

1986

The effect of television viewing on children's attitudes about interpersonal conflict resolutions

Kathlean Hendricks Hill
University of Northern Iowa

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Copyright ©1986 Kathlean Hendricks Hill

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.uni.edu/etd>



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Hill, Kathlean Hendricks, "The effect of television viewing on children's attitudes about interpersonal conflict resolutions" (1986). *Dissertations and Theses @ UNI*. 1417.

<https://scholarworks.uni.edu/etd/1417>

This Open Access Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Work at UNI ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations and Theses @ UNI by an authorized administrator of UNI ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@uni.edu.

Offensive Materials Statement: Materials located in UNI ScholarWorks come from a broad range of sources and time periods. Some of these materials may contain offensive stereotypes, ideas, visuals, or language.

THE EFFECT OF TELEVISION VIEWING ON CHILDREN'S ATTITUDES
ABOUT INTERPERSONAL CONFLICT RESOLUTIONS

An Abstract of a Thesis
Submitted
In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Specialist in Education

Kathlean Hendricks Hill
University of Northern Iowa

May 1986

This is to certify that

205

Kathlean Hendricks Hill

✓ satisfactorily completed the comprehensive oral examination
 did not satisfactorily complete the comprehensive oral examination

for the Specialist in Education degree with a major
in Educational Psychology: School Psychology
at the University of Northern Iowa at Cedar Falls

on May 15, 1986 .

Examining Committee

Donald W. Schmits

Chairperson

Jack Yates

Member

Bill Kline

Member

Member

Larry L. Kavich

Transmitted by:

Lawrence L. Kavich, Head
Department of Educational
Psychology & Foundations

ABSTRACT

The present study examined the effect of television viewing on children's attitudes about submissive, assertive, and aggressive resolutions to interpersonal conflicts from the Children's Action Tendency Scale (CATS). Subjects rated resolutions on a six item Likert scale which consisted of the following semantics: kind, good, wise, successful, strong, and brave. The 84 subjects for this study were fourth, fifth, and sixth grade children (40 males and 44 females) attending Price Laboratory School, University of Northern Iowa.

Data were analyzed by the multiple regression analysis procedure found in the Shazam statistical program (version 4.6, Oct. 1984). The predictor variables were gender, the violence content of five most-watched television shows, and the frequency of viewing the five most-watched shows. The dependent variables were the Likert semantic ratings on all three conflict resolution classes.

Results of this study indicated that males rated aggressive resolutions to interpersonal conflicts on the CATS significantly more "kind, wise, successful, and strong" than did females. Also revealed in the present study was subjects who were high frequency television viewers rated aggressive resolutions to interpersonal conflicts on the CATS significantly more "kind, good, and wise" than did low frequency viewers. Results of this study failed to reveal an effect for violence content of most-watched television shows for any of the resolution

classes of the CATS. No significant relationship was revealed for any of the predictor variables on assertive and submissive resolutions.

THE EFFECT OF TELEVISION VIEWING ON CHILDREN'S ATTITUDES
ABOUT INTERPERSONAL CONFLICT RESOLUTIONS

A Thesis

Submitted

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Specialist in Education

Kathlean Hendricks Hill

University of Northern Iowa

May 1986

This Study by: Kathleen Hendricks Hill

Entitled: The Effect Television Viewing On Children's Attitudes
About Interpersonal Conflict Resolutions

has been approved as meeting the thesis requirement for the
Degree of Specialist in Education

Donald W. Schmits

<u>5-15-86</u> Date	Chairman, Thesis Committee Bill Kline
<u>5-15-86</u> Date	Member, Thesis Committee Jack Yates
<u>5-15-86</u> Date	Member, Thesis Committee John C. Downey
<u>7-22-86</u> Date	Dean of the Graduate College

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	v
CHAPTER 1 -- THE PROBLEM	1
Statement of the Hypothesis	3
Importance of the Study	5
Assumptions	6
Limitations of the Study	7
CHAPTER 2 -- REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	8
The "Mainstream Effect"	8
Attitudes Cultivated by Television	10
Mitigating the Effect of Television Violence by	
Changing Only Attitudes About Aggression	15
Review of the Methodology of Television Watching	
Research	17
The Development of the CATS	20
CHAPTER 3 -- METHODOLOGY	24
Subjects	24
Instruments and Procedure	25
CHAPTER 4 -- RESULTS	30
Subjects' Television Viewing Patterns	30
Specific Hypothesis Tested	34
CHAPTER 5 -- DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND SUMMARY	40
Discussion	40

Implications 43

Summary 44

REFERENCES 46

APPENDIX A 51

APPENDIX B 63

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Occupational Status of Parents of Students Attending Price Laboratory School, UNI	26
2. Educational Status of Parents of Price Laboratory School, UNI	27
3. Frequency of Scores and Percentage of Subjects at Each Mean Violence Rating for Five Most-Watched Television Shows	31
4. Mean Violence Rating and Frequency of Subjects Listing Each Television Show	31
5. Mean Frequency of Watching Five Favorite Television Shows	34
6. Standard Coefficients, Standard Coefficients Squared, and Post Hoc t-Values on the "Kind" Rating for Aggressive Resolutions on the CATS	36
7. Standard Coefficients, Standard Coefficients Squared, and Post Hoc t-Values on the "Good" Rating for Aggressive Resolutions on the CATS	37
8. Standard Coefficients, Standard Coefficients Squared, and Post Hoc t-Values on the "Wise" Rating for Aggressive Resolutions on the CATS	37

9. Standard Coefficients, Standard Coefficients Squared,
and Post Hoc t-Values on the "Successful" Rating
for Aggressive Resolutions on the CATS 38
10. Standard Coefficients, Standard Coefficients Squared,
and Post Hoc t-Values on the "Strong" Rating for
Aggressive Resolutions on the CATS 38
11. Standard Coefficients, Standard Coefficients Squared,
and Post Hoc t-Values on the "Brave" Rating for
Aggressive Resolutions on the CATS 39

CHAPTER 1

THE PROBLEM

The topic of this research involves the effect of television viewing on children's attitudes about interpersonal conflict resolutions. That a relationship exists between high violence television viewing and high amounts of aggressive interpersonal behavior is well documented (Chaffee, 1972; Comstock, 1975; Huesmann, 1982; Lefkowitz & Huesmann, 1980). Bandura and his colleagues have demonstrated that children will show an increase in aggressive behavior as a result of exposure to aggressive models. This effect occurs whether or not the model is a live person or a person dressed as a cartoon character in a film, or a filmed human model (Bandura, Ross, & Ross, 1963). Eron (1982) obtained highly significant correlations between viewing violent television programs in third grade and being characterized as aggressive at age eighteen.

Less well researched is the relationship between television viewing and attitudes. There is, however, a growing body of evidence that television viewing may affect a wide variety of attitudes. Carlson (1983) found that heavy television viewers share a common outlook on crime control. The more individuals reported viewing crime shows the more likely they were to feel the federal government was spending too little on crime control. Morgan (1982) found that heavy television watching girls were much more likely to hold stereotypical sex roles than their light television watching peers. Leifer and Baron

(1971) observed that children who were heavy viewers of violent television chose more aggressive resolutions to written vignettes involving interpersonal conflicts than did light violent television viewers. What is absent in the literature is research on the relationship between television viewing and resolutions to interpersonal conflicts other than those involving aggressive responses.

The Children's Action Tendency Scale (CATS) was used in the present study to examine children's attitudes about assertive, submissive, and aggressive resolutions to interpersonal conflicts. Deluty (1979) developed the CATS, a self-report measure of assertiveness, submissiveness, and aggressiveness, based on his definition of these three response classes. His definition is as follows:

If assertiveness is defined as the ability to express, in a nonhostile manner, one's thoughts and feelings while not violating the rights of others, then nonassertiveness can take one of two forms: aggressiveness or submissiveness. An aggressive response can be defined as a hostile act involving self-expression at the expense of others, whereas a submissive response is a nonhostile act that involves considering the feelings, power, or authority of others while denying (or not standing up for) one's own rights and feelings. (p. 1062)

In the present study, nine of the thirteen CATS vignettes were randomly chosen. Each of the vignettes involved an interpersonal

conflict between children age 10-13 years. After each vignette an assertive, submissive, and aggressive resolution was given. Subjects in this study used a six item Likert semantic differential scale to rate each of the three resolutions on the Likert semantics scales of: "kind, good, wise, successful, strong, and brave." The present study examined the relationship between fourth, fifth, and sixth grade children's television watching habits and their ratings of the three conflict resolutions of the CATS.

Statement of the Hypothesis

The primary purpose of this study was to examine the general hypothesis that television viewing affects children's attitudes about the appropriateness of submission, assertion, and aggression in solving interpersonal conflicts. Multiple regression analyses were employed to examine the sources of variation in response to each Likert semantic on the CATS. Predictor variables included in the regression equation were gender, violence content of the five most-watched television shows, and frequency of viewing the five most-watched television shows. The following null hypothesis were examined:

HO¹ = The predictor variables account for no variation in ratings of submissive resolutions on the "kind" Likert semantic.

HO² = The predictor variables account for no variation in ratings of submissive resolutions on the "good" Likert semantic.

HO³ = The predictor variables account for no variation in ratings of submissive resolutions on the "wise" Likert semantic.

HO⁴ = The predictor variables account for no variation in ratings of submissive resolutions on the "successful" Likert semantic.

HO⁵ = The predictor variables account for no variation in ratings of submissive resolutions on the "strong" Likert semantic.

