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## CHAPTER I

## INTRODUCTION

Critical parents and numerous magazine articles have echoed the need for research studies dealing with television, the "mechanical Pied Piper." ${ }^{\text {nl }}$ Allegedly the "Piper" has led children into violence, aggressive behavior, an unforgiveable waste of time, calloused attitudes toward pain and suffering, and many other examples of undesirable behavior.

Within recent years, efforts have been made to systematically study the effects of television on children. Yet, of greatest concern to researcher, broadcaster, and advertiser alike has been the lack of a rigorous and reliable audience research method. How can one effectively isolate either the quantitative influences of the time a child spends in front of his television set or the qualitative aspects which affect the behavior of the child, both at present and in the future? In fact, how can one accurately determine which members of the family are present in the television audience, and how much of that time they are actually paying attention to television's offerings?

Is the child viewer in the television audience attentive enough to commercials to influence parents' buying habits? Does the child's influence warrant a greater number of programs directed to this group's special viewing interests?
${ }^{1}$ Robert Lewis Shayon, Television and Our Children (New York, 1951), p. 17.

The photochronographic information which is the basis for this study was made available by Dr. Charles L. Allen, director of the School of Journalism at Oklahoma State University. Data was obtained through careful analysis of nearly one and one half million individual pictures taken in 95 homes. In each home, photographs of the entire viewing audience were recorded at the rate of one every 15 seconds during the time the television set was turned on. Each of the 95 families was monitored for two continuous weeks. The device which made this type of study possible is known commercially as the DynaScope. Operation of the DynaScope, analysis of its film, and handling of its data output will be explained fully in Chapter III.

This researcher believes that the DynaScope studies most nearly approach the type of research suggested by Wilbur Schramm:

It has seemed . . . that the research now most needed is . . . extensive in time rather than in numbers of geography, intensive in treatment. The most worrisome effects, if they exist, are long-term effects. The process of effect is extremely complex, and cannot be well understood one variable at a time. We feel, therefore, that the situation calls for the kind of understanding and insight that come from knowing a few children very well, over time, and in interaction, rather than knowing a great many children only slightly, or a few children well but briefly. ${ }^{2}$

In some ways, the DynaScope seems to offer much more as an important method of study than Schramm had conceived; in others, it is clearly lacking. However, DynaScope study offers an encompassing opportunity for photochronographic observation during the viewing periods of children, as well as the normal family interaction that these children ordinarily experience.

2Wilbur Schramm, Jack Lyle, and Edwin B. Parker, Television in the Lives of Our Children (Stanford,1961), p. 187.

Some facets of human behavior, i.e., audience interaction, expression of emotion, etc., are largely excluded in this study. Basically, the information presented relies upon those patterns of child television viewing which tend to be quantitative in nature (average child audience per minute, percentage of "set-in-use" time with a child in the audience, etc.).

The data is divided into two major sections: that which applies to all of the children in four DynaScope studies recently conducted in Oklahoma and Kansas, and an intensive analysis of data yielded from the DynaScope study conducted in Stillwater, Okla., in the latter part of 1962, in which the researcher took an active part as a field worker, film scanner, programmer, key punch and computer operator.

Interpretation of the data, as such, must be left to the judgment of those who are more directly concerned with the sociological and psychological implications of children and television viewing.

It is the purpose of this thesis, then, to make available data on children's television viewing patterns which, before studies by the DynaScope method, had not been available, as well as certain observations concerning the characteristics of the children's audience as recorded on DynaScope films.

Although this study in no way exhausts the information which can be obtained from these films, this researcher feels that the DynaScope method of behavior study is, and will continue to be, an important contribution to social research.

## CHAPTER II

RELATED STUDIES

After the writer had surveyed some 45 magazine articles dealing with children's viewing of television for the period from January, 1959, through January, 1963 , it seemed evident that the general public has had little opportunity to become acquainted with research in this area. ${ }^{3}$ Only one-third of the articles was based on information from research studies, while the remainder largely was based on personal opinions. The research studies are few in comparison with the oft-published concern of parents and broadcasters.

The research studies themselves generally have been limited in sample size or in the extent of information presented. Inadequate means of study over long periods of time, as well as the difficulties inherent in attempting to analyze the actual impact and effect of television on children, have been limiting factors. Findings from some of the more intensive studies applicable to this research are presented here.

Length of Time With Television Sets Turned On

The amount of time families have their sets turned on has been an important aspect of television research, particularly to broadcasters and
${ }^{3}$ Source material for the survey was taken from listings in The Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature and Journalism Quarterly.
program sponsors.
The hours of TV viewing have been reported regularly by the A. C. Nielsen Company, a television rating service. Average "set-in-use" hours per TV home are determined by Nielsen through use of mechanical recorders (the audimeter and the recordimeter) and diaries. ${ }^{4}$ Recent Nielsen figures ${ }^{5}$ on the amount of time TV sets were on in U. S. homes show these estimates:

Daily Hours of TV
Year Viewing Per TV Home

| 1961 | 6.1 Hours |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1962 | 5.1 |
| 1963 | 6.1 |

Nielsen's report for 1963 indicated the following TV viewing patterns during different days of the week and parts of the day ${ }^{6}$ :

| Night |  | Afternoon |  | Mornina |  | Total Day |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hrs. | Mins. | Hrs. | Mins. | Hrs. | Mins. | Hrs. | Mins. |
| 3 | 31 | 1 | 47 |  | 46 | 6 | 3 |
| 3 | 56 | 1 | 49 | 1 | 54 | 6 | 38 |
| 3 | 41 | 1 | 56 |  | 28 | 6 | 5 |
| 3 | 35 | 1 | 49 |  | 44 | 6 | 8 |

Broadcasting Yearbook also indicated the following Nielsen figure variations in "set-in-use" time according to time of year during 1962 ${ }^{7}$ :

Average TV Viewing Time: $\quad 5$ Hours 6 Minutes Daily Per Home
Average TV Viewing Time-Winter: 540
Average TV Viewing Time-Summer: 4 31

[^0]In 1951, Eleanor Maccoby ${ }^{8}$ of the Department of Social Relations, Harvard University, reported that there was no tendency for the families in her study to cut down on the amount of viewing time after the novelty of the set wore off. The study included interviews with 332 mothers of school children in Cambridge, Mass., with the resulting average daily

```
"set-in-use" time:
```

Length of TV Ownership

Average Number of Hours
"Set-in-use" Time Daily
Less than 3.5 Months
5.3 Hours
$3.5-7.5$
$7.6-11.5$
$11.6-15.5$
$15.6-23.5$
23.6 - or more
5.3
5.3
5.5
6.0
5.2

American Research Bureau ${ }^{9}$ produced the following weekly statistics from telephone interviews conducted in specific market areas:

## Weekly Hours Sets Were in Use

| Time of Day | "Set-in-use" Hours |
| :---: | :---: |
| 7 A.M. - Noon Monday through Friday | 3.38 |
| Noon - 3 P.M. | 2.33 |
| 3 P.M. - 5 P.M. | 1.76 |
| 5 P.M. - 7 P.M. | 3.53 |
| 7 P.M. - 10 P.M. Sunday through Saturday | 14.15 |
| 10 P.M. - Midnight | 4.56 |
| Midnight- 2 A.M. | . 51 |

8Eleanor Maccoby, "Television: Its Impact on School Children," Public Opinion Quarterly (Fall, 1951) 15, p. 421.
${ }^{9}{ }^{\prime \prime}$ National Survey of Television Sets in U.S. Households," (New York, June, 1955).

## Amount of Time Children Devote to Television

As early as 1948, researchers Riley, Cantwell, and Ruttiger ${ }^{10}$ attempted to measure the amount of time children were spending with television by interviews with parents. The sample of 193 New Brunswick, N. J., children was divided into two age groups of 6 to 12 years and 13 to 19 years. The interviews revealed that the 6 - to 12 -year-old children were spending 3.1 hours viewing television compared to 2.6 hours per day for the older children.

Through interviews with parents in Cambridge, Mass., Maccoby ${ }^{11}$ learned that children 4 to 17 were viewing television 2.4 hours on weekdays and 3.5 hours on Sundays.

During the winter of 1951-1952, Maccoby ${ }^{12}$ again conducted interviews with 379 mothers in Boston, Mass. This study revealed that the time children were watching TV ranged from 1.0 to 1.6 hours per day in upper-middle class homes. In the upper and lower class homes, children viewed slightly more, from 1.2 to 1.9 hours per day.

Battin ${ }^{13}$ conducted a doctoral study which tested the questionnaire versus the diary method of determining time children spend on television.

10 J. M. Riley, F. V. Cantwell, and Katherine Ruttiger, "Some Observations on the Special Effects of TV," Public Opinion Quarterly (1949) 13, pp. 223-34.
${ }^{11}$ Maccoby, "Television: Its Impact on School Children," p. 421.
${ }^{12}$ Maccoby, "Why Do Children Watch Television?" Public Opinion Quarterly (1954) 18, p. 239.

13
T. C. Battin, "The Use of the Diary and Survey Technique Method Involving the Questionnaire-Interview Technique to Determine the Impact of Television on School Children in Regard to Viewing Habits and Formal and Informal Education." (unpub. Ph.D. dissertation, Uni versity of Michigan, 1952). (Dissertation Abstracts (1952) 12, p. 343.

Battin learned that 86 percent of the diaries indicated only a one - to two-hour deviation from the time the children previously estimated spending with TV. In one percent of the cases only, there was a discrepancy of more than four hours per week. The research revealed an average weekly TV viewing time of 18.5 hours per week for children in grades one through six, and 21 hours per week for those in grades seven through twelve.

Forest Whan ${ }^{14}$ conducted a study in Iowa (1954) to determine viewing differences among families living in cities, in villages, and on farms. The study indicated the following differences:

| Average Time Spent Viewing Daily |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Urban | Village | Farm |  |
| 2.95 Hrs. | 3.02 Hrs. | 3.41 Hrs. |  |
| 3.15 | 3.95 | 3.44 |  |

Catherine St. John Mahony ${ }^{15}$, in her 1953 study with elementary pupils, found that third-grade children were watching television 2.5 hours per day, compared to a 3.0 hour per day average for fifth-graders. Of the 808 -child sample in Boston public and parochial schools, 74.8 percent said they watched television seven days a week.

Probably one of the most important studies dealing with children and television was completed in England under the sponsorship of the Nuffield Foundation ${ }^{16}$. Begun in 1954 when television was very new, and in a sense,

[^1]still very limited in England, the study was conducted under almost optimum conditions for comparison of effects on children whose families owned a television set and those in non-TV homes. Researchers Himmelweit, et al., proposed to study "the impact of television on children and young people." With a matched sample of 1,854 children (age $10-11$ and $13-14$ years), the study utilized questionnaires, diaries, program lists, and interviews. Parents and teachers were also interviewed to gain information on the background, intelligence, and personality of the children. Efforts were then made to determine any existing correlation between the personal characteristics and viewing patterns. English children were spending about the same amount of time on TV in each of the age groups studied. With an average of 11-13 hours per week ( 1.9 hours per day) devoted to television, the viewing consumed more leisure time than any other activity.

During 1956, Irving Merril1 ${ }^{17}$ attempted to test some of the existing information on children's TV viewing. From other research, he synthesized a basis for study by personal interview in 2,103 households in Lansing, Mich. Merrill reported that the average time spent viewing after 5 p.m. was 1.87 hours per day. He noted that four- and five-year-old children were viewing as much as the older children.

Under the direction of Dr. Wilbur Schramm ${ }^{18}$, studies were conducted in several areas of the United States and Canada. In much the same way as the Nuffield Foundation research, the studies sought to encompass the aggregate effect of television on children in homes with TV by comparing
${ }^{17}$ Irving Merrill, "Broadcast Viewing and Listening By Children," Public Opinion Quarterly (Summer, 1961), p. 263.
${ }^{18}$ Schramm, et al., p. 17.
these children with those in non-TV homes. The information - gathered by parent interviews, questionnaires, and diaries - indicated that the amount of time "Teletown" viewers were spending with television was one hour, 40 minutes for first-grade children; two hours, 54 minutes for sixth-grade children; one hour, 36 minutes for tenth-grade children. With Sunday viewing time included, the first-grade children were watching for ten hours, 30 minutes a week; sixth-graders, twenty hours, 30 minutes; tenth-grade children were watching for eleven hours, 36 minutes per week.

Percentage of Time With a Child in the Television Audience
Leo Bogart ${ }^{19}$ gives the following comparison of audience composition during the day as measured by three rating services:

## Videodex

Children Teenagers
Weekday Evenings
$17 \% \quad 7 \%$
Saturday Evenings
Sunday Evenings
23
9
16
8

## American Research Bureau

Weekdays:
Sign on - Noon $36 \%$
Noon - 6 P.M. 33
6 PoM. - Sign off 21
Saturday:
Sign on - Noon $74 \%$
Noon - 6 P.M. 29
6 P.M. - Sign off 38
Sunday:

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
\text { Noon } & -6 \text { P.M. } & 26, \% \\
6 \text { P.M. } & - \text { Sign off } & 18
\end{array}
$$

6 P.M. - Sign off
${ }^{19}$ Leo Bogart, The Age of Television (New York, 1958), p. 70.

# New York Telepulse ${ }^{20}$ 

Children \& Teenagers

| 7 - 8 A.M. | $35 \%$ |
| ---: | ---: |
| 10 - 11 A.M. | 47 |
| 4 - P.M. | 53 |
| 5 - 6 P.M. | 63 |
| 8 - $P . M$. | 29 |
| 11 - Midnight | 6 |

The A. C. Nielsen Company lists the following TV audience composition for 1963, in Broadcasting Yearbook ${ }^{21}$

## IV Audience Composition

Time Period
Mon. - Fri. 9 A.M. - 12 Noon
12 Noon - 6 P.M.
All nights 6 P.M. - 11 P.M.

Teens
$3 \%$
8
9

Children
$39 \%$
27
25

Television's Effect on Children's Bed Time

Through open-end interviews conducted in Cambridge, Mass., Maccoby ${ }^{22}$ reported that mothers had difficulty in getting children to leave the TV set to go to bed. To her question "What happens when children are watching TV and you want them to go to bed?" the following answers were given:
$\left.\begin{array}{l}\text { No problem - Children are not watching at bed time } \\ \text { No problem - Children go to bed without pressure } \\ \text { No problem - Children are allowed to go to bed when- } \\ \text { ever they wish }\end{array}\right)$

20Missing time periods were not available in source material.
${ }^{21}$ Broadcasting Yearbook, 66 ; p. 14.
${ }^{22}$ Maccoby, ${ }^{\text {"Television: }}$ Its Impact on School Children," p. 429.

The Cambridge study also indicated that the average weekday bed time for children in TV homes was 9 p.m., or 25 minutes later than for children in non-TV homes. Sunday bed time was 8:55 p.m. in the TV homes, compared to 8:40 p.m. in homes without television.

Mahony ${ }^{23}$, commented in her 1953 study that "bed time and meal time furnish perplexing problems" when children watch television.

Himmelweit, et al. 24; point out that "within the two age groups studied, viewing caused a slight postponement of bed time on weekdays, on the average not more than twenty minutes a night." Further comment revealed that the children in non-TV homes usually spent a greater amount or time playing or reading in bed, making relatively little difference in actual bed times of viewers and non-viewers.

Irving Merrill ${ }^{25}$ noted that bed times for children in the homes with television did not differ significantly from that of children in the homes with only radio.

Schramm and associates. ${ }^{26}$ state that. "Teletown" first-grade children were permitted to stay up for an avage of 13 minutes later per night than children in non-TV families.

Other Activities in the Television Audience

The 1950-1951 research conducted by Maccoby ${ }^{27}$ in the Boston area

[^2]revealed the activities children were engaged in while viewing TV. Information for the study came from the mothers of the children through personal interviews.

Activity
None - TV Only Other

Active play, unrelated to TV program
Non-active play (coloring)
Eating
Studying
Other Reading
Imitating Characters in Programs

Percent of Viewing Time
62 \%
38

- 11 \%
- 8
- 7
- 5
- 3
- 5
$38 \%$

The San Francisco children studied by Schramm ${ }^{28}$ indicated the time spent on other activities while watching television as follows:

Play
Study Eat Games Read Work Dance Other

| 6th-Grade |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Boys: | $16.7 \%$ | $19.3 \%$ | $4.4 \%$ | $5.3 \%$ | $4.4 \%$ | $19.3 \%$ | $38.6 \%$ |
| Girls: | 31.4 | 24.8 | 1.0 | 10.5 | 13.3 | 21.9 | 17.1 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8th-Grade |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Boys: | 16.5 | 28.2 | 1.2 | 7.1 | 3.5 | 12.9 | 38.8 |
| Girls: | 31.0 | 20.7 | .9 | 10.3 | 8.6 | 31.9 | 24.1 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10th-Grade |  |  | 3.3 | 6.5 | 4.1 | 11.4 | 34.9 |
| Boys: | 19.5 | 29.3 | 3.3 | 10.1 | 18.3 | 33.9 | 22.0 |

Types of Programs Children Watch on Television

Children in the Nuffield Foundation study ${ }^{29}$..indicated by vote that they preferred adult programs, particularly crime thrillers, comedies,

[^3]variety programs, and family serials. The younger children also favored westerns.

In her study, Bailyn ${ }^{30}$ classified the content of media to determine children's preferences. The categories preferred by boys included animal, situational (comedy, variety, quiz programs, musicals), western, crime, and spy and war. Girls in the study preferred situational first, followed by animal, western, crime, and superforce (programs whose heroes are "endowed with supernatural powers", e.g., Superman).

Specific programs selected by children were indicated by Niven ${ }^{31}$ based upon personal interviews with mothers. The most popular program types were children's (17.0 percent), thriller drama ( 2.70 percent), children's variety (13.0 percent), westerns ( 9.0 percent), comedy drama ( 1.7 percent, and light music (1.3 percent).

Keely ${ }^{32}$ studied viewing practices of four- and five-year-old children in Stillwater, Okla., by consulting mothers of the children. Of the top 30 programs viewed by the preschool children, 23 were children's programs, five were family programs, and only two were adult programs. In 80 perqent of the cases, the mothers indicated that the children "never" watched crime and violence programs. The program type viewed most was children's variety. Children in Witty's ${ }^{33}$ (1963) study of televiewing suggested certain
${ }^{30}$ Lotte Bailyn, "Mass Media and Children: A Study of Exposure Habits and Cognitive Effects," Psychological Monographs (1959) 73, p. 13.
${ }^{31}$ Harold Niven, "Who in the Family Selects TV?" Journalism Quarterly (Winter, 1960), p. 110.
${ }^{32}$ Suzanne Keely, "Television Viewing Practices of Four and Five Year Old Children," (unpub. Master's thesis, Oklahoma State University, 1961), p. 32.
${ }^{33}$ Witty, Paul A., Paul Kinsella, and Anne Coomer, "A Summary of Yearly Studies of Televiewing 1949-1963," Elementary'English (Oct., 1963) 40, p. 594.
program types for future presentation. Second- and third-grade children suggested that there be more space, science, movie, war, and mystery type programs. Children in grades four through six indicated that there should be more programs based on comedy, war, movies, horror, and mystery.

## CHAPTER III

SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

This study of children and television incorporates basic data obtained from 95 homes in four DynaScope studies: two in Stillwater, Okla., and one each in Tulsa, Okla., and Wichita, Kan. These four studies were supported by private funds, the O. S. U. Research Foundation, and commercial interests.

The initial study was conducted in Stillwater from October 15 to November 25,1961 , in 15 homes. The second study was carried out in Stillwater in 20 homes during the period of Spetmeber 3 to November 10 , 1962. The third study was done in Wichita in 30 homes from October 29, 1962 to February 9, 1963. The last study was done in Tulsa, immediately following the Wichita study, in an additional 30 homes from February 9 until March 23, 1963.

Weather conditions, highly important factor in the size of the television audience, were quite similar in both Stillwater studies, characterized by the warm weather generally associated with Oklahoma in early Fall. In Wichita and Tulsa, the noticeable changes in viewing patterns may be largely attributed to the extremely cold weather recorded for those areas. Newspapers in Wichita reported that the winter weather, ranging from 40 degrees to 12 degrees below zero, was the coldest in the city's history. Weather conditions in Tulsa were also recorded as lower than normal during the period of study.

FIGURE 1
FOUR DYNASCOPE STUDIES

| PRESCHOOLERS: | 9 | 22 |  | 19 | 12 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GRADESCHOOLERS: | 11 | 7 |  | 23 | 16 |
| TEENAGERS: | 13 | 14 |  | 19 | 17 |
| TOTALS: | 33 | 43 |  | 61 | 45 |
|  | Ave No. No. |  | $\begin{array}{r} 3.77 \\ 1.76 \\ 33 \end{array}$ | Total No. of Children: No. of Boys: No. of Girls: | 182 87 95 |

## Selection of Sample Homes

Since Stillwater, Okla., is a university town with a population of approximately 26,000 persons, selection of the homes used for these studies was necessarily somewhat different than in the two larger cities. These homes were obtained by students in a graduate research seminar who went from door to door in various sections of the town, explaining the study and seeking permission to install the DynaScope for the two week period. The criteria for selection were that no two homes selected should be in the same immediate area, and that the chief wage earners must have variety of occupation.

In both the Wichita and Tulsa studies, field workers went from door to door in a specified pattern within six pre-selected areas of the city. Again, care was taken to secure geographical dispersion of the instruments in all areas. In these studies, information pertaining to family income was also recorded. A field supervisor ${ }^{34}$ reported that the incomes of the families ranged from a $\$ 2,500$ government pension to a business executive ${ }^{\prime}$ 's salary of $\$ 25,000$. The median income for the Wichita homes was $\$ 6,750$; the median for those homes in Iulsa was $\$ 7,500$.

In all of the studies, families with no children, as well as some having as many as seven children, were included. Besides those children in the families of the second Stillwater study, there were an additional 15 children who viewed television in a nursery school held in one of the participating homes. The viewing patterns for these children are treated separately in̆ Chapter $V$.
${ }^{34}$ Rita P. Cornish, "Four Allen TV Audience Studies, (unpub. research report, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, 1963), p. 3.

Average family size for all four DynaScope studies was 3.77 persons. The average number of children per family was 1.76 .
DynaScope - The Research Device

Designed, developed, and built by Dr. Charles L. Allen, the DynaScope is an instrument with almost limitless applications in the study of human behavior. It has been brought to its present stage after nearly 15 years of modification, improvement, and testing by its inventor.

The DynaScope is a photochronographic instrument which automatically takes small still pictures at pre-set intervals which may be varied, according to the needs of the particular study, from one per minute to one per second. Not only is the speed of operation variable, but the film size with which the instrument will operate may be varied as well. DynaScope will operate on $8 \mathrm{~mm}, 16 \mathrm{~mm}$, or 35 mm movie film, usually produced as positive rather than negative to make analysis easier. Lenses are selected to afford an angle wide enough to photograph all persons in the normal viewing situation in the home.

Should the study call for non-continuous photographing of a situation, DynaScope's timing system permits the recording of selected periods during the day, or during the week.

In these television audience studies, the DynaScope was set at the rate of four frames per minute, running 16 hours per 100 feet of film.

No portion of the DynaScope's mechanism is visible, nor can its settings be altered except by the fieldworkers in charge of its handing. The mechanism is housed in a compact metal or wooden case slightly larger than an ordinary table radio.

The television set is plugged into the DynaScope; the instrument itself is plugged into an ordinary wall socket. Again, the DynaScope does not permit easy disconnection. There is no tangle of wires, and no changes are made in the television's normal operation. The tiny motor which powers the DynaScope is nearly silent, and cannot be heard when the television set is playing. The power it consumes is about the same amount as needed to burn a 5 -watt light buib.

The instrument is ordinarily installed next to the set, with its wideangle lens directed toward the television audience. A record of time is kept by the installation of a calendar clock in the background. In addition to audience behavior, the film records what is on the television screen itself by the temporary placement of a system of mirrors in the background.

The installation and removal of the DynaScope and its accessories can be made easily and in a short period of time.

Methods Used in DynaScope Studies

After selection of the participating families, the DynaScopes were installed in homes to run for the scheduled period of two consecutive weeks, with the fieldworker checking regularly on film supply, machine operation, and lens setting. In addition to the DynaScope operation, a check was maintained on the programs viewed and channels tuned by requesting that the families indicate those programs in a copy of the local IV Guide which was furnished by the fieldworker. DynaScopes were removed from the homes, as nearly as possible on the exact hour, two weeks from the time they were installed.

## Data Analysis

Each roll of film recorded in these studies was carefully viewed and matched with the IV Guide record by trained persons operating film scanners. The desired information was recorded on tabulation sheets for summarization. Results for the first Stillwater study (1961) were determined largely by small calculator operation, but because of the size of the other three studies, basic results were calculated on IBM high-speed computers. Data for each summarized minute (four pictures per minute) was key punched on Hollerith cards, and the output analyzed for Week 1, Week 2 and both weeks combined. For each of these major time segments, viewing patterns were also broken down into morning, afternoon, evening, and all periods combined. Within each time period, patterns were calculated for men, women, children, and all viewers. In the Stillwater-1962 study, and in part in the Wichita and Tulsa studies, further breakdown was made of the children's group into teenagers, gradeschoolers and preschoolers.

## Data for This Study of Children and Television

Since the resulting data from the four studies was not handled similarly in all cases, it was necessary to return to the tabulation sheets for further information in the Stillwater-1961 study, and to make certain conversions in the Wichita and Tulsa studies for the presentation of data. The original data sheets also were used for the intensive study of the Stillwater-1962 study, as well as the re-scanning of each roll of film in that study for a precise tabulation and breakdown of children's activities while in the television audience.

Throughout this thesis, the individual statistics for each family are
identified by the family number which was originally assigned in the DynaScope studies.

Tables of data represent the accumulation over the total two week period. Summaries representing each individual week of study also accompany the tables.

The DynaScope Method Versus Other Methods Used to Study the Child Television Audience

For further reader comparison, brief surveys of the advantages and disadvantages of the different methods used for the study of the child audience in contrast with the DynaScope method are introduced here.

These various methods have been used by researchers and private rating services, many of which have undergone investigation in 1962-1963, by a subcommittee of Congress. The subcommittee investigators proposed that advertisers and broadcasters had been putting too much faith in the rating process. 35 Although the DynaScope inventor does not propose this method of study as a program rating device, it is not unrealistic to expect it to be so used in view of the many positive advantages DynaScope has over other methods.

## Personal Interview

The personal interview method of gathering audience information must depend upon many human factors to assure its accuracy and consistency. One of its main disadvantages is interviewer bias. The manner in which

35James Harwood, "TV, Radio Audience Rating Services Face Attacks at House Hearings Opening Today." Well Street Journal, March 5, 1963.
questions are asked and the choice of words plays no small part in the respondent's answers. An article published in the Archives of Psychology on the interviewer-effect pointed out:

It is the belief of many people who work in the field of public opinion polls and market research surveys that the interviewers who are used in the studies have an important effect on the results they obtain. . . . Whether or not the interviewer-effect is intentional, its presence would be far-reaching and its detection and understanding would be important. ${ }^{36}$

The Wall Street Journal reported that the subcommittee investigators made the following comment about personal interview:

For example, they [the investigators_] believe personal interviewers of ten make 'suggestions' to help viewers recall what they saw. ${ }^{37}$

Like many of the other methods which will be mentioned later, the personal interview is largely dependent upon the memory of persons interviewed regarding what they have watched. One experimental psychologist makes the following comment regarding human memory:

The process of memory is launched on its course by the learner's perception of the stimulus situation. Perception is selective, and out of the totality of stimuli present only a limited fraction is perceived. Only those events which are favored by selective perception are well retained. . . . When the time has come for active recall, the individual attempts to reconstruct his past experience, and in the process of reconstruction the continuous series of omissions, changes, interpretations, and distortions which began at the very first moment of perception finds its full expression. The act of recall, the ability to reproduce or report what one remembers, is a final source of memory change.
${ }^{36}$ Alfred B. Udow, The InterviewerEffect in Public Opinion and Market Research Surveys." Archives of Psychology, XXXIX (Apr. -Aug., 1943), p. 26 37.
${ }^{37}$ Harwood, ${ }^{\text {TV }}$ TV, Radio Audience Rating Services Face Attacks at House Hearings Opening Today."
. . Whenever an individual remembers, he re-creates his past expereince, subject to all the errors and transformations which have accumulated since he first perceived the event which he is trying to remember. 38

With the inherent weakness in recall that the human memory seems to impose on this method of gathering information for a television adience study, it may be said that one can obtain by personal interview only data regarding what that particular person watched. Yet, many studies rely on the ability of the mother to recall the behavior of other family members. The reader should keep in mind the role that the modern American mother must play in this socially active country, along with the fact that more than one out of every three American women are employed today. ${ }^{39}$ How can the mother be expected to know and recall her child's IV viewing practice?

## The Questionnaire

While the questionnaire method of gathering information for television audience surveys permits the accumulation of many depth factors fairly inexpensively, it is of utmost importance for questionnaire users to remember the impact of the wording and general semantics of the questions asked. If the questionnaire is largely made up of attitude scales, it is also important that the recipient be given an opportunity to respond in the way he chooses, and not be strictly held to the selection of categories set up on the scale. In addition, the true value of the questionnaire is of ten

38 Robert S. Woodworth, Experimental. Psycholoay (New York,1950), p. 405.
${ }^{39}$ American Women (Washington, D.C., 1963), p. 27.
hampered by the uncooperativeness of respondents if it is lengthy.

The Recall or Roster Method

The recall method of interviewing is one in which the persons interviewed are given a list of programs, commercials, etc., and asked to recall their viewing patterns. One of the chief rating services which uses this method is Pulse, Inc., in which recall is sought by the interviewer regarding a four- or five hour period immediately preceding the interview. The Pulse interview method reduces memory error, but still relies on memory, and is, of course, faulty when one person tries to recall another's activities. Robert Woodworth, experimental psychologist, adds this about recall:

Recall is the least adequate index of retention. . . . Recall is a response which depends upon the conditions of the moment as well as upon the trace. An item which cannot be recalled can ofteh be recognized. Recognition is better than recall as an index of retention. ${ }^{40}$

Some of the advantages of the recall method, as well as the personal interview and the questionnaire are:

1. It is inexpensive.
2. It obtains information for periods which coincidental phone calls cannot cover; and
3. It permits accumulation of data for audience classification and extensive market analysis. ${ }^{41}$

40woodworth, p. 50.
${ }^{41}$ Bogart, p. 324.

The Coincidental Telephone Call Method

The coincidental telephone call method is used to obtain information dealing with viewing or listening at a specific moment.

Another of the rating services, Trendex, produces an index of popularity for programs in 15 cities by telephone calls. The interviewer for Trendex seeks information regarding age, sex of viewers, and identification of the product or sponsor. The method makes rapid reporting possible as well as sponsor identification.

Trendex suffered its share of disgrace at the time of the subcommittee investigations, however, when The Gallagher Report published the following statement:

A Trendex brochure advertised: "Say What You Choose To Say And Then Document It With A Trendex Report." 42

The coincidental telephone call is extremely limited in scope and represents oniy a very small sample of the over-all viewing patterns of the particular families called. The sample may be biased somewhat by the fact that only those families with telephones may be used.

## Panel Method

In some audience research, panels of families are enlisted to report regularly by mail on their viewing patterns. In essence, these families are asked to keep diaries of their television viewing. One of the major services using family panels is TVQ (from the Television Division of the Home Testing Institute). Some of the faulty aspects of the diary method,

[^4]usually used to obtain information from the panel members, will be discussed under the next heading.

## Diaxy Method

The diary method has been used by both rating services and researchers. Each family or participating person in the study is asked to list each program watched and to indicate the audience present. In some research studies, children are asked to keep this diary as a school project, recalling the programs viewed on the preceding day or during the preceding week. The diaries do provide continuous records of viewing and, under the best circumstances, records of actual programs viewed. Diaries allow a better insight into the audience characteristics than some other me thods.

Diaries are, however, far from fool-proof because of unintentional human error. Memory loss results in hit-or-miss entries if the diaries are not filled out immediately. Many persons who are part of a panel will guess at viewing patterns rather than risk the loss of the small income they can gain for participation. Diaries may tend to make viewers selfconscious of their viewing over long periods of time, and as a result, these persons are no longer typical. Incomplete or unusable diaries are also a hazard in this type of study. They require, above all, active continuous cooperation of the persons in the sample.

