Journal of Personality and Social Psychology
1979, Vol. 37, No. 2, 170-179

Television Viewing and Fear of Victimization: Is the Relationship Causal?

Anthony N. Doob and Glenn E. Macdonald
University of Toronto
Toronto, Canada

Previous findings have suggested that people who watch a lot of television are more likely to fear their environment than are those who report being less frequent viewers of television. From this simple correlation, previous authors have suggested that television causes people to overestimate the amount of danger that exists in their own neighborhoods. The present study attempted to replicate this finding and to determine if the apparent effect was due to a previously uncontrolled factor: the actual incidence of crime in the neighborhood. Respondents to a door-to-door survey indicated their media usage and estimated the likelihood of their being a victim of violence. Neighborhoods were chosen so as to include a high- and a low-crime area in downtown Toronto and a high- and a low-crime area in Toronto's suburbs. Pooling across the four areas sampled, the previous findings were replicated. However, the average within-area correlation was insignificant, suggesting that when actual incidence of crime is controlled for, there is no overall relationship between television viewing and fear of being a victim of crime. A multiple regression analysis and a canonical correlation analysis confirmed these findings.

A variety of social problems have been attributed to television viewing. It is said that television makes people more violent, that it lowers the level of literacy in the population, and that it distorts the viewer's perception of the world. There is little denying that the picture of reality that comes into people's homes is not an accurate reflection of their own society. That we learn from television, as we learn from every other medium, seems intuitively plausible independent of research results. Gerbner and Gross (1974, 1976a, 1976b; Gerbner et al., 1976), however, have suggested something even more serious than simple learning effects: that people not only learn factual information, such as the proportion of people involved in law enforcement, but that they generalize from the information that they get from television. In particular, Gerbner and his associates show that those who watch a lot of television are more likely to feel that they might be involved in some kind of violence during a given week than do those who watch relatively little television. This same pattern of results shows up in a variety of questions having to do with the viewers' perceptions of various aspects of the society in which they live. As Gerbner et al. (1976) point out, "Their heightened sense of fear and mistrust is manifested in their typically more apprehensive responses

We wish to thank Julian Roberts for his help and useful suggestions at all phases of this work and Bob Gebotys for his help in analyzing the data. The Metropolitan Toronto Police were very open and helpful to us in providing the data necessary for choosing our experimental neighborhoods. The research was supported by the (Ontario) Royal Commission on Violence in the Communications Industry, and a version of this study is published in Volume V of that commission's report. We wish to thank Mr. C. K. Marchant, the Director of Research of that commission, for his help and encouragement throughout all phases of the work. The data analysis was supported, in part, by funds provided to the Centre of Criminology, University of Toronto, by the Ministry of the Solicitor General, Canada.

Requests for reprints should be sent to Anthony N. Doob, Department of Psychology, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5S 1A1.

to questions about their own personal safety, about crime and law enforcement, and about trust in people" (p. 9).

Obviously, heavy television viewing is not independent of other social factors. Gerbner and Gross (1976a) have found that "heavy viewing is part and parcel of a complex syndrome which also includes lower education, lower mobility, lower aspirations, higher anxieties, and other class, age, and sex-related characteristics" (p. 191).

Because of the problem of confounding variables, Gerbner has been careful to break down his data on various other characteristics of television viewers such as age, sex, educational level, news reading, news magazine reading, prime-time viewing, and viewing or nonviewing of TV news. The notable finding in all of these comparisons is that although there may be main effects of some of these other characteristics, in all cases, heavy viewers are more likely than light viewers to feel that they might be involved in some violence.

No list of possible confounding variables can be complete. The worry of any researcher doing correlational research and wishing to make a causal statement is that some other variable would, in fact, account for the effect apparently demonstrated. We felt that there is one quite plausible factor that might account for the correlation between viewing and fear of violence: People who watch a lot of television may have a greater fear of being victims of violent crimes because, in fact, they live in more violent neighborhoods.

