

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

DIMENSIONS OF VIOLENCE
IN TELEVISION DRAMA

A study of network programs transmitted
October 1 through 7 in 1967 and 1968;
conducted in October and November, 1968

for the
Mass Media Task Force
National Commission on the Causes and
Prevention of Violence

PROJECT STAFF

Principal investigator: George Gerbner, Professor of Communications.

Associate investigators: Marten Brouwer, Visiting Professor of Communications.
Consultant on data processing, and supervisor of study of role relationships in violent encounters.

Cedric C. Clark, Postdoctoral Fellow in Communications. Supervisor of data processing. Special study of values and ethnic relationships in violence (not available for this report).

Jay Haley, Director of Family Research, Child Guidance Clinic, Philadelphia. Special study of family relationships in the portrayal of violence (not available for this report).

Klaus Krippendorff, Assistant Professor of Communications. Supervisor of general methodology and computer programming. Special study of violent acts.

Administrative Assistant and Staff Supervisor: Michael F. Eeley

Technical Director: Vernon J. Wattenberger, Director of Facilities and Engineering

Assistants: Barry Hampe, Supervisor of Film Laboratory Services
John Massi, Supervisor of Broadcasting Laboratory Services

CONTENTS

PREVIEW	1
The task	1
Challenge and difficulties	1
Accomplishments	2
A bird's-eye view of the results	3
The extent of violence	4
The nature of violence	5
The people of violence	6
The world of violence	7
METHOD OF ANALYSIS	9
Selection of the television programs	10
Units of analysis and types of data generated	15
The recording of data	18
Reliability	19
Training of observers	20
Process of recording	21
Results	22
Analysis	24
Merging of categories	24
Effects of reliability	26
Effects of unitizing and conditional judgments	27
DIMENSIONS OF VIOLENCE	30
The extent of violence	32
Prevalence	33
Significance to the story	34
Rates of violent episodes and acts	34
The "seriousness" of violence	36
The nature of violence	36
Means and personal aspects	37
Group aspects	38
Witnesses to violence	39
Physical consequences	40
"Good" vs. "Bad" and "Winner" vs. "Loser"	41
The people of violence	41
"Violents," killers, and their victims	42
Males and females	43
Age and marriage	43
Forces of law and of lawlessness	44
Outcome: "happies" and "unhappies"	46
The world of violence	47
Time of action	47
Places and people	48
Law and its enforcement	49
APPENDIX A: The Recording Instrument for Programs as a Whole	
APPENDIX B: The Recording Instrument for Major Characters	
APPENDIX C: The Recording Instrument for Violent Episodes	
APPENDIX D: The Recording Instrument for Values Supported by the Process	
APPENDIX E: The Recording Instrument for Values Held by the Major Characters	
APPENDIX F: The Recording Instrument for Violent Encounters and Acts and Their Justification	
APPENDIX G: Tabulation of Results	

PREVIEW

This is a report of a study of violence in television drama. A brief description of the task and a bird's-eye view of the results here will be followed, in the next section, by a detailed account of the method of analysis. Understanding of the method will provide guidelines for the critical use of findings, summarized in the third section and tabulated in full in Appendix G. Appendices A through F contain the data forms, the instruments of analysis, and measures of reliability of observations for each instrument.

The task

In September 1968 the Mass Media Task Force of the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence contacted the principal investigator to inquire if a study of violence in television drama could be conducted and reported in less than two months. The study was to be based on a week's prime time network programming transmitted in 1967. The purpose of the study was to yield objective and reliable indicators of the extent and nature of violent presentations in the largest common body of imaginative cultural content shared by all classes of the American viewing public.

Challenge and difficulties

The scope and significance of the challenge was matched by its difficulties. Some of these were conceptual. What are useful indicators of violence in fictional dramatizations, and for what purposes? What comparative leverage can illuminate the meaning and tendency to be attributed to any indicator? How could a study based on 1967 material reflect the impact upon television programming, if any, of the tragic series of violent events that shook the conscience of the nation and the world in 1968? It was felt that the

study was worth attempting only if it could yield multiple indicators useful for a variety of investigative and policy purposes, if it could contain dimensions salient to problems of social communication theory and practice, and if it could include 1968 material relevant to tendencies and dynamics of television programming.

Other difficulties were logistical. A team of research collaborators, staff, and analysts had to be recruited immediately. Physical facilities and program material had to be obtained and organized. Instruments of analysis had to be constructed and tested without the opportunity for pilot studies. Analysts had to be instructed in the use of the instruments without the opportunity for intensive screening and training. It was anticipated that much information would fall below acceptable standards of reliability and would have to be discarded. Therefore, several simultaneous approaches had to be employed, at great cost to efficiency and economy, in order to assure corroboration of results and sufficient useful information even after eventual elimination of much that had been assembled.

Accomplishments

The decision to proceed with the study was taken in the understanding that this would be a "bare bones" report with little interpretation. Its purpose would be to extend the factual basis for a consideration of one aspect of television programming and for the further exploration of the dynamics and role of fictional violence in contemporary culture. Development of results, and the analysis and interpretation of findings, was to continue in a broader scope and context after the termination of the phase of the research reported here.

What follows, then, must be seen in light of these circumstances. It is submitted with satisfaction over having overcome some of the difficulties and

achieved some of the objectives, and regret over the false starts, the endless trouble-shooting (and finding), the elimination of much interesting material of questionable reliability, and the shortcomings that could not be avoided. The principal lessons for researchers and social agencies are (1) the confirmation of the adage that "haste makes waste," and (2) the clear conviction that if indecies of mass cultural content have theoretical, social, and policy significance, as we believe they do, only a systematic and continuous program of research, rather than spasmodic efforts, will be adequate to the task.

No accomplishment would have been possible without the indulgence of wives and friends for many evenings and weekends of work, the ready assistance of an able clerical force and particularly Mrs. Kiki Faye, the support of the research staff of the Mass Media Task Force, and the full cooperation of the television networks.

A bird's-eye view of the results

All network television programs transmitted during prime evening time and Saturday morning in the week of October 1 through 7, 1967, and in the same week in 1968, were screened or monitored for this study. Regular television dramas, cartoon programs, and feature films presenting one or more plays were subjected to analysis by pairs of trained analysts. Using methods described in the next section, and instruments attached as Appendices A through F, the analysts recorded observations about the prevalence and "seriousness" of violence in each play; the rates and types of violent episodes; the role of major characters in inflicting violence and falling victim to it; the role different times, places, people, and the law play in the world of dramatic violence; the significance of the violence to the plays' plots; and, when the violence was an integral part of the plot, the rates and some characteristics of encounters between parties inflicting and suffering violence.

Key terms used throughout this report (explained in detail in the section on Methods of Analysis), and the way in which they are used, are, therefore, as follows:

"Program" or "play" are synonymous unless otherwise noted, and mean a single fictional story presented in play or skit form. "Violence" means the overt expression of force intended to hurt or kill. A "violent episode" is a scene of whatever duration between the same violent parties. A story element, such as violence, "significant to the plot" is one that would be noted in a one-page general synopsis of the play. An "act of violence" or "encounter" is action originating in a particular source and directed toward a particular receiver without a major shift in the style of action.

During the week of October 1 through 7, 1967, the three television networks transmitted 96 plays in 64 hours of broadcast time. During the same week in 1968 the networks transmitted 87 plays in 58½ hours of time. In the total of 183 plays or 122½ program hours analyzed, 455 characters played major parts, 241 of them violent. These occurred in 149 plays (or 104.4 program hours), which contained a total of 872 violent episodes. Of all plays containing violence, 112 plays (or 78.9 program hours) portrayed violence significant to the plot. These plays included 1215 separate violent encounters.

The extent of violence

Some violence prevailed in eight out of every ten plays. The average rate of violent episodes was 5 per play (ranging from 3 per comedy to 7 per cartoon or action drama) and 7 per program hour (ranging from 5 per comedy to 24 per cartoon hour).

Most violence was an integral part of the play in which it occurred. The average rate of acts of violence in these plays was 11 per play or 15 per hour. Eight out of every ten of both violent episodes and acts were presented as serious rather than humorous occurrences.

There was no evidence of overall decline in the prevalence of violence from 1967 to 1968. Some indications of possible moderation come from slight and selective reductions in the rates of violent episodes per play, in the proportions of "serious" violence, and in the proportions of plays in which violence was significant to the plot. The rates of violent encounters in these plays indicated that, except for CBS programs, the saturation of such programs with acts of violence remained in 1968 what it was in 1967.

Programming on CBS generally featured the least violence, and moved in two different directions: the prevalence and rate of violent episodes increased somewhat from 1967 to 1968, but the proportion of violence significant to the plots, and the frequency of violent acts in such plays, decreased. ABC, the most violent in many respects, maintained its share of violent programming but reduced the proportion of programs containing the most significant type and the highest rate of violent episodes. Violence on NBC, as prevalent in 1967 as on ABC, declined slightly in some respects in 1968.

The nature of violence

Violent acts were usually at close range. They were inflicted mostly by means of a weapon, half the time upon strangers, and in the majority of encounters upon opponents who could not or did not resist.

Those who committed acts of violence generally perceived it to be in their own self-interest rather than in the service of some other cause.

Violent encounters were usually between males, and almost as frequently between different national or ethnic groups as within such groups. These encounters engaged group leaders more as initiators and group members more as targets of violence.

When there were any witnesses to scenes of violence, they were usually passive spectators. For every bystander who intervened to prevent violence, there was at least one who joined to assist or encourage it.

Pain or hurt was difficult to detect except when severe or fatal. Even so, some injury was evident in half of all violent episodes. The casualty count of injured and dead was at least 790 for the two weeks, 5 casualties per violent play, or 2 per episode with any casualty. One in every ten acts of violence resulted in a fatality.

Most violence occurred between clear-cut good and evil. The encounters engaged "good guys" inflicting as much violence as the "bad guys," and, if anything, suffering a little more but triumphing in the end.

The people of violence

The two weeks of dramatic programming featured 455 leading characters. By the end of the plays, 241 committed some violence, 54 killed an opponent, and 24 died violent deaths. A dramatic lead thus had an even chance of inflicting violence, one in ten to become a killer, and one in twenty to be killed. Most of those killed were also killers. However, less than half of all killers paid for their act with their lives. In fact, more than half of all killers achieved a clearly happy ending in the plays.

The "typical violent" was an unmarried young or middle-aged male. At least one out of three characters in every age group, from schoolboy to old age, committed violence, but the young adult and the middle-aged committed more than their share. They also played nine out of every ten killers and eight out of every ten fatal victims. The younger of the two age groups was more likely to kill, but the older was more likely to be the fatal victim.

The forces of law and of lawlessness, each numbering about one out of every ten leading characters, made up one-third of all "violents" and half of all killers. Criminals were somewhat more likely to commit violence, but, when violent, agents of law were as likely to kill as the criminals. Members of the armed forces were less violent than the other two groups, but, when violent, the most deadly; every other violent soldier killed an enemy. More criminals than soldiers and none of the agents died violent deaths.

Those who commit acts of violence may number as many "good guys" as "bad guys," but those fated for a clearly happy outcome (mostly "good guys") were slightly less likely to be involved in violence than were those fated for a clearly unhappy outcome (mostly "bad guys"). Even though half of all "violents" and nearly half of all killers achieved a happy ending, those who reached an unhappy end were more likely to commit violence, to kill, and, of course, to be killed.

The world of violence

The past, the future, and the far-away loomed large in the world of violence. The settings of plays without violence tended to be more contemporary, more domestic, and more localized to more civilized settings, inhabited by more

familiar people. By comparison, then, the world of violence was more global, more distant in time as well as in place, more mobile, and more exotic.

Foreigners and nonwhites committed more than their share of violence. But, unlike white Americans, for nearly every life taken they paid with a life of their own.

Violence rarely appeared to violate legality, and when it did, the law itself was likely to be violent.

*

To sum up -- the prevalence of violence in about eight out of every ten plays did not decline from 1967 to 1968, despite some evidence of moderation in its rate and tone. Most violence is individual and selfish, often directed against strangers and victims who do not resist. Violence stuns, maims, and kills without much "hurt." A count of visible casualties may find an average of 5 per play injured or dead. Those who inflict violence may be "good guys" or "bad guys," but they are not as likely to reach a happy ending as those who do not inflict violence. All major characters, especially males in the prime of life, have a better than even chance to commit violence, at least one chance in ten to kill, and can still reach a happy ending in nearly half the time. Foreigners and nonwhites are more violent than white Americans, but pay much more dearly for it. Television drama projects a largely violent America in wild world of many violent strangers, with a mostly violent past and a totally violent future.

METHOD OF ANALYSIS

In the following the method of analysis is described without reference to findings and interpretations. It was felt that a critical use of the findings of this study presupposes an examination of the procedures by which the data were generated, processed, and presented, and an understanding of the problems encountered in the course of investigation.

The first section describes the kind of observations on which the study was based, particularly with regard to the sampling characteristics of the available material. The second section describes the approaches to and terms of analysis, and notes the types of data generated. The third section discusses the process of recording the primary data for analysis with emphasis on the problem of achieving high data reliability. The fourth section discusses the analytical procedures applied on the data, particularly how errors in sampling and failures to achieve high reliability may constrain the validity of the findings.

Detailed descriptions of the instruments are attached as Appendices A through F. They may be used for possible replications of the findings.

By way of introduction and perhaps as an explanation for the shortcomings of this study it should be repeated that the study was commissioned in late September 1968, and a report on the findings was supposed to be available early November of the same year. Consequently little more than two weeks could be used to develop necessary tools of investigation. Pretests which normally result in refinements of the tool could here be used only as a way of selecting those variables on which information would be gathered. The extremely small amount of time available thus imposed a severe restriction on the number and kind of ideas that could have been operationalized otherwise. The findings and particularly the tools of investigation, therefore, leave much to be

desired in the way of improvements. Had the study not been executed under such severe time pressures these improvements would have been possible in the normal course of the investigation.

Selection of the television programs

Entertainment programs (but not news, public affairs, or other documentary type presentations) transmitted by the three national television networks (ABC, CBS, and NBC) in prime evening time and Saturday morning during the week of October 1 through 7, 1967, were made available initially for this study. In order to provide a basis for comparison between 1967 and 1968 network programming, the same types of programs were obtained for the same week in 1968. The hours of screening were 4 to 10 p.m. on weekdays and Sundays, 8 to 11 a.m. and 7 to 10 p.m. on Saturday, October 7, 1967, and 8 to 12 a.m. and 7 to 10 p.m. on Saturday, October 5, 1968. Any program still in progress at the end of the screening period was followed through to the end. (Commercial and public service announcements were logged and any violent content noted in them was recorded.)

All these programs were screened to select for analysis dramatic programs i.e. fictional presentations involving a story line.

Figures 1, 2, and 3 present charts of all programs analyzed on all networks during both study periods.

With the large number of children known to be watching television late in the evening, and the Saturday morning programming consisting mostly of cartoons, it was decided that a separate classification of programs by "children's hours" would be misleading. Some measures computed separately by program types, including a classification for cartoons, could indicate dimensions of programming designed especially for children. But even if adults seldom watch children's programs, the majority of children's viewing consists of programs designed for adults.

	Sun. 10/1/67	Mon. 10/2/67	Tue. 10/3/67	Wed. 10/4/67	Thurs. 10/5/67	Fri. 10/6/67	Sat. 10/7/67		Sat. AM 10/7/67
4:00	The Beagles							8:00	
4:30								8:30	
4:30	Magilla Gorilla							8:30	
5:00								9:00	
7:00	Voyage to the Bottom of the Sea							9:00	Casper
7:30								9:30	
7:30		Cowboy in Africa	Garrison's Gorillas	Custer	Batman			9:30	Fantastic Four
8:00					The Flying Nun	Off To See The Wizard		10:00	
8:00								10:00	Spider-man
8:30	The F.B.I.							10:30	
8:30		Rat Patrol		Second Hundred Years	Bewitched			10:30	Journey to Center of the Earth
9:00			The Invaders			Hondo		11:00	
9:00	Movie: Whatever Happened to Baby Jane	Felony Squad		Movie: The Trouble With Harry	That Girl			11:00	
9:30		Peyton Place	N.Y.P.D.		Peyton Place	Will Sonnett	Iron Horse	11:30	
9:30								11:30	
10:00								12:00	

ABC, 1968

	Sun. 10/6/68	Mon. 10/7/68	Tue. 10/1/68	Wed. 10/2/68	Thurs. 10/3/68	Fri. 10/4/68	Sat. 10/5/68		Sat. AM 10/5/68
4:00								8:00	
4:30								8:30	
4:30								8:30	
5:00								9:00	
7:00	Land of The Giants							9:00	
7:30								9:30	
7:30		The Avengers	The Mod Squad	Here Come The Brides	Ugliest Girl in Town			9:30	
8:00					Flying Nun			10:00	
8:00	The F.B.I.							10:00	Spider-man
8:30		Peyton Place	It Takes a Thief	Peyton Place	Bewitched	Felony Squad		10:30	Fantastic Voyage
8:30								10:30	
9:00	Movie: Do Not Disturb	The Outcasts		Movie: Cat Ballou	That Girl			11:00	
9:00								11:00	
9:30			N.Y.P.D.		Journey to the Unknown	Will Sonnett		11:30	
9:30								11:30	Fantastic Four
10:00								12:00	

FIGURE 1: ABC DRAMATIC PROGRAMS ANALYZED FOR 1967 AND 1968

	Sun 10/1/67	Mon 10/2/67	Tue 10/3/67	Wed 10/4/67	Thur 10/5/67	Fri 10/6/67	Sat 10/7/67		Sat am 10/7/67
4:00								8:00	
4:30								8:30	
4:30								8:30	
5:00								9:00	
7:00	Lassie							9:00	Franken- stien, Jr.
7:30								9:30	The Hercu- loids
7:30	Gentle Ben					The Wild Wild West		9:30	
8:00		Gunsmoke	Daktari	Lost in Space				10:00	
8:00					Cimarron Strip			10:00	Shazzan
8:30								10:30	
8:30		The Lucy Show		Beverly Hill- billies		Gomer Pyle	My Three Sons	10:30	Space Ghost
9:00								11:00	
9:00	The Smothers Brothers	Andy Griffith		Green Acres	Movie: Viva Las Vegas	Movie: The Yellow Rolls- Royce	Hogan's Heroes	11:00	
9:30								11:30	
9:30		Family Affair	Good Morn- ing World	He and She			Petticoat Junction	11:30	
10:00								12:00	

CBS, 1968

	Sun 10/6/68	Mon 10/7/68	Tue 10/1/68	Wed 10/2/68	Thurs 10/3/68	Fri 10/4/68	Sat 10/5/68		Sat am 10/5/68
4:00								8:00	Go-Go Gophers
4:30								8:30	
4:30								8:30	
5:00								9:00	
7:00	Lassie							9:00	
7:30								9:30	
7:30	Gentle Ben				Blondie	The Wild, Wild West		9:30	Wacky Races
8:00		Gunsmoke	Lancer	Daktari				10:00	
8:00								10:00	The Archie Show
8:30					Hawaii Five-0			10:30	
8:30		Here's Lucy		The Good Guys		Gomer Pyle	My Three Sons	10:30	The Bat- man
9:00								11:00	Superman Hour
9:00		Mayberry RFD		Beverly Hill- billies	Movie: Night of the Iguana	Movie: The Singing Nun	Hogan's Heroes	11:00	
9:30								11:30	
9:30		Family Affair	Doris Day	Green Acres			Petticoat Junction	11:30	The Her- culoids
10:00								12:00	

TABLE 2: CBS DRAMATIC PROGRAMS ANALYZED FOR 1967 AND 1968

NBC, 1967

	Sun. 10/1/67	Mon. 10/2/67	Tue. 10/3/67	Wed. 10/4/67	Thur. 10/5/67	Fri. 10/6/67	Sat. 10/7/67		Sat. AM 10/7/67
4:00								8:00	
4:30								8:30	
4:30								8:30	
5:00								9:00	
7:00								9:00	Super Six
7:30								9:30	
7:30		The Monkees	I Dream of Jeannie					9:30	Super Pres.
8:00	Walt Disney			The Virginian	Daniel Boone	Tarzan	Maya	10:00	Flintstones
8:00								10:00	
8:30		The Man From Uncle						10:30	
8:30	Mothers in-Law						Get Smart	10:30	Samson & Goliath
9:00						Star Trek		11:00	
9:00							Movie: Man's Favorite Sport	11:00	
9:30	Bonanza	The Danny Thomas Show	Movie: The Second Time Around					11:30	
9:30					Dragnet	Accident-		11:30	
10:00								12:00	

NBC, 1968

	Sun. 10/6/68	Mon. 10/7/68	Tue. 10/1/68	Wed. 10/2/68	Thurs. 10/3/68	Fri. 10/4/68	Sat. 10/5/68		Sat. AM 10/5/68
4:00								8:00	
4:30								8:30	
4:30								8:30	
5:00								9:00	
7:00	Adv. of Huck Finn							9:00	Super Six
7:30								9:30	
7:30		I Dream of Jeannie					Adam-12	9:30	Topcat
8:00					Daniel Boone	The High Chaparral		10:00	
8:00							Get Smart	10:00	Flintstones
8:30								10:30	
8:30	Mothers in-Law		Julia	The Virginian			Ghost & Mrs. Muir	10:30	Banana Splits Advent. Hour
9:00								11:00	
9:00		Movie: The Rare Breed	Movie: A Man Could Get Killed			The Name of Game	Movie: Khar-toum	11:00	
9:30	Bonanza							11:30	
9:30					Dragnet			11:30	Underdog
10:00								12:00	

FIGURE 3: NBC DRAMATIC PROGRAMS ANALYZED FOR 1967 AND 1968

The 1967 programming was made available by the networks in the form of videotapes and films. Only one potentially relevant program, "Captain Kangaroo," could not be obtained, presumably because the tape had been destroyed. The 1968 material was taped off the air. In a few cases in which technical difficulties interfered with the recording, the networks supplied the programs on tape and film. The fourteen days of programming included in the sample is thus sufficiently complete.

It should be noted that the selection of programs thus described cannot be regarded a random sample. The time periods of screening were chosen to include what large audiences are exposed to. A probability sample that would consider the known estimates of audience sizes and use the total programming of 1967 and 1968 as the universe from which the material for analysis would be drawn could not be taken. The availability of a week's programming in 1967 determined the choice of the same week for 1968. As it is, the dramatic programming selected for analysis from both weeks consists of a total of 183 plays or 122½ hours of dramatic network programming.

All this material was studied with respect to certain content dimensions. Programs that contained any violence were subjected to further analysis. Programs that contained violence integral to the story of a play were also independently studied to determine certain characteristics of behavior in violent encounters.

Violence was defined as the explicit and overt expression of the use of physical force, or of the intention to use physical force, to inflict hurt, injury, or death. Such expression had to be plausible and credible in the context of the program in order to be considered violent. Idle, distant, or vague threats; mere verbal insults, quarrels, or abuse; or comic or figurative expressions with no violent intent behind them were not considered violent. Of the 149 plays which contained some violence, 112 contained violence

"significant to the plot," defined as necessary for a one-page summary of the play's story.

Units of analysis and types of data generated

In content analysis, the definitions of categories and variables are an integral part of the recording instructions to observers. The instructions used in this study and the data sheets on which observations were noted are reproduced in Appendices A through F and are not discussed below. However, explicit in these instructions are also the criteria used to identify relevant units of recording. A brief description of the recording units on which this study is based is necessary before proceeding to other aspects of the method and to the findings. The nature of these units and the kind of data which the study produced are discussed below.

As already noted, urgency made the employment of several simultaneous approaches necessary, even though not all approaches were expected to, and did, result in usable findings. To estimate extent and nature of violence in televised drama the study employed six interrelated and complementary frameworks and units of analysis. In all cases judgments regarding the presentation of violence were limited to what was made available within a program. Also, in all cases, the kind of things recorded, the recording units, were defined in such a way that they could be enumerated.

A. "Programs." One unit of analysis was the program as a whole, meaning a fictional story presented as a play. The term "program" as used in this report, is, therefore not to be confused with a program as listed in a TV log.

It might better be regarded as referring to a "play." In most instances a drama was a single play. But in 1967 twelve cartoon sequences contained 30 separate plays, and three general entertainment shows contained 5 dramatic

skits. In 1968 seven cartoons contained 17 separate plays, and a children's variety show contained 7 separate plays. Each of these plays was considered a unit of analysis and is counted as a program. There were 96 such programs in 1967 and 87 in 1968, a total of 183. (Actual playing time was also measured to correct for differences between short and long programs.)

Appendix A describes the instrument of analysis focusing on the program as a whole.

B. "Major characters." Another approach, and unit of analysis, focused on major characters in all the plays, defined as those playing leading roles and representing the principal types essential to the story. A total of 455 such characters, or 2.5 per play, were analyzed with respect to their relationship to violence (if any) and a number of demographic and personality characteristics. The instrument used in the analysis of characters is attached as Appendix B.

C. "Violent episodes." This was defined as a scene of whatever duration which concerns the same agent and the same receiver. Thus, a battle scene would be an episode; a chase scene with a posse pursuing a man would be one episode, even if interrupted by flashbacks to other scenes. But an attack by one person on a second, in the course of which a third person attacks the first, would be two episodes. A total of 872 violent episodes were found in all dramatic programs. Various aspects of such episodes and of their participants were observed using the instrument attached as Appendix C.

D. "Values of program." An attempt was made to record "values supported by the program" as a whole, using the instrument attached as Appendix D. Very few of the observations generated by this instrument proved to be reliable, and the resulting data were not used in this report.

E. "Values held by major characters." Values were recorded for one major character per program, using the instrument attached as Appendix E. Problems of validity and reliability precluded the development and use of this information in this report.

F. "Acts of violence." Violent encounters were analyzed independently from violent episodes (noted above). While the analysis of episodes focused on characteristics of scenes of violence in all plays, the analysis of violent encounters was limited to the study of the violent interactions in those 112 programs in which violence was judged significant to the plot (as defined above). Thus the study of violent encounters yielded observations of violent acts originating in a particular human or humanized source and directed toward a particular human or humanized receiver who is (at least potentially) harmed by that action. A single "act of violence" may be one such action or a series of such actions without a major shift in the style of action. A total of 1215 acts were observed using the recording instrument attached as Appendix F.

The recording units are, therefore, interrelated as follows:

Each of the programs may contain a variable number of major characters and a variable number of violent episodes. Major characters need not be involved in violence. Values were recorded only for one major character per program and for the program as a whole. Acts of violence, on the other hand, were recorded only for programs in which violence was significant to the story or plot. And each such program could contain a variable number of acts of violence.

