.1 | 2.2 | 5.9 | +3.7 |
| NBC | 6.3 | 4.6 | 3.3 | 6.7 | 4.9 | 2.2 | 4.6 | 4.8 | 5.4 | $+0.6$ |
| 9-11 P.M. EST 0 , 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ABC | 4.3 | 4.1 | 3.8 | 5.9 | 2.4 | 6.4 | 8.5 | 6.3 | 4.6 | $-1.7$ |
| CBS | 2.1 | 3.0 | 4.8 | 4.7 | 5.6 | 6.7 | 5.5 | 5.6 | 6.8 | $+1.2$ |
| -NBC | 5.2 | 4.5 | 4.1 | 5.2 | 5.4 | 6.7 | 6.8 | 8.7 | 5.3 | - 3.4 |
| Action Programs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - ABC | 8.7 | 11.8 | 7.5 | 9.9 | 8.2 | 7.7 | 9.4 | 11.7 | 9.0 | -2.7 |
| CBS | 10.8 | 12.5 | 10.8 | 9.4 | 10.7 | 8.8 | 7.9 | 7.5 | 9.5 | $+2.0$ |
| NBC | 8.5 | 9.7 | 7.8 | 7.2 | 8.7 | 6.2 | 7.3 | 8.7 | 7.1 | - 1.6 |
| Weekend A.M. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ABC | 21.3 | 24.6 | 10.1 | 18.2 | 12.4 | 10.8 | 13.0 | 19.0 | 16.0 | - 3.0 |
| - CBS | 24.2 | 22.6 | 21.1 | 14.6 | 17.7 | 11.9 | 12.2 | 19.2 | 15.2 | -4.0 |
| NBC | 21.2 | 31.6 | 16.4 | 14.3 | 11.5 | 14.1 | 18.0 | 29.4 | 15.7 | -13.7 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - ABC | 21.3 | 24.6 | 13.1 | 20.5 | 12.9 | 11.6 | 13.9 | 21.5 | 18.5 | $-3.0$ |
| CBS | - 24.2 | 24.0 | 23.2 | 17.1 | 17.7 | 14.2 | 19.9 | 29.7 | 21.5 | -8.2 |
| NBC | 21.7 | 32.6 | 20.2 | 13.8 | 14.3 | 19.7 | 24.5 | 59.5 | 18.7 | -40.8 |

1 These figures are based upon two samples collected in the fall of each of these years.
2 These figures are based upon two samples - one from the fall and one from the spring.
${ }^{3}$ The Fall 1977 sample consists of two weeks of prime-time and one weekend morning of network dramatic programs.


[^6]NBC early evening programs, and action programs, early evening programs and cartoon programs on CBS.

Table 5 takes a closer look at a number of violence-related measures for the three networks for the 1976 and 1977 samples. As we have already noted, NBC still has the highest Violence Index (190), CBS is second (159) and $A B C$ third (154). Thas order holds for prime-time programming, but for weekend morning programming we find that $A B C$ has the highest Violence Index (216) while CBS and NBC are tied with indices of 206. However, all of these measures are down from last year. Figure 3 (See Section I) presents yearly Violence Index trends by Network. This figure reveals that while there has been considerable fluctuation in violence levels from $196 \%$ to 1977, NBC has usually been the network with the mose violent programming while $A B C$ and CBS seem to jockey for third place each year.

Table 6 presents a breakdownof the Violence Index by network and broadcast time. It indicates that the concept of having an hour of programming sưtablesfor all family members (that is, an hour of proyming. with less violence) has lost its force with as least two of the three networks. CBS and NBC have increased, from last year, the amount of violence aixed during this time slot ( $8-9$ p.m. EST). Moreover, NBC has the same level of violence in both early and late evening programs. $A B C$ has less violence in the early evening programs this year than last year, and there is also a difference in the Violence Index for late and early evening programs in the 1977 sample. This contrasts with 976 , when $A B C$ had about the same level of violence in programs aired during both time $x$ t slots. Violence for children's (weekend a.m.) programs is still the highest despite reductions, and about the same on all three networks.

Tables 1 through 44 of Section III present detailed findings for the different types of network dramatic programs included in our samples.

Table 5
Table 5
Violence Index Components for 1976 and 1977 by Network Yootence mdex Components for 1976 an 1977 by Network
ABC
$1976 \quad 1977$
$1976 \quad 1977$
19761977

A11 Programs
\% Programs w/violence Rate pex program Rate per hour
Program Score
$\%$ involved in violence
Gara\%tinvolved in violence Character Score

Violence Index
93.874 .6
$5.9 \quad 4.3$ 8.96 .0 12395
$76.3 \quad 55.8$ 8458

207 154
$182 \quad 159$
225 190

## Prime-Time

\% Programs w/violence
Rate per program
Rate per hour
Program Score
\% involved in violence
Character Score
Violence Index

Weekend A.M.
\% Programs w/violence Raterper program Rate per hour
Program Score
\% involved in violence Character Score

Violence Index 237216
$196 \quad 136$
148146
$70.8 \quad 64.4$
$3.5 \quad 5.2$
4.76 .4

8788
54.1 51.2 6258
89.567 .4
$5.8 \quad 3.9$
6.54 .5

11484
$\begin{array}{rr}75.0 & 48,3 \\ 82 & 52\end{array}$
100.0 93.8
6.15 .4
$19.0 \quad 16.0$
150137
$78.4 \quad 79.2$
8\% $\quad 79$
$100.0 \quad 85.7$
6.84 .5
$19.2 \quad 15.2$
152125
$87.5 \quad 80.8$ 8781 $239 \quad 206$

