

Introduction

One major, nagging question that has consumed the interests of media scholars (and, particularly, those of the political socialization bailiwick) within the last two decades is not simply the reaction of adults to television but socialization processes of children vis-a-vis exposure to the electronic medium. The proliferating interest in the latter phenomenon, no doubt, symbolizes a reassuring turnabout from the earlier traditional adult-oriented focus.

However, in a seemingly vivid break with the fledgling *modi operandi* and a potpourri of other procedural problems involved in this "new" concern is the cognizance of the paramountcy of --if not the ascendancy of the vexing disagreements on--television's effects on children.

Although Hyman,¹ Dawson and Prewitt,² and Greenstein,³ inter alia, point to the role of television in socializing children politically, they, however, do so only in incidental (as against forthright) terms, thus somewhat clouding the climate of discord that has characterized milieu of television's effects on its diverse viewing audiences.

¹ Herbert Hyman, Political Socialization (Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1959).

² Richard E. Dawson and Kenneth Prewitt, Political Socialization (Boston: Little Brown and Co., 1969).

³ Fred I. Greenstein, Children and Politics (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1965).

These studies, as well as those of Jennings and Niemi,⁴ seem constrained by limitations on their scope. The last decade, nonetheless, ushered in the halcyon days of a "mixed bag" of research that focussed on political socialization. With Hyman's⁵ premier socialization study of 1959 blazing the trail came mounting evidence that the family, school, peers, and political events together play interdependent roles in the process. McLeod, Chaffee, and Wackman, for instance that family communication patterns affect children's political socialization⁶ while the Bryne of sixth, tenth and eleventh graders found that children more exposed to the electronic media demonstrated more positive attitudes toward the government than did children who were relatively more exposed to the print media.⁷

⁴M. Kent Jennings and Richard Niemi, "Patterns of Political Learning," Harvard Educational Review, 38 (Summer 1968), pp. 443-67, and "The Transmission of Political Values from Parent to Child," American Political Science Review, 62 (March 1968), pp. 169-84.

⁵Herbert Hyman, op. cit.

⁶Steven H. Chaffee, Jack McLeod, and Daniel B. Wackman, "Family Communication Patterns and Adolescent Political Participation," in Jack Dennis, (ed.) Socialization to Politics: A Reader (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1973), pp. 349-64.

⁷Gary C. Bryne, "Mass Media and Political Socialization of Children and Pre-Adults," Journalism Quarterly (Spring 1969), p. 140.

Other studies, in varying degrees, note the effects of peers, the family, school and political events on the process.⁸

Theoretical Orientation and Literature Evaluation

Historically, in the United States, scholarly pursuits in the political socialization milieu could be traced to the late 1920s and early 1930s, a period that the rising interest in civic training and the psychology of child development.⁹ The growth of political science, particularly World War II, and of the social sciences generally, gave added impetus to its current interdisciplinary character.¹⁰

⁸ See, for example, James C. Davies, "The Family's Role in Political Socialization," Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 361 (1965), pp. 10-19; Frank A. Pinner, "Parental Overprotection and Political Distrust," Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 361 (1965), pp. 58-70; Stephen L. Wasby, "The Impact of the Family on Politics: An Essay and Review of the Literature," The Family Life Coordinator, 15 (1966), pp. 3-23; Martin L. Levin, "Social Climates and Political Socialization," Public Opinion Quarterly, 25 (1961), pp. 596-606; David Ziblath, "High School Extracurricular Activities and Political Socialization," Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 361 (1965) pp. 20-31; Robert D. Hess and Judith V. Torney, The Development of Political Attitudes in Children, (Chicago: Aldine, 1967), passim.

⁹ Michael P. Riccards, The Making of the American Citizenry: An Introduction to Political Socialization, (New York: Chandler Publishing Co., 1973), p. 11.

¹⁰

Herbert Hirsch, Poverty and Politicization: Political Socialization in an American Sub-Culture, (New York: The Free Press, 1971), pp. 1-2.

Hyman's work¹¹--the first comprehensive on the subject-- was followed by Greenstein's New Haven survey,¹² Hess's and Torney's Chicago study of 1967,¹³ and by Easton's and Dennis's Children in the Political System: Origins of Political Legitimacy.¹⁴

Although all of these studies delineated a new area of research, they exuded a far-fetched posture in resolving the conceptual and methodological problems that beset them. They were affected, primarily science and by overt political behavior of adults. In addition, they stressed the institution of family, school, and peers as potent agents in the socialization process.

The contributions of psychologists and other social scientists have also been very important in giving a new dimension to the socialization perspective. This is especially so with the cognitive school of thought which is the most widely accepted.