HO⁶ = The predictor variables account for no variation in ratings of submissive resolutions on the "brave" Likert semantic.

HO⁷ = The predictor variables account for no variation in ratings of assertive resolutions on the "kind" Likert semantic.

HO⁸ = The predictor variables account for no variation in ratings of assertive resolutions on the "good" Likert semantic.

HO⁹ = The predictor variables account for no variation in ratings of assertive resolutions on the "wise" Likert semantic.

HO¹⁰ = The predictor variables account for no variation in ratings of assertive resolutions on the "successful" Likert semantic.

HO¹¹ = The predictor variables account for no variation in ratings of assertive resolutions on the "strong" Likert semantic.

HO¹² = The predictor variables account for no variation in ratings of assertive resolutions on the "brave" Likert semantic.

HO¹³ = The predictor variables account for no variation in ratings of aggressive resolutions on the "kind" Likert semantic.

HO¹⁴ = The predictor variables account for no variation in ratings of aggressive resolutions on the "good" Likert semantic.

HO¹⁵ = The predictor variables account for no variation in ratings of aggressive resolutions on the "wise" Likert semantic.

HO¹⁶ = The predictor variables account for no variation in ratings of aggressive resolutions on the "successful" Likert semantic.

HO¹⁷ = The predictor variables account for no variation in ratings of aggressive resolutions on the "strong" Likert semantic.

HO¹⁸ = The predictor variables account for no variation in ratings of aggressive resolutions on the "brave" Likert semantic.

Importance of the Study

There is an increasing body of evidence that children's attitudes may be influenced by both the amount and kind of television programs they watch (Carlson, 1983; Morgan, 1982; Leifer & Baron, 1971). This research involves the effect viewing television has on children's attitudes about the appropriate way to solve interpersonal conflict. If children who watch high violent television develop positive attitudes toward the use of aggression in solving interpersonal conflict, one must ask what effect it has on society in general. What impact would violent television viewing have on other attitudes about aggression such as national and international actions and crime control? If results are positive, this study would be beneficial in understanding solutions children use to solve interpersonal conflict and in helping them choose the most effective and socially appropriate ones. If it turns out that attitudes are affected by television viewing, it may be appropriate to provide attempts at preventing or reversing inappropriate attitude change. A study by Huesmann, Eron, Klein, Brice, and Fisher (1983) indicates that children are less likely to hold pro-aggressive attitudes as a result of high levels of violent television watching if they do not see television as a realistic portrayal. Thus, attempts at mitigating the attitudinal effects, if

they exist, should focus on appropriateness of violent television alternatives in real life situations.

Assumptions

One of the basic assumptions of this study is that children are able to identify the shows they watch the most and both accurately list those shows and how often they watch them. If the subjects in this study inaccurately list the shows they watch the most, the data may be sufficiently contaminated to render results meaningless. No literature at this point either supports or fails to support this form of data collection. However, the self-report form of data collection is widely accepted by current researchers (Carlson, 1983; Huesmann et al., 1983; Morgan, 1982). Because there is no apparent reason for subjects to answer inaccurately, and because no name will be put on television watching lists, this form of data collection was chosen as the most expedient.

In rating the three alternatives to interpersonal conflict situations of the CATS, the assumption is made that children are able to understand the directions in filling out the Likert scale and answers according to their true feelings regardless of which response might be more socially appropriate. Subjects were assured that no one will know how they responded individually. In defense of this assumption, a number of studies on the CATS indicated children's choices of one of the three alternatives as well as Likert ratings of all three alternatives correlated positively and significantly with peer, teacher and self reports of assertion, aggression and submission

in classroom behavior (Deluty, 1979, 1983, 1984). As the population in this study is not presumed to be significantly different from the subjects who appeared to answer honestly and consistently with behavioral observations in Deluty's studies, one would expect similar accuracy in this population.

Limitations of the Study

Because subjects were rating alternatives to written vignettes, one must use care in inferring similar reactions to real life occurrence. It is possible that children may perceive an alternative resolution differently on a paper and pencil test than they would in real life. Secondly, one must not take the results to indicate how a subject might behave if faced with the conflict situation. Subjects are not asked to choose an alternative they would use and no behavioral response should be assumed based on data from this study.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

There is an increasing body of evidence that children's attitudes about life may be influenced by both the amount and the kind of television programs they watch. Carlson (1983), Adoni (1979) and Eisenstock (1984), for example, have demonstrated that heavy television viewers have real-world perceptions similar to those reflected in television program content while light viewers are much more divergent from program content. Some of the attitudes affected by heavy television viewing include attitudes toward women in American society (Morgan, 1982), attitudes toward civil liberties (Carlson, 1983), and attitudes toward crime control (Carlson, 1983).

The review is organized as follows:

- A. Segments of society most affected by television viewing the "Mainstream Effect";
- B. Attitudinal areas cultivated by television viewing;
- C. Mitigating the effect of television viewing by changing attitudes about television;
- D. Methodology used to collect television watching data; and
- E. The development of the CATS.

The "Mainstream Effect"

The first review is about the so-called "Mainstream Effect." Heavy television viewing seems to result in the cultivation of similar

attitudes on a number of issues among otherwise different groups. A recent line of reasoning in this area involves the idea that a "Mainstream Effect" may explain the sameness of attitudes among heavy television viewers.

The idea of mainstreaming suggests that heavy television viewers within subgroups that possess values outside of the mainstream may be the most susceptible to cultivation effects. For example, highly educated individuals are generally less likely to be heavy viewers of television and more likely to expose themselves to a variety of sources of information than individuals with low levels of education. In general they are less likely to give mainstream or 'television' answers to survey questions than the less educated. Within highly educated subgroups, however, heavy viewers of television are more likely to give survey responses that resemble those of less educated people. In other words, television appears to be influential in that it promotes a common outlook and discourages deviant or non-mainstream points of view; regardless of group membership heavy television viewers share a common outlook. (Carlson, 1983, p. 537)

Based on the Mainstream Effect it is the opinion of this researcher that when examining the effect of television on attitudes, one must look at the socio-economic composition and educational levels of the subjects under study.

Attitudes Cultivated by Television

This review of the literature involving attitudes cultivated by television viewing will include four specific categories: Attitudes about sex role stereotypes, attitudes about crime control, attitudes about civil liberties, and attitudes about aggressive behavior.

Attitudes in the classes of sex roles, crime control, civil liberties, and aggressive behavior seem to be cultivated by heavy television viewing. Each of these classes will be reviewed in the listed sequence, starting with sex roles.

One message strongly related to television is the role of women in American society. A "symbolic annihilation of women has been accomplished through under-representation, over-victimization, and trivialization" (Morgan, 1982, p. 947). Women are depicted as not being part of the working world and are confined to the traditional realm of homemaker and mother. If television does affect one's attitude about reality, heavy viewers would be expected to have more traditional sex role stereotypes than light viewers. Cross sectional studies have confirmed that the more television subjects report viewing, the more likely they are to express sexist attitudes about women (Honig, 1982; Morgan, 1982).

Morgan (1982) conducted a two-year longitudinal study concerning the relationship between stereotypical sex role attitudes and television viewing. Subjects were middle school children whose IQ's were controlled. Results of Morgan's study indicate that the association between stereotypical sex role attitudes and television holds only for high IQ girls. No significant correlation between

stereotypical sex role attitudes and television watching was obtained for middle and low IQ girls, or for boys of all IQ's. Morgan reports that, "A mainstream effect seems to be working for the children in this study" (Morgan, 1982, p. 953). Girls with higher IQ's tended to be less sexist and their attitudes about stereotypical sex roles did not parallel those portrayed on television--unless they were heavy television viewers. Although boys in all IQ groups showed a greater decrease in sexism scores over time, their scores remained significantly higher than girls each year. Because boys' sexism scores closely resembled what was on television, whether they were light or heavy television watchers, they appeared to be less affected by television portrayals of sexist roles. As predicted by the Mainstream Effect theory, the groups most affected by stereotypical sex roles on television are those whose attitudes are most unlike those presented on television. In addition Morgan found that observations of counterstereotypical presentations can influence one's sex-role images, especially among young children.

Carlson (1983) described television portrayals of crime and law enforcement as follows:

Both communications analysts and television critics have argued that most of the shows on television present a distorted view of crime and law enforcement. Crime shows have been characterized by their lack of accuracy and the neoconservative point of view they represent. (p. 532)

Joseph Dominick (1973) investigated the accuracy of crime portrayal on television by comparing a content analysis of television crime shows

with an examination of FBI statistics. Dominick found that violent crimes, such as murder and assault, are overrepresented on television. Television crime shows portrayed police as more violent than in real life; compared to reality, television criminal activity was more likely to result in violent resolution than resolution through legal processes. In addition, Dominick identified 21 scenes of clear constitutional violations, 15 acts of police brutality, and 70 of other legality questions. Dominick summarized his findings by stating that, ". . . along a number of factual dimensions there is little correlation between crime control as portrayed on television and crime control in reality" (Dominick, 1973, p. 7).

Carlson (1983) indicates that television places a great deal of emphasis on the "Crime Control Model of criminal justice" (p. 530). The Crime Control Model sees repression of criminal conduct as the most important function of the criminal justice system. Public order and high regard for the criminal justice process is seen as important for social freedom. Consequently, the Crime Control Model stresses a high rate of apprehension and conviction of criminals. Carlson notes that built into the Crime Control Model is a "presumption of guilt which is a reflection of confidence in the efficiency of the criminal justice system" (p. 533).

