

Violence in Television Drama: Trends and Symbolic Functions

George Gerbner

*The Annenberg School of Communications
University of Pennsylvania*

This research began as the conclusion of a three-year study of violence in prime time and Saturday morning network television drama.¹ It concluded as the beginning of the development of indicators of popular cultural trends, and of a theory of the symbolic functions of television violence.

The basic findings of the three-year comparative analysis (and of a separately tabulated enlarged 1969 sample, providing a broader base for future trend studies) appear in tabular form, in Appendix A. The results may lend themselves to a variety of further analyses and interpretations. A summary and interpretation of the results comprises the text of the

report. The Appendix contains a full account of analytical procedures and a description of the samples of programs analyzed.

It is obvious that television violence is communication, not violence. The implication of this simple fact is that research presumably investigating the relationships between violence and communication cannot proceed on the basis of unexamined assumptions about the extent, nature, and functions of the communication. The conventional approaches and methods of social research appropriate to the study of violent (or any other) behavior are not fully adequate to the analysis of the symbolic presentations of that behavior. Research on mass communications has the unique task of studying symbol systems and their roles in social behavior. Such specialized study is needed when the symbolic functions of the communication are not necessarily or even typically the same as the functions of the behavior they symbolize. It becomes necessary, therefore, to investigate the message of dramatic violence before attempting to find out what that message might cultivate in social conceptions and behavior. Such an investigation was undertaken in this study.

Symbolic functions are, of course, intimately involved in and govern most human activity. The social meaning of an act stems from the symbolic context in which it is embedded. The significance of a life or a death rests in some conception of personality, goals, values, and fate. Similarly, the significance of dramatic action such as violence is an organic part of symbolic structures in which the action helps define, move, and resolve dramatic situations. If the structure changes, the significance of the act will change. If the incidence of a certain dramatic act such as violence changes because of censorship or other controls, the dramatic structures may shift to accommodate the change and to preserve—or even enhance—the symbolic functions of the act.

The study of dramatic violence and its symbolic functions reveals how such a communication helps define, characterize, and often decide the course of life, the fate of people, and the nature of society in a fictional world. The fact that the fictional world is often very different from the real world and that dramatic behavior bears little resemblance to everyday actions is the very essence of the power and human significance of symbolic functions. Fiction and drama can structure situations and present action in a variety of realistic, fantastic, tragic, or comic ways so as to provide the appropriate symbolic context for some human, moral, and social significance that could not be presented or would not be accepted (let alone enjoyed) in other ways.

Interpretations will, of course, vary. But they must start from some knowledge of the time, space, characterization, plot, type of action, and other elementary facts that define the situations to be interpreted. The basic common message of television drama was seen as implicit in these definitions.

Although setting agenda and defining issues do not determine all decisions, in the long run they have a systematic and critical influence on the outcome of most decisions. Similarly, this research assumed that the almost ritualistically regular and repetitive symbolic structures of television drama cultivate certain premises about the rules of the game of life. Violence plays an important role in that game. Not only is real life violence ruled by real consequences but, more important, it is governed by the symbolic attributes that illuminate its meaning and significance. Men commit violence out of love as well as hate, avoid it out of fear as well as prudence, fall victim to it out of accident as well as weakness, and die deaths that can be ignominious as well as glorious. Dramatic violence, free from constraints of reality, calculates the risks of life and the pecking order of society for symbolic purposes. Its implicit moral and social significance governs all behavior. Its functions can define the basic premises that affect interpretations and conclusions independent of individual differences.

These assumptions guided the methodology of this research. The methods of analyzing media content were designed to investigate the aggregate and collective premises defining life and its issues in representative samples of mass-produced symbolic material. Such analysis attempts to establish the incidence and grouping of selected terms presented in the material. The analysis rests on the reliable determination of unambiguously perceived elements of communication. Its data base is not what any individual would select, but what an entire national community absorbs. It does not attempt to interpret single or selected units of material or to draw conclusions about artistic merit. The analysis is limited to those interpretations and conclusions that are implicit in the prevalence, rate, and distribution of clear and common terms over the entire sample. By depending on the reliable determination of unambiguously perceived terms and by ordering these terms along lines of theoretical and social interest, the analysis can identify symbolic structures and functions not available to any selective scrutiny or to any subjective general interpretation.

The reliability of the analysis is achieved by multiple codings and by the measured agreement of trained analysts on each usable item (see Appendix A). If one were to substitute the perceptions and impressions of casual observers, no matter how sophisticated, the value of the investigation would be reduced and its purpose confounded. Only by objectively analyzing unambiguous message elements and separating them from global personal impressions left by unidentified clues can the researcher track the symbolic functions of a specific type of dramatic action (such as violence) and provide the basis for comparison with audience perceptions, conceptions and behavior. No such relationships can be established as long as the actual common terms and their implicit symbolic functions are unknown, are derived from unexamined assump-

tions, or are inferred from subjective verbalizations of uncertain and ambiguous origin. By taking into account the symbolic origins of the relationships, the researcher will be able to direct attention to the most relevant behavioral and other aspects. If change is desired, an account of symbolic dynamics will also reveal what the potentials and limitations of specific program controls might be and how such changes might relate to symbolic and social structures. In other words, the next step toward understanding television violence and social behavior is to look for the effects of the message where the message actually is. That step was beyond the scope of this research, but some suggestions are made in the conclusions on page 39.

Violence connotes a great variety of physical and mental violations, emotions, injustices, and transgressions of social and moral norms. For this study violence was defined in its strictest physical sense as an arbiter of power. Analysts were instructed to record as violent only "the overt expression of physical force against others or self, or the compelling of action against one's will on pain of being hurt or killed." The expression of injurious or lethal force had to be credible and real in the symbolic terms of the drama. Humorous and even farcical violence can be credible and real, even if it has a presumable comic effect. But idle threats, verbal abuse, or comic gestures with no real consequences were not to be considered violent. The agent of violence could be any sort of creature, and the act could appear to be accidental as well as intentional. All characters serve human purposes in the symbolic realm, and accidents or even "acts of nature" occur only on purpose in drama.

The purpose was assumed to be simply to tell a story. Dramatic purposes shape symbolic functions in ways implicit in the distribution and arrangement of elements over a large and representative sample of stories; they do not necessarily derive from stated or implied purposes of specific plays. The basic unit of analysis, therefore, was the play, defined as a single fictional story in play or skit form.

All plays produced specifically for television, all feature films, and all cartoon programs telecast during prime time and Saturday morning on the three major national networks were included in the analysis. (If a program included more than one play, each play became a separate unit of analysis. However, trends are reported in terms of program hours as well as of plays in order to control the possibly distorting effects of a few multi-play programs.)

The study period was one full week of fall programming for each annual television season. The 1969 analysis enlarged the time period to provide a broader base for future trend studies. However, all comparative findings for 1967, 1968, and 1969 were reported only for programs telecast during the same time periods. The enlarged 1969 sample was tabulated in a separate column and is so labeled in the relevant tables of Appendix A. A description of the exact time period and an account of

the representativeness of the one-week sample is found in Appendix B. An index and a calendar are listed in Appendix C.

The story defines a play, but characters act out the dramatic story. Units of analysis within the basic context unit—the play—were, therefore, leading characters and scenes of violent action. Leading characters were defined as all those who play leading parts representing the principal types essential to the story and to the thematic elements (including violence) significant to the play. Scenes of violent action were defined as those confined to the same agents of violence. Every such scene (also called a “violent episode”) was considered a single unit of analysis as long as the violence involved the same parties; if a new agent of violence entered the scene, it became another episode.

Trained analysts worked in rotating pairs, with two pairs (four analysts) independently recording all observations after repeated viewings of all programs. The programs were videotaped for that purpose from network broadcasts aired during the analysis periods. The analysis procedures and the assessment of reliability determining the usability of observations are described in Appendix A. The entire three-year analysis yielded comparable samples of a total of 281 plays or 182.25 program hours, 762 leading characters, and 1355 violent episodes.

Certain items of the 1967-68 analysis, such as the “significance of the violence to the plays’ plots” (included in the tabulations) and the enumeration of “acts” and “encounters,” are not summarized here because of their duplication of other and more valid measures. The instrument of analysis for the 1969 study included items in the 1967-68 research (published in the previously cited report on *Violence and the Media*²) and new items for which previous data were reanalyzed to yield comparative and comprehensive results. The instrument is contained in a 110-page book of instructions.³

The text of this report presents and interprets the findings of the three-year analysis, including all comparative features added in 1969. The first major section is devoted to measures and indicators of variations in amounts of violence presented over the three years. The trends are analyzed for all programming, for networks, and for different kinds of programs. The general prevalence of violence, the rate of violent episodes, and the frequency of roles involving violent characterizations are indicated; these are also combined into composite scores and an overall violence index. A separate analysis of the distribution of violent presentations shows the contribution of each network and program type to the total volume and how that contribution changed over time. These trends illustrate the effects of program *policy* controls upon the symbolic *mix*.

The second major section deals with the structure of the symbolic world and the functions of violence in it. It describes the dynamics of violent action and the consequences of selective changes upon the setting and population of television plays. The shifting complexion of vio-

lence roles and their relationship to the temporal, spatial, demographic, and ethnographic dimensions of the fictional world define the risks of life and allocation of powers in that world, and set the stage for some final conclusions.

VARIATIONS IN AMOUNTS OF VIOLENCE OVER TIME, PROGRAMS, AND NETWORKS

The amount of violence in network television drama is essentially a matter of programming *policy*. The mix of different program formats and types and the selection of plays for each kind determine the extent and frequency of violent representations. The measures and indicators developed to compare violent representation over time, across different kinds of programs, and among the three major networks are described below. The trends and comparisons are presented in detail in Tables 1 through 66.

Measures and indicators

The amount of violence in television plays was measured in several ways. Some of these ways showed the extent to which there was any violence in the program samples. Others noted the frequency of violence. Still others showed the number of leading characters involved in violence. These measures were called *prevalence*, *rate*, and *role*, respectively.

The *prevalence* of violence in the program samples is expressed as the percent of plays, program hours, or both, containing any violence at all. This shows the likelihood of encountering (or chances of avoiding) violence in the course of nonselective viewing.

The *rate* of violence expresses the frequency and concentration of violent action in the samples. It is based on scenes of violence (violent episodes between the same opponents). The number of violent episodes divided by the total number of plays (whether violent or not) yielded the rate per all programs; the same number divided by the total number of program hours gave the rate per all hours.

Roles related to violence are those of leading characters committing violence, falling victim to it, or both. Each of these roles was separately computed; so was the percentage of those involved in lethal violence and fatal victimization.

These measures of violence are based directly on analysts’ observations. They are combined to form *indicators* expressing several of the qualities measured in single summary figures. The indicators facilitate gross comparisons. However, they should be used in light of the in-

interpretive judgments and assumptions inherent in the formulas that generated them.

Three kinds of indicators are used. Two are based on selected measures showing qualities of programs and of characterizations. The third and most general index is the sum of the first two. The two intermediate indicators are called scores. Prevalence, rate per play, and rate per hour are reflected in the *program score* (PS). This was computed as:

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

In this 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 are doubled in order to raise their relatively low numerical value to the importance that the concepts of frequency and saturation deserve. The rate per hour is included to reflect the concentration or diffusion of violent action in time. The formula, then, gives the greatest weight to the extent to which violence prevails at all in the programs. Secondary but substantial weight is given to the frequency of violence and to the saturation of programs with violent action.

Roles involving characters in some violence, weighted by roles involving them in killing, are expressed in the *character score* (CS). The formula:

$$CS = (\%V) + (\%K)$$

represents the percentage of all leading characters committing violence, suffering violence, or both (%V), with added weight given to the percent of those involved in killing either as killers or as victims or both (%K).

Finally, the *violence index* was obtained by adding the program score to the character score. Prevalence, rate, and role are thus reflected in the index, with program information weighing usually slightly more heavily in the balance than information derived from character analysis. Of course, all these indices are additive: if all components change in the same direction, the index accumulates the changes; if they counter to one another, the index balances them.

An examination of the trends and comparisons indicated in the findings follows. The results are presented in Tables 1-28. The basic frequencies and some additional measures are given in detail in Tables 29-66.

Trends and comparisons

General trends in television programming are something like fluctuations of average national temperature or average barometer readings; they do not necessarily resemble what any one person experiences, but they do indicate what the nation as a whole absorbs and how that

changes, if at all, over time. This report of programming trends shows what systems of images and messages network television as a whole releases into the mainstream of national consciousness.

Nevertheless, overall trends can be misleading unless one knows their composition. Shifts in complex cultural manifestations are seldom evenly distributed. The complexion of the total system of messages and the specific conceptions cultivated by them is a blend of different programs, policies, and viewer selections.

Overall trends. The percentage of programs containing violence (*prevalence*) and the rates of violent episodes did not change significantly from 1967 to 1969. About eight in ten plays still contained violence, and the frequency of violent episodes was still about five per play and nearly eight per hour.

The percentage (although, as the tabulations show, not the number) of characters involved in violence declined from over seven in ten in 1967 to somewhat more than six in ten in 1969, with most of the reduction from 1967 to 1968. More substantial and steady was the reduction of lethal violence. Leading characters involved in killing dropped from nearly two in ten in 1967 to one in ten in 1968 and to one in 20 in 1969.

The violence index was 198.7 in 1967, 180.7 in 1968, and 175.5 in 1969. The drop in the violence index can be attributed to the reduction in violent characterizations, especially in killing. Total violence remained the same, but it was committed by fewer characters. Only a handful committed violence of a lethal sort. This resulted in declining character scores and violence index, but at the same time program scores remained steady over the years.

A compilation of detailed program scores, character scores, and the violence index of network programming can be seen in Tables 1 and 2.

Comparison of network indicators. Although not license holders themselves, networks dominate national television programming. Since they compete in the same markets, networks do not differ from one another as much as programs on the same network differ from one another. Nevertheless, network policies do change from time to time.

The violence index of each network was:

	1967	1968	1969	1967-69
ABC	222.3	192.9	170.0	193.4
CBS	151.0	167.1	148.7	155.2
NBC	219.6	187.3	203.8	203.4

The violence index of all network programming declined from 1967 to 1969, but NBC's rose from 1968 to 1969 (see Table 2). That rise can be attributed to an increase in program violence while character violence

remained steady. CBS viewers had the best chance of avoiding violence, if they wished to. After a rise in 1968 (mostly in program violence), the index returned to slightly below its 1967 level, the lowest of the three networks. ABC, formerly the most violent, substantially reduced its dependence on video mayhem, but not quite to the level of CBS. NBC, after a reduction in both program and character violence in 1968, increased its program violence (specifically in cartoon programming), making its index the highest in 1969.

Comparison of kinds of programs. Technique, tradition, and markets shape dramatic formulas on television, each with its own violence quotient. Competition and convention tend to inhibit drastic tampering with profitable formulas. Program formats that we have analyzed separately are cartoons, feature films, and plays. These are exclusive categories; a program may be classified in only one of them. Programs were also tabulated by two additional types: crime, western, action-adventure type; and comedy type. These two are not exclusive categories; a program classified in any one of them may also be classed in others.

Cartoons, already the most violent programs in 1967, increased their lead in 1969. In fact, only plays were substantially less violent in 1969 than they had been in 1967. Feature films dropped to slightly below 1967 levels after a surge of violence in 1968. The rise in the prevalence and rate of cartoon violence was also reflected in the program scores of crime-action and comedy programs.

A more detailed record of measures and indicators by kinds of programming can be found in Tables 3-7. A comparative examination confirmed that only plays produced specifically for prime time adult television declined on all measures of violence from 1967 to 1969. It is also clear that children watching Saturday morning cartoons had the least chance of escaping violence or of avoiding the heaviest saturation of violence on all television.

Of all 95 cartoon plays analyzed during the three annual study periods, only two in 1967 and one each in 1968 and 1969 did *not* contain violence. The average cartoon hour in 1967 contained more than three times as many violent episodes as the average adult dramatic hour. The trend toward shorter plays sandwiched between frequent commercials on fast-moving cartoon programs further increased the saturation. By 1969, with a violent episode at least every two minutes in all Saturday morning cartoon programming (including the least violent and including commercial time), and with adult drama becoming less saturated with violence, the average cartoon hour had nearly six times the violence rate of the average adult television drama hour, and nearly 12 times the violence rate of the average movie hour.

While crime, western, action-adventure programs are, of course, more violent than comedy programs, an increase in program score for the former and in all measures for the latter can be attributed to the number of cartoon programs in each.

Network programming. Tables 8-22 present measures and indicators of violence for each network and selected measures for each network by cartoons, noncartoon programming, crime, western, action-adventure programs, and comedy.

ABC programs were less violent in 1969 than they had been in 1967. ABC's violence index dropped further than any other network's. All measures for the network as a whole declined, with the sharpest reductions in video killing. The bulk of the reductions, however, came from general adult programming, with cartoons and crime-action programs all remaining violent and highly saturated with violence. ABC comedy programs, unlike those of the other networks, were no more violent in 1969 than they had been in 1967.

CBS programming, the least violent, also changed the least among the networks. Its violence index combined conflicting tendencies. A rise in the prevalence and rate of violence balanced a drop in the proportion of killers, while the percentage of violent acts and victims remained steady. The bulk of the increase in program violence came from comedy, crime, western, action-adventure, and general adult drama. Cartoon programs in 1969 were not significantly more violent than in 1967.

NBC's 1969 violence index, although below that of 1967, was the highest of the networks. The main reason was the high concentration of violence in NBC cartoon programming, which also affected the comedy program score. An all-network record of 43 violent episodes per hour over all NBC Saturday morning cartoon hours boosted the 1969 NBC violence index to 203.8, compared with 170.0 for ABC and 148.7 for CBS.

Distribution of violent presentations

Measures and indicators do not reveal the relative amounts of material (including violent material) that each network and program type contributes to the whole. For example, if cartoons increased in violence but decreased in number, they would have less impact on the entire flow of violent representations than if their number remained steady or increased; a nonselective viewer would have less chance of finding cartoon violence, despite the fact that cartoons had become more violent.

In fact, this hypothetical example turns out to be false. Tables 23-28 present the distribution of selected measures of violence by program format, type, programming within networks, and network totals. They show what share each contributed to all programming and to violent programming each year. The figures for cartoons, for example, are:

	1967	1968	1969
Share of cartoons out of			
all programs	33.3	28.7	38.8
violent programs	38.5	33.8	46.8
violent episodes	31.6	41.1	52.6

all leading characters	25.8	21.9	33.2
those involved in violence	31.8	26.4	41.7
those involved in killing	20.0	8.0	6.3

Share by program format and type

Researchers studied the relative contributions of cartoons, plays and feature films to total programming. Cartoons' share of all plays increased, as did their contribution to violence. For example, cartoons provided 151 violent episodes in 1967, less than one-third of all such episodes on prime time and Saturday morning network plays. In 1969, cartoons' share of all violent episodes was 254, more than half of the total. Cartoons also gained in their share of characters involved in violence, despite the sharp drop in cartoon killings.

Plays decreased their share of all programming and of violent programs but increased their share of killers. With the reduction in TV killings, plays produced for television boosted their share from about seven of every ten killings in 1967 to eight of ten in 1969. Crime, western, and action-adventure programs have the greatest share of violence; they contain most violent episodes, characters, and nearly all killings. Comedies have less violence. Their share of violent programs and episodes increased, but their share of violent characters decreased. Killing disappeared from comedies. (See details in Tables 23 and 24.)

Share by networks and programs. Among the networks, CBS contributed less program violence throughout the years (1967-69) than the other networks. ABC's violence by most measures decreased, while NBC's increased.

A viewer tuned to ABC in 1969 found half of all plays cartoons; but six out of ten violent plays and episodes were in cartoons. Cartoon violence had increased in time. ABC crime drama, containing the most violence, also increased its violent representations. ABC comedy contained a larger share of all violence on that network in 1969 than it had in 1968 and 1967, but the number of comedy plays increased even more. (It should be noted again that these are not exclusive classifications. A play can be classified in more than one; the overlap with cartoons may be especially significant.)

CBS cartoons contributed an increasing share, crime dramas a decreasing share, of violence to the total on that network. CBS comedy, formerly containing much less than its proportional share of violence, increased its contribution to the total; by 1969 more than half of all plays and the same proportion of violence came from comedies (including cartoons) on CBS.

NBC cartoons and crime dramas both contributed more than their share of violence to the network total. Comedies' share increased until, as on CBS, they contained nearly half of all violence on the network. Substantiation of these conclusions can be found in Tables 25-28.

Conclusions

Strictly defined as the overt expression of physical force intended to hurt or kill, violence prevailed in about eight of every ten plays during prime time and Saturday morning network television drama. Scenes of violence were shown at the rate of five per play or eight per hour. The overall prevalence and rate of violence did not change over the years but differed by network and by kind of program. What did show a significant change were the proportion of leading characters engaged in violent action and the physical consequences of the violence. Violents committed as much violence in 1969 as they had in 1967, but they were fewer in number and their violence was less lethal. An overall drop in the composite index of violence could be attributed to selective reductions of some of its most blatant manifestations, and to a shifting of its burden within the fictional population.

What is the meaning of these changes? Amounts of violence indicate the general climate of the fictional world of television drama but reveal nothing about the nature and role of violence in that world. The symbolic functions of violence are implicit in its representation, regardless of amount; they emerge from an examination of the dynamics of violent action in its relationship to the roles and to the types of characters that populate the fictional world. In order to chart the social relevance of these symbolic fluctuations and currents, we need to know what winds blow good or ill for whom, and how they change. Varying amounts and shifting burdens of violence become meaningful only if we can determine how the selective changes alter the structure of action, and whose burden shifts whose fate in what direction.

SYMBOLIC FUNCTIONS OF VIOLENCE IN THE WORLD OF TELEVISION

An analysis of the role of violence in the fictional world of television drama illuminates symbolic functions of violence. These are not as amenable to administrative and other policy controls as is the sheer amount of violence. Symbolic functions of mass-produced violence have deep institutional and cultural roots. They cultivate dominant assumptions about how things work in the world and, more particularly, about how conflict and power work in the world.

However, changes in total amounts of violence and variations in the relative distribution of types and people of violence, may shift the balance of power in the symbolic world of television. When they do, they alter the calculus of the risks of life that provides the implicit lessons and performs the symbolic functions of violence.

Selected characteristics of two major aspects of violence in the world of television drama are examined: violent actions and the violence-related roles of the cast of characters that populates the fictional world.

Violent action

Violent acts must have agents to commit them, means to inflict them, casualties to sustain them, and scenes to contain them. Symbolic violence is also conveyed in some tone or style and is located in time, space, and setting of some significance. These characteristics of violent action in television were analyzed in all programs, cartoons, and noncartoon plays separately, and are tabulated in Tables 67-87.

Agents, means, and consequences. For each violent episode—a total of 1,355 for the three years—analysts recorded who engaged in violence, how, and with what consequences. (A violent episode was defined as a scene of whatever duration involving violence between the same opponents. A change in opponents would start a new episode.)

Human agents inflicted violence in 70 percent of all violent episodes. The proportion of human agents of violence declined somewhat over the years as that of nonhuman agents increased, especially in cartoons.

In general drama, nonhuman agents engaged in violence in one of every ten violent episodes in 1967 and 1968 and in two of ten in 1969. In cartoon episodes, nonhuman agents and causes of violence climbed from about half in 1967 and 1968 to three-quarters of all such episodes in 1969.

Agents of law enforcement played a minor but increasingly violent role in the encounters. Their part was limited to about one in every ten of all and two in ten of general (noncartoon) dramatic episodes. When they did play a role, it was violent in 60 percent of such episodes in 1967, 72 percent in 1968, and 77 percent in 1969. (The role of such agents will be discussed below under "Occupation.")

Violence was inflicted by a weapon other than the body in half or more of all violent episodes. The use of weapons increased from 52 to 83 percent in cartoon episodes, as did the incidence of violence itself and of violence by nonhuman agents. At the same time, the proportion of violent episodes taking place in a light or comic program context also increased in cartoons (from 41 to 48 percent), but decreased in noncartoon plays (from 22 to 14 percent).

The number and rate of casualties and fatalities declined sharply, as was also indicated by the results of the character analysis. Casualties were observed in half of all violent episodes in 1967 and 1968, but in only one of six in 1969. The weekly casualty count dropped from 437 to 134 in the same period. The "body count" of dead fell from 182 to 46, or from 42 percent to 34 percent of all casualties. While in 1967 and 1969 nearly every violent episode produced an injury, in 1969 three such encounters

produced one casualty. Similarly, in 1967 and 1968 it took two to three episodes to produce a fatality; in 1969 it took ten.

Violence appeared no more painful or debilitating (except for the dead) in 1969 than it had before. Pain and suffering were so difficult to detect that observers could not agree often enough to make the results acceptable. There was little doubt that no painful effect was shown in more than half of all violent episodes.

Time, place, and setting. Symbolic violence was more likely to occur in remote settings than in the here and now. Plays set in the past and the future were nearly always violent and had a much higher rate of violent episodes per play than programs set in the present (about the time of production). Since all but two cartoons were violent (Table 77), the differences apply mostly to noncartoon programs. However, the rate of violent episodes in cartoon plays was also consistently highest in those set in the past.

Action in the "worlds" of television took place in the present more than half the time. But comparing all violent programs with all plays that do not contain violence, we find that the world of violence held nearly all dramatic images of the past and the future. Although the evidence is not clear-cut, it may be that reducing violence also narrows the time range of representations to the more current and familiar settings.

Location has a similar affinity with the symbolic functions of violence. When the setting of the play was partly or wholly outside the United States, violence was much more likely than when the action took place only in the United States. Foreign, international, and mixed settings contained the bulk of television violence. Consequently, the world of violence on television was much more distant, exotic, or geographically indistinct than the predominantly domestic world of nonviolence. The distribution in cartoon plays and trends was similar to that in all programs.

As in time and place, so also in social setting, symbolic violence on television sought that which was far removed from the experience of most viewers. The prevalence and rate of violence was lowest in an urban setting, higher in a small town or rural setting, and highest when the locale was uninhabited, mobile, or not identifiable at all. The rate of violent episodes per play in remote or indistinct settings was twice that per play in urban settings. The social setting of the world of violence was half the time uninhabited or unidentifiable, while the world without violence was half urban and one-third small town or rural.

A comparison of trends between violent and nonviolent programs also shows that as proportions of violent characterizations and casualties decrease, the locales of violent programs shift away from urban settings while the nonviolent programs become more urbanized. As will be observed in the discussion of illegal occupations, the probable reason is that selective reductions first eliminate those characters who do not fit

within the most conventional and acceptable formats. These cuts can best be made by limiting urban violence to crime and detective plays. Thus the proportion of violence in urban settings decreases, and settings "close to home" for most viewers become more pacified. A separate check on plays set in an urban environment showed that in 1967 and 1968 seven to eight of all such plays contained violence, but that in 1969 only half did. As most plays were still violent, this shift resulted in a slight overall reduction of all plays located in an urban environment (see Table 83), a proportion that never exceeded one-third of all programs.

Selective reduction of certain features of violent representations—with other conditions of cultural production remaining the same—appears to have two major consequences. First, the changes tend to trim potentially disturbing or troublesome manifestations not essential to the traditional and ritualistic symbolic functions that violence performs in the world of television. Second, the changing proportions and shifting burdens of violent representations further tip the scales of power in the direction already inherent in the representations. Both consequences lead to a tightening and sharpening of the basic social functions of symbolic violence.

It appears that the most convenient dramatic circumstances for the smooth performance of those social functions rest in symbolic structures relatively far removed from familiar issues and direct social relevance. The apparent paradox vanishes when we recognize that dramatic violence is not behavior but a communication, a message. It can be viewed most appropriately as an element of myth in the historic sense of a moral ritual. Its lesson can have direct social significance to the extent that it can freely demonstrate the clash and resolution of personalized social values and forces. The historic role of the demonstration is to socialize real life behavior in ways that do not require violent enforcement of its norms. The ritualistic functions of violence rest on its roles symbolizing the risks of life and arbitrating man's fate in socially determined ways. These roles require imaginary situations. The situations define life so as to indicate the relative powers and fates of different groups of characters and to demonstrate how power works (or should work) in the preferred moral and social order. Such functions may be easiest to perform in settings relatively remote, unfamiliar, exotic, farcical, or whimsical, unaffected by the need or opportunity for reality-testing or other factors in the viewers' everyday experience. Most traditional rituals, myths, fairy tales, and other forms of implicit acculturation function in that way; there is no reason to assume that industrial lore must be essentially different. The implicit lessons of acts of violence, the lessons of the different risks of violence for different kinds of people assuming different power roles in the vicarious world of mass entertainment, probably emerge most clearly and sharply when relatively stylized and uncontaminated by familiar and potentially conflicting clues.

The fictional world of television and the role of violence as an integral part and often prime mover of that world are artificial, synthetic, and symbolic. They are constructed for dramatic purposes, serve institutional tasks, and condition members of society to modes of thinking considered functional to its dominant institutions. The resort to violence to perform social functions in the symbolic world appears to be inversely related to the general relevance of the plays to contemporary domestic social issues, except in ritualized conventional forms. However, a reduction in violent characterizations and gory details, combined with the apparent social irrelevance of most violent action and settings, need not weaken and may only enhance the social relevance of the collective lessons. Action and settings serve mainly to animate characters, to facilitate and frame their acting of a moral drama of direct social import. Exotic, distant, or stylized though the circumstances may be, in the final analysis it is the people—characters in action—who represent the contending values and drive home the lessons through their struggles and their fate.

The history and geography depicted in the world of television drama have been shaped by society's institutional and functional requirements. Demography and ethnography are similarly structured. The people of the fictional world must be considered; what do the winds of violence, and their changing currents, blow in their paths?

Violence roles and the role of violence

The fictional world reflects, not life, but purpose. Its time, space, and motion—even its accidents—follow, not laws of physics, but the logic of dramatic action. Its society is not a mirror but a projection of dramatic and social intent. Its people are not born but are created to serve a purpose. They do not behave as real people; they act out the purposes for which they were created.

In a fictional world governed by the economics of the assembly line and the production values of optimal appeal at least cost, action follows conventional ground rules of social morality. The requirement of wide acceptability assures general adherence to common notions of justice and fair play. The ground rules are usually expressed in clear-cut characterizations, tested plot lines, and proven formulas for resolving all issues. Problems are personalized rather than verbalized, conflicts are settled through action, and the resolutions are implicit in the outcomes.

Roles are written and parts are cast to convey images consistent with desired patterns of action in a symbolic society. Any society seems freest to those who run it; the dominant groups of the fictional world are those who can be cast in the greatest variety of freewheeling roles. A leading character will be female, for example, not on any occasion when a woman might be cast in a certain role, but typically when a romantic or

family theme requires it. Similarly, age, occupation, and ethnic or other identity are used to signify thematic, value, and power attributes needed for a dramatic purpose.

Representation in the fictional world signifies social existence; absence means symbolic annihilation. Being buffeted by events and victimized by people denotes social impotence; ability to wrest events about, to act freely, boldly, and effectively, is a mark of dramatic importance and social power. Values and forces come into play through characterizations: good is a certain type of attractiveness, evil is a personality defect, and right is the might that wins. Plots weave a thread of causality into the fabric of dramatic ritual, as stock characters act out familiar parts and confirm preferred notions of what's what, who's who, and who counts for what. The issue is rarely in doubt; the action is typically a game of personality, group identification, skill, and power.

Violence plays a key role in such a game. It is the simplest and cheapest dramatic action available to signify risk to human integrity and purpose. In real life, much violence is subtle, slow, circumstantial, invisible, even impersonal. Acts of physical violence are rare, a last resort when symbolic means fail. In the symbolic world, overt physical motion makes dramatically visible that which in the real world is usually symbolic and hidden. Thus violence in drama cannot be equated with violence in the real world. Real violence is the dead end of symbolic action. Symbolic violence is one of society's chief instruments for achieving the aims of real violence without having to commit any. Symbolic hurt to symbolic people and causes can show real people how they might use—or avoid—force to stay alive and to advance their causes. The ritual of dramatic violence demonstrates the relative power of people, ideas, and values in a clash of personalized forces. To be able to hit hard and to strike terror in the hearts of one's opponents—that makes one count when the chips are down. The battered hero triumphs over evil by subduing the bad guy in the end. The last man to hit the dust confirms his own flaw of character and cause. Hurting is a test of virtue and killing is the ultimate measure of man. Loss of life, limb, or mind, any diminution of the freedom of action, are the wages of weakness or sin in the symbolic shorthand of ritual drama. What appears to be the resolution of an issue is the art of staging the demise of doomed powers and the fall of ill-fated characters. The typical plot ends by reaching a reassuring and usually foregone conclusion about who is the better man.