The study that this explanation suggests, then, is quite obvious: A survey of the television viewing habits of people and their perception of being involved in violence should be performed in both high- and low-crime neighborhoods. Pooling across neighborhoods, we should be able to replicate Gerbner's and his associates' findings; within neighborhoods, however, the effect should be substantially reduced or eliminated.

Method

For purposes of efficient distribution of resources, the Metropolitan Toronto Police have divided Toronto into approximately 210 patrol areas. The size of these patrol areas varies not only as a function of the resident population but also as a function of the number of calls of all types that the police receive in the area: Busy areas thus tend to be smaller in terms of the size of the population served and in terms of geographic area. The police identified for us the 10 patrol areas with the highest number of reported assaults and woundings and the 14 areas with the lowest number of reported assaults and woundings for the 7-month period ending 2 months before the beginning of the survey. From these data, four geographic areas, approximately equal in size, were chosen. Two (one within the city of Toronto, the other suburban) were high in reported crime; two (one city, one suburban) were low in reported crime. It is difficult to estimate the exact rates of crime for the four areas. However, very rough estimates would suggest that the rates of assaults and woundings per 100,000 resident population for the 7-month period for the four designated areas would be the following: high-crime city, 614; low-crime city, 8; high-crime suburb, 195; low-crime suburb, 6. It must be emphasized that these are very rough figures: The low-crime areas each had only two reported assaults (and no woundings) for the entire 7-month period; hence the estimates are bound to be unstable. There were eight patrol areas constituting the high-crime city area; one patrol area was sampled for the high-crime suburban area and two each for the low-crime areas.

Obviously, the four areas differ considerably on a large number of social variables other than reported crime rates. The high-crime city area contains a portion of the downtown commercial/entertainment district of the city, the largest block of public housing in the metropolitan area, and much of the poorest portion of the population. The low-crime city area is largely expensive, single, detached houses and is one of the more exclusive residential areas. The high-crime suburban area contains a high concentration of low-rise public housing and is generally fairly poor. The low-crime suburban area is mostly single, detached, middle-class housing.

Random households were chosen within each of these areas. Interviewers, employed by a commercial survey company, did a door-to-door survey. The person who answered the door was asked to list all of the people over 18 years of age living in the household. One of these people was then chosen at random by the interviewer. If this person could not be interviewed at that time or at some mutually acceptable time, the interviewer went on to the next randomly chosen household, and the procedure was repeated. The effect of this selection procedure was an oversampling of women (70.5%) and, presumably, a general oversampling of those who spend much of the time at home. Although this effect would be unfortunate if one were interested in estimating population values for the measures that were taken, it was less relevant in our study, where we were interested in the relationship between television viewing and fear of criminal victimization.

Table 1
Mean Fear-of-Crime Factor Scores for Each of the Sampled Areas

Area	City		Suburb	
	M	*n*	*M*	*n*
High crime	.28	83	.15	69
Low crime	−.34	71	−.13	77

Note. The higher the number, the more fear.

Respondents were first asked to indicate those programs that they had watched during the previous week. According to our interviewers, very few people had any difficulty in doing this. They were then asked to complete a 37-item fixed-alternatives questionnaire. This questionnaire consisted of six questions dealing directly with the person's estimate of his or her own likelihood of being a victim of a crime; four questions dealing with estimates of the likelihood of particular groups of people being victims; four questions dealing with the perception of crime in general being a problem and there being a need for more police personnel; two questions dealing with the necessity to arm oneself; eight questions of a factual nature dealing with crime; three questions dealing with society's response to crime; four questions dealing with the respondents' view of Toronto with respect to crime; three questions dealing with the respondents' prediction of their response to a request for help; and three questions dealing with media usage. The whole interview took approximately 45 minutes on the average.

For purposes of analyzing the types of television, we decided to use the number of programs watched as an index of total viewing. In addition, programs were coded by a research associate into violent and nonviolent types before the tabulation of the other data. It should be pointed out that this last measure is, necessarily, somewhat subjective. However, as will be seen, this turns out not to be a serious problem in understanding the results.

