84

13976

MICROFILMED – 1984

Downloaded from SHAREOK. Persistent Handle URL: https://hdl.handle.net/11244/5208

INFORMATION TO USERS

This reproduction was made from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this document, the quality of the reproduction is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help clarify markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure complete continuity.

2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark, it is an indication of either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, duplicate copy, or copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed. For blurred pages, a good image of the page can be found in the adjacent frame. If copyrighted materials were deleted, a target note will appear listing the pages in the adjacent frame.

3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed, a definite method of "sectioning" the material has been followed. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again–beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.

4. For illustrations that cannot be satisfactorily reproduced by xerographic means, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and inserted into your xerographic copy. These prints are available upon request from the Dissertations Customer Services Department.

5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases the best available copy has been filmed.

University
Microfilms
International
300 N. Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

8413976

Huff, John Larry

A COMPARISON OF THE TELEVISION VIEWING HABITS AND CLASSROOM BEHAVIOR OF DISRUPTIVE AND NON-DISRUPTIVE STUDENTS

The University of Oklahoma Ed.D. 1984

University
Microfilms
International 300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106

PLEASE NOTE:

In all cases this material has been filmed in the best possible way from the available copy. Problems encountered with this document have been identified here with a check mark ✓.

1. Glossy photographs or pages _____
2. Colored illustrations, paper or print _____
3. Photographs with dark background _____
4. Illustrations are poor copy _____
5. Pages with black marks, not original copy _____
6. Print shows through as there is text on both sides of page _____
7. Indistinct, broken or small print on several pages ✓
8. Print exceeds margin requirements _____
9. Tightly bound copy with print lost in spine _____
10. Computer printout pages with indistinct print _____
11. Page(s) _____ lacking when material received, and not available from school or author.
12. Page(s) _____ seem to be missing in numbering only as text follows.
13. Two pages numbered _____. Text follows.
14. Curling and wrinkled pages _____
15. Other _____

University
Microfilms
International

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

A COMPARISON OF THE TELEVISION VIEWING HABITS AND CLASSROOM BEHAVIOR OF DISRUPTIVE AND NON-DISRUPTIVE STUDENTS

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for

degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

By

JOHN LARRY HUFF

Norman, Oklahoma

1984

A COMPARISON OF THE TELEVISION VIEWING HABITS AND CLASSROOM BEHAVIOR OF DISRUPTIVE AND NON-DISRUPTIVE STUDENTS

APPROVED BY

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

A COMPARISON OF THE TELEVISION VIEWING HABITS AND CLASSROOM BEHAVIOR OF DISRUPTIVE AND NON-DISRUPTIVE STUDENTS

By

JOHN LARRY HUFF

Major Professor: Dr. Charlyce King

The purpose of this study was to determine the differences between the television viewing habits of disruptive and non-disruptive students. Two groups of students, disruptive students (N=32) and non-disruptive students (N=50), reported the number of hours they viewed particular television programs aired during a particular one-week period. The number of hours spent viewing television and the number of violent acts viewed were compared for the disruptive students and the non-disruptive students to test two major hypotheses. Three other hypotheses were tested concerning the inter-relationships among the variables measured on the disruptive students.

The results of testing the first null hypothesis led to the general conclusion that there was no real difference between the amount of time the disruptive and non-disruptive students spend watching television. A common belief is that disruptive students watch considerably more television than non-disruptive students but the results of this study would not support this idea.

The results of testing the second null hypothesis led to the general conclusion that the disruptive students watched television that was much more violence oriented than the television viewed by the non-disruptive students.

The results of testing the third null hypothesis led to the conclusion that those disruptive students who watched the most television saw the most violent acts.

Results of testing the fourth null hypothesis led to the general conclusion that those disruptive students who viewed the most violent acts on television tended to cause the most classroom disruptions.

Results of testing the fifth null hypothesis led to the general conclusion that those disruptive students who viewed the most violent acts tended to commit the most serious classroom disruptions.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The author wishes to express sincere appreciation to Dr. Charlyce King for her continual guidance, assistance, and encouragement in the development of this study. Also, appreciation is expressed to Dr. Robert Bibens, Dr. Charles Butler, Dr. William Eick, and Dr. Gerald Kidd for their assistance and counsel as members of the committee.

Appreciation is extended to Dr. Lewis Eubanks, Superintendent of Midwest City Public Schools, and Mr. Guy Burkhart, Principal of Kerr Junior High School, for their cooperation in making this study possible.

A special thanks to Dr. Ed Porter who advised me with the statistical analysis of the data.

To my wife, Betty Kay, my daughters, Amanda and Cindy, and my son, John, I am indebted for their patience and understanding throughout the years of graduate study and the completion of this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS		iii
LIST OF TABLES		vi
Chapter		
I.	INTRODUCTION AND PROBLEM	1
	Need for the Study	3
	Statement of the Problem	11
	Hypotheses to be Tested	11
	Population Defined	12
	Limitations of the Study	12
	Definition of Terms	13
	Statement of the Purpose	14
II.	REVIEW OF LITERATURE	16
	Psychological Effects	20
	Television Affects Learning	26
	Violence and Television	29
III.	METHODOLOGY	33
	Design of the Study	33
	Description of the Subjects	33
	Instrumentation	34
	Procedure for Collecting Data	35
	Treatment of the Data	37
IV.	FINDINGS	38
	Results of Testing Null Hypothesis Number One	39
	Results of Testing Null Hypothesis Number Two	42
	Results of Testing Hypotheses Concerning Disruptive Students (Only)	44
	Summary of Results	46

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont'd)

		Page
V.	SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS	48
	Results of the Experiment	48
	Conclusions Drawn from the Results of the Experiment	49
	Implications for Further Research	51
REFERENCES	. . . . .	52
APPENDICES		
	Appendix A: Discipline Problem Reporting Form	58
	Appendix B: Seriousness of Discipline Problem Rating Scale	60
	Appendix C: Student Viewing Questionnaire	62
	Appendix D: Program Violence Monitoring Results	78
	Appendix E: Letter to Parents	91
	Appendix F: Approval Form	93
	Appendix G: Correspondence	95
	Appendix H: Raw Data	100

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Means and Standard Deviations Concerning the Number of Hours of Television Viewed and the Number of Violent Acts Viewed by the Disruptive Students	40
2.	Statistical Results Comparing the Number of Hours of Television Viewed by the Disruptive and Non-Disruptive Students	41
3.	Statistical Results Comparing the Number of Violent Acts Viewed by the Disruptive and Non-Disruptive Students	43
4.	Correlation Matrix Showing the Inter-Relationships of all Variables Measured on the Disruptive Students	45

A COMPARISON OF THE TELEVISION VIEWING HABITS AND CLASSROOM BEHAVIOR OF DISRUPTIVE AND NON-DISRUPTIVE STUDENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND PROBLEM

For years the question has been debated whether the school or the family is the primary force in the education of the young. This question is academic. Niether parents nor teachers are any longer the principal shaper of children's minds in the United States. Television has become the primary force.

A. L. Rowse (1927), the English historian, once wrote that all great changes in history have one theory in common: the people caught up in those changes never really know what is happening to them. Television became the most pervasive force in American life so quickly that its saturated effects have never really been comprehended. Although many of studies on the impact of television have been undertaken in the past quarter-century, the full significance of television as the central preoccupation of family life has yet to be assessed.

Statistics bear out the fact that since television first appeared in about 1950, an explosive television revolution has taken place. According to Nielsen (1982a):

1. Ninety-eight percent of all U. S. homes have a television set which is more than have indoor plumbing or telephones. More than one-half have two televisions and twenty-five percent have several.

2. The average television set is on sixty hours per week or eight and one-half hours per day.

3. Two-thirds of Americans get "most" of their news from television and one-half of the American families watch news during dinner.

4. The typical American child now watches television more than thirty hours per week which is more time than he or she spends with their parents, plays with peers, attends school or reads books.

5. By the time a child reaches the first grade he or she will have compiled more hours watching television than would be needed to earn a college degree.

6. Children invest a full twenty-four hour day each week viewing television, and by the time one graduates from high school he or she will have spent fifteen thousand hours--the equivalent of two and one-half uninterrupted years--watching television, which is forty-five percent more time than he or she spent in classroom education.

7. Eighteen million children are still in the viewing audience between 8:00 p.m. and 9:00 p.m., and no fewer than one million are still watching at midnight.

The cumulative effects of television watching affects everyone but none so decidedly as children. In fact, recent research indicates that habitual viewing can affect a young person's basic outlook and sensibilities, pre-disposition to violence and hyperactivity, I. Q., reading ability, imagination, play, language patterns, critical thinking, self-image, perception of others, and values in general (Moody, 1980).

The National PTA's Television Commission, through a series of hearings, concluded that television has negative effects on children's education (Young, 1981). Examples of classroom disruption and the

breakdown of discipline were frequently cited as being directly related to children's viewing of violence in television programming.

There are many problems facing the public schools of this country which were amplified in the Final Report of the National Commission of Excellence in Education (Bell, 1983), but none more serious than discipline. The American people perceive discipline as the most important problem facing the public schools (Gallup, 1979) and indications are that discipline may be directly related to the other top public school problems of teacher burnout, public teachers' lack of interest, and the inability to recruit and retain teachers in the profession.

If the public schools are to survive the 80's, educators must constantly search for all sources of the festering that are infecting the public schools of our country and eating away at the foundation of our profession. One problem that appears necessary to study is a comparison of the television viewing habits of disruptive and non-disruptive students in the public schools to determine if there are any significant differences.

Need for the Study

These is no doubt that television has become an integral part of the lives of virtually every American child (Eisenhower, 1969). Gondor (1969) found in studying the American family construct, that television had actually taken a place in the family as a new member. Gondor discovered that television had pervaded many family constructs and at times had even taken over the role of the mother. He reported several cases where an infant's first words were in imitation of certain

television commercials. Instead of the traditional "ma-ma", Gondor found many of the infants cooing such phrases as, "Coca-Cola" or "Alka-Seltzer".

During the early years of television effects research, the principal tool of investigation was content analysis (Budd, 1967). The counting, numbering and classifying of violent program content was widespread (Thrush and Labovitz, 1969). In the 1950's the National Association of Broadcasters, sponsored by the Ford Foundation, employed Dallas Smythe to conduct a two week content analysis in four large cities to determine the amount of murder, torture, and mayhem being shown over prime-time commercial television (Smythe, 1952a). Smythe found prime-time programs depicting someone injured or threatened by violence once every six minutes. Almost all of the violence occurred in the entertainment type program, and children's programs were particularly aggressive averaging thirty-eight acts or threats of violence per hour. Eleven years later Smythe conducted another content study (Smythe, 1963b). He noted that there had been an increase of violence in prime-time television. He reported that in three hours of network prime-time, four stabbings, eight shootings, one kidnapping and one-hundred and fifty other acts of violence took place.

The influence of these early content studies was profound. Almost immediately, concerned members of the community banded together to begin an organized effort to halt television violence (Rustein, 1974). The dawn of a great and continuing controversy had begun.

Sociologists and psychologists began to conduct research in the area of televised violence and viewer responses. Although the results

of this research were often in conflict, it has indicated that to ignore the possibilities of television's effects on young viewers would be a serious mistake. The years of continuing research in this area have indicated that the impact of television program content upon the viewer is both varied and great (Schramm, et al., 1961). Schramm pointed out that a child's own life experiences shaped the way in which he was influenced by television. He seemed to be implying that children's responses to aggressive or prosocial television content was a function of a number of interrelated variables or characteristics. Time spent watching a particular type of program, preferences of program content, and the total time viewing television, have all been some of the "consumption" variables, which have been found to be significant in terms of subsequent behavior. The "behavior" variables usually considered in the research have been: overt aggressive behavior, predisposition to violence, anomie, and most recently, predisposition to fantasy.

In 1968, President Lyndon Johnson appointed a National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence. This action was, in part, due to the increased violence on college campuses during the 1960's and the assassinations of prominent political figures such as John F. Kennedy, Robert F. Kennedy, and Martin Luther King, Jr. The purpose of the establishment of this Commission was to study the question of whether or not there is a causal connection between violence and antisocial behavior of individuals, especially children. In reviewing the work of this Commission, Mukerji (1977) stated that violence in television was linked to aggressive behavior, but other factors should be considered as contributors.

It was against this backdrop in 1969 that Senator John O. Pastore, chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Communication, requested the Surgeon General of the United States, William H. Stewart, to thoroughly investigate the evidence relevant to questions about the effects of television on children. Controversy, criticism, and scandal surrounded the project from the beginning and continues at this present time. There remains evidence of American network censorship, tactics of concealment, deceit, obstruction, and subsequently, a "cover-up."

In spite of the controversy about the Surgeon General's report, some important conclusions were reached which stimulated public interest and financial support for further exploration of television's effects on children. The report concluded that television and other media violence can arouse children and youth, instigate copying of aggression and antisocial acts, and shape the values of the young regarding a variety of undesirable and antisocial behavior. The report further concluded that television violence had a great effect on a small percentage of youngsters and a small, but significant, effect on a large percentage of youngsters.

Since the Surgeon General's report in 1972, many other studies have been conducted to examine the relationship between television violence viewing and aggressive behavior. The findings converge in three respects: a preliminary and tentative indication of a causal relationship between viewing violence on television and aggressive behavior; an indication that any such causal relationship operates only on some children; and an indication that it operates only in some enviromental contexts.

In a publication sponsored by the United States Department of Commerce, George Comstock (1972) outlined what he considered to be two major themes for continued research in the area of television violence. These themes are designated as:

(1) The control question of the role of televised violence in aggressiveness among the young cannot be taken as fully resolved. The most justifiable interpretation of the evidence presently available is that televised violence increases aggressiveness. The case, however, is not reversible.

(2) The processes and dynamics, social and psychological, involved in any effects of televised violence on aggressiveness clearly demand further thorough and extensive investigations. Particularly important are: (a) the circumstances which increase the likelihood of aggressive behavior attributable to the viewing of televised violence, and (b) the circumstances which mitigate any such effects. At present, understanding of the phenomenon now given the stamp of scientific verisimilitude is remarkably slight (Comstock, 1972).

The investigation of these two underlying themes proposed by Comstock are currently plagued with confusion and problems. His first theme calls for an open minded approach to the research. In light of the research and evidence it would be difficult to adopt a "violence begets violence theory" (Berkowitz, 1965), a "cathartic theory" (Feshbach, 1961) or a "no effects theory" (Zajonc, 1954). It seems only logical that the answer lies somewhere among all three. As DeFleur (1970) contended, you can pick up any side of this question and always

find enough "evidence" to support your contentions. The idea that the effects of television is not a completely settled question should find little opposition among researchers. As Comstock explains, "The contention is not based on the axiom that nothing is ever permanently resolved in science, but on the doubts of the evidence" (Comstock, 1972).

