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This exploratory study examines what Latter-day Saint young single adults remember about their parents mediating the television and its use, and how those recollections contribute to their current attitudes and values toward the media, as well as their media choices. A stratified random sample of 267 LDS young single adults across the United States and outside the state of Utah responded to a cross sectional mail or online survey. The three mediation styles established by Valkenburg, Krcmar, Peeters, and Marseille (1999)—Restrictive, Instructive, and Coviewing—were used as the independent variables while scales assessing television offensiveness levels, attitudes, orientation, and usage were used as dependent variables.

According to this study, individuals who recall high levels of Restrictive mediation tend to restrict their personal media choices when exposed to personally
offensive material more than those that recall low Restrictive mediation ($p < .01$). High levels of Restrictive mediation also indicate (a) negative attitudes towards television ($p < .001$), (b) more media sensitivity ($p < .05$), and (c) a Traditionals approach to media choices ($p < .001$). Individuals who come from highly Instructive based homes watch more informational/educational programs and more situational comedies than individuals from low Instructive homes ($p < .05$). Individuals who recall high levels of Coviewing have a neutral orientation towards the media, finding it neither positive nor negative ($p > .05$) and tend to watch more informational/educational programming ($p < .05$). This study, while exploratory adds to the research on parental mediation and mediation theory, and offers support to the effectiveness of mediation. It suggests a possible benefit from teaching parents how to mediate the television and encourages religious groups to educate church members on using methods of television mediation.
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CHAPTER I

Introduction

The television set has become a key member of the family, the one who tells most of the stories most of the time. Its massive flow of stories showing what things are, how things work, and what to do about them has become the common socializer of our times. These stories form a coherent if mythical “world” in every home. Television dominates the symbolic environment of modern life. (Gerbner, Gross, Morgan, & Signorielli, 1980, p. 14)

Research of the parental mediation of television has increased over the past 20 years. Generally, mediation is “some form of active effort by parents and others to translate the complexities of the physical and social environment, as well as the television medium, into terms capable of comprehension by children at various levels of cognitive development” (Desmond, Singer, Singer, Calam, & Colimore, 1985). Studies on mediation have ranged from how much mediation occurs in the home, to family and other predictors of mediation, and lastly to the effects of mediation (Valkenburg, Krcmar, Peeters, & Marseille, 1999). Effects studies have explored the short term effects of mediation in situations such as knowledge retention and recall, fright and upset, violence perception, and maternal obedience (Cantor, Ziemke, & Sparks, 1984; Corder-Bolz, 1980; Corder-Bolz & O’Bryant 1978; Prasad, Rao, & Sheikh, 1978; Valkenburg, Krcmar, & de Roos, 1998; Watkins, Calvert, Huston-Stein, & Wright, 1980). Mediation effects studies are rare, and what researchers have not explored are the long-term effects, if any, of the parental mediation of television.

The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (the Church) offers a rich field to explore the long-term effects of mediation among its members. Employing a love/hate relationship with the media, the Church encourages its members to embrace and shun the media all in the same breath (Ballard, 1989; Perry, 2003). Members are commanded to
teach their children how to live righteous lives, and part of this admonition includes
monitoring their media consumption (Perry, 2003). As such, the Church offers guidance
and council on handling the media in the home (Griffin & Cline, 1976; Hinckley, 1996).
The Church instructs parents to carefully monitor the media allowed in the home and
teach their children to make wise and moral media choices (Griffin & Cline, 1976;
Ballard, 1989; Ballard 2003). In addition to this council, the Church provides its own
media outlets, which host wholesome family television programs, news, and information
(Perry 2003). Some of these media offerings include the Church website, www.lds.org;
television channels, such as BYU TV; magazines, specifically the Ensign, New Era,
Friend, and Liahona; and family oriented commercials.

Looking at the lasting effects of mediation by members of the Church, who may
consciously mediate the media in various forms, may offer valuable insights into the
lasting results of parental mediation. This study looks at the relationship between
parental media mediation and the morals, attitude, and behaviors of grown children.
Specifically, it examines (a) what LDS young single adults remember their parents
teaching them about the media and its use, and (b) how those recollections contribute to
their attitudes and values toward the media, as well as their media choices.

Why Parental Television Mediation

Since its inception in the 1930s, television has become a staple in American life.
Today more than one television resides in 87% of American households (Violence, 1999,
p. 267). Television has been invited as a “member” of the American home. Living
rooms once arranged to better facilitate family conversations, now center around the
television set. Where virtually all other mass media require a certain level of skill or intellect to participate, the television captures the attention of even the youngest child with no prerequisites.

Television is the central and most pervasive mass medium in American culture and it plays a distinctive and historically unprecedented role. Other media are accessible to the individual (usually at the point of literacy and mobility) only after the socializing functions of the home and family life have begun. In the case of television, however, the individual is introduced virtually at birth into its powerful flow of messages and images. The television set has become a key member of the family, the one who tells most of the stories most of the time. Its massive flow of stories showing what things are, how things work, and what to do about them has become the common socializer of our times. These stories form a coherent if mythical “world” in every home. Television dominates the symbolic environment of modern life. (Gerbner et al., 1980, p. 14)

Statistics of television use among children and teenagers reiterate Gerbner’s message of media socialization. According to a recent national study, children, on average, watch 25 hours of television per week. Fifty-six percent of 13-17 year olds have a television in their bedrooms, which results in more time spent viewing. Additionally, 30% of families studied have the television on often or always during meals (Gentile & Walsh, 1999, pp. 4-5). The amount of sexual and violent content shown on television is increasing. The percentage of television programs containing any sexual content rose from 56% in 1998 to 64% in 2002 (Kunkel et al. 2003, p. 15). Additionally, in 2002, 73%
of comedies and 71% of dramas contained sexual content (Kunkel et al., 2003, p. 38). In terms of violence, as of 1994, prime time television showed 15 violent scenes per hour, up from the reported four scenes per hour of the twenty years previous (Violence, 1999, p. 267).

Parents show concern about this trend of violent and sexual media. Eighty-one percent of the parents of children ages 2-17 report they are concerned about the amount of violent content in visual media, and 77% are concerned with the amount of sexual content. This same study shows that 57% of parents surveyed believe their children are affected by the violence seen on television (Gentile & Walsh, 1999, p. 4). With television receiving a captive audience from children since essentially birth and the types of content increasing in sexual depictions and violent acts, it is no surprise parents and religious groups, such as the LDS Church, show caution towards the media.

Though not explored deeply enough, using mediation to monitor media use is one way parents and religious groups may mitigate the effects of television messages (Corder-Bolz, 1980; Dorr, Kovaric, & Doubleday, 1989; Nathanson, 1999; Nathanson & Cantor, 2000; Prasad et al., 1978). Surprisingly, however, active mediation of the media in families is rare (Austin, 1993). “Only 58% of parents have rules about how much TV may be watched,” for example (Gentile & Walsh, 1999, p. 5). The LDS Church encourages parents to make active decisions about media use. As such, LDS parents may use mediation more often than parents in general.

**LDS Church Media Guidance**

Media doctrine of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (the Church) is conservative and plentiful. As mentioned above, church leaders praise television for its
technological and other benefits, but they also express concerns about the effects of

the Church stresses selective use of the media, and in warning against the

negative effects of television and other media, the Church does not call for abstinence,

but rather appeals for media literacy (Ballard, 2003; Perry, 2002; Griffin & Cline, 1976).

President Gordon B. Hinckley said, “There are so very many things of value that come

over television, but we must be selective and not be as dumb, driven slaves to the trash of

many writers and producers” (1996, p. 8). In a talk given specifically about television,

Elder M. Russell Ballard, of the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles, said the following:

The Lord does not need a society that hides and isolates itself from the world.

Rather, He needs stalwart individuals and families who live exemplary lives in the

world and demonstrate that joy and fulfillment come not of the world, but through

the spirit and the doctrine of Jesus Christ. (1989, p. 80)

To help members make good media choices, the Church provides guidelines for media

use. Church leaders encourage families to use the media for pro-social purposes,

especially strengthening the family. However they also discourage media they deem as

hurtful to individuals and family (Ballard, 2003; Stout, 1996). One example is rated-R

movies. President Ezra Taft Benson (1986) advised, “Don’t see R-rated movies or vulgar

videos or participate in any entertainment that is immoral, suggestive, or pornographic”

(p. 45). The Church also provides youth with a pamphlet offering guidelines for media

use.

Do not attend, view, or participate in entertainment that is vulgar, immoral,

violent, or pornographic in any way. Do not participate in entertainment that in
any way presents immorality or violent behavior as acceptable. Have the
courage to walk out of a movie or video party, turn off a computer or television,
change a radio station, or put down a magazine if what is being presented does not
meet Heavenly Father's standards. Do these things even if others do not. (For the
Strength, 2001, p. 17, 19)

Much of the direction given to parents by the Church is general, such as Ballard’s
(1989) admonition that parents must teach their children to make “personal righteous
decisions” about media consumption (p. 80). However, the Church also offers more
specific guidelines for parents to follow to help mitigate the negative influences of media:

1. We need to hold family councils and decide what our media standards are
going to be.

2. We need to spend enough quality time with our children that we are
consistently the main influence in their lives, not the media or any peer group.

3. We need to make good media choices ourselves and set good examples for our
children.

4. We need to limit the amount of time our children watch TV or play video
games or use the Internet each day. Virtual reality must not become their reality.

5. We need to use Internet filters and TV programming locks to prevent our
children from “chancing upon” things they should not see.
6. We need to have TVs and computers in a much-used common room in the home, not in a bedroom or a private place.

7. We need to take time to watch appropriate media with our children and discuss with them how to make choices that will uplift and build rather than degrade and destroy. (Ballard, 2003, p.18-19)

Although the Church does not call it by the academic name, much of its media council mirrors various forms of media mediation found in research. Furthermore, the Church encourages members to get and stay married, gain education, and provide for their families—all factors research has shown to influence media usage and mediation. With such an abundance of guidelines and tools for mediating the media, members of the LDS Church, may prove to be a fruitful group to explore long-term effects of mediation.
CHAPTER II

Literature Review

Research shows "that television's impact on children can be enhanced, channeled, or counteracted through parental guidance of children's viewing" (Van der Voort, Nikken & Van Lil, 1992, p. 61). This regulation of media consumption can be explored in terms of parental mediation. Mediation, when talking about the relationship between television and family, more specifically can be defined as:

Those processes by which the family (or other institutions) filters educational influences—the processes by which it screens, interprets, criticizes, reinforces, complements, counteracts, refracts, and transforms. (Leichter, 1979, p. 32)

Due to its focus on the family, and broad list of actions, this definition of mediation will be used for this study.

The study of the “theory” of mediation, beginning in the 1970s, stems from the flux of research in the 1960s and 70s that focused on the effects of television (Desmond et al., 1985). Powerful effects theories, such as cultivation theory and social learning theory emerged during this time, and with the academic focus on the impact of television, it is natural researchers started wondering how these effects could be tempered (Bandura, 1977; Gerbner & Gross, 1976). Mediation theory is one of the results. Like other active audience theories, such as Uses and Gratifications theory, Mediation theory views media audiences as “selective, motivated, and resistant to influence” (McQuail, 2000, p. 490). Though not generally talked about as a theory in the research, mediation has a growing body of literature. It assumes, or explores the idea of what mediation is, if and how it
works, is performed, and effects individuals (Valkenburg et al., 1999). It is looked on as a possible antidote to the television effects shown in the research.

**Types of Mediation**

Research has found three main types and one possible additional branch of parental mediation—Restrictive, Instructive, Coviewing, and possibly implicit (Bryce and Leichter, 1983; Chaffee & Tims, 1976; Desmond, Hirsch, Singer, & Singer, 1987; Valkenburg et al., 1999). These methods incorporate basically all forms of mediation found, and the three established methods serve as a good foundation to study the types of mediation used in the home (Valkenburg et al., 1999). This study explores mediation used in the homes of LDS people using this categorization, not only because it is the most common in the research, but also because the Church encourages the members to use all three styles of mediation in their homes. As such, using this categorization of mediation allows for a more focused and reliable study of the effects of mediation.

**Restrictive**

Restrictive mediation is when parents “set rules for viewing or prohibit the viewing of certain content” (Valkenburg et al., 1999, p. 53). This method of mediation is aimed at controlling, via rules or force, the amount or type of media consumption a child engages in. “Parents report that they intervene in children’s viewing by limiting viewing and enforcing bedtimes, prohibiting or encouraging specific programs, or in extreme cases removing television from the home” (Desmond et al., 1987, p. 376).
This form of mediation, like all the other methods, is evident in the LDS Church’s teachings. For example, leaders admonish parents to limit the amount of media consumed daily, to use media filters, and to not put a television in a child’s bedroom (Ballard, 2003). Since the Church encourages all three forms of mediation, looking at how LDS young single adults react to each type will provide insight into mediation effects.