Several times a day, seven days a week, the dramatic pattern defines situations and cultivates premises about power, people, and issues. Just as casting the dramatic population has a meaning of its own, assigning "typical" roles and fates to "typical" groups of characters provides an inescapable calculus of chances and risks for different kinds of people. Who commits and who suffers violence of what kind is a central and revealing fact of life in the world of television drama that viewers must

grasp before they can follow, let alone interpret, the play. The allocation of values and of the means of their implementation defines any social structure. Who gets (and gives) what, how, and why delineates the social structure of the world of television drama. The distribution of roles related to violence, with their different risks and fates, performs the symbolic functions of violence, and conveys its basic message about people.

The cast of characters. Casting in the symbolic world has a meaning of its own. Every member of the dramatic population is created to serve a purpose. Violence plays a role not only in ruling but also in populating the fictional universe.

Of all 762 leading characters analyzed, three-quarters or more were male, American, middle and upper class, unmarried, and in the prime of life (see Table 88). The lion's share of representation went to types that dominate the social order and to characterizations that permit unrestrained action. Symbolic independence requires freedom relatively uninhibited by real-life constraints. Less representation was allocated to those lower in the domestic and global power hierarchy and to characters involved in familiar social contexts, human dependencies, and other situations that impose real-life burdens of primary human relationships and obligations upon freewheeling activity.

Geared for independent action in a loosely-knit and often remote social context, two-thirds to three-quarters of all characters were free to engage in violence, and nearly half were free to "specialize" in violence as far as dramatic role and purpose was concerned. A separate analysis of the 1967-68 program material⁴ found that violence on television, unlike real-life violence, rarely stems from close personal relationships. It usually occurs between people who do not even know each other, or at least do not know each other well. Most of it is directed against strangers or members of "other" groups and stems from instrumental purposes such as a personal goal, private gain, power, or duty, not from social or moral issues transcending individual interest. In a world of contrived and specialized relationships, violence is just another speciality; it is a skill, a craft, an efficient means to an end.

Women typically represent romantic or family interest, close human contact, love. Males can act in nearly any role, but rare is the female part that does not involve at least the suggestion of sex. Most women cast in other specialties are marked for impotence or death.

The theme of marriage in a program requires a woman lead and makes the incidence of violence less likely. While only one in three male leads in the programs surveyed was shown as intending to or ever having been married, two of every three females were married or expected to marry in the story. The number of women characters generally varied inversely with the frequency of violent characterizations. As the latter declined from three-quarters to two-thirds of all characters, the proportion of

women increased from one-fifth to one-fourth. Women's share of all leading characters in feature films (which have the highest incidence of love stories) was 47 percent in 1967, 39 percent in 1968 (when films reached a peak in violence), and 41 percent in 1969. In plays, where violence declined most over the years, the proportion of female characters climbed from 21 percent in 1967 to 29 percent in 1969. In cartoons, where violence is highest and romantic interest or family settings are rare, women played between seven and 11 percent of leading roles. In general, women's roles and fates is one of the most sensitive indicators of the distribution of power and the allocation of values that the symbolic world bestows upon its victors and victims.

Children, adolescents, and old people together accounted for only about ten percent of the total fictional population. The rest were young and middle-aged adults available to act out their fates free of family dependencies or marital entanglements. Nearly half of all females were concentrated in the most sexually eligible young adult population, to which only one-fifth of males were assigned; women were also disproportionately represented among the very young and old.

Assigning a character to a category provides the characterization (and often the setting) necessary for the solution of a special dramatic problem. But such solutions create the problem of specialists destined to seek solutions along lines of their specialties. Many of these specialties do not require professionalization or occupational activity, but some do. Gainful employment was indicated for about half of all characters; discernible occupational activity of any kind for six in ten.

Much of the "work to be done" in the world of television drama revolves around threats to and the preservation of the moral, social, and global order. We have seen before that symbolic demonstrations of power with violence as a dramatic test and arbiter are most likely to appear in relatively remote, exotic, farcical, or whimsical settings. Bringing them into familiar situations is more likely to be upsetting and offensive and to raise dangerous issues close to home, except when the potential threats can be neutralized and ritualized in the form of the conventional law-and-order formats. The symbolic functions of power are best performed, therefore, in the crime, western, and action-adventure types of plays, including cartoons. In fact, half of all leading roles in all dramatic programs were males in those categories. Their occupations and activities generally related to the game of power and provided a disproportionate number of the stock jobs and tasks of the fictional labor force.

Of the approximately five in ten characters who could be unambiguously identified as gainfully employed, three were proprietors, managers, and professionals. The fourth came from the ranks of labor—including all those employed in factories, farms, offices, shops, stores, mining, transportation, service stations, restaurants, and households,

and working in unskilled, skilled, clerical, sales, and domestic service capacities. The fifth served to enforce the law or preserve the peace on behalf of public or private clients.

Type of activity—paid and unpaid—reflected the dramatic requirements and functions more adequately. The six in ten characters engaged in discernible occupational activity could be roughly divided into three groups of two each. The first group represented the world of legitimate private business, industry, agriculture, finance, etc. The second group was engaged in activity related to art, science, religion, health, education, and welfare, as professionals, amateurs, patients, students, or clients. The third group made up the forces of official or semiofficial authority and the army of criminals, outlaws, spies, and other enemies arrayed against them. One in every four leading characters acted out a drama of some sort of transgression and its suppression at home and abroad.

Sex, age, occupation, and other social characteristics quickly add up to a complex dramatic demography not dealt with in the task of this report. The investigator here deals merely with a feeling for the significance of casting in the symbolic world and of the role of violence in the creation of the fictional population. The main task was to investigate the relationships between types of violence and the social structure of the fictional population. The ethnography of the symbolic world is examined in that context.

Violence roles. We looked at different types of involvement in violence and their distribution among different types of characters. "Violents" were, of course, those who committed violence, and "nonviolents" were those who did not. Two groups of violents were (a) those who injured but did not kill, and (b) those who killed. Similarly, victims of violence were divided into (a) those who only got hurt, and (b) those who got killed. Three roles related to violence and three related to victimization define nine basic roles:

	VICTIMS who		NONVICTIMS
VIOLENTS who	(a) get hurt 1	(b) get killed 2	3
(a) injure	Injure another and get hurt 4	Injure another and get killed 5	Injure another with impunity 6
(b) kill	Kill another and get hurt 7	Kill another and get killed 8	Kill another with impunity 9
NONVIOLENTS	Get hurt but commit no violence	Get killed but commit no violence	Not involved

Tables 88-113 provide yearly figures and totals on *violents* (1-6, above); *killers* (4-6); *victims* (1,2,4,5,7,8); *killed* (2,5,8); all those involved in any violence (1-8); and those involved in any killing (2,4-6,8). Character scores (percentage of those involved in any violence plus percentage involved in any killing) are also given in the tables.

Tables 89-93 present violence roles, by network and by program format and type. These findings amplify but do not modify the summary of roles and character scores presented in the first section of this report. Table 94 presents violence roles of all leading characters, and Table 95 shows the share of male and female characters in these roles. Subsequent tables group the results by demographic, social, and dramatic classifications.

The investigators attempted to report and interpret a complex structure of dramatic and power relationships implicit in the distribution of violence roles and in the dynamics of their change. These relationships and shifts compose the specific message of violence in television plays. That message is a definition of social situations that underlies all perceptions, interpretations, and uses of the material. We looked at the overall frequencies of violence roles and at the probabilities of committing or suffering violence (or both) inherent in them. We compared distributions, relative shares, and probable risks by different types of leading characters: men and women, single and married, young and old, rich and poor, selected occupations, races, nationalities, and characters were destined for a happy or an unhappy fate.

Violent people and the risks of life. Of all 762 leading characters studied during the three annual study periods, 513, or 67 percent, were involved in some violence (as *violents*, as *victims*, or as both). That left 249 not involved. The ratio of the two numbers is 2.1 to one. Thus the "average" character's chance of being involved in some violence is about twice as good as his chance of not being involved.

Of those involved, more were involved as *victims* than as *violents*. Five in ten committed some violence, but six in ten suffered. Chances of suffering violence rather than escaping it were 1.5 to one. Chances of being a violent or nonviolent were even.

The overriding message is that of the risk of victimization. For every three *violents* there were three nonviolents, but for every three *victims* there were only two nonvictims. If one had to be either a violent or a victim, chances were 1.2 to one of becoming a victim.

Violent victims—those who injured or killed and got hurt or killed in return—numbered 42 percent of all leading characters. Only eight percent committed violence with impunity, i.e. did not suffer violence in return. Thus the odds were 5.3 to one that violence brought counter violence.

Nonviolent victims—those who got hurt or killed without inflicting violence upon others—numbered 17 percent of all characters. Chances

were, therefore, 2.5 to one against being victimized without having committed violence. The risk of being only victimized (suffering violence without inflicting any) was more than twice as great as the chance of committing violence with impunity. The relative probabilities suggest that few *violents* will escape injury or death. But nonviolents must beware, too—perhaps even more; although most (71 percent) will escape injury or death, nonviolents are twice as likely to suffer unprovoked violence as *violents* are likely to hurt or kill with impunity.

Dramatic characters can take—and dish out—a great deal of physical punishment, but the elimination of a leading character concludes a moral lesson. The relative probabilities of killing and being killed shift the emphasis from the risks of victimization to the efficacy of the final blow.

A three-year total of 86 leading characters (11 percent of all) were involved in lethal violence. That is more than one in ten; the probability against being involved is 7.9 to one. Killers numbered eight percent, killed were four percent, and killers who were also killed numbered one percent of all leading characters. So while, in general, more suffered than committed violence, twice as many leading characters killed than got killed in the stories; the odds in favor of being a killer rather than killed were two to one. Chances were 6.9 to one that a killer would not get killed in return. But chances were only 2.9 to one that one got killed without having killed (rather than after having killed) someone. Fear of victimization and the image of the suffering hero may be somewhat tempered by the suggestion that lethal violence will balance the score, at least for the more dominant figures of the symbolic world.

The total proportions and trends in the involvement of all characters in different kinds of violence can be seen in the "All Characters" columns of Table 94. While general involvement decreased from 1967 to 1968, the proportion of killing dropped each year. Within these overall trends, however, several currents mingled. Victims always outnumbered *violents* by approximately six to five, and their proportion appeared to decline more slowly. This would suggest that if violence is reduced by cutting out more violent characters than victims, each of the remaining *violents* hurts more people, and the ratio of victimization increases. Indeed, while the percentage of *violents* declined, nonviolent victims of violence remained 16-17 percent of all characters.

Killers consistently outnumbered the killed. Both killers and killed became less numerous. Fatal victimization, in general, dropped more slowly than killing. In 1967 there were four killers for every two killed; in 1969 there were three killers for every two killed. Thus the relative probability of being killed rather than killing increased, as did the ratio of all victims to all *violents*.

Men and women. Different and shifting roles and risks are likely to affect two unequal populations in different ways. (Table 94 shows some of these differences.) Violence was part of the roles of most males but

part of only about half of all female characters. Male involvement, essential to the dramatic functions of violence, dipped slightly and uncertainly, while female involvement, often troublesome and disturbing, was cut more decisively. But a clearer look at the violence roles shows how differently the changes affected the sexes.

The drop was mostly in violent females and in male victims. The number of violent males declined only slightly, that of female victims not at all. The shifting sands of fate piled a greater burden of victimization upon women.

A look at the probabilities shows that men's chances of encountering some violence were 2.6 to one, while women had an even chance. But once they brushed up against violence, women took a greater and increasing risk of falling victim to it. The disparity was greatest when it came to "pure" violence roles—those of only committing or only suffering violence.

If a man was violent, his odds against committing violence with impunity were 6.9 to one; if a woman was violent, her odds against getting away with it were 1.6 to one. But male victims were also violent 2.9 to one, whereas female victims had only an even chance for counter-violence. Furthermore, male killers outnumbered males killed 2.1 to one, while female killers outnumbered females killed only 1.5 to one.

The reduction of violence roles intensified the differences. Most of the decline in violence was due to the reduction of the number of violent in general and to the virtual elimination of killing among women. The number of victims, however, did not decline as much, and not at all among women. So the shift was more than in amount of violence; it was also in the power position of women.

For men, there were five victims to every four violent throughout the three years, a steady ratio of 1.2 to one. For women, there was an equal number of victims and violent in 1967, four victims to every three violent in 1968, and four victims to little over two violent in 1969. Women's odds of being victimized rather than inflicting violence shifted from 1 to one, to 1.3 to one, to 1.5 to one. So a reduction in the percentage of violence roles without a reduction in either the number or the proportion of women victims resulted in changing the complexion of women's involvement in violence. In 1967 as many dishd out as suffered violence; by 1969, one and one-half times as many suffered from violence as could inflict it upon others. In 1967, 17 percent of all women fell victim to violence without committing violence themselves; 17 percent of women committed violence with impunity. By 1969, the same 17 percent fell victim to unreciprocated violence, but only five percent were allowed to commit violence with impunity.

The relative share of the sexes in the distribution of violence roles reflects these shifts. On the whole, women were represented less in all violence roles. But, as has been noted, their share of victims hurt and

especially killed was greater than their share of violent and killers, while the male proportions were the reverse.

The percentage of women in the entire fictional population increased slowly as the share of violent characterizations declined. The only female violence roles that increased in the same or greater proportion than the number of women in the fictional population were their share of all victims and of the killed. Women's share of all victims increased from 12 to 15 percent, and their proportion of all killed rose from six to 17 percent. The sex balance of those killed shifted from one woman for every 16 men in 1967 to one woman for every five men in 1969.

These shifts of fate and power position appeared to be the result of selective reductions in violence roles. These reductions, by following existing ground rules, only enhanced the inherent biases of the pattern. When violent were cut, they were least likely to be cut from the ranks of those whose violence was most essential for the performance of the symbolic functions and dramatic purposes of the drama: the free, the independent, the powerful. These are typically male roles. But since the more powerful and more violent also require the most victims, the less free, independent, and dramatically useful or powerful groups must supply a disproportionate share of the victims. These target groups became increasingly passive, for they absorbed most of the cut in active, aggressive violence. The pattern was not so much one of declining violence (for the overall prevalence and rate of violence did not decrease) as one of the increasing victimization and simultaneous pacification of the underdog under the impact of the more concentrated and relatively even higher levels of punishment meted out by the more powerful.

The dynamics of the sex differences in violence roles has illustrated the dynamics of power in television drama. But analysis showed that women's roles were involved both as an element and as an index of the balance of violent power in most other groups.

Young and old. Age does not affect violence as much as sex. An average of six in ten children, nearly seven in ten young adults, over six in ten middle-aged, and over five in ten old characters were involved in some violence. The level of involvement would be expected to drop most where there is least necessity for it, but remain where it is most essential to the dramatic tasks and social functions to be performed. This appeared to be true by the drop in the youngest and the steady rates in the young adult groups. The small number of old characters makes that category unreliable. The large group of middle-aged (345 for the three years) shows a decided drop in violent characterizations, perhaps greater than might be expected from the heavy and essential involvement of middle-aged characters in dramatic violence.

The role of women may be indicative of the reasons for certain configurations and trends in any category. If we examine the percent of mid-

dle-aged violent and victims separately by sex, we find that women indeed play their role more intensively in the middle-aged category than in the context of all characters. The sharp and disproportionate drop in the percentage of violent middle-aged women is clearly responsible for the marked decline shown in that age category (note tables 96 and 97).

The middle-aged contribute more than their proportional share of killers and especially of killed to the fictional population. (Old people are just more likely to be killed than younger people.) Most middle-aged violence and all middle-aged killing shifted to males. The rising middle-aged female population appeared continually to be victimized, even as they were being pacified. The marital status involved in these findings will be discussed below.

Marital status. Most interpersonal conflict and violence in life occurs in the context of the most frequent and intimate interpersonal relationships—the family. But real-life sources of violence are only tangentially relevant to their symbolic functions. When reality interferes, it is avoided or transformed. That appears to be the case with regard to the relationship of violence to marital status.

Married (and about-to-be-married) characters were less frequently involved in violence than the unmarried (including those for whom there was no indication of marital status). Violence also declined more among the married than the unmarried. Further examination indicated that a major part of the reason was the different and shifting composition of the two groups.

The unmarried lead characters were overwhelmingly male. The proportion of women among single characters never went much above two in ten. The married population, on the other hand, was more than one-third female. Violence, as we have seen, fell more rapidly as a characteristic of female than of male roles. Hence the lower level and general decline of violent characterizations was among married and about-to-be-married characters.

However, a separate examination of violence roles by sex yields some additional findings of interest. The frequency of unmarried male violence and victimization was, as would be expected, somewhat higher than that of all males, but the pattern was the same. Married male violence was substantially lower and steady.

Women were, of course, generally less violent than the men, and the difference increased over the years. But single women were much more likely to fall victim of violence than married women, and the relative rate of victimization increased. Married women, on the other hand, started from a different power position to arrive at the same relative standing.

In 1967, married women were more likely to be violent (42 percent) than victims (37 percent), and they were more violent even than married men (36 percent). But the frequency of married women violent fell

from 42 percent of all married women in 1967 to 17 percent in 1969. The frequency of married women victims fell from 37 percent to 28 percent. The rates of both violence and victimization among married men remained stable.

Therefore, the largest change relevant to the trends in violence and marital status was the striking pacification of the married woman, and her relegation to the same fate of relatively increasing victimization as was the lot of all women.

In the context of the male-dominated and power- and violence-oriented world of television drama, married women have often been seen by writers and analysts as potentially disturbing and even punitive conscience-figures. The success of motherless family situation shows and of the lovable "bachelor father" types has been explained on that basis. The share of unmarried and of married characters in the different violence roles (table 101) provides further insight into the "politics" of sex and marriage in the world of television plays.

While nearly three-quarters of all male dramatic leads were unmarried, only about half of all female leads were single. So the world of the single character was largely male; it comprised most males (and the more violent males) seen in television plays. The world of married characters was one-third female; half of all women characters inhabited it. Not surprisingly, married characters were represented less and singles more in all violence roles.

But married women again played a special role. They comprised a much larger proportion of all married characters than did single girls of all single characters. Therefore, violence committed and suffered by married women was a larger proportion of all violence roles among the married than was single-girl-violence among all unmarried. Numbering 17 percent of all unmarried characters, single women committed nine percent of the violence and suffered 12 percent of the victimization of all single characters. Numbering 32 percent of the married characters, married women committed 27 percent of the violence and suffered 20 percent of the victimization of all married characters. The implication was that married women were more dangerous than single girls, and also more vulnerable. But single girls were more likely to be victims than violent, while—at least on the average for the three years—married women administered more punishment than they suffered. It has been noted before that the trend has been to pacify the married woman and to reduce, if not eliminate, this menace to male power on television.

Occupations. This study focused on four occupational categories closely related to the dramatic requirements of television and the symbolic tasks of violence. These were the challengers, the protectors, the enforcers of law and order, and (one other sizeable occupational category that does not necessarily symbolize social conflict and power but

rather projects the television industry's own self-image) the entertainers. The challengers are professionals engaged in illegal business of a domestic or international nature. The protectors are members of some armed forces, and the enforcers are the agents of law and of crime detection.

The law-and-order population balance shifted slightly in favor of the enforcers, and its complexion changed toward the relative pacification of challengers. The proportion of criminals declined from ten to seven percent of all characters. Law enforcement and crime detection occupied nearly seven percent of all characters in 1967, and increased to equal or surpass the proportion of criminals. Military occupations, however, declined from over seven to less than four percent. Entertainers (comprising roles in show business, sports, mass media, and the popular arts) increased in proportion from eight to 11 percent of all characters.

Trends in violence roles, shown in Table 102, reflect falling levels of violence among the illegals, sharp fluctuations among lawmen and the military, and some overall drop in violence among entertainers. The pattern suggests that the violent activity of criminals was cut, but that of lawmen and the military ranged up and down (and, on the whole, increased in a less lethal form) in an apparently complementary fashion. When military violence fell in 1968, violence committed and suffered by police agents rose as if to fill a void on the side of the law. The proportion of entertainers involved in violence dropped, but their percentage of violent victims (those both committing and suffering violence) more than doubled. The involvement of women in illegal and entertainment occupations (the only two of the selected categories in which women were involved) played a part in the changing complexion of violence in the two groups.

A separate examination of violence roles in each group fills the gaps in the pattern. In the illegal occupations, eight of ten committed and nine of ten suffered violence in both 1967 and 1968. In those years, the number of criminals victimized without committing violence was negligible. By 1969, illegal violents declined to 54 percent and victims to 68 percent of the criminal population, but those who fell victims of violence without committing (or before having a chance to commit) violence rose to nearly one in four. The relative pacification of criminals applied to both men and women. But the few women criminals doubled in number (from two to four a week) and enhanced the effect while remaining relatively more likely to be victimized than the men. The overall picture was of a less violent and apparently less victimized criminal element, but one that was, in fact, more vulnerable to violent attack because it was less able to inflict violence upon its opponents.

Most of these opponents were, of course, their occupational counterparts—the agents of crime detection and law enforcement. Starting from a minority representation and power position, the lawmen achieved

numerical equality and balance-of-power superiority. While criminal violence fell and nonviolent vulnerability rose, lawmen's violence did not decline. More important, the agents' vulnerability to violent attack and ability to inflict punishment with impunity shifted dramatically. In the year when criminal violence was highest (1968), the number of non-violent police victims of violence (negligible the year before) shot up to one in four, then fell to one in seven in 1969. Meanwhile, the proportion of lawmen who only inflicted violence but did not suffer from it rose from 19 percent in 1967 to 22 percent in 1968 and 27 percent in 1969. Police violence of a unilateral or preventive nature appeared to have overcome the rise in police victimization. The sequence, then, might be: high criminal violence; a sharp rise in police victimization, provoking even more massive unilateral police violence; the relative pacification of criminals and their growing vulnerability to violent attack, all against the background of the massing of forces of the law.

Soldiers and entertainers provided different and contrasting patterns. Soldiers declined in number but, after a drop in 1968, increased their violent activities. (The protectors of a national order uphold a variety of foreign and domestic interests. This involves a variety of symbolic functions and yields no clear pattern without a longer and more detailed analysis.) A decline in the number and lethal activity of members of the armed forces was found, yet their overall violence fluctuated regardless of their numbers. In 1967 they appeared not much more violent, in 1968 much less violent, than the average dramatic character in television, as if they were switching from wartime to peacetime armies. In 1969, however, they led criminals and lawmen in both violence and victimization. In any case, in 1967 and 1968 no soldier was shown inflicting violence with impunity, while an occasional soldier each year became the victim of violence he did not or could not return. Unlike lawmen, most of whom were in domestic service, soldiers did not appear to gain in unpunished violence. The diffusion of armies in the world of television and the ambivalence of military life in war, peace, and peacetime war, permitted sheer victimization but inhibited roles of the unpunished (and thus usually righteous) violent soldier.

Entertainers in the fictional world occupy a special position. They project the self-image of the talent industry, provide a favorite staple of stock parts, and form the single largest peaceful occupational category. Their number roughly equals that of criminals or of law enforcers. What the illegals lost of their share of the population over the three years, the entertainers gained. As the general population became less violent, the entertainers became more violent. Starting with a mere one violent in every four, the entertainers nearly doubled their violent members even as their total involvement in violence declined. Most of the rising violence was done by characters who previously only took punishment; the proportion of victims who also inflicted violence more than doubled. On

the whole, therefore, program control over violence worked to improve the power position of the fictional entertainment group. But while the men within the group became more violent and less easily victimized, the women remained relatively nonviolent and as vulnerable to victimization as were the female criminals. The increase in the number of women entertainers from four to 11 a week meant that the proportionate share of women victims of all entertainers who suffered violence tended to increase. The overall effect, then, became one of growing male pugnacity in the much-victimized entertainment world, with the burden of suffering shifting to a larger corps of female entertainers. There was no evidence to indicate whether such trends were peculiar to this occupational category or were part of a general shift in the balance of power as reflected in those parts of the fictional population that were identified with a profession and in which women played especially sensitive and potentially vulnerable roles.

The violence-related professions, while obviously highly involved in violence, did not represent most of the violence in the world of television drama. The share of each occupation in selected violence roles can be seen in Table 103. Illegals naturally inflicted proportionately more violence. But about nine-tenths of all violence and at least three-quarters of all killing did not involve criminals. The chief symbolic function of violence was moral and social, rarely legal. Recognition of the illegality of violence usually relegated the play to the limited genre of crime or courtroom drama. The 1967-68 analysis found that due process of law was indicated as a consequence of major acts of violence in only two of every ten violent plays.

The legal protectors and enforcers of the social order also engaged in violence in greater proportions than their numbers in the population would suggest, and their ratio of killers to killed was naturally more favorable than that of criminals. But entertainers, who were much less violent, claimed as large a share of all violent acts as did members of the armed forces and as a group contained as many victims as did all soldiers or all agents of law. Occupations in the fictional world serve functions of characterization and plot. None has the lion's share of all violence, because violence is diffused to serve symbolic functions of power in every segment of that world.

Social class. Social class, however, is a direct but delicate matter of power. Therefore, the symbolic rituals of a society—especially those rituals produced for consumer markets—rarely flaunt naked power based on class distinction alone. When they do, they are likely to be showing the ruthlessness of other times and places. Otherwise, class is a troublesome dramatic element. When class distinctions are apparent at all, they appear to be incidental to other traits, goals, and outcomes.

Television drama in America particularly blurs class distinctions, even if it cannot obscure its dynamics. The vast majority of leading

characters can only be classified as members of that elastic "middle class" stretching from the well-to-do professional, entertainer, or executive through the comfortable or careless majority, to the frugal paraprofessional (nurse, reporter, detective). Many are presented outside any regular class structure (adventurers, spies, members of the armed services). Even other classes are easiest and most "entertaining" to present through middle-class eyes, as when a family of impoverished farmers become suburban millionaires, or when the wealthy exurbanite lawyer attempts to make good as a simple farmer among other simple folk.

No more than two in every ten leading roles was distinctively upper-class. Many of them played in settings far away and long ago. Their involvement in violence was greater than that of middle-class characters. Constraints on violence may have helped to shrink the upper-class population from 22 percent of all characters in 1967 to nine percent in 1969. Upper-class involvement in violence was reduced from 74 percent of all upper-class characters in 1967 to 54 percent in 1969. The middle class and mixed-class population increased in size; their involvement in violence fell much less than did that of the upper class: from 72 to 65 percent. Table 104 indicates these trends. A contributing cause may be the tendency to portray more women in the upper class than in other classes. Sex breakdown by class (available only for 1969) shows women comprising 29 percent of the upper-class population, 24 percent of the middle-class and mixed-class population, and none of the lower-class population.

Lower-class characters were few to begin with (four percent in 1967), and dropped to half or less of that number. But they were the most violent of all. Violence, victimization, or both was the lot of all but one of the 17 lower-class characters who played leading roles in the three annual samples. That one escaped involvement in 1969, accounting for the reduction that year. The three-year average rate of victimization and its margin over the rate of violence were higher among the lower-class characters than among all others.

As with upper-class and other relatively "sensitive" roles, killing by or of lower-class characters disappeared. Nevertheless, such killing as there was in 1967 and 1968 yielded a three-year average higher than that of the other classes. The ratio of killers to killed was twice as "favorable" (to killers) in the middle class as in the other classes.

Table 105 gives the relative shares of the classes in violence roles for 1967-69. The upper and lower classes represented more, and the middle class less, than their proportionate shares of characters killed.

Nationality. The nationality of a dramatic character is not an accident of birth. It is another element of the symbolic structure in which persons and actions take on particular significance. When nationality is not used for characterization, it may be assumed from the setting. When the setting itself is unclear or mixed and nationality is irrelevant to character

and action, it cannot be reliably assessed. However, it was possible to differentiate the clear from the unclear and mixed cases of nationality and to divide the dramatic population into two groups: Americans and Others.

In comparing these two groups, it should be kept in mind that Americans is the clear-cut category; Others includes both foreign nationals and those for whom no nationality could be established. The image of foreigners is thus blurred by that of mixed and unclear nationals. If we assume that the nationals of the producing country might be presented in a different light from foreigners, this grouping would tend to provide a most conservative estimate of the differences.

More than two-thirds of all characters could be identified as Americans. As is shown in Table 106, a smaller proportion of Americans than of Others engaged in violence, and the involvement of Americans declined over the years, while that of the Others did not. Over the three years, six in ten Americans but eight in ten Others committed violence, suffered violence, or both. Even greater was the difference in the "both": 36 percent of Americans, but only 57 percent of all Others, committed and suffered violence. In other words, foreigners and those not identifiable as Americans, as a group, were increasingly more likely to become involved in violence and to pay a higher price for it than were the Americans.

The different mix of the sexes again contributed to these findings. Nearly three in ten Americans but fewer than two in ten Others were women. A somewhat larger proportion of women contributed to the declining number of violent acts (and the more slowly declining number of victims) among the Americans. On the other hand, the high and persistent violence of the Others reflected, in part, the smaller proportion of women. Of course, dramatic population mix is not an independent "fact of life." It is, in fact, quite unrelated to actual population figures. But it is related to the message implicit in the symbolic functions of given groups in given settings. If the domestic group appears a little more "feminine" than the rest of the world (within a still overwhelmingly masculine structure), it is not simply because there are more women in it, but because its symbolic tasks call upon that group to perform most familiar scenes of domesticity. The Others, by comparisons, act in the more remote regions of representation and embody most of the symbolic attributes of "pure" masculinity, such as freewheeling action, mobility, and social unrelatedness. These characterizations do not lend themselves to feminine roles. (Which is why the exceptions are often disturbing and the most likely to be muted in any tightening of controls.) These factors help shape the patterns of the groups' relationships to violence.

Among the Americans both violence and victimization declined, but victimization fell more. Among the Others, the relative trends were the reverse; in fact, victimization increased in absolute terms, as well as in relation to the number of violent Others.

Table 107 indicates the shares of the two groups in the different violence roles. The Others represented more violent acts and victims but fewer killers. The incidence of killing dropped sharply in both groups. But the three-year balance of killers and killed favored the Americans. For every American killed, 2.6 Americans were killers. But for every Other killed, only 1.3 Other characters were able to inflict fatal violence. Like every subordinate group of characters, the Others are especially prone to victimization; as violence ebbs and killing drops, their chances of being victimized become greater. Becoming more violent does not prevent victimization; in fact, it appears to provoke it, especially when the minority group commits the violence. But the role of killer and the lethal balance—the final arbiter of power—remains a prime preserve of the dominant group.

"Reducing violence" thus becomes selective muting of its most morbid and marginal manifestations while enhancing its symbolic utility. The trimming of some commercially sensitive and dramatically problematic scenes from conventional plays works to widen the gap of differential risks in favor of the already dominant groups. The net effect is to sharpen rather than to blur the symbolic functions of violence as dramatic demonstrations cultivating assumptions about social power.

Race. Television drama presents a world of many places and races. The ethnic composition of this world intertwines with other characteristics in the total symbolic structure. Television drama's global population during the observation period was 77 percent white, 70 percent American, and 67 percent white American.

The white majority was 82 percent American, while the nonwhite majority was only 15 percent American. Of those clearly identified as Americans, 95 percent were white, while of the Others only 35 percent could be identified as white. The imbalance of the sexes between the white majority and the nonwhite minority was even more pronounced than that between Americans and Others. Almost three in ten whites but barely one in ten nonwhites were women. Yet, despite the larger percentage of women among both whites and Americans than among all others, fully half of all TV dramatic characters observed were white American males.

Therefore, the population mix of whites combines American male dominance with a substantial female representation. Nonwhites are virtually all male and mostly distant from the American social setting. Although nonwhites comprise the majority of the world's people, and non-American nationalities comprise the bulk of nonwhites, both appear in the position of minorities in the world of television. These features facilitate the development of a symbolic structure in which "whiteness" is largely associated with American dominance and "nonwhiteness" with the bulk of "other" humanity subordinate to it. It is consistent with the implicit message of this population mix that the findings on the relationship of race and violence (Table 110) present a pattern very similar to

that of nationality and violence. The figures show lower and declining engagement among whites, and higher and persisting involvement among nonwhites. The margin between the generally higher proportion of victims and lower proportion of violent acts was consistently in favor of whites, despite the fact that they had the higher percentage of women (who, in general, suffered more victimization than men).

Nonwhites were more than proportionately represented among violent acts and especially among victims, but less than proportionately represented among killers (see Table 109). However, as with non-Americans, such killing as nonwhites encountered exacted a higher price from them than from whites. For every white killed, 2.3 whites were killers. But a nonwhite was killed for every nonwhite killer. In the symbolic world of television, nonwhites suffered more and killed less than whites. But when nonwhites killed they died for it, while the white group was more than twice as likely to get away with murder—or to kill in a “good cause” to begin with.