The Wall Street Journal published this statement about the use of diaries in rating services:

The investigators will attack the diary system, in which listeners jot down what they've watchedr investigators say listeners frequently forget to fill in the dharies for seversl days running,
and make mistakes when they finally do. 43

## Mechanical Recorders

In recent years, a great emphasis has been placed upon ratings produced by services using mechanical recorders. The leading research of this kind is done by the A. C. Nielsen Company, with instruments called the audimeter and the recordimeter. At this time Nielsen supplies about 90 percent of the network ratings information. 44

The audimeter is wired into the television set, and records on magnetic tape or film the station to which the set is tuned. The recordimeter, although not wired directly to the set, records the length of time the set was turned on, not differentiating between channels. The mechanical recorders are supplemented by diaries which are kept near the set in each home and are filled in by family members. The instruments are kept in a national panel of homes, and the final ratings developed by the combined results of the diary and tape records, which are periodically sent in by the families.

While the diaries introduce inherent errors, the major disadvantage is that the recorders provide no information about the audience itself.

A few of the charges made by the House Subcommittee regarding Nielsen's method of audience study are self-explanatory in some of the newspaper accounts of the hearings.

The Washington Post published this question whic $h$ was asked on the

[^5]opening day of the public hearings:
Is it possible to rig an audimeter? Yes. _It can be done mechanically. That has been testified. [and] . . . testimony revealed that about 10 percent of the measuring machines are out of order all the time. 45

Another writer for the Washington Post added later:
He LRobert E. L. Richardson, assistant counsel to the House Special Subcommittee on Investigations cited audimeter results that showed a receiving set was in continuous use for a nine-day period. . . . Several other audimeter records showed a set in use for over 25 hours, continuously. Acting Chairman John E. Moss said the examples proved to him that persons whe will permit audimeters to be attached to radio or TV sets are "not typical" of the overall population and shouldn't be used as a measure of national viewing habits. ${ }^{46}$

Advertising Age, a weekly trade publication, reported the following
comment by Richardson:
In addition, he [Richardson]/ said he has yet to find a college educated statistician who believes a permanent sample is sound statistically. ${ }^{47}$

Oklahomans were faced with an example of non-representative samples
in the Nielsen research in a story which appeared in the Tulsa World:
Two families on relief who live next door to each other in Chickasha, Okla., represent approximately 100,000 homes in a survey firm's ratings. . . . Richardson said that if certain areas were "over-sampled," it followed that other areas probably were "under-sampled."48
${ }^{5}$ J. A. Livingston, " 1060 Silent Witnesses of TV Habit," Washington (D.C.) Bost, March 27, 1963.
${ }^{46}$ Lawrence Laurent, "Memo Shows Nielsen Was Wary of Probe," Washington (D.C.) Post, March 29, 1963.
${ }^{47 w}$ Nielsen Accused of Sample-Size Deception," Advertising Age (April 1, 1963), p. 1.
${ }^{48}{ }^{10}$ Two Chickasha Reliefers ' $100,000^{\prime}$ in TV Ratings," Tulsa World, April 6, 1963.

The DynaScope Method

Since the operation of the DynaScope was explained earlier in this chapter, only a few of its major advantages and disadvantages as an adience study method are listed here.

Advantages:

1. DynaScope is the only instrument which does not rely on the memory of anyone in the household to reconstruct the viewing audience.
2. No other device or method can accurately report a minute-by-minute breakdown of the audience and its viewing characteristics.
3. Times when no one is in the audience may be easily detected.
4. Accurate records may be kept of times when members of the audience are attentive to some other activity.
5. Children in the television audience may be studied in a normal family situation.
6. Because of the permanent nature of the film record, it may be studied by many persons at their convenience.
7. DynaScope cannot be readily tampered with mechanically, except by completely disconnecting the television set.
8. No alterations need be made in the television set, and no more wiring is visible than would be present from any small appliance.
9. DynaScope can be set to produce pictorial records at
a rate of one per second to one per minute on a continuous basis, or discriminately during certain selected periods of the day or of the week.
10. DynaScope provides the most intensive method of audience study devised to date.

Disadvantages:

1. "Turn-downs" by families in the original design of the sample. Some families will not have the instrument in their homes. (Nielsen has 50 percent turn-down.)
2. DynaScope is an expensive method to operate. The average family in these studies used about $\$ 15$ worth of 16 mm film per week. (This is not prohibitively costly, however, in comparison with other mechanically recorded data.)
3. There is the question of awareness of the device by the viewing audience, and what might be the resulting modification of normal viewing patterns. (Nearly one and one half million still pictures in these studies are permanent records of viewing stiuetions in homes with children. Research directors to whom many of these pictures have been shown attest to the genuineness of viewing situations without undue awareness by the viewers. Data taken from the studies indicates no abnormal amount of viewing.)
4. Analysis of data is painstakingly slow because of the massive amounts of data produced.

For the purpose of this thesis and the four DynaScope studies, the following terminology has been used:

1. Audience - All persons in the range of the BynaScope lens, with the exception of children less than one year of age.
2. Viewer-Minute -1 Viewer $\times 1$ Minute $=1$ Viewer-Minute. $A$ viewer-minute was any minute with one person in the audience, e.g., four viewers in the television audience during one minute is equal to four viewer-minutes.
3. Attentive Audience - All persons whose eyes are directed toward the television set, including those persons who are situated in such a way that it would be possible for them to see the set form the "attentive" audience. Since there were four pictures taken each minute the set was on, a minute was counted "attentive" if the person was looking at the set two ox more frames during that minute.
4. Inattentive Audience - Persons in view of the television set, but who were not looking at the set for more than half of the minute, were counted "inattentive."
5. Average Audience Per Minute - The average number of persons in front of the television set during an average DynaScope minute. The average audience per minute was computed by dividing the total number of viewer-minutes by the total number of minutes sets were in use.
6. Set-in-Use Time - All minutes that the television sets were turned on.
7. Ne Audience Iime - Any time when the television set was in use with no one in the audience.
8. Commercial Minute - Any minute of "set-in-use" time when a commercial could be indentified by the film scanner. These figures are subject to some error for any of the following reasons:
a. Because of poor reception or a poor quality picture tube, it may be difficult to identify the commercial.
b. Commercials shorter than 15 seconds may be missed in the film record.
c. Members of the audience may prevent the researcher from seeing the screen by standing in front of it or in front of the mirror, although this happens infrequently.
d. Commercials may be given by persons on the television show - "integrated" into the program - giving the researcher no clue. The researcher must largely depend upon signatures, showing of packages or labels, and similar. items to help him identify the commercial.
9. Time Period - Any one of the prescribed day parts:
a. Morning - From the time set was turned on until noon.
b. Afternoon - From noon until six o'clock in the evening.
c. Evening - From six o'clock until the set was turned off.
d. Combined - The totals of morning, afternoon, and evening periods.
10. Age Groups - Ages by which viewing patterns were categorized:
a. Teenagers - Children who are out of gradeschool up to the age of 18 years.
b. Gradeschoolers - Children who attend gradeschool.
c. Preschoolers - Children above the age of one year who are not yet attending school.
d. Nursery school children - Those preschoolers who viewed television in a nursery school situation in one of the participating homes in the Stillwater1962 DynaScope study.
11. Program Type - An arbitrarily chosen general category into which programs with similar characteristics were summarized. Fifteen different program types are used in this study, such as Situation Comedy, Western, Children's Drama, etc.
12. Related Activity - Any activity in which members of the television audience were participating while the set was in use.

## VIEWING PATTERNS OF CHI LDREN IN THE TELEVISION AUDIENCE

This chapter presents findings from all four DynaScope studies regarding child-audience composition during the time sets were in use by the 95 families in this study. Of the 95 families, 77 had at least one child, with an average of 1.76 children per family. The viewing of some children other than those living in the sample families is included in Chapter IV. For example, 15 children were enrolled in a nursery school in one of the homes. In addition, data is reported for a number of grandchildren, nephews and nieces, children next door, and babysitters who viewed TV in the sample homes at some time during the two-week research period.

Some of the families were childless, as an attempt was made to maintain a well-balanced sample and, as nearly as possible, a normal audience. In line with the national averages, about one-third of the homes represented had a working mother.

The figures given here are the child-viewer totals gathered from the entire two week period that the DynaScope remained in the homes, with summaries of Week 1 and Week 2 for comparisen.

```
"Set-in-Use" Time
```

How does the age of children in the family affect the amount of time during which television sets were turned on? In an effort to determine existing differences, if any, "set-in-use" time was isolated for families
with children in each age group. By this approach, "set-in-use" time for teenage-only families may be compared to that for gradeschool-only families or families with preschool-only children.

There were no teenage-only families in the first Stillwater study, and no families in the second Stillwater study with gradeschool-childrenonly; families with exclusively preschool children appeared in all four of the DynaScope studies.

## Eamilies With Teenage-Children-Only

Families with teenagers-only watched television for an average of about 2.23 morning hours per week. (Table $I_{0}$ ) Morning "set-in-use" time ranged from 0 to 55 minutes per day. Approximately 22 percent of the 18 families did not turn their television sets on during the morning period for the entire two weeks of the study.

By afternoon, viewing had increased considerably in these homes. All of the homes turned their television sets on some time between noon and six o"clock during the two weeks. The two week average afternoon *set-in-use" time was 7.38 hours per week per family, more than triple the morning time. The time sets were turned on per day ranged from only 18 minutes to a high of 2.60 hours. The average "set-in-use" time during the afternoons was 1.05 hours per week in homes with teenage-only children.

In the evening, "set-in-use" time showed a marked increase to a weekly average of 17.95 hours. Total time ran from a low of 1.40 hours to 6.20 hours. It is important to note again the weather conditions during these studies. The low "set-in-use" time occurred during one of the Stillwater studies when the Fall weather was relatively warm, and the high occurred during the much colder weather which was characteristic of Tulsa

TABLE I
${ }^{\text {w}}$ SET-IN-USE" TIME FOR FAMILIES WITH ONLY-TEENAGE CHILDREN

| Eamily | Total "Set-in-Use" Time (In Minutes) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Morning | Afternoon | Evenina | Combined |
| Stillwater-1961 | No families with only-teenage children |  |  |  |
| Stillwater-1962 |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | - | 607 | 2004 | 2611 |
| 8 | 232 | 446 | 1177 | 1855 |
| 9 | 94 | 890 | 1694 | 2678 |
| 10 | 608 | 659 | 2044 | 3311 |
| 15 | 300 | 1019 | 1856 | 3175 |
| 17 | 754 | 1190 | 1679 | 3623 |
| Wichita |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | 768 | 2208 | 2520 | 5496 |
| 15 | - | 1080 | 1950 | 3030 |
| 17 | 540 | 420 | 2046 | 3006 |
| 19 | 90 | 870 | 2016 | 2976 |
| 29 | 150 | 1176 | 1380 | 2706 |
| Tulsa |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 118 | 2126 | 3038 | 5282 |
| 3 | 29 | 252 | 1794 | 2075 |
| 5 | - | 321 | 1940 | 2261 |
| 8 | 168 | 552 | 2719 | 3439 |
| 14 | 174 | 935 | 3849 | 4958 |
| 15 | 757 | 895 | 3103 | 4755 |
| 21 | 26 | 292 | 1947 | 2265 |
| Total Mins. ${ }^{n}$ Set-in-Use ${ }^{n}$ : | 4,808 | 15,938 | 38,756 | 59,502 |
| Two Weeks Avg. Per Family: | 267.1 | 885.4 | 2,153.1 | 3,305.3 |
| Avg. Hours For Two Weeks: | 4.45 | 14.76 | 35.89 | 55.09 |
| Avg. Hours <br> Per Week: | 2.23 | 7.38 | 17.95 | 27.55 |

during the early part of the year. Daily "set-in-use" time was slightly more than two hours during the evening period for the teenage-only families.

The total "set-in-use" time for families with ternagers-only fell below the average for the entire study by 4.25 hours per week. Wet-inuse" time ranged from 2.20 hours in one family to as high as 6.45 hours per day in another. Oyen-all, families with teenage-children-only averaged 3.94 hours per day with their $T V$ sets turned on.

## Eamilies With Gradeschool-Children-Only

Families with gradeschoolers-only had their sets in use nearly an hour per day more than families with teenagers-only. (Table 2.)

The "set-in-use" time during the morning time period rose to an average of more than one and one half hours per week above that recorded for teen-only homes. Morning "set-in use" time in these families was found to be 3.95 hours a week. Yet, one gradeschooler-family indicated an average of 9.60 of television time per week. Sets were not turned on at all during the morning in 17 percent of the homes with gradeschool age children.

Families of gradeschoolers only had their sets turned on for an average of 9.45 hours per week, or 1.35 hours per day, during the afternoons. This average was about 15 minutes a day higher than the average of teenonly families for the same time period.

Evening "set-in-use" time climbed to an average of 20.50 hours per week in homes with gradeschool-age-children-only. The increase was about 2.50 hours more than for the teen-only families. Daily average time with television on in ech gradeschooler-family was 2.93 hours.

The total "set-in-use" time for the gradeschoolers" families averaged

TABLE II
${ }^{00}$ SET-IN -USE" TIME FOR FAMILIES WITH ONLY-GRADESCHOOL CHILDREN

| Eamily | Total "Set-in-Use" Time (In Minutes) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Morning | Afternoon | Evening | Combined |
| Stiliwater-1961 |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | 693 | 679 | 2472 | 3844 |
| 9 | 276 | 1184 | 3347 | 4807 |
| Stillwater-1962 No families with only-gradeschool children |  |  |  |  |
| Wichita |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 654 | 1578 | 3330 | 5562 |
| 6 | 228 | 918 | 2970 | 4116 |
| 23 | 1152 | 1830 | 1872 | 4854 |
| 28 | 180 | 1470 | 2442 | 4092 |
| Tulsa |  |  |  |  |
| 20 | 1026 | 881 | 2324 | 4231 |
| 22 | - | 1317 | 2596 | 3913 |
| 23 | - - | 315 | 1574 | 1889 |
| 24 | 870 | 949 | 2567 | 4386 |
| 28 | 483 | 2058 | 2188 | 4729 |
| 29 | 120 | 370 | 1846 | 2336 |
| Total Mins. "Set-in-Use": | 5,682 | 13,549 | 29,528 | $48,759$ |
| Two Weeks Avg. |  |  |  |  |
| Avg. Hours For |  |  |  |  |
| Avg. Hours Per Week: | 3.95 | 9.45 | 20.55 | 33.86 |

33.86 hours per week, or 4.84 hours per day. This was an increase of nearly one hour per day "set-in-use" time above that of the teen-only homes. The extreme "set-in-use" times of 2.25 hours in one family and 6.61 hours per day in another were very similar to the extremes recorded for teenonly families.

## Families With Preschool-Children-Only

Understandably, the preschool-children-only families showed a substantial increase of ${ }^{\text {w }}$ set-in-use ${ }^{00}$ time over both other groups.

Throughout the morning viewing period, preschool-only families averaged 5.07 hours per week of TV viewing. This weekly average was nearly three hours a week greater than that in teen-only families, and slightly more than an hour above that in the gradeschooler-only families. Twelve percent of the families with preschoolers-only did not turn their sets on at all during the morning period.

The afternoon period for this group was an average of 12.15 hours per week of "set-in-use" time, about 1.75 hours per day. One family with preschoolers only had their set on for an average of 4.60 hours daily during the afternoons alone.

By evening, the higher average "set-in-use" time for preschoolers" families leveled off. Weekly average during the evenings was 19.90 hours, or approximately 2.66 hours daily.

Total "set-in-use" time during the three periods of the day in pre$\stackrel{\circ}{8}$ school-children-only families averaged slightly greater than three hours more than it did in gradeschool-only families, and nearly 10 hours more than it did in families with teenagers-only. The "set-in-use" time for families with preschoolers-only was 37.12 hours per week, or a 5.30 hours

TABLE III
"SET-IN-USE" TIME FOR FAMILIES WITH ONLY -PRESCHOOL CHILDREN

| Eamily | Total "Set-in-Use" Iime (In Minutes) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Mornina | Afternoon | Evening | Combined |
| Stillwater-1961 |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 203 | 144 | 2023 | 2370 |
| 3 | 1605 | 491 | 1692 | 3788 |
| 5 | 1145 | 1165 | 1672 | 3982 |
| Stillwater-1962 |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | 1439 | 1514 | 1919 | 4872 |
| 7 | 776 | 1485 | 3047 | 5308 |
| 14 | 248 | 1117 | 2256 | 3621 |
| Wichita |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | 582 | 3862 | 4134 | 8580 |
| 9 | 792 | 1248 | 1728 | 3768 |
| 11 | 96 | 1266 | 2502 | 3864 |
| 18 | 144 | 1476 | 3948 | 5568 |
| 22 | 690 | 1602 | 2142 | 4434 |
| 30 | - | 804 | 2454 | 3258 |
| Tulsa |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | 280 | 1749 | 1603 | 3632 |
| 10 | 1137 | 3221 | 3713 | 8071 |
| 18 | 402 | 1684 | 2006 | 4092 |
| 26 | - | 897 | 1638 | 2535 |
| 30 | 795 | 1056 | 2121 | 3972 |
| Total Mins. ${ }^{00}$ Set-in-Use ${ }^{n}$ : | 10,334 | 24,783 | 40,598 | 75,715 |
| Two Weeks Avg. Per Family: | 607.9 | 1,457.8 | 2,388.1 | 4,453.8 |
| Avg. Hours Foz <br> Two Weeks: | 10.13 | 24.29 | 39.80 | 74.23 |
| Avg. Hours <br> Per Week: | 5.07 | 12.15 | 19.90 | 37.12 |

TABLE IV

## A COMPARISON OF "SET-IN-USE" TIME FOR FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN OF ONLY ONE AGE GROUP

| Average "Set-in-Use ${ }^{\text {N }}$ Minutes Eer Two Week IPeriod: | Morning | Afternoon | Evening | Combined |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Families With OnlyTeenage Children: | 267.1 | 885.4 | 2153.1 | 3305.3 |
| Families With OnlyGradeschool Children: | 473.5 | 1129.0 | 2460.7 | 4063.3 |
| Families With OnlyPreschool Children: | 607.9 | 1457.8 | 2388.1 | 4453.8 |
| Average "Set-in-Wse Hours For Two Week Period: |  |  |  |  |
| Families With OnlyTeenage Children: | 4.45 | 14.76 | 35.89 | 55.09 |
| Families With OnlyGradeschool Children: | 7.89 | 18.81 | 41.01 | 67.72 |
| Families With OnlyPreschool Children: | 10.13 | 24.29 | 39.80 | 74.23 |
| Average "Set-in-Use" Hours Per Week: |  |  |  |  |
| Families With OnlyTeenage Children: | 2.23 | 7.38 | 17.95 | 27.55 |
| Families With OnlyGradeschool Children: | 3.95 | 9.45 | 20.55 | 33.86 |
| Families With OnlyPreschool Children: | 5.07 | 12.15 | 19.90 | 37.12 |

daily average. "Set-in-use ${ }^{\text {P0 }}$ time in one family hit a high of 10.90 hours daily, but another family had television turned on for only 2.80 hours a day.

## "No Audience" Time

One of the important advantages of the DynaScope technique is that it determines how much time the advertiser must pay for when no one is in the TV audience. Although it seems impossible for any other method of audience or behavior study to indicate accurately this "no audience" factor, the DynaScopes show that in one study there was "no audience" for 26 percent of the time. In the four studies reported here, there was no viewer in the television audience for an average of 18.87 percent of the "set-in-use time

Since the combination of visual and audio on TV is what the advertiser pays for, he loses a great deal of his advertising potential with "no audience." Even though family members in the next room may be hearing the audio portion of the commercial, they cannot possibly benefit from the advertising message as fully as if in the IV audience. One article by Beik ${ }^{49}$ reports that the video portion of the commercials tested got about 75 percent more mentions than audio, and that a combination of picture, print, and sound made the most efficient commercials in his study.

Having determined the average time that sets were turned on with "no audience ${ }^{* 0}$ present, those families having exclusively one age group of children again were isolated to see if the "no audience" time varied.

[^6]
## Families With Teenage -Children-Onil

The "no audience" time during morning hours in these teen-only homes was comparatively small. It averaged about .29 hour per week, or nearly 13 percent of the "set-in-use" time. (Table V.) Morning "no audience" time varied from only 5 minutes during the entire two week period to 11 minutes a day.

In the afternoon period, the "no audience" time average was 1.23 hours per week, nearly 17 percent of the time sets were in use.

During the evening viewing period, time with "no audience" dropped considerably, due probably to the larger number of persons viewing. Average "no audience" time was 1.61 hours per week, less than nine percent of the total "set-in-use ${ }^{* 8}$ time.

Total "no audience" time in teenage-only families averaged 3.14 hours per week, approximately 11 percent of the time sets were in use. One home had a high of 8.30 hours per week of "no audience" time (about one-third of that family"s "set-in-use" time), but on the whole, the families with only-teenage children did not often leave their television sets operating when no one was in the audience.

## Families With Gradeschool-Children-Only

While the "set-in-use ${ }^{\infty}$ time for gradeschoolers" families doubled the amount recorded by teenagers' families, the gradeschoolers' families also had their television sets on with "no audience" three times as long as teen-only families during the morning. Average time with "no audience" in homes with only-gradeschoolers was . 99 hours per week, about 25 percent of total wset-in-use ${ }^{w}$ time. One gradeschooler-only home had no one present in the TV audience for an average of 4.45 hours weekly. (Table VI.)

TABLE V

## MINUTES WHILE SET WAS IN USE WITH "NO AUDIENCE" PRESENT IN FAMILIES WITH ONLY-TEENAGE CHILDREN

| Eamily |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Morning | Afternoon | Evening | Combined |
| Stillwater-1961 | No families with only-teenage children |  |  |  |
| Stiliwater-1962 |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | - | 43 | 328 | 371 |
| 8 | 28 | 59 | 43 | 130 |
| 9 | 24 | 265 | 203 | 492 |
| 10 | 11 | 151 | 184 | 346 |
| 15 | 5 | 172 | 246 | 423 |
| 17 | 9 | 112 | 71 | 192 |
| Wichita |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | 150 | 380 | 284 | 814 |
| 15 | - | 198 | 800 | 998 |
| 17 | 70 | 50 | 262 | 382 |
| 19 | 19 | 105 | 147 | 271 |
| 29 | 97 | 565 | 259 | 921 |
| Tulsa |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 42 | 204 | 36 | 282 |
| 3 | - | 96 | 180 | 276 |
| 5 | - | 18 | 30 | 48 |
| 8 | 6 | 24 | 114 | 144 |
| 14 | 6 | 30 | 18 | 54 |
| 15. | 156 | 174 | 234 | 564 |
| 21 | - | 12 | 48 | 60 |
| Total Mins. |  |  |  | 6,768 |
| Two Weeks Avg. <br> "No Audience ${ }^{\text {no }}$ Time |  |  |  |  |
| Per Family: | 34.6 | 147.7 | 192.6 | 376.0 |
| Avg. Hours With <br> ${ }^{\omega}$ No Audience: ${ }^{\text {P0 }}$ For |  |  |  |  |
| Two Weeks: | . 58 | 2.46 | 3.21 | 6.27 |
| Avg. Hours With |  |  |  |  |
| Week: | . 29 | 1.23 | 1.61 | 3.14 |

## TABLE VI

MINUTES WHILE SET WAS IN USE WITH "NO AUDIENCE" PRESENT IN FAMILIES WITH ONLY-GRADESCHOOL CHILDREN

| Eamily | Iotal "No Audience" İme (In Minutes) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Morning | Afternoon | Evening | Combined |
| Stillwater-1961 |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | 115 | 226 | 537 | 878 |
| 9 | 16 | 230 | 1405 | 1651 |
| Stillwater-1962 | No families with only-gradeschool children |  |  |  |
| Wichita |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 31 | 111 | 190 | 332 |
| 6 | 17 | 84 | 214 | 315 |
| 23 | 237 | 246 | 196 | 679 |
| 28 | 50 | 463 | 226 | 739 |
| Tulsa |  |  |  |  |
| 20 | 534 | 282 | 246 | 1062 |
| 22 | - | 114 | 210 | 324 |
| 23 | - | 84 | 426 | 510 |
| 24 | 210 | 270 | 78 | 564 |
| 28 | 186 | 882 | 378 | 1440 |
| 29 | 30 | 78 | 180 | 288 |
| Total Mins. |  |  |  |  |
| Two Weeks Avg. ${ }^{\text {w }}$ No Audience ${ }^{\text {II }}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Time Per Family: | 118.8 | 255.8 | 357.2 | 731.8 |
| Avg. Hours With "No Audience ${ }^{\text {en }}$ For |  |  |  |  |
| Two Weeks: | 1.98 | 4.26 | 5.95 | 12.20 |
| Avg. Hours With ${ }^{\text {w }}$ No Audience ${ }^{\text {w }}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Per Week: | . 99 | 2.13 | 2.98 | 6.10 |

From noon until six o"clock, the average "no audience" time per week increased again, about one hour more than in the homes with teens-only, to 2.13 hours. Average "set-in-use" time with "no audience" during the afternoon was 21.48 percent, which was a slight decrease from that for the morning. One family recorded as high as 43 percent of the "set-in-use" time with "no audience ${ }^{\text {w }}$ during the afternoon.

During the evening, while sets were generally in greater use, the increase in time with ${ }^{m} n o$ adience ${ }^{n 0}$ was very small, the percentage falling to 14.51. This figure is about five percent greater for the same period than that recorded for teen-only homes. "No audience" time average was 2.98 hours per week in homes with only-gradeschoolers for the evening period.

Total time with ${ }^{\text {D0 }}$ no audience" averaged more than six hours per week for the gradeschoolers" families, nearly twice that amount recorded for the teen-only families. One family had a low "no audience time of only 20 minutes a day; another gradeschooler family had an average of nearly two hours day.

## Families With Preschool-Children-Only

The amount of ${ }^{\infty}$ no audience ${ }^{\text {" }}$ time for the preschooler families averaged 1.72 hours per week during the mornings. The average time with "no audience ${ }^{00}$ was equal to 34.25 percent of the time with "sets-in-use ${ }^{00}$, compared to 13 percent in teen-only families, and 25 percent in the grade-schooler-only families for the morning period. (Table VII.)

Percentage-wise, the "no audience" time for these families remained well above the others in the afternoon period. While the preschoolers" families had 33 percent of ${ }^{n}$ set-in-4se* time with "no audience", the

TABLE VII
MINUTES WHILE SET WAS IN USE WITH "NO AUDIENCE" PRESENT IN FAMILIES WITH ONLY -PRESCHOOL CHILDREN

| Eamily | Total m No Audience ${ }^{\text {m }}$ Time (In Minutes) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Morning | Afternoon | Evening | Combined |
| Stillwater-1961 |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 56 | 47 | 239 | 342 |
| 3 | 560 | 186 | 676 | 1422 |
| 5 | 503 | 525 | 765 | 1793 |
| Stillwater-1962 |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | 459 | 600 | 427 | 1486 |
| 7 | 179 | 396 | 437 | 1012 |
| 14 | 114 | 313 | 300 | 727 |
| Wichita |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | 121 | 1929 | 1178 | 3228 |
| 9 | 408 | 446 | 400 | 1254 |
| 11 | 37 | 218 | 316 | 571 |
| 18 | 24 | 98 | 285 | 407 |
| 22 | 154 | 597 | 300 | 1051 |
| 30 | - | 158 | 84 | 242 |
| Tulsa |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | 24 | 462 | 366 | 852 |
| 10 | 264 | 1038 | 600 | 1902 |
| 18 | 198 | 816 | 354 | 1368 |
| 26 | - | 90 | 144 | 234 |
| 30 | 408 | 372 | 138 | 918 |
| Total Mins. |  |  |  |  |
| Two Weeks Avg. "No Audience ${ }^{\text {No }}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Time Per Family: | 206.4 | 487.7 | 418.3 | 1106.4 |
| Avg. Hours with ${ }^{\text {PN }}$ No Audience ${ }^{\text {e9 }}$ For |  |  |  |  |
| Two Weeks: | 3.44 | 8.13 | 6.87 | 18.44 |
| Avg. Hours With |  |  |  |  |
| Week: | 1.72 | 4.06 | 3.44 | 9.22 |

TABLE VIII
A COMPARISON OF ${ }^{\text {w }}$ NO AUDIENCE ${ }^{*}$ TIME FOR FAMILIES WITH Children of only one age group

|  | Morning | Afternoon | Evening | Combined |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Average "No Audience ${ }^{00}$ Minutes For Two Week Period: |  |  |  |  |
| Families With OnlyTeenage Children: | 34.6 | 147.7 | 192.6 | 376.0 |
| Families With OnlyGradeschool Children: | 118.8 | 255.8 | 357.2 | 731.8 |
| Families with OnlyPreschool Children: | 206.4 | 487.7 | 412.3 | 1106.4 |
| Average "No Audience ${ }^{\text {N }}$ Hours For Two Week Period: |  |  |  |  |
| Families With OniyTeenage Childmen: | . 58 | 2.46 | 3.21 | 6.27 |
| Families With OnlyGradeschool Children: | 1.98 | 4.26 | 5.95 | 12.20 |
| Families With OnlyPreschool Children: | 3.44 | 8.13 | 6.87 | 18.44 |
| Average ${ }^{\text {n }} \mathrm{No}$ Audience ${ }^{\text {s0 }}$ Hours Per Week: |  |  |  |  |
| Families With OnlyTeenage Children: | . 29 | 1.23 | 1.61 | 3.14 |
| Families with OnlyGradeschool Children: | . 99 | 2.13 | 2.98 | 6.10 |
| Families With OnlyPreschool Children: | 1.72 | 4.06 | 3.44 | 9.22 |

teen-oniy homes had 17 percent, and the gradeschooler-homes had 21 percent ${ }^{\text {no }}$ no audience time. Afternoon "no audience" time for families with only-preschool age children was 4.06 hours per week.

As in the other groups, "no audience time dropped significantly during the evening for preschoolers' families. Preschoolers' homes, in the evening, averaged 3.44 hours a week "no audience* time, or 17 percent of the "set-in-use" time.

Average "no audience time for all three periods during the two weeks was 9.22 hours (about 1.33 hours per day), or 24.8 percent of recorded "set-in-use ${ }^{\infty}$ time for the preschool-children-only families. The highest ${ }^{\infty}$ no audience ${ }^{\infty}$ time indicated by any family in this group was 13.40 hours per week, nearly 38 percent of that family's total "set-in-use" time.
"Set-in-Use" Time Compared With "No Audience" Time

From examination of the data representing the three groups, certain trends appear in the relationship between "set-in-use" time and "no audience ${ }^{m}$ time.

Morning periods in preschool-only families were well above those for the other two groups in the amount of time sets were in use, with an average of 5.07 hours pert week. This contrasts with 3.95 hours in grade-school-only homes, and 2.23 hours in homes with only-teenagers. The additional time is easily explained, because it is possible for the preschool child to view while others are in school. Even on a percentage basis, however, the families with preschoolers-only had a greater amount of "no audience time. Those families with only-teenagers had about 13 percent; in gradeschooler-only homes there was "no audience" for 25 percent of the time. But ${ }^{\infty}$ no audience ${ }^{n}$ time in the preschoolers homes climbed to 33.93 percent.

The gradeschooler group of families more nearly reflected the norms of the average "set-in-use" time and "no audience" time for all families in the four DynaScope studies. The gradeschoolers" "set-in-use" time was greater by nearly one half hour per week than the average of 3.50 hours; their ${ }^{\infty}$ no audience ${ }^{\infty}$ time was approximately three percent less than the 28.01 percent average. (Figure 2.)

All groups showed an appreciable rise in the amount of "set-in-use". time during the afternoon period. The preschooler families maintained a wide lead in both average "set-in-use" time and "no audience" time. "Set-in-use ${ }^{00}$ time for the preschoolers ${ }^{\circ}$ families was 12.15 hours per week; teenagers ${ }^{\circ}$ families had their sets operating for the least amount of afternoon time, 7.38 hours per week.