Results

In order to reduce the number of measures to a somewhat workable number, a factor analysis was performed [1] on the 34 opinion questions. Using a varimax rotation, only one factor accounted for a substantial amount of the common variance. The percentages of the common variance accounted for by the first 4 of the 11 factors were 35.9%, 12.5%, 10.8%, and 8.4%. The questions that loaded highest on the first factor are shown in Table 4; they were the six questions related to the respondents' estimates of their own chances of victimization, two of the questions dealing with the chances of victimization of particular groups, and one of the questions dealing with crime as a general problem. Generally speaking, it seems fair to label this factor "fear of crime." Each of the next three factors had substantial loadings from only one or two questions.

As one would expect, the residents of the four areas differed significantly on their overall fear of crime. The average factor scores for the four areas are shown in Table 1. Analysis of variance on the factor scores revealed a main effect for high-/low-crime area that was highly significant, $F(1, 296) = 17.79$, $p < .01$. Neither the city/suburb effect nor the interaction was significant. It is clear, then, that people who live in high-crime areas, are, in fact, more afraid.

The four areas sampled also differed on their exposure to the various media. Table 2 presents these data. Overall, people in high-crime areas watched more television and, generally speaking, tended to watch more violent television. Although there were interactions between the two factors on these two measures, for the purposes of this article, these interactions are not very important. As one might expect, since the areas differed on so many dimensions, there were also effects on self-report of exposure to radio news: People living in low-crime areas tended to report listening to radio news more frequently. Furthermore, the reported frequency of newspaper reading was higher in low-crime areas and in the city.

Gerbner and his associates (Gerbner & Gross, 1974, 1976a, 1976b; Gerbner et al., 1976) do not directly present measures of association between the total amount of tele-

[1] The input for the factor analysis consisted only of those 300 respondents (of the total of 408) who answered every question. Most of the other 108 respondents failed to answer only a few of the questions. The proportion of complete questionnaires varied somewhat from area to area. The numbers of complete/total questionnaires are as follows: high-crime city, 83/119, or 70%; low-crime city, 71/118, or 60%; high-crime suburb, 69/85, or 81%; low-crime suburb, 77/86, or 90%.

Table 2
Media Usage for the Four Areas

Medium	High-crime area		Low-crime area		*F* value		
	City(119)	Suburbs(85)	City(118)	Suburbs(86)	High/low crime	City/ suburb	Inter-action
Total TV	36.25	31.71	18.89	25.03	25.21**	<1	4.98*
TV violence	6.97	3.73	2.11	3.33	23.25**	2.72	18.11**
TV news	3.07	2.99	3.72	3.74	2.83	<1	<1
Radio news	5.07	4.96	5.44	5.37	9.79**	<1	<1
Newspaper reading	4.78	4.58	5.26	4.80	6.89**	6.01*	<1

Note. For TV viewing, numbers refer to mean number of programs watched during the previous week. The other measures are mean values on a scale where 1 equals never and 6 equals daily. *n*s are in parentheses.
* $p < .05$.
** $p < .01$.

vision viewed by their respondents (in response to the question "How many hours a day do you usually watch television? Please include morning, afternoon, and evening") and their fear of being a victim of a violent crime (in response to the question "During any given week, what are your chances of being involved in some type of violence—about a 50–50 chance, about a 1-in-10 chance, or about a 1-in-100 chance?"). However, estimating from the data that are presented in the various reports, we calculated a phi coefficient of .13 and a contingency coefficient of the same value.

Looking at our data, then, we calculated the (Pearson) correlation between our fear-of-crime factor scores and our various measures of media usage. These correlations are presented in the first column of Table 3. It is quite clear that the basic effect is much the same as that found by Gerbner and his associates: Across the four areas, those who watched the most television (or violent television) tended to be those who were the most afraid. However, the effect *within* area is not quite so simple: Although the effect would appear to hold in the high-crime area of the city, it tended to disappear for the other areas. Indeed, the average correlations (last column of Table 3) indicate that there is essentially no relationship between media usage and fear of crime when the effect of neighborhood is removed. We have suggested that the artifact that created the first two correlations in the first column might be labeled "actual incidence of crime." However, in terms of the focus of this article (the relationship of media usage to fear of crime), the