One of the most controversial questions in relation to this area is the long standing battle between experimental laboratory and correlational field studies. The laboratory experiment has its limitations in the kinds of data which can be collected for interpretation. Obviously one limitation is that of environment (Neale and Liebert, 1973). For example, television viewing is frequently indulged in by most people, however, their viewing rarely consists of a "glued to the tube" or narcotized environment. They engage in numerous other activities while viewing, they: talk, read, sew, play games, and naturally make frequent trips to the refrigerator (Liebert, et al., 1973).

Another problem with the laboratory experiment deals with the time spent viewing. The average child spends approximately twenty-five hours a week before the television set. Laboratory studies, in contrast, usually take from ten to twenty minutes and could not possibly have the same effect on an individual who is accustomed to several hours of viewing in one sitting.

A final major problem with the laboratory study is its warning to the subjects that there is about to be a scientific experiment conducted. The fact that the subjects realize they are going to be manipulated and observed under controlled laboratory conditions might have an eventual effect on the research results. Jerome Singer (1971) summed up

the issue as follows:

> Perhaps the major criticism of these studies is their artificiality. They smell of the laboratory and involve complex sequences of procedures that simply seem too far removed from the ordinary course of events in real life (Singer, 1971 p. 47).

This is not to say that the laboratory study has not been of great value in the comparison of viewed televised violence and subsequent behavior. As the review of the literature indicates, the laboratory study has demonstrated that children do learn from television content. The general findings of the Surgeon General's study were an excellent example of this. Numerous laboratory experiments over the past ten years have indicated that children do imitate aggressive behavior viewed on television. The results of experiments conducted by the Surgeon General's Committee are consistent with these earlier findings. Liebert, et al., (1973) point out that these studies, in scientific discourse, would be viewed as "strong evidence" for a causal effect relationship. But as Liebert also points out, a great deal is at stake. The problem under investigation is one which is very sensitive and salient to many people. Researchers must be certain that the data collected and analyzed from a laboratory experiment is generalizable to the world or as Liebert says: "generalized to the living rooms, televisions, and children of our society" (Liebert, et al., 1973).

In summarizing the problems of the laboratory experiment, Comstock notes three areas of concern: (1) the circumstances of measurement are abnormal because of the absence of social inhibitions against aggressiveness and the possibility of retaliation, (2) imitation of viewed aggression depends largely on the presence in the measurement situation of stimuli similar or identical to that observed earlier, and (3) ag-

gressiveness is operationalized in a form far from equivalent to what might occur in everyday aggressive behavior. As Comstock points out, the major "thrust" of all of these concerns is simply that the television experiment in the laboratory environment has very little relationship with what occurs in ordinary behavior, and therefore proves very little in terms of formulated causal hypotheses.

Field studies solve many of the problems which are inherent in the controlled laboratory experiment. Namely: subjects are viewed in their natural environment, there is no problem with viewing time or experimentally manipulated viewing situations, and there is no effect of a laboratory environment. There are, of course, arguments against the field survey. Haskins (1968) points out that the field survey is plagued with all the problems of any non-experimental design--lack of control. He also indicated that the lack of control in the field survey does not mean that control must be completely forsaken. Although complete control would require vast amounts of time and money (Haskins, 1968), careful methodology and survey design can help to overcome complex control problems.

The arguments concerning laboratory and field research seem to indicate that further comparisons of television viewing habits and subsequent viewer behavior must: (1) deal with the objections of the laboratory experiment and establish a bridge between the laboratory environment and the real world, and (2) further verify, using measures of "real life" behavior, a comparison of televised violence and overt aggressive behavior.

Because of the variety of conclusions reached in laboratory re-

search relating to television violence viewing and aggressive behavior and the serious doubts about much of the research in this area, this researcher was prompted to go into the everyday lives of students to examine their television viewing habits and behavior patterns. A comparison of the viewing habits of disruptive and non-disruptive students in public schools was made in this study to determine any differences.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of the study was to determine the differences between the television viewing habits of disruptive and non-disruptive students in public schools. More specifically, the study was an attempt to answer the question: Are students who watch excessive amounts of violence on television more likely to exhibit disruptive school behavior than students who do not watch excessive amounts of violence on television?

Hypotheses to be Tested

HO_1 There is no statistically significant difference between the number of hours the disruptive students spent viewing television and the number of hours the non-disruptive students spent viewing television.

HO_2 There is no statistically significant difference between the number of violent acts viewed by the disruptive students during their television watching and the number of violent acts viewed by the non-disruptive students during their television watching.

HO_3 There is no significant relationship between the number of hours the disruptive students spent watching television and the number of violent acts viewed.

HO_4 There is no significant relationship between the number of violent acts viewed by the disruptive student and the number of times they were referred for disciplinary action.

HO_5 There is no significant relationship between the number of violent acts viewed by the disruptive students and the seriousness of the disruptive infractions.

Population Defined

The population of this study were eighth-grade students enrolled in public schools in a southwestern city of the United States.

Limitations of the Study

The following limitations were placed on the present study in order to make it possible:

(1) This study was limited to the accuracy of the information considered and the measurement system contained on the instruments in this study. The researcher recognizes that the questionnaire completed by the students and the referral form completed by school personnel may contain a certain amount of subjectivity, however, attempts were made through the use of standardized instruments to minimize the subjectivity of the information.

(2) This study was limited to eighth-grade students enrolled in public schools of a southwestern city in the United States. The findings of this study are to be generalized only to the original population from which this sample of experimental subjects was drawn.

Definition of Terms

It was necessary to define several terms used in the present study. The following definitions and explanations were offered in order to avoid multiple interpretations of terms:

(1) Violence on Television: For the present study, the National Coalition on Television Violence, Monitoring Results, Weekly Report, (Fall, 1983) was used to determine programs containing violence. In their guidelines, violence was defined as an overt expression of physical force (with or without weapon) against one's self or others; a compelling action against one's will on pain of being hurt or killed; and/or actual hurting or killing. An action to be considered violent must be plausible and credible and must include human or humanlike characters. It may be an intentional or accidental action, humorous or serious or a combination of both as long as the previous conditions are satisfied.

(2) Television Viewing Habits: Television viewing habits included the hours regularly spent viewing television during prime-time and the programs watched during those hours.

(3) Prime-time Television Viewing: For purposes of this study, prime-time television viewing was the time spent watching television between 6:00 p.m. and 12:00 midnight each day.

(4) Disruptive Student: A disruptive student was any student who had been reported three (3) or more times to school officials for disruptive school behavior during the Fall Semester, 1983.

(5) Non-disruptive Student: A non-disruptive student was any student who had not been reported to school officials for disruptive school behavior during the Fall Semester, 1983.

Statement of the Purpose

The purpose of the study was to contribute additional knowledge in the field of education by trying to ascertain whether or not there are significant differences between the television viewing habits of disruptive and non-disruptive students in public schools.

An attempt was made in the study to compare the television viewing habits of disruptive and non-disruptive students. Any significant difference in the viewing habits of disruptive and non-disruptive students may be an indication to some that intervention by concerned citizens is needed. The specific correctives advocated generally fall into three categories:

(1) There are those whose goal it is to influence the content of television. The strategies of this group are:
   (a) to exert pressure on television stations and executives to change the type of programs they present and alter the content of those programs that are shown and
   (b) to promote increased federal regulations over the content of television programming especially aimed at children.

(2) There are those who exhort people to reduce their television viewing time and even to stop watching entirely. It is the contention of this group that by reducing excessive television viewing or eliminating viewing time entirely, youngsters will

engage in other presumably more worthwhile activities.

(3) There are those who advocate, through education in the schools, the development of critical television viewing skills. The skills taught are: the ability to evaluate one's own television viewing behavior; a knowledge of the business of television viewing; and the ability to recognize the effects of television viewing.

It is the plan of this researcher to draw the attention of those who might take a practical ameliorative action to the guidance that behavior and social scientists can provide. In particular, this group includes those in the broadcasting industry who are directly responsible for the television content that children view, and those who are not in the industry but are concerned enough to become involved in influencing those who are responsible for television content or student viewing habits.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In 1952 television receivers were widely available and programming was rapidly increasing. The "freeze" of the preceding four years was over and the television industry as well as the public was anxiously awaiting the availability of television. At this same period there also began the rumblings of concern and disapproval over the content of television programming. This concern, generated mainly over the violent and aggressive content of television programs, was actually not a "new" development. There had been similar concern over such content on radio in the 1940's (Wertham, 1966). It was predictable that violence on television would also raise the issue of its effect (Witty, 1966).

The idea that television was a "school for violence" (Wertham, 1966) or a "preparatory school for delinquency" (Banay, 1955) has been of growing concern since the early 1950's. Probably the leader in the research field of learning antisocial behavior via television is Bandura. Bandura's research has demonstrated that sequences of antisocial behavior could be learned and often imitated by viewers of aggressive film content. Bandura is known for his "bobo doll" experiments. The basic paradigm for these studies consisted of showing a group of children an aggressive film and a group of children a neutral

film. The children were then observed in play to see if they would choose an aggressive or non-aggressive toy. Bandura discovered that those who had viewed the violent film consistently chose the most aggressive toy, a "bobo" punching doll, which they used to "fight" (Bandura, 1965a).

A major problem with the Bandura studies was the restrictions placed on the experimental procedure: (1) children were frustrated prior to the testing, (2) children were tested in a situation which was very similar to the situation which they had just witnessed in the film, and (3) children were tested immediately after they observed the violent film.

Although the Bandura results must be interpreted with these conditions in mind, his studies indicated that children could learn and perform novel aggressive behavior after viewing such behavior on film. Bandura contended that his experiments supported the theory that novel aggressive techniques, such as those shown on ABC's Kung Fu series, could be acquired by children, simply by witnessing the acts on television.

The effect of time lapse between viewing aggression on television and the measurement of overt aggression has become an area for much concern and study. The research in this area (Hicks, 1965) has shown that a large portion of the aggressive behaviors are retained over long periods of time. This was particularly found to be true if the viewer of an aggressive film engaged in such a behavior at least one time between viewing the film and the observed behavior.

Concern has also been shown over the similarity of the setting of

the observed violence and the setting of the film cues presented to the subjects. Siegel (1956), Lovaas (1961), Meyerson (1966), and Greenwald and Albert (1968) indicated that subsequent aggressive behavior by subjects who viewed aggressive film was affected by the similarity of the setting observed in the film and the setting where the subjects were placed for observation.

Other studies, however, such as those conducted by Ross and Ross (1961), and Walters, Thomas, and Acker (1962), have controlled for this "setting" variable and have further supported the Bandura findings. Their results indicated that viewing violence can instigate aggressive behavior after the viewing of an aggressive scene. All of these studies followed the basic Bandura papadigm with only minor variations.

The research compiled thus far dealing with the question of learning from television content indicates that the audience does indeed learn something (Fuchs and Lyle, 1972). Survey reports indicate that both parents and children feel that they learn from entertainment programming on television. There is also empirical support for various types of television learning. Ward (1971) has indicated that children can easily remember and recite television commercial jingles by the time they are four years old. He also notes that by the time the child finishes the sixth-grade, he or she is able to understand and comprehend the function of the television commercial.

A pioneer in the study of television and children, Wilber Schramm (1961), also found some supporting evidence for a television learning effect. He discovered that there was a higher rate of vocabulary learning skills among children who most frequently viewed television. More

recently, LaPlante (1966) found similar evidence among both children and adults.

A study which is often cited in the literature was conducted by Stein and Friedrich (1971). The research combined both laboratory and field techniques to investigate the learning of aggression from television. Over a four-week period three nursery school groups viewed systematically varied television programs. One group saw a program categorized as prosocial. Another group viewed an aggressive program, while a control group viewed a neutral film. One of the more interesting results from this research related to the group of nursery children who viewed the aggressive program. Children in this group who were predisposed to aggression showed an increase in overt aggressive behavior. Those who were not predisposed to such a behavior showed no change. Finally, those children viewing the aggressive film showed less persistence, tolerance, and rule obedience than the children exposed to the prosocial program.

Numerous correlational studies have been conducted which have also investigated the relationship between "learning" and television consumption. Lyle and Hoffman (1971) found that viewing of violence on television was correlated with a number of variables including age, sex, parental conflict, and intellectual levels. An exhaustive review of correlational research in this area was completed by Chaffee (1971). He concluded that the studies reviewed, if looked at singularly, did not appear to be overly significant. However, he indicated that the "overall" pattern of the studies pointed to a positive relationship between aggressive behavior and aggressive television program consumption.

In a review of media violence research, Meyer and Anderson (1973) noted that one of the more unexpected findings was a child's ability to learn observed behavioral responses from television, regardless of the occurrence of reinforcement. The authors indicated that even children who viewed an aggressive film model being "punished" for his actions would still imitate the model's behavior when given the opportunity. In their summary they concluded by stating:

> (1) Viewers learn aggressive behavior provided by TV content. They can and do add responses to their behavioral hierarchies, regardless of the presented reinforcement results; (2) When violent TV content is presented as rewarding, vicarious reinforcement can affect the position of the response in the hierarchy and raises the probability of it being evoked or demonstrated; (3) TV violence acts that are shown to be unrewarding are lowered in the hierarchy if the viewer sees that the circumstances in his own enviornment are similar to the conditions where TV violence was unsuccessful (Meyer and Anderson, 1973, p. 451).

Psychological Effects

Today's children are the first generation exposed to overstimulation and we know nothing of its long-term consequences. In his book, Overload, psychiatrist Leopold Bellak (1975) explains that the brain is a complex system of electric circuitry which, when overloaded with stimuli, can "short circuit." "What has us spinning," says Bellak, "is the tremendous overloading of our senses. We are hit with too much, too fast. Our signals are conflicting."

When rhesus monkeys at the University of Miami Medical School were subjected to the sounds of alarm clocks, radios, traffic, telephones, and televisions for three weeks, the monkey's average blood pressure increased by forty three percent (Moody, 1980). Exactly which part of

a person's (or monkey's) overload can be attributed to television is difficult to determine. However, we do know that in many households the television is turned on at breakfast time and plays almost constantly throughout the day and evening. Whether the people at home watch it, or listen to it, or simply co-exist with the turned-on television, its sound and flickers must be taken into account as a major stimulus.

Data are insufficient as to how cumulative television viewing will affect the development of the human species in the long run, but in the case of children who are growing up on continuous television special concern has been reported. The new emerging evidence reveals television viewing is affecting such individual physical responses as brain waves, eye movement, the use of the hands and overall body movements. It is becoming increasingly vital to know and understand how children respond to television and how respective physical and mental responses relate to each other.

The brain, like the heart and all muscles, is alive with electrical activities. This activity of the cells can be measured in volts, recorded, and charted in ways that help to explain what is going on inside the body. The tool used to measure and chart brain activity is the electroencephalograph, or the EEG.

The most common type of brain waves, those which can be recorded during most of a person's waking hours, are the medium paced "beta" waves, which are typically associated with "alert" activities such as focusing, paying attention, reading, talking, cooking dinner, driving a car, playing ball, etc. A marked slowdown of electrical activity in the brain will be measured and charted on the EEG as long, slow "alpha"

waves. The alpha waves occur when the individual is not orienting. They are associated with lack of eye movement, fixation, lack of definition, idleness, inactivity, and overall body inertness (Mulholland, 1979).