Research shows Restrictive mediation having mixed reactions from children. Seeing how LDS young single adults react to this style of mediation will provide more insight into Restrictive mediation effects (Nathanson 1999).

Research reveals certain characteristics of employing Restrictive mediation as an intervening tactic. For example, the use of Restrictive mediation decreases with age (Van der Voort et al., 1992). Atkin, Greenber, and Baldwin (1991) found Restrictive mediation to be more commonly used with children who have televisions in their own room. Parents who carry negative attitudes about the media are more likely to use Restrictive methods than those who do not have negative attitudes (Nathanson, 2001). Mothers and higher educated parents use Restrictive mediation more often than lower educated parents, though higher education is not a predictor of Restrictive mediation (Valkenburg et al., 1999; Van der Voort et al., 1992).

Restrictive mediation has been shown to be negatively related to TV-induced aggression. However, Restrictive mediation may backfire, due to the restraining and controlling technique it assumes over media use. As such, Instructive mediation may offer a more sound technique (Nathanson, 1999).
Instructive mediation, also known as evaluative, active, explicit, and nonrestrictive mediation, "refers to the process of discussing certain aspects of programs with children, either during or after viewing" (Valkenburg et al., 1999, p. 54). Instructive mediation is when a parent talks to a child about television (either indirectly or directly) through approval or disapproval based talk about a program (Chaffee & Tims, 1976; Desmond et al., 1987). It can also be interpretation oriented, where a parent or sibling "[explains] the characteristics of television programs . . . or the conventions of program production . . ." (Desmond et al., 1987, p. 376).

The Church encourages this form of mediation by advising families to meet together and decide on their viewing standards, and by encouraging members to talk about the media with their children (Ballard, 2003). Studying the level of Instructive mediation in LDS homes and its associated effects can give insight into the long term results of this effort, specifically in a religious population.

Research shows positive outcomes from Instructive parental mediation (Collins, Sobol, & Wesby, 1981; Desmond et al., 1985; Nathanson, 1999; Nathanson & Cantor, 2000). Instructive mediation is shown to increase comprehension levels of implicit media messages in children (Collins et al., 1981). Active mediation has also been shown to predict skepticism in children towards television (Austin, 1993). Additionally, Instructive mediation may avoid the backfiring risk inherent in Restrictive mediation (Nathanson, 1999).
Nathanson & Cantor (2000) found that children who were instructed to think about the victim’s feelings in an aggressive cartoon did think more about the victim, liked the perpetrator less, felt the violence was less justified, had more positive feelings about the victim, and found the violence less funny than children not thus instructed. They even found that boys who participated in the mediation during the show did not exhibit post-viewing aggressiveness like the boys who watched the show with no mediation. The boys in the mediation group were identical in aggressiveness levels with the control group who saw no show at all. No group of girls was found to have increased post-viewing aggressiveness. In another study, Nathanson (1999) found a negative relationship between Instructive mediation and TV-induced aggression.

Like Restrictive mediation, parental use of nonrestrictive mediation also decreases with age. Additionally, parents who believe the media has strong effects (whether positive or negative) use evaluative guidance more frequently than others (Van der Voort et al., 1992). However, Nathanson (2001) found active mediation exists more among parents with negative attitudes towards the media.

Coviewing/Unfocused Guidance

Often Unfocused Guidance is considered a third form of mediation, of which Coviewing is one type (Abelman & Pettey, 1989; Bybee, Robinson, & Turow 1982; Van der Voort et al., 1992; Weaver & Barbour, 1992). The difference given between Instructive and Unfocused mediation is largely based on the intent of the parent. Instructive guidance “involves discussing program material with the child for the deliberate purpose of helping the child to evaluate the meaning” (Van der Voort et al.,
Unfocused guidance incorporates Coviewing and discussing media programs with a child, but is “not necessarily motivated by parents’ desires to mediate children’s television experiences” (p. 62). Valkenburg et al. (1999), however, found that unfocused mediation is not a valid form of mediation because the standard measure developed by Bybee et al. (1982) to measure unfocused mediation lacks face validity due to intuitively unrelated assessment questions (Valkenburg et al., 1999). This is further shown by low internal reliability coefficients for these assessment questions (Valkenburg et al., 1999). Based on their findings Valkenburg et al. believe it is a “methodological artifact resulting from a forced interpretation of items that loaded on a ‘left-over’ factor” in previous research” (1999, p.54). As such, they suggest Coviewing as the third and last style of mediation.

Coviewing occurs “when adults and children watch television together, sharing the viewing experience, but not engaging in any discussion about the program” (Valkenburg et al., 1999, p. 54). Evidences of the Church’s encouragement of this form of mediation include admonishing parents to watch wholesome programs with their children, and to carefully select their own media choices (Ballard, 2003), as children will often join their parents in viewing television programs. Since LDS are encouraged to practice Coviewing in the home, looking at the possible effects of using this form of mediation versus the other forms, will provide insight into how children react to media when parents choose to focus on this style of mediation.—again specifically with a religious audience.

In formal research, Coviewing has been shown to be related to “greater learning gratifications for children” (Dorr et al., 1989, p. 46). Interestingly, parents tend to only
watch television with their children when there is a mutual interest in a program. Valkenburg et al. (1999) found “the more children watch television, the more they view television with their parents” (p. 60).

Dorr et al. (1989) found in their study on Coviewing that parents who have strong beliefs about the power of the media’s ability to influence children tend to Coview more often. However, there is a dispute in the research regarding whether positive or negative parental attitudes toward the media predict Coviewing. The research leans towards positive parental attitudes associated with Coviewing, but this has not been reliably substantiated and neither has the reverse (Austin, Bolls, Fujioka, & Engelbertson, 1999; Dorr et al., 1989; Nathanson, 2001).

Using Coviewing as a mediation technique may lead to more post TV aggression in children, than using Restrictive or Instructive mediation (Nathanson, 1999). One interesting finding with Coviewing is that children tend to watch the most violence or violent program with their parents, not with their peers (Chaffee & Tims, 1976). This may help explain the relationship between Coviewing and aggression. Additionally, one possible unforeseen impact of Coviewing, at least in terms of violent media, may include children assuming a parent endorses a program and its content if they watch it with the child. “[Coviewing may communicate] to children that the depicted content is important, useful, and should be attended to carefully” (Nathanson, 1999, p. 129). This may explain the finding of another study that indicated Coviewing “leads to greater cultivation” or the degree to which one believes the real world is how the media depicts it (Rothschild & Morgan, 1987, p.306).
Bryce and Leichter (1983) argue mediation research is too narrowly confined to the three main types and as such is not often found among studies. They conducted a field study to see if mediation is indeed underrepresented by looking for other forms of implicit mediation (non-verbal, seemingly related, or obvious). They came up with three forms of implicit mediation. First, embedded verbal mediation or media in context is when a parent makes a noise, such as a grunt while watching TV. Secondly, mediation in non-TV contexts includes family conversations about television in “contexts that do not include television and to configurations of family members other than parents and children” (Bryce and Leichter, 1983, p. 319). Lastly, families mediated television “through the organization of time and space” in regards to TV location and family patterns of viewing (p. 321).

Bryce and Leichter are not alone in advocating a different spectrum to measure parental mediation. Austin et al. (1999) offer a distinct typology more focused on parental attitudes towards the media. The four attitudes predict what mediation style the parent will use. Though Austin includes Coviewing as a mediation style, she looks at mediation more in terms of positive versus negative, instead of Restrictive and Instructive. As such, even though there is not a complete consensus on mediation types, the Valkenburg et al. (1999) study attempted to consolidate and evaluate as many mediation measures as available (this excludes the Austin et al. instrument, which again mainly focuses on parental attitudes, and not mediation styles directly). In evaluating the gamut of mediation scales, Valkenburg et al. (1999) found Restrictive, Instructive, and
Coviewing to be the only mediation styles that exhibited the necessary validity and reliability. Warren, Gerke, and Kelly (2002) also confirm the same three types of mediation. With this in consideration, this study will focus on the three types of mediation better established by Valkenburg et al. (1999)—Restrictive, Instructive, and Coviewing.

Interestingly, while forms of mediation are widely discussed in the literature, relationships between mediation style and effects on children’s attitudes toward the media are sparse. Austin (1993), however, did find active mediation to be positively correlated with concept-oriented communication styles and with skepticism. While researchers have not explored the attitudinal effects of mediation, studies examining factors that influence why a family may choose a particular mediation style are plentiful.

*Factors Influencing Mediation Style*

The dominant form which mediation takes in the home is dependent upon and includes many factors. Some of those factors found in research include the (a) gender of children and (b) family predictors (For examples: Brown, Childers, Bauman, & Koch, 1990; Desmond et al., 1987; Lin & Atkin, 1989; Valkenburg et al., 1999). Though the LDS Church does not give out specific demographic information, families of this church of more than 11 million members certainly come from all walks of life and will likely follow some of these same patterns.

Gender Differences in Mediation

Boys and girls have notable differences that may affect mediation styles. Boys tend to watch more television than girls do, and boys tend to be more aggressive and
more restless within the first ten years of life (Brown et al., 1990; Desmond et al., 1987). One study found that in regards to VCR use, boys tend to receive more viewing rules than girls (Lin & Atkin, 1989). “Power-assertive, physical modes of discipline are more frequently administered to boys than to girls. Girls are more typically punished via removal of parental affection, or ‘love withdrawal’” (Desmond et al. 1987). However, it is important to note other studies have not found gender to be an important determinant to mediation style (Atkin et al. 1991; Valkenburg et al., 1999).

Desmond et al. (1987) found mediation more effective for boys than girls in areas of media comprehension. This, however, may be due to the fact that girls tend to start out with greater comprehension, and thus boys have a greater level to go. The Desmond et al. (1987) study looks at the immediate effects of mediation in disciplinary functions. It found “love withdrawal” and styles of discipline significantly positively correlated with aggression in boys, but not with girls. Power assertiveness styles of discipline are significantly positively correlated with aggression in both boys and girls—hence the backfire risk found with Restrictive mediation (Nathanson, 1999).

Though gender differences between mediation styles in LDS families have not been studied, differences between gender and media attitude/approaches have. Stout, Scott, & Martin (1996) found some possible tendencies between LDS males and females. In this research, LDS women tended to view the media more negatively, and to be more rule based in their media selection. They were likely to apply blanket decisions when restricting media, and were likely to follow council given more strictly. Males seemed to make media choices based more on personal beliefs and preferences. They tend to limit
media on a case-by-case basis. Stout et al.'s research is exploratory and these gender differences are simply possibilities.

Family Predictors of Mediation

Many socio-economic factors influence media use and mediation. Regarding media use, families with a lower socio-economic status (SES) tend to watch more television than those with high SES (Lin & Atkin, 1989). Additionally parental presence affects television viewing: “Children view more in homes where the father is absent and where the mother works” (Atkin et al., 1991, p. 42).

Parents tend to mediate more often when young children or girls are a part of the family (Atkin et al, 1991). Children watch more rated R movie when they are allowed to watch television late at night and when parents are not at home with the child (Atkin et al., 1991). Greater amounts of mediation occur in homes with more parents (Lin & Atkin, 1989). “Households with less than full-time employed, or less educated parents [are] more likely to formulate viewing rules” (p. 61). Families that own more televisions and families where the child owns media are less likely to have viewing rules. There is also an inverse relationship between viewing rules and family and child viewing time. “Thus, single parents, younger children, fewer child-owned media, and less solitary child viewing imply higher levels of viewing and rulemaking” (p. 62). Families with higher SES tend to mediate media more than those with lower SES (Atkin et al, 1991).
Formal Research on Latter-day Saints and the Media

Although the Church encourages all forms of mediation and offers ample guidance for personal media choices, how members interpret that guidance and choose to monitor media use widely differs. Even with central messages from church leaders, young single adults vary on their personal media choices and beliefs.

Though formal research on LDS media habits is limited, some studies are beginning to emerge. Stout et al., (1996) studied the ways in which young single LDS react to the counsel on R-rated movies. They found two types of young single adults in relation to reasoning through media choices: (a) Traditionals and (b) Independents. Traditionals tend to be women and they strongly rely on the rating system advice given by church authorities. They focus more on the negative effects of television, and they feel certain R-rated films should be censored for a more general audience. Independents, who tend to be males, look to their peers for advice on whether a movie is worth seeing. They look less to ratings and more to content in making their movie selections. Independents tend to “evaluate films based on more personal private interests rather than relying on institutional guidelines” (Stout et al., 1996).

In an analysis of three separate studies of LDS women and young single adults, including the study mentioned above, Stout and Scott (2003) re-categorized LDS media selection practices into three groups: (a) Belief-based media literacy, (b) Personal media literacy, and (c) Interactional media literacy. Similar to Traditionals, a member who uses belief-based media literacy tactics “[emphasizes] religious teachings and predetermined sets of guidelines in their media selections” (Stout & Scott, 2003, p.149). This group is likely to restrict the media it consumes by either refusing to watch it simply based on a
rating or other instruction given by the Church, or by walking out of a movie or turning off a television show it deems as against church (and their) guidelines (Stout & Scott, 2003).