Final outcome. The “good cause,” usually embodied in a “good guy,” typically leads to the hero’s success and a happy outcome. Happiness is goodness on television. The “mistakes” and frailties of the hero may enhance his attractiveness, but the final demonstration of “who is the better man” usually resolves any lingering doubts about the preferred structure traits, values, and power.

Violence is more likely to be reduced where it is already relatively low—among the “happies”—than among the “lesser men,” those who supply the unhappy violent acts and victims. This selective reduction can achieve an overall softening of potentially disturbing mayhem and leave intact, or even tighten, the essential symbolic structure.

Involvement in all kinds of violence dropped most among characters who reached a clearly happy ending in the plays. The relative distribution of violent acts and victims can be examined in Table 110. “Happy” violent acts declined most in number, while “happy” victims declined somewhat less. The victimization of the hero is, of course, a more essential dramatic element than his commission of violence—except perhaps in the end. Among the “unhappies,” however, the number of violent acts did not decline, and the proportion of victims fell only to equal that of violent acts. Those who reached an unhappy fate needed not to be victimized any more—or less—than seemed “fair” to reciprocate their high level of aggression.

When the pressure is on, therefore, the “good guys” victimized by the “bad guys” become less violent (save perhaps for the final blow), while the ill-fated “bad guys” continue to get what they deserve. It is advisable to see if this differential outcome applies evenly to other groups. For example, as the general frequency of violence declined, the proportion of women increased. The percentage of women among the “happies” rose even more (from 22 percent in 1967 to 29 percent in

1969), but that of women among the “unhappies” fell from 13 to seven percent. On the basis of previously reported findings, women can be expected to be less violent but relatively more often victimized than men. Does outcome make a difference in the relative position of women? Table 111 shows that it does.

The pressures on programming that led to a reduction in the number of unhappy women characters resulted in a corresponding decline in violence among ill-fated women. There was no such decline either among men of the same fate or among “happy” women. The increase of victimization among women was left for the “happy” female population to absorb.

This suggests that the shift toward female victimization is not so much an aspect of defeat as of fear and suffering. With an increase in both the proportion of women and their rate of victimization, the complexion of the “happy” population can be expected to change.

The “happies” clearly engaged in less than their proportionate share of violence, although their ratio of killers to killed—a sign of the “final blow”—was naturally more favorable than that of the “unhappies.” What, then, was the effect of rising female victimization on the complexion of the “happy” majority?

Males, of course, dominated both groups. But, as indicated in Table 113, women’s share of all “unhappies” dropped by 1969 to half its 1967 percentage, and violent women practically disappeared from among those who met an unhappy end. On the other hand, as the share of women among all “happy” characters rose, and as violence among them declined, the proportion of female victims of violence increased from 12 percent in 1967 to 15 percent in 1968 and to 20 percent in 1969. This is greater than the rise of women’s share among the “happies” and greater than the increase of female victims among all characters (12, 14, and 15 percent, respectively). Just like a decline in violence, then, a “happy” outcome relegates women to a less favorable treatment than that accorded the dominant male group. The unhappy world of “bad guys” becomes virtually all male, but the “happy heroes” suffer less and the “happy” heroines more than before. The world of the good and the happy appears to need an increasing number of “happy” women victims to suffer the indignities inflicted by the bad guys.

CONCLUSIONS

Violence in prime time and Saturday morning network television drama was, on the whole, no less prevalent in 1969 than it had been in 1967 or 1968. It was, however, less lethal. Cartoons were the most violent, and increasingly so. CBS programs remained the least violent, but by a decreasing margin. The proportion of violent characterizations declined, and killings and casualties dropped sharply, resulting in a general lower-

ing of the overall violence index. The effect of *policy* and program controls was most noticeable in reducing mayhem on certain types of non-cartoon plays produced for television, in shifting some network lineups in the violence "rating game," and in altering the mix of elements in the symbolic structure.

The symbolic structure of a message system defines its own world. Differences in representation direct varying amounts of attention to what exists in that world. Dramatic focus and emphasis signify hierarchies of importance: type casting and fate accent value and power; and the thread of action ties things together into a dynamic whole. Casual, subjective, and selective interpretations and conclusions start from and rest on the basic premises of what exists, what is important, what is right, and what is related to what in the symbolic world.

The freedom of fiction permits the time, space, distance, style, demography, and ethnography of the symbolic world and the fate of men to be bent to the institutional purposes of dramatic mass production and to its rules of social morality. Violence is a pervasive part and instrument of the allocation of values and powers in the symbolic world. It touches most characters, but, of course, it does not touch them equally; sex, age, status, occupation, nationality, race, and the consequent dramatic destinies all play a role in the pattern of allocation. The pattern appears to project the fears, biases, privileges, and wishful thinking of dominant institutions onto a cosmic canvas. The changes apparent over the years shift the burdens of violence and victimization, escalate the already differential risks, skew the actuarial tables, and further load the unequal balance of symbolic powers.

The fundamental function and social role of ritualized dramatic violence is, then, the maintenance of power. The collective lessons taught by drama tend to cultivate a sense of hierarchical values and forces. The conflicts expose the danger of crossing the lines and induce fear of subverting them. Historically, such symbolic functions of myth and ritual socialized people; they grew up knowing how to behave in different roles in order to avoid, as well as to use, violence. The culture of every society cultivates images of self and of the world that tend to reduce the necessity for resorting to social violence to enforce its norms, but that also justify the frequent necessity for doing so.

Changes in the pattern are, then, equally selective. Cuts are made in areas least damaging to and most consistent with the pattern's essential features. Violence may be trimmed, but not everywhere. It may be "degoryfied" or even deglorified (for neither gore nor glory is essential to the pattern), but only in ways that serve the dramatic purposes as well as, if not better than, gore and glory. Writers, producers, directors, and censors will eliminate or soften violent characterizations that run counter to the conventional rules, that demand complexity not easily accepted (or obtained) in television drama, and that may offend commercial sensitivity to selected moral sensibilities. The net effect is not to blur but to

heighten dramatic functions and to tighten the symbolic noose of social power.

The frequency of dramatic violence and the shifting ratios of victimization may have important effects on setting levels of expectation and acquiescence, and on generating a climate of fear. But the message of symbolic violence is implicit in whatever amount there is of it; the message is unaffected by overall frequencies. That message has deep roots in the institutional structure. Real acts of social violence are likely to stem from the same stresses that dramatic violence bends to its symbolic purpose. The two structures—symbolic and social—stem from the same social order and serve the same purposes in their own different ways.

This study has shown that symbolic functions rooted in social power relationships are not easily altered. It is doubtful that they can be significantly altered at all without some institutional innovation and social alteration. The evidence of change found by the investigator (mostly along lines of least resistance) suggests that even the best-intentioned program controls introduced into the same basic structures have unanticipated consequences.

It seems appropriate now to point to implications for further study and to such other considerations as the findings suggest:

1. Trend studies of longer duration and comparative scope are needed to confirm or modify and extend the findings of this research. A broader base for such comparison is reported in the tables in Appendix A on the "Enlarged 1969 Sample."

2. Some of the measures developed for this study lend themselves to a comprehensive system of "cultural indicators," yielding periodic reports on symbolic representations of theoretical and social importance. The broader the context, the more reliable and valid would be the determination of each function in the total symbolic structure. Such indicators would provide the type of information for the mass-produced cultural environment that economic indicators provide for the economy, that public opinion polling provides for reflecting verbal responses (without revealing their symbolic premises), that social indicators are proposed to provide for social health and welfare, and that ecological indicators might provide for the physical environment.

3. The effective control of symbolic violence, and the free dramatic use of its essential function to serve the aims of a democratic society, will exact a higher price than we have been willing to pay. When a society attempts to control an industrial process polluting the air only to find that its basic productive powers depend on it, a predicament of major proportions becomes apparent and demands creative and costly institutional, scientific, and technical innovation. All that can—and in time must—be done. Cheaper solutions have limited value; although they may, in the short run, alleviate selected problems, in the long run they

may only disguise a worsening situation. Symbolic production, including the portrayal of violence, when necessary, running counter to its prevailing ritualistic functions, should be encouraged. As real social relations and institutional processes change, the old symbolic rituals become dysfunctional. Indicators of cultural trends can be sensitive measures not only of what mass media produce but also of what society requires for the cultivation of its changing patterns.

4. Two other types of related research are indicated. One is of the institutional processes of creation and decisionmaking in the mass media, particularly in television. The objective would be to specify the diffuse and now largely invisible pressures and controls that shape dramatic—and probably also other—types of symbolic functions in ways that neither the decisionmaker nor the public fully realizes. The other type of related research would investigate what the symbolic functions cultivate in popular conception and social behavior. Such research would relate television exposure not to violent behavior alone, but also to definitions of social situations, values, powers, and aspirations. It would relate exposure to the means of attaining people's aspirations and to the price to be paid for the use of different means by different people. The research would proceed on the assumption, supported by the findings of this study, that symbolic violence is neither a singular concept nor a semantic equivalent for violent behavior but a function implicit in certain basic premises about life, society, and power. Television relates to social behavior as it defines the world beyond one's ken, and cultivates symbolic structures in which violence may—or may not—play an instrumental role.

FOOTNOTES

1. The 1967 and 1968 studies were conducted under contract to the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence and were included in its task force report *Violence and the Media* (U.S. Government Printing Office, 1969). The 1969 study was done under contract to the Surgeon General's Scientific Advisory Committee on Television and Social Behavior, National Institute of Mental Health, to which this report is submitted. The research reported here revamped and refined procedures, permitting both a fuller utilization of the previous studies and new information in an enriched comparative perspective.

Thanks for support, advice, and complete assurance of the scientific integrity of the research should go to the staff of the Scientific Advisory Committee, and particularly to its director, Dr. Eli A. Rubinstein. Research associates on this project were Michael F. Eleey and Nancy Tedesco, whose competent technical assistance and collaboration made the work possible. The investigator is also grateful to

Mrs. Kiki Schiller and Mrs. Joyce Wattenberger for their skillful assistance.

2. U.S. Government Printing Office, 1969. A task force report of the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence.
3. An 84-page listing of all items, annotated with reliability results, is available from the investigator at the cost of reproduction and shipment.
4. George Gerbner, "Cultural Indicators: The Case of Violence in Television Drama," *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 1970, 388, 69-81.

Appendix A: Tabulation of findings

Table 1: Measures and indicators: all networks, all programs

	One week's prime time and Saturday morning programs in				Enlarged
	1967	1968	1969	1967-69	sample
SAMPLES (100%)	N	N	N	N	N
Programs (plays) analyzed	96	87	98	281	121
Program hours analyzed	62.00	58.50	61.75	182.25	71.75
Leading characters analyzed	240	215	307	762	377

MEASURES OF VIOLENCE

Prevalence	%	%	%	%	%
(%P) Programs containing violence	81.2	81.6	80.6	81.1	83.5
Program hours containing violence	83.2	87.0	82.0	84.0	83.2
Rate	N	N	N	N	N
Number of violent episodes	478	394	483	1355	630
(R/P) Rate per all programs (plays)	5.0	4.5	4.9	4.8	5.2
(R/H) Rate per all hours	7.7	6.7	7.8	7.4	8.8
Roles (% of leading characters)	%	%	%	%	%
Violents (committing violence)	55.8	49.3	46.6	50.3	48.5
Victims (subjected to violence)	64.6	55.8	57.7	59.3	58.9
(%V) All those involved in violence either as violents or as victims or both	73.3	65.1	64.2	67.3	66.3
Killers (committing fatal violence)	12.5	10.7	3.3	8.3	3.7
Killed (victims of lethal violence)	7.1	3.7	2.0	4.1	2.1
(%K) All those involved in killing either as killers or as killed or both	18.8	11.6	5.3	11.3	5.5

INDICATORS OF VIOLENCE

Program score:					
PS=(%P)+2(R/P)+2(R/H)	106.6	104.0	106.0	105.5	111.5
Character score: CS=(%V)+(%K)	92.1	76.7	69.5	78.6	70.8
Violence index: VI=PS+CS	198.7	180.7	175.5	184.1	182.3

Table 2: Summary of network and program indicators

	1967	1968	1969	1967-69
ABC				
Program score	117.6	113.5	102.1	110.4
Character score	104.7	79.4	67.9	83.0
Violence index	222.3	192.9	170.0	193.4
CBS				
Program score	84.0	98.7	92.8	92.1
Character score	67.1	68.4	55.9	63.3
Violence index	151.0	167.1	148.7	155.4
NBC				
Program score	118.3	103.8	121.0	114.6
Character score	101.3	83.5	82.8	88.8
Violence index	219.6	187.3	203.8	203.4
Cartoons				
Program score	146.3	155.8	169.4	158.0
Character score	104.8	83.0	91.2	93.3
Violence index	251.1	238.8	260.6	251.3
TV plays				
Program score	98.3	88.1	84.7	90.7
Character score	88.0	69.5	57.4	71.5
Violence index	186.3	157.6	142.1	162.2
Feature films				
Program score	97.5	126.8	103.1	109.5
Character score	84.3	108.7	65.4	84.5
Violence index	181.8	235.5	168.5	194.0
Crime, western, action-adventure				
Program score	125.9	128.1	135.2	129.3
Character score	116.0	100.0	93.2	102.7
Violence index	241.9	228.1	228.4	232.0
Comedy				
Program score	81.3	86.3	102.4	89.3
Character score	59.8	58.0	63.4	60.3
Violence index	141.1	144.3	165.8	149.6

Table 3: Measures and indicators: cartoons, all networks

	One week's prime time and Saturday morning programs in				Enlarged 1969 sample
	1967	1968	1969	1967-69	
SAMPLES (100%)	N	N	N	N	N
Programs (plays) analyzed	32	25	38	95	53
Program hours analyzed	7.00	6.92	8.67	22.59	12.17
Leading characters analyzed	62	47	102	211	146

MEASURES OF VIOLENCE

Prevalence	%	%	%	%	%
(%P) Programs containing violence	93.7	96.0	97.4	95.8	98.1
Program hours containing violence	94.3	92.8	96.1	94.5	97.2
Rate	N	N	N	N	N
Number of violent episodes	151	162	254	567	370
(R/P) Rate per all programs (plays)	4.7	6.5	6.7	6.0	7.0
(R/H) Rate per all hours	21.6	23.4	29.3	25.1	30.4
Roles (% of leading characters)	%	%	%	%	%
Violents (committing violence)	72.6	66.0	70.6	54.0	67.1
Victims (subjected to violence)	83.9	76.6	85.3	82.9	80.1
(%V) All those involved in violence either as violents or as victims or both	90.3	78.7	90.2	87.6	87.0
Killers (committing fatal violence)	4.8	4.3	0.0	2.4	0.7
Killed (victims of lethal violence)	9.7	0.0	1.0	19.4	1.4
(%K) All those involved in killing either as killers or as killed or both	14.5	4.3	1.0	5.7	2.1

INDICATORS OF VIOLENCE

Program score: PS=(%P)+2(R/P)+2(R/H)	146.3	155.8	169.4	158.0	172.9
Character score: CS=(%V)+(%K)	104.8	83.0	91.2	93.3	89.1
Violence index: VI=PS+CS	251.1	238.8	260.6	251.3	262.0

Table 4: Measures and indicators: TV plays, all networks

	One week's prime time and Saturday morning programs in				Enlarged 1969 sample
	1967	1968	1969	1967-69	
SAMPLES (100%)	N	N	N	N	N
Programs (plays) analyzed	58	55	52	165	60
Program hours analyzed	42.50	36.58	36.58	115.66	43.08
Leading characters analyzed	159	145	176	480	202

MEASURES OF VIOLENCE

Prevalence	%	%	%	%	%
(%P) Programs containing violence	74.1	72.7	67.3	71.5	70.0
Program hours containing violence	81.2	80.6	76.8	79.6	77.0
Rate	N	N	N	N	N
Number of violent episodes	298	168	187	653	218
(R/P) Rate per all programs (plays)	5.1	3.1	3.6	4.0	3.6
(R/H) Rate per all hours	7.0	4.6	5.1	5.6	5.1
Roles (% of leading characters)	%	%	%	%	%
Violents (committing violence)	49.7	40.7	34.7	41.5	37.1
Victims (subjected to violence)	59.1	46.9	42.6	49.4	44.6
(%V) All those involved in violence either as violents or as victims or both	67.3	57.2	50.0	57.9	52.5
Killers (committing fatal violence)	15.7	11.0	5.1	10.4	5.9
Killed (victims of lethal violence)	6.3	4.1	2.3	4.2	2.5
(%K) All those involved in killing either as killers or as killed or both	20.7	12.4	7.4	13.3	7.9

INDICATORS OF VIOLENCE

Program score: PS=(%P)+2(R/P)+2(R/H)	98.3	88.1	84.7	90.7	87.4
Character score: CS=(%V)+(%K)	88.0	69.6	57.4	71.2	60.4
Violence index: VI=PS+CS	186.3	157.7	142.1	161.9	147.8

Table 5: Measures and indicators: feature films, all networks

	One week's prime time and Saturday morning programs in				Enlarged 1969 sample
	1967	1968	1969	1967-69	
SAMPLES (100%)	N	N	N	N	N
Programs (plays) analyzed	6	7	8	21	8
Program hours analyzed	12.50	15.00	16.50	44.00	16.50
Leading characters analyzed	19	23	29	71	29

MEASURES OF VIOLENCE

Prevalence	%	%	%	%	%
(%P) Programs containing violence	83.3	100.0	87.5	90.5	87.5
Program hours containing violence	84.0	100.0	86.4	90.0	86.4
Rate	N	N	N	N	N
Number of violent episodes	29	64	42	135	42
(R/P) Rate per all programs (plays)	4.8	9.1	5.3	6.4	5.3
(R/H) Rate per all hours	2.3	4.3	2.5	3.1	2.5
Roles (% of leading characters)	%	%	%	%	%
Violents (committing violence)	52.6	69.6	34.5	50.7	34.5
Victims (subjected to violence)	47.4	69.6	51.7	56.3	51.7
(%V) All those involved in violence either as violents or as victims or both	68.4	87.0	58.6	70.4	58.6
Killers (committing fatal violence)	10.5	21.7	3.4	11.3	3.4
Killed (victims of lethal violence)	5.3	8.7	3.4	5.6	3.4
(%K) All those involved in killing either as killers or as killed or both	15.8	21.7	6.9	14.1	6.9

INDICATORS OF VIOLENCE

Program score: PS=(%P)+2(R/P)+2(R/H)	97.5	126.8	103.1	109.5	103.1
Character score: CS=(%V)+(%K)	84.2	108.7	65.5	84.5	65.5
Violence index: VI=PS+CS	181.7	235.5	168.6	194.0	168.6

Table 6: Measures and indicators: crime, western, action-adventure, all networks

	One week's prime time and Saturday morning programs in				Enlarged 1969 sample
	1967	1968	1969	1967-69	
SAMPLES (100%)	N	N	N	N	N
Programs (plays) analyzed	64	54	63	181	82
Program hours analyzed	47.60	39.20	33.25	120.05	40.25
Leading characters analyzed	164	135	190	489	248

MEASURES OF VIOLENCE

Prevalence	%	%	%	%	%
(%P) Programs containing violence	95.3	98.1	96.8	96.7	97.6
Program hours containing violence	94.3	98.7	96.5	96.4	97.1
Rate	N	N	N	N	N
Number of violent episodes	419	341	418	1178	559
(R/P) Rate per all programs (plays)	6.5	6.3	6.6	6.5	6.8
(R/H) Rate per all hours	8.8	8.7	12.6	9.8	13.9
Roles (% of leading characters)	%	%	%	%	%
Violents (committing violence)	72.6	65.9	64.2	67.5	63.7
Victims (subjected to violence)	80.5	73.3	77.4	77.3	75.4
(%V) All those involved in violence either as violents or as victims or both	89.0	82.2	85.3	85.7	84.3
Killers (committing fatal violence)	18.3	16.3	4.7	12.5	5.2
Killed (victims of lethal violence)	9.8	5.2	3.2	5.9	3.2
(%K) All those involved in killing either as killers or as killed or both	26.8	17.8	7.9	17.0	8.1

INDICATORS OF VIOLENCE

Program score: PS=(%P)+2(R/P)+2(R/H)	125.9	128.1	135.2	129.3	139.0
Character score: CS=(%V)+(%K)	115.8	100.0	93.2	102.7	92.4
Violence index: VI=PS+CS	241.7	228.1	228.4	232.0	231.4

Table 7: Measures and indicators: comedy, all networks

	One week's prime time and Saturday morning programs in				Enlarged 1969 sample
	1967	1968	1969	1967-69	
SAMPLES (100%)	N	N	N	N	N
Programs (plays) analyzed	44	42	48	134	60
Program hours analyzed	24.30	20.20	19.07	64.07	22.32
Leading characters analyzed	107	81	82	270	101

MEASURES OF VIOLENCE

Prevalence	%	%	%	%	%
(%P) Programs containing violence	65.9	66.7	70.8	67.9	73.3
Program hours containing violence	57.30	68.4	55.1	57.6	61.4
Rate	N	N	N	N	N
Number of violent episodes	122	134	216	472	324
(R/P) Rate per all programs (plays)	2.8	3.2	4.5	3.5	5.4
(R/H) Rate per all hours	4.9	6.6	11.3	7.7	14.51
Roles (% of leading characters)	%	%	%	%	%
Violents (committing violence)	37.4	38.3	40.2	38.5	47.5
Victims (subjected to violence)	46.7	43.2	61.0	50.0	68.3
(%V) All those involved in violence either as violents or as victims or both	55.1	53.1	63.4	57.0	70.3
Killers (committing fatal violence)	3.7	4.9	0.0	3.0	0.0
Killed (victims of lethal violence)	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.0
(%K) All those involved in killing either as killers or as killed or both	4.7	4.9	0.0	3.3	0.0

INDICATORS OF VIOLENCE

Program score: PS=(%P)+2(R/P)+2(R/H)	81.3	86.3	102.4	89.3	113.1
Character score: CS=(%V)+(%K)	59.8	58.0	63.4	60.3	70.3
Violence index: VI=PS+CS	141.1	144.3	165.8	149.6	183.4

Table 8: Measures and indicators: ABC, all programs

	One week's prime time and Saturday morning programs in				Enlarged 1969 sample
	1967	1968	1969	1967-69	
SAMPLES (100%)	N	N	N	N	N
Programs (plays) analyzed	35	22	34	91	39
Program hours analyzed	22.00	17.50	20.00	59.50	22.50
Leading characters analyzed	86	63	109	258	127

MEASURES OF VIOLENCE

Prevalence	%	%	%	%	%
(%P) Programs containing violence	88.6	90.9	76.5	84.6	76.9
Program hours containing violence	90.9	94.3	71.3	85.3	70.0
Rate	N	N	N	N	N
Number of violent episodes	195	111	161	467	168
(R/P) Rate per all programs (plays)	5.6	5.0	4.7	5.1	4.3
(R/H) Rate per all hours	8.9	6.3	8.1	7.8	7.5
Roles (% of leading characters)	%	%	%	%	%
Violents (committing violence)	62.8	55.6	44.0	53.1	41.7
Victims (subjected to violence)	72.1	57.1	53.2	60.5	48.8
(%V) All those involved in violence either as violents or as victims or both	82.6	66.7	61.5	69.8	57.5
Killers (committing fatal violence)	14.0	12.7	3.7	9.3	3.1
Killed (victims of lethal violence)	8.1	1.6	2.7	4.3	2.4
(%K) All those involved in killing either as killers or as killed or both	22.1	12.7	6.4	13.2	5.5

INDICATORS OF VIOLENCE

Program score: PS=(%P) + 2(R/P) + 2(R/H)	117.6	113.5	102.1	110.4	100.5
Character score: CS=(%V)+(%K)	104.7	79.4	67.9	83.0	63.0
Violence index: VI=PS+CS	222.3	192.9	170.0	193.4	163.5

Table 9: Selected measures, ABC cartoons

	One week's prime time and Saturday morning programs in				Enlarged 1969 sample
	1967	1968	1969	1967-69	
SAMPLES (100%)	N	N	N	N	N
Programs (plays) analyzed	13	4	16	33	18
Program hours analyzed	3.00	1.50	3.50	8.00	4.00
Prevalence	%	%	%	%	%
(%P) Programs containing violence	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Program hours containing violence	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Rate	N	N	N	N	N
Number of violent episodes	70	26	95	191	99
(R/P) Rate per all programs (plays)	5.4	6.5	5.9	5.8	5.5
(R/H) Rate per all hours	23.3	17.3	27.1	23.9	24.8
Program score: PS=(%P)+2(R/P)+2(R/H)	157.4	147.6	166.0	159.4	160.6

Table 10: Selected measures, ABC noncartoon programs

	One week's prime time and Saturday morning programs in				Enlarged 1969 sample
	1967	1968	1969	1967-69	
SAMPLES (100%)	N	N	N	N	N
Programs (plays) analyzed	22	18	18	58	21
Program hours analyzed	19.00	16.00	16.50	51.50	18.50
Prevalence	%	%	%	%	%
(%P) Programs containing violence	81.8	88.9	55.6	75.9	57.1
Program hours containing violence	89.5	93.8	65.2	83.0	63.5
Rate	N	N	N	N	N
Number of violent episodes	125	85	66	276	69
(R/P) Rate per all programs (plays)	5.7	4.7	3.7	4.8	3.3
(R/H) Rate per all hours	6.6	5.3	4.0	5.4	3.7
Program score: PS=(%P)+2(R/P)+2(R/H)	106.4	108.9	71.0	96.3	71.1

Table 11: Selected measures, ABC crime, western, action-adventure

	One week's prime time and Saturday morning programs in				Enlarged 1969 sample
	1967	1968	1969	1967-69	
SAMPLES (100%)	N	N	N	N	N
Programs (plays) analyzed	25	16	24	65	26
Program hours analyzed	18.60	12.50	12.25	43.35	12.75
Prevalence	%	%	%	%	%
(%P) Programs containing violence	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Program hours containing violence	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Rate	N	N	N	N	N
Number of violent episodes	170	99	154	423	158
(R/P) Rate per all programs (plays)	6.8	6.2	6.4	6.5	6.1
(R/H) Rate per all hours	9.1	7.9	12.6	9.8	12.4
Program score: PS=(%P)+2(R/P)+2(R/H)	131.8	128.2	138.0	132.6	137.0

Table 12: Selected measures, ABC comedy

	One week's prime time and Saturday morning programs in				Enlarged 1969 sample
	1967	1968	1969	1967-69	
SAMPLES (100%)	N	N	N	N	N
Programs (plays) analyzed	13	6	16	35	18
Program hours analyzed	6.00	6.00	7.85	19.85	8.85
Prevalence	%	%	%	%	%
(%P) Programs containing violence	76.9	100.0	62.5	74.3	66.6
Program hours containing violence	58.3	100.0	39.5	63.5	46.3
Rate	N	N	N	N	N
Number of violent episodes	45	32	57	134	77
(R/P) Rate per all programs (plays)	3.5	5.3	3.6	3.8	4.3
(R/H) Rate per all hours	7.5	5.3	7.3	6.8	8.7
Program score: PS=(%P)+2(R/P)+2(R/H)	98.9	121.2	84.3	95.5	92.6

Table 13: Measures and indicators: CBS, all programs

	One week's prime time and Saturday morning programs in				Enlarged 1969 sample
	1967	1968	1969	1967-69	
SAMPLES (100%)	N	N	N	N	N
Programs (plays) analyzed	32	35	29	96	44
Program hours analyzed	19.50	20.00	18.00	57.50	24.00
Leading characters analyzed	73	79	93	245	135

MEASURES OF VIOLENCE

Prevalence	%	%	%	%	%
(%P) Programs containing violence	65.6	77.1	72.4	71.9	81.8
Program hours containing violence	70.5	80.0	78.7	76.4	84.0
Rate	N	N	N	N	N
Number of violent episodes	111	137	113	361	232
(R/P) Rate per all programs (plays)	3.5	3.9	3.9	3.8	5.3
(R/H) Rate per all hours	5.7	6.9	6.3	6.3	9.7
Roles (% of leading characters)	%	%	%	%	%
Violents (committing violence)	39.7	40.5	38.7	39.6	49.6
Victims (subjected to violence)	46.6	51.9	47.3	48.6	57.8
(%V) All those involved in violence either as violents or as victims or both	53.4	59.5	52.7	55.1	65.2
Killers (committing fatal violence)	8.2	7.6	1.1	5.3	3.7
Killed (victims of lethal violence)	6.8	3.8	2.2	4.1	3.0
(%K) All those involved in killing either as killers or as killed or both	13.7	8.9	3.2	8.2	5.9

INDICATORS OF VIOLENCE

Program score: $PS = (\%P) + 2(R/P) + 2(R/H)$	84.0	98.7	92.8	92.1	111.8
Character score: $CS = (\%V) + (\%K)$	67.0	68.4	55.9	63.3	71.1
Violence index: $VI = PS + CS$	151.0	167.1	148.7	155.4	182.9

Table 14: Selected measures, CBS cartoons

	One week's prime time and Saturday morning programs in				Enlarged 1969 sample
	1967	1968	1969	1967-69	
SAMPLES (100%)	N	N	N	N	N
Programs (plays) analyzed	10	13	9	32	20
Program hours analyzed	2.00	3.00	3.00	8.00	5.50
Prevalence	%	%	%	%	%
(%P) Programs containing violence	90.0	100.0	88.9	93.8	95.0
Program hours containing violence	90.0	100.0	88.7	93.3	94.0
Rate	N	N	N	N	N
Number of violent episodes	44	77	66	187	160
(R/P) Rate per all programs (plays)	4.4	5.9	7.3	5.8	8.0
(R/H) Rate per all hours	22.0	25.7	22.0	23.4	29.1
Program score: $PS = (\%P) + 2(R/P) + 2(R/H)$	142.8	163.2	147.5	152.2	169.2

Table 15: Selected measures, CBS noncartoon programs

	One week's prime time and Saturday morning programs in				Enlarged 1969 sample
	1967	1968	1969	1967-69	
SAMPLES (100%)	N	N	N	N	N
Programs (plays) analyzed	22	22	20	64	24
Program hours analyzed	17.50	17.00	15.00	49.50	18.50
Prevalence	%	%	%	%	%
(%P) Programs containing violence	54.5	63.6	65.0	60.9	70.8
Program hours containing violence	68.6	76.5	76.7	73.7	81.1
Rate	N	N	N	N	N
Number of violent episodes	67	60	47	174	72
(R/P) Rate per all programs (plays)	3.0	2.7	2.4	2.7	3.0
(R/H) Rate per all hours	3.8	3.5	3.1	3.5	3.9
Program score: $PS = (\%P) + 2(R/P) + 2(R/H)$	68.1	76.0	76.0	73.3	84.6

Table 16: Selected measures, CBS crime, western, action-adventure

	One week's prime time and Saturday morning programs in				Enlarged 1969 sample
	1967	1968	1969	1967-69	
SAMPLES (100%)	N	N	N	N	N
Programs (plays) analyzed	18	18	12	48	27
Program hours analyzed	11.00	9.00	5.50	25.50	11.50
Prevalence	%	%	%	%	%
(%P) Programs containing violence	94.4	94.4	91.6	93.8	96.3
Program hours containing violence	97.7	94.4	87.8	94.6	94.2
Rate	N	N	N	N	N
Number of violent episodes	99	107	76	282	195
(R/P) Rate per all programs (plays)	5.5	5.9	6.3	5.9	7.2
(R/H) Rate per all hours	9.0	11.9	13.8	11.1	17.0
Program score: PS=(%P)+2(R/P)+2(R/H)	123.4	130.0	131.8	127.8	144.7

Table 17: Selected measures, CBS comedy

	One week's prime time and Saturday morning programs in				Enlarged 1969 sample
	1967	1968	1969	1967-69	
SAMPLES (100%)	N	N	N	N	N
Programs (plays) analyzed	16	21	17	54	26
Program hours analyzed	8.00	7.90	7.50	23.40	9.50
Prevalence	%	%	%	%	%
(%P) Programs containing violence	43.8	61.9	64.7	57.4	76.9
Program hours containing violence	37.5	49.4	62.7	49.6	70.5
Rate	N	N	N	N	N
Number of violent episodes	16	61	66	143	143
(R/P) Rate per all programs (plays)	1.0	2.9	3.9	2.6	5.5
(R/H) Rate per all hours	2.0	7.7	8.8	6.1	15.1
Program score: PS=(%P)+2(R/P)+2(R/H)	49.8	83.1	90.1	74.8	118.1