Brain wave studies indicate that children and adults alike lapse into a "predominantly alpha wave state" after only thrity seconds of television viewing (Emery and Emery, 1976). This characteristic pattern of brain wave activity is established and maintained no matter what program is being viewed.

In a landmark study, Dr. Thomas Mulholland (1979) found that even when watching their favorite show, the children's brain waves did not respond to the content but to the act of watching. Brain waves do not distinguish between "boring" or "exciting" content, "good" or "bad" shows. When Dr. Mulholland asked the children to be interested and involved in the program, he looked for an oscillation between alpha--slow waves and beta--medium waves, but that didn't happen. The children just sat and watched and remained in alpha most of the time.

The alpha state, when associated with television viewing, seems to be a response to the experience of watching a television screen rather than to a specific picture or program. Television can create extreme excitement in the brain, and after prolonged viewing, it can produce a "drugged state" and alpha waves in the brain (Lippold, 1973).

What elements of the medium might account for these effects on brain waves? Researchers believe that it is light--the particular kind of artificial light delivered by television (Mander, 1978). Television is an intense kaleidoscope of moving light and sound. For eight and

one-half hours a day, human beings sit in dark rooms, their bodies stilled, gazing at this light. Previous generations looked at starlight, firelight and moonlight, but no culture in all of history has spent such enormous blocks of time, every day, sitting a dark rooms looking at artificial light. This in itself represents an enormous change in human experience.

Television light is purposeful and directed rather than ambient. It is projected into the eyes from behind the screen by cathode-ray guns which are literally aimed at the viewer. These guns are powered by 25,000 volts in the case of color television and by about 15,000 volts in black and white sets.

Upon close inspection of a color television screen, it is evident that pictures emanate from a collection of red, blue, and green dots on lines. When moving away from the screen, the colors merge in the eyes to seem like other colors. These dots are made of phosphorescent metal placed inside the glass and they glow when the cathode-ray gun shoots electrons at them. Television is a fluorescent light (Mander, 1978).

Dr. John Ott, founder of the Environmental Health and Light Research Institute in Sarasota, Florida, has done extensive research on the effects of x-radiation emanating from television sets and the danger of fluorescent artificial light. In one celebrated study (Ott, 1974), the roots of bean plants placed in front of color television sets grew upward out of the soil. Another set of plants became monstrously large and distorted. Mice which were similarly placed developed cancerous lesions.

In another experiment involving two thousand mice, it was noted that the mice kept under pink fluorescent light developed tumors and died, on the average, within seven and one-half months. Those kept under other light sources had an average life span double that of the first group (Ott, 1974).

Cancer wasn't the only reaction to artificial light. When mice were kept under one particular pink fluorescent light for long periods of time, their tails would literally wither and fall off. Under a certain dark blue fluorescent light the cholesterol level in the blood of mice rose sharply, and male mice became obese, although the females did not.

A red filter placed over ordinary incandescent light was found to weaken and rupture the heart cells of chick embryos. A blue incandescent light placed over the cages of chinchillas increased the number of females in the litter; a similar light increased the female population of fish in a tank. Other light changes caused aggressiveness, hyperactive behavior, aimlessness and disorientation, as well as changes in sexual patterns among mice, rats, and other animals.

Ott believes there is a connection between the light received in the eyes and cell structure. He says light passes through the eyes to contact the retina. The rays pass via neurochemical channels into and through the pineal and pituitary glands into the animal and human endocrine systems.

The kind of light that passes through the eyes determines the reaction of human cells. His experiments on plants and animals were attempts to demonstrate that even minute changes in wavelength spectra

(what we call "color")--say between one kind of artificial light and another, or between natural light and artificial light--cause important biochemical alterations.

According to reports in the prestigious British medical journal, Lancet, increasing numbers of people have experienced fits or seizures while viewing television. In one study the journal reported:

> Many of these patients (98 of 176) experienced absence or seizures only while viewing television and usually when they are close to the set, adjusting the picture or switching channels. At least half of these patients have normal EEG's except when they are exposed to photic stimulation. Their physicians have labeled this response television epilepsy (Clement, 1976).

While "television epilepsy" is an unusual response to television, hyperactivity is a common response among children. When school psychologists and teachers speak of the "television syndrome" they are referring to the child who seems too tired to pay attention for more than a couple of seconds, yet is too restless or hyperactive to sit still or control his or her aggressive behavior.

Hyperactivity is increasing rapidly in American nurseries and elementary schools. According to a report by Dr. Werner I. Halpern (1975), the psychiatrist who heads the Rochester, New York Mental Health Clinic, there has been a sudden increase of young children referred to the clinic for behavior disturbances. They are restless, hyperactive and frantic. Their speech is inappropriate and they compulsively recite serial numbers and letters learned from Sesame Street. He said that usually this recitation occurs in the absence of any apparent cue.

When the parents of Halpern's young patients cut out the viewing of Sesame Street the children improved dramatically. Halpern contends

that the rapidity and choppiness of the Sesame Street images prevent reflection and the adaptive capacity of children from entering into the learning process. He reports that there is an overloading of the sensory perceptions which create the tension and hyperactivity and irritability in some children.

Television Affects Learning

Television is giving children stunningly complex pieces of information, but this knowledge is largely unintegrated and lacks sufficient context and meaning (Gondor, 1969). With understandable alarm parents, physicians, and teachers are observing rising numbers of children who can't process information. It was reported by Larrick (1979) that children generally can't see, hear, or pay attention as well as most children did only ten years ago.

Experienced teachers are coming to alarming conclusions about current learning styles and abilities. According to Moody (1980), children can't listen for any length of time; they can't follow verbal directions very well; they can't pay attention; they can't wait or delay gratification; they can't process language as well as past generations; and they don't seem motivated to use their imaginations and creative abilities.

Teachers report many children come to school exhausted. They watch television late and get up in time for an hour of television before boarding the school bus. They are only half-awake when they arrive at school and either put their heads down on their desks and have a quiet nap or sleep with their eyes open. "When they get that glazed look",

said one teacher, "I know they've tuned me out" (Gondor, 1969).

A school librarian noted that she shortens the stories she tells so that they are five or six minutes long and then offers a stretch period before beginning the next mini-story. She said, "Eight or ten minutes seem to be the longest time children can stay on task" (Larrick, 1979).

Mander (1978) discloses the same lethargic state shows up at recess. Given the option of going out on the playground or going to the reading room, most children in one school elected to stay indoors even on a sunny day. In one affluent community, sixth-graders were observed sitting on the curb of the blacktop just waiting for recess to end.

Increasingly, the television child wants the teacher to be as quick, fast paced, and full of flashiness as television with a constantly changing bag of materials, jokes, and costumes. Moody (1980) noted one teacher's frustration, "I can't compete with television. I can't change my body into different letters, nor can I change color. The lessons I consider exciting fall flat because I don't do these phenomenal things."

Television viewing has been correlated with poor reading ability and low I.Q. in two separate studies by Michael Morgan and Larry Gross (1977) at the Annenberg School of Communications, University of Pennsylvania, and by Drs. Dorothy and Jerome Singer (1977) at Yale University. When Morgan and Gross studied 625 public school students in the sixth through ninth grades in suburban/rural New Jersey, they found that those who watched a great deal of television had the poorer

reading ability and less comprehension of material read.

Psychologists Dorothy and Jerome Singer reported similar findings in their studies at Yale University. In another study mentally gifted grammar school students showed a marked drop in creative abilities (and lower I.Q. test scores) after only three weeks of intense television viewing (Esslin, 1982).

A 1980 study involving half a million sixth-grade to twelfth-grade students, conducted by the California Department of Education, demonstrated a strong statistical link between high levels of television watching (three hours or more per day) and low achievement scores, regardless of the number of hours they spent reading and doing homework.

Researchers generally agree that the more television a child watches, the worse he or she does in school. This analysis is strengthened by the fact that ever since the first member of the television generation began applying to colleges during the early 1960's, Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) scores have shown a steady decline (Swerdlow, 1981). Television viewing is the most obvious new and major factor in the lives of children during this period of time and it may very well be the leading influence contributing to this phenomenon (Esslin, 1982).

Not only is television being watched excessively by children, but the very entertainment techniques--short segments, fast action, quick cuts, fades, and dissolves--that produce pace and polish of successful television programming often create negative influences on the child's motivation and ability to learn. In a real sense television watching acts as a major drag on learning in America (Eisenhower, 1969).

Violence and Television

Television affects all kinds of human behavior but no aspect has greater consequences than violence. On television, violent incidents occur on the average of five times per hour during prime-time and eighteen times per hour during weekend day-time children's shows (Swerdlow, 1981). According to another study, children who are average television viewers watch up to twenty-five incidents of violence per hour and what is even more frightening is that it may make them violent, too (Marioni, 1979).

The bulk of the research supports the disturbing observation that children who see a great deal of violence on television are more likely than children who see less to engage in aggressive play, to accept force as a problem solver, to fear becoming a victim of violence and to believe that an exaggerated proportion of the society is employed in law enforcement (Steinfeld, 1972).

Gerbner and Gross (1977) conducted sets of surveys of children who were "heavy viewers" or "light viewers." They asked, "How often is it allright to hit someone if you are mad at them?" They found that heavy viewers of television, more often than light viewers, responded that it is "almost always right to hit someone."

Ten separate studies were done by five research teams that focused on television's role in the instigation of aggressive behavior: Stein and Friedrich (1971); Feshbach (1971); Liebert and Baron (1971); Ekman, et al, (1972); and Leifer and Roberts (1971). These studies reported by the researchers differ in terms of the subjects and specific research procedures. However, the general research paradigm is similar

in each study.

The typical procedure was to show one group of children films or television programs that contained a number of violent episodes, while another group viewed relatively non-violent material. Each child was placed in a setting where his behavior was observed.

The specific types of aggressive behavior observed differed from one study to another and were not restricted to the mimicking or copying of what had just been observed. In most cases the children's aggressive behavior after watching the programs was quite different in quality and character from the aggressive or violent behavior in the television program.

Although the studies indicated the likelihood that a viewer will behave more aggressively after watching aggressive behavior portrayed on film or television, the research did not deal with the effects of the actual television programs. These investigators typically employed a several-minute violent excerpt severed from its original context which is quite different than determining the effects of content as it is presented on home television screens in total television programming.

A twenty year longitudinal study in the sixties and seventies in upstate New York by Lefkowitz and his colleagues (1977) charted possible predictors of aggressive behavior--including television--and checked them out in a sample of third-graders, who were re-tested after the twelfth-grade. The researchers found a clear correlation between the amount of television violence viewed by eighteen year old boys and subsequent aggressiveness in young adulthood. The study showed that the more violent the programs watched by boys in the third-grade, the

more aggressive their behavior both at that time and ten years later.

Atkins and Greenberg (1977) of the Department of Communications at Michigan State University have done extensive studies on the behavior of children in grades six through eight. "We analyzed how children behaved in an aggressive fashion on a day-to-day basis," says Atkins, "and we found that those children who watched violent television programs gave more aggressive answers to questions about how to solve day-to-day problems. And children ages eight to fifteen are those most vulnerable to the violent factor on television."

In a six year study in Great Britain, Belson (1978) of the London School of Economics Survey Research Center, concluded that young men who are heavy television viewers are fifty percent more likely than similar light viewers to commit violent crimes. Serious acts of violence were smashing cars and phone booths, setting shopping bags on fire, punching someone in the face or kicking them in the groin.

Peper (1978) said, "The horror of television is that information goes in, but we don't react to it until later when we don't know what we are reacting to. When you watch television you are training yourself not to react and so, later on, you're doing things without knowing why you're doing them or where they come from."

Nobody yet understands how cumulative television viewing will affect the development of the human species in the long run, but in the case of children who are growing up on continuous television there is special concern. Because of the existing evidence that suggests/demonstrates television viewing affects the overt behavior of viewers and the emerging evidence that shows television viewing affects such

individual physical responses as brain waves, eye movement, the use of the hands and over-all body movements, it is becoming increasingly vital to know and understand how children respond to television and how respective physical responses relate to each other.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Design of the Study

This study was designed to compare the television viewing habits and classroom behavior of disruptive and non-disruptive students in the public schools. The study was designed to answer the question: Are students who watch excessive amounts of violence on television more likely to exhibit disruptive school behavior than students who do not watch excessive amounts of violence on television?

Requests for approval of the study were made to the superintendent of the school involved in the study and to the parents of the participating students. This was in fulfillment of the requirements for research involving human subjects.

Description of the Subjects

The methods and procedures of this study resulted in the identification of two general populations: (1) the population of students exhibiting disruptive school behavior and (2) the population of students not exhibiting disruptive school behavior. The students exhibiting disruptive school behavior (N=32) were determined by school

personnel and reported for three (3) or more separate disruptive incidents on Porter's Discipline Problem Reporting Form. The students not exhibiting disruptive school behavior (N=50) were randomly selected from the eighth-grade population who had not been reported for disruptive behavior by school personnel.

Instrumentation

Four instruments were used in the study. The Student Television Viewing Questionnaire (Appendix C) and the Monitoring Results of the National Coalition on Violence (Appendix D) were selected to collect data from both the disruptive and non-disruptive students. Porter's Discipline Problem Reporting Form (Appendix A) and Porter's Seriousness of Discipline Problems Rating Scale (Appendix B) provided data from the disruptive students only.

The Student Television Viewing Questionnaire on viewing patterns and types of programs viewed was developed to survey the eighth-grade students in the study school. The questionnaire contained a checklist of programs aired during prime-time television for the week of October 17-24, 1983. Data collected from this instrument determined the total number of hours viewed and a complete listing of programs viewed by each student for the week.

The Monitoring Results of the National Coalition on Violence was selected to determine the total number of violent acts aired on prime-time television for the week of October 17-24, 1983. The students' responses to the viewing questionnaire were checked against the monitoring results to determine the total number of violent acts viewed

by each student for the week.

Porter's Discipline Problem Reporting Form was provided to the study school personnel to report any eighth-grade student exhibiting disruptive behavior during the Fall Semester, 1983. The form contained a checklist of twenty-six discipline problems. A separate form was completed for each disruptive occurence although the same student may have been involved many times. Data from this form provided a total number of times referred for each student and a classification for each infraction.

Porter's Seriousness of Discipline Problem Rating Scale assigned a numerical value for each disruptive infraction. The scale grouped the twenty-six discipline problems into five categories. The categories were given values ranging from 1 to 5 from least to most severe. Each referred infraction was checked against this scale and a numerical score was assigned.

Procedures for Collecting Data

The experimental procedures consisted of the collection of data from the disruptive and non-disruptive students in the study. To dedermine the disruptive and non-disruptive students, school personnel in the study school were asked to complete Porter's Discipline Problem Reporting Form for every disruptive behavior incident involving an eighth-grade student during the Fall Semester, 1983. A separate form was completed for each disruptive occurence although the same student may have been involved many times.