Table 3
Correlations Between Media Usage and Fear-of-Crime Factor Scores for all Subjects (Pooled), for Each of the Four Areas, and for the Average of the Four Areas

Medium	Pooled across all areas	High crime		Low crime		Average correlation
		City(83)	Suburb(69)	City(71)	Suburb(77)	
Total TV	.18**	.24*	.16	.06	−.09	.09
TV violence	.18**	.22*	−.03	.14	−.04	.07
TV news	.05	.14	−.04	.05	.06	.05
Radio news	.05	.18	−.09	−.02	.21	.07
Newspaper reading	−.07	−.20*	−.14	.09	.15	−.03

Note. Positive correlations indicate more fear associated with higher media usage. *n*s are in parentheses.
* $p < .05$.
** $p < .001$.

Table 4
Fear-of-Crime Questions and the Correlations Between Responses to Each Question and Total TV Viewing and TV Violence for the Four Areas Pooled and the Average of the Four Areas Calculated Individually

Question	Total TV		TV violence		High TV viewing associated with
	Pooled	Average within area	Pooled	Average within area	
1. To what extent are crimes of violence a serious problem in your neighborhood? (399)	.07	−.02	.16*	0	Serious problem
2. What do you think the chances are that if you were to walk alone at night on the residential streets of your neighborhood each night for a month that you would be the victim of a serious crime? (391)	.18*	.10*	.19*	.05	High probability (1 in 10)
3. If a child were to play alone in a park each day for a month, what do you think the chances are that he would be the victim of a violent crime? (382)	.12*	.02	.22*	.12*	High probability (1 in 10)
4. If you were to walk by yourself in a park close to your home each night for a month, what do you think the chances are that you would be the victim of a serious crime? (391)	.10*	.02	.14*	.04	High probability (1 in 10)
5. What do you think the chances are that an unaccompanied woman would be the victim of a violent crime late at night in a Toronto subway station? (389)	.10*	.04	.09	.04	High probability (1 in 10)
6. What do you think the chances are that you, one of your family, or one of your close friends might be the victim of an assault during the next year? (385)	.13*	.02	.12*	−.02	High probability (1 in 10)
7. How likely do you think it is that you or one of your close friends would have their house broken into during the next year? (405)	−.04	−.07	.01	−.01	Extremely unlikely
8. Do you ever decide not to walk alone at night because you are afraid of being the victim of a violent crime? (402)	.05	.06	−.04	−.04	Very often
9. Is there any area around your home (i.e., within a mile) where you would be afraid to walk alone at night? (403)	.12*	.05	.02	−.06	Yes

Note. *ns* of respondents for each question are in parentheses.
* $p < .05$.

name given to this variable is unimportant: When the effect of neighborhood is removed, the "effect" of television is reduced to almost nothing.

Clearly, however, the artifact (whatever it is called) measures in only the crudest way the amount of crime that a person is exposed to. For example, a person living in one part of what we have labeled as a high-crime section of the city might, in fact, be quite safe: The crimes might well be in a different section of that patrol area. However crude the measure might be, the size of the correlations does drop dramatically.

It should be pointed out that correlations are responsive to effects other than the strength of the relationship between two variables. In particular, as McNemar (1962) points out, "the magnitude of the correlation coefficient varies with the degree of heterogeneity (with respect to the traits being correlated) of the sample" (p. 144). Given that we have divided our overall sample (into the four areas) in a manner that clearly relates to both of the variables (see Tables 1 and 2), this curtailment of the variance could be a problem. It turns out, however, not to be a serious problem in this case. The ratios of the standard deviations of the "curtailed" distribution (average of the four areas' standard deviations) to the uncurtailed distribution (standard deviation for the four areas pooled) are .965, .917, and .844 for the factor scores, total TV viewing scores, and TV violence scores, respectively. McNemar (1962) indicates that "formulas for 'correcting' for double curtailment are not too satisfactory" (p. 145). However, correcting for the curtailment of the range for the most curtailed distribution (TV violence) would only raise the average correlation between fear and amount of violent TV watched (averaged across the four areas) from .07 to .09.