The preschooler-only homes showed an average of 33.42 percent "no audience ${ }^{* 0}$ time, about 11 percent higher than that in the gradeschooleronly homes, and 16 percent more than in homes with only-teenagers. Again, families with only-gradeschoolers were nearer the four-study averages for the afternoon viewing period. (Figure 3.)

In the evening, a different pattern of "set-in-use" time appears for all three groups. While the families with only-preschoolers led in "set-in-use ${ }^{0 p}$ time for both morning and afternoon periods, the gradeschooler group of families had slightly more "set-in-use" time during the evening, with an average of 20.55 hours. Preschooler-only families dropped to an average of 19.55 hours per week "set-in-use" time, and the teen families fell below that to 17.95 hours per week "set-in-use" time. Average "set-in-use ${ }^{17}$ time for all families in the four studies was 18.60 hours per


Even with the leveling of ${ }^{\infty}$ set-in-use time during the evening, families with preschool-only children continued to leave their sets on with

FIGURE 2
A COMPARISON OF THE "SET-IN-USE" TIME WITH PERCENTAGE OF "NO AUDIENCE" TIME DURING THE MORNING HOURS 6: A.M. TO 12 NOON


FIGURE 3
A COMPARISON OF "SET-IN-USE" TIME WITH PERCENTAGE OF ${ }^{\text {nNO }} \mathrm{NO}$ AUDIENCE ${ }^{10}$ TIME DURING. AFTERNOON HOURS

12 NOON TO 6 P.M.
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## FIGURE 4

A COMPARISON OF "SET-IN-USE" TIME WITH PERCENTAGE OF ${ }^{\text {T }} \mathrm{NO}$ AUDIENCE ${ }^{*}$ TIME DURING EVENING HOURS 6 P.M. TO SET-OFF


FIGURE 5

## "SET-IN-USE" TIME COMPARED WITH PERCENTAGE OF "NO AUDIENCE" TIME DURING THE WEEK <br> 6 A.M. TO SET-OFF



Percentage of "Set-In-Use" Time With "No Audience" Present



#### Abstract

"no audience" for a longer period than the others. The evening "no audience" comparison is: preschooler-only families, 17.95 percent; grade-schooler-only families, 14.50 percent; teenager-only families, 8.97 percent.


Data for the three periods indicates certain trends between the child viewer's age, i.e., the younger the child, the greater the "set-in-use ${ }^{n}$ time and the greater the "no audience" time. As the child grows older, the less he looks at television. Total "set-in-use" time per week for all families in the study was 31.80 hours. While families with only-teenagers had an average "set-in-use" time of 27.55 hours per week, the families with gradeschoolers had 33.86 hours, and preschooler-only families had 37.12 hours of "set-in-use" time. (Figure 5.) Time with ${ }^{n}$ no audience ${ }^{01}$ for all families in the four studies was nearly one-fifth of the total "set-in-use" time, 18.87 percent. "No audience" time in teen-only families was 11.39 percent, and in gradeschoolers" families, 18.01 percent. The highest group average of "no audience" time, 24.84 percent was recorded in homes with children of preschool-age-only.

## Total Child Viewer-Minutes

The reader will recall that the viewer-minute has been defined for use in these DynaScope stadies as that minute during which one viewer is present; hence, one viewer $x$ one minute $=$ one viewer-minute. To the advertiser or program sponsor, a viewer-minute means one with a potential buyer in the audience. In the case of the child viewer-minute, it may mean a television viewing minute with a child who, if not a potential buyer himself, can greatly influence potential buyers.

On the average, the four studies by DynaScope indicate that there
were nearly 149 child viewer-minutes per week during the morning period, or about 2.50 hours. It may be said that during "set-in-use" time in the morning (about 210 minutes per week), a child viewer was in the audience nearly three-fourths of the time. (Table IX Summary.)

During the afternoon, a child was viewing about 62 percent of the "set-in-use minutes, somewhat less than during the morning period. In the afternoon, there were 52 child viewer-minutes daily per family, compared to the saverage daily "set-in-use" time of 82.8 minutes.

In the evening period, the child viewer time nearly doubled from the noon-until-six o'clock period. The audience composition, however, in relation to the child viewer stayed about the same. A child was viewing in the audience 97 minutes per day, while sets were in use 160 minutes, indicating that a child was in the audience about 60 percent of the evening "set-in-use" time.

A total of 226,906 child viewer-minutes was recorded during the entire two weeks of study, averaging $1,194.3$ child viewer-minutes per family per week. In terms of hours, a child viewed 19.90 hours per week in each family compared to the "set-in-use" time of 31.80 hours per week. This was about 62 percent of the total "set-in-use" time.

Keeping in mind that there were some 182 children represented in these four studies ( 1.76 children per family), the totals indicated that each of the children was present in the television audience for an average of 10.40 hours per week.

As shown by individual study statistics in Table IX, there was a slight decrease in the total number of child viewer-minutes from Week 1 to Week 2. The totals reflecting the evening viewing period showed a decrease during the second week in all four Dynascope studies. The weekly

TABLE IX
TOTAL CHILD VIEWER-MINUTES

A Summary of Child Viewer-Minutes in the Stillwater-1961 DynaScope Study:

|  | Morning | Afternoen | Evening | Combined |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Week 1: | 2455 | 4073 | 10011 | 16539 |
| Week 2: | 1554 | 4212 | 7982 | 13748 |
| Both Weeks: | 4009 | 8285 | 17993 | 30287 |
| Avg./Week: | 2004.5 | 4142.5 | 8996.5 | 15143.5 |
| Weekly Avg. Per Family: | 133.6 | 276.2 | 599.8 | 1009.6 |
| Weekly Avg. <br> Hours Per <br> Family: | 2.23 | 4.60 | 10.00 | 16.83 |


| Eamily | Child Viewer-Minutes |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Morning | Afternoon | Evening | Combined |
| Stillwater-1961 |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 249 | 155 | 1425 | 1829 |
| 2 | 236 | 497 | 2153 | 2886 |
| 3 | 772 | 226 | 480 | 1478 |
| 4 | 563 | 245 | 867 | 1675 |
| 5 | 785 | 692 | 538 | 2015 |
| 6 | 118 | 633 | 338. | 1089 |
| 7 | - | - | - | - |
| 8 | 203 | 497 | 456 | 1166 |
| 9 | 477 | 1140 | 2138 | 3755 |
| 10 | 21 | 655 | 1663 | 2339 |
| 11 | 49 | 1218 | 2766 | 4033 |
| 12 | 95 | 106 | 880 | 1081 |
| 13 | 188 | 570 | 1363 | 2121 |
| 14 | 104 | 398 | 1371 | 1873 |
| 15 | 139 | 1253 | 1555 | 2947 |

Table IX (Continued)

A Summary of Child Viewer-Minutes in the Stillwater-1962 DynaScope Study:

|  | Morning | Afternoon | Evening | Combined |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Week 1: | 4504 | 5151 | 7793 | 17448 |
| Week 2: | 3716 | 2882 | 6532 | 13130 |
| Both Weeks: | 8220 | 8033 | 14325 | 30578 |
| Avg./Week: | 4110 | 4016.5 | 7162.5 | 15289 |
| Weekly Avg. <br> Per Family: | 205.5 | $3 \quad 200.8$ | 351.8 | 766.4 |
| Weekly Avg. Hours Per |  |  |  |  |
| Family: | 3.43 | 3.35 | 5.97 | 12.77 |


| Family | Child Viewer minutes |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Morning | Afternoon | Evening | Combined |
| Stillwater-1962 |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 6 | 92 | 347 | 445 |
| 2 | - | 113 | 280 | 393 |
| 3 | 763 | 628 | 1007 | 2398 |
| 4 | - | 3 | - | 3 |
| 5 | - | 33 | 23 | 56 |
| 6 | 10 | 1217 | 1889 | 3116 |
| 7 | 304 | 348 | 458 | 1110 |
| 8 | 150 | 301 | 717 | 1168 |
| 9 | - | - | 1 | 1 |
| 10 | 79 | 142 | 742 | 963 |
| 11 | 413 | 381 | 2568 | 3362 |
| 12 | 183 | 1113 | 3474 | 4770 |
| 13 | - | 41 | 107 | 148 |
| 14 | 279 | 317 | 355 | 951 |
| 15 | 115 | 219 | 936 | 1270 |
| 16 | 117 | 370 | 706 | 1193 |
| 17 | 5771 | 2593 | 667 | 9031 |
| 18 | 30 | 1 | 40 | 71 |
| 19 | - | - | - | - |
| 20 | - | 121 | 9 | 130 |

Table IX (Continued)


Table IX (Continued)

A Summary of the Child Viewer-Minutes in the Iulsa DynaScope Study:

|  | Morning | Afterneon | Evening | Combined |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Week l: | 2149 |  |  |  |
| Week 2: | 3421 | 9843 | 21187 | 33179 |
| Both Weeks: | 5570 | 19012 | 19486 | 32076 |
| Avg./Week: | 2785 | 9506 | 40673 | 65255 |
| Weekly Avg. |  |  | 20336.5 | 32627.5 |
| Per Family: | 92.8 | 316.9 |  |  |
| Weekly Avg. |  |  | 677.9 | 1087.6 |
| Heurs Per |  |  |  |  |
| Family: | 1.55 | 5.28 | 11.28 | 18.13 |


| Eamily | Child Viewer-Minutes |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Morning | Afternoon | Evening | Combined |
| Tulsa |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 48 | 2385 | 3236 | 5669 |
| 2 | - | 31 | 17 | 48 |
| 3 | - | 31 | 317 | 348 |
| 4 | - | - | - | - |
| 5 | - | 87 | 1008 | 1095 |
| 6 | 360 | 1109 | 1158 | 2627 |
| 7 | 375 | 1304 | 531 | 2210 |
| 8 | 139 | 779 | 4213 | 5131 |
| 9 | 31 | 69 | - | 100 |
| 10 | 498 | 781 | 1181 | 2460 |
| 11 | - | 91 | 329 | 420 |
| 12 | - | - | 11 | 11 |
| 13 | - | - | - | - |
| 14 | 124 | 1024 | 4592 | 5740 |
| 15 | 333 | 563 | 2309 | 3206 |
| 16 | - | - | - | - |
| 17 | - | - | - | - |
| 18 | 286 | 863 | 942 | 2091 |
| 19 | 755 | 2693 | 3092 | 6540 |
| 20 | 364 | 113 | 1230 | 1707 |
| 21 | 24 | 257 | 700 | 981 |
| 22 | - | 2082 | 3406 | 5488 |
| 23 | - | 183 | 977 | 1160 |
| 24 | 264 | 415 | 1539 | 2218 |
| 25 | 585 | 636 | 1968 | 3189 |
| 26 | - | 723 | 1134 | 1857 |
| 27 | 574 | 904 | 2981 | 4459 |
| 28 | 293 | 864 | 1139 | 2296 |
| 29 | 122 | 473 | 1565 | 2160 |
| 30 | 395 | 552 | 1096 | 2043 |

Table IX (Continued)

| TOTAL CHILD VIENER MINUTES |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Morning | Afternoon | Evening | Combined |
| Week 1: S-1 | 2455 | 4073 | 10011 | 16539 |
| S-2 | 4504 | 5151 | 7793 | 17448 |
| W | 5204 | 18656 | 30494 | 54354 |
| I | 2149 | 9843 | 21187 | 33179 |
| Total Week 1: | 14.312 | 37,723 | 69,485 | 121.520 |
| Week 2: 5-1 | 1554 | 4212 | 7982 | 13748 |
| S-2 | 3716 | 2882 | 6532 | 13130 |
| W | 5229 | 15498 | 25705 | 46432 |
| I | 3421 | 9169 | 19486 | 32076 |
| Total Week 2: | 13,920 | 31,761 | 59,705 | 105,386 |
| Both Weeks: |  |  |  |  |
| S-1 | 4009 | 8285 | 17993 | 30287 |
| S-2 | 8220 | 8033 | 14325 | 30578 |
| W | 10433 | 34154 | 56199 | 100786 |
| I | 5570 | 19012 | 40673 | 65255 |
| Total Both Weeks: | $28,232$ | $69,484$ | $129.190$ | 226,906 |
| Avg. Per Family: |  |  |  |  |
| Week l: | 150.7 | 397.1 | 731.4 | 1279.2 |
| Week 2: | 146.5 | 334.3 | 628.5 | 1109.3 |
| Both Weeks: | 297.2 | 731.4 | 1359.9 | 2388.5 |
| Avg./Week: | 148.6 | 365.7 | 680.0 | 1194.3 |
| Avg. Hrs./Week: | 2.48 | 6.10 | 11.30 | 19.90 |

totals for all studies decreased during the second week by only 392 child viewer-minutes during the morning, 5,962 child viewer-minutes during the afternoon, 9,780 child viewer-minutes in the evening, or a total decrease from Week 1 to Week 2 of 16,134 child viewer'minutes.

It would be difficult with only four studies to exactly determine the cause for the decrease, since many factors are involved. Prevailing weather conditions and television programming during the se weeks must not be over-looked. And even though the DynaScope films show no over-awareness of the presence of the instrument by the child audience, it is possible that by the second week of installation any "novelty" effect present during the first week may have worn off. This is more probable in view of the fairly stable viewing during the morning period while the child audience was largely composed of preschool viewers who would probably show less awareness than older children.

TABLE X
CHI LD VIEWER-MINUTES - A SUMMARY

## Time Period

Morning (Set on - Noon) Afternoon (Noon - 6 p.m.) Evening ( 6 p.m. - Set off) Total Day

Child ViewerHours Per Week 2.48 Hours 6.10
11.30
19.90

Percentage of All Possible Hours During Period
$6.89 \%$
14.52
26.90
16.58

## Total "Attentive" Child Viewer-Minutes

The "attentive" child viewer is any child between the ages of one and eighteen years, whose eyes are directed toward the television set, or who is situated in such a way that it would be possible for him to see the set.

The viewer must be looking at the set for two or more of the four frames taken each minute to be counted as "attentive". Since the main asset of television advertising is the combination of sight, sound, and printed word, it is the "attentive ${ }^{\text {en }}$ audience in which the advertiser and broadcaster are most interested.

A summary of the "attentive child viewer-minutes during the morning period shows that 16,689 minutes of the total child viewer time were spent "attentively" watching the television set. In other words, the child viewer audience was "attentive" for only 59 percent of the time during the mornings. Totals indicate that the average family had approximately 88 minutes per week with an "attentive ${ }^{n}$ child viewer in front of the television set, or 1.46 hours of "attentive" child viewing. (Table XI Summary.)

Even with the older children in the audience during the afternoon period, the average child viewer was found to be "attentive" only slightly more ( 62 percent) of the time than in the morning period. With a total of $43,279{ }^{\text {º }}$ attentive ${ }^{60}$ child viewer-minutes for the two weeks, children in the 95 families averaged 227.8 "attentive" minutes a week, or 3.80 hours.

During the evening viewing period, the "attentive" child audience rose to 80,230 viewer-minutes, yet, in relation to total child viewerminutes, the audience remained exactly the same as for the afternoon period with 62 percent ${ }^{\text {wattentive }}$ time. Child viewers spent 422.3 "attentive" minutes per week, or 7.04 attentiven hours, in front of their sets in the evenings.

Summarizing the four DynaScope studies, it may be said that during 140,198 viewer-minutes a child was actually looking at the television screen. Total "attentive ${ }^{\text {w }}$ child viewer-minutes comprised only 61.80 percent of the total viewer-minutes for children.

TABLE XI

```
TOTAL "ATTENTIVE" CHILD VIEWER -MINUTES
```

A Summary of "Attentive" Child Viewer-Minutes in Stillwater-1961 DynaScope Study:
"Attentive* Child Viewer Minutes
Family
Morning Afternoen Evening

Combined
Stillwater-1961

| 1 | 43 | 63 | 298 | 404 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 2 | 165 | 385 | 1702 | 2252 |
| 3 | 672 | 178 | 419 | 1269 |
| 4 | 279 | 166 | 535 | 980 |
| 5 | 342 | 326 | 156 | 824 |
| 6 | 91 | 341 | 167 | 599 |
| 7 | - | - | - | - |
| 8 | 16 | 389 | 122 | 527 |
| 9 | 349 | 673 | 1211 | 2233 |
| 10 | 13 | 417 | 1009 | 1439 |
| 11 | 39 | 759 | 2213 | 3011 |
| 12 | 82 | 51 | 681 | 814 |
| 13 | 172 | 336 | 1161 | 1669 |
| 14 | 6 | 261 | 725 | 992 |
| 15 | 113 | 836 | 1167 | 2116 |

Table XI (Continued)

| A Summary of ${ }^{*} A$ Study: | ntive ${ }^{\infty}$ Chi <br> Morning | ewer-Minute Afternoon | Stillwate Evening | 62 DynaSco Combined |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Week 1: | 2002 | 2481 | 4270 | 8753 |
| Week 2: | 1728 | 1951 | 3344 | 7023 |
| Both Weeks: | 3730 | 4432 | 7614 | 15776 |
| Avg./Week: | 1865 | 2216 | 3807 | 7888 |
| Weekly Avg. <br> Per Family: | 93.2 | 110.8 | 190.4 | 394.4 |
| Weekly Avg. <br> Heurs Per <br> Family: | 1.55 | 1.85 | 3.17 | 6.57 |


| Family | "Attentive* Child Viewer-Minutes |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Mornina | Afternoen | Evening | Combined |
| Stiliwater-1962 |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 6 | 78 | 186 | 270 |
| 2 | - | 92 | 227 | 319 |
| 3 | 169 | 93 | 164 | 426 |
| 4 | - | 3 | - | 3 |
| 5 | - | 27 | 14 | 41 |
| 6 | - | 715 | 1412 | 2127 |
| 7 | 268 | 226 | 429 | 923 |
| 8 | 96 | 100 | 317 | 513 |
| 9 | - | - | - | - |
| 10 | 4 | 104 | 437 | 545 |
| 11 | 195 | 192 | 820 | 1207 |
| 12 | 114 | 680 | 1871 | 2665 |
| 13 | - | - | - | - |
| 14 | 240 | 116 | 126 | 482 |
| 15 | 47 | 70 | 444 | 561 |
| 16 | 82 | 251 | 477 | 810 |
| 17 | 2489 | 1581 | 542 | 4612 |
| 18 | 20 | - | 34 | 54 |
| 19 | - | - | - | - |
| 20 | - | 63 | 7 | 70 |

Table XI (Continued)

Eamily Morning Wententive Child Viewerminutes Combined

| Wichita |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 471 | 555 | 1819 | 2845 |
| 2 | 1080 | 2599 | 1718 | 5397 |
| 3 | 392 | 1224 | 1080 | 2696 |
| 4 | 310 | 1061 | 3138 | 4509 |
| 5 | 214 | 494 | 755 | 1463 |
| 6 | 286 | 750 | 1107 | 2143 |
| 7 | 1 | 90 | 189 | 280 |
| 8 | 236 | 194 | 807 | 1237 |
| 9 | 205 | 168 | 196 | 569 |
| 10 | 152 | 543 | 1333 | 2928 |
| 11 | 4 | 368 | 338 | 710 |
| 12 | 424 | 1019 | 1521 | 2964 |
| 13 | 305 | 893 | 4189 | 5387 |
| 14 | 215 | 1811 | 1702 | 3728 |
| 15 | - | 235 | 541 | 776 |
| 16 | 348 | 1601 | 1097 | 3046 |
| 17 | 380 | 53 | 815 | 1248 |
| 18 | 18 | 675 | 1605 | 2298 |
| 19 | 63 | 554 | 953 | 1570 |
| 20 | 336 | 1551 | 2406 | 4293 |
| 21 | 154 | 824 | 1601 | 2579 |
| 22 | 236 | 242 | 471 | 949 |
| 23 | 654 | 1557 | 1714 | 3925 |
| 24 | 244 | 1772 | 2999 | 5015 |
| 25 | 5 | 15 | 5 | 25 |
| 26 | - | - | - | - |
| 27 | 99 | - | - | - |
| 28 | 10 | 617 | 910 | 1626 |
| 29 | - | 168 | 488 | 821 |
| 30 |  |  | 291 | 459 |

Table XI (Continued)
A Summary of "Attentive ${ }^{\text {os }}$ Child Viewer-Minutes in Tulsa DynaScope Study:

|  | Morning | Afternoon | Evening | Combined |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Week 1: | 1430 | 6201 | 13659 | 21290 |
| Week 2: | 2305 | 5509 | 11603 | 19417 |
| Both Weeks: | 3735 | 11710 | 25262 | 40707 |
| Avg./Week: | 1867.5 | 5855.0 | 12631.0 | 20353.5 |
| Weekly Avg. <br> Per Family: | 62.3 | 195.2 | 421.0 | 678.5 |
| Weekly Avg。 Hours Per |  |  |  |  |
| Family: | 1.04 | 3.25 | 7.02 | 11.30 |


| Eamily | *Attentive* Child Viewer-Minutes |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Moxning | Afternoen | Evenina | Combined |
| Tulsa |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 24 | 959 | 1908 | 2891 |
| 2 | - | 4 | 3 | 7 |
| 3 | - | 15 | 132 | 147 |
| 4 | - | - | - | - |
| 5 | - | 87 | 777 | 864 |
| 6 | 284 | 831 | 734 | 1849 |
| 7 | 351 | 1115 | 357 | 1823 |
| 8 | 81 | 488 | 2763 | 3332 |
| 9 | 8 | 16 | - | 24 |
| 10 | 201 | 167 | 149 | 517 |
| 11 | - | 40 | 261 | 301 |
| 12 | - | - | 11 | 11 |
| 13 | - | - | - | - |
| 14 | 67 | 627 | 2358 | 3052 |
| 15 | 290 | 463 | 2003 | 2756 |
| 16 | - | - | - | - |
| 17 | - | - | - | - |
| 18 | 118 | 413 | 422 | 953 |
| 19 | 490 | 1830 | 2230 | 4550 |
| 20 | 229 | 31 | 719 | 979 |
| 21 | 24 | 206 | 454 | 684 |
| 22 | - | 1840 | 2797 | 4637 |
| 23 | - | 21 | 386 | 407 |
| 24 | 166 | 246 | 799 | 1211 |
| 25 | 394 | 240 | 1145 | 1779 |
| 26 | - | 500 | 866 | 1366 |
| 27 | 448 | 587 | 1832 | 2867 |
| 28 | 131 | 245 | 386 | 762 |
| 29 | 103 | 299 | 1204 | 1606 |
| 30 | 326 | 440 | 566 | 1332 |

Table XI (Continued)

|  | total wattentiven child viewer minutes <br> A Summary of Four DynaScope Studies |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Morning | Afternoon | Evening | Combined |
| Week 1: S-1 | 1670 | 2776 | 6176 | 10622 |
| . S-2 | 2002 | 2481 | 4270 | 8753 |
| W | 3287 | 11834 | 19535 | 34656 |
| T | 1430 | 6201 | 13659 | 21290 |
| Total Week 1: | 8,389 | 23,292 | 43,659 | 75,321 |
| Week 2: S-1 | 712 | 2405 | 5390 | 8507 |
| S-2 | 1728 | 1951 | 3344 | 7023 |
| W | 3555 | 10122 | 16253 | 29930 |
| T | 2305 | 5509 | 11603 | 19417 |
| Total Week 2: | 8,300 | 19,987 | 36,590 | 64,877 |
| Both Weeks: |  |  |  |  |
| S-1 | 2382 | 5181 | 11566 | 19129 |
| S-2 | 3730 | 4432 | 7614 | 15776 |
| W | 6842 | 21956 | 35788 | 64586 |
| T | 3735 | 11710 | 25262 | 40707 |
| Total Both Weeks: | 16,689 | 43,279 | 80,230 | 140,198 |
| Avg. Per Family: |  |  |  |  |
| Week 1: | 88.3 | 245.2 | 459.4 | 792.9 |
| Week 2: | 87.4 | 210.4 | 385.2 | 682.9 |
| Both Weeks: | 175.7 | 455.6 | 844.6 | 14.75 .8 |
| Avg./Week: | 87.8 | 277.8 | 422.3 | 737.9 |
| Avg. Hrs./Week: | 1.46 | 3.80 | 7.04 | 12.30 |

A child was "attentively" viewing IV for 39 percent of the total "set-in-use" time, but he was in the audience for nearly 62 percent of the "set-in-use ${ }^{n}$ time.

Of the 10.40 hours per week the average child spent in view of the television set, he was "attentively ${ }^{\infty 0}$ watching only 6.42 hours.

TABLE XII
"ATTENTIVE" CHILD VI EWER -MINUTES - A SUMMARY

| Time Period | "At'tentive* Child <br> Viewer-Hours <br> Per Week | Percentage of All Possible Hours Ducing Period | Percentage of Child ViewerMinutes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Morning: | 1.46 Hours | 4.06\% | 58.87\% |
| Afternoon: | 3.80 | 9.05 | 62.30 |
| Evening: | 7.04 | 16.76 | 62.30 |
| Total Day: | 12.30 | 10.25 | 61.81 |

Total ${ }^{m}$ Inattentive ${ }^{\infty}$ Child Viewer-Minutes

An "inattentive" child viewer-minute for this study has been defined as a minute in which children were in a position to view television, but were not looking at the set. In order for the minute to be counted as "inattentive", the child must not have looked at the set for more than two frames out of the four taken during the minute.

Children watched a total of 28,232 viewer-minutes during the morning period, yet, for 11,543 viewer-minutes these children were paying no atten tion to what was taking place on the television screen. Of the total view-er-minutes, children were "inattentive approximately 40 percent of the time in the morning. On the average, 60.8 child viewer-minutes per week were "inattentive" (1.01 hours). "Set-in-use" time for an average family during the same period was 3.50 hours per week. (Table XIII Summary.)

TABLE XIII
TOTAL "INATTENTIVE" CHILD VIEWER-MINUTES


Table XIII (Continued)

A Summary of "Inattentive" Child Viewer-Minutes in Stillwater-1962 DynaScope Study:

|  | Morning | Afternoon | Evening | Combined |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Week 1: | 2502 | 2670 | 3523 | 8695 |
| Week 2: | 1988 | 931 | 3188 | 6107 |
| Both Weeks: | 4490 | 3601 | 6711 | 14802 |
| Avg./Week: | 2245 | 1800:5 | 3355.5 | 7401 |
| Weekly Avg. <br> Per Family: | 112.3 | 90.0 | 167.8 | 370.1 |
| Weekly Avg. Hours Per |  |  |  |  |
| Family: | 1.87 | 1.50 | 2.80 | 6.17 |



Table XIII (Continued)

| A Summary of "Inattentive" Child Viewer Minutes in Wichita DynaScope |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Morning | Aftiernoon | Evening | Combined |
| Week 1: | 1917 | 6822 | 10959 | 19698 |
| Week 2: | 1674 | 5376 | 9452 | 16502 |
| Both Weeks: | 3591 | 12198 | 20411 | 36200 |
| Avg./Week: | 1795.5 | 6099 | 10205.5 | 18100 |
| Weekly Avg. <br> Per Family: | 59.9 | 203.3 | 340.2 | 603.3 |
| Weekly Avg. <br> Hours Per <br> Family: | 1.00 | 3.39 | 5.66 | 10.06 |


| Family | "Inattentive" Child Viewer-Minutes |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Morning | Afternoon | Evening | Combined |
| Wichita |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 66 | 121 | 474 | 661 |
| 2 | 95 | 301 | 317 | 713 |
| 3 | 281 | 1045 | 1193 | 2519 |
| 4 | 70 | 436 | 1330 | 1836 |
| 5 | 184 | 543 | 1020 | 1747 |
| 6 | 61 | 270 | 650 | 981 |
| 7 | 15 | 43 | 30 | 88 |
| 8 | 127 | 250 | 631 | 1008 |
| 9 | 164 | 275 | 282 | 721 |
| 10 | 43 | 317 | 1085 | 1445 |
| 11 | 19 | 715 | 1013 | 1747 |
| 12 | 781 | 1454 | 1779 | 4014 |
| 13 | 21 | 149 | 643 | 813 |
| 14 | 45 | 671 | 976 | 1692 |
| 15 | - | 23 | 59 | 82 |
| 16 | 45 | 637 | 697 | 1379 |
| 17 | 190 | 73 | 472 | 735 |
| 18 | 2 | 142 | 462 | 606 |
| 19 | 4 | 18 | 39 | 61 |
| 20 | 190 | 599 | 839 | 1628 |
| 21 | 389 | 1534 | 1907 | 3830 |
| 22 | 287 | 450 | 987 | 1724 |
| 23 | 308 | 688 | 1048 | 2044 |
| 24 | 124 | 565 | 790 | 1479 |
| 25 | 49 | 6 | 33 | 88 |
| 26 |  | - |  |  |
| 27 | - | - | - | - |
| 28 | 31 | 421 | 276 | 728 |
| 29 | - | 115 | 76 | 191 |
| 30 | - | 337 | 1303 | 1640 |

Table XIII (Continued)

| A Summary of "Inattentive* Child Viewer-Minutes in Tulsa DynaScope Study: |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Morning | Afternoon | Evening | Combined |
| Week 1: | 719 | 3642 | 7528 | 11889 |
| Week 2: | 1116 | 3660 | 7883 | 12659 |
| Both Weeks: | 1835 | 7302 | 15411 | 24584 |
| Avg./Week: | 917.5 | 3651 | 7705.5 | 12274 |
| Weekly Avg. <br> Per Family: | 30.6 | 121.7 | 256.9 | 409.1 |
| Weekly Avg. <br> Hours Per <br> Family: | . 51 | 2.03 | 4.28 | 6.82 |


| Family | "Inattentive" Child Viewer Minutes |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Morning | Afternoon | Evening | Combined |
| Tulsa |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 24 | 1426 | 1328 | 2778 |
| 2 | - | 27 | 14 | 41. |
| 3 | - | 16 | 185 | 201 |
| 4 | - | - | - | - |
| 5 | - | - | 231 | 231 |
| 6 | 76 | 278 | 424 | 778 |
| 7 | 24 | 189 | 174 | 387 |
| 8 | 58 | 291 | 1450 | 1799 |
| 9 | 23 | 53 | - | 76 |
| 10 | 297 | 614 | 1032 | 1943 |
| 11 | - | 51 | 68 | 119 |
| 12 | - | - | - | - |
| 13 | - | - | - | - |
| 14 | 57 | 397 | 2234 | 2688 |
| 15 | 43 | 100 | 308 | 451 |
| 16 | - | - | - | - |
| 17 | - | - | - | - |
| 18 | 168 | 450 | 520 | 1138 |
| 19 | 265 | 863 | 862 | 1990 |
| 20 | 135 | 82 | 511 | 728 |
| 21 | - | 51 | 246 | 297 |
| 22 | - | 242 | 609 | 851 |
| 23 | - | 162 | 591 | 753 |
| 24 | 98 | 169 | 740 | 1007 |
| 25 | 191 | 396 | 823 | 1410 |
| 26 | - | 223 | 268 | 491 |
| 27 | 126 | 317 | 1149 | 1592 |
| 28 | 19 | 174 | 361 | 554 |
| 29 | 162 | 619 | 753 | 1534 |
| 30 | 69 | 112 | 530 | 711 |

Table XIII (Continued)

TOTAL "INATTENTIVE" CHILD VIEWER -NINUTES
A Summary of Four DynaScope Studies

|  | Morning | Afternoon | Evening | Combined |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Week 1: S-1 | 785 | 1297 | 3835 | 5917 |
| S-2 | 2502 | 2670 | 3523 | 8695 |
| W | 1917 | 6822 | 10959 | 19698 |
| I | 719 | 3642 | 7528 | 11889 |
| Total Week 1: | 5,923 | 14,431 | 25,845 | 46,199 |
| Week 2: S-1 | 842 | 1807 | 2592 | 5241 |
| S-2 | 1988 | 931 | 3188 | 6107 |
| W | 1674 | 5376 | 9452 | 16502 |
| I | 1116 | 3660 | 7883 | 12659 |
| Total Week 2: | 5,620 | 11,774 | 23,115 | 40,509 |
| Both Weeks: |  |  |  |  |
| S-1 | 1627 | 3104 | 6427 | 11158 |
| S-2 | 4490 | 3601 | 6711 | 14802 |
| W | 3591 | 12198 | 20411 | 36200 |
| I | 1835 | 7302 | 15411 | 24548 |
| Total Both Weeks: | 11,543 | 26,205 | 48,960 | 86,708 |

Avg. Per Family:

| Week 1: | 62.3 | 151.9 | $272.1:$ | 486.3 |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Week 2: | 59.2 | 123.9 | 243.3 | 426.4 |
| Both Weeks: | 121.5 | 257.8 | 515.4 | 912.7 |
| Avg./Week: | 60.8 | 137.9 | 257.7 | 456.4 |
| Avg. Hrs./Week: | 1.01 | 2.30 | 4.30 | 7.61 |

In the afternoon viewing period, the "inattentive" audience decreased only slightly to 38 percent; child viewer-minutes rose to 26,205 . These children spent 2.30 inattentive ${ }^{00}$ hours per week in the $T V$ adience during the afternoon. In the average family, sets were in use for 9.70 afternoon hours.