Since it was not known until the semester was completed which

students were classified as disruptive and non-disruptive, all eighth-grade students (N=471) were requested to complete the self-reporting Student Television Viewing Questionnaire during prime-time television for the week of October 17-24, 1983. This resulted in a total number of hours of television viewed and a complete listing of the programs viewed by each student. The programs watched were then checked against the Monitoring Results of the National Coalition on Television Violence to determine the total number of violent acts viewed by each student.

At the end of the semester, the students who had three (3) or more referrals for disruptive behavior were identified as the disruptive students (N=32). The non-disruptive students (N=50) were selected at random from the eighth-grade population who had not been reported by school personnel for disruptive behavior.

Additional data pertaining to the disruptive students were drawn from Porter's Discipline Problem Reporting Form and Porter's Seriousness of Discipline Problem Rating Scale. The data processed provided a total number of times each disruptive student was referred for disruptive behavior and a classification for each disruptive infraction. Each infraction was checked against the seriousness rating scale and assigned a numerical value ranging from 1 to 5 from least to most severe. The seriousness scores were summed for each disruptive student to determine an overall seriousness-infraction-score (I). The seriousness-infraction-score (I) was then multiplied by the number of times referred to obtain a final seriousness-rating-index (R).

Treatment of the Data

The following data were collected, processed, and analyzed in the study: (1) the total number of hours of television viewed by each student (2) a complete listing of programs viewed by each student (3) a total number of violent acts viewed by each student (4) a total number of times each disruptive student was referred for disruptive behavior and (5) an assigned numerical value for each disruptive incident. These data were used to test the five null hypotheses stated earlier.

The first null hypothesis was tested by comparing the mean number of hours the disruptive students spent viewing television with the mean number of hours the non-disruptive students spent viewing television. A *t* test was used to make the comparison.

The second null hypothesis was tested by comparing the mean number of violent acts viewed by the disruptive students with the mean number of violent acts viewed by the non-disruptive students during the time they watched television. A *t* test was used to make the comparison.

The data pertaining to the disruptive students (only) included: (1) the number of referrals and (2) the types of infractions. The types of infractions were categorized and given a numerical value according to their seriousness. These two values were then multiplied to yield an overall seriousness-rating-index (R).

A product-moment correlation was used to determine possible relationships among the variables. The correlation matrix was used to test the final three hypotheses.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

The television viewing habits of eighty-two (N=82) eighth-grade students from a public school in the southwestern United States were analyzed to compare the television viewing habits of disruptive and non-disruptive students. Two groups of students, disruptive students (N=32) and non-disruptive students (N=50), reported the number of hours they viewed particular television programs aired during a particular one-week time period during the Fall of 1983.

The disruptive students (N=32) had been reported for classroom disruptions. The number of referrals during the time period ranged from twenty-two (the highest) to three (the lowest). Discipline problems were classified using Porter's Discipline Problem Reporting Form (Appendix A) and the seriousness of the discipline infractions were determined by using Porter's Seriousness of Discipline Problems Rating Scale (Appendix B) and given a numerical value from 1 to 5 from least to most severe for each referral. The seriousness of infraction values were summed to obtain a seriousness-infraction-score (I). The times referred and the seriousness-infraction-score (I) were then multiplied to determine an overall seriousness-rating-index (R).

The number of hours spent viewing television and the number of

violent acts viewed were compared for the disruptive students and the non-disruptive students to test two major hypotheses. Three other hypotheses were tested concerning the inter-releationships among the variables measured on the disruptive students.

This chapter contains the results of testing all the hypotheses and a summary of all the results. Conclusions drawn from the results of the analysis are presented in Chapter V.

Data concerning the television viewing habits of the disruptive and non-disruptive students are presented in Table 1.

Results of Testing Null Hypothesis Number One

The first null hypothesis was stated and tested as follows:

HO_1 There is no statistically significant difference between the number of hours the disruptive students spent viewing television and the number of hours the non-disruptive students spent viewing television.

The first null hypothesis was tested by comparing the mean number of hours the disruptive students spent viewing television with the mean number of hours the non-disruptive students spent viewing television. A *t* test was used to make the comparison. The means, standard deviations, and results of the statistical calculations are presented in Table 2.

The data presented in Table 2 show no significant difference between the number of hours of television viewing reported by the two groups ($t=0.849;df=80;p>.05$). These results would not allow the researcher to reject the first null hypothesis. Even though the disruptive students watched television slightly more than the non-

TABLE 1

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS CONCERNING THE NUMBER OF HOURS OF TELEVISION VIEWED AND THE NUMBER OF VIOLENT ACTS VIEWED BY THE DISRUPTIVE AND NON-DISRUPTIVE STUDENTS

Group	Number of Hours of Television Viewed	Number of Violent Acts Viewed
Disruptive Students (N=32)	$\bar{X}$ = 29.578 s = 9.194	$\bar{X}$ = 191.679 s = 68.252
Non-Disruptive Students (N=50)	$\bar{X}$ = 27.760 s = 9.543	$\bar{X}$ = 142.450 s = 62.108

TABLE 2

STATISTICAL RESULTS COMPARING THE NUMBER OF HOURS OF TELEVISION VIEWED BY THE DISRUPTIVE AND NON-DISRUPTIVE STUDENTS

Group	Number of Hours of Television Viewed	Calculated t - value *	Significance Level
Disruptive Students (N=32)	$\bar{X}$ = 29.578 s = 9.194		
		t = 0.849	p > .05
Non-Disruptive Students (N=50)	$\bar{X}$ = 27.760 s = 9.543		

*The calculated t-value was based on 80 degrees of freedom

disruptive students, the difference was not significant.

Results of Testing Null Hypothesis Number Two

The second null hypothesis was stated and tested as follows:

HO_2 There is no statistically significant difference between the number of violent acts viewed by the disruptive students during their television watching and the number of violent acts viewed by the non-disruptive students during their television watching.

The second null hypothesis was tested by comparing the mean number of violent acts viewed by the disruptive students with the mean number of violent acts viewed by the non-disruptive students during the time they watched television. A t test was used to make the comparison. The means, standard deviations, and results of the statistical calculations are presented in Table 3.

The data presented in Table 3 show that there was a significant difference between the number of violent acts viewed by the disruptive students and the number of violent acts viewed by the non-disruptive students ($t=3.252;df=80;p<.01$). The disruptive students viewed significantly more violent acts in their television viewing than the non-disruptive students.

The results of testing the first two null hypotheses showed that there was no difference between the amount of time the two groups spent watching television, but the disruptive students tended to watch television programs which were significantly more violent than the non-disruptive students.

TABLE 3

STATISTICAL RESULTS COMPARING THE NUMBER OF VIOLENT ACTS VIEWED BY THE DISRUPTIVE AND NON-DISRUPTIVE STUDENTS

Group	Number of Violent Acts Viewed	Calculated t - value*	Significance Level
Disruptive Students (N=32)	$\bar{X}$ = 191.679 s = 68.252		
		t = 3.253	p < .01
Non-Disruptive Students (N=50)	$\bar{X}$ = 142.450 s = 62.108		

*The calculated t-value was based on 80 degrees of freedom

Results of Testing Hypotheses Concerning Disruptive Students (only)

Additional data were collected from the disruptive students. These data included (1) the number of referrals and (2) the types of infractions. The types of infractions were categorized and given a numerical value according to their seriousness. The seriousness of infraction values were summed to obtain a seriousness-infraction-score (I). These two values were then multiplied to yield an overall seriousness-rating-index (R).

The primary question the researcher wanted to address was, "Are there significant relationships between the number of violent acts viewed by students on television and the number and seriousness of classroom disruptions that these students cause?"

A product-moment correlation was used to determine possible relationships among the variables. The resulting correlation matrix is presented in Table 4. The raw data are presented in the appendices.

The three null hypotheses tested as a result of the correlation matrix were stated and tested as follows:

HO_3 There is no significant relationship between the number of hours the disruptive students spent watching television and the number of violent acts viewed.

HO_4 There is no significant relationship between the number of violent acts viewed by the disruptive students and the number of times they were referred for disciplinary action.

HO_5 There is no significant relationship between the number of violent acts viewed by the disruptive students and the seriousness of the disruptive infractions.

TABLE 4

CORRELATION MATRIX SHOWING THE INTER-RELATIONSHIPS OF ALL VARIABLES MEASURED ON THE DISRUPTIVE STUDENTS

Variables	(1) Number of Hours of Television Viewed	(2) Number of Violent Acts Viewed	(3) Number of Discipline Referrals	(4) Seriousness Infraction Score	(5) Seriousness Rating Index
(1) Number of Hours of Television Viewed	------				
(2) Number of Violent Acts Viewed	0.3412*	------			
(3) Number of Discipline Referrals	0.1687	0.3643*	------		
(4) Seriousness Infraction Score	-0.0364	0.3960*	0.9782**	------	
(5) Seriousness Rating Index	0.1214	0.3839*	0.8309**	0.9277**	------

*Significant beyond the .05 level
**Significant beyond the .01 level

The results presented in Table 4 show that there was a significant relationship between the number of hours spent watching television and the number of violent acts viewed ($r=0.3412;df=31;p<.05$). These results simply indicate that the more television the disruptive students watched the more violent acts they viewed.

Another significant relationship of particular importance was noted between the number of violent acts viewed (variable 2) and the number of discipline referrals (variable 3) ($r=0.3643;df=31;p<.05$). These results indicate a strong positive relationship between the number of violent acts viewed and the number of times the students were referred for disciplinary action.

A significant correlation was noted between the number of violent acts viewed and the seriousness of the infraction committed ($r=0.3960$; $df=31;p<.05$). These results indicate that the students who viewed the most violent acts on television committed the most serious disruptive actions in the classroom.

The extremely high relationships noted among variables 3, 4, and 5 were expected because they are actually linear transformations of each other. While these correlations are significantly high, they yield no particularly useful information to the results of the present study.

Summary of Results

The results of testing the two hypotheses concerning the disruptive and non-disruptive students revealed no significant difference between the number of hours they spent watching television, but the disruptive students viewed significantly more violent acts during their television

viewing than the non-disruptive students.

Further analysis of additional data collected from the disruptive students showed that there were significant relationships between the number of violent acts viewed and the number and seriousness of discipline referrals. Those who viewed the most violent acts on television caused the greatest number and the most serious classroom disruptions.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The problem in this study was to determine the differences between the television viewing habits of disruptive and non-disruptive students. Two groups of students, disruptive students (N=32) and non-disruptive students (N=50), reported the number of hours they viewed particular television programs aired during a particular one-week time period. The disruptive students had been reported for classroom disruptions. The infractions were rated and assigned a numerical value from 1 to 5, from least to most severe. The seriousness of infraction values were summed to obtain a seriousness-infraction-score (I). The times referred and the seriousness-infraction-score (I) were then multiplied to determine an overall seriousness-rating-index (R). The numbers of hours spent viewing television and the number of violent acts viewed were compared for the disruptive students and the non-disruptive students to test two major hypotheses. Three other hypotheses were tested concerning the inter-relationships among the variables measured on the disruptive students.

Results of the Experiment

Results of testing the first null hypothesis showed that there was

no significant difference between the number of hours of television viewing reported by the disruptive students and the non-disruptive students.

Results of testing the second null hypothesis showed that there was a significant difference between the number of violent acts viewed by the disruptive students and the number of violent acts viewed by the non-disruptive students. The disruptive students viewed significantly more violent acts in their television viewing than the non-disruptive students.

Results of the three hypotheses concerning the inter-relationship among the variables measured on the disruptive students showed that there were significant relationships between the number of violent acts viewed and the number and seriousness of discipline referrals. Those who viewed the most violent acts on television caused the greatest number and the most serious classroom disruptions.

Conclusions Drawn from the Results of the Experiment

The results of testing the five hypotheses led to several conclusions. Each of these conclusions are stated in the order of their occurrence.

The results of testing the first null hypothesis led to the general conclusion that there was no real difference between the amount of time the disruptive and non-disruptive students spent watching television. A common belief is that disruptive students watch considerably more television than non-disruptive students, but the results of this study did not support this idea.

The results of testing the second null hypothesis led to the general conclusion that the disruptive students watched television that was much more violence oriented than the television viewed by the non-disruptive students.

The results of testing the third null hypothesis led to the conclusion that those disruptive students who watched the most television saw the most violent acts. However, this was not a linear relationship. Those disruptive students who watched moderate amounts of television watched some non-violent programs, but those who watched a great deal of television tended to watch violent programs exclusively. This finding should serve as a catalyst for further research.

Results of testing the fourth null hypothesis led to the general conclusion that those disruptive students who viewed the most violent acts on television tended to cause the most classroom disruptions. There is no intention to imply a cause-effect relationship in this finding, but there was definitely a relationship which could serve as a basis for further research.

Results of testing the fifth null hypothesis led to the general conclusion that those disruptive students who viewed the most violent acts tended to commit the most serious classroom disruptions.

These last two results seem to imply an acting-out behavior on the part of the disruptive students, but that conclusion cannot be drawn from these results. That particular phenomenon will have to be investigated further in another study.

Implications for Further Research

During the course of this experiment several ideas and ancillary studies were conceptualized. Many of these studies could be easily dedigned and shown under significant contribution to education in general.

Reflection of the present research paradigm to students in both lower and upper grades, K-7 and 9-12, could provide indices which would allow for greater generalizability. Also, a longitudinal study reflecting the same research paradigm at various grade levels, 3-6-9-12, would provide consistency across time.

Another consideration would be the method of establishing a more controlled experimental enviroment. Through careful methodology and survey design, the school environment could be modified to incorporate the freedom of a field survey with the controls of a laboratory survey without investing vast amounts of time and money.

The final recommendations for further research would be a general replication of the study with the addition of other variables included in the analysis. It would be suggested that these variables be considered in future studies: parent's viewing habits; parent's overt behavior; sibling's viewing habits; sibling's overt school behavior; sibling's overt behavior outside school; and subject's overt behavior outside school.

Much research is needed to answer the many questions raised by this study. It is anticipated that further investigations into television's impact on children will yield information that can help eliminate the negative influence on children's behavior and their ability to learn.

REFERENCES

Albert, R. "The Role of Mass Media and the Effect of Aggressive Film Content Upon Children's Aggressive Responses and Identification Choices." Genetic Psychology Monographs, 1957, 55, 221-285.

Atkins, Charles, and Greenberg, Bradley. "Television Role Models and Young Adolescents: An ACT Workshop." Action for Children's Television, 1977.

Banay, R. P. Testimony Before the Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, of the Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, eighty-fourth Cong. S. Res., April 1955, 62, Washington, D.C: Government Printing Office.

Bandura, A. "Influence of Models Reinforcement Contingencies on the Acquisition of Imitative Responses." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1965a, 1, 589-595.

Bandura, A. "Vicarious Processes: A Case of No-Trial Learning," In L. Berkowitz (ed.) Advances in Experimental Social Psychology. New York: Academic Press, 1965b.

Bandura, A, and Menlove, F. L. "Factors Determining Vicarious Extinction of Avoidance Behavior Through Symbolic Modeling." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1968, 8, 99-108.

