Main Study – Analysis' Results

University of Cyprus

Cyprus' DATA

4

▪ **Reliability**

Measuring the scale reliability of the 4 instruments used in the main study, in the Harter's Instrument (1st part with 36 items), Cronbach's alpha was found to be 0.918, an excellent value of reliability since values of 0.7-0.8 are widely acceptable in the research literature. For the 2nd part of the Harter's Instrument, Cronbach's alpha was found to be 0.604, quite satisfactory whereas for the 3rd part of the Harter's instrument, Cronbach's Alpha was found to be 0.910. For the Scenarios' Instrument, Cronbach's alpha reached the value of 0.692, approaching 0.7 and thus satisfactory.

(Harter's Instrument_for the Child_36 items)
Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	68	85,0
	Excluded[a]	12	15,0
	Total	80	100,0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
,918	36

(Harter's Instrument_for the Child_10 items)
Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	79	98,8
	Excluded[a]	1	1,3
	Total	80	100,0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
,604	10

(Harter's Instrument_for the Teacher_15 items)
Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	77	96,3
	Excluded[a]	3	3,8
	Total	80	100,0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
,910	15

Scenarios' Instrument_for the Child_40 items
Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	75	93,8
	Excluded[a]	5	6,3
	Total	80	100,0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
,692	40

Demographics

The sample of Cyprus consists of 80 persons, 40 children who were identified being exposed to violence and 40 children randomly selected from a larger sample. A matching process was pursued regarding gender, class and age thus in each group 25 are boys and 15 are girls whereas 8 are 4th graders, 20 are 5th graders and 12 are 6th graders. 30 of the exposed to violence children have a mother who speaks Greek thus she comes from Cyprus, whereas the mothers of the other 10 children have other maternal languages. This pattern is not happening with the fathers though since only one of them speaks other language than Greek.

		gender		Total
		boy	girl	
exposure	child randomly selected	25	15	40
	child exposed to violence	25	15	40
Total		50	30	80

		class			Total
		4th grade	5th grade	6th grade	
exposure	child randomly selected	8	20	12	40
	child exposed to violence	8	20	12	40
Total		16	40	24	80

		gender		Total
		boy	girl	
class	4th grade	12	4	16
	5th grade	26	14	40
	6th grade	12	12	24
Total		50	30	80

		motherLang						Total
		Greek	English	Russian	Romanian	Bulgarian	Swiss	
exposure	child randomly selected	37	1	1	0	1	0	40
	child exposed to violence	30	5	3	1	0	1	40
Total		67	6	4	1	1	1	80

		fatherLang		Total
		Greek	English	
exposure	child randomly selected	40	0	40
	child exposed to violence	39	1	40
Total		79	1	80

Harter's Instrument 1st part_for the child_36 items

The subscales' means and standard deviations, calculated from the data given in **the first part of the Harter's Instrument (for the child-36 items)** for the children randomly selected and for the children exposed to violence, are presented in the table below. There, it can be seen that the means in general fluctuate around the value of 3.0, which is above the midpoint of the scale. In addition, almost in all subscales children exposed to violence have lower means in the self rating scale.

Group Statistics

	exposure	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Scholastic_Competence_Ch	child randomly selected	39	3,2521	,57082	,09140
	child exposed to violence	37	2,8739	,62781	,10321
Social_Acceptance_Ch	child randomly selected	40	3,1208	,66772	,10558
	child exposed to violence	37	2,9820	,74202	,12199
Athletic_Competence_Ch	child randomly selected	40	2,9750	,74779	,11824
	child exposed to violence	40	2,9917	,63487	,10038
Physical_Appearance_Ch	child randomly selected	40	3,1917	,60922	,09633
	child exposed to violence	40	2,8750	,79506	,12571
Behavioral_Conduct_Ch	child randomly selected	38	3,1974	,59257	,09613
	child exposed to violence	37	2,9234	,55499	,09124
Global_SelfWorth_Ch	child randomly selected	39	3,3462	,61699	,09880
	child exposed to violence	40	3,1125	,69017	,10913

