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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Viewer advisories, a statement preceding some television programs cautioning discretion as to which members of the family should view the program that follows, due to some aspect of that program's content, have become an important consideration in television programming. Each year motion pictures containing explicit language and scenes are being shown on television. Because of the content of such programming, networks and their affiliate stations bear the responsibility of presenting such motion pictures in a manner that is suitable for the best public interest.

Television programs are made for an audience that must be attracted from all competing stimuli and sources. "The changes in our attitudes toward media and our expectations of them spring primarily from changes in media and the generally increasing complexity of life around us" (Rivers & Schramm, 1969, p. 236). The American television system "evolved in a series of patchwork progressions, affected variously by government regulations, corporate aims, technological advances,
advertising and marketing requirements, and to some degree by public reaction (Brown, 1971, p. 61).

Television programming is included under the protection of the First Amendment freedoms of speech. However, there are some aspects of the broadcasting medium which bring exceptions to the rules that apply to the other media.

In the Federal Communication Commission's petition in Grove Press, Inc. and Readers Subscription, Inc. v. Robert K. Christenberry (Case No. 25, 861) filed in the U. S. Court of Appeals, the Second Circuit, the Commission stated:

Radio and TV programs enter the home and are readily available not only to the average normal adult but also to children and to the emotionally immature...Thus for example, while a nudist magazine may be within the protection of the First Amendment...the televising of nudes might well raise a serious question of programming contrary to 18 U.S.C. 1164...Similarly, regardless of whether the "four-letter words" and sexual description set forth in Lady Chatterley's Lover (when considered in the context of the whole book) make the book obscene for mail-ability purposes, the utterance of such words or the description of such sexual activity on radio or TV would raise similar public interest and Section 1464 questions. (Kahn, 1968, pp. 211-212)

Considering the protection of the First Amendment and the individual station's discretion of public interest, the question arises of how to adapt motion pictures for television viewing. In the 1954 case of
Superior Films v. Department of Education, 346 U. S.

587. Justice Douglas in a concurring opinion stated:

Motion pictures are, of course, a different medium of expression than the radio, the stage, the novel or the magazine. But the First Amendment draws no distinction between the various methods of communicating ideas. (Kahn, 1968, p. 211)

Despite the seeming latitude of First Amendment protection, motion pictures have been involved in public protest from their beginnings. In the 1890's the first public protest against a movie was recorded. The charge involved an entertainment film called "Dolorita in the Passion Dance," a peep show parlor movie on the Boardwalk in Atlantic City (Randall, 1968, p. 11). Other such films followed, some to be closed by court orders because they were deemed to be an outrage to public decency.

Business-licensing laws were one of the first attempts to limit movies.

In Delaware, owners of movie houses were subject to heavy license fees on the ground that their business constituted a "circus" within the meaning of existing statutes. A similar result was obtained in New York, where movies were grouped with "public cartmen...hawkers...ticket speculators...and bowling alleys." (Randall, 1968, p. 11)

The cities of Chicago and New York began a two-year period of local pre-exhibition censorship for movies in 1907. Two years later, in 1909, the first attempt at a
national system was begun.

Chicago's censorship ordinance was tested in the first movie censorship case in 1909. In the case of Block v. Chicago, 239 Ill. 251 (1909),

Chicago censors had refused to license films entitled "The James Boys" (Jesse and Frank) and "Night Riders" because they were deemed to be immoral. The exhibitor of these films argued before the Supreme Court of Illinois that the ordinance was discriminatory because it did not apply to the legitimate theater, that it constituted a delegation of legislative power to the Chief of Police, and that it deprived him of his property without due process. (Carmen, 1966, pp. 187-188)

The Court upheld the ordinance.

Soon after the Block case, a group of citizens in New York City who were concerned with social research and adult education set up an advisory committee called the National Board of Censorship. The Board set up its own film classification system and primarily opposed federal and state censorship proposals. Because of the Board's efforts for better films, it began to concentrate more on classification and less on censorship. In 1916 the Board changed its name to the National Board of Review, and it became a previewing board to guide the public (Hunnings, 1967, p. 152).

The first state to enact a censorship law was Pennsylvania in 1911. The Pennsylvania State Board of Censors consisted of three people who were "to approve
such films as were 'moral and proper' and to disapprove such as were 'sacrilegious, obscene, indecent, or immoral, or such as tend, in the judgment of the Board, to debase or corrupt morals'" (Hunnings, 1967, p. 166).

In August, 1921, New York State established a licensing system for motion pictures.

New York's action was an especially hard blow to the industry. Not only did the state represent the country's major film market, but the censorship law, which was bitterly fought by the National Association of Motion Picture Industry, a trade organization mainly of producers, marked the failure of what was once considered a noble experiment in voluntary censorship. (Randall, 1968, p. 16)

March of 1922 brought Will H. Hays, Postmaster General of President Harding's administration as head of a new organization, the Motion Picture Producers and Distributors of America. His task was "to launch a public relations campaign and to persuade individual moviemakers to tone down their more sensational and lurid films for the good of the entire industry" (Randall, 1968, p. 16).

In 1930 this organization took the initiative of formal self-regulation with the creation of the Motion Picture Code. "In response to public and legal pressures, the American motion picture industry decided that it must regulate the content of its own pictures, lest the states and cities do it by laws and censorship
boards" (Nelson & Teeter, 1969, p. 365).

The Code listed categories which were to be handled with care: "crime, costumes, dances, religion, bedroom scenes, national feelings, titles and repellent subjects. Other categories were to be forbidden altogether: explicit sexual scenes, vulgarity, obscenity and profanity" (Nelson & Teeter, 1969, p. 365).

Censorship went unrestrained in the years 1915 to 1952. The case of Mutual Film Corp. v. Industrial Commission of Ohio, 236 U. S. 230, 237-238, 35 S. Ct. 387 (1915) established that movies were not protected by the Bill of Rights. Prior restraint was difficult to manage, but not until February of 1952 did the U. S. Supreme Court agree to hear a case on film censorship—it's first in thirty-seven years.

The landmark case of 1952, Joseph Burstyn, Inc. v. Wilson, 343, U. S. 495, 72 S. Ct. 777, brought a ruling from the Supreme Court that motion pictures were entitled to First Amendment protection. This decision reversed all trends of previous years.

In the years to follow, First Amendment protection for the movies was fairly well established. Movies demonstrated that they could deal with social and political controversy. Not until sixteen years after the Burstyn decision, in the wake of the Supreme Court's decision in Interstate Circuit, Inc. v. Dallas, 390 U. S.
did the motion picture industry adopt a film rating system reflecting the Court's renewed interest in protecting minors (Nelson & Teeter, 1969, p. 366).

The initial plan for the film ratings was essentially the same as the program in effect today. There have been only a few changes in the past years. There were four rating categories: G for general audiences—all ages admitted; M for mature audiences—parental guidance suggested; R for restricted—under 16 years old must be accompanied by parent or guardian; X no one under 16 years old admitted. Because the "M" label was misunderstood by the public, it was later changed to "PG—parental guidance suggested—some material may not be suitable for pre-teenagers," and X was later raised to under 17 years of age not admitted (Valenti, Note 2).

From the outset the purpose of the rating system was to provide advance information to enable parents to make judgments on movies they wanted their children to see or not to see. Basic to the program was and is the responsibility of the parent to make the decision. (Valenti, Note 2)

Ratings for motion pictures are decided by a full-time Board of seven people. The only qualifications for membership on the Board are to enjoy movies, to possess an intelligent maturity of judgment, and to be able to put himself or herself in the role of most
parents and view the film as most parents might.

The Board views each film and after group discussion votes on the rating. Each board member completes a rating form spelling out his or her reason for the rating in each of the four categories of theme, violence, language, and nudity and sex, and then gives the film an overall rating based on the category assessments. (Valenti, Note 2)

Ratings by the Board are subjective in nature. There is, however, a basic definition of content for each rating category.

G: "General Audiences—All ages admitted."
   This is a film which contains nothing in theme, language, nudity and sex, or violence which would, in view of the Rating Board, be offensive to parents whose younger children view the film. The G rating is not a "certificate of approval," nor does it signify a children's film. Some profoundly significant films are rated G (for example, "A Man For All Seasons").
   Some snippets of language may go beyond polite conversation but they are common everyday expressions. No words with sexual connotations are present in G rated films. The violence is at a minimum. Nudity and sex scenes are not present.

PG: "Parental Guidance suggested; some material may not be suitable for pre-teenagers."
   Parents are warned against sending their children, unseen without inquiry, to PG-rated movies.
   There may be profanity in these films, but certain works with strong sexual meaning will vault a PG rating into the R category. There may be violence but it is not deemed excessive by the Rating Board. Cumulative man-to-man violence or on-the-screen dismemberment may take a film into the R category.
   There is no explicit sex on the screen, although there may be some indication of sensuality. Fleeting nudity may appear in PG-rated films, but anything beyond that
puts the film into R...  

R: "Restricted, under 17's require accompanying parent or guardian."

The language may be rough, the violence may be hard, and while explicit intercourse is not to be found in R-rated films, nudity and lovemaking may be depicted in the film...

X: "No one under 17 admitted."

This is patently an adult film and no children are allowed to attend. It should be noted, however, that X does not necessarily mean obscene or pornographic...

The reason for not admitting children to X-rated films can relate to the accumulation of brutal or sexually connected language, or of explicit sex or excessive and sadistic violence. (Valenti, Note 2)

The dilemma over film content continues to the present day. To compound the seesaw of decision, television came into popularity and film-makers found their audience attracted to a different medium. "Broadcasting required a far more carefully worked out structure than the film because from the beginning it was seen to be a means of communicating a far wider range of content---it was not only an extension of theatre, it was a new technology which could carry into people's homes, beyond the neat control of the box office, a total range of cultural genres" (Smith, 1973, p. 52). The very time scale of television made a difference between movie house presentations and those for the living room audience.
In a 1975 article in *New Republic*, Stanley Kauffmann predicts that "TV can be used for film modes that are less congenial to the theater screen" (p. 20).

A future view of television may involve all motion pictures being revised for television.

An average movie made for television, without any special billing or advertising or big-name stars, and without even a particularly extraordinary subject, can and will get 24 million viewers in one showing. In 1973, only five movies shown in theaters got over 20 million viewers. And, 1973 was an extraordinarily good year for theater movies. (Stein, 1974, p. 30)

In the winter of 1975, ABC launched the idea of the novel made for television. ABC invested six-million dollars in the twelve hour serialization of Irwin Shaw's *Rich Man, Poor Man* for television showing. This showing was the first successful venture of its type (Waters, 1976, p. 63).

It is not only necessary to consider box office hits when discussing movies on television, but also this new breed of movies like "Rich Man, Poor Man" made solely for television. The popularity of these films outdoes some of the biggest screen hits in the history of America.

Using the narrowest possible definition of a "movie made for television," at least four times as many Americans watch movies made for television each week as view movies playing in local theaters.
In fact, in an average week more time will be spent watching one movie in one television showing than will be spent watching all the movies in all the theaters in America in one week. (Stein, 1974, p. 30)

The most common time slot for television movies is evening prime time. If the theme of the movie is particularly arresting, a television audience of forty million is commonplace for a first run feature (Stein, 1974, p. 30). "Awards for excellence in filmmaking and previous market success appear to be potentially good indicators that a film will have the ability to attract a large audience on its television premiere" (Taylor, 1974, p. 182).

Themes for movies made expressly for television include love, pain, murder, the occult, and homosexuality. As both these television movies and theatrical releases go into American homes, the important issue of standards of taste must be considered.