Barnouw, E. The Golden Web. New York: Oxford Press, 1968.

Bell, Terrel H. "A Nation at Risk." Education Week, April 27, 1983.

Bellak, Leopold. Overload: The New Human Condition. New York: The New Human Press, 1975, 122-126.

Belson, William. Report on Research, London School of Economics Survey, 1978.

Berkowitz, L. "Some Aspects of Observed Aggression." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1965, 2, 359-369.

Budd, R. W.; Thorp, R. K.; and Donohew, L. Content Analysis of Communication. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1967.

Chaffee, S. H. "Television and Adolescent Aggressiveness." In Television and Social Behavior: Report to the Surgeon General's Scientific Advisory Committee, 1971, 3, Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office.

Chaffee, S. H., and McLeod, J. M. "Adolescents, Parents, and Television Violence." Paper presented at the American Psychological Association, 1971. Based on the technical report to the Surgeon General's Scientific Advisory Committee on Television and Social Behavior.

Clement, Pierre. "Self Induced Television Epilepsy." Canadian Psychiatric Association Journal, Volume 21, Number 3, 1976.

Comstock, G. A. Television Violence: Where the Surgeon General's Study Leads. Washington, D. C.: The Rand Corp., 1972.

Coppola, Raymond. "What if Wonder Woman Teamed Up With the Hulk." TV Guide, December 30, 1978, 25-26.

DeFleur, M. L. Theories of Mass Communication. New York: David McKay, 1970.

Eisenhower, M. Statement from the National Commission on the Causes and Preventing of Violence. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1969.

Ekman, P.; Liebert, R. M.; Friesen, W.; Harrison, R.; Zlatchin, C.; Malmstrom, E. J.; and Baron, R. A. "Facial Expressions of Emotion While Watching Television Violence as Predictors of Subsequent Aggression." In G. A. Comstock, E. A. Rubinstein, and J. P. Murray (eds.) Television and Social Behavior. Vol. 5. Television's Effects: Further Explorations. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1972.

Emery, Fred, and Emery, Merrely. A Choice of Futures. Leiden: Matinum Nijhoff, 1976, 74-76.

Esslin, Martin. The Age of Television. San Francisco: W. H. Frieman and Company, 1982, 79-80.

Feshbach, S. "The Stimulating Versus Cathartic Effect of a Vicarious Aggressive Activity." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1961, 63, 381-385.

Finn, Peter. "Developing Critical Television Viewing Skills." The Education Forum, Volume XLIV, Number 4, May 1979, 473-481.

Fuchs, D. A., and Lyle, J. "Mass Media Portrayal--Sex and Violence." In G. Kline and D. Tichenor (eds.) Current Perspectives in Mass Communication Research. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1972.

Gallup, George. Gallup Youth Survey. Princeton, N. J., 1979.

Gerbner, George. "Television and Social Behavior." Volume 1. Content and Control. Government Printing Office, 1971.

Gerbner, George, and Gross, Larry. Report of Research. Annenberg School of Communications, 1977.

Gondor, L. H. "Changing Times." American Journal of Psychotherapy, 1969, 6, 67-68.

Greenberg, B. S., and Gordon, T. F. "Television and Social Behavior." Volume 1. Content and Control. Government Printing Office, 1971.

Greenwald, A., and Albert, S. S. "Observational Learning: A Technique for Elucidating S-R Mediation Processes." Journal of Experimental Psychology, 1968, 76, 267-272.

Gross, Larry, and Morgan, Michael. "Reading, Writing and Watching: Television Viewing, I.Q., and Academic Achievement." Report of Research. Annenberg School of Communications, 1977.

Halpern, Werner I. "Turned on Toddlers." Journal of Communications, Autumn, 1975.

Haskins, J. B. How to Evaluate Mass Communications. New York: The Advertising Research Foundation, 1968.

Hertzog, H. "Why Did People Believe in the Invasion from Mars." In M. C. Topping and L. W. Litchy (eds.) American Broadcasting. New York: Hastings House, 1975.

Hicks, D. J. "Imitation and Retention of Film Mediated Aggressive Peer and Adult Models." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1965, 2, 97-100.

Krugman, Herbert E. "Electroencephlographic Aspects of Low Involvement: Implications for the McLuhan Hypothesis." Marketing Science Institute, October 1979, 4-7.

LaPlante, W. A. "An Investigation of the Sight Vocabulary of Pre-School Children as Measured by Their Ability to Recognize Words Shown Frequently on Television." Temple University, Dissertation Abstracts, 1966.

Larrick, Nancy. "TV and Kids: What Teachers are Complaining About." Learning, October 1979, 44-45.

Lefkowitz, Monroe M. Growing Up to be Violent. Elmsford, N.Y.: Pergamon Press, 1977.

Leifer, A. D., and Roberts, D. F. "Children's Response to TV Violence." In Television and Social Behavior: Report to the Surgeon General's Scientific Advisory Committee, 1971, 2, Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office.

Liebert, R. M., and Baron, R. A. "Some Immediate Effects of Televised Violence on Children's Behavior." Developmental Psychology, 1972, 6, 469-475.

Liebert, R. M.; Neale, J. M.; and Davidson, E. S. The Early Window: Effects of Television on Children and Youth. New York: Pergamon Press, 1973.

Lippold, Olof. The Origin of the Alpha Rhythm. London: Longmans, 1973, 20-22.

Lovaas, O. "Effect of Exposure to Symbolic Aggression on Aggressive Behavior." Child Development, 1961, 32, 37-44.

Lyle, J., and Hoffman, H. R. "Children's Use of Television and Other Media." In Television and Social Behavior: Report to the Surgeon General's Scientific Advisory Committee, 1971, 4, Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office.

Mander, Jerry. Four Arguments for the Elimination of Television. New York: William Morrow, 1978, 209-210.

Marioni, John. "The Impact of Television Violence on Your Children." Family Weekly, November 11, 1979.

Meyer, T. P., and Anderson, J. "Media Violence Research: Interpreting the Findings." Journal of Broadcasting, 1973, 17, 447-458.

Meyerson, L. J. "The Effects of Filmed Aggression on the Aggressive Responses of High and Low Aggressive Subject." University of Iowa, Dissertation Abstracts, 1966.

Moody, Kate. Growing Up on Television. New York: Time Books, 1980, 6-90.

Mukerji, Rose. "What Effect is TV Having on the Young." Paper presented at the annual conference, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Houston, Texas, March 19-23, 1977.

Mulholland, Thomas B. "The Concept of Attention and the Electroencephlographic Alpha Rhythm." Attention in Neurophysiology. London: Butterworths, 1979, 100-101.

Neale, J. M., and Liebert, R. M. Science and Behavior. New Jersey, Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1973.

Nielsen, A. C. Television Fact Book, Northbrook, IL, 1982a.

Nielsen, A. C. Viewers in Profile, Northbrook, IL, 1982b.

Ott, John. Eye, Ear, Nose and Throat Monthly, July 1974.

Peper, Erik. Described by Jerry Mander. Four Arguments for the Elimination of Television. New York: William Morrow, 1978, 209-210.

Ross, D.; Bandura, A.; and Ross, S. "Imitation of Film Mediated Aggressive Models." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1963, 66, 3-11.

Rowse, A. L. On History: A Study of Present Tendencies. London: K. Paul, Trench and Trubnar, 1927, 13-15.

Rustein, N. Go Watch TV! New York: Sheed and Ward, 1974.

Schramm, W.; Lyle, J.; and Parker, E. Television in the Lives of Our Children. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1961.

Siegel, A. E. "Film Mediated Fantasy Aggression and Strength of Aggressive Drive." Child Development, 1956, 27, 365-378.

Singer, Dorothy, and Singer, Jerome. Patterns in Play. New York: Harper and Row, 1977.

Singer, J. L. The Control of Aggression and Violence. New York: Academic Press, 1971.

Smythe, D. W. New York Television. January 4-10, 1951, 1952; Monitoring Study No. 4, 1952a, Urbana: Illinois, National Association of Educational Broadcasters.

Smythe, D. W. A Personal Interview, 1963b. In E. Barnouw, The Golden Web. New York: Oxford Press, 1968.

Stein, A. H., and Friedrich, L. K. "Television Content and Young Children's Behavior." In Television and Social Behavior: Report to the Surgeon General's Scientific Advisory Committee, 1971, 2, Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office.

Steinfeld, Jesse L. Television and Growing Up: The Impact of Television Violence. U. S. Government Documents, 1972.

Swerdlow, Joel. "What is Television Doing to Real People?" Today's Education, September - October 1981, 50-53.

Thrush, J. C., and Labovitz, A. "Television Violence 1968-1969." Unpublished Research Report, Central Michigan University, 1969.

Walters, R. H.; Thomas, E. L.; and Acker, C. "Enchancement of Punitive Behavior by Audiovisual Displays." Science, 1962, 136, 872-873.

Ward, S. "Effects of Television Advertising on Children and Adolescents." In Television and Social Behavior: Report to the Surgeon General's Scientific Advisory Committee, 1971, 4, Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office.

Ward, S.; Levinson, D.; and Wackman, D. "Children's Attention to Television Advertising." In Television and Social Behavior: Report to the Surgeon General's Scientific Advisory Committee, 1971, 4, Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office.

Wertham, F. S. The Seduction of the Innocent. New York: The MacMillian Company, 1966.

White, Ned. Inside Television. Palo Alto, CA, 1980.

Witty, P. R. "Studies of the Mass Media." Science Education, 1966, 50, 119-126.

Young, William M. PTA TV Manual. Oak Park, IL, 1981.

Zajonc, R. "Some Effects of the Space Serials." Public Opinion Quarterly, 1954, 18, 367.

APPENDIX A

DISCIPLINE PROBLEM

REPORTING FORM

DISCIPLINE PROBLEM REPORTING FORM

Student Name _____

School Personnel Completing Form _____

Date Completed ____/____/____

Circle the most appropriate discipline problem (only one per incident).

---

1. Threatening other students/teacher with weapons
2. Using/pushing drugs (includes alcohol)
3. Cheating on exams, lessons, etc.
4. Using vulgar language and gestures
5. Petty thievery (school property)
6. Forging parents name
7. Lying about grades and activities
8. Petty thievery (personal property)
9. Disorderly conduct in halls and rooms
10. Disrespect for authority
11. Hostility and aggression toward teachers
12. Disruption of classroom climate
13. Hazing of other students
14. Hostility and aggression towards peers
15. Bad behavior in transit (on bus, etc.)
16. Smoking on school premises
17. Changing of report card or lessons
18. Illegal driving of vehicle on school premises
19. Failure to pay fines, bills, or fees
20. Improper dress
21. Failure to get haircut or other improper grooming
22. Violation of school rules and codes
23. Truancy
24. Cutting class
25. Letting outside responsibilities interfere with school work
26. Performing inferior school work
27. Other (explain) _____

*Permission was granted to use Porter's Seriousness of Discipline Problems Reporting Form.

APPENDIX B

SERIOUSNESS OF DISCIPLINE PROBLEMS

RATING SCALE

SERIOUSNESS OF DISCIPLINE PROBLEMS RATING SCALE

CATEGORY	DISCIPLINE PROBLEM	SCALE
I	1. Threatening other students or teachers with weapon 2. Using/pushing drugs (includes alcohol)	5
II	3. Cheating on exams, lessons, etc. 4. Using vulgar language and gestures 5. Petty thievery (school property) 6. Forging parents name 7. Lying about grades and activities 8. Petty thievery (personal property)	4
III	9. Disorderly conduct in halls and rooms 10. Disrespect for authority 11. Hostility and aggression toward teachers 12. Disruption of classroom climate 13. Hazing of other students 14. Hostility and aggression toward peers 15. Bad behavior in transit (on bus, etc.)	3
IV	16. Smoking on school premises 17. Changing a report card or lessons 18. Illegal driving of vehicle on school premises 19. Failure to pay fines, bills, or fees 20. Improper dress 21. Failure to get hair cut or other improper grooming 22. Violation of school rules and codes	2
V	23. Truancy 24. Cutting class 25. Performing inferior school work 26. Letting outside responsibilities interfere with school work	1

*Permission was granted to use Porter's Seriousness of Discipline Problems Rating Scale.

APPENDIX C

STUDENT VIEWING

QUESTIONNAIRE

STUDENT TELEVISION VIEWING QUESTIONNAIRE

STUDENT'S NAME _____

Sex M F
(circle one)

Does student have television set of his/her own?

YES NO
(circle one)

Student's three (3) favorite television programs:

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

Student's three (3) least favorite television programs:

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

DIRECTIONS: Indicate programs viewed by placing a check in the blank space beside the channel and program listed. Write in the blank space the channel and program title if the program viewed is not listed or there has been a change in the schedule.

PRIME TIME LISTINGS FOR:

Monday, October 17, 1983

6:00 P.M.

___(4) News
___(5) News
___(9) News
___(13) Nightly Business Report
___(14) TNB Today
___(25) Chips Patrol
___(34) Soap
___(43) Startrek
___( ) _____
_____

6:30 P.M.

___(4) PM Magazine
___(5) Love Connection
___(9) People's Court
___(13) Oklahoma Report
___(14) Kids Praise the Lord
___(25) Chips Patrol
___(34) Sanford & Son
___(43) Startrek
___( ) _____
_____

7:00 P.M.

___(4) Boone
___(5) That's Incredible
___(9) Scarecrow & Mrs. King
___(13) Cosmos
___(14) Calling Dr. Whitaker
___(25) Movie "Cactus Flower"
___(34) Movie "Sunset Blvd."
___(43) Tic Tac Dough
___( ) _____
_____

7:30 P.M.

___(4) Movie "Policewoman Centerfold"
___(5) That's Incredible
___(9) Scarecrow & Mrs. King
___(13) Cosmos
___(14) Calling Dr. Whitaker
___(25) Movie "Cactus Flower"
___(34) Movie "Sunset Blvd."
___(43) Joker's Wild
___( ) _____
_____

8:00 P.M.

___(4) "Policewoman Centerfold"
___(5) Monday Night Football
___(9) After Mash
___(13) Shakespeare Plays
___(14) Sonshine
___(25) "Cactus Flower"
___(34) "Sunset Boulevard"
___(43) Bonanza
___( ) _____
_____

8:30 P.M.

___(4) "Policewoman Centerfold"
___(5) Monday Night Football
___(9) Newhart
___(13) Shakespeare Plays
___(14) Jack Van Impe
___(25) "Cactus Flower"
___(34) "Sunset Boulevard"
___(43) Bonanza
___( ) _____
_____

LISTINGS CONTINUED FOR:

Monday, October 17, 1983

9:00 P.M.

___(4) "Policewoman Centerfold"
___(5) Monday Night Football
___(9) Emerald Point NAS
___(13) The Shakespeare Plays
___(14) Praise the Lord
___(25) Quincy
___(34) Hawaii Five-O
___(43) Big Valley
___( ) _____
_____

9:30 P.M.

___(4) "Policewoman Centerfold"
___(5) Monday Night Football
___(9) Emerald Point NAS
___(13) The Shakespeare Plays
___(14) Praise the Lord
___(25) Quincy
___(34) Hawaii Five-O
___(43) Big Valley
___( ) _____
_____

10:00 P.M.