In broad terms,

Political socialization refers to the way in which a society transmits political orientations --knowledge, attitude or norms, and values --from generation to generation. Without such socialization across the

¹¹Herbert Hyman, op. cit.

¹²Fred I. Greenstein, op cit.

¹³Robert D. Hess and J. V. Torney, The Development of Political Attitudes in Children, (Chicago: Aldine, 1967).

¹⁴David Easton and Jack Dennis, Children in the Political System:Origins of

generations, each new member of the system, whether a child newly born into it or an immigrant newly arrived, would have to seek an entirely fresh adjustment in the political sphere.¹⁵

Socialization is such an important aspect of social reality that it is also understood as the "life-long sociopsychological processes in which the individual makes as part of himself the norms, values, and behavior patterns which his society emphasizes."¹⁶

In this study, we will be concerned with the phase of the socialization process that covers the early period of an individual's life, as it has been established that learning during that period of development affects later learning. However, this study concerns itself with that part of the individual's socialization process is relevant to the individual's political development. That is, its focus will be on the politically relevant learning of the young which may be referred to as their political socialization.

¹⁵David Easton and Jack Dennis, "The Child's Image of Government," in Jack Dennis (ed.) op. cit., p. 59.

¹⁶R. H. Blake and E. O. Haroldsen, A Taxonomy of Concepts in Communication, (New York: Hastings House, 1975), p. 67.

In this context, therefore, political socialization will be understood as

all political learning, formal and informal, deliberate and unplanned, at every stage of the life-cycle, including not only explicitly political learning but also nominally nonpolitical learning of political relevant personality characteristics.¹⁷

Gabriel A. Almond speaks of "latent" and "manifest" political socialization. The former is nominally non-political learning, which in some ways affects political behavior, while the latter is the explicit transmission of information, values or feelings vis-a-vis the roles, inputs, and outputs of the political system.¹⁸

Latent and manifest socialization, according to some child development theorists, can occur through incidental learning processes in which personal interaction between the receiver and the communicator is absent.¹⁹

¹⁷ Sidney Kraus, "Mass Communication and Political Socialization: A Re-Assessment of Two Decades of Research," The Quarterly Journal of Speech, 59 (December 1973), p. 390.

¹⁸ Fred I. Greenstein, op. cit., p. 11.

¹⁹ M. Margaret Conway, A. Jay Stevens, Stevens, and Robert G. Smith, "The Relation Between Media Use and Children's Civic Awareness," Journalism Quarterly, 52 (Autumn 1975), pp 531-38.

In that case, the learner, exposed to symbolic or real life models, tends to immitate their behavior. That is, he tends to "reproduce the action, attitudes, or emotional responses exhibited by symbolic real life models."²⁰

Bandura identifies the largest of models as symbolic. Such models may include audiovisual stimuli as provided by television and they may play a major pant in shaping behavior or modifying social norms particularly affecting children and adolescents.²¹

The influence of television in the socialization process seem aided by the fact, among others, that, today in the U. S., 96% of homes have one or more television sets, and that children view at least hours of TV daily by the age of six. Indeed, frequent exposure to TV typically begins at the age of three.²²

Also, American children spend more time watching TV than they spend in the classroom.²³ Parents now depend more and more on television as a babysitter and as an instructor of their children in the ways of the world.²⁴

²⁰Herbert Hirsch, op. cit., p. 22.

²¹Herbert Hirsch, Ibid., pp. 118-20.

²²C. K. Atkin, et. al., "The Surgeon General's Research Program on Television and Social Behavior: A Review of Empirical Findings," Journal of Broadcasting, 16 (Winter 1971-72), p. 21.

²³A. E. Siegel, "Communicating with the Next Generation," Journal of Communication, 25 (Autumn 1975), p. 14.

²⁴C. V. Feilitzen and O. Linne, "Identifying with Television Characters," Journal of Communication, 25 (Autumn 1975), p. 51.

Television affects a young person's attitudes and information, especially on topics where the the environment does not supply first-hand experience or other source of information.²⁵

Rarick et. al., in 1973, studied children's perception of the police as seen on television and in reality. The television perception of police was homogenous, positive, and rather idealized differently from reality.²⁶

It is the purpose of this study to examine what effects television viewing may have on the political socialization of fourth, fifth and sixth graders. The selection of these grades is based on what development psychologists say about the learning capacity of children at these ages, as well as the findings of researchers in the political socialization perspective.

²⁵George Comstock, "The Evidence So Far," Journal of Communication, 25:4 (Autumn 1975), p. 27. See also M. L. DeFleur and L. B. DeFleur, "The Relative Contribution of Television as a Learning Source for Children's Occupational Knowledge," American Sociological Review, 32 (1967), pp. 777-89, and Neil Hollander, "Adolescents and the war: The Sources of Socialization," Journalism Quarterly, (Autumn 1971), pp. 472-79.