Already, frontal nudity has appeared on educational television. Rapes, pimps, and prostitutes are commonplace on television networks during prime time. And the Code of the National Association of Broadcasters has been revised recently to allow any display of sex which the producer and the network deem "tasteful." (Stein, 1974, p. 144)

Only recently, though, have the three major networks allowed the showing of couples in bed together. Some speculation about programming content by producers and
writers says that it is the language rather than the visuals which will become even more explicit.

Still, there are the producers and writers who praise the new permissive trend of television movies. There are also those others "who wonder whether television producers know their own strength, i.e., whether they know the example that is set for millions of teenagers watching the repeated sanctioning, by repeated showing, of televised sexual behavior that many find unacceptable" (Stein, 1974, p. 144).

As long as a question remains about how explicit movies can be with certain subjects, censorship remains an important element.

A special limitation on censorship for broadcasting is Section 326 of the Communications Act which proscribes any censorship by the Federal Communication Commission (Minow, 1961, p. 16). "The point to remember is that government always tends to do the work that other units of society do not do for themselves. If the media are irresponsible and the public is ineffective, the government will step in to act" (Rivers & Schramm, 1969, p. 236).

The Commission, in view of areas of censorship is faced with the task of defining such terms as "indecent" and "obscene." In 1970, the Commission focused on the problem in Eastern Educational Radio (WUHY-FM), supra,
and did so again in 1973 with Sounderling Broadcasting Co., 27 R. R., 2nd 285. For both these cases the FCC used the prevailing Constitutional obscenity test. The earlier Constitutional definition of obscenity was "utterly without redeeming social value" which the court modified in Miller v. California, 413, U. S. 15 (1973) to "the use of language that describes in terms patently offensive as measured by contemporary community standards" (Federal Register, 1975, p. 11025).

The Commission believes that Title 18, section 1464 may be inadequate for the purpose of prohibiting explicit visual depictions of sexual material. The precise terms of the statute refer to "utter(ance) of ***language sic..." It is, therefore, uncertain whether the Commission has statutory authority to proceed against the video depiction of obscene or indecent material. (Federal Register, 1975, p. 11025)

Responsibility for broadcast content comes not only from governmental enforcement powers of the FCC, but also from within the industry itself. The National Association of Broadcasters is the broadcasting industry's attempt at self-regulation. The Association has no powers of enforcement for their adopted code.

The NAB Code has an outlined list of General Program Standards (See Appendix A). However, with the advent of more explicit language and visuals in television programming, especially from motion pictures on television, the NAB Television Code Board adopted an
amendment to the NAB Code on February 4, 1975:

Additionally, entertainment programming inappropriate for viewing by general family audience should not be broadcast during the first hour of network entertainment programming in prime time and in the immediately preceding hour. In the occasional case when an entertainment program in this time period is deemed to be inappropriate for such an audience, advisories should be used to alert viewers. Advisories should also be used when programs in later prime time periods contain material that might be disturbing to significant segments of the audience. These advisories should be presented in audio and video form at the beginning of the program and when deemed appropriate at a later point in the program. Advisories should also be used responsibly in promotion material in advance of the program. When using an advisory, the broadcaster should attempt to notify publishers of television program listings. (National Association of Broadcasters, 1975, pp. 2-3)

As the NAB Code was undergoing its amendment processes to include the use of advisories, each network reviewed the principles which govern their television programming content. The major additions to former standards include family viewing time programming and the added use of advisories.

Recommendations to the NAB Code Review Board from Dr. Frank Stanton, the President of CBS, Inc. included changes important to the public interest.

Because of varying tastes, interest, opinions and ages, no program "code" could ever, in its entirety, satisfy even a large percentage of American television viewers. The best
and most respected literary works in the world, for instance, contain incidents which some segments of our society would consider inappropriate for portrayal on television. We are wholly convinced that if the intellectual and cultural quality of our nation is to advance, broadcasters must remain free to exercise their best judgment on the way in which they serve the tastes of the various audience groups. They must also avoid permitting the tastes of one age or interest group to completely dominate those of others. Insofar as children are concerned, we must not lose sight of the fact that there simply is no substitute—nor should there be—for discriminating parental supervision of television viewing within each family's home and according to each family's judgment as to what is appropriate material for its younger members. (Federal Register, 1975, p. 11026)

The program standards statement from the National Broadcasting Company includes treatment of adult themes in programming, scheduling of these programs, and an application of advance audience warnings. NBC decided to devote the first hours of network prime time to programs suitable for general family viewing. Advance advisories received considerable attention from NBC.

**Warnings.** Programs suitable for general audiences may in certain cases contain material regarded by some parents as unsuitable for their children or other members of their family. NBC will make a case-by-case judgment on whether the circumstances—including the subject, treatment and time period—warrant special precautions. When NBC judges that such precautions are necessary, it will pre-screen the program for affiliated stations and follow a system of audience warnings. These audience warnings will include advisories in audio and video form at the beginning of the program and also at a later point in the program and warning...
in advance of the program where possible, in appropriate promotional material. This system is designed to alert viewers to the situation in advance, so that they can determine whether they care to view the program or permit children or other members of the family to do so. NBC has recently expanded its procedures in publicising advance warnings along the foregoing lines, and will apply this expanded procedure when appropriate. (Federal Register, 1975, p. 11026)

On January 8, 1976 American Broadcasting Companies, Inc. announced a new policy for prime time scheduling and practices for dealing with adult subject matter (See Appendix B). In dealing with adult subject matter, ABC follows the following procedures:

1. Advisory announcements, when made, are commonly telecast in the following form: "This film deals with mature subject matter. Parental judgment and discretion are advised."

2. All affiliates are furnished Advance Program Advisory bulletins detailing content.

3. Closed circuit previews of prime time programs are presented on a regularly scheduled rotational basis.

4. Advance descriptive program information is made available to the NAB Code Authority and the NAB Code Authority Director is accorded an opportunity to request screenings prior to broadcast. All pilot programs are prescreened for the NAB Code Authority Director.

5. Our independent outside consultants (Dr. Melvin Heller and Dr. Samuel Polsky) review all pilots and other programming from time to time as requested by the Standards and Practices Department. (American Broadcasting Companies, Inc., Note 1)
Contributory Research

Recently, TV Guide conducted a survey through the services of Opinion Research Corporation of Princeton, New Jersey to ascertain the general public's reaction to the family viewing time initiated by the three major networks. The results reported that 50 per cent of America's adults still are unaware that a family viewing time exists, and only 11 per cent responded that Family Viewing Time has had any effect on their viewing habits. (Ryan, 1976). "Important too, is the finding that in more than half of the households with children surveyed, youngsters 17 and under watch at least some television after Family Viewing Time" (Ryan, 1976, p. 5). This time period after the hours set aside for family viewing, is the usual time slot for motion pictures on television, especially those which would carry viewer advisories.

Statement of the Problem

Although there have been studies on television viewing habits and psychological reaction to television programs, researchers have failed to determine the use of viewer advisories.

The purpose of this study is to determine public reaction to viewer advisories that precede motion pictures on television and to explore network and local station policies on the use of viewer advisories for motion pictures on television.
Significance of the Study

In view of the history of motion picture regulation, which reflects the social consciousness of the public, the television industry has initiated viewer advisories for movies on television. No one yet knows how these advisories are being used. Because of the limited information about viewer advisories, this study seeks specific information about attitudes toward the advisories that precede motion pictures on television.
CHAPTER II
PROCEDURES
RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Few scholars deny that television is the strongest social force in the United States today. With the advent of more explicit language and visuals contained in motion pictures presented on television, networks and their affiliate stations have initiated the use of advisory legends. Specifically, this research is designed to provide answers to the following questions concerning the use of advisory legends that precede motion pictures on television:

1. Is the public considering advisories when selecting a motion picture to be viewed on television?

2. Does the public agree with current network practices in the selection of motion pictures for television and advisement on the pictures?

3. Is the public aware of attempts by the network to distinguish a family viewing time on television?

4. Are local stations working with the networks to best advise the public about the more explicit motion pictures on television?
5. Are the networks discerning, as accurately as possible motion pictures on television to carry advisories?

6. Are networks doing everything possible to keep advisories from becoming enticing advertisements for motion pictures on television?

Development of the Research Questions

The questions posed in this study represent an attempt to initiate some scientific research on the use of advisories for motion pictures on television.

Question number 1 is an attempt to measure if people are aware of advisory legends and if they clearly understand the message of the advisories. Further, the question examines if people use an advisory when selecting a program to be viewed on television. A secondary part of the question involves the question of whether people view television mostly in the company of others or alone.

Research question number 2 considers the public's opinion of motion pictures on television, and the acceptability of their content for television. A poll conducted by Opinion Research Corporation for TV Guide interviewed 1021 heads of households across the United States. "The poll disclosed that nearly three-quarters of the adults in America feel that there is too much violence on television—and by a 2-to-1 margin find violence more objectionable than sex on TV" (Ryan, 1976,
p. 5). However, no distinction was made involving explicit violence and sex in motion pictures on television compared with other programming. "This research will attempt specifically to answer for what reason people feel motion pictures carry advisories when shown on television."?

Research question number 3 seeks information about how many hours a day most households watch television. In a 1973 study by Davis, Edwards, Bartel, and Martin, on the television viewing behavior of older adults, the results showed that for subjects ages 60 to beyond 80, the average amount of daily viewing was 3.41 hours (p. 73). Also, as a comparison to the Family Viewing Time research conducted by Opinion Research Corporation for TV Guide, the question examines if people are aware of the family viewing time set aside by the networks in conjunction with their initiation of advisory legends. The Opinion Research Corporation study dealt only with familiarity with family viewing time. This study will attempt to specify knowledge of time periods for family viewing time.

Research question number 4 deals with local stations and seeks information about local station practices and opinions concerning advisories for motion pictures on television.

Research question number 5 considers network practices for selecting a motion picture to be shown on television and the procedure for deciding what movies will carry
advisories.

Research question number 6 examines network practices to keep advisories from becoming an advertisement for an explicit motion picture shown on television.

Application of the Questionnaire

Three survey type questionnaires were used to provide answers to the research questions. For research questions 1 to 3, the General Public Questionnaire was administered by means of telephone survey.

Research question number 1 is answered by questions 7, 8, 10, and 17 on the General Public Questionnaire. For questions 7 and 8 percentages were tabulated. For questions 10 and 17, percentages were tabulated and a chi-square test was administered to check for significance.

Research question number 2 is answered by questions 9, 11, 12, 13, and 16 on the General Public Questionnaire. Because question number 9 allowed for more than one response per subject, percentages were tabulated and analyzed for significant differences.

Answers to research question number 3 were provided by questions 14 and 15 on the General Public Questionnaire. Percentages were tabulated and significant differences were determined.

Answers to research question number 4 were obtained from the Questionnaire for Local Station Managers. Channel 6 (CBS), and Channel 2 (WBC) both answered the
survey via mail. Mr. Walter Windsor, General Manager of Channel 9 (ABC), granted a personal interview to discuss the questions.

Research questions 5 and 6 are answered in the Questionnaire for Networks. Recorded telephone interviews were conducted with Mr. Alfred Schneider from ABC and Mr. Hermino Traviesas from NBC. These network people are the ones who ultimately make the decision on motion pictures selected for television broadcast, and those selected to carry advisory legends. CBS was contacted on three different occasions. Due to a personnel change in CBS Program Practices in July, the interview was not completed.

Subject Selection

The data for the General Public Questionnaire was obtained by means of telephone survey. Subjects were selected by systematic sampling from the listings in the 1976 Southern Bell Telephone Directory for Orlando and Winter Park, Florida (Babbie, 1973). For a sample of 250 subjects every 366th name was selected.