212188
83.381 .1
8.26 .1
6.95 .3

114104
$74.5 \quad 70.6$ $98 \quad 84$

| 100.0 | 93.8 |
| ---: | ---: |
| 7.6 | 4.8 |
| 29.4 | 15.7 |
| 174 | 135 |
| 90.2 | 71.1 |
| 90 | 71 |
|  |  |
| 264 | 206 |

Table 6
Violence Index by Network and Time of Broadcast (1976 and 1977)

|  | ABC |  | CBS |  | NBC |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1976 | 1977 | 1976 | 1977 | 1976 | 1977 |
| Altancograms | 207 | 154 | 182 | 159 | 224 | 190 |
| 8am. P.m. EST | 197 | 126 | 102 | 123 | 139 | 188 |
| 9aselu p.m.gos | 196 | 143 | 175 | 166 | 212 | 188 |
| Weekend a.m. | 237 | 216 | 239 | 206 | 264 | 206 |

Violence as an Indicator of Power

Other components of the Violence Profile deal with the structure of power demonstrated by isolating those characters who commit violence or who are victimized in television programs. Such involvement in violence is presented in Tables 7, 8 and 9. Overall, except for characters portrayed as being married, non-white or elderly, more than 50 percent of the characters in each of the character classifications are involved in violence. For the most part, actual levels of involvement have decreased from 1976 to 1977. The most noticeable decreases are for characters classified as nonAmerican, characters who are neither "good" nor "bad", and characters who are members of a minority racial group.

Males are more likely than females to be involved in violence. In 1977 we find that at least half of all male major characters categorized in all classifications, except the unmarried, are involved in violence; while there are only four groups of female major characters that have more than half of their members categorized as being involved in violence. They are: females classified as young adults, unmarried women, lower class women and females categorized as "bad."

The most elementary -- and telling - - social structure involved in a violence scenario is that of violents and victims. The ratios of those who inflict and those who suffer violence provide a calculus of life's chances for different groups of people in the world of television drama. These risk ratios (see Table 10) are obtained by dividing the more numerous of these two roles by the less numerous within each group. A plus sign indicates that there are more violents or killers than victims or killed and a minus sign indicates that there are more victims or killed than violents or killers. A ratio of 0.00 means that there were no characters classified as violents or killers or as victims or killed. A +0.00 ratio

Table 7

Percent of All Major Characters Involved in Violence in All Programs
(1969-1977)


[^7]Table 8
Percent of Major Male Characters Involved in Violence in All Programs (1969-1977)

|  | 69-70 ${ }^{1}$ | 1971 | 1972. | $\underline{1973}$ | $74-75^{2}$ | $75-76^{2}$ | 1976 | $1971^{3}$ | Change $1976 \text { to } 1977$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All Males | 70.5 | 65.4 | 66.8 | 60.4 | 69.6 | 68.6 | 79.8 | 66.3 | -13.5 |
| Social Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Child-Adolescent | 61.8 | 46.2 | 65.0 | 71.1 | 57.6 | 70.5 | 76.9 | 70.2 | - 6.7 |
| Young Adult | 73.6 | 80.6 | 70.5 | 49.1 | 67.7 | 75.5 | 61.9 | 73.3 | +11.4 |
| Settied Adult | 61.6 | 63.7 | 62.6 | 60.9 | 71.1 | 64.7 | 78.8 | 62.0 | -16.8 |
| Elderly | 69.2 | 25.0 | 50.0 | 16.7 | 57.1 | 41.7 | - | 54.5 | NA |
| Marital Status |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Not Married | 72.5 | 67.0 | 69.2 | 59.0 | 66.7 | 71.0 | 79.0 | 70.0 | - 9.0 |
| Married | 52.6 | 52.2 | 53.4 | 43.1 | 63.3 | 47.2 | 69.0 | 47.2 | -21.8 |
| Social Class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Clearly Upper | 60.5 | 62.5 | 65.0 | 66.7 | 79.3 | 72.7 | 57.1 | 76.9 | +19.8 |
| Mixed | 71.1 | 65.3 | 66.3 | 59.3 | 69.4 | 68.5 | 79.6 | 64.9 | -14.7 |
| Clearly Lower | 88.9 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 71.4 | 60.0 | 65.4 | 100.0 | 93.3 | - 6.7 |
| Race |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White | 64.7 | 60.1 | 64.9 | 58.4 | 67.8 | 64.9 | 74.8 | 65.8 | - 9.0 |
| Other | 73.1 | 60.0 | 67.9 | 62.5 | 58.1 | 55.6 | 70.6 | 51.2 | -19.4 |
| Character Type 650 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| "Good" | 65.0 | 63.7 | 64.8 | 55.0 | 65.4 | 64.2 | 74.8 | 59.4 | -15.4 |
| Mixed | 69.4 | 61.4 | 50.9 | 46.8 | 70.0 | 64.5 | 86.5 | 67.0 | -19.5 |
| "Bad" | 88.7 | 75.0 | 94.9 | 88.7 | 85.7 | 95.8 | 88.6 | 96.3 | + 7.7 |
| Nationality |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| U.S. | 60.4 | 59.6 | 63.0 | 55.2 | 67.0 | 64.6 | 72.3 | 61.8 | -10.5 |
| Other | 86.1 | 68.4 | 78.6 | 100.0 | 71.4 | 75.0 | 100.0 | 78.6 | -21.4 |