²⁶David L. Rarick, et. al., "Adolescent Perceptions of Police: Actual and as Depicted in TV Drama," Journalism Quarterly, 50 (Autumn 1973), pp. 438-46.

Children of these ages have been found to have developed a strong orientation toward political compliance, an abstract allegiance to the nation-state, the positive manifestation of common good, unity, and national primacy, along with the negative manifestation of egoism and apathy.²⁷

Greenstein reports "the years between nine and thirteen are an undramatic but crucial period of both sociopsychological and political development."²⁸ During that age period, the child, from near total ignorance of adult politics, acquires an awareness of most adult features of political behavior.²⁹ Easton and Dennis see childhood as a period of non-political but politically relevant learning.³⁰ A similar study by et. al. examined party identification, voting choict activity, and perception of government in relation to media consumption, and especially television. They found significant variations with television news consumption but not with total television viewing. Controlling for grade and sex, and again with news watching but not total television viewing, some significant relationships were revealed. Girls showed greater difference in party policy

²⁷Michael P. Riccards, The Making of the American Citizenry: An Introduction to Political Socialization, (New York: Chandler Publishing Co., 1973), pp. 69-81.

²⁸Fred I. Greenstein, *op. cit.*, p. 1

²⁹Fred I. Greenstein, *Ibid.*, pp. 1 and 32.

³⁰David Easton and Jack Dennis, *op. cit.*, p. 77.

activity than boys, and their perceptions were lower in higher grades. Party choice was also lower among fifth and sixth graders than among fourth graders. The pattern, though, was similar with political efficacy.³¹

In a study by Rubin of seventh graders, the media were evaluated as principal sources of information and the level of political information or attitudes toward political objects. This study revealed significant relationships with television exposure, generally, and types of television exposure, particularly.³²

Variables and Operational Explication of Key Concepts

Cast against the background of the preceding analysis, and assuming that television is a primary of political socialization, it (exposure to television) constitutes the independent variable. Operationally, it is understood in terms of General Television Exposure (GTE).

Political socialization is construed as the dependent variable. It is understood in terms of the level of Political Information (PI) and the Perception of Government (PG), the latter being subsumed as Perception of Government-Idealistic (GPI) and Perception of Government-Favorable (GPF).

³¹M. Margaret Conway, et. al., op. cit., pp. 531-38.

³²Alan M. Rubin, "Television in Children's Political Socialization," Journal of Broadcasting, 20 (Winter 1976), p. 51.

GTE is understood as exposure to television content and is measured as either high (three or more hours of daily viewing) or low (two hours or less of daily viewing).

By (PI) we understand general knowledge of political object, for example, names of officials, administration units, etc.

By Government Perception (GP) we understand two things: first, the degree to which children's perception of it is favorable or unfavorable, and second, the degree to which children perceive government as an institutional process rather than as personalized authority figures, that is, realistic versus idealistic.

At another level of this study, (GTE) is considered as the independent variable in relation to the dependent variables Ethnocentrism (E), Individualism (I), and Political Monism (PM).

By Ethnocentrism (E) we understand the degree to which children perceive their country (or their nation-state) as superior to others.

By Individualism (I) we understand the degree to which the individual is stressed (that is, given priority) over the group.

By Political Monism (PM) we understand the reduction of the political spectrum to a single, unified political outlook, for example, Marxism. It is also the tendency to overlook the divergencies inherent or evident in a political system in favor of a singular perspective --for example, seeing Republican and Democratic parties' programs as not dissimilar.

Design and Procedure

A four-Page questionnaire was filled out, during month of June, 1978, by (N=85) pupils in the fourth, fifth, and sixth grades at Sunnyside Elementary School in New Brighton, Minnesota. The selection of this school was prompted primarily by its accessibility to us, and availability (within time constraints) of a sample that meets the basic criteria of age and size, among others. While an evidently major drawback of our sample is its socioeconomic and racial homogeneity, it is hoped that age, class and sex differences (if controlled on) would show differential response patterns that may be illuminating.

Regarding sex differences, for example, Greenstein pointed out that boys were almost always found to be more "political," were more informed, more partisan leaders, more likely to advocate political change, and more interested in political information.³³ Riccards also asserted that

...appropriate sex-role behavior plays an important part in mediating between the child and the political world. Because politics is considered a masculine activity, male interest is heightened, and feelings of efficacy and saliency are accentuated. For the female citizen, the opposite occurs with obvious results.³⁴

³³Fred I. Greenstein, op. cit., pp. 115-17.