Independent samples T-test were performed so as to compare the subscale means between the two groups, the children randomly selected and the children exposed to violence. As it seems, in 3 of the 6 subscales from the Instrument for the child, p value is less than 0.05 indicating that there are significant differences between the two samples as far as *the scholastic competence* (p=0.007<0.05), *the physical appearance* (p=0.049<0.05) and *the behavioral conduct* (p=0.042<0.05) is concerned. Therefore, the hypothesis H0 that all the means are equal can be rejected as far as these 3 subscales is concerned since the sample of the children exposed to violence has lower means in all these three subscales. More specifically, children exposed to violence tend to believe that they have lower ability or competence within the realm of their scholastic performance, that they do not like the way they behave and that they are not very happy with the way they look.

Gender effects

Taking only the sample of **the children exposed to violence**, Independent samples T-test were also performed so as to compare the means **between boys and girls** in the six subscales of the child's self-rating scale. As it seems, in 5 of the 6 subscales p value is greater than 0.05 indicating that there are no significant differences between boys and girls as far as these subscales is concerned. In the *physical appearance* domain though p value is slightly lower than 0.05 (p=0.048<0.05) indicating that there are significant differences between boys and girls. As it seems from the means, boys exposed to violence tend to be happier with the way they look than girls.

Group Statistics

	gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Scholastic_Competence_Ch	boy	23	2,8623	,72414	,15099
	girl	14	2,8929	,45105	,12055
Social_Acceptance_Ch	boy	22	3,0606	,68727	,14653
	girl	15	2,8667	,82664	,21344
Athletic_Competence_Ch	boy	25	3,0933	,61629	,12326

		girl	15	2,8222	,64999	,16783
Physical_Appearance_Ch	boy		25	3,0667	,75000	,15000
	girl		15	2,5556	,78848	,20358
Behavioral_Conduct_Ch	boy		22	2,8106	,62211	,13264
	girl		15	3,0889	,40270	,10398
Global_SelfWorth_Ch	boy		25	3,0733	,73924	,14785
	girl		15	3,1778	,61871	,15975

Independent samples T-test were also performed so as to compare the means between **boys randomly selected and boys exposed to violence** in the six subscales of the child's self-rating scale. As it seems, in *the scholastic competence* domain, p value is lower than 0.05 (p=0.030<0.05) indicating that there are significant differences between boys exposed to violence and boys randomly selected. As it seems from the means, boys randomly selected consider themselves better students since they have significantly higher Scholastic Competence score (3,29) than the boys exposed to violence (2,86).

Group Statistics

	exposure	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Scholastic_Competence_Ch	child randomly selected	25	3,2933	,60721	,12144
	child exposed to violence	23	2,8623	,72414	,15099
Social_Acceptance_Ch	child randomly selected	25	3,1067	,69702	,13940
	child exposed to violence	22	3,0606	,68727	,14653
Athletic_Competence_Ch	child randomly selected	25	3,0467	,77208	,15442
	child exposed to violence	25	3,0933	,61629	,12326
Physical_Appearance_Ch	child randomly selected	25	3,1533	,58317	,11663
	child exposed to violence	25	3,0667	,75000	,15000
Behavioral_Conduct_Ch	child randomly selected	24	3,1250	,63370	,12935
	child exposed to violence	22	2,8106	,62211	,13264
Global_SelfWorth_Ch	child randomly selected	25	3,3067	,69335	,13867
	child exposed to violence	25	3,0733	,73924	,14785

Independent samples T-test were also performed so as to compare the means between **girls randomly selected and girls exposed to violence** in the six subscales of the child's self-rating scale. As it seems, in *the physical appearance* domain, p value is lower than 0.05 (p=0.014<0.05) indicating that there are significant differences between girls exposed to violence and girls randomly selected. As it seems from the means, girls randomly selected feel happier with the way they look since they have significantly higher Physical Appearance score (3,25) than the girls exposed to violence (2,55).