During the evening period, $48,960{ }^{\text {vin }}$ inattentive" child viewer-minutes again totaled 38 percent of the possible viewing minutes. Average time spent ${ }^{m}$ inattentively in each family per week by children wals 257.7 minutes, or 4.30 hours. Evening average ${ }^{00}$ set-in-use ${ }^{00}$ time ran 18.60 hours per week.

A total of $86,708{ }^{20}$ inattentive ${ }^{\infty 9}$ child viewer-minutes was recorded during the entire two week study by BynaScope in the 95 homes. While sets were in use 31.80 hours pers week, children spent about 7.61 viewerhours in the television audience doing something besides watching the screen. On this basis, each child in the study spent about four hours per week as an inattentive* part of the TV audience.

TABLE XIV
${ }^{\text {º }}$ INATTENTIVE ${ }^{00}$ CHILD VIEWER-MINUTES - A SUMMARY

Iime Period
Morning: Afternoon: Evening: Total Day:
${ }^{00}$ Inattentive Child Viewer Hours Per Week

Percentage of All Percentage of Possible Hours Child ViewerDuring Period Minutes

### 2.78. \%

5.48
10.24
6.34
$41.13 \%$
37.70
37.70
38.19

## Average Child Audience

The average child audience figures represent the number of children in the television audience during an average minute. To be counted as part
of the audience during any specific minute, the child had to be present for two or more frames of the four frames per minute. The average audience figure was computed by dividing the total number of child viewerminutes by the total number of minutes sets were in use.

The morning average child audience during two weeks of DynaScope study was . 71 per minute, or, in other words, some child was present an average of seven minutes out of ten while sets were in use. Since there was an average of 1.76 children in these families, each child spent only about four out of ten minutes that the set was in use in front of the TV set. (Table XV Summary)

Average child audience during the afternoon period was slightly less than in the morning with .63 of a child per minute. It could be said that each child was present in the audience about three and one-half minutes out of every ten minutes that the set was in use.

Again in the evening, a small decrease in the average child audience took place, bringing it down to .61 of a child per minute, the lowest average child audience of all three time periods.

By totaling the three time periods, the average child audience for all four DynaScope studies per minute was found to be .63 of a child.

The Week 1 and Week 2 averages for the four studies, as in the case of viewer-minutes, showed a decrease in the average audience, but for all time periods, the decrease was less than .10 of a child per minute.

The greatest average child audience during the morning was found to be in the Stillwater-1962 study. This particular time period was the only occasion when the average child audience was greater than one child per minute. The next largest average child audience was . 79 of a child which occurred several times in different studies during Week 1. The high

TABLE XV

## AVERAGE CHILD AUDIENCE

A Summary of the Average Child Audience in Stillwater-1961 DynaScope Study:

|  | Merning | Afternoon | Evening | Combined |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Week 1: | .79 | .79 | .59 | .66 |
| Week 2: | .56 | .75 | .51 | .55 |
| Avg./Week: | .69 | .77 | .55 | .62 |


| Familv | Average Child Audience |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Morning | Afternoon | Evening | Combined |
| Stiliwater-1961 |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 1.23 | 1.08 | . 70 | . 77 |
| 2 | . 68 | . 94 | 1.00 | . 95 |
| 3 | . 48 | . 46 | . 29 | . 39 |
| 4 | . 81 | . 36 | . 35 | . 44 |
| 5 | . 69 | . 59 | . 32 | . 51 |
| 6 | . 65 | . 85 | . 29 | . 52 |
| 7 | - | - |  | - |
| 8 | . 94 | 1.19 | . 63 | . 86 |
| 9 | 1.73 | . 96 | . 64 | . 78 |
| 10 | . 31 | . 85 | . 43 | . 49 |
| 11 | . 69 | 1.08 | 1.37 | 1.26 |
| 12 | . 79 | . 37 | . 34 | . 37 |
| 13 | . 52 | . 58 | . 99 | . 66 |
| 14 | . 29 | . 83 | . 55 | . 56 |
| 15 | . 68 | . 89 | . 56 | . 67 |

Table XV (Continued)

A Summary of the Average Child Audience in Stillwater-1962 DynaScope Study:

|  | Morning | Afterneon | Evening | Combined |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Week 1: | 1.11 | .49 | .40 | .51 |
| Week 2: | 1.23 | .35 | .36 | .45 |
| Avg./Week: | 1.16 | .43 | .38 | .48 |


|  | Average Child Audience |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Eamily | Moming | Afternoon | Evening | Combined |


| Stiliwa ter-1962 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | .60 | .45 | .21 | .24 |
| 2 | - | .19 | .14 | .15 |
| 3 | .53 | .41 | .52 | .49 |
| 4 | - | - | - | - |
| 5 | - | .02 | .01 | .01 |
| 6 | .39 | .02 | .01 | .01 |
| 7 | .65 | .23 | .15 | .21 |
| 8 | - | .67 | .61 | .63 |
| 9 | .13 | - | - | .0 |
| 10 | .93 | .20 | .36 | .09 |
| 11 | 1.21 | .35 | 1.13 | .88 |
| 12 | - | .87 | 1.48 | 1.62 |
| 13 | 1.13 | .06 | .06 | .05 |
| 14 | .38 | .37 | .16 | .26 |
| 15 | .15 | .31 | .50 | .40 |
| 16 | .65 | 2.18 | .47 | .37 |
| 17 | .07 | - | .40 | 2.49 |
| 18 | - | - | .03 | .02 |
| 19 | - | .16 | - | - |
| 20 |  |  | - | .05 |

Table XV (Continued)

| A Summary of | Average Child Audience in the Wichita DynaScope Study: |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Morning | Afternoon | Evening | Combined |
| Week 1: | . 66 | . 72 | . 79 | . 75 |
| Week 2: | . 70 | . 65 | . 73 | . 70 |
| Avg。/Week: | . 68 | . 69 | . 76 | . 73 |


| Eamily | Average Child Audience |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Mornina | Afternoon | Evening | Combined |
| Wichita |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | . 82 | . 43 | . 69 | . 63 |
| 2 | . 63 | . 87 | . 58 | . 70 |
| 3 | 1.15 | . 59 | . 55 | . 60 |
| 4 | . 83 | 1.27 | 1.20 | 1.18 |
| 5 | . 52 | . 47 | . 71 | . 59 |
| 6 | 1.51 | 1.11 | . 96 | . 98 |
| 7 | . 03 | . 12 | . 14 | . 12 |
| 8 | 1.65 | . 50 | 1.34 | 1.20 |
| 9 | . 47 | . 36 | . 27 | . 34 |
| 10 | . 96 | 1.03 | 1.18 | 1.13 |
| 11 | . 24 | . 85 | . 55 | . 63 |
| 12 | . 85 | . 88 | 1.04 | . 94 |
| 13 | . 88 | . 86 | 1.44 | 1.26 |
| 14 | 1.57 | 1.23 | . 68 | . 89 |
| 15 | - | . 24 | . 31 | . 29 |
| 16 | 1.33 | 1.93 | 1.51 | 1.67 |
| 17 | 1.06 | . 30 | . 63 | . 67 |
| 18 | . 13 | . 56 | . 53 | . 52 |
| 19 | . 74 | . 66 | . 49 | . 55 |
| 20 | . 69 | . 76 | 1.06 | . 90 |
| 21 | . 46 | . 80 | 1.25 | . 92 |
| 22 | . 76 | . 43 | . 68 | . 60 |
| 23 | . 84 | 1.23 | 1.48 | 1.23 |
| 24 | . 69 | . 90 | 1.69 | 1.21 |
| 25 | . 11 | . 01 | . 03 | . 03 |
| 26 | - | - | - | - |
| 27 | - | - | - | - |
| 28 | .71 | . 71 | . 48 | . 58 |
| 29 | . 07 | . 37 | . 41 | . 37 |
| 30 | - | . 63 | . 65 | . 64 |

Table XV (Continued)

| A Summary of | Average Ch Morning | Audience - in Afternoon | ulsa Dyna <br> Evening | Study: <br> Combined |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Week 1: | . 45 | . 66 | . 60 | . 60 |
| Week 2: | . 51 | . 56 | . 59 | . 57 |
| Avg./Week: | . 48 | . 60 | . 59 | . 59 |
| Average Child Audience |  |  |  |  |
| Family | Morning | Afternoon | Evening | Combined |
| Tulsa |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | . 40 | 1.12 | 1.07 | 1.08 |
| 2 | - | . 56 | . 01 | . 02 |
| 3 | - | . 12 | . 17 | . 17 |
| 4 | - |  |  | - |
| 5 | - | . 27 | . 52 | . 48 |
| 6 | . 33 | . 41 | . 36 | . 38 |
| 7 | 1.34 | . 75 | . 33 | . 61 |
| 8 | . 83 | 1.41 | 1.55 | 1.49 |
| 9 | . 20 | . 05 | - | . 03 |
| 10 | . 44 | . 24 | . 32 | . 31 |
| 11 | - | . 12 | . 15 | . 14 |
| 12 | - | - | . 01 | . 01 |
| 13 | - | - | - | - |
| 14 | . 72 | 1.10 | 1.19 | 1.16 |
| 15 | . 44 | . 63 | . 75 | . 68 |
| 16 | - | - | - | - |
| 17 | - | - | - | - |
| 18 | . 71 | . 52 | . 47 | . 51 |
| 19 | . 94 | 1.21 | 1.19 | 1.16 |
| 20 | . 35 | . 13 | . 53 | . 40 |
| 21 | . 92 | . 89 | . 36 | . 43 |
| 22 | - | 1.58 | 1.32 | 1.41 |
| 23 | - | . 58 | . 63 | . 62 |
| 24 | . 30 | . 44 | . 60 | . 51 |
| 25 | 1.31 | 1.39 | . 72 | . 88 |
| 26 | - | . 81 | . 69 | . 73 |
| 27 | . 86 | . 79 | . 83 | . 82 |
| 28 | . 61 | . 42 | . 52 | . 48 |
| 29 | 1.02 | 1.28 | . 85 | . 95 |
| 30 | . 50 | . 53 | . 52 | . 52 |

Table XV (Continued)

| AVERAGE CHILID AUDIENCE |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Morning | Afternoon | Evening | Combined |
| Week 1: S-1 | . 79 | . 79 | . 59 | . 66 |
| S-2 | 1.11 | . 49 | . 40 | . 51 |
| W | . 66 | . 72 | . 79 | . 75 |
| I | . 45 | . 66 | . 60 | . 60 |
| Week 2: S-1 | . 56 | . 75 | . 51 | . 55 |
| S-2 | 1.13 | . 35 | . 36 | . 45 |
| W | . 70 | . 65 | . 73 | . 70 |
| I | . 51 | . 56 | . 59 | . 57 |
| Avg./Week: S-1 | . 69 | . 77 | . 55 | . 62 |
| S-2 | 1.16 | . 43 | . 38 | . 48 |
| W | . 68 | . 69 | . 76 | . 73 |
| T | . 48 | . 60 | . 59 | . 59 |
| Average for Eour Studies |  |  |  |  |
| Week 1: | . 72 | . 67 | . 63 | . 65 |
| Week 2: | . 69 | . 59 | . 59 | . 60 |
| Average Child Audience Per Week - Four Studies |  |  |  |  |
|  | Morning | Afternoon | Evening | Combined |
|  | . 71 | . 63 | . 61 | . 63 |

average child audience for the second week was .75 of a child during the afternoon in the Stillwater-1961 study.

## TABLE XVI

AVERAGE CHILD AUDIENCE - A SUMMARY

Iime Pexiod
Marming:
Afternoon:
Evening:
Total Days

## Average Audience

.71 of a child
.63
.61
.63

Average ${ }^{\text {en }}$ Attentive ${ }^{00}$ Child Audience

Calculation of the average "attentive" child audience, like that of the average child audience, was done by dividing the total number of Mattentive child viewer-minutes by the number of minutes sets were in use 。

The average "attentive child audience was similar for all three periods, the averages differing by no more than .04 of a child per minute in any of the time peziods. (Table XVII Summary.)

The average "attentive ${ }^{\infty}$ child audience for the morning period was . 42 of a child per minute, compared to the average child audience for the same period of 71 . For approximately 59 percent of the average audience time, the child viewer was "attentive ${ }^{\infty}$ in the morning.

The afternoon time period showed a slight drop in the average "attentive ${ }^{40}$ child audience to 40 of a child per minute. The average child audience, however, dropped comparatively more for this time period, making the average wattentive child audience 63.5 percent of the average child audience.

In the evening, the "attentive child audience dropped again, by

TABLE XV
AVERAGE "ATTENTIVE* CHILD AUDIENCE

| A Summary of the DynaScope Study: | Average "Attentive" Child |  | Audience in th | Stillwater-1961 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Morning | Afterneon | Evening | Combined |
| Week 1: | . 54 | . 54 | . 36 | . 42 |
| Week 2: | . 33 | . 43 | . 35 | . 36 |
| Avg./Week: | . 44 | . 48 | . 36 | . 39 |

Family Morning Average wAttentive Child Audience Combined

| Stillwater-1961 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | .21 | .44 | .15 | .17 |
| 2 | .48 | .73 | .79 | .74 |
| 3 | .42 | .36 | .25 | .33 |
| 4 | .41 | .24 | .22 | .26 |
| 5 | .29 | .28 | .09 | .20 |
| 6 | .51 | .46 | .14 | -29 |
| 7 | .07 | - | - | -45 |
| 8 | 1.26 | .91 | .17 | .47 |
| 9 | .19 | .47 | .36 | .30 |
| 10 | .55 | .54 | .26 | .94 |
| 11 | .67 | .67 | 1.10 | .28 |
| 12 | .48 | .18 | .27 | .52 |
| 13 | .02 | .34 | .85 | .30 |
| 14 | .55 | .54 | .29 | .48 |
| 15 |  | .59 | .42 |  |

Table XVII (Continued)

A Summary of the Average "Attentive" Child Audience in the Stillwater-1962 DynaSeope Study:

| Morning | Afternoon | Evening | Combined |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| .49 | .23 | .22 | .26 |
| .57 | .24 | .19 | .24 |
| .53 | .24 | .20 | .25 |


| Family | Average "Attentive" Child Audience |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Morning | Afternoon | Evering | Combined |
| Stillwater-1962 |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | . 60 | . 38 | . 11 | . 15 |
| 2 | - | . 15 | . 11 | . 12 |
| 3 | . 12 | . 06 | . 09 | . 09 |
| 4 | - | - | - | - |
| 5 | - | . 02 | - | . 01 |
| 6 | - | . 45 | . 88 | . 66 |
| 7 | . 35 | . 15 | . 14 | . 17 |
| 8 | . 41 | . 22 | . 27 | . 28 |
| 9 | - | - | - | - |
| 10 | - | . 16 | . 21 | . 16 |
| 11 | . 44 | . 18 | . 36 | . 32 |
| 12 | 1.14 | 1.14 | . 80 | . 91 |
| 13 | - | . 06 | . 06 | . 05 |
| 14 | . 97 | . 10 | . 06 | . 13 |
| 15 | . 16 | . 07 | . 24 | . 18 |
| 16 | . 11 | . 26 | . 32 | . 25 |
| 17 | 3.30 | 1.33 | . 32 | 1.27 |
| 18 | . 05 | - | . 02 | . 02 |
| 19 | - | - | - |  |
| 20 | - | . 09 | - | . 02 |

Table XVII (Continued)

| A Summary of Scope Study: | rage | * | nce in th |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Morning | Afternoon | Evening | Combined |
| Week 1: | . 42 | . 46 | . 51 | . 48 |
| Week 2: | . 47 | . 42 | . 46 | . 45 |
| Avg./Week: | . 44 | . 44 | . 49 | . 47 |


| Eami iv | Average "Attentive" Child Audience |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Mornina | Afternoon | Evening | Combined |
| Wi chita |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | . 72 | . 35 | . 55 | . 51 |
| 2 | . 58 | . 78 | . 49 | . 62 |
| 3 | . 67 | . 32 | . 26 | . 31 |
| 4 | . 68 | . 90 | . 84 | . 84 |
| 5 | . 28 | . 22 | . 30 | . 27 |
| 6 | 1.24 | . 82 | . 37 | . 52 |
| 7 | - | . 08 | . 12 | . 09 |
| 8 | 1.07 | . 22 | . 75 | . 56 |
| 9 | . 26 | . 14 | . 11 | . 15 |
| 10 | . 75 | . 65 | . 65 | . 66 |
| 11 | . 04 | . 29 | . 14 | . 18 |
| 12 | . 30 | . 36 | . 48 | . 40 |
| 13 | . 82 | . 74 | 1.25 | 1.09 |
| 14 | 1.30 | . 90 | . 43 | . 61 |
| 15 | - | . 22 | . 28 | . 26 |
| 16 | 1.18 | 1.38 | . 92 | 1.15 |
| 17 | . 71 | . 13 | . 40 | . 42 |
| 18 | . 12 | . 46 | . 41 | . 41 |
| 19 | . 70 | . 64 | . 47 | . 53 |
| 20 | . 44 | . 55 | . 79 | . 65 |
| 21 | . 13 | . 28 | . 57 | . 37 |
| 22 | . 34 | . 15 | . 22 | . 21 |
| 23 | . 57 | . 85 | . 92 | . 81 |
| 24 | . 46 | . 68 | 1.34 | . 93 |
| 25 | . 01 | . 01 | - | . 01 |
| 26 | - | - | - | - |
| 27 | - | - | - | - |
| 28 | . 54 | . 42 | . 37 | . 40 |
| 29 | . 07 | . 27 | . 35 | . 30 |
| 30 | - | . 21 | . 12 | . 14 |

Table XVII (Continued)

A Summary of the Average "Attentive. Child Audience in the Tulsa DynaScope Study:

|  | Morning | Afterneen | Evening | Combined |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Week 1: | .30 | .41 | .39 | .39 |
| Week 2; | .34 | .34 | .35 | .34 |
| Avg./Week: | .32 | .37 | .37 | .37 |
|  |  |  |  |  |


| Eamily | Average "Attentive" Child Audience |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Morning | Afternoon | Evening | Combined |
| Tulsa |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | . 20 | . 45 | . 63 | . 55 |
| 2 | - | . 01 | - | - |
| 3 | - | . 06 | . 07 | . 07 |
| 4 | - | - | - | - |
| 5 | - | . 27 | . 40 | . 38 |
| 6 | . 26 | . 31 | . 23 | . 27 |
| 7 | 1.25 | . 64 | . 22 | . 50 |
| 8 | . 48 | . 88 | 1.02 | . 97 |
| 9 | . 05 | . 01 | - | . 01 |
| 10 | . 18 | . 05 | . 04 | . 06 |
| 11 | - | . 05 | . 12 | . 10 |
| 12 | - | - | . 01 | . 01 |
| 13 | - | - | - | - |
| 14 | . 39 | . 67 | . 61 | . 62 |
| 15 | . 38 | . 52 | . 65 | . 58 |
| 16 | - | - | - | - |
| 17 | - | - | - | - |
| - 18 | . 29 | . 25 | . 21 | . 23 |
| 19 | . 61 | . 82 | . 86 | . 81 |
| 20 | . 22 | . 04 | . 31 | . 23 |
| 21 | . 92 | . 71 | . 23 | . 30 |
| 22 | - | 1.40 | 1.08 | 1.19 |
| 23 | - | . 07 | . 25 | . 22 |
| 24 | .19 | . 26 | . 31 | . 28 |
| 25 | . 88 | . 52 | . 42 | . 49 |
| 26 | - | . 56 | . 53 | . 54 |
| 27 | . 67 | . 51 | . 51 | . 53 |
| 28 | . 27 | . 12 | . 18 | . 16 |
| 29 | . 86 | . 81 | . 65 | . 69 |
| 30 | . 41 | . 42 | . 27 | . 34 |

Table XVII (Continued)

| AVERAGE "ATTENTIVE" CHILD AUDIENCE <br> A Summary of Four DynaScope Studies |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Morning | Afternoon | Evening | Combined |
| Week 1: S-1 | . 54 | . 54 | . 36 | . 42 |
| S-2 | . 49 | . 23 | . 22 | . 26 |
| W | . 42 | . 46 | . 51 | . 48 |
| T | . 30 | . 41 | . 39 | . 39 |
| Week 2: S-1 | . 33 | . 43 | . 35 | . 36 |
| S-2 | . 57 | . 24 | . 19 | . 24 |
| W | . 47 | . 42 | . 46 | . 45 |
| I | . 34 | . 34 | . 35 | . 34 |
| Avg./Week: |  |  |  |  |
| S-1 | . 44 | . 48 | . 36 | . 39 |
| S-2 | . 53 | . 24 | . 20 | . 25 |
| W | . 44 | . 44 | . 49 | . 47 |
| T | . 32 | . 37 | . 37 | . 37 |
| Average for Four Studies: |  |  |  |  |
| Week 1: | . 42 | . 41 | . 40 | . 40 |
| Week 2: | . 41 | . 40 | . 36 | . 37 |
| Average Child "Attentiven Audience Per Week - Four Studies: |  |  |  |  |
|  | Morning | Afternoon | Evening | Combined |
|  | . 42 | . 40 | . 38 | . 39 |

.02 of a child, to .38 of a child per minute.
For all three time periods, the average "attentive" child audience was 039 of a child. While a child was in the audience about six minutes out of each ten the sets were in use, an "attentive" child was in the audience nearly fous minutes out of ten. On an individual basis, each child viewed "attentively only two minutes of each ten sets were in use.

The highest average ${ }^{\infty}$ attentive ${ }^{\infty}$ child audience occurred in one family in the morning period of the second week of the Stillwater-1962 study; the low was found in the same study during the evening period in another fami ly。

TABLE XVIII

## AVERAGE ${ }^{\infty}$ ATTENTIVE ${ }^{\text {® }}$ CHILD AUDIENCE - A SUMMARY

| Time Period | Average ${ }^{\infty}$ Attentive Child Audience | Percentage of Aver age Child Audience |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Morning: | . 42 of a child | $59 \%$ |
| Afternoon: | . 40 | 63 |
| Evening: | . 38 | 62 |
| Total Day: | . 39 | 63 |

## Average "Inattentive ${ }^{\text {P }}$ Child Audience

The ${ }^{\text {winattentive }}{ }^{\text {in }}$ child audience, calculated in the same manner as the other two child audience figures, represents that portion of the child audience which was in the television viewing area but engaged in some other activity. In most of the weekly averages for all studies, this figure was fairly consistent, ranging from .20 to .30 of a child per minute

The summary of the four DynaScope studies indicated that the morning period had the largest average "inattentive" child audience, as well

TABLE XIX
AVERAGE ${ }^{\text {oIN }}$ INATTENTIVE" GHILD AUDIENCE

A Summary of the Average "Inattentive" Child Audience in the Stillwater1961 DynaScope Study:
Morning Afternoon Evening Combined

| Week 1: | .25 | .25 | .23 | .24 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Week 2: | .23 | .32 | .16 | .19 |
| Avg。/Week: | .25 | .29 | .19 | .23 |


| Family | Averege ${ }^{\text {II }}$ nattentive ${ }^{\text {c Child Audience }}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Morning | Afternoon | Evening | Combined |
| Stillwa ter-1961 |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 1.01 | . 64 | . 55 | . 60 |
| 2 | . 20 | . 21 | . 21 | . 21 |
| 3 | . 06 | . 10 | . 04 | . 06 |
| 4 | . 40 | . 12 | . 13 | . 18 |
| 5 | . 40 | . 31 | . 23 | . 31 |
| 6 | . 14 | . 39 | . 15 | . 23 |
| 7 | - | - | - | - |
| 8 | . 87 | . 28 | . 46 | . 41 |
| 9 | . 47 | . 49 | . 28 | . 31 |
| 10 | . 12 | .31 | . 17 | . 19 |
| 11 | . 14 | . 41 | . 27 | . 32 |
| 12 | . 12 | . 19 | . 07 | . 09 |
| 13 | . 04 | . 24 | . 14 | . 14 |
| 14 | . 27 | . 29 | . 26 | . 26 |
| 15 | . 13 | . 30 | . 14 | . 19 |

Table XIX (Continued)

A Summary of the Average "Inattentive" Child Audience in the Stillwater1962 DynaScope Study:

|  | Morning | Afternoon | Evening | Combined |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Week 1: | .62 | .26 | .18 | .25 |
| Week 2: | .66 | .11 | .17 | .21 |
| Avg./Week: | .63 | .19 | .18 | .23 |


| Eamill | Average "Inattentive ${ }^{09}$ Child Audience |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Mozning | Afternoon | Evening | Combined |
| Stillwater-1962 |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | - | . 07 | . 10 | . 09 |
| 2 | - | . 04 | . 03 | . 03 |
| 3 | . 41 | . 35 | . 43 | . 40 |
| 4 | - | - | - | - |
| 5 | - | - | . 01 | - |
| 6 | . 02 | . 32 | . 29 | . 30 |
| 7 | . 04 | . 08 | . 01 | . 04 |
| 8 | . 24 | . 45 | . 34 | . 35 |
| 9 | - | - | - | - |
| 10 | . 13 | . 04 | . 15 | . 13 |
| 11 | . 49 | . 17 | . 77 | . 56 |
| 12 | . 07 | . 73 | . 68 | . 71 |
| 13 | - | - | - | - |
| 14 | . 16 | . 27 | . 10 | . 13 |
| 15 | . 22 | . 14 | . 26 | . 22 |
| 16 | . 04 | . 13 | . 15 | . 12 |
| 17 | 3.35 | . 75 | . 08 | 1.22 |
| 18 | . 02 | - | . 01 | - |
| 19 | - | - | - | - |
| 20 | - | . 07 | - | . 03 |

Table XIX (Continued)


| Family | Average "Inattentive" Child Audience |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Morning | Afternoon | Evening | Combined |
| Wichita |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | . 10 | . 08 | . 14 | . 12 |
| 2 | . 05 | . 09 | . 09 | . 08 |
| 3 | . 48 | . 27 | . 29 | . 29 |
| 4 | . 15 | . 37 | . 36 | . 34 |
| 5 | . 24 | . 25 | . 41 | . 32 |
| 6 | . 27 | . 29 | . 22 | . 24 |
| 7 | . 03 | . 04 | . 02 | . 03 |
| 8 | . 58 | . 28 | . 59 | . 46 |
| 9 | . 21 | . 22 | . 16 | . 19 |
| 10 | . 21 | . 38 | . 53 | . 47 |
| 11 | . 20 | . 56 | . 41 | . 45 |
| 12 | . 55 | . 52 | . 56 | . 54 |
| 13 | . 06 | . 12 | . 19 | . 17 |
| 14 | . 27 | . 33 | . 25 | . 28 |
| 15 | - | . 02 | . 03 | . 03 |
| 16 | . 15 | . 55 | . 59 | . 52 |
| 17 | . 35 | . 17 | . 23 | . 25 |
| 18 | . 01 | . 10 | . 12 | . 11 |
| 19 | . 04 | . 02 | . 02 | . 02 |
| 20 | . 25 | . 21 | . 27 | . 25 |
| 21 | . 33 | . 52 | . 68 | . 55 |
| 22 | . 42 | . 28 | . 46 | . 39 |
| 23 | . 27 | . 38 | . 56 | . 42 |
| 24 | . 23 | . 22 | . 35 | . 28 |
| 25 | . 10 | - | . 03 | . 02 |
| 26 | - | - | - | - |
| 27 | - | - | - | - |
| 28 | . 17 | . 29 | . 11 | . 18 |
| 29 | - | . 10 | . 06 | . 07 |
| 30 | - | . 42 | . 53 | . 50 |

Table XIX (Continued)


| Family | Average "Inattentive" Child Audience |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Morning | Afterneon | Evening | Combined |
| Tulsa |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | . 20 | . 67 | . 44 | . 53 |
| 2 | - | . 06 | . 01 | . 02 |
| 3 | - | . 06 | . 10 | . 10 |
| 4 | - | - | - | - |
| 5 | - | - | . 12 | . 10 |
| 6 | . 07 | . 10 | . 13 | . 11 |
| 7 | . 09 | . 11 | . 11 | . 11 |
| 8 | . 35 | . 53 | . 53 | . 52 |
| 9 | . 15 | . 04 | - | . 02 |
| 10 | . 26 | . 19 | . 28 | . 24 |
| 11 | - | . 07 | . 03 | . 04 |
| 12 | - | - | - | - |
| 13 | - | - | - | - |
| 14 | . 33 | . 43 | . 58 | . 54 |
| 15 | . 06 | . 11 | . 10 | . 10 |
| 16 | - | - | - | - |
| 17 | - | - | - | - |
| 18 | . 42 | . 27 | . 26 | . 28 |
| 19 | . 33 | . 39 | . 33 | . 35 |
| 20 | . 13 | . 09 | . 22 | . 17 |
| 21 |  | . 18 | . 13 | . 13 |
| 22 | - | . 18 | . 24 | . 22 |
| 23 | - | . 51 | . 38 | . 40 |
| 24 | . 11 | . 18 | . 29 | . 23 |
| 25 | . 43 | . 87 | . 30 | . 39 |
| 26 | - | . 25 | . 16 | . 19 |
| 27 | . 19 | . 28 | . 32 | . 29 |
| 28 | . 34 | . 30 | . 34 | . 32 |
| 29 | . 16 | . 47 | . 20 | . 24 |
| 30 | . 09 | . 11 | . 25 | . 18 |

Table XIX (Continued)

|  | AVERAGE "INATTENTIVE" CHILD AUDIENCE <br> A Summary of Four DynaScope Studies |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Moxning | Afternoon | Evening | Combined |
| Week 1: S-1 | . 25 | . 25 | . 23 | . 24 |
| S-2 | . 62 | . 26 | . 18 | . 25 |
| W | . 24 | . 26 | . 29 | . 27 |
| T | . 15 | . 24 | . 21 | . 22 |
| week 2: S-1 | . 23 | . 32 | . 16 | . 19 |
| S-2 | . 66 | . 11 | . 17 | . 21 |
| W | . 22 | . 23 | . 27 | . 25 |
| T | . 17 | . 22 | . 24 | . 22 |
| Avg./Week: |  |  |  |  |
| S-1 | . 25 | . 29 | . 19 | . 23 |
| S-2 | . 63 | . 19 | . 18 | . 23 |
| W | . 23 | . 25 | . 28 | . 26 |
| T | . 16 | . 23 | . 23 | . 22 |

Average for Four Studies:

| Week 1: | . 30 | . 26 | . 23 | . 25 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Week 2: | . 28 | . 19 | . 23 | . 23 |
| Average "Inattentive ${ }^{\text {N }}$ Child Audience Per Week - Four Studies: |  |  |  |  |
|  | Morning | Afternoon | Evening | Combined |
|  | . 29 | . 23 | . 23 | . 24 |

as the largest average "attentive" audience. For nearly three out of ten "set-in-use" minutes, there was an "inattentive" child in the television audience. (Table XIX Summary.)

The afternoon and evening audience figures were the same for the "inattentive" child. Of the .63 of a child per minute figure during the afternoon and the .61 of a child per minute during the evening, . 23 of a child made up the average "inattentive" child audience each minute.

The three periods combined produced an "inattentive" child audience of .24 of a child per minute. On the average, however, each child in the study spent about one minute in the "inattentive" audience for each ten minutes sets were in use.