Heavy television viewers tend to share a common outlook in crime control (Carlson, 1983; Gerbner, 1982). The more individuals report viewing crime shows the more likely they are to feel that the federal government is spending too little on crime control as opposed to light

television viewers who feel the current spending is appropriate (Gerbner, 1982).

Many adolescents who are heavy television viewers develop an overwhelming support for the crime control model of criminal justice. Because of the neglect of civil liberties within this model of criminal justice a retarding of democratic ideals is experienced by heavy television watching adolescents. As predicted by the Mainstream Effect hypothesis, heavy crime show viewing has its greatest impact on pre-adults from homes where the head of the household has a white-collar occupation. Heavy crime show viewing in blue-collar homes has little impact on civil liberties attitudes (Carlson, 1983).

Relatively few studies have examined the relationship between violent television viewing and attitudes toward violent resolutions to conflicts. Most studies have examined the behavioral correlates to violent television viewing. One exception was the Siegel (1958) study in which children who heard violent portrayals of taxi drivers in a fictional radio show attributed much more violence to real life taxi drivers than those who heard non violent portrayals. When children were asked to predict endings to newspaper stories involving taxi drivers, children who heard violent portrayals of taxi drivers in a radio show predicted much more violent behaviors for them than did children who heard non-violent portrayals on television. The conclusion that children's attitudes were affected by fictional portrayals is further strengthened by the fact that only children who understood that newspapers report real world events while the radio portrayals were fictional were retained in the final analysis.

Leifer and Baron (1971) investigated whether knowledge of motives and consequences affected attitudes. Children watched programs varying in level of violence and in presence of information on motives and consequences of violence. They found that children who had viewed the more violent programs chose more aggressive alternatives to written vignettes involving interpersonal conflicts. However, information on motives or consequences concerning violence did not affect the child's attitude toward aggressive alternatives.

Some authors have suggested that repetitive observation of violence can result in emotional habituation. Bergner (1962) found that adults become decreasingly emotionally aroused as they watch a victim receive a large number of painful electric shocks. Drabman and Thomas (1974) presented television shows to two groups of third and fourth grade subjects. One group was presented a television show characterized by high violence content while the other group was presented a nonviolent television show. After presentation of the television show, subjects were asked to observe a group of young children through a two-way mirror. Subjects were told to summons the examiner if the young children "got into trouble." Subjects who viewed television shows high in violence content responded more slowly to aggressive behavior on the part of the young children than did subjects who were presented television shows low in violence content. It was hypothesized that children who had observed violent behavior on television became emotionally habituated to aggression and so reacted much more slowly to aggression on the part of children in their care.

Mitigating the Effect of Television Violence by Changing Only Attitudes
About Aggression

Separating the effects of frequency of television watching, content of programs watched, and attitude about aggression independent of any television related influence has not proven to be an easy task. It is even possible that the relationship is circular and not independently verifiable. One way to approach the study of the relationship between television watching, overt aggressive behavior, and attitudes about aggression is to allow television watching and program content to be as subjects freely select and for the researcher to modify only the subjects' attitudes about the acceptability of aggressive behavior. Under this design, the relationship between the attitude and the level of aggressive behavior can be studied.

Huesmann, Eron, Klein, Brice and Fisher (1983) attempted to moderate the relationship between children's level of violent television watching and subsequent aggressive behavior by changing children's attitude about aggressive behavior. Huesmann et al. suggested that aggressive problem solving strategies may be associated with specific cues in an aggressive film and retrieved when those or similar cues are present in the child's environment. Three contributors to the likelihood of a child behaving aggressively as a result of viewing violent television include: (a) perception of televised violence as realistic; (b) extent the viewer identifies with the violent character and; (c) a viewer's belief that the aggressive behavior is acceptable to society. The literature indicates the more that children watch violent television, the more they believe the

depicted violence to be realistic and the more accepting they are of aggression in peers (Lefkowitz & Huesmann, 1980; Huesmann et al., 1983). When a child's attitudes about the realism of television violence and the appropriateness of such violent behavior were changed, that child's aggressive behavior was significantly altered, even though they did not change the amount of violent television they watched. Huesmann and his colleagues hypothesized that the effect of television violence on children is dependent on each child's cognition about aggressive behavior, television characters, and television violence.

Eron (1982) tried to change children's attitudes about television violence by having them write a paragraph on "why TV violence is unrealistic and why viewing too much of it is bad." After writing and rewriting the paragraph, taping themselves reading the paragraph and watching tapes of themselves and peers reading the paragraphs, these children were able to lower their peer-nominated aggression scores while the placebo group stayed the same. No attempt was made to reduce the amount of high violence content television shows that children watched. Thus, by changing the child's attitude about violent behavior on television, a change was made in peer's perceptions of their aggressiveness. This change in peer-nominated aggression remained at the four month follow-up study. The best predictor of peer-nominated aggression in the experimental group was identification with aggressive TV characters and belief in the realism of television. The higher a subject's self-rating of identification of TV characters and realism of television the higher the peer rating of aggressiveness. The children with the highest peer ratings of aggressiveness in the study were boys

who watched high amounts of aggressive television and identified with aggressive characters. This group was the least susceptible to treatment. Eron also found that children who read fairy tales or had fairy tales read to them were more likely to experience a change in their attitude about aggressive behavior and behave less aggressively themselves. Eron stated that children who hear fairy tales are better able to understand the difference between fantasy and reality.

As shown by both Huesmann et al. and Eron, the relationship between high violent television watching and high behavioral aggression may be reduced by changing only a child's attitudes about the acceptability of aggression. Thus, it is not clear that either frequency or content of television watching alone is a predictor of aggressive behavior. Further research about the relatedness of attitude and television viewing is needed.

Review of the Methodology of Television Watching Research

Data collection of television viewing has varied over the years. The following is a historical review of the three main data collection techniques: laboratory presentations; television viewing logs; and questionnaires.

Much of the early television viewing research involved laboratory presentations of violent vs. nonviolent videos and then measurements of subsequent aggressive behavior (Bandura, 1961, 1965; Berkowitz & Rawlings, 1963; Drabman & Thomas, 1974). In a procedure similar to earlier studies Eisenstock (1984) showed two types of shows, one with stereotyped female figures and another with non-stereotypical sex

roles. Measurements were taken on how sex role stereotypes changed depending on whether they watched stereotypical or non-stereotypical portrayals. Difficulties were noted in the laboratory presentations because no control was taken for the amount and content of television viewed outside the laboratory (Himmelweit, 1960).

Following the laboratory technique, data on television viewing turned to some form of logging of home television viewing throughout a specified period of time (Maccoby, 1951; Adoni, 1979; Himmelweit, 1960). One difficulty noted in this form of data collection was that when elementary grade subjects were used, parents generally logged television viewing. It was observed that, "Parents tended to underestimate the amount their children viewed and were rarely familiar with their children's program preference" (Maccoby, 1951, p. 427). However, when elementary grade children were asked to log their own television viewing, logs were often incomplete or forgotten completely (Himmelweit, 1960).

Several studies examining television viewing habits involved some form of paper and pencil questionnaire. Carlson (1983) used an index of crime show viewing. A content analysis was done on prime-time programs which contained at least one arrest during each show (the topic of this particular research). Sixteen programs were identified; these shows were placed on a list of regularly scheduled network programs. Respondents were asked to indicate on a scale from 1 "never watch" to 4 "almost always watch" the frequency of viewing each program. The index had a scale range of 16 to 64 which was the summation of weights for each of the sixteen programs.

A variation on the Carlson (1983) method of data collection was conducted by Eron, Huesmann, Brice, Fisher, and Mermelstein (1983), and also involved respondents rating the frequency with which they watched specifically named shows. The programs used were the 80 television shows identified by the Nielson data as the most popular for children ages 6-11 years. The shows were divided into eight lists of 10 programs each. Each subject was asked to select one show on each list that they watched the most. They were then asked to indicate by checking the appropriate box whether they "watched every single time the show was on," "watched a lot, but not every single time," or "watched just once in a while." Two psychology graduate students who had small children but were not associated with the study rated all eighty programs on a 5-point scale from "not violent" to "very violent." The subject's TV violence score was the sum of the violence ratings of the 8 shows the child had indicated he or she watched, weighted by the frequency with which the child reported watching the program. This exact procedure was replicated by Eron (1982), and Huesmann (1982). No data were given on the reliability of Carlson's or Eron et al. procedures in the sense of being representative of shows the subjects actually watched.

Berman and Stookey (1980) gave each respondent a checklist of 160 regularly scheduled programs currently being aired and asked each subject to mark which he/she regularly watched. Program types were then isolated by factor analysis. Programs which rated high on a factor, such as violence content, were used to create an index of the extent to which a number of program types were watched. Indexes were

based on the number of programs within each type watched by the subject, divided by the number of programs of that type. A number of studies also have subjects list the five to eight shows they watch the most and then have judges rate the violence content (Morgan, 1982; Gunter & Furnham, 1984).

A variety of data collection methods exist for collecting television watching data. It is the opinion of this reviewer that no clear conclusions can be drawn involving the superiority of one form over another. Additional data need to be collected involving the most representative form of collecting television watching data.

The Development of the CATS

Although several self-report measures of aggressiveness exist for adults (i.e., Buss & Durkee, 1957; Cook & Medley, 1954; Zaks & Walters, 1959), only four measures exist for children (Dembo, 1973; Deluty, 1979; Leifer & Baron, 1971; Sears, 1961). Of these, only the CATS (Deluty, 1979) has been empirically validated with children of several age groups by use of external criteria other than teacher/tutor reports. For this reason, the CATS was chosen for use in this study. A brief description of the development of the CATS and validation studies conducted will follow.