[^8]Table 9
Percent of Major Female Characters Involved in Violence in A11 Programs (1969-1977)


[^9]TABLE 10: RISK RATTOS ${ }^{1}$
Major Characters in All Programs
(1969-1977)


Risk ratios are obtained by dividing the more numerous of these two roles by the less numerous within each group. A plus sign indicates that
there are more violents or killers than victims or killed and minus sign indicates that there are more victims or killed than violents or
killers. A ratio of 0.00 means that there were no victims or killers or violents or killed. A to. 00 ratio means that there were some violents or killers but no victims or killed; a -0.00 ratio means there were victims or killed but no violents or killers.
means that some characters ane classifed as violents or killers but none are, classiftiedi as victims or killed. Finally, a $\mathbf{- 0 . 0 0}$ ratio reveals that there vane victims or killed but no violents or killers.

The overall violent-victim ratio since 1969 (when this measure was developed) is -1.19 , meaning that for every violent there are 1.19 victims. However, while the overall victimization ratio for men is -1.18 , for women it is higher: $\mathbf{- 1 . 2 7}$. Even more striking is the differential risk of fatal victimization. There are more than two male killers for every male killed (killex-killed ratio of +2.04 ). Female killers also outnumber women who are killed (k-k ratio of +1.17 ) but by a much smaller margin.

Particularly high risks of victimization (relative to the ability to inflict violence) are borne by old women ( -3.00 ), nonwhite women $(-1.82)$, upper-class women (-1.81), young adult women ( -1.73 ), lower class women $(-1.71)$, all children ( -1.58 ), unmarried women ( -1.38 ), and all nonwhites (-1.32). "Good" characters are more likely to be victimized (-1.26) than "bad" characters (-1.02). However, "good" characters are more likely to be killers than killed (+3.29). "Bad" characters are also more likely to be killers than killed ( +1.80 ), although not nearly as often as "good" characters. "Good" women are even more likely victims ( -1.40 ) than "good" men (-1.23), but "bad" women have the most favorable violent-victim ratio of all groups (+1.13). Committing violence seems more likely to mark a female than a male character as "bad" in the world of television. The only groups that have high relative risks of fatal victimization are the old and the poor, particularly among men, and women categorized as "good."

Further examination of Table 10 reveals that, overal1, characters are more likely to suffer violence than to commit violence, but that when killing (killing others and being killed) is isolated, major characters are more likely to kill than to be killed. The killer-killed ratios for males
are somewhat larger than those found for females. The overall magnitude of vidlent-victim ratios is quite similar for both men and women in characterization classifications such as marital status, social class, race, and nationality. However, some interesting differences exist for males and $\qquad$ females in the social age and character type ("good"-"bad") classifications.

The major findings for the four social age classifications are that children and adolescents have the most negative victimization ratio and the elderly are the only ge group more likely to be killed than to kill.

When we isolate male and female characters by age-related groups we find that among males, children and adolescents are more likely to suffer than commit violence, but that these characters have the most positive killer-killed ratio -- that is, they are four times as likely to kill than be killed. Elderly male characters are the only group withà positive violent-victim ratio, i.e., these characters are more likely to commit than suffer violence. However, elderly male characters also have a fairly negative killer-killed ratio -- they are thince as likely to be killed as to kill. The image found for different age-related groups of female major characters is quite different. Elderly female charactersare three times as likely to suffer than commit violence and women classified as young adults are more likely to be victimized than very young female eharacters (children-adolescents). Finally, no elderly female characters killed anyone, but two of these characters were killed.

The other demographic classification with interesting differences in violent-victim and killer-killed ratios are characters categorized as "good," "bad" or neither "good" nor "bad." Females categorized as "bad" are the only group more likely to commit than suffer violence ( +1.13 ), while males so classified are about equally likely to commit as to suffer violence (-1.03). Males classified as "good" are four times as likely to be killers,

However, "good" female characters have a greater chance of being killed than of killing. Both males and females classified as "bad" have a greater chance of killing than of being killed.

Summaries of annual findings for violent-victim ratios for major characters (all characters, males and femáles) are presented in Tables 11, 12, and 13. Examination of Tables 12 and 13 reveals that victimization has been the consistent trend. That is, since 1969, most major characters, males as well as females, have been more likely to be victimized (hurt or killed) than to commit violence.

Some interesting findings revealed in these tables are that the negative violent-victim ratio for males classified as children and adolescents has been decreasing since 1973. That is, even though these characters are more likely to suffer than commit violence, the number of those who commit violence relative to the number who suffer is increasing. Aso, trat

The killer-killed ratio is another indicator of the power in the world of television drama. Tables 14,15 and 16 present killer-killed ratios for all major characters and for male and female major characters from 1969 to 1977 on a number of characterization classifications. Since the number of characters who either killed or are killed is small, these tables should be examined and interpreted carefully.

Since 1969 most male characters have been portrayed as powerfulqerfly that is, men in television drama are more likely to kill people than to be killed. Only males categorized as "elderly" are portrayed as more likely to be killed than to kill. Male characters classified as lower class, neither "good" nor "bad" or non-white have fluctuated between positive and negative ratios. That is, some years these groups are more likely to kill than be killed, while in other years, they are more likely to be killed than to kill.