Table 18: Measures and indicators: NBC, all programs

	One week's prime time and Saturday morning programs in				Enlarged 1969 sample
	1967	1968	1969	1967-69	
SAMPLES (100%)	N	N	N	N	N
Programs (plays) analyzed	29	30	35	94	38
Program hours analyzed	20.50	21.00	23.75	65.25	25.25
Leading characters analyzed	81	73	105	259	115

MEASURES OF VIOLENCE

Prevalence	%	%	%	%	%
(%P) Programs containing violence	89.7	80.0	91.4	87.2	92.1
Program hours containing violence	87.0	87.7	93.7	89.7	94.1
Rate	N	N	N	N	N
Number of violent episodes	172	146	209	527	230
(R/P) Rate per all programs (plays)	5.9	4.9	6.0	5.6	6.1
(R/H) Rate per all hours	8.4	7.0	8.8	8.1	9.1
Roles (% of leading characters)	%	%	%	%	%
Violents (committing violence)	63.0	53.4	56.2	57.5	54.8
Victims (subjected to violence)	72.8	58.9	71.4	68.5	71.3
(%V) All those involved in violence either as violents or as victims or both	81.5	69.9	77.1	76.4	77.4
Killers (committing fatal violence)	14.8	12.3	4.8	10.0	4.3
Killed (victims of lethal violence)	6.2	5.5	1.0	3.9	0.9
(%K) All those involved in killing either as killers or as killed or both	19.8	13.7	5.7	12.4	5.2

INDICATORS OF VIOLENCE

Program score: PS=(%P)+2(R/P)+2(R/H)	118.3	103.8	121.0	114.6	122.5
Character score: CS=(%V)+(%K)	101.3	83.5	82.8	88.8	82.6
Violence index: VI=PS+CS	219.6	187.3	203.8	203.4	205.1

Table 19: Selected measures, NBC cartoons

	One week's prime time and Saturday morning programs in				Enlarged 1969 sample
	1967	1968	1969	1967-69	
SAMPLES (100%)	N	N	N	N	N
Programs (plays) analyzed	9	8	13	30	15
Program hours analyzed	2.00	2.42	2.17	6.59	2.67
Prevalence	%	%	%	%	%
(%P) Programs containing violence	88.9	87.5	100.0	93.3	100.0
Program hours containing violence	90.0	79.2	100.0	89.1	100.0
Rate	N	N	N	N	N
Number of violent episodes	37	33	93	189	111
(R/P) Rate per all programs (plays)	4.1	7.4	7.2	6.3	7.4
(R/H) Rate per all hours	18.5	24.4	42.9	28.7	41.6
Program score: $PS=(\%P)+2(R/P)+2(R/H)$	134.1	151.1	200.2	163.3	198.0

Table 20: Selected measures, NBC noncartoon programs

	One week's prime time and Saturday morning programs in				Enlarged 1969 sample
	1967	1968	1969	1967-69	
SAMPLES (100%)	N	N	N	N	N
Programs (plays) analyzed	20	22	22	64	23
Program hours analyzed	18.50	18.58	21.58	58.66	22.58
Prevalence	%	%	%	%	%
(%P) Programs containing violence	90.0	77.3	86.4	84.4	87.0
Program hours containing violence	86.5	88.8	93.0	89.6	93.4
Rate	N	N	N	N	N
Number of violent episodes	135	87	116	338	119
(R/P) Rate per all programs (plays)	6.8	4.0	5.3	5.3	5.2
(R/H) Rate per all hours	7.3	4.7	5.4	5.8	5.3
Program score: $PS=(\%P)+2(R/P)+2(R/H)$	118.2	94.7	107.8	106.6	108.0

Table 21: Selected measures, NBC crime, western, action-adventure

	One week's prime time and Saturday morning programs in				Enlarged 1969 sample
	1967	1968	1969	1967-69	
SAMPLES (100%)	N	N	N	N	N
Programs (plays) analyzed	21	20	27	68	29
Program hours analyzed	18.00	17.70	15.50	51.20	16.00
Prevalence	%	%	%	%	%
(%P) Programs containing violence	90.5	100.0	96.3	95.6	96.5
Program hours containing violence	86.1	100.0	97.0	94.1	97.0
Rate	N	N	N	N	N
Number of violent episodes	150	135	188	473	206
(R/P) Rate per all programs (plays)	7.1	6.8	7.0	7.0	7.1
(R/H) Rate per all hours	8.3	7.6	12.1	9.2	12.9
Program score: $PS=(\%P)+2(R/P)+2(R/H)$	121.3	128.8	134.5	128.0	136.5

Table 22: Selected measures, NBC comedy

	One week's prime time and Saturday morning programs in				Enlarged 1969 sample
	1967	1968	1969	1967-69	
SAMPLES (100%)	N	N	N	N	N
Programs (plays) analyzed	15	15	15	45	16
Program hours analyzed	10.80	6.30	3.72	20.82	3.97
Prevalence	%	%	%	%	%
(%P) Programs containing violence	80.0	60.0	86.0	75.5	87.5
Program hours containing violence	71.0	35.7	72.9	60.1	74.4
Rate	N	N	N	N	N
Number of violent episodes	61	41	93	195	104
(R/P) Rate per all programs (plays)	4.1	2.7	6.2	4.3	6.5
(R/H) Rate per all hours	5.6	6.5	25.0	9.4	26.2
Program score: $PS=(\%P)+2(R/P)+2(R/H)$	99.4	78.4	148.4	102.9	152.9

Table 23: Distribution of selected measures by format

	Totals N (100%)		Cartoons N %		TV play N %		Feature film N %	
1967								
All programs	96	32	33.3	58	60.4	6	6.3	
Violent programs	78	30	38.5	43	55.1	5	6.4	
Violent episodes	478	151	31.6	298	62.3	29	6.1	
All leading characters	240	62	25.8	159	66.3	19	7.9	
Characters involved	176	56	31.8	107	60.8	13	7.4	
in any violence	45	9	20.0	33	73.3	3	6.7	
in killing								
1968								
All programs	87	25	28.7	55	63.2	7	8.0	
Violent programs	71	24	33.8	40	56.3	7	9.9	
Violent episodes	394	162	41.1	168	42.6	64	16.2	
All leading characters	215	47	21.9	145	67.4	23	10.7	
Characters involved	140	37	26.4	83	59.3	20	14.3	
in any violence	25	2	8.0	18	72.0	5	20.0	
in killing								
1969								
All programs	98	38	38.8	52	53.1	8	8.1	
Violent programs	79	37	46.8	35	44.3	7	8.9	
Violent episodes	483	254	52.6	187	38.7	42	8.7	
All leading characters	307	102	33.2	176	57.3	29	9.4	
Characters involved	197	92	46.7	88	44.7	17	8.6	
in any violence	16	1	6.3	13	81.2	2	12.5	
in killing								
1967-69								
All programs	281	95	33.8	165	58.7	21	7.5	
Violent programs	228	91	39.9	118	51.8	19	8.3	
Violent episodes	1355	567	41.8	653	48.2	135	10.0	
All leading characters	762	211	27.7	480	63.0	71	9.3	
Characters involved	513	185	36.1	278	54.2	50	9.7	
in any violence	86	12	14.0	64	74.4	10	11.6	
in killing								
Enlarged 1969 sample								
All programs	121	53	43.8	60	49.6	8	6.6	
Violent programs	101	52	51.5	42	41.6	7	6.9	
Violent episodes	630	370	58.7	218	34.6	42	6.7	
All leading characters	377	146	38.7	202	53.6	29	7.7	
Characters involved	250	127	50.8	106	42.4	17	6.8	
in any violence	21	3	14.3	16	76.2	2	9.5	
in killing								

Table 24: Distribution of selected measures by program type

	Totals N (100%)		CWWA* N %		Comedy* N %	
1967						
All programs	96	64	66.7	44	45.8	
Violent programs	78	61	78.2	29	37.2	
Violent episodes	478	419	87.7	122	25.5	
All leading characters	240	164	68.3	107	44.6	
Characters involved	176	146	83.0	59	33.5	
in any violence	45	44	97.8	5	11.1	
in killing						
1968						
All programs	87	54	62.1	42	48.3	
Violent programs	71	53	74.6	28	39.4	
Violent episodes	394	341	86.5	134	34.0	
All leading characters	215	135	62.8	81	37.7	
Characters involved	140	111	79.3	43	30.7	
in any violence	25	24	96.0	4	16.0	
in killing						
1969						
All programs	98	63	64.3	48	49.0	
Violent programs	79	61	77.2	34	43.0	
Violent episodes	483	418	86.5	216	44.7	
All leading characters	307	190	61.8	82	26.7	
Characters involved	197	162	82.2	52	26.4	
in any violence	16	15	93.8	0	0.0	
in killing						
1967-69						
All programs	281	181	64.4	134	47.7	
Violent programs	228	175	76.8	91	39.9	
Violent episodes	1355	1178	86.9	472	34.8	
All leading characters	762	489	64.2	270	35.4	
Characters involved	513	419	81.7	154	30.0	
in any violence	86	83	96.5	90	10.5	
in killing						
Enlarged 1969 sample						
All programs	121	82	67.8	60	49.6	
Violent programs	101	80	79.2	46	45.5	
Violent episodes	630	559	88.7	324	51.4	
All leading characters	377	248	65.8	101	26.8	
Characters involved	250	209	83.6	71	28.4	
in any violence	21	20	95.2	0	0.0	
in killing						

*Program type classifications are not mutually exclusive.

Table 25: Distribution of selected measures of violence on ABC

	Totals		Cartoons *		CWAA *		Comedy *	
	N	(100%)	N	%	N	%	N	%
1967								
All programs	35		13	37.1	25	71.4	13	37.1
Violent programs	31		13	41.9	25	80.6	10	32.3
Violent episodes	195		70	35.9	170	87.2	45	23.1
1968								
All programs	22		4	18.2	16	72.7	6	27.3
Violent programs	20		4	20.0	16	80.0	6	30.0
Violent episodes	111		26	23.4	99	89.2	32	28.8
1969								
All programs	34		16	47.1	24	70.6	16	47.1
Violent programs	26		16	61.5	24	92.3	10	38.5
Violent episodes	161		95	59.0	154	95.7	57	35.4
1967-69								
All programs	91		33	36.3	65	71.4	35	38.5
Violent programs	77		33	42.9	65	84.4	26	33.8
Violent episodes	467		191	40.9	423	90.6	134	28.7
Enlarged 1969 sample								
All programs	39		18	46.2	26	66.7	18	46.2
Violent programs	30		18	60.0	26	86.7	12	40.0
Violent episodes	168		99	58.9	158	94.0	77	45.8

*Classifications are not mutually exclusive

Table 26: Distribution of selected measures of violence on CBS

	Totals		Cartoons *		CWAA *		Comedy *	
	N	(100%)	N	%	N	%	N	%
1967								
All programs	32		10	31.3	18	56.3	16	50.0
Violent programs	21		9	42.9	17	81.0	7	33.0
Violent episodes	111		44	39.6	99	89.2	16	14.4
1968								
All programs	35		13	37.1	18	51.4	21	60.0
Violent programs	27		13	48.1	17	63.0	13	48.1
Violent episodes	137		77	56.2	107	78.1	61	44.5
1969								
All programs	29		9	31.0	12	41.4	17	58.6
Violent programs	21		8	38.1	11	52.4	11	52.4
Violent episodes	113		66	58.4	76	67.3	66	58.4
1967-69								
All programs	96		32	33.3	48	50.0	54	56.3
Violent programs	69		30	43.5	45	65.2	31	44.9
Violent episodes	361		187	51.8	282	78.1	143	39.6
Enlarged 1969 sample								
All programs	44		20	45.5	27	61.4	26	59.1
Violent programs	36		19	52.8	26	72.2	20	55.6
Violent episodes	232		160	69.0	195	84.1	143	61.6

*Classifications are not mutually exclusive

Table 27: Distribution of selected measures of violence on NBC

		Totals N (100%)		Cartoons * N %		CWAA * N %		Comedy * N %	
1967	All programs	29	9	31.0	21	72.4	15	51.7	
	Violent programs	26	8	30.8	19	73.1	12	46.2	
	Violent episodes	172	37	21.5	150	87.2	61	35.5	
1968	All programs	30	8	26.7	20	66.7	15	50.0	
	Violent programs	24	7	29.2	20	83.3	9	37.5	
	Violent episodes	146	59	40.4	135	92.5	41	28.1	
1969	All programs	35	13	37.1	27	77.1	15	42.9	
	Violent programs	32	13	40.6	26	81.3	13	40.6	
	Violent episodes	209	93	44.5	188	90.0	93	44.5	
1967-69	All programs	94	30	31.9	68	72.3	45	47.9	
	Violent programs	82	28	34.1	65	79.3	34	41.5	
	Violent episodes	527	189	35.9	473	89.8	195	37.0	
Enlarged 1969 sample	All programs	38	15	39.5	29	76.3	16	42.1	
	Violent programs	35	15	42.9	28	80.0	14	40.0	
	Violent episodes	230	111	48.3	206	89.6	104	45.2	

* Classifications are not mutually exclusive

Table 28: Distribution of selected measures by network

		Totals N (100%)		ABC N %		CBS N %		NBC N %	
1967	All programs	96	35	36.5	302	33.3	29	30.2	
	Violent programs	78	31	39.7	21	26.9	26	33.3	
	Violent episodes	478	195	40.8	111	23.2	172	36.0	
	All leading characters	240	86	35.8	73	30.4	81	33.8	
	Characters involved	176	71	40.3	39	22.2	66	37.5	
	in any violence	45	19	42.2	10	22.2	16	35.6	
	in killing								
1968	All programs	87	22	25.3	35	40.2	30	34.5	
	Violent programs	71	20	28.2	27	38.2	24	33.8	
	Violent episodes	394	111	28.2	137	34.8	146	37.0	
	All leading characters	215	63	29.3	79	36.7	73	34.0	
	Characters involved	140	42	30.0	47	33.6	51	36.4	
	in any violence	25	8	32.0	7	28.0	10	40.0	
	in killing								
1969	All programs	98	34	34.7	29	29.6	35	35.7	
	Violent programs	79	26	32.9	21	26.6	32	40.5	
	Violent episodes	483	101	33.3	113	23.4	209	43.3	
	All leading characters	307	109	35.5	93	30.3	105	34.2	
	Characters involved	197	67	34.0	49	24.9	81	41.1	
	in any violence	16	7	43.8	3	18.7	6	37.5	
	in killing								
1967-69	All programs	281	91	32.4	96	34.2	94	33.4	
	Violent programs	228	77	33.8	69	30.3	82	35.9	
	Violent episodes	1355	467	34.5	361	26.6	527	35.9	
	All leading characters	762	258	33.9	245	32.1	259	34.0	
	Characters involved	513	180	35.1	135	26.3	198	38.6	
	in any violence	86	34	39.5	20	23.3	32	37.2	
	in killing								
Enlarged 1969 sample	All programs	121	39	32.2	44	36.4	38	31.4	
	Violent programs	101	30	29.7	36	35.6	35	34.7	
	Violent episodes	630	168	26.7	232	36.8	230	36.5	
	All leading characters	377	127	33.7	135	35.8	115	30.5	
	Characters involved	250	73	29.2	88	35.2	89	35.6	
	in any violence	21	7	33.3	8	38.1	6	28.6	
	in killing								

Table 29: Network distribution of programs and hours: all networks

	1967		1968		1969		1967 - 69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
ALL PROGRAMS	96	100.0	87	100.0	98	100.0	281	100.0	121	100.0
ABC	35	36.5	22	25.3	34	34.7	91	32.4	39	32.2
CBS	32	33.3	35	40.2	29	29.6	96	34.2	44	36.4
NBC	29	30.2	30	34.5	35	35.7	94	33.4	38	31.4
ALL PROGRAM HOURS	62.00	100.0	58.50	100.0	61.75	100.0	182.25	100.0	71.75	100.0
ABC	22.00	35.5	17.50	29.9	20.00	32.4	59.50	32.6	22.50	31.4
CBS	19.50	31.4	20.00	34.2	18.00	29.1	57.50	31.6	24.00	33.4
NBC	20.50	33.1	21.00	35.9	23.75	38.5	65.25	35.8	25.25	35.2

Table 30: Format distribution of programs and hours: all networks

	1967		1968		1969		1967 - 69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
ALL PROGRAMS	96	100.0	87	100.0	98	100.0	281	100.0	121	100.0
Cartoons	32	33.3	25	28.7	38	38.8	95	33.8	53	43.8
TV plays	58	60.4	55	63.2	52	53.0	165	58.7	60	49.6
Feature films	6	6.3	7	8.1	8	8.2	21	7.5	8	6.6
ALL HOURS	62.00	100.0	58.50	100.0	61.75	100.0	182.25	100.0	71.75	100.0
Cartoons	7.00	11.3	6.92	11.8	8.67	14.1	22.59	12.4	12.17	17.0
TV plays	42.50	68.5	36.58	62.5	36.58	59.2	115.66	63.5	43.08	60.0
Feature films	12.50	20.2	15.00	25.7	16.50	26.7	44.00	24.1	16.50	23.0

Table 31: Crime, western, action-adventure and comedy, programs and hours: all networks

	1967		1968		1969		1967 - 69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
ALL PROGRAMS	96	100.0	87	100.0	98	100.0	281	100.0	121	100.0
CWAA	64	66.7	54	62.1	63	64.3	181	64.4	82	67.8
Comedy	44	45.8	42	48.3	48	49.0	134	47.7	60	49.6
ALL HOURS	62.00	100.0	58.50	100.0	61.75	100.0	182.25	100.0	71.75	100.0
CWAA	47.60	76.8	39.20	67.0	33.25	53.8	120.05	65.9	40.25	56.1
Comedy	24.80	40.0	20.20	34.5	19.07	30.9	64.07	35.2	22.32	31.1

Table 32: Format distribution of programs and hours: ABC

	1967		1968		1969		1967 - 69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
ALL PROGRAMS	35	100.0	22	100.0	34	100.0	91	100.0	39	100.0
Cartoons	13	37.2	4	18.2	16	47.1	33	36.3	18	46.2
TV plays	20	57.1	16	72.7	15	44.1	51	56.0	18	46.2
Feature films	2	5.7	2	9.1	3	8.8	7	7.7	3	7.6
ALL HOURS	22.00	100.0	17.50	100.0	20.00	100.0	59.50	100.0	22.50	100.0
Cartoons	3.00	13.6	1.50	8.6	3.50	17.5	8.00	13.4	4.00	17.8
TV plays	14.50	65.9	12.00	68.6	10.75	53.7	37.25	62.6	12.75	56.7
Feature films	4.50	20.5	4.00	22.8	5.75	28.8	14.25	24.0	5.75	25.5

Table 33: Crime, western, action-adventure and comedy, programs and hours: ABC

	1967		1968		1969		1967 - 69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
ALL PROGRAMS	35	100.0	22	100.0	34	100.0	91	100.0	39	100.0
CWAA	25	71.4	16	72.7	24	70.6	65	71.4	26	66.7
Comedy	13	37.1	6	27.2	16	47.1	35	38.5	18	46.2
ALL HOURS	22.00	100.0	17.50	100.0	20.00	100.0	59.50	100.0	22.50	100.0
CWAA	18.60	84.5	12.50	71.5	12.25	61.0	43.35	72.9	12.75	56.0
Comedy	6.00	27.3	6.00	34.3	7.85	39.3	19.85	33.4	8.85	39.3

Table 34: Format distribution of programs and hours: CBS

	1967		1968		1969		1967 - 69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
ALL PROGRAMS	32	100.0	35	100.0	29	100.0	96	100.0	44	100.0
Cartoons	10	31.2	13	37.1	9	31.0	32	33.3	20	45.5
TV plays	20	62.5	20	57.1	18	62.1	58	60.4	22	50.0
Feature films	2	6.3	2	5.8	2	6.9	6	6.3	2	4.5
ALL HOURS	19.50	100.0	20.00	100.0	18.00	100.0	57.50	100.0	24.00	100.0
Cartoons	2.00	10.3	3.00	15.0	3.00	16.7	8.00	13.9	5.50	22.9
TV plays	13.50	69.2	13.00	65.0	11.00	61.1	37.50	65.2	14.50	60.4
Feature films	4.00	20.5	4.00	20.0	4.00	22.2	12.00	20.9	4.00	16.7

Table 35: Crime, western, action-adventure and comedy, programs and hours: CBS

	1967		1968		1969		1967 - 69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
ALL PROGRAMS	32	100.0	35	100.0	29	100.0	96	100.0	44	100.0
CWAA	18	56.3	18	51.4	12	41.4	48	50.0	27	61.4
Comedy	16	50.0	21	60.0	17	58.6	54	56.3	26	59.1
ALL HOURS	19.50	100.0	20.00	100.0	18.00	100.0	57.50	100.0	24.00	100.0
CWAA	11.00	56.4	9.00	45.0	5.50	30.0	25.50	44.3	11.50	47.9
Comedy	8.00	41.0	7.90	39.5	7.50	41.7	23.40	40.7	9.50	39.5

Table 36: Format distribution of programs and hours: NBC

	1967		1968		1969		1967 - 69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
ALL PROGRAMS	29	100.0	30	100.0	35	100.0	94	100.0	38	100.0
Cartoons	9	31.0	8	26.7	13	37.1	30	31.9	15	39.5
TV plays	18	62.1	19	63.3	19	54.3	56	59.6	20	52.6
Feature films	2	6.9	3	10.0	3	8.6	8	8.5	3	7.9
ALL HOURS	20.50	100.0	21.00	100.0	23.75	100.0	65.25	100.0	25.25	100.0
Cartoons	2.00	9.8	2.42	11.5	2.17	9.1	6.59	10.1	2.67	10.6
TV plays	14.50	70.7	11.58	55.2	14.83	62.5	40.91	62.7	15.83	62.7
Feature films	4.00	19.5	7.00	33.3	6.75	28.4	17.75	27.2	6.75	26.7

Table 37: Crime, western, action-adventure and comedy, programs and hours: NBC

	1967		1968		1969		1967 - 69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
ALL PROGRAMS	29	100.0	30	100.0	35	100.0	94	100.0	38	100.0
CWAA	21	72.4	20	66.7	27	77.1	68	72.3	29	76.3
Comedy	15	51.7	15	50.0	15	42.9	45	47.9	16	42.1
ALL HOURS	20.50	100.0	21.00	100.0	23.75	100.0	65.25	100.0	25.25	100.0
CWAA	18.00	87.8	17.70	84.3	15.50	65.3	51.20	78.5	16.00	63.4
Comedy	10.80	52.7	6.30	30.0	3.72	15.7	20.82	31.9	3.97	15.7

Table 38: Prevalence of violence: all programs, all networks

	1967		1968		1969		1967 - 69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
ALL PROGRAMS	96	100.0	87	100.0	98	100.0	281	100.0	121	100.0
All violence	78	81.2	71	81.6	79	80.6	228	81.1	101	83.5
significant to plot	63	65.6	48	55.2	67	68.4	178	63.3	87	71.9
incidental to plot	15	15.7	23	26.4	12	12.2	50	17.8	14	11.6
ALL HOURS	62.00	100.0	58.50	100.0	61.75	100.0	182.25	100.0	71.75	100.0
All violence	51.59	83.2	50.92	87.0	50.66	82.0	153.17	84.0	59.67	83.2
significant to plot	41.17	66.4	35.17	60.0	41.83	67.7	118.17	64.8	50.09	69.8
incidental to plot	10.42	16.8	15.75	26.9	8.83	14.3	35.00	19.2	9.58	13.4

Table 39: Number and rate of violent episodes: all programs, all networks

	1967		1968		1969		1967 - 69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
ALL VIOLENT EPISODES	478		394		483		1355		630	
Rate per all programs	5.0		4.5		4.9		4.8		5.2	
Rate per violent program	6.1		5.5		6.1		5.9		6.2	
Rate when violence is significant to plot	6.9		6.9		6.7		6.8		6.8	
Rates per all hours	7.7		6.7		7.8		7.4		8.8	
Rate per violent hour	9.3		7.7		9.5		8.8		10.6	
Rate per hour when violence is significant to plot	10.5		9.5		10.7		10.3		11.8	

Table 40: Prevalence of violence: TV plays, all networks

	1967		1968		1969		1967 - 69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
ALL PROGRAMS	58	100.0	55	100.0	52	100.0	165	100.0	60	100.0
All violence	43	74.1	40	72.7	35	67.3	118	71.5	42	70.0
significant to plot	32	55.2	23	41.8	25	48.1	80	48.5	31	51.7
incidental to plot	11	19.0	17	30.9	10	19.2	38	23.0	11	18.3
ALL HOURS	42.50	100.0	36.58	100.0	36.58	100.0	115.66	100.0	43.08	100.0
All violence	34.50	81.2	29.50	80.6	28.08	76.8	92.08	79.6	33.58	77.0
significant to plot	28.50	67.1	20.75	56.7	21.58	59.0	70.83	61.2	26.58	61.7
incidental to plot	6.00	14.1	8.75	23.9	6.50	17.8	21.25	18.4	7.00	16.2

Table 41: Number and rate of violent episodes: TV plays, all networks

	1967	1968	1969	1967 - 69	Enlarged 1969 sample
ALL VIOLENT EPISODES	298	168	187	653	218
Rate per all programs	5.1	3.1	3.6	4.0	3.6
Rate per violent program	6.9	4.2	5.3	5.5	5.2
Rate when violence is significant to plot	8.5	5.7	6.5	7.1	6.2
Rates per all hours	7.0	4.6	5.1	5.6	5.1
Rate per violent hour	8.6	5.7	6.7	7.1	6.5
Rate per hour when violence is significant to plot	9.5	6.3	7.5	8.0	7.2

Table 42: Prevalence of violence: feature films, all networks

	1967		1968		1969		1967 - 69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
ALL PROGRAMS	6	100.0	7	100.0	8	100.0	21	100.0	8	100.0
All violence	5	83.3	7	100.0	7	87.5	19	90.5	7	87.5
significant to plot	3	50.0	4	57.1	6	75.0	13	61.9	6	75.0
incidental to plot	2	33.3	3	42.9	1	12.5	6	28.6	1	12.5
ALL HOURS	12.50	100.0	15.00	100.0	16.50	100.0	44.00	100.0	16.50	100.0
All violence	10.50	84.0	15.00	100.0	14.25	86.4	39.75	90.0	14.25	86.4
significant to plot	6.50	52.0	9.00	60.0	12.25	74.3	27.25	61.9	12.25	74.3
incidental to plot	4.00	32.0	6.00	40.0	2.00	12.2	12.00	27.3	2.00	12.2

MEDIA CONTENT AND CONTROL

Table 43: Number and rate of violent episodes: feature films, all networks

	1967	1968	1969	1967 - 69	Enlarged 1969 sample
ALL VIOLENT EPISODES	29	64	42	135	42
Rate per all programs	4.8	9.1	5.3	6.4	5.3
Rate per violent program	5.8	9.1	6.0	7.1	6.0
Rate when violence is significant to plot	7.3	13.0	5.8	8.4	5.8
Rates per all hours	2.3	4.3	2.5	3.1	2.5
Rate per violent hour	2.8	4.3	2.9	3.4	2.9
Rate per hour when violence is significant to plot	3.4	5.8	2.9	4.0	2.9

Table 44: Prevalence of violence: cartoons, all networks

	1967		1968		1969		1967 - 69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
ALL PROGRAMS	32	100.0	25	100.0	38	100.0	95	100.0	53	100.0
All violence	30	93.7	24	96.0	37	97.4	91	95.8	52	98.1
significant to plot	28	87.5	21	84.0	36	94.7	85	89.5	50	94.3
incidental to plot	2	6.3	3	12.0	1	2.6	6	6.3	2	3.8
ALL HOURS	7.00	100.0	6.92	100.0	8.67	100.0	22.59	100.0	12.17	100.0
All violence	6.59	94.3	6.42	92.8	8.33	96.1	21.34	94.5	11.83	97.2
Significant to plot	6.17	88.1	5.42	78.3	8.00	92.3	19.59	86.7	11.24	92.4
incidental to plot	0.42	6.0	1.00	14.5	0.33	3.8	1.75	7.7	0.59	4.8

VIOLENCE IN TELEVISION DRAMA

Table 45: Number and rate of violent episodes: cartoons, all networks

	1967	1968	1969	1967 -- 69	Enlarged 1969 sample
ALL VIOLENT EPISODES	151	162	254	567	370
Rate per all programs	4.7	6.5	6.7	6.0	7.0
Rate per violent program	5.0	6.8	6.9	6.2	7.1
Rate when violence is significant to plot	5.0	7.1	6.9	6.4	7.3
Rates per all hours	21.6	23.4	29.3	25.1	30.4
Rate per violent hour	22.9	25.2	30.5	26.6	31.3
Rate per hour when violence is significant to plot	22.7	27.7	31.3	27.6	32.4

Table 46: Prevalence of violence. ABC

	1967		1968		1969		1967 -- 69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
ALL PROGRAMS	35	100.0	22	100.0	34	100.0	91	100.0	39	100.0
All violence	31	88.6	20	90.9	26	76.5	77	84.6	30	76.9
significant to plot	26	74.3	14	63.6	26	76.5	66	72.5	28	71.8
incidental to plot	5	14.3	6	27.3	0	0.0	11	12.1	2	5.1
ALL HOURS	22.00	100.0	17.50	100.0	20.00	100.0	59.50	100.0	22.50	100.0
All violence	20.00	90.9	16.50	94.3	14.25	71.3	50.75	85.3	15.75	70.0
significant to plot	17.58	79.9	11.00	62.9	14.25	71.3	42.83	72.0	15.00	66.7
incidental to plot	2.42	11.0	5.50	31.4	0.00	0.0	7.92	13.3	0.75	3.3

Table 47: Number and rate of violent episodes: ABC

	1967	1968	1969	1967 -- 69	Enlarged 1969 sample
ALL VIOLENT EPISODES	195	111	161	467	168
Rate per all programs	5.6	5.0	4.7	5.1	4.3
Rate per violent program	6.3	5.6	6.2	6.1	5.6
Rate when violence is significant to plot	6.8	6.9	6.2	6.6	5.9
Rates per all hours	8.9	6.3	8.1	7.8	7.5
Rate per violent hour	9.8	6.7	11.3	9.2	10.7
Rate per hour when violence is significant to plot	10.1	8.8	11.3	10.2	11.0

Table 48: Prevalence and rate of violence: ABC cartoons

	1967		1968		1969		1967 -- 69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
NUMBER OF VIOLENT EPISODES	70		26		95		191		99	
ALL PROGRAMS	13	100.0	4	100.0	16	100.0	33	100.0	18	100.0
Violent programs	13	100.0	4	100.0	16	100.0	33	100.0	18	100.0
Violent episodes: rate per program	5.4		6.5		5.9		5.8		5.5	
ALL HOURS	3.00	100.0	1.50	100.0	3.50	100.0	8.00	100.0	4.00	100.0
Violent hours	3.00	100.0	1.50	100.0	3.50	100.0	8.00	100.0	4.00	100.0
Violent episodes: rate per program	23.3		17.3		27.1		23.9		24.8	

Table 49: Prevalence and rate of violence: ABC TV plays

	1967		1968		1969		1967 - 69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
NUMBER OF VIOLENT EPISODES	119		67		53		239		56	
ALL PROGRAMS	20	100.0	16	100.0	15	100.0	51	100.0	18	100.0
Violent programs	16	80.0	14	87.5	8	53.3	38	74.5	10	55.5
Violent episodes: rate per program	6.0		4.2		3.5		4.7		3.1	
ALL HOURS	14.50	100.0	12.00	100.0	10.75	100.0	37.25	100.0	12.75	100.0
Violent hours	12.50	86.2	11.00	91.7	7.25	67.4	30.75	82.6	8.25	76.4
Violent episodes: rate per hour	8.2		5.6		4.9		6.4		4.4	

Table 50: Prevalence and rate of violence: ABC feature films

	1967		1968		1969		1967 - 69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
NUMBER OF VIOLENT EPISODES	6		18		13		37		13	
ALL PROGRAMS	2	100.0	2	100.0	3	100.0	7	100.0	3	100.0
Violent programs	2	100.0	2	100.0	2	66.6	6	85.7	2	66.6
Violent episodes: rate per program	3.0		9.0		4.3		5.3		4.3	
ALL HOURS	4.50	100.0	4.00	100.0	5.75	100.0	14.25	100.0	5.75	100.0
Violent hours	4.50	100.0	4.00	100.0	3.50	60.9	12.00	84.2	3.50	60.9
Violent episodes: rate per hour	1.3		4.5		2.3		2.6		2.3	