³⁴Riccards, op. cit., p. 55.

A pretest of N=18, of both sexes, and of the three different grades was carried out, of which a final of Questions was drawn up.

The questionnaire was administered during regular school hours, with teachers serving as cohorts in explaining questions to the students.

Twenty-four questions were asked of the respondents and the questions used to explore the dependent variables and independent variables had been rephrased several times before put into the questionnaire.

Indices of Exposure to Television (Independent Variables):

Responses to questions on exposure to television were categorized as either high (three hours or more each day of exposure) or low (two hours or less).

Nineteen questions on the dependent variables were asked of respondents, some open-ended, others close-ended (see attached questionnaire).

The scoring system adopted may be exemplified by stating one of the questions. On ethnocentrism, we stated thus:

"Children in other countries are as good as children in the United States." If a subject answered "agree," he was considered not to be ethnocentric. He got 0 point. If he answered "disagree," it is considered that he was ethnocentric. He got 2 points. If the respondent answered "don't know," the weight was 1.

Statistical Analysis:

To understand clearly whether or not television exposure contributed to the difference in terms of political information (PI), government perception idealistic (GPI), government perception favorable (GPF), ethnocentrism (EN), political monism (PM), and Individualism (ID), a statistical analysis of the answers given to the questions by the subjects shows the following:

Table 1a: The difference of mean scores in terms of dependent variables according to TV exposure of all sample subjects

	Mean Scores						Standard Deviations					
	PI	GPF	GPI	EN	PM	ID	PI	GPF	GPI	EN	PM	ID
High TV Exposure (53)	0.774	0.931	0.918	0.67	0.818	0.877	0.24	0.48	0.44	0.52	0.47	0.52
Low TV Exposure (32)	0.741	1.051	0.896	0.516	0.896	1.125	0.24	0.46	0.53	0.49	1.36	0.52
Gap	0.003	-0.12	0.022	0.054	0.078	0.248	0.00	0.02	0.09	0.03	0.89	0.00

Table 1b: Statistical evaluation with T-test formula

	PI	GPF	GPI	EN	PM	ID
T Value	0.627	-1.132	0.21	1.347	-0.384	-2.127
Significant	no	no	no	no	no	no

df-83
critical value-
1.671(5%)

I. All Sample Subjects:

Students highly exposed to television had higher mean scores for their level of political information than those lowly exposed by 0.003. (Table 1a) The result was tested as statistically insignificant. (Table 1b)

Those lowly exposed to television had higher mean scores for their level of government perception favorable than those highly exposed by 0.12. The result was tested as statistically insignificant.

Those highly exposed to television had higher mean scores for their level of government perception idealistic than those lowly exposed by 0.022. The result was tested as statistically insignificant.

Those highly exposed to television had higher mean scores for their level of ethnocentrism than those lowly exposed by 0.054. The result was tested as statistically insignificant.

Those lowly exposed to television had higher mean scores for their level of political monism than those highly exposed by 0.078. The result was tested as statistically insignificant.

Those lowly exposed to television had higher mean scores for their level of individualism than those highly exposed by 0.248. The result was tested as statistically insignificant.

From the analysis above, it seems that, so far as the differences of the means are concerned, the students with television exposure had higher scores than those with low exposure with respect to political information, government

perception idealistic, and ethnocentrism, while the students with low television exposure had higher scores than the highly exposed in terms of government perception favorable, political monism, and individualism. The results were tested to be insignificant statically. As a result, it is unlikely to assert that, on the basis the mean scores from the entire subjects regardless of sex and grade, there existed any difference between any level of exposure and the dependent variables. Apparently, television exposure is not necessarily positively related to the dependent variables as hypothesized as a dissection of the answers of the whole respondents to the questions has shown.

Table 2a: The difference of mean scores in terms of dependent variables according to TV exposure of all sample males

	Mean Scores						Standard Deviations					
	PI	GPF	GPI	EN	PM	ID	PI	GPF	GPI	EN	PM	ID
High TV Exposure (25)	0.747	0.867	0.934	0.77	0.881	0.94	0.26	0.53	0.41	0.51	1.74	0.53
Low TV Exposure (18)	0.761	1.019	0.778	0.347	0.76	1.222	0.22	0.45	0.52	0.37	2.40	0.6
Gap	0.014	0.152	0.156	0.423	0.121	0.282	0.04	0.08	0.11	0.14	0.66	0.07

Table 2b: Statistical evaluation with T-test formula

	PI	GPF	GPI	EN	PM	ID
T Value	-0.176	-0.988	1.1	3.003	0.412	-1.636
signi- ficant	no	no	no	**	no	no

df=41
 critical value:
 1.684 (5%)
 2.423 (1%)

II. All Sample Males:

Students lowly exposed to television had higher mean scores for their level of political information than those highly exposed by 0.014. (Table 2a) The result was tested as statistically insignificant. (Table 2b)

Those lowly exposed to television had higher mean scores for their level of government perception favorable than those highly exposed by 0.152. The result was tested as statistically insignificant.