TABLE XX

| AVERAGE "INATTENTIVE" CHILD AUDIENCE - A SUMMARY |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | Average "Inattentive" |
| Time Period | Percentage of Aver- |
|  | Child Audience |

Morning: . 29 of a child $41 \%$

Afternoon: . 23 27
Evening: .23 28
Total Day: . 24 28

Percentage of Time With a Teenager in the Audience

In this study, the teenage viewers ranged in age from those children who were attending junior high school up through 18 years. Percentage of time with a teenager in the audience was calculated on the basis of "setin -use" time for each family. Teenagers composed nearly 35 percent of the entire group of children in the four DynaScope studies.

Teenage viewers spent less time than any other group during the morning period, averaging about 7.80 percent of "set-in-use" time in the television audience. In the Stillwater-1961 study, teenagers were in the

FIGURE 6

## A COMPARISON OF THE CHILD AUDIENCE FOR AN AVERAGE MINUTE IN FOUR DYNASCOPE STUDIES

Average Child Audience Per Minute


TABLE XXI
PERCENTAGE OF TIME WITH A TEENAGER IN AUDIENCE

A Summary of Percentage of Time With A Teenager in the Audience in the Stillwater-1961 DynaScope Study:

|  | Merning | Afternoen | Evening | Combined |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Week 1: | 3.55 | 12.45 |  | 14.25 | 12.79 |
| Week 2: | 5.13 | 17.35 | 12.89 | 13.04 |  |
| Percentage/. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Week: | 4.29 | 15.00 | 13.78 | 12.91 |  |


| Family | Percientage of Time With A Teen in Audience |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Merning | Afternoon | Evening | Combined |
| Stillwater-1961 | , |  |  |  |
| 1 | - | - | - | - |
| 2 | 5.49 | . 19 | 8.15 | 6.45 |
| 3 | - | - | - | - |
| 4 | - | - | - | - |
| 5 | - | - | - | - |
| 6 | 34.27 | 31.94 | 9.86 | 19.72 |
| 7 | - | - | - | - |
| 8 | - | - | - | - |
| 9 | - | - | - | - |
| 10 | - | 1.55 | 1.26 | 1.29 |
| 11 | 54.93 | 67.47 | 109.93 | 93.83 |
| 12 | - | - | . 47 | . 37 |
| 13 | 25.13 | 19.09 | 57.73 | 33.28 |
| 14 | 1.69 | 54.37 | 29.05 | 29.79 |
| 15 | 17.65 | 10.89 | 13.93 | 13.13 |

Table XXI (Continued)

A Summary of Percentage of Time With a Teenager in the Audience in the Stillwater -1962 DynaScope Study:

|  | Morning | Afternoen | Evening | Combined |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Week 1: | 10.39 | 15.79 | 15.81 | 15.17 |
| Week 2: | 9.13 | 11.43 | 15.12 | 13.44 |
| Percentage/ Week: | 9.88 | 13.90 | 15.48 | 14.39 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Percen | of Tine Wit | een in th | ence |
| Eamily | Morning | Afternoon | Evening | Combined |
| Stillwater-1962 |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 60.00 | 8.37 | 2.65 | 3.59 |
| 2 | - | 18.62 | 13.97 | 15.05 |
| 3 | . 21 | - | . 09 | . 04 |
| 4 | - | . 53 | - | . 16 |
| 5 | - | . 21 | . 07 | . 11 |
| 6 | 18.87 | 37.82 | 49.23 | 43.18 |
| 7 | . 26 | 4.04 | . 95 | 1.71, |
| 8 | 64.66 | 67.49 | 60.83 | 62.91 |
| 9 | - | - | - | - |
| 10 | 12.99 | 21.55 | 36.06 | 28.93 |
| 11 | 18.47 | 3.68 | 2.51 | 4.71 |
| 12 | - | 95.62 | 45.59 | 54.66 |
| 13 | - | 6.17 | 5.76 | 5.21 |
| 14 | - | - | 2.08 | 1.30 |
| 15 | - | - | 50.43 | 40.00 |
| 16 | 5.78 | 17.85 | 21.55 | 16.67 |
| 17 | 26.92 | 27.90 | 39.37 | 33.01 |
| 18 | . 25 | . 08 | - | . 06 |
| 19 |  | - | - | - |
| 20 | - | - | . 06 | . 04 |

Table XXI (Continued)

A Summary of Percentage of Time with a Teenager in the Audience in the Wichita DynaScope Study:

|  | Morning | Afternoon | Evening | Combined |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Week 1: | 7.10 | 12.90 | 21.30 | 16.70 |
| Week 2: | 7.30 | 13.20 | 17.60 | 14.90 |
| Percentage/ <br> Week: | 7.20 | 13.10 | 19.50 | 15.80 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Percent | Ifime With | een in the | ence |
| Eamily | Morniog | Afternoen | Evening. | Combined |
| Wichita |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | - | - | - | - |
| 2 | - | . 10 | . 20 | . 10 |
| 3 | - | . 20 | . 10 | . 20 |
| 4 | 58.40 | 86.40 | 80.50 | 79.99 |
| 5 | 9.00 | . 10 | 10.90 | 6.30 |
| 6 | 64.30 | 53.40 | 26.50 | 34.60 |
| 7 | 43.00 | 13.90 | 24.00 | 21.80 |
| 8 | - | 10.00 | 13.30 | 10.10 |
| 9 | - | - | - | - |
| 10 | 26.70 | 57.30 | 59.20 | 56.60 |
| 11 | - | - | - | - |
| 12 | 8.20 | 20.90 | 37.30 | 25.50 |
| 13 | . 50 | - | 35.80 | 24.40 |
| 14 | 7.80 | 21.40 | 18.40 | 19.10 |
| 15 | - | 23.70 | 11.80 | 16.00 |
| 16 | 1.70 | . 70 | . 80 | . 80 |
| 17 | - | - | - | - |
| 18 | 10.30 | 55.20 | 49.40 | 49.90 |
| 19 | 74.40 | 65.90 | 49.20 | 54.90 |
| 20 | - | 1.20 | - | . 50 |
| 21 | 4.70 | 9.30 | 25.10 | 15.00 |
| 22 | 7.90 | - | . 30 | 1.40 |
| 23 | - | . 30 | - | .10 |
| 24 | 27.00 | 33.50 | 49.00 | 39.30 |
| 25 | - | - | . 10 | - |
| 26 | - | - | - | - |
| 27 | - | - | - | - |
| 28 | - | - | . 50 | . 30 |
| 29 | 6.60 | 34.30 | 36.20 | 33.70 |
| 30 | - | - | - | - |

Table XXI (Continued)

A Summary of Percentage of Time With a Teenager in the Audience in the Tulsa DynaScope Study:


Table XXI (Continued)

| PERCENTAGE OF TIME WITH A TEENAGER IN AUDIENCE <br> A Summary of Four DynaScope Studies |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Merning | Afternoon | Evening. | Combined |
| Week 1: S-1 | 3.55 | 12.45 | 14.52 | 12.79 |
| S-2 | 10.39 | 15.79 | 15.81 | 15.71 |
| W | 7.10 | 12.90 | 21.30 | 16.70 |
| T | 7.30 | 18.70 | 21.40 | 19.40 |
| Week 2: S-1 | 5.13 | 17.35 | 12.89 | 13.04 |
| S-2 | 9.13 | 11.43 | 15.12 | 13.44 |
| W | 7.30 | 13.20 | 17.60 | 14.90 |
| T | 10.40 | 14.80 | 23.10 | 19.20 |
| Percentage/ |  |  |  |  |
| S-1 | 4.29 | 15.00 | 13.78 | 12.91 |
| 5-2 | 9.88 | 13.90 | 15.48 | 14.39 |
| W | 7.20 | 13.10 | 19.50 | 15.80 |
| T | 9.10 | 16.60 | 22.20 | 19.30 |

Average for Four Studies:

| Week 1: | 7.27 | 14.94 | 19.31 | 16.79 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Week 2: | 8.32 | 13.85 | 18.27 | 15.78 |

Percentage/ Week for Four Studies:
 Morning Afternoon Evening Combined
$\begin{array}{lll}7.80 \% & 14.41 \% & 18.81 \% \\ \end{array}$
morning television audience only 3.55 percent of the time during Week 1 . (Table XXI Summaryo)

During the afternoon hours, the teenagers' time in the TV audience rose to 14.41 percent.

By evening, they were spending their greatest amount of time in front of the sets, 18.81 percent. During their heaviest viewing period, therefore, teenagers were in front of the television sets less than onefifth of the "set-in-use" time.

In summary, the teenage viewers were in the TV audience 16.31 percent of the total "set-in-use" time. Weekly summary figures for this group were particularly stable, increasing or decreasing by only one percent.

TABLE XXII
PERCENTAGE OF TImE WITH A TEENAGER IN THE AUDIENCE - A SUMMARY

| Time Peried | Percentage_of "Set-in-Use" Time |
| :--- | :---: |
|  | $7.80 \%$ |
| Morternoon: | 14.41 |
| Evening: | 18.81 |
| Total Day: | 16.31 |

Percentage of Time with a Gradeschooler in the Audience

As used in all DynaScope studies, the gradeschooler group includes those children attending school from grades one through six. Thrity-one percent of the children in the four DynaScope studies were of gradeschoolage.

The morning viewing period figures for gradeschool children indicate that they viewed television about 16 percent of the time that their television sets were turned on. This was about double the amount of time

TABLE XXIII
PERCENTAGE OF TIME WITH A GRADESCHOOLER IN AUUDIENCE

A Summary of Percentage of Time With a Gradeschooler in the Audience in the Stillwater-1961 DynaScope Study:

|  | Morning | Afternoon | Evening | Combined |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | ---: | :---: |
|  |  | 22.23 | 22.94 | 10.68 |
| Week 1: | 12.04 | 15.80 | 15.28 | 18.57 |
| Week 2: |  |  |  | 15.03 |
| Percentage/ | 17.40 | 19.24 | 15.96 | 16.85 |
| Week: |  |  |  |  |


| Eamily $\quad$ Percentage of Time With a Gradeschooler in Audience |
| ---: |
| Morning_ Afternoon Evening Combined |


| Stillwater-1961 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | - | -29 | .25 |  |
| 2 | 41.91 | 72.73 | 71.09 | 68.07 |
| 3 | - | -65 | .29 |  |
| 4 | 40.26 | 24.45 | 21.64 | 25.49 |
| 5 | 4.45 | -34 | - | 1.39 |
| 6 | - | - | - | - |
| 7 | - | - | 15.28 | 43.38 |
| 8 | 45.62 | 93.27 | 29.88 | 36.36 |
| 9 | 95.65 | 40.71 | 24.59 | 29.04 |
| 10 | 19.40 | 52.26 | - | - |
| 11 | - | 17.89 | 28.67 | 27.17 |
| 12 | 67.21 | 15.03 | 26.89 | 18.63 |
| 13 | 22.90 | - | - | - |
| 14 | - | 2.83 | - | .91 |

Table XXIII (Continued)

A Summary of Percentage of Time With a Gradeschooler in the Audience in the Stillwater-1962 DynaScope Study:

|  | Morning | Afternoon | Eyening | Combined |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Week 1: | 7.37 | 10.73 | 13.86 | 11.96 |
| Week 2: | 3.41 | 7.33 | 14.14 | 11.13 |
| Percentage/ Week: | 5.68 | 9.25 | 13.84 | 11.58 |

Eamily - Percentage of Time With a Gradeschooler in Audience Stillwater-1962

| 1 | - | 36.95 | 18.71 | 20.62 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 2 | - | - | - |  |
| 3 | .04 | 3.37 | 1.46 | 1.74 |
| 4 | - | - | - | - |
| 5 | - | - | - |  |
| 6 | -13 | 39.09 | 67.89 | 52.76 |
| 7 | - | .07 | .13 | .11 |
| 8 | - | - | .08 | .05 |
| 9 | - | - | - | - |
| 10 | 44.13 | 22.24 | 57.00 | 45.55 |
| 11 | 80.13 | 72.39 | 87.59 | 84.19 |
| 12 | - | - | - | $-\overline{7}$ |
| 13 | - | - | .13 | .08 |
| 14 | 9.24 | 20.77 | 25.13 | 20.03 |
| 15 | .66 | .08 | .36 | .33 |
| 16 | - | - | 2.65 | 1.24 |
| 17 | - | - | - |  |
| 18 | - | 16.37 | .51 | 4.61 |

Table XXIII (Continued)

A Summary of Percentage of Time With a Gradeschooler in the Audience in the Wichita DynaScope Study:

|  | Morning | Afternoen | Evening | Combined |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Week 1: | 22.80 | 23.90 | 25.60 | 24.70 |
| Week 2: | 20.00 | 22.30 | 25.30 | 23.60 |
| Percentage/ Week: | 21.50 | 23.10 | 25.50 | 24.20 |
|  | -Percentage of Time With a Gradeschooler in Audience |  |  |  |
| Eamily | Mornina | Afterneon | Evening | Combined |
| Wichita |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 82.50 | 42.90 | 68.80 | 63.00 |
| 2 | 16.80 | 36.20 | 26.20 | 28.00 |
| 3 | - | . 10 | . 20 | . 10 |
| 4 | . 20 | 3.90 | . 60 | 1.30 |
| 5 | 32.80 | 31.60 | 19.20 | 26.10 |
| 6 | 84.30 | 46.20 | 31.30 | 37.60 |
| 7 | - | - | - | - |
| 8 | 67.90 | 10.90 | 63.00 | 42.20 |
| 9 | - | - | - | - |
| 10 | - | - | - | - |
| 11 | - | - | - | - |
| 12 | 58.60 | 57.40 | 59.70 | 58.60 |
| 13 | 74.50 | 76.00 | 72.90 | 73.80 |
| 14 | 54.80 | 42.10 | 17.70 | 26.70 |
| 15 | - | . 20 | - | . 10 |
| 16 | 39.50 | 56.60 | 60.00 | 56.20 |
| 17 | 1.50 | - | - | . 30 |
| 18 | - | - | - | - |
| 19 | - | - | - | - |
| 20 | 6.10 | 17.60 | 46.10 | 29.40 |
| 21 | 9.40 | 45.50 | 67.20 | 48.30 |
| 22 |  | . 10 | . 70 | . 40 |
| 23 | 8.80 | 36.70 | 73.50 | 44.30 |
| 24 | 28.30 | 37.10 | 81.80 | 54.80 |
| 25 | - | - | - | - |
| 26 | - | - | - | - |
| 27 | - | - | - | - |
| 28 | 71.40 | 56.20 | 47.20 | 51.50 |
| 29 | - | - | - | - |
| 30 | - | . 20 | - | . 10 |

Table XXIII (Continued)

A Summary of Percentage of Time With a Gradeschooler in the Audience in the Tulsa DynaScope Study:

|  | Morning | Afternoon | Evening | Combined |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Week 1: | 6.40 | 17.80 | 18.30 | 17.10 |
| Week 2: | 17.80 | 12.60 | 14.80 | 14.50 |
| Percentage/ Week: | 13.00 | 15.10 | 16.60 | 15.60 |
|  | Percentage of Iime With a Gradeschooler in Audience |  |  |  |
| Family | Morning | Afternoon | Evening | Combined |
| Tulsa |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | - | . 10 | . 10 | . 10 |
| 2 | - | 4.10 | 1.50 | 1.70 |
| 3 | - | - | - | - |
| 4 | - | - | - | - |
| 5 | - | - | - | - |
| 6 | .20 | . 40 | . 20 | . 30 |
| 7 | - | . 20 | - | . 10 |
| 8 | 25.00 | 38.60 | 46.90 | 44.50 |
| 9 | - | - | - | - |
| 10 | - | - | - | - |
| 11 | - | 9.30 | 12.90 | 11.40 |
| 12 | - | - | - | - |
| 13 | - | - | - |  |
| 14 | - | - | - | - |
| 15 | . 10 | - | - | - |
| 16 | - | - | - | - |
| 17 | - | - | - |  |
| 18 | - | . 10 | - | - |
| 19 | 54.00 | 69.20 | 71.40 | 68.00 |
| 20 | 35.50 | 11.10 | 51.20 | 39.00 |
| 21 | - | - | 6.20 | 5.30 |
| 22 | - | 89.10 | 71.00 | 77.10 |
| 23 | - | 1.60 | 30.40 | 25.60 |
| 24 | 25.40 | 38.90 | 52.00 | 43.70 |
| 25 | 38.50 | 29.90 | 24.30 | 26.70 |
| 26 | - | 60.50 | 47.10 | 51.90 |
| 27 | 27.80 | 10.90 | 19.90 | 19.00 |
| 28 | - | - - | - | - |
| 29 | 66.70 | 86.50 | 45.40 | 53.00 |
| 30 | - | 11.30 | - | 3.00 |

Table XXIII (Continued)

PERCENTAGE OF TIME WITH A GRADESCHOOLER IN AUDIENCE
A Summary of Four DynaScope Studies

|  | Morning | Afternoon | Evening | Combined |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Week 1: S-1 | 22.23 | 22.94 | 10.68 | 18.57 |
| S-2 | 7.37 | 10.73 | 13.56 | 11.96 |
| W | 22.80 | 23.90 | 25.60 | 24.70 |
| T | 6.40 | 17.80 | 18.30 | 17.10 |
| Week 2: S-1 | 12.04 | 15.80 | 15.28 | 15.03 |
| S-2 | 3.41 | 7.33 | 14.14 | 11.13 |
| W | 20.00 | 22.30 | 25.30 | 23.60 |
| I | 17.80 | 12.60 | 14.80 | 14.50 |
| Avg./Week: S-1 | 17.40 | 19.24 | 15.96 | 16.85 |
| S-2 | 5.68 | 9.25 | 13.84 | 11.58 |
| W | 21.50 | 23.10 | 25.50 | 24.20 |
| I | 13.00 | 15.10 | 16.60 | 15.80 |

Average Per Week for Four Studies:

| Week 1: | 15.58 | 19.72 | 18.83 | 19.29 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Week 2: | 15.66 | 16.42 | 18.41 | 17.49 |

Eesoentage/ Week for Four Studies:
Morning Afternoon Evening Combined
spent by teenage viewers. The variation for the morning period, however, was great. Percentage of time with a gradeschooler in the morning audience ranged from 3.41 percent in the Stillwater-1962 study to 22.80 percent in the Tulsa study. (Table XXIII Summary.)

In the afternoon, percentage of time with a gradeschooler in the audience increased very little compared to that for the teenagers. Gradeschoolers were found in the audience about 18 percent of the time.

Average amount of time with a gradeschooler in the evening audience totaled 18.63 percent, only about one half of one percent increase over the afternoon viewing period.

The combined total time with a gradeschooler in the audience was similar to the afternoon and evening periods, with 18.44 percent of "setin -use time. The Week 1 and Week 2 summary figures for this group were very close.

TABLE XXIV
PERCENTAGE OF TIME WITH A GRADESCHOOLER IN THE AUDIENCE

- A SUMMARY

Iime Period
Morning:
Afternoon:
Evening:
Total Day:

Percentage of "Set-in-Use" Time
$15.62 \%$
18.11
18.63
18.44

Percentage of Time With a Preschooler in the Audience

The preschooler audience in these DynaScope studies was composed of children from one year to the gradeschool-age child, generally six years old. In only a few cases, the children were as young as one or two years. Thizty-four percent of the children in the audience studied by DynaScope were preschool children.

TABLE XXV
PERCENTAGE OF TIME WITH A PRESCHOOLER IN AUDIENCE

A Summary of Percentage of Time With a Preschooler in the Audience in the Stiliwater-1961 DynaScope Study:

|  | Maxning | Afternoon | Evening | Combined |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Week 1: | 25.58 | 18.44 | 5.27 | 10.34 |
| Week 2: | 15.86 | 9.84 | 6.43 | 8.32 |
| Percentage / Week: | 22.56 | 13.97 | 5.83 | 9.15 |
|  | Percenta | Time With | schooler | dience |
| Family | Mornina | Afternoon | Evening | Combined |
| Stilliwater-1961 |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 21.18 | 43.75 | 14.43 | 16.79 |
| 2 | - | - | - | - |
| 3 | 41.87 | 36.25 | 24.11 | 33.21 |
| 4 | - | - | - | - |
| 5 | 25.41 | 27.64 | 9.33 | 19.31 |
| 6 | 16.85 | 14.21 | 4.33 | 8.88 |
| 7 | - | - | - | - |
| 8 | - | - | - | - |
| 9 | 30.79 | 16.13 | 6.24 | 10.09 |
| 10 | - | - | - | - |
| 11 | - | - | - | - |
| 12 | - | - | - | - |
| 13 | - | - | - | - |
| 14 | - | - | - | - |
| 15 | 37.75 | 45.40 | 28.01 | 34.11 |

Tabie XXV (Continued)

A Summary of Percentage of Time with a Preschooler in the Audience in the Stillwater-1962 DynaScope Study:


| Stillwater-1962 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | - | - | - | - |
| 2 | - | - | - | - |
| 3 | 52.40 | 38.11 | 50.13 | 47.06 |
| 4 | - | - | - | - |
| 5 | - | - | - | - |
| 6 | - | .06 | -03 |  |
| 7 | 56.57 | 33.60 | 31.64 | 35.83 |
| 8 | - | - | - | - |
| 9 | - | - | - | - |
| 10 | 30.41 | - | 53.61 | 38.16 |
| 11 | 41.06 | 24.41 | 14.97 | 18.98 |
| 12 | 112.50 | - | -17 | .11 |
| 13 | - | 28.38 | 15.74 | 26.26 |
| 14 | 737.79 | 189.92 | - | -13 |

Table XXV (Continued)

A Summary of Percentage of Time With a Preschooler in the Audience in the Wichita DynaScope Study:

|  | Morning | Afternoon | Evening | Combined |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Week 1: | 27.90 | 23.70 | 19.40 | 21.90 |
| Week 2: | 32.30 | 20.90 | 18.50 | 20.90 |
| Percentage/ Week: | 30.00 | 22.30 | 19.00 | 21.40 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Percentag | Time With a | chooler i | ience |
| Family | Morning | Afternoon | Evening | Combined |
| Wichita |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | - | - | . 20 | . 10 |
| 2 | 41.40 | 45.80 | 27.00 | 37.30 |
| 3 | 90.50 | 43.60 | 39.80 | 45.00 |
| 4 | - | - | - | - |
| 5 | . 40 | 8.50 | 19.80 | 12.50 |
| 6 | - | - | - | - |
| 7 | 3.30 | 1.90 | . 60 | 1.50 |
| 8 | 53.40 | 24.60 | 46.50 | 38.30 |
| 9 | 40.60 | 31.60 | 24.50 | 30.20 |
| 10 | 69.80 | 32.60 | 42.30 | 41.50 |
| 11 | 22.70 | 71.60 | 48.80 | 55.60 |
| 12 | - | - | - | - |
| 13 | - | - | - | - |
| 14 | 94.00 | 59.20 | 29.10 | 40.70 |
| 15 | - | - | - | - |
| 16 | 53.40 | 64.00 | 37.90 | 51.10 |
| 17 | 73.00 | 24.80 | 44.80 | 47.10 |
| 18 | - | - | - | - |
| 19 | - | - | . 20 | . 20 |
| 20 | 55.00 | 47.00 | 38.30 | 43.90 |
| 21 | 21.90 | 6.00 | 1.60 | 6.90 |
| 22 | 67.60 | 39.30 | 66.90 | 57.10 |
| 23 | 70.00 | 61.90 | 41.20 | 55.90 |
| 24 | . 70 | 2.00 | 7.20 | 4.10 |
| 25 | 8.50 | 1.00 | 1.90 | 220 |
| 26 | - | - | - | - |
| 27 | - | - | - | - |
| 28 | - | . 30 | - | . 10 |
| 29 | - | - | - | - |
| 30 | - | 62.50 | 64.90 | 64.30 |

Table XXV (Continued)

A Summary of Percentage of Time With a Preschooler in the Audience in the Tulsa DynaScope Study:

|  | Morning | Afternoon | Evening | Combined |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | ---: | :---: |
| Week 1: | 24.30 | 17.80 | 10.70 | 13.80 |
| Week 2: | 18.90 | 18.70 | 11.70 | 14.60 |
| Percentage/ |  |  |  |  |
| Week: | 21.10 | 18.30 | 11.20 | 14.20 |

Eamily - Morcentage of Time With a Preschooler in Audience

Tulsa

| 1 | - | - | . 10 | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | - | - | - | - |
| 3 | - | 6.30 | 5.50 | 5.50 |
| 4 | - | - | - | - |
| 5 | - | - | - | - |
| 6 | 32.40 | 33.50 | 21.50 | 27.80 |
| 7 | 94.10 | 54.10 | 24.10 | 43.80 |
| 8 | - | 8.30 | 19.80 | 17.00 |
| 9 | - | . 40 | - | . 20 |
| 10 | 43.80 | 23.20 | 30.60 | 29.50 |
| 11 | - | 2.30 | 2.10 | 2.10 |
| 12 | - | - | . 60 | . 60 |
| 13 | - | - | - | - |
| 14 | - | - | - | - |
| 15 | - | . 10 | . 50 | . 30 |
| 16 | - | - | - | - |
| 17 | - | - | - | - |
| 18 | 47.30 | 41.90 | 35.30 | 39.20 |
| 19 | 24.60 | 30.80 | 25.40 | 27.40 |
| 20 | - | - | - | - |
| 21 | - | - | . 30 | . 30 |
| 22 | - | 5.00 | . 20 | 1.80 |
| 23 | - | - | - | - |
| 24 | - | - | 1.40 | . 80 |
| 25 | - | - | - | - |
| 26 | - | 1.30 | - | . 50 |
| 27 | 49.80 | 42.30 | 36.20 | 39.20 |
| 28 | 46.00 | 32.00 | 31.90 | 33.30 |
| 29 | 5.80 | 8.60 | 13.20 | $12 \times 10$ |
| 30 | 48.70 | 40.80 | 51.30 | 48.00 |

Table XXV (Continued)

| percentage of time with a preschooler in the audience A Summary of Four DynaScope Studies |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Morning | Afternoon | Evening | Combined |
| Week 1: S-1 | 28.58 | 18.44 | 5.27 | 10.34 |
| S-2 | 93.67 | 22.00 | 10.22 | 23.69 |
| W | 27.90 | 23.70 | 19.40 | 21.90 |
| I | 24.30 | 17.80 | 10.70 | 13.80 |
| Week 2: S-1 | 15.86 | 9.84 | 6.43 | 8.32 |
| S-2 | 114.99 | 19.43 | 10.32 | 23.69 |
| W | 32.30 | 20.90 | 18.50 | 20.90 |
| T | 18.90 | 18.70 | 11.70 | 14.60 |
| Avg./Week: |  |  |  |  |
| S-1 | 22.56 | 13.97 | 5.83 | 9.15 |
| S-2 | 102.79 | 20.88 | 10.27 | 23.69 |
| W | 30.00 | 22.30 | 19.00 | $21 \div 40$ |
| I | 21.10 | 18.30 | 11.20 | 14.20 |
| Averege Per Week for Four Studies: |  |  |  |  |
| Week 1: | 40.52 | 22.61 | 12.81 | 18.87 |
| Week 2: | 37.96 | 18.71 | 9.16 | 17.60 |
| Percentagel Week for Four Studies: |  |  |  |  |
|  | Morning | Afternoon | Evening | Combined |
|  | 39.23\% | 20.06\% | 11.07\% | 18.26\% |

Spending a far greater amount of time than either of the other two child groups, the gradeschoolers were in the morning television audience for nearly 40 percent of the time. These percentages varied tremendously, from 15.86 to 114.99 , the latter due to the greater than average multiplechild audience which occurred in the Stillwater-1962 study because of the nunsery school. (Table XXV Summary.)

During the afternoon period, the preschoolers were in the television audience only a little more than gradeschoolers, with an average of 20.06 percent of ${ }^{0}$ set-in-use ${ }^{*}$ time.

By evening, the preschoolers time in the television audience dropped to nearly one-fourth of their morning viewing, or 11.07 percent. Earlier bed time for the preschoolers is, of course, the most probable explanation for the low percentage.

For all thee periods, the total amount of viewing recorded for the preschool group was about the same as for the other two groups. Preschoolers viewed about 18.26 percent of total ${ }^{* 1}$ set-in-use" time, slightly less than the gradeschoolers and somewhat greater than the amount of time the teenage audience was viewing.

TABLE XXVI

PERCENTAGE OF TIME WITH A PRESCHOOLER IN THE AUDIENCE

- A SUMMARY

Time Period
Percentage of "Set-in-Use" Time

Morning:
Afternoon:
Evening:
Total Day:
$39.23 \%$
20.06
11.07
18.26

Percentage of Time With a Child in the Audience

In the four DynaScope studies, children were found in the morning television audience 70.79 percent of the time sets were in use. (Table XXVII Summary.) Preschool-age children alone formed more than half of the entire child viewing group for the morning period.

During the afternoon, the percentage of time with a child in the audience dropped about eight percent to 62.77. The preschool-age child was again viewing for a greater percentage of "set-in-use" time than either teenagers or gradeschool children.

Evening showed another small decline in child-audience time to 61.09 percent. During this period, both gradeschoolers and teenagers were in the audience more than 18.50 percent of the time, while preschoolers were viewing for only 11.07 percent of the evening "set-in-use" time.

A total of the three time periods indicates that a child was in the television audience for nearly 63 percent of the entire "set-in-use" time.