___(4) News
___(5) Monday Night Football
___(9) News
___(13) Shakespeare Plays
___(14) Praise the Lord
___(25) Alfred Hitchcock
___(34) Benny Hill Show
___(43) Night Gallery
___( ) _____
_____

10:30 P.M.

___(4) Tonight Show
___(5) Monday Night Football
___(9) Entertainment Tonight
___(13) Late Night America
___(14) Praise the Lord
___(25) Harry-O
___(34) Alice
___(43) One Step Beyond
___( ) _____
_____

11:00 P.M.

___(4) Tonight Show
___(5) News
___(9) Movie "Hart to Hart"
___(13) Late Night America
___(14) Praise the Lord
___(25) Harry-O
___(34) Comedy Court
___(43) The 700 Club
___( ) _____
_____

11:30 P.M.

___(4) Late Night w/ David Letterman
___(5) Thicke of the Night
___(9) Movie "Hart to Hart"
___(13) Late Night America
___(14) Praise the Lord
___(25) Late Show "Honey Pot"
___(34) The 700 Club
___(43)
___( ) _____
_____

PRIME TIME LISTINGS FOR:

Tuesday, October 18, 1983

6:00 P.M.

___(4) News
___(5) News
___(9) News
___(13) Nightly Business Report
___(14) TNB Today
___(25) Chips Patrol
___(34) Soap
___(43) Startrek
___( ) _____
_____

6:30 P.M.

___(4) PM Magazine
___(5) Love Connection
___(9) People's Court
___(13) Oklahoma Report
___(14) One Way Game the Lord
___(25) Chips Patrol
___(34) Sanford & Son
___(43) Startrek
___( ) _____
_____

7:00 P.M.

___(4) The A Team
___(5) Just My Luck
___(9) The Mississippi
___(13) Nova
___(14) Dottie Rammo's
Magazine
___(25) Movie "The Mephisto"
___(34) Movie "Texas Detour"
___(43) Tic Tac Dough
___( ) _____
_____

7:30 P.M.

___(4) The A Team
___(5) Happy Days
___(9) The Mississippi
___(13) Nova
___(14) I Choose Life
___(25) Movie "The Mephisto"
___(34) Movie "Texas Detour"
___(43) Joker's Wild
___( ) _____
_____

8:00 P.M.

___(4) Remmington Steele
___(5) Three's Company
___(9) Movie "China Rose"
___(13) Vietnam: A TV History
___(14) The Answer
___(25) Movie "The Mephisto"
___(34) Movie "Texas Detour"
___(43) Bonanza
___( ) _____
_____

8:30 P.M.

___(4) Remmington Steele
___(5) Oh! Madeline
___(9) Movie "China Rose"
___(13) Vietnam: A TV History
___(14) The Answers
___(25) Movie "The Mephisto"
___(34) Movie "Texas Detour"
___(43) Bonanza
___( ) _____
_____

LISTINGS CONTINUED FOR:
Tuesday, October 18, 1983

9:00 P.M.

___(4) Bunco
___(5) Hart to Hart
___(9) Movie "China Rose"
___(13) Mirage
___(14) Praise the Lord
___(25) Quincy
___(34) Hawaii Five-O
___(43) Big Valley
___( ) _____
_____

9:30 P.M.

___(4) Bunco
___(5) Hart to Hart
___(9) Movie "China Rose"
___(13) Mirage
___(14) Praise the Lord
___(25) Quincy
___(34) Hawaii Five-O
___(43) Big Valley
___( ) _____
_____

10:00 P.M.

___(4) News
___(5) News
___(9) News
___(13) Dr. Who
___(14) Praise the Lord
___(25) Alfred Hitchcock
___(34) Benny Hill Show
___(43) Night Gallery
___( ) _____
_____

10:30 P.M.

___(4) Tonight Show
___(5) News/Mash
___(9) Entertainment Tonight
___(13) Late Night America
___(14) Praise the Lord
___(25) Nightline
___(34) Alice
___(43) One Step Beyond
___( ) _____ _____
_____

11:00 P.M.

___(4) Tonight Show
___(5) Mash/Thicke of the Night
___(9) Movie "Magnum P.I."
___(13) Late Night America
___(14) Praise the Lord
___(25) Showcase 25, "Mephisto"
___(34) The Late Show "Tempest"
___(43) The 700 Club
___( ) _____
_____

11:30 P.M.

___(4) Late Night w/David Letterman
___(5) Thicke of the Night
___(9) Movie "Magnum P.I."
___(13) Late Night America
___(14) Praise the Lord
___(25) Showcase 25 "Mephisto"
___(34) Late Show "Tempest"
___(43) The 700 Club
___( ) _____
_____

PRIME TIME LISTINGS FOR:

Wednesday, October 19, 1983

6:00 P.M.

___(4) News
___(5) News
___(9) News
___(13) Nightly Business Report
___(14) TNB Today
___(25) Chips Patrol
___(34) Soap
___(43) Startrek
___( ) _____
_____

6:30 P.M.

___(4) PM Magazine
___(5) Love Connection
___(9) People's Court
___(13) Oklahoma Report
___(14) AIA Sports Magazine
___(25) Chips Patrol
___(34) Sanford & Son
___(43) Startrek
___( ) _____
_____

7:00 P.M.

___(4) Real People
___(5) Fall Guy
___(9) Whiz Kids
___(13) The Oil Kingdoms
___(14) Upon Melody Mountain
___(25) Movie "Which Way is Up"
___(34) Movie "Sterile Cuckoo"
___(43) Tic Tac Dough
___( ) _____
_____

7:30 P.M.

___(4) Real People
___(5) Fall Guy
___(9) Whiz Kids
___(13) The Oil Kingdoms
___(14) Prayer Concert
___(25) Movie "Which Way is Up"
___(34) Movie "Sterile Cuckoo"
___(43) Joker's Wild
_____
_____

8:00 P.M.

___(4) The Facts of Life
___(5) Dynasty
___(9) Movie "S.O.B."
___(13) The Oil Kingdoms
___(14) Faith That Lives
___(25) Movie "Which Way is Up"
___(34) Movie "Sterile Cuckoo"
___(43) Bonanza
___( ) _____
_____

8:30 P.M.

___(4) Family Ties
___(5) Dynasty
___(9) Movie "S.O.B."
___(13) The Oil Kingdoms
___(14) Shockwaves of Armegeddon
___(25) Movie "Which Way is Up"
___(34) Movie "Sterile Cuckoo"
___(43) Bonanza
___( ) _____
_____

LISTINGS CONTINUED FOR:

Wednesday, October 19, 1983

9:00 P.M.

___(4) St. Elsewhere
___(5) Hotel
___(9) Movie "S.O.B."
___(13) The Oil Kingdoms
___(14) Praise the Lord
___(25) Quincy
___(34) Hawaii Five-O
___(43) Big Valley
___( ) _____
_____

9:30 P.M.

___(4) St. Elsewhere
___(5) Hotel
___(9) Movie "S.O.S."
___(14) Praise the Lord
___(25) Quincy
___(34) Hawaii Five-O
___(43) Big Valley
___( ) _____
_____

10:00 P.M.

___(4) News
___(5) News
___(9) Movie "S.O.B?"
___(13) Doctor Who
___(14) Praise the Lord
___(25) Alfred Hitchcock
___(34) Benny Hill Show
___(43) Night Gallery
___( ) _____
_____

10:30 P.M.

___(4) Tonight Show
___(5) News/Mash
___(9) News
___(13) Late Night America
___(14) Praise the Lord
___(25) Nightline
___(34) Alice
___(43) One Step Beyond
___( ) _____
_____

11:00 P.M.

___(4) Tonight Show
___(5) Mash/Thicke of the Night
___(13) Late Night America
___(14) Praise the Lord
___(25) Nightline
___(34) Comedy Court
___(43) The 700 Club
___( ) _____
_____

11:30 P.M.

___(4) Late Night w/David Letterman
___(5) Thicke of the Night
___(9) Movie "Police Story"
___(13) Late Night America
___(14) Praise the Lord
___(25) Showcase 25 "Which Way Is Up"
___(34) Late Show "The City"
___(43) The 700 Club
___( ) _____
_____

PRIME TIME LISTINGS FOR:

Thursday, October 20, 1983

6:00 P.M.

___(4) News
___(5) News
___(9) News
___(13) Nightly Business Report
___(14) TNB Today
___(25) Chips Patrol
___(34) Soap
___(43) Startrek
___( ) _____
_____

6:30 P.M.

___(4) PM Magazine
___(5) Love Connection
___(9) People's Court
___(13) Oklahoma Report
___(14) Bible Bowl
___(25) Chips Patrol
___(34) Sanford & Son
___(43) Startrek
___( ) _____
_____

7:00 P.M.

___(4) Gimme A Break
___(5) Trauma Center
___(9) Magnum P.I.
___(13) Sneak Previews
___(14) Lordship of Christ
___(25) Movie "Demon Seed"
___(34) Movie "Crime Boss"
___(43) Tic Tac Dough
___( ) _____
_____

7:30 P.M.

___(4) Barry Switzer Show
___(5) Trauma Center
___(9) Magnum P.I.
___(13) Wild America
___(14) In the Land of the Bible
___(25) Movie "Demon Seed"
___(34) Movie "Crime Boss"
___(43) Joker's Wild
___( ) _____
_____

8:00 P.M.

___(4) We Got it Made
___(5) 9 to 5
___(9) Simon & Simon
___(13) Nature II
___(14) Dwight Thompson
___(25) Movie "Demon Seed"
___(34) Movie "Crime Boss"
___(34) Bonanza
_____
_____

8:30 P.M.

___(4) Cheers
___(5) It's Not Easy
___(9) Simon & Simon
___(13) Nature II
___(14) Dwight Thompson
___(25) Movie "Demon Seed
___(34) Movie "Crime Boss"
___(43) Bonanza
_____
_____

LISTINGS CONTINUED FOR:

Thursday, October 20, 1983

9:00 P.M.

___(4) Hill Street Blues
___(5) 20/20
___(9) Knots Landing
___(13) All Creatures
___(14) Praise The Lord
___(25) Quincy
___(34) Hawaii Five-O
___(43) Big Valley
___( ) _____
_____

9:30 P.M.

___(4) Hill Street Blues
___(5) 20/20
___(9) Knots Landing
___(13) All Creatures
___(14) Praise the Lord
___(25) Quincy
___(34) Hawaii Five-O
___(43) Big Valley
___( ) _____
_____

10:00 P.M.

___(4) News
___(5) News
___(9) News
___(13) Dr. Who
___(14) Praise the Lord
___(25) Alfred Hitchcock
___(34) Benny Hill Show
___(43) Night Gallery
___( ) _____
_____

10:30 P.M.

___(4) Tonight Show
___(5) News/Mash
___(9) Entertainment Tonight
___(13) Late Night America
___(14) Praise the Lord
___(25) Nightline
___(34) Alice
___(43) One Step Beyond
___( ) _____
_____

11:00 P.M.

___(4) Tonight Show
___(5) Mash/Thick of the Night
___(9) Movie "Trapper John, M.D."
___(13) Late Night America
___(14) Praise the Lord
___(25) Nightline
___(34) Comedy Court
___(43) The 700 Club
_____
_____

11:30 P.M.

___(4) Late Night w/David Letterman
___(5) Thicke of the Night
___(9) Movie "Trapper John, M.D."
___(13) Late Night America
___(14) Praise the Lord
___(25) Showcase 25 "Demon Seed"
___(34) Late Show "The Great Escape"
___(43) The 700 Club
___( ) _____
_____

PRIME TIME LISTINGS FOR:

Friday, October 21, 1983

6:00 P.M.

___(4) News
___(5) News
___(9) News
___(13) Nightly Business Report
___(14) TNB Today
___(25) Chips Patrol
___(43) Startrek
___( ) _____
_____

6:30 P.M.

___(4) PM Magazine
___(5) Love Connection
___(9) People's Court
___(13) Oklahoma Report
___(14) Kids Praise the Lord
___(25) Chips Patrol
___(34) Sanford & Son
___(43) Startrek
___( ) _____
_____

7:00 P.M.

___(4) Mr. Smith
___(5) Benson
___(9) Dukes of Hazzard
___(13) Wash. Week in Review
___(14) Lahayes on Family Life
___(25) Movie "Blue Knight"
___(34) Movie "Countdown:
___(43) Tic Tac Dough
___( ) _____
_____

7:30 P.M.

___(4) Jennifer Slept Here
___(5) Webster
___(9) Dukes of Hazzard
___(13) Wall Street Week
___(14) Joy of Music
___(25) Movie "Blue Knight"
___(43) Joker's Wild
___( ) _____
_____

8:00 P.M.

___(4) Manimal
___(5) Lottery
___(9) Dallas
___(13) Oklahoma Week in Review
___(14) Ever Increasing Faith
___(25) Movie "Blue Knight"
___(34) Movie "Countdown"
___(43) Bonanza
___( ) _____
_____

8:30 P.M.

___(4) Manimal
___(5) Lottery
___(9) Dallas
___(13) The Lawmakers
___(14) Ever Increasing Faith
___(25) Movie "Blue Knight"
___(34) Movie "Countdown"
___(43) Bonanza
___( ) _____
_____

LISTINGS CONTINUED FOR:

Friday, October 21, 1983

9:00 P.M.

___(4) For Love & Honor
___(5) Matt Houston
___(9) Falcon Crest
___(13) Inside Story
___(14) Praise the Lord
___(25) Quincy
___(34) Hawaii Five-O
___(43) Big Valley
___( ) _____
_____

9:30 P.M.

___(4) For Love & Honor
___(5) Matt Houston
___(9) Falcon Crest
___(13) Market to Market
___(14) Praise the Lord
___(25) Quincy
___(34) Hawaii Five-O
___(43) Big Valley
___( ) _____
_____

10:00 P.M.

___(4) News
___(5) News
___(9) News
___(13) Dr. Who
___(14) Praise the Lord
___(25) Alfred Hitchcock
___(34) Benny Hill Show
___(43) Night Gallery
___( ) _____
_____

10:30 P.M.

___(4) Tonight Show
___(5) News/Mash
___(9) Entertainment Tonight
___(13) Dr. Who
___(14) Praise the Lord
___(25) Nightline
___(34) Alice
___(43) One Step Beyond
___( ) _____
_____

11:00 P.M.

___(4) Friday Night Videos
___(5) Mash/Thick of the Night
___(9) Late Movie "Terror Among Us"
___(13) Dr. Who
___(14) Praise the Lord
___(25) Nightline
___(34) Comedy Court
___(43) The 700 Club
___( ) _____
_____

11:30 P.M.

___(4) Friday Night Videos
___(5) Thicke of the Night
___(9) Movie "Terror Among Us"
___(13) Dr. Who
___(14) Praise the Lord
___(25) Movie "Return of the Seven"
___(34) Comedy Court
___(43) The 700 Club
___( ) _____
_____

PRIME TIME LISTINGS FOR:

Saturday, October 22, 1983

6:00 P.M.