The types of scales that were used in the study are not uniform. Most of the variables are recorded in the form of nominal scales in which no order is assumed among a set of mutually exclusive categories.

In some cases, the definitions of the values of a variable imply an order of magnitude or extent. Although there might be some justification for treating many of these scales as interval scales, time did not permit to test

the presumed equality of the intervals implied. The semantic differential scales for describing major characters (see Appendix B) are regarded as interval scales.

In the recording of violent episodes (see Appendix C) some dichotomous classifications were used. These represent judgments regarding whether a delineated aspect could be observed or not.

It should be noted that when developing the recording instruments no attempt has been made to test for the statistical independence of the variables. Thus, some of the associations between content variables may not only reflect the nature of television violence but also possible semantic overlaps. This does not apply, however, for associations between content variables and network, for example, or for change over time.

The instruction manuals also requested the observers to record short descriptions and comments. This has in part been used to verify the codings. However, since adequate data processing devices could not be made available in time, no analytical use has been made of this information. Also, an informal log was kept (as noted in Appendix A) to record commercial and public service announcements. Any acts and products relevant to violence were noted in 995 commercials observed. Although the commercials in the 1967 data were not necessarily the original announcements carried at the time, a summary of the finding appears on Table 33 of Appendix G.

The recording of data

One of the main obstacles in content analysis and certainly the one which was most time consuming to overcome is the recording of data. Television drama rarely appears in an analyzable and easily measurable form. In order to make objective statements about dramatic events, its relevant aspects have to

be recorded in some detail, put into unambiguous categories, scaled or enumerated.

Reliability

The major problem in recording qualitative material is to design a recording instrument that is appropriate to the material under analysis, that maintains the information which is relevant to the research objective, and that does not lead to confusion by the observers (or coders). Rarely are all three requirements on the adequacy of data met jointly. If two independent observers are exposed to exactly the same phenomena, and their recording instrument yields markedly different or even contradictory descriptions, then the data generated by this instrument may reflect the observers individual biases rather than the properties of the phenomena under study. One important safeguard against such biases, and assurance of the phenomenon's representation in data, is high inter-observer agreement.

Measures of the degree to which agreement among independent observers is above chance are often referred to as reliability. In their common form as coefficients, they assume the value zero when agreement is purely accidental and unity when agreement is perfect. Such measures of reliability indicate the degree to which the recording process is affected by the observed phenomena rather than by the uncontrolled idiosyncracies of the observer. They are measures of the extent to which data can be relied upon in subsequent manipulations, and they define the upper limit on the possible validity of ultimate interpretation.

In this study two reliability coefficients were used. In the case of nominal (categorical) scales we used William A. Scott's coefficient of agreement ("Reliability of Content Analysis: the case of Nominal Scale Coding," PUBLIC OPINION QUARTERLY 17,3: 321-325, 1955). In order to make measures of

reliability on interval scales compatible with the former, a coefficient was devised that is sensitive to varying degrees of deviation from perfect agreement but makes otherwise the same assumptions as Scott's measure.

If n_{ij} is the frequency with which a unit of recording is assigned to scale value i by the first and to scale value j by the second observer, and if n_i and n_j is the frequencies with which the scale values i and j are used by the first and second observer respectively, the reliability is defined as follows:

$$a = 1 - \frac{\sum \sum n_{ij} d_{ij}}{\frac{1}{n} \sum \sum \left(\frac{n_{i.} + n_{.i}}{2} \right) \left(\frac{n_{.j} + n_{j.}}{2} \right) d_{ij}}$$

With $d_{ij} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } i=j \\ 1 & \text{if } i \neq j \end{cases}$ for nominal scales the measure becomes Scott's agreement coefficient. For interval scales, d is defined by $d_{ij} = (i-j)^2$.

In the case of two mutually exclusive categories the measures then assume identical values. (For a discussion of the properties of these coefficients see Klaus Krippendorff, A FAMILY OF BIVARIATE AGREEMENT COEFFICIENTS FOR THE RELIABILITY OF DATA, Mimeo, Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania, 1968.)

Training of observers

During the development phase of the recording instrument categories and scales were explained to a large number of observers who watched television shows jointly, and then had a chance to discuss the task and request further information on the meanings of the terms. Those variables that yielded apparently little agreement were modified and, in the case of the instruments described in Appendices A, B, and C, an initial reliability test was run which resulted in further modifications of the tool.

During the training phase for the recording process, observers were merely instructed as to how the instrument was to be used. In the case of the instruments described in Appendices A through E each observer underwent between two to four training sessions before the first data were actually recorded. In the case of that part of the instrument which is described in Appendix F, observers first were collectively instructed, then worked through a self-training manual prepared for viewing of three selected programs, and had one opportunity for individual consultation with the investigators.

The recording of data for the reliability pretest and for the final test after data had been collected was always done jointly by pairs of observers. Experiences during the developmental phase made this duplication seem necessary because pairs of individuals could presumably correct each other's idiosyncracies and see more than would isolated individuals. The data thus reflect joint observations by two individuals. In two cases an exception was made to this rule. The semantic differential scales described in Appendix B and the value ranking described in Appendices D and E required each individual of the observer pair to provide individual scores.

Process of recording

About 80 individuals were employed during the developmental and training phase of the instrument. Sixty-six individuals finally participated in the generation of data. Their age ranged between 18 and 28. About 55% were females. One half of the observers were undergraduates of the University of Pennsylvania, 40% were graduate students mainly from The Annenberg School of Communications. About 10% of the observers were not affiliated with the University.

During the developmental phase, it seemed advantageous to minimize possible confusion of the observers trained in the detailed recording of the

acts of violence in an encounter (Appendix F) with those trained in the recording of the program as a whole (Appendix A) and of the general characteristics of violent episodes (Appendix C). Consequently, 16 individuals worked on the recording of acts of violence, while 53 used the instruments described in Appendices A through E, and 3 individuals worked with all instruments.

The time required to use instruments A through E was approximately 80% of the program length while the instrument F required about 110% of the viewing time. Thus, the viewing and recording of a 60 minute program required approximately 110 and 160 minutes respectively.

The observers were paired unsystematically, i.e. they were rotated as much as possible but within the limits of the time periods in which they were available to the project. This rotation was an attempt to minimize the development of pair-specific idiosyncracies and preferences in recording. No control was introduced to assess their individual contribution to unreliability.

Results

It should be noted that the results of the reliability pre-test were not encouraging. If the study would have been under less severe time pressure, the recording instrument would have had to have been substantially modified. As it was, in order to produce some reliable data in the short time available and to utilize the data recorded for the reliability tests, definitions of categories and variables could not be altered. The only strategy for refinement was the merging of several categories into one and the elimination of variables from the instrument. Of some 200 variables of the original instruments only one-fourth turned out to be acceptable, one half was maintained because of lack of information, and the rest had to be rejected unconditionally. Anticipating that a large number of variables would

have to be rejected at a final test, all programs were screened and recorded with a battery of 148 variables.

To estimate the final reliability (see Table 1) of the population of data on which the conclusions in this study are based, a random sample of programs was again recorded by a second pair of observers. For the instruments reported in Appendices A through E the sample was drawn from the whole population of programs, and in the case of the recording of acts of violence, the sample was drawn only from the programs in which violence was significant to the plot. The actual values of the reliability coefficients are listed in the respective appendices, together with the recording or changing of categories as used in the report.

TABLE 1: FINAL RELIABILITY OF VARIABLES AS REPORTED IN DETAIL IN APPENDICES A THROUGH F

	above .800 uncondi- tionally accepted	between .667 and .8 condi- tionally accepted	below .667 rejected	
Program (Appendix A) N = 30	10	7	14	31
Character (Appendix B) N = 66	6	15	27	48
Episode (Appendix C) N = 52	5	7	1	13+1 ¹
Program Values (Appendix D) N = 15	2		16	18
Character Values (Appendix E) N = 15			18	18
Acts of Violence (Appendix F) N = 156	6+1 ²	7	5	19
Total	30	36	81	148

¹ reliability for one variable was not available

² of one variable only a part was above the .8 level of reliability. The remaining distinction had to be rejected

Analysis

Each viewing of programs by trained observers resulted in several data sheets which are reproduced in the Appendices A through F. They were then put on IBM punch cards as described in the same appendices, listed and verified by comparison with the original data sheets. Where necessary, the responsible observers were consulted to eliminate illegitimate codes. The NUCROS program proved most helpful in providing the analyst not only with many dimensional contingency tables but also with a variety of interpretative devices such as percentages across rows and columns, the values of chi-square, the contingency coefficient, etc. It also permitted to recode or lump categories. This recoding was necessary not only because some of the variables and categories appeared more meaningful when merged but also because of the results of the final reliability tests. Due to the extraordinary time limitations statistical relations between variables could not be explored, and the use of more sophisticated methods of analysis had to be postponed. However, in order to understand the manipulation of the data for this report certain comments have to be made.

Merging of categories

As mentioned above, time did not permit the introduction of substantial modifications of the recording instruments. Low reliability in the final test could therefore result only in two strategies: (1) a lumping of those categories among which confusion was evident and, when this strategy failed to improve data reliability, (2) a rejection of the variable involved.

For example, judgments regarding the seriousness of the violent encounter (see Appendix F) could not achieve the required level of reliability. Upon inspection, it was found that observers mainly confused the category "slapstick" with "self satire, high camp" and "scrimmage, friendly competition"

with "real fight, serious combat." When the distinction between the two humorous categories (both involving an audience) and between the two categories referring to competition and combat were dropped, reliability reached an acceptable level (.827).

A similar case in point is the judgment regarding the number of fatal and the number of non-fatal casualties which were designed (as described in Appendix C) as two independent dimensions. As it turned out, observers could judge the number of casualties involved more reliably than whether the casualty was fatal or not. Consequently, the scores on these two dimensions were added and appear in this report as one variable with conditionally acceptable reliability (.710).

Because of the importance that may be given to the results, strict adherence to scientific standards was essential. This often resulted in the rejection of variables that could have been saved -- if more time had been available. For example judgments regarding the ethnicity of the source and the receiver of violence yielded a reliability of only .656. Inspection revealed that this was in part due to an administrative error that could have been eliminated by inspection of the data sheets. An elimination of the errors encountered in the reliability data would have made this variable conditionally acceptable. However, since time was not available to check all data sheets, no report could be made on this variable.

Caution must also be exercised in combining categories when summarizing or interpreting the results of the report. How categories are reported and the reliability associated with their form are listed in the appendices. Any reclassification of categories may affect the reliability of the findings and -- unless the reliability is perfect or nearly perfect -- a different organization of the results might well produce potentially invalid interpretations. If variables are to be combined or categories to be recoded

it is therefore advisable to consult the reliability data.

Effects of reliability

The reliability also sets limits on the interpretation of data.

If n_i is the frequency with which the i -th category is used and Scott's coefficient of agreement $\hat{\eta}$ is known for the variable in question, then the proportion of erroneous category assignments to the total number of units of recording is

$$\frac{n_{\text{error}}}{n} = (1 - \hat{\eta}) \left(1 - \frac{\sum n_i^2}{n} \right)$$

The following Table 2 might illustrate the case in which frequencies in the available categories are equal.

TABLE 2: PERCENTAGE OF ERRORS IN DATA FOR TWO LEVELS OF RELIABILITY

No. of categories	Percentage of errors	
	at reliability level .67	at reliability level .80
2	17%	10%
3	22%	13%
4	25%	15%
5	27%	16%
.	.	.
.	.	.
.	.	.
.	.	.
∞	33%	20%

While the error percentages can only decrease when frequencies are not equal, differences in the findings below the error frequency must be interpreted with great caution. The interpretation of small frequencies

therefore becomes doubtful when the reliability is low.

The nature of the data, particularly the total numbers of recording units and the average reliability coefficients, furthermore suggests fractions of percentages to be quite meaningless.

Effects of unitizing and conditional judgments

There is another peculiarity of the data which needs special attention in interpretation. The samples involving different units of analysis (programs, violent episodes, characters and acts of violence) are not independent. The differentiation into programs precedes the identification of characters and violent episodes. And the identification of acts of violence is preceded by a judgment regarding whether violence is significant to the plot. The averages of the number of violent acts or the number of violent episodes per program are uniquely dependent on how programs are differentiated or unitized. In the case of serials with a continuing theme but different stories, decisions regarding where a program starts and where it ends are somewhat arbitrary. The effects of these decisions may be seen in the following table of the average number of violent acts per program (in which violence is significant to the plot) distributed over years and networks:

TABLE 3: AVERAGE NUMBER OF VIOLENT ACTS PER PROGRAM (AS DEFINED IN THIS STUDY)

	1967	1968	total
ABC	10.8	13.3	11.7
CBS	10.9	7.1	9.0
NBC	11.7	11.5	11.6
total	11.1	10.5	10.8

This table indicates that the networks were quite similar in 1967, but that CBS reduced the number of violent acts per program in 1968, whereas

that number seems to increase somewhat for ABC. One may be led to the conclusion that these differences in averages stand for real differences in the programs concerned. However, in interpreting such averages one must keep in mind that "program" refers to a particular recording unit. A dramatic presentation was considered a separate program if it was a story all by itself, so that some cartoon sequences, for example, would consist of a number of separate programs. An indication of the failure to consider such definitions is provided by a re-calculation of these averages on the basis of the way programs are announced by the networks. These larger units would tend to inflate the averages as can be seen in Table 4.

TABLE 4: AVERAGE NUMBER OF VIOLENT ACTS PER LISTING OF PROGRAMS IN TV LOGS

	1967	1968	total
ABC	14.1	14.3	14.2
CBS	15.9	12.1	14.1
NBC	14.4	14.8	14.6
total	14.6	13.9	14.3

The one and only inference which can be made safely is, therefore, that CBS reduced the number of violent acts per program from 1967 to 1968.

Another property of the data which is easily overlooked lies in the fact that violent encounters are regarded as consisting of one or more directed violent acts and not of the parties engaged in such interactions. However, several more general properties of the source and of the receiver and non-violent relations between them were recorded as background factors to explain the forms of violence observed. Such information is repeated as often as the same parties engage in violent forms of interaction of the same direction. Hence, frequencies associated with characteristics of sources

and receivers of violence do not refer to individuals or to relations of individuals. They express how often acts of violence are observed on the background of the properties concerned. Properties of and relations between individuals are enumerated strictly in terms of acts of violence..

A further consequence of conditional judgments might have to be considered when attempts are made to establish the statistical significance of findings. For example, if the large number (1215) of acts of violence are regarded as independent occurrences, then, as it turns out, many variables exhibit significant correlations. However, the observation of acts of violence is dependent on judgments regarding whether violence is an important ingredient of the plot. Hence, with the inclusion or exclusion of one program, the size of the sample of violent acts can be expected to increase or decrease respectively by 10.8, not by one. The unreliability of judgments that lead to the sample of violent acts need not affect the averages. But the fact that a set of units of recording depends on judgments made regarding another unit poses computational problems of accepting statistical hypotheses, and thus demand care in interpretation. This points again to the necessity for avoiding interpretations of small frequencies and for caution in attaching importance to small differences even though they may appear to be subjectively interesting. It is advisable to discuss most frequency differences in decimals rather than in percentages or in fractions of percentages.

DIMENSIONS OF VIOLENCE

Violence in drama, as in life, is a complex matter whose subtle manifestations or full implications were not the subject of this study. The subject was the extent and nature of overt violence in television plays. The purposes were (1) to extend the factual basis for the consideration of one aspect of television programming; (2) to make a contribution to the understanding of some dimensions of the dynamics of fictional violence in the largest single body of dramatic presentations shared by all groups of the American viewing public; and (3) thus to suggest certain expectations about violent behavior and consequences, at least on television, that the presentations might cultivate.

The previous section described the selection of programs, the terms, units, and other conditions of analysis, and the methods used to control and measure the extent to which unreliable observations or prior judgment might affect the usefulness of the results in providing a basis for fresh judgment. The strictures on interpretation noted there should be kept in mind in reading and using the results. Here we shall give a descriptive account of the "bare facts" relevant to the extent of violent representations during the 1967 and 1968 study periods, and to selected manifestations of violent behavior, people, and circumstances in the fictional world of television drama.

The basic results of the study were coded observations generated in the manner described in the previous section and tabulated in Appendix G. Time did not permit the integration of tabular and text material. The tables of Appendix G provide information generated by each instrument which yielded at least partial results in time for inclusion in this report. Since the grouping of the findings reported here does not necessarily follow the same order, and reference to information bearing on the same issue but contained in

several tables would be unwieldy, no reference to tables will be made in this account. The interested reader is invited to examine Appendix G for a more comprehensive or different selection and interpretation of the facts.

Selected findings, generated by all instruments and units of analysis, will be discussed according to their relevance to these questions:

How much violence is there in television drama? Has the prevalence, significance, frequency, and "seriousness" of violent portrayals changed between the 1967 and 1968 study periods?

What is the nature of violence in television drama? What characteristics of violent behavior and of its consequences do the portrayals present to those exposed to them?

Who are the people of violence? What is the distribution of violent roles, and those of killer and victim, among various groups of the fictional population? What part does violence play in the fate of "good guys" and "bad guys?"

And, finally, how does the world of violence differ from the world of non-violent drama in historical time, in place of action, in nationality and ethnicity of the population and in some of its recurrent themes?

In order to take a measure of the extent of violence, and of some differences between violent and non-violent plays and characters, the analysis included all dramatic network programs transmitted in prime evening time and Saturday mornings for the weeks of October 1 through 7 in 1967 and 1968. The 1967 study period contained 96 plays and the 1968 period 87 plays, a total of 183. It should be noted again that the basic program unit analyzed was the play, and the terms program and play are used interchangeably and mean the same thing in this report. The previous section dealt with the effect of some multi-play (especially cartoon) programs (as the term is used in a TV log) upon the reporting of the findings. To correct for differences in playing time between short plays and skits and long plays or feature length films, the time of a program was also measured. The 1967 study period included 64 hours of dramatic programming, and the 1968 period 58½ hours, a total of 122½ hours.

Regular drama programs produced for television comprised 60 percent of all plays in 1967 and 63 percent in 1968, or 62 percent and 69 percent of program hours, respectively. Cartoons accounted for 33 percent of all plays in 1967 and 29 percent in 1968, but only 11 and 12 percent of program time, respectively. Six feature films were telecast each week, accounting for 6 and 8 percent of plays but 20 and 26 percent of program time, respectively.

Crime, western, and action-adventure style stories of all types comprised about two-thirds of all television drama, and comedies of all types included nearly half of all programs, with some changes in proportions and shifts in network share of each kind between the two study periods. Differences in the extent of violence between the 1967 and 1968 study periods and among networks may be attributed to shifts in a few program categories, or to policies affecting most programs, or to a combination of both. Therefore, some measures of the extent of violence have been tabulated (in Appendix G) by program type as well as by year and network.

The extent of violence

How much violence was there in television drama? Did the three networks share equally in the amount? Did the proportions change between 1967 and 1968?

The four dimensions dealing primarily with the amount of violent representations in general are prevalence, significance to the story, rate, and the extent of "seriousness" of violence.

Prevalence is the incidence of any violence on a program. It measures the extent to which violence prevails in dramatic programming regardless of frequency or other characteristics.

Significance to the story indicates the extent to which violence was an integral part of the plot of the play.

The rate of violence was measured as the frequency of violent episodes and acts per play and program hour.

"Seriousness" involved the style and context of violent portrayals. How much violence was presented in a light or humorous vein, and how much was shown as "for real?"

Prevalence

Some violence occurred in 81 percent of all programs and 85 percent of all program hours. The prevalence of violence in dramatic programming did not decline between 1967 and 1968. If anything, there was a slight (4 percent) increase in the proportion of hours devoted to programs containing violence.

Dramatic programming on ABC and NBC comprised a larger proportion of plays containing violence than did such programming on CBS. However, CBS increased its percentage of violent programming between the 1967 and 1968 study periods.

Nearly all crime, western, and action-adventure type programs (97 percent), and cartoon programs (95 percent) contained some violence. Two-thirds of all comedies contained some violence. The proportions did not decline between the two study periods.

Two-thirds of all programs but three-fourths of all violent programs were in the crime, western, action-adventure categories; 31 percent of all programs but 36 percent of all violent programs were cartoon plays; and 47 percent of all programs but only 38 percent of all violent programs were comedies.

If the prevalence of some violence did not decline between the study periods, some indication of moderation comes from measures of significance, rate, and "seriousness."

Significance to the story

Violence may be only in the background, or it may be an integral part of the story. The measure of significance was used to ascertain the proportions of these two types of presentations. (It was also employed as a screening device to select out those plays in which violent encounters and acts were to be subjected to further analysis.) The criterion of "significance to the plot" was whether or not the violence, regardless of its type or amount, would have to be noted in a one-page summary of the story of the play.

Most plays containing any violence contained violence integral to the story. Eight out of every ten violent programs in 1967 and seven out of ten in 1968 contained violence significant to the plot. Whether this slight change represents a real decline or merely reflects shifts in the proportion of different types of plays is not certain, but at least the overall significance of violence to the stories of all plays did not increase on any network from 1967 to 1968.

Rates of violent episodes and acts

The observation of violent episodes (scenes of violence involving the same parties) made it possible to calculate the frequency of such episodes per play and program hour. The independent observation of violent acts (actions by each party in each violent encounter on programs where violence was judged to be significant to the plot) made it possible to calculate the rate of such acts per such program.

During the 1967 study week, a total of 478 violent episodes were observed on all dramatic programs. During the 1968 study week, 394 such episodes were observed. This decline of 18 percent, compared to the 10 percent decrease of all dramatic programs analyzed, indicates the possibility of a slight reduction in the overall number of violent episodes.

Violent episodes ranged from 3 per comedies to 7 per cartoons or crime, western, action-adventure plays, and from 5 per hour of all comedy programming to 24 per hour of cartoons. The overall rate of violent episodes was 5 per play or 7 per program hour. Programming which contained any violence at all, contained an average of 6 violent episodes per play and 8 per hour. Reductions in these rates by less than one point per play and per hour indicate that the frequency of violent episodes might have declined slightly from 1967 to 1968. But the overall reduction, if any, was not evenly distributed.

CBS programs generally contained somewhat lower rates of violent episodes than did those of the other two networks. But while ABC and NBC reduced their frequencies of violent episodes, those of CBS increased between the two periods.

Another way to look at these figures is to note that of all violent episodes on all networks for both years, 35 percent was transmitted by ABC, 37 percent by NBC, and 28 percent by CBS. But while in 1967 ABC was leading with 41 percent, NBC was second with 36 percent, and CBS was third with 23 percent, in 1968 NBC led with 37 percent, CBS was second with 35 percent, and ABC third with 28 percent. A reduction in the number of cartoon, crime, and other action programs as well as perhaps in the general level of violent episodes on ABC, and an increase in cartoon violence on both CBS and NBC, appeared to have been the major sources of these relative shifts.

The rate of violent acts per play (in which violence was significant to the plot) was 11.1 in 1967 and 10.5 in 1968. The only substantial change was a reduction of the rate of violent acts from 10.9 to 7.1 per play on CBS programs. In other words, although CBS, generally the least violent, increased its share of dramatic violence, it reduced the frequency of violent acts on those programs on which violence was most germane to the story.

The "seriousness" of violence

It can be argued that part of the appeal of violence is that it is always relevant to personal existence, well-being, and integrity. To that extent, violence is always serious. Whether presenting it in a humorous way makes it more or less acceptable or more or less a part of a given framework of knowledge are issues that measures of presentation alone cannot resolve.

Measures of "seriousness" can indicate dramatic convention, convenience, and intent. They show that even when we include such fantasy plays as cartoons (the most saturated with violence), the great bulk of all violence occurs in a serious or sinister context.

Three-fourths of all violent programs and nearly nine out of every ten violent episodes were found in the crime, western, action-adventure categories. Nearly all such programs contained some violence. But separate observations in all program categories showed that eight out of every ten violent episodes in all plays occurred in a serious or sinister context. Eight out of every ten violent acts were also judged as "serious." In other words, overtly humorous (slapstick, sham, satirical) intent could be observed in only two out of every ten violent episodes or acts across all program categories. However, there appeared to be a shift (of perhaps one in every ten) toward a higher proportion of "humorous" and correspondingly lower proportion of "serious" types of violence between the two study periods.

The nature of violence

What happens in violent incidents, and how? What are some personal and social characteristics and consequences of violent behavior in television drama? The ways in which violence tends to be portrayed may be at least as relevant to the cultivation of public assumptions as the amounts of violence

presented. We turn, therefore, from a general account of "how much" to more specific questions about the nature of violent representations.

Two different approaches, and units of analysis, focused on selected characteristics of violent behavior. One was the observation of episodes (scenes) of violence (as defined on page 16) in all plays, inquiring into aspects such as the agents of violence, means of violence, witnesses to violence in the play, and group relations among violent opponents. Another set of observations dealt with acts of violence (as defined on page 17) in plays in which violence was significant to the plot (112 out of the total 183). The focus of most observations of violent acts was the nature of the interaction between sources and receivers of violence.

Any reference to persons involved in violent episodes and acts is not to individuals as such but to their participation in the incidents observed. A single individual may participate in several capacities. Participation as both source and receiver of violent acts tends to equalize figures in those categories and gives such differences as may occur a somewhat larger importance.

Three-fourths of all violent episodes involved human agents (both "live" and cartoon). The rest were divided among "humanized" (speaking) and other animals, creatures and "things" (such as a robot), and "accidents" (which, in fiction, are of course not accidental). There was no "act of nature" found as an agent of violence.

All violent acts involved human or human-like sources and receivers.

Means and personal aspects

Weapons were used in at least six out of every ten violent episodes and acts. Small instruments were used to commit one-third of all violent acts. More complex instruments, ranging from machine guns and explosives to elaborate devices of torture or of mass destruction, were used in 26 percent of the acts.

In the majority of acts (six out of ten) those who committed violence perceived it as in their own personal self-interest rather than as a service to some other cause.

Was it effective? At least in terms of immediate response, it was. Again six out of ten violent acts evoked no response from their victims; they could not or did not resist. Counter-violence was the response in 36 percent of the acts; non-violent resistance in 6 percent of the acts.

Was it personal? In seven out of ten acts the violent opponents were within easy talking distance. In 24 percent of the acts they were more distant but still within sight; in 4 percent they were out of sight of each other.

Violent encounters may be at close range but they are rarely among intimates. Half of all violent acts took place between parties having no other contact with each other.