Those highly exposed to television had higher mean scores for their level of government perception idealistic than those lowly exposed by 0.156. The result was tested as statistically insignificant.

Those highly exposed to television had higher mean scores for their level of ethnocentrism than those lowly exposed by 0.423. The result was tested as statistically very significant.

Those highly exposed to television had higher mean scores for their level of political monism than those lowly exposed by 0.121. The result was tested as statistically insignificant.

those lowly exposed to television had higher mean scores for their level of individualism by 0.282. The result was tested as statistically insignificant.

From the analysis above, it is known that, so far as the differences are concerned, the students with high television exposure had higher scores than those with low exposure in terms of government perception idealistic, ethnocentrism, and political monism, but, however, the students with low exposure had higher scores in connection with political information, government perception favorable, and individualism than those highly exposed. Except ethnocentrism there were no dependent variables tested to be significant statistically. Surely, it is supposed that, based on the mean scores all the males got, no positive difference could be found existent between levels of exposure and the dependent variables other than ethnocentrism. The statistical evaluation shows a very strong relationship between high television exposure exposure and ethnocentrism, so this dependent variable is positively related to high exposure. All other hypotheses are rejected.

Table 3a: The difference of mean scores of terms of dependent variables according to TV exposure of all sample females

	Mean Scores						Standard Deviations					
	PI	GPF	GPI	EN	PM	ID	PI	GPF	GPI	EN	PM	ID
High TV Exposure (28)	0.799	0.988	0.905	0.58	0.762	0.821	0.23	0.44	0.47	0.53	2.05	0.5
Low TV Exposure (14)	0.715	1.093	1.048	0.732	1.071	1.0	0.26	0.5	0.52	0.56	3.2	0.3
Gap	0.084	0.105	0.143	0.152	0.309	0.199	0.03	0.06	0.05	0.03	1.15	0.1

Table 3b: Statistical evaluation with T-test formula

	PI	GPF	GPI	EN	PM	ID
T Value	1.071	-0.716	-0.898	-0.862	0.560	-1.143
Significant	no	no	no	no	no	no

df=40
critical value:
1.684 (5%)

III. All Sample Females:

Students highly exposed to television had higher mean scores for their level of political information than those lowly exposed by 0.084. (Table 3a) The result was tested as statistically insignificant. (Table 3b)

Those lowly exposed to television had higher mean scores for their level of government perception favorable than those highly exposed by 0.105. The result was tested as statistically insignificant.

Those lowly exposed to television had higher mean scores for their level of government perception idealistic than those highly exposed by 0.143. The result was tested as statistically insignificant.

Those lowly exposed to television had higher mean scores for their level of ethnocentrism than those highly exposed by 0.152. The result was tested as statistically insignificant.

Those lowly exposed to television had higher scores for their level of political monism than those highly exposed by 0.309. The result was tested as statistically insignificant.

Those lowly exposed to television had higher mean scores for their level of individualism than those highly exposed by 0.179. The result was tested as statistically insignificant.

From the analysis above, it appears that, concerning the differences of the means, the high-exposure students had lower scores than the low-exposure

ones in nearly all the dependent variables excluding political information. Although the results did not arrive at the degree of significance in the wake of a statistical evaluation, it seems that television exposure was negatively related to the latter five dependent variables in view of the mean scores coming from all the females sampled from the three grades. This finding might not be in accordance with what has been discovered in the previous researches on the relationship between mass media political socialization, nor with what has been hypothesized in this study.

Tabel 4b: The difference of mean scores in terms of dependent variables according to TV exposure of 4th-grade subjects

	Mean Scores						Standard Deviations					
	PI	GPF	GPI	EN	PM	ID	PI	GPF	GPI	EN	PM	ID
High TV Exposure (17)	0.628	1.177	1.078	0.897	0.981	0.842	0.23	0.43	0.38	0.54	0.45	0.35
Lcw TV Exposure (11)	0.545	1.332	0.969	0.591	0.85	0.909	0.23	0.49	0.43	0.61	1.46	0.38
Gap	0.083	0.155	0.109	0.306	0.131	0.085	0.00	0.06	0.05	0.07	1.01	0.03

Table 4b: Statistical evaluation with T-test formula

	PI	GPF	GPI	EN	PM	ID
T Value	0.925	-0.886	0.702	1.401	0.348	-0.613
Signifi- cant	no	no	no	no	no	no

df=26
critical value:
1.706 (5%)

IV. The Fourth-Grade Sample Subjects:

Students highly exposed to television had higher mean scores for their level of political information than those lowly exposed by 0.083. (Table 4a) The result was tested as statistically insignificant. (Table 4b)

Those lowly exposed to television had higher scores for their level of government perception favorable than those highly exposed by 0.155. The result was tested as statistically insignificant.