___(4) News
___(5) News
___(9) News
___(13) Undersea/Cousteau
___(14) Felicidad
___(25) How the West was Won
___(34) Mid-South Wrestling
___(43) Fame
___( ) _____
_____

6:30 P.M.

___(4) At the Movies
___(5) Music City, U.S.A.
___(9) People's Court
___(13) Oklahoma Report
___(14) Lifeline
___(25) How the West was Won
___(34) Mid-South Wrestling
___(43) Fame
___( ) _____
_____

7:00 P.M.

___(4) Different Strokes
___(5) T. J. Hooker
___(9) Cutter to Houston
___(13) Live from the Met
___(14) Dayspring
___(25) Movie "Missiles of October"
___(34) Movie "Buccaneer"
___(43) Salute
___( ) _____
_____

7:30 P.M.

___(4) Silver Spoons
___(5) T. J. Hooker
___(9) Cutter to Houston
___(13) Live from the Met
___(14) Today in Bible Prophecy
___(25) Movie "Missiles of October"
___(34) Movie "Buccaneer"
___(43) Salute
___( ) _____
_____

8:00 P.M.

___(4) The Rousters
___(5) The Love Boat
___(9) Movie "Caribbean Mystery"
___(13) Live from the Met
___(14) Hour of Power
___(25) Movie "Missiles of October"
___(34) Movie "Buccaneer"
___(43) Cimarron Strip
___( ) _____
_____

8:30 P.M.

___(4) The Rousters
___(5) The Love Boat
___(9) Movie "Caribbean Mystery"
___(13) Live from the Met
___(14) Hour of Power
___(25) Movie "Missiles of October"
___(34) Movie "Buccaneer"
___(43) Cimarron Strip
___( ) _____
_____

LISTINGS CONTINUED FOR:

Saturday, October 22, 1983

9:00 P.M.

___(4) The Yellow Rose
___(5) Fantasy Island
___(9) Movie "Caribbean Mystery"
___(13) Live from the Met
___(14) James Robison
___(25) Movie "Missiles of October"
___(34) Movie "Buccaneer"
___(43) Cimarron Strip
___( ) _____
_____

9:30 P.M.

___(4) The Yellow Rose
___(5) Fantasy Island
___(9) Movie "Caribbean Mystery"
___(13) Life from the Met
___(14) Our Jewish Roots
___(25) Movie "Missiles of October"
___(34) Movie "Buccaneer"
___(43) Wanted: Dead or Alive
___( ) _____
_____

10:00 P.M.

___(4) News
___(5) News
___(9) News
___(13) Live from the Met
___(14) Love Special
___(25) Movie "Missiles of October"
___(34) Movie "Home Bodies"
___(43) Championship Wrestling
___( ) _____
_____

10:30 P.M.

___(4) WKRP in Cincinnati
___(5) Taxi
___(9) This Week in Country Music
___(13) Live from the Met
___(14) Love Special
___(25) Movie "The Heartbreak Kid"
___(34) Movie "Home Bodies"
___(43) Championship Wrestling
___( ) _____
_____

11:00 P.M.

___(4) Movie "THX 1138"
___(5) Movie "Bridge at Remagen"
___(9) Starsearch
___(13) Live from the Met
___(14) Zola Levitt
___(25) Movie "The Heartbreak Kid"
___(34) Movie "Home Bodies"
___(43) Rock TV
___( ) _____
_____

11:30 P.M.

___(4) Movie "THX 1138"
___(5) Movie "Bridge at Remagen"
___(9) Starsearch
___(13) Live from the Met
___(14) The Answer
___(25) Movie "The Heartbreak Kid"
___(34) Movie "Home Bodies"
___(43) Rock TV
___( ) _____
_____

PRIME TIME LISTINGS FOR:

Sunday, October 23, 1983

6:00 P.M.

___(4) OU Football Playback
___(5) Ripley's Believe It
___(9) 60 Minutes
___(13) Austin City Limits
___(14) Good News
___(25) Movie "Aunt Mary"
___(34) Outdoor U.S.A.
___(43) The Incredible Hulk
___( ) _____
_____

6:30 P.M.

___(4) OU Football Playback
___(5) Ripley's Believe It
___(9) 60 Minutes
___(13) Austin City Limits
___(14) Our Jewish Roots
___(25) Movie "Aunt Mary"
___(34) Rat Patrol
___(43) Incredible Hulk
___( ) _____
_____

7:00 P.M.

___(4) Nightrider
___(5) Hardcastle & McCormick
___(9) Alice
___(13) Nature II
___(14) A Reason to Sing
___(25) CNN News
___(34) Oklahoma Horse Report
___(43) Best of the 700 Club
___( ) _____
_____

7:30 P.M.

___(4) Nightrider
___(5) Hardcastle & McCormick
___(9) One Day at a Time
___(13) Nature II
___(14) Eagle's Nest
___(25) Wild, Wild West
___(34) Oklahoma City Forum
___(43) Best of the 700 Club
___( ) _____
_____

8:00 P.M.

___(4) Movie "Women of San Quentin"
___(5) NFL Football
___(9) The Jeffersons
___(13) Masterpiece Theatre
___(14) Father Manning
___(25) Wild, Wild West
___(34) Jim Bakker
___(43) Jimmy Swaggart
___( ) _____
_____

8:30 P.M.

___(4) Movie "Women of San Quentin"
___(5) NFL Football
___(9) Good Night Bean Town
___(13) Masterpiece Theatre
___(14) Lloyd Ogilvie
___(25) Sunday P.M.
___(34) Jim Bakker
___(43) Jimmy Swaggart
___( ) _____
_____

LISTINGS CONTINUED FOR:

Sunday, October 23, 1983

9:00 P.M.

___(4) Movie "Women of San Quentin"
___(5) NFL Football
___(9) Trapper John, M.D.
___(13) Arts Chronicle
___(14) Believers Voice
___(25) Sunday P.M.
___(34) Jerry Falwell
___(43) Mission Impossible
___( ) _____
_____

9:30 P.M.

___(4) Movie "Women of San Quentin"
___(5) NFL Football
___(9) Trapper John, M.D.
___(13) Dinner at Julia's
___(14) Believer's Voice
___(25) Jack Van Impe
___(34) Jerry Falwell
___(43) Mission Impossible
___( ) _____
_____

10:00 P.M.

___(4) News
___(5) NFL Football
___(9) News
___(13) Vietnam: A TV History
___(14) Praise the Lord
___(25) Search
___(34) Prophecy in the News
___(43) Lawrence Welk
___( ) _____
_____

10:30 P.M.

___(4) WKRP In Cincinnati
___(5) NFL Football
___(9) Entertainment This Week
___(13) Vietnam: A TV History
___(14) Praise the Lord
___(25) Honeymooners
___(34) Restoration
___(43) Lawrence Welk
___( ) _____
_____

11:00 P.M.

___(4) Movie "Thief Who Came to Dinner"
___(5) Taxi
___(9) CBS Sunday Night News
___(13) Vietnam: A TV History
___(14) Praise the Lord
___(25) Ernest Angley
___(34) Women in Crises
___(43) Independent Network News
___( ) _____
_____

11:30 P.M.

___(4) Movie "Thief Who Came to Dinner"
___(5) Taxi
___(9) CBS Sunday Night News
___(13) Vietnam: A TV History
___(14) Praise the Lord
___(25) Ernest Angley
___(34) Women in Crises
___(43) Independent Network News
___( ) _____
_____

APPENDIX D

PROGRAM VIOLENCE MONITORING RESULTS

Network
Program Monitoring Results
for October 17 - 24, 1983

	PROGRAM TITLE	NETWORK	VIOLENCE PER/HOUR
1.	Fall Guy	ABC	63
2.	A Team	NBC	39
3.	Manimals	NBC	37
4.	Matt Houston	ABC	28
5.	Hardcastle and McCormick	ABC	22
6.	Rousters	NBC	22
7.	Hart to Hart	ABC	20
8.	Simon & Simon	CBS	20
9.	T. J. Hooker	ABC	20
10.	Magnum PI	CBS	19
11.	Bunco	NBC	17
12.	Nightrider	NBC	15
13.	Scarecrow & Mrs. King	CBS	14
14.	Hill Street Blues	NBC	11
15.	Ripley's Believe It or Not	ABC	11
16.	The Yellow Rose	NBC	10
17.	For Love & Honor	NBC	7
18.	Happy Days	ABC	7
19.	Mississippi	CBS	6
20.	Trauma Center	ABC	6
21.	Family Ties	NBC	5
22.	Remington Steel	NBC	5
23.	Benson	ABC	3
24.	Dukes of Hazzard	CBS	3
25.	Jennifer Slept Here	NBC	3
26.	Just My Luck	ABC	3
27.	Three's Company	ABC	3
28.	Dynasty	ABC	3
29.	Gimme a Break	NBC	2
30.	Lottery	ABC	2
31.	Alice	CBS	1
32.	Boone	NBC	1
33.	Dallas	CBS	1
34.	Different Strokes	NBC	1
35.	Emerald Point NAS	CBS	1
36.	Falcon Crest	CBS	1
37.	Knots Landing	CBS	1
38.	Mr. Smith	NBC	1
39.	St. Elsewhere	NBC	1
40.	After Mash	CBS	0

Network
Program Monitoring Results
for October 17 - 24, 1983
(continued)

PROGRAM TITLE	NETWORK	VIOLENCE PER/HOUR
41. Cheers	NBC	0
42. Cutter to Houston	CBS	0
43. Fantasy Island	ABC	0
44. First Camera	NBC	0
45. Goodnight Beantown	CBS	0
46. Hotel	ABC	0
47. It's Not Easy	ABC	0
48. Mama's Family	NBC	0
49. Newhardt	CBS	0
50. Nine to Five	ABC	0
51. Oh! Madeline	ABC	0
52. One Day at a Time	CBS	0
53. Real People	NBC	0
54. Silver Spoons	NBC	0
55. Sixty Minutes	CBS	0
56. That's Incredible	ABC	0
57. The Jeffersons	CBS	0
58. The Love Boat	ABC	0
59. Trapper John, M.D.	CBS	0
60. Twenty-Twenty	ABC	0
61. Webster	ABC	0
62. We Got It Made	NBC	0
63. Whiz Kids	CBS	0

Syndicated Program
Monitoring Results
for October 17 - 24, 1983

PROGRAM TITLE	VIOLENCE/PER HOUR
1. Mission Impossible	19
2. Harry-O	16
3. Hawaii Five-O	15
4. Rat Patrol	14
5. Night Gallery	13
6. Startrek	10
7. Big Valley	7
8. Chips	7
9. Incredible Hulk	7
10. Wild, Wild West	7
11. How the West Was Won	6
12. One Step Beyond	6
13. Bonanza	5
14. Cimarron Strip	5
15. Wanted Dead or Alive	5
16. Alfred Hitchcock	4
17. Quincy	4
18. Benny Hill	2
19. Masterpiece Theatre	2
20. Soap	2
21. Mash	1
22. Taxi	1
23. A Reason tc Sing	0
24. AIA Sports Magazine	0
25. All Creatures	0
26. Arts Chronicle	0
27. At the Movies	0
28. Austin City Limits	0
29. Believers Voice	0
30. Bible Bowl	0
31. Calling Dr. Whitaker	0
32. Cosmos	0
33. Day Spring	0
34. Doctor Who	0
35. Dottie Rambo's Magazine	0
36. Dwight Thompson	0
37. Eagles Nest	0
38. Entertainment Tonight	0
39. Ernest Angley	0
40. Ever Increasing Faith	0

Syndicated Program
Monitoring Results
for October 17 - 24, 1983
(continued)

PROGRAM TITLE	VIOLENCE PER/HOUR
41. Faith That Lives	0
42. Fame	0
43. Father Manning	0
44. Friday Night Videos	0
45. Good News	0
46. Honeymooners	0
47. Hour of Power	0
48. I Choose Life	0
49. In the Land of the Bible	0
50. Jack Van Impe	0
51. James Robison	0
52. Jerry Falwell	0
53. Jim Bakker	0
54. Jimmy Swaggart	0
55. Jokers Wild	0
56. Kids Praise the Lord	0
57. Lahayes on Family Life	0
58. Late Night America	0
59. Late Night With David Letterman	0
60. Lifeline	0
61. Live From the Met	0
62. Lloyd Ogilvie	0
63. Lordship of Christ	0
64. Love Connection	0
65. Love Special	0
66. Mirage	0
67. Music City U.S.A.	0
68. Nature II	0
69. Nightline	0
70. Nightly Business Report	0
71. Nova	0
72. Oklahoma House Report	0
73. Our Jewish Roots	0
74. Outdoor U.S.A.	0
75. Outdoors Oklahoma	0
76. P.M. Magazine	0
77. Peoples Court	0
78. Praise the Lord	0
79. Prophecy in the News	0
80. Restoration	0

Syndicated Program
Monitoring Results
for October 17 - 24, 1983
(continued)

PROGRAM TITLE		VIOLENCE PER/HOUR
81.	Rock TV	0
82.	Salute	0
83.	Search	0
84.	Shock Waves of Armageddon	0
85.	Sneak Previews	0
86.	Sonshine	0
87.	Starsearch	0
88.	Sunday P.M.	0
89.	The Answer	0
90.	The Oil Kingdom	0
91.	The Law Makers	0
92.	The 700 Club	0
93.	The Shakespeare Plays	0
94.	Thicke of the Night	0
95.	This Week in Country Music	0
96.	Tic Tac Dough	0
97.	TNB Today	0
98.	Today in Bible Prophecy	0
99.	Tonight Show	0
100.	Toy of Music	0
101.	Undersea/Cousteau	0
102.	Upon Melody Mountain	0
103.	Vietnam: A TV History	0
104.	Wall Street Week	0
105.	Wild America	0
106.	Women in Crisis	0
107.	Zola Levitt	0

Movie Monitoring Results

MOVIE TITLE	VIOLENCE PER/HOUR
1. Forced Vengence	125
2. Shogun Assassin	123
3. An Eye for an Eye	120
4. Sword and the Sorcerer	117
5. Flash Gordon	100
6. The Sorcerer	100
7. Attack Force	96
8. Lion of the Desert	90
9. Parasite	88
10. Conan the Barbarian	80
11. For your Eyes Only	80
12. Raiders of the Lost Ark	80
13. Big Jake	78
14. Inchon	78
15. Night of the Juggler	72
16. Moonraker	70
17. Death Wish	62
18. Heavy Metal	61
19. Fighting Back	60
20. The Swamp Thing	60
21. Legend of the Lone Ranger	59
22. Penitentiary	59
23. Blast Master	58
24. Vice Squad	57
25. Battle Beyond the Stars	56
26. Silent Rage	56
27. Condorman	55
28. Escape from New York	54
29. Diamonds are Forever	53
30. The Big Red One	52
31. The Empire Strikes Back	49
32. The Golden Raiders	49
33. Tron	49
34. Fire Fox	48
35. March or Die	48
36. Tattoo	48
37. Time Bandits	48
38. Wind Walker	48
39. Scanners	47
40. The Shadow Raiders	47