In at least eight out of every ten violent acts both sources and receivers were male. The source of violence was female in 7 percent of all acts generated, and the receiver was female in 6 percent of all acts received. The rest were indeterminate or mixed as far as the sexes of sources and receivers were concerned. A sexual aspect to the relationship between sources and receivers was noted in 4 percent of all violent acts.

Group aspects

Nationality, ethnicity, or family membership of the opponents could be observed in two-thirds of all violent episodes. In about one-third, violent opponents were of the same nationality or ethnicity. Violence between different national or ethnic group members was observed in 28 percent of all violent episodes. Violence between members of the same family was rare (2 percent of all violent episodes).

An indication of the group structure of violent encounters, and of the effect of group membership upon chances of generating and suffering violence, comes from the analysis of acts coded separately by sources and receivers. Among those involved in violent encounters, isolated individuals, group leaders, and groups themselves each generated about one-fifth of all violent acts, and individual group members generated more than one-third. On the receiving end, however, group leaders suffered less and group members more than their share. Group leaders generated 21 percent of all acts of violence attributed to a source and received 18 percent of violent acts attributed to a receiver, while group members committed 37 percent of violent acts generated and suffered 40 percent of all violent acts received. If there is any pattern in these slight differences, it suggests that, among those involved in violence, there is greater safety in isolation from, leadership of, or total submerging in a group than in being an identifiable group member. Followers administered 16 percent more of all violent acts committed than did the leaders, but became the targets of 22 percent more of all violent acts inflicted than did the leaders.

Witnesses to violence

Is violence presented as accepted or acceptable in the social context of the portrayal itself? One way to approach that question is to observe whether there are witnesses to violence in the play, and, if there are, to note their reaction or relation to the violence.

Witnessing violence in fiction, and especially on television, is difficult to pinpoint. Frequent closeups and medium shots tend to exclude witnesses. The presence and reaction of witnesses in drama is not an independent occurrence but part of the whole structure and intent of the play. Even if

witnesses are assumed to be present, showing them and their reactions adds to the cost and complications of the scene, and is done to make a point in the story.

Half of all violent episodes did not show any witnesses. When witnesses were shown they were usually passive. In one-third of all violent episodes witnesses were present but did not or could not react. In 8 percent of all episodes witnesses attempted to prevent violence. In 9 percent of all episodes witnesses assisted or encouraged violence. On the whole, it is safe to conclude that violence is rarely shown as unacceptable in the immediate social context of the world of television drama.

Physical consequences

Violence was defined as an overt act with intent to hurt. Yet "hurt" was difficult to detect unless it was severe or fatal. At least three-fourths of all violent acts had no permanent physical effects upon the victims. Some incapacity was observed in 7 percent and death or annihilation in 9 percent of the acts. We should note that focusing on acts rather than individuals tends to emphasize the more repeatable (and, therefore, less serious) consequences; a victim may suffer several acts of violence but only one fatality.

Focusing on violent episodes rather than discrete acts revealed that half of all episodes resulted in physical injury or fatality. The average rate was almost two casualties per violent episode. Three-fourths of all episodes with any injury resulted in a single casualty, 13 percent in two casualties, another 8 percent in three to eight casualties, and 6 percent in eight or more (including mass) casualties.

Gory details of physical injury (blood and wounds) were shown in 14 percent of all programs, or 17 percent of violent programs.

"Good" vs. "Bad" and "Winner" vs. "Loser"

In at least eight out of every ten violent acts, the opponents were clearly recognizable as "good" or "bad" and as ultimate "winners" and "losers." The initiative for violence was equally divided between the "good guys" and the "bad guys," and between the "winners" and the "losers." But on the receiving end the "good guys" suffered five out of every ten acts while the "bad guys" received only three out of every ten. The difference between "winners" and "losers" as targets of violence was less pronounced but in the same direction; "winners" were subjected to violence in 35 percent and losers in 31 percent of all acts received.

The pattern remained the same with "good guy winners" and "bad guy losers." Violent acts tended to engage the two combined types equally as sources but not as receivers. Violent virtue suffered more than violent evil, but triumphed.

The people of violence

Violence is a form of conflict in which lives are at stake, and force governs the outcome. Who is given the power to inflict violence upon whom in television drama? What are some characteristics of the killers and of their victims? What parts do the forces of law and of lawlessness play in the distribution of violence? What part does violence play in the fate of the fictional characters?

These questions guided the analysis of all major characters (defined as those playing leading roles and representing the principal types essential to the story) in all plays, both violent and non-violent. A total 455 such characters were found in the plays analyzed for both 1967 and 1968. Nearly one out of every four (23 percent) were cartoon characters; nearly nine out of every ten (89 percent) were human (both "live" and cartoon); the rest were "humanized" (speaking) and other animals, and a robot.

Unmarried white males in the prime of life dominated the dramatic lead population. Violence was the dominant theme of life in their fictional world. What was the pattern of relative allocations? We shall look at these as the proportions of "violents," killers, and their victims in the different groups, and as the representations of different lead population groups among all "violents," killers, and fatal victims.

"Violents," killers, and their victims

At least half of all characters inflicted some violence upon others. The proportion of these "violents" was 56 percent in 1967 and 50 percent in 1968.

At least one out of every ten leading character (12 percent) was a killer. Fatal violence was inflicted by more than one in every five (22 percent) of those who committed any violence. The proportion of killers remained unchanged from one study period to the other.

Widespread victimization was evident but again difficult to specify unless it resulted in a fatality. At least 5 percent of all characters, 8 percent of all violent characters, and 15 percent of all killers died violent deaths.

Most of those who suffered fatal violence also committed violence,

but most killers did not die violent deaths. Of the 25 major characters killed in all television plays, 20 inflicted violence upon others and 8 were killers themselves. Of all 54 killers, 46, or three-fourths, did not pay for their acts with their own lives.

Males and females

Male characters dominated the world of television drama four-to-one. Among those who committed some violence, males outnumbered females more than six to one. Among the killers, males outnumbered females eight to one, and among the fatal victims of violence seven to one.

To look at these figures another way, 58 percent of all male leading characters and 33 percent of all female leading characters committed some violence. Of violent males, 23 percent (or, of all males, 13 percent) were "killers." Of violent females 18 percent (or of all females 7 percent) were "killers." Finally, 6 percent of all males and 3 percent of all females died violent deaths.

Age and marriage

The average character had an even chance of committing some violence. The likelihood increased with age but declined in old age. Middle aged characters and those of indeterminate age (mostly cartoon characters) had a greater than average share of "violents." More specifically, "violents" comprised one-third of all preschool and primary school age characters, 45 percent of secondary school age characters, 48 percent of young adults, 56 percent of middle aged characters, 42 percent of those in old age, and 65 percent of indeterminate or "ageless" characters.

Young adults and middle aged characters played nine out of every ten killers and eight out of every ten victims of fatal violence. Each of these two age groups had a greater share of killings than their proportion of the total population might suggest. The younger of the two was less likely to play violent roles than the older but more likely to commit fatal violence. However, the older characters were much more likely to fall victims of fatal violence than the younger.

These chances of killing in the prime of life and of violent death in middle age can be seen in the findings that of all violent young adults one-third turned killers, whereas of all violent middle aged characters 24 percent turned killers. However, most fatal victims (60 percent), were middle aged. The violent fatality rate among young adults was 3.4 percent. Among middle aged characters it was 7.3 percent.

Being or getting married reduced chances of being involved in violence. Characters portrayed in the plays as married played 29 percent of all major parts, 22 percent of "violents," 19 percent of violent killers, and 12 percent of fatalities. The bulk of "violents," killers, and their victims came from among the unmarried characters or those whose marital status could not be ascertained. More of these engaged in violence than of the married characters (58 percent against 40 percent), turned killers (14 percent against 8 percent of the marrieds), and died violent deaths (7 percent against 2 percent of the marrieds).

Forces of law and of lawlessness

The forces of law and of lawlessness together made up one-fourth of the total lead population of television drama, one-third of all violent characters, and half of all killers.

Criminals numbered 10 percent of all characters, 15 percent of violent characters, 20 percent of killers, and 24 percent of those killed. Arrayed against them were public and private agents numbering 9 percent of the total lead population, 11 percent of the "violents," and 13 percent of the killers, but none of the killed.

Violent acts engaged criminals in about two out of every ten and public and private agents in one out of every ten such encounters. But while criminals inflicted 22 percent of all acts generated and suffered only 17 of all acts received, the agents were equally balanced on both ends of the violent encounters. The imbalance we have observed earlier between virtue and evil on the receiving end of violence may be due, in part, to criminals suffering less frequent but more lethal violence than others.

Most criminals (82 percent) engaged in some violence; 25 percent of all criminals and 31 percent of violent criminals killed someone; 14 percent of all criminals were killed.

Police and other official law enforcement agents were almost as violent but they rarely if ever paid with their own lives. Seven out of every ten official agents of law committed violence, two out of ten with fatal result. Those who committed violence, were as likely to kill as were violent criminals.

Fewer private agents were violent (67 percent), and they rarely killed or were killed.

The armed forces of various states made up 6 percent of the total lead population, about the same proportion of "violents," 15 percent of the killers, and 12 percent of the fatal victims.

Fewer members of the armed forces (six out of ten) committed violence than did either agents or criminals. When they did, they killed more often but suffered fewer casualties themselves. Half of all soldiers involved

in violence killed but only one in ten fell victim of an opponent.

Outcome: "happies" and "unhappies"

Violent good and evil may commit the same number of violent acts, but are all good and evil equally violent?

Not quite. Most of the "good guys," usually also the "winners," are by definition those who achieve a happy outcome in the stories. "Bad guys - losers" come to an unhappy end. Six out of every ten major characters reached an unmistakably happy, and two out of ten an unhappy end; the rest were mixed or indeterminate. The "happies" numbered 6 percentage points less among the "violents" than among all, while the "unhappies" numbered 5 percentage more among the "violents" than among all. The "mixed" had the same share among both.

The pattern extends to killers. The proportion of "happies" among all killers declines by another 6 percentage points, and the proportion of "unhappies" among killers further increases by 5 percentage points.

So, even though more than half of all "violents" and nearly half of all killers may be destined for a happy ending, violence and killing each make a happy outcome less likely for one out of every ten major characters.

If we look at the figures from the point of view of those destined for different fates, we find that nearly half (47 percent) of the "happies" commit violence and nearly one out of every ten "happies" (9 percent) turns killer; the proportions are only slightly below those for the total lead population. For the "unhappies" the proportions are above those for all: seven out of every ten "unhappies" commit violence, two out of ten become killers, and three out of ten die violent deaths. Being fated for a happy or unhappy end makes a difference in violence for two out of ten and in killing for one out of ten characters. None of the "happies" died a violent death;

of all those who did ended unhappily, which is surely a tautology.

The world of violence

What is the setting of the fictional world in which violence is prevalent? What kind of people inhabit that world? How is the law enforced in that world?

Dimensions of the analysis addressed to these questions compared violent and non-violent television plays with respect to the time and place of action, nationality and ethnicity of populations, and aspects of law enforcement portrayed.

Time of action

Most television plays were set in contemporary America. Eight out of every ten contained some violence. Those that did not were more likely to take place here and now. The world of violence in television drama tended to be more distant and exotic.

The "present" (1960'ies) was the time of action in 85 percent of the non-violent plays but only 55 percent of the plays that contained violence.

The past was the time of action in only a negligible portion (3 percent) of non-violent plays but 26 percent of the violent plays.

The future was never shown without some violence. It was the time of action in one out of every ten violent plays.

The time of action was indeterminate in one out of ten plays regardless of violence.

Looking at the figures from the point of view of the incidence of violence by time periods, we find that 98 percent of all plays set in the past contained violence, the future was always violent, the "present" contained less than the average share of violent plays (74 percent), and the plays set in

several or no identifiable time periods contained the average share of violence (79 percent).

Places and people

Violence tended to shift the action toward other places, as well as to other times. The location was several countries, indeterminate, or totally outside the U.S. in 38 percent of violent plays but only 15 percent of non-violent plays. Other countries and foreign or minority groups or people were significant themes in four out of ten violent but only two out of ten non-violent plays.

Moving through wilderness or space was also twice as frequent in violent plays as in non-violent plays. Uninhabited or mobile settings provided the locales of 44 percent of violent but only 21 percent of non-violent plays. Urban and rural settings, on the other hand, dominated the locales of the great majority of non-violent plays.

In other words, whenever the place of action was not limited to the U.S. alone or not localized to a city, town, or village or whenever foreign themes or people other than majority-type Americans were significant elements in the story, violence prevailed in nine out of every ten plays.

We have noted before that intergroup violence was nearly as frequent as ingroup violence. Now we see that foreign themes and "different" people are more frequent in the fictional world of violence than of non-violence. It is not surprising, therefore, to find that a violent world of other times and places involved in violent action a disproportionate number of "others."

Major characters playing violent roles included half of all white Americans, six out of every ten white non-Americans, and nearly seven out of every ten nonwhites. (It should be noted that the total number of clearly nonwhite leading characters was 30; another 74 characters were classified as

"uncertain" and not counted among the nonwhites.)

While all the "others" were more violent, white foreigners killed more, but nonwhites killed less, than white Americans. On the receiving end, both foreigners and nonwhites suffered proportionately higher fatalities than did the white Americans. Comparing white and nonwhite casualty rates, we find that 28 percent of all violent whites inflicted fatal violence, and white killers outnumbered whites killed two-to-one. But only 2 of the 20 violent nonwhites killed an opponent, and for each nonwhite killer there was a nonwhite killed.

Law and its enforcement

Eight out of every ten television plays contained violence, most of it illegal in reality. But legality itself was seldom portrayed as violated unless other criminal themes were involved. Such themes were featured as significant elements in one-third of all and less than half (45 percent) of violent plays. When featured, however, the plays nearly always involved violence.

Due process of law (legal apprehension or trial) was indicated as a consequence of major acts of violence in only two out of every ten violent plays. Official agents of law enforcement, 7 percent of all major characters, were thus confined to a small segment of the fictional world of violence. These agents played a discernible role in one out of every ten violent episodes. When they did play a part, it was violent on two out of every three such occasions. The violence was initiated by agents of law themselves on four out of every ten such occasions. Agents of law responded to violence in a violent manner on three out of every ten occasions. Police restraint in the face of violence was rare; they responded to violence in a non-violent manner in one out of every ten such episodes. And they suffered violence but could make no other response in two out of every ten such episodes.

The level of violence employed by agents of law appeared to be no more than that necessary to accomplish their objectives on eight out of every ten occasions. Their actions were portrayed as clearly justified by circumstances on seven of every ten occasions.

In conclusion, then, television drama presents a largely lawless world in which due process plays a small part, and that too is self-justifyingly violent. It is also a wild world of many violent strangers, with a mostly violent past and a totally violent future.

APPENDIX A

The Recording Instrument for Programs as a Whole

APPENDIX AThe Recording Instrument for Programs as a Whole1. Recording Unit

The Unit of observation for which this instrument is developed is the program, but it might more appropriately be called the play or story. Most dramatic television presentations (e.g., feature films) contain a single play or story and are therefore regarded as one program. When a cartoon show contains several separate stories or when general entertainment consists of several dramatic skits then each of these separate stories and skits is considered a separate program.

A "program" as listed in a television log or "program" schedule is not to be confused with the program as a recording unit in this instrument.

The duration is not a defining characteristic of the recording unit. Rather, the program length is considered as a variable of this unit.

Commercials are not subjected to the recording procedure described below; a log of commercials, however, is kept for further analysis.

2. Recording Procedure

The recording presupposes the viewing of the program as a whole, making necessary observations and, where necessary to complete the data sheets, reviewing of the details. A log of commercials is kept separately from the data sheets and any acts or products relevant to violence, weapons, war, etc., are noted.

The observer is instructed to record all items on the basis of explicit clues, clear verbal or other behavior, or other evidence. In order to decide on the category assignments of each program, evidence is to be obtained from the program itself, rather than from speculation.

COVER PAGE FOR CARD NUMBER 1

<u>Column</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Description</u>
1-3	2 5 5	Project Number (Bin Number)
4	1	Deck Number (Unit = Program)
5	—	Extent of Violence
6	—	Network
7	—	Year
8-9	0 1	Card Number
10-12	— — —	Program Identification
13	—	(Blank)
14-15	— —	Coder Identification
16	—	Month
17-18	— —	Day
19	—	Audience
20	—	Format
21	—	Type
22	—	Duration
23-24	— —	Program Description

Revised 10/10/68

CODING SHEETS

Part I

23-24 Write your answer to question 23-24 on this page.

ANSWER QUESTIONS 25 through 55 ON REVERSE SIDE

25. _____

43. _____

26. _____

44. _____

27. _____

45. _____

28. _____

46. _____

29. _____

47. _____

30. _____

48. _____

31. _____

49. _____

32. _____

50. _____

33. _____

51. _____

34. _____

52. _____

35. _____

53. _____

36. _____

54. _____

37. _____

55. _____

38. _____

39. _____

40. _____

41. _____

42. _____

3. Variables and Categories

PROGRAM TONE (25) (1) the program is a comedy
(2) the program is serious, tragic or other; comic touch, if any, plays minor role

TIME (26) of major action: (1) before 1900
(2) turn of century to World War II
(3) WW II to the 1960'ies
(4) the 1960'ies or general "present"
(i.e., contemporary with time of production)
(5) future
(9) other (explain)

Note: State year if known on the coding sheet

LOCATION (27) (1) in U.S. (state location, if known)
Geographical location of (2) in a country outside of the U.S. (describe)
major action; (9) other (describe)

SETTING (28) of major action (1) urban or suburban setting
(2) small town, provincial place, village, farm, rural
(3) generally uninhabited area; desert, ocean, etc.
(4) mainly mobile (ship, plane, train, etc.)
(5) other planets
(9) other or mixed (explain)

RELIGION (29) (1) Religion, church, clergy; also religious customs, rituals or any single term in the theme or aspect of life was part of the subject matter of the program as a significant element.
(0) theme or aspect of life is not relevant to the subject or story.

Note: Use the following criteria of significance: code it (1) only if the theme or aspect would have to be noted in a one-page summary. This criterion applies to the following seven themes.

ANIMALS-NATURE (30) (1) Animals, nature (jungle, mountains, ocean, rivers), forces of nature and the elements; exploration, discovery, and natural catastrophies; also agriculture, breeding, conservation of natural resources are significant elements of the program's subject or story
(0) theme is not relevant

- MENTAL ILLNESS (31)
- (1) Mental illness, deficiency, abnormality, serious mental disorder; amnesia, phobias; cure, therapy, rehabilitation is significant to the subject or story
 - (0) theme is irrelevant
- SCIENCE (32)
- (1) Science and scientist (including social science); technology is significant to the subject or story
 - (0) theme is not relevant
- MINORITIES (33)
- (1) Minority groups and people; foreign countries and people; non-whites religious and ethnic minorities are significant to the subject or story
 - (0) theme is not relevant
- ARMED FORCES (34)
- (1) Armed forces are significant to the subject or story
 - (0) theme is not relevant
- CRIME (35)
- (1) Crime, corruption, rackets, "fixes," crime detection is significant to the subject or story
 - (0) theme is not relevant
- EDUCATION (36)
- (1) Schools, education, training, study, self-development are significant to the subject or story
 - (0) theme is not relevant
- VIOLENCE (37)
- (1) no violence
 - (2) violence incidental to the plot
 - (3) violence significant to the plot (defined as violence so germane that it would have to be noted in a brief [one-page] summary of the story)
 - (9) other (explain)
- Note: Violence is defined to include physical or psychological injury, hurt, or death, addressed to living things. Violence is explicit and overt. It can be verbal or physical. If verbal, it must express intent to use physical force and must be plausible and credible in the context of the program. IDLE, DISTANT, OR VAGUE THREATS: MERE VERBAL INSULTS, QUARRELS, OR ABUSE: OR COMIC THREATS WITH NO VIOLENT INTENT BEHIND THEM ARE NOT TO BE CONSIDERED VIOLENT.
- PLEASURE (38)
- (1) the program as a whole clearly supports or includes the proposition:
there is pleasure, satisfaction derived from violence
 - (0) the proposition is irrelevant to the program

Note: In the following description of variables the theme is listed. It should be coded (1) if the program as a whole clearly supports or includes the proposition. Otherwise it should be coded (0).

- WEALTH (39) (1) desire for money, wealth results in violence
(0) irrelevant
- POVERTY (40) (1) poverty, hunger, misery results in violence
(0) irrelevant
- POWER (41) (1) desire for power leads to violence
(0) irrelevant
- ALTERNATIVES (42) (1) there is an attempt to try alternative methods
before resorting to violence; argument,
negotiations, other ways are tried.
(0) irrelevant
- HERO-ETHNICITY (43) (1) features of hero or sympathetic character are or
resemble those of a race or ethnic group other
than white Caucasian.
(0) irrelevant
- WAR (44) (1) war between nations results in violence
(0) irrelevant
- VILLAIN-ETHNICITY (45) (1) features of enemy or villain are or resemble
those of a race or ethnic group other than
white Caucasian.
(0) irrelevant
- WOUNDS (46) (1) blood, wounds are actually shown on the screen
(0) irrelevant
- L. ENF.-INCOMPETENCE (47) (1) agent of law enforcement is shown as incompetent,
bungling, or inefficient.
(0) irrelevant
- L. ENF.-CORRUPTION (48) (1) agent of law enforcement is shown as venal,
corrupt, or criminal
(0) irrelevant
- LEGAL CONSEQUENCES (49) (1) due process of law (legal apprehension or trial
or both) is indicated as a consequence of major
act(s) of violence
(0) irrelevant
- NEGRO-POLICE (50) (1) an agent of law enforcement is American Negro
(0) irrelevant
- NEGRO-CRIMINAL (51) (1) a criminal or alleged criminal is American Negro
(0) irrelevant
- "POLICE BRUTALITY"-USED (52) (1) the phrase "police brutality" is explicitly used
in the program (regardless of context)
(0) irrelevant

"POLICE BRUTALITY"-RIDUCLED
(53)

- (1) the phrase "police brutality" is riducled
in the program
- (0) irrelevant

NON-ENCLOSED SPACES (54)

- (1) violence occurs in the streets or in non-enclosed
spaces
- (0) irrelevant

ENCLOSED SPACES (55)

- (1) violence occurs inside of a building or vehicle
- (0) irrelevant

4. Reliability of variables

In the following the results of the final reliability estimates are listed for all variables that survived the pre-test. The reliability is assessed on the basis of a random sample of 30 programs out of a total of 183 programs.

The information is listed in the following order:

Name of variable

Type of scale (N = nominal, I = interval)

Recoding whenever report differs from primary data

Reliability coefficient (1 = perfect agreement and 0 = chance)

Inclusion in the report (Yes = included, No = rejected)

PROGRAM TONE (25)	N		.861	Yes
TIME (26)	N	(1,2,3), 4, 5, 9	.771	Yes
LOCATION (27)	N		1.0	Yes
SETTING (28)	N	1, 2, (3, 4, 5, 9)	.693	Yes
RELIGION (29)	N		.630	No
ANIMALS-NATURE (30)	N		.788	Yes
MENTAL ILLNESS (31)	N		1.0	Yes
SCIENCE (32)	N		.856	Yes
MINORITIES (33)	N		.722	Yes
ARMED FORCES (34)	N		1.0	Yes
CRIME (35)	N		.931	Yes
EDUCATION (36)	N		.423	No
VIOLENCE (37)	I		.969	Yes
PLEASURE (38)	N		.509	No
WEALTH (39)	N		.583	No
POVERTY (40)	N		-.017	No
POWER (41)	N		.346	No
ALTERNATIVES (42)	N		.667	Yes
HERO-ETHNICITY (43)	N		.489	No

WAR (44)	N	1.0	Yes
VILLAIN-ETHNICITY (45)	N	.255	No
WOUNDS (46)	N	.869	Yes
LAW ENFORCEMENT-INCOMPETENCE (47)	N	0.0	No
LAW ENFORCEMENT-CORRUPTION (48)	N	0.0	No
LEGAL CONSEQUENCES (49)	N	.760	Yes
NEGRO-POLICE (50)	N	1.0	Yes
NEGRO-CRIMINAL (51)	N	.649	No
"POLICE BRUTALITY"-USED (52)	N	0.0	No
"POLICE BRUTALITY"-RIDICULED (53)	N	0.0	No
NON-ENCLOSED SPACES (54)	N	.700	Yes
ENCLOSED SPACES (55)	N	.520	No

APPENDIX B

The Recording Instrument for Major Characters

APPENDIX BThe Recording Instrument for Major Characters1. Recording Unit

The unit of observation recorded by this instrument is a major character. Major characters are defined here as all leading roles representing the principal types essential to telling the story. This criterion applies equally to living and cartoon characters. How each character is portrayed in the context of the program as a whole, the role he assumes in the episodes of the play is the subject of detailed recording described below.

2. Recording Procedure

Observers must be familiar with the way each major character is portrayed in the play. They therefore must see the program at least once and may re-screen details if necessary.

In the first step, both observers in the pair must agree on which characters to record, and then record the characters' full names, with brief verbal descriptions of each.

In the second step, both observers jointly decide on the category assignments along the first 21 variables.

In the third step, each observer fills out a separate sheet, both sheets containing 27 identical semantic differential scales. For this, the observers are instructed as follows:

Place an X in the space closer to the end of each scale which fits the character better than the opposite. If one end of the scale seems very closely associated with the character, you would mark the first scale, for example, like this:

old X : : : : : young or old : : : : : X young

If one end of the scale seems quite closely related to the character, you would mark the scale like this:

old : : X : : : : : young or old : : : : : X : : young

If one end of the scale is only slightly related to the character, you would mark the scale like this:

old : : : : X : : : : : young or old : : : : : X : : : : young

If both sides are equally associated with the character, or if you cannot decide which is more related to the character, or if the scale does not apply to the character, mark the center space. Mark each scale.