Group Statistics

	exposure	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Scholastic_Competence_Ch	child randomly selected	14	3,1786	,51251	,13697
	child exposed to violence	14	2,8929	,45105	,12055
Social_Acceptance_Ch	child randomly selected	15	3,1444	,63891	,16496
	child exposed to violence	15	2,8667	,82664	,21344
Athletic_Competence_Ch	child randomly selected	15	2,8556	,71511	,18464
	child exposed to violence	15	2,8222	,64999	,16783
Physical_Appearance_Ch	child randomly selected	15	3,2556	,66627	,17203
	child exposed to violence	15	2,5556	,78848	,20358
Behavioral_Conduct_Ch	child randomly selected	14	3,3214	,51251	,13697
	child exposed to violence	15	3,0889	,40270	,10398

Global_SelfWorth_Ch	child randomly selected	14	3,4167	,46570	,12446
	child exposed to violence	15	3,1778	,61871	,15975

Grade effects

For the sample of **the children exposed to violence**, there were also <u>grade effects</u> favoring 4th graders in the scholastic competence domain. One Way Analysis of Variance was conducted so as to compare the means by grade in the six subscales of the child's rating scale. As it can be seen in the table ANOVA below, in <u>*the scholastic competence*</u> p value is lower than 0.05 (p=0.031<0.05) indicating that there are significant differences between children of different grade. As it seems from the means, 4th graders consider themselves better students since they have significantly higher Scolastic Competence score (3,37) than the 5th graders (2,77) and the 6th graders (2,68).

Children exposed to violence
ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Scholastic_Competence_Ch	Between Groups	2,625	2	1,313	3,859	**,031**
	Within Groups	11,564	34	,340		
	Total	14,189	36			
Social_Acceptance_Ch	Between Groups	,957	2	,478	,862	,431
	Within Groups	18,865	34	,555		
	Total	19,821	36			
Athletic_Competence_Ch	Between Groups	,400	2	,200	,483	,621
	Within Groups	15,319	37	,414		
	Total	15,719	39			
Physical_Appearance_Ch	Between Groups	,997	2	,499	,780	,466
	Within Groups	23,655	37	,639		
	Total	24,653	39			
Behavioral_Conduct_Ch	Between Groups	,369	2	,184	,584	,563
	Within Groups	10,720	34	,315		
	Total	11,089	36			
Global_SelfWorth_Ch	Between Groups	1,862	2	,931	2,061	,142
	Within Groups	16,715	37	,452		
	Total	18,577	39			

Harter's Instrument 3rd part_for the teacher_15 items

The subscales' means and standard deviations, calculated from the data given in **the third part of the Harter's Instrument (for the teacher-15 items)** for the children randomly selected and for the children exposed to violence, are presented in the table below. There, it can be seen that the means in general fluctuate around the value 3.0, which is above the midpoint of the scale. In addition, almost in all subscales children exposed to violence have lower means in the teacher rating scale.

Group Statistics

	exposure	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Scholastic_Competence_T	child randomly selected	40	**<u>3,2000</u>**	,75410	,11923
	child exposed to violence	40	**<u>2,5833</u>**	,92681	,14654
Social_Acceptance_T	child randomly selected	40	**<u>3,1667</u>**	,84057	,13291
	child exposed to violence	40	**<u>2,7667</u>**	,70489	,11145
Athletic_Competence_T	child randomly selected	38	2,9211	,86450	,14024
	child exposed to violence	39	2,7350	,59323	,09499

		N			
Physical_Appearance_T	child randomly selected	40	3,4583	,64356	,10176
	child exposed to violence	40	3,2333	,63246	,10000
Behavioral_Conduct_T	child randomly selected	40	3,3500	,77331	,12227
	child exposed to violence	40	2,8667	,86660	,13702

Regarding the subscale means from the **teacher rating scale**, significant differences between the two samples are observed in *the scholastic competence* (p=0.002<0.05), in *the social acceptance* (p=0.024<0.05) and in *the behavioral conduct* (p=0.010<0.05). As it seems from the means, teachers give lower values for the children exposed to violence than for the others in these 3 subscales. More specifically, teachers evaluate children exposed to violence with a lower ability or competence within the realm of their scholastic performance, rate them as not so popular and give them lower marks in the behavior domain.