Table 51: Prevalence and rate of violence: ABC crime, western, action-adventure

	1967		1968		1969		1967 - 69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
NUMBER OF VIOLENT EPISODES	170		99		154		423		158	
ALL PROGRAMS	25	100.0	16	100.0	24	100.0	65	100.0	26	100.0
Violent programs	25	100.0	16	100.0	24	100.0	65	100.0	26	100.0
Violent episodes: rate per program	6.8		6.2		6.4		6.5		6.1	
ALL HOURS	18.60	100.0	12.50	100.0	12.25	100.0	43.35	100.0	12.75	100.0
Violent hours	18.60	100.0	12.50	100.0	12.25	100.0	43.35	100.0	12.75	100.0
Violent episodes: rate per hour	9.1		7.9		12.6		9.8		12.4	

Table 52: Prevalence and rate of violence: ABC comedy

	1967		1968		1969		1967 - 69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
NUMBER OF VIOLENT EPISODES	45		32		57		134		77	
ALL PROGRAMS	13	100.0	6	100.0	16	100.0	35	100.0	18	100.0
Violent programs	10	76.9	6	100.0	10	62.5	26	74.3	12	66.6
Violent episodes: rate per program	3.5		5.3		3.6		3.8		4.3	
ALL HOURS	6.0	100.0	6.0	100.0	7.85	100.0	19.85	100.0	8.85	100.0
Violent hours	3.5	58.3	6.0	100.0	3.10	39.5	12.60	63.5	4.10	46.3
Violent episodes: rate per hour	7.5		5.3		7.3		6.8		8.7	

Table 53: Prevalence of violence: CBS

	1967		1968		1969		1967 - 69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
ALL PROGRAMS	32	100.0	35	100.0	29	100.0	96	100.0	44	100.0
All violence	21	65.6	27	77.1	21	72.4	69	71.9	36	81.8
significant to plot	16	50.0	17	48.6	13	44.8	46	47.9	28	63.6
incidental to plot	5	15.6	10	28.5	8	27.6	23	24.0	8	18.2
ALL HOURS	19.50	100.0	20.00	100.0	18.00	100.0	57.50	100.0	24.00	100.0
All violence	13.75	70.5	16.00	80.0	14.17	78.7	43.92	76.4	20.17	84.0
significant to plot	8.25	42.3	8.00	40.0	8.34	46.3	24.59	42.8	14.34	59.8
incidental to plot	5.50	28.2	8.00	40.0	5.83	32.4	19.33	33.6	5.83	24.3

Table 54: Number and rate of violent episodes: CBS

	1967	1968	1969	1967 - 69	Enlarged 1969 sample
ALL VIOLENT EPISODES	111	137	113	361	232
Rate per all programs	3.5	3.9	3.9	3.8	5.3
Rate per violent program	5.3	5.1	5.4	5.2	6.4
Rate when violence is significant to plot	5.9	6.2	6.8	6.3	7.4
Rates per all hours	5.7	6.9	6.3	6.3	9.7
Rate per violent hour	8.1	8.6	8.0	8.2	11.5
Rate per hour when violence is significant to plot	11.4	13.3	10.7	11.8	14.5

Table 55: Prevalence and rate of violence: CBS cartoons

	1967		1968		1969		1967 - 69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
NUMBER OF VIOLENT EPISODES	44		77		66		187		160	
ALL PROGRAMS	10	100.0	13	100.0	9	100.0	32	100.0	20	100.0
Violent programs	9	90.0	13	100.0	8	88.9	30	93.8	19	95.0
Violent episodes: rate per program	4.4		5.9		7.3		5.8		8.0	
ALL HOURS	2.00	100.0	3.00	100.0	3.00	100.0	8.00	100.0	5.50	100.0
Violent hours	1.80	90.0	3.00	100.0	2.66	88.7	7.46	93.3	5.17	94.0
Violent episodes: rate per hour	22.0		25.7		22.0		23.4		29.1	

Table 56: Prevalence and rate of violence: CBS TV plays

	1967		1968		1969		1967 - 69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
NUMBER OF VIOLENT EPISODES	60		49		36		145		61	
ALL PROGRAMS	20	100.0	20	100.0	18	100.0	58	100.0	22	100.0
Violent programs	10	50.0	12	60.0	11	61.1	33	56.9	15	68.2
Violent episodes: rate per program	3.0		2.5		2.0		2.5		2.8	
ALL HOURS	13.50	100.0	13.00	100.0	11.00	100.0	37.50	100.0	14.50	100.0
Violent hours	8.00	59.3	9.00	69.2	7.50	68.2	24.50	65.3	11.00	75.9
Violent episodes: rate per hour	4.4		3.8		3.3		3.9		4.2	

Table 57: Prevalence and rate of violence: CBS feature films

	1967		1968		1969		1967 - 69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
NUMBER OF VIOLENT EPISODES	7		11		11		29		11	
ALL PROGRAMS	2	100.0	2	100.0	2	100.0	6	100.0	2	100.0
Violent programs	2	100.0	2	100.0	2	100.0	6	100.0	2	100.0
Violent episodes: rate per program		3.5		5.5		5.5		4.8		5.5
ALL HOURS	4.00	100.0	4.00	100.0	4.00	100.0	12	100.0	4.00	100.0
Violent hours	4.00	100.0	4.00	100.0	4.00	100.0	12	100.0	4.00	100.0
Violent episodes: rate per hour		1.8		2.8		2.8		2.4		2.8

Table 58: Prevalence and rate of violence: CBS crime, western, action-adventure

	1967		1968		1969		1967 - 69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
NUMBER OF VIOLENT EPISODES	99		107		76		282		195	
ALL PROGRAMS	18	100.0	18	100.0	12	100.0	48	100.0	27	100.0
Violent programs	17	94.4	17	94.4	11	91.6	45	93.8	26	96.3
Violent episodes: rate per program		5.5		5.9		6.3		5.9		7.2
ALL HOURS	11.00	100.0	9.00	100.0	5.50	100.0	25.50	100.0	11.50	100.0
Violent hours	10.80	97.7	8.50	94.4	4.83	87.8	24.13	94.6	10.83	94.2
Violent episodes: rate per hour		9.0		11.9		13.8		11.1		17.0

Table 59: Prevalence and rate of violence: CBS comedy

	1967		1968		1969		1967 - 69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
NUMBER OF VIOLENT EPISODES	16		61		66		143		143	
ALL PROGRAMS	16	100.0	21	100.0	17	100.0	54	100.0	26	100.0
Violent programs	7	43.8	13	61.9	11	64.7	31	57.4	20	76.9
Violent episodes: rate per program		1.0		2.9		3.9		2.6		5.5
ALL HOURS	8.00	100.0	7.90	100.0	7.50	100.0	23.4	100.0	9.50	100.0
Violent hours	3.00	37.5	3.90	49.4	4.70	62.7	11.6	49.6	6.70	70.5
Violent episodes: rate per hour		2.0		7.7		8.8		6.1		15.1

Table 60: Prevalence of violence: NBC

	1967		1968		1969		1967 - 69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
ALL PROGRAMS	29	100.0	30	100.0	35	100.0	94	100.0	38	100.0
All violence	26	89.7	24	80.0	32	91.4	82	87.2	35	92.1
significant to plot	21	72.4	17	56.7	28	80.0	66	70.2	31	81.6
incidental to plot	5	17.3	7	23.3	4	11.4	16	17.0	4	10.5
ALL HOURS	20.50	100.0	21.00	100.0	23.75	100.0	65.25	100.0	25.25	100.0
All violence	17.83	87.0	18.42	87.7	22.25	93.7	58.50	89.7	23.75	94.1
significant to plot	15.33	74.8	16.17	77.0	19.25	81.1	50.75	77.8	20.75	82.2
incidental to plot	2.50	12.2	2.25	10.7	3.00	12.6	7.75	11.9	3.00	11.9

Table 61: Number and rate of violent episodes: NBC

	1967	1968	1969	1967 — 69	Enlarged 1969 sample
ALL VIOLENT EPISODES	172	146	209	527	230
Rate per all programs	5.9	4.9	6.0	5.6	6.1
Rate per violent program	6.6	6.1	6.5	6.4	6.6
Rate when violence is significant to plot	7.7	7.6	7.0	7.4	7.0
Rates per all hours	8.4	7.0	8.8	8.1	9.1
Rate per violent hour	9.6	7.9	9.4	9.0	9.7
Rate per hour when violence is significant to plot	10.6	8.0	10.2	9.6	10.5

Table 62: Prevalence and rate of violence: NBC cartoons

	1967		1968		1969		1967 — 69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
NUMBER OF VIOLENT EPISODES	37		59		93		189		111	
ALL PROGRAMS	9	100.0	8	100.0	13	100.0	30	100.0	15	100.0
Violent programs	8	88.9	7	87.5	13	100.0	28	93.3	15	100.0
Violent episodes: rate per program	4.1		7.4		7.2		6.3		7.4	
ALL HOURS	2.00	100.0	2.42	100.0	2.17	100.0	6.59	100.0	2.67	100.0
Violent hours	1.80	90.0	1.90	79.2	2.17	100.0	5.87	89.1	2.67	100.0
Violent episodes: rate per hour	18.5		24.4		42.9		28.7		41.6	

Table 63: Prevalence and rate of violence: NBC TV plays

	1967		1968		1969		1967 — 69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
NUMBER OF VIOLENT EPISODES	119		52		98		269		101	
ALL PROGRAMS	18	100.0	19	100.0	19	100.0	56	100.0	20	100.0
Violent programs	17	94.4	14	73.7	16	84.2	47	83.9	17	85.0
Violent episodes: rate per program	6.6		2.7		5.2		4.8		5.1	
ALL HOURS	14.50	100.0	11.58	100.0	14.83	100.0	40.91	100.0	15.83	100.0
Violent hours	14.00	96.6	9.50	82.0	13.33	89.9	36.83	90.0	14.33	90.5
Violent episodes: rate per hour	8.2		4.5		6.6		6.6		6.4	

Table 64: Prevalence and rate of violence: NBC feature films

	1967		1968		1969		1967 — 69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
NUMBER OF VIOLENT EPISODES	16		35		18		69		18	
ALL PROGRAMS	2	100.0	3	100.0	3	100.0	8	100.0	3	100.0
Violent programs	1	50.0	3	100.0	3	100.0	7	87.5	3	100.0
Violent episodes: rate per program	8.0		11.7		6.0		8.6		6.0	
ALL HOURS	4.00	100.0	7.00	100.0	6.75	100.0	17.75	100.0	6.75	100.0
Violent hours	2.00	50.0	7.00	100.0	6.75	100.0	15.75	88.7	6.75	100.0
Violent episodes: rate per hour	4.0		5.0		2.7		3.9		2.7	

Table 65: Prevalence and rate of violence: NBC crime, western, action-adventure

	1967		1968		1969		1967 - 69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
NUMBER OF VIOLENT EPISODES	150		135		188		473		206	
ALL PROGRAMS	21	100.0	20	100.0	27	100.0	68	100.0	29	100.0
Violent programs	19	90.5	20	100.0	26	96.3	65	95.6	28	96.5
Violent episodes: rate per program	7.1		6.8		7.0		7.0		7.1	
ALL HOURS	18.00	100.0	17.70	100.0	15.50	100.0	51.20	100.0	16.00	100.0
Violent hours	15.50	86.1	17.70	100.0	15.00	97.0	48.20	94.1	15.50	97.0
Violent episodes: rate per hour	8.3		7.6		12.1		9.2		12.9	

Table 66: Prevalence and rate of violence: NBC comedy

	1967		1968		1969		1967 - 69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
NUMBER OF VIOLENT EPISODES	61		41		93		195		104	
ALL PROGRAMS	15	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	45	100.0	16	100.0
Violent programs	12	80.0	9	60.0	13	86.0	34	75.5	14	87.5
Violent episodes: rate per program	4.1		2.7		6.2		4.3		6.5	
ALL HOURS	10.80	100.0	6.30	100.0	3.72	100.0	20.82	100.0	3.97	100.0
Violent hours	7.70	71.0	2.30	35.7	2.70	72.9	12.70	60.1	2.90	74.4
Violent episodes: rate per hour	5.6		6.5		25.0		9.4		26.2	

Table 67: Agent of violence in violent episodes

	1967		1968		1969		1967 - 69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
All episodes	478	100.0	394	100.0	483	100.0	1355	100.0	630	100.0
Human being	362	75.7	306	77.7	238	49.3	906	66.9	314	49.9
Animal (including cartoon animals and other animated creatures)	37	7.8	29	7.3	83	17.2	149	11.0	94	14.9
Nature, accident, mixed, unclear, etc.	79	16.5	59	15.0	162	33.5	300	22.1	222	35.2
Cartoon episodes	150	100.0	163	100.0	254	100.0	567	100.0	370	100.0
Human being	66	44.0	96	58.9	59	23.2	221	39.0	106	28.6
Animal (including cartoon animals and other animated creatures)	31	20.7	26	16.0	79	31.1	136	24.0	89	24.1
Nature, accident, mixed unclear, etc.	53	35.3	41	25.1	116	45.7	210	37.0	175	47.3
Noncartoon episodes	328	100.0	231	100.0	229	100.0	788	100.0	260	100.0
Human being	296	90.2	210	90.9	179	78.2	685	86.9	208	80.0
Animal (including cartoon animals and other animated creatures)	6	1.8	3	1.3	4	1.7	13	1.6	5	1.9
Nature, accident, mixed, unclear, etc.	26	8.0	18	7.8	46	20.1	90	11.4	47	18.1

Table 68: Use of weapon in violent episodes

	1967		1968		1969		1967 - 69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
All episodes	478	100.0	394	100.0	483	100.0	1355	100.0	630	100.0
Weapon was used	281	58.8	184	46.7	338	70.0	863	59.3	463	73.5
No weapon was used	197	41.2	210	53.3	145	30.0	552	40.7	167	26.5
Cartoon episodes	150	100.0	163	100.0	254	100.0	567	100.0	370	100.0
Weapon was used	78	52.0	76	46.6	210	82.7	364	64.2	316	85.4
No weapon was used	72	48.0	87	53.4	44	17.3	203	35.8	54	14.6
Noncartoon episodes	328	100.0	231	100.0	229	100.0	788	100.0	260	100.0
Weapon was used	203	61.9	108	46.8	128	55.9	439	55.7	147	56.5
No weapon was used	125	38.1	123	53.2	101	44.1	349	44.3	113	43.5

Table 69: Comic context: tone of program in which violent episode appears

	1967		1968		1969		1967 - 69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
All episodes	478	100.0	394	100.0	483	100.0	1355	100.0	630	100.0
Mostly light, comic humorous	132	27.6	142	26.1	156	32.3	430	23.7	221	35.1
Serious, mixed, unclear	346	72.4	252	73.9	327	67.7	925	76.3	409	64.9
Cartoon episodes	150	100.0	163	100.0	254	100.0	567	100.0	370	100.0
Mostly light, comic, humorous	61	40.7	84	51.5	123	48.4	268	47.3	184	49.7
Serious, mixed, unclear	89	59.3	79	48.5	131	51.6	299	52.7	186	50.3
Noncartoon episodes	328	100.0	231	100.0	229	100.0	788	100.0	260	100.0
Mostly light, comic, humorous	71	21.6	58	25.1	33	14.4	162	20.6	37	14.2
Serious, mixed, unclear	257	78.4	173	74.9	196	85.6	626	79.4	223	85.8

Table 70: Agents of law in violent episodes*

	1967		1968		1969		1967 - 69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
All episodes	478	100.0	394	100.0	483	100.0	1355	100.0	630	100.0
Law enforcement agents play no role	418	87.4	346	87.8	431	89.2	1195	88.2	550	87.3
Law enforcement agents play some role	60	12.6	48	12.2	52	10.8	160	11.8	80	12.7
When they do play a role, it is:										
nonviolent	24	40.0	13	27.1	12	23.1	49	30.6	25	31.2
violent	36	60.0	35	72.4	40	76.9	111	69.4	55	68.8
Cartoon episodes					254	100.0			370	100.0
Law enforcement agents play no role					244	96.1			345	83.2
Law enforcement agents play some role					10	3.9			25	6.8
Noncartoon episodes					229	100.0			260	100.0
Law enforcement agents play no role					186	81.2			204	78.8
Law enforcement agents play some role					43	18.8			56	21.2
When they do play a role, it is:										
nonviolent:					9	20.9			13	23.2
violent					34	79.1			43	76.8

*1969 figures meet levels of acceptable reliability for noncartoon episodes only

Table 71: Casualties in violent episodes

	1967		1968		1969		1967 - 69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Violent episodes in all programs	478	100.0	394	100.0	483	100.0	1355	100.0	630	100.0
No casualties	223	46.7	194	49.2	403	83.4	820	60.5	522	82.9
Some casualties	255	53.3	200	50.8	80	16.6	535	39.5	108	17.1
Violent episodes in which the casualty count was:										
one	189	39.5	146	37.1	64	13.3	399	29.4	85	13.5
two	34	7.1	26	6.6	8	1.7	68	5.0	13	2.1
three	11	2.3	9	2.3	3	0.6	23	1.7	4	0.6
four	2	0.4	5	1.3	0	0.0	7	0.5	0	0.0
five	3	0.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	0.2	0	0.0
six	4	0.8	0	0.0	1	0.2	5	0.4	2	0.3
seven	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
eight or more	12	2.5	14	3.6	4	0.9	30	2.2	4	0.6
Number of individual casualties	437	100.0	371	100.0	134	100.0	942	100.0	174	100.0
Fatal casualties	182	41.6	131	35.3	46	34.3	359	38.1	58	33.3
Rate of all casualties per violent episode	0.9		0.9		0.3		0.7		0.3	
Rate of fatal casualties	0.4		0.3		0.1		0.3		0.1	

Table 72: Crime, science, and minority and foreign themes related to the prevalence and rate of violence: all programs

Programs containing the following themes as significant story elements	Total No. programs containing theme	% of all programs	Violent programs containing theme			Nonviolent programs containing theme	
			% of all with theme	% of all violent programs	% of all nonviolent programs	N	%
	N	%	N	%	%	N	%
Crime, corruption, illegality							
1967	31	32.3	29	93.5	37.2	2	11.1
1968	39	44.8	38	97.4	53.5	1	6.3
1969	43	43.9	39	90.7	49.7	4	21.1
1967 - 69	113	40.2	106	93.8	46.5	7	13.2
Enlarged 1969 sample	54	44.6	50	92.6	50.0	4	20.0
Science and technology							
1967	29	30.2	26	89.7	33.3	3	16.7
1968	24	27.6	21	87.5	29.6	3	18.8
1969	52	53.1	43	82.7	54.4	9	47.4
1967 - 69	105	37.4	90	85.7	39.5	15	28.3
Enlarged 1969 sample	68	56.2	58	85.3	57.4	10	50.0
Minority and foreign themes							
1967	30	31.3	28	93.3	35.9	2	11.1
1968	39	44.8	34	87.2	47.9	5	31.3
1969	49	50.0	38	77.6	48.1	11	57.8
1967 - 69	118	42.0	100	84.7	43.9	18	34.0
Enlarged 1969 sample	59	48.8	48	81.4	48.0	11	55.0

Table 73: Distribution of all programs by time of action

	1967		1968		1969		1967 - 69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
ALL PROGRAMS	96	100.0	87	100.0	98	100.0	281	100.0	121	100.0
Past	19	19.8	19	21.8	21	21.4	59	21.0	22	18.2
Contemporary (Present)	52	54.2	59	67.8	70	71.4	183	65.1	85	70.2
Future	8	8.3	5	5.7	3	3.1	16	5.7	5	4.1
Several, other	15	15.6	4	4.6	4	4.1	23	8.2	9	7.4
PROGRAMS THAT CONTAIN VIOLENCE	78	100.0	71	100.0	79	100.0	228	100.0	101	100.0
Past	19	24.4	18	25.4	20	25.3	57	25.0	21	20.8
Contemporary (Present)	39	50.0	45	63.4	52	65.9	136	59.7	66	65.3
Future	8	10.3	5	7.0	3	3.8	16	7.0	5	4.9
Several, other	12	15.4	3	4.2	4	5.0	19	8.3	9	8.9
PROGRAMS THAT DO NOT CONTAIN VIOLENCE	18	100.0	16	100.0	19	100.0	53	100.0	20	100.0
Past	0	0.0	1	6.3	1	5.3	2	3.8	1	5.0
Contemporary (Present)	15	83.3	14	87.5	18	94.7	47	88.7	19	95.0
Future	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Several, other	3	16.7	1	6.3	0	0.0	4	7.5	0	0.0
ALL PROGRAMS SET IN THE PAST	19	100.0	19	100.0	21	100.0	59	100.0	22	100.0
Violence	19	100.0	18	94.7	20	95.2	57	96.6	21	95.5
No violence	0	0.0	1	5.3	1	4.8	2	3.4	1	4.5
ALL PROGRAMS SET IN THE PRESENT	54	100.0	59	100.0	70	100.0	183	100.0	85	100.0
Violence	39	72.2	45	76.3	52	74.3	136	74.3	66	77.6
No violence	15	28.8	14	23.7	18	25.7	47	25.7	19	22.4

Table 73: Distribution of all programs by time of action--Continued

	1967		1968		1969		1967-69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
ALL PROGRAMS SET IN THE FUTURE	8	100.0	5	100.0	3	100.0	16	100.0	5	100.0
Violence	8	100.0	5	100.0	3	100.0	16	100.0	5	100.0
No violence	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
ALL PROGRAMS WITH SEVERAL OR OTHER SETTING	15	100.0	4	100.0	4	100.0	23	100.0	9	100.0
Violence	12	80.0	3	75.0	4	100.0	19	82.6	9	100.0
No violence	3	20.0	1	25.0	0	0.0	4	17.4	0	0.0

Table 74: Distribution of cartoon programs by time of action

	1967		1968		1969		1967-69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
ALL PROGRAMS	32	100.0	25	100.0	38	100.0	95	100.0	53	100.0
Past	1	3.1	4	16.0	5	13.1	10	10.5	6	11.3
Contemporary (present)	11	34.4	15	60.0	28	73.7	54	56.8	35	66.1
Future	6	18.8	4	16.0	1	2.6	11	11.6	3	5.7
Several, other	14	43.8	2	8.0	4	10.5	20	21.1	9	17.0
PROGRAMS THAT CONTAIN VIOLENCE	30	100.0	24	100.0	37	100.0	91	100.0	52	100.0
Past	1	3.3	4	16.7	5	13.5	10	11.0	6	11.5
Contemporary (present)	11	36.7	15	62.5	27	72.9	53	58.2	34	65.4
Future	6	20.0	4	16.7	1	2.7	11	12.1	3	5.8
Several, other	12	40.0	1	4.2	4	10.8	17	18.7	9	17.3

Table 74: Distribution of cartoon programs by time of action--Continued

	1967		1968		1969		1967-69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
PROGRAMS THAT DO NOT CONTAIN VIOLENCE	2	100.0	1	100.0	1	100.0	4	100.0	1	100.0
Past	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Contemporary (present)	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	1	25.0	1	100.0
Future	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Several, other	2	100.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	3	75.0	0	0.0
ALL PROGRAMS SET IN THE PAST	1	100.0	4	100.0	5	100.0	10	100.0	6	100.0
Violence	1	100.0	4	100.0	5	100.0	10	100.0	6	100.0
No violence	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
ALL PROGRAMS SET IN THE PRESENT	11	100.0	15	100.0	28	100.0	54	100.0	35	100.0
Violence	11	100.0	15	100.0	27	96.4	53	98.1	34	97.1
No violence	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	3.5	1	1.9	1	31.4
ALL PROGRAMS SET IN THE FUTURE	6	100.0	4	100.0	1	100.0	11	100.0	3	100.0
Violence	6	100.0	4	100.0	1	100.0	11	100.0	3	100.0
No violence	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
ALL PROGRAMS WITH SEVERAL OR OTHER SETTING	14	100.0	2	100.0	4	100.0	20	100.0	9	100.0
Violence	12	85.7	1	50.0	4	100.0	17	85.0	9	100.0
No violence	2	14.3	1	50.0	0	0.0	3	15.0	0	0.0

Table 75: Distribution of noncartoon programs by time of action

	1967		1968		1969		1967-69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
ALL PROGRAMS	64	100.0	62	100.0	62	100.0	186	100.0	68	100.0
Past	18	28.1	15	24.2	16	26.7	49	26.3	16	23.5
Contemporary (present)	43	67.2	44	71.0	42	70.0	129	69.4	50	73.5
Future	2	3.1	1	1.6	2	3.3	5	2.7	2	2.9
Several, other	1	1.6	2	3.2	0	0.0	3	1.6	0	0.0
PROGRAMS THAT CONTAIN VIOLENCE	48	100.0	47	100.0	42	100.0	137	100.0	49	100.0
Past	18	37.5	14	29.8	15	35.7	47	34.3	15	30.6
Contemporary (present)	28	58.3	30	63.8	25	59.5	83	60.6	32	65.3
Future	2	4.2	1	2.1	2	4.8	5	3.6	2	4.1
Several, other	0	0.0	2	4.3	0	0.0	2	1.5	0	0.0
PROGRAMS THAT DO NOT CONTAIN VIOLENCE	16	100.0	15	100.0	18	100.0	49	100.0	19	100.0
Past	0	0.0	1	6.7	1	5.6	2	4.1	1	5.3
Contemporary (present)	15	93.8	14	93.3	17	94.4	46	93.9	18	94.7
Future	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Several, other	1	6.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.0	0	0.0
ALL PROGRAMS SET IN THE PAST	18	100.0	15	100.0	16	100.0	49	100.0	16	100.0
Violence	18	100.0	14	93.3	15	93.8	47	95.9	15	93.8
No violence	0	0.0	1	6.7	1	6.3	2	4.1	1	6.3
ALL PROGRAMS SET IN THE PRESENT	43	100.0	44	100.0	42	100.0	129	100.0	50	100.0
Violence	28	65.1	30	68.2	25	59.5	83	64.3	32	64.0
No violence	15	34.9	14	31.8	17	40.5	46	35.7	18	36.0

MEDIA CONTENT AND CONTROL

Table 75: Distribution of noncartoon programs by time of action—Continued

	1967		1968		1969		1967-69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
ALL PROGRAMS SET IN THE FUTURE	2	100.0	1	100.0	2	100.0	5	100.0	2	100.0
Violence	2	100.0	1	100.0	2	100.0	5	100.0	2	100.0
No violence	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
ALL PROGRAMS WITH SEVERAL OR OTHER SETTING	1	100.0	2	100.0	0	0.0	3	100.0	0	0.0
Violence	0	0.0	2	100.0	0	0.0	2	66.7	0	0.0
No violence	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	33.3	0	0.0

VIOLENCE IN TELEVISION DRAMA

Table 76: Rate of violent episodes, by time of action

	1967	1968	1969	1967 - 69	Enlarged 1969 sample
ALL PROGRAMS	5.0	4.5	4.9	4.8	5.2
Past	9.3	7.1	6.1	7.5	6.2
Contemporary (present)	3.7	3.5	4.3	3.9	4.4
Future	6.3	5.8	8.3	6.5	9.0
Several, other	3.3	6.3	7.8	4.6	7.9
CARTOON PROGRAMS	4.7	6.5	6.7	6.0	7.0
Past	12.0	7.8	7.8	8.2	7.8
Contemporary (present)	5.2	6.1	6.4	6.0	6.4
Future	5.3	6.3	6.0	5.7	8.7
Several, other	3.6	7.5	7.8	4.8	8.2
NONCARTOON PROGRAMS	5.1	3.7	3.8	4.2	3.8
Past	9.1	6.9	5.6	7.3	5.6
Contemporary (present)	3.4	2.6	2.9	2.9	3.0
Future	9.0	4.0	9.5	8.2	9.5
Several, other	0.0	5.0	0.0	3.3	0.0

Table 77: Measures of violence by time of action: 1967 - 69 totals

	Past	Present	Future	Other
ALL PROGRAMS				
Programs containing violence (% of all programs)	96.6	74.3	100.0	100.0
Number of violent episodes	440	705	104	106
Rate per all programs	7.5	3.9	6.5	4.6
All those involved in violence (% of leading characters)	80.7	60.3	78.6	76.2
All those involved in killing (% of leading characters)	19.3	7.4	14.3	16.7
CARTOONS				
Programs containing violence (% of cartoon programs)	100.0	98.1	100.0	85.0
Number of violent episodes	82	326	63	96
Rate per all programs	8.2	6.0	5.7	4.8
NONCARTOON PROGRAMS				
Programs containing violence (% of all noncartoon programs)	95.9	64.3	100.0	100.0
Number of violent episodes	358	379	41	10
Rate per all programs	7.3	2.9	8.2	3.3

Table 78: Distribution of all programs by place of action

	1967		1968		1969		1967 - 69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
ALL PROGRAMS	96	100.0	87	100.0	98	100.0	281	100.0	121	100.0
U.S. only	61	63.5	60	69.0	69	70.4	190	67.6	80	66.1
Several, other	35	36.5	27	31.0	29	29.6	91	32.4	41	33.9
PROGRAMS THAT CONTAIN VIOLENCE	78	100.0	71	100.0	79	100.0	228	100.0	101	100.0
U.S. only	46	59.0	46	64.8	52	65.8	144	63.2	62	61.4
Several, other	32	41.0	25	35.2	27	34.2	84	36.8	39	38.6
PROGRAMS THAT DO NOT CONTAIN VIOLENCE	18	100.0	16	100.0	19	100.0	53	100.0	20	100.0
U.S. only	15	83.3	14	87.5	17	89.5	46	86.8	18	90.0
Several, other	3	16.7	2	12.5	2	10.5	7	13.2	2	10.0
PROGRAMS SET IN U.S. ONLY	61	100.0	60	100.0	69	100.0	190	100.0	80	100.0
Violence	46	75.4	46	76.7	52	75.4	144	75.8	62	77.5
No violence	15	24.6	14	23.3	17	24.6	46	24.2	18	22.5
PROGRAMS IN SEVERAL OR OTHER SETTINGS	35	100.0	27	100.0	29	100.0	91	100.0	41	100.0
Violence	32	91.4	25	92.6	27	93.1	84	92.3	39	95.1
No violence	3	8.6	2	7.4	2	6.9	7	7.7	2	4.9

MEDIA CONTENT AND CONTROL

Table 79: Distribution of cartoon programs by place of action

	1967		1968		1969		1967 - 69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
ALL PROGRAMS	32	100.0	25	100.0	38	100.0	95	100.0	53	100.0
U.S. only	14	43.8	16	64.0	25	65.8	55	57.9	30	56.6
Several, other	18	56.2	9	36.0	13	34.2	40	42.1	23	43.4
PROGRAMS THAT CONTAIN VIOLENCE	30	100.0	24	100.0	37	100.0	91	100.0	52	100.0
U.S. only	13	43.3	15	62.5	24	64.9	52	57.1	29	55.8
Several, other	17	56.7	9	37.5	13	35.1	39	42.9	23	44.2
PROGRAMS THAT DO NOT CONTAIN VIOLENCE	2	100.0	1	100.0	1	100.0	4	100.0	1	100.0
U.S. only	1	50.0	1	100.0	1	100.0	3	75.0	1	100.0
Several, other	1	50.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	25.0	0	0.0
PROGRAMS SET IN U.S. ONLY	14	100.0	16	100.0	25	100.0	55	100.0	30	100.0
Violence	13	92.9	15	93.8	24	96.0	52	94.5	29	96.7
No violence	1	7.1	1	6.2	1	4.0	3	5.5	1	5.5
PROGRAMS SET IN SEVERAL OR OTHER SETTINGS	18	100.0	9	100.0	13	100.0	40	100.0	23	100.0
Violence	17	94.4	9	100.0	13	100.0	39	97.5	23	100.0
No violence	1	5.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.5	0	0.0

VIOLENCE IN TELEVISION DRAMA

Table 80: Distribution of noncartoon programs by place of action

	1967		1968		1969		1967 - 69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
ALL PROGRAMS	64	100.0	62	100.0	60	100.0	186	100.0	68	100.0
U.S. only	47	73.4	44	70.9	44	73.3	135	72.6	50	73.5
Several, other	17	26.6	18	29.1	16	26.7	51	27.4	18	26.5
PROGRAMS THAT CONTAIN VIOLENCE	48	100.0	47	100.0	42	100.0	137	100.0	49	100.0
U.S. only	33	68.8	31	65.9	28	66.7	92	67.2	33	67.3
Several, other	15	31.2	16	34.1	14	33.3	45	32.8	16	32.7
PROGRAMS THAT DO NOT CONTAIN VIOLENCE	16	100.0	15	100.0	18	100.0	49	100.0	19	100.0
U.S. only	14	87.5	13	86.7	16	88.9	43	87.7	17	89.5
Several, other	2	12.5	2	13.3	2	11.1	6	12.2	2	10.5
PROGRAMS SET IN U.S. ONLY	47	100.0	44	100.0	44	100.0	135	100.0	50	100.0
Violence	33	70.2	31	70.5	28	63.6	92	68.1	33	66.0
No violence	14	29.8	13	29.5	16	36.4	43	31.9	17	34.0
PROGRAMS SET IN SEVERAL OR OTHER SETTINGS	17	100.0	18	100.0	16	100.0	51	100.0	18	100.0
Violence	15	88.2	16	88.9	14	87.5	45	88.2	16	88.9
No violence	2	11.8	2	11.1	2	12.5	6	11.8	2	11.1