COVER PAGE FOR CARD NUMBER _____ (1st Semantic Differential)

<u>Column</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Description</u>
1-3	2 5 5	Project Number
4-5	__ __	Total Number of Characters
6-9	__ __ __	Character ID for this card
10-11	__ __	Card Number
12-13	__ __	Coder Identification
14-15	__ __	(Blank)

(16-63) = Basic character data plus Semantic Differential for First Coder

COVER PAGE FOR CARD NUMBER _____ (2nd Semantic Differential)

<u>Column</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Description</u>
1-3	2 5 5	Project Number
4-5	— —	Total Number of Characters
6-9	— — — —	Character ID for this card
10-11	— —	Card Number
12-13	— —	Coder Identification
14-36		(Blank)

(37-63) = Semantic Differential Data for Second Coder

Program _____

Names of Codes _____

Today's Date _____

PART II: CHARACTER ANALYSIS

16. _____

27. _____

17. _____

28. _____

18. _____

29. _____

19. _____

30. _____

20. _____

31. _____

21. _____

32. _____

22. _____

33. _____

23. _____

34. _____

24. _____

35. _____

25. _____

36. _____

26. _____

Coding Sheet

Part II Character Analysis (cont'd)

B-5

column code

Do Not Write in Boxes

old : : : : : : : young
 tall : : : : : : : short
 unusual : : : : : : : usual
 emotional : : : : : : : unemotional
 dull : : : : : : : sharp
 honest : : : : : : : dishonest
 feminine : : : : : : : masculine
 happy : : : : : : : sad
 repulsive : : : : : : : attractive
 tough : : : : : : : delicate
 moral : : : : : : : immoral
 predictable : : : : : : : unpredictable
 wholesome : : : : : : : unwholesome
 irrational : : : : : : : rational
 sensitive : : : : : : : insensitive
 bungling : : : : : : : efficient
 kind : : : : : : : cruel
 learned : : : : : : : ignorant
 dirty : : : : : : : clean
 free : : : : : : : restrained
 intuitive : : : : : : : logical
 bold : : : : : : : timid
 sociable : : : : : : : unsociable
 humble : : : : : : : proud
 rich : : : : : : : poor
 good : : : : : : : bad
 violent : : : : : : : non-violent

37	
38	
39	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
45	
46	
47	
48	
49	
50	
51	
52	
53	
54	
55	
56	
57	
58	
59	
60	
61	
62	
63	

EACH ANALYST IS TO CODE SCALES INDEPENDENTLY

Part II Character Analysis (cont'd)

column code

Do Not Write in Boxes

- old : : : : : : : young
- tall : : : : : : : short
- unusual : : : : : : : usual
- emotional : : : : : : : unemotional
- dull : : : : : : : sharp
- honest : : : : : : : dishonest
- feminine : : : : : : : masculine
- happy : : : : : : : sad
- repulsive : : : : : : : attractive
- tough : : : : : : : delicate
- moral : : : : : : : immoral
- predictable : : : : : : : unpredictable
- wholesome : : : : : : : unwholesome
- irrational : : : : : : : rational
- sensitive : : : : : : : insensitive
- bungling : : : : : : : efficient
- kind : : : : : : : cruel
- learned : : : : : : : ignorant
- dirty : : : : : : : clean
- free : : : : : : : restrained
- intuitive : : : : : : : logical
- bold : : : : : : : timid
- sociable : : : : : : : unsociable
- humble : : : : : : : proud
- rich : : : : : : : poor
- good : : : : : : : bad
- violent : : : : : : : non-violent

37	
38	
39	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
45	
46	
47	
48	
49	
50	
51	
52	
53	
54	
55	
56	
57	
58	
59	
60	
61	
62	
63	

3. Variables and Categories

Full name of the character and a one sentence description is required

(a) Demographic characteristics and relation to violence

- | | |
|---------------------|--|
| SEX (16) | (1) male
(2) female
(9) other (explain) |
| HUMANITY (17) | (1) human
(2) humanized (speaking) animal
(3) animal (not "humanized")
(9) uncertain, other |
| AGE (18) | (1) infant, pre-school age
(2) primary school age
(3) secondary school age; teens; adolescent
(4) young adult
(5) middle age (may play romantic part)
(6) old
(9) ageless, several, other, cannot specify
(explain on Coding sheet) |
| MARTIAL STATUS (19) | (1) unmarried or unknown, uncertain, other
(2) married, or has been married
(3) marries in story or expects to marry |
| OCCUPATION (20) | (1) housewife
(2) illegal (code for criminals, outlaws)
(3) armed forces; militia
(4) entertainment, arts, mass media
(5) official law enforcement: police, FBI, T-men; marshall, sheriff
(6) agent working for private "client" in occupation that usually involve crime or violence; private detective, etc.
(9) professional, other, uncertain, no visible means of support (explain on coding sheet) |

Note: If the character has several occupations simultaneously, consider only the major one.

- | | |
|----------------|--|
| ETHNICITY (21) | (1) white, Anglo-Saxon, native American
(2) white, non-Anglo-Saxon, native American
(3) white foreign-born American (speaks with accent, etc.)
(4) white non-American (other nationality)
(5) non-white American
(6) non-white non-American
(9) uncertain, other |
|----------------|--|

Note: The nationality and ethnicity of the character must be judged as apparent on the screen.

SOC./ECON. STATUS (22) (1) upper, elite, executive
 (2) middle, average, common, other, uncertain, mixed
 (3) lower, poor

VICTIM (23) (1) not subjected to violence
 (2) subjected to violence, not fatal.
 (3) dies violent death
 (9) subjected, other

Note: If several categories are appropriate for situations at different points in time consider the highest degree of violence to which he is subjected.

AGRESSOR (24) (1) does not subject another to violence
 (2) subjects another to violence, not fatal
 (3) commits fatal violence
 (9) subjects, other

Note: If several categories are appropriate for situations at different points in time consider the highest degree of violence involved.

FINAL OUTCOME (25) (1) clearly happy, unambiguous success
 (2) clearly unhappy; unambiguous failure
 (3) mixed, unclear, ambiguous

(b) Values held by the character

SEXUAL OR AMOROUS GOALS (26) (0) if it was not explicitly desired or sought by the character at any time in the program (whether achieved or not)
 (1) if it was explicitly desired or sought by the character at any time in the program.

FAMILY, HOME (27) (0) as above
 (1)

RESPECT FOR LEGALITY (28) (0) as above
 (1)

MONEY, MATERIAL GOODS (29) (0) as above
 (1)

AMBITION, WILL FOR POWER (30) (0) as above
 (1)

RELIGIOUS (31) (0) as above
 (1)

SCIENTIFIC (32) (0) as above
 (1)

dirty ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ clean

free ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ restrained

intuitive ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ logical

bold ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ timid

sociable ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ unsociable

humble ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ proud

rich ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ poor

good ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ bad

violent ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ non-violent

4. Reliability of variables

Below are listed the final reliability estimates for all those variables that survived the pre-test. The reliability is assessed on the basis of a random sample of 30 programs out of a total of 183 and contained 66 characters out of a total of 455. In the case of personality characteristics, the scale values of the two observers were summed.

The information is listed in the following order:

Name of variable

Type of scale (N = nominal, I = interval)

Recoding whenever the report differs from primary data

Reliability coefficient (1 = perfect agreement and 0 = chance)

Inclusion in the report (Yes = included, No = rejected)

(a) Demographic characteristics and relation to violence

SEX (16)	N		.904	Yes
HUMANITY (17)	N		.903	Yes
AGE (18)	N		.686	Yes
MARITAL STATUS (19)	N		.939	Yes
OCCUPATION (20)	N		.893	Yes
ETHNICITY (21)	N	(1,2,3)4,(5,6),9	.722	Yes
SOC./ECON STATUS (22)	I		.651	No
VICTIM (23)	N	(1,2),3	.792	Yes
AGRESSOR (24)	N		.734	Yes
FINAL OUTCOME (25)	N		.721	Yes

(b) Values held by the character

SEXUAL/AMOROUS GOALS (26)	N		.482	No
FAMILY/HOME (27)	N		.754	Yes
RESPECT FOR LAW (28)	N		.665	No
MONEY, GOODS (29)	N		.450	No
AMBITION (30)	N		.573	No
RELIGIOUS (31)	N		.484	No

SCIENTIFIC (32)	N	.631	No
ARTISTIC (33)	N	1.0	Yes
SELF-PRESERVATION (34)	N	.624	No
VENGEANCE (35)	N	.573	No
EVIL, DESTRUCTIVE GOALS (36)	N	.716	Yes

(c) Personality characteristics of the character

OLD-YOUNG (37)	I	.709	Yes
TALL-SHORT (38)	I	.678	Yes
UNUSUAL-USUAL (39)	I	.591	No
EMOTIONAL-UNEMOTIONAL (40)	I	.525	No
DULL-SHARP (41)	I	.434	No
HONEST-DISHONEST (42)	I	.789	Yes
FEMINE-MASCULINE (43)	I	.778	Yes
HAPPY-SAD (44)	I	.652	No
REPULSIVE-ATTRACTIVE (45)	I	.565	No
TOUGH-DELICATE (46)	I	.572	No
MORAL-IMMORAL (47)	I	.760	Yes
PREDICTABLE-UNPREDICTABLE (48)	I	.516	No
WHOLESOME-UNWHOLESOME (49)	I	.747	Yes
IRRATIONAL-RATIONAL (50)	I	.589	No
SENSITIVE-insensitive (51)	I	.657	No
BUNGLING-EFFICIENT (52)	I	.564	No
KIND-CRUEL (53)	I	.773	Yes
LEARNED-IGNORANT (54)	I	.567	No
DIRTY-CLEAN (55)	I	.252	No
FREE-RESTRAINED (56)	I	.358	No
INTUITIVE-LOGICAL (57)	I	.484	No

BOLD-TIMID (58)	I	.372	No
SOCIABLE-UNSOCIABLE (59)	I	.438	No
HUMBLE-PROUD (60)	I	.253	No
RICH-POOR (61)	I	.824	Yes
GOOD-BAD (62)	I	.581	No
VIOLENT-NON-VIOLENT (63)	I	.783	Yes

5. Current Form of Primary Data

Data are available in the form of IBM punch cards.

Card Number 1

<u>Column</u>	<u>Variable</u>	<u>Code</u>
1-3	Project Number	.255
4	Recording Unit	2 = character
5	Number of character in program	exact number
6		blank
7-9	Character Identification	For a list see the end of this appendix
10-12	Program Identification	For a list see the end of this appendix
13	Card Number	1
14-15	Coder Identification	For a list see the end of this appendix
16	SEX	(1) male (2) female (9) other
17	HUMANITY	(1) human (2) humanized (speaking) animal (3) animal (not "humanized") (9) uncertain, other
18	AGE	(1) infant, pre-school age (2) primary school age (3) secondary school age; teens; adolescent (4) young adult (5) middle age (may play romantic part) (6) old (9) ageless, several, other, cannot specify
19	MARITAL STATUS	(1) unmarried or unknown, uncertain, other (2) married, or has been married (3) marries in story or expects to marry

Card Number 1 (Continued)

<u>Column</u>	<u>Variable</u>	<u>Code</u>
20	MAJOR OCCUPATION	(1) housewife (2) illegal(criminals, outlaws) (3) armed forces; Militia (4) entertainment, arts, mass media (5) official law enforcement: police, FBI, T-men; marshall, sheriff (6) agent working for private "client" in occupation that usually involve crime or violence; private detective, etc. (9) professional, other, uncertain, no visible means of support
21	ETHNICITY	(1) white, Anglo-Saxon, native American (2) white, non-Anglo-Saxon, native American (3) white foreign-born American (speaks with accent, etc.) (4) white non-American (other nationality) (5) non-white American (6) non-white non-American (9) uncertain, other
22	SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS	(1) upper, elite, executive (2) middle, average, common, other uncertain, mixed (3) lower, poor
23	VICTIM	(1) not subjected to violence (2) subjected to violence, not fatal (3) dies violent death (9) subjected, other
24	AGGRESSOR	(1) does not subject another to violence (2) subjects another to violence, not fatal (3) commits fatal violence (9) subjects, other
25	FINAL OUTCOME	(1) clearly happy, unambiguous success (2) clearly unhappy; unambiguous failure (3) mixed, unclear, ambiguous

Card Number 1 (Continued)

<u>Column</u>	<u>Variable</u>	<u>Code</u>
26	SEXUAL OR AMOROUS	0 = not explicitly desired 1 = explicitly desired
27	FAMILY, HOME	0 = not explicitly desired 1 = explicitly desired
28	RESPECT FOR LEGALITY	0 = not explicitly desired 1 = explicitly desired
29	MONEY, MATERIAL GOODS	0 = not explicitly desired 1 = explicitly desired
30	AMBITION, WILL FOR POWER	0 = not explicitly desired 1 = explicitly desired
31	RELIGION	0 = not explicitly desired 1 = explicitly desired
32	SCIENTIFIC	0 = not explicitly desired 1 = explicitly desired
33	ARTISTIC	0 = not explicitly desired 1 = explicitly desired
34	SELF-PRESERVATION	0 = not explicitly desired 1 = explicitly desired
35	VENGEANCE	0 = not explicitly desired 1 = explicitly desired
36	EVIL, DESTRUCTIVE GOALS	0 = not explicitly desired 1 = explicitly desired
37	OLD-YOUNG	(Columns 37-63: score range from 1-7; 1 is assigned to the left term and 7 is assigned to its polar opposite on the right)
38	SHORT-TALL	
39	UNUSUAL-USUAL	
40	EMOTIONAL-UNEMOTIONAL	
41	DULL-SHARP	
42	DISHONEST-HONEST	
43	FEMININE-MASCULINE	
44	SAD-HAPPY	
45	REPULSIVE-ATTRACTIVE	

Card Number 1 (Continued)

<u>Column</u>	<u>Variable</u>	<u>Code</u>
46	DELICATE-TOUGH	
47	IMMORAL-MORAL	
48	UNPREDICTABLE-PREDICTABLE	
49	UNWHOLESOME-WHOLESOME	
50	IRRATIONAL-RATIONAL	
51	INSENSITIVE-SENSITIVE	
52	BUNGLING-EFFICIENT	
53	CRUEL-KIND	
54	IGNORANT-LEARNED	
55	DIRTY-CLEAN	
56	RESTRAINED-FREE	
57	INTUITIVE-LOGICAL	
58	BOLD-TIMID	
59	UNSOCIABLE-SOCIABLE	
60	HUMBLE-PROUD	
61	POOR-RICH	
62	BAD-GOOD	
63	VIOLENT-NON-VIOLENT	

Card Number 2

<u>Column</u>	<u>Variable</u>	<u>Code</u>
1-3	Project Number	255
4	Recording Unit	2 = character
5	Number of character in program	exact number
6		blank
7-9	Character Identification	For a list see the end of this appendix
10-12	Program Identification	For a list see the end of this appendix
13	Card Number	2
14-15	Coder Identification	For a list see the end of this appendix
16-36		blank
37	OLD-YOUND	(Columns 37-63: score ranges from 1-7;
38	SHORT-TALL	1 is assigned to the left term and 7
39	UNUSUAL-USUAL	is assigned to its polar opposite on the right)
40	EMOTIONAL-UNEMOTIONAL	
41	DULL-SHARP	
42	DISHONEST-HONEST	
43	FEMININE-MASCULINE	
44	SAD-HAPPY	
45	REPULSIVE-ATTRACTIVE	
46	DELICATE-TOUGH	
47	IMMORAL-MORAL	
48	UNPREDICTABLE-PREDICTABLE	
49	UNWHOLESOME-WHOLESOME	
50	IRRELATIONAL-RATIONAL	
51	INSENSITIVE-SENSITIVE	
52	BUNGLING-EFFICIENT	
53	CRUEL-KIND	

Card Number 2 (Continued)

<u>Column</u>	<u>Variable</u>	<u>Code</u>
54	IGNORANT-LEARNED	
55	DIRTY-CLEAN	
56	RESTRAINED-FREE	
57	INTUITIVE-LOGICAL	
58	BOLD-TIMID	
59	UNSOCIABLE-SOCIABLE	
60	HUMBLE-PROUD	
61	POOR-RICH	
62	BAD-GOOD	
63	VIOLENT-NON-VIOLENT	

APPENDIX C

The Recording Instrument for Violent Episodes

APPENDIX CThe Recording Instrument for Violent Episodes1. Recording Unit

The unit of recording for which this Instrument is designed is called a violent episode. A program may contain many violent episodes and in order to identify these units two definitions have been advanced as follows:

Violence is defined to include physical or psychological injury, hurt, or death, addressed to living things. Violence is explicit and overt. It can be verbal or physical. If verbal, it must express intent to use physical force and must be plausible and credible in the context of the program. Idle, distant, or vague threats: mere verbal insults, quarrels, or abuse: or comic threats with no violent intent behind them are not to be considered violent.

A violent episode is defined as a scene of whatever duration which concerns the same agent and the same receiver. Thus, a battle scene would be one episode; a chase scene with a posse pursuing a man would be one episode, even if interrupted by flashbacks to other scenes; an attack by one person on a second, in the course of which a third person attacks the first, would be two episodes.

2. Recording Procedure

The recording of violent episodes presupposes viewing the program as a whole, making necessary observations and, when necessary to complete the data sheets, a reviewing of the details.

A log containing notes pertaining to observed acts concerned with violence, weapons, war, etc., is compiled during the viewing. This record then provides the basis for identifying the program's set of violent episodes. Their actual number in the program is to be listed in the appropriate space on the data sheet. Then each violent episode (working across the respective rows on the data sheet) is to be judged independently according to the specified variables.

COVER PAGE FOR CARD NUMBER 3

<u>Column</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Description</u>
1-3	2 5 5	Project Number
4	1	Deck Number
5	—	Extent of Violence
6-7	— —	(Blank)
8-9	0 3	Card Number
10-12	— — —	Program ID
13	—	(Blank)
14-15	— —	Coder ID
16-17	— —	Number of Violent Episodes
18-29		Episode 1
30-41		Episode 2
42-53		Episode 3
54-65		Episode 4
66-77		Episode 5

COVER PAGE FOR CARD NUMBER 4

<u>Column</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Description</u>
1-3	2 5 5	Project Number
4	1	Deck Number
5	—	Extent of Violence
6-7	— —	(Blank)
8-9	0 4	Card Number
10-12	— — —	Program Identification
13	—	(Blank)
14-15	— —	Coder Identification
16-17	— —	Number of Violent Episodes
18-29		Episode 6
30-41		Episode 7
42-53		Episode 8
54-65		Episode 9
66-77		Episode 10

COVER PAGE FOR CARD NUMBER 5

<u>Column</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Description</u>
1-3	2 5 5	Project Number
4	1	Deck Number
5	---	Extent of Violence
6-7	--- --	(Blank)
8-9	0 5	Card Number
10-12	--- -- ---	Program Identification
13	---	(Blank)
14-15	--- --	Coder Identification
16-17	--- --	Number of Violent Episodes
18-29		Episode 11
30-41		Episode 12
42-53		Episode 13
54-65		Episode 14
66-77		Episode 15

COVER PAGE FOR CARD NUMBER 6

<u>Column</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Description</u>
1-3	2 5 5	Project Number
4	1	Deck Number
5	—	Extent of Violence
6-7	— —	(Blank)
8-9	0 6	Card Number
10-12	— — —	Program Identification
13	—	(Blank)
14-15	— —	Coder Identification
16-17	— —	Number of Violent Episodes
18-29		Episode 16
30-41		Episode 17
42-53		Episode 18
54-65		Episode 19
66-77		Episode 20

COVER PAGE FOR CARD NUMBER 7

<u>Column</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Description</u>
1-3	2 5 5	Project Number
4	1	Deck Number
5	—	Extent of Violence
6-7	— —	(Blank)
8-9	0 7	Card Number
10-12	— — —	Program Identification
13	—	(Blank)
14-15	— —	Coder Identification
16-17	— —	Number of Violent Episodes
18-29		Episode 21
30-41		Episode 22
42-53		Episode 23
54-65		Episode 24
66-77		Episode 25

3. Variables and Categories

NUMBER OF EPISODES	Exact number of violent episodes that occur in the program
AGENT (a)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) human (live or cartoon) individual(s) (2) humanized (speaking) animal (e.g. in cartoons) (3) animal (live or cartoon) (4) "thing," creature (5) act of nature (wide-spread effect; not merely an accident) (6) accident (mechanical or other; mishap; chance) (9) other
WEAPONS (b)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) none; carried out by verbal or bodily means only (2) weapon is used (9) other
CONTEXT (c)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) violence which occurs in serious or sinister contexts (2) comic or sham violence
DOUBLE CONTEXT (d)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) if the context is "1" above <u>and</u> if there is a comic element built into the presentation, despite its serious surface appearance. For example, canned (or real) audience laughter on soundtrack despite apparently real injury. Mark only if there is clear evidence of comic effect <u>in the context of serious presentation.</u> (0) if no such double context is present or if irrelevant
WITNESSES (e)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) the witnesses are passive; they do not or cannot react (2) the witnesses assist or encourage violence (3) the witnesses attempt to prevent, restrain, or seek alternatives to violence (9) other, or no witnesses
L-ENF. VIOLENT ROLE (f)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) they play a non-violent role (2) they commit violence in the course of official duties (3) they commit violence, but not in the course of official duties (9) other, or they play no role
Note:	Law enforcement agencies include only police, sheriff, marshall, official, deputies and detectives - not private detectives, agents, spies, armed forces, etc.
L-ENF. VIOLENCE JUSTIFIED(g)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) if violence is committed by law enforcement agencies, their actions are portrayed on the screen as justified (2) their actions are portrayed on the screen as unjustified (3) their actions are portrayed on the screen as both justified and unjustified (i.e., "mixed") (9) irrelevant (i.e., violence is not committed)

- L.-ENF. INITIATION/RESPONSE(h) (1) if the agents of law enforcement play a role in violence, they initiate violence
 (2) they respond to violence in a violent manner
 (3) they respond to violence in a non-violent manner
 (4) they become victims of violence
 (9) irrelevant (i.e., they do not play a role)
- L.-ENF.-VIOL. NECESSARY (i) (1) if the agents of law enforcement play a role in violence, they commit only that level of violence which appears necessary to accomplish their objective(s)
 (2) they commit violence which appears to go beyond what is necessary (i.e., brutality, and recognized as such on screen.)
 (3) both, mixed
 (9) irrelevant (i.e., they do not play a role)
- RELATIONS-OPPONENTS (j) (1) group relations among violent opponents are in the family
 (2) violent opponents are members of the same national or ethnic groups (but not in family)
 (3) violent opponents are members of different national or ethnic groups
 (9) other
- NON-FATAL CASUALTIES (k) (0) none
 (1) one
 (2) two
 (3) three
 (4) four
 (5) five
 (6) six
 (7) seven
 (8) eight or more, but can be counted
 (9) mass casualties; cannot be counted

Note: Count the number of persons or humanized animals hurt in the scene.

- FATAL CASUALTIES (l) (0) none
 (1) one
 (2) two
 (3) three
 (4) four
 (5) five
 (6) six
 (7) seven
 (8) eight or more, but can be counted
 (9) mass casualties; cannot be counted

Note: Count the number of fatal casualties (bodies) in the scene. Include victims who are shown dead or who die as a consequence of injury in the scene.

4. Reliability of variables

Below are listed the final reliability estimates for all those variables that survived the pre-test. The reliability is assessed on the basis of a random sample of 30 programs out of a total of 183 and contained 52 violent episodes out of a total of 873.

The information is listed in the following order:

Name of variable

Type of scale (N = nominal, I = interval)

Recoding whenever the report differs from primary data

Reliability coefficient (1 = perfect agreement and 0 = chance)

Inclusion in the report (Yes = included, No = rejected)

NO. OF EPISODES	I		not assessible	
AGENT (a)	N		.731	Yes
WEAPONS (b)	N	1(2,9)	.799	Yes
CONTEXT (c)	N		.736	Yes
DOUBLE CONTEXT (d)	N		.729	Yes
WITNESSES (e)	N		.677	Yes
L. ENF.-VIOLENT ROLE (f)	N		.819	Yes
L. ENF.-VIOLENCE JUSTIFIED (g)	N		.866	Yes
L. ENF.-INITIATION/RESPONSE (h)	N		.761	Yes
L. ENF. VIOLENCE NECESSARY (i)	N		1.0	Yes
RELATIONS-OPPONENTS (j)	N		.915	Yes
NON-FATAL CASUALTIES (k)	I		.995	Yes
FATAL CASUALTIES (l)	I		.514	No
CASUALTIES, (k) & (l) summed	I		.710	Yes

APPENDIX D

The Recording Instrument for Values Supported by the Program

APPENDIX DThe Recording Instrument for Values Supported by the Program1. Recording Unit

The recording unit is one dramatic program; i.e., a fictional presentation having a plot, a definite beginning and a recognizable end. In the case of serials, each program in the series constitutes one recording unit; it is to be judged independently of the other programs in the series.

2. Recording Procedure

The observer watched the whole program at least once. On the basis of a prepared list of 18 values, the program as a whole was characterized with respect to the values it emphasized or supported.

The first step required a scaling of each value on the list according to its significance to the plot. The numerical code given was as follows:

1. very important
2. somewhat important
3. irrelevant

There was no restriction as to the distribution of these code numbers over the values. After one of the three numbers had been assigned to each of the eighteen values, those which have been judged "very important" and assigned a (1) were considered in a second step. They were ranked according to their relative importance to each other. The single most important value was assigned a +1, the next most important is assigned a +2, etc. All "very important" values thus had two numbers: a (1) to indicate their significance and a +1, +2, +3, etc. to indicate their relative importance to each other.

3. Variables and Categories

The values considered by this instrument are listed below*

* These values were adopted in toto from an instrument developed by Milton Rokeach, Department of Psychology, Michigan State University. For a brief description of an earlier form of this scale, see "A Theory of Organization and Change Within Value-Attitude Systems," Journal of Social Issues, XXIV, No.1, 1968.

A COMFORTABLE LIFE (a prosperous life)
AN EXCITING LIFE (a stimulating, active life)
A SENSE OF ACCOMPLISHMENT (lasting contribution)
A WORLD AT PEACE (free of war and conflict)
A WORLD OF BEAUTY (beauty of nature and the arts)
EQUALITY (brotherhood, equal opportunity for all)
FAMILY SECURITY (taking care of loved ones)
FREEDOM (independence, free choice)
HAPPINESS (contentedness)
INNER HARMONY (freedom from inner conflict)
MATURE LOVE (sexual and spiritual intimacy)
NATIONAL SECURITY (protection from attack)
PLEASURE (an enjoyable, leisurely life)
SALVATION (saved, eternal life)
SELF-RESPECT (self-esteem)
SOCIAL RECOGNITION (respect, admiration)
TRUE FRIENDSHIP (close companionship)
WISDOM (a mature understanding of life)

4. Reliability of Variables

Below are the inter-coder reliability estimates for each of the 18 values as judged in terms of their "importance" to the program, based on a sample of 15 programs. The information is listed in the following order:

Name of variable	Type of scale (N = nominal, O = ordinal, I = interval)	Reliability	Inclusion in the report (Yes = included, No = rejected)
A COMFORTABLE LIFE	N	.37	No
AN EXCITING LIFE	N	.27	No
SENSE OF ACCOMPLISHMENT	N	.04	No
A WORLD AT PEACE	N	.18	No
A WORLD OF BEAUTY	N	.44	No
EQUALITY	N	.30	No
FAMILY SECURITY	N	.39	No
FREEDOM	N	.16	No
HAPPINESS	N	.50	No
INNER HARMONY	N	.15	No
MATURE LOVE	N	.24	No
NATIONAL SECURITY	N	.82	Yes
PLEASURE	N	.21	No
SALVATION	N	1.00	Yes
SELF-RESPECT	N	-.37	No
SOCIAL RECOGNITION	N	.02	No
TRUE FRIENDSHIP	N	.25	No
WISDOM	N	.26	No

Below is listed the rank-order inter-coder reliability figures for the value scale as a whole:

Average rank order correlation for sample of 15 1967 programs: .57

Average rank order correlation for sample of 10 1968 programs: .64

Average rank order correlation across all (183) programs: .59

Range of rank order correlation coefficients across all (183) programs: .13-.98

Mode of rank order correlation coefficients across all (183) programs: .63, .67, .70

5. Current Form of Primary Data

See Appendix E, part 5.