Pilot Study

A pilot study for the General Public Questionnaire was conducted during the Spring Quarter of 1976 at Florida Technological University. On April 19, 1976 the original draft of the General Public Questionnaire was administered to thirty-five undergraduate and graduate
students at Florida Technological University. The group was a class in broadcasting composed of ten females and twenty-five males. As a result of the pilot study, questions number 6 and 17 were added to the survey. Also for question number 9, the choice of "all of the above" was added. Aside from these changes, the General Public Questionnaire remained the same.

In summary, the data for the General Public Questionnaire was obtained by means of telephone survey, after a pilot of the General Public Questionnaire deemed it satisfactory.

Methodology

Collection of the data for the General Public Questionnaire was completed in a one week period from May 20, 1976 to May 27, 1976 (not including Saturday and Sunday). All calls were made between 6:45 p.m. and 9:30 p.m. On the initial evening, three interviewers were used to make phone calls with the hope of collecting all the data at one time. Unfortunately, the amount of time needed for the calls was underestimated. The remaining calls were made by one interviewer only. In all cases the interviewers read the subjects a prepared script of introduction (See Appendix C). The interviewers then marked each survey as to "response," "no response," or "no answer," depending on the cooperation of the subject. The "no answer" category included busy signals
and no answer. Disconnected telephones were marked under "no response," along with those subjects who declined to answer the survey. All the "no answer" responses were called back twice. One call back was made the same night as the first call and if again there was no answer, another call was made on the final night of the survey. The study yielded 121 "responses," (providing a 10% error), 92 "no responses," and 37 "no answers."

On the first evening of the survey, the interviewers found after three telephone calls each that reaction to the survey was less hostile if the demographic questions were asked at the end of the interview. Consequently, the procedure followed was to read the introduction, ask question number 1 on the General Public Questionnaire, then proceed to question number 7, follow through to the end of the survey, and then return to demographic questions 2 through 6. The interviewers then read a prepared closing script that ended the interview.

For the Questionnaire for Local Station Managers, all General Managers for the three local network affiliates were approached by telephone to arrange an interview. Mr. John Haberlan of Channel 2 was not available, and Mr. Arnold Shoem, General Manager of Channel 6 (CBS) referred me to his Program Director, Mr. Everett Hughes. Mr. Hughes felt he could answer any questions without setting up an interview time. Mr. Walter Windsor,
General Manager of Channel 9 (ABC) agreed to the interview which was completed on May 13, 1976. Both Mr. John Haberlan, General Manager of Channel 2, and Mr. Everett Hughes from Channel 6 were mailed copies of the Questionnaire for Local Station Managers.

Arrangements were made to record telephone interviews with the network people thanks to Mr. Alfred R. Schneider, Vice President in charge of Broadcast Standards and Practices at ABC who provided a list of his counterparts at the other two networks.
CHAPTER III

RESULTS

When the General Public surveys were completed, the data obtained therein was tabulated by hand with the assistance of a pocket calculator and an Olivetti Underwood Programma 101 Computer. This process, in addition to providing answers to the research questions, enables generalizations to be made about the demographic characteristics of those subjects surveyed.

Demographic Characteristics

Sex of the Subjects

The subjects used in this research were systematically selected and, in this manner, sex was not manipulated. Even though control over stratification of male versus female was not exercised, the data (Table 1) shows a reasonable distribution with 58.7% of the subjects being female and 41.3% of the subjects being male.
### Table 1

Sex of the Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>58.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Age of the Subjects

The questionnaire provided the subjects with five possible selections for age. Analysis of the data (Table 2) shows that 14.9% of the subjects were 20 years of age or under; 24.8% of the subjects were between 21 and 30 years of age; 19.8% of the subjects were between 31 and 40 years of age and 18.2% were 41 to 50 years old. Subjects over 50 years of age comprised 22.3% of the sample population.
Table 2
Age Level of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 or Under</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 to 30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 to 40</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 to 50</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 50</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of Formal Education of Subjects

The amount of education completed by the subjects is fairly well distributed except for the classification of Elementary School or Less which was only 1.7%. 19.0% of the subjects completed some high school and 29.7% of the subjects were high school graduates. Some college was completed by 31.4% of the subjects while 18.2% were college graduates or beyond.
Table 3

Formal Education Completed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of Education</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School or Less</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some High School</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduate</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Graduate or Beyond</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* In future calculations this category is combined with Some High School creating the category Some High School or Less.

Number of Children

In the study 65.3% of the households surveyed had children and 34.7% of the households had no children.

Table 4

Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status of Family</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Households with Children</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>65.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households without Children</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Educational Level of the Children

Of those households that had children, 65.0% had children in the Pre-School or Elementary range; 30.0% had children in Secondary grades; and 5.0% had children in college or working.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Level</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-School and Elementary</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College or Working</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Annual Family Income

The category of annual family income had to be discarded for analysis because the majority of subjects would not answer. 43.9% of the subjects responded to the question, 56.1% refrained from listing their annual income.
Table 6
Annual Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjects who responded</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects who declined</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>56.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question Results

Research Question Number 1

The first research question attempted to determine if the general public is considering advisories when selecting a motion picture to be viewed on television. A secondary part of this question is whether people watch television mostly in the company of others or by themselves. The first analysis of this question is to determine if people are aware of advisories that accompany some movies on television. Using the total population, the total number of responses, in percentage form, who are aware of advisories is 94.2%. Only 5.8% of the sampled population said they were not aware of advisories.
Table 7
Categorical Response for Question Number 7 Using Total Population
"Are you aware of viewer advisories?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>94.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second analysis deals with responses to question 8 on the General Public Questionnaire—do people understand clearly the message of the advisories? Again, the entire sample population was used for calculation. The majority of respondents (86.0%) felt they understand advisory messages. Only 11.6% of the subjects felt they did not understand clearly the advisory message. 0.8% of the subjects felt the advisory message is not specific enough, and 1.6% did not answer.
Table 8

Categorical Response for Question 8 Using Total Population "Do you understand clearly the message of advisories?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>86.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Message not Specific Enough</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 10 asks whether people take viewer advisories into account when selecting programs. The total number of responses, in percentage form, who take advisories into account is 59.5%. Those who do not take advisories into account totaled 39.7%.

Table 9

Categorical Response for Question 10 Using Total Population "Do you consider advisories when selecting programs?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Of those people sampled who take advisories into account, 50.0% almost always take advisories into account. 29.2% of the respondents consider advisories 50% of the time, and 19.4% consider advisories 10% of the time.

Table 10

Categorical Response to Part Two of Question 10
"How often do you consider advisories?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10% of the time</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% of the time</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost Always</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To determine if having children in the household has any influence on taking advisories into account when selecting programs, analysis was made by those measures. Significantly more subjects (70.9%) with children in the household use advisories than subjects without children in the household (35.7%).
Table 11

Categorical Response for Question 10 by Children/No Children in Household
"Do you take viewer advisories into account when selecting programs?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With Children</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>70.9%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without Children</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$x^2 = 12.58; < .01$

Educational level was examined as a factor in taking advisories into account. High School Graduates reported the largest percentage of usage (72.2%), while College Graduates or Beyond reported the least use of advisories (45.5%).
Table 12

Categorical Response of Question 10 By Educational Level of the Subjects
"Do you take advisories into account when selecting programs?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Level</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some High School or Less</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduate</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Graduate or Beyond</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Between High School Graduate and College Graduate or Beyond $x^2 = 3.10$; approaches .05 level. All other comparisons; NSD.

In households that have children, the age of the children by school divisions was analyzed as a possible factor for taking advisories into account.
Table 13

*Categorical Analysis of Question 10 By Age of Children in the Household
"Do you take viewer advisories into account when selecting programs?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age of Children</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-School and Elementary</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior and Senior High</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>70.8%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = .015; \text{NSD} \]

*Children in College or Working were not included in the calculations.

The final question that answers Research Question 1 is number 17 on the General Public Questionnaire. Once again, using the entire sample population, 84.3% of the people watch television with others, and only 15.7% usually view television alone.
Table 14
Categorical Response for Question 17 Using Total Population
"Do you watch television mostly alone or with others?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alone</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Others</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>84.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question Number 2

Research Question number 2 is analyzed with responses to question 9, 11, 12, 13 and 16 on the General Public Questionnaire.

Question number 9 on the General Public Questionnaire deals with the reasons why people feel a movie on television would carry an advisory. Dividing the sample population into those under 40 years of age and those over 40 years of age, it is possible to determine any differences opinion between age groups. Table 15 indicates that the largest percentage of respondents in each age category believe that all three: language, sensuous scenes, and violence are nearly equal reasons for placing an advisory on a motion picture on television.
Table 15 A

*Categorical Response to Question 9 By Age of the Subjects "For what reason do you feel an advisory is placed before a movie on TV?"

SUBJECTS UNDER 40 YEARS OF AGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensuous Scenes</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of the Above</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15 B

SUBJECTS OVER 40 YEARS OF AGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensuous Scenes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of the Above</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* More than one response per subject could be reported, frequencies may vary.

Question 11 asks if people feel that more movies on television should carry viewer advisories. Dividing the sampled subjects into households with children and
households without children, it is possible to determine a significant difference between the two groups. Computation of the responses reports that 70.1% of the households with children feel there should be more advisories for motion pictures on television, while only 48.8% of those households without children feel the need for more advisories.

Table 16

*Categorical Response for Question 11 Using Children/No Children

"Do you feel that some movies on TV should carry viewer advisories but do not?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Households With Children</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>70.1%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households Without Children</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 4.34; < .05 \]

*Due to "No Answers" frequencies may vary.

Analyzing the same question, but dividing the subjects by educational level, it is possible to determine some significant differences between those with some high school or less and the group of college graduates or beyond. In the Some High School or Less grouping, 83.3% feel the need for more movies on television to carry
advisories. College Graduates or Beyond feel the least need for more advisories (38.1%).

There is also a trend toward significance between the High School Graduates and the College Graduates or Beyond. There was no significant difference between all other pairs for comparison.

Table 17
*Categorical Analysis of Question 11 By Educational Level of the Subjects
"Do you feel that some movies on TV should carry viewer advisories but do not?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Level</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some High School or Less</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduate</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Graduate or Beyond</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Between Some High School or Less and College Graduate or Beyond $x^2 = 7.92; < .01$

Between High School Graduate and College Graduate or Beyond $x^2 = 3.31;$ approaches the .05 level.

*Due to "No Answers" frequencies may vary.

Using age of the subjects as a comparison, there is no significant difference reported between the age
groups. Table 18 shows that regardless of age, the largest percentage of subjects feel that there should be more advisories for motion pictures on television.

Table 18

*Categorical Response for Question 11 By Age of Subjects "Do you feel that some movies on TV should carry viewer advisories but do not?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 40 years</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 40 years</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = .0049; \text{ NSD} \]

*Due to "No Answers" frequencies may vary.

Question 12 asks whether people feel that some movies on TV have advisories that do not need them. There was no significant difference for the comparison of households with children and households without children.
Table 19

*Categorical Response for Question 12 By Children/No Children

"Do you feel that some movies on TV have advisories that do not need them?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Households with Children</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households without Children</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$x^2 = 2.18; 	ext{NSD}$

*Due to "No Answers" frequencies may vary.

Analyzing the same question (12) by different educational levels indicates that regardless of educational level, there is no significant difference. The majority of subjects for all educational levels do not feel that some movies on television have advisories that do not need them.
Table 20
*Categorical Response for Question 12 By Educational Level of Subjects
"Do you feel that some movies on TV have advisories that do not need them?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Level</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some High School or Less</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduate</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>67.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Graduate or Beyond</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

x^2 for all pairs for comparison = NSD
*Due to "No Answers" frequencies may vary.