Table 11
Violent-Victim Ratios: 1
Al1 Major Characters in All Programs
(1969-1977)


[^10]4
The Fall 1977 sample consists of two weeks of prime-time and one weekend morning of network dramatic programs.

Table 12
Violent - Victim Ratios: ${ }^{1}$ Male Major Characters in All Programs (1969-1977)

|  | 69-70 ${ }^{2}$ | 1971 | 1972 | 1973 | $74-75^{3}$ | 75-76 ${ }^{3}$ | 1976 | $1977{ }^{4}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All Males | -1.15 | -1.06 | -1.20 | -1.38 | -1.25 | -1.25 | -1.08 | -1.05 |
| Social Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Child-Adolescent | -1.46 | -1.67 | -1.22 | -2.88 | -2.21 | -1.87 | -1. 33 | -1.31 |
| Young Adult | -1.26 | 1.00 | -1.17 | -1.41 | -1.40 | -1.27 | -1. 20 | -1.06 |
| Settled Adult | -1.09 | -1.05 | -1.22 | -1.25 | -1.17 | -1.16 | -1.06 | +1.02 |
| Elderly | -1.33 | +2.00 | +1.33 | +0.00 | -1.20 | +1.25 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Marital Status |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Not Married | -1.13 | 1.00 | -1.13 | -1.69 | -1.34 | -1.32 | -1.10 | -1.07 |
| Married | -1.34 | -1.33 | -1.56 | -1.41 | -1.13 | -1.29 | -1.19 | -1.08 |
| Social Class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Clearly Upper | -1.50 | 1.00 | 1.00 | -1.33 | -1.64 | -1.35 | +1.33 | 1.00 |
| Mixed | -1.13 | -1.08 | -1.26 | -1.38 | -1.22 | -1.23 | -1.09 | -1.04 |
| Clearly Lower | 1.00 | +2.00 | +2.00 | -1.43 | -1.57 | -1.42 | -1.13 | -1. 17 |
| Race |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White | -1.14 | -1.01 | -1.20 | -1.37 | -1.29 | -1.22 | -1.04 | -1.02 |
| Other | -1.36 | -1.20 | -1.08 | -1.90 | -1.10 | -1.41 | -1.57 | +1.14 |
| Character Type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| "Good" | -1.21 | -1. 15 | -1.21 | -1.40 | -1.31 | -1.30 | -1.09 | -1.16 |
| Mixed | -1.31 | -1.07 | -1.28 | -2.33 | -1.22 | -1.36 | -1.13 | +1.13 |
| "Bad" | +1.08 | +1.08 | -1. 13 | -1.11 | -1.19 | -1.02 | +1.04 | 1.00 |
| Nationality |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| U.S. | -1.15 | -1.05 | -1.13 | -1.39 | -1.27 | -1.17 | -1.06 | -1.01 |
| Other | -1.25 | -1.20 | -1.50 | -1.50 | 1.00 | -2.00 | -1.50 | +1.13 |

[^11]Table 13
Violent - Victim Ratios: ${ }^{1}$
Female Major Characters in All Programs
(1969-1977)

|  | $69-70^{2}$ | 1971 | 1972 | 1973 | $74-75^{3}$ | $75-76^{3}$ | 1976 | $1977^{4}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A11 Females | -1.26 | -1.43 | -1.69 | -1.52 | -1.45 | -1.18 | -1.03 | $-1.13$ |
| - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Social Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Child-Adolescent | 1.00 | +1. 50 | 1.00 | -1.83 | -1.75 | -2.33 | +3.00 | +1.40 |
| Young Adult | -1.50 | -1.67 | -1.67 | -2.33 | -2.38 | -1.80 | -5.00 | -1.19 |
| Settled Adult | -1.11 | -1.67 | $-1.40$ | +1.67 | -1.13 | +1.38 | +1.04 | -1.20 |
| Elderly | -2.00 | $-0.00$ | -0.00 | -2.00 | -3.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Marital Status |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Not Married | -1.29 | -1.30 | -2.13 | -1.42 | -1.68 | -2.00 | -1. 14 | -1.03 |
| Married | -1.25 | -2.00 | 1.00 | -1.60 | -1.07 | 1.00 | +1.40 | -1.18 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Social Class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Clearly Upper | $-3.00$ | -0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | -1.40 | -1.25 | -2.00 | -2.00 |
| Mixed | -1.12 | -1.21 | -1.64 | -1.55 | -1.45 | -1.14 | , 1.00 | -1.10 |
| Clearly Lower | -0.00 | 0.00 | -3.00 | 0.00 | $-1.50$ | -2.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Race |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White | $-1.29$ | $-1.43$ | -1.58 | $-1.50$ | -1. 39 | -1.13 | 1.00 | -1.10 |
| Other | -1.67 | 0.00 | -0.00 | -2.00 | -2.50 | $-0.00$ | 0.00 | 1.00 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Character Type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| "Good". | $-1.30$ | -1.83 | -2.13 | -2.18 | -1.81 | 1.00 | +1. 13 | -1.22 |
| Mixed | -1.44 | -1.20 | -1.33 | $+1.25$ | -1.31 | -1. 89 | -1.33 | +1.09 |
| "Bad" | +1. 20 | 1.00 | +2.00 | +1.25 | 1.00 | +1.33 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nationality |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| U.S. | -1.33 | -1.25 | -1.90 | -1.86 | -1.58 | -1.33 | +1.04 | -1.04 |
| Other | -1.50 | -2.00 | 1.00 | -3.00 | +1.50 | 1.00 | -0.00 | -0.00 |

[^12]Tab1e 14
Killer - Killed Ratios: ${ }^{1}$
All Major Characters in All Programs
(1969-1977)


## 1

Risk ratios are obtained by dividing the more numerous of these two roles by the less numerous within each group. A plus sign indicates that there are more violents or killers than victims or killed and a minus sign indicates that there are more victims or killed than violents or killers. A ratio of 0.00 means that there were no victims or killers or violents or killed. A +0.00 ratio means that there were some violents or killers but no victims or killed; a -0.00 ratio means there were victims or killed but no violents or killexs.