APPENDIX E

The Recording Instrument for Values Held by the Major Characters

APPENDIX EThe Recording Instrument for Values Held by the Major Characters1. Recording Unit

The recording unit is the individual character playing the leading role in the dramatic presentation. Only one character for each program was considered for description by the coders.

2. Recording Procedure

The observer watched the whole program at least once. He, in agreement with his coding partner, selected the character playing the leading role. On the basis of a prepared list of 18 values, the character was then described with respect to the values he emphasized or supported.

The first step required a scaling of each value on the list according to its significance to the leading character. The numerical code given was as follows:

1. very important
2. somewhat important
3. irrelevant

There was no restriction as to the distribution of these code numbers over the values. After one of the three numbers had been assigned to each of the eighteen values, those which were judged "very important" and assigned a (1) were considered in a second step. They were ranked according to their relative importance to each other. The single most important value was assigned a +1, the next most important assigned a +2, etc. All "very important" values thus had two numbers: a (1) to indicate their significance and a +1, +2, +3, etc. to indicate their relative importance to each other.

3. Variables and Categories

The list of values used in this instrument are listed below.*

* See footnote, Appendix D, page D-1.

AMBITIOUS (hard-working, aspiring)
BROADMINDED (open-minded)
CAPABLE (competent, effective)
CHEERFUL (lighthearted, joyful)
CLEAN (neat, tidy)
COURAGEOUS (standing up for your beliefs)
FORGIVING (willing to pardon others)
HELPFUL (working for the welfare of others)
HONEST (sincere, truthful)
IMAGINATIVE (daring, creative)
INDEPENDENT (self-reliant, self-sufficient)
INTELLECTUAL (intelligent, reflective)
LOGICAL (consistent, rational)
LOVING (affectionate, tender)
OBEDIENT (dutiful, respectful)
POLITE (courteous, well-mannered)
RESPONSIBLE (dependable, reliable)
SELF-CONTROLLED (restrained, self-disciplined)

4. Reliability of Variables

Below are the inter-coder reliability estimates for each of the 18 values as judged in terms of their "importance" to the program based on a sample of 15 programs. The information is listed in the following order:

Name of variable

Type of scale (N = nominal, O = ordinal, I = interval)

Reliability

Inclusion in the report (Yes = included, No = rejected)

Inter-coder agreement

AMBITIOUS	N	.39	No
BROADMINDED	N	.43	No
CAPABLE	N	.58	No
CHEERFUL	N	.37	No
CLEAN	N	.20	No
COURAGEOUS	N	.35	No
FORGIVING	N	.08	No
HELPFUL	N	.59	No
HONEST	N	.37	No
IMAGINATIVE	N	.49	No
INDEPENDENT	N	.19	No
INTELLECTUAL	N	.05	No
LOGICAL	N	.19	No
LOVING	N	.52	No
OBEDIENT	N	.03	No
POLITE	N	.36	No
RESPONSIBLE	N	.30	No
SELF-CONTROLLED	N	.25	No

Below is listed the rank-order inter-coder reliability figures for the character value scale as a whole:

Average rank order correlation for sample of 15 1967 programs: .68

Average rank order correlation for sample of 10 1968 programs: .66

Average rank order correlation across all (183) programs: .65

Range of rank order correlation coefficients across all (183) programs: .17-.91

Mode(s) of rank order correlation coefficients across all (183) programs: .61, .66, .67

5. Current Form of Primary Data

Data are available in the form of IBM punch cards.

Card Number 1

<u>Column</u>	<u>Variable</u>	<u>Code</u>
1-3	Project Number	255
4	Recording Unit	3 = values
5	Program Year	1 = 1967 2 = 1968
6		blank
7-9	Character Identification	For a list see the end of this appendix
10-12	Program Identification	For a list see the end of this appendix
13		blank
14	Card Number	1
15-16		blank
	Cards 1 & 2 = Average Coder Pair rank for program values	
17-21	A COMFORTABLE LIFE	exact average rank (F5.2)
22		blank
23-27	AN EXCITING LIFE	exact average rank (F5.2)
28		blank
29-33	A SENSE OF ACCOMPLISHMENT	exact average rank (F5.2)
34		blank
35-39	A WORLD AT PEACE	exact average rank (F5.2)
40		blank
41-45	A WORLD OF BEAUTY	exact average rank (F5.2)
46		blank

Card Number 1

<u>Column</u>	<u>Variable</u>	<u>Code</u>
47-51	EQUALITY	exact average rank (F5.2)
52		blank
53-57	FAMILY SECURITY	exact average rank (F5.2)
58		blank
59-63	FREEDOM	exact average rank
64		blank
65-69	HAPPINESS	exact average rank (F5.2)
70		blank
71-75	INNER HARMONY	exact average rank (F5.2)
76-80	MATURE LOVE	exact average rank (F5.2)

Card Number 2

1-3	Project Number	255
4	Recording Unit	3 = values
5	Program Year	1 = 1967 2 = 1968
6		blank
7-9	Character Identification.	for a list see the end of this appendix
10-12	Program Identification	for a list see the end of this appendix
13		blank
14	Card Number	2
15-16		blank
17-21	NATIONAL SECURITY	exact average rank (F5.2)
22		blank
23-27	PLEASURE	exact average rank (F5.2)

Card Number 2

<u>Column</u>	<u>Variable</u>	<u>Code</u>
28		blank
29-33	SALVATION	exact average rank (F5.2)
34		blank
35-39	SELF-RESPECT	exact average rank (F5.2)
40		blank
41-45	SOCIAL RECOGNITION	exact average rank (F5.2)
46		blank
47-51	TRUE FRIENDSHIP	exact average rank (F5.2)
52		blank
53-57	WISDOM	exact average rank (F5.2)
58-80		blank

Card Number 3

1-3	Project Number	255
4	Recording Unit	3 = values
5	Program Year	1 = 1967 2 = 1968
6		blank
7-9	Character Identification	for a list see the end of this appendix
10-12	Program Identification	for a list see the end of this appendix
13		blank
14	Card Number	3
15-16		blank

Card 3 & 4 = Average
Coder Pair for Character
Values

Card Number 3

<u>Column</u>	<u>Variable</u>	<u>Code</u>
17-21	AMBITIOUS	exact average rank (F5.2)
22		blank
23-27	BROADMINDED	exact average rank (F5.2)
28		blank
29-33	CAPABLE	exact average rank (F5.2)
34		blank
35-39	CHEERFUL	exact average rank (F5.2)
40		blank
41-45	CLEAN	exact average rank (F5.2)
46		blank
47-51	COURAGEOUS	exact average rank (F5.2)
52		blank
53-57	FORGIVING	exace average rank (F5.2)
58		blank
59-63	HELPFUL	exact average rank (F5.2)
64		blank
65-69	HONEST	exact average rank (F5.2)
70		blank
71-75	IMAGINATIVE	exact average rank (F5.2)
76-80	INDEPENDENT	exact average rank (F5.2)

Card Number 4

1-3	Project Number	255
4	Recording Unit	3 = values
5	Program Year	1 = 1967 2 = 1968

Card Number 4

<u>Column</u>	<u>Variable</u>	<u>Code</u>
6		blank
7-9	Character Identification	for a list see the end of this appendix
10-12	Program Identification	for a list see the end of this appendix
13		blank
14	Card Number	4
15-16		blank
17-21	INTELLECTUAL	exact average rank (F5.2)
22		blank
23-27	LOGICAL	exact average rank (F5.2)
28		blank
29-33	LOVING	exact average rank (F5.2)
34		blank
35-39	OBEDIENT	exact average rank (F5.2)
40		blank
41-45	POLITE	exact average rank (F5.2)
46		blank
47-51	RESPONSIBLE	exact average rank (F5.2)
52		blank
53-57	SELF-CONTROLLED	exact average rank (F5.2)
58-80		blank

Card Number 5

<u>Column</u>	<u>Variable</u>	<u>Code</u>
1-3	Project Number	255
4	Recording Unit	3 = values
5	Program Year	1 = 1967 2 = 1968
6		blank
7-9	Character Identification	for a list see the end of this appendix
10-12	Program Identification	for a list see the end of this appendix
13		blank
14	Card Number	5 (1st coder)
15-16	Coder Identification	for a list see the end of this appendix
17-24		blank
25	A COMFORTABLE LIFE	1 = very important 2 = important 3 = irrelevant
26	AN EXCITING LIFE	1 = very important 2 = important 3 = irrelevant
27	A SENSE OF ACCOMPLISHMENT	1 = very important 2 = important 3 = irrelevant
28	A WORLD AT PEACE	1 = very important 2 = important 3 = irrelevant
29	A WORLD OF BEAUTY	1 = very important 2 = important 3 = irrelevant
30	EQUALITY	1 = very important 2 = important 3 = irrelevant

Card Number 5

<u>Column</u>	<u>Variable</u>	<u>Code</u>
31	FAMILY SECURITY	1 = very important 2 = important 3 = irrelevant
32	FREEDOM	1 = very important 2 = important 3 = irrelevant
33	HAPPINESS	1 = very important 2 = important 3 = irrelevant
34	INNER HARMONY	1 = very important 2 = important 3 = irrelevant
35	MATURE LOVE	1 = very important 2 = important 3 = irrelevant
36	NATIONAL SECURITY	1 = very important 2 = important 3 = irrelevant
37	PLEASURE	1 = very important 2 = important 3 = irrelevant
38	SALVATION	1 = very important 2 = important 3 = irrelevant
39	SELF-RESPECT	1 = very important 2 = important 3 = irrelevant
40	SOCIAL RECOGNITION	1 = very important 2 = important 3 = irrelevant
41	TRUE FRIENDSHIP	1 = very important 2 = important 3 = irrelevant
42	WISDOM	1 = very important 2 = important 3 = irrelevant

Card Number 5

<u>Column</u>	<u>Variable</u>	<u>Code</u>
43-44		blank
45	AMBITIOUS	1 = very important 2 = important 3 = irrelevant
46	BROADMINDED	1 = very important 2 = important 3 = irrelevant
47	CAPABLE	1 = very important 2 = important 3 = irrelevant
48	CHEERFUL	1 = very important 2 = important 3 = irrelevant
49	CLEAN	1 = very important 2 = important 3 = irrelevant
50	COURAGEOUS	1 = very important 2 = important 3 = irrelevant
51	FORGIVING	1 = very important 2 = important 3 = irrelevant
52	HELPFUL	1 = very important 2 = important 3 = irrelevant
53	HONEST	1 = very important 2 = important 3 = irrelevant
54	IMAGINATIVE	1 = very important 2 = important 3 = irrelevant
55	INDEPENDENT	1 = very important 2 = important 3 = irrelevant
56	INTELLECTUAL	1 = very important 2 = important 3 = irrelevant

Card Number 5

<u>Column</u>	<u>Variable</u>	<u>Code</u>
57	LOGICAL	1 = very important 2 = important 3 = irrelevant
58	LOVING	1 = very important 2 = important 3 = irrelevant
59	OBEDIENT	1 = very important 2 = important 3 = irrelevant
60	POLITE	1 = very important 2 = important 3 = irrelevant
61	RESPONSIBLE	1 = very important 2 = important 3 = irrelevant
62	SELF-CONTROLLED	1 = very important 2 = important 3 = irrelevant

Card Number 6

1-3	Project Number	255
4	Recording Unit	3 = values
5	Program Year	1 = 1967 2 = 1968
6		blank
7-9	Character Identification	for a list see the end of this appendix
10-12	Program Identification	for a list see the end of this appendix
13		blank
14	Card Number	6 (2nd coder)
15-16	Coder Identification	for a list see the end of this appendix

Card Number 6

<u>Column</u>	<u>Variable</u>	<u>Code</u>
17-24		blank
25	A COMFORTABLE LIFE	1 = very important 2 = important 3 = irrelevant
26	AN EXCITING LIFE	1 = very important 2 = important 3 = irrelevant
27	A SENSE OF ACCOMPLISHMENT	1 = very important 2 = important 3 = irrelevant
28	A WORLD AT PEACE	1 = very important 2 = important 3 = irrelevant
29	A WORLD OF BEAUTY	1 = very important 2 = important 3 = irrelevant
30	EQUALITY	1 = very important 2 = important 3 = irrelevant
31	FAMILY SECURITY	1 = very important 2 = important 3 = irrelevant
32	FREEDOM	1 = very important 2 = important 3 = irrelevant
33	HAPPINESS	1 = very important 2 = important 3 = irrelevant
34	INNER HARMONY	1 = very important 2 = important 3 = irrelevant
35	MATURE LOVE	1 = very important 2 = important 3 = irrelevant

Card Number 6

<u>Column</u>	<u>Variable</u>	<u>Code</u>
36	NATIONAL SECURITY	1 = very important 2 = important 3 = irrelevant
37	PELASURE	1 = very important 2 = important 3 = irrelevant
38	SALVATION	1 = very important 2 = important 3 = irrelevant
39	SELF-RESPECT	1 = very important 2 = important 3 = irrelevant
40	SOCIAL RECOGNITION	1 = very important 2 = important 3 = irrelevant
41	TRUE FRIENDSHIP	1 = very important 2 = important 3 = irrelevant
42	WISDOM	1 = very important 2 = important 3 = irrelevant
43-44		blank
45	AMBITIOUS	1 = very important 2 = important 3 = irrelevant
46	BROADMINDED	1 = very important 2 = important 3 = irrelevant
47	CAPABLE	1 = very important 2 = important 3 = irrelevant
48	CHEERFUL	1 = very important 2 = important 3 = irrelevant

Card Number 6

<u>Column</u>	<u>Variable</u>	<u>Code</u>
49	CLEAN	1 = very important 2 = important 3 = irrelevant
50	COURAGEOUS	1 = very important 2 = important 3 = irrelevant
51	FORGIVING	1 = very important 2 = important 3 = irrelevant
52	HELPFUL	1 = very important 2 = important 3 = irrelevant
53	HONEST	1 = very important 2 = important 3 = irrelevant
54	IMAGINATIVE	1 = very important 2 = important 3 = irrelevant
55	INDEPENDENT	1 = very important 2 = important 3 = irrelevant
56	INTELLECTUAL	1 = very important 2 = important 3 = irrelevant
57	LOGICAL	1 = very important 2 = important 3 = irrelevant
58	LOVING	1 = very important 2 = important 3 = irrelevant
59	OBEDIENT	1 = very important 2 = important 3 = irrelevant
60	POLITE	1 = very important 2 = important 3 = irrelevant

Card Number 6

<u>Column</u>	<u>Variable</u>	<u>Code</u>
61	RESPONSIBLE	1 = very important 2 = important 3 = irrelevant
62	SELF-CONTROLLED	1 = very important 2 = important 3 = irrelevant

List of Characters recorded by this instrument

All Cards

<u>Column</u>	<u>Variable</u>	<u>Code</u>
7-9	Character Identification	001 = Batman
		006 = Mrs. Gerta Millet
		008 = Steve Douglas
		010 = Chris Merrick
		012 = Ann Marie
		015 = Huckleberry Finn
		018 = Robert Ironsides
		020 = Emmet Ricker
		024 = Kate Bradley
		027 = Judy (chimpanzee)
		028 = Prof. Oliver Lindenbrook
		034 = Betty Cord
		037 = Jeannie
		038 = James Kirk
		040 = Napoleon Solo
		045 = Admiral Nelson
		047 = Hondo Lane
		051 = Col. George Custer
		055 = Dick Hollister
		058 = Tanner
		061 = Tiger Boy
		066 = Dr. Smith
		067 = D. Vincent
		071 = Rojas
		074 = Samantha
		076 = Jerry Wechsler
		078 = Sister Bertille
		080 = Luke Carpenter
		082 = Lucky
		084 = Bob Johnson
		086 = Sheriff Andy Taylor
		091 = Roger Willoughby
		092 = Brothers Matzoriley
		096 = Super Boing
		097 = Mike Nesmith
		101 = Tom Wedlow
		102 = Mush Mouse
		103 = Breesely the Bear
		104 = Magilla Gorilla
		105 = Jeepers
		106 = Goodie Gremlin
		107 = Casper
		108 = Tom Smothers
		110 = Tomato Hater
		112 = El Cadaver
		113 = Super President
		116 = Super President
		118 = Lassie
		120 = Oliver Wendell Douglas
		121 = Bungling Professor

List of Characters recorded by this instrument (continued)

All Cards

<u>Column</u>	<u>Variable</u>	<u>Code</u>
		123 = Klaus
		124 = Reed Richards
		126 = Bungling Brother
		129 = Granite Man
		130 = Kaye Buell
		134 = J. Jonah Jamison
		139 = Lucretia Rogers
		140 = Tarzan
		144 = Police Lt.
		146 = Lucy Carmichael
		149 = Joe Lehigh
		152 = Joe Friday
		156 = Gomer Pyle
		159 = David Lewis
		160 = Garrison
		162 = Hugh, Prince of Donegal
		167 = James West
		168 = Liz Carter
		170 = Betty Cord
		173 = Uncle Bill
		179 = Sam Marlowe
		180 = Jethro Clampett
		182 = Indian Chief (Iron Horse)
		184 = Col. Hogan
		188 = Evil Jester
		191 = Shazzan
		193 = The Impossibles
		195 = Frankenstein, Jr.
		199 = Impossibles
		202 = Fred Flintstone
		203 = Space Ghost
		204 = Space Ghost
		205 = Dino Boy
		206 = Sandor
		207 = Gorbak
		208 = Samson
		210 = Samson
		216 = Danny Thomas
		221 = Inspector Erskine
		223 = Tennessee
		224 = Stringer
		228 = Maxwell Smart
		230 = Sgt. Troy
		231 = Will Sonnett
		236 = Sandman
		243 = Jane

List of Characters recorded by this instrument (continued)

All Cards

<u>Column</u>	<u>Variable</u>	<u>Code</u>
		302 = Anne Marie
		305 = Julia Baker
		306 = Tom
		309 = General David
		311 = Officer Mallory
		313 = T. Lawrence Sharron
		319 = Lincoln Hayes
		322 = Mrs. Lane
		325 = Steed
		328 = Jason Bolt
		332 = Murdoch Lancer
		333 = M. Cervantes
		338 = Mike Riley
		342 = Cat Ballou
		343 = Oliver Wendell Douglas
		346 = Rufus
		347 = Janet Harper
		351 = J. Jonah Jamison
		353 = Spiderman
		355 = Katy
		359 = Matt Dillon
		361 = Insp. McGarrett
		362 = Mr. Beadows
		367 = Marsh Tracy
		369 = Jeannie
		372 = Eve
		374 = Steve - the Captain
		375 = Uncle Joe
		378 = Huck Finn
		381 = Carolyn
		384 = Samantha
		385 = Jethro Clampett
		387 = Dr. Joe Rossi
		389 = James West
		393 = Alexander Mundy
		396 = Lucy
		398 = Aunt Bea Taylor
		399 = Ben Cartwright
		402 = Sissy Davis
		406 = Doris Martin
		407 = Colonel Hogan
		410 = Dagwood Bumstead
		412 = Gomer Pyle
		414 = Jane Brown
		417 = Maxwell Smart
		420 = Fred Flintstone
		424 = Mrs. Muir
		428 = Corey
		429 = Dave Evans
		434 = Glen Howard

List of Characters Recorded by this instrument (concluded)

All Cards

<u>Column</u>	<u>Variable</u>	<u>Code</u>
		437 = Johnny Taylor
		439 = Reggie
		440 = Jughead Jones
		442 = Ben (the bear)
		444 = Colonel Coyote
		445 = Captain Skyhook
		446 = Sergeant
		447 = Underdog
		449 = Penelope
		450 = Dick Dastardly
		452 = Capt. Lomento
		456 = Sam Burnett
		459 = Jonathan Kidd
		465 = Sam Butler
		467 = Ric Richards
		469 = Top Cat
		472 = Sister Ann
		478 = General Cordon
		481 = Mr. Granger
		483 = Bingo
		484 = Wizard
		488 = Morgan
		490 = Tully
		492 = Mildred - robot
		493 = Fleagle
		494 = Drooper
		495 = Gideon
		500 = Sandor
		511 = Super Boing
		512 = 3 headed man
		513 = Elevator man
		515 = Thorak

List of Programs recorded by this instrument

All Cards

<u>Column</u>	<u>Variable</u>	<u>Code</u>
10-12	Serial Number of Program (1967)	001 = Batman
		002 = Yellow Rolls Royce
		003 = My Three Sons
		004 = Felony Squad
		005 = That Girl
		006 = Off to See the Wizard
		007 = Ironside
		008 = Virginian
		009 = Petticoat Junction
		010 = Daktari
		011 = Journey to Center of Earth
		012 = Peyton Place
		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 Fri.
		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 Show, I
		049 = Fantastic Four

List of Programs recorded by this instrument

All Cards

<u>Column</u>	<u>Variable</u>	<u>Code</u>
		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
		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 = Frankenstein Jr.- Smogula
		076 = Frankenstein Jr.- Shocking Monster
		077 = Frankenstein 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

List of Programs recorded by this instrument (continued)

All Cards

<u>Column</u>	<u>Variable</u>	<u>Code</u>
10-12	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

List of Programs recorded by this instrument (continued)

All Cards

<u>Column</u>	<u>Variable</u>	<u>Code</u>
		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 = Gerculoids - "Electrode Men"
		174 = Daniel Boone
		175 = Guns of Will Sonnett
		176 = Khartoum
		177 = Fantastic 4 - "Yancy St."
		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

List of Observers Using the instrument

Cards 5,6

<u>Column</u>	<u>Variable</u>	<u>Code</u>
15-16	Observer Identification	01 = Oscar Gandy.
		02 = Marcia Bryer
		03 = Burt Fox
		04 = Earl Miller
		05 = Ellen DuBrowin
		06 = James Christiansen
		07 = Carolyn Clark
		09 = William Shuster
		11 = Stuart Rawlings
		12 = Jenet Fogman
		13 = Roger Cann
		15 = Albert Belsky
		16 = Kenny Burns
		17 = David Crowley
		18 = Jefferson Dix
		19 = Lawrence Fabian
		20 = Gerald Forney
		21 = Leslie Fox
		22 = Pattison Fulton
		23 = Andrew Gates
		24 = William Gough
		26 = Janis Good
		27 = Daniel Grossman
		28 = Paul Haley
		29 = Janice Hastrup
		30 = Ted Jadwin
		31 = Michael Javoronok
		32 = Mark Kalmanash
		33 = Darryl Kramer
		34 = Farid Lavipour
		35 = Michael McGuire
		36 = Robert Meadow
		38 = John Merrick
		40 = Alaknanda Rege
		41 = Mary Rogers
		42 = Hope Rothenberg
		43 = Barbara Tripp
		45 = Herbert Denton
		47 = Hugh McPhee
		48 = Candace Ryan
		49 = Millicent Schonborn
		50 = James Denker
		51 = Laurence Howard
		52 = Bert McKinnon
		61 = Anne Love
		62 = Ann Gilchrist
		63 = James Murphy

APPENDIX F

The Recording Instrument for Violent Encounters and Acts
and their Justification

APPENDIX FThe Recording Instrument for Violent Encounters and Acts
and their Justification1. Recording Unit

The units in terms of which violent encounters are transcribed are acts of violence. One TV-Program may have many acts of violence. Each has to be recorded as a separate entity. Acts of violence have to meet the following two defining criteria:

1. People, human groups or living things (including animals with human characteristics) are physically harmed, forcefully restrained or barely escape death, injury, pain, etc.
2. The harm is caused by or explained in terms of the behavior of other people. (Intention and motivation do not enter as defining criteria and entirely verbal threats are also excluded).

The two criteria for identifying acts of violence may be distributed over a whole program. Thus if an event is explained initially as an accident but linked to the behavior of another person at a later point in the drama it qualifies as an act of violence.

If harm, injury or physical confinement cannot be linked to individuals or groups of individuals then, by definition, it does not constitute an act of violence. Violence is a form of interaction involving at least two individuals or groups. The armed pursuit of a person constitutes an act of violence even though the bullet may miss its target. Forcing a person at gun point is an act of violence but just pointing a gun at someone may merely be regarded a threat and is therefore excluded as an act of violence. Acts of violence must have actual or potentially harmful consequences for their receivers. If one party physically attacks another party and the latter does not return the violence in defense, then the violent encounter has to be recorded as a single act. Acts of violence are distinguished on the number of bullets fired or how severe the kick may have been. Acts of violence mediate between a source of violence and a receiver.

However, if the receiver in turn responds with violence then the encounter has to be characterized by two acts of violence with the parties being interchangeably source and receiver of violence, though perhaps for different reasons. Lengthy shooting duels, fist fights and large-scale battle scenes would have to be regarded as two acts of violence provided that the exchange is actually shown (and not merely present in the phantasies of one party) and that this interaction is continuous, i.e., without significant interruptions and without significant changes in the way violence is exchanged.

If a prolonged exchange of violence is not continuous in the sense that major shifts in the style of interactions occur (e.g., a change in the means of fighting, a change in initiative or aims pursued, the introduction of a third party or a change in the original parties involved), then the violence has to be represented by more than two acts of violence. Shifts in the basic dimensions of violent interaction are indicative of transitions from one encounter to the next, differentiating between the acts (or pairs of acts) of violence to be recorded.

Two violent encounters may occur simultaneously on the screen. For example, two parties - who are relatively independent of each other, and whose behavior is not significantly coordinated, and hence cannot be considered a single group - may interact with different portions of a joint enemy. Or, when a third party becomes a source of violence without significantly affecting the nature of violent interaction between the first two parties, then the first encounter may be said to continue while a second encounter may have started at the point of the third party's entry.