Personal Media Literacy uses a more evaluative method, selecting media “according to the fulfillment of individual needs and objectives” (Stout & Scott, 2003, p. 149). Closely related to Independents, this group establishes personal media standards, based on its religious convictions, that likely lead to case by case decisions about media choices. Lastly, Interactional media literacy “revolves around relationships and church members often defer to other family members in making media selections” (Stout & Scott, 2003, p. 149). This group, which may have largely emerged from the predominately female samples taken, makes media choices in conjunction with what will keep the peace or provide more time with family members. This group dismisses its own personal views of appropriate media use (which may be belief-based or interactional) for the benefit of quality time with others.

In light of this research regarding LDS media habits, it is apparent variation exists among church members’ attitudes and behaviors towards the media. Even with consistent counsel about the media, members are not homogeneous. As such, considering the family and church messages that encourage guided media use and literacy among church members, how do church members respond to these directives? Do they teach their children media literacy and in what ways? Do they follow similar patterns found in previous research, or do they behave differently?

More importantly, how do LDS children respond to various forms of media mediation? Do they adopt their parent’s/church’s media views? Are there certain types
of mediation that lend themselves to certain attitudes about media in young, single LDS adults? What types of homes and families do Traditionals versus Independents stem from? Are there differences on media mediation tactics used in LDS homes that yield lasting different attitudes and values about the media, or is gender the determining factor?

The purpose of this study is to explore how LDS families mediate the media, and if certain mediation styles yield certain attitudes toward the media in their adult children. The main research question of this study is as follows: What relationships exist between the recalled mediation styles of LDS parents regarding television (as remembered by young single adults) and their children’s attitudes and behavior towards television once they become young adults?

**Research Questions and Hypotheses**

This study is interested in young single adults’ perceptions of their parents’ mediation styles. It explores how LDS young single adults (ages 19-25) remember their parents teaching them about the media and its use, and if their parents’ teachings are reflected in the young single adults’ attitudes and beliefs about the media. The Church has counseled parents to manage media consumption and teach their children about media use. This study explores if and how this is done, and what means of teaching “media literacy” is most effective. Based on the literature studied, this study seeks to analyze and offer preliminary answers to the following research questions:

1. What habits, beliefs, and attitudes do LDS young single adults hold towards the media in relation to their family’s mediation style?
2. What methods of media literacy yield which television behaviors?
3. Does Mediation Style influence whether a LDS Young Single Adult views the television positively or negatively?

4. Is there a relationship between the type of mediation used in LDS homes and the attitudes (media orientation) children later develop about the television?

5. Regarding media offensiveness, do mediation styles influence what LDS young adults find offensive on television?

6. Is there a relationship between mediation styles and the types and amount of television consumed by LDS young single adults?

7. Is there a relationship between mediation style and television genre choice?

Previous studies, the research questions, and a pretest, lead to the following groups of hypotheses this study will seek to answer:

Hypotheses regarding parents who primarily use a Restrictive method of media literacy

Hr1: LDS young single adults who recall their parents using high levels of Restrictive mediation will restrict television viewing for themselves when offended, more than those who come from homes that use low levels of Restrictive mediation.

Hr2: Young single adults who recall their parents using high levels of Restrictive mediation in the home will have a more negative orientation towards television.

Hr3: Young single adults who recall their parents using high levels of Restrictive mediation in the home will find television/visual media to be more offensive than young single adults who come from homes that used low levels of Restrictive mediation.
Hr4: Young single adults who recall their parents using high levels of Restrictive mediation in the home, will watch a different number of hours of television than young single adults who come from homes that used low levels of Restrictive mediation.

Hr5: Young single adults who recall their parents using high levels of Restrictive mediation in the home, will watch a different variety of television shows, than young single adults who come from homes that used low levels of Restrictive mediation.

Hr6: Young single adults who recall their parents using high levels of Restrictive mediation in the home, will select television shows based on a Traditionals standpoint (Stout et al., 1996).

Hypotheses regarding parents who primarily use an Instructive method of media literacy

Hr7: Young single adults who recall their parents using high levels of Instructive mediation in the home will be Independent (Stout et al., 1996) in their selection of television programs.

Hr8: Young single adults who recall their parents using high levels of Instructive mediation in the home will have a more positive orientation towards television.

Hr9: Young single adults who recall their parents using high levels of Instructive mediation in the home will find television/visual media scenarios to be less offensive than young single adults who come from homes that used low levels of Instructive mediation.

Hr10: Young single adults who recall their parents using high levels of Instructive mediation in the home will watch fewer hours of television than young single adults who come from homes that used low levels of Instructive mediation.
Hr11: Young single adults who recall their parents using high levels of Instructive mediation in the home will watch less variety of television shows than young single adults who come from homes that used low levels of Instructive mediation.

Hypotheses regarding parents who primarily use a Coviewing method of media literacy

Hr12: Young single adults who recall their parents using high levels of Coviewing mediation in the home will have neither a negative nor a positive orientation towards television.

Hr13: Young single adults who recall their parents using high levels of Coviewing mediation in the home will find less television/visual media to be offensive than young single adults who come from homes that used low levels of Coviewing mediation.

Hr14: Young single adults who recall their parents using high levels of Coviewing mediation in the home will watch more hours of television than young single adults who come from homes that used low levels of Coviewing mediation.

Hr15: Young single adults who recall their parents using high levels of Coviewing mediation in the home will watch a greater variety of television shows than young single adults who come from homes that used low levels of Coviewing mediation.
CHAPTER III

Method

To answer the research questions, this study employs a cross sectional study of randomly selected LDS young single adults. Two-hundred sixty seven respondents completed the cross sectional survey regarding their memories of how their parents mediated the television while they were children. Due to the low response rate (12.10%), the study is considered exploratory.

Procedure

This study utilizes a mail and internet survey to test the research hypotheses and answer the research questions. While many mediation researchers in the past have used an experimental design, Valkenburg et al. (1999) point out the limitations of experimental designs in creating a natural setting and exploring long-term effects. They contend “to develop a clearer understanding of the effects of different styles of television mediation, both cross-sectional and longitudinal survey studies are necessary” (p 53). While this study is technically considered a cross sectional survey, it does seek to explore long-term effects of mediation and may lay a foundation for more longitudinal research. The survey asks research subjects to reflect back on parental mediation experiences while they were growing up. The survey tests the relationship between recalled mediation techniques used in the home and current media attitudes held by the research subjects. As such, a cross sectional mail survey design is useful in answering the research questions.
Description of Subjects

The population for this exploratory study is LDS young single adults ages 19-25. The random sample consists of 2,200 LDS young single adults ages 19-25 outside the state of Utah. The random sample is stratified into equal numbers of males and females (1,100 males and 1,100 females). The sample frame was obtained from the Membership and Statistical Records Department of the LDS Church.

Participating subjects were promised confidentiality and anonymity. Informed consent was obtained from the participants through a statement on the cover page of the survey (see appendix A). The statement on the cover page informed the participant that by returning the survey they consent to participate in the study. The subjects were informed no punishment exists for not participating in the study. The subjects were not compensated for their participation, and the surveys will be destroyed upon completion of the research.

The initial survey was sent via mail with an appropriately addressed postage-paid return envelope. In order to elicit a greater response rate, the researcher posted the survey online. A follow up postcard was sent to the same sample inviting the participants to send in the mail survey or to go online and complete the same survey. The online survey was pre-tested with a communications research class. More than 80 students completed the test-survey, with only one or two having technical difficulties with completing or submitting the survey. From the initial and follow up mailings, 238 surveys were completed and returned via mail. The online survey yielded an additional 29 surveys to make a total count of 267 completed surveys. There was no significant difference between the online and mail survey responses except with one question where
the online respondents were more offended by the scenario "a mother quits her job to stay home with preschool-age children," than the mail group (t=2.22, p=.027). The total response rate was 12.10%. The researcher decided to not supplement the surveys with a non-random sample because she felt it would muddy the type of sample drawn, without dramatically increasing the response rate. With such a low response rate, this study represents exploratory research of the effects of mediation on LDS young single adults.

Response Rate

There are many possible reasons for the low response rate of 12.10%. Cliff Higbee, the Director of the Management Information Center for the LDS Church, indicates church members of this age group tend to move around often. They tend to be the less active group in the LDS Church—even if born in active families. He indicated that church activity rates tend to drop off for members in their 20s. Activity levels increase as young single adults get married and have children. The young single adults tend to move around a lot, and tend to change wards (geographically set congregations) often. The addresses obtained are the location where the young single adult has his or her LDS Church membership records (a specific ward). It is possible a young single adult will live in a different location than his or her record indicates. This mobility and inactivity may mean the addresses received from the Church may be inaccurate and/or the young single adults don’t have a high motivation to return the surveys. Additionally, the age for missions (where the young single adults lives away from home to teach about the LDS faith for either two years for males or one and a half years for females) in the LDS Church is 19 to 25 for males and 21 or over for females. Some of these applicants
may have been away serving missions and thus not at their given address. Indeed, the researcher received a handful of letters written by moms explaining their son or daughter could not participate due to serving a mission.

Another challenge to the response rate is the timing of the survey. Doug Koller from the Correlation Research Department of the LDS Church indicated around September is the biggest turnover in addresses for this age group—as college is starting. The survey for this study was sent in early August (3rd class), meaning addressees did not receive the survey until mid or late August. As such, potential subjects may have already moved, or been busy and focused on getting ready to leave for school, and thus not received or had time to complete the survey.

General Demographics

While all the subjects are members of the LDS Church, it was expected that differences would exist. Although an equal number of surveys were sent out to males and females, (1100 to each) 95 Males versus 165 Females completed the survey (seven respondents did not indicate their gender) (See Table 1). Regarding age, 45.80% of respondents were between the ages of 19 and 22, with 41.58% between the ages of 23 and 25 (See Table 2). There was a healthy spread between college grade, with the most common respondent being a junior (22.10%) (See Table 3). Since this study examines family patterns of mediation, the study asked about the marital status of the subject’s parents while the subject grew up. Important to note, 77.53% grew up in a home where their parents were married. Only 10.11% grew up in homes with divorced parents (See
Additionally, 30.71% of respondents’ parents make an income of $50,000 or less per year (See Table 5).

### Table 1
Frequency Respondent Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>35.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>61.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2
Frequency of Respondent Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>17.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-22</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>38.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-24</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>29.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 and Older</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>11.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3
Frequency Respondent Education Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current College Status</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Attended</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>17.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>17.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>22.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduated</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.87%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4
Frequency Parents Marital Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>77.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remarried</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not ever Married</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although this study does not look at gender differences in mediation, there are a few important differences worth noting. For this sample, females scored significantly higher than males on the Coviewing scale ($M_{females} = 17.48$, $SD = 4.01$, $M_{males} = 16.34$, $SD = 16.35$, $t = 2.28$, $p = .024$,) and on the Instructive scale ($M_{female} = 14.52$, $SD = 4.19$, $M_{males} = 13.31$, $SD = 4.29$, $t = 2.22$, $p = .027$). Females were also significantly more offended with media scenes that are sexual ($M_{females} = 69.24$, $SD = 17.38$, $M_{males} = 63.81$, $SD = 19.06$, $t = 2.34$, $p = .020$), profane ($M_{females} = 14.08$, $SD = 4.57$, $M_{males} = 12.13$, $SD = 4.82$, $t = 3.26$, $p = .001$), and violent ($M_{females} = 25.99$, $SD = 6.71$, $M_{males} = 20.26$, $SD = 6.7$, $t = 6.61$, $p < .001$) in nature than males. There were no other significant differences found among other scales used in the study (Scales used in the study are discussed later in this chapter).