2
These figures are based upon two samples collected in the fall of each of these years.
3
These figures are based upon two samples - one from the fall and one from the spring.
4
The Fall 1977 sample consists of two weeks of prime-time and one weekend morning of network dramatic programs.

Table 15
Killer - Killed Ratios: ${ }^{1}$
Male Major Characters in All Programs
(1969-1977)


[^13]Female Major Characters in All Programs
(1969-1977)


[^14]4
The Fall 1977 sample consists of two weeks of prime-time and one weekend morning of network dramatic programs.

Female characterizations have undergone an interesting change. From 1969 through 1973, when they encounter violence they are more likely to be killed than to kill. However, starting in 1974 we find women in parts in which they are the killers. Female major characters have changed from being the usual victims of killers to being portrayed as able to kill, as men do, without being killed and for the first time in eleven years there are no female victims of lethal violence.

Tables 45 through 65 of Section III present detailed findings for characters on violence-related items.

## Cultivation Analysis Methodology

Cultivation Analysis is the study of what is usually called effects or impact. We consider the latter terms inappropriate to the study of broad cultural influences. The "effects" of a pervasive medium upon the composition and structure of the symbolic environment are subtle, complex and mingled with other influences. Also, the concept of causation, borrowed from simpler experimental studies in the physical and biological sciences, is not fully applicable to the steady flow of images and messages that make up much of contemporary popular culture.

People are born into a culture that cultivates their needs as well as their satisfactions. Culture affects assumptions about facts as well as responses to facts. In modern cultures demand is manufactured, as we11 as the supply. Social and psychological characteristics draw individuals to select certain types of content which, in turn, nourish and cultivate those characteristics. Innumerable facts (and values) outside of personal experience can only be learned -- and related values derived -- from the mass media; or from others who have learned them from the mass media. Increasingly, media-cultivated facts and values become standards by which we judge personal experience and family and community behavior.

A slight but pervasive shift in the cultivation of common perspectives may not change much in personal outlook and behavior but may change the relative meaning of much behavior. Furthermore, common perspectives help structure the agenda of public (and often private) discourse and provide a basis of interaction among different social groups. Just as a barely perceptible change of a few degrees average temperature can lead to an Ice

Age or make the desert bloom, so a slight but pervasive change in the cultural climate may creat shifts in perspective that do not amount to much measurable difference in single individuals but can have major social and public policy consequences. That is why we tend to speak in terms of the contribution of television to the cultivation of common perspectives rather than in terms of achieving any preconceived goals, impact, or effects.

Cultivation Analysis begins with the patterns found in the "world" of television drama. The message system composing that world presents a coherent image of life and society. How is this image reflected in the assumptions and values held by its audiences? How are the "lessons" of symbolic behavior presented in fictional forms applied to conceptions about real life?

These days nearly everyone "1ives" to some extent in the world of television*, so that the problem of studying television's effects is a difficult one. Without control groups of non-viewers it is hard to isolate television's impact. Experiments do not solve the problem, for they are not comparable to people's day-to-day viewing of television. Our approach reflects the
$\qquad$ hypothesis that heavier viewers of television - those exposed to a greater/ extent than lighter viewers to its messages -- are more likely to understand social reality in terms of the "facts of life" they see on television. To investigate this idea we partition the population and our samples according to television exposure. By contrasting light and heavy viewers, some of the "difference" television makes in people's conception of social reality can be examined.

* Jackson-Beeck, Marilyn, "The Nonviewers: Who Are They?" Journal of Communication, 48, 1977, pp 65-72.


## Development of Questions

The investigation of television's effects upon conceptions of social reality begins with systematic analysis of the world of television drama. Message System Analysis reveals how certain "facts" and aspects of social reality are presented in television drama; these "facts" are then compared with other conceptions of the same "facts" and aspects derived from direct and independent observations, such as U.S. Census figures. For example, in prime-time television drama aired from 1969-76, 64 percent of major characters and 30 percent of all characters (major and minor*) were involved in violence as either perpetrators or victims or both. According to the 1970 Census, there were only . 32 violent crimes per 100 persons.** In the world of television, therefore, one has between a 30 and 64 percent chance of being involved in violence, but, in the real world, only a one-third of one percent chance.

Next, we determine what heavy and light viewers (both children and adults) believe to be the facts. To the extent that patterns of life presented in dramatic television programs cultivate distinct conceptions of social reality, heavy viewers are expected to be more likely than light viewers to choose answers that reflect television perspectives. Our research strategy, instrumentation, and samples are designed to establish the extent to which and the ways in which television cultivates such patterned responses.