Deluty (1979) reports that the CATS was developed following the behavioral-analytic model outlined by Goldfried and D'Zurilla (1969). According to this model, response alternatives on a self-report assessment measure should be chosen on the basis of empirical research concerned with the relevant problem situations and of the likely

courses of action undertaken by individuals representative of the population the assessment device is to be used on. The development of the CATS was conducted in three stages. Stage 1 consisted of making a survey of relevant aggression, assertion, and submission-eliciting situations for children 6-12 years old. In stage 2 a list of possible discriminating responses to each of the situations chosen in stage 1 was obtained. Stage 3 consisted of children, teachers, parents, and psychologist evaluating (in terms of aggressiveness, assertiveness, and submissiveness) the most popular discriminating response of stage 2. At the end of stage 3 the responses rated as aggressive, assertive, and submissive by the greatest number of evaluators were used as the response choices in the questionnaire (Deluty, 1979). An aggressive response was defined for the subjects as a "hostile act that involves expressing one's rights and feelings at the expense of others." An assertive response was defined as a nonhostile act that involves self-expression and self-enhancement without violating the rights and feelings of others. Lastly, submissive responses were defined as a "nonhostile, unassertive act that involves considering the feelings, power, or authority of others while denying (or not standing up for) one's own rights and feelings" (Deluty, 1979, p. 1064). Deluty noted that for the children evaluator's definitions of aggressive, assertive, and submissive responses were phrased more simply but still conveyed the basic differentiating qualities of the terms.

The CATS has been shown to correlate with other measures of aggression and assertion. CATS aggressive scores and peer physical aggression scores and peer-teacher most aggressive scores correlate

.68, $p < .01$. CATS assertiveness and teacher assertiveness rating scores correlate .47, $p < .01$. Submissiveness scores and peer and teacher submissiveness ratings correlate .59, $p < .01$. Test-retest reliability was found to correlate significantly at the $p < .001$ level across sex and response categories over a four month interval.

As further validation of the CATS, subjects' scores on the CATS subscales were correlated with performance on the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory (Coopersmith, 1967). He reported the following characteristic of low self-esteem children:

Although children with low self-esteem are no more delinquent or aggressive than children with high self-esteem, they are much more likely to claim that their parents stress and value accommodation than are the parents of children with either medium or high self-esteem. (Coopersmith, 1967, p. 20)

Based on this statement, Deluty (1979) hypothesized that children with low self-esteem scores on the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory would have high submissiveness scores, but would not differ from high self-esteem subjects in terms of their aggressiveness scores. This hypothesis was confirmed as a significant negative correlation, $r = -.37$, $p < .05$, was found between CATS submissiveness scores and subjects' self-esteem scores, and no significant correlation was obtained between CATS aggressiveness and self-esteem scores. Scores on the Crandal (1965) Children's Social Desirability Questionnaire correlated positively with submissiveness scores, $r = .57$, $p < .001$, and negatively with aggressiveness scores, $r = -.44$, $p < .01$ (Deluty, 1979). A two-way analysis of variance (Sex x Grade) revealed that

boys have significantly larger aggressiveness scores and significantly smaller assertiveness scores than did girls. No significant difference was revealed between boys' and girls' submissiveness scores. In addition, there were no significant main effects for grade, nor was any significant Sex-Grade interaction found for any of the three measures (Deluty, 1979). Finally, the CATS aggressiveness scores have been shown to correlate negatively ($p < .001$) with CATS assertiveness scores ($r = -.69$) and with CATS submissiveness scores ($r = -.75$) (Deluty, 1984).

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between television viewing and children's attitudes about resolutions to interpersonal conflicts on the CATS. Attitudes about submissive, assertive and aggressive resolutions of the CATS were measured by employing a Likert-style rating of four, seven-point "evaluative" semantic differential scales ("good-bad," "wise-foolish," "successful-unsuccessful," "kind-cruel") and of two "potency" semantic differential scales ("strong-weak," "brave-cowardly"). Multiple analyses were employed to examine the source of variation in response to each Likert semantic. Predictor variables included in the regression equation were gender, violence content of the five most-watched television shows, and frequency of viewing the five most-watched television shows.

Subjects

Fourth, fifth and sixth grade students attending Price Laboratory School, University of Northern Iowa (UNI), comprised the subjects for this study. One-hundred four students attend Price Laboratory School in this grade range; of these, eighty-four participated in the study. Parents were sent a letter the Monday before the week data were to be collected explaining the purpose of the study. Any parents who did not wish their child to be part of the study were asked to sign the letter and return it to the school by Friday of that week.

Ten of the twenty students who did not participate were requested not to do so by their parents. Additionally, there were two students who filled out the questionnaire incorrectly and eight who were absent.

Data gathered on the occupational and educational status of all parents of Price Laboratory School, UNI, students in kindergarten through twelfth grade are presented in Table 1 and Table 2. Based on data in the tables, it is evident that the educational status and occupational status of this group of parents is well above the national average.

Instruments and Procedure

Subjects were given a questionnaire packet (see Appendix A) by their classroom teacher. The questionnaire first asked them to list the five shows they watched most. Next to each show they were asked to check how often they usually watched that show. Alternatives to the frequency of watching were, "every time it is on," "often but not every time," or "not very often." Points of three for "every time it is on," two for "often but not every time," and one for "not very often" are given for each response. After the five shows were listed on the lines provided, subjects were presented with the question, "I am a ____ boy, ____ girl." They were asked to check the appropriate response. Before beginning the television watching questionnaire, the children were told not to put their names on any pages of the packet. They were asked to answer each page honestly and told no one would know how they answered any questions.

Table 1

Occupational Status of Parents of Students Attending Price Laboratory School, UNI

Occupation	Father	Mother	Occupation	Father	Mother
Agriculture	3.0%	0.0%	Semiskilled	6.00%	3.0%
Clerical	0.0%	14.0%	Service	3.00%	1.0%
Housewife	0.0%	30.0%	Skilled	15.00%	5.0%
Managerial	11.0%	1.5%	Unskilled	.05%	0.0%
Military	0.0%	0.0%	Unemployed	0.00%	0.0%
Professional	56.0%	36.0%	Sales	3.00%	1.5%
Retired	1.5%	0.0%	Self-employed	1.5%	5.0%
Student	0.0%	2.0%			

Note. Data collected in the fall of 1985. No significant changes in occupational status is suspected.

After all the data were collected from the subjects, five graduate students who had elementary grade children were asked to rate the shows on a five-point scale from "not violent" to "very violent" in terms of the amount of visually portrayed physical aggression (see Appendix B for rating form). The interrater reliability for violence content was .95, with a standard deviation of .02, and was computed from an 88 x 5 matrix using shows for rows and raters for columns wherein the columns

Table 2

Educational Status of Parents of Price Laboratory School, UNI

Highest Grade Completed	Father	Mother
Elementary	0.05%	0.5%
Partial But Incomplete High School	5.00%	1.0%
Completed High School	20.00%	26.0%
Beyond High School Other Than College	2.00	4.0%
Some College But Without Degree	10.00%	20.0%
Bachelor's (or Baccalaureate)	17.00%	31.0%
Advanced Degree	46.00%	18.0%

Note. Data collected in the fall of 1985. No significant change in educational status is suspected.

were correlated with each other and the column is averaged to be the reliability coefficient. Eron (1982) obtained an interrater reliability of .75 but the procedure used to determine reliability was not specified. A child's score for violence content of most-television shows is the sum of the violence ratings of the five shows listed as the ones they watched the most. The subjects' frequency of watching favorite television shows score is the total number of 3's, 2's, and 1's circled for each television show. The data obtained from the first sheet of the packet will provide the three independent variables, sex

of subject, violence content of the most watched shows, and frequency of watching favorite television shows.

The second part of the questionnaire involved the subjects' ratings of assertive, submissive, and submissive resolution alternatives to nine randomly selected conflict situations on the CATS. To determine children's attitudes about aggressive, assertive, and submissive alternatives to interpersonal conflict situations, subjects were asked to rate all three alternatives on the CATS. The evaluations consisted of Likert-style ratings on four, seven-point "evaluative" semantic differential scales ("good-bad," "wise-foolish," "successful-unsuccessful," "kind-cruel") and on two "potency" semantic differential scales ("strong-weak," "brave-cowardly"). Each of the nine conflict situations were presented in a questionnaire format, followed by each of the three response resolutions. After each of the response resolutions, the seven-point scale was presented. Children rated each of the three resolutions in all nine conflict situations.

The first page of the CATS involves the directions and a sample situation with one aggressive resolution followed by the Likert scale. Children read the directions to themselves as the teacher read them out loud (see Appendix A). Next they were told by the teacher, "Remember boys and girls that it is important to answer according to how you feel about each of the ways of acting. No one will know how you rate any alternative, including myself." Next the subjects read the example situation to themselves as the teacher read it out loud. Then they read the response, "Push the kid out of line." The teachers then said, "Now look at the six lines under push him out of line. If you think

pushing him out of line is a very kind thing to do, circle the words 'very kind.' If you think it is kind but not very kind, circle 'kind.' If you think it is unkind or very unkind, circle those words. Remember you should circle one word on each one of the six lines." The teachers then read the rest of the scales on the example page. Next the teachers asked for any questions. All teachers involved in this study preferred to read all nine situations and the three alternatives to the children as they read them to themselves. It was felt that this was the fastest and most reliable procedure to use.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

First, subjects' television viewing habits will be analyzed to determine any biasing characteristics of the sample which may have influenced the obtained results. Next, results pertaining to the eighteen specific hypothesis tested are presented.