Gender effects
Taking only the sample of **the children exposed to violence**, Independent samples T-test were also performed so as to compare the means between boys and girls in the five subscales of the teacher's rating scale. As it seems, in 2 of the 5 subscales p value is lower than 0.05 indicating that there are significant differences between boys and girls as far as *the scholastic competence* (p=0.026<0.05) and *the behavioral conduct* (p=0.000<0.05) is concerned. As it seems from the means, teachers give lower values for the boys than for the girls in these 2 subscales. More specifically, teachers evaluate boys with a lower ability or competence within the realm of their scholastic performance and give them lower marks in the behavior domain.

Group Statistics

	gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Scholastic_Competence_T	boy	25	2,3333	,93294	,18659
	girl	15	3,0000	,77664	,20053
Social_Acceptance_T	boy	25	2,8000	,68041	,13608
	girl	15	2,7111	,76497	,19752
Athletic_Competence_T	boy	25	2,7467	,61071	,12214
	girl	14	2,7143	,58261	,15571
Physical_Appearance_T	boy	25	3,0933	,61252	,12250
	girl	15	3,4667	,61464	,15870
Behavioral_Conduct_T	boy	25	2,4400	,72470	,14494
	girl	15	3,5778	,56997	,14717

Independent samples T-test were also performed so as to compare the means between **boys randomly selected and boys exposed to violence** in the five subscales of the teacher's rating scale. As it seems, in *the scholastic competence* domain (p=0.001<0.05) and in *the behavioral conduct* domain (p=0.002<0.05) p value is lower than 0.05 indicating that there are significant differences between boys exposed to violence and boys randomly selected. As it seems from the means, teachers consider boys randomly selected better students since they evaluate them with significantly higher Scholastic Competence score (3,17) than the boys exposed to violence (2,33). In addition, in the behavior domain teachers give lower scores to children exposed to violence (2,44) than to the children randomly selected (3,14).

Group Statistics

	exposure	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Scholastic_Competence_T	child randomly selected	25	3,1733	,72085	,14417
	child exposed to violence	25	2,3333	,93294	,18659
Social_Acceptance_T	child randomly selected	25	3,0933	,81944	,16389
	child exposed to violence	25	2,8000	,68041	,13608

Athletic_Competence_T	child randomly selected	25	3,0267	,82170	,16434
	child exposed to violence	25	2,7467	,61071	,12214
Physical_Appearance_T	child randomly selected	25	3,3467	,64893	,12979
	child exposed to violence	25	3,0933	,61252	,12250
Behavioral_Conduct_T	child randomly selected	25	3,1467	,79396	,15879
	child exposed to violence	25	2,4400	,72470	,14494

Independent samples T-test were also performed so as to compare the means between **girls randomly selected and girls exposed to violence** in the five subscales of the teacher's rating scale. As it seems, in all domains, p value is greater than 0.05 indicating that there are no significant differences between girls exposed to violence and girls randomly selected as rated from their teachers.

Group Statistics

	exposure	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Scholastic_Competence_T	child randomly selected	15	3,2444	,83063	,21447
	child exposed to violence	15	3,0000	,77664	,20053
Social_Acceptance_T	child randomly selected	15	3,2889	,88968	,22971
	child exposed to violence	15	2,7111	,76497	,19752
Athletic_Competence_T	child randomly selected	13	2,7179	,94130	,26107
	child exposed to violence	14	2,7143	,58261	,15571
Physical_Appearance_T	child randomly selected	15	3,6444	,61032	,15758
	child exposed to violence	15	3,4667	,61464	,15870
Behavioral_Conduct_T	child randomly selected	15	3,6889	,62319	,16091
	child exposed to violence	15	3,5778	,56997	,14717

Grade effects

One way Analysis of Variance was conducted so as to compare the means between the children of different grades (4th, 5th and 6th grade) in the five subscales of the teacher's rating scale. So, concerning teacher's rating scale for the sample of **the children exposed to violence**, there weren't <u>grade effects</u> favoring any group of children as it can be seen from the table ANOVA below.