Once the "television view" and the "real world" or some other view of selected facts and aspects of social reality have been determined, we construct questions dealing with these facts and aspects of life. Each question

* This report presents findings for major characters only.
** Newer data on personal violent crime victimization range from .41 per 100 (based on 1973 Police reported figures which include homicide) to 3.3 per 100 persons over 12 (based on 1974 probability sample which doesn't include homicide).
has an inferred or objectively determined "television response" reflecting the "television view" of the fact as well as a "non-television answer." For example, one cultivation question asks: "Duxing any given week, what are your chances of being involved in some kind of violence? About one in ten? About one in a hundred?" The first answer -- "about one in ten" -- more closely reflects the world of television and is used as the "television answer," while the "one in a hundred" more closely matches U.S. Census data and reflects the real-1ife circumstances of most Americans.


## Samples of Respondents

To test our hypothesis we continually gather data reflecting television viewers' beliefs and behaviors. These data have been collected from samples diverse in characteristics such as age, location, and institutional affiliation. Within each sample, television viewers' responses are further analyzed in terms of age, education, sex, and other social and personal characteristics.

We have collected data from samples of children; adult data have been gathered by our students, commercial agencies, and academic institutions.* Our policy is to administer the same questions repeatedly to various samples, including both children and adults, whenever possible.

Figures 4 and 5 describe the ten data bases used in Cultivation Analysis over the past five years. Our New Jersey rural-suburban school children's data are complemented by data from children of the same-age attending the Bank Street School in Manhattan. Our surveys of University of Pennsylvania students are counterpointed by surveys including Philadelphia residents who are not students. Most national samples used in Cultivation Analysis are

[^15]New Jersey School Children


Parents'
Education

Dates
Location
Sampling

Number of
respondents
Collecting
organization
Method of
collection
Demographic characteristics
Sampling

Dec. 75 ; May 76

Rural/suburban $\quad$ New York City New Jersey

Student population of a public middle school

649

Cultural Indicators

Self-administered questionnaire
$\bar{x}=12.77$ years
Neither went to
college
Father or both



## Figure 5

"Adult" Data Bases Used in CuItivationiAnalysis


## Figure 5 (continued)

"Adult" Data Bases Used in Cultivation Analysis
fully representative; however, one includes/respondents from only four major cities.

The NEW JERSEY SCHOOL Sample (Figure 4) represents a cross-sectional sample from our three-year study which combines six questionnaires and a personal interview with students, and questionnaires completed by their parents. The 649 children from a suburban-rural school district were in the seventh, eighth, and ninth grades in 1975-76 when the questionnaire items reported here were administered. Seventh and eighth-graders completed their questionnaires at the school under group administration conditions, while ninth graders completed their questionnaires at home and mailed them to the project. The New Jersey sample is mostly white and almost equally divided between boys and girls. About half the respondents' fathers attended college. Only a quarter of the students reported watching as 1ittle as two hours of television on the average day, while 18 percent claimed to watch television for six or more hours daily. Most students reported reading a newspaper, at least occasionally.

The BANK STREET SCHOOL sample (Figure 4) represents students from an ungraded demonstration school of a Manhattan teaching college. Questionnaires were administered by teachers to 133 respondents who are comparable to the New Jersey sample in terms of race (mainly white), age, and relative proportion of boys and girls. In contrast to the New Jersey sample, these children were more likely to be light viewers of television and regular readers of newspapers. Parents of Bank Street students were much more likely than New Jersey parents to have attended college.

The STARCH survey was commissioned by the Cultural Indicators Project in Spring 1973 (See Figure 5). In each of four cities (Dallas, Chicago, Philadelphia, and Los Angeles), Starch/Hooper selected households at random
from the area telephone directories according to the following procedures: Pages wereselected by random start and fixed intervals. One column was selected at random from each page. One telephone number was selected at random from each column. If the number was not assigned to a private household, the next number in the column was used. Potential respondents then were screened for television viewing level and for sex, so the sample is comprised equally of heavy and light television viewers and of men and women. Interviewers sought men in households until the quota was filled; then they filled the quota for women. A11 respondents were asked this question concerning television viewing: "How many hours a day do you usually watch television? Please include morning, afternoon and evening." Respondents who answered "less than two hours" are light viewers and those who answered "at least four hours" are heavy viewers.

ORC data were contracted for by the Cultural Indicators Project in the May 1974 Opinion Research Corporation General Public Caravan Survey. These surveys consisted of face-to-face interviews of national probability samples of men and women 18 years of age or over living in private households in the continental United States. The primary sampling unit (PSU) was the community, defined as those people included in the largest telephone book containing a randomly selected "minor civil division" (MCD). The MCD's came from sixty U.S. counties chosen by systematic random methods (with probability proportional to size of population). Within the community (PSU), individuals to be interviewed were chosen on the basis of randomly determined starting points, which became the first of a household cluster. In effect, interviewing thus proceeded, by neighborhood, and included households with and without listed telephone numbers.

NORC data come from the National Data Program for the Social Sciences, as part of its data diffusion project and continuing program of social indicator research. The 1975 study is mixed with respect to sampling technique: it is one-half full-probability and one-half block-quota, because of _ a transition tio full probability sampling. The quota sample is a multi-stage area probability sample to the block or segment level. At the block level, however, quota sampling was used (interviewing occurred only after 3 p.m. on weekdays or during the weekend or holidays). Interviewers at the block or segment level traveled from the first dwelling unit of the northwest corner of the block and proceeded as specified until age, sex, and employment quotas were filled (based on the exact proportions in each segment determined by the 1970 Census tract data). The full probability samples in 1975 and 1977 are stratified, multi-stage, area probability samples of clusters of households in the continental United States. Households at which interviews took place were probabilistically selected from available lists of addresses for blocks and enumeration districts within Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas or counties.