A final analysis of Question 12 was computed by dividing the sample population by age. Table 21 shows no significant difference between age groups.
Table 21
*Categorical Response to Question 12 By Age of the Subjects
"Do you feel that some movies on TV have advisories that do not need them?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 40 years</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>63.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 40 years</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>76.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$x^2 = 1.59; \text{NSD}$

* Due to "No Answers" frequencies may vary.

Question 13 was analyzed to find out if people feel that movies on television are too explicit in their portrayal of sex, violence, and language.

No significant difference was noted between households with children and households without children.
Table 22
Categorical Response for Question 13 By Children/No Children
"Do you feel that movies on television are too explicit?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Households with Children</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>65.3%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households without Children</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No Answer = 2 or 2.5%

χ² = .17; NSD

Question 13 was also analyzed by educational levels of the sample population. Significant differences were noted between college graduates or beyond and high school graduates. 74.3% of the high school graduates feel movies on television are too explicit; 41.0% of the college graduates or beyond feel movies on television are too explicit. There is also a significant difference between subjects with some college education compared to those who are college graduates or beyond. There was no significant difference comparing subjects with some high school or less with any other educational level.
Table 23
*Categorical Response for Question 13 By Educational Level
"Are movies on television too explicit?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Level</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some High School or Less</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduate</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>74.3%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>73.0%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Graduate or Beyond</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Due to "No Answers" frequencies may vary.

Between High School Graduates and College Graduates or Beyond \( x^2 = 5.02; \leq .05. \)
Between Some College and College Graduate or Beyond \( x^2 = 4.70; \leq .05. \)

To determine if age is a factor in people feeling that movies on television are too explicit in their portrayal of sex, violence, and language, question 13 was analyzed by those under 40 years of age and those over 40 years of age. A significantly greater number of those subjects over 40 (77.6%) feel that movies on television are too explicit.
Table 24
*Categorical Response for Question 13 By Age
"Are movies on television too explicit?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Level</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 40 years</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 40 years</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$x^2 = 3.84; \leq .05$

*Due to "No Answers" frequencies may vary.

Differences in the opinions of men and women were also examined in question 13 to determine if sex was a factor in people feeling that movies on television are too explicit. Although there was no significant difference, 73.9% of the women feel movies on TV are too explicit, while only 56.0% of the men feel movies on TV are too explicit.
Table 25
*Categorical Response for Question 13 By Sex of the Subjects
"Are movies on television too explicit?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>73.9%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$x^2 = 3.40$; Approaches .05 Level
*Due to "No Answers" frequencies may vary.

The final analysis concerning Research question number 2 is the question that asks if the subjects feel that a significant number of movies on television violate the moral standards they have set for their families (question 16).

Households with children were used for analysis of this question. Table 26 examines if age of the children in the family would influence the subjects' feelings that movies on television violate the moral standards they have set for their families. Divisions were made between households with children in pre-school or elementary, and households with children in junior or senior high school (secondary). There was no significant difference reported. Responses, reported in percentage form, show a
larger majority of households with children in secondary grades (60.9%) feel that movies on television violate the moral standards they have set for their families.

Table 26

*Categorical Response for Question 16 By Age of Children
Household
"Do a significant number of movies on television violate the moral standards you have set for your family?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age of Children</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-School and Elementary</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 0.29; \text{NSD} \]

*Due to "No Answers" frequencies may vary.

Question 16 was also analyzed by educational level of the subjects with children in the household. Subjects with some high school or less, and those who graduated from high school show a larger percentage (57.9% and 60.9%, respectively) who feel that movies on television sometimes violate the moral standards they have set for their families. There was, however, no significant difference for any pairs for comparison.
Table 27

*Categorical Response for Question 16 By Educational Level of Subjects with Children in the Household

"Do you feel that a significant number of movies on television violate the moral standards you have set for your family?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Level</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some High School or Less</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduate</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Graduate or Beyond</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$x^2$ between all comparisons = NSD

Research Question Number 3

Research question number 3 is answered by questions 14 and 15 on the General Public Questionnaire. Question 14 asked how many hours a day the households watch television. The first analysis (Table 28) was to determine if children in the household were a factor in how many hours a day the household watches television. There was a significant difference reported between households with children and households without children.
Table 28
Categorical Response for Question 14 By Children/No Children
"How many hours a day does your household watch television?"

| Category              | Less than 3 hours | 3-4 hours | 5-6 hours | 7 or more | %
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Households with Children</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households without Children</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 11.41; \quad \chi^2 < .01 \]

To determine if age of the subjects is a factor in how many hours a day the household watches television, Table 29 divides subjects into those under 40 years of age and those over 40 years of age. There was a significant difference between groups. For computer calculation, this analysis combines the last two categories of question 14 into the category "5 hours or more."
Table 29

Categorical Response for Question 14 By Age of the Subjects "How many hours a day does your household watch television?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Less than 3 hours</th>
<th>3 to 4 hours</th>
<th>5 hours or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40.8%</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 11.35; < .01 \]

To examine the knowledge subjects have of the family viewing time (7 p.m. to 9 p.m.) each evening, several analyses were made. The first determination was made between subjects with children in the household and subjects without children in the household. Although there was no significant difference, 50.7% of the subjects with children in the household knew the correct family viewing time compared with 42.9% of the households without children.
Table 30

*Categorical Response for Question 15 By Children/No Children

"Do you know when the time is during evening broadcast when programs are specifically set aside by the networks for family viewing?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>5 to 7 o'clock</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>7 to 9 o'clock</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Households with Children</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households without Children</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

x² = 1.00; NSD

*Subjects with children in college or working were not included in tabulations.

To determine if educational level of the subjects is a factor in knowledge of the network family viewing time, Table 31 analyzed the educational levels. For purposes of computer calculation, educational levels were combined into two categories: High School Graduate or Less, and Some College or Beyond. A larger percentage of those subjects with some college or beyond knew the network family viewing time.
Table 31
Categorical Response for Question 15 By Educational Level of the Subjects
"Do you know when the time is during evening broadcast when programs are specifically set aside by the network for family viewing?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Level</th>
<th>5 to 7 o'clock %</th>
<th>7 to 9 o'clock %</th>
<th>Don't Know %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduate or Less</td>
<td>9 14.5%</td>
<td>27 43.5%</td>
<td>26 42.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College or Beyond</td>
<td>7 11.9%</td>
<td>31 52.5%</td>
<td>21 35.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$x^2 = 1.00; \text{ NSD}$

Research Question Number 4

Research question number 4 attempts to examine if the local television stations are working with the networks to best advise the public about more explicit motion pictures on television. Responses for local stations are taken from the Questionnaire for Local Station Managers.
1. What is your opinion of viewer advisories that precede some motion pictures on television?

Hughes (Channel 6-CBS) Feel advisories are good.
Haberlan (Channel 2-NBC) Feel the advisories are very good and that the audience deserves to be advised in the event they are unfamiliar with the subject matter.
Windsor (Channel 9-ABC) "I think they're good, but that in many cases they don't go far enough. They are considered parental advisories—their whole thrust is to alert parents to the fact that something in the following program may not be suitable for children. But in many cases there's something in the following program which is objectionable to a large number of adults. So, I have felt all along that the advisories should not be directed entirely at the children's audience, but directed that some content in the following program would be found for children and by some adults, or something along that line. This is not a perfected wording for it. But that the advisories should take into consideration that some programming is not suitable or may be objectionable to some element of the adult audience as well. Also sometimes they'll put one at the beginning of a two hour movie and then say nothing else about it for the remainder of the movie, and it would be that
the chief objectionable portion doesn't occur until 60 or 90 or 100 minutes into the picture, and in that time it would pick up an audience of children or others who would find this unexpected development objectionable to them. So quite often when the network only puts such an advisory, say at 9 o'clock for a two hour movie, if they won't put another one at 10 or 10:30, and we feel that the big damage is in the last portion, we will insist on inserting one at the middle mark."

2. When did your local TV station first start using advisories?

Hughes (Channel 6-CBS) "Approximately two years ago."

Haberlan (Channel 2-NBC) "About two years ago."

Windsor (Channel 9-ABC) "I can't recall exactly, it seems to me that we may have used—yes, I definitely recall that we sometimes used an advisory of our own before the network started using them. This was on theatrical movies that we might have purchased which usually run at a fairly late hour if they did have potentially objectionable material in them. Even so, we felt that some sort of a warning was advisable. And we may have done that 3 or 4 times prior to the time that the network began, and then we sort of..."
adopted to the network procedure on them except that we, when we make one of our own, we make it more general in nature and not specifically children."

3. If your station has used advisories: What is the major reaction of the viewing audience?

Hughes (Channel 6-CBS) Favorable.

Haberlan (Channel 2-NBC) Favorable. "Due to considerable advance advisories, we only received two calls regarding 'The Godfather'."

Windsor (Channel 9-ABC) "We get feedback on almost everything, and we get it from both sides. So we have had people write complaining because we put an advisory on a picture, calling us squares for doing so. Then we've had others who complain because we carried the picture and say that the advisory didn't really do much good, that if the parent wasn't home, or wasn't back in the where the kid had his own TV, that it didn't have anything to do with the kid watching or not watching. And sometimes even saying that the advisory in itself is an invitation to those who might be looking for something salacious to tune in. I don't agree with the latter contention with respect to advisories on the program itself. But the few occasions the networks have
used the advisories on the advanced promotion of the program—I feel that there, when you're promoting a program ahead of time, and you point out that it may contain material not suitable for children, then you're almost making the children take a mental note "Let's see, where can I be at 9 o'clock Thursday night where mom and papa won't know I'm watching that, because that sounds good!"

4. Do you feel that the general public uses advisories in the spirit in which they are intended; namely as a warning about program content?

Hughes (Channel 6-CBS) Yes
Haberlan (Channel 2-NBC) Yes
Windsor (Channel 9-ABC) "That's something that I would like to know. I'll be very interested in knowing what you find out. I haven't had the opportunity to feel out the general public sufficiently to make a guess on that."

5. Do you feel that the use of advisories is potentially harmful to your station's image?

Hughes (Channel 6-CBS) No
Haberlan (Channel 2-NBC) No
Windsor (Channel 9-ABC) "Only in the way, that when you carry something that merits an advisory, you're
automatically right in the middle. If you carry
the program, 50% of the people object because you
carried something they think you shouldn't. If you
reject the program, the opposite 50% of the public
objects because you 'censored.' I think the advisory
of the program itself is the best thing that we can
do under the circumstances along with the family
hour which I don't agree with in general principle,
but certainly, at least, should create one safe
period of time for parents to allow unrestricted
viewing, and we have been militant against the
network when they would invade that family hour with
something inappropriate. But the advisory again
on the promotional announcement, I think has an
undesirable effect. I think the answer to that is
simply not to run promotional announcements for
that type of program except in the late hours where
you would run that type of a program itself. But
the network has sometimes been guilty of running a
promotional for a movie that required an advisory
in let's say 'Donnie and Marie' or 'Happy Days' or
a program of that nature. Then I think that advisory
hurts rather than helps."

6. Do you feel that the public should be allowed to
see all movies and to make its own decision about
Hughes (Channel 6-CBS) "In most instances—not all."
Haberlan (Channel 2-NBC) "Only after they are edited for television."
Windsor (Channel 9-ABC) No

7. Do you feel that it is up to the local station to censor movies on television above and beyond network controls?
Hughes (Channel 6-CBS) "In some instances."
Haberlan (Channel 2-NBC) "Sometimes, due to differences in local tastes."
Windsor (Channel 9-ABC) "I object to the word 'censor' because I have tried to convince members of the public who have called or written to the station that there's no censorship involved. The answer always is 'Well, who are you to tell us what we're going to watch.' That's my job! Thousands of programs are made available to me every year which I don't accept. The fact that a network accepts it, is not necessarily grounds for our acceptance. We know that the network is operated by people who live and operate in New York and Hollywood where standards are quite different than they are of the average viewer in Central Florida. Plus the fact that our
license from the FCC makes us responsible for what goes on our air. And so, from time to time, we do reject a program which the network offers. But we do not consider it censorship. Now if we took the program and cut part of it out, I would consider that censorship. But we have yet to do that and doubt that we will."