Table 81: Rate of violent episodes, by place of action

	1967	1968	1969	1967 - 69	Enlarged 1969 sample
ALL PROGRAMS	5.0	4.5	4.9	4.8	5.2
U.S. only	4.3	3.7	4.2	4.1	4.4
Several, other	6.2	6.3	6.7	6.4	6.9
CARTOON PROGRAMS	4.7	6.5	6.7	6.0	7.0
U.S. only	3.8	4.6	6.4	5.2	6.7
Several, other	5.4	9.8	7.2	7.0	7.3
NONCARTOON PROGRAMS	5.1	3.7	3.8	4.2	3.8
U.S. only	4.4	3.4	2.9	3.6	3.0
Several, other	7.0	4.6	6.3	5.9	6.2

Table 82: Measures of violence by place of action: 1967 - 69 totals

	U.S. Only	Other
ALL PROGRAMS		
Programs containing violence (% of all programs)	75.8	92.3
Number of violent episodes	773	582
Rate per all programs	4.1	6.4
All those involved in violence (% of leading characters)	61.3	80.4
All those involved in killing (% of leading characters)	9.8	14.6
CARTOONS		
Programs containing violence (% of cartoon programs)	94.5	97.5
Number of violent episodes	287	280
Rate per all programs	5.2	7.0
NONCARTOON PROGRAM		
Programs containing violence (% of all noncartoon programs)	68.1	88.2
Number of violent episodes	486	302
Rate per all programs	3.6	5.9

Table 83: Distribution of all programs by setting of action

	1967		1968		1969		1967 - 69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
ALL PROGRAMS	96	100.0	87	100.0	98	100.0	281	100.0	121	100.0
Urban	32	33.3	29	33.3	27	27.6	88	31.3	30	24.8
Small town, rural	20	20.8	30	34.5	26	26.5	76	27.7	31	25.6
Uninhabited, mobile, etc.	44	45.8	28	32.2	45	45.9	117	41.6	60	49.6
PROGRAMS THAT CONTAIN VIOLENCE	78	100.0	71	100.0	79	100.0	228	100.0	101	100.0
Urban	24	30.8	23	32.4	14	17.7	61	26.7	16	15.9
Small town, rural	13	16.6	24	33.8	22	27.9	59	25.9	27	26.7
Uninhabited, mobile, etc.	41	52.6	24	33.8	43	54.4	108	47.4	58	57.4
PROGRAMS THAT DO NOT CONTAIN VIOLENCE	18	100.0	16	100.0	19	100.0	53	100.0	20	100.0
Urban	8	44.4	6	37.5	13	68.4	27	50.9	14	70.0
Small town, rural	7	38.9	6	37.5	4	21.1	17	32.1	4	20.0
Uninhabited, mobile, etc.	3	16.7	4	25.0	2	10.5	9	17.0	2	10.0
PROGRAMS IN URBAN SETTINGS	32	100.0	29	100.0	27	100.0	88	100.0	30	100.0
Violence	24	75.0	23	79.3	14	51.9	61	69.3	16	53.3
No violence	8	25.0	6	20.7	13	48.1	27	30.7	14	46.7
PROGRAMS SET IN SMALL TOWN, RURAL	20	100.0	30	100.0	26	100.0	76	100.0	31	100.0
Violence	13	5.0	24	80.0	22	84.6	59	77.6	27	87.1
No violence	7	5.0	6	20.0	4	15.4	17	22.4	4	12.9
PROGRAMS SET IN UNINHABITED OR MOBILE SETTING, ETC.	44	100.0	28	100.0	45	100.0	117	100.0	60	100.0
Violence	41	93.2	24	85.7	43	95.6	108	92.3	58	96.7
No violence	3	6.8	4	14.3	2	4.4	9	7.7	2	3.3

Table 84: Distribution of cartoon programs by setting of action

	1967		1968		1969		1967 - 69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
ALL PROGRAMS	32	100.0	25	100.0	38	100.0	95	100.0	53	100.0
Urban	8	25.0	7	28.0	4	10.5	19	20.0	4	7.5
Small town, rural	2	6.3	4	16.0	14	36.9	20	21.1	17	32.1
Uninhabited, mobile, etc.	22	68.7	14	56.0	20	52.6	56	58.9	32	60.4
PROGRAMS THAT CONTAIN VIOLENCE	30	100.0	24	100.0	37	100.0	91	100.0	52	100.0
Urban	8	26.7	6	25.0	4	10.8	18	19.8	4	7.7
Small town, rural	1	3.3	4	16.7	13	35.1	18	19.8	16	30.8
Uninhabited, mobile, etc.	21	70.0	14	58.3	20	54.0	55	60.4	32	61.5
PROGRAMS THAT DO NOT CONTAIN VIOLENCE	2	100.0	1	100.0	1	100.0	4	100.0	1	100.0
Urban	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	1	25.0	0	0.0
Small town, rural	1	50.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	2	50.0	1	100.0
Uninhabited, mobile, etc.	1	50.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	25.0	0	0.0
PROGRAMS IN URBAN SETTING	8	100.0	7	100.0	4	100.0	19	100.0	4	100.0
Violence	8	100.0	6	85.7	4	100.0	18	94.7	4	100.0
No violence	0	0.0	1	14.3	0	0.0	1	5.3	0	0.0
PROGRAMS SET IN SMALL TOWN, RURAL	2	100.0	4	100.0	14	100.0	20	100.0	17	100.0
Violence	1	50.0	4	100.0	13	92.9	18	90.0	16	94.1
No violence	1	50.0	0	0.0	1	7.1	2	10.0	1	5.9
PROGRAMS SET IN UNINHABITED OR MOBILE SETTINGS, ETC.	22	100.0	14	100.0	20	100.0	56	100.0	32	100.0
Violence	21	95.5	14	100.0	20	100.0	55	98.2	32	100.0
No violence	1	4.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.8	0	0.0

Table 85: Distribution of noncartoon programs by setting of action

	1967		1968		1969		1967 - 69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
ALL PROGRAMS	64	100.0	62	100.0	60	100.0	186	100.0	68	100.0
Urban	24	37.5	22	35.5	23	38.3	69	37.1	26	38.2
Small town, rural	18	28.1	26	41.9	12	20.0	56	30.1	14	20.6
Uninhabited, mobile, etc.	22	34.4	14	22.6	25	41.7	61	32.8	28	41.2
PROGRAMS THAT CONTAIN VIOLENCE	48	100.0	47	100.0	42	100.0	137	100.0	49	100.0
Urban	16	33.3	17	36.2	10	23.8	43	31.4	12	24.5
Small town, rural	12	25.0	20	42.5	9	21.4	41	29.9	11	22.4
Uninhabited, mobile, etc.	20	41.7	10	21.3	23	54.8	53	38.7	26	53.1
PROGRAMS THAT DO NOT CONTAIN VIOLENCE	16	100.0	15	100.0	18	100.0	49	100.0	19	100.0
Urban	8	50.0	5	33.3	13	72.2	26	53.1	14	73.7
Small town, rural	6	37.5	6	40.0	3	16.7	15	30.6	3	15.8
Uninhabited, mobile, etc.	2	12.5	4	26.7	2	11.1	8	16.3	2	10.5
PROGRAMS IN URBAN SETTING	24	100.0	22	100.0	23	100.0	69	100.0	26	100.0
Violence	16	66.7	17	77.3	10	43.5	43	62.3	12	46.2
No violence	8	33.3	5	22.7	13	56.5	26	37.7	14	53.8
PROGRAMS SET IN SMALL TOWN, RURAL	18	100.0	26	100.0	12	100.0	56	100.0	14	100.0
Violence	12	66.7	20	76.9	9	75.0	41	73.2	11	78.6
No violence	6	33.3	6	23.1	3	25.0	15	26.8	3	21.4
PROGRAMS SET IN UNINHABITED OR MOBILE SETTINGS, ETC.	22	100.0	14	100.0	25	100.0	61	100.0	28	100.0
Violence	20	90.9	10	71.4	23	92.0	53	86.9	26	92.9
No violence	2	9.1	4	28.6	2	8.0	8	13.1	2	7.1

Table 86: Rate of violent episodes, by setting of action

	1967	1968	1969	1967 - 69	Enlarged 1969 sample
ALL PROGRAMS	5.0	4.5	4.9	4.8	5.2
Urban	2.8	3.7	2.1	2.9	2.3
Small town, rural	3.9	4.8	4.8	4.6	5.1
Uninhabited, mobile, etc.	7.0	5.2	6.7	6.4	6.7
CARTOON PROGRAMS	4.7	6.5	6.7	6.0	7.0
Urban	4.1	5.0	6.5	4.9	6.5
Small town, rural	2.5	3.8	5.6	5.0	6.2
Uninhabited, mobile, etc.	5.1	8.0	7.5	6.7	7.5
NONCARTOON PROGRAMS	5.1	3.7	3.8	4.2	3.8
Urban	2.4	3.2	1.4	2.3	1.7
Small town, rural	4.1	4.9	3.8	4.4	3.8
Uninhabited, mobile, etc.	8.9	2.4	6.0	6.2	5.8

Table 87: Measures of violence by setting of action: 1967 - 69 totals

	Urban	Small town	Uninhabited, mobile, etc.
ALL PROGRAMS			
Programs containing violence (% of all programs)	69.3	77.6	92.3
Number of violent episodes	255	346	754
Rate per all programs	2.9	4.6	6.4
All those involved in violence (% of leading characters)	55.1	62.5	80.5
All those involved in killing (% of leading characters)	7.0	13.9	12.9
CARTOONS			
Programs containing violence (% of cartoon programs)	94.7	90.0	98.2
Number of violent episodes	94	99	374
Rate per all programs	4.9	5.0	6.7
NONCARTOON PROGRAMS			
Programs containing violence (% of all noncartoon programs)	62.3	73.2	86.9
Number of violent episodes	161	247	380
Rate per all programs	2.3	4.4	6.2

Table 88: Census of leading characters analyzed

	1967		1968		1969		1967-69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
All characters	240	100.0	215	100.0	307	100.0	762	100.0	377	100.0
Humans	206	85.8	200	93.0	255	83.1	661	86.7	313	83.0
Humanized animals	17	7.1	9	4.2	47	15.3	73	9.6	54	14.3
Other, unclear	17	7.1	6	2.8	5	1.6	28	3.7	10	2.7
Males	191	79.6	167	77.7	234	76.2	592	77.7	290	76.9
Females	47	19.6	46	21.4	73	23.8	166	21.8	82	21.8
Other, unclear	2	0.8	2	0.9	0	0.0	4	0.5	5	1.3
Cartoons	62	100.0	47	100.0	102	100.0	211	100.0	146	100.0
Males	56	90.3	40	85.1	92	90.2	188	89.1	129	88.4
Females	4	6.5	5	10.6	10	9.8	19	9.0	12	8.2
Other, unclear	2	3.2	2	4.3	0	0.0	4	1.9	5	3.4
TV plays	159	100.0	145	100.0	176	100.0	480	100.0	202	100.0
Males	125	78.6	113	77.9	125	71.0	363	75.6	144	71.3
Females	34	21.4	32	22.1	51	29.0	117	24.4	58	28.7
Other, unclear	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Feature films	19	100.0	23	100.0	29	100.0	71	100.0	29	100.0
Males	10	52.6	14	60.9	17	58.6	41	57.7	17	58.6
Females	9	47.4	9	39.1	12	41.4	30	42.3	12	41.4
Other, unclear	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Crime, western, action-adventure	164	100.0	135	100.0	190	100.0	489	100.0	248	100.0
Males	141	86.0	113	83.7	165	86.8	419	85.7	214	86.3
Females	21	12.8	21	15.6	25	13.2	67	13.7	29	11.7
Other, unclear	2	1.2	1	0.7	0	0.0	3	0.6	5	2.0

Table 88: Census of leading characters analyzed—Continued

	1967		1968		1969		1967-69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Comedies	107	100.0	81	100.0	82	100.0	270	100.0	101	100.0
Males	78	72.9	59	72.8	64	78.0	201	74.4	80	79.2
Females	27	25.2	21	25.9	18	22.0	66	24.4	20	19.8
Other, unclear	2	1.9	1	1.2	0	0.0	3	1.1	1	1.0
Networks										
ABC	86	35.8	63	29.3	109	35.5	258	33.9	127	32.7
CBS	73	30.4	79	36.7	93	30.3	245	32.2	135	35.8
NBC	81	33.7	73	34.0	105	34.2	259	34.0	115	30.5
Characters from plays in										
Past	59	24.6	56	26.1	77	25.1	192	25.2	91	24.1
Present	136	56.7	134	62.3	216	70.4	486	63.8	265	70.3
Future	16	6.7	12	5.6	14	4.6	42	5.5	21	5.6
Other, unclear	29	12.0	13	6.0	0	0.0	42	5.5	0	0.0
Characters from plays in										
U.S. only	160	66.7	147	68.4	215	70.0	522	68.5	248	65.8
Several other, unclear	80	33.3	68	31.6	92	30.0	240	31.5	129	34.2
Characters from plays in										
Urban locale	80	33.3	75	34.9	88	28.7	243	31.9	98	26.0
Small town, rural	55	22.9	85	39.5	76	24.8	216	28.3	92	24.4
Several, other, unclear	105	43.8	55	25.6	143	46.6	303	39.8	187	49.6

Table 88: Census of leading unaracters analyzed—Continued

	1967		1968		1969		1967-69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Marital status										
Unmarried, unknown	173	72.1	152	70.7	227	73.9	552	72.4	285	75.6
Married, has been married	55	22.9	55	25.6						
Expects to marry; impending marriage	12	5.0	3	3.7						
Total married and expects to marry	67	27.9	63	29.3	80	26.1	210	27.6	92	24.4
Age of characters										
Children and adolescents	12	5.0	16	7.5	28	9.1	56	7.3	33	8.8
Young adults	65	27.1	80	37.2	89	29.0	234	30.7	104	27.6
Middle aged	113	47.1	94	43.7	138	45.0	345	45.3	170	45.1
Old	12	5.0	14	6.5	5	1.6	31	4.1	7	1.9
Uncertain, unclear, several	38	15.8	11	5.1	47	15.3	96	12.6	63	16.7
Selected occupations										
Illegal	25	10.4	19	8.8	22	7.2	66	8.7	30	8.0
Armed forces	18	7.5	8	3.7	12	3.9	38	5.0	14	3.7
Entertainers	20	8.3	15	7.0	33	10.7	68	8.9	46	12.2
Law enforcement and crime detection	16	6.7	23	10.7	22	7.2	61	8.0	24	6.4
Socioeconomic status										
Upper class	54	22.5	35	16.3	28	9.1	117	15.4	32	8.5
Middle class, unclear, other	176	73.3	177	82.3	275	89.6	628	82.4	340	90.2
Lower class	10	4.2	3	1.4	4	1.3	17	2.2	5	1.3

Table 88: Census of leading characters analyzed--Continued

	1967		1968		1969		1967-69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Race										
Whites	178	74.2	173	80.5	234	76.2	585	76.8	290	76.9
Nonwhite, other, unclear	62	25.8	42	19.5	73	23.8	177	23.2	87	23.1
Nationality										
American	156	65.0	164	76.3	211	68.7	531	69.7	257	68.2
Non-American, other, unclear	84	35.0	51	23.7	96	31.3	231	30.3	120	31.8
Outcome for character										
Happy ending	134	55.8	132	61.4	143	46.6	409	53.7	168	44.6
Unhappy ending	47	19.6	42	19.5	44	14.3	133	17.5	62	16.4
Mixed, uncertain	59	24.6	41	19.1	120	39.1	220	28.9	147	39.0

MEDIA CONTENT AND CONTROL

Table 89: Violence roles by network

	1967		1968		1969		1967-69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
ABC										
Totals	86	100.0	63	100.0	109	100.0	258	100.0	127	100.0
Violents	54	62.8	35	55.6	48	44.0	137	53.1	53	41.7
Killers	12	14.0	8	12.7	4	3.7	24	9.3	4	3.1
Victims	62	72.1	36	57.1	58	53.2	156	60.5	62	48.8
Killed	7	8.1	1	1.6	3	2.7	11	4.3	3	2.4
Involved in										
any violence	71	82.6	42	66.7	67	61.5	180	69.8	73	57.5
any killing	19	22.1	8	12.7	7	6.4	34	13.2	7	5.5
Character score		104.7		79.4		67.9		83.0		63.0
CBS										
Totals	73	100.0	79	100.0	93	100.0	245	100.0	135	100.0
Violents	29	39.7	32	40.5	36	38.7	97	39.6	67	49.6
Killers	6	8.2	6	7.6	1	1.1	13	5.3	5	3.7
Victims	34	46.6	41	51.9	44	47.3	119	48.6	78	57.8
Killed	5	6.8	3	3.8	2	2.2	10	4.1	4	3.0
Involved in										
any violence	39	53.4	47	59.5	49	52.7	135	55.1	88	65.2
any killing	10	13.7	7	8.9	3	3.2	20	8.2	8	5.9
Character score		67.1		68.4		55.9		63.3		71.1
NBC										
Totals	81	100.0	73	100.0	105	100.0	259	100.0	115	100.0
Violents	51	63.0	39	53.4	59	56.2	149	57.5	63	54.8
Killers	12	14.8	9	12.3	5	4.8	26	10.0	5	4.3
Victims	59	72.8	43	58.9	75	71.4	177	68.3	82	71.3
Killed	5	6.2	4	5.5	1	1.0	10	3.9	1	0.9
Involved in										
any violence	66	81.5	51	69.9	81	77.1	198	76.4	89	77.4
any killing	16	19.8	10	13.7	6	5.7	32	12.4	6	5.2
Character score		101.3		83.5		82.8		88.8		82.6

VIOLENCE IN TELEVISION DRAMA

Table 90: Network share in violence roles

	1967		1968		1969		1967-69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
All characters	240	100.0	215	100.0	307	100.0	762	100.0	377	100.0
ABC	86	35.8	63	29.3	109	35.5	258	33.9	127	33.7
CBS	73	30.4	79	36.7	93	30.3	245	32.1	135	35.8
NBC	81	33.8	73	34.0	105	34.2	259	34.0	115	30.5
Violents	134	100.0	106	100.0	143	100.0	383	100.0	183	100.0
ABC	54	40.3	35	33.0	48	33.6	137	35.8	53	29.0
CBS	29	21.6	32	30.2	36	25.2	97	25.3	67	36.6
NBC	51	38.1	39	36.8	59	41.2	149	38.9	63	34.4
Killers	30	100.0	23	100.0	10	100.0	63	100.0	14	100.0
ABC	12	40.0	8	34.8	4	40.0	24	38.1	4	28.6
CBS	6	20.0	6	26.1	1	10.0	13	20.6	5	35.7
NBC	12	40.0	9	39.1	5	50.0	26	41.3	5	35.7
Victims	155	100.0	120	100.0	177	100.0	452	100.0	222	100.0
ABC	62	40.0	36	30.0	58	32.8	156	34.5	62	27.9
CBS	34	21.9	41	34.2	44	24.9	119	26.3	78	35.1
NBC	59	38.1	43	35.8	75	42.3	177	39.2	82	37.0
Killed	17	100.0	8	100.0	6	100.0	31	100.0	8	100.0
ABC	7	41.2	1	12.5	3	50.0	11	35.4	3	37.5
CBS	5	29.4	3	37.5	2	33.3	10	32.3	4	50.0
NBC	5	29.4	4	50.0	1	16.7	10	32.3	1	12.5
Involved in any violence	176	100.0	140	100.0	197	100.0	513	100.0	250	100.0
ABC	71	40.3	42	30.0	67	34.0	180	35.1	73	29.2
CBS	39	22.2	47	33.6	49	24.9	135	26.3	88	35.2
NBC	66	37.5	51	36.4	81	41.1	198	38.6	89	35.6

MEDIA CONTENT AND CONTROL

Table 90: Network share in violence roles—Continued

	1967		1968		1969		1967-69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Involved in any killing	45	100.0	25	100.0	16	100.0	86	100.0	21	100.0
ABC	19	42.2	8	32.0	7	43.8	34	39.5	7	33.3
CBS	10	22.2	7	28.0	3	18.7	20	23.3	8	38.1
NBC	16	35.6	10	40.0	6	37.5	32	37.2	6	28.6
Characters in crime-adventure										
Totals	164	100.0	135	100.0	190	100.0	489	100.0	248	100.0
Violents	119	72.6	89	65.9	122	64.2	330	67.5	158	63.7
Killers	30	18.3	22	16.3	9	4.7	61	12.5	13	5.2
Victims	132	80.5	99	73.3	147	77.4	378	77.3	187	75.4
Killed	16	9.8	7	5.2	6	3.2	29	5.9	8	3.2
Involved in any violence	146	89.0	111	82.2	162	85.3	419	85.7	209	84.3
any killing	44	26.8	24	17.8	15	7.9	83	17.0	20	8.1
Character score		115.8		100.0		93.2		102.7		92.4
Characters in comedy										
Totals	107	100.0	81	100.0	82	100.0	270	100.0	101	100.0
Violents	40	37.4	31	38.3	33	40.2	104	38.5	48	47.5
Killers	4	3.7	4	4.9	0	0.0	8	3.0	0	0.0
Victims	50	46.7	35	43.2	50	61.0	135	50.0	69	68.3
Killed	1	0.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.4	0	0.0
Involved in any violence	59	55.1	43	53.1	52	63.4	154	57.0	71	70.3
any killing	5	4.7	4	4.9	0	0.0	9	3.3	0	0.0
Character score		59.8		58.0		63.4		60.3		70.3

VIOLENCE IN TELEVISION DRAMA

Table 91: Violence role by program format and type

	1967		1968		1969		1967-69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Characters in cartoons										
Totals	62	100.0	47	100.0	102	100.0	211	100.0	146	100.0
Violents	45	72.6	31	66.0	72	70.6	148	70.1	98	67.1
Killers	3	4.8	2	4.3	0	0.0	5	2.4	1	0.7
Victims	52	83.9	36	76.6	87	85.3	175	82.9	117	80.1
Killed	6	9.7	0	0.0	1	1.0	7	3.3	2	1.4
Involved in any violence	56	90.3	37	78.7	92	90.2	185	87.7	127	87.0
any killing	9	14.5	2	4.3	1	1.0	12	5.7	3	2.1
Character score		104.8		83.0		91.2		93.3		89.1
Characters in TV plays										
Totals	159	100.0	145	100.0	176	100.0	480	100.0	202	100.0
Violents	79	49.7	59	40.7	61	34.7	199	41.5	75	37.1
Killers	25	15.7	16	11.0	9	5.1	50	10.4	12	5.9
Victims	94	59.1	68	46.9	75	42.6	237	49.4	90	44.6
Killed	10	6.3	6	4.1	4	2.3	20	4.2	5	2.5
Involved in any violence	107	67.3	83	57.2	88	50.0	278	57.9	106	52.5
any killing	33	20.7	18	12.4	13	7.4	64	13.3	16	7.9
Character score		88.0		69.6		57.4		71.2		60.4

MEDIA CONTENT AND CONTROL

Table 91: Violence role by program format and type--Continued

	1967		1968		1969		1967-69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Characters in feature films										
Totals	19	100.0	23	100.0	29	100.0	71	100.0	29	100.0
Violents	10	52.6	16	69.6	10	34.5	36	50.7	10	34.5
Killers	2	10.5	5	21.7	1	3.4	8	11.3	1	3.4
Victims	9	47.4	16	69.6	15	51.7	40	56.3	15	51.7
Killed	1	5.3	2	8.7	1	3.4	4	5.6	1	3.4
Involved in any violence	13	68.4	20	87.0	17	58.6	50	70.4	17	58.6
any killing	3	15.8	5	21.7	2	6.9	10	14.1	2	6.9
Character score		84.2		108.7		65.5		84.5		65.5
Characters in cartoons										
Totals	62	100.0	47	100.0	102	100.0	211	100.0	146	100.0
Violents	45	72.6	31	66.0	72	70.6	148	70.1	98	67.1
Killers	3	4.8	2	4.3	0	0.0	5	2.4	1	0.7
Victims	52	83.9	36	76.6	87	85.3	175	82.9	117	80.1
Killed	6	9.7	0	0.0	1	1.0	7	3.3	2	1.4
Involved in any violence	56	90.3	37	78.7	92	90.2	185	87.7	127	87.0
any killing	9	14.5	2	4.3	1	1.0	12	5.7	3	2.1
Character score		104.8		83.0		91.2		93.3		89.1

VIOLENCE IN TELEVISION DRAMA

Table 91: Violence role by program format and type--Continued

	1967		1968		1969		1967-69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Characters in TV plays										
Totals	159	100.0	145	100.0	176	100.0	480	100.0	202	100.0
Violents	79	49.7	59	40.7	61	34.7	199	41.5	75	37.1
Killers	25	15.7	16	11.0	9	5.1	50	10.4	12	5.9
Victims	94	59.1	68	46.9	75	42.6	237	49.4	90	44.6
Killed	10	6.3	6	4.1	4	2.3	20	4.2	5	2.5
Involved in										
any violence	107	67.3	83	57.2	88	50.0	278	57.9	106	52.5
any killing	33	20.7	18	12.4	13	7.4	64	13.3	16	7.9
Character score		88.0		69.6		57.4		71.2		60.4
Characters in feature films										
Totals	19	100.0	23	100.0	29	100.0	71	100.0	29	100.0
Violents	10	52.6	16	69.6	10	34.5	36	50.7	10	34.5
Killers	2	10.5	5	21.7	1	3.4	8	11.3	1	3.4
Victims	9	47.4	16	69.6	15	51.7	40	56.3	15	51.7
Killed	1	5.3	2	8.7	1	3.4	4	5.6	1	3.4
Involved in										
any violence	13	68.4	20	87.0	17	58.6	50	70.4	17	58.6
any killing	3	15.8	5	21.7	2	6.9	10	14.1	2	6.9
Character score		84.2		108.7		65.5		84.5		65.5

MEDIA CONTENT AND CONTROL

Table 92: Program format share in violence roles

	1967		1968		1969		1967-69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
All characters	240	100.0	215	100.0	307	100.0	762	100.0	377	100.0
Cartoon	62	25.8	47	21.9	102	33.2	211	27.7	146	38.7
TV play	159	66.3	145	67.4	176	57.3	480	63.0	202	53.6
Feature film	19	7.9	23	10.7	29	9.4	71	9.3	29	7.7
All violents	134	100.0	106	100.0	143	100.0	383	100.0	183	100.0
Cartoon	45	33.6	31	29.2	72	50.3	148	38.6	98	53.6
TV play	79	59.0	59	55.7	61	42.7	199	52.0	75	41.0
Feature film	10	7.4	16	15.1	10	7.0	36	9.4	10	5.5
All killers	30	100.0	23	100.0	10	100.0	63	100.0	14	100.0
Cartoon	3	10.0	2	8.7	0	0.0	5	7.9	1	7.1
TV play	25	83.3	16	69.6	9	90.0	50	79.4	12	85.7
Feature film	2	6.7	5	21.7	1	10.0	8	12.7	1	7.1
All victims	155	100.0	120	100.0	177	100.0	452	100.0	222	100.0
Cartoon	52	33.5	36	30.0	87	49.2	175	38.7	117	52.7
TV play	94	60.6	68	56.7	75	42.4	237	52.4	90	40.5
Feature film	9	5.8	16	13.3	15	8.5	40	8.8	15	6.8
All killed	17	100.0	8	100.0	6	100.0	31	100.0	8	100.0
Cartoon	6	35.3	0	0.0	1	16.7	7	22.6	2	25.0
TV play	10	58.8	6	75.0	4	66.7	20	64.5	5	62.5
Feature film	1	5.9	2	25.0	1	16.7	4	12.9	1	12.5
All violents and/or victims	176	100.0	140	100.0	197	100.0	513	100.0	250	100.0
Cartoon	56	31.8	37	26.4	92	46.7	185	36.1	127	50.8
TV play	107	60.8	83	59.3	88	44.7	278	54.2	106	42.4
Feature film	13	7.4	20	14.3	17	8.6	50	9.7	17	6.8
All killers or killed	45	100.0	25	100.0	16	100.0	86	100.0	21	100.0
Cartoon	9	20.0	2	8.0	1	6.3	12	14.0	3	14.3
TV play	33	73.3	18	72.0	13	81.2	64	74.4	16	76.2
Feature film	3	6.7	5	20.0	2	12.5	10	11.6	2	9.5

VIOLENCE IN TELEVISION DRAMA

Table 93: Program type share in violence roles

	1967		1968		1969		1967 - 69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
All characters	240	100.0	215	100.0	307	100.0	762	100.0	377	100.0
Crime-adventure	164	68.3	135	62.8	190	61.9	489	64.2	248	65.8
Comedy	107	44.6	81	37.7	82	26.7	270	35.4	101	26.8
Violents	134	100.0	106	100.0	143	100.0	383	100.0	183	100.0
Crime-adventure	119	88.8	89	84.0	122	85.3	330	86.2	158	86.3
Comedy	40	39.9	31	29.2	33	23.1	164	27.2	48	26.2
Killers	30	100.0	23	100.0	10	100.0	63	100.0	14	100.0
Crime-adventure	30	100.0	22	95.7	9	90.0	61	96.8	13	92.9
Comedy	4	13.3	4	17.4	0	0.0	2	12.7	0	0.0
Victims	155	100.0	120	100.0	177	100.0	452	100.0	222	100.0
Crime-adventure	132	85.2	99	82.5	147	83.1	378	83.6	187	84.2
Comedy	50	32.3	35	29.2	50	28.2	138	29.9	69	31.1
Killed	17	100.0	8	100.0	6	100.0	31	100.0	8	100.0
Crime-adventure	16	94.1	7	87.5	6	100.0	29	93.5	8	100.0
Comedy	1	5.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	3.2	0	0.0
Involved in any violence	176	100.0	140	100.0	197	100.0	513	100.0	250	100.0
Crime-adventure	146	83.0	111	79.3	162	82.2	419	81.7	209	83.6
Comedy	59	33.5	43	30.7	52	26.4	154	30.0	71	28.4
Involved in any killing	45	100.0	25	100.0	16	100.0	86	100.0	21	100.0
Crime-adventure	44	97.8	24	96.0	15	93.8	83	96.5	20	95.2
Comedy	5	11.1	4	16.0	0	0.0	5	10.5	0	0.0

MEDIA CONTENT AND CONTROL

Table 94: Violence roles of leading characters

	1967		1968		1969		1967 - 69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
All characters										
Totals	240	100.0	215	100.0	307	100.0	762	100.0	377	100.0
Violents	134	55.8	106	49.3	143	46.6	383	50.3	183	48.5
Killers	30	12.5	23	10.7	10	3.3	63	8.3	14	3.7
Victims	155	64.6	120	55.8	177	57.7	452	59.3	222	58.9
Killed	17	7.1	8	3.7	6	2.0	31	4.1	8	2.1
Involved in any violence	176	73.3	140	65.1	197	64.2	513	67.3	250	66.3
any killing	45	18.8	25	11.6	16	5.3	86	11.3	21	5.5
Character score		92.1		76.7		69.5		78.6		70.8
Male characters*										
Totals	191	100.0	167	100.0	234	100.0	592	100.0	290	100.0
Violents	114	59.7	91	54.5	125	53.4	330	55.7	159	54.8
Killers	26	13.6	21	12.6	10	4.3	57	9.6	14	4.8
Victims	135	70.7	101	60.5	150	64.1	386	65.2	186	64.1
Killed	16	8.4	6	3.6	5	2.1	27	4.6	7	2.4
Involved in any violence	148	77.5	114	68.3	166	70.9	428	72.3	209	72.0
any killing	40	21.0	22	13.2	15	6.4	77	13.0	20	6.9
Character score		98.5		81.5		77.3		85.3		78.9

VIOLENCE IN TELEVISION DRAMA

Table 94: Violence roles of leading characters—Continued

	1967		1968		1969		1967-69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Female characters*										
Totals	47	100.0	46	100.0	73	100.0	166	100.0	82	100.0
Violents	18	38.3	13	28.3	18	24.7	49	29.5	22	26.8
Killers	4	8.5	2	4.3	0	0.0	6	3.6	0	0.0
Victims	18	38.3	17	37.0	27	37.0	62	37.3	32	39.0
Killed	1	2.1	2	4.3	1	1.4	4	2.4	1	1.2
Involved in any violence	26	55.3	24	52.2	31	42.5	81	48.8	37	45.1
any killing	5	10.6	3	6.4	1	1.4	9	5.4	1	1.2
Character score		65.9		58.6		42.9		54.2		46.3

*"Other" characters, i.e. those whose sex could not be identified (all in cartoon plays), were not included.