Subjects' Television Viewing Patterns

Subjects' mean violence content of favorite television shows is presented in Table 3. Data indicate that an overwhelming majority of subjects listed television shows low in physically-portrayed violence. Over half the subjects (70%) obtained a mean violence content score for favorite shows of 2.49 or less, while 99% of the subjects obtained a mean violence content score of 3.5 or less. The modal interval for the mean was 1.50 to 2.49, with the distribution being skewed positively. A list of the television shows subjects indicated watching, violence ratings of those shows, and the number of subjects listing each show is presented in Table 4.

Subjects' score distribution for frequency of watching favorite shows is presented in Table 5. Results indicate that none of the subjects had a mean frequency rating in the "not very often" watching category (rating of 1). Subjects' mean watching score was fairly evenly distributed between the "always" and "sometimes" watching category (ratings of 3 and 2, respectively).

Table 3

Frequency of Scores and Percentage of Subjects at Each Mean Violence Rating for Five Most-Watched Television Shows

Mean Violence Rating	Frequency	Percent of Subjects
1.0-1.49	27	32
1.5-2.49	32	38
2.5-3.49	18	21
3.5-4.49	5	6
4.5-5.00	2	3

Note: Most violent rating is 5; least violent rating 1.

Table 4

Mean Violence Rating and Frequency of Subjects Listing Each Television Show

Television Show	Mean Violence Rating	Frequency of Listing
Andy Griffith Show	1.0	3
Anne of Green Gables	1.0	2
Bewitched	1.0	1
Brady Bunch	1.0	3
Carol Burnett Show	1.4	1
Cheers	1.0	7
Cosby Show	1.0	52
Different Strokes	1.0	23
Down to Earth	1.0	2
Facts of Life	1.0	4
Family Ties	1.0	18

Table 4

Mean Violence Rating and Frequency of Subjects Listing Each Television Show (continued)

Television Show	Mean Violence Rating	Frequency of Listing
Flying Nun	1.0	1
Golden Girls	1.0	5
I Dream of Jeannie	1.2	4
Jefferson's	1.0	2
Kate and Allie	1.0	4
Leave It To Beaver	1.0	1
Little House on the Prairie	1.0	1
Mr. Wizard	1.0	1
Muppet Babies	1.2	3
Newhart Show	1.0	1
Newlywed Game	1.0	2
Night Court	1.4	5
Punky Brewster	1.0	7
Sale of the Century	1.0	1
Silver Spoons	1.0	10
The Bozo Show	1.4	1
The Price is Right	1.0	1
Three's Company	1.2	13
Turkey T.V.	1.0	1
Valerie	1.2	1
Wheel of Fortune	1.0	6
Who's the Boss	1.4	21
Wonder Works	1.0	4
Room 227	1.8	3
Alvin & The Chipmunks	2.0	2
Amazing Stories	2.4	6
Donald Duck Presents	2.0	2
Double Trouble	2.0	1
General Hospital	2.2	2
Give Me a Break	2.0	11
Good Times	2.0	2
Growing Pains	2.0	9
He the Mayor	2.0	1
Highway to Heaven	1.8	1
Looney Tunes	2.0	1
M.A.S.H.	2.4	6
Mr. Belvedere	2.0	3
People's Court	2.0	1
The Twilight Zone	1.8	2

Table 4

Mean Violence Rating and Frequency of Subjects Listing Each Television Show (continued)

Television Show	Mean Violence Rating	Frequency of Listing
TV's Bloopers & Practical Jokes	2.0	2
Wuzzles	2.0	1
You Can't Do That on Television	2.0	8
You Again	2.0	2
Basketball	3.4	3
Benny Hill	3.0	1
Black's Magic	3.0	1
Cartoon Express	3.0	1
Dallas	3.4	1
Misfits of Science	3.0	7
Moonlighting	3.2	15
M.T.V.	3.2	3
Murder, She Wrote	3.0	4
Nick Rocks	3.0	1
Star Trek	3.0	1
Cagney & Lacey	4.2	2
Danger Mouse	4.0	2
Dukes of Hazzard	4.2	1
Hardcastle & McCormic	4.0	1
Hill Street Blues	4.0	2
Knight Rider	4.4	5
MacGyver	4.0	11
Mask	4.0	5
National News	3.6	5
Riptide	4.0	6
Saturday Night Live	3.6	2
Simon & Simon	4.0	2
The Roadrunner Show	4.2	1
Transformers	4.0	7
A-Team	5.0	11
Airwolf	5.0	4
Equalizer	5.0	2
Football	4.8	3
HeMan & Masters of the Universe	5.0	2
Hunter	5.0	1
Miami Vice	5.0	15

Table 4

Mean Violence Rating and Frequency of Subjects Listing Each Television Show (continued)

Television Show	Mean Violence Rating	Frequency of Listing
Sting Ray	5.0	1
WWF Wrestling	5.0	1

Note. Interrater reliability = average $r = .95$

Table 5

Mean Frequency of Watching Five Favorite Television Shows

Frequency Rating	Number of Subjects	Percentages of Subjects
Always Watch	40	48
Sometimes Watch	44	52
Not Very Often	0	0

Specific Hypotheses Tested

Statistical significance for each of the eighteen specific hypotheses of this study was tested using a multiple regression analysis procedure in the Shazam (version 4.6, Oct. 1984) statistical program. Statistical significance was tested at the $p < .05$ level.

Only the specific hypotheses in which the null hypothesis of no significant difference was rejected will be presented.

HO¹³: The predictor variables account for no variation in ratings of aggressive resolutions on the "kind" Likert semantic. Significant differences were found in the way males and females rated the aggressive resolutions on the "kind" semantic. Males rated aggressive resolutions significantly more "kind" than did females. The more frequently subjects reported watching their favorite show the more "kind" they rated aggressive resolutions.

HO¹⁴: The predictor variables account for no variation in ratings of aggressive resolutions on the "good" Likert semantic. A significant positive relationship was revealed between frequency of viewing most-watched television shows and ratings of aggressive resolutions on the "good" semantic. Subjects who indicated they watched their favorite television shows the most frequently rated aggressive resolutions significantly more "good."

HO¹⁵: The predictor variables account for no variation in the ratings of aggressive resolutions on the "wise" Likert semantic. Significant positive relationships were revealed between gender of subject and frequency of viewing most-watched television shows and ratings of aggressive resolutions on the "wise" semantic. Males were significantly more likely to rate aggressive resolutions as "wise." Subjects who reported watching their favorite television shows the most frequently rated aggressive alternatives more "wise."

HO¹⁶: The predictor variables account for no variation in the ratings of aggressive resolutions on the "successful" Likert semantic.

Statistical differences were found in the way males and females rated aggressive alternatives on the "successful" semantic. Males rated aggressive alternatives significantly more "successful" than females.

HO¹⁷: The predictor variables account for no variation in the ratings of aggressive resolutions on the "strong" Likert semantic. Statistical differences were found in the way males and females rated aggressive resolutions on the "strong" semantic. Males rated aggressive resolutions significantly more "strong" than did females.

Tables 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11 present the standard coefficients, coefficients squared, and t-tests for aggressive resolutions on the CATS. One table is presented for each of the six semantics used to rate the resolutions.

Table 6

Standard Coefficients, Standard Coefficients Squared, and Post Hoc t-Values on the "Kind" Rating for Aggressive Resolutions on the CATS

	Standard Coefficients	Coefficients Squared	t-Values
Sex	-0.24	0.06	-1.90*
Frequency of Watching	0.20	0.04	1.91*
Violence Content	0.005	0.00	0.04

* $p < .05$

Note: f-ratio = 3.10, $R^2 = .1042$

Table 7

Standard Coefficients, Standard Coefficients Squared, and Post Hoc t-Values on the "Good" Rating for Aggressive Resolutions on the CATS

	Standard Coefficients	Coefficients Squared	t-Values
Sex	-0.18	0.03	-1.48
Frequency of Watching	0.26	0.07	2.53*
Violence Content	0.17	0.03	-1.41

* $p < .05$

Note: f-ratio = 5.36, $R^2 = 0.17$

Table 8

Standard Coefficients, Standard Coefficients Squared, and Post Hoc t-Values on the "Wise" Rating for Aggressive Resolutions on the CATS

	Standard Coefficients	Coefficients Squared	t-Values
Sex	-0.22	0.05	-1.82*
Frequency of Watching	0.26	0.07	2.58*
Violence Content	-0.19	0.04	-1.56

* $p < .05$

Note: f-ratio = 6.63, $R^2 = 0.20$

Table 9

Standard Coefficients, Standard Coefficients Squared, and Post Hoc t-Values on the "Successful" Rating for Aggressive Resolutions on the CATS

	Standard Coefficients	Coefficients Squared	t-Values
Sex	-0.25	0.06	-2.02*
Frequency of Watching	0.15	0.02	1.46
Violence Content	0.18	0.03	-1.46

* $p < .05$

Note: f -ratio = 5.30, $R^2 = 0.17$

Table 10

Standard Coefficients, Standard Coefficients Squared, and Post Hoc t-Values on the "Strong" Rating for Aggressive Resolutions on the CATS

	Standard Coefficients	Coefficients Squared	t-Values
Sex	-0.23	0.05	-1.84*
Frequency of Watching	0.10	0.01	.99
Violence Content	0.16	0.03	-1.61

* $p < .05$

Note: f -ratio = 4.07, $R^2 = 0.13$

Table 11

Standard Coefficients, Standard Coefficients Squared, and Post Hoc t-Values on the "Brave" Rating for Aggressive Resolutions on the CATS

	Standard Coefficients	Coefficients Squared	t-Values
Sex	-0.17	0.03	-1.36
Frequency of Watching	0.007	0.00	0.66
Violence Content	0.13	0.02	-1.03

* $p < .05$

Note: f -ratio = 2.30, $R^2 = 0.08$

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND SUMMARY

A summary of findings is presented in this chapter and the implications for further research are discussed. Fourth, fifth, and sixth grade students attending Price Laboratory School, UNI, were asked to rate assertive, submissive, and aggressive resolutions of the CATS on a six item Likert scale. Likert ratings consisted of the following semantics: "kind, good, wise, successful, strong, and brave." The following problematic questions were addressed:

1. Will male and female subjects differ in their ratings of aggressive, assertive, and submissive interpersonal conflict resolutions on the CATS?