8. Has your local station ever initiated an advisory for a motion picture to be shown on your local television station?

Hughes (Channel 6-CBS) Yes
Haberlan (Channel 2-NBC) "No, but we have used an additional advisory prior to network originated movies."

Windsor (Channel 9-ABC) Yes

9. Do you agree with current network practices of the placing of advisories before movies on TV?

Hughes (Channel 6-CBS) Agree with current practices
Haberlan (Channel 2-NBC) Agree with current practices
Windsor (Channel 9-ABC) "I think we have fairly well covered that with the exception of the last portion. There have been occasions when the network did not put an advisory on a program or a movie which we felt we could carry, but only with an advisory. In those cases we have added
10. Are you, as a local station owner/operator plugged into the process of deciding which network motion pictures should carry advisories?

Hughes (Channel 6-CBS) "Do not understand 'Plugged into the process--'."

Haberlan (Channel 2-NBC) "Yes, in the sense that we might issue our own regardless of the network's use or non-use."

Windsor (Channel 9-ABC) "To this extent--I happen to be rather uniquely situated in that regard being a member of the governing board of the ABC affiliates, nine representatives of the 200 or so stations. And my particular assignment on the board is Standards and Practices, so I work with Al Schneider, and he will sometimes call me when he has a close one, or invite me to call him when I see a closed circuit of something that either does or doesn't contain an advisory as to whether I think that stations will find it objectionable, or whether I think the advisory is necessary or not. So, I probably have more impact than the average manager would because I have this direct dialogue with Schneider. But the manager of any affiliate station has the right to make his feelings known."
And quite often when any number take the same position on something it will make the networks step back and take notice and sometimes change its plans."

11. Does your local station have an adopted written policy on the use of advisories?

Hughes (Channel 6-CBS) Yes

Haberlan (Channel 2-NBC) "Yes, per NAB Code."

Windsor (Channel 9-ABC) "There is probably something written somewhere in the form of a memo from me to the Operations Manager. Perhaps several memos over a period of time—perhaps it all ought to be brought together and put in one form. But since advisories are an elusive sort of thing, and individual to each situation, we have a standard piece of copy that we will use for a local program that we think should carry one or a network program that doesn't where we think it should. But we would examine each such instance, and in some cases, work it slightly differently if we felt that the particular problem in that case called for a little bit different treatment of the advisory. Also as to whether one advisory is sufficient or whether should be two or three advisories spaced throughout the program. It's sort of an individual case-by-case
basis. And there aren't really that many of them."

12. In your opinion, should there be more or less use of advisories for motion pictures on television?

Hughes (Channel 6-CBS) Remain the same
Haberlan (Channel 2-NBC) Remain the same
Windsor (Channel 9-ABC) "Personally, I feel there should be fewer motion pictures requiring the advisories on television. But I think that, at least with our network, the number of instances in which they use advisories is about right—possible not quite enough. As to local stations, I think there is probably not sufficient. I think that we do it frequently enough, justified by the programming involved. But I fear that many stations are lethargic about things of this nature, and don't give it the thought and attention that we do here. This is not necessarily any particular compliment to us, but we are in an area where many residents and viewers are very sensitive to these problems. And yet, we also have many young people here with modern ideas who find it most objectionable for us to cater to the older element in the audience that takes the directly opposite viewpoint. About the only way that you can do it is to try and play it down the
middle and not make your decision to the utter disregard of either audience. So, from time to time we get problems and carry programs that the young, liberal people feel quite acceptable. And yet, at other times, it crosses the line to where we feel that we would be creating a disservice to more people to carry it than not to carry it. As a result, we're criticized severely by both. I guess that's a pretty sure indication that we're making the decisions pretty well. If we always carried the questionable program, then half of our audience would be totally against us. And if we never carried a provocative program, then the other half would be totally against us. But we're the hero one week, and the goat the next of either group, and I guess that's the best way to be."

Research Question Number 5

Research question number 5 examines the procedures used by the networks to select motion pictures for television and to determine which of these motion pictures should carry an advisory legend. Questions 1 through 4 plus 7 and 8 on the Questionnaire for Networks give responses for research question number 5.
1. What event or sequence of events led (name of network) to begin using advisories for motion pictures shown on television?

Schneider (ABC) "I think we started back in 1973, and it came about to find the programs that dealt with adult subject matter such as 'The Moon for the Misty Garden,' 'Pueblo,' 'Long Days Journey into Night,' 'Rosemary's Baby,' the kinds of materials that even though the pictures were edited for television, to advise the audience in a responsible manner, of the kind of programming that was being presented."

Traviesas (NBC) "I guess the first experience we had with it was the reaction of the public to our 'Born Innocent' show, which was over two years ago. We had used it in what we call only a video. And I guess the public didn't pay attention to it, and that led us to think more about advisories and how to properly use them. We've learned from public reaction on 'Born Innocent' to use it very effectively on 'The Godfather.' There we not only used it as now standard operating procedure, but whenever we use an advisory we use it both audio and video right up front before the show begins, and what we call the second act curtain, or the first major station commercial break, which can be anywhere from twelve
to eighteen minutes. One more thing about 'The Godfather,' we also learned to use in our promotional material, a legend--both in advertisements and in TV Guide listings, and also on-the-air promotions."

2. What was the first motion picture on (name of network) to carry an advisory? When?

Schneider (ABC) "'Long Days Journey into Night' on March 10, 1973 which was broadcast between 8:30 and 11:00."

Traviesas (NBC) "2-20-74 'Case of Rape' was the first film on NBC to use an advisory legend. The next was 'The Execution of Private Slovik' on 3-13-74. The reason we used it there was that we were concerned with the realistic approach toward the end of the show having to do with the actual execution of this young man who you became very sympathetic with as you developed the story. And we thought that there would be members in the audience, in the younger family audience who might find it too shocking to find that he finally died. And that was the reason we put one there, and then 'Born Innocent' on 9-10-74. Now, the 'Case of Rape' that was very bold. Just the work itself--Rape--I mean, there was a lot of discussion about that word. To many people it connotes a taste problem. For many years I don't think that if you were raped you even mentioned the
word rape. It's like cancer, you know, you don't talk freely about it. So, we felt after we saw the finished product that it was such a well-done show, that it gave a message and yet it was so explicit in terms of the trial scenes which you had to make explicit. And yet, we did not use words—I'm quite sure we never used the word 'intercourse.' Because of the subject matter, that it was thought for us to let the general audience know that we're doing something a little different. That was more the total theme of the story rather than any one incident in it. 'Slovick' again was the theme of the story at the end. 'Born Innocent,' when we went into 'Born Innocent,' and I'm responsible because you know the buck stops at my desk, and I also report to the Corporate Vice-President who was with me when we looked at it—again, we thought the total story was so great in terms of trying adolescence, that if they thought family life was bad, that the institution was worse. Also it had a second part story that the child was really looking for love from her father and mother, and it was only until she was physically hurt by the broom handle that she turned and became a leader of the gang. And that was the turning point of the story, and we thought from a 'telling a story' point of view
that was the important part. The public, however, felt that they were actually seeing the insertion of the broom handle, which is not true—it was the struggle to get her down. But we lost a judgment factor there, not realizing what the public might think when they saw the scene. And when we repeated the show, which you probably have heard we cut that scene down to practically nothing, and that we did a better job on the legend, we put it in according to standard operating procedures.

Then we went to 'Klute,' and then we went to 'The Godfather' and on down the line. There are not too many in terms of totals. It's a very important responsibility on the part of the two of us who make the final judgment. We make the final judgment as to whether a legend should be used, and we usually wait to see what we call the 'rough cut' because you cannot make the judgment on just a script. The script might be more innocent than what actually comes out or vice-versa. We also have to be sure that we don't titillate the audience—that we don't use it for promotional reasons and promise them more than is there. So, when we use it, it is not just an arbitrary use. We discuss it—we discuss it with the editor on the West Coast, and his superior
who is closest to it, and we finally come up with a judgment to recommend to the network, because we do not report to the network. My department reports to the Corporate Manager—and we make a recommendation to the President of the network and if he accepts that recommendation, which he usually does, we then initiate through a memorandum, not only that the legend will be used, but what the wording will be."

3. How do you gauge for mass audience acceptability for content of motion pictures shown on television?

Schneider (ABC) "Well, that's a very broad question. What we do is there are many publics. You have to take several basic assumptions. One is that in today's society, I know of no way not to offend one person sometime, someplace. And therefore, the question is the responsibility in terms of selecting and editing those motion pictures which we feel are appropriate (A) depending upon the scheduling of time, (B) whether or not it has an advisory, (C) whether or not we can edit it appropriately for viewing in the home. In addition, any 'R'—we do not accept 'X' rated pictures—any 'R' is reclassified, resubmitted to the Motion Picture Association of America for reclassification.
Depending upon the film, they will re-label it as 'PG' or 'G' and we will then telecast it."

Traviesas (NBC) "Well, that's a tough one to answer, because there are so many factors that come into it. First of all, there's a constant input into my office in terms of mail, in terms of phone calls, in terms of—what is more important—the reaction of your station managers who measure their own community standards, in terms of the critical reviews, and obviously, in terms of some of the pressures that come from the governmental agencies. These, you find a trend, you know one letter isn't a reason for thinking you did something wrong, because in my job you cannot please everybody. You go in with that complete understanding. Yet, I've always felt because I've been in this business for—oh—forty years in the broadcast/advertising business, that the country is basically Puritanical. And that Puritanical instinct that instinct is inherent in the majority of people in this country, and which is now being reflected in our political situation, is there, and it goes from the younger people who complain on censorship when they're in college and then suddenly have children and are writing you, complaining about something they found distasteful. So, it's a gut reaction, it's not scientific, I
must admit. I wish there were better research on this. But I do know that when I push forward on something that I think is acceptable and the public does not like it, they react immediately. And they react—you know—is a hundred letters the whole world? But a hundred letters when you haven't been receiving letters on a particular show is an instant reaction that something went wrong."

4. What standards do you use in editing a movie for television?

Schneider (ABC) "We use our own written standards, of which I will be happy to send you a copy." (See Appendix B)

Traviesas (NBC) "Well, let's start off by saying we use the same basic taste standards on all our entertainment programs. For instance, I'll give you some specifics: at NBC we're very tough on the use of language. That is, we find unacceptable words like 'sonofabitch,' the four-letter gutter words, scatological words. So that standard goes throughout whether it is a feature film that was made for the theatrical release or whether it was 'McCLOUD' made for the 'Mystery Movie.' The difficulty and the frame of reference that comes into play when we're cutting a feature film like 'The Owl and
the Pussycat' is that in one case you have, in 'Owl and Pussycat' a film that you had no input at the beginning also is a well known theatrical release. In the other case like 'McCloud,' you have the right of editing and correcting right at the outline and script level. So that you are able to take things out there, that is more difficult to take out when you have a finished product. And our attempt at the finished product like 'Owl and the Pussycat' include 'not to ruin the basic creative integrity of that film.' And at times, NBC has turned down films because we have felt that the number of edits required would just ruin the story."

Do you re-submit your films to the Motion Picture Association?