The data look very much the same when analyzed question by question. The nine questions with the highest weight on the first factor of the factor analysis are shown in Table 4. In addition, the overall correlations for all subjects pooled across areas are shown in the first column (for each question with total TV viewing) and the third column (for the responses to each question and violent TV). All of the significant correlations are in the direction consistent with the Gerbner (Gerbner & Gross, 1974, 1976a, 1976b; Gerbner et al., 1976) findings (i.e., more TV associated with higher likelihood of victimization, etc.). Generally speaking, it is clear that the correlations tend to decrease substantially in size when they are run within the four areas and then pooled.

Table 5
Stepwise Multiple Regression Summary[a]

Variable	R when entered[b]	F when entered[c]	F in final equation[d]
High/low crime	.234	17.234**	16.704**
City/suburb	.235	.186	.051
Interaction: Crime × City/Suburb	.251	2.335	2.322
Sex	.350	19.858**	21.176**
Age	.376	6.605*	5.206*
Total TV	.385	2.363	.058
TV violence	.391	1.703	1.537
Radio news	.401	2.637	3.002
Newspaper reading	.403	.389	.389

[a] Variables entered in the order indicated.
[b] R achieved with this and all variables above it included.
[c] Equivalent to a test of the significance of the partial correlation between this variable and fear of crime with all variables listed above it partialed out.
[d] Equivalent to a test of the null hypothesis that the beta for this measure in the final equation involving all nine variables is zero.
* $p < .05$ ($df = 1$ and ≥ 290 for all Fs).
** $p < .01$.

An alternative method of analyzing these data is in a stepwise multiple regression analysis using the fear-of-crime factor scores as the criterion and various other social and media exposure data as predictors. In order to control for neighborhood, this was entered first into the regression equation (coded as three variables: high/low crime, city/suburb, and their interaction). Next, two subject characteristics, sex and age, were entered, since both of them related to the fear-of-crime measure. (Not surprisingly, women and older people reported higher levels of fear than did men and younger people.) After these more "basic" variables had been entered, total TV viewing and TV violence were entered. Finally, the frequency of listen-

Table 6
Standardized Canonical Variate Coefficients

Variable	High score indicates	Variate 1	Variate 2	Variate 3
Outcome set				
Question 1	No problem	.536	−.102	.339
Question 2	Low chance	.064	−.108	.266
Question 3	Low chance	.365	−.012	−.773
Question 4	Low chance	.107	−.175	.283
Question 5	Low chance	−.159	−.059	−.806
Question 6	Low chance	.394	.216	.541
Question 7	Unlikely	−.420	.131	.131
Question 8	Never	−.501	−.451	.417
Question 9	No	.028	−.577	−.281
Predictor set				
Total TV	Much	.079	.088	−.063
TV violence	Much	−.136	−.017	.335
Radio news	Little	−.177	−.194	.430
Newspaper reading	Little	−.014	−.168	.032
High/low crime area	High	−.609	.472	−.178
City/surburb	City	−.279	−.145	−.845
Interaction: Crime × Location	High suburb/ low city	.465	−.283	−.236
Age	Older	.010	.163	.096
Sex	Female	.229	.889	−.110
Canonical correlation		.608	.468	.305
p value[a]		<.001	<.001	<.002

[a] Using Wilks' lambda. Using the method of the greatest characteristic root, the third pair of canonical variates is not significant. For a discussion of this problem, see Harris (1976).

ing to radio news and newspaper reading were entered into the equation.

The results are shown in Table 5. It is clear that after the subject characteristics had been entered, the media questions had no significant predictive value. Most relevant to the Gerbner results is of course the lack of importance of total TV viewing when it first entered the equation.

Finally, a canonical correlation analysis was done, using the nine fear-of-crime questions (see Table 4) as the criterion set and the same nine variables as in the multiple regression analysis (see Table 5) as the predictor set. Three significant canonical correlations were found. The variates associated with these correlations are shown in Table 6.