For the purpose of analysis several basic components of an act of violence are distinguished each of which is subsequently characterized along several more specific variables.

By definition of an act of violence, the following three components must occur:

1. The source of violence, or that person or group which behaves in such a way that some second party is physically affected by it, whether intentionally or not.
2. The receiver of violence, or that person or group which is either directly harmed by the source's behavior or put in the immediate danger of being so affected regardless of whether the person or group is aware of the consequences of the encounter. Note that receivers are sometimes merely the vehicles through which an ultimate target is intended to be affected.
3. The act of violence ; a causal link between the source's behavior and the receiver's harm or danger.

Moreover, there may be:

4. The beneficiary of the act or that individual, group or abstract idea in behalf of, or for the benefit of which the violent act is performed. The beneficiary need not appear on the screen but may appear in the source's justification of his behavior or may be asserted in the plot in order to make his behavior consistent. Source and beneficiary may or may not coincide.

Sometimes the parties of violent encounters are single individuals (e.g., the lone hero or victim). But more often the role of the source and/or receiver of violence is assumed by a small group or an organization (e.g., a gang or an army). If a set of characters is referred to as a whole (e.g., the dynamic duo, Garrison's Gorillas, Charlie), if their behavior is highly coordinated (e.g., division of labor, the existence of formal organization) or if they lack individuality in the plot (e.g., same uniform, never shown isolated from others) then they should be regarded as one group. Conversely, if the characters are carefully distinguished, their behavior is relatively independent of each other and differences among their personalities is emphasized, they should be regarded as individuals. However, the recording of acts of violence should consider the fact that characters may act as individuals at one point in time and join a group as indistinguishable members at some other point in time. The witness of a violent encounter is always regarded as one component regardless of how many members it contains.

Beneficiaries are often perceived in terms of a hierarchy of increasing generality. A particular police officer may be seen as a member of a patrol and this patrol could be taken as an incident of the police in general which in turn is part of

everything that is concerned with the preservation of law and order. Law enforcement agencies may have to fight on all levels. However, if it is the declared purpose of a detective to fight his own enemy than the beneficiary is the source itself. Generally, the beneficiary should be identified as that person, group or abstract idea which is thought to be gaining most directly from the acts of violence or which is most explicitly asserted in the source's justification for the act. The observer should avoid long chains of reasoning and describe the most obvious beneficiary and ultimate target.

2. Recording procedure

The observer must see the whole program at least once (during which he may make informal notes regarding the acts of violence involved).

One cover sheet is provided for each program and one data sheet for each act of violence with cells into which the required information is to be inserted. No cell should be left blank.

The first step of the recording procedure is to isolate the acts of violence occurring in the program. The two defining criteria must be met in each case. It seems to be helpful to note the beginning and the end of the act of violence and to write this down on the data sheet for further reference. Then assign a serial number to this act, beginning with "01."

The second step of the recording procedure is to identify the components for describing the act in detail. The principal characters and groups involved in the violent encounter are to be assigned identification numbers. These are to be inserted in the appropriate cells for the source and the receiver on the data sheet together with a short description of the character or group.

The third step of the procedure is to record more detailed information along several variables. A set of questions are formulated that require an answer in terms of predefined categories and may call for a short verbal description.

2	1
5	2
5	3
9	4

columns 5 through 9 BLANK

Program _____

	10
	11
	12

column 13 BLANK

Coders _____

	14
	15

SOURCE

21

1	
---	--

(nature of act)

21

3	
---	--

(instrument)

RECEIVER

21

4	
---	--

(ethnicity)

21

2	
---	--

(ethnicity)

22

5

ethnicity 23

sex 24

stardom 25

serial 26

group-belongingness 27

good - bad 28

law 29

outcome 30

beneficiary 31

relation source-
beneficiary 32

complexity of instrument 33

degree of seriousness 34

distance source-receiver 35

prior relation source-
receiver 36

amount of non-violent
interaction 37

sexual aspect 38

ethnicity 39

sex 40

stardom 41

serial 42

group-belongingness 43

good - bad 44

law 45

outcome 46

cognitive preparation 47

immediate response 48

consequences 49

3. Variables and categories(a) The source of violence

A verbal description of the source is required

ETHNICITY (0) not identifiable
(1) identifiable

If the source's ethnicity is identifiable give a verbal description (e.g., Negro, German, American Indian. Do not forget to include American white).

SEX (0) indeterminate (like some cartoon characters)
(1) male individual or group of males
(2) female individual or group of females
(3) mixed (if it is a group with both males and females)

STARDOM (0) no visible role (only indirectly referred to)
(1) minor part (role neither central nor extensive)
(2) medium part (in between minor and major)
(3) major part (role central and/or very extensive)

Note: Only the role in the plot has to be taken into account, not some actor's general fame.

SERIAL (0) program is not a serial
(1) regular part (mostly announced as such)
(2) guest part (mostly announced as such)

GROUP-BELONGINGNESS (1) isolated individual (no clear cut co-operation with or close ties to other individuals in the dramatic plot; Note: disregard information on ties to individuals not actually shown on screen)
(2) group-leader (someone who actually has or shares the highest authority in the group he belongs to)
(3) group member
(4) group (non-individualized collectivity)

GOOD - BAD (0) irrelevant (not clearly portrayed as good or bad; neutral)
(1) good (portrayed as belonging basically to the right side, even though he may on occasion act wrongly)
(2) bad (portrayed as belonging basically to the wrong side, even though he may on occasion act in the right way)
(3) good-bad (someone who switches from the right side to the wrong side, or the other way around; or someone with a complex role, as in Greek tragedy.)

RELATION TO LAW

- (0) no special relation to the law portrayed (e.g., ordinary citizen)
- (1) law enforcement officer (e.g., policeman, national guard, etc., if portrayed in that role)
- (2) semi-law enforcement (e.g., private detective working closely together with police; prison guard, executioner)
- (3) criminal (if portrayed in that role)

FINAL OUTCOME

- (0) neither gain nor loss shown; irrelevant; if a person or group does not appear in latest part of show, and is not by implication there, code 0 is appropriate.
- (1) clear winner (e.g., gangster who gets away with the loot, the sheriff who killed the outlaw, etc.)
- (2) winner - but (e.g., the man who got away, but lost a close friend. I.e., Pyrrhic Victory)
- (3) loser - but (e.g., the man who lands in jail but has a treasure hidden somewhere)
- (4) clear loser (e.g., killed, or imprisoned without compensation)

(b) The beneficiary of the violence as perceived by the source

BENEFICIARY

- (0) a designated individual
- (1) a designated leader of a group
- (2) a small group, a team
- (3) an organization
- (4) a large collectivity and/or an abstract idea as represented by the convictions and beliefs of many people

RELATION SOURCE-BENEFICIARY

- (0) identity (the source is the beneficiary)
- (1) family ties and friendship, affection, communion and informal relations
- (2) formal social, occupational and economical grounds, on relations between well defined roles (e.g., employer-employee, officer-soldier or formal authority)
- (3) ideological, ethnic and religious grounds or stems merely from possessing certain common or contrasting properties such as race, convictions, age groups, etc.
- (4) general rules of social conduct in public places, cutting across familial, formal social and ideological boundaries. (The encounter is typically accidental, e.g., with a stranger, but social norms are not absent)

(c) The act of violence

A verbal description is required of both the act of violence and the instruments used by the source during the violent encounter.

COMPLEXITY OF INSTRUMENTS

- (1) no instruments (e.g., fists)
- (2) small devices, objects from everyday life (e.g., furniture, cars, small concealable firearms) including natural forces (e.g., leaving receiver in desert)
- (3) somewhat more sophisticated and specialized machinery (e.g., torture chambers, specially prepared traps, machine guns, plastic explosives)
- (4) elaborate organization and/or complex and specialized machinery (e.g., mass destruction devices, acts of James Bond's enemies.)

Note: In the case of instruments of a mixed type, (e.g., fist fighting as well as shooting with a gun), always record the more complex of the instruments involved.

SERIOUSNESS

- (1) violence appears as an integral part of slapstick, (e.g., The Three Stooges, pie fights, cartoons)
- (2) violence appears in the context of self satire, high camp
- (3) violence appears as scrimmage, friendly competition
- (4) violence appears as a real fight, serious combat

Note: To decide how serious the violence is meant, consider the overall climate in which the violent acts take place. If removed from its contextural setting, the degree of seriousness may be distorted. If more than one category is appropriate, take the first one on this list.

PERCEPTUAL DISTANCE

- (1) direct, interpersonal, and of closest proximity, i.e., within natural talking distance (e.g., violence within a small room or small area)
- (2) mediated in face-to-face contact, i.e., involving distances beyond the limits of natural conversation (e.g., sniper, cannon)
- (3) mediated without sight (e.g., poisoning without observing the effects, sending the receiver into a fatal situation, dynamiting with a fuse)
- (4) global and/or undirected (e.g., killing by push button, nuclear missiles, etc.) directed indiscriminately against a large population

(d) Relations between source and receiver

- PRIOR RELATION
- (0) none (strangers)
 - (1) husband and wife
 - (2) direct family (parents, children, brothers, sisters)
 - (3) family, other
 - (4) friends
 - (5) neighbors
 - (6) job colleagues, co-workers
 - (7) competitors
 - (8) enemies
 - (9) other

Note: Here the relationship between source and receiver, as existing prior to their first violent encounter, has to be coded. This applies also when entering the code for the second, third, etc., violent encounter.

- NON-VIOLENT INTERACTION
- (0) no other than violent interaction
 - (1) minor (only on one or two occasions, of short duration)
 - (2) medium (in between minor and major)
 - (3) major (very frequent and/or of long duration)

- SEXUAL ASPECT
- (0) no sexual aspect
 - (1) sex explicitly present (kissing, necking and other overt behavior)
 - (2) sex implicitly present (as indicated by relevant verbal statements; by relationship husband-wife lovers, boy friend-girl friend, or by flirtation)

(e) The receiver of violence

A verbal description of the receiver is required

- ETHNICITY
- (0) not identifiable
 - (1) identifiable

If the receiver's ethnicity is identifiable give a verbal description (e.g., Negro, German, American Indian. Do not forget to include American white).

- SEX
- (0) indeterminate (like some cartoon characters)
 - (1) male individual or group of males
 - (2) female individual or group of females
 - (3) mixed (if it is a group with both males and females)

STARDOM

- (0) no visible role (only indirectly referred to)
- (1) minor part (role neither central nor extensive)
- (2) medium part (in between minor and major)
- (3) major part (role central and/or very extensive)

Note: Only the role in the plot has to be taken into account, not some actor's general fame.

SERIAL

- (0) program is not a serial
- (1) regular part (mostly announced as such)
- (2) guest part (mostly announced as such)

GROUP-BELONGINGNESS

- (1) isolated individual (no clear cut co-operation with or close ties to other individuals in the dramatic plot; Note: disregard information on ties to individuals not actually shown on screen)
- (2) group-leader (someone who actually has or shares the highest authority in the group he belongs to)
- (3) group member
- (4) group (non-individualized collectivity)

GOOD - BAD

- (0) irrelevant (not clearly portrayed as good or bad; neutral)
- (1) good (portrayed as belonging basically to the right side, even though he may on occasion act wrongly)
- (2) bad (portrayed as belonging basically to the wrong side, even though he may on occasion act in the right way)
- (3) good-bad (someone who switches from the right side to the wrong side, or the other way around; or someone with a complex role, as in Greek tragedy.)

RELATION TO LAW

- (0) no special relation to the law portrayed (e.g., ordinary citizen)
- (1) law enforcement officer (e.g., policeman, national guard, etc., if portrayed in that role)
- (2) semi-law enforcement (e.g., private detective working closely together with police; prison guard, executioner)
- (3) criminal (if portrayed in that role)

FINAL OUTCOME

- (0) neither gain nor loss shown; irrelevant if a person or group does not appear in latest part of show, and is not by implication there, code 0 is appropriate.
- (1) clear winner (e.g., gangster who gets away with the loot, the sheriff who killed the outlaw, etc.)
- (2) winner - but (e.g., the man who got away, but lost a close friend. I.e., Pyrrhic Victory)
- (3) loser - but (e.g., the man who lands in jail but has a treasure hidden somewhere)
- (4) clear loser (e.g., killed, or imprisoned without compensation)

(f) State of and consequences for the receiver

COGNITIVE PREPARATION

- (1) the receiver is totally unaware, violence is not perceived prior to occurrence (e.g., shooting from back)
- (2) recognizes the violence spontaneously, i.e. immediately before occurrence (e.g., stranger draws gun on sheriff)
- (3) anticipates the violence in general outline, i.e., expects violence before encounter takes place, in warned
- (4) anticipates the violence in great detail (e.g., when elaborate plans of attack are known to receiver)

IMMEDIATE RESPONSE

- (2) physically unable to respond (e.g., completely confined, unconscious, dead), not responding or the response is not clearly recognizable
- (3) withdraws from encounter, disengages
- (4) submits unconditionally
- (5) submits conditionally (e.g., intends to escape, plans counter-violence or other measures of retaliation)
- (6) resists by other than violent means
- (7) responds with violence

Note: All responses that are demanded by the source and are willingly executed by the receiver should be regarded as "unconditional submission." If the receiver submits to the source's demands in view of subsequent resistance or as a tactical means to counter violence, the response should be considered "conditional submission."

CONSEQUENCES

- (0) are not shown or are not evident on the screen
- (1) are shown not to exist, i.e., the receiver remains unaffected in the long run
- (2) somewhat impaired
- (3) severely incapacitated
- (4) dead or annihilated

Note: Do not make long chains of inference. If someone is shown to be hurt and subsequently disappears from the screen, ultimate consequence may not be known, hence category "0" is appropriate.

Again note: If the receiver is a small group, an organization or a nation, judgements should consider the severity of the permanent consequences. Thus, if a settler's raid on an indian tribe leaves half of its members dead, the tribe might be said to be "permanently incapacitated" though not "dead." If only a few are killed without significantly affecting the tribe's ability to defend itself, the permanent consequence might be "somewhat impaired."

4. Reliability of variables

In the following the results of the final reliability estimates are listed for all those variables that survived the pre-test. The reliability is assessed on the basis of a random sample of 17 programs out of a total of 183 and contained 156 acts of violence out of a total of 1215. Where both the source and the receiver of violence are characterized by the same variables the observations are taken together.

The information is listed in the following order:

Name of variable

Type of scale (N = nominal, I = interval)

Recoding whenever the report differs from primary data

Reliability coefficient (1 = perfect agreement and 0 = chance)

Inclusion in the report (Yes = included, No = rejected)

(a) The source of violence and (e) the receiver of violence

ETHNICITY	N	0, (1,2)	.656	No
SEX	N		.915	Yes
STARDOM	I	(0,1), 2,3	.652	No
SERIAL	N		.875	Yes
GROUP-BELONGINGNESS	N		.844	Yes
GOOD-BAD	I	1, (0,3), 2	.886	Yes
RELATION TO LAW	N		.784	Yes
FINAL OUTCOME	I	1,2,0,3,4	.792	Yes

(b) The beneficiary of violence

BENEFICIARY	N	(0,1), (2,3,4)	.650	No
RELATION SOURCE-BENEFICIARY	N	0, (1,2,3,4)	.704	Yes

(c) The act of violence

COMPLEXITY OF INSTRUMENTS	I	1,2,(3,4)	.678	Yes
SERIOUSNESS	N	(1,2),(3,4)	.827	Yes
PERCEPTUAL DISTANCE	N	1,2, (3,4)	.728	Yes

(d) Relations between source and receiver

PRIOR RELATION	N	0, (1,2,3,4,5,6,9),(7,8)	.460	No
NON-VIOLENT INTERACTION	I		.753	Yes
SEXUAL ASPECT	N	0, (1,2)	1.00	Yes

(f) State of and consequences for the receiver

COGNITIVE PREPARATION	I		.616	No
IMMEDIATE RESPONSE	N	(2,3,4,5),6,7	.752	Yes
CONSEQUENCES	N	0, (1,2,3,4)	.473	No
CONSEQUENCES	I	1, (2,3),4	.853	Yes

5. Current Form of Primary Data

Data are available in the form of IBM punch cards

<u>Column</u>	<u>Variable</u>	<u>Code</u>
1-3	Project Number	255
4	Recording Unit	9 = act of violence
5		blank
6	Network	1 = ABC 2 = CBS 3 = NBC
7-9		blank
10-12	Serial number of Program	for a list see the end of this appendix
13		blank
14-15	Observer identification	for a list see the end of this appendix
16-18		blank
19-20	Serial number of the act of violence	01 to .99 depending on the number of acts observed
21		blank
22	Card Number	5
23	ETHNICITY	0 = not identifiable 1 = identifiable
24	SEX	0 = indeterminate 1 = male 2 = female 3 = mixed
25	STARDOM	0 = no visible role 1 = minor part 2 = medium part 3 = major part
26	SERIAL	0 = program is not a serial 1 = regular part 2 = guest part
27	GROUP-BELONGINGNESS	1 = isolated individual 2 = group leader 3 = member of a group 4 = group, collectivity

<u>Column</u>	<u>Variable</u>	<u>Code</u>
28	GOOD-BAD	0 = neutral, irrelevant 1 = good 2 = bad 3 = good-bad
29	RELATION TO LAW	0 = none 1 = law enforcement officer 2 = semi-law enforcement 3 = criminal
30	FINAL OUTCOME	0 = neither gain nor loss shown 1 = clear winner 2 = winner - but 3 = loser - but 4 = clear loser
31	BENEFICIARY	0 = a designated individual 1 = a leader of a group 2 = a small group or a team 3 = an organization 4 = a large collectivity
32	RELATION SOURCE-RECEIVER	0 = identity, self 1 = family and friendship 2 = formal social 3 = ideological, ethnic 4 = rules of conduct in public
33	COMPLEXITY OF INSTRUMENTS	1 = no instruments 2 = small devices 3 = somewhat sophisticated machinery 4 = elaborate organization
34	SERIOUSNESS	1 = slapstick 2 = self satire, high camp 3 = scrimmage, friendly competition 4 = fight, serious combat
35	PERCEPTUAL DISTANCE	1 = direct interpersonal 2 = mediated in face to face combat 3 = mediated without sight 4 = global and/or undirected

<u>Column</u>	<u>Variable</u>	<u>Code</u>
36	PRIOR RELATION	0 = none 1 = husband 2 = direct family 3 = family, other 4 = friends 5 = neighbors 6 = job colleagues, co-workers 7 = competitors 8 = enemies 9 = others
37	NON-VIOLENT INTERACTION	0 = none prior to violence 1 = minor 2 = medium 3 = major
38	SEXUAL ASPECT	0 = no 1 = explicitly present 2 = implicitly present
39	ETHNICITY	0 = not identifiable 1 = identifiable
40	SEX	0 = indeterminate 1 = male individual or group of males 2 = female individual or group of females 3 = mixed
41	STARDOM	0 = no visible role 1 = minor part 2 = medium part 3 = major part
42	SERIAL	0 = program is not a serial 1 = regular part 2 = guest part
43	GROUP-BELONGINGNESS	1 = isolated individual 2 = group-leader 3 = group member 4 = group
44	GOOD-BAD	0 = irrelevant 1 = good 2 = bad 3 = good-bad
45	RELATION TO LAW	0 = no special relation to the law portrayed 1 = law enforcement officer 2 = semi-law enforcement 3 = criminal

46	FINAL OUTCOME	0 = neither gain nor loss shown 1 = clear winner 2 = winner - but 3 = loser - but 4 = clear loser
47	COGNITIVE PREPARATION	1 = unaware 2 = spontaneously recognized 3 = anticipated without detail 4 = anticipated in great detail
48	IMMEDIATE RESPONSE	2 = unable to respond 3 = withdrawal 4 = unconditional submission 5 = conditional submission 6 = active non-violent resistance 7 = counter violence
49	CONSEQUENCES	0 = not shown 1 = do not exist 2 = somewhat impaired 3 = severely incapacitated 4 = dead or annihilated
50-80		blank

List of observers using the instrument

<u>Column</u>	<u>Variable</u>	<u>Code</u>
14-15	Observer identification	01 = Cauley-Meadow 02 = Christianson-Hastrup 03 = Hastrup-Bryer 04 = Cauley-Javoronok 05 = Marcy-Hastrup 06 = Cauley-Bryer 07 = Cauley-Hastrup 08 = Travis-Gilbert 09 = Christianson-Fabian 10 = Meadow-Hastrup 11 = Gough-Meadow 12 = Bryer-Fulton 13 = Fabian-Gough 14 = Gandy-Fulton 15 = Belsky-Cauley 16 = Cauley-Fabian 17 = Fabian-Hastrup 18 = Gilbert-Cauley 19 = Christianson-Javoronok 20 = Christianson-Rothenberg 21 = Gough-Marcy 22 = Marcy-Javoronok 23 = Gough-Bryer 24 = Gough-Christianson 25 = Marcy-Belsky 26 = Bryer-Rothenberg 27 = Fabian-Burns 28 = Gilbert-Hastrup 29 = Christianson-Gilbert 30 = Cauley-Marcy 31 = Cauley-Christianson

List of program recorded by this instrument

<u>Column</u>	<u>Variable</u>	<u>Code</u>
10-12	Serial Number of Program (1967)	001 = Batman
		004 = Felony Squad
		006 = Off to See the Wizard
		007 = Ironside
		008 = The Virginian
		010 = Daktari
		011 = Journey to the Center of the Earth
		014 = Star Trek
		015 = Man From U.N.C.L.E.
		016 = Voyage to the Bottom of the Sea
		017 = Hondo
		018 = Custer
		020 = Daniel Boone
		021 = Maya
		022 = Lost in Space
		023 = The Invaders
		024 = Bonanza
		030 = Gunsmoke
		033 = Super 6--Matzonuts
		034 = Super 6--Man From TRASH
		046 = Gentle Ben
		037 = Magilla Gorilla I
		038 = Casper
		039 = Casper
		040 = Casper
		042 = Smothers Brothers
		043 = Super President
		044 = Super President
		045 = Super President
		049 = Fantastic 4
		050 = Fantastic 4
		054 = Spiderman I
		055 = Second Time Around
		056 = Tarzan
		057 = NYPD
		059 = Cimarron Strip
		060 = Dragnet
		063 = Garrison's Gorillas
		064 = Walt Disney's World of, etc.
		065 = Wild, Wild West
		069 = Trouble with Harry
		071 = Iron Horse
		074 = Shazzan!
		075 = Frankenstein, Jr.
		076 = Frankenstein, Jr.
		077 = Frankenstein, Jr.
		078 = Flintstones
		079 = Space Ghost I
		080 = Herculoids
		081 = Herculoids

<u>Column</u>	<u>Variable</u>	<u>Code</u>
		082 = Samson and Goliath I
		083 = Danny Thomas
		084 = The FBI
		085 = The Beagles II
		087 = Get Smart
		088 = Rat Patrol
		089 = Guns of Will Sonnett
		090 = Whatever Happened to Baby Jane
		091 = Magilla Gorilla II
		092 = Magilla Gorilla III
		093 = Spiderman II
		094 = Samson and Goliath II
		095 = Space Ghost II
		096 = Space Ghost III
Serial Number of Program (1968)		103 = Ugliest Girl in Town
		104 = Outcasts
		107 = The Mod Squad
		108 = NYPD
		109 = The Avengers
		111 = Lancer
		112 = Ironside
		113 = The FBI
		114 = Cat Ballou
		118 = Spiderman II
		119 = Spiderman I
		121 = Gunsmoke
		122 = Hawaii 5-0
		123 = A Man Could Get Killed
		124 = Daktari
		127 = Land of the Giants
		134 = Wild, Wild West
		138 = Bonanza
		140 = Doris Day Show
		145 = Get Smart
		148 = Lassie
		150 = The Name of the Game
		151 = Felony Squad
		155 = Go-Go-Gophers Pt. I
		156 = Go-Go-Gophers Pt. II
		157 = Go-Go-Gophers Pt. III
		158 = Underdog
		159 = Wacky Races, Pt. I
		160 = Wacky Races, Pt. II
		162 = The Rare Breed
		163 = Batman/Superman I [9 Lives of Batman]
		164 = Batman/Superman II [Can a Luthor Change His Spots]
		165 = Batman/Superman III [Superham(Forget Me Not Superdog]
		166 = Batman/Superman IV [In and Out Again Penguin]
		167 = High Chaparral
		168 = Fantastic Voyage
		169 = Super Six I [Thunder-8-Ball]

List of program recorded by this instrument (Continued)

<u>Column</u>	<u>Variable</u>	<u>Code</u>
		170 = Super Six II [Ruin & Board]
		171 = Super Six III [Nursey Caper]
		172 = Herculoids I [Tiny World of Terror]
		173 = Herculoids II [Invasion of the Electrode Men]
		174 = Daniel Boone
		175 = Guns of Will Sonnett
		176 = Khartoum
		177 = Fantastic Four
		178 = Topcat
		180 = The Virginian
		182 = Banana Splits - "The Wizard Ramizer"
		183 = Banana Splits - "Danger Island"
		184 = Banana Splits - "The Plot of the Puppetmaster"

APPENDIX G

Tabulations of Results

TABLE 1: PROGRAMS ANALYZED, 1967

	Total		ABC		CBS		NBC	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
All Programs (% of total)	96 (100.0)	100.0	35 (36.5)	100.0	32 (33.3)	100.0	29 (30.2)	100.0
Program Format								
Cartoons (% of total)	32 (100.0)	33.3	13 (40.6)	37.1	10 (31.3)	31.3	9 (28.1)	31.0
TV Plays (% of total)	58 (100.0)	60.4	20 (34.5)	57.1	20 (34.5)	62.5	18 (31.0)	62.1
Feature Films (% of total)	6 (100.0)	6.3	2 (33.3)	5.7	2 (33.3)	6.3	2 (33.3)	6.9
Program Style								
Crime (% of total)	10 (100.0)	10.4	6 (60.0)	17.1	0 (0.0)	0.0	4 (40.0)	13.8
Western (% of total)	9 (100.0)	9.4	4 (44.4)	11.4	3 (33.3)	6.3	2 (22.2)	6.9
Action-Adventure (% of total)	45 (100.0)	46.9	15 (33.3)	42.9	15 (33.3)	46.9	15 (33.3)	51.7
Other (% of total)	32 (100.0)	33.3	10 (31.3)	28.6	14 (43.8)	43.8	8 (25.0)	27.6
Program Tone								
Comedy (% of total)	44 (100.0)	45.8	13 (29.5)	37.1	16 (36.4)	50.0	15 (34.1)	51.7
Other (% of total)	52 (100.0)	54.2	22 (42.3)	62.9	16 (30.8)	50.0	14 (26.9)	48.3