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Scholastic_Competence_T	Between Groups	,370	2	,185	,207	,814
	Within Groups	33,130	37	,895		
	Total	33,500	39			
Social_Acceptance_T	Between Groups	,826	2	,413	,824	,447
	Within Groups	18,552	37	,501		
	Total	19,378	39			
Athletic_Competence_T	Between Groups	,629	2	,315	,889	,420
	Within Groups	12,744	36	,354		
	Total	13,373	38			
Physical_Appearance_T	Between Groups	,844	2	,422	1,059	,357
	Within Groups	14,756	37	,399		
	Total	15,600	39			
Behavioral_Conduct_T	Between Groups	,548	2	,274	,353	,705
	Within Groups	28,741	37	,777		
	Total	29,289	39			

Considering the possibility that the teachers do not use the rating scales in the same fashion as the students, initially ratings of both child subjects and adult raters were converted to standardized scores (i.e., z-scores) for the purpose of comparison. Then, a **Spearman's Rank Order correlation** was run to determine the relationship between the child's self rating and the teacher's rating in each of the five common subscales of the Harter's Instrument (scholastic competence, social acceptance, athletic competence, physical appearance and behavioral conduct) in each group of children.

Taking only the sample of **the children randomly selected,** it seems that there is a moderate, positive correlation between *Scholastic_Competence* subscale as rated from the child randomly selected and as rated from the teacher, *which is statistically significant* ($r_s(37) = 0.536$, $P = 0.000$).

Children randomly selected
Correlations

			Z_Scholastic _Comp_Ch	Z_Scholastic _Comp_T
Spearman's rho	Z_Scholastic_Comp_Ch	Correlation Coefficient	1,000	,536**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	,000
		N	39	39
	Z_Scholastic_Comp_T	Correlation Coefficient	,536**	1,000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	.
		N	39	40

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Taking only the sample of **the children exposed to violence,** it seems that there is a moderate, positive correlation between *Scholastic_Competence* subscale as rated from the child and as rated from the teacher, *which is statistically significant* ($r_s(35) = 0.533$, $P = 0.001$).

Children exposed to violence
Correlations

			Z_Scholastic _Comp_Ch	Z_Scholastic _Comp_T
Spearman's rho	Z_Scholastic_Comp_Ch	Correlation Coefficient	1,000	,533**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	,001
		N	37	37
	Z_Scholastic_Comp_T	Correlation Coefficient	,533**	1,000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	,001	.
		N	37	40

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Taking only the sample of **the children randomly selected,** it seems that there is a moderate, positive correlation between *Social_Acceptance* subscale as rated from the child and as rated from the teacher, *which is statistically significant* ($r_s(38) = 0.457$, $P = 0.003$).

Children randomly selected
Correlations

			Z_Social_A ccept_Ch	Z_Social_ Accept_T
Spearman's rho	Z_Social_Accept_Ch	Correlation Coefficient	1,000	,457**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	,003
		N	40	40
	Z_Social_Accept_T	Correlation Coefficient	,457**	1,000

| | | | Sig. (2-tailed) | ,003 | . |
| | | | N | 40 | 40 |

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Taking only the sample of **the children exposed to violence,** it seems that there is a positive correlation between *Social_Acceptance* subscale as rated from the child and as rated from the teacher, *which is not statistically significant* ($r_s(35) = 0.288$, $P = 0.083$).

Children exposed to violence
Correlations

			Z_Social_Acc ept_Ch	Z_Social_Acc ept_T
Spearman's rho	Z_Social_Accept_Ch	Correlation Coefficient	1,000	,288
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	,083
		N	37	37
	Z_Social_Accept_T	Correlation Coefficient	,288	1,000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	,083	.
		N	37	40

Taking only the sample of **the children randomly selected,** it seems that there is a moderate, positive correlation between *Athletic_Competence* subscale as rated from the child and as rated from the teacher, *which is statistically significant* ($r_s(36) = 0.417$, $P = 0.009$).

Children randomly selected
Correlations

			Z_Athletic_ Comp_Ch	Z_Athletic_ Comp_T
Spearman's rho	Z_Athletic_Comp_Ch	Correlation Coefficient	1,000	,417[**]
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	,009
		N	40	38
	Z_Athletic_Comp_T	Correlation Coefficient	,417[**]	1,000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	,009	.
		N	38	38

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Taking only the sample of **the children exposed to violence,** it seems that there is a positive correlation between *Athletic_Competence* subscale as rated from the child and as rated from the teacher, *which is not statistically significant* ($r_s(37) = 0.080$, $P = 0.629$).