The first pair of canonical variates suggests that those who do not see crimes of violence as a problem in their neighborhood (Question 1), who do not think that a child playing alone in a park is in danger (Question 3), and who do not think that they themselves are likely to be victims of an assault (Question 6), but who are afraid that their houses will be broken into (Question 7) and who do not walk alone at night (Question 8), tend to be females living in low-crime (city) areas.

The second pair of canonical variates appears to indicate that people who have areas near them that they will not walk in at night (Question 9) and who fear walking alone at night (Question 8), but who do not think that they will be victims of a violent crime (Question 6), tend to be females living in high-crime (city) areas who listen to a lot of radio news.

The third set of variates suggests that those who think that unaccompanied female subway riders (Question 5) and children playing alone in parks (Question 3) are vulnerable to attacks, but who themselves do not feel vulnerable (Question 6) and do not worry

about walking alone at night (Question 8), since their neighborhoods are safe (Question 1), tend to be suburban (low-crime area) residents who watch a lot of violent TV and do not listen to radio news.

The total amount of television watched did not seem to be important, and the amount of violent television watched entered into the interpretation only in the third canonical variate. Even in this case, it appears that the amount of violent TV watched related positively to the perceived vulnerability of particular groups (female subway riders and children playing alone in parks) but negatively to the perceived likelihood of the respondents themselves being victims of violent crime.

In summary, then, looking at these data from three somewhat different points of view, it appears that the amount of television watched did not relate to the amount of fear a person felt about being a victim of crime when other, more basic variables were taken into account.

Other Findings

As indicated earlier, we asked 25 other questions. Most of these questions related, directly or indirectly, to the respondents' views of the nature and frequency of crime or violence around them. In 14 of the questions, there was a significant relationship (pooled or calculated individually and then averaged) between TV viewing and the response to the question. The questions and the relationship of each question to TV viewing are shown in Table 7. What is noteworthy about these correlations is that there is generally not a substantial drop when the correlations are computed within area and then averaged (column 2 of Table 7). Thus, it appears that the relationship between total TV viewing and responses to these questions is not mediated by the area in which the respondent resides. These were the only other questions that correlated with TV viewing, and, at least from our point of view, they are qualitatively different from those that were large contributors to the "fear index" (see Table 4). Because it is not of central interest to this study, we did not look at other possible factors that might account for the correlations that we have presented.

Discussion

A number of things are reasonably clear from these data. First of all, the basic findings of Gerbner and his associates (Gerbner & Gross, 1974, 1976a, 1976b; Gerbner et al., 1976) are replicable: People who watch a lot of television are more likely to indicate fear of their environment. It is equally clear, however, that this relationship disappears when attempts are made to control for other variables, including the actual incidence of crime in the neighborhood. Thus, it would appear that television itself is not likely to be a direct cause of people's fear of being victims of crime.

Although clearly at the level of speculation, it is interesting to note that Gerbner's (Gerbner & Gross, 1974) own data on this issue were collected by telephone interview in four cities: Philadelphia, Chicago, Los Angeles, and Dallas. One can assume that there exists in these cities some variability in the dangerousness of different neighborhoods. Since households for that survey were selected randomly from telephone books, it seems reasonable to expect that neighborhoods differing in actual dangerousness would be included from each city. This variation could be sufficient to produce the apparently small correlation that Gerbner found. More interesting, however, is the possibility that for some unspecifiable reason, the relationship only holds in high-crime areas, or in high-crime cities in particular. As shown in Table 3, we, too, got significant correlations within the high-crime area of the city of Toronto. One possible admittedly post hoc explanation for this result is that television violence in the form of police shows and so forth deals mostly with high-crime city neighborhoods. It is possible that people outside of such areas do not feel that the violence on television has any relevance for them; hence, there is no relationship between the amount of television watched and the perception of the likelihood of being a victim.