TABLE 2: PROGRAMS ANALYZED, 1968

	Total		ABC		CBS		NBC	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
All Programs (% of total)	87 (100.0)	100.0	22 (25.3)	100.0	35 (40.2)	100.0	30 (34.5)	100.0
Program Format								
Cartoons (% of total)	25 (100.0)	28.7	4 (16.0)	18.2	13 (52.0)	37.1	8 (32.0)	26.7
TV Plays (% of total)	55 (100.0)	63.2	16 (29.1)	72.7	20 (36.4)	57.1	19 (34.5)	63.3
Feature Films (% of total)	7 (100.0)	8.1	2 (28.6)	9.1	2 (28.6)	5.8	3 (42.8)	10.0
Program Style								
Crime (% of total)	8 (100.0)	9.2	4 (50.0)	18.2	1 (12.5)	2.9	3 (37.5)	10.0
Western (% of total)	11 (100.0)	12.6	4 (36.4)	18.2	3 (27.2)	8.6	4 (36.4)	13.3
Action-Adventure (% of total)	35 (100.0)	40.2	8 (22.9)	36.4	14 (40.0)	40.0	13 (37.1)	43.4
Other (% of total)	33 (100.0)	38.0	6 (18.2)	27.2	17 (51.5)	48.5	10 (30.3)	33.3
Program Tone								
Comedy (% of total)	42 (100.0)	48.3	6 (14.3)	27.2	21 (50.0)	60.0	15 (35.7)	50.0
Other (% of total)	45 (100.0)	51.7	16 (35.6)	72.8	14 (31.1)	40.0	15 (33.3)	50.0

TABLE 3: PROGRAMS ANALYZED, 1967 and 1968 TOTALS

	Total		ABC		CBS		NBC	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
All Programs (% of total)	183 (100.0)	100.0	57 (31.1)	100.0	67 (36.6)	100.0	59 (32.3)	100.0
Program Format								
Cartoons (% of total)	57 (100.0)	31.1	17 (29.8)	29.8	23 (40.4)	34.3	17 (29.8)	28.8
TV Plays (% of total)	113 (100.0)	61.7	36 (31.9)	63.2	40 (35.4)	59.7	37 (32.7)	62.7
Feature Films (% of total)	13 (100.0)	7.2	4 (30.8)	7.0	4 (30.8)	6.0	5 (38.4)	8.5
Program Style								
Crime (% of total)	18 (100.0)	9.8	10 (55.6)	17.5	1 (5.6)	1.5	7 (38.8)	11.9
Western (% of total)	20 (100.0)	10.9	8 (40.0)	14.0	6 (30.0)	9.0	6 (30.0)	10.2
Action-Adventure (% of total)	80 (100.0)	43.7	23 (28.8)	40.4	29 (36.2)	43.3	28 (35.0)	47.4
Other (% of total)	65 (100.0)	35.5	16 (24.6)	28.1	31 (47.7)	46.2	18 (27.7)	30.5
Program Tone								
Comedy (% of total)	86 (100.0)	47.0	19 (22.1)	33.3	37 (43.0)	55.2	30 (34.9)	50.8
Other (% of total)	97 (100.0)	53.0	38 (39.2)	66.7	30 (30.9)	44.8	29 (29.9)	49.2

TABLE 4: PROGRAM HOURS ANALYZED, 1967

	Total		ABC		CBS		NBC	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
All Hours	64.0	100.0	23.0	100.0	20.5	100.0	20.5	100.0
(% of total)	(100.0)		(35.9)		(32.0)		(32.0)	
Program Format								
Cartoons	7.0	10.9	3.0	13.0	2.0	9.8	2.0	9.8
(% of total)	(100.0)		(42.9)		(28.5)		(28.5)	
TV Plays	44.0	68.8	15.0	65.2	14.5	70.7	14.5	70.7
(% of total)	(100.0)		(34.1)		(33.0)		(33.0)	
Feature Films	13.0	20.3	5.0	21.7	4.0	19.5	4.0	19.5
(% of total)	(100.0)		(38.5)		(30.8)		(30.8)	
Program Style								
Crime	9.0	14.1	5.3	23.0	0.0	0.0	3.7	18.0
(% of total)	(100.0)		(58.9)		(0.0)		(41.1)	
Western	9.5	14.8	3.5	15.2	3.5	17.1	2.5	12.2
(% of total)	(100.0)		(36.8)		(36.8)		(26.3)	
Action/Advent.	27.3	42.7	10.5	45.7	7.0	34.1	9.8	47.8
(% of total)	(100.0)		(38.5)		(25.6)		(35.9)	
Other	18.2	28.4	3.7	16.1	10.0	48.8	4.5	22.0
(% of total)	(100.0)		(20.3)		(54.9)		(24.7)	
Program Tone								
Comedy	24.8	38.8	6.0	26.1	8.0	39.0	10.8	52.7
(% of total)	(100.0)		(24.2)		(32.3)		(43.5)	
Other	39.2	61.2	17.0	73.9	12.5	61.0	9.7	47.3
(% of total)	(100.0)		(43.4)		(31.9)		(24.7)	

TABLE 5: PROGRAM HOURS ANALYZED, 1968

	Total		ABC		CBS		NBC	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
All Hours (% of total)	58.5 (100.0)	100.0	17.5 (29.9)	100.0	20.0 (34.2)	100.0	21.0 (35.9)	100.0
Program Format								
Cartoons (% of total)	6.9 (100.0)	11.8	1.5 (21.7)	8.6	3.0 (43.5)	15.0	2.4 (34.8)	11.4
TV Plays (% of total)	36.6 (100.0)	62.6	12.0 (32.8)	68.6	13.0 (35.5)	65.0	11.6 (31.7)	55.3
Feature Films (% of total)	15.0 (100.0)	25.6	4.0 (26.7)	22.8	4.0 (26.7)	20.0	7.0 (46.6)	33.3
Program Style								
Crime (% of total)	6.5 (100.0)	11.1	3.5 (53.8)	20.0	1.0 (15.4)	5.0	2.0 (30.8)	9.5
Western (% of total)	13.3 (100.0)	22.7	4.5 (33.8)	25.7	3.0 (22.6)	15.0	5.8 (43.6)	27.6
Action-Adventure (% of total)	19.4 (100.0)	33.2	4.5 (23.2)	25.7	5.0 (25.8)	25.0	9.9 (51.0)	47.2
Other (% of total)	19.3 (100.0)	33.0	5.0 (25.9)	28.6	11.0 (57.0)	55.0	3.3 (17.1)	15.7
Program Tone								
Comedy (% of total)	20.2 (100.0)	34.5	6.0 (29.7)	34.3	7.9 (39.1)	39.5	6.3 (31.2)	30.0
Other (% of total)	38.3 (100.0)	65.5	11.5 (30.0)	65.7	12.1 (31.6)	60.5	14.7 (38.4)	70.0

TABLE 6: PROGRAM HOURS ANALYZED, 1967 AND 1968 TOTALS

	Total		ABC		CBS		NBC	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
All Hours (% of total)	122.5 (100.0)	100.0	40.5 (33.1)	100.0	40.5 (33.1)	100.0	41.5 (33.8)	100.0
Program Format								
Cartoons (% of total)	13.9 (100.0)	11.3	4.5 (32.4)	11.1	5.0 (36.0)	12.3	4.4 (31.6)	10.6
TV Plays (% of total)	80.6 (100.0)	65.8	27.0 (33.5)	66.7	27.5 (34.1)	67.9	26.1 (32.4)	62.9
Feature Films (% of total)	28.0 (100.0)	22.9	9.0 (32.1)	22.2	8.0 (28.6)	19.8	11.0 (39.3)	26.5
Program Style								
Crime (% of total)	15.5 (100.0)	12.7	8.8 (56.8)	21.7	1.0 (6.5)	2.5	5.7 (36.7)	13.7
Western (% of total)	22.8 (100.0)	18.6	8.0 (35.1)	19.8	6.5 (28.5)	16.0	8.3 (36.4)	20.0
Action/Advent. (% of total)	46.7 (100.0)	38.1	15.0 (32.1)	37.0	12.0 (25.7)	29.6	19.7 (42.2)	47.5
Other (% of total)	37.5 (100.0)	30.6	8.7 (23.2)	21.5	21.0 (56.0)	51.9	7.8 (20.8)	18.8
Program Tone								
Comedy (% of total)	45.0 (100.0)	36.7	12.0 (26.7)	29.6	15.9 (35.3)	39.3	17.1 (38.0)	41.2
Other (% of total)	77.5 (100.0)	63.3	28.5 (36.8)	70.4	24.6 (31.7)	60.7	24.4 (31.5)	58.8

TABLE 7: PROGRAMS CONTAINING VIOLENCE, 1967, 1968, AND TOTALS

	Total		ABC		CBS		NBC	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
All Programs, 1967 (% of total)	96 (100.0)	100.0	35 (36.5)	100.0	32 (33.3)	100.0	29 (30.2)	100.0
<u>Incidence of Violence, 1967</u>								
No violence (% of total)	18 (100.0)	18.8	4 (22.2)	11.4	11 (61.1)	34.4	3 (16.7)	10.3
Programs containing violence (% of total)	78 (100.0)	81.3	31 (39.7)	88.6	21 (26.9)	65.6	26 (33.3)	89.7

All Programs, 1968 (% of total)	87 (100.0)	100.0	22 (25.3)	100.0	35 (40.2)	100.0	30 (34.5)	100.0
<u>Incidence of Violence, 1968</u>								
No violence (% of total)	16 (100.0)	18.4	2 (12.5)	9.1	8 (50.0)	22.9	6 (37.5)	20.0
Programs containing violence (% of total)	71 (100.0)	81.6	20 (28.2)	90.9	27 (38.0)	77.1	24 (33.8)	80.0

All Programs, 1967 and 1968 totals (% of total)	183 (100.0)	100.0	57 (31.1)	100.0	67 (36.6)	100.0	59 (32.3)	100.0
<u>Incidence of Violence 1967 and 1968</u>								
No violence (% of total)	34 (100.0)	18.6	6 (17.6)	10.5	19 (55.9)	28.4	9 (26.5)	15.3
Programs containing violence (% of total)	149 (100.0)	81.4	51 (34.2)	89.5	48 (32.2)	71.6	50 (33.6)	84.7

TABLE 8: PROGRAM HOURS CONTAINING VIOLENCE, 1967, 1968, AND TOTALS

	Total		ABC		CBS		NBC	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
All hours, 1967 (% of total)	64.0 (100.0)	100.0	23.0 (35.9)	100.0	20.5 (32.0)	100.0	20.5 (32.0)	100.0
Incidence of Violence, 1967								
No violence (% of total)	10.5 (100.0)	16.4	2.0 (19.0)	8.7	5.8 (55.2)	28.3	2.7 (25.7)	13.2
Program hours cont. violence (% of total)	53.5 (100.0)	83.6	21.0 (39.3)	91.3	14.7 (27.5)	71.7	17.8 (33.2)	86.8

All hours, 1968 (% of total)	58.5 (100.0)	100.0	17.5 (29.9)	100.0	20.0 (34.2)	100.0	21.0 (35.9)	100.0
Incidence of Violence, 1968								
No violence (% of total)	7.6 (100.0)	13.0	1.0 (13.2)	5.7	4.0 (52.6)	20.0	2.6 (34.2)	12.4
Program hours cont. violence (% of total)	50.9 (100.0)	87.0	16.5 (32.4)	94.3	16.0 (31.4)	80.0	18.4 (36.2)	87.6

All hours, 1967, 1968 totals (% of total)	122.5 (100.0)	100.0	40.5 (33.1)	100.0	40.5 (33.1)	100.0	41.5 (33.8)	100.0
Incidence of vio- lence, 1967,1968 totals								
No violence (% of total)	18.1 (100.0)	14.8	3.0 (16.6)	7.4	9.8 (54.1)	24.2	5.3 (29.3)	12.8
Program hours cont. violence (% of total)	104.4 (100.0)	85.2	37.5 (35.9)	92.6	30.7 (29.4)	75.8	36.2 (34.7)	87.2

TABLE 9: NUMBERS AND RATES OF VIOLENT EPISODES, 1967, 1968, AND TOTALS

	TOTALS	ABC	CBS	NBC
Number of violent episodes, 1967 (% of total)	478 (100.0)	195 (40.8)	111 (23.2)	172 (36.0)
Rates per program, 1967				
Ave. for all programs	5.0	5.6	3.5	5.9
Ave. for programs containing violence	6.1	6.3	4.3	6.6
Rates per hour, 1967				
Ave. for all hours	7.5	8.5	5.4	8.4
Ave. for hours containing violence	8.9	9.3	7.5	9.7

Number of violent episodes, 1968 (% of total)	394 (100.0)	111 (28.2)	137 (34.8)	146 (37.0)
Rates per program, 1968				
Ave. for all programs	4.5	5.0	3.9	4.9
Ave. for programs containing violence	5.5	5.5	5.1	6.1
Rates per hour, 1968				
Ave. for all hours	6.7	6.3	6.9	7.0
Ave. for hours containing violence	7.7	6.7	8.6	7.9

Number of violent episodes, 1967, 1968 tot. (% of total)	872 (100.0)	306 (35.1)	248 (28.4)	318 (36.5)
Rates per program, 1967, 1968 totals				
Ave. for all programs	4.8	5.4	3.7	5.4
Ave. for programs containing violence	5.9	6.0	5.2	6.4
Rates per hour, 1967 and 1968 totals				
Ave. for all hours	7.1	7.6	6.1	7.7
Ave. for hours containing violence	8.4	8.2	8.1	8.8

TABLE 10: ALL VIOLENCE, VIOLENCE SIGNIFICANT TO THE PLOT, AND RATE OF VIOLENT EPISODES, 1967, 1968, AND TOTALS

	All net programs			ABC programs			CBS programs			NBC programs		
	1967	1968	Both	1967	1968	Both	1967	1968	Both	1967	1968	Both
All programs (N)	96	87	183	35	22	57	32	35	67	29	30	59
All hours (N)	64.0	58.5	122.5	23.0	17.5	40.5	20.5	20.0	40.5	20.5	21.0	41.5
<u>All violence</u>												
% of programs containing violence	81.2	81.6	81.4	88.6	90.9	89.5	65.6	77.1	71.6	89.7	80.0	84.7
% of hours containing violence	83.6	87.0	85.2	91.3	94.4	92.6	71.7	80.0	75.8	86.8	87.6	87.2
<u>Violence significant to the plot</u>												
% of all programs	65.6	56.3	61.2	74.3	63.6	70.2	50.0	48.6	49.2	72.4	60.0	66.1
% of programs containing violence	80.8	69.0	75.2	83.9	70.0	78.4	76.2	63.0	68.7	80.1	75.0	78.0
% of all program hours	67.9	61.4	64.7	80.9	63.9	73.1	44.9	40.0	42.5	75.5	79.5	77.5
% of program hours cont. violence	81.2	70.1	75.9	88.6	66.7	78.9	62.6	50.0	56.0	87.2	90.8	88.9
<u>Network share of violence</u>												
Network share of all programs (%)				36.5	25.3	31.1	33.3	40.2	36.6	30.2	34.5	32.2
Network share of programs containing violence (%)				39.7	28.2	34.4	26.9	38.0	32.2	33.3	33.8	33.5
Network share of all hours (%)				35.9	29.9	33.1	32.0	34.3	33.1	32.0	35.9	33.8
Network share of hours cont. violence (%)				39.3	32.4	35.9	27.5	31.4	29.4	33.2	36.1	34.7
<u>Violent episodes</u>												
Number of violent episodes (N)	478	394	873	195	111	306	111	137	248	172	146	318
Network share of all violent episodes (%)				40.7	28.2	35.0	23.2	34.8	28.4	36.0	37.0	36.5
Ave. no. of violent episodes per program	5.0	4.5	4.8	5.6	5.0	5.4	3.5	3.9	3.7	5.9	4.9	5.4
Ave. no. of violent episodes per hour	7.5	6.7	7.1	8.5	6.3	7.6	5.4	6.9	6.1	8.4	7.0	7.7

TABLE 11: VIOLENCE BY ALL PROGRAMS AND SELECTED PROGRAM TYPES; ALL NETWORKS

	<u>All Programs</u>			<u>Cartoons</u>			<u>Crime, Western, Action-Adventure</u>			<u>Comedy</u>		
	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>Both</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>Both</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>Both</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>Both</u>
Programs analyzed (N)	96	87	183	32	25	57	64	54	118	44	42	86
Programs containing violence (N)	78	71	149	30	24	54	61	53	114	29	28	57
Percent containing violence	81.3	81.6	81.1	93.7	96.0	94.7	95.3	98.1	96.6	65.9	66.7	66.3
Program hours analyzed (N)	64.0	58.5	122.5	7.0	6.9	13.9	47.6	39.2	86.8	24.8	20.2	45.0
Hours containing violence (N)	53.5	50.9	104.4	6.6	6.4	13.0	44.8	38.7	83.5	14.2	12.2	26.4
Percent containing violence	83.6	87.0	85.2	94.3	92.8	93.5	94.1	98.7	96.2	57.3	60.4	58.7
Number of violent episodes (N)	479	394	873	151	162	313	419	341	760	122	134	256
Average per program	5.0	4.5	4.8	4.7	6.5	5.5	6.5	6.3	6.4	2.8	3.2	3.0
Average per hour	7.5	6.7	7.1	21.6	23.5	22.5	8.8	8.7	8.7	4.9	6.6	5.7
Percentage share of program type out of all programs				33.3	28.7	31.1	66.7	62.1	64.5	45.8	48.3	47.0
Percentage share of program type containing violence out of all programs containing violence				38.5	33.8	36.2	78.2	74.6	76.5	37.2	39.4	38.3
Percentage share of violent episodes in each program type out of all violent episodes				31.5	41.1	35.8	87.5	86.5	87.1	25.5	34.0	29.3

TABLE 12: VIOLENCE BY ALL PROGRAMS AND SELECTED PROGRAM TYPES, ABC

	<u>All Programs</u>			<u>Cartoons</u>			<u>Crime, Western, Action-Adventure</u>			<u>Comedy</u>		
	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>Both</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>Both</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>Both</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>Both</u>
Programs analyzed (N)	35	22	57	13	4	17	25	16	41	13	6	19
Programs containing violence (N)	31	20	51	13	4	17	25	16	41	10	6	16
Percent containing violence	88.5	90.9	89.5	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	76.9	100.0	84.2
Program hours analyzed (N)	23.0	17.5	40.5	3.0	1.5	4.5	18.6	12.5	31.1	6.0	6.0	12.0
Hours containing violence (N)	21.0	16.5	37.5	3.0	1.5	4.5	18.6	12.5	31.1	3.5	6.0	9.5
Percent containing violence	91.3	94.4	92.6	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	58.3	100.0	79.2
Number of violent episodes (N)	195	111	306	70	26	96	170	99	269	45	32	77
Average per program	5.6	5.0	5.4	5.4	6.5	5.6	6.8	6.2	6.6	3.5	5.3	4.1
Average per hour	8.5	6.3	7.6	23.3	17.3	21.3	9.1	7.9	8.6	7.5	5.3	6.4
Percentage share of program type out of all programs				37.1	18.2	29.8	71.4	72.7	71.9	37.1	27.3	33.3
Percentage share of program type containing violence out of all programs containing violence				41.9	12.9	33.3	80.6	51.6	80.4	32.3	19.4	31.4
Percentage share of violent episodes in each program type out of all violent episodes				35.9	23.4	31.4	87.2	89.2	87.9	23.1	28.8	25.2

TABLE 13: VIOLENCE BY ALL PROGRAMS AND SELECTED PROGRAM TYPES, CBS

	<u>All Programs</u>			<u>Cartoons</u>			<u>Crime, Western, Action-Adventure</u>			<u>Comedy</u>		
	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>Both</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>Both</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>Both</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>Both</u>
Programs analyzed (N)	32	35	67	10	13	23	18	18	36	16	21	37
Programs containing violence (N)	21	27	47	9	13	22	17	17	34	7	13	20
Percent containing violence	65.6	77.1	70.1	90.0	100.0	95.7	94.4	94.4	94.4	43.8	61.9	54.1
Program hours analyzed (N)	20.5	20.0	40.5	2.0	3.0	5.0	11.0	9.0	20.0	8.0	7.9	15.9
Hours containing violence (N)	14.7	16.0	30.7	1.8	3.0	4.8	10.8	8.5	19.3	3.0	3.9	6.9
Percent containing violence	71.7	80.0	75.8	87.5	100.0	96.0	97.7	94.4	96.5	37.5	49.4	43.4
Number of violent episodes (N)	111	137	248	44	77	121	99	107	206	16	61	77
Average per program	3.5	3.9	3.7	4.4	5.9	5.3	5.5	5.9	5.7	1.0	2.9	2.1
Average per hour	5.4	6.9	6.1	22.0	25.7	24.2	9.0	11.9	10.3	2.0	7.7	4.8
Percentage share of program type out of all programs				31.3	37.1	34.3	56.3	51.4	53.7	50.0	60.0	55.2
Percentage share of program type containing violence out of all programs containing violence				42.9	48.1	46.8	81.0	63.0	72.3	33.3	48.1	42.6
Percentage share of violent episodes in each program type out of all violent episodes				39.6	56.2	48.8	89.2	78.1	83.1	14.4	44.5	31.0

TABLE 14: VIOLENCE BY ALL PROGRAMS AND SELECTED PROGRAM TYPES, NBC

	<u>All Programs</u>			<u>Cartoons</u>			<u>Crime, Western, Action-Adventure</u>			<u>Comedy</u>		
	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>Both</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>Both</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>Both</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>Both</u>
Programs analyzed (N)	29	30	59	9	8	17	21	20	41	15	15	30
Programs containing violence (N)	26	24	50	8	7	15	19	20	39	12	9	21
Percent containing violence	86.2	80.0	84.7	88.9	87.5	88.2	90.5	100.0	95.1	80.0	60.0	70.0
Program hours analyzed (N)	20.5	21.0	41.5	2.0	2.4	4.4	18.0	17.7	35.7	10.8	6.3	17.1
Hours containing violence (N)	17.8	18.4	34.7	1.8	1.9	3.7	15.5	17.7	33.2	7.7	2.3	10.0
Percent containing violence	86.8	87.6	87.2	90.0	79.2	84.1	86.1	100.0	93.0	71.0	35.7	58.5
Number of violent episodes (N)	173	146	319	37	59	96	150	135	285	61	41	102
Average per program	6.0	4.9	5.4	4.1	7.4	5.6	7.1	6.8	7.0	4.1	2.7	3.4
Average per hour	8.4	7.0	7.7	18.5	24.6	21.8	8.3	7.6	8.0	5.6	6.5	6.0
Percentage share of program type out of all programs				31.0	26.7	28.8	72.4	66.7	69.5	51.7	50.0	50.8
Percentage share of program type containing violence out of all programs containing violence				30.8	29.2	30.0	73.1	83.3	78.0	46.2	37.5	42.0
Percentage share of violent episodes in each program type out of all violent episodes				21.4	40.4	30.1	86.7	92.5	89.3	35.3	28.1	32.0

TABLE 15: SELECTED ASPECTS OF VIOLENT EPISODES; 1967, 1968, AND TOTALS

	1967	1968	Both years
Total no. of violent episodes	478	394	872
<u>Agents of violence</u>	%	%	%
Human (whether live or cartoon character)	75.7	77.7	76.6
"Humanized" (speaking) animal character	4.0	2.0	3.1
Animal character (live or cartoon)	3.8	5.3	4.5
Other creature or "thing"	6.7	4.8	5.9
Act of nature	0.0	0.0	0.0
Accident	5.0	7.9	6.3
Uncertain, other	4.8	2.3	3.7
<u>Means of violence</u>			
Weapon is used	58.8	47.0	53.4
No weapon is used or uncertain	41.2	53.0	46.6
<u>Seriousness of context</u>			
Violence occurs in serious or sinister context	87.0	73.9	81.1
Violence occurs in comic or sham context	13.0	26.1	18.9
<u>Witnesses to violence</u>			
None; no evidence of any witnesses to violence	50.4	44.7	47.8
There are witnesses but they are passive; they do not or cannot react to violence	33.5	37.3	35.2
Witnesses attempt to prevent violence	7.7	7.4	7.6
Witnesses assist or encourage violence	8.4	10.7	9.4
<u>Group relations among violent opponents</u>			
Members of the same family	2.5	2.0	2.3
Members of the same national or ethnic group	28.0	43.9	35.2
Members of different national or ethnic groups	29.9	26.1	28.2
Uncertain, other	39.5	27.9	34.3

TABLE 16: CASUALTIES IN VIOLENT EPISODES, 1967, 1968 AND TOTALS

	1967		1968		Both years	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
All violent episodes	478	100.0	394	100.0	872	100.0
Violent episodes in which						
nobody appears to be physically injured or killed	250	52.3	202	51.3	454	51.8
somebody appears to be physically injured or killed	228	47.7	192	48.7	420	48.2
Total number of casualties in all violent episodes was more than:*	433		357		790	
Average number of casualties per violent episodes in which there were casualties was more than:*	1.9		1.9		1.9	
Percent of violent episodes which the casualty count was-----						
one		74.1		73.0		73.6
two		13.3		13.0		13.2
three		4.3		4.5		4.4
four		0.8		2.5		1.5
five		1.2		0.0		0.7
six		1.6		0.0		0.9
seven		0.0		0.0		0.0
eight or more, including mass casualties		4.7		7.0		5.7

* For episodes in which there were eight or more casualties, including mass casualties, only eight were recorded.