2. Will a significant relationship be revealed between content of five most-watched television shows and subjects' ratings of assertive, submissive, and aggressive resolutions on the CATS?

3. Will a significant relationship be revealed between frequency of viewing most-watched television shows and subjects' ratings of aggressive, assertive, and submissive resolutions on the CATS?

Discussion

Results obtained in this study were used to examine the relationship between gender, violence content of five most-watched television shows, and frequency of viewing most-watched television shows and subjects' ratings of aggressive, assertive, and submissive

interpersonal conflict resolutions on the CATS. Ratings consisted of Likert style semantic ratings "kind, good, wise, successful, strong, and brave."

Deluty (1979) found boys and girls did not differ in their submissiveness scores but did differ in their assertiveness and aggressiveness scores. Boys in Deluty's study were less likely to choose assertive resolutions on the CATS and rated assertive resolutions significantly less positively than girls. Boys were significantly more likely to choose aggressive resolutions on the CATS and they rated aggressive alternatives significantly more positively. Males and females in this study did not differ significantly in their ratings of assertive and submissive resolutions on the CATS. Consistent with Deluty's findings, a significant sex variable was revealed in subjects' ratings of aggressive solutions to interpersonal resolutions on the "kind, wise, successful, and strong ratings." Boys in this study rated aggressive alternatives significantly more "kind, wise, successful, and strong" than girls. Boys and girls did not differ in their ratings of how "good and brave" aggressive alternatives are in solving interpersonal conflicts.

A significant relationship was revealed between subjects' frequency of viewing most-watched television shows and their ratings of aggressive resolutions on the "kind, good, and wise" semantics. Subjects who were the most frequent viewers of television rated aggressive alternatives significantly more "kind, good, and wise" than the lower frequency television watchers. No effects were revealed in respect to violence content of favorite television shows. It is not

clear what results would have been revealed if there were a sufficient number of subjects in the high violent television viewing subgroup. No significant differences were revealed between frequency of viewing or violence content of most-watched television shows and subjects' ratings of assertive and submissive response alternatives on the CATS. In this population, television viewing patterns do not appear to affect subjects' attitudes about assertive and submissive conflict resolutions.

Analysis of subjects' television viewing patterns indicated that an overwhelming majority of the fourth, fifth, and sixth grade students involved in this study viewed television shows low in physically portrayed violence. Because only nine percent of all subjects listed shows in the high violence content range (ranking of 4 or 5), analysis of the effect of viewing television violence was difficult. The population used in this study was not proportionally distributed into equal cell numbers in respect to violent television viewing.

It is possible that the population in the present study differs significantly from other fourth, fifth, and sixth grade children in the amount of high violence content television they watch. On the other hand, elementary grade children in the general population may not watch television shows high in violent content. More research is needed to determine the amount of violent television shows most elementary age children watch. Literature on television viewing indicates that because of the Mainstream Effect, viewers coming from higher socio-economic subgroups are more likely to be affected by the amount of television they watch and the content of those shows (Carlson, 1983;

Gerbner, 1982). This being the case, subjects from this study would be more likely to be affected by viewing television shows high in violence content due to the high educational and occupational status of families attending Price Laboratory School, UNI. However, this population did not consist of enough children who viewed violent television shows to measure its effect on attitudes about interpersonal conflict resolutions.

In summary it was the intention of this study to provide insight into the effect of both television viewing patterns and sex on children's attitudes about three classes of interpersonal conflict resolutions. The data obtained in the present study suggest fourth, fifth, and sixth grade children who are frequent watchers of their five most-watched television shows hold attitudes about aggressive conflict resolutions which differ from their lighter television viewing peers. High frequency television viewers tended to perceive aggressive alternatives as more "kind, good, and wise." Males tended to perceive aggressive alternatives as more "kind, wise, successful, and strong" than did girls. No significant relationships were revealed for assertive and submissive resolutions on any of the predictor variables.

Implications

Further research should address the following considerations:

1. Subjects in this study were found not to be proportionally distributed in terms of amount of television watched and violence content of shows watched. Further research is needed to determine the amount of high violence television shows elementary students watch.

2. Results of this study indicate that amount of television viewed, and not content of television shows watched, is related to attitudes about interpersonal conflict solutions. Further investigation is needed to confirm or disconfirm this finding.

3. The present study failed to confirm Deluty's (1979) finding that males and females differ in their ratings of submissive interpersonal conflict resolutions on the CATS. Further studies should investigate the consistency of Deluty's findings with different populations.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to examine differences in the attitudes fourth, fifth, and sixth grade children have about resolutions to interpersonal conflicts. Multiple regression analyses were employed to examine the sources of variation in response to the Likert style semantic ratings of submissive, assertive, and aggressive resolutions to interpersonal conflicts on the CATS. Predictor variables included in the regression equation were gender, violence content of five most-watched television shows, and frequency of viewing of five most-watched television shows.

The 84 subjects for this study were fourth, fifth, and sixth grade students (40 males and 44 females) attending Price Laboratory School, UNI. Parent permission had been granted for all subjects prior to their participation.

Data were analyzed to determine if sex of the subject, subject's frequency of viewing five most watched television shows, or violence

content of five most-watched television shows would have an effect on subject's ratings of aggressive, assertive, and submissive interpersonal conflict resolutions on the CATS. A multiple aggression analysis with its accompanying f-test and post hoc t-tests were used to test for significance at the .05 level.

The analyses of the data collected in this study revealed the following:

1. Males rate aggressive resolutions to interpersonal conflicts on the CATS significantly more "kind, wise, successful, and strong" than do females.

2. Subjects of either sex who are high frequency television viewers rate aggressive resolutions to interpersonal conflict on the CATS significantly more "kind, good, and wise."

Results of this study failed to reveal an effect for violence content of most-watched television shows for any of the response classes of the CATS. In addition, no significant relationship was revealed for any of the predictor variables on assertive and submissive resolutions.

REFERENCES

- Adoni, H. (1979). The functions of mass media in the political socialization of adolescents. Communication Research, 6, 84-106.
- Bandura, A. (1961). Imitation of film-mediated aggressive models. Journal of Social Psychology, 65, 575-582.
- Bandura, A. (1965). Influence of model's reinforcement contingencies on the acquisition of imitative responses. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1, 589-595.
- Bandura, A., Ross, D., & Ross, S. (1963). Vicarious reinforcement and imitative learning. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 67, 601-607.
- Bergner, S. (1962). Conditioning through vicarious instigation. Psychological Review, 69, 405-456.
- Berkowitz, L., & Rawlings, E. (1963). Effects of film violence on inhibitions against subsequent aggression. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 66, 405-412.
- Berman, D. R., & Stookey, J. A. (1980). Adolescents, television, and support for government. Public Opinion Quarterly, 44, 330-340.
- Buss, A. H., & Durkee, A. (1957). An inventory for assessing different kinds of assertiveness. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 21, 343-349.

- Carlson, J. M. (1983). Crime show viewing by preadults: The impact of attitudes toward civil liberties. Communication Research, 10, 529-552.
- Chaffee, S. H. (1972). Television and adolescent aggressiveness. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.
- Comstock, G. (1975). The effects of television on children and adolescents: The evidence so far. Journal of Communications, 25, 25-34.
- Cook, W. W., & Medley, D. M. (1954). Proposed hostility and pharisaic-virtue scale for the MMPI. Journal of Applied Psychology, 39, 414-418.
- Coopersmith, S. (1967). The antecedents of self-esteem. San Francisco: Freeman.
- Crandal, V. C. (1965). A children's social desirability questionnaire. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 29, 27-36.
- Deluty, R. H. (1979). Children's Action Tendency Scale: A self-report measure of aggressiveness, assertiveness, and submissiveness in children. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 47, 1061-1071.
- Deluty, R. H. (1983). Children's evaluations of aggressive, assertive, and submissive responses. Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 12, 124-129.
- Deluty, R. H. (1984). On the proper use of the Children's Action Tendency Scale. Behavior Therapy, 15, 426-428.
- Dembo, R. A. (1973). A measure of aggression among working class youths. British Journal of Criminology, 13, 245-252.