Children exposed to violence
Correlations

			Z_Athletic_ Comp_Ch	Z_Athletic_ Comp_T
Spearman's rho	Z_Athletic_Comp_Ch	Correlation Coefficient	1,000	,080
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	,629
		N	40	39
	Z_Athletic_Comp_T	Correlation Coefficient	,080	1,000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	,629	.
		N	39	39

Taking only the sample of **the children randomly selected,** it seems that there is a positive correlation between *Physical_Appearance* subscale as rated from the child and as rated from the teacher, *but it is not statistically significant* ($r_s(38) = 0.248$, $P = 0.123$).

Children randomly selected
Correlations

			Z_Physical_ Appear_Ch	Z_Physical_ Appear_T
Spearman's rho	Z_Physical_Appear_Ch	Correlation Coefficient	1,000	,248
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	,123
		N	40	40
	Z_Physical_Appear_T	Correlation Coefficient	,248	1,000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	,123	.
		N	40	40

Taking only the sample of **the children exposed to violence,** it seems that there is a negative correlation between *Physical_Appearance* subscale as rated from the child and as rated from the teacher, *which is not statistically significant* ($r_s(38) = -0.049$, $P = 0.762$).

Children exposed to violence
Correlations

			Z_Physical_ Appear_Ch	Z_Physical_ Appear_T
Spearman's rho	Z_Physical_Appear_Ch	Correlation Coefficient	1,000	-,049
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	,762
		N	40	40
	Z_Physical_Appear_T	Correlation Coefficient	-,049	1,000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	,762	.
		N	40	40

Taking only the sample of **the children randomly selected,** it seems that there is a moderate positive and moderate correlation between *Behavioral_Conduct* subscale as rated from the child and as rated from the teacher, *which is statistically significant* ($r_s(36) = 0.388$, $P = 0.016$).

Children randomly selected
Correlations

			Z_Behavioral_ Conduct_Ch	Z_Behavioral_ Conduct_T
Spearman's rho	Z_Behavioral_Conduct_Ch	Correlation Coefficient	1,000	,388[*]
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	,016
		N	38	38
	Z_Behavioral_Conduct_T	Correlation Coefficient	,388[*]	1,000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	,016	.
		N	38	40

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Taking only the sample of **the children exposed to violence,** it seems that there is a moderate positive correlation between *Behavioral_Conduct* subscale as rated from the child and as rated from the teacher, *which is statistically significant* ($r_s(38) = .410$, $P = .012$).

Children exposed to violence
Correlations

			Z_Behavioral _Conduct_Ch	Z_Behavioral_ Conduct_T
Spearman's rho	Z_Behavioral_Conduct_Ch	Correlation Coefficient	1,000	,410[*]
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	,012
		N	37	37
	Z_Behavioral_Conduct_T	Correlation Coefficient	,410[*]	1,000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	,012	.
		N	37	40

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

		Z_Behavioral _Conduct_Ch	Z_Behavioral_ Conduct_T
Z_Behavioral_Conduct_Ch	Correlation Coefficient		,410[*]
	Sig. (2-tailed)		,012

Regarding the analysis of the data resulting from the scenarios' instrument, the initial theoretical grouping of the scenarios was required as well as the coding of each possible answer in each item that was pre-decided in the construction of the questionnaire.

The 14 scenarios were categorized in 6 groups according to what they measure (instrument's aims) as follows:

- Items from Scenarios 1,5,7 (Group 1 = *sc1q1, sc1q2, sc5q1, sc5q2, sc5q3, sc7q1, sc7q2, sc7q3* - adoption of violent behavior - child's reaction in an ordinary situation)
- Items from Scenarios 3,9,14 (Group 2 = *sc3q1, sc3q2, sc3q3, sc9q1, sc9q2, sc9q4, sc14q1, sc14q2, sc14q3* - adoption of violent or tolerant behavior/child's reaction while exposed directly to violence)
- Items from Scenarios 4, 12, part of 11 (Group 3 = *sc4q1, sc4q2, sc4q3, sc12q1, sc12q2, sc11q3* - views/attitudes on violence - child's reaction while witnessing violence)
- Items from Scenarios 11, 13 (Group 4 = *sc11q1, sc13q1* - mother as a role model)
- Items from Scenarios 2, 10 (Group 5 = *sc2q1, sc10q1, sc10q2* - self-image & self-confidence)
- Items from Scenarios 6, 8 (Group 6 = *sc6q1, sc6q2, sc8q1, sc8q2, sc8q3* - views on school performance and school in general).