Religious Demographics

With a highly religious population, it is important to notice some basic religious demographics (see Table 6). Of the sample taken, 64.90% indicated they attended sacrament (church) meeting last week. Thirty percent completed their visiting teaching/home teaching (a general church assignment where members visit those they are assigned to on a monthly basis) last month and 48.70% fasted on the first day of the
Regarding personal religious study, 54.10% of respondents study their scriptures a few times or more during the week prior to taking the survey. In terms of prayer, 65.60% indicated they say formal prayers (excluding prayers over meals) at least once a day, with 53.80% having already said at least one formal personal prayer the day they took the survey. Concerning missionary service, 27.50% served an LDS mission, with an additional 6.10% indicating they were too young to serve, but planned to serve a mission when they reached the appropriate age. Although general church activity statistics are not disclosed, these religious measures do indicate a somewhat highly religious group. Almost two-thirds attended church the week previous and have daily prayer, and nearly half fasted the month before and have regular scripture study. The sample certainly doesn’t represent only inactive church members, or only active members. A mix of activity is apparent, which may provide some evidence for a representative sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Activity</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attended Sacrament</td>
<td>64.90%</td>
<td>35.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visit/Home Teaching</td>
<td>30.00%</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fasted</td>
<td>48.70%</td>
<td>51.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scripture Study</td>
<td>54.10%</td>
<td>45.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Prayer</td>
<td>65.40%</td>
<td>34.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missionary</td>
<td>27.50%</td>
<td>72.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The final survey was derived from the results of an extensive pre-test, from the literature search, and from Stout et al.’s (1996) research. A pretest was given out to a class of undergraduates students. Factor analyses and Cronbach’s alpha and basic statistics were run based on the pretest, to assess the reliability and validity of the scale. Changes were made to the scale, based on these results before the test was sent out.
Additionally, as mentioned before, the online version of the test was pretested with a class of communications research students. The intent of this pretest was not for collecting pretest data, but to check the reliability of the online technology used to administer the survey.

Mediation Style Scale

This study involves a quantitative survey of LDS family media practices and habits from the viewpoint of LDS young single adults (19-25). The survey is composed of three main sections. The first assesses the primary mediation style used in the family of the young adult while growing up. It is based on Valkenburg et al.’s survey instrument, developed in 1999. In an effort to standardize the instrument used in assessing mediation, Valkenburg et al. compiled and tested questions from survey instruments used in the past for validity and reliability. Their final instrument tests for three mediation styles (Instructive, Restrictive, and Social Coviewing) determined by 15 questions (five questions per style). The Cronbach’s alpha values for the three methods during Valkenburg et al.’s study were .80, .79, and .79 respectively (p. 58).

For this study, the researcher added an additional six questions to Valkenburg et al.’s scale, to further examine mediation. However, when the researcher computed the factor analysis on the actual sample, the factors cleanly cut on Valkenburg et al.’s original questions, but did not lay as clearly on the added questions. It appears that the additional questions simply muddied the water instead of clarifying it. The researcher concluded to only use Valkenburg et al.’s 15 questions. The Cronbach’s alphas for this study were .88 for Instructive, .87 for Restrictive, and .88 for Coviewing. These are
higher than those Valkenburg et al. recorded, and indicate high reliability within the mediation portion of the survey instrument. It also adds to the validity of Valkenburg et al.'s scale and to this portion of the study. The three final questions of this first section assess which parent primarily performs mediation functions in the home.

The researcher summed every subject's five scores for each mediation style to create a general score for each type of mediation. Each style's overall distribution was then divided into three groups indicating respondents who come from homes with (a) high, (b) moderate, and (c) low use of the mediation style. The criteria used to divide the overall scores into high, mid, and low groups was two fold: First, the researcher aimed to divide the groups in as even numbers as possible, one-third of the respondents in each group, without dividing a score. For example, rather than placing half of the respondents who scored a "16" out of 25 on a mediation style into the mid group and the other half in the high group in order achieve equal numbers in each group, the researcher divided on clean whole numbers—all with the score of "16" would be placed into either the mid or the high group. Second, the researcher aimed to keep the dividing scores as equal as possible—such that the low, mid, and high groups for each mediation style consisted of a similar range of scores (see Table 7). Based on these criteria, the research aimed to produce as even groups as possible in terms of number of subjects and score range.
TABLE 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mediation style</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Score Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restrictive</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>5-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>13-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>18-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructive</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>5-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>13-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>17-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coviewing</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>5-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>15-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>19-25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Offensiveness Scales and Personal Media Restriction

Part II of the survey uses a Likert scale (from “completely inoffensive” to “completely offensive”) to determine the media sensitivity of the subjects. These 36 questions stem from the researcher’s mentor’s experience, and successively go from conservative to more explicit scenarios regarding sexuality, violence, and profanity. The Sexual Offensiveness scale is made up of 18 statements from Part II of the survey that ask the subject to rate the offensiveness level of each plot scenario (see Appendix B). The alpha level of these 18 questions is .96, indicating they hang together well. If any items were taken out, the alpha level would decrease.

The Violence Offensiveness scale is made up of seven questions, taken from the same section of the survey (see Appendix B). The alpha level is .94. The Profanity Offensiveness scale is comprised of four questions taken from Part II of the survey (see Appendix B). The alpha level is .94. All three scales show very high reliability, and are used in the analysis for hypotheses dealing with media sensitivity.

Three questions seek to determine the actions subjects have taken when offended by media (specifically, whether or not they have turned off a personally offensive
program). The questions mimic the offensiveness categories above, and address whether or not the subject turns off a program when offended by certain content.

Questions 11-18 explore the personal media tastes of the respondent by asking them to indicate the frequency with which they watch various genres of television. The questions regarding television genres use a four option interval scale asking the respondents to rate how frequently they watch a certain genre (never, rarely, sometimes, or often). These questions simply list the genre and then offer examples of current television shows in that genre for clarification. Each question has a similar format as the following example: “Situational Comedies (i.e., Friends, Everybody Loves Raymond, That 70’s Show, etc)”. Additionally, three questions assessed the amount of television the respondent currently consumes. Using an interval scale, the survey asks the subjects to indicate how many hours of television they view on weekdays and on the weekends.

Media Attitudes and Orientation

Part IV uses a Likert scale to determine current media attitudes and beliefs, specifically regarding television, of the subjects. This section was derived from the results of Stout et al.’s (1996) study on LDS young single adults and movie selection. This portion of the survey was used to create four scales. The first two scales assessed the degree to which a subject has a positive or negative attitude towards the media. For the Negative Attitude scale, the researcher selected questions from this portion of the survey that have a negative connotation towards the media and ran Chronbach’s alpha on those items. After adjusting the number of items for the best fit, 12 variables comprised
this scale, with an alpha of .90. The Positive Attitude scale was created the same way and uses four items with an alpha level of .71.

This same section of the survey was used to derive two additional scales—a Traditionals scale and an Independents scale. Stout et al.’s (1996) research indicates these are two dominate orientations LDS people take when making personal media choices. This scale is very exploratory, and attempts to capture these qualitatively found media orientations in a quantitative form. The Traditionals scale uses 19 items and has an alpha level of .90. Many of the questions that make up this scale also make up the Negative Attitudes scale, as Traditionals tend to have a more negative orientation. The Independents scale is made up of six items and has an alpha level of .75.

The media attitudes/orientation portion of the survey is the most exploratory section. Based largely on qualitative data, this scale attempts to quantify Stout et al.’s idea of Traditionals, and Independents. Originally, the researcher ran factor analysis on the media attitudes/orientation scale, but had difficulty coming up with a multi-factor solution that was clean. The reason for this difficulty is partially due to the exploratory nature of the scales and also because the items have high colinearity, making factor analysis difficult. The researcher decided against this method of grouping the variables. Instead, the researcher created groupings from a scale reliability approach using Chronbach’s alpha (shown above).

The final section of the survey gathers demographics as well as assesses the religiosity of the subjects (see appendix A for complete survey instrument).
Data Analysis

The researcher used multivariate statistical options using SPSS 11.5 and 12 to analyze the data. Specifically the research employed t-tests, One-Way ANOVA tests, Chronbach's Alpha, and Correlations to analyze the data.
CHAPTER IV

Results

While these findings are not conclusive, and certainly don’t prove causation, they are a start in indicating some interesting trends. According to this study, individuals who recalled high levels of Restrictive mediation tended to restrict their personal media choices when exposed to personally offensive material more than those that recalled low levels of Restrictive mediation. High levels of Restrictive mediation also indicated (a) negative attitudes towards television, (b) more media sensitivity, and (c) a Traditionals approach to media choices.

Regarding Instructive mediation, the most insightful information is that individuals who came from highly Instructive based homes watched more informational/educational programs and more situational comedies than individuals from low Instructive homes. Individuals who recalled high levels of Coviewing had a neutral orientation towards the media, finding it neither positive nor negative. They also tended to watch more informational/educational programming and daytime soap operas. These are some of the general results of this study. Below are the complete results segmented by hypothesis type.

Restrictive Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1
LDS young single adults who recall their parents using high levels of Restrictive mediation will restrict television viewing for themselves when offended, more than those who come from homes that use low levels of Restrictive mediation.
Hypothesis one was largely substantiated for this sample. Hypothesis one looked at the relationship between the level of recalled Restrictive mediation and personal current media restriction. Due to the ordinal/nominal nature of the dependent variables, this hypothesis allowed for a chi-square analysis. The sum of the Restrictive Valkenburg et al. questions divided into low, mid, and high Restrictive groups was used, in conjunction with three questions asking the respondent if they have turned off programs in the past due to being offended by language, sexual content, or violence. Between 4-5 subjects did not answer these questions, so the mode was used to fill in their void.

There was a significant association between recalled Restrictive mediation level and restricting one’s program viewing due to language offensiveness ($\chi^2 = 10.55, d.f. = 2, p = .005$) (see Chart 1). A gamma test indicated this relationship was positive—the higher the recalled Restrictive level, the more likely one was to restrict themselves from a program due to offensive language ($\gamma = .31, p = .003$). The same relationship existed for self restricting sexual content and violence (sexual content: $\chi^2 = 25.97, d.f. = 2, p < .001, \gamma = .50, p < .001$; Violence: $\chi^2 = 11.07, d.f. = 2, p = .004, \gamma = .31, p = .001$) (see Charts 2 and 3).

The following three charts show this relationship had a consistent and interesting trend regarding not turning off an offensive program. As the level of recalled mediation increased, the number of subjects who did not choose to restrict the program decreased. The results of Hypothesis 1 are limited due to the nominal and ordinal variables, but it offers an interesting look at the possible long term effects of parental mediation.
FIGURE 1
Subject choice in changing the channel due to offensive language

Level of recalled Restrictive Mediation

FIGURE 2
Subject choice in changing the channel due to offensive sexual content

Level of recalled Restrictive Mediation

FIGURE 3
Subject choice in changing the channel due to offensive violence

Restrictive recoded into three groups
Hypothesis 2
Young single adults who recall their parents using high levels of Restrictive mediation in the home will have a more negative orientation towards television.

Hypothesis two explores the relationship between level of recalled mediation and negative attitude towards the media. Hypothesis two was supported for this sample. A One-Way ANOVA indicated there was a significant difference between levels of recalled Restrictive mediation and current negative attitudes towards television ($F_{(2, 264)} = 10.26, p < .001$) (see Table 8). Those who recalled high levels of Restrictive mediation scored significantly higher in having negative attitudes towards television, than those with low levels of Restrictive mediation ($p < .000$), as indicated by the Bonferroni post hoc test. The high and mid Restrictive groups had no significant difference, though the low group differed from both the high and the mid groups.

Hypothesis 3
Young single adults who recall their parents using high levels of Restrictive mediation in the home will find television/visual media to be more offensive than young single adults who come from homes that used low levels of Restrictive mediation.

Hypothesis three was validated for this sample frame. For all types of scenarios (profanity, sexual, and violence), individuals who recalled high levels of Restrictive mediation indicated higher personal offensiveness than individuals who recalled low Restrictive levels (Sexual: $F_{(2, 264)} = 13.18, p < .001$; Profanity: $F_{(2, 264)} = 6.93, p = .001$; Violence: $F_{(2, 264)} = 3.61, p = .029$) (see Table 9). A Bonferroni post hoc test indicated the difference exists between the high and low ($p < .001$) and the mid and low ($p < .001$) groups.
Hypothesis 4

Young single adults who recall their parents using high levels of Restrictive mediation in the home, will watch a different number of hours of television than young single adults who come from homes that used low levels of Restrictive mediation.

Hypothesis four looked at the amount of television viewed by young single adults compared with their recalled Restrictive mediation level (low, mid, high). It was partially substantiated for this sample. A One-Way ANOVA test was conducted to compare the mean amount of television viewed on weekdays, Saturday, and Sunday with the level of Restrictive mediation used in the home. The ANOVA indicated those that recalled coming from highly Restrictive mediated homes watched significantly less television (regardless of the day of the week) than those who indicated they came from homes with moderate and/or low amounts of Restrictive mediation (See Table 10). However, the Bonferroni post hoc test qualified the statistical significance.

Specifically, the post hoc test reveals the high Restrictive group watched significantly less television on Saturday and Sunday than the low Restrictive mediated group (Saturday: \( p = .006 \), Sunday: \( p < .000 \)). Though the ANOVA indicated a significant difference regarding weekday television viewing, the Bonferroni post hoc test did not indicate a significant difference between any of the groups (\( p = .061 \)). As such, individuals who recalled coming from high Restrictive mediated homes, watched significantly less television on the weekends than individuals who recalled coming from low Restrictive mediated homes. The same relationship did not exist between the high and moderate group levels.