Movie Monitoring Results
(continued)

MOVIE TITLE	VIOLENCE PER/HOUR
41. Comin at Ya	46
42. Kill and Kill Again	46
43. Superman II	46
44. Going Ape	45
45. It Came from Hollywood	45
46. Death Hunt	44
47. Excalibur	44
48. The Return of Maxwell Smart	44
49. Bugs Bunny Movie	41
50. Class of 1984	41
51. The Great Escape	41
52. First Blood	40
53. Quest for Fire	40
54. Rocky III	40
55. The Four Muskateers	40
56. The Outlaw Josie Wales	40
57. Through the Magic Pyramid	40
58. Zorro the Gay Blade	39
59. Butch Cassidy and the Sundance Kid	38
60. Caveman	38
61. Every Which Way But Loose	38
62. Sharkey's Machine	38
63. The Enforcer	38
64. Outland	37
65. The Beast Within	37
66. Bear Island	36
67. Butch and Sundance	36
68. Nighthawks	36
69. The Blue and the Gray, Part III	36
70. The Blues Brothers	36
71. Wrong is Right	36
72. Concrete Jungle	35
73. Day Breakers	35
74. Dogs of War	35
75. Forbidden World	35
76. Super Fuzz	35
77. A Stranger is Watching	34
78. Dr. No	34
79. Her Majesty's Secret Service	34
80. The Gauntlet	34

Movie Monitoring Results
(continued)

MOVIE TITLE		VIOLENCE PER/HOUR
81.	The Thing	34
82.	Golden Rendevouz	33
83.	Marco Polo, Part IV	33
84.	The Boys in Company "C"	33
85.	Thunder Ball	33
86.	Friday the 13th, Part III	32
87.	Sphinx	32
88.	Halloween, Part III	30
89.	Hanky Panky	30
90.	Striking Back	30
91.	The Man with the Golden Gun	30
92.	Any Which Way You Can	29
93.	Clash of the Titans	29
94.	Paradise	29
95.	Return of the Seven	29
96.	The Blue and the Gray, Part II	29
97.	The Last Ride of the Dalton Gang	29
98.	A Rumor of War	28
99.	Blue Knight	28
100.	House of Wax	28
101.	Mega Force	28
102.	Revenge of the Pink Panther	28
103.	The Border	28
104.	The Gambler	28
105.	Avalanche Express	27
106.	Blade Runner	27
107.	Coast to Coast	27
108.	Eye of the Needle	27
109.	Honey Boy	27
110.	Busting Loose	26
111.	Crime Boss	26
112.	Crossed Sword	26
113.	Trial of Billy Jack	26
114.	Eye Witness	25
115.	Police Story	25
116.	The Blue and the Gray, Part I	25
117.	Baltimore Bullets	24
118.	Blazing Saddles	24
119.	Casablanca	24
120.	Deadly Encounter	24

Movie Monitoring Results
(continued)

MOVIE TITLE	VIOLENCE PER/HOUR
121. Friday the 13th	24
122. From Russia with Love	24
123. High Noon Part II: The Return of Will Cane	24
124. History of the World, Part I	24
125. Poltergeist	24
126. Robin Hood	24
127. Rollicing Adventures of Elisa Fraser	24
128. Southern Comfort	24
129. Sunburn	24
130. Under the Rainbow	24
131. Bite the Bullet	23
132. Bridge at Remagen	23
133. Creepshow	23
134. My Bodyguard	23
135. Buccaneer	22
136. Dragonslayer	22
137. Some Kind of Hero	22
138. Smokey and the Bandit II	22
139. Visiting Hours	22
140. Detour to Terror	21
141. Looker	21
142. Muppet Movie	21
143. My Favorite Year	21
144. Student Bodies	21
145. Terro Train	21
146. Uptown Saturday Night	21
147. White Line Fever	21
148. Who'll Stop the Rain	21
149. Caligula	20
150. China 7, Liberty 27	20
151. Class Reunion	20
152. Fade to Black	20
153. Popeye	20
154. Smokey Bites the Dust	20
155. The Fox and Hound	20
156. Young Doctors in Love	20
157. The Rocky Horror Picture Show	20
158. Altered States	10
159. Annie	10
160. Cat People	10

Movie Monitoring Results
(continued)

MOVIE TITLE	VIOLENCE PER/HOUR
161. Exorcist	10
162. Fiendish Plot of Fu Manchu	10
163. Ghost Stories	10
164. Jimmy the Kid	10
165. Love and Bullets	10
166. Love Child	10
167. Montenagro	10
168. The Great Muppet Caper	10
169. The Secret of Nimh	10
170. This is Kate Bennett	10
171. Atlantic City	9
172. Blow Out	9
173. Man from Snowy River	9
174. Monty Python	9
175. Prince of the City	9
176. Tex	9
177. The World According to Garp	9
178. The Mephisto	9
179. True Confessions	9
180. Alice in Wonderland	8
181. Bad News Bears Break Training	8
182. Endless Love	8
183. First Family	8
184. Jinxed	8
185. Lovers and Liars	8
186. Modern Problems	8
187. Neighbors	8
188. Private Lessons	8
189. Shoot the Moon	8
190. Sunset Boulevard	8
191. Urban Cowboy	8
192. An Officer and a Gentleman	7
193. Elephant Man	7
194. Nice Dreams	7
195. On the Right Track	7
196. Partners	7
197. A Midsummer's Night Sex Comedy	6
198. Beneath the Valley of the Ultra Vixens	6
199. Best Little Whorehouse in Texas	6
200. Fantasia	6

Movie Monitoring Results
(continued)

MOVIE	TITLE	VIOLENCE PER/HOUR
201.	Harry's War	6
202.	Missionary	6
203.	Reds	6
204.	Roommates	6
205.	S.O.B.	6
206.	Seems Like Old Times	6
207.	Take This Job and Shove It	6
208.	The Toy	6
209.	Things are Tough All Over	6
210.	Arthur	5
211.	Cannery Row	5
212.	Change of Seasons	5
213.	Christanne	5
214.	E.T.	5
215.	Earthbound	5
216.	Grease II	5
217.	Hopscotch	5
218.	The Front	5
219.	Crises at Central High	4
220.	Diner	4
221.	Fast Times at Ridgemont High	4
222.	Hamlet	4
223.	If You Could See What I Hear	4
224.	Cactus Flower	3
225.	Caribbean Mystery	3
226.	Dial "M" for Murder	3
227.	Falling in Love Again	3
228.	Improper Channels	3
229.	Lady Chatterley's Lovers	3
230.	Mommie Dearest	3
231.	Night Crossing	3
232.	Pennies From Heaven	3
233.	Private Benjamen	3
234.	The Formula	3
235.	The Jazz Singer	3
346.	Author! Author!	2
237.	Body Heat	2
238.	Evil Under the Sun	2
239.	Homework	2
240.	Honey Pot	2

Movie Monitoring Results
(continued)

MOVIE TITLE	VIOLENCE PER/HOUR
241. Rich and Famous	2
242. The Mirror Cracked	2
243. Absence of Malice	1
244. Best Little Girl	1
245. Candy Goes to Hollywood	1
246. Chariots of Fire	1
247. Four Seasons	1
248. Health	1
249. I Ought to Be in Pictures	1
250. Joni	1
251. Making Love	1
252. Middle Age Crazy	1
253. Only When I Laugh	1
254. Personal Best	1
255. Summer Lovers	1
256. The French Lieutenant's Woman	1
257. Trapper John, M.D.	1
258. Up	1
259. Victory	1
260. Cancer Confrontation	0
261. Country Gold	0
262. Devil and Max Devlin	0
263. First Monday in October	0
264. Gray Lady Down	0
265. Heartland	0
266. Hollywood High, Part II	0
267. It's My Turn	0
268. Missiles of October	0
269. My Dinner with Andre	0
270. Oh God, Book II	0
271. On Golden Pond	0
272. One Trick Pony	0
273. Ordinary People	0
274. Other Side of the Mountain	0
275. Paternity	0
276. Policewoman Centerfold	0
277. Richard Pryor	0
278. Santa & the Bears	0
279. Stevie	0
280. The Priest	0
281. Who's Life is it Anyway	0
282. Yes, Georgio	0

APPENDIX E

LETTER TO PARENTS

Dear Parents,

I am sure that you are aware of the interest and concern being shown by many people today regarding television viewing and how it may be affecting behavior. It is with this concern that I am asking for your cooperation in conducting some research which I believe will be helpful in determining what effects, if any, television is having on our children.

Students participating in the study will be requested to complete a questionnaire on viewing patterns and types of programs viewed during the third week of October. There will be no physical risk involved and your child will not be identified in any manner in the findings.

I would appreciate you allowing your child to participate in this study and return the signed permission form as soon as possible. It is with the consent of the administration of your school district that I am conducting this investigation.

Sincerely,

Larry Huff, Administrator
Instructional Media and
Television
Oklahoma State Department
of Education

APPENDIX F

APPROVAL FORM

_____ has permission to participate in
Name of Student

your study which will assess television viewing habits and student behavior.

Signed _____
Parent or Guardian

APPENDIX G

CORRESPONDENCE

August 16, 1983

Dr. Lewis Eubanks
Superintendent
Midwest City Public Schools
607 West Rickenbacker
Midwest City, Oklahoma 73110

Dear Dr. Eubanks:

This correspondence is directed at our telephone conversation concerning the possibility of allowing me the opportunity to conduct research involving students and staff in the Midwest City Junior High Schools during the 1983-84 school year.

The research deals with a comparison of television viewing habits and classroom behavior of disruptive and non-disruptive students in public schools. It is hoped that the results of this research study will help to provide additional insight into a major concern among educators today, disruptive student behavior in the public schools.

Your consideration in helping to assimilate this data is greatly appreciated. The results of this study will be made available to the Midwest City Public Schools upon request.

Sincerely,

Larry Huff, Administrator
Instructional Media
and Television
Oklahoma State Department
of Education

August 18, 1983

Mr. Larry Huff, Administrator
Instructional Media Television
State Department of Education
2500 North Lincoln Boulevard
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73105

Dear Mr. Huff:

This letter is in reply to your correspondence and our telephone conversation concerning you conducting research involving students and staff in the Midwest City Junior High Schools. We are willing to cooperate and most interested in learning of the results of the research pertaining to a comparison of the television viewing habits and behavior of disruptive and non-disruptive students in our schools.

It is believed that your findings will not only be interesting but also very helpful to educators who are responsible for providing a suitable learning enviroment for our youth. We would be very appreciative if you made available to us the results of your findings.

Sincerely,

Lewis Eubanks

Lewis Eubanks, Superintendent
Midwest City Public Schools

September 7, 1983

Dr. Edward Porter
The Educational Services Center
1607 North Harrison Street
Shawnee, Oklahoma 74801

Dear Dr. Porter:

This correspondence is directed to our conversation concerning the possibility of you allowing me to use research instruments you designed dealing with the reporting of disruptive student behavior in public schools and the rating of the seriousness of the disruptive behavior.

Your consideration in allowing me to use these instruments is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Larry Huff, Administrator
Instructional Media and
Television
Oklahoma State Department
of Education

September 16, 1983

Mr. Larry Huff, Administrator
Instructional Media and Television
Oklahoma State Department of Education
2500 North Lincoln
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73105

Dear Mr. Huff:

This letter is in response to our conversation and your letter to me requesting permission to use instruments developed by me and included in my dissertation entitled, The Effect of Type of Discipline Problem, Appearance and Previous Behavior on Discipline Decisions in the Public Schools.

It would be a priviledge for me to allow another researcher to use materials developed by me. Hopefully, the instruments will meet your needs without modification, however, feel free to modify them to meet the individual needs of your study.

Sincerely,

Edward Porter

Edward Porter

APPENDIX H

RAW DATA CONCERNING THE DISRUPTIVE AND NON-DISRUPTIVE STUDENTS

DATA CONCERNING THE
NON-DISRUPTIVE STUDENTS

Subject Number	Gender	Total Hours of Television Viewed	Number of Violent Acts Viewed
1	F	40	211
2	M	31.5	191
3	F	42	131
4	M	42	268
5	F	41.5	231.5
6	M	35	130
7	F	9	43.5
8	M	23.5	155
9	F	21.5	72
10	M	27	101.5
11	F	26.5	84.5
12	M	15.5	108.5
13	F	42	192
14	M	31.5	171
15	F	30.5	214
16	M	36.5	219
17	F	13	131
18	M	34	185.5
19	F	12.5	41
20	M	6.5	50.5
21	F	23	132
22	M	36	132
23	F	13	80
24	M	35.5	155
25	F	33	153.5
26	M	36	186
27	F	31	76
28	M	28.5	126
29	F	24.5	101.5
30	M	30	136.5
31	F	33	236
32	M	32	183.5
33	F	24	70
34	M	20	155.5
35	F	33.5	209.5
36	M	32	243.5
37	F	9	26.5
38	M	36	206
39	F	30	69
40	M	19.5	190
41	M	23.5	102.5
42	F	20	82
43	M	26.5	146.5
44	F	42	172
45	M	38	253
46	F	25	89
47	M	34.5	143
48	F	23.5	100.5
49	M	19	94
50	M	19.5	171
Mean =		27.760	142.45
Standard Deviation =		9.5433	62.1081

DATA CONCERNING THE
DISRUPTIVE STUDENTS

Subject Number	Gender	Total Hours of Television Viewed	Number of Violent Acts Viewed	Number of Times Referred	Seriousness Infraction Score	Seriousness Rating Index
1	M	22.5	185	22	70	1540
2	M	31.5	177	19	67	1273
3	M	42	310	18	68	1224
4	F	25.5	171	16	46	736
5	M	37	188.5	16	44	704
6	M	42	299	15	44	660
7	M	17.5	180.5	14	43	602
8	M	38	193.5	12	36	432
9	F	33.5	214.5	12	34	408
10	F	25.5	133.5	12	34	408
11	M	32	207.5	10	37	370
12	M	38.5	288	9	33	297
13	F	28	338.5	8	30	240
14	M	35.5	182	8	26	208
15	M	32.5	225.5	8	22	176
16	M	33.5	254.5	7	23	161
17	M	24	170.5	7	20	140
18	M	34	241.5	6	20	120
19	M	32.5	201.5	6	19	114
20	F	24.5	287	6	18	108
21	F	40	196.5	6	17	102
22	F	31	227.5	6	16	96
23	M	33.5	136.5	5	18	90
24	M	26	169	5	15	75
25	M	25.5	56	5	12	60
26	M	10.5	94	4	10	40
27	M	22.5	192.5	3	10	30
28	M	15.5	68.5	3	9	27
29	F	41	137.5	3	9	27
30	F	19	93.5	3	9	27
31	F	41	193.5	3	5	15
32	F	31	119.5	3	3	9
Mean =		29.578	191.6788	8.750	25.8438	328.7188
Standard Deviation =		9.1942	68.2519	5.3279	18.1856	396.389