Those highly exposed to television had higher mean scores for their level of government perception idealistic than those lowly exposed by 0.109. The result was tested as statistically insignificant.

Those highly exposed to television had higher mean scores for their level of ethnocentrism than those lowly exposed by 0.306. The result was tested as statistically insignificant.

Those lowly exposed to television had higher scores for their level of individualism than those highly exposed by 0.085. The result was tested as statistically insignificant.

From the analysis above, it is thought that, regarding the differences of the means, the highly TV-exposed students in the sample fourth-grade subjects had high scores than those lowly exposed in political information, government perception idealistic, ethnocentrism and political monism, in spite of the results evaluated statistically to be insignificant, while in the other two dependent variables, the high-exposure students had lower scores than the low-exposure subjects, however. Even if the hypotheses had been rejected of statistical insignificance, among the dependent variables which positively had something to do with the high degree of television exposure purely on the basis of mean scores, ethnocentrism sounded to have much higher T-value than the other three variables.

Table 5a: The difference of mean scores in terms of dependent variables according to TV exposure of 5th-grade subjects

	Mean Scores						Standard Deviations					
	PI	GPF	GPI	EN	PM	ID	PI	GPF	GPI	EN	PM	ID
High TV Exposure (18)	0.778	0.649	0.853	0.417	0.631	0.861	0.26	0.45	0.40	0.27	1.39	0.78
Low TV Exposure (12)	0.78	0.806	0.806	0.458	0.972	1.292	0.16	0.39	0.56	0.38	2.03	0.45
Gap	0.002	0.157	0.047	0.41	0.341	0.431	0.10	0.06	0.16	0.11	0.64	0.33

Table 5b: Statistical evaluation with T-test formula

	PI	GPF	GPI	EN	PM	ID
T Value	-0.02	-0.987	0.269	-0.35	-0.549	-1.72
Significant	no	no	no	no	no	no

df=28
critical value:
1.701 (5%)

V. The Fifth-Grade Sample Subjects:

Students lowly exposed to television had higher mean scores for their level of political information than those highly exposed by 0.002. (Table 5a) The result was statistically insignificant. (Table 5b)

Those lowly exposed to television had higher mean scores for their level of government perception favorable than those highly exposed by 0.157. The result was tested statically insignificant.

Those highly exposed to television had higher mean scores for their level of government perception idealistic than those lowly exposed by 0.047. The result was tested as statistically insignificant.

Those lowly exposed to television had higher mean scores for their level of ethnocentrism than those highly exposed by 0.041. The result was tested as statistically insignificant.

Those lowly exposed to television had higher scores for their level of political monism than those highly exposed by 0.341. The result was tested as statistically insignificant.

Those lowly exposed to television had higher mean scores for their level of individualism than those highly exposed by 0.431. The result was tested as statistically insignificant.

The analysis above indicates that with the exception of government perception idealistic all the dependent variables maintained negative relations with high degree of television exposure in the sense of the disparity of the

mean scores on the part of the fifth-grade respondents. Though tested as insignificant with a T-test formula, the outcome remained to be worth noticing. because television did not exert any positive influence over the pupils of this grade the viewpoints of this observation. No doubt, all the hypotheses are rejected.

Table 6a: The difference of mean scores in terms of dependent variables according to TV exposure of 6th-grade subjects

	Mean Scores						Standard Deviations					
	PI	GPF	GPI	EN	PM	ID	PI	GPF	GPI	EN	PM	ID
High TV Exposure (18)	0.908	0.981	0.833	0.708	0.852	0.944	0.15	0.44	0.50	0.61	1.89	0.29
Low TV Exposure (9)	0.927	1.036	0.927	0.50	0.851	1.167	0.15	0.35	0.64	0.52	3.09	0.71
Gap	0.019	0.055	0.094	0.208	0.001	0.223	0.00	0.09	0.14	0.09	1.20	0.42

Table 6b: Statistical evaluation with T-test formula

	PI	GPF	GPI	EN	PM	ID
T Value	0.299	-0.325	-0.418	1.87	0.006	-1.166
Significant	no	no	no	*	no	no

df=25
critical value:
1.708 (5%)

VI. The Sixth-Grade Sample Subjects:

The students lowly exposed to television had higher mean scores for the level of political information than those highly exposed by 0.019. (Table 6a) The result was tested as statistically insignificant. (Table 6b)

Those lowly exposed to television had higher mean scores for the level of government perception favorable than those highly exposed by 0.055. The result was tested as statistically insignificant.