Perhaps the Sunday difference arose from a possible childhood rule of no TV on Sundays, which is common for LDS households. This view of television being inappropriate on the Sabbath day may have carried with children raised in Restrictive
households; therefore, they adopted this belief and chose to not watch television on Sunday.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8</th>
<th>Hypothesis Two: One-Way ANOVA Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Media Attitude</td>
<td>10.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 9</th>
<th>Hypothesis Three: One-Way ANOVA Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Content Offensiveness</td>
<td>13.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profanity Offensiveness</td>
<td>6.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence Offensiveness</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 10</th>
<th>Hypothesis Four: One-Way ANOVA Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekday</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>11.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis five examined the relationship of the level of Restrictive mediation used in the home, to television genre viewing frequency. Hypothesis 5 was sustained for this sample. A One-Way ANOVA analysis, indicated Young Single Adults who recalled their parents using high levels of Restrictive mediation in the home, differed in television show choice in only three of the 18 genres. They indicated watching significantly less daytime soap operas \((F_{2, \, 264} = 4.36, \, p = .014)\), primetime animation \((F_{2, \, 264} = 4.31, \, p = .014)\), and music videos \((F_{2, \, 264} = 6.55, \, p = .002)\) than young single adults who recalled growing up in low Restrictive homes (see Table 11).

The Bonferroni post hoc test indicated the difference lies between only the high and the low groups, except with Primetime Animation where the low Restrictive group significantly watched more than both the mid and high groups \((\text{Mid: } p = .037 \, \text{High: } p = .031)\).

The difference with only these three genres may have existed due to possible parental restriction of these types of shows. Parents who chose to restrict television may have focused on these genres. It is not uncommon for parents to forbid their children to watch soap operas, primetime animation, such as the Simpsons, and music video stations, such as MTV.
Hypothesis 6

Young single adults who recall their parents using high levels of Restrictive mediation in the home, will select television shows based on a Traditionals standpoint (Stout et al., 1996).

Hypothesis six, explored the relationship between the level of recalled Restrictive mediation and media orientation, or media selection reasoning. It was partially substantiated. The One-Way Anova test indicated that young single adults who recalled growing up in highly Restrictive mediated homes approached media choice from a more Traditionals standpoint, as Stout et al. (1996) indicated, than young single adults who recalled growing up in a low Restrictive mediated home \((F(2, 264) = 10.97, p < .001)\) (see Table 12). The Bonferroni post hoc test indicated the significant difference existed between the low Restrictive group and both the mid and high group \((Mid: p = .004, High: p < .001)\). There was no significant difference between the mid and high groups.

### Table 11
Hypothesis Five: One-Way ANOVA Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>Restrictive Mediation Level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daytime Soap Operas</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primetime Animation</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Videos</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 12
Hypothesis Six: One-Way ANOVA Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>Restrictive Mediation Level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditionals Approach</td>
<td>10.97</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>56.13</td>
<td>13.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>61.98</td>
<td>11.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>64.88</td>
<td>11.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Instructive Hypotheses

Hypothesis 7
*Young single adults who recall their parents using high levels of Instructive mediation in the home will be Independent* (Stout et al., 1996) *in their selection of television programs.*

There was no difference found between young single adults who recalled high, mid, or low levels of Instructive mediation and having an Independents media orientation \((F_{(2, 264)} = .13, p = .881)\). There was also no relationship between Instructive mediation and a Traditionals media attitude.

This lack of relationship may be due to an inadequate Independents scale. Not much is known about Independents, and this was a first stab. As such, it is not appropriate to completely rule out the likeliness of this hypothesis.

Hypothesis 8
*Young single adults who recall their parents using high levels of Instructive mediation in the home will have a more positive orientation towards television.*

Hypothesis eight examined the relationship between Instructive mediation and attitude towards the media. Using a One-Way ANOVA, there was no relationship found between degree of recalled mediation and positive or negative attitude towards the media \((Positive: F_{(2, 264)} = .39, p = .677, Negative: F_{(2, 264)} = 1.15, p = .317)\). Instructive mediation didn’t appear to affect one’s media orientation.

Recognizing this is exploratory, this lack of relationship can be seen as a positive effect of Instructive mediation, since this style of mediation does not seem to lead to labeling the media as one or the other, unlike Restrictive mediation, which seems to lead to negative attitudes.
Hypothesis 9
Young single adults who recall their parents using high levels of Instructive mediation in the home will find television/visual media scenarios to be less offensive than young single adults who come from homes that used low levels of Instructive mediation.

Hypothesis nine explored the relationship between recalled Instructive mediation and degree of offensiveness. While the relationship was significant for violent depictions, it was opposite of the research hypothesis. The research hypothesis suggested the higher the level of Instructive mediation, the lower the offensiveness score. The opposite was true. For violent scenes only, the higher the Instructive score, the higher the offensiveness score \((\text{Violence: } F(2,264) = 4.79, p = .009)\) (see Table 13). The Bonferroni Post Hoc test revealed the difference was between the low and high \((p = .019)\) and low and mid \((p = .031)\) groups. The initial One-Way ANOVA test found a significant relationship between Instructive mediation and sexual offensiveness \((\text{Sexual: } F(2,264) = 3.45, p = .033)\), but the post hoc did not find significance for low and mid \((p = .058)\) or low and high \((p = .092)\) groups. With a larger sample size, this significance may have emerged between the low and mid groups.

It appears both Instructive and Restrictive mediation may lead to increased media sensitivity, though the Restrictive appears clearly more influential.

Hypothesis 10
Young single adults who recall their parents using high levels of Instructive mediation in the home will watch fewer hours of television than young single adults who come from homes that used low levels of Instructive mediation.

Hypothesis 10 looked at the relationship between Instructive mediation and viewing hour habits. This hypothesis was substantiated for weekday and Sunday viewing, but not for Saturday viewing. A One-Way ANOVA indicated there was a significant difference in the number of weekday viewing hours and the amount of
Instructive mediation ($F_{(2, 264)} = 3.24, p = .041$) (see Table 14). The significance is between the low and mid group only ($p = .035$). However, this may be a function of the way the groups were divided.

Sunday viewing hours showed the anticipated relationship ($F_{(2, 264)} = 4.96, p = .008$) (see Table 1). There was a significant difference between Sunday viewing hours and high and low Instructive levels ($p = .04$). Additionally, with a bivariate correlation, the relationship between Instructive mediation and Sunday viewing hours was the only significant correlation ($r = -.18, p = .001$). This supports Hypothesis 10 that individuals who came from higher Instructive families watched less television than those from lower Instructive families.

Hypothesis 11

Young single adults who recall their parents using high levels of Instructive mediation in the home will watch less variety of television shows than young single adults who come from homes that used low levels of Instructive mediation.

The examination of Hypothesis 11 indicated there was a significant difference in chosen television genre and level of Instructive mediation, only between situational comedies and information/education. Individuals who recalled experiencing high levels of Instructive mediation tended to watch fewer situational comedies ($F_{(2, 264)} = 3.06, p = .0490$) and more information/education type shows ($F_{(2, 264)} = 4.53, p = .012$) (see Table 15). The post hoc test indicated a significant difference between the high and low groups for information/education shows ($p = .013$), and just missed the significant point for the high and low group for Situational Comedies ($p = .054$). This very close relationship may have been more distinct with a larger sample size.
These findings are interesting. They reinforce the idea that using an Instructive mediation style may lead to individuals choosing more instructive and educational programming, and less comedic programming. For a parent concerned with television being a waste, Instructive mediation may be a positive method to instill more educational programming.

Table 13
Hypothesis Nine: One-Way ANOVA Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>Instructive Mediation Level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Content</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>63.16</td>
<td>20.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offensiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>69.17</td>
<td>15.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>69.32</td>
<td>18.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profanity</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>12.41</td>
<td>5.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offensiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>13.68</td>
<td>4.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>14.04</td>
<td>4.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>21.94</td>
<td>7.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offensiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>24.58</td>
<td>6.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>25.06</td>
<td>7.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14
Hypothesis 10: One-Way ANOVA Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>Instructive Mediation Level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weekday</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.576</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15
Hypothesis 11: One-Way ANOVA Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>Instructive Mediation Level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comedies</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information/Educational</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coviewing Hypotheses

Hypothesis 12
*Young single adults who recall their parents using high levels of Coviewing mediation in the home will have neither a negative nor a positive orientation towards television.*

Hypothesis 12 postulated individuals from high Coviewing families have neither a negative nor positive orientation towards the media. This hypothesis was substantiated. A One-Way ANOVA test compared recalled levels of Coviewing with positive and negative media attitude scales (see methods chapter). No relationship was found in either direction *(Positive: $F(2, 264) = 0.17, p = .843$; Negative: $F(2, 264) = 1.02, p = .362$)* ironically lending support to this hypothesis. Additionally, a bivariate correlation test supported the lack of statistical significance *(Positive: $r = .08, p = .109$; Negative: $r = -.09, p = .079$).* However, since this hypothesis looked for no significance, more research should be done.

Hypothesis 13
*Young single adults who recall their parents using high levels of Coviewing mediation in the home will find less television/visual media to be offensive than young single adults who come from homes that used low levels of Coviewing mediation.*

Hypothesis 13 examined the relationship between perceived media offensiveness and recalled level of Coviewing. Hypothesis 16 was not verified. Young single adults
who recalled growing up in a high Coviewing home, did not find the media to be less offensive than those who recalled a low Coviewing home. This is true for all three types of offensiveness—sexual, profanity, and violence. \( \text{Sexual: } F(2, 264) = .47, p = .623; \) \( \text{Profanity: } F(2, 264) = .76, p = .486; \) \( \text{Violence: } F(2, 264) = .33, p = .720 \).

Hypothesis 14
Young single adults who recall their parents using high levels of Coviewing mediation in the home will watch more hours of television than young single adults who come from homes that used low levels of Coviewing mediation.

Hypothesis 14 postulated young single adults who recalled high levels of Coviewing watch more hours of television than those who recalled low levels of Coviewing. This hypothesis was not confirmed. With this sample, there was no significant relationship between hours of television viewed and recalled level of Coviewing \( \text{Weekday: } F(2, 264) = .71, p = .493; \) \( \text{Saturday: } F(2, 264) = .82, p = .442; \) \( \text{Sunday: } F(2, 264) = .51, p = .604 \).

Hypothesis 15
Young single adults who recall their parents using high levels of Coviewing mediation in the home will watch a greater variety of television shows than young single adults who come from homes that used low levels of Coviewing mediation.

Hypothesis 15 compared recalled level of Coviewing to television genre choice. It hypothesized high levels of Coviewing would predict a greater variety of television show choices than low levels of Coviewing. Collectively, this hypothesis was not substantiated. The only significant difference in television show viewing was with information/education type shows—where individuals who recalled high levels of Coviewing watched more of this type of genre \( F(2, 264) = 3.08, p = .048 \).
Bonferroni post hoc test revealed the difference was between the high and low levels \((p = .048)\). There was an almost significant difference with daytime soap operas, where young single adults who recalled high levels of Coviewing watched more daytime soap operas than those who recalled low levels \((F_{(2, 264)} = 3.02, p = .051)\). With a larger sample, this variable may have shown significance (see Table 16).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>Coviewing Mediation Level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information/ Educational</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daytime Soap Operas</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusion**

The results of the hypotheses testing iterate the importance of studying mediation. While many of the hypotheses proved fruitful, the results also clearly indicated the need for more research. The greatest information gathered revolves around Restrictive mediation. More hypotheses regarding the Restrictive mediation style were substantiated than the other two approaches. This may be because more was known about Restrictive mediation, or because it was easier to define and pull apart. While this study provides some insight into Coviewing and Instructive mediation, it mainly offers some direction for future researchers to discover. The following chapter explores the implications and meanings from these findings.
CHAPTER V
Discussion

Importance of the Study

This study adds significantly to the mediation literature. Many studies focus on the “what”, “how,” and “who” of mediation—mediation styles, family predictors, etc. What researchers have yet to explore deeply are the effects, and especially the long term effects, of mediation. While research has established what forms of mediation there are, most studies have not focused on the very thing that justifies using mediation in the home—the effects of it. What good is mediation research and pushing parents to use mediation in the home, if it has no long term effect at all? Mediation research that explores the “what” and “how” of mediation makes a critical assumption that it works. The research fails to state the end goal of mediation. While this study does not explore what the goals of mediation should be, it assumes they should be long-term and looks for those kinds of effects. It ventures into assessing the end result of mediation—to see if mediation influences people over a long period of time. This study isn’t an experiment, and it isn’t a truly longitudinal study. However, it does look at the relationship between having the television mediated and current media attitudes, habits, and beliefs. Thus, it attempts to chart the path to fulfilling the dearth of mediation effects research.

This study offers support for the theory of mediation. It is a start at showing mediation is effective and works to mitigate media message. It provides further support for mediation as an active audience theory. Mediation theory warrants its own niche in the active audience paradigm. It, in essence, is a bridge between active audience theories and effects theories. While other active audience theories look at why people use the
media, such as Uses and Gratifications theory, Mediation theory accepts the notion that media have effects on individuals. But, rather than simply observing those effects, like many of the passive audience effects theories do, mediation theory looks for a method to lessen the effects, and even combat against them.