PENN (Quota) data are a collection of responses from quota/accidental samples drawn by University of Pennsylvania students during April, 1976. The students were asked to interview in person or by telephone a total of ten fellow students, half of whom were "light" television viewers, and half of whom were "heavy" viewers. For the purposes of this sample, "light" was defined as less than one hour of daily television exposure; heavy, as two or more hours. There are 540 respondents in the PENN sample.

PENN552 includes data from 209 University of Pennsylvania undergraduates interviewed during October 1976 by Penn graduate students. The chosen undergraduates comprise a sex-stratified probability sample of University of

Pennsylvania freshman and seniors drawn from the student directory in fall 1967. Sample selection was done by computer from the University registrar's file of personal data on full-time undergraduates, according to the following procedures: (1) freshman and senior, males and females were sorted into four groups, (2) students in each group were ordered randomly, (3) every twelfth male and every fifth female were chosen, except for foreign students. Interview method (in person or by phone) was determined randomly, by the toss of a coin.

PHILLY data are from 387 Philadelphia area adults interviewed during April 1977 by University of Pennsylvania students. Sampling was probabilistic, drawing on individual telephone subscribers listed in the August 1976 Philadephia Telephone Book (white pages) Pages from the telephone book were chosen at fixed intervals after a random start. Each page, divided into ten equal half-columns, was assigned to a class member for interviewee selection within the following constraints: (1) no calls to businesses, associations, or professional offices, and (2) no interviews with children or relatives of chosen telephone subscribers or their spouses

CPS76 data are part of the 1976 American National Election Study by the Center for Political Studies, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan. Respondents were interviewed both before ( $\mathrm{N}=2,248$ ) and after ( $\mathrm{N}=1,909$ ) the 1976 presidential election, by professional interviewers. The sample* derives from the CPS 1972 election study sample frame, based on housing units exclusive of institutional populations. Included are a selfweighting subset of respondents previously interviewed in 1972 and 1974. These panelists were augmented with a set of new interviews selected to

[^16]provide, with the application of prescribed weighting factors, a representative cross-section of U.S. citizens.

Dimensions of Analysis

When reporting responses to forced-choice questions, the non-parametric gamma statistic is given. Gamma measures the relationship between television exposure and $T V$ answers, with significance indicated by tau-b or tau-c. For open-ended questions, as in our PHILLY data base, exposure group means are compared statistically by reference to student's-t or F-tests.

The proportion of respondents who give the television answer to cultivation questions are tabulated on the basis of daily television exposure, controlling for personal and social characteristics. Our analysis typically classifies "heavy":" "medium" and "light" television viewers (group-relative), and then compares the proportion of television answers among aggregates of viewers. The comparison is made in terms of gamma and what we call the "cultivation differential" (CD). The "cultivation differential" is the difference in relative frequency of TV answers between lighter and heavier viewing aggregates (for example, the proportion of heavy viewers who give TV answers minus the proportion of light viewers who give these answers). A positive $C D$ in our view indexes television's cultivation potential in the hypothesized direction.

The present report focuses on two aspects of perceived social reality which have been investigated among television viewers: (1) perceived danger and (2) mistrust and alienation. Perceived danger is tapped by the following items (TV Answer underscored) constructed by the Cultural Indicators staff:

During any given week, about how many people out of 100 are involved in some kind of violence -- would you say 1 in a 100 , or about 10 in 100 ?

About what percent of all males who have jobs work in law enforcement and crime detection -- like policemen, sheriffs, detectives? Would you say it is 1 percent or 5 percent?

What percent of all crimes are violent crimes -- like murder, rape, robbery and aggravated assault? Would you say it is 15 percent or 25 percent?

Does most killing take place between people who know each other well or between strangers?

Some or all of these items have been administered with slightly different response options to samples of adults and children: STARCH, ORC, PENN, New Jersey and Bank Street School children. Open-ended versions of the first two questions have been administered also to the PHILLY sample.

To extend our analyses, overt and hypothetical behaviors suggesting perceived dangers also have been studied.

Respondent school children in New Jersey and New York have been asked:*
How often is it all right to hit someone if you are mad at them for some good reason? Is it almost always all right or almost never all right?

Respondents' fear of walking in the city has been studied among New Jersey child viewers and adults in the 1976 Election Study and 1977 NORC General Social Survey. Generally, the question is:

Would you be afraid to walk alone in the city at night? (Yes; No)

Also, in our most recent secondary analysis, four $\% *$ of a series of five items reflecting crime-defensive behavior of adult respondents were analyzed in relation to viewing crime and police television programs. The 1976

American National Election Study respondents were asked:

* Cf. Mcleod, Jack, M., Charles K. Atkin, and Steven H. Chaffee, "Adolescents, Parents, and Television Use: Adolescent Self-Report Measures from Maryland and Wisconsin Samples," in Television and Social Behavior, Vol. III, George A. Gomstock and Eli A. Rubinstein (eds) (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1972), pp. 173-238.
** The fifth item, installation of alarm systems, was analyzed but not included in the report because the small number of respondents who had purchased alarm systems ( $N=110$ ) made cross-tabular analysis impossible.

