

CONTENTS

PREFACE	X
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 The social learning theory	1
1.2. Our definition of aggressive and prosocial behaviour	6
1.3. Studying the relationship between television viewing and behaviour	10
1.3.1. Correlations between television viewing and behaviour	11
1.3.2. Experimenting in a natural situation	14
1.3.3. Experimenting in the laboratory	17
1.4. Television and the effect of other relevant factors	21
1.4.1. The viewer's age	21
1.4.2. Sex, sex-role orientation and identification	22
1.4.3. The use of fantasy	24
1.4.4. Intelligence and school achievement	25
1.4.5. The perceived reality of television programmes	27
1.5. The influence exerted by parents on their children	28
1.5.1. Parental television viewing habits	28
1.5.2. The effects of parents' aggression and prosocial behaviour	29
1.5.3. Parents' nurturance and rejection of the child	30
1.5.4. Physical punishment and reward	30
1.6. The Netherlands: some background information	31
1.6.1. Aggression and prosocial behaviour in Dutch television programmes	34
CHAPTER 2: METHOD	37
2.1 Subjects	38
2.2. Procedure	38
2.3. Children's interviews	39
2.3.1. Peer-rate of aggressive behaviour	39
2.3.2. Peer-rate of prosocial behaviour	40
2.3.3. Popularity	42

2.3.4.	Television violence viewing	42
2.3.5.	Viewing of prosocial behaviour	44
2.3.6.	Perceived reality of television programmes	45
2.3.7.	Identification with television characters	45
2.3.8.	Sex-role orientation	46
2.3.9.	Fantasy	47
2.3.10.	Intelligence and school achievement	48
2.3.11.	Physical measures	49
2.4.	Parental interviews	50
2.4.1.	Parental aggression	51
2.4.2.	Viewing frequency	51
2.4.3.	Perceived reality	52
2.4.4.	Punishment behaviour and norms	52
2.4.5.	Rewarding behaviour and norms	53
2.4.6.	Rejection	54
2.4.7.	Nurturance scale	54
2.4.8.	The use of fantasy	55
2.4.9.	Upward mobility	55
2.5.	Conclusion	55

CHAPTER 3: RESULTS 59

3.1.	Television viewing and aggression	61
3.2.	Intermediating variables	68
3.2.1.	Sex of viewer and observed television character	68
3.2.2.	Age	69
3.2.3.	Intelligence and school achievement	70
3.2.4.	Sex-role orientation	72
3.2.5.	Identification with television characters	73
3.2.6.	Perceived reality	74
3.2.7.	Fantasy behaviour	75
3.2.8.	Physical measures	76
3.2.9.	Popularity	77
3.2.10.	Parental measures	78
3.3.	The predictability of aggression	81
3.3.1.	Intelligence or social class?	84
3.4.	Prosocial behaviour and prosocial behaviour on television	85
3.5.	Models for aggression	93
3.5.1.	Short description of the LISREL method	94
3.5.2.	Formulation of our model	95
3.5.3.	The testing of a preliminary model	97
3.5.4.	Longitudinal models	98
3.6.	Models for prosocial behaviour	108
3.7.	Final conclusion	114

CHAPTER 4: THE DUTCH RESEARCH COMPARED WITH THAT OF THE OTHER COUNTRIES	117
4.1. Comparison of the subjects	117
4.2. Comparison of the procedure	118
4.3. Comparison of the instruments	118
4.3.1. The contents of the instruments used	119
4.3.2. Comparison of reliability	122
4.4. Comparison of analysis procedures	125
4.5. Comparison of the results from the different countries	126
4.6. Comparison of the intermediating variables	129
4.7. Conclusion and summary	135
 CHAPTER 5: FINAL COMMENTS AND CONCLUSIONS	 139
5.1. Television viewing and aggression	139
5.2. Television viewing and prosocial behaviour	142
5.3. Intelligence and school achievement as intermediating factors	143
5.4. Sex and sex-role orientation as intermediating factors	146
5.5. Age as intermediating factor	148
5.6. Other child variables as intermediating variables	150
5.6.1. Identification	150
5.6.2. Perceived reality	150
5.6.3. Fantasy	151
5.7. Parental variables as intermediating variables	151
5.8. Conclusion	153
 REFERENCES	 157
 AUTHOR INDEX	 175
 APPENDICES	 180
1: Correlations between socio-economic background and the other variables for boys, Kendall's tau.	180
2: Regression analysis, predicting aggression from social class, intelligence and punishment behaviour, when prior aggression was taken into account	184
3: The testing of the preliminary model for aggression, for boys and girls: Fit, standardised path coefficients with absolute T-value and residuals in aggression.	185

4:	Correlation matrix of violence viewing, aggression, intelligence and punishment behaviour, for boys	188
5:	The testing of the model for aggression for the children on whom we had data on all the variables	189
6:	Correlation matrix of viewing frequency, prosocial behaviour and intelligence.	190
7:	The testing of the model for prosocial behaviour for the children on whom we had data on all the variables	191