Table 95: Share of the sexes in violence roles

	1967		1968		1969		1967 - 69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
All characters	240	100.0	215	100.0	307	100.0	762	100.0	377	100.0
Males	191	79.6	167	77.7	234	76.2	592	77.7	290	76.9
Females	47	19.6	46	21.4	73	23.8	166	21.8	82	21.8
Violents	134	100.0	106	100.0	143	100.0	383	100.0	183	100.0
Males	114	85.1	91	85.8	125	87.4	330	86.2	159	86.9
Females	18	13.4	13	12.3	18	12.6	49	12.8	22	12.0
Killers	30	100.0	23	100.0	10	100.0	63	100.0	14	100.0
Males	26	86.7	21	91.3	10	100.0	57	90.5	14	100.0
Females	4	13.3	2	8.7	0	0.0	6	9.5	0	0.0
Victims	155	100.0	120	100.0	177	100.0	452	100.0	222	100.0
Males	135	87.1	101	84.2	150	84.7	386	85.4	186	83.8
Females	18	11.6	17	14.2	27	15.2	62	13.7	32	14.4
Killed	17	100.0	8	100.0	6	100.0	31	100.0	8	100.0
Males	16	94.1	6	75.0	5	83.3	27	87.1	7	87.5
Females	1	5.9	2	25.0	1	16.7	4	12.9	1	12.5
Involved in any violence	176	100.0	140	100.0	197	100.0	513	100.0	250	100.0
Males	148	84.1	114	81.4	166	84.3	428	83.4	209	83.6
Females	26	14.8	24	17.1	31	15.8	81	15.8	37	14.8
Involved in any killing	45	100.0	25	100.0	16	100.0	86	100.0	21	100.0
Males	40	88.9	22	88.0	15	93.7	77	89.5	20	95.2
Females	5	11.1	3	12.0	1	6.2	9	10.5	1	4.8

Table 96: Violence roles by age

	1967		1968		1969		1967-69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Children and adolescents										
Totals	12	100.0	16	100.0	28	100.0	56	100.0	33	100.0
Violents	8	66.7	4	25.0	10	35.7	22	39.3	11	33.3
Killers	1	8.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.8	0	0.0
Victims	9	75.0	10	62.5	14	50.0	33	58.9	17	51.5
Killed	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Involved in any violence	10	83.3	10	62.5	15	53.6	35	62.5	19	57.6
any killing	1	8.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.8	0	0.0
Character score		91.6		62.5		53.6		64.3		57.6
Young adults										
Totals	65	100.0	80	100.0	89	100.0	234	100.0	104	100.0
Violents	31	47.7	38	47.5	39	43.8	108	46.1	46	44.2
Killers	11	16.9	9	11.2	4	4.5	24	10.3	4	3.8
Victims	42	64.6	46	57.5	55	61.8	143	61.1	65	62.5
Killed	2	3.1	3	3.7	2	2.2	7	3.0	2	1.9
Involved in any violence	44	67.7	52	65.0	62	69.7	158	67.5	73	70.2
any killing	13	20.0	10	12.5	6	6.7	29	12.4	6	5.8
Character score		87.7		77.5		76.4		79.9		76.0

MEDIA CONTENT AND CONTROL

Table 96: Violence roles by age—Continued

	1967		1968		1969		1967-69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Middle-aged										
Totals	113	100.0	94	100.0	138	100.0	345	100.0	170	100.0
Violents	64	56.6	52	55.3	59	42.8	175	50.7	78	45.9
Killers	15	13.3	13	13.8	6	4.3	34	9.8	10	5.9
Victims	70	61.9	51	54.3	65	47.1	186	53.9	82	48.2
Killed	11	9.7	4	4.3	3	2.2	18	5.2	5	2.9
Involved in any violence	83	73.4	62	65.9	76	55.1	221	64.1	98	57.6
any killing	24	21.2	14	14.9	9	6.5	47	13.6	14	8.2
Character score		94.6		80.8		61.6		77.7		65.8
Old										
Totals	12	100.0	14	100.0	5	100.0	31	100.0	7	100.0
Violents	5	41.7	6	42.9	0	0.0	11	35.5	1	14.3
Killers	0	0.0	1	7.1	0	0.0	1	3.2	0	0.0
Victims	6	50.0	4	28.6	3	60.0	13	41.9	4	57.1
Killed	1	8.3	1	7.1	1	20.0	3	9.7	1	14.3
Involved in any violence	7	58.3	7	50.0	3	60.0	17	54.8	4	57.1
any killing	1	8.3	1	7.1	1	20.0	3	9.7	1	14.3
Character score		66.6		57.1		80.0		64.5		71.4

VIOLENCE IN TELEVISION DRAMA

Table 97: Middle-aged violent and victims by sex

Middle-aged males	1967	1968	1969
	(N=94) %	(N=78) %	(N=112) %
Violents	59.6	57.7	50.0
Victims	69.1	60.3	54.5
Either or both	77.6	68.0	63.4
Middle-aged females			
	1967	1968	1969
	(N=19) %	(N=16) %	(N=26) %
Violents	42.1	43.8	11.5
Victims	26.3	25.0	15.4
Either or both	52.6	56.3	19.2

Table 98: Share of ages in violence roles

	1967		1968		1969		1967 - 69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
All characters	240	100.0	215	100.0	307	100.0	762	100.0	377	100.0
Children and adolescents	12	5.0	16	7.5	28	9.1	56	7.3	33	8.8
Young adults	65	27.1	80	37.2	89	29.0	234	30.7	104	27.6
Middle-aged	113	47.1	94	43.7	138	45.0	345	45.3	170	45.1
Old	12	5.0	14	6.5	5	1.6	31	4.1	7	1.9
Violents	134	100.0	106	100.0	143	100.0	383	100.0	183	100.0
Children and adolescents	8	6.0	4	3.8	10	7.0	22	5.7	11	6.0
Young adults	31	23.1	38	35.8	39	27.3	108	28.2	46	25.1
Middle-aged	64	47.8	52	49.1	59	41.2	175	45.7	78	42.6
Old	5	3.7	6	5.7	0	0.0	11	2.9	1	0.5
Killers	30	100.0	23	100.0	10	100.0	63	100.0	14	100.0
Children and adolescents	1	3.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.6	0	0.0
Young adults	11	36.7	9	39.1	4	40.0	24	38.1	4	28.6
Middle-aged	15	50.0	13	56.5	6	60.0	34	54.0	10	71.4
Old	0	0.0	1	4.3	0	0.0	1	1.6	0	0.0
Victims	155	100.0	120	100.0	177	100.0	452	100.0	222	100.0
Children and adolescents	9	5.8	10	8.3	14	7.9	33	7.3	17	7.6
Young adults	42	27.1	46	38.3	55	31.1	143	31.6	65	29.3
Middle-aged	70	45.2	51	42.5	65	36.7	186	41.1	82	36.9
Old	6	3.9	4	3.3	3	1.7	13	2.9	4	1.8
Killed	17	100.0	8	100.0	6	100.0	31	100.0	8	100.0
Children and adolescents	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Young adults	2	11.8	3	37.5	2	33.3	7	22.6	2	25.0
Middle-aged	11	64.7	4	50.0	3	50.0	18	58.1	5	62.5
Old	1	5.9	1	12.5	1	16.7	3	9.7	1	12.5

Table 98: Share of ages in violence roles—Continued

	1967		1968		1969		1967-69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Involved in any violence	176	100.0	140	100.0	197	100.0	513	100.0	250	100.0
Children and adolescents	10	5.7	10	7.1	15	7.6	35	6.8	19	7.6
Young adults	44	25.0	52	37.1	62	31.5	158	30.8	73	29.2
Middle-aged	83	47.1	62	44.3	76	38.6	221	43.1	98	39.2
Old	7	4.0	7	5.0	3	1.5	17	3.3	4	1.6
Involved in any killing	45	100.0	25	100.0	16	100.0	86	100.0	21	100.0
Children and adolescents	1	2.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.2	0	0.0
Young adults	13	28.9	10	40.0	6	37.5	29	33.7	6	28.6
Middle-aged	24	5.3	14	56.0	9	56.2	47	54.6	14	6.7
Old	1	2.2	1	4.0	1	6.2	3	3.5	1	4.8

Table 99: Share of middle-aged women in violence roles of all middle-aged characters

	1967			1968			1969		
	Total (100%)	N	Women %	Total (100%)	N	Women %	Total (100%)	N	Women %
All middle-aged characters	113	19	16.8	94	16	17.0	138	26	18.8
Middle-aged									
violents	64	8	12.5	52	7	13.5	59	3	5.1
killers	15	1	6.7	13	0	0.0	6	0	0.0
victims	70	5	7.1	51	4	7.8	65	4	6.2
killed	11	1	9.0	4	0	0.0	3	0	0.0

Table 100: Violence roles by marital status

	1967		1968		1969		1967 - 69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Unmarried, unknown										
Totals	173	100.0	152	100.0	227	100.0	552	100.0	285	100.0
Violents	111	64.2	77	50.7	120	52.9	308	55.8	156	54.7
Killers	26	15.0	17	11.2	8	3.5	51	9.2	10	3.5
Victims	124	71.7	94	61.8	143	63.0	361	65.4	183	64.2
Killed	15	8.7	7	4.6	6	2.6	28	5.1	8	2.8
Involved in										
any violence	137	79.2	103	67.8	160	70.5	400	72.5	207	72.6
any killing	40	23.1	19	12.5	14	6.2	73	13.2	17	6.0
Character score		102.3		80.3		76.7		85.7		78.6
Married, marries, expects to marry										
Totals	67	100.0	63	100.0	80	100.0	210	100.0	92	100.0
Violents	23	34.3	29	46.0	23	28.7	75	35.7	27	29.3
Killers	4	6.0	6	9.5	2	2.5	12	5.7	4	4.3
Victims	31	46.3	26	41.3	34	42.5	91	43.3	39	42.4
Killed	2	3.0	1	1.6	0	0.0	3	1.4	0	0.0
Involved in										
any violence	39	58.2	37	58.7	37	46.2	113	53.8	43	46.7
any killing	5	7.5	6	9.5	2	2.5	13	6.2	4	4.3
Character score		65.7		68.2		48.7		60.0		51.0

MEDIA CONTENT AND CONTROL

Table 101: Share of unmarried and married in violence roles

	1967		1968		1969		1967 - 69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
All characters	240	100.0	215	100.0	307	100.0	762	100.0	377	100.0
Unmarried, unknown	173	72.1	152	70.7	227	73.9	552	72.4	285	75.6
Married, marries, expects to marry	67	27.9	63	29.3	80	26.1	210	27.6	92	24.4
Violents	134	100.0	106	100.0	143	100.0	383	100.0	183	100.0
Unmarried, unknown	111	82.8	77	72.6	120	83.9	308	80.4	156	85.2
Married, marries, expects to marry	23	17.2	29	27.4	23	16.1	75	19.6	27	14.8
Killers	30	100.0	23	100.0	10	100.0	63	100.0	14	100.0
Unmarried, unknown	26	86.7	17	73.9	8	80.0	51	81.0	10	71.4
Married, marries, expects to marry	4	13.3	6	26.1	2	20.0	12	19.0	4	28.6
Victims	155	100.0	120	100.0	177	100.0	452	100.0	222	100.0
Unmarried, unknown	124	80.0	94	78.3	143	80.8	361	79.9	183	82.4
Married, marries, expects to marry	31	20.0	26	21.7	34	19.2	91	20.1	39	17.6
Killed	17	100.0	8	100.0	6	100.0	31	100.0	8	100.0
Unmarried, unknown	15	88.2	7	87.5	6	100.0	28	90.3	8	100.0
Married, marries, expects to marry	2	11.8	1	12.5	0	0.0	3	9.7	0	0.0
Involved in										
any violence	176	100.0	140	100.0	197	100.0	513	100.0	250	100.0
Unmarried, unknown	137	77.8	103	73.6	160	81.2	400	78.0	207	82.8
Married, marries, expects to marry	39	22.2	37	26.4	37	18.8	113	22.0	43	17.2
Involved in										
any killing	45	100.0	25	100.0	16	100.0	86	100.0	21	100.0
Unmarried, unknown	40	88.9	19	76.0	14	87.5	73	84.9	17	81.0
Married, marries, expects to marry	5	11.1	6	24.0	2	12.5	13	15.1	4	19.0

VIOLENCE IN TELEVISION DRAMA

Table 102: Violence roles by occupation*

	1967		1968		1969		1967-69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Illegal										
Totals	25	100.0	19	100.0	22	100.0	66	100.0	30	100.0
Violents	20	80.0	16	84.2	12	54.5	48	72.7	19	63.3
Killers	7	28.0	5	26.3	3	13.6	15	22.7	4	13.3
Victims	22	88.0	17	89.5	15	68.2	54	81.8	21	70.0
Killed	3	12.0	2	10.5	1	4.5	6	9.1	2	6.7
Involved in any violence killing	22	88.0	17	89.5	16	72.6	55	83.3	23	76.7
Character score	9	36.0	6	31.6	4	18.2	19	28.8	6	20.0
		124.0		121.1		90.8		112.1		96.7
Armed forces										
Totals	18	100.0	8	100.0	12	100.0	38	100.0	14	100.0
Violents	12	66.7	3	37.5	9	75.0	24	63.2	11	78.6
Killers	6	33.3	2	25.0	0	0.0	8	21.0	1	7.1
Victims	13	72.2	4	50.0	10	83.3	27	71.1	12	85.7
Killed	1	5.6	2	25.0	0	0.0	3	7.9	2	14.3
Involved in any violence killing	15	83.3	4	50.0	10	83.3	29	76.3	12	85.7
Character score	7	38.9	2	25.0	0	0.0	9	23.7	2	14.3
		122.2		75.0		83.3		100.0		100.0

MEDIA CONTENT AND CONTROL

Table 102: Violence roles by occupation*—Continued

	1967		1968		1969		1967-69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Entertainment										
Totals	20	100.0	15	100.0	33	100.0	68	100.0	46	100.0
Violents	5	25.0	7	46.7	14	42.4	26	38.2	23	50.0
Killers	1	5.0	1	6.7	0	0.0	2	2.9	0	0.0
Victims	12	60.0	7	46.7	17	51.5	36	52.9	25	54.3
Killed	0	0.0	1	6.7	1	3.0	2	2.9	1	2.2
Involved in any violence killing	14	70.0	8	53.3	20	60.6	42	61.8	31	67.4
Character score	1	5.0	1	6.7	1	3.0	3	4.4	1	2.2
		75.0		60.0		63.6		66.2		69.6
Law enforcement and crime detection										
Totals	16	100.0	23	100.0	22	100.0	61	100.0	24	100.0
Violents	10	62.5	17	73.9	13	59.1	40	65.6	15	62.5
Killers	2	12.5	5	21.7	0	0.0	7	11.5	0	0.0
Victims	8	50.0	17	73.9	10	45.5	35	57.4	11	45.8
Killed	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Involved in any violence killing	11	68.8	22	95.7	16	72.6	49	80.3	18	75.0
Character score	2	12.5	5	21.7	0	0.0	7	11.5	0	0.0
		81.3		117.4		72.6		91.8		75.0

*The occupational categories are not mutually exclusive.

VIOLENCE IN TELEVISION DRAMA

Table 103: Share of occupation in violence roles*

	1967		1968		1969		1967-69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
All characters	240	100.0	215	100.0	307	100.0	762	100.0	377	100.0
Illegal	25	10.4	19	8.8	22	7.2	66	8.7	30	8.0
Armed forces	18	7.5	8	3.7	12	3.9	38	4.9	14	3.7
Entertainment	20	8.3	15	7.0	33	10.7	68	8.9	46	12.2
Law enforcement/ crime detection	16	6.7	23	10.7	22	7.2	61	8.0	24	6.4
Violents	134	100.0	106	100.0	143	100.0	383	100.0	183	100.0
Illegal	20	14.9	16	15.1	12	8.4	48	12.5	19	10.4
Armed forces	12	9.0	3	2.8	9	6.3	24	6.3	11	6.0
Entertainment	5	3.7	7	6.6	14	9.8	26	6.8	23	12.6
Law enforcement/ crime detection	10	7.5	17	16.0	13	9.1	40	10.4	15	8.2
Killers	30	100.0	23	100.0	10	100.0	63	100.0	14	100.0
Illegal	7	23.3	5	21.7	3	30.0	15	23.8	4	28.6
Armed forces	6	20.0	2	8.7	0	0.0	8	12.7	1	7.1
Entertainment	1	3.3	1	4.3	0	0.0	2	3.2	0	0.0
Law enforcement/ crime detection	2	6.7	5	21.7	0	0.0	7	11.1	0	0.0
Victims	155	100.0	120	100.0	177	100.0	452	100.0	222	100.0
Illegal	22	14.2	17	14.2	15	8.5	54	12.2	21	9.5
Armed forces	13	8.4	4	3.3	10	5.6	27	6.0	12	5.4
Entertainment	12	7.7	7	5.8	17	9.6	36	8.0	25	11.3
Law enforcement/ crime detection	8	5.2	17	14.2	10	5.6	35	7.7	11	5.0

MEDIA CONTENT AND CONTROL

Table 103: Share of occupation in violence roles*—Continued

	1967		1968		1969		1967-69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Killed	17	100.0	8	100.0	6	100.0	31	100.0	8	100.0
Illegal	3	17.6	2	25.0	1	16.7	6	19.4	2	25.0
Armed forces	1	5.9	2	25.0	0	0.0	3	9.7	2	25.0
Entertainment	0	0.0	1	12.5	1	16.7	2	6.5	1	12.5
Law enforcement/ crime detection	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Involved in any violence	176	100.0	140	100.0	197	100.0	513	100.0	250	100.0
Illegal	22	12.5	17	12.1	16	8.1	55	10.7	23	9.2
Armed forces	15	8.5	4	2.8	10	5.1	29	5.7	12	4.8
Entertainment	14	8.0	8	5.7	20	10.2	42	8.2	31	12.4
Law enforcement/ crime detection	11	6.3	22	15.7	16	8.1	49	9.6	18	7.2
Involved in any killing	45	100.0	25	100.0	16	100.0	86	100.0	21	100.0
Illegal	9	20.0	6	24.0	4	25.0	19	22.1	6	28.6
Armed forces	7	15.6	2	8.0	0	0.0	9	10.5	2	9.5
Entertainment	1	2.2	1	4.0	1	6.3	3	3.5	1	4.8
Law enforcement/ crime detection	2	4.4	5	20.0	0	0.0	7	8.1	5	23.8

*The occupational categories are not mutually exclusive.

VIOLENCE IN TELEVISION DRAMA

Table 104: Violence roles by class

	1967		1968		1969		1967 - 69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Upper										
Total	54	100.0	35	100.0	28	100.0	117	100.0	32	100.0
Violent	27	50.0	21	60.0	8	28.6	56	47.9	10	31.3
Killer	6	11.1	4	11.4	0	0.0	10	8.5	1	3.1
Victim	36	66.7	20	57.1	13	46.4	69	59.0	17	53.1
Killed	6	11.1	3	8.6	0	0.0	9	7.7	1	3.1
Involved in										
any violence	40	74.1	25	71.4	15	53.6	80	68.4	19	59.4
any killing	11	20.4	5	14.3	0	0.0	16	13.7	1	3.1
Character score		94.5		85.7		53.6		82.1		62.5
Middle, mixed										
Total	176	100.0	177	100.0	275	100.0	628	100.0	340	100.0
Violent	98	55.7	84	47.5	133	48.4	315	50.2	170	50.0
Killer	22	12.5	19	10.7	10	3.6	51	8.1	13	3.8
Victim	110	62.5	97	54.8	161	58.5	368	58.6	201	59.1
Killed	9	5.1	5	2.8	6	2.2	20	3.2	7	2.1
Involved in										
any violence	126	71.6	112	63.3	179	65.0	417	66.4	227	66.8
any killing	31	17.6	20	11.3	16	5.8	67	10.7	20	5.9
Character score		89.2		74.6		70.8		77.1		72.7
Lower										
Total	10	100.0	3	100.0	4	100.0	17	100.0	5	100.0
Violent	9	90.0	1	33.3	2	50.0	12	70.6	3	60.0
Killer	2	20.0	1	33.3	0	0.0	3	17.6	0	0.0
Victim	9	90.0	3	100.0	3	75.0	15	88.2	4	80.0
Killed	2	20.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	11.8	0	0.0
Involved in										
any violence	10	100.0	3	100.0	3	75.0	16	94.1	4	80.0
any killing	3	30.0	1	33.3	0	0.0	4	23.5	0	0.0
Character score		130.0		133.3		75.0		117.6		80.0

MEDIA CONTENT AND CONTROL

Table 105: Share of classes in violence roles

	1967		1968		1969		1967 - 69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
All characters	240	100.0	215	100.0	307	100.0	762	100.0	377	100.0
Upper	54	22.5	35	16.3	28	9.1	117	15.4	32	8.5
Middle, mixed	176	73.3	177	82.3	275	89.6	628	82.4	340	90.2
Lower	10	4.2	3	1.9	4	1.3	17	2.2	5	1.3
Violents	134	100.0	106	100.0	143	100.0	383	100.0	183	100.0
Upper	27	20.1	21	19.8	8	5.6	56	14.6	10	5.5
Middle, mixed	98	73.1	84	79.2	133	93.0	315	82.2	170	92.9
Lower	9	6.7	1	0.9	2	1.4	12	3.1	3	1.6
Killers	30	100.0	24	100.0	10	100.0	63	100.0	14	100.0
Upper	6	20.0	4	16.7	0	0.0	10	15.8	1	7.1
Middle, mixed	22	73.3	19	79.2	10	100.0	50	80.9	13	92.9
Lower	2	6.7	1	4.2	0	0.0	3	4.7	0	0.0
Victims	155	100.0	120	100.0	177	100.0	452	100.0	222	100.0
Upper	36	23.2	20	16.7	13	7.3	69	15.3	17	7.7
Middle, mixed	110	71.0	97	80.8	161	91.0	368	81.4	201	90.5
Lower	9	5.8	3	2.5	3	1.7	15	3.3	4	1.8
Killed	17	100.0	8	100.0	6	100.0	31	100.0	8	100.0
Upper	6	35.3	3	37.5	0	0.0	9	29.0	1	12.5
Middle, mixed	9	52.9	5	62.5	6	100.0	20	64.5	7	87.5
Lower	2	11.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	6.4	0	0.0
Involved in violence	176	100.0	140	100.0	197	100.0	513	100.0	250	100.0
Upper	40	22.7	25	17.9	15	7.6	80	15.6	19	7.6
Middle, mixed	126	71.6	112	80.0	179	90.9	417	81.3	227	90.8
Lower	10	5.7	3	2.2	3	1.5	16	3.1	4	1.6
Involved in killing	45	100.0	25	100.0	16	100.0	86	100.0	21	100.0
Upper	11	24.4	5	20.0	0	0.0	16	18.6	1	4.8
Middle, mixed	31	68.9	20	80.0	16	100.0	67	77.9	20	95.2
Lower	3	6.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	3.5	0	0.0

VIOLENCE IN TELEVISION DRAMA

157

Table 106: Violence roles by nationality

	1967		1968		1969		1967 - 69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
American										
Total	156	100.0	164	100.0	211	100.0	531	100.0	257	100.0
Violent	78	50.0	79	48.2	81	38.4	238	44.8	106	41.2
Killer	20	12.8	20	12.2	6	2.8	46	8.7	9	3.5
Victim	96	61.5	83	50.6	99	46.9	278	52.4	126	49.0
Killed	7	4.5	6	3.7	5	2.4	18	3.4	5	1.9
Involved in										
any violence	108	69.2	101	61.6	116	55.0	325	61.2	149	58.0
any killing	26	16.7	22	13.4	11	5.2	59	11.1	14	5.4
Non-American and other, mixed unclear										
Total	84	100.0	51	100.0	96	100.0	231	100.0	120	100.0
Violent	56	66.7	27	52.9	62	64.6	145	62.8	77	64.2
Killer	10	11.9	3	5.9	4	4.2	17	7.4	5	4.2
Victim	59	70.2	37	72.5	78	81.2	174	75.3	96	80.0
Killed	10	11.9	2	3.9	1	1.0	13	5.6	3	2.5
Involved in										
any violence	68	80.9	39	76.5	81	84.4	188	81.4	101	84.2
any killing	19	22.6	3	5.9	5	5.2	27	11.7	7	5.8

MEDIA CONTENT AND CONTROL

Table 107: Share of nationality in violence roles

	1967		1968		1969		1967 - 69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
All characters										
American	156	65.0	164	76.3	211	68.7	531	69.7	257	68.2
Non-American, mixed, other	84	35.0	51	23.7	96	31.2	231	30.3	120	31.8
Violents										
American	78	58.2	79	74.5	81	56.6	238	62.1	106	37.5
Non-American, mixed, other	56	41.8	27	25.5	62	43.4	145	37.9	77	27.2
Killers										
American	20	66.7	20	87.0	6	60.0	46	73.0	9	64.3
Non-American, mixed, other	10	33.3	3	13.0	4	40.0	17	27.0	5	35.7
Victims										
American	96	61.9	83	75.4	99	55.9	278	61.5	126	56.8
Non-American, mixed, other	59	38.1	37	33.6	78	44.1	174	38.5	96	43.2
Killed										
American	7	41.2	6	75.0	5	83.3	18	58.1	5	62.5
Non-American, mixed, other	10	58.8	2	25.0	1	16.7	13	41.9	3	37.5
Involved in any violence										
American	108	61.4	101	72.1	116	58.9	325	63.4	149	59.6
Non-American, mixed, other	68	38.6	39	27.9	81	41.1	188	36.6	101	40.4
Involved in any killing										
American	26	57.8	22	88.0	11	68.8	59	68.6	14	66.7
Non-American, mixed, other	19	42.2	3	12.0	5	31.2	27	31.4	7	33.3

VIOLENCE IN TELEVISION DRAMA

Table 108: Violence roles by race

	1967		1968		1969		1967 - 69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Whites										
Total	178	100.0	173	100.0	234	100.0	585	100.0	290	100.0
Violent	94	52.8	81	46.8	97	41.5	272	46.5	129	44.5
Killer	27	15.2	21	12.1	8	3.4	56	9.6	12	4.1
Victim	108	60.6	86	49.7	120	51.3	314	53.7	154	53.1
Killed	11	6.2	7	4.0	6	2.6	24	4.1	8	2.8
Involved in any violence	123	69.1	106	61.3	138	59.0	367	62.7	180	62.1
any killing	36	20.2	23	13.3	14	6.0	73	12.5	19	6.6
Nonwhites and other, mixed, uncertain										
Total	62	100.0	42	100.0	73	100.0	177	100.0	87	100.0
Violent	40	64.5	25	59.5	46	63.0	111	62.7	54	62.1
Killer	3	4.8	2	4.8	2	2.7	7	4.0	2	3.3
Victim	47	75.8	34	81.0	57	78.1	138	78.0	68	78.2
Killed	6	9.7	1	2.4	0	0.0	7	4.0	0	0.0
Involved in any violence	53	85.5	34	81.0	59	80.2	146	82.5	70	80.5
any killing	9	14.5	2	4.8	2	2.7	13	7.3	2	2.3

MEDIA CONTENT AND CONTROL

Table 109: Share of race in violence roles

	1967		1968		1969		1967 - 69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
All characters	240	100.0	215	100.0	307	100.0	762	100.0	377	100.0
Whites	178	74.2	173	80.5	234	76.2	585	76.8	290	76.9
Nonwhites, mixed, other	62	25.8	42	19.5	73	23.8	177	23.2	87	23.1
Violents	134	100.0	106	100.0	143	100.0	383	100.0	183	100.0
Whites	94	70.1	81	76.4	97	67.8	272	71.0	129	70.5
Nonwhites, mixed, other	40	29.9	25	23.6	46	32.2	111	29.0	54	29.5
Killers	30	100.0	23	100.0	10	100.0	63	100.0	14	100.0
Whites	27	90.0	21	91.3	8	80.0	56	88.9	12	85.7
Nonwhites, other, mixed	3	10.0	2	8.7	2	20.0	7	11.1	2	14.3
Victims	155	100.0	120	100.0	177	100.0	452	100.0	222	100.0
Whites	108	69.7	86	71.7	120	67.8	314	69.5	154	69.4
Nonwhites, other, mixed	47	30.3	34	28.3	57	32.2	138	30.5	68	30.6
Killed	17	100.0	8	100.0	6	100.0	31	100.0	8	100.0
Whites	11	64.7	7	87.5	6	100.0	24	77.4	8	100.0
Nonwhites, other, mixed	6	35.3	1	12.5	0	0.0	7	22.6	0	0.0
Involved in any violence	176	100.0	140	100.0	197	100.0	513	100.0	250	100.0
Whites	123	69.9	106	75.7	138	70.1	367	71.5	180	72.0
Nonwhites, other, mixed	53	30.1	34	24.3	59	29.9	146	28.5	70	28.0
Involved in any killing	45	100.0	25	100.0	16	100.0	86	100.0	21	100.0
Whites	36	80.0	23	92.0	14	87.5	73	84.9	19	90.5
Nonwhites, other, mixed	9	20.0	2	8.0	2	12.5	13	15.1	2	9.5

VIOLENCE IN TELEVISION DRAMA

Table 110: Violence roles by outcome for character

	1967		1968		1969		1967 - 69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Happy ending										
Totals	134	100.0	132	100.0	143	100.0	409	100.0	168	100.0
Violents	66	49.3	60	45.5	49	34.3	175	42.8	60	35.7
Killers	16	11.9	9	6.8	1	0.7	26	6.4	2	1.2
Victims	76	56.7	68	51.5	71	49.7	215	52.6	90	53.6
Killed	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.7	1	0.2	1	0.6
Involved in any violence	90	67.2	80	60.6	79	55.2	249	60.9	98	58.3
any killing	16	11.9	9	6.8	2	1.4	27	6.6	3	1.8
Character score		79.1		67.4		56.6		67.5		60.1
Unhappy ending										
Totals	47	100.0	42	100.0	44	100.0	133	100.0	62	100.0
Violents	34	72.3	27	64.3	33	75.0	94	70.7	50	80.6
Killers	5	10.6	11	26.2	6	13.6	22	16.5	8	12.9
Victims	38	80.9	28	66.7	33	75.0	99	74.4	47	75.8
Killed	17	36.2	8	19.0	3	6.8	28	21.1	4	6.5
Involved in any violence	40	85.1	32	76.2	35	79.5	107	80.5	52	83.9
any killing	20	42.6	13	31.0	9	20.5	42	31.6	12	19.4
Character score		127.7		107.2		100.0		112.1		103.3

MEDIA CONTENT AND CONTROL

Table 110: Violence roles by outcome for character—Continued

	1967		1968		1969		1967-69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Mixed, unclear ending										
Totals	59	100.0	41	100.0	120	100.0	220	100.0	147	100.0
Violents	34	57.6	19	46.3	61	50.8	114	51.8	73	49.7
Killers	9	15.3	3	7.3	3	2.5	15	6.8	4	2.7
Victims	41	69.5	24	58.5	73	60.8	138	62.7	85	57.8
Killed	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	1.7	2	0.9	3	2.0
Involved in any violence	46	78.0	28	68.3	83	69.2	157	71.4	100	68.0
any killing	9	15.3	3	7.3	5	4.2	17	7.7	6	4.1
Character score		93.3		75.6		73.4		79.1		72.1

VIOLENCE IN TELEVISION DRAMA

Table 111: Selected violence roles by sex and outcome

	1967		1968		1969	
	M	F	M	F	M	F
Happy ending N(100%)	103	30	97	33	102	41
Violents	52.4	36.7	50.5	27.3	41.2	17.1
Victims	64.1	30.0	57.7	30.3	55.9	34.1
Unhappy ending	41	6	36	6	41	3
Violents	78.0	33.3	66.7	50.0	78.0	33.3
Victims	85.4	50.0	66.7	66.7	78.0	33.3

Table 112: Share of outcomes in violence roles

	1967		1968		1969		1967 - 69		Enlarged 1969 sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
All characters	240	100.0	215	100.0	307	100.0	762	100.0	377	100.0
Happy ending	134	55.8	132	61.4	143	46.6	409	53.7	168	44.6
Unhappy ending	47	19.6	42	19.5	44	14.3	133	17.4	62	16.4
Mixed, unclear	59	24.6	41	19.1	120	39.1	220	28.9	147	39.0
Violents	134	100.0	106	100.0	143	100.0	383	100.0	183	100.0
Happy ending	66	49.2	60	56.6	49	34.3	175	45.7	60	32.8
Unhappy ending	34	25.4	27	25.5	33	23.1	94	24.5	50	27.3
Mixed, unclear	34	25.4	19	17.9	61	42.6	114	29.8	73	39.9
Killers	30	100.0	23	100.0	10	100.0	63	100.0	14	100.0
Happy ending	16	53.3	9	39.1	1	10.0	26	41.3	2	14.3
Unhappy ending	5	16.7	11	47.8	6	60.0	22	34.9	8	57.1
Mixed, unclear	9	30.0	3	13.1	3	30.0	15	23.8	4	28.6
Victims	155	100.0	120	100.0	177	100.0	452	100.0	222	100.0
Happy ending	76	49.0	68	56.7	71	40.1	215	47.6	90	40.5
Unhappy ending	38	24.5	28	23.3	33	18.6	99	21.9	47	21.2
Mixed, unclear	41	26.5	24	20.0	73	41.3	138	30.5	85	38.3
Killed	17	100.0	8	100.0	6	100.0	31	100.0	8	100.0
Happy ending	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	16.7	1	3.2	1	12.5
Unhappy ending	17	100.0	8	100.0	3	50.0	28	90.3	4	50.0
Mixed, unclear	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	33.3	2	6.5	3	37.5
Involved in any violence	176	100.0	140	100.0	197	100.0	513	100.0	250	100.0
Happy ending	90	51.1	80	57.1	79	40.1	249	48.5	98	39.2
Unhappy ending	40	22.7	32	22.9	35	17.8	107	20.9	52	20.8
Mixed, unclear	46	26.2	28	20.0	83	42.1	157	30.6	100	40.0
Involved in any killing	45	100.0	25	100.0	16	100.0	86	100.0	21	100.0
Happy ending	16	35.6	9	36.0	2	12.5	27	31.4	3	14.3
Unhappy ending	20	44.4	13	52.0	9	56.2	42	48.8	12	57.1
Mixed, unclear	9	20.0	3	12.0	5	31.3	17	19.8	6	28.6

Table 113: Share of women in the violence roles of all "happy" and "unhappy" characters

	1967		1968		1969	
	"Happy"	"Unhappy"	"Happy"	"Unhappy"	"Happy"	"Unhappy"
Women as percent of all characters	22.4	12.8	25.0	14.3	28.7	6.8
all Violents	16.7	5.9	15.0	11.1	14.3	3.0
all Victims	11.8	7.9	14.7	14.3	19.7	3.0

Appendix B: Analytical procedures

I. Samples of Programming

Network dramatic programs transmitted October 10-16, 1969 during prime evening time (weekdays and Saturday evening 7:30 to 11 p.m. and Sunday evening 7 to 11 p.m.) and Saturday 8 a.m. to 2:30 p.m. were videotaped for the analysis. The calendar position of this sample week corresponded closely to the October 1-7 weeks of 1967 and 1968 analyzed previously. The 1969 sample, however, extended its prime time limits an extra hour, to 11 p.m., and expanded the Saturday daytime interval past noon into the early afternoon. This was done in order to secure all relevant program material and provide a baseline archive for future analyses of this sort.