- Dominick, J. R. (1973). Crime control and law enforcement on prime time television. Journalism Quarterly, 51, 5-12.
- Drabman, R. S., & Thomas, M. H. (1974). Does media violence increase children's toleration of real life aggression? Developmental Psychology, 10, 418-442.
- Eisenstock, B. (1984). Sex-role differences in children's identification with counterstereotypical television portrayals. Sex Roles, 10, 417-430.
- Eron, L. D. (1982). Parent-child interaction, television violence, and aggression in children. American Psychologist, 37, 197-211.
- Eron, L. D., Huesmann, R., Brice, P., Fisher, P., & Mermelstein, R. (1983). Age trends in the development of aggression, sex typing, and related television habits. Developmental Psychology, 19, 71-77.
- Gerbner, G. (1982). Charting the mainstream: Television's contributions to political orientations. Journal of Communication, 32, 100-127.
- Goldfried, M., & D'Zurilla, T. J. (1969). Current topics in clinical and community psychology. New York: Academic Press.
- Gunter, B., & Furnham, A. (1984). Perceptions of television violence: Effects of programme genre and type of violence on viewers' judgments of violent portrayals. British Journal of Social Psychology, 23, 155-164.
- Himmelweit, H. T. (1960). Television and the child. Great Britain: Oxford University Press.

- Honig, A. S. (1982). Prosocial development in children. Young Children, 37, 51-62.
- Huesmann, L. R. (1982). Television violence and aggressive behavior. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.
- Huesmann, L. R., Eron, D., Klein, R., Brice, P., & Fisher, P. (1983). Mitigating the imitation of aggressive behaviors by changing children's attitudes about media violence. Journal of Personality and School Psychology, 44, 899-910.
- Lefkowitz, M. M., & Huesmann, L. R. (1980). Developing discriminating consumers. Journal of Communication, 30, 94-105.
- Leifer, R. M., & Baron, R. A. (1971). Developmental aspects of variables relevant to observational learning. Child Development, 42, 1509-1516.
- Maccoby, E. E. (1951). Television, its impact on school children. Public Opinion Quarterly, 15, 421-444.
- Morgan, M. (1982). Television and adolescent's sex role stereotypes: A longitudinal study. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 43, 947-955.
- Sears, P. R. (1961). Relation of early socialization experience to aggression in middle childhood. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 63, 466-492.
- Siegel, A. (1958). The influence of violence in the mass media upon children's role expectations. Child Development, 29, 35-56.

Zaks, M., & Walters, R. (1959). First steps in the construction of a scale for the measurement of aggression. Journal of Psychology, 47, 199-208.

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE

Please write down the five shows that you watch the most on television. Next to each show circle the word that best describes how often you usually watch that show.

<u>Show</u>	<u>How often do you watch</u>		
1.	Always	Sometimes	Not very often
2.	Always	Sometimes	Not very often
3.	Always	Sometimes	Not very often
4.	Always	Sometimes	Not very often
5.	Always	Sometimes	Not very often

I am a (please circle): girl boy

Directions

On the following pages are descriptions of nine different situations in which you are to imagine yourself involved. Read each situation and then each of the three different ways in which you might act. Rate each of the three actions according to how kind, good, wise, successful, strong, and brave you think they are.

Example

You're standing in line for a drink of water. A kid your age and size walks over and just shoves you out of line. What would you do?

A. Push the kid out of line.

Very Kind	Kind	Unkind	Very Unkind
Very Good	Good	Bad	Very Bad
Very Wise	Wise	Unwise	Very Unwise
Very Successful	Successful	Unsuccessful	Very Unsuccessful
Very Strong	Strong	Weak	Very Weak
Very Brave	Brave	Cowardly	Very Cowardly

1. You're playing a game with your friends. You try your very best but you keep making mistakes. Your friends start teasing you and calling you names. What would you do?

a. Quit the game and come home.

Very Kind	Kind	Unkind	Very Unkind
Very Good	Good	Bad	Very Bad
Very Wise	Wise	Unwise	Very Unwise
Very Successful	Successful	Unsuccessful	Very Unsuccessful
Very Strong	Strong	Weak	Very Weak
Very Brave	Brave	Cowardly	Very Cowardly

b. Tell them to stop because they wouldn't like it if I did it to them.

Very Kind	Kind	Unkind	Very Unkind
Very Good	Good	Bad	Very Bad
Very Wise	Wise	Unwise	Very Unwise
Very Successful	Successful	Unsuccessful	Very Unsuccessful
Very Strong	Strong	Weak	Very Weak
Very Brave	Brave	Cowardly	Very Cowardly

c. Punch the kid who's teasing me the most.

Very Kind	Kind	Unkind	Very Unkind
Very Good	Good	Bad	Very Bad
Very Wise	Wise	Unwise	Very Unwise
Very Successful	Successful	Unsuccessful	Very Unsuccessful
Very Strong	Strong	Weak	Very Weak
Very Brave	Brave	Cowardly	Very Cowardly

2. One morning before class, a friend comes over to you and asks if they can copy your homework. They tell you that if you don't give them your answers, they'll tell everyone that you're really mean.

What would you do?

- a. Tell them to do their own work.

Very Kind	Kind	Unkind	Very Unkind
Very Good	Good	Bad	Very Bad
Very Wise	Wise	Unwise	Very Unwise
Very Successful	Successful	Unsuccessful	Very Unsuccessful
Very Strong	Strong	Weak	Very Weak
Very Brave	Brave	Cowardly	Very Cowardly

- b. Give them the answers.

Very Kind	Kind	Unkind	Very Unkind
Very Good	Good	Bad	Very Bad
Very Wise	Wise	Unwise	Very Unwise
Very Successful	Successful	Unsuccessful	Very Unsuccessful
Very Strong	Strong	Weak	Very Weak
Very Brave	Brave	Cowardly	Very Cowardly

- c. Tell them that I'll tell everyone they're a cheater.

Very Kind	Kind	Unkind	Very Unkind
Very Good	Good	Bad	Very Bad
Very Wise	Wise	Unwise	Very Unwise
Very Successful	Successful	Unsuccessful	Very Unsuccessful
Very Strong	Strong	Weak	Very Weak
Very Brave	Brave	Cowardly	Very Cowardly

3. You're standing in line for a drink of water. A kid your age and size walks over and just shoves you out of line. What would you do?

a. Push the kid back out of line.

Very Kind	Kind	Unkind	Very Unkind
Very Good	Good	Bad	Very Bad
Very Wise	Wise	Unwise	Very Unwise
Very Successful	Successful	Unsuccessful	Very Unsuccessful
Very Strong	Strong	Weak	Very Weak
Very Brave	Brave	Cowardly	Very Cowardly

b. Tell them, "You've no right to do that."

Very Kind	Kind	Unkind	Very Unkind
Very Good	Good	Bad	Very Bad
Very Wise	Wise	Unwise	Very Unwise
Very Successful	Successful	Unsuccessful	Very Unsuccessful
Very Strong	Strong	Weak	Very Weak
Very Brave	Brave	Cowardly	Very Cowardly

c. I'd go to the end of the line.

Very Kind	Kind	Unkind	Very Unkind
Very Good	Good	Bad	Very Bad
Very Wise	Wise	Unwise	Very Unwise
Very Successful	Successful	Unsuccessful	Very Unsuccessful
Very Strong	Strong	Weak	Very Weak
Very Brave	Brave	Cowardly	Very Cowardly

4. You're coming out of school. A kid who is smaller and younger than you are throws a snowball right at your head. What would you do?

a. Beat the kid up.

Very Kind	Kind	Unkind	Very Unkind
Very Good	Good	Bad	Very Bad
Very Wise	Wise	Unwise	Very Unwise
Very Successful	Successful	Unsuccessful	Very Unsuccessful
Very Strong	Strong	Weak	Very Weak
Very Brave	Brave	Cowardly	Very Cowardly

b. Ignore it.

Very Kind	Kind	Unkind	Very Unkind
Very Good	Good	Bad	Very Bad
Very Wise	Wise	Unwise	Very Unwise
Very Successful	Successful	Unsuccessful	Very Unsuccessful
Very Strong	Strong	Weak	Very Weak
Very Brave	Brave	Cowardly	Very Cowardly

c. Tell the kid that throwing at someone's head is very dangerous.

Very Kind	Kind	Unkind	Very Unkind
Very Good	Good	Bad	Very Bad
Very Wise	Wise	Unwise	Very Unwise
Very Successful	Successful	Unsuccessful	Very Unsuccessful
Very Strong	Strong	Weak	Very Weak
Very Brave	Brave	Cowardly	Very Cowardly

5. You're watching a really terrific show on television. In the middle of the show, your parents tell you that it's time for bed and turn off the T.V. What would you do?

a. Scream at them, "I don't want to!"

Very Kind	Kind	Unkind	Very Unkind
Very Good	Good	Bad	Very Bad
Very Wise	Wise	Unwise	Very Unwise
Very Successful	Successful	Unsuccessful	Very Unsuccessful
Very Strong	Strong	Weak	Very Weak
Very Brave	Brave	Cowardly	Very Cowardly

b. Start crying.

Very Kind	Kind	Unkind	Very Unkind
Very Good	Good	Bad	Very Bad
Very Wise	Wise	Unwise	Very Unwise
Very Successful	Successful	Unsuccessful	Very Unsuccessful
Very Strong	Strong	Weak	Very Weak
Very Brave	Brave	Cowardly	Very Cowardly

c. Promise to go to bed early tomorrow night if they let me stay up late tonight.

Very Kind	Kind	Unkind	Very Unkind
Very Good	Good	Bad	Very Bad
Very Wise	Wise	Unwise	Very Unwise
Very Successful	Successful	Unsuccessful	Very Unsuccessful
Very Strong	Strong	Weak	Very Weak
Very Brave	Brave	Cowardly	Very Cowardly

6. You're having lunch in the cafeteria. Your friend has a big bag of delicious chocolates for dessert. You ask if you can have just one, but your friends says, "No." What would you do?

a. Offer to trade something of mine for the chocolate.

