


*Called 8/16/95. Winwood Grott
on ches. wire David Weiner.
Said OK* 

Rhoda Baruch, Ed.D. Chair o the Board, and
Suzanne Stutman, M.A., M.S.W., B.C.D., President
Institute for Mental Health Initiatives
4545 42ns Street, N.W., Suite 311
Washington, D.C., 20016
Fax: 202 368 3891

February 23, 1995

Dear Drs. Baruch and Stutman:

Thank you for your letter of January 27. The description of IMHI's mission and history will of course be important for the final report.

When I referred to "therapeutic or counseling effort" I included "working with media professionals" (p. 7), meaning any advice given to the creative community. The study was designed to provide a factual and representative basis for primary preventive work, which is also our objective.

The disagreement about ratings is not with us but with common knowledge in the industry. It is amply demonstrated that ratings represent audience flow more than individual selection or preference. Furthermore, the cost of programs is also a key factor in the ratio of cost-per-thousand, used to determine sponsorship. I agree that constructive portrayals of anger are of great value in and of themselves, and on rare occasions can be parts of programs that are both successful and of high quality. However, I have seen no evidence that ratings can measure such values.

We never claimed that violence sells. In fact, our studies have shown that, on the whole, it depresses ratings. As you will see in the material I attach to this letter, we show that it is pervasive because it travels well on the global market. "Action programs" can be sold in many countries, despite their relative unpopularity in each. Syndicators dictate the formula because they more than make up for domestic losses by selling cheaply in many countries. Here again, both ratings and preferences lose out to the imperatives of scheduling and worldwide cost-per-thousand. At any rate, the list of programs in the sample is attached.

Whether anger scenes, as such, involve violence or not, nine out of ten dramatic (fictional and "reality") prime time programs with anger scenes involve violence, more than half contain both violence and anger, and all Saturday morning children's programs contain violence (Table 1). As viewers watch programs and not isolated scenes, that is not particularly encouraging of positive learning. The fact that most violence "is 'cool' and does not involve anger or perhaps any expression of emotion" is, if anything, prescription for desensitization, especially with the power-imbalance our research shows. That is not to argue against working for more responsible and positive resolution of

anger, but to stress the need for looking at it realistically in the context of total viewing, which is what our study contributes to the effort.

I know that you do not define "effective" portrayals in terms of dramatic purpose, but writers, directors and producers do, and our research shows that viewers perceive it that way. When someone hurts or threatens another, they don't call emergency. They understand such action as a demonstration of power, and learn that effective behavior in a conflict situation depends on their own gender, age, etc. vs. the "other." That is why I believe that effectiveness must be understood in the context of the dramatic portrayals we found.

As to who are the "angriest group on television," the fourth line on Table 2 shows the following percents of major characters expressing anger: prime time males, 52.5; prime time females 49.0; Saturday morning children's programs males 64.4, and Saturday morning children's programs females 68.4, which makes them "angriest group on television," with Saturday morning children's programs males a close second.

The Script Archive was utilized for illustrative purposes only. We were looking for situations and dialogues to illustrate some representative findings and make a few observations that could not be made otherwise. The record of those observations was the notes cited in the report. They were not included in the tables because they did not come from the same database and were not a representative sample.

The Script Archive is the property of the Annenberg School. We paid a graduate assistant to read through scripts until enough anger scenes and characters were found for our illustrative purposes. The scripts could not be removed from the School. I am told that the Archive is now being scanned into a computer and will be available for on-line search in September.

The discrepancy between dramatic and real-life uses of anger illustrates my earlier point. The relatively few improved relationships may or may not mean "positive results," depending on casting and plot. Such improvement among gangsters on the way to rob a bank will send a different message from that among friends in another situation. How any resolution of an anger scene might affect subsequent scenes with all types of plot configurations and casts is almost impossible to trace. Such a scene-by-scene demographic and plot analysis with trained coders and reliability measures would still be going on and cost many times the budget we had for this study.

The ultimate outcome also depends on casting and plot. The hero always wins, regardless of who resolves any anger scene and how. What our study shows is a more important pattern, i.e. the overall pattern of anger in the general dramatic context that most viewers absorb. We found that most dramatic presentations use anger to provoke and express, not to resolve. The resolutions that do exist are reported in detail on pages 5 and 6. The total set of results provides a factual and realistic basis for your efforts; it is neither optimistic or pessimistic or even interpretive.

Again, as I also noted in the report, it is important to keep in mind what this study contributes and how it complements your efforts. It was not designed to deal with individual programs except as cited for illustrative purposes. It was designed to reveal features cutting across all types of dramatic programming, involving images and messages that large communities absorb over long periods of time. That bird's-eye-view brings out general patterns of anger in a representative and comparative perspective that cannot be obtained any other way. It does not select out "good" or "bad" examples, but shows what viewers actually see and what they may learn from what they see. Television can be a more powerful and positive potential tool only if these facts are confronted.

I have a major investment and interest in this study, and would prefer to collaborate with you on the final report. The next draft with its implications and suggestions for working with the creative community should be yours. My contribution will be to try to fit them as creatively as possible to the facts we found, and perhaps to make additional suggestions for your consideration. I am confident that we can agree, profit from the collaboration, and produce a significant contribution.

Please let me know if that is acceptable to you and what the timetable will be.

Sincerely yours,

George Gerbner, Professor and Dean Emeritus
Director, the Cultural Indicators Project
University City Science Center - One East
3624 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19104-6220
Tel/fax 215 387 5202

PS: Hard copy with enclosures, including corrected copy of draft report, is being sent by regular mail.