Another area of importance covered by this study is the use of a religious audience. Oftentimes religious leaders offer media guidelines for their congregations (Stout & Buddenbaum, 1996). These guidelines usually will fit within the frame of the three types of mediation—Restrictive, Instructive, and Coviewing. For example, besides the LDS Church, the Catholic Church used Restrictive mediation when it employed its *Index of Forbidden Books* (Jelen, 1996). Mainline Protestants, however, tend to advocate more Instructive mediation (Buddenbaum, 1996). This study not only looks at a congregation’s reaction to the advice given, but at the effects of that advice on young adult members. In a way, this study looks at the possible effects of the parents trying to carry out church leaders’ admonition regarding the media.

This study, while important, is exploratory in nature and should be looked to as such. It delves into the un-chartered waters of religious mediation effects research. As such, confidence in the reliability and validity of the study is limited. One should be cautious in trying to extrapolate these results to the larger population. Rather, the results of this study lay the foundation on which future studies can build.

*Meaning Behind the Results*

It should be understood that the results from this study do not imply causation, establish effects, or apply to beyond the sample drawn. This study attempts to start the
exploration of the study of the long-term effects of mediation. Having established this understanding, this study does offer some valuable insight into possible effects of using different forms of mediation.

Restrictive Mediation

Six of the fifteen hypotheses explore the relationship between Restrictive mediation and current media attitudes, orientation, and sensitivity. In a nutshell, this study indicates that people who come from homes with high levels of Restrictive mediation are more likely to do the following in regards to television:

- Restrict their personal media based on profane, sexual, and violent content
- Carry a negative attitude towards television
- Indicate high levels of offensiveness towards profane, sexual and violent television scenes
- Watch less television on the weekends
- Watch less daytime soap operas and primetime animation on television
- Hold a Traditionals orientation toward television and media selection

If a parent’s goal for employing a Restrictive mediation style is to have the child choose to restrict their own media, than this method appears effective. One of the concerns regarding Restrictive mediation is that the child will feel starved of media exposure, and will in turn run wild watching everything possible when finally gaining the freedom to make his or her own media choices (Nathanson, 1999). According to the results of this study, this does not appear to be the case in terms of television viewing. In fact, the participants who recall coming from homes that use high levels of Restrictive mediation tend to be Restrictive with themselves in terms of television viewing.

As discussed in the results chapter, the way in which young single adults from highly Restrictive homes restrict their own media is interesting. Why would these individuals
watch less television on the weekends and less daytime soap operas and primetime animation? Perhaps the time of week and type of shows personally restricted are the same as the restriction the young adult experienced while young. This study cannot determine this with the data gathered. Though this study doesn’t ask what specific shows were restricted, it would be interesting to see if these three genres are the most common, and hence are also watched less as adults. If that is true, Restrictive mediation may have some merit as to its long-term effectiveness. A future study will need to look at the specifics of Restrictive mediation and current viewing habits. The backfire effect does not hold a strong case with these variables either, as there is no increase in television viewed or television genre chosen among the individuals who came from highly Restrictive homes. Rather, the opposite is true.

A possible effect of using a Restrictive mediation style is a negative attitude and Traditionals approach towards television viewing. Restriction holds a negative connotation, and perhaps employing a negative technique to monitor the media breeds a negative media attitude. Depending on the individual, this can be viewed as a possible negative effect of using Restrictive mediation. The Traditionals approach to the media is one where the individual follows blanket rules or guidelines given by a governing group, in this case the LDS Church, without necessarily looking at media entities individually to make an informed decision as to what to watch (Stout et al., 1996). This is a natural fit for those that come from primarily Restrictive families because Traditionals tend to have negative attitudes towards the media and people from highly Restrictive families are accustomed to following media rules.
The largest amount of information gathered was about the effects of recalled Restrictive mediation, rather than about Instructive or Coviewing mediation. This may be due to several factors: Restrictive mediation is the cleanest defined mediation style. It is clear cut whether someone is restricting the media or not. Instructive and Coviewing mediation styles are more open to interpretation. This may lead to stronger internal validity within the Restrictive portion of the Valkenburg et al. (1999) scale. Restrictive mediation may also simply lead to more obvious long term effects, and in fact be more effective than other mediation styles. More research is needed to support these exploratory findings. Alone, they are simply ideas, inklings worth exploring.

Instructive Mediation

The five hypotheses exploring Instructive mediation do not yield as fruitful results as the Restrictive hypotheses. Individuals who recall growing up in highly Instructive mediated families do not have a more Independents or Traditionals orientation towards the media, nor do they have a more positive or negative attitude towards the media than individuals who recall growing up in moderate or low Instructive homes. The failure to find a relationship between Instructive mediation and these variables may be more of a function of inadequate scales, than of there not really being a relationship. The Independents scale especially may not indicate one has an independent media approach. This researcher-made scale is just too exploratory to know, and thus more research will need to be done. The positive media attitude scale is also researcher-made and has not been adequately established for validity. However, if the findings are accurate, it appears using an Instructive method for mediation leads to a neutral attitude and perhaps a mixed
orientation towards the media, which may be exactly what a parent wants. In this case, this method may be an effective means of mediating television.

While the hypothesis estimates less media sensitivity for individuals who recall high levels of Instructive mediation, the opposite is true for violence and possibly sexual content, but no relationship was found with profane content. Since the mediation styles are not mutually exclusive, meaning just because one individual comes from a high Instructive home does not mean they don’t also come from a highly Restrictive home, it is hard to know if these results are confounded. It may be that Instructive mediation indeed leads to higher levels of media sensitivity, but it is hard to tell based on these preliminary results. A researcher would need to find subjects who primarily grew up under the influence of only one of the mediation styles, to be sure of the effect.

It is interesting that young adults from this sample, who recall high levels of Instructive mediation watch fewer situational comedies and more informational/educational shows. Perhaps using Instructive mediation encourages children to watch shows with more substance than simply entertainment. These results are too exploratory to tell, but pursuing research in this area more may provide more direction as to if this is the case.

Coviewing Mediation

Coviewing indicates the least amount of effects in accordance with the hypotheses. Individuals recalling high levels of Coviewing in the home show a neutral attitude toward the media, no increased or decreased sensitivity level towards the media, and watch no more or less hours of television than those who recall moderate or low
levels of Coviewing. It may be that Coviewing leads to the least amount of long term
effects than the other forms of mediation. At least, however, Coviewing does not seem to
have a negative effect on individuals who were largely exposed to it. Coviewing, it could
be argued, may not be an adequate form of mediation for parents who want their children
to be oriented one way or the other. Or it may be that Coviewing neutralizes the negative
influence of the media, but does not particularly lead to different, maybe more positive
habits with the media. Obviously this study does not establish either of these ideas.
More research is needed.

Only one of the four Coviewing-based hypotheses is statistically significant—that
individuals who recall high levels of Coviewing mediation watch more
informational/educational television shows than individuals with low recalled levels of
Coviewing. This is interesting as both Instructive and Coviewing mediation share this
outcome. Though this study does not go into this, it would be interesting to see if the
motivation to watch this genre is the same. With Coviewing, it may be due to parents
selecting the shows to watch with the children, and parents tending to choose more
educational shows. This may not be the reason at all—more exploration is needed. Thus
those children are exposed to this genre of television and grow up to watch similar shows.

With regards to daytime soap operas, it is interesting to see an opposite trend from
individuals who recall high levels of Restrictive mediation. Perhaps high Coviewing
families are less strict on what children watch, and hence they are less strict with
themselves when they are grown. Again, more exploration is needed.

Finding very little significance with Coviewing mediation may be due to the lack
of adequate scales as discussed above and below in the limitations section. Additionally,
Coviewing needs to be studied more to verify its legitimacy as an effective mediation style.

Mediation and Parenting

This study suggests a possible benefit from teaching parents how to mediate television. It implies that with more study, researchers may be able to divide out the effects of each type of mediation. With this knowledge, parents can then choose their method of mediation based on the desired outcome, rather than using whatever method they are used to, or guessing which one they think is best. For example, parents may shy away from Restrictive mediation for fear of it backfiring—kids suddenly going media “wild” when they have the freedom to do so. With this sample, that fear was not substantiated, but rather Restrictive mediation led to personal restriction. If parents desire for their children to be more selective with media use, and more offended by profane, sexual, or violent media, Restrictive mediation may be the appropriate method. If parents don’t want their children to develop a negative attitude towards the media, perhaps they should use less Restrictive mediation and more of the other methods.

For this to happen, parents need to understand different methods of mediation and their potential outcomes. With this knowledge, parents can strategically choose how they handle the media in the home. Currently, media literacy programs are typically geared toward children and occur at school or on television or other media outlets. Parents are encouraged to “get involved,” but little is said on how to do so. While the LDS Church, as explained previously, offers guidelines and ideas on how to mediate the media (using all three types of mediation), this level of instruction is not common and is given at a
general church level. Rather than relying on the education system or media outlets, perhaps the parents should be educated on mediation styles, since they are the ones who are with their children during most media use times.

Based only on the current knowledge and the sample represented in this study, some guidelines parents should consider in mediating the television in the home, include the following:

- **Awareness**—becoming aware of the styles of mediation, and assessing what the parent(s) current style is.

- **Considering the end outcome the parent(s) want the mediation to have**—think long term (5 to 10 years from now), not just the current moment. Once the parent(s) know the desired outcome, selecting a method or combining methods that lead to that outcome. For example, with this study's sample:
  - Parents who desire for their children to restrict their own media use and be more sensitive to profane, sexual, and violent media should consider using Restrictive mediation.
  - Parents who want to avoid encouraging their children to have a negative attitude towards the media and want them to watch more educational/informational television shows, should consider using Instructive mediation or Coviewing.

- **Using multiple methods**—perhaps different methods works best for each child in the family—or combining methods to reap the benefits of each form.

As more information is gathered on the effects of mediation, parents can be offered valuable knowledge that will offer them an element of control over the media entering the
Information for the LDS Church

This study offers initial feedback for the LDS Church. For this sample, mediation seems to have long term effects. This is a powerful argument for the LDS Church to continue their consistent instruction on media use. While the LDS Church offers instruction to both the parents (during church conferences) and youth (pamphlets specially made for the youth), they can use this and future knowledge to create effective curriculum or forums for parents to learn about mediation styles from Church leaders and each other. On a ward level, firesides (periodically scheduled meetings, usually with a speaker) may be a great place to discuss these issues. Additionally, other church educational efforts, at a broader level make a good forum to discuss mediation.

Limitations of the Study

As with all studies, this study is laden with limitations and challenges. While the information provided is valuable and furthers research in the mediation field, it does not answer all questions and certainly does not provide perfect answers. For this study, the main areas of caution in terms of validity and reliability include limitations in the sample, survey, and hypotheses.
Sampling

The random sampling technique is sound, but even with a random sample, if you don’t receive enough participants, your study is limited. While the initial sample frame started out rather large (2200), as discussed in the methods section, it yielded only 267 usable surveys (12.1% response rate). This study lacks external validity due to the small sample size. It is plausible that only a certain type of person returned the survey, thus biasing the sample to that type of person. Additionally, the external validity is jeopardized with the sample size resting under 300. A replication of a similar study with this same population will help solidify or debunk aspects of this sample.

The methods chapter explores some of the reasons for the lack of respondents to the survey, including: transience, inactivity rates, missionary service, and timing. However, additional reasons for the undersized return include (a) the length of the survey, (b) the lack of an incentive, and (c) the sponsor of the survey. The twelve page survey consists of 149 questions. The length of the survey may have deterred potential subjects from participating. Additionally, as mentioned in the methods section, the survey was administered via mail during the month of September. This time of year is the most transient time for young adults as many are busy getting ready for school, which includes moving to a new location for the school year. With a long survey administered during a busy time, offering no incentive may have been the clincher for subjects choosing not to participate.

Additionally, there is a possibility of the sponsoring university or church being a deterrent. The researcher received a few surveys returned with anti LDS and explicit comments written on them. One participant even asked to have his or her name removed.
from the records of the LDS Church. While most members are positive towards the Church and many are positive towards BYU, some are not. Sometimes when a young adult reaches college age, if they do not meet the requirements to attend BYU or are in company with those who harbor hard feelings towards the school, they become unfriendly or antagonistic towards the school. Especially with mailing the surveys only outside of Utah, many participants may have been turned off by the source of the survey. As such, again the external validity of the sample is jeopardized, as the surveys were returned on a voluntary basis.