"No, ABC is the only one. That's where we and ABC part company in terms that we think it's wrong. It is our belief that we are the standard bearers, not the Motion Picture Company. I personally, seldom realize that I'm looking at an 'R' movie until the very end then I'll say--'I guess that was rated R.' The judgment I have to make is what do I think NBC's standards are to put that movie so it's general family audience."

What sort of feedback have you at (name of network)
received from the general viewing public about advisories?

Schneider (ABC) Since the expanded use of advisories began, we've had no complaints.*

Traviesas (NBC) "Nothing since initiation of advisories about the use of sophisticated matter."

8. What sort of feedback have you at (name of network) received from affiliate stations about advisories for motion pictures on television?

Schneider (ABC) Some use addition advisories, most seem happy with the set-up.*

Traviesas (NBC) "They like it!"

Research Question Number 6

Research question number 6 asks if networks are doing everything possible to keep advisories from becoming enticing advertisements for motion pictures on television. Question 5 and 6 on the Questionnaire for Networks give responses to these questions.

* Due to distortion in the recording, exact quotations are impossible.
5. What can the network do to keep advisories from becoming an exploitation tool?

Schneider (ABC) "The control of whether an advisory is used or not, is within the Standards and Practices Department. It has no connection with Programming or Sales, but only with the legislative body. So that is in no way used as a promotion by these departments."

Traviesas (NBC) "That's my job! My job is, you see, the creative fraternity, they don't do it now because they know our tough standards, but when we first started using the legend they would say to me, 'Well, why are you worried about it?' Why not go into the scene that's about as close to copulation as you can see, because you're going to put up a legend. And we said the legend is only an afterthought. The legend will only be used if we think, after we put the whole thing together, there's still something in there that we should tell the public about. Therefore, it is our job as Broadcast Standards to be sure it doesn't go beyond normal limits. That's what I just told you up front, the legend has added a tremendous responsibility to my job."
6. What distinction is there between advisories that appear prior to 9 P.M. and those that appear past 9 P.M. (wording, reasoning, etc.)?

Schneider (ABC) Due to tape distortion, most of Mr. Schneider's remarks were inaudible. However, he did mention that advisories are often worded as they occur according to the type of program, time period, etc.

Traviesas (NBC) "There is a little bit of frame difference. Let me give you an example. First of all, at NBC we have never used an advisory on a regular show that appeared between the early evening hours which is now called Family Hour. But we have had shows which were in our development that lend themselves only to three hours—'Law and Order' was a recent one. That was eight o'clock to eleven, that story, and therefore we used a legend. The reason we used it on the 'Lindberg Kidnap Case' which was also eight to eleven o'clock and we used it on 'James Dean—Protrait or Friend' which is eight to ten o'clock. I think the easiest one to explain is 'James Dean.' When I finally looked at that, I realized that there was an important segment of it having to do with a subject that not many people talk about, and some children in the audience might turn around to their folks
and ask what was Mr. Dean trying to do in trying to get the young man to meet an older man at a bar—it was a homosexual relationship. Not that it was dirty, not that it was done as a distasteful thing, but only a sophisticate would understand what Dean was trying to do. And it would raise a lot of questions, it could raise a lot of questions. Also the relationship of Dean himself with a young lady who was lame, was very borderline and, therefore, we thought it would be best to put a legend on that one. On the 'Law and Order' one, which is the recent one, that was a tough story based on the book, based on the lifestyle of the New York police force during the time the Irish were in control. I hate to use the word—but an Irish mafia—and there was the relationship of the Irish against the Jew, there was the relationship of this man who had an affair with a Black harlot, and it was a tough story all the way through. And again, because it started at eight o'clock, because it was a three hour story, we thought a legend was necessary. Now, let's take 'The Call of the Wild' which we just had on. 'Call of the Wild' was based on London's story and very closely depicted the actual story which was the submission of the beautiful dog to become a pat
dog. It was our judgment, that should the Program Department put that in at eight o'clock, we definitively would have put on a legend because children are concerned about having an animal hurt. Even though it already had its own legend up front saying that the American Humane Society supervised the whole depiction of the dog. You think the dog is being hit, but it is never hit—it is cut away. So a dog is never hurt, but a young kid doesn't know that as he watches it. When they decided to put it on at 9 o'clock, there was a difference of opinion here as to whether we should or should not, and we decided not to put it on at nine o'clock because at that time, we felt, that the parent had more control of the dial, and that the reason for putting on a legend was not necessary. That it would again, be more titillating than necessary. However, an interesting thing happened. The press which reviewed the show that week prior to when it went on the air, came out both in the Daily News here, and in the AP report and said that we probably were going to put on the most brutal dog scenes they'd ever seen on television. This concerned our management, and I got a call, and I went to a meeting, and we discussed it out, and the President of the network then suggested, late Friday, that even though
we had the legend, let's not have a mistake like we
did on 'Born Innocent' of not having it voice
over—it was only video. So I ordered up the voice
over at the last minute on Friday—it was going to
be on Saturday—and then I said, 'Let's play it
safe and do it again at the second act break.'
And we repeated it both times. We still got 70 or
80 phone calls here in New York, and we still will
get letters—we knew it going in. We got it on
one movie just because a little bird was killed."
CHAPTER IV
DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study is to seek specific information about attitudes toward viewer advisories that precede motion pictures on television. Information concerning such attitudes comes from three sources: the general public, local station management, and the three major networks.

Six different issues arise from the goal of obtaining attitude information about advisory legends. It is these six issues which comprise the research questions for this study and with which this chapter will deal.

The General Public and Advisories

The intent of research question number 1 is to determine if the public is considering advisories when selecting a motion picture to be viewed on television. A secondary part of this question is whether people watch television mostly in the company of others or by themselves. Questions 7, 8, 10, and 17 on the General Public Questionnaire were used to answer this research question.
The data indicates that most people are aware of viewer advisories (Table 7) and most people understand the message of the advisories (Table 8). The majority (59.5%) of the subjects questioned consider advisories when selecting programs (Table 9), and 50% of these subjects almost always consider advisories (Table 10). Significantly, reported at the .01 level, more subjects with children in the household consider advisories than those without children (Table 11). However, age of the children in the household is not a factor in considering advisories; use of advisories was nearly equal for both age groups of children (Table 13). High School Graduates reported the greatest use of advisories, while College Graduates or Beyond reported the least use of advisories (Table 12).

Considering the second part of research question number 1, 84.3% of the respondents watch television with others, and only 15.7% said they watch television mostly alone (Table 14).

In reviewing the information for research question number 1, it may be concluded that most respondents are aware of viewer advisories and understand advisory messages. The majority of respondents consider advisories when selecting programs and do so almost always.

The second conclusion drawn from research question
number 1 is that respondents who have children in the household, regardless of the children's age, consider advisories more than those respondents who do not have children in the household. Percentages also indicate that respondents who are college graduates or beyond consider advisories less than any other educational level. This result is logical in terms of the amount of exposure to more sources of stimuli that is a part of higher formal education. The finding has nothing to do with intelligence level, but only with the greater exposure to literary and art works, and the assertiveness to make a decision about content of such works.

The final conclusion for research question number 1 is that television seems to be a social entertainment, shared in the company of others.

General Public Agreement with Network Practices

Research question number 2 asks, "Does the public agree with current network practices in the selection of motion pictures for television and advisement on the pictures?" Responses to questions 9, 11, 12, 13, and 16 on the General Public Questionnaire were analyzed to answer this research question. Regardless of age, most subjects feel that language, sensuous scenes, and violence, all affect the use of an advisory before a movie on television (Tables 15A and 15B). Also
regardless of age, most subjects feel that some movies on television should carry viewer advisories but do not (Table 18).

Significantly more households with children than households without children feel that some movies on television should carry viewer advisories but do not (reported at the .05 level; Table 16). A significantly greater percentage (reported at the .01 level) of High School Graduates than College Graduates or Beyond feel that some movies on television should carry viewer advisories but do not (Table 17).

The greatest percentage of subjects in all categories of analysis do not feel that some movies on television have advisories that do not need them (Tables 19, 20, and 21).

For the consideration of movies on television being too explicit in their portrayal of sex, violence, and language, there is a significant difference between subjects over 40 years old and subjects under 40 years old (reported at the .05 level). Of the subjects over 40, 77.6% feel that movies on television are too explicit compared with 58.6% of the subjects under 40 who feel the same way (Table 24).

Subjects who graduated from high school and subjects with some college compared with subjects who are College
Graduates or Beyond show a significantly greater percentage (reported at the .05 level) who feel that movies on television are too explicit (Table 23).

A greater percentage of households with children in secondary grades compared with households with children in pre-school or elementary grades said that a significant number of movies on television violate the moral standards they have set for their families (Table 26). Subjects with some high school or less and those who are High School Graduates both of whom have children in the household, feel that a significant number of movies on television violate the moral standards they have set for their families (Table 27).

These results show a trend that indicates the majority of the respondents would prefer advisories to be placed on more movies on television. The majority of the respondents sampled feel that movies on television are too explicit in their portrayal of sex, violence, and language. The only group that does not have a majority feeling that movies on television are too explicit are those who are College Graduates or Beyond.

High School Graduates with children in the household and households with children in secondary grades reported the greatest percentage who feel that movies on television violate the moral standards set for their
families. One possible explanation for the age level of the children in this case could be that these children are at an age when they are easily influenced by anything that seems "socially acceptable." Explicit scenes from movies on television could lead children at this age to try what they see. It would then be logical for the parents of children at this influential age to be concerned about the moral standard set for their children.

Time Spent Watching Television

The purpose of research question number 3 is twofold. First, the question determines how many hours a day different groups of people watch television. Second, the question determines if people know when the family viewing time set aside by the networks in conjunction with the initiation of viewer advisories is broadcast.

There is a significant difference (reported at the .01 level) in the amount of time households with children watch television compared with the amount of time households without children watch television. The largest percentage (44.3%) of households with children watch television 3 to 4 hours a day (Table 28). The largest percentage of households without children (42.9%) watch television less than 3 hours a day (Table 28).

Subjects over 40 years old watch television
significantly less than subjects under 40 years old (reported at the .01 level; Table 29). The daily reported amount of television viewing for subjects over 40 years is 4 hours or less per day (Table 29). This result is similar to the 1973 study by Davis, et al. which showed that for subjects 60 to beyond 80, the average amount of daily television viewing was 3.41 hours (p. 73).

In households with children, 50.7% of the subjects knew the correct family viewing time (Table 30). Only 42.9% of the households without children knew the correct family viewing time period (Table 30).

More subjects with some college or beyond knew the correct time for Family Viewing than subjects who are High School Graduates or Less (Table 31). This result relates to the findings in the 1976 Opinion Research Corporation study for TV Guide which reported that subjects with some college education are almost twice as positive toward Family Viewing Time as those with an eighth-grade education or less (Ryan, p. 8).

Several conclusions can be drawn about the amount of time per day spent watching television and knowledge of Network Family Viewing Time.

First, people under 40 years old and households with children spend the most time each day watching television.

Second, the trend indicates that households with
children and people who have more formal education are those who are most knowledgeable of the Network Family Viewing Time.

Local Stations and Advisories

In terms of the local stations working with the networks to best advise the public about the more explicit motion pictures on television, information obtained for research question number 4 provides insight in this area.

All responses from managers of local stations in the Orlando area show these managers feel that viewer advisories are good and that the managers agree with current network practices for advisories in most cases. Because of the different tastes of their local viewers, all of the local stations have issued some control over movies on television above and beyond network control.

The question of frequency of placing advisories on a local level is raised. Mr. Walter Windsor (Channel 9-ABC) expressed the fear that many local stations are lethargic about giving thought and attention to advisories. Further in-depth interviewing with the other local stations would be necessary before a conclusion could be drawn in this area. However, noting the response to attempts to initiate such in-depth interviews with the other local stations, Mr. Windsor's statement may be legitimate.
Generally, from the information obtained from the three local stations, they seem to be favoring their respective networks' policies for advisories. All information shows that the local stations work with the networks to advise the public about the more explicit motion pictures on television.