Table 7
Questions Associated Significantly With TV Viewing: Correlations Between Responses to Each Question and Total TV and TV Violence for the Four Areas Pooled and the Average of the Four Areas Calculated Individually

Question	Total TV		TV violence		High TV viewing associated with
	Pooled	Average within area	Pooled	Average within area	
10. Would you imagine that you would be more likely to be seriously harmed by someone you knew previously or by a complete stranger? (400)	.12*	.09*	.04	.06	Previously known
12. How dangerous do you think it is for a female driver of a car to pick up a male hitchhiker who is a stranger? (404)	.09*	.06	.06	.06	Dangerous
13. Do you think that it would be a good idea to spend more money on police patrols of your area of the city? (403)	.11*	.06	.12*	.08	Definitely yes
17. Do you think that it is useful for people to keep firearms in their homes to protect themselves? (405)	.31*	.20*	.25*	.11*	Definitely yes
20. Should women carry a weapon such as a knife to protect themselves against sexual assault? (405)	.18*	.17*	.19*	.18*	Definitely yes
21. Some people have suggested that one way to reduce the incidence of violent crime is to encourage people to stay away from areas thought to be high in crime. Do you think that this is a good way of dealing with the problem of crime? (403)	.09*	.07	.09*	.06	Definitely yes
22. What proportion of murders in Toronto do you think are committed by people who could be classified as mentally ill? (381)	.11*	.10*	.08*	.09*	High proportion
23. Approximately what proportion of assaults in Toronto are directed against members of racial minorities (i.e., nonwhites) by whites? (359)	.10*	.12*	.09*	.11*	High proportion
24. What proportion of serious assaults in Toronto do you think are carried out by nonwhites? (364)	.08	.11*	.08	.12*	High proportion
25. How many murders do you think took place in metropolitan Toronto during 1975? (372)	.17*	.16*	.16*	.13*	Large number

Table 7 (*continued*)

Question	Total TV		TV violence		High TV viewing associated with
	Pooled	Average within area	Pooled	Average within area	
26. During the last 5 years, how many people do you think were murdered in the TTC subway? (384)	.15*	.12*	.09*	.08*	Large number
31. If you were walking alone on a residential street at night and someone asked you for directions, would you stop and give him the directions? (404)	.10*	.11*	0	0	Definitely not
32. If a person were to have an epileptic seizure on the street in front of you, how likely do you think most people would be to help? (405)	.10*	.07	.08	0	Very likely
33. If, in the middle of the night, a stranger knocked on your door and asked to use your telephone to call someone to help him start his car that had apparently stalled on your street, which of the following would you be most likely to do? (404)	.11*	.12*	.05	.03	Not help

Note. *ns* of respondents for each question are in parentheses.
* $p < .05$.

The second general point that should be made about our data is that although the correlation between TV viewing and fear dropped off when neighborhood was used as a controlling factor, this same factor did not eliminate the relationship between TV viewing and other factors (see Table 7). It is possible that the questions listed in Table 7 are, in fact, related to television viewing because they deal with matters of a more factual nature than the questions having to do with the person's own level of fear. Thus, television may well act as a source of information with regard to questions of fact, whereas it does not change people's views of how afraid they should be.

References

Gerbner, G., & Gross, L. *Trends in network television drama and viewer conceptions of social reality, 1967–1973. Violence profile number 6.* Washington, D.C.: Educational Resources Information Center, 1974.

Gerbner, G., & Gross, L. Living with television: The violence profile. *Journal of Communication,* 1976, *26,* 172–199. (a)

Gerbner, G., & Gross, L. The scary world of TV's heavy viewer. *Psychology Today,* April 1976, pp. 41–45; 89. (b)

Gerbner, G., Gross, L., Eleey, M. F., Fox, S., Jackson-Beeck, M., & Signorielli, N. *Trends in network television drama and viewer conceptions of social reality, 1967–1975. Violence profile number 7.* Philadelphia, Pa.: The Annenberg School of Communications, University of Pennsylvania, 1976.

Harris, R. J. The invalidity of partitioned-U tests in canonical correlation and multivariate analysis of variance. *Multivariate Behavioral Research,* 1976, *11,* 353–366.

McNemar, Q. *Psychological statistics* (3rd ed.). New York: Wiley, 1962.

Received February 24, 1978 ■