TABLES AND FIGURES

Table 1:	Frequency of choices on the mask test (Wiegman, 1975)	20
Table 2:	Summary of the internal consistencies averaged over three years, the test-retest reliability coefficients of the different scales and some inter-rater reliabilities	56
Table 3:	Characteristics of the content of television drama in the three years of our study over a three month period	60
Table 4:	Two-way analysis of variance of aggression and television violence viewing by sex and cohort (N=354)	61
Table 5:	Correlations between the viewing of violence and peer-nominated aggression for grades and sexes (p one-tailed)	64
Table 6:	Correlations between the viewing of violence and peer-nominated aggression for boys and girls (p one-tailed)	64
Table 7:	Multiple regression analysis predicting third year aggression from first year aggression, grade and the mean of the violence viewing scores in the first two years	65
Table 8:	Multiple regression analysis predicting third year violence viewing from first year violence viewing, grade and the mean aggression scores for the first two years	66
Table 9:	Correlations between the frequency of television viewing and peer-nominated aggression for boys and girls (two-tailed p)	67
Table 10:	Correlations between intelligence, school achievement, aggression and violence viewing (p two-tailed)	71
Table 11:	Partial correlation between aggression and violence viewing, controlling for intelligence and school achievement (two-tailed p)	72
Table 12:	Pearson correlations between identification and the viewing of violence and aggression (p one-tailed)	74

Table 13: Pearson correlations between perceived reality and violence viewing and aggression (p one-tailed)	75
Table 14: Pearson correlations between fantasy behaviour and the viewing of violence aggression (p two-tailed)	76
Table 15: Mean correlation between physical measures, violence viewing and aggression (n=number of significant correlations out of 3 (one-tailed $p < .05$))	77
Table 16: Pearson correlation between popularity, aggression and violence viewing (two-tailed p)	77
Table 17: Correlations between parental variables and child violence viewing and aggression (p two-tailed)	79
Table 18: Variance explained in aggression, and the first predictors in the regression equation and their standardized regression coefficients	82
Table 19: Regression analysis, predicting aggression from social class, intelligence and punishment behaviour	84
Table 20: Two-way analysis of variance of prosocial behaviour and the viewing of prosocial behaviour on television by sex and cohort (N=354)	86
Table 21: Correlations between prosocial behaviour and the viewing of prosocial behaviour on television (one-tailed p)	88
Table 22: Correlations between prosocial behaviour and the viewing of prosocial behaviour on television, for grades and sexes (one-tailed p)	89
Table 23: Correlations between the ratio of prosocial to violent models and prosocial behaviour, and between the ratio of violent to prosocial models and aggressive behaviour (one-tailed p)	91
Table 24: Correlations between prosocial behaviour and the parental and child variables in the study (two-tailed p)	92
Table 25: Maximum likelihood estimates for the parameters in the long-term effect model, with an additional path from first to third year violence viewing for boys (standardised solution)	102
Table 26: Maximum likelihood estimates for the paths from violence viewing to aggression (synchronous effect model)	104
Table 27: Maximum likelihood estimates for the model for prosocial behaviour, visualized in figure 9 (standardised solution)	110
Table 28: Maximum likelihood estimates for the paths from viewing frequency to prosocial behaviour, synchronous effect model (standardised solution)	112
Table 29: Summary of the internal consistencies of the different scales for the various countries, where known	123

Table 30: Summary of the test-retest coefficients of the different scales for the Netherlands and the U.S.A. (test-retest interval: one month)	125
Table 31: Correlation of violence viewing in the first two years (tvv1+2) with third year aggression (agg3), standardized regression coefficient (Beta) predicting third year aggression from violence viewing, controlling for first year aggression (aggl) and grade, and standardized regression coefficient predicting third year violence viewing (tvv3) from aggression (aggl+2), controlling for first year violence viewing (tvv1) and grade	127
Table 32: Correlations between the average viewing frequency score for the three years, the comparable violence viewing score and the average aggression score, for the different countries	129
Table 33: Correlations, for the different countries, of (the indicators for) intelligence with the peer-rate index of aggression and the various television measures	130
Table 34: Correlations, for the different countries, of the mean identification score for the three years with the mean peer-rated aggression score for the three years	132
Table 35: Correlations, for the different countries, of the parental measures with the mean peer-rate index of aggression for the three years	134
Figure 1: Correlation between aggressive behaviour and the viewing of violence on television over a period of 10 years (adapted from Eron et al., 1972)	13
Figure 2: Mean score on peer-nominated aggression	62
Figure 3: Mean score on the viewing of violence on television	63
Figure 4: Mean score on peer-nominated prosocial behaviour	87
Figure 5: Mean scores on the viewing of prosocial behaviour on TV	88
Figure 6: Structural equation model for violence viewing and aggression, preliminary model	96
Figure 7: Structural equation model for the viewing of violence and aggression, longitudinal model	100
Figure 8: Structural equation model for aggression from which intelligence and punishment are excluded	106
Figure 9: Structural equation model for prosocial behaviour	109
Scheme 1: Peer-nomination instrument	40