The Networks and Advisories

Research question number 5 seeks to determine if the networks are discerning, as accurately as possible, motion pictures on television to carry advisories. Information for this question can be based only on the responses from ABC and NBC networks as CBS was not available for interview. Questions 1 through 4 plus 7 and 8 on the Questionnaire for Networks were used to answer research question number 5.

Both Mr. Schneider (ABC) and Mr. Traviesas (NBC) emphasized the fact that everyone in the general public cannot be pleased all the time. Both gentlemen also pointed out the many considerations of editing, time scheduling, and input from the public and local station affiliates that precede a decision to air a movie on television. They agreed that there is no scientific formula for placing advisories. Mr. Traviesas pointed out that because of the subjective nature of the decision, sometimes mistakes in judgment are made concerning
advisories.

The information from ABC and NBC indicates that these two networks make every possible effort to make films acceptable for general television viewing and to advise the audience of any questionable content.

Advisories as Advertisements

The purpose of research question number 6 is to determine if networks are doing everything possible to keep advisories from becoming enticing advertisements for motion pictures on television. Again, information can only be based on responses from ABC and NBC. Questions 5 and 6 on the Questionnaire for Networks were used to answer research question number 6.

Both network executives were adamant about their departments' efforts to keep advisories from becoming an advertisement. Mr. Schneider (ABC) stressed the separation of ABC's Standards and Practices Department from Programming and Sales. This jurisdiction assures the network that the advisory legend will in no way affect the promotional sales of the movie on television.

Mr. Traviesas (NBC) several times noted the efforts made to avoid titillating the audience with an advisory. He also mentioned the tremendous responsibility of Broadcast Standards to make sure the creative fraternity does not abuse the use of the advisory, and to make
sure advised movies do not go beyond normal limits of NBC's programming standards.

**Implications for Future Research**

The conclusions drawn from the data gathered in this research suggest that the general public is aware of viewer advisories, is using the advisories, and is concerned about the content of motion pictures on television. Additionally, the local stations attempt to determine local tastes as they work with the networks to advise questionable content in motion pictures on television. ABC and NBC networks give much time and attention to content of movies on television and control of the advisory legends.

This study, however, was conducted on a limited basis, and future research might attempt to replicate this survey using a general public sample from a different geographical area of the nation to possibly determine a difference in "local tastes." Thought also might be given to do a comparison study using rural and urban areas.

Secondly, a study of local station policies from different areas might be studied to determine criteria for issuing advisories on the local level.

It would also be interesting in future research to elicit the views of the CBS network. This would enable
the researcher to compare the policies of all three of the major networks.

A final consideration for future research would be the expanded use of advisories. The framework of this study dealt only with the advisories used for motion pictures on television. Other entertainment programs sometimes carry viewer advisories, and future research might obtain information about the policies and attitudes in such cases.

Summary

There were three major goals to this study based on the three sources of information for the data in the study. In terms of the general public, which was the first source of information, the data indicates that most respondents use advisories when selecting a program and in many cases the majority of respondents would like to see advisories for more motion pictures on television. In many instances, the respondents feel that movies on television are too explicit in their portrayal of sex, violence, and language. Data also indicates that only a marginal majority of respondents who watch the most television per day are aware of Network Family Viewing Time.

The second goal of this research was to determine if local stations are working with the networks to best
advise the public about explicit motion pictures on television. The data indicates that local stations do follow network advisory practices. However, there are potentialities that more advisories should be initiated on the local station level.

Using ABC and NBC Networks as the sources of information for the third goal of the study, network policies and practices concerning advisories were determined. Analyzing information from ABC and NBC, data indicates that these networks use every method available to them to select and edit movies so they are acceptable for general family viewing on television. Responses from these two networks also indicate that much precaution is used to keep advisory legends from becoming an advertisement for motion pictures on television.

The networks and local stations can only base their policies for advisories on the feedback they receive from their viewing audience. Consideration should be given to regular review of the attitudes of the viewing public regarding advisories, and also of the practices and procedures of the local stations and the networks.
APPENDIX A

PORTIONS OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF BROADCASTERS TELEVISION CODE

PREAMBLE

Television is seen and heard in nearly every American home. These homes include children and adults of all ages, embrace all races and all varieties of philosophic or religious conviction and reach those of every educational background. Television broadcasters must take this pluralistic audience into account in programming their stations. They are obligated to bring their positive responsibility for professionalism and reasoned judgment to bear upon all those involved in the development, production and selection of programs.

The free, competitive American system of broadcasting which offers programs of entertainment, news, general information, education and culture is supported and made possible by revenues from advertising. While television broadcasters are responsible for the programming and advertising on their stations, the advertisers who use television to convey their commercial messages also have a responsibility to the viewing audience. Their advertis-
ing messages should be presented in an honest, responsible and tasteful manner. Advertisers should also support the endeavors of broadcasters to offer a diversity of programs that meet the needs and expectations of the total viewing audience.

The viewer also has a responsibility to help broadcasters serve the public. All viewers should make their criticisms and positive suggestions about programming and advertising known to the broadcast licensee. Parents particularly should oversee the viewing habits of their children, encouraging them to watch programs that will enrich their experience and broaden their intellectual horizons.

PROGRAM STANDARDS

1. Principles Governing Program Content

It is the interest of television as a vital medium to encourage programs that are innovative, reflect a high degree of creative skill, deal with significant moral and social issues and present challenging concepts and other subject matter that relate to the world in which the viewer lives.

Television programs should not only reflect the influences of the established institutions that shape our values and culture, but also expose the dynamics of social change which bear upon our lives.
To achieve these goals, television broadcasters should be conversant with the general and specific needs, interests and aspirations of all the segments of the communities they serve. They should affirmatively seek out responsible representatives of all parts of their communities so that they may structure a broad range of programs that will inform, enlighten, and entertain the total audience.

Broadcasters should also develop programs directed toward advancing the cultural and educational aspects of their communities.

To assure that broadcasters have the freedom to program fully and responsibly, none of the provisions of this Code should be construed as preventing or impeding broadcast of the broad range of material necessary to help broadcasters fulfill their obligations to operate in the public interest.

The challenge to the broadcaster is to determine how suitably to present the complexities of human behavior. For television, this requires exceptional awareness of considerations peculiar to the medium.

Accordingly, in selecting program subjects and themes, great care must be exercised to be sure that treatment and presentation are made in good faith and not for the purpose of sensationalism or to shock or exploit
the audience or appeal to purient interests or morbid curiosity.

Additionally, entertainment programming inappropriate for viewing by a general family audience should not be broadcast during the first hour of network entertainment programming in prime time and in the immediately preceding hour. In the occasional case when an entertainment program in this time period is deemed to be inappropriate for such an audience, advisories should be used to alert viewers. Advisories should also be used when programs in later prime time periods contain material that might be disturbing to significant segments of the audience.*

These advisories should be presented in audio and video form at the beginning of the program and when deemed appropriate at a later point in the program. Advisories should also be used responsibly in promotional material in advance of the program. When using an advisory, the broadcaster should attempt to notify publishers of television program listings.*

Special care should be taken with respect to the content and treatment of audience advisories so that they do not disserve their intended purpose by containing material that is promotional, sensational or exploitative.

* Effective September 1975
Promotional announcements for programs that include advisories should be scheduled on a basis consistent with the purpose of the advisory.*

II. Responsibility Toward Children

Broadcasters have a special responsibility to children. Programs designed primarily for children should take into account the range of interests and needs of children from instructional and cultural material to a wide variety of entertainment material. In their totality, programs should contribute to the sound, balanced development of children to help them achieve a sense of the world at large and informed adjustments to their society.

In the course of a child's development, numerous social factors and forces, including television, affect the ability of the child to make the transition to adult society.

The child's training and experience during the formative years should include positive sets of values which will allow the child to become a responsible adult, capable of coping with the challenges of maturity.

Children should also be exposed, at the appropriate times, to a reasonable range of the realities which exist

* Effective September 1975
in the world sufficient to help them make the transition to adulthood.

Because children are allowed to watch programs designed primarily for adults, broadcasters should take this practice into account in the presentation of material in such programs when children may constitute a substantial segment of the audience.

All the standards set forth in this section apply to both program and commercial material designed and intended for viewing by children.

IV. Special Program Standards

1. Violence, physical or psychological, may only be projected in responsibly handled contexts, not used exploitatively. Programs involving violence should present the consequences of it to its victims and perpetrators. Presentation of the details of violence should avoid the excessive, the gratuitous and the instructional. The use of violence for its own sake and the detailed dwelling upon brutality or physical agony, by sight or by sound, are not permissible. The depiction of conflict, when presented in programs designed primarily for children, should be handled with sensitivity.
2. The treatment of criminal activities should always convey their social and human effects. The presentation of techniques of crime in such detail as to be instructional or invite imitation shall be avoided.

3. Narcotic addiction shall not be presented except as a destructive habit. The use of illegal drugs or the abuse of legal drugs shall not be encouraged or shown as socially acceptable.

4. The use of gambling devices or scenes necessary to the development of plot or as appropriate background is acceptable only when presented with discretion and in moderation, and in a manner which would not excite interest in, or foster, betting nor be instructional in nature.

5. Telecasts of actual sports programs at which on-the-scene betting is permitted by law shall be presented in a manner in keeping with federal, state and local laws, and should concentrate on the subject as a public sporting event.

6. Special precautions must be taken to avoid demeaning or ridiculing members of the audience who suffer from physical or mental
afflictions or deformities.

7. Special sensitivity is necessary in the use of material relating to sex, race, color, age, creed, religious functionaries or rites, or national or ethnic derivation.

8. Obscene, indecent or profane matter, as proscribed by law, is unacceptable.

9. The presentation of marriage, the family and similarly important human relationships, and material with sexual connotations, shall not be treated exploitatively or irresponsibly, but with sensitivity. Costuming and movements of all performers shall be handled in a similar fashion.

10. The use of liquor and the depiction of smoking in program content shall be de-emphasized. When shown, they should be consistent with plot and character development.

11. The creation of a state of hypnosis by act or detailed demonstration on camera is prohibited, and hypnosis as a form of "parlour game" antics to create humorous situations within a comedy setting is forbidden.

12. Program material pertaining to fortune-telling, occultism, astrology, phrenology, palm-reading,
numerology, mind-reading, character-reading, and the like is unacceptable if it encourages people to regard such fields as providing commonly accepted appraisals of life.

13. Professional advice, diagnosis and treatment will be presented in conformity with law and recognized professional standards.

14. Any technique whereby an attempt is made to convey information to the viewer by transmitting messages below the threshold of normal awareness is not permitted.

15. The use of animals, consistent with plot and character delineation, shall be in conformity with accepted standards of humane treatment.

16. Quiz and similar programs that are presented as contests of knowledge, information, skill or luck must, in fact, be genuine contest; and the results must not be controlled by collusion with or between contestants, or by any other action which will favor one contestant against any other.

17. The broadcaster shall be constantly alert to prevent inclusion of elements within a program dictated by factors other than the requirements of the program itself. The acceptance of cash
payments or other considerations in return for including scenic properties.

18. Contests may not constitute a lottery.

19. No program shall be presented in a manner which through artifice or simulation would mislead the audience as to any material fact. Each broadcaster must exercise reasonable judgment to determine whether a particular method of presentation would constitute a material deception, or would be accepted by the audience as normal theatrical illusion.

20. A television broadcaster should not present fictional events or other non-news material as authentic news telecasts or announcements, nor should he permit dramatizations in any program which would give the false impression that the dramatized material constitutes news.