So, initially, categorical answers in each item/variable from each scenario were dummy coded (*transform – recode into same variables*) with values 0/1 according to the predetermined coding of each answer, indicating the absence or presence of some categorical effect that may be expected to shift the outcome. For example, in the item sc1q1, there were eight possible categorical answers falling into three subcategories (aggressive, passive, assertive) which were dummy coded with values 0/1. In the same way, all variables from each group were recoded.

Then, new variables were created (*transform – compute variable*) for each group of scenarios by summing the similar dummy variables. For example, in the group 1 of scenarios, aggressive_sc1q1, aggressive_sc1q2, aggressive_sc5q1, aggressive_sc5q2, aggressive_sc5q3, aggressive_sc7q1, aggressive_sc7q2 and aggressive_sc7q3 were computed into a new variable been named "aggressiveness_group 1". The new variables were computed according to the predetermined coding of the answers in each item-variable. Therefore, mean scores for each student in each subcategory were calculated, so as to be able to move on to comparisons.

So, in the groups 1, 2 and 3, the new variables computed were those of a) aggressiveness, b) passiveness and c) assertiveness.

In the group 4, the new variables computed were those of a) mother as a role model, b) mother as a non ideal role model and c) protecting mother.

In the group 5, the new variables computed were those of a) high self image and b) low self image.

In the group 6, the new variables computed were those of a) excellent school performance, b) very good school performance, c) good school performance and d) poor school performance and failure.

After that, for each group of scenarios, t-test groups Analysis (*Analyze-Compare Means-Independent Samples T-Test)* was conducted so as to compare the means between the two samples, the children randomly selected and the children exposed to violence, as far as the new variables computed are concerned. Factors such as gender and grade *(with One Way analysis of Variance, Analyze-Compare Means-One Way ANOVA)* were also taken into consideration for each sample and comparisons of means were made.

In addition, *crosstabulation analysis with chi square* was performed on the scenarios' data so as to examine whether there is a relationaship between the exposure factor and students' answers each time in each item.

Moreover, *One Way analysis of Variance* was performed so as to examine the relationship between students' answers in the scenarios and students' mean scores in the six subascales of Harter's instrument.

Independent samples T-test were performed so as to compare the means between the two samples regarding a possible adoption of violent behavior reacting in an ordinary situation (Group 1 = Scenarios 1,5,7). As it seems, in 2 of the 3 new variables computed, p value is lower than 0.05 indicating that there are significant differences between the two samples as far as *the aggressiveness* ($p=0.000<0.05$) and *the assertiveness* ($p=0.000<0.05$) is concerned. As it can be seen from the Descriptives table below, children exposed to violence tend to react more aggressively in an ordinary situation and thus adopt a violent behavior whereas children randomly selected react more assertively preferring a constructive solution. As far as the passiveness variable is concerned, no significant differences are found between the 2 samples ($p=0.322>0.05$), thus both children exposed to violence and those who are not may behave passively and adopt a tolerant behavior in an ordinary situation.

Group Statistics

	exposure	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Aggressiveness_Group1	child randomly selected	40	,0094	,05929	,00938
	child exposed to violence	40	,2906	,26912	,04255
Passiveness_Group1	child randomly selected	40	,1750	,14281	,02258
	child exposed to violence	40	,2143	,20460	,03235
Assertiveness_Group1	child randomly selected	40	,8344	,14263	,02255
	child exposed to violence	40	,5219	,23494	,03715

Gender effects

Taking only the sample of **the children exposed to violence**, Independent samples T-test were also performed so as to compare the means **between boys and girls** in the three variables (aggressiveness, passiveness, assertiveness). As it seems, in the 3 new variables computed, p value is greater than 0.05 indicating that there are no significant differences between boys and girls as far as the aggressiveness ($p=0.303>0.05$), the passiveness ($p=0.575>0.05$) and the assertiveness ($p=0.454>0.05$) is concerned.