Another potential issue with the sample chosen is social desirability. The religious audience chosen is taught by parents’ and church leaders’ morals, guidelines, church rules etc. The survey, especially the offensiveness scale, addresses moral issues that may conflict with the LDS Church’s stance. It is plausible that participants, knowing the survey came from BYU and that their name was selected from the LDS Church records, may have been more liberal in stating they found offense with different scenarios, simply because they knew the LDS Church’s stance implies they should. Other questions also may have encouraged socially desirable results as they dealt with religious activity, political stance, and media attitudes.

Evidence of social desirability includes remarks by the participants written in the margins of the survey. It was almost as if some participants assumed the researches had a “right” answer in mind for the questions, or had a preconceived opinion of what they “should” say. For example, one participant commented that he or she “[did] not have a calling,” after he or she indicated “no” in response to a question asking about the completion of a church calling. Another participant explained that he or she is
“hypoglycemic,” after indicating he or she did not fast from food and water on the first Sunday of the month. Beyond qualifying a given response, evidence of participants believing the researchers held a preconceived “right” answer includes a participant commenting on the particulars of a question. In one area, the answer scale ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree, and asked the respondent’s agreement of the following question:

“Similar to TV and movies, there should be ratings for paintings, museums, and novels.”

The respondent indicated he strongly disagreed with the statement and then wrote “Seriously?!” in the margin. This participant, along with others, made the assumption that the researchers had a preconceived opinion as to what attitude or orientation a person should hold regarding the media.

Survey

This study is largely exploratory, and researcher-made scales were necessary. As such, the survey instrument offers its own set of validity challenges. Aside from the Valkenburg et al. (1999) scale that was tested and established for validity and reliability, the remaining survey is researcher made, and thus has not undergone the rigorous process of establishing a scale.

While the offensiveness portion of the scale grouped together nicely, the attitude portion offered the greatest amount of challenges. This portion was established from Stout et al.’s (1996) research, and thus has the challenge of converting qualitative data
into a quantitative measure. The idea was that each of the items on the scale were associated with a media orientation—Traditionals and Independents (at the time of this study, the research had not yet emerged Contextuals). However, the questions were not mutually exclusive between the three groups. In fact the groups showed high levels of multi co linearity, and thus reliability was the only easy way to divide the groups out. In general, the number of questions addressing each attitude style were not equal between any of the groups. Traditionals were assessed by the most questions, followed by Independents. In the future, careful planning of establishing mutually exclusive questions that specifically measure each type of media approach is needed. Also, cutting down on the number of items to assess media orientation will benefit the muddiness of the concepts.

Even with the Valkenburg et al. (1999) survey being established in terms of validity and reliability, limitations still exist. Because real life is multidimensional, labeling someone as coming from a Restrictive, Instructive or Coviewing mediated home is difficult. People are not mutually exclusive in terms of what mediation style a family uses. As such someone who comes from a highly Restrictive home may also come from a highly Instructive home and even a highly Coviewing home. Just because someone recalls high levels of one form of mediation does not mean they don’t also recall high levels of the other forms. Because of this, it is hard to establish the effects of mediation. An experiment that instructs a parent to only use one form of mediation would have to be used in order to separate out the mediation variable. Even then, confounding factors including the influences of others (besides parents) on media use must be taken into account. Such a mutually exclusive study is impossible, because you cannot separate out
all the variables into isolated form. Thus, typical of social science research, this study seeks to come close to examining the complex influences in the human life.

Aside from the challenges associated with specific scales, the length and sensitivity of the survey poses an issue. Some subjects may have experienced fatigue from the length of the study, and thus not provided as accurate answers for the questions. Or, as mentioned above, some subjects may have opted not to participate at all. This possible participant fatigue brings up questions of internal validity and reliability with the survey. Additionally, the survey covered a number of sensitive subjects, and as discussed above, may have led to unreliable answers from the subjects. The researchers encouraged the subjects to be honest in their answers and promised anonymity and confidentiality. Even with these precautions, it is hard to predict after only one study if the subjects were accurate in their answers. Future studies may help strengthen confidence in these answers.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

The research questions and hypotheses were altered during the study. The original questions and hypotheses were not answerable based on the limitations of the survey instrument. Many of the original hypotheses assumed mutual exclusivity between the mediation styles. They required a comparison between one mediation style and another. Because this was not possible (as described above), the researcher altered the hypotheses to reflect high and low levels of each mediation style.

A few of the hypotheses originally asked if different mediation techniques yield individuals who “hold . . . similar beliefs and attitudes towards the media as the LDS
Church advocates.” In researching the subject further, it became apparent that the LDS Church advocates all three methods of mediation. Additionally, the attitude questions used in the survey were not necessarily morally based, and thus could not be labeled as LDS approved or not approved. In fact based on the reading, there are very few hard rules the LDS Church offers in terms of media use. As such, it was not feasible to answer these hypotheses.

Finally, the researcher decided to not include the original additional hypotheses that looked at the relationship between religiosity and media use. The researcher chose not to include these because they did not relate to the primary topic at hand in this study—mediation effectiveness. Following these alterations made to the hypotheses, the researcher adjusted the research questions to reflect these changes.

**Conclusion: Future Research Studies**

After teaching research methods for two terms and performing my own research, I am consistently convinced there is no perfect study, and as described above, this study is no exception. It started out with high expectations, and ended with some amazing, though not as grandiose results. At every stage there were challenges, rocks to climb, and blocks to hurdle. Yet, I believe that is part of the research process—diving into a little known subject and emerging with a hard earned pearl while the rest of the treasure has to remain behind. But you’ve seen the treasure, and perhaps almost touched it, and so you know it’s there. And the next time you venture into the deep you will know a straighter path, the reeves to avoid, the tools to bring.
This study is indeed one pearl of the vast treasure of knowledge in the realm of mediation waiting to be explored. Beyond establishing what forms mediation can take, looking at how well those methods fulfill their purpose is well understudied. Within this attempt at studying mediation effects, this research uncovers some particular areas of mediation that need some examination. While many are mentioned throughout this chapter, below is a catalogue of various needs:

- Looking at other effects, not explored in this study, using the three mediation methods
- Duplicating this study with other religious and non-religious groups
- Establishing the concepts of Traditionals, Independents, and Contextuals more clearly
- Looking to see if other religious audiences (not LDS) have similar orientations towards the media as Stout et al. (1996) indicate
- Establishing stronger positive and negative media attitude measures
- Studying the plausibility of Coviewing and Instructive styles as effective methods of mediation
- Going deeper on researching the effects of Restrictive mediation on personal restriction
- Specifically looking at the plausibility of the backfire effect of Restrictive mediation
- Focus on Instructive mediation as an effective method of teaching media literacy

The media mediation niche is large and ripe for harvest. This research not only further the academic field, but has a direct application to parenting and church leader direction. With future studies, parents, church leaders, and other social entities can be prepared with knowledge to choose mediation methods.
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APPENDIX A

Complete Research Instrument
This is the survey referred to in the letter you should have received previously.

Thank you for participating in this study. We are interested in your attitudes about television programming and your preferences for specific programs. The identities of all participants in this study will remain anonymous and their answers will be confidential. Once the data analysis has been completed, all questionnaires will be destroyed.

Participation in this project is completely voluntary. Research subjects have the right to withdraw or refuse to participate. There are no anticipated risks to health, BYU standing, or LDS church standing for participating, or for not participating in this project. By completing this questionnaire, you are agreeing to be a subject in this study.

Please answer each question as completely and truthfully as possible. We are interested in what you honestly think, not what you feel you should think. This survey will take approximately 15 -20 minutes to complete. After completing the survey, please insert it into the provided envelope and put it in the mail.

You may turn the page and begin—starting on the back of this sheet.
Part I.
In this section, we will ask you some questions about your interaction with your parents when you were a child and/or teenager. Please answer each question as honestly as possible, using the following scale:

- Circle “1” for “Never”
- Circle “2” for “Rarely”
- Circle “3” for “Sometimes”
- Circle “4” for “Often”
- Circle “5” for “Almost Always”

**How often did one of your parents...**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Almost Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Try to help you understand what you saw on television?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Point out to you why some things television characters do are good?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Point out to you why some things television characters do are bad?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Explain the motives of a television character?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Explain what something on television really means?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Tell you to turn off the television when you were watching an unsuitable program?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Set specific viewing hours for you?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Forbid you to watch certain programs?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Restrict the amount of your viewing time?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Specify in advance the programs that you could watch?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Watch a program with you because you both liked the program?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Watch television with you because of a common interest in a program?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Watch television together just for fun?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Watch your favorite television program with you?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Laugh with you about the things you see on television?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Say that something seen on television is OK?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**How often did one of your parents...**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Almost Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. Say that something seen on television is not OK?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Say that something on television is not real?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Tell you more about something seen on television?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Speak up when they see something on television they dislike.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Say something on television is not true?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. My mother was the primary parent to restrict television viewing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. My mother was the primary parent to discuss what we viewed on television</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. My mother was the primary parent to watch television with me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part IIa**

We are interested in your opinions about the content or story plots found on prime time television programs during recent and current seasons. Below, we have listed several brief statements that describe or summarize possible content or story lines that you might find offensive or inoffensive as a television viewer. Using the following scale:

1 = “Completely inoffensive”  
2 = “Somewhat inoffensive”  
3 = “Neutral feelings”  
4 = “Somewhat offensive”  
5 = “Completely offensive”

Please indicate the degree to which you would personally find the content or story line “offensive” or “inoffensive” for a prime time television program (on networks such as NBC, CBS, ABC, Fox, UPN, WB). Please be as honest in your answers as possible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completely Inoffensive</th>
<th>Completely Offensive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Mother quits her job to stay home with preschool-age children.  
2. Teenage son lies to his father to protect a friend who is in trouble with the law.  
3. Teenage son lies to his father to keep himself out of trouble.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Completely Inoffensive</th>
<th></th>
<th>Completely Offensive</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Teenagers discuss sexual activities and/or behaviors.

5. Teenagers engaging in physical contact of a sexual nature (i.e., kissing, holding hands, hugging, etc.).

6. Teenagers having sex (implied but not actually shown).

7. Teenagers having sex (shown in the activity).

8. Unmarried adults of the opposite sex engaging in physical contact of a sexual nature (i.e., kissing, hugging, etc.).

9. Unmarried adults of the opposite sex living together (sexual relations are implied but not shown).

10. Unmarried adults of the opposite sex having sex (shown in the activity).

11. Married adults engaging in physical contact of a sexual nature (i.e., kissing, hugging, etc.).

12. Married adults discussing sexual relations.

13. Married adults having sex (shown in the Activity).

14. Unmarried adults of the same sex engaging in physical contact of a sexual nature (i.e., kissing, hugging, etc.).

15. Unmarried adults of the same sex living together (sexual relations are implied but not shown).

16. Unmarried adults of the same sex having sex (shown in the activity).

17. Partial male nudity.

18. Full male nudity.


20. Full female nudity.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Completely Inoffensive</th>
<th>Completely Offensive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Profane or vulgar language used for comedic effect.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Profane or vulgar language used for comedic effect with the appropriate words “bleeped” out.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Profane or vulgar language used for dramatic effect.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Profane or vulgar language used for dramatic effect with the appropriate words “bleeped” out.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Two gay men go out to dinner on a “date” arranged by friends.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Specific mention of male or female genitalia by name.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Violence that involves the exchange of gunfire between individuals.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Violence that involves the use of a weapon (i.e., gun, knife, bomb) to kill one person.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Violence that involves the use of a weapon (i.e., gun, knife, bomb) to kill two or more people.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Violence that involves a physical confrontation (i.e., hitting, slapping, fist fight, beating) between individuals.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Violence that depicts a physical confrontation (i.e., hitting, slapping, fist fight, beating) between a man and a woman.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Violence that involves the destruction of personal or public property (cars, buildings, houses, etc.).</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Violence of a satanic nature.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>The depiction of witches, sorcerers, vampires.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Religion as a solution to personal or social problems.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>The depiction of angels or other heavenly beings/messengers.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part IIB
Please answer the following questions as truthfully as possible. Please circle your answer choice.

1. In the past, I have changed channels or turned off a program because I was offended by the **language** being used.
   Yes  No

2. In the past, I have changed channels or turned off a program because I was offended by the nature of its **sexual content**.
   Yes  No

3. In the past, I have changed channels or turned off a program because I was offended by the **violent** nature of its content.
   Yes  No

Part IIIa
Please circle your answer choice.

1. On a **typical weekday**, about how much time do you spend watching television (this does not include rented video tapes or DVDs).
   
   Never  An hour or less  1 to 2 hours  2 to 3 hours
   3 to 4 hours  4 to 5 hours  5 to 6 hours  6 to 7 hours
   7 to 8 hours  8 or more hours

2. On a **typical Saturday (day and evening)**, about how much time do you spend watching television (this does not include rented video tapes or DVDs).
   
   Never  An hour or less  1 to 2 hours  2 to 3 hours
   3 to 4 hours  4 to 5 hours  5 to 6 hours  6 to 7 hours
   7 to 8 hours  8 or more hours

3. On a typical **Sunday (day and evening)**, about how much time do you spend watching television (this does not include rented video tapes or DVDs).
   