21. The standards of this Code covering program content are also understood to include, wherever applicable, the standards contained in the advertising section of the Code.
APPENDIX B

ABC NEWS RELEASE
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

January 8, 1975

ABC ANNOUNCES THAT STARTING WITH 1975 FALL SEASON, FIRST HOUR OF EACH NIGHT OF PRIME TIME SCHEDULE WILL BE DEVOTED TO PROGRAMMING FOR GENERAL FAMILY AUDIENCES

The American Broadcasting Company announced today that the first hour of each night of its prime time network entertainment schedule will be devoted to programming suitable for general family audiences starting with the new television season in the Fall of 1975.

When, in ABC's judgment, programming in this time period may, on occasion, contain material which might be regarded as unsuitable for younger family members, viewers will be advised both visually and aurally at the start of such programs.

In a statement on its policies on broadcasts which portray violence and adult themes, ABC emphasized a continuing awareness of its obligation to select with sensitivity its programs; cognizant of the possible effect that violence and adult themes may have on the audience, particularly younger viewers.

In order to better inform viewers, ABC has been televising audio and video advisory announcements, when appropriate, in certain entertainment programs to afford parents the opportunity of exercising discretion with regard to younger viewers.

As part of a continuing review of these policies, ABC recently increased the use of advisory announcements and will now also include them in on-air promotion and print advertising.

A statement of ABC's policies on broadcasts which portray violence and adult themes is attached.

(MORE)
The American Broadcasting Company issued the following statement in response to recent inquiries about its policies on broadcasts which portray violence and adult themes:

The American Broadcasting Company acknowledges and accepts the continuing responsibility to its viewers for all programs broadcast by the ABC Television Network. We are, and have been, aware of our obligation to select, with sensitivity, programs, cognizant of the possible effect that violence and certain adult themes may have on that audience, particularly younger viewers.

Aware of current public opinion concerns and in order to better inform the viewing audience, ABC has been televising audio and video advisory announcements, when appropriate, in certain entertainment programs to afford parents the opportunity to exercise discretion in regard to younger viewers.

As part of a continuing review of these policies, we have recently increased the use of such audio-visual viewer advisories, and will also now be including them in print advertising and on-air promotional material.

As an additional measure, starting with the new television season in the Fall of 1975, the first hour of each night of the week of our prime time network entertainment schedule will be devoted to programming suitable for general family audiences. When in our judgment, programming in this period may, on occasion, contain material which might be regarded as unsuitable for younger members of the family, the audience will be appropriately advised as outlined above.

We wish to emphasize the necessity to preserve the basic rights of freedom of expression under the Constitution and under the Communications Act. Government action in the area of program content must be both cautious and carefully limited lest we do permanent damage to the principles of free expression which are so fundamental in our society. All Americans recognize, we are sure, that these are sensitive and fragile concepts. Accordingly, ABC strongly supports the concept of industry self-regulation.

The providing of network television programming is an extremely complicated task which we attempt to do in a responsible fashion. We serve a diverse audience, among whom are people with wide differences of opinion about our programs. For instance, there are those who look upon the treatment of certain subjects in dramatic programs as too controversial to be touched upon. There are also those who feel that these same subjects reflect changes in our society which television should realistically portray; and if not, has failed its responsibility. It is for these reasons that we attempt to present each season a balanced program schedule with diverse content and program types which will appeal to broad segments of the public.

(MORE)
Since June of 1963, the following has been the policy of American Broadcasting Company with respect to portrayal of violence in television programs:

"The use of violence for the sake of violence is prohibited. In this connection, special attention should be given to encourage the de-emphasis of acts of violence.

While a storyline or plot development may call for the use of force -- the amount, manner of portrayal and necessity for same should be commensurate with a standard of reasonableness and with due regard for the principle that violence, or the use of force, as an appropriate means to an end, is not to be emulated."

Additionally, special attention has been directed to avoid close-ups of demonstrations of criminal techniques. The foregoing has been brought to the attention of producers of ABC entertainment programs on a regular basis.

It has also been ABC's policy, since April, 1972, to prohibit acts of personal violence from being portrayed in teasers, prologues and promotional announcements.

In connection with the application of this policy and because of our special concerns over the possible effects of televised violence on young people, ABC took the initiative to sponsor on-going research in this area and has retained two teams of entirely independent research consultants. An important adjunct to this research is the refinement and continued development of guidelines by which we can effectuate our policies. We have found, for example, that violence can be responsibly portrayed to the extent to which its consequences are adequately depicted in depth. Under these circumstances, such portrayals may even have the effect of reinforcing real-life prohibitions, thereby acting as a suppressor of violence. On the other hand, as it is clear that gratuitous violence serves no useful purpose and may be emulated, we are extremely cautious in avoiding the portrayal of specific, detailed techniques involved in the use of weapons, the commission of crimes or avoidance of detection.
ADULT SUBJECT MATTER

In meeting the challenge to present innovative programming which deals with significant moral or social issues and with current topical program treatments of inter-personal relationships, it has been a guiding principle that the presentation of such material be accomplished unexploitatively, unsensationally and responsibly. In relation to made-for-television programs it is the responsibility of the Standards and Practices Department to review material which includes sensitive or controversial matter from the script state through the final print so as to avoid the exploitative and sensational.

Feature films initially produced by others for theatrical release are screened prior to acquisition by ABC to determine, in the first instance, the acceptability of the overall theme and tenor of the films, and, if appropriate, in the second instance, the nature and extent of editing which we will require to assure compliance with our policies. After acquisition the films are screened again to review prior judgments, and as an additional measure, the edited version is viewed prior to telecast to insure compliance with broadcast standards and practices directives. In the event a film which we proposed to televise was originally rated "R", we require that it be resubmitted to the Motion Picture Association of America for reclassification in terms of their judgment and on the basis of our editing. If the MPAA feels that the edits would have made the picture presentable theatrically with a higher rating than "R", e.g., "PG" or "G", we will then accept it for telecast.

As a matter of practice ABC follows the following procedures:

1. Advisory announcements, when made, are commonly telecast in the following form:

   "This film deals with mature subject matter. Parental judgment and discretion are advised."

2. All affiliates are furnished Advance Program Advisory bulletins detailing content.

3. Closed circuit previews of prime time programs are presented on a regularly scheduled rotational basis.

(MORE)
4. Advance descriptive program information is made available to the NAB Code Authority and the NAB Code Authority Director is accorded an opportunity to request screenings prior to broadcast. All pilot programs are prescreened for the NAB Code Authority Director.

5. Our independent outside consultants (Dr. Melvin Heller and Dr. Samuel Polsky) review all pilots and other programming from time to time as requested by the Standards and Practices Department.

The foregoing policies will continue to be implemented by our Department of Broadcast Standards and Practices in consultation with ABC's independent professional consultants.
APPENDIX C

SCRIPT FOR GENERAL PUBLIC QUESTIONNAIRE

Hello, my name is ______________. I'm conducting some research for Florida Technological University. I would like to take about three minutes of your time, if you will answer a few questions for me. Any information you give me will be confidential and in no way will your identity be connected to your answers or to the study.

That completes the questions for the survey. Thank you very much.
GENERAL PUBLIC QUESTIONNAIRE

PART I.

1. Do you have a television set that you can watch?
   ( ) YES
   ( ) NO

PART II. DEMOGRAPHICS

2. Sex
   ( ) MALE
   ( ) FEMALE

3. In which of the following ranges does your age fall?
   ( ) 20 or under
   ( ) 21-30
   ( ) 31-40
   ( ) 41-50
   ( ) Over 50

4. How much formal schooling have you completed?
   ( ) Elementary School or Less
   ( ) Some High School
   ( ) High School Graduate
   ( ) Some College
   ( ) College Graduate or Beyond
5. In which of the following ranges does your annual family income fall?

- Less than $6,000
- $6,100 to $10,000
- $10,000 to $15,000
- Above $15,000

6. How many children are in your household?

If there are children, are they

- Pre-School
- Elementary
- Secondary
- College

7. Are you aware of viewer advisories that accompany some movies on television? (An advisory is a warning that certain parts of the following program might be unsuitable viewing for some members of your family)

- Yes
- No

8. Do you understand clearly the message of the advisories?

- Yes
- No

9. Which of the following do you feel affects the use of advisory preceding a movie on television?

- Language
- Sensuous Scenes
- Violence
- All of the above

10. Do you take viewer advisories into account when you are selecting television programs to be viewed by your family?

- Yes
- No
If yes: What percentage of the time do you consider advisories?

( ) 10%
( ) 50%
( ) Almost always

11. Do you feel that some movies on television should carry viewer advisories, but do not?

( ) Yes
( ) No

12. Do you feel that some movies on television have advisories that do not need them?

( ) Yes
( ) No

13. Do you feel that movies on television are too explicit in their portrayal of sex, violence, and language?

( ) Yes
( ) No

14. How many hours a day does your household usually watch television?

( ) Less than 3
( ) 3-4
( ) 5-6
( ) 7-8
( ) More than 8

15. When is the time during the broadcast day when programs are specifically set aside by the networks for family viewing?

( ) 5-6
( ) 6-7
( ) 7-8
( ) 8-9
( ) Don't know

16. Do you feel that a significant number of movies on television violate the moral standards you have set for your family?

( ) Yes
( ) No
17. Do you view television most of the time by yourself or with others?

( ) Alone
( ) with others
APPENDIX D

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR LOCAL STATION MANAGERS

1. What is your opinion of viewer advisories that precede some motion pictures on television?
   ( ) Very Good
   ( ) Good
   ( ) Fair
   ( ) Not Good

   Additional Comments:

2. When did your local TV station first start using advisories?

3. If your station has used advisories: What is the major reaction of the viewing audience?
   ( ) Favorable
   ( ) Not Favorable
   ( ) No Reaction

4. Do you feel the general public uses advisories in the spirit in which they are intended; namely as a warning about program content?
   ( ) Yes
   ( ) No

5. Do you feel that the use of advisories is potentially harmful to your station's image?
   ( ) Yes
   ( ) No
6. Do you feel that the public should be allowed to see all movies and to make its own decisions about them?

( ) Yes
( ) No

7. Do you feel that it is up to the local station to censor movies on television above and beyond network controls?

( ) Yes
( ) No

8. Has your local station ever initiated an advisory for a motion picture to be shown on your television station?

( ) Yes
( ) No

9. Do you agree with the current network practices in the placing of advisories before movies on TV.

( ) Agree with current practices
( ) Feel advisories are illplaced or not utilized properly

10. Are you, as a local station owner/operator plugged into the process of deciding which network motion pictures should carry advisories?

( ) Yes
( ) No

11. Does your local station have an adopted written policy on the use of advisories?

( ) Yes
( ) No

12. In your opinion, should there be more or less use of advisories for motion pictures on television?

( ) More
( ) Less
( ) Remain the same
APPENDIX E

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR NETWORKS

1. What event or sequence of events led (name of network) to begin using advisories for motion pictures on television?

2. What was the first motion picture on (name of network) to carry an advisory? When?

3. How do you gauge for mass audience acceptability for content of motion pictures shown on television?

4. What standards do you use in editing a movie for television?

5. What can the network do to keep advisories from becoming an exploitation tool?

6. What distinction is there between advisories that appear prior to 9 p.m. and those that appear past 9 p.m. (wording, reasoning, etc.)?

7. What sort of feedback have you at (name of network) received from the general viewing public about advisories?

8. What sort of feedback have you at (name of network) received from affiliate stations about advisories for motion pictures on television?
Reference Notes


References


Stein, B. Hooked on television movies. The Saturday Evening Post, May 1974, pp. 30-33; 144.