TABLE XXVII
Percentage of Time With a Child in the Audience

Time Period Percentage of "Set-in-Use" Iime
Morning: $\quad 71 \%$

Afternoon: 63
Evening: 61
Total Day: 63

## Summa ry

Chapter IV has dealt with child audience patterns for both weeks in each of the 95 homes in the four DynaScope studies done in 1961-1963. The studies have provided data about the length of time that families which

## PERCENTAGE OF TIME WITH A CHILD IN AUDIENCE

A Summary of Percentage of Time with a Child in the Audience in the Stillwater-1961 DynaScope Study:

Morning Afternoon Evening Combined

| Week 1: | 79.92 | 78.98 | 59.04 | 65.67 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Week 2: | 56.16 | 75.35 | 51.26 | 57.45 |
| Percentage /   <br> Week: 68.66 77.09 |  |  |  |  |

Eamily Mexcentage of Iime With a Child in Audience

| Stillwater-1961 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 21.18 | 43.75 | 14.72 | 17.04 |
| 2 | 4.40 | 72.92 | 79.24 | 74.52 |
| 3 | 41.87 | 36.25 | 24.76 | 33.50 |
| 4 | 40.26 | 24.45 | 21.64 | 25.49 |
| 5 | 29.86 | 27.98 | 9.33 | 20.70 |
| 6 | 51.12 | 46.15 | 14.19 | 28.60 |
| 7 | - | - | - |  |
| 8 | 45.62 | 93.51 | 16.95 | 44.34 |
| 9 | 166.44 | 56.84 | 30.12 | 46.45 |
| 10 | 19.40 | 53.81 | 25.85 | 30.33 |
| 11 | 54.93 | 67.47 | 109.93 | 93.83 |
| 12 | 47.21 | 17.89 | 29.14 | 27.54 |
| 13 | 1.03 | 34.12 | 84.62 | 51.91 |
| 14 | 55.40 | 54.37 | 29.05 | 29.79 |
| 15 |  | 59.12 | 41.94 | 48.15 |

Table XXVIII (Continued)

A Summary of Percentage of Time With a Child in the Audience in the Stillwater-1962 DynaScope Study:

|  | Morning | Afternoon | Evening | Combined |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Week 1: | 91.93 | 48.53 | 39.56 | 50.81 |
| Week 2: | 122.97 | 35.31 | 38.32 | 46.51 |
| Percentage! Week: | 116.36 | 41.73 | 38.00 | 48.87 |
|  | Perce | of Time Wi | Child in | nce |
| Eami iv | Morning | Afternoon | Evening | Combined |
| Stillwater-1962 |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 60.00 | 45.32 | 21.36 | 24.21 |
| 2 | - | 18.62 | 13.97 | 15.05 |
| 3 | 52.65 | 41.48 | 51.61 | 48.84 |
| 4 | - | . 53 | - | . 16 |
| 5 | - | . 21 | . 07 | . 11 |
| 6 | 18.87 | 76.97 | 117.12 | 105.97 |
| 7 | 56.96 | 37.71 | 32.72 | 37.65 |
| 8 | 64.66 | 67.49 | 60.91 | 62.96 |
| 9 | - | - | - | - |
| 10 | 12.99 | 21.55 | 36.30 | 29.08 |
| 11 | 93.01 | 35.11 | 113.12 | 88.42 |
| 12 | 121.19 | 192.42 | 148.15 | 157.83 |
| 13 | - | 6.70 | 5.93 | 5.32 |
| 14 | 112.50 | 28.32 | 17.95 | 27.64 |
| 15 | 38.33 | 21.49 | 50.43 | 40.00 |
| 16 | 15.02 | 38.62 | 46.81 | 36.76 |
| 17 | 765.37 | 217.90 | 39.73 | 248.44 |
| 18 | 7.44 | . 08 | 2.72 | 2.26 |
| 19 | - | - | - | - |
| 20 | - | 16.37 | . 56 | 4.65 |

Table XXVIII (Continued)

A Summary of Percentage of Time With a Child in the Audience in the Wichita DynaScope Study:

|  | Morning | Afternoon |  | Evening | Combined |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Week 1: | 57.90 | 60.40 | 66.20 | 63.20 |  |
| Week 2: | 59.60 | 56.40 | 61.50 | 59.40 |  |
| Percentage/ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Week: | 58.70 | 58.50 | 64.00 | 61.40 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Eamily | Pefcentage of Time With a Child in Audience |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Morning | Afternoon | Evening | Combined |
| Wichita |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 82.50 | 42.90 | 68.90 | 63.10 |
| 2 | 58.20 | 82.00 | 53.40 | 65.50 |
| 3 | 90.50 | 43.90 | 40.20 | 45.30 |
| 4 | 58.60 | 90.30 | 81.00 | 81.20 |
| 5 | 42.20 | 40.20 | 49.90 | 44.90 |
| 6 | 148.70 | 99.70 | 57.70 | 72.20 |
| 7 | 3.30 | 11.90 | 13.90 | 11.60 |
| 8 | 164.30 | 49.50 | 133.50 | 102.30 |
| 9 | 40.60 | 31.60 | 24.50 | 30.20 |
| 10 | 96.50 | 89.90 | 101.50 | 98.10 |
| 11 | 22.70 | 71.60 | 48.80 | 55.60 |
| 12 | 66.80 | 78.30 | 97.00 | 84.10 |
| 13 | 75.10 | 76.00 | 108.60 | 98.10 |
| 14 | 156.60 | 122.60 | 65.10 | 86.50 |
| 15 | - | 23.90 | 18.90 | 20.70 |
| 16 | 94.60 | 121.30 | 98.70 | 108.10 |
| 17 | 74.50 | 24.80 | 44.80 | 47.30 |
| 18 | 10.30 | 55.20 | 49.60 | 50.10 |
| 19 | 74.40 | 65.90 | 49.30 | 54.90 |
| 20 | 61.10 | 65.70 | 84.40 | 73.80 |
| 21 | 36.10 | 60.80 | 93.90 | 70.10 |
| 22 | 75.60 | 39.40 | 68.00 | 58.90 |
| 23 | 78.80 | 98.40 | 114.80 | 100.20 |
| 24 | 56.00 | 72.60 | 138.00 | 98.20 |
| 25 | , 8.50 | 1.00 | 2.00 | 2,30 |
| 26 | - | - | - | - |
| 27 | - | - | - | - |
| 28 | 71.40 | 56.50 | 47.60 | 51.90 |
| 29 | - | - | - | - |
| 30 | - | 62.70 | 65.00 | 64.40 |

Table XXVIII (Continued)

A Summary of Percentage of Time With a Child in the Audience in the Tulsa DynaScope Study:

|  | Morning | Afternoon | Evening | Combined |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Week 1: | 38.10 | 54.30 | 50.40 | 50.40 |
| Week 2: | 47.00 | 46.10 | 49.60 | 48.30 |
| Percentage/ Week: | 43.30 | 50.00 | 50.00 | 49.30 |
|  | Perce | of Time Wi | Child in | ce |
| Eamily | Morning | Afternoon | Evening | Combined |
| Tulsa |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 40.70 | 101.70 | 92.90 | 95.30 |
| 2 | - | 5.90 | 1.50 | 1.70 |
| 3 | - | 12.30 | 17.50 | 16.60 |
| 4 | - | - | - | - |
| 5 | - | 26.50 | 43.00 | 40.60 |
| 6 | 33.00 | 41.00 | 36.60 | 37.70 |
| 7 | 91.40 | 54.30 | 24.10 | 43.80 |
| 8 | 82.70 | 11.300 | 137.60 | 131.00 |
| 9 | 20.30 | 5.20 | - | 3.10 |
| 10 | 43.80 | 23.30 | 30.60 | 29.60 |
| 11 | - | 11.60 | 15.00 | 13.50 |
| 12 | - | - | . 60 | . 60 |
| 13 | - | - | - | - |
| 14 | 66.70 | 84.60 | 92.40 | 90.00 |
| 15 | 43.10 | 56.50 | 62.30 | 58.10 |
| 16 | - | - | - | - |
| 17 | - | - | - | - |
| 18 | 47.30 | 42.00 | 38.10 | 40.60 |
| 19 | 78.50 | 100.00 | 97.00 | 95.50 |
| 20 | 35.50 | 11.10 | 52.10 | 39.50 |
| 21 | 92.30 | 88.00 | 35.00 | 42.50 |
| 22 | - | 94.20 | 71.20 | 78.90 |
| 23 | - | 58.10 | 61.90 | 61.30 |
| 24 | 25.40 | 37.90 | 53.40 | 44.50 |
| 25 | 116.90 | 101.70 | 66.40 | 77.00 |
| 26 | - | 62.40 | 47.10 | 52.50 |
| 27 | 85.20 | 77.60 | 81.10 | 80.90 |
| 28 | 46.00 | 32.00 | 45.80 | 39.80 |
| 29 | 72.50 | 95.10 | 58.70 | 65.20 |
| 30 | 48.70 | 52.10 | 51.30 | 51.00 |

Table XXVIII (Continued)
percentage of TIME WITH A CHILD IN AUDIENCE
A Summary of Four DynaScope Studies

have preschool-only, gradeschool-only, or teenage-only children leave their sets turned on each week and how much of that time there is "no audience". From the sample of 182 children, the number of viewer-minutes, ${ }^{\text {"attentive }}{ }^{\infty}$ and ${ }^{\text {minattentive }}$, and the average audience, "attentive ${ }^{N}$ and "inattentive", have been determined. The percentage of time that teenagers, gradeschoolers, preschoolers and all children in the studies spent in the television audience has also been presented.

The average time sets were in use in the four DynaScope studies was 31.80 hours per week, the time gradually increasing from the morning viewing period until evening. Yet, when families with children of one specific age group only were isolated, certain trends in the amount of time the television sets were in use seemed to appear. The younger the children in the family, the greater was the amount of time with television sets turned on. Teenagez-only families had the low "set-in-use" time of 27.55 hours per week. Gradeschooler-only families had an average "set-in-use" time of 33.86 hours, while families with only-preschoolers had the recorded high of 37.12 hours of ${ }^{\text {ws }}$ set-in-use ${ }^{10}$ time during the average week. Similarly, these families indicated the same patterns for the amount of time that "no audience ${ }^{00}$ was present while sets were in use. Teenageronly families had TV sets operating with "no audience" for an average of 3.4 hours per week, comparad to 6.10 hours for gradeschooler-only families, and 9.22 hours per week for families with preschoolers-only. As with the ${ }^{n}$ set-in-use ${ }^{n}$ time figures, "no audience" time increased as the day progressed (with the exception of the preschooler families). These families showed the greatest "no audience ${ }^{00}$ time during the afternoon viewing period and somewhat less during the evening. The evening figure of 3.44 hours per week for preschooler-only families still remained greater than the "no audience ${ }^{0 N}$ hours for either of the other two groups.

All children, ages one to 18 years, viewed television for a total of 226,907 viewer-minutes over the two-week period. Average child viewerhours per week per family were 2.48 hours for the morning, 6.10 hours in the afternoon, and 11.30 hours in the evening, with a total of 19.90 hours per week. These viewer-statistics are based on the entire number of children in the family; therefore, the average child viewed only 10.40 hours per week during the four studies.

The most important part of the child audience to the advertiser and program sponsor, those who are "attentive", viewed television "attentively for 140,198 viewer-minutes, about 62 percent of the total time they were present in front of the TV set. Average "attentive" viewing hours per week according to the time of day were: morning, 1.46 hours; afternoon, 3.80 hours; evening, 7.04 hours; a total of 12.30 hours per week per family. The individual child viewer spent only 6.40 hours a week "attentively" viewing television.

Total ${ }^{0}$ inattentive ${ }^{0}$ child viewer-minutes for the two week study period by BynaScope totaled 86,708 , about 38 percent of the child-viewer time. Weekly average per family was calculated as 7.61 hours; for the individual child, 4.00 hours.

The average child audience stayed relatively constant during the three time periods with the greatest average audience (. 71 of a child per "set-in-use ${ }^{10}$ minute) present in the morning. During the afternoon, average child audience dropped to .63 of a child and for the evening to .61 of a child, or in other words, some child was present about six out of ten minutes that sets were in use. However, each of the 182 children in the study was present only three and one half minutes of each ten when the television sets were in use。
"Attentively" viewing children averaged about . 42 of a child in the morning, 40 of a child in the afternoon, and .38 of a child per average minute in the evening. For all periods combined, the average "attentive" child audience was .39 of a child per minute, and each child in the study viewed "attentively" only two minutes out of ten that the TV sets were turned on.

The "inattentive child audience for both weeks in the four DynaScope studies xan: 29 of a child in the morning, 23 of a child in the afternoon, 23 of a child in the evening. Total "inattentive" child audience was .24 of a child.

The teenage viewer spent, on a percentage basis, less time in the television audience than either of the other groups. The morning teenviewers were spending 7.80 percent of the family ${ }^{\text {w }}$ set-in-use ${ }^{n}$ time in the audience. During the afternoon, they could be found in the audience 14.41 percent, and in the evening, 18.81 percent of "set-in-usep time, making their over-all percentage of time in the audience average 16.31.

With percentage of time increasing as the age of the child decreased, gradeschoolers could be found in the audience during the morning viewing period 16.00 percent of the "set-in-use time. For the afternoon, the figure was 18.00 percent, and for the evening, 18.63 percent. Average time with a gradeschooler in the audience was nearly 18.50 percent of the total ${ }^{00}$ set-in-use ${ }^{80}$ time.

The preschool child recorded the greatest percentage of time in the audience during the morning (nearly 40 percent) and the afternoon (20.06 percent). In the evening, however, their percentage of viewing time decreased sharply to 17.07 . As a group, preschoolers remained in the audience for the greatest amount of time with 18.26 percent of "set-in-use"
time.
A child was present 71 percent of the morning "set-in-use" time, 63 percent of afternoon time, 61 percent in the evening, and during the entire day for approximately 63 percent of the "set-in-use" time per week.

## CHAPTER V

## AN INTENSIVE LOOK AT CHILD VIEWING PATTERNS IN THE STILLWATER-1962 DYNASCOPE STUDY

In Chapter IV, children's viewing patterns were analyzed in relation to the entire sample of 95 families participating in the four DynaScope studies. The information to be presented in this chapter will deal with a closer examination of data from those 15 families in the Stillwater-1962 study which had children.

By focusing on these 15 families, a more intensive study of the three age groups is permitted, and the writer feels that in this way a better understanding of the impact of a particular age group's viewing may be gained.

Another reason for this separation from the entire sample is the abnormal effect on the Stillwater-1962 sample created by the presence of 15 nursery school children who watched television daily in one of the homes. This nursery school group is treated separately in this chapter following an examination of teenagers, gradeschoolers, and preschoolers.

The reader must remember that the sample size is restricted to fourteen teenagers, seven gradeschoolers, and seven preschoolers, exclusive of the section dealing with the fifteen nursery school children. The average number of children per family in the Stillwater-1962 DynaScope study was 1.87.

## A Teen Profile

The audience patterns included here are those of teenagers from ten different homes. In an attempt to give a more representative picture of the teen viewer in a normal home viewing situation, the figures do not include the patterns of those teens who baby sit in homes with gradeschoolers or preschoolers, or teenage children who were visiting in some sample homes. Since no attempt was made to balance the number of children according to sex when obtaining the homes for this DynaScope study, these figures may be slightly more representative of female teenage viewers.

## Rercentage of Iime With a Teenagex in the Audience

In the Stillwater-1962 study, teenagers were in the audience about one-third of the time TV sets were in use.

TABLE XXIX
"SET-IN-USE" TIME COMPARED WITH TEEN VIEWER HOURS
Average "Set-in-Use" Time Average Teenage Per Week In Families With Viewer Hours Ieenagers

Morning:
2.35 Hours
. 51 Hours
Afternoon:
Evening:
6.80
2.02

Total Day:
14.60
4.64
23.80
7.17

During the morning period, teens were in the TV audience 21.48 percent of the "set-in-use" time. By afternoon, viewing had increased to 29.84 percent; in the evening, teens were in the audience 31.70 percent of the time. Total time with a teen in the audience was 30.15 percent of the ${ }^{\text {mset-in-use }}{ }^{\text {se }}$ time. (Table XXX.)

TABLE XXX
PERCENTAGE OF TIME WITH A TEEN IN THE AUDIENCE

| Family | Morning | Afternoon | Evening | Combined |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 60.00\% | 8.37\% | 2.65\% | 3.59 \% |
| 2 | - | 18.62 | 13.97 | 15.05 |
| 6 | 37.74 | 37.82 | 49.23 | 43.18 |
| 8 | 64.66 | 69.73 | 60.83 | 62.91 |
| 9 | - | - | - |  |
| 10 | 12.99 | 21.55 | 36.06 | 28.93 |
| 12 | - | 90.57 | 45.69 | 54.66 |
| 15 | 38.33 | 21.49 | 50.43 | 40.00 |
| 16 | 5.75 | 17.85 | 21.55 | 16.67 |
| 17 | 26.92 | 27.90 | 39.37 | 33.01 |
| Avg. Week 1: | 19.53\% | 31.95\% | 32.29 \% | 30.69 \% |
| Avg. Week 2: | 25.56 | 26.69 | 31.07 | 29.49 |
| Avg. Per Week: | 21.48\% | 29.84\% | $31.70 \%$ | 30.15\% |

As previously indicated in Table XXI, teens in the entire 1962 study were in the audience 14.39 percent of the time, and teens in the four DynaScope studies were in the TV audience 16.31 percent of the "set-in-use." time.

Percentage of Time With ${ }^{\text {an }}$ "Attentive" Teen in the Audience

Although the percentage of time with an "attentive" teen in the TV audience increased, the percentage remained about the same as for the entire sample of 95 families. The teen audience appeared to be "attentive" about one-half of the time in front of the TV set. Time with an attentive teen in the morning audience averaged 10.39 percent; in the afternoon, 16.30 percent; in the evening, teens were in the TV audience 18,73 percent of the "set-in-use" time. The three-period total indicated that 17.21 percent of the time a teenager was in the the audience viewing wattentively ${ }^{\text {te }}$, or slightly more than one half of the entire time teens were
in the audience. (Table XXXI.)

TABLE XXXI

| Family | Morning | Afternoon | Evening | Combined |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 60.00\% | $7.39 \%$ | 2.65\% | 3.48\% |
| 2 | - | 15.16 | 11.33 | 12.22 |
| 6 | - | 19.10 | 32.42 | 25.41 |
| 8 | 41.37 | 22.42 | 26.93 | 27.65 |
| 9 | - | - | - | - |
| 10 | 6.57 | 15.78 | 21.38 | 16.46 |
| 12 | - | 53.03 | 21.49 | 27.86 |
| 15 | 15.67 | 6.87 | 23.92 | 17.67 |
| 16 | 3.69 | 11.90 | 16.91 | 12.27 |
| 17 | 14.85 | 18.15 | 31.98 | 23.88 |
| Avg. Week 1: | 10.28\% | 17.12\% | $17.89 \%$ | 16.86 \% |
| Avg. Week 2: | 10.56 | 15.93 | 19.31 | 17.71 |
| Avg. Pex Wee | k: $10.39 \%$ | $16.30 \%$ | 18.73\% | 17.21\% |

## Average Teen Audience

Weekly averages indicate that the teen audience figures vary from .20 to .32 of a child per minute during the two week period of study. The lowest average audience for the teenage children was recorded in the morning period at .21 of a child per minute. In the afternoon, the audience average climbed to .30 of a child per minute, and changed only slightly in the evening to .31 of a child. The average teen audience for the total time was .30 of a child per minute in the families with teenage children. (Table XXXII)

Average "Attentive ${ }^{\text {"o }}$ Teen Audience

The average "attentive ${ }^{w}$ teen audience recorded for the morning was . 10 of a child per minute. In the afternoon, the teen viewers were watching "attentively ${ }^{\text {po }}$ with an audience of .17 of a child per minute; in the evening,
.19 of a child. The average "attentive" teen audience for all three time periods was found to be .17 of a child per minute. In other words, a teenage child was viewing "attentively less than two minutes out of each ten that sets were in use. (Table XXXIII.) Figures for the entire 1962-Stillwater study indicate that the "attentive. ${ }^{10}$ teen audience was . 08 of a child per minute, about one-half of the figure analyzed in relation to only those families with teenage children.

TABLE XXXII
average teen audience

| Eamily | Morning | Afternoon | Evening | Combined |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | . 60 | . 28 | . 03 | . 04 |
| 2 | - | . 19 | . 14 | . 15 |
| 6 | . 19 | . 38 | . 49 | . 43 |
| 8 | . 65 | . 70 | . 61 | . 63 |
| 9 | - | - | - | - |
| 10 | . 13 | . 22 | . 36 | . 29 |
| 12 | - | . 91 | . 46 | . 55 |
| 15 | . 38 | . 21 | . 50 | . 40 |
| 16 | . 06 | . 19 | . 22 | . 17 |
| 17 | . 27 | . 28 | . 39 | . 33 |
| Avg. Week 1: | . 20 | . 32 | . 32 | . 31 |
| Avg. Week 2: | . 26 | . 27 | . 31 | . 29 |
| Avg. Per Week: | . 21 | . 30 | . 31 | . 30 |

Average Teen Audience During Commercials
This average audience figure is based upon those commercials which were identifiable and, the reasons listed in Chapter III, may be subject to some error.

The teen audience during commercials for the morning period was somewhat higher than for the average audience. With 33 of a child per minute during commercials in the mozning, the figure declined to .28 of a child
in the afternoon, and rose slightly to 29 of a child per minute during the evening. The total teen audience per minute during commercials was calculated to be .29 of a child per minute, only .01 less than the average teen audience. (Table XXXIV.)

TABLE XXXIII

## AVERAGE ${ }^{\text {PATTENTIVE }}$ TEEN AUDIENCE

| Family | Morning | Afternoon | Evening | Combined |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | .60 | . 21 | . 01 | . 04 |
| 2 | - | . 15 | . 11 | . 12 |
| 6 | - | . 19 | . 32 | . 25 |
| 8 | . 41 | . 22 | . 27 | . 28 |
| 9 | - | - | - | - |
| 10 | . 01 | . 16 | . 21 | . 16 |
| 12 | - | . 53 | . 21 | . 28 |
| 15 | . 16 | . 07 | . 24 | . 18 |
| 16 | . 04 | . 12 | . 17 | . 12 |
| 17 | . 15 | . 18 | . 32 | . 24 |
| Avg. Week 1: | . 10 | . 17 | . 18 | . 17 |
| Avg Week 2: | . 11 | . 16 | . 19 | . 18 |
| Avg. Per Week: | . 10 | . 17 | . 19 | . 17 |

TABLE XXXIV
average teen audience during commercials
Eamily Morning Afternoon Evening Combined

| 1 | - | - | .02 | .02 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | - | .17 | .14 | .14 |
| 6 | - | .37 | .53 | .44 |
| 8 | .81 | .67 | .53 | .59 |
| 9 | 1.33 | .41 | .48 | .51 |
| 10 | - | .41 | .48 | .51 |
| 12 | 1.44 | .50 | .43 | .43 |
| 15 | .05 | .39 | .38 | .42 |
| 16 | .26 | .09 | .12 | .10 |
| 17 | .40 | .59 | .83 | .48 |
| Week 1: | .26 | .21 | .35 | .35 |
| Week 2: |  | .28 | .23 | .23 |
| Per Week: | .33 |  | .29 | .29 |

## Average "Attentive" Teen Audience During Commercials

The average "attentive" teen audience during commercial minutes proved to be less than one half that of the average audience figure, while the average "attentive" audience was slightly more than half the average audience for all minutes.

During morning commercials, the average "attentive" teen audience was . 11 of a child. In the afternoon, the figure rose to .13 of a child, and then another increase in the evening brought the figure to . 15 of an "attentive ${ }^{p 0}$ child per commercial minute. Total "attentive" teen audience for families with teenage children was . 14 of a child during the average commercial minute. (Table XXXV。)

TABLE XXXV

## AVERAGE "ATTENTIVE" TEEN AUDIENCE DURING COMMERCIALS

| Family | Morning | Afternoon | Evening | Combined |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | - | - | - | - |
| 2 | - | . 13 | . 12 | . 12 |
| 6 | - | . 15 | . 38 | . 25 |
| 8 | . 48 | . 21 | . 18 | . 21 |
| 9 | - | - | - | - |
| 10 | - | . 31 | . 28 | . 28 |
| 12 | - | . 18 | . 11 | . 12 |
| 15 | . 30 | . 13 | . 17 | . 17 |
| 16 | . 02 | . 04 | . 10 | . 07 |
| 17 | . 08 | . 30 | . 52 | . 29 |
| Avg. Week l: | . 12 | . 14 | . 17 | . 16 |
| Avg. Week 2: | . 08 | . 11 | . 14 | . 13 |
| Avg. Per Week: | . 11 | . 13 | . 15 | . 14 |

This profile consists of audience viewing patterns of gradeschool age children in relation only to those homes with children of that age
in the Stillwater-1962 study. The group patterns represent a small number of children, but show the gradeschooler as part of a family group.

Percentage of Time With a Gradeschooler in the Audience

Data from homes with children in grades one through six indicated that a gradeschooler was in the IV audience nearly one half of the time television sets were in use. (Table XXXVI.)

TABLE XXXVI
"SET-IN-USE" TIME COMPARED WITH GRADESCHOOLER VIEWER HOURS

Average "Set-in-Use" Time Average Gradeschool Per Week in Families With Viewer Hours Per. Gradeschool Children
Time Period
Morning:
Evening:
Afternoon:
Total Day:
2.16 Hours
6.94
15.62
24.70

Week
. 65 Hours
2.61
8.54
11.78

From the time sets were first turned on until noon, a gradeschooler was found in the TV audience approximately one-third of the time (29.99 percent), or about 8.50 percent more than teen viewers. (Table XXXVI.) During the afternoon, the gradeschooler was in the audience 37.85 percent, and in the evening, 54.70 percent of the time sets were on. Total time with a gradeschooler in the audience averaged 47.76 percent of the "set-in-use time per week compared to the total 30.15 percent with a teen in the audience.

Percentage of Time With an Attentive Gradeschooler in the Audience

While the amount of time with a gradeschooler in the audience was more than that for the teen viewer, the amount of time with an "attentive gradeschooler increased even more, to approximately 60 percent. Morning
viewing figures indicate that an "attentive" gradeschooler was in the TV audience 19.51 percent of the time. Gradeschooler "attentiveness" increased throughout the day, with 24.69 percent in the afternoons, and 39.36 percent of ${ }^{\text {wset-in-use }}$ time in the evenings. The total amount of time with an "attentive" gradeschooler in the audience was 28.80 percent, nearly as great as the entire amount of time teenagers were devoting to TV, both "attentively ${ }^{10}$ and "inattentively ${ }^{010}$. (Table XXXVIII.)

TABLE XXXVII PERCENTAGE OF TIME WITH A GRADESCHOOLER IN THE AUDIENCE

| Family | Morning | Afternoon | Evening | Combined |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | \% | 36.95\% | 18.71\% | 20.62 \% |
| 6 | - | 46.78 | 67.47 | 57.16 |
| 11 | 44.14 | 22.42 | 57.00 | \% 45.55 |
| 12 | 12.08 | 72.39 | 87.59 | 66.12 |
| 16 | 9.24 | 20.77 | 25.13 | 20.03 |
| Avg. Week 1: | 45.63\% | 37.90\% | 61.49 \% | 51.51\% |
| Avg. Week 2: | 14.99 | 37.09 | 49.81 | 42.77 |
| Avg. Per Week | 29.99\% | 37.58\% | 54.70\% | 47.76\% |

TABLE XXXVIII
PERCENTAGE OF TIME WITH AN MATIENTIVE GRADESCHOOLER IN THE AUDIENCE

| Family | Mornina | Afternoon | Evening | Combined |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | - | 17.24\% | 10.52\% | 12.68 \% |
| 6 | - | 31.26 | 54.78 | 43.44 |
| 11 | 28.83 | 14.06 | 29.69 | 25.12 |
| 12 | 7.19 | 48.82 | 52.54 | 40.46 |
| 16 | 6.80 | 14.30 | 14.72 | 12.70 |
| Avg. Week 1: | 31.72\% | 26.36\% | 38.53\% | 31.18\% |
| Avg. Week 2: | 7.73 | 22.04 | 40.07 | 25.67 |
| Avg. Per Week: | 19.51\% | 24.69\% | 39.36 \% | 28.80\% |

Average Gradeschooler Audience

The gradeschooler audience per week varied from a low of .15 of a child during one morning period up to .61 of a child per minute in one evening summary. The audience average for the morning period was .30 of a gradeschool child, and in the afternoon, . 38 of a gradschool child per minute. The evening gradeschooler audience increased to .55 of a child, while during the total day the gradeschooler audience was .48 of a child per minute. (Table XXXIX.)

TABLE XXXIX
AVERAGE GRADESCHOOLER AUDIENCE

| Eamily | Morning | Afternoon | Evening | Combined |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | - | . 37 | . 19 | . 21 |
| 6 | - | . 47 | . 67 | . 57 |
| 11 | . 44 | . 22 | . 57 | . 46 |
| 12 | . 12 | . 72 | . 88 | 666 |
| 16 | . 09 | . 21 | . 25 | . 20 |
| Avg. Week I: | . 46 | . 38 | . 61 | . 52 |
| Avg. Week 2: | . 15 | . 37 | . 50 | . 43 |
| Avg. Per Week: | . 30 | . 38 | . 55 | . 48 |

## Average ${ }^{\text {"0 Attentive }}$ Gradeschooler Audience

The gradeschooler audience was viewing "attentively" two minutes of each ten that sets were in use during the mornings. The morning average "attentive ${ }^{01}$ audience was .20 of a child per minute, increasing to .25 of a child in the afternoon, and rising again in the evening to .39 of a child per minute. Total ${ }^{\text {mattentiven }}$ gradeschooler audience was .29 of a child, almost two times as great as that indicated for the "attentive ${ }^{00}$ teen audience. (Table XL.)

TABLE XL

| AVERAGE *ATTENTIVE" GRADESCHOOLER AUDIENCE |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Family | Mosning | Afternoon | Evening | Combined |
| 1 | - | . 17 | . 11 | . 13 |
| 6 | - | . 32 | . 55 | . 43 |
| 11 | . 29 | . 14 | . 30 | . 25 |
| 12 | . 07 | . 49 | . 53 | . 40 |
| 16 | . 07 | . 14 | . 15 | . 13 |
| Avg. Week 1: | . 32 | . 27 | . 39 | . 31 |
| Avg. Week 2: | . 08 | . 22 | . 40 | . 26 |
| Avg. Per Week: | . 20 | . 25 | . 39 | . 29 |

Avorage Gradeschooler Audience During Commercials

Although the average gradeschooler was in the audience nearly onehalf of the time sets were in use during the identifiable commercial minutes, the gradeschooler audience was present only one-third of the time. (Table XLI.)

TABLE XLI

| Eamily | Morning | Afternoon | Evening | Combined |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | - | . 36 | . 17 | . 19 |
| 6 | - | . 26 | . 48 | . 35 |
| 11 | . 24 | . 21 | . 52 | . 39 |
| 12 | . 66 | . 49 | . 86 | . 77 |
| 16 | . 15 | . 13 | . 28 | . 15 |
| Avg. Week 1: | . 23 | . 27 | . 41 | . 35 |
| Avg. Week 2: | . 19 | . 17 | . 36 | . 30 |
| Avg. Per Week: | . 22 | . 23 | . 39 | . 33 |

During the morning, the average gradeschooler audience was . 22 of a child per commercial minute. In the afternoon, this figure changed slightly to .23 of a child, then rose to .39 of a child per commercial
minute during the evening. The evening commercial audience for gradeschoolers was still well below the audience during the average minute, however. Total gradeschooler audience during commercials averaged . 33 of a child per minute.

Average "Attentiven Gradeschooler Audience During Commercials

Audience figures indicate that the gradeschool viewer was "attentive" only one minute out of each ten a commercial was aired. The greatest ${ }^{10}$ attentive ${ }^{00}$ gradeschooler audience proved to be . 12 of a child per commercial minute, both during the morning and evening viewing periods. In the afternoons there was an "attentive" gradeschool audience of . 10 of a child during commercial minutes, while the total "attentive" gradeschool audience during a commercial minute was .ll of a child. (Table XLII.) About one-third of the time, a gradeschooler was in the commercial audience.

TABLE XLII

| Eamily | Morning | Afternoon | Evening | Combined |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | - | . 11 | . 02 | . 03 |
| 6 | - | . 12 | . 21 | . 16 |
| 11 | . 06 | . 09 | . 13 | . 11 |
| 12 | . 66 | . 29 | . 22 | . 26 |
| 16 | . 11 | . 04 | . 06 | . 06 |
| Avg. Week l: | . 14 | . 15 | . 20 | . 18 |
| Avg. Week 2: | . 06 | . 03 | . 03 | . 03 |
| Avg. Per Week: | . 12 | . 10 | . 12 | . 11 |

## A Preschooler Profile

The childsen represented in this profile are of preschool-age, and members of families in the Stillwater-1962 study. The viewing patterns do not include the characteristics of the 15 preschoolers in the nursery school held in one home.

## Percentege of Tine With Peschooler in the Audience

The preschool viewers in this study were in the TV audience only one-third of the time sets were in use in their homes although the "set-in-use time was significantly greater for this group than for those homes with either teenagers or gradeschoolers. (Table XLIII.)

TABLE XLIII
${ }^{\text {pS }}$ SET-IN-USE ${ }^{*}$ TIME COMPARED WITH PRESCHOOLER VIEWER HOURS
Average "Set-in-Use" Time Average Preschooler Per Week in Families With Viewer Hours Per

Iime Period
Morning:
Afternoon:
Evening:
Total Day:

Preschoolers
4.85 Hours
2.78 Hours
9.67
2.73
6.41
11.92

During the morning, preschoolers were in the TV audience 57.39 percent of the "set-in-use ${ }^{10}$ time, more than the combined percentage of time spent by both teenagers and gradeschoolers during this period. In the afternoon, the percentage of time with a preschooler in the audience dropped sharply, falling siightly below the time for teenagers, and nearly 10 percent below the time with a gradeschooler in the TV audience for this part of the day. The preschool child was in the TV audience 32.53 percent of the " set-in-trse time during the evenings, devoting about one percent more time than the teens, but 20 percent less than the gradeschoolers were
spending with television. Total time with a preschooler in the audience was 34.83 percent. (Table XLIV.)

TABLE XLIV

## percentage of time with a preschooler in the audience

| Family | Morning | Afternoon | Evening | Combined |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 | 52.40\% | 38.11\% | 50.13\% | $47.06 \%$ |
| 7 | 56.57 | 33.60 | 47.09 | 44.15 |
| 11 | 30.41 | 9.10 | 53.61 | 38.16 |
| 12 | 6.19 | 26.09 | 14.97 | 18.98 |
| 14 | 72.18 | 28.38 | 15.69 | 26.26 |
| Avg Week 1: | 60.75\% | $27.28 \%$ | 34.21\% | 36.20\% |
| Avg. Week 2: | 53.75 | 29.28 | 30.85 | 33.40 |
| Avg. Per Week: | 57.39 \% | 28.23 \% | $32.53 \%$ | 34.83\% |

## Percentage of Time With an Attentive Preschooler in the Audience

An "attentive" preschooler was in the audience about one half of the time during the morning, or 25.48 percent of "set-in-use" time. In the afternoon, the "attentive" preschool audience dropped to 8.19 percent, and by evening, their "attentiveness" fell to less than one-fourth of their audience time, or 7.73 percent. Evening was, then, the least "attentive" part of the day recorded for the preschoolers. Total percentage of time with an "attentive" preschool-age child in the audience was 11.83 percent, averaging about one-third of the time with a preschooler in the TV audience. (Table XLV.) This over-all wattentiveness ${ }^{\infty}$ was also less than for either of the other age groups.