Those lowly exposed to television had higher mean scores for the level of government perception idealistic than those highly exposed by 0.094. The result tested as statistically insignificant.

Those highly exposed to television had higher mean scores for the level of ethnocentrism than those lowly exposed by 0.208. The result was tested as statistically significant.

Those highly exposed to television had higher mean scores for the level of political monism than those lowly exposed by 0.001. The result was tested as statistically insignificant.

Those lowly exposed to television had higher mean scores for the level of individualism than those highly exposed by 0.223.

This statistical anatomy shows that ethnocentrism and political monism were the only two dependent variables which were, in a positive way, related to high television exposure in the light of the discrepancy of mean scores. Referring to other four dependent variables, those usually watching television

every day had fewer mean scores than those seldom watching. Among the two dependent variables positively related to television exposure, ethnocentrism was proved to be significant as expected. For the second time, it was tested significant statically in this study.

Summary and Discussion:

After a rather detailed statical analysis of the data collected, we would like to summarize in the following:

I. So far as the differences of means for all the sample subjects and their statistical testing are concerned, it is unlikely to assert that there existed any positive relationship between television exposure and dependent variables. That is, whether television exposure contributed positively to political socialization the part of teenagers, at least, in the sample school, can not be confirmed.

II. With reference to the mean scores all sample males got and the results stemming from statistical evaluation, no positive difference could be found existent between levels of exposure and the dependent variables other than ethnocentrism. Either the difference of mean scores or statistical evaluation showed that ethnocentrism was very positively related to high exposure.

III. In connection with to the disparity lying between the mean scores attributed to the two levels of exposure in terms of all sample

females, television exposure was negatively related to all the dependent variables with political information exclusive. Unfortunately, it seems that spending more time in watching television might the female teenagers, at least, in the Sunnyside Elementary School, from being socialized politically. Perhaps because of statistical insignificance this could not be evaluated as true, yet it was still worth noticing.

IV. Based on the statistical evaluation, all the hypotheses were rejected though all the dependent variables excluding government perception favorable and individualism had positive relationship with high television exposure only in terms of the discrepancy of mean scores which both the high-exposure and the low-exposure subjects in the fourth-grade class got.

V. With the exception of government perception idealistic, all the dependent variables maintained negative relations with high degree of television exposure in the sense of the disparity of the all the hypotheses were rejected.

VI. Ethnocentrism and political monism were the only two dependent variables found to be, in a positive way, related to high television exposure in the difference of mean scores. Especially, the former was tested as significant statistically. As expected, all other hypotheses were rejected.

This modest study set for itself the well-meaning goal of testing what relationships exist between exposure to television and the political socialization of children. Out six hypotheses, only one got a decisive form of validation with

respect to all sample males and the sixth-grade subjects: that general television exposure is positively related to ethnocentrism. Other hypotheses were rejected.

Probably, in this study it appears that the outcome of testing all female subjects regardless of grade tended to be that television exposure was negatively related to nearly all dependent variables. By the way, considering grade, the results discovered in the fifth and sixth grade respondents were likely to show that television exposure was negatively related to the dependent variables, too. For us, three international students from Europe, Africa and Asia respectively, it is rather difficult to explore the actual factors even superficially which have led the sample subjects in this state to express their attitude in this manner.

So far, this team of researchers have been taking into account three aspects of this exploratory survey: precision of questionnaire construction, reliability of sampling, and propriety of investigating in that period, Provided that the three points we have been worried about ever since are seemingly invulnerable, our findings would be correct even if they were inconsistent with the propositions in this aspect in the past.

Initially, it was intended to analyze the data of the fourth, fifth, and sixth grades subjects with sex as a control variable. Later, this thought was given away because the samples for each grade not large enough to be separated into male and female sub-groups, and partly because the results for the six

categories dealt with at length in the preceding section rejected overwhelmingly the hypotheses.

Finally, on account of our amateurish research experience, time limitations, problems with designing an all-out questionnaire instrument that would ascertain fully respondents attitudes, and the idiosyncracies of our sample, little or no support was found for hypotheses. Research efforts in the political socialization milieu have, by tradition, not focussed on so small and so homogeneous a sample size. As a direction for subsequent investigation, we suggest that definite steps be taken to examine--if possible--cross-culturally with overtones of turall international significance and across socioeconomic classes.