   Never  An hour or less  1 to 2 hours  2 to 3 hours
   3 to 4 hours  4 to 5 hours  5 to 6 hours  6 to 7 hours
   7 to 8 hours  8 or more hours
Part IIIb
Please answer each of the following questions as honestly and accurately as possible using the following scale:
1 = “Never”  2 = “Rarely”  3 = “Sometimes”  4 = “Often”

*When you watch television (other than rented movies), how frequently do you watch the following types of programs?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never (1)</th>
<th>Rarely (2)</th>
<th>Sometimes (3)</th>
<th>Often (4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Situation Comedies (i.e., Friends, Everybody Loves Raymond, That 70’s Show, etc.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Fantasy/Science Fiction (i.e., X-Files, Andromeda, etc.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Daytime Soap Operas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Daytime Talk Shows (i.e., Springer, Oprah, Maury Povich, etc.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Daytime “Courtroom” Shows (i.e., Judge Judy, Animal Court, etc.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Dramas/Action (i.e., ER, 24, Crossing Jordan, The Practice, West Wing, etc.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Television Movies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Variety Shows (i.e., Mad TV, Saturday Night Live, stand-up comedy, Whose Line Is It Anyway? etc.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. News/News Magazines (i.e., 60 Minutes, 20/20, evening news, etc.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Sports News (i.e., Sportscenter, CNNSI, Golf Channel, ESPN Classic, etc.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Sporting Events</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Primetime Animation (i.e., Simpsons, King of the Hill, etc.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Children’s (i.e., Sesame Street, Builder Bob, Rugrats, etc.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Information/Education (i.e., Nova, Frontline, Animal Planet, TLC, National Geographic, Discovery Channel, HGTV, Food Channel, Travel Channel, etc.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15. Late Night Talk Shows  
(i.e., Letterman, Leno, Politically Incorrect, etc.)
1  2  3  4

16. Game Shows  
(i.e., The Chair, Millionaire, etc.)
1  2  3  4

17. Reality  
(i.e., Survivor, Cops, etc.)
1  2  3  4

18. Music Videos
1  2  3  4

Part IV
Please indicate your level of disagreement or agreement with each of the statements below, using the following scale:

1 = “Strongly disagree”  2 = “Disagree”  3 = “Neither disagree nor agree”  4 = “Agree”  5 = “Strongly agree”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The values presented in television programs run contrary to the values taught by my church.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Watching television interferes with my ability to perform my church callings/assignments.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Watching television interferes with my ability to study the scriptures on a regular basis.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Watching television takes me away from my time with my family and friends.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Television watching is not a part of my daily routine.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Watching television runs contrary to what my religious leaders have taught.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Watching television does not fulfill my entertainment needs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Watching television helps me escape from the pressures of daily life.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Watching television helps me find ways to interact with others.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Watching television is a waste of time.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. I would like to remove the television from my home/apartment.

12. The only reason I would have a TV in my home/apartment would be for the purposes of watching rented movies that I have chosen.

13. The only reason I would have a TV in my home/apartment would be for the purposes of watching the news or general conference.

14. Most television programs are “garbage.”

15. It is possible to become addicted to watching television.

16. Watching television negatively affects the attitudes and behaviors of children and teenagers.

17. Children and teenagers who watch television are more likely to use profanity than those who don’t.

18. Children and teenagers who watch television are more likely to become sexually promiscuous than those who don’t.

19. Children and teenagers who watch television are more likely to be disobedient than those who don’t.

20. Parents should screen all programs before they allow their children to watch.

21. I consider decisions about what to watch on television to be a personal matter.

22. I consider what my church leaders have to say about the media, but I make my own decisions about what I will and will not watch.

23. I look forward to watching television.

24. I often talk to my friends about something I saw or heard on television.

25. Television is entertaining.

26. I sometimes feel guilty when I watch television.

27. I usually turn on the television when I am home even if I am doing other things.

28. I feel guilty about watching television if I am not doing something else at the same time.

29. I frequently go days without watching television.
30. I often watch television when I have nothing else to do.

31. I rely on the advice of other members of the Church when selecting television programs.

32. If my friends in the Church say they are offended by a particular television program, I would probably not watch it.

33. A person doesn’t have to actually see a television program to know that it is inconsistent with Church standards.

34. Artistic merit is the most important criterion in choosing a television program.

35. If a television program has nudity or partial nudity, it is inappropriate according to Church standards.

36. If a television program has violence it is inappropriate according to Church standards.

37. Television programs rated TV-14 are usually inappropriate according to Church standards.

38. Similar to TV and movies, there should be ratings for paintings, museums, and novels.

Part V
Please circle your answer choice.

1. What is your gender? Male Female

2. Please indicate your age.

   19 to 20 21 to 22 23 to 24 25 and older

3. Please indicate your level of current college status.

   College Freshman  College Sophomore  College Junior

   College Senior  Graduate School  Have not attended college

4. Please indicate your parents’ income level (If your parents are divorced, indicate the income of the parent you lived with most while growing up):

   Under $25,000 $25,001 to $50,000 $50,001 to $75,000

   $75,001 to $100,000 $100,000+ Don’t Know

5. On a scale of 1 to 10 (1 being “ultra-conservative,” 10 being “ultra-liberal”), please indicate your personal orientation on political issues by circling your answer choice.

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
6. On a scale of 1 to 10 (1 being “ultra-conservative,” 10 being “ultra-liberal”), please indicate your personal orientation on social issues by circling your answer choice.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

7. Last week I attended Sacrament Meeting. Yes No

8. I completed (100 percent) my visiting or home teaching last month. Yes No

9. I fasted on the first Sunday of this month. Yes No

10. I read the Church-published magazines

Cover to cover every month Cover to cover some months
Some of the articles every month Some of the articles some months
Not very often Never

11. Last week I studied the scriptures

An hour or more every day About half an hour every day
A few minutes every day A few times during the week
Hardly at all Never

12. Besides blessing food, I say formal, personal prayers

Many times a day In the mornings and in the evenings each day
Once a day Sometimes
Rarely Never

13. Today, I have said a formal, personal prayer

Many times A few times Once
Not at all, but I plan to Not at all

14. I served an LDS mission

Yes No
Not old enough, but I plan to Not old enough and I don’t plan to
15. While growing up, my parents were (if more than one applies, pick the status that existed for the greatest amount of time while you were growing up):

Married  Divorced  Remarried
Widowed  Not ever married

16. What U.S. State do you currently live in? ____________________________

17. In the last month, I have done the following on a Sunday (check all that apply):

☐ Attended parties and/or open houses
☐ Completed school work
☐ Exercised
☐ Participated in outdoors activities
☐ Played sports with friends or family
☐ Shopped
☐ Bought gas
☐ Took a long nap
☐ Watched movies at home
☐ Went to the movies
☐ Watched television
☐ Worked for pay

Thank you for participating in this study. If you have any questions about this study, or your rights as a human subject, you may contact Dr. Daniel Stout, 553 F- HFAC, Department of Communications, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah 84602, (801) 422-7551, e-mail: daniel_stout@byu.edu.
# APPENDIX B

Researcher Combined Scales

## TABLE 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valkenburg et al. (1999) Scale Divided by Mediation Styles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructive Mediation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Try to help you understand what you saw on television?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Point out to you why some things television characters do are good?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Point out to you why some things television characters do are bad?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Explain the motives of a television character?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Explain what something on television really means?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Restrictive Mediation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Tell you to turn off the television when you were watching an unsuitable program?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Set specific viewing hours for you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Forbid you to watch certain programs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Restrict the amount of your viewing time?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Specify in advance the programs that you could watch?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coviewing Mediation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Watch a program with you because you both liked the program?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Watch television with you because of a common interest in a program?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Watch television together just for fun?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Watch your favorite television program with you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Laugh with you about the things you see on television?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question Plot Scenario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Teenagers discuss sexual activities and/or behaviors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Teenagers engaging in physical contact of a sexual nature (i.e., kissing, holding hands, hugging, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Teenagers having sex (implied but not actually shown).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Teenagers having sex (shown in the activity).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Unmarried adults of the opposite sex engaging in physical contact of a sexual nature (i.e., kissing, hugging, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Unmarried adults of the opposite sex living together (sexual relations are implied but not shown).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Unmarried adults of the opposite sex having sex (shown in the activity).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Married adults discussing sexual relations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Married adults having sex (shown in the Activity).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Unmarried adults of the same sex engaging in physical contact of a sexual nature (i.e., kissing, hugging, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Unmarried adults of the same sex living together (sexual relations are implied but not shown).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Unmarried adults of the same sex having sex (shown in the activity).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Partial male nudity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Full male nudity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Partial female nudity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Full female nudity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Two gay men go out to dinner on a “date” arranged by friends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Specific mention of male or female genitalia by name.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions included in Violent Offensiveness Scale</th>
<th>Total Alpha = .94</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question Plot Senerio</strong></td>
<td><strong>Alpha if item deleted</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Violence that involves the exchange of gunfire between individuals.</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Violence that involves the use of a weapon (i.e., gun, knife, bomb) to kill one person.</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Violence that involves the use of a weapon (i.e., gun, knife, bomb) to kill two or more people.</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Violence that involves a physical confrontation (i.e., hitting, slapping, fist fight, beating) between individuals.</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Violence that depicts a physical confrontation (i.e., hitting, slapping, fist fight, beating) between a man and a woman.</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Violence that involves the destruction of personal or public property (cars, buildings, houses, etc.).</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Violence of a satanic nature.</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions included in Profanity Offensiveness Scale</th>
<th>Total Alpha = .94</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question Plot Senerio</strong></td>
<td><strong>Alpha if item deleted</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Profane or vulgar language used for comedic effect.</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Profane or vulgar language used for comedic effect with the appropriate words “bleeped” out.</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Profane or vulgar language used for dramatic effect.</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Profane or vulgar language used for dramatic effect with the appropriate words “bleeped” out.</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 21

Questions included in Negative Attitude Scale | Total Alpha = .90
--- | ---
Question | Alpha if item deleted
--- | ---
10. Watching television is a waste of time. | 0.89
11. I would like to remove the television from my home/apartment. | 0.89
13. The only reason I would have a TV in my home/apartment would be for the purposes of watching the news or general conference. | 0.89
14. Most television programs are “garbage.” | 0.89
15. It is possible to become addicted to watching television. | 0.89
16. Watching television negatively affects the attitudes and behaviors of children and teenagers. | 0.88
17. Children and teenagers who watch television are more likely to use profanity than those who don’t. | 0.88
18. Children and teenagers who watch television are more likely to become sexually promiscuous than those who don’t. | 0.88
19. Children and teenagers who watch television are more likely to be disobedient than those who don’t. | 0.88
20. Parents should screen all programs before they allow their children to watch. | 0.89
26. I sometimes feel guilty when I watch television. | 0.89
28. I feel guilty about watching television if I am not doing something else at the same time. | 0.89

### TABLE 22

Questions included in Positive Attitude Scale | Total Alpha = .71
--- | ---
Question | Alpha if item deleted
--- | ---
8. Watching television helps me escape from the pressures of daily life. | 0.70
9. Watching television helps me find ways to interact with others. | 0.66
23. I look forward to watching television. | 0.59
25. Television is entertaining. | 0.65
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Alpha if item deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Watching television takes me away from my time with my family and friends.</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Television watching is not a part of my daily routine.</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Watching television does not fulfill my entertainment needs.</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Watching television is a waste of time.</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I would like to remove the television from my home/apartment.</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The only reason I would have a TV in my home/apartment would be for the purposes of watching rented movies that I have chosen.</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. The only reason I would have a TV in my home/apartment would be for the purposes of watching the news or general conference.</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Most television programs are “garbage.”</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. It is possible to become addicted to watching television.</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Watching television negatively affects the attitudes and behaviors of children and teenagers.</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Children and teenagers who watch television are more likely to use profanity than those who don’t.</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Children and teenagers who watch television are more likely to become sexually promiscuous than those who don’t.</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Children and teenagers who watch television are more likely to be disobedient than those who don’t.</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Parents should screen all programs before they allow their children to watch.</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. A person doesn’t have to actually see a television program to know that it is inconsistent with Church standards.</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. If a television program has nudity or partial nudity, it is inappropriate according to Church standards.</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. If a television program has violence it is inappropriate according to Church standards.</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Television programs rated TV-14 are usually inappropriate according to Church standards.</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Similar to TV and movies, there should be ratings</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 24

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Alpha if item deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. Watching television helps me escape from the pressures of daily life.</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Watching television helps me find ways to interact with others.</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I look forward to watching television.</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I often talk to my friends about something I saw or heard on television.</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Television is entertaining.</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Artistic merit is the most important criterion in choosing a television program.</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Alpha = .75