## Average Preschooler Audience

The average preschooler audience ranged from .27 of a child in the aftesnoon of Week 1 , to .61 of a child in the morning of the same week.

The preschooler audience average for morning was .57 of a child per minute, or nearly six out of ten minutes sets were in use. In the afternoon, the the audience was oniy .28 , and in the evening, .33 of a preschool child during the average minute. Average preschool audience for the entire day was . 35 of a child per minute. (Table XLVI.)

TABLE XLV


TABLE XLVI
AVERAGE PRESCHOOLER AUDIENCE

| Family | Morning | Afternoon | Evening | Combined |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 | . 52 | . 38 | . 50 | . 47 |
| 7 | . 57 | . 34 | . 47 | . 44 |
| 11 | . 30 | . 09 | . 54 | . 38 |
| 12 | . 06 | . 26 | . 15 | . 19 |
| 14 | . 72 | . 28 | . 16 | . 26 |
| Avg. Week 1: | . 61 | . 27 | . 34 | . 36 |
| Avg. Week 2: | . 54 | . 29 | . 31 | . 33 |
| Avg. Per Week: | . 57 | . 28 | . 33 | . 35 |

Average "Attentive" Rreschool Audience

Preschoolers, according to Table XLVII, viewed TV "attentively" with an average audience of .25 of a child in the morning, and .08 of a child per minute in both the afternoon and evening periods. Compared to their total audience of .35 of a child, the preschoolers were viewing with an ${ }^{\infty}$ attentive ${ }^{m}$ audience of .12 of a child per average minute.

TABLE XLVII
AVERAGE "ATTENTIVE" PRESCHOOLER AUDIENCE

| Family | Morning | Afternoon | Evening | Combined |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 | . 12 | . 06 | \% 08 | . 06 |
| 7 | . 34 | . 12 | . 20 | . 20 |
| 11 | . 06 | . 01 | . 05 | . 04 |
| 12 | . 04 | . 13 | . 06 | . 09 |
| 14 | . 56 | . 10 | . 05 | . 11 |
| Avg. Week 1: | . 29 | . 09. | . 08 | . 11 |
| Avg. Week 2: | . 22 | . 07 | . 08 | . 12 |
| Avg. Per Week: | . 25 | . 08 | . 08 | . 12 |

## Average Preschooler Audience During Commercials

Preschoolers, like the gradeschool-age children, were in the audience for less time during commercials than for programs. (Table XLVIII.) Average preschool audience during commercials in the morning was .42 of a child; in the afternoon, 23 of a child; in the evening, . 28 of a child per commercial minute. Total preschool commercial audience was .30 of a child, compared to .29 of a child for teenagers, and .33 of a child for gradeschoolage children.

TABLE XLVIII
AVERAGE PRESCHOOLER AUDIENCE DURING COMMERCIALS

| Family | Merning | Afternoon | Evening | Combined |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 | . 48 | . 28 | . 42 | . 39 |
| 7 | . 48 | . 22 | . 20 | . 26 |
| 11 | . 20 | . 09 | . 52 | . 36 |
| 12 | . 50 | . 17 | . 15 | . 17 |
| 14 | . 63 | . 30 | . 14 | . 25 |
| Avg. Week 1: | . 40 | . 22 | . 32 | . 31 |
| Avg. Week 2: | . 50 | . 25 | . 25 | . 28 |
| Avg. Per Week: | . 42 | . 23 | . 28 | . 30 |

## Average MAtentive Preschool Audience During Commercials

Table XLIX indicates that the average preschool audience during the morning was the largest for all time periods. The . 18 of an "attentive" preschool child per commercial minute in the morning dropped to .07 of a child in the afternoon, and to .05 of a child in the evening. Total "attentive ${ }^{10}$ preschooler audience was .08 of a child per commercial minute, while the average "attentive ${ }^{\text {w }}$ audience for this group during all programs was . 12 of a child per minute.

TABLE XLIX
AVERAGE "ATTENTIVE* PRESCHOOLER AUDIENCE DURING COMMERCIALS

| Eamily | Morning | Afterneen | Evening | Combined |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 | . 07 | . 05 | . 03 | . 05 |
| 7 | . 33 | . 08 | . 09 | . 13 |
| 11 | - | . 01 | . 03 | . 02 |
| 12 | . 33 | . 09 | . 06 | . 08 |
| 14 | . 61 | . 12 | . 04 | . 13 |
| Avg. Week 1: | .16 | . 06 | . 07 | . 09 |
| Avg. Week 2: | . 21 | . 09 | . 04 | . 07 |
| Avg. Per Week: | . 18 | . 07 | . 05 | . 08 |

Types of Programs Viewed By Children

Since it was necessary to limit the extent of this study, programs watched by children were categorized into 15 general program types. The audience information is presented for each of these basic program types, rather than for each of the individual programs. Figures are based on the actual length of time sets were tuned to the program types.

Listed below are the 15 program types and examples of programs included in that category:

Children's Variety - "Captain Kangaroo", "Foreman Scotty"
Children's Drama - "Superman ${ }^{\infty}$, "My Friend Flicka"
Cartoons - "5 p.m. Cartoons", ${ }^{\text {" }}$ Bugs Bunny"
Westerns - "Bonanza", "Wagon Train"

General Variety - "Garry Moore", "Ed Sullivan Show"
Situation Comedy - "Dobie Gillis", "Beverly Hillbillies"
News - "Muntley-Brinkley Report", "Farm Reportit y
Sports - "Saturday Football", "La te Sports"
Music - Wawtence Welke "Sing Along With Mitch"

Quiz -Panel Shows - Who Do You Trust?", "To Tell The Truth"
Specials - opresident's.Report on the Cuban Crisis", "U. N.
( $\quad$. Security Council ${ }^{10}$
Movies - "Saturday Night at the Movies", "Opening Night"
Mystery - "Alfred Hitchcock Presents", "Route 66"

The program type most frequently tuned by children in the Stillwater1962 study was Situation Comedy. (Table L.) Time spent with the television sets tuned to programs falling this category composed, roughly, 20 percent of all program time when a child was in the audience. The second most popular program type was Movies (11.47 percent) followed by Westerns (10.38 percent).

## TABLE L

TYPES OF PROGRAMS VIEWED BY CHILDREN

## Program Tyos

Children's Variety
Children's Drama
Cartoons
Westerns
General Drama
General Variety
Situation Comedy
News
Sports
Music
Teen Music
Quiz - Panel Shows
Specials
Movies
Mystery
Total Percent:

Percentage of Time Program Was On With a Child in the Audience
$7.96 \%$
2.40
5.47
10.38
7.68
3.20
19.91
9.16
6.03
1.34
1.50
3.26
1.09
11.47
9.14
$100.00 \%$

Though the sets were tuned to these specific types, previous data has indicated that the child viewer was not always "attentive", or even present, for the entire program time.

## Teen Viewers

The teen viewers studied seemed to prefer Children's Drama. This program type had a teenager in the audience about 60 percent of the time.

TABLE LI
CHILD AUDIENCE VIEWING PATTERNS ACCORDING TO PROGRAM TYPES IN VIEWER MINUTES

| Program Iypes | Minutes With Set Turned On During Program Types. | Total <br> "Attentive" Viewer-Mins. | Total "Inattentive" Viewer-Mins. | Total <br> ViewerMins. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Children's Variety | 2008 | 1194 | 580 | 1774 |
| Children's Drama | 603 | 606 | 333 | 939 |
| Cartoons | 1387 | 1030 | 464 | 1494 |
| Westerns | 2621 | 1190 | 1100 | 2290 |
| General Drama | 1938 | 983 | 741 | 1724 |
| General Variety | 809 | 1400 | 506 | 1906 |
| Situation Comedy | 5029 | 2629 | 1898 | 4527 |
| News | 2313 | 394 | 976 | 1370 |
| Sports | 1523 | 283 | 705 | 988 |
| Music | 338 | 52 | 132 | 184 |
| Teen Music | 377 | 115 | 190 | 305 |
| Quiz - Panel Shows | 830 | 143 | 399 | 542 |
| Specials | 275 | 35 | 101 | 136 |
| Movies | 2898 | 1246 | 1204 | 2450 |
| Mystery | 2309 | 826 | 646 | 1472 |
| Totals: | 25,258 | 12,126 | 9,975 | 22,101 |

TABLE LII
MINUTES WITH A CHILD IN AUDIENCE DURING VARIOUS TYPES OF PROGRAMS

| Program Type | Family No: 1 | Child Viewer-Minutes According To Family |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 2 | 3 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| Children"s Variety | - | - | 162 | 204 | 356 | 89 | - | - |
| Children's Drama | 30 | - | 90 | 82 | - | 80 | - | - |
| Cartoons | 59 | - | 28 | 116 | 90 | 92 | - | 39 |
| Westerns | 60 | 60 | 154 | 40 | 255 | 122 | - | 46 |
| General Drama | 60 | - | 355 | 111 | 330 | - | - | 120 |
| General Variety | . - | - | - | 55 | 58 | 14 | - | 30 |
| Situation Comedy | 140 | 90 | 1183 | 987 | 415 | 240 | - | 150 |
| News | 26 | 44 | 457 | 301 | 389 | 143 | - | 63 |
| Sports | 63 | - | 61 | 391 | 91 | 118 | - | 314 |
| Music | - | - | - | 65 | 30 | 77 | - | - |
| Teen Music | 53 | - | - | 30 | 90 | 153 | - | - |
| Quiz - Panel Shows | 5 | - | 453 | 21 | - | 109 | - | 60 |
| Specials | - | - | 85 | 70 | 90 | - | - | 30 |
| Movies | 126 | 170 | 480 | - | 90 | 71 | 1 | 360 |
| Mystery | 186 | 150 | 99 | - | 283 | 130 | - | 120 |
| Total Viewer-Minutes: | 808 | 514 | 3,607 | 2,473 | 2,567 | 1,438 | 1 | 1,332 |

Table LII (Continued)

| Program Type | Child Viewer-Minutes According To Family |  |  |  |  |  | Total Child ViewerMinutes According To Program Type |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Family No: 11 | 12 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 |  |
| Children's Variety | 116 | 176 | 358 | 60 | 150 | 337 | 2008 |
| Children's Drama | 144 | 63 | 50 | 2 | 30 | 32 | 603 |
| Cartoons | 298 | 225 | 167 | - | 165 | 148 | 1387 |
| Westerns | 384 | 344 | 317 | 326 | 405 | 108 | 2621 |
| General Drama | 217 | 180 | - | 283 | 120 | 162 | 1938 |
| General Variety | 210 | 122 | 50 | 30 | 210 | 30 | 809 |
| Situation Comedy | 567 | 613 | 114 | 243 | 120 | 137 | 5029 |
| News | 186 | 50 | 257 | 146 | 100 | 151 | 2313 |
| Sports | - | 238 | 155 | - | 35 | 90 | 1523 |
| Music | 131 | - | 25 | - | - | 10 | 338 |
| Teen Music | - | 51 | - | - | - | - | 377 |
| Quiz - Panel Shows | 30. | 36 | 32 | 84 | - | - | 830 |
| Specials |  | - | - | - | - | - | 275 |
| Movies | 458 | 486 | 125 | 120 | 118 | 293 | 2898 |
| Mystery | 388 | 251 | 184 | 266 | 35 | 217 | 2309 |
| Total Viewer-Minutes: | 3,129 | 2,792 | 1,834 | 1,560 | 1,488 | 1,715 | 25,258 |

## TABLE LIII

PERCENTAGE OF TIME WI TH A CHILD IN AUDIENCE DURING VARIOUS TYPES OF PROGRAMS

| Program Ivpe | Percentage of Child Viewer-Minutes Devoted to Program Irpes - According to Family |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Family No: 1 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| Children's Variety | - | - | 4.49 | 8.25 | 13.86 | 6.19 | - | - |
| Children's Drama | 3.71 | - | 2.50 | 3.32 | - | 5.56 | - | - |
| Cartoons | 7.30 | - | . 78 | 4.74 | 3.50 | 6.40 | - | 2.92 |
| Westerns | 7.43 | 11.63 | 4.27 | 1.62 | 9.93 | 8.48 | - | 3.45 |
| General Drama | 7.43 | - | 9.84 | 4.49 | 12.85 | - | - | 9.01 |
| General Variety | - | - | -. | 2.22 | 2.26 | . 97 | - | 2.25 |
| Situation Comedy | 17.33 | 17.51 | 32.78 | 39.90 | 16.16 | 16.69 | - | 11.26 |
| News | 3.21 | 8.56 | 12.67 | 12.17 | 15.15 | 9.94 | - | 4.73 |
| Sports | 7.80 | - | 1.69 | 15.81 | 3.54 | 8.21 | - | 23.55 |
| Music | - | - | - | 2.63 | 1.17 | 5.35 | - | - |
| Teen Music | 6.56 | - | - | 1.21 | 3.50 | 10.64 | - | - |
| Quiz - Panel Shows | . 62 | - | 12.56 | . 85 | - | 7.58 | - | 4.50 |
| Specials | - | - | 2.37 | 2.83 | 3.50 | - | - | 2.25 |
| Movies | 15.59 | 33.08 | 13.32 | - | 3.50 | 4.94 | 100.00 | 27.03 |
| Mystery | 23.02 | 29.18 | 2.74 | - | 11.02 | 9.04 | - | 9.01 |

Table LIII (Continued)

| Proaram Ivpes | Percentage of Child Viewer Minutes Devoted to Program Types - According to Eamily |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Family No: 11 | 12 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 |
| Children's Variety | 3.71 | 6.24 | 19.52 | 3.85 | 10.08 | 19.65 |
| Children's Drama | 4.60 | 2.23 | 2.73 | . 01 | 2.02 | 1.87 |
| Cartoons | 9.52 | 7.97 | 9.11 | - | 11.09 | 8.63 |
| Westerns | 12.27 | 12.18 | 17.28 | 20.90 | 27.22 | 6.30 |
| General Drama | 6.94 | 6.38 | - | 18.14 | 8.06 | 9.45 |
| General Variety | 6.71 | 4.32 | 2.73 | 1.92 | 14.11 | 1.75 |
| Situation Comedy | 18.12 | 21.72 | 6.27 | 15.58 | 8.06 | 7.99 |
| News . | 5.94 | 1.77 | 14.01 | 9.36 | 6.72 | 8.80 |
| Sports | - | 7.26 | 8.45 | - | 2.35 | 5.25 |
| music | 4.19 | - | 1.36 | - | - | . 58 |
| Teen Music |  | 1.81 |  | - | - |  |
| Quiz - Panel Shows | . 96 | 1.28 | 1.74 | 5.38 | - | - |
| Specials | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Movies | 14.64 | 17.02 | 6.82 | 7.69 | 7.93 | 17.08 |
| Mystery | 12.40 | 8.89 | 10.03 | 17.05 | 2.35 | 12.65 |

Average "attentive" teen audience was . 47 of a child, while average "inattentive ${ }^{08}$ teen audience was .17 of a child per minute during the Children's Drama programs. Although Teen Music programs drew a similar total audience, the "attentive* audience was . 13 of a child, and the average ${ }^{m}$ inattentive ${ }^{01}$ teen audience was .41 of a child per minute. General Drama, Cartoons, Mystery, Movies, and General Variety also fanked high with the ${ }^{\text {"attentive }}$ teen viewer audience. (Table LIV.)

## TABLE LIV

TEEN AUDIENGE PATTERNS DURING PROGRAM TYPES WATCHED BY CHILDREN

| Program_Type | Percentage of Time Program Type Was Tuned in With a Teen in the Audience |  | Average Teen Audience |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | "Attentive" | "Inattentive" | "Attentive" | "Inattentive" |
| Children's Variety | 14.24\% | 13.30\% | . 15 | . 13 |
| Children's Drama | 44.28 | 16.42 | . 47 | .17 |
| Cartoons | 24.36 | 13.41 | . 27 | . 14 |
| Westerns | 20.34 | 9.73 | . 21 | . 10 |
| General Drama | 29.93 | 9.65 | . 32 | . 10 |
| General Variety | 20.40 | 21.63 | . 23 | . 22 |
| Situation Comedy | 18.99 | 8.05 | . 19 | . 08 |
| News | 9.81 | 10.46 | . 10 | . 11 |
| Sports | 13.79 | 31.45 | . 14 | . 35 |
| Music | 10.35 | 15.09 | . 10 | . 16 |
| Teen Music | 13.26 | 41.11 | . 13 | . 41 |
| Quiz - Panel Shows | 5.09 | 19.07 | . 05 | . 19 |
| Specials | - | 5.81 | - | . 06 |
| Movies | 24.29 | 13.84 | . 24 | . 14 |
| Mystery | 24.03 | 7.88 | . 26 | . 08 |

## Gradeschool Viewers

The gradeschool audience was greatest during Cartoons. The average audience for this program type was .49 of a child per minute, and the average "attentive" child audience was high by comparison with . 40 of a child per minute. (Table LV.) Children's Drama, General Variety, and Situation Comedy also had a fairly large average gradeschooler audience.

## TABLE LV

GRADESCHOOLER AUDIENCE PATTERNS DURING PROGRAM TYPES WATCHED BY CHILDREN

| Program Type | Percentage of Time Program Type Was Tuned in With a Gradeschooler in Audience |  | Average Gradeschooler Audience $\qquad$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | "Attentive" | "Inattentive" | "Attentive" | "Inattentive" |
| Children's Variety | 18.87\% | $5.48 \%$ | . 19 | . 06 |
| Children's Drama | 35.52 | 6.30 | . 36 | . 07 |
| Cartoons | 38.41 | 8.49 | . 40 | . 09 |
| Westerns | 17.36 | 13.51 | . 18 | . 15 |
| General Drama | 11.45 | 6.86 | . 11 | . 07 |
| General Variety | 22.25 | 17.92 | . 25 | . 10 |
| Situation Comedy | 21.63 | 8.72 | . 25 | . 10 |
| News | 4.73 | 10.16 | . 05 | . 11 |
| Sports | 2.89 | 3.48 | . 03 | . 17 |
| Music | 1.33 | 10.60 | . 01 | . 11 |
| Teen Music | 10.61 | 4.77 | . 11 | . 05 |
| Quiz - Panel Shows | 2.65 | 6.14 | . 03 | . 08 |
| Specials | 9.09 | 5.81 | . 12 | . 06 |
| Movies | 13.98 | 10.18 | . 16 | . 11 |
| Mystery | 7.06 | 4.03 | . 07 | . 04 |

## Preschool Viewers

Children" Drama proved to be the most popular program type with the preschoolers, although Children's. Variety had a larger average "attentive" audience per minute. (Table LVI,) Only during those programs which were either Children's Drama or Children's Variety did the preschooler average ${ }^{00}$ attentive ${ }^{18}$ audience exceed . 10 of a child per minute. Specials had a large audience average, but the "attentive" average per minute was almost negligible. Sports, Mystery, General Variety, News, Music, and Movies also recorded very low "attentive" audience averages with the preschool group.

## TABLE LVI

PRESCHOOLER AUDIENCE PATTERNS DURING PROGRAM TYPES WATCHED BY CHILDREN

| Erogram Type | Percentage of Time Program Type Was Tuned in With a Preschooler in Audience |  | Average Preschooler Audience $\qquad$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 日Attentive | "Inattentive" | "Attentive" | "Inattentive" |
| Children's Variety | 25.89\% | 9.71 \% | . 26 | . 10 |
| Children's Drama | 17.74 | 31.01 | . 18 | . 32 |
| Cartoons | 7.49 | 10.81 | . 07 | . 11 |
| Westerns | 6.52 | 16.41 | . 07 | . 16 |
| General Drama | 7.02 | 18.32 | . 07 | . 21 |
| General Variety | 1.73 | 22.00 | . 02 | . 22 |
| Situation Comedy | 8.27 | 19.78 | . 08 | . 20 |
| News | 2.51 | 20.32 | . 03 | . 12 |
| Sports | 1.31 | 6.70 | . 01 | . 08 |
| Music | 3.25 | 11.54 | . 03 | . 12 |
| Teen Music | 6.63 | 4.24 | . 07 | . 04 |
| Quiz - Panle Shows | 8.31 | 21.08 | . 08 | . 21 |
| Specials | 1.09 | 36.00 | . 01 | . 36 |
| Movies | 3.07 | 16.07 | . 03 | . 16 |
| Mystery | 2.38 | 15.02 | . 02 | . 16 |

The Average Child Audience

The only program type which drew an "attentive" average child audience of more than one child per minute (1.01) was Children's Drama. This program type also recorded an average "inattentive" audience of .56 of a child per minute. (Table LIX.) Cartoons, Children's Variety, Situation Comedy, General Drama, and General Variety had relatively high "attentive" audience averages per minute. Those program types with the largest "inattentive ${ }^{18}$ audience per minute were General Variety, Sports, Specials, Children's Drama, and Teen Music.

TABLE LVII
"ATTENTIVE" CHILD AUDIENCE BREAKDOWN FOR TYPES OF PROGRAMS WATCHED BY CHILDREN

| Program Type | "Attentive" Child Audience |  |  |  |  |  | All Children |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Mins. With At Least One Child | ViewerMinutes | Mins. With At least One Child | ViewerMinutes | Mins. With At Least One Child | ViewerMinutes | Mins. With At Least One Child | ViewerMinutes |
| Children's Variety | 286 | 297 | 379 | 379 | 518 | 518 | 1183 | 1194 |
| Children's Drama | 267 | 283 | 213 | 216 | 107 | 107 | 587 | 606 |
| Cartoons | 338 | 376 | 533 | 559 | 104 | 104 | 975 | 1030 |
| Westerns | 533 | 541 | 455 | 478 | 171 | 171 | 1159 | 1190 |
| General Drama | 580 | 617 | 212 | 223 | 136 | 143 | 928 | 983 |
| General Variety | 165 | 188 | 180 | 198 | 14 | 14 | 1359 | 1400 |
| Situation Comedy | 955 | 960 | 1088 | 1253 | 416 | 416 | 2459 | 2629 |
| News | 227 | 228 | 101 | 108 | 58 | 58 | 386 | 394 |
| Sports | 210 | 217 | 44 | 46 | 20 | 20 | 274 | 283 |
| Music | 35 | 35 | 5 | 5 | 12 | 12 | 52 | 52 |
| Teen Music | 50 | 50 | 40 | 40 | 25 | 25 | 115 | 115 |
| Quiz - Panel Shows | 49 | 49 | 22 | 25 | 69 | 69 | 140 | 140 |
| Specials | - | - | 25 | 32 | 3 | 3 | 28 | 35 |
| Movies | 704 | 704 | 405 | 452 | 89 | 90 | 1198 | 1246 |
| Mystery | 555 | 608 | 163 | 163 | 55 | 55 | 773 | 826 |
| Total Viewer-Minutes: | : 4,954 | 5,143 | 3,865 | 4,177 | 1,797 | 1,805 | 10,616 | 11,125 |

## TABLE LVIII

"INATTENTIVE" CHILD AUDIENCE BREAKDOWN FOR TYPES OF PROGRAMS WATCHED BY CHILDREN


TABLE LIX
AVERAGE CHILD AUDIENCE DURING PROGRAM TYPES WATCHED BY CHILDREN
Average Child Audience

Program Type
Children's Variety . 60 . 29
Children's Drama
Cartoons
Westerns
General Drama
General Variety
Situation Comedy
News
Sports
Music
Teen Music
Quiz - Panel Shows
Specials
Movies
Mystery
"Attentive" "Inattentive"
1.01 . 56
.74 . 34
.46 . 41
.50 . 38
$.50 \quad .63$
$.52 \quad .38$
$.18 \quad .42$
.18 . 60
.14 . 39
.31 . 50
.16 . 48
.13 . 58
.43 . 41
.35 . 28

## Children's Television Viewing with an Adult Present in Audience

It has been the contention of many critics, broadcasters, and parents, as well, that much of the responsibility for regulation of the type of programs children watch lies with the parents themselves. Although it is not possible to discern the supervision aspect of the parent from the DynaScope film record alone, a study of the minute-by-minute data records provided the following information about the amount of time these children viewed television when an adult was present.

In the Stillwater-1962 study there was a total of 16,768 minutes with at least one child in the television audience. Table LX indicates that of the 16,768 minutes, at least one adult viewer also was present for 63.32 percent of that time.

## TABLE LX

MINUTES A CHILD WAS VIEWING TELEVISION WITH AN ADULT PRESENT IN AUDIENCE

| Family <br> Number | Minutes With At Least One Child in Aud | "Attentive ${ }^{*}$ Man |  | "Attentive"$\qquad$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { "Inattentive }{ }^{\text {I }} \\ \quad \text { Man } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | "I nattentive" Woman |  | At Least One Adult |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Mins. | Pret. | Mins. | Prat. | Mins. | Prct | Mins. | Pret. | Mins. | Pret. |
| 1 | 396 | 17 | 4.29 | 38 | 9.60 | 8 | 2.02 | 39 | 9.85 | 114 | 28.78 |
| 2 | 330 | 192 | 58.18 | 84 | 25.45 | 15 | 4.55 | 10 | 3.03 | 245 | 74.24 |
| 3 | 2381 | 268 | 11.25 | 607 | 25.49 | 134 | 5.63 | 730 | 30.65 | 1229 | 51.59 |
| 6 | 1520 | 358 | 23.55 | 1041 | 68.49 | 71 | . 48 | 488 | 32.11 | 1478 | 97.24 |
| 7 | 1667 | 390 | 23.40 | 458 | 27.47 | 243 | 14.58 | 621 | 37.25 | 1438 | 86.26 |
| 8 | 1141 | 170 | 14.89 | 122 | 10.69 | 140 | 12.27 | 174 | 15.25 | 476 | 41.72 |
| 9 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | 892 | 33 | 3.70 | 461 | 51.68 | 38 | 4.26 | 218 | 24.44 | 613 | 68.72 |
| 11 | 1924 | 107 | 5.56 | 589 | 30.61 | 183 | 9.51 | 789 | 41.01 | 1515 | 78.74 |
| 12 | 2351 | 741 | 31.51 | 116 | 4.93 | 213 | 9.06 | 64 | 2.72 | 950 | 40.41 |
| 14 | 1009 | 143 | 14.17 | 141 | 13.97 | 151 | 14.97 | 232 | 22.99 | 521 | 51.64 |
| 15 | 1191 | 531 | 44.59 | 84 | 7.05 | 97 | 8.14 | 30 | 2.52 | 691 | 58.01 |
| 16 | 860 | 138 | 16.05 | 59 | 6.86 | 15 | 1.74 | 101 | 11.74 | 345 | 40.12 |
| 17 | 1105 | 12 | 1.09 | 44 | 3.98 | 111 | 10.05 | 153 | 13.85 | 502 | 45.43 |
| Totals: | 16,768 | 3,000 |  | 3,844 |  | 11,419 |  | 3,649 |  | 0,617 |  |
| Average | ntage: |  | 17.90\% |  | 22.92\% |  | 8.64\% |  | 21.76\% |  | 63.32\% |

A woman viewer was present for nearly 45 percent of the time a child was in front of the IV set. About one half of this time (22.92 percent, ), she was viewing "attentively".

A man viewer was in the television audience only 26.50 percent of the time a child was present, and he was viewing "attentively" for nearly 18 percent of the time.

## Related Activities

According to the data from the four DynaScope studies, a child was in the television audience nearly 63 percent of the time sets were in use. In the 1962 DynaScope study, a child was in the audience about 49 percent of the time. Yet, further data showed that for more than one-third of the time the child audience was "inattentive" to the television screen. What were these childzen doing for such a significant proportion of their viewing time? A frame-by-frame search of the 1962 film records revealed that for approximately one-fourth of the time, these children were engaged in some other activity. The varied activities in which these children participated, and the amount of viewing time they devoted to each is included here.

## Teen Viewer Activities

The teen viewers in this study were found to devote nearly 28 percent of the time that they were in the television audience to some other activity. (Table [XI.) The television activity taking the greatest amount of time was Study. Teens spent 7.24 percent of their television viewing time studying, but that was only about one-third to one half of the time that they actually had study materials in front of them. While some were able
to study for long periods of time, concentration for others lasted only a few minutes before they glanced back to the TV set.

This particular group of teenagers was composed largely of girls, and the activity which took the next greatest time was Rolling Hair (on brush rollers). Other important activities in front of the set were Eating, Talking on the Phone, and Reading the Newspaper. The teen diet in the films included everything from apples to Peerless brand chocolate chip ice cream (eaten directly from the one half gallon container). Though several large city newspapers are cinculated in Stillwater, the teens who read newspapers in these films chose only the local News-Press. Magazine reading time was spent on McCall's, Life, and IV Guide. The Play in which the teenagers participated consisted of cards and playing with pets. One teenage girl played with a balloon while rapidly chewing and blowing bubble gum.

## TABLE LXI

PERCENTAGE OF TEEN VIEWER-MINUTES DEVOTED TO RELATED ACTIVITIES

## Activity

Reading Newspaper
Reading Magazine
Reading Other (Books, IV Guide)
Eating
Studying
Talking on Phone
Talking to Another Person
Rolling Hair
Manicure, etc.
Sleeping
Playing
Sewing, Knitting
Polishing Shoes
3
2,383 Mins.
$27.71 \%$

## Gxadeschooler Viewer Activities

Spending considerably less TV time on other activities than the teen viewers, the gradeschoolers in the study devoted only 18 percent of their total viewer-minutes to other interests. (Table LXII.)

Play occupied the greatest amount of gradeschooler time (4.68 percent), and included play with pets, building sets, cars, and playing with other children. Eating proved to be the second most time-consuming activity. Magazines and books were of more interest to this group of children than Newspapers, with Life and TV Guide read most frequently.

TABLE LXII
PERCENTAGE OF GRADESCHOOLER VIEWER-MINUTES DEVOTED TO RELATED ACTIVITIES

Activity
Reading Newspaper
Reading Magazine
Reading Other (Books, IV Guide)
Eating
Talking to Another Person
Study
Talking on Phone
Ironing
Holding Baby
Rolling Hair
Play
Totals:

Minutes Devoted Percentage of to an Activity Viewing Iime
$.31 \%$
2.88
1.97
3.12
.50
2.11
.10
.43
.17
1.84
4.68

1,056 Mins. 18.11\%

## Preschool Viewer Activities

The preschool-age group in the study devoted 28.42 percent of their time in the television audience to other activities. (Table LXIII.) The majority of this time was spent in Play which took took a total of 18.18 percent of their viewing time. A breakdown of Play time indicates that a
little more than one-fourth of this time was spent playing with one or both parents. Household items, from the empty milk carton to the ashtray, proved to be important play toys. Other children, stuffed animals, rubber toys, blocks, cars, and western toys were among the other interests of preschoolers. A significant amount of time ( 7.56 percent) was devoted to Eating. One preschooler ate breakfast regularly in view of the television set, while others enjoyed such snacks as milk, raisins, Ritz crackers, toast, and animal cookies.

## TABLE LXIII

PERCENTAGE OF PRESCHOOLER VIEWER-MIMUTES DEVOTED TO RELATED ACTIVITIES

Minutes Devoted Percentaige of to an Activity Viewina Time

Looking at Magazine
Mother Reading to Preschooler
Eating
Sleeping
Getting Dressed
Play (See itemized list below)
Totals:

## Play

With one or both parents 292.06
With Another Child
With Baby
By Self (Climbing, etc.)
Stuffed Animals
Other Toys (Bubber animals, toy iron)
Household Items (Utensils, ashtray) 282
Books 25
Dolls 44
Cowgirl - Cowboy toys. 79
Building Blocks 100
Cars 91
Coloring
Totals for Play:

## Child Viewer Activities Sumarized

As a group, the children in the Stillwater-1962 DynaScope study devoted 25.43 percent of the time they were in the TV audience to some other activity. The greatest amount of time was devoted to Play, followed by Eating, Study, Personal Care, Reading Magazines, Talking on the Phone, and reading books or Newspapers.