The the results of this study fail to justify the researchers hunches should not, in themselves, be unappealing. But that the processes in which we have been involved have provided some "seasoning" and guidelines for future individualized undertakings may perhaps be very strong assets unto themselves.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Atkin, C. K. et. al., "The Surgeon General's Research Program on Television and Social Behavior: A Review of Empirical Findings," Journal of Broadcasting, 16 (Winter 1971-72), p. 21.
2. Blake, R. H. and Haroldsem E. O., A Taxonomy of Concepts in Communication, New York: Hastings House, 1975.
3. Bryne, Gary C., "Mass Media and Political Socialization of Children and Pre-Adults," Journalism Quarterly, Spring 1969, pp. 140-142.
4. Chaffee, S. H., McLeod, J. M., and Wackman, D. B., "Family Patterns and Adolescent Political Participation," in Jack Dennis (ed.), Socialization to Politics: A Reader, New York: Wiley, 1973, pp. 349-64.
5. Comstock, George, "The Evidence So Far," Journal of Communication, 25:4 (Autumn 1975), pp. 24-29.
6. Conway, Margaret M., Stevens, A. Jay, and Smith Robert G., "The Relation Between Media Use and Children's Civic Awareness," Journalism Quarterly, 52 (Autumn 1975), pp. 531-38.
7. Davies, James C., "The Family's Role in Political Socialization," Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 361 (1965), pp. 10-19.
8. Dawson, Richard E. and Prewitt, Kenneth, Political Socialization, Boston: Little Brown and Co., 1969.

9. DeFleur, M. L. and DeFleur, L. B., "The Relative Contribution of Television as a Learning Source for Children's Occupational Knowledge," American Sociological Review, 32 (1967), pp. 777-89.
10. Easton, David and Dennis, Jack, Children in the Political System: Origins of Political Legitimacy, New York: McGraw Hill, 1969.
11. Feilitzen, C. V. and Linne, O., "Identifying with Television Characters," Journal of Communication, 25 (Autumn 1975), pp. 48-53.
12. Greenstein, Fred I., Children and Politics, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1965.
13. Hess, Robert D. and Torney, Judith V., The Development of Political Attitudes in Children, Chicago: Aldine, 1967.
14. Hirsch, Herbert, Poverty and Politicization: Political Socialization in the American Sub-Culture, New York: The Free Press, 1971.
15. Hollander, Neil, "Adolescents and the War: The Sources of Socialization," Journalism Quarterly, (Autumn 1971), pp. 472-79.
16. Hyman, H. H., "Mass Communication and Socialization," Public Opinion Quarterly, 37 (1973), pp. 524-40.
17. _____, Political Socialization, Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1959.
18. Jennings, Kent M. and Niemi, Richard, "Patterns of Political Learning," Harvard Educational Review, 38 (Summer 1968), pp. 443-67.

19. _____, "The Transmission of Political Values from Parent to Child," American Political Science Review, 62 (March 1968), pp. 169-84.
20. Johnson, N. R., "Television and Politicization: A Test of Competing Models," Journalism Quarterly, 50 (1973), pp. 447-55.
21. Katz, E., Blumler, J. G., and Gurevitch, M. "Uses and Gratifications Research," Public Opinion Quarterly, 37 (1973), pp. 509-23.
22. Kraus, Sidney, "Mass Communication and Political Socialization: A Re-Assessment of Two Decades of Research," The Quarterly Journal of Speech, 59 (December 1973).
23. Leifer, A. D., Gordon, N. J., and Graves, S...B., "Children's Television: More than Mere Entertainment," Harvard Educational Review, 44 (1974) pp. 213-45.
24. Lesser, G. S. Children and Television: Lessons from Sesame Street, New York: Random House, 1974.
25. Levin, Martin L. "Social Climates and Political Socialization," Public Opinion Quarterly, 25 (1961), pp. 596-606.
26. Riccards, Michael P. The Making of the American Citizenry: An Introduction to Political Socialization, New York: Chandler Publishing Co., 1973.
27. Rubin, Alan M. "Television's Political Socialization," Journal of Broadcasting, 20 (Winter 1976), pp. 50-55.
28. Siegel, A. E. "Communicating With the Next Generation," Journal of Communication, 25 (Autumn 1975), pp. 12-15.

29. Wasby, Stephen L. "The Impact of the Family on Politics: An Essay and Review of the Literature," The Family Life Coordinator, 15 (1966), pp. 3-23.
30. Ziblath, David. "High School Extracurricular Activities and Political Socialization," Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 361 (1965), pp. 20-31.