Inasmuch as the 1967 and 1968 monitorings terminated at 10 p.m. and excluded Saturday afternoon, the comparisons, interpretations and trend analyses were limited to the same time periods in 1969. The 1969 results have thus been reported separately for the entire sample and for that portion which conforms to the 1967-68 parameters.

The solid-week sample has been demonstrated to be at least as generalizable to a year's programming as larger randomly selected samples. 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 selection procedure, for a calendar year that approximately bridged the interval between the 1967 and 1968 one-week samples*. There proved to be no significant differences in proportions along the dimensions of program style, format, type and tone (as defined for the 1967-68 projects) between the experimental and solid-week samples. This is consistent with some assumptions about network programming. This week of October is located about one month into the new, or "Fall," television season. At such a time the programming schedule is generally kept more free of "specials" and preemptions to allow the audience to become familiar with the new schedule and to facilitate the preliminary audience ratings. As the bulk of the fall programs will continue into the rest of the programming year, many with summer reruns, this particular week may be considered highly representative of the ensuing year of network programming.

II. Coder Training and Instrument Revision

Thirteen graduate students were recruited for this project. Approximately ten days were devoted to familiarizing them with the preliminary recording instrument. This involved several general meetings during

*Eleey, Michael F., *Variations in Generalizability Resulting from Sampling Characteristics of Content Analysis Data: A Case Study*. The Annenberg School of Communications, University of Pennsylvania, 1969.

which the instrument was discussed and explained item by item. All students involved then coded three programs available on tape from the 1968 sample: "The Guns of Will Sonnett," a melodramatic western; "That Girl," a situation comedy; and "The Herculoids," a fantastic science-fiction cartoon. Subsequent general discussions illuminated practical problems experienced by the coders in this exercise, and consequent modifications were introduced into the coding instrument.

The next three weeks were devoted to further refinement, using this modified instrument and involving seven more 1968 programs: "Felony Squad," "Petticoat Junction," "Peyton Place," "The Night of the Iguana," "Wacky Races," "The Land of the Giants," "The Avengers." A second revision of the instrument arose out of the common experience of the coders' work with these additional programs. This revision constituted the final working version of the instrument.

III. Assessment of Reliability

The entire 1969 sample was analyzed according to a procedure in which four assigned coders screened each program and then split into two assigned pairs, to separately agree on joint codings between the two partners. Each pair worked independently of the other pair, and all pairing combinations were systematically rotated by assignment. In this way, the entire sample was double-coded and submitted for reliability analysis.

The purpose of reliability measures in content analysis is to ascertain the degree to which the recorded data truly reflect the properties of the material being studied, and do not reflect the contamination of observer bias or of 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 coder. Measures of reliability may thus serve two functions: as diagnostic tools in the confirmation of the recording process; and as final arbitrators of the accuracy of the phenomena's representations in the actual recorded data. In this project, reliability measures served both purposes. During the preliminary period of instrument revision and coder training, they provided direction to the problem areas in the recording process. Final measures, computed on the study's entire corpus of double-coded data, determined the acceptability of information for analysis and provided guidelines for the interpretation of data.

Agreement due merely to chance gives no indication that the data truly reflect the phenomena under observation; reliability measures in the form of agreement coefficients indicate the degree to which agreement among independent observers is above chance. In general, then,

$$\text{Coefficient of agreement} = 1 - \frac{\text{observed disagreement}}{\text{expected disagreement}}$$

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.

Four computational formulas are currently available for calculating the coefficient of agreement. These variations are distinguished by a difference function, the form of which depends upon the type of scale used by the particular variable being analyzed. For nominal scales, the difference between any two categories is equal. For interval scales, the difference between two neighboring categories is equal. For polar scales, the distinctions among scale points are finer, and the differences are more significant near the boundaries of the scale as defined by its polar opposites. For ratio scales, the distinctions among scale points are finer near zero, and the significance of the differences are relative to the zero point.*

Except for their respective scale-appropriate sensitivity to deviations from perfect agreement, all formulas make the same basic assumptions as the prototype for nominal scales devised by Scott.** Thus in the case of the binary variable, all four formulas yield identical results.

The project's double-coded sample of data was analyzed for agreement via these four coefficients, with the aid of a recently developed computer program.*** In addition to being computed for the entire sample of 1969 programs, the coefficients have also been computed separately for cartoon and noncartoon programs. And where indicated by preliminary reliability results, variables have been recoded (i.e., categories have been collapsed and/or rearranged) and reanalyzed for reliability.

Variables meeting reliability criteria were selected for the analysis. Those variables exhibiting coefficients of .80 or higher were accepted as unconditionally reliable. Variables between .67 and .80 were accepted as conditionally reliable, to be interpreted cautiously. Variables below .67 were considered unreliable and excluded from the analysis.†

IV. Data Processing

As data were recorded by the coders, it was office-checked for administrative errors and keypunched twice. The two sets of data cards were then submitted for matching by computer for verification. Mismatches

*Krippendorff, Klaus, *Reliability in Message Analysis*, The Annenberg School of Communications, Philadelphia, March 1970. Discusses the formulae's derivations and properties.

**Scott, William A., *Reliability of Content Analysis: The Case of Nominal Scale Coding*, *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 17:3:321-325, 1955.

***Krippendorff, Klaus, *A Computer Program for Analyzing Multivariate Agreements*, Version 2, The Annenberg School of Communications, Philadelphia, March, 1970.

†See Eley, *op cit.*, for a justification of the levels of acceptability according to the probabilities of Type I and Type II errors involved.

were corrected by a return to the original recording sheets. Verified data were then submitted for computerized agreement analysis to evaluate reliability. On the basis of reliability measures, variables were selected for analysis, which proceeded by a combination of standard computer programs and specific software designed for the project's needs.

Appendix C: Samples of programs

The 1969 sample of television programs for the analysis represented a departure from some sampling criteria used for the 1967 and 1968 selections. For the latter, the time periods used were: weekdays and Saturday evening—4 to 10 p.m.* Sunday evening 7 to 10 p.m.; Saturday children's programs 8 a.m. to noon. Since these parameters eliminated potentially valuable material, i.e. the prime time hour from 10 to 11 p.m., and the early Saturday afternoon children's programming, the 1969 sample was not subject to these limitations. In 1969, the Sunday time period extended from 7 p.m. to 11 p.m., the weekday and Saturday evening period from 7:30 to 11 p.m., and the Saturday daytime period from 8 a.m. to 2:30 p.m.

These additional time periods made available program slots not secured for the previous analysis. In the Calendar of Television Programs Analyzed, programs videotaped in 1969 which were beyond the scope of the previous samples, are bordered in double lines, and their serial numbers are in parentheses.

The 1969 analysis was performed on all the programs secured according to the revised time criteria. The results, however, are presented separately for the entire 1969 sample and only for those 1969 sample programs *that are strictly comparable to the previous time constraints*. In the interpretations of the results and trends, data used were based on a restricted 1969 sample to maintain the integrity of the comparisons. The enlarged 1969 sample, however, has now been secured and analyzed as a more complete baseline for future analyses.

Index of television programs analyzed, 1967-69

Serial Number of	001 = <i>Batman</i>
Program (1967)	002 = <i>Yellow Rolls Royce</i>
	003 = <i>My Three Sons</i>
	004 = <i>Felony Squad</i>
	005 = <i>That Girl</i>
	006 = <i>Off to See the Wizard</i>
	007 = <i>Ironside</i>
	008 = <i>Virginian</i>
	009 = <i>Petticoat Junction</i>
	010 = <i>Daktari</i>
	011 = <i>Journey to Center of Earth</i>
	012 = <i>Peyton Place</i>

*Programs beginning before 10 p.m. but terminating after that time were taped and analyzed in their entirety.

MEDIA CONTENT AND CONTROL

- 013 = *I Dream of Jeannie*
- 014 = *Star Trek*
- 015 = *The Man from U.N.C.L.E*
- 016 = *Voyage to Bottom of Sea*
- 017 = *Hondo*
- 018 = *Custer*
- 019 = *He & She*
- 020 = *Daniel Boone*
- 021 = *Maya*
- 022 = *Lost in Space*
- 023 = *The Invaders*
- 024 = *Bonanza*
- 025 = *Bewitched*
- 026 = *Accidental Family*
- 027 = *Flying Nun*
- 028 = *Second-Hundred Years*
- 029 = *Viva Las Vegas - CBS Friday*
- 030 = *Gunsmoke*
- 031 = *Andy Griffith Show*
- 032 = *Man's Favorite Sport*
- 033 = *Super 6-Matzanuts*
- 034 = *Super 6-Man from T.R.A.S.H*
- 035 = *Monkees*
- 036 = *Gentle Ben*
- 037 = *Magilla Gorilla*
- 038 = *Casper Cartoon #1 Troubly Date*
- 039 = *Casper #2 Goody Gremlin*
- 040 = *Casper #3 Wandering Ghost*
- 041 = *Smothers Brothers*
- 042 = *Smothers Brothers*
- 043 = *Super President - Spy Shadow*
- 044 = *Super President*
- 045 = *Super President*
- 046 = *Lassie*
- 047 = *Green Acres*
- 048 = *The Jerry Lewis Shoe, I*
- 049 = *Fantastic Four*
- 050 = *Fantastic Four*
- 051 = *The Jerry Lewis Show, II*
- 052 = *Super Six*
- 053 = *Mothers-in-Law*
- 054 = *Spiderman*
- 055 = *Second Time Around*
- 056 = *Tarzan*
- 057 = *NYPD*

VIOLENCE IN TELEVISION DRAMA

- 058 = *Lucy*
- 059 = *Cimarron Strip*
- 060 = *Dragnet*
- 061 = *Gomer Pyle*
- 062 = *Good Morning World*
- 063 = *Garrison's Gorillas*
- 064 = *Walt Disney - The Fighting Prince*
- 065 = *Wild, Wild West*
- 066 = *Cowboys in Africa*
- 067 = *Peyton Place*
- 068 = *Family Affair*
- 069 = *Trouble with Harry*
- 070 = *Beverly Hillbillies*
- 071 = *Iron Horse*
- 072 = *Hogan's Heroes*
- 073 = *Shazzan-Evil Jester of Messina*
- 074 = *Shazzan-City of the Tombs*
- 075 = *Frankenstien Jr. - Smogula*
- 076 = *Frankenstien Jr. - Shocking Monster*
- 077 = *Frankenstien Jr. - Perilous Paper Doll*
- 078 = *Flintstones - House Guest*
- 079 = *Space Ghost*
- 080 = *Herculoids - Spider Man*
- 081 = *Herculoids - Android People*
- 082 = *Young Samson & Goliath #1*
- 083 = *Danny Thomas Show*
- 084 = *FBI*
- 085 = *Beagles #3 - By the Plight of the Moon*
- 086 = *Beagles #1 - Ghosts, Ghouls & Fouls*
- 087 = *Get Smart*
- 088 = *Rat Patrol*
- 089 = *Guns of Will Sonnet*
- 090 = *Whatever Happened to Baby Jane*
- 091 = *Magilla Gorilla #2 - B. Brun*
- 092 = *Magilla Gorilla #3 - Cat and Mouse*
- 093 = *Spiderman #2*
- 094 = *Young Samson & Goliath #2*
- 095 = *Space Ghost #2*
- 096 = *Space Ghost #3*

Serial Number of
Program (1968)

- 101 = *That Girl*
- 102 = *Julia*
- 103 = *Ugliest Girl in Town*
- 104 = *Outcasts*
- 105 = *Adam 12*

- 106 = *Night of the Iguana*
- 107 = *Mod Squad*
- 108 = *NYPD*
- 109 = *Avengers*
- 110 = *Here Come the Brides*
- 111 = *Lancer*
- 112 = *Ironside*
- 113 = *FBI*
- 114 = *Cat Ballou*
- 115 = *Green Acres*
- 116 = *The Good Guys*
- 117 = *Do Not Disturb*
- 118 = *Spiderman - Captured by J. Jonah Jamison*
- 119 = *Spiderman - Sky is Falling In*
- 120 = *My Three Sons*
- 121 = *Gunsmoke*
- 122 = *Hawaii 5-0*
- 123 = *A Man Could Get Killed*
- 124 = *Daktari*
- 125 = *I Dream of Jeannie*
- 126 = *Mothers-In-Law*
- 127 = *Land of the Giants*
- 128 = *Petticoat Junction*
- 129 = *New Adventures of Huck Finn*
- 130 = *Peyton Place*
- 131 = *Bewitched*
- 132 = *Beverly Hillbillies*
- 133 = *Peyton Place*
- 134 = *Wild, Wild West*
- 135 = *It Takes a Thief*
- 136 = *Here's Lucy*
- 137 = *Mayberry RFD*
- 138 = *Bonanza*
- 139 = *Family Affair*
- 140 = *Doris Day Show*
- 141 = *Hogan's Heroes*
- 142 = *Blondie*
- 143 = *Gomer Pyle USMC*
- 144 = *Journey to the Unknown*
- 145 = *Get Smart*
- 146 = *Flintstones - No Biz Like Show Biz*
- 147 = *The Ghost & Mrs. Muir*
- 148 = *Lassie*
- 149 = *Dragnet*
- 150 = *The Name of the Game*

- 151 = *Felony*
- 152 = *The Archie Show - The Circus*
- 153 = *The Archie Show - Jughead & the Airplane*
- 154 = *Gentle Ben*
- 155 = *Go Go Gophers - Up in the Air*
- 156 = *Go Go Gophers - Space Kiddettes*
- 157 = *Go Go Gophers - Big Banger*
- 158 = *Underdog - Bubbleheads*
- 159 = *Wacky Races - Creepy Trip to Lemon Twist*
- 160 = *Wacky Races - Baja Ha-Ha*
- 161 = *Flying Nun*
- 162 = *Rare Breed*
- 163 = *Batman/Superman Hour - 9 Lives of Batman*
- 164 = *Batman/Superman Hour - Can Luthor Change His Spots*
- 165 = *Batman/Superman Hour - Forget Me Not, Superdog*
- 166 = *Batman/Superman Hour - In Again Out Again Penguin*
- 167 = *High Chaparral*
- 168 = *Fantastic Voyage - Master Spy*
- 169 = *Super 6 - Thunder 8 Ball*
- 170 = *Super 6 - Ruin & Board*
- 171 = *Super 6 - Mummy Caper*
- 172 = *Herculoids - Tiny World of Terror*
- 173 = *Herculoids - Electrode Men*
- 174 = *Daniel Boone*
- 175 = *Guns of Will Sonnett*
- 176 = *Khartoum*
- 177 = *Fantastic 4 - Yancy Street*
- 178 = *Top Cat*
- 179 = *The Singing Nun*
- 180 = *The Virginian*
- 181 = *Banana Splits - Introduction*
- 182 = *Banana Splits - Wizard Ramizer*
- 183 = *Banana Splits - Danger Island*
- 184 = *Banana Splits - Puppet Masters*
- 185 = *Banana Splits - End Segment*
- 186 = *Banana Splits - 1st Comic Interlude*
- 187 = *Banana Splits - 2nd Comic Interlude*

Serial Number of
Program (1969)

- 201 = *Marcus Welby, M.D.*
- 202 = *Land of the Giants*
- 203 = *Julia*
- 204 = *Pink Panther - Prehistoric Pink*

- 205 = *Pink Panther - The Inspector*
- 206 = *Pink Panther - Bicep Beach*
- 207 = *Here's Lucy*
- 208 = *ABC Sunday Night Movie - Fantastic Voyage*
- 209 = *Jonny Quest*
- 210 = *Good Buys*
- 211 = *NBC Tuesday Night at the Movies -
The Tiger and the Pussy-cat*
- 212 = *The Ghost and Mrs. Muir*
- 213 = *Get Smart*
- 214 = *The Bill Cosby Show*
- 215 = *Dragnet*
- 216 = *I Dream of Jeannie*
- 217 = *Bewitched*
- 218 = *CBS Thursday Night Movie - Inside Daisy Clover*
- 219 = *It Takes a Thief*
- 220 = *The Bold Ones*
- 221 = *The Survivors*
- 222 = *Adam-12*
- 223 = *Hawaii Five-O*
- 224 = *Daniel Boone*
- 225 = *Lassie*
- 226 = *Then Came Bronson*
- 227 = *Jackie Gleason*
- 228 = *The Bugs Bunny - 14 Carrot Rabbit*
- 229 = *The Bugs Bunny - Tweety & the Beanstalk*
- 230 = *The Bugs Bunny - War and Pieces*
- 231 = *The Bugs Bunny - Knightly Knight Bugs*
- 232 = *The Bugs Bunny - Clippity Clobbered*
- 233 = *The Bugs Bunny - Hillbilly Hare*
- 234 = *Petticoat Junction*
- 235 = *The New People*
- 236 = *NBC Monday Night at the Movies -
By Love Possessed*
- 237 = *Mannix*
- 238 = *Lancer*
- 239 = *Superman - Rain of Iron*
- 240 = *Superman - Superboy Meets Mighty Lad*
- 241 = *My Three Sons*
- 242 = *Mayberry R.F.D.*
- 243 = *Chattanooga Cats - Witchy Wacky*
- 244 = *Chattanooga Cats - Sno Go*
- 245 = *Chattanooga Cats - India or Bust*
- 246 = *Chattanooga Cats - Any Sport in a Storm*
- 247 = *Chattanooga Cats - Hard Day's Day*

- 248 = *Movie of the Week - Wake Me When the War is Over*
- 249 = *Banana Splits - Saucy Saucers*
- 250 = *Banana Splits - Danger Island*
- 251 = *Banana Splits - Jewels of Joowar*
- 252 = *Hardy Boys - Restaurant Mystery*
- 253 = *Hardy Boys - Mr. Izmeer*
- 254 = *Here Come the Brides*
- 255 = *Family Affair*
- 256 = *The F.B.I.*
- 257 = *Wacky Races - Hot Race at Chillicothe*
- 258 = *Wacky Races - By Roller Coaster to Ups & Downs*
- 259 = *Mr. Deeds Goes to Town*
- 260 = *Doris Day Show*
- 261 = *That Girl*
- 262 = *Green Acres*
- 263 = *Mission Impossible*
- 264 = *Monkees*
- 265 = *Skyhawks - Untamed Wildcat*
- 266 = *Skyhawks - Trouble Times Three*
- 267 = *The Jetsons*
- 268 = *Heckle & Jeckle - Thousand Smile Check-Up*
- 269 = *Heckle & Jeckle - Don't Burro Trouble*
- 270 = *Heckle & Jeckle - Pastry Panic*
- 271 = *Heckle & Jeckle - Miami Maniacs*
- 272 = *Heckle & Jeckle - Sad Cat Basketball*
- 273 = *Heckle & Jeckle - Stuntmen*
- 274 = *Heckle & Jeckle - Darn Barn*
- 275 = *Heckle & Jeckle - Hair Cut-Ups*
- 276 = *Jambo*
- 277 = *H. R. Pufnstuff*
- 278 = *Walt Disney*
- 279 = *Virginian*
- 280 = *Scooby-do, Where Are You?*
- 281 = *Flying Nun*
- 282 = *Love, American Sytle - Love and the Doorknob*
- 283 = *Love, American Style - Love and the Phone Booth*
- 284 = *Bracken's World*
- 285 = *Gunsmoke*
- 286 = *Perils of Penelope Pitstop*
- 287 = *To Rome With Love*
- 288 = *The High Chaparral*
- 289 = *Courtship of Eddie's Father*
- 290 = *Bonanza*

- 291 = *Name of the Game*
292 = *The Brady Bunch*
293 = *Hot Wheels - Avalanche Country*
294 = *Adventures of Gulliver*
295 = *Medical Center*
296 = *Archie Hour - Magic Bone*
297 = *Archie Hour - Visiting Nephew*
298 = *Archie Hour - Detective Jughead*
299 = *Hogan's Heroes*
300 = *Mod Squad*
301 = *Casper the Friendly Ghost - A Visit From Mars*
302 = *Casper the Friendly Ghost - Be Mice to Cats*
303 = *Casper the Friendly Ghost - Cane & Able*
304 = *Debbie Reynolds Show*
305 = *CBS Friday Night Movie - Doctor,
You've Got to be kidding*
306 = *Here Comes the Grump: The Yuks*
307 = *Room 222*
308 = *My World and Welcome to It*
309 = *Ironsides*
310 = *Dastardly & Muttley - Operation Anvil*
311 = *Dastardly & Muttley - Cuckoo Patrol*
312 = *Dastardly & Muttley - Masked Muttley*
313 = *NBC Saturday Night at the Movies -
The Hell With Heroes*
314 = *Beverly Hillbillies*
315 = *The Governor & J.J.*
316 = *ABC Wednesday Night Movie -
Divorce American Style*
317 = *Smokey Bear Show - Heroes Are Born*
318 = *Smokey Bear Show - Winner & Still Chump*
319 = *Smokey Bear Show - Freddy's Big Date*
320 = *Here Comes the Grump - Wily Wheelies*
321 = *Hot Wheels - Hit & Run*

Calendar of television programs analyzed, 1967-69

Table 114: October 1-7, 1967

[illegible]

Selected Aspects of Television Programs Analyzed, 1967-69

Explanation of Codes:

Number: Refer to Index of Television
Programs Analyzed for serialized
list of program titles.

No. Violent Acts: The number of violent actions
observed to have occurred in the
program.

Format: 1 = cartoon
2 = TV play
3 = feature film

Type: 1 = crime
2 = western
3 = action-adventure
4 = other

Tone: 1 = comedy
2 = serious, other

Number	No. Violent Acts	Format	Type	Tone
1	3	2	1	1
2	2	3	3	2
3	0	2	4	1
4	4	2	1	2
5	4	2	4	1
6	14	2	3	2
7	4	2	1	2
8	2	2	2	2
9	4	2	4	1
10	3	2	3	2
11	12	1	3	2
12	1	2	4	2
13	1	2	4	1
14	12	2	3	2
15	14	2	3	2
16	21	2	3	2
17	12	2	2	2
18	11	2	2	2
19	0	2	4	1
20	11	2	3	2
21	10	2	3	2
22	6	2	3	2
23	4	2	3	2
24	15	2	2	2
25	0	2	4	1
26	0	2	4	1
27	0	2	4	1
28	0	2	4	1
29	5	3	4	2
30	3	2	2	2
31	0	2	4	1
32	0	3	3	1
33	1	1	3	1
34	2	1	3	1

Number	No. Violent Acts	Format	Type	Tone
35	5	2	4	1
36	4	2	3	2
37	5	1	3	1
38	2	1	4	1
39	9	1	4	1
40	2	1	3	1
41	0	2	4	1
42	1	2	4	1
43	5	1	3	2
44	6	1	3	2
45	4	1	3	2
46	0	2	4	2
47	2	2	4	1
48	1	2	4	1
49	8	1	3	2
50	5	1	3	2
51	1	2	4	1
52	0	1	1	1
53	2	2	4	1
54	4	1	3	2
55	16	3	1	1
56	15	2	3	2
57	3	2	1	2
58	0	2	4	1
59	20	2	2	2
60	1	2	1	2
61	0	2	4	1
62	0	2	4	1
63	11	2	3	2
64	7	2	3	2
65	15	2	2	2
66	3	2	3	2
67	0	2	4	2
68	0	2	4	1
69	0	3	1	2
70	0	2	4	1
71	13	2	2	2
72	2	2	3	1
73	2	1	3	2
74	4	1	3	2
75	1	1	3	1
76	2	1	3	1
77	4	1	3	1
78	7	1	4	1
79	7	1	3	2
80	4	1	3	2
81	6	1	3	2
82	6	1	3	2
83	5	2	4	1
84	5	2	1	2
85	6	1	1	1
86	4	1	4	1
87	13	2	3	1
88	7	2	3	2
89	3	2	2	2
90	6	3	3	2
91	5	1	4	1
92	5	1	3	1
93	3	1	3	2

MEDIA CONTENT AND CONTROL

Number	No. Violent Acts	Format	Type	Tone
94	6	1	3	1
95	8	1	3	2
96	6	1	3	2
101	1	2	3	1
102	0	2	4	1
103	4	2	3	1
104	5	2	2	2
105	1	2	1	2
106	7	3	4	2
107	8	2	3	2
108	3	2	1	2
109	11	2	1	2
110	1	2	2	2
111	11	2	2	2
112	3	2	1	2
113	5	2	1	2
114	17	3	2	1
115	7	2	4	1
116	1	2	4	1
117	1	3	4	1
118	3	1	3	2
119	5	1	3	2
120	0	2	4	1
121	7	2	2	2
122	6	2	1	2
123	15	3	3	2
124	3	2	3	2
125	0	2	4	1
126	0	2	4	1
127	4	2	3	2
128	0	2	4	1
129	3	2	3	2
130	0	2	4	2
131	3	2	4	1
132	1	2	4	1
133	0	2	4	2
134	7	2	2	2
135	2	2	3	2
136	1	2	4	1
137	0	2	4	1
138	7	2	2	2
139	0	2	4	1
140	0	2	4	1
141	0	2	3	1
142	0	2	4	1
143	0	2	4	1
144	2	2	4	2
145	4	2	3	1
146	0	1	4	1
147	0	2	4	1
148	1	2	4	2
149	1	2	1	2
150	2	2	3	2
151	6	2	1	2
152	4	1	4	1
153	2	1	4	1
154	2	2	4	2
155	1	1	3	1

VIOLENCE IN TELEVISION DRAMA

Number	No. Violent Acts	Format	Type	Tone
156	8	1	3	1
157	3	1	3	1
158	13	1	3	1
159	12	1	3	1
160	8	1	3	1
161	6	2	4	1
162	10	3	2	2
163	13	1	3	2
164	5	1	3	2
165	4	1	3	1
166	3	1	3	2
167	3	2	2	2
168	3	1	3	2
169	5	1	3	1
170	5	1	3	1
171	3	1	3	1
172	5	1	3	2
173	9	1	3	1
174	10	2	3	2
175	8	2	2	2
176	10	3	3	2
177	15	1	3	2
178	6	1	4	1
179	4	3	4	2
180	8	2	2	2
181	2	2	4	1
182	15	1	3	2
183	5	2	3	2
184	12	1	3	2
185	2	2	4	1
186	0	2	4	1
187	1	2	4	1
201	0	2	4	3
202	12	2	3	3
203	0	2	4	1
204	8	1	3	1
205	8	1	1	1
206	11	1	3	1
207	1	2	4	2
208	7	3	3	3
209	11	1	3	3
210	6	2	4	1
211	3	3	4	2
212	0	2	4	1
213	3	2	3	2
214	0	2	4	1
215	0	2	1	3
216	6	2	4	2
217	0	2	4	1
218	4	3	4	3
219	8	2	1	3
220	5	2	1	3
221	4	2	3	3
222	6	2	1	3
223	10	2	1	3
224	10	2	2	3
225	0	2	4	3
226	6	2	3	3

MEDIA CONTENT AND CONTROL

Number	No. Violent Acts	Format	Type	Tone
227	9	2	4	1
228	7	1	3	1
229	9	1	3	1
230	8	1	3	1
231	10	1	3	1
232	8	1	3	1
233	5	1	3	1
234	0	2	4	1
235	5	2	1	3
236	2	3	4	3
237	3	2	1	3
238	3	2	2	3
239	9	1	3	3
240	1	1	3	2
241	0	2	4	1
242	4	2	4	1
243	6	1	3	1
244	9	1	3	2
245	9	1	3	2
246	8	1	3	1
247	6	1	3	1
248	6	3	4	1
249	5	1	3	1
250	9	2	3	3
251	12	1	3	3
252	5	1	3	3
253	8	1	3	3
254	9	2	2	2
255	0	2	4	1
256	10	2	1	3
257	14	1	3	1
258	12	1	3	1
259	1	2	4	2
260	0	2	4	1
261	0	2	4	1
262	2	2	4	2
263	8	2	3	3
264	4	2	3	1
265	2	1	1	3
266	2	1	1	3
267	6	1	3	1
268	9	1	3	1
269	10	1	3	1
270	1	1	3	2
271	8	1	3	1
272	5	1	3	1
273	12	1	3	1
274	1	1	3	1
275	3	1	3	1
276	3	2	3	2
277	12	2	3	1
278	7	2	4	3
279	9	2	2	3
280	9	1	1	1
281	0	2	4	1
282	1	2	4	1
283	2	2	4	1

VIOLENCE IN TELEVISION DRAMA

Number	No. Violent Acts	Format	Type	Tone
284	3	2	4	3
285	4	2	2	2
286	20	1	3	2
287	0	2	4	2
288	3	2	2	2
289	0	2	4	1
290	8	2	2	3
291	7	2	1	3
292	0	2	4	2
293	1	1	3	3
294	9	1	3	2
295	1	2	4	3
296	0	1	3	1
297	4	1	3	1
298	5	1	1	1
299	2	2	4	2
300	4	2	1	3
301	4	1	3	1
302	7	1	3	1
303	4	1	3	1
304	1	2	4	1
305	7	3	4	2
306	7	1	3	2
307	0	2	4	2
308	2	2	4	2
309	4	2	1	3
310	8	1	3	1
311	10	1	3	1
312	4	1	3	1
313	13	3	3	3
314	1	2	4	1
315	0	2	4	1
316	0	3	4	1
317	3	1	3	1
318	8	1	3	1
319	5	1	3	1
320	11	1	3	1
321	3	1	1	3