It is interesting to note that even though a great deal of activity time while in the IV audience was devoted to other media ( 3.76 percent of total viewing time), children were never observed reading comic books at any time.

Most of the children, when actively viewing television, tended to watch regularly from some favorite spot in the room. One child viewed from a small rocking chair, several from a special place on the rug, and one small preschooler (who could be seen in the mirror system which reflected the TV screeen) stood consistently about one foot away from the screen.

TABLE LXIV
CHILD VIEWER-MINUTES DEVOTED TO RELATED ACTIVITIES WHILE IN THE TELEVISION AUDIENCE
Activity

## Play

Eating
Study
Personal Care (Rolling hair, etc.)
Reading Magazine
Talking on Phone
Reading Other (Books, TV Guide)
Reading Newspaper
Talking to Another Person'
Dressing
Misc. Housework
Looking at Magazine (Preschoolers)
Mother Reading to Preschooler
Totals:

Minutes Devoted Percentage of to an Activity Viewing Time

Time of Day a Child Was First in TV Audience

DynaScope films show the child viewer entering the TV audience for the first time during the day between $7 \mathrm{a} . \mathrm{m}$. and $8 \mathrm{a} . \mathrm{m}$. The greatest number of these children, as shown in Figure 7, appear for the first time during the day between $8 \mathrm{a} . \mathrm{m}$. and $9 \mathrm{a} . \mathrm{m}$. on weekdays. Another large group of children come into the television audience for the first time during the day between 6 p.m. and 7 p.m.

On Saturday and Sunday, however, most child viewers did not appear in the TV audience until between noon and l p.m., as indicated in Figure 8.

## Time of Day a Child Was Last Viewing Television

The time of day during which a child viewer was last seen in the television audience varied somewhat, as did the time of day when the child was first in the audience. The time when most children saw their last TV program of the day was usually between 9 p.m. and 10 p.m., Sunday through Thursday. In a few cases, the children were viewing as late as 11 pom. to 12 p.m. (Figure 9.)

On Friday and Saturday evening, the time with a child last in the audience appeared to be bi-modal. Figure 10 shows that the greatest numbex of children left the TV sets between $7 p_{0} m_{0}$ and $8 p_{0} m_{0,}$ and the next greatest number left the audience between 9 p.m. and 10 p.m. There were also fewer children in the audience from $10 \mathrm{p} . \mathrm{m}$. to $11 \mathrm{p} . \mathrm{m}$. than on weekday nights. Since approximately one half of the children in this DynaScope study was in the teenage group, it is probable that their absence (due to dating and other activities) contributed largely to this early disappearance of the child viewer from the television audience.

FIGURE 7
TIME OF DAY CHI LDREN WERE FIRST IN THE TELEVISION AUDIENCE (MONDAY THROUGH FRIDAY)


Time of Day Child First in Audience

FIGURE 8
TIME OF DAY CHILDREN WERE FIRST IN THE TELEVISION AUDIENCE (SATURDAY AND SUNDAY)


FIGURE 9
TIME OF DAY CHILDREN WERE LAST IN THE TELEVISION AUDIENCE (SUNDAY THROUGH THURSDAY)


Time of Day Child Last in Audience

FIGURE 10
TIME OF DAY CHILDREN WERE LAST IN
THE TELEVISION AUDIENCE (FRI DAY-AND SATURDAY)


Time of Day Child Last in Audience

## The Nursery School Child

The audience patterns presented here are those for 15 children of preschool-age attending a nursery school held in one of the DynaScope homes. This is an intensive look at their viewing patterns for a twoweek period, Monday through Friday. The children were watching television in a supervised situation and in the presence of many more child viewers than they would ever encounter in their own homes. The ages of the eight boys and seven girls were between three and five years.

## Programs Viewed By Nursery School Children

Children in this nursery school were permitted to view television between the hours of $7 ; 30$ to $9: 00$ a.m. and $3: 30$ to $5: 30$ p.m. They consistently viewed eight specific programs, and a number of the children were in the audience when another program was viewed briefly on one occasion. The programs they watched were "Captain Kangaroo", "Miss Fran", "5 pom. Cartoons", "Foreman Scotty", "Make Room for Daddy", "News-Weather at 7:30 a.m.", "Here"s Hollywood", "Our Five Daughters", and "Superman". Table LXV shows the amount of time devoted to each program compared with the percentage of time with at least one child in the audience. Commanding more viewing time than any other programs were "Captain Kangaroo" and "Miss Fran". There was at least one child in the audience each minute that these programs were tuned. Of all programs viewed, the average amount of time the set was turned on during the minutes in which it would have been possible to view was only 50.33 percent. At least one child was in the viewing audience for only 43.79 percent of the possible viewing time for the entire group of programs.

## TABLE LXV

## TIME DEVOTED TO PROGRAMS VIEWED BY NURSERY SCHOOL CHILDREN (TWO WEEKS - MONDAY THROUGH FRIDAY)

| Program | Possible Number of Viewing Minutes During Period of Ten Days | Minutes With "Set-in-use" During Programs \& Percentage of Pessible Minutes |  | Minutes With At Least One Child in the Audience \& Percentage of Possible Minutes |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Captain Kangaroo | 450 | 445 | 98.98\% | 445 | 98.98\% |
| Miss Fran | 250 | 240 | 96.00 | 240 | 96.00 |
| Cartoons - 5 p.m | 300 | 145 | 48.33 | 138 | 46.00 |
| Foreman Scotty | 300 | 106 | 35.33 | 106 | 35.33 |
| Make Room for Daddy | Y 300 | 99 | 33.00 | 78 | 26.60 |
| News - Weather - 7 | a.m. 200 | 72 | 36.00 | 69 | 34.50 |
| Here's Hollywood | 300 | 59 | 19.67 | 59 | 19.67 |
| Our Five Daughters | 300 | 30 | 10.00 | 4 | 1.33 |
| Superman | 300 | 2 | .67 | 2 | . 67 |
| Average: |  |  | $50.33 \%$ |  | 43.79\% |

Five of the programs viewed by the nursery schoolers had at least one child in the audience 100 percent of the time that the program was tuned. (Table LXVI.) Those programs with a high percentage of time with an "inattentive only" audience (all members of the audience were "inattentive" at times to TV) were "News-Weather", "Miss Fran", and "Here's Hollywood". This table indicates that although there was at least one of the nursery school children in the audience for 95.28 percent of the time the programs were turned on, for 22.76 percent of the time there was only an "inattentive ${ }^{\text {al }}$ audience.

The average nursery school child audience for each program is listed in Table LXVII. The largest average audience was found during the "Superman" program; however, previous data showed that this program was on the screen for only two minutes. "Captain Kangaroo", "Miss Fran", and "Foreman Scotty", all children's variety type shows, had high audience averages of more than seven children per minute.: "Foreman Scotty" had nearly two

```
"attentive" viewers per minute more than either "Captain Kangaroo" or
"Miss Fran". Even though not viewed for long periods of time, "Make Room
for Daddy" and "Here's Hollywood" also had relatively high average "atten-
tive"audience figures.
```

TABLE LXVI
PERCENTAGE OF "SET-IN-USE" TIME WTIH AT LEAST ONE CHILD IN AUDIENCE COMPARED WITH PERCENTAGE OF TIME A CHILD WAS IN AN "INATTENTIVE-ONLY" AUDIENCE
Program

Captain Kangaroo
Miss Fran
Cartoons
Foreman Scotty
Make Room for Daddy
News Wea ther
Here's Hollywood
Our Five Daughters
Superman
Average:

Percentage of Time
"Set-in-Use" With
at Least One Child
in the Audience.
$100.00 \%$
100.00
95.17
100.00
78.79
95.84
100.00
13.33
100.00
95.28\%

Percentage of Time
"Set-in-Use" With An
"Inattentive -Only"
Child Audience
$8.31 \%$
53.60
15.17
9.43
6.06
61.11
35.60
3.33
-
$22.76 \%$
table LXVII
AVERAGE NURSERY SCHCOL CHILD AUDIENCE DURING PROGRAMS VIENED

## Program

Captain Kangaroo Miss Fran
Cartoons
Foreman Scotty
Make Room for Daddy
News -Nea ther
Here's Hollywood
Our Five Daughters
Superman
Total Averages:

| Total No. of Child ViewerMinutes | Average "Attentive" Child Audience | Average <br> "Inattentive" Child Audience | Total <br> Average <br> Child <br> Audience |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2,596 | 2.97 | 2.86 | 5.83 |
| 2,327 | 2.71 | 6.99 | 9.70 |
| 767 | 3.45 | 1.84 | 5.29 |
| 1,062 | 6.94 | 3.08 | 10.02 |
| 379 | 2.64 | 1.19 | 3.83 |
| 247 | . 74 | 2.69 | 3.43 |
| 323 | 1.98 | 3.49 | 5.47 |
| 15 | . 13 | . 37 | . 50 |
| 8 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 4.00 |
|  | 3.02 | 3.37 | 6.39 |

Total average nursery school audience was 6.39 children per minute. only 3.02 children were "attentive" during the average minute; 3.37 childwere viewing "inattentively".

During the minutes in which commercials were identified, at least one nursery school child was in the audience 93.75 percent of that time. The entire nursery school audience was "inattentive" during commercials, however, for about 20 percent of the time. (Table LXVII.)

TABLE LXVII
PERCENTAGE OF COMMERCIAL MINUTES WITH A NURSERY SCHOOL CHILD IN AUDIENCE COMPARED WITH COMMERCIAL MINUTES WITH AN "INATTENTIVE-ONLY" AUDIENCE

| Program | Percentage of Minutes With Commercial \& at Least One Nursery School Child in the Audience | Percentage of Minutes With Commercial \& an "Inattentive-only" Child Audience Present |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Captain Kangaroo | 100.00\% | 12.96\% |
| Miss Fran | 100.00 | 35.29 |
| Cartoons | 88.89 | 22.22 |
| Foreman Scotty | 100.00 | 12.50 |
| Make Room for Daddy | - 90.00 | - |
| News - Wea ther | 100.00 | 41.18 |
| Here's Hollywood | 100.00 | - |
| Our Five Daughters | 33.33 | - |
| Superman | 100.00 | - |
| Average: | 93.75\% | 20.00\% |

The average "attentive" nursery school audience during commercials was 2.75 children per minute. The program with the largest "attentive" audience was *Foreman Scotty ${ }^{* 1}$ with 4.63 children per average commercial minute. The "inattentive" audience averaged 3.51 children, while the total nursery school child audience was 6.26 children per commercial minute. (Table LXIX.)

TABLE LXIX
AVERAGE NURSERY SCHOOL AUDIENCE DURING COMMERCIALS

| Programs | Number of <br> Commercials <br> During <br> Erograms | Average "Attentive" Child <br> Audience | Average "Inattentive" Child <br> Audience | Total <br> Average <br> Audience |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Captain Kangaroo | 54 | 3.07 | 4.37 | 7.44 |
| Miss Fran | 34 | 2.19 | 5.04 | 7.23 |
| Cartoons - 5 p.m. | 18 | 3.06 | 1.78 | 4.84 |
| Foreman Scotty | 16 | 4.63 | 3.06 | 7.69 |
| Make Room for Daddy | y 10 | 3.70 | . 90 | 4.60 |
| News -Nea ther | 17 | . 76 | 2.41 | 3.17 |
| Here's Hollywood | 7 | 3.57 | 2.14 | 5.71 |
| Our Five Daughters | 3 | . 67 | 1.00 | 1.67 |
| Superman | 1 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 8.00 |
| Averages: |  | 2.75 | 3.51 | 6.26 |

The nursery schoolers viewed television with an adult present in the audience about 30 percent of the time. The adult woman supervising the children was watching the programs "attentively" for 9.32 percent; "inattentively ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ for 20.24 percent of the time. (Table LXX.)

TABLE LXX
MINUTES WITH ADULT WOMAN IN AUDIENCE WHEN NURSERY SCHOOL GHILDREN WERE WATCHING TELEVISION

| Minutes With at Least One Child <br> in the Television Audience: | $\mathbf{1 , 2 0 1}$ Minutes | $100.00 \%$ |
| :--- | :---: | ---: |
| Minutes With an "Attentive" <br> Woman in the Television Audience: | 112 | $\mathbf{9 . 3 2 \%}$ |
| Minutes With an "Inattentive" <br> Woman in the Television Audience: | 243 | $20.24 \%$ |
| Total Time With an Adult Woman in <br> the Audience With Nursery School <br> Children: | $\mathbf{3 5 5}$ | $29.56 \%$ |

The nursery school children devoted about four percent of their viewing time to some other activity. The greatest amount of that time was
devoted to Play (3.30 percent). Play consisted of holding dolls and other toys, and an interchange of toys with other children in the group. Eating took place only about . 55 percent of the viewing time when the children were served milk during the afternoon. One child spent a few minutes looking at a magazine while in the television audience.

The viewing took place normally with six to eight of the children seated in a semi-circle in front of the set. A considerable amount of inter-play between several of the children (laughing and talking together, hitting, etc.) characterized most of the viewing minutes.

## TABLE LXXI

NURSERY SCHOOL VIEWER-MINUTES DEVOTED TO RELATED ACTIVITIES

## Activity

Play - This includes playing with dolls, sand-pail, and active play between different individuals:

Eating - Milk was sometimes served to all members of the group while they were viewing afternoon programs; 43

Child Looking at Magazine:

Total Nursery School Viewer-Minutes Devoted to Related Activities:

306
Percentage of Total ViewerMinutes

> Viewer-Minutes Devoted to an Activity
$3.30 \%$
$.55 \%$
$.10 \%$
$3.91 \%$

Total Nursery School Viewer-Minutes: 7,724

## Summa ry

In the 1962 DynaScope study, the teen and preschool viewers were in the TV audience about one third of the time that sets were in use in their homes. Gradeschool-age children were viewing about one-half of the "setwinause" time. Gradeschoolers had the highest audience average of 048 of a child per minute, compared to .35 of a child for preschoolers, and .30 of a child per minute for teenagers.

Teenagers, gradeschoolers, and preschoolers were "attentive" to the television screen, however, only approximately onethalf of the time they were in the audience. The gradeschoolwage child had the greatest "atten= tive ${ }^{n}$ audience, also, with .29 of a child during the average minute. For nearly 60 percent of the time a gradeschooler was in the audience, he was viewing "attentively". Teenagers viewed "attentively" for 57 percent of the time in the audience, and preschoolers, 34 percent of their audience time.

The average audience during commercials was more uniform for the three age groups: gradeschoolers, 33 of a child; preschoolers, . 30 of a child; teenagers, 29 of a child per commercial minute.

Although gradeschoolers had the highest average audience, teenagers were more "attentive" during commercials. Teen average "attentive" audience during commercials was . 14 of a child ( 48 percent of audience average). Gradeschoolers had an "attentive" audience of .ll of a child (33 percent of audience average), while preschoolers had . 08 of a child (27 percent of audience average) during commercials.

Children in the 1962 study had their TV sets tuned for the greatest length of time to Situation Comedy programs, followed by Movies and Westerns. Although sets were tuned to these program types for long
periods of time, programs which were designed specifically for children had a greater average audience per minute.

Teens favored Children's Drama shows. They were present about 60 percent and viewing "attentively for nearly 45 percent of the time that Children's Drama was tuned. Other shows which attracted the teens' attention weze Cartoons, Movies, and Mystery programs.

Gradeschoolers preferred Cartoon programs. These children were in the IV audience about 47 percent of the time Cartoons were tuned, and "attentive" for 38 percent of the time. Gradeschoolers were highly "attentive ${ }^{* 7}$, also, during Children's Drama, General Variety, and Situation Comedy.

The children of preschool age were most "attentive" during Children's Variety shows, although a larger preschool audience was present during Children's Drama.

Children in this study were found to devote about one-fourth of their time in the television audience to other activities. The greatest amount of time was spent in Play, followed by Eating, reading Newspapers, Magazines, and Bpoks, and on Study.

Teenagers devoted 28 percent of their time in the TV audience to activities such as Study; Rolling Hair, and Eating.

Only 18.18 percent of the time gradeschoolers were in the audience was spent in other activities. The gradeschoolers spent most activity time in Play and Eating.

The majority of the preschoolers' time was spent Playing ( 18.18 piercent), followed by Eating ( 7.56 percent). This group devoted 28.42 percent of their time in the TV audience to other activities.

Further data from the 1962 study indicated that an adult was viewing television 63 percent of the time a child was in the audience. A woman was viewing TV, "attentively" or "inattentively", for 45 percent of the child audience minutes, and a man was viewing for only 26.50 percent of the time that a child was in the audience.

Most children were first entering the TV audience from 8 a.m. to 9 a.m. and 6 p.m. to 7 p.m. on weekdays. On Saturday and Sunday, children were most frequently seen first in the audience between noon and 1 p.m.

Children were last in the TV audience between 9 p.m. and 10 p.m. from Sunday through Thursday. On Friday and Saturday evenings, a large number of children left the audience between 7 p.m. and 8 p.m., and another large group left between 9 p.m. and 10 p.m. Some children viewed later than midnight. One reason for a number of children leaving television between 7 p.m. and 8 p.m. is that the teen viewer probably left for dates and other activities at that time.

Fifteen nursery school viewers were permitted to view TV for a maximum of 3.50 hours per day, Monday through Friday. The programs watched most by this group were "Captain Kangaroo", "Miss Fraṇ", and ${ }^{\text {w }}$ Foreman Scotty ${ }^{\infty}$ 。
"For reman Scotty" had the largest nursery school audience during both the program and its commercials. The nursery school children were also more "attentive" during the "Foreman Scotty" show and commercials than during other programs.

The average nursery school audience was 6.39 children per minute, and approximately one-half of the average audience was viewing "attentively.

The average audience during commercials was 6.26 nursery school children per minute. The nursery schoolers were less "attentive", however, during the commercials than for the programs.

Average minattentive" audience was 3.51, compared to the "attentive" audience of 2.75 nursery schoolers per minute during commercials.

All viewers in the nursery school audience were "inattentive" for about 23 percent of the time programs were tuned, while during commercials there was an "inattentive-only" audience for 20 percent of the time.

An adult woman was in the audience with the nursery school viewers for 30 percent of the time, but she viewed television "attentively" for only onew.third of that time.

Devoting four percent of the total viewer-minutes in front of the TV set to other activities, the nursery school child was engaged in Play and Eating for brief periods of time. A great deal of laughing and talking between several members of the viewing group characterized most viewing minutes.

CHAPTER VI

## SUMMARY, FINDINGS AND IMPLICATIONS

The study of children's television viewing was undertaken for the purpose of discovering child audience patterns which have not heretofore been available. The DynaScope method of studying human behavior not only helps evaluate existing research, but allows more definitive observation to be made about the impact of television on the child. Many views concerning children and television in popular periodicals have been based largely upon personal opinions of critics.

It is the opinion of this writer that children are not actually viewing TV as much as has been implied in published articles, and that television has become a reasonable part of their lives.

Data for this study was obtained from the DynaScope film records made in four studies, 1961-1963. These studies, in Stillwater and Tulsa, Okla。, and Wickita, Kan., were conducted by Dr. Charles L. Allen, Director of the School of Journalism at Oklahoma State University. The DynaScopes recorded nearly one and one half million pictures of the television audiience in the 95 participating homes. Every time television sets were turned on in these homes for a period of two consecutive weeks, the DynaScopes were capturing audience behavior patterns once each 15 seconds. Careful study of these film records provided audience patterns of 167 children in normal family interaction and 15 children in a supervised nursery school situation。

## Viewing Patterns

From the four DynaScope studies, the following viewing patterns were found:

1. As the age of the child increased, the amount of time he spent in the television audience decreased.
2. This decrease of time with a child in the audience was reflected in the length of time television sets were turned on in the home.
3. While the average time sets were in use for all families in the four DynaScope studies averaged 31.80 hours per week, families with only-gradeschool-age children ${ }^{50}$ turned their sets on for 33.86 hours per week. In homes with only-teenage children, sets were in use for 27.55 hours a week, and families with only-preschool-age children had their sets on for 37.12 hours per week.
4. The amount of television "no audience" time in the home also decreased as the child viewer became older.
5. "No audience" time in homes with only-preschool children was 24.84 percent of the "set-in-use" time, and in gradeschooler"only homes it dropped to 18.01 percent. The least amount of "no audience" time was recorded in homes with only-teenage children. These families had "no audience" present for only 11.39 percent of their "set-in-use" time.
$5^{50}$ For definitions of grade levels and DynaScope research terms used in this chapter, turn to p. 32.
6. In both "set-in-use" time and "no audience" time, the families with only gradeschool children more nearly reflected the norms of data for all families.
7. Children in each of the 95 families viewed television more as the time of day progressed, averaging approximately 2.50 hours for the entire daily viewing time.
8. Each child in the study was spending about 10.40 hours each week viewing television, or approximately 1.50 hours each day.
9. The amount of time with a child viewing "attentively" proved to be only three fifths of the total child viewing minutes, or about 1.75 hours per day in each home.
10. While sets were in use for 31.80 hours each week, children were spending 7.61 viewer-hours per week doing something besides watching the television screen. For nearly 38 percent of the time sets were in use, a child was viewing "inattentively".
11. The child audience remained fairly constant throughout the entire day, but there was a slightly greater audience during the morning period.
12. The average child audience was .63 of a child per minute, or in other words, a child was present in the television audience for six out of each ten minutes that sets were in use.
13. Although ohildren were in the television audience for six out of ten minutes, they were viewing "attentively" for only four minutes out of ten, or approximately two-fifths of the "set-in-use" time.
14. The average "inattentive" child audience, 38 percent of the total child audience, was .24 of a child per minute.
15. Even though the child audience was more "attentive" during the morning period, he was also more "inattentive" during this period
than in the afternoon or evening.
16. As noted earlier, the age of the children in the family affected both the "set-in-use" time and the "no audience" time. Further, as the age of the child increased, the amount of time he spent viewing television became less.
17. The teenage viewers spent less time in the TV audience than either the gradeschoolers or preschoolers. Their heaviest period was during the evening, when for about 19 percent of the time, a teenager was in the audience. On the average, however, teens were in the audience about one-sixth of the total "set-in-use ${ }^{01}$ time.
18. The gradeschoolage child devoted more time than the other children to television, with the total daily time of 18.44 percent. Although the teenager and the gradeschooler had about same opportunity to view television in the mornings, the gradeschoolers were watching twice as much of the time as the teenagers during that period.
19. Preschoolage children showed a gradual decine in the percentage of time devoted to television throughout the day. While their morning viewing was greater than any other group for any time period, the preschoolers were in the audience only 11.07 percent of evening "set-inmuse" time. The small amount of time the preschoolers spent in the evening audience was next to the lowest time recorded for any group, with teenagers in the audience only 7.80 percent of the morning "set-in-use" time.
20. On the whole, children were spending slightly more than 60 percent of the total "set-in-use" time in the TV audience.
21. The heaviest percentage of child viewing took place during the morning when children were watching television for 71 percent of the "setminouse" time.

## Intensive Investigation

The second section of this thesis dealt with information obtained from an intensive investigation of data compiled in the Stillwater-1962 DynaScope study, and the following findings apply only to that section.

The information regarding the child audience was analyzed for only those homes with children, rather than in relation to the entire sample of families.
22. The teenage viewers were present about one-third of the time their families had the $T V$ set turned on.
23. As shown by data from the four DynaScope studies, the teenage child spent more time in front of the set as the day progressed, with the heaviest teen viewing taking place in the evenings.
24. The teenagers were "attentively" viewing television for slightly more than half of the time they were in the audience.
25. This relationship of viewing "attentively" one-half of the time remained fairly stable throughout the entire day; hence, the greatest amount of "attentive" teen viewing also took place in the evening.
26. During the average minute that television sets were on there was .30 of a teenager in the audience. In other words, a teenager was watching IV three minutes out of each ten that sets were in use。
27. The largest teen audience was present during the average minute of the evening viewing period.
28. From the "attentive" teen audience during the three time periods (. 17 of a child), the reader can again see that the teenager was watching the television set only about one half of the time he was in the audience. A teenager was viewing "attentively" for nearly two minutes of each ten that sets were in use.
29. While commercials were being shown, the teen audience per minute was about the same as for all program minutes, 29 of a child. The largest teen audience during commercials was present in the morning. During all identified commercial minutes, a teenager was in the audience three minutes out of ten.
30. "Attentively" viewing teenagers were in the audience somewhat less than half of the time (. 14 of a child per minute) during commercials.
31. Children who were in gradeschool viewed television about one-half of the time ( 48 percent) that sets were in use in their homes. Evening was the heaviest viewing period for these children. While this was also true for the teen viewers, a greater increase in the evening viewing time over the afternoon time was more evident for the gradeschoolers.
32. The gradeschool viewer not only viewed TV more than the other age children, but were spending slightly more time viewing "attentively", as well. For approximately 29 percent of the "set-in-use" time, and 60 percent of the total time in the television audience, the gradeschoolsage child in the audience.
33. For each minute sets were in use, there was approximately 48 of a gradeschool-age child in the audience.
34. The gradeschoolers" average "attentive" audience of .29 of a child per minute was nearly double the "attentive" teen audience.
35. The gxadeschooler audience during commercial minutes was about the same as that of the teenagers, . 33 of a child.
36. However, the gradeschoolers showed a significant decrease in ${ }^{00}$ attentive ${ }^{\infty}$ audience size during the commercials to .ll of a child.
37. Like the teen viewer, the children of preschool-age viewed teled vision about one third of the time sets were in use.
38. The heaviest preschool viewing took place during the morning, and was the largest viewing percentage of "set-in-use" time for any period or age group.
39. The total amount of preschooler viewer time per week, 11.92 hours, was greater than the amount of time teenagers devoted to TV by more than 4.50 hours. And although preschoolers were in the TV audience more than gradeschoolers, the difference was only. 14 hour, or about 8.5 minutes more per week.
40. The preschool-age child was viewing television "attentively" only oneothird of the time ( 34 percent), less than for ther teenagers or gradeschoolers.
41. Morning viewing records showed that the preschooler was most "attentive ${ }^{*}$ during this period, for about one-half of the time.
42. Even though the amount of time preschooler's were in the audience increased in the evening above that during the afternoon, the time these children were "attentive" continued to drop to as low as 24 percent of the time they were in the evening audience.
43. Approximately . 35 of a preschool child could be found in the television audience during the average minute.
44. Only ol2 of a child per minute was viewing TV "attentively", how ever. The average "attentive" audience recorded for the preschoolage child" was the lowest of the three age groups studied.
45. Preschoolers were in the TV audience for less time during commercials than for programs.
46. And while the preschooler was "attentive" about one-third of the program time, he was "attentive ${ }^{0}$ only onemfourth of the time during the commercials. The "attentiveness" during commercials was also the lowest of all three age groups of children, since the preschooler was watching the commercial less than one minute of each ten commercial minutes.
47. The television sets in the homes of the 1962-DynaScope study were tuned for the longest period of time (when a child was in the audience at least part of the time) to programs which were of the Situation Comedy, Movie, and Western types. ${ }^{51}$ This does not mean that the children remained in the audience, or were watching television for the entire length of the program.
48. The program type which drew the largest average child audience and average "attentive child audience was Children's Drama shows.
49. The average audience during Children's Drama was 1.57 children per minute, while the average "attentive" audience was slightly more than one child per minute.
50. Teenage children in the study spent more time viewing programs which were Children's Drama, General Variety, and Teen Music types.

## 51

Examples of each of the program types viewed by the children in this study may be found on p. 142.
51. The gradeschool TV viewer in this study seemed to prefer Cartoons, followed by Children's Drama, General Variety, and Situation Comedy.
52. Children of preschoolwage watched Children's Drama and Children's Variety shows most, and had the largest ${ }^{\text {mattentive" audi- }-~}$ ence present during Children's Variety programs.
53. About onexfourth of the time that children were in the television audience they were engaged in some other activity. The greatest amounts of TV viewing time were devoted to Play, Eating, and Study。
54. Teenage children, who devoted about 28 percent of their viewing time to other activities, were busy Studying, Reading Newspapers, Magazines, and Books, Eating, and Talking on the Phone.
55. While the gradeschoolers were devoting only 18.11 percent of their viewing time to other activities, their greatest interest was Play. Other activities which consumed significant amounts of time were Eating, Reading Magazines, and Study.
56. Preschoolage children spent as much time Playing in front of the TV set as the entire time gradeschoolers devoted to all activities. The Play of the preschoolers was quite diversified, with large amounts of time spent playing with one or both parents and with household items. Another category to which preschoolers devoted a great amount of their time was Eating. Total time de voted to related activities by the preschool children was 28.42 percent of the "set-in-use ${ }^{\text {no }}$ time.
57. The children in the 1962 study viewed with an adult in the audi ence about 63 percent of the time.
58. Most children were first in the TV audience between 8 a.m. and $9 \mathrm{a} . \mathrm{m}$. or between $6 \mathrm{p.m}$. and $7 \mathrm{p} . \mathrm{m}$. on weekdays.
59. On Satuxday and Sunday, the greatest number of child viewers were first seen in the audience from noon to 1 p.m.
60. The greatest number of children were viewing television as late as $9 \mathrm{pom}_{\mathrm{o}}$ to $10 \mathrm{p} . \mathrm{m}_{\mathrm{o}}$, Sunday through Thursday evenings.
61. On weekend nights, however, most children left the audience between 7 pomo and 8 pom $_{0}$, and many were still watching TV from 9 p.m. to 10 p.m.

Nursery School Viewers

A nursery school was conducted in one of the homes in the 1962-DynaScope study.
62. The 15 preschool-age boys and gizis in this nursery school were permitted to view television for a maximum of 3.50 hours each day.
63. Study of this group"s viewing patterns, Monday through Friday, for a period of two consecutive weeks, showed that eight programs were viewed consistently by the chịldren. The average, nursery school audience during the programs was 6.39 children per minute.
64. Approximately one-half of the audience ( 3.02 children) was viewing IV ${ }^{\infty}$ attentively"
65. The program which compelled both the largest audience and largest "attentive" audience was "Foreman Scotty".
66. Other shows which attracted the preschoolers were "Captain Kangaroo" and "Miss Fran". These three nursery school favorites may be classified as Children's Variety type programs.
67. During commercials, the nursery schoolers were in the audience somewhat less. The average audience during commercials was 6.26 children, with an average "attentive" audience of 2.75 children per commercial minute.
68. The entire nursery school audience was "inattentive" to the television screen about 23 percent of the time programs were tuned.
69. During commerials, there was an winattentive only nursery school audience for 20 percent of the time.
70. An adult woman was in the audience with the nursery school children about 30 percent of the time, but viewing "attentively" only onecthird of that time.
71. In the supeavised viewing situation, the nursery school children devoted relatively little time (less than four percent) to other activities while in the TV audience. Most of the time with a nursery schooler in the audience was characterized, however, by laughing and talkipg among members of the group.

Implications of Study

Following are some of the implications from this study of children and television which seem to be of greatest importance:

1. The age of the children in the family affects both the amount of time sets are in use and the amount of time when no audience is present.
2. Children are not spending as much time in the television audience as has been indicated by writers in popular periodicals, or even by research done to date, although children spend a far greater amount of time viewing television than adults.
3. Even when the child is in the television audience, he is not always "attentively ${ }^{\text {en }}$ absorbing the subject matter. Child viewers appear to be viewing "attentively ${ }^{n}$ about oneahalf of the time they are in the audience, but "attentiveness" tends to vary with the type of program they are viewing.
4. Although the television sets are tuned to Situation Comedy and Western type programs for long periods of time when children are prespent in the audience, the children pend more time in the audience of programs which are designed especially for children.
5. These children spent very little time viewing shows which were basically crime and violence types. The amount of attention children give to these programs increases as the child's age in $=$ creases.
6. Children devote a significant amount of time while they are in the television audience to other activities. The ways children spend their inattentive viewing time are rather diverse in nature, but a great deal of the time is devoted to a few major activities.
7. Children appear to be viewing in a situation which is supervised (at least in the sense that an adult is also viewing) for a greater amount of time than has generally been reported by other writers.
8. The bed time of these viewers must be somewhat later than indicat ed by other studies. Even on weekday nights, children were still viewing television as late as between 9 pqm . and 10 p.m.
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