Very Kind	Kind	Unkind	Very Unkind
Very Good	Good	Bad	Very Bad
Very Wise	Wise	Unwise	Very Unwise
Very Successful	Successful	Unsuccessful	Very Unsuccessful
Very Strong	Strong	Weak	Very Weak
Very Brave	Brave	Cowardly	Very Cowardly

b. Call the kid mean and selfish.

Very Kind	Kind	Unkind	Very Unkind
Very Good	Good	Bad	Very Bad
Very Wise	Wise	Unwise	Very Unwise
Very Successful	Successful	Unsuccessful	Very Unsuccessful
Very Strong	Strong	Weak	Very Weak
Very Brave	Brave	Cowardly	Very Cowardly

c. Forget about it and continue to eating my lunch.

Very Kind	Kind	Unkind	Very Unkind
Very Good	Good	Bad	Very Bad
Very Wise	Wise	Unwise	Very Unwise
Very Successful	Successful	Unsuccessful	Very Unsuccessful
Very Strong	Strong	Weak	Very Weak
Very Brave	Brave	Cowardly	Very Cowardly

7. A kid in your class brags that they're much smarter than you.

However, you know for sure that the kid is wrong and that really you're smarter. What would you do?

a. Tell the kid to shut up.

Very Kind	Kind	Unkind	Very Unkind
Very Good	Good	Bad	Very Bad
Very Wise	Wise	Unwise	Very Unwise
Very Successful	Successful	Unsuccessful	Very Unsuccessful
Very Strong	Strong	Weak	Very Weak
Very Brave	Brave	Cowardly	Very Cowardly

b. Suggest that we ask each other questions to find out who is smarter.

Very Kind	Kind	Unkind	Very Unkind
Very Good	Good	Bad	Very Bad
Very Wise	Wise	Unwise	Very Unwise
Very Successful	Successful	Unsuccessful	Very Unsuccessful
Very Strong	Strong	Weak	Very Weak
Very Brave	Brave	Cowardly	Very Cowardly

c. Ignore the kid and just walk away.

Very Kind	Kind	Unkind	Very Unkind
Very Good	Good	Bad	Very Bad
Very Wise	Wise	Unwise	Very Unwise
Very Successful	Successful	Unsuccessful	Very Unsuccessful
Very Strong	Strong	Weak	Very Weak
Very Brave	Brave	Cowardly	Very Cowardly

8. One of your parents does something which really bugs you. They know that it bugs you, but they just ignore how you feel and keep doing it anyway. What would you do?

a. Get back at them by doing something that bugs them.

Very Kind	Kind	Unkind	Very Unkind
Very Good	Good	Bad	Very Bad
Very Wise	Wise	Unwise	Very Unwise
Very Successful	Successful	Unsuccessful	Very Unsuccessful
Very Strong	Strong	Weak	Very Weak
Very Brave	Brave	Cowardly	Very Cowardly

b. Tell them that they are bugging me.

Very Kind	Kind	Unkind	Very Unkind
Very Good	Good	Bad	Very Bad
Very Wise	Wise	Unwise	Very Unwise
Very Successful	Successful	Unsuccessful	Very Unsuccessful
Very Strong	Strong	Weak	Very Weak
Very Brave	Brave	Cowardly	Very Cowardly

c. Try to ignore it.

Very Kind	Kind	Unkind	Very Unkind
Very Good	Good	Bad	Very Bad
Very Wise	Wise	Unwise	Very Unwise
Very Successful	Successful	Unsuccessful	Very Unsuccessful
Very Strong	Strong	Weak	Very Weak
Very Brave	Brave	Cowardly	Very Cowardly

9. You're playing with a friend in your house and you're making a lot of noise. Your parents get really angry and start yelling at you for making so much noise. What would you do?

a. Find something else to do.

Very Kind	Kind	Unkind	Very Unkind
Very Good	Good	Bad	Very Bad
Very Wise	Wise	Unwise	Very Unwise
Very Successful	Successful	Unsuccessful	Very Unsuccessful
Very Strong	Strong	Weak	Very Weak
Very Brave	Brave	Cowardly	Very Cowardly

b. Ignore their yelling and continue to make noise.

Very Kind	Kind	Unkind	Very Unkind
Very Good	Good	Bad	Very Bad
Very Wise	Wise	Unwise	Very Unwise
Very Successful	Successful	Unsuccessful	Very Unsuccessful
Very Strong	Strong	Weak	Very Weak
Very Brave	Brave	Cowardly	Very Cowardly

c. Tell them, "I'm sorry, but I can't play the game without making noise."

Very Kind	Kind	Unkind	Very Unkind
Very Good	Good	Bad	Very Bad
Very Wise	Wise	Unwise	Very Unwise
Very Successful	Successful	Unsuccessful	Very Unsuccessful
Very Strong	Strong	Weak	Very Weak
Very Brave	Brave	Cowardly	Very Cowardly

APPENDIX B

The following is a list of 87 television shows which fourth, fifth, and sixth grade students attending Price Laboratory School, UNI, have indicated that they watch the most. Please rate each show from 1 to 5 in terms of the amount of physical aggression portrayed in each show. If you feel a particular show is very high in physical aggression a rating of "5" would be given. If you feel a television show is very low in physical aggression a "1" would be given. A show average in physical aggression would be given a rating of "3". If you come to a show you have never seen even once, leave it blank. Thank you for your help!

Airwolf	1 2 3 4 5	Cosby Show	1 2 3 4 5
Alvin & The Chipmunks	1 2 3 4 5	Dallas	1 2 3 4 5
Amazing Stories	1 2 3 4 5	Danger Mouse	1 2 3 4 5
Andy Griffith Show	1 2 3 4 5	Different Strokes	1 2 3 4 5
Anne of Green Gables	1 2 3 4 5	Donald Duck Presents	1 2 3 4 5
A-Team	1 2 3 4 5	Double Trouble	1 2 3 4 5
Basketball	1 2 3 4 5	Down to Earth	1 2 3 4 5
Benny Hill	1 2 3 4 5	Dukes of Hazzard	1 2 3 4 5
Bewitched	1 2 3 4 5	Equalizer	1 2 3 4 5
Black's Magic	1 2 3 4 5	Facts of Life	1 2 3 4 5
Brady Bunch	1 2 3 4 5	Family Ties	1 2 3 4 5
Cagney & Lacey	1 2 3 4 5	Flying Nun	1 2 3 4 5
Carol Burnett Show	1 2 3 4 5	Football	1 2 3 4 5
Cartoon Express	1 2 3 4 5	General Hospital	1 2 3 4 5
Cheers	1 2 3 4 5	Give Me a Break	1 2 3 4 5

Golden Girls	1 2 3 4 5	Mr. Wizard	1 2 3 4 5
Good Times	1 2 3 4 5	Muppet Babies	1 2 3 4 5
Growing Pains	1 2 3 4 5	Murder, She Wrote	1 2 3 4 5
Hardcastle & McCormic	1 2 3 4 5	National News	1 2 3 4 5
He the Mayor	1 2 3 4 5	Newhart Show	1 2 3 4 5
HeMan & Masters of the Universe	1 2 3 4 5	Newlywed Game	1 2 3 4 5
Highway to Heaven	1 2 3 4 5	Night Court	1 2 3 4 5
Hill Street Blues	1 2 3 4 5	People's Court	1 2 3 4 5
Hunter	1 2 3 4 5	Punky Brewster	1 2 3 4 5
I Dream of Jeannie	1 2 3 4 5	Riptide	1 2 3 4 5
Jefferson's	1 2 3 4 5	Rocks	1 2 3 4 5
Kate and Allie	1 2 3 4 5	227	1 2 3 4 5
Knight Rider	1 2 3 4 5	Sale of the Century	1 2 3 4 5
Leave It To Beaver	1 2 3 4 5	Saturday Night Live	1 2 3 4 5
Little House on the Prairie	1 2 3 4 5	Silver Spoons	1 2 3 4 5
Looney Tunes	1 2 3 4 5	Simon & Simon	1 2 3 4 5
M.A.S.H.	1 2 3 4 5	Star Trek	1 2 3 4 5
M.T.V.	1 2 3 4 5	Sting Ray	1 2 3 4 5
MacGyver	1 2 3 4 5	The Price is Right	1 2 3 4 5
Mask	1 2 3 4 5	The Bozo Show	1 2 3 4 5
Miami Vice	1 2 3 4 5	The Twilight Zone	1 2 3 4 5
Misfits of Science	1 2 3 4 5	The Roadrunner Show	1 2 3 4 5
Moonlighting	1 2 3 4 5	Three's Company	1 2 3 4 5
Mr. Belvedere	1 2 3 4 5	Transformers	1 2 3 4 5
		Turkey T.V.	1 2 3 4 5

TV's Bloopers &

Practical Jokes	1 2 3 4 5
Valerie	1 2 3 4 5
Wheel of Fortune	1 2 3 4 5
Who's the Boss	1 2 3 4 5
Wonder Works	1 2 3 4 5
Wuzzles	1 2 3 4 5
WWF Wrestling	1 2 3 4 5
You Again	1 2 3 4 5
You Can't Do That on Television	1 2 3 4 5

Average interrater reliability of .85; this is the average of r for 88 shows. S.D. = .03. An r was calculated for all 88 shows.