Now we would like to ask you how crime affects you personally. Some people find it necessary to take certain precautions in order to be safe from crime. Please tell me if you've done any of the following things to protect yourself against crime:
-- bought a dog for purposes of protection
-- put new locks on windows or doors for purposes of protection
-- kept a gun for purposes of protection
-- stayed away from certain areas in a town or city for purposes of protection.

The response dimension "mistrust and alienation" is measured by existing
indicators that have been tested and constructed by other researchers. Beginning with our secondary analysis of the 1975 NORC General Social Survey data, three of Rosenberg's (1957)* "faith in people" index items have been used:

Do you think most people would try to take advantage of you if they got a chance, or would they try to be fair?

Generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted, or that you can't be too careful in dealing with people?

Would you say that most of the time people try to be helpful, or that they are mostly just looking out for themselves?

These three items subsequently were administered to our two groups of school children and to Penn students in the PENN and PENN522 surveys. Also, they were analyzed among respondents to the 1976 American National Election Study.

Three items reflecting "anomie"** were also analyzed among respondents to the 1977 NORC General Social Survey:

In spite of what some people say, the lot of the average man is getting worse, not better. (Agree, Disagree)

It's hardly fair to bring a child into the world with the way things look for the future. (Agree, Disagree)

[^17]Most public officials are not really interested in the problems of the average man. (Agree, Disagree)

As an extension of the same idea, secondary analysis of television viewers' outlook on international affairs was conducted by using the following (or similar) items in the 1976 American National Election Study and the 1975 NORC General Social Survey:*

Do you think it would be best for the future of the country if we take an active part in world affairs or if we stay out of world affairs?

Do you expect the United States to fight in another war within the next ten years? (Yes, No)

[^18]
## Cultivation Findings


#### Abstract

Cultivation Analysis over the past five years reveals a consistent; significant, "positive" relationship between television exposure and two aspects of social reality -- (1) perceived danger, and (2) mistrust and alienation. Heavy viewers in greater proportion than light viewers appear to generalize from observation of television's message system to real life situations, despite facts to the contrary and despite the fictional nature of most television content. This relationship usually cannot be explained by social or personal characteristics, although these characteristics make important contributions to baseline levels of criterion variables and to differences in the strength and intensity of television's apparent impact.


 Heavy viewers are more likely to perceive crime and danger in the real world than light viewers. Moreover, when we investigate the related phenomena of mistrust and alienation, the same relationship occurs. Heavy viewers more than light viewers are pessimistic about the future and about others' motives in interpersonal interaction. Finally, and importantly, more heavy viewers than light viewers take action to protect themselves from danger -with firearms, dogs and locks. Overall, the data suggest that heavy viewers who are exposed to a world of fear and violence on television are more likely to see the real world in television terms than are light viewers exposed to the same facts of life.Tables 66 through 85 (Section III) reveal that heavy viewers (both children and adults) generally overestimate chances of encountering violence; the percentage of employed men working in crime detection and law enforcement; the percentage of crimes that are violent; and the number of murders
committed by unknown assailants. At the interpersonal level, among school children, heavier viewers are more likely to approve physical violence inspired by anger. Analysis also suggests that heavy television viewers are slightly more reluctant to go out at night than light viewers and that they take more precautionary measures against attacks and break-ins (Section III, Tables 86 through 92). Among adult respondents (representing the United States population) included in the 1976 American National Election Study, those who report that they "frequently" watch evening police and crime programs also report that they have obtained dogs, guns, and locks expressly for purposes of protection, in greater proportions than those respondents who "sometimes," "rarely" or "never" watch crime and police programs. (However, these viewers did not necessarily stay away from certain areas in towns or cities for purposes of protection.)

We also find that heavy viewers more than light viewers mistrust others and doubt the possibility of a better future (Section III, Tab1es 93 through 113). They are significantly more likely to report that "you can't be too careful in dealing with people," and that others are self-interested and will take advantage of people if they get the chance. The heavy viewers are more likely to say that "things" look bad --- so bad that it would be unfair to have children; that officials do not care about the public; and that the lot of the average man is getting worse, rather than better. In fact, significantly greater proportions of heavy viewers envision another war within the next ten years and say it would be better for the United States to stay out of world affairs.

It must be stressed that these data are in no way adequate to suggest that television alone causes exaggerated perceptions of danger and fearrelated phenomena in all people. What we have found is that the television-danger-mistrust relationship is remarkably consistent and robust across
samples and across most control groups. However, we hasten to add that television viewing derives meaning largely within the context of respondents' other characteristics. For example, when we regress television exposure and other potential predictors onto PHILLY respondents' open-ended estimates of violent crimes, the chances of meeting violence, and the proportion of employed men working at law enforcement and crime detection, we find that age and years of education, as well as hours of television exposure, are all strong and significant predictors. Likewise; when we regress frequency of exposure to crime and police programs along with age, sex, race, education, newspaper reading, family income, and network television news viewing, into a summary index of the four crime-defensive measures relating to guns, locks, dogs and avoiding certain areas of a town or city (see tables 89-92 in Section III), exposure to crime and police programs registers the largest standardized beta. However, exposure to crime and police programs is not the only important predictor; race, education, and exposure to network television news are also significant. The moral is that television viewing cannot readily be isolated as a single "causal" factor, nor should it be. But to the extent that television viewing is as important as other social and demographic predictors we feel its cultivation characteristics should be further investigated on a continuing, consistent basis.
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