TABLE 17: MAJOR CHARACTERS ANALYZED IN 1967 PROGRAMS

	All characters				Humans				Non-humans*			
	Tot.	Male	Fem.	Others	Tot.	Male	Fem.	Others	Tot.	Male	Fem.	Others
Cartoon	63	58	3	2	39	37	2	0	24	21	1	2
TV drama	158	124	34	0	147	117	30	0	11	7	4	0
Feature film	19	9	10	0	18	9	9	0	1	0	1	0
Crime	32	22	10	0	27	18	9	0	5	4	1	0
Western	24	24	0	0	24	24	0	0	0	0	0	0
Action/advent.	108	94	12	2	88	78	10	0	20	16	2	2
Other	76	51	25	0	65	43	22	0	11	8	3	0
Comedy	108	80	26	2	88	65	23	0	20	15	3	2
Other	132	111	21	0	116	98	18	0	16	13	3	0
Totals	240	191	47	2	204	163	41	0	36	28	6	2

TABLE 18: MAJOR CHARACTERS ANALYZED IN 1968 PROGRAMS

	All characters				Humans				Non-humans*			
	Tot.	Male	Fem.	Others	Tot.	Male	Fem.	Others	Tot.	Male	Fem.	Others
Cartoon	43	36	5	2	35	30	5	0	8	6	0	2
TV drama	145	113	32	0	140	109	31	0	5	4	1	0
Feature film	27	16	11	0	27	16	11	0	0	0	0	0
Crime	20	18	2	0	20	18	2	0	0	0	0	0
Western	38	32	6	0	38	32	6	0	0	0	0	0
Action/advent.	77	63	13	1	71	58	13	0	6	5	0	1
Other	80	52	27	1	73	47	26	0	7	5	1	1
Comedy	81	57	23	1	71	49	22	0	10	8	1	1
Other	134	108	25	1	131	106	25	0	3	2	0	1
Totals	215	165	48	2	202	155	47	0	13	10	1	2

*Including "humanized" (speaking) animals, other animals, and other non-human characters (such as a robot).

TABLE 19: MAJOR CHARACTERS ANALYZED IN 1967 AND 1968 PROGRAMS

	All characters				Humans				Non-humans*			
	Tot.	Male	Fem.	Others	Tot.	Male	Fem.	Others	Tot.	Male	Fem.	Others
Cartoon	106	94	8	4	74	67	7	0	32	27	1	4
TV drama	303	237	66	0	287	226	61	0	16	11	5	0
Feature film	46	25	21	0	45	25	20	0	1	0	1	0
Crime	52	40	12	0	47	36	11	0	5	4	1	0
Western	62	56	6	0	62	56	6	0	0	0	0	0
Action/advent.	185	157	25	3	159	136	23	0	26	21	2	3
Other	156	103	52	1	138	90	48	0	18	13	4	1
Comedy	189	137	49	3	159	114	45	0	30	23	4	3
Other	266	219	46	1	247	204	43	0	19	15	3	1
Totals	455	356	95	4	406	318	88	0	49	38	7	4

*Including "humanized" (speaking) animals, other animals, and other non-human characters (such as a robot).

TABLE 20: "VIOLENTS," "KILLERS," AND "KILLED," 1967, 1968, AND SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS FOR BOTH YEARS

	TOTALS		THOSE WHO COMMIT VIOLENCE AGAINST OTHERS				THOSE WHO DIE					
	N	%	ALL "VIOLENTS"			"VIOLENT KILLERS" ONLY			VIOLENT DEATH			
			N	%	% of total	N	%	% of total violent	N	%	% of total	
All characters-1967	240	52.7	134	55.6	55.8	30	55.6	12.5	22.4	17	68.0	7.1
All characters-1968	215	47.3	107	44.4	49.8	24	44.4	11.2	22.4	8	32.0	3.7
Both years	455	100.0	241	100.0	53.0	54	100.0	11.9	22.4	25	100.0	5.5
Selected characteristics for both 1967 and 1968												
<u>Sex</u>												
Males	358	78.7	206	85.5	57.5	48	88.9	13.4	23.3	22	88.0	6.1
Females	93	20.4	31	12.9	33.3	6	11.1	6.5	17.6	3	12.0	3.2
Other, uncertain	4	0.9	4	1.7		0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0
	455		241	100.0		54	100.0			25	100.0	
<u>Age</u>												
Preschool and primary	9	2.0	3	1.3	33.3	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0
Secondary school age	20	4.4	9	3.7	45.0	1	1.8	5.0	11.1	0	0.0	0.0
Young adult	145	31.9	70	29.0	48.3	21	38.9	14.5	30.0	5	20.0	3.4
Middle age	206	45.3	116	48.1	56.3	28	51.9	13.5	24.1	15	60.0	7.3
Old age	26	5.7	11	4.6	42.3	1	1.8	3.8	9.1	2	8.0	7.7
Ageless, indeterminate	47	10.7	32	12.3	65.3	3	5.6	6.4	9.4	3	12.0	6.4
	455	100.0	241	100.0		54	100.0			25	100.0	
<u>Marital status</u>												
Unmarried, unknown	325	71.4	189	78.4	58.1	44	81.5	13.5	23.3	22	88.0	6.7
Married, marries	130	28.6	52	21.6	40.0	10	18.5	7.7	19.2	3	12.0	2.3
	455	100.0	241	100.0		54	100.0			25	100.0	
<u>Occupation</u>												
Housewife	25	5.5	10	4.2	40.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0
Illegal occupation	44	9.7	36	14.9	81.8	11	20.4	25.0	30.6	6	24.0	13.6
Armed forces	26	5.7	15	6.2	57.7	8	14.8	30.8	53.3	3	12.0	11.5
Entertainment	35	7.7	12	5.0	34.3	2	3.7	5.7	16.7	1	4.0	2.9
Official law enforcement	30	6.6	21	8.7	70.0	6	11.1	20.0	28.6	0	0.0	0.0
Private agent	9	2.0	6	2.5	66.7	1	1.8	11.1	16.7	0	0.0	0.0
Other occupations	286	62.9	141	58.5	49.3	26	48.1	9.1	18.4	15	60.0	5.2
	455	100.0	241	100.0		54	99.9			25	100.0	
<u>Nationality, ethnicity</u>												
White Americans	305	67.0	149	61.8	48.9	40	74.1	13.1	26.8	11	44.0	3.6
White non-Americans	46	10.1	27	11.2	58.7	9	16.7	19.6	33.3	7	28.0	15.2
Non-whites	30	6.6	20	8.3	66.7	2	3.7	6.7	10.0	2	8.0	6.7
Uncertain, other	74	16.3	45	18.7	60.8	3	5.5	4.0	6.7	5	20.0	6.7
	455	100.0	241	100.0		54	100.0			25	100.0	
<u>Outcome for character</u>												
Happy	266	58.5	126	52.3	47.4	25	46.3	9.4	19.8	0	0.0	0.0
Unhappy	89	19.6	61	25.3	68.5	16	29.6	18.0	26.2	25	100.0	28.1
Mixed, uncertain	100	22.0	54	22.4	54.0	13	24.1	13.0	24.1	0	0.0	0.0
	455	100.0	241	100.0		54	100.0			25	100.0	
<u>Fatal victimization</u>												
Do not die	430	94.5	221	91.7	51.4	46	85.2	10.7	20.8			
Die violent death	25	5.5	20	8.3	80.0	8	14.8	32.0	40.0			
	455	100.0	241	100.0		54	100.0					

TABLE 21: TIME OF ACTION AS A STORY ELEMENT IN VIOLENT AND NON-VIOLENT
TV DRAMA: 1967, 1968 AND TOTALS

STORY ELEMENT AND YEAR	OCCURRENCE OF STORY ELEMENT IN						PERCENT OF VIO- LENT PROGRAMS OUT OF ALL PRO- GRAMS IN WHICH ELEMENT OCCURS
	all programs		percent of programs which contain no violence		contain violence		
TIME OF ACTION, 1967	(N 96)		(N 18)		(N 78)		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	%
Past	21	21.9	0	0.0	21	26.9	100.0
Contemporary (1960's)	52	54.2	15	83.3	37	47.4	71.2
Future	8	8.3	0	0.0	8	10.3	100.0
Several, other	15	15.6	3	16.7	12	15.4	80.0
TIME OF ACTION, 1968	(N 87)		(N 16)		(N 71)		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	%
Past	19	13.8	1	6.3	18	25.4	94.7
Contemporary(1960's)	59	67.8	14	87.5	45	63.4	76.3
Future	5	5.7	0	0.0	5	7.0	100.0
Several, other	4	4.6	1	6.3	3	4.2	75.0
TIME OF ACTION, 1967 AND 1968 TOTALS	(N 183)		(N 34)		(N 149)		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	%
Past	40	21.9	1	2.9	39	26.2	97.5
Contemporary(1960's)	111	60.7	29	85.3	82	55.0	73.9
Future	13	7.1	0	0.0	13	8.7	100.0
Several, other	19	10.3	4	11.8	15	10.1	78.9

TABLE 22: PLACE OF ACTION AS A STORY ELEMENT IN VIOLENT AND NON-VIOLENT TV DRAMA; 1967, 1968, AND TOTALS

STORY ELEMENT AND YEAR	OCCURRENCE OF STORY ELEMENT IN						PERCENT OF VIOLENT PROGRAMS OUT OF ALL PROGRAMS IN WHICH ELEMENT OCCURS
	all programs		percent of programs which contain no violence		contain violence		
PLACE OF ACTION, 1967	(N 96)		(N 18)		(N 78)		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	%
U.S. only	61	63.5	15	83.3	46	59.0	75.4
Several indeterminate, or outside U.S.	35	36.5	3	16.7	32	40.8	91.4
Urban setting	31	32.3	8	44.4	23	29.5	74.2
Small town, rural	21	21.9	7	38.9	14	17.9	66.7
Uninhabited, mobil, etc.	44	45.8	3	16.7	41	52.6	93.2
PLACE OF ACTION, 1968	(N 87)		(N 16)		(N 71)		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	%
U.S. only	60	69.0	14	87.5	46	64.8	76.7
Several indeterminate, or outside U.S.	27	31.0	2	12.5	25	35.2	92.6
Urban setting	29	33.3	6	37.5	23	32.4	79.3
Small town, rural	30	34.5	6	37.5	24	33.8	80.0
Uninhabited, mobil, etc.	28	32.2	4	25.0	24	33.8	85.7
PLACE OF ACTION 1967 AND 1968 TOTALS	(N 183)		(N 34)		(N 149)		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	%
U.S. only	121	66.1	29	85.3	92	61.7	76.0
Several indeterminate, or outside U.S.	62	33.9	5	14.7	57	38.3	91.9
Urban setting	60	32.8	14	41.2	46	30.9	76.7
Small town, rural	51	27.9	13	38.2	38	25.5	74.5
Uninhabited, mobil, etc.	72	39.3	7	20.6	65	43.6	90.3

TABLE 23: CRIME, SCIENCE, AND MINORITY AND FOREIGN THEMES AS SIGNIFICANT STORY ELEMENTS* IN VIOLENT AND NON-VIOLENT TV DRAMA; 1967, 1968, AND TOTALS

STORY ELEMENT AND YEAR	OCCURRENCE OF STORY ELEMENT IN						PERCENT OF VIO- LENT PROGRAMS OUT OF ALL PRO- GRAMS IN WHICH ELEMENT OCCURS %
	all programs (N 96)		percent of programs which contain no violence (N 18)		contain violence (N 78)		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	
1967							
Crime, corruption	31	32.3	2	11.1	29	37.2	93.6
Science, scientist	29	30.2	3	16.7	26	33.3	90.7
Minority, foreign	30	31.2	2	11.1	28	35.9	93.3
1968							
		(N 87)		(N 16)		(N 71)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	%
Crime, corruption	39	44.8	1	6.3	38	53.5	97.4
Science, scientist	24	27.6	3	18.8	21	29.6	87.5
Minority, foreign	39	44.8	5	31.3	34	47.9	87.2
1967 and 1968							
		(N 183)		(N 34)		(N 149)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	%
Crime, corruption	70	38.3	3	8.8	67	45.0	95.7
Science, scientist	53	28.0	6	17.6	47	31.5	88.7
Minority, foreign	69	37.7	7	20.6	62	41.6	89.9

* Significant element was defined as necessary for a one-page plot description. I.e. of all programs containing violence in 1967, 37.2 percent featured crime, 33.3 percent featured science or scientists, and 35.9 percent featured minority of foreign groups or people as significant themes or aspects.

TABLE 24: LAW AND LAW ENFORCEMENT AS STORY ELEMENTS IN VIOLENT AND NON-VIOLENT TV DRAMA; 1967, 1968 AND TOTALS

STORY ELEMENT AND YEAR	OCCURRENCE OF STORY ELEMENT IN						PERCENT OF VIO- LENT PROGRAMS OUT OF ALL PRO- GRAMS IN WHICH ELEMENT OCCURS
	all programs		percent of programs which contain no violence		contain violence		
<u>1967</u>	(N 96)		(N 18)		(N 78)		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	%
Due process of law (legal apprehension or trial) is indicated as a consequence of major act(s) of violence	18	18.7	0	0.0	18	23.1	100.0
Agent of law enforce- ment is American Negro	2	2.1	0	0.0	2	2.6	100.0
<u>1968</u>	(N 87)		(N 16)		(N 71)		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	%
Due process of law (legal apprehension or trial) is indicated as a consequence of major act(s) of violence	17	19.5	0	0.0	17	23.9	100.0
Agent of law enforce- ment is American Negro	4	4.6	0	0.0	4	5.6	100.0
<u>1967 and 1968</u>	(N 183)		(N 34)		(N 149)		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	%
Due process of law (legal apprehension or trial) is indicated as a consequence of major act(s) of violence	35	19.2	0	0.0	35	23.5	100.0
Agent of law enforce- ment is American Negro	6	3.3	0	0.0	6	4.0	100.0

TABLE 25: ASPECTS OF LAW ENFORCEMENT IN VIOLENT EPISODES

	1967	1968	Both years
Total no. of violent episodes	478	394	872
	%	%	%
Law enforcement agents or agencies play no role or no clearly identifiable role in connection with violent episodes	87.4	87.8	87.6
<u>When they do play a role,</u>			
it is non-violent	40.0	27.1	34.3
they commit violence in course of duty	53.3	64.6	58.3
they commit violence <u>not</u> in course of duty	6.7	8.3	7.4
<u>When they are involved in violence,</u>			
they initiate violence	44.4	43.2	43.8
they respond to violence in violent manner	28.9	38.6	33.7
they respond in non-violent manner	6.7	9.1	7.9
they become victims of violence	20.0	9.1	14.6
they employ only the level of violence necessary to accomplish their objectives	79.5	83.8	81.6
they commit violence that appears to go beyond that necessary to accomplish objective	5.1	16.2	10.5
both, uncertain	15.4	0.0	7.9
their actions are portrayed as justified	81.6	56.8	69.3
unjustified	5.3	29.7	17.3
both, uncertain	13.2	13.5	13.3

TABLE 26: ETHNICITY IN VIOLENT AND NON-VIOLENT TV DRAMA; 1967, 1968 AND TOTALS

STORY ELEMENT AND YEAR	OCCURRENCE OF STORY ELEMENT IN						PERCENT OF VIO- LENT PROGRAMS OUT OF ALL PRO- GRAMS IN WHICH ELEMENT OCCURS
	all programs		percent of programs which contain no violence		percent of programs which contain violence		
<u>1967</u>	(N 96)		(N 18)		(N 78)		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	%
Place of action partly or wholly outside U.S.	35	36.5	3	16.7	32	40.8	91.4
Minority groups, people, or foreign countries, people, play significant role	30	31.2	2	11.1	28	35.9	93.3
Agent of law enforcement is American Negro	2	2.1	0	0.0	2	2.6	100.0
<u>1968</u>	(N 87)		(N 16)		(N 71)		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	%
Place of action partly or wholly outside U.S.	17	19.5	1	6.3	16	22.5	94.1
Minority groups, people, or foreign countries, people, play significant role	39	44.8	5	31.3	34	47.9	87.2
Agent of law enforcement is American Negro	4	4.6	0	0.0	4	5.6	100.0
<u>1967-1968 TOTALS</u>	(N 183)		(N 34)		(N 149)		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	%
Place of action partly or wholly outside U.S.	52	28.4	4	11.8	48	32.2	92.3
Minority groups, people, or foreign countries, people, play significant role	69	37.7	7	20.6	62	41.6	89.9
Agent of law enforcement is American Negro	6	3.3	0	0.0	6	4.0	100.0

TABLE 27: WHITES AND NON-WHITES AMONG THE "VIOLENTS," "KILLERS," AND "KILLED"

	TOTALS		WHITES		NONWHITES		UNCERTAIN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
ALL CHARACTERS (% of total)	455 (100.0)	100.0	351 (77.1)	100.0	30 (6.6)	100.0	74 (16.3)	100.0
THOSE WHO COMMIT VIOLENCE								
All "violents" (% of total)	241 (100.0)	53.0	176 (73.0)	50.1	20 (8.3)	66.7	45 (18.7)	60.8
"Killers" only (% of total)	54 (100.0)	11.9	49 (90.7)	14.0	2 (3.7)	6.7	3 (5.6)	4.0
(% of "violents")		(22.4)		(27.8)		(10.0)		(6.7)
THOSE WHO DIE VIOLENT DEATH (% of total)	25 (100.0)	5.5	18 (72.0)	5.1	2 (8.0)	6.7	5 (20.0)	6.7

TABLE 28: FREQUENCIES OF VIOLENT ACTS IN 112 PLAYS IN WHICH VIOLENCE WAS SIGNIFICANT TO THE PLOT

	1967	1968	total
ABC	281	186	467
CBS	175	121	296
NBC	245	207	452
total	701	514	1215

TABLE 29: AVERAGE NUMBER OF VIOLENT ACTS PER PLAY

	1967	1968	total
ABC	10.8	13.3	11.7
CBS	10.9	7.1	9.0
NBC	11.7	11.5	11.6
total	11.1	10.5	10.8

TABLE 30: AVERAGE NUMBER OF VIOLENT ACTS RECOMPUTED PER FULL PROGRAM*

	1967	1968	total
ABC	14.1	14.3	14.2
CBS	15.9	12.1	14.1
NBC	14.4	14.8	14.6
total	14.6	13.9	14.3

* "Full program" includes all plays on a multi-play program in a single unit.

TABLE 31: RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS AND FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS OF VIOLENT ACTS

Categories	Relia- bility*	Totals	ABC		CBS		NBC	
			1967	1968	1967	1968	1967	1968
<u>Complexity of instruments</u>	.68 I							
No instruments		494	122	87	47	44	105	89
Simple instruments		400	82	58	59	42	85	74
Complex instruments		321	77	41	69	35	55	44
Totals		1215	281	186	175	121	245	207
<u>Seriousness</u>	.83 N							
Humorous aspect present		249	42	74	22	38	43	30
Serious violence		966	239	112	153	83	202	177
Totals		1215	281	186	175	121	245	207
<u>Distance source receiver</u>	.73 N							
Close proximity		875	222	139	79	81	187	167
Far, but within sight		287	54	36	93	37	37	30
Without sight		53	5	11	3	3	21	10
Totals		1215	281	186	175	121	245	207
<u>Beneficiary and source</u>	.70 N							
Identical		712	168	91	113	72	154	114
Not identical		503	113	95	62	49	91	93
Totals		1215	281	186	175	121	245	207
<u>Immediate re-sponse</u>	.75 N							
No resistance		711	174	97	93	84	150	113
Non-violent resistance		72	18	17	7	5	15	10
Violent resistance		432	89	72	75	32	80	84
Totals		1215	281	186	175	121	245	207
<u>Permanent consequences</u>	.85 I							
Not evident		83	16	9	9	4	24	21
No consequences		935	219	146	130	97	192	151
Somewhat impaired or severely incapacitated		83	20	13	13	11	9	17
Dead or annihilated		114	26	18	23	9	20	18
Totals		1215	281	186	175	121	245	207
<u>Amount of non-violent interaction</u>	.75 I							
None		595	155	66	112	62	93	107
Minor		311	65	70	31	26	83	36
Medium		144	22	35	13	15	35	24
Major		165	39	15	19	18	34	40
Totals		1215	281	186	175	121	245	207

* Coefficient, and whether nominal (N) or interval (I). See description of reliability tests in section on methodology.

TABLE 31 (cont.): RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS AND FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS OF VIOLENT ACTS

Categories	Relia- bility*	Totals	ABC		CBS		NBC	
			1967	1968	1967	1968	1967	1968
<u>Sexual aspect</u>	1.00 N							
Not present		1168	273	176	175	121	227	196
Present		47	8	10	0	0	18	11
Totals		<u>1215</u>	<u>281</u>	<u>186</u>	<u>175</u>	<u>121</u>	<u>245</u>	<u>207</u>
<u>Sex of source</u>	.92 N							
Indeterminate		118	22	15	51	17	8	5
Male(s)		983	241	148	117	92	208	177
Female(s)		86	15	18	3	7	23	20
Mixed group		28	3	5	4	5	6	5
Totals		<u>1215</u>	<u>281</u>	<u>186</u>	<u>175</u>	<u>121</u>	<u>245</u>	<u>207</u>
<u>Sex of receiver</u>	.92 N							
Indeterminate		81	16	9	43	8	5	0
Male(s)		993	238	149	115	97	209	185
Female(s)		72	21	20	5	6	15	5
Mixed group		69	6	8	12	10	16	17
Totals		<u>1215</u>	<u>281</u>	<u>186</u>	<u>175</u>	<u>121</u>	<u>245</u>	<u>207</u>
<u>Serial classification of source</u>	.88 N							
Program no serial		161	16	22	0	0	51	72
Regular part in serial		402	102	50	66	63	72	49
Other part in serial		652	163	114	109	58	122	86
Totals		<u>1215</u>	<u>281</u>	<u>186</u>	<u>175</u>	<u>121</u>	<u>245</u>	<u>207</u>
<u>Serial classification of receiver</u>	.88 N							
Program no serial		161	16	22	0	0	51	72
Regular part in serial		476	115	68	84	70	82	57
Other part in serial		578	150	96	91	51	112	78
Totals		<u>1215</u>	<u>281</u>	<u>186</u>	<u>175</u>	<u>121</u>	<u>245</u>	<u>207</u>
<u>Group belongingness of source</u>	.84 N							
Isolated individual		242	72	39	32	17	45	37
Group leader		258	51	25	35	36	79	32
Group member		446	96	91	55	40	74	90
Group		269	62	31	53	28	47	48
Totals		<u>1215</u>	<u>281</u>	<u>186</u>	<u>175</u>	<u>121</u>	<u>245</u>	<u>207</u>
<u>Group belongingness of receiver</u>	.84 N							
Isolated individual		228	66	33	30	16	43	40
Group leader		219	40	26	32	28	75	18
Group member		487	112	90	70	44	74	97
Group		281	63	37	43	33	53	52
Totals		<u>1215</u>	<u>281</u>	<u>186</u>	<u>175</u>	<u>121</u>	<u>245</u>	<u>207</u>

* Coefficient, and whether nominal (N) or interval (I). See description of reliability tests in section on methodology.

TABLE 31 (cont.): RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS AND FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS OF VIOLENT ACTS

Categories	Relia- bility*	Totals	ABC		CBS		NBC	
			1967	1968	1967	1968	1967	1968
<u>Evaluative portrayal of source</u> .89 I								
Good		515	129	80	75	49	94	88
Neutral, in between		183	39	30	16	15	49	34
Bad		517	113	76	84	57	102	85
Totals		1215	281	186	175	121	245	207
<u>Evaluative portrayal of receiver</u> .89 I								
Good		610	140	95	90	57	121	107
Neutral, in between		187	37	37	13	15	52	33
Bad		418	104	54	72	49	72	67
Totals		1215	281	186	175	121	245	207
<u>Relation of source to law</u> .78 N								
Law enforcement officer		120	34	18	13	16	34	5
Semi law enforcement officer		94	13	29	14	10	13	15
Criminal		269	23	60	58	29	44	55
No special relation		732	211	79	90	66	154	132
Totals		1215	281	186	175	121	245	207
<u>Relation of receiver to law</u> .78 N								
Law enforcement officer		92	24	19	13	12	18	6
Semi law enforcement officer		113	16	33	16	8	23	17
Criminal		209	21	47	51	28	27	35
No special relation		801	220	87	95	73	177	149
Totals		1215	281	186	175	121	245	207
<u>Outcome for source</u> .79 I								
Winner		401	94	71	65	36	63	72
Winner but		122	29	10	15	15	30	23
Neither, irrelevant		199	56	29	16	11	57	30
Loser but		133	12	11	33	14	21	22
Loser		380	90	65	46	45	74	60
Totals		1215	281	186	175	121	245	207
<u>Outcome for receiver</u> .79 I								
Winner		423	97	83	71	32	65	75
Winner but		157	38	19	15	20	44	21
Neither, irrelevant		165	35	19	15	8	60	28
Loser, but		97	9	5	31	19	15	18
Loser		373	102	60	43	42	61	65
Totals		1215	281	186	175	121	245	207

* Coefficient, and whether nominal (N) or interval (I). See description of reliability tests in section on methodology.

TABLE 32: ASSOCIATIONS BETWEEN EVALUATIVE PORTRAYALS AND OUTCOME
FOR SOURCES AND RECEIVERS OF VIOLENT ACTS

Sources (total of 1215 acts)

	Good	In-between	Bad
Winner	363	35	3
Winner, but...	77	16	29
Neither	42	87	70
Loser, but ...	24	9	80
Loser	9	36	335

Kendall's
 $\tau_c = +.72$

Receivers (total of 1215 acts)

	Good	In-between	Bad
Winner	394	28	1
Winner, but...	117	19	21
Neither	48	74	43
Loser, but...	29	12	56
Loser	22	54	297

Kendall's
 $\tau_c = +.70$

TABLE 33: VIOLENCE IN COMMERCIALS*

	All			ABC			CBS			NBC		
	1967	1968	Both	1967	1968	Both	1967	1968	Both	1967	1968	Both
All commercials (N)	441	554	995	194	154	348	142	187	329	105	213	318
Violence in commercials (N)	45	31	76	18	2	20	18	13	31	9	16	25
Percent of tot.	10.2	5.6	7.6	9.3	1.3	5.7	12.7	7.0	9.4	8.6	7.5	7.9
Categories of commercials containing violence (in percents of all commercials containing violence)	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Breakfast cereals, chewing gum, foods	24.4	48.4	34.2	16.7	0.0	15.0	38.9	53.8	45.2	11.1	50.0	36.0
Automobiles	2.2	16.1	7.9	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	23.1	9.7	11.1	0.0	4.0
Toys	4.4	9.7	6.6	5.6	0.0	5.0	5.6	0.0	3.2	0.0	18.8	12.0
Tobacco	11.1	3.2	7.9	5.6	0.0	5.0	16.7	7.7	12.9	11.1	0.0	4.0
Promotional announcements	46.7	19.4	35.5	61.1	0.0	55.0	33.3	15.4	25.8	24.4	25.0	32.0
Others	11.1	3.2	7.9	11.1	0.0	10.0	5.6	0.0	3.2	22.2	6.2	12.0

*These are the results of an informal tally of commercial and public service announcements observed on the programs. No reliability tests were performed. Furthermore, the 1967 commercials attached to tapes and films used were not necessarily those transmitted during the initial airing of these programs, and commercials for five 1968 programs were omitted because of mechanical recording difficulties.