Group Statistics

	gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Aggressiveness_Group1	boy	25	,3250	,28641	,05728
	girl	15	,2333	,23560	,06083
Passiveness_Group1	boy	25	,2000	,21028	,04206
	girl	15	,2381	,19961	,05154
Assertiveness_Group1	boy	25	,5000	,25000	,05000
	girl	15	,5583	,21058	,05437

Independent samples T-test were also performed was also conducted so as to compare the means between **boys randomly selected and boys exposed to violence** in the three variables (aggressiveness, passiveness, assertiveness). As it seems, in 2 of the 3 new variables computed, p value is lower than 0.05 indicating that there are significant differences between boys exposed to violence and boys randomly selected as far as *the aggressiveness* ($p=0.000<0.05$) and *the assertiveness* ($p=0.000<0.05$) is concerned. As it can be seen from the Descriptives table below, boys exposed to violence tend to react more aggressively in an ordinary situation and thus adopt a violent behavior whereas boys randomly selected react more assertively preferring a constructive solution. As far as the passiveness variable is concerned, no significant differences are found between the 2 groups ($p=0.566>0.05$), thus both boys exposed to violence and those who are not may behave passively and adopt a tolerant behavior in an ordinary situation.

Group Statistics

	exposure	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Aggressiveness_Group1	child randomly selected	25	**,0150**	,07500	,01500

13

	child exposed to violence	25	**,3250**	,28641	,05728
Passiveness_Group1	child randomly selected	25	,1714	,13041	,02608
	child exposed to violence	25	,2000	,21028	,04206
Assertiveness_Group1	child randomly selected	25	**,8300**	,14380	,02876
	child exposed to violence	25	**,5000**	,25000	,05000

Independent samples T-test were also performed so as to compare the means between **girls randomly selected and girls exposed to violence** in the three variables (aggressiveness, passiveness, assertiveness). As it seems, in 2 of the 3 new variables computed, p value is lower than 0.05 indicating that there are significant differences between girls exposed to violence and girls randomly selected as far as *the aggressiveness* (p=0.001<0.05) and *the assertiveness* (p=0.000<0.05) is concerned. As it can be seen from the Descriptives table below, girls exposed to violence tend to react more aggressively in an ordinary situation and thus adopt a violent behavior whereas girls randomly selected react more assertively preferring a constructive solution. As far as the passiveness variable is concerned, no significant differences are found between the 2 groups (p=0.401>0.05), thus both girls exposed to violence and those who are not may behave passively and adopt a tolerant behavior in an ordinary situation.

Group Statistics

	exposure	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Aggressiveness_Group1	child randomly selected	15	**,0000**	,00000	,00000
	child exposed to violence	15	**,2333**	,23560	,06083
Passiveness_Group1	child randomly selected	15	,1810	,16613	,04289
	child exposed to violence	15	,2381	,19961	,05154
Assertiveness_Group1	child randomly selected	15	**,8417**	,14536	,03753
	child exposed to violence	15	**,5583**	,21058	,05437

B

Regarding the Group 2 of the scenarios that investigates the child's adoption of violent or tolerant behavior while exposed directly to violence and where the scenarios 3, 9 and 14 (variables = sc3q1, sc3q2, sc3q3, sc3q4, sc9q1, sc9q2, sc9q4, sc14q1, sc14q2, sc14q3) are included, the new variables computed are again those of a) aggressiveness, b) passiveness and c) assertiveness.
Independent samples T-test were performed so as to compare the means between the two samples in the way they react while exposed directly to violence (Group 2 = Scenarios 3,9,14). As it seems, in 2 of the 3 new variables computed, p value is lower than 0.05 indicating that there are significant differences between the two samples as far as *the aggressiveness* (p=0.000<0.05) and *the assertiveness* (p=0.000<0.05) is concerned. As it can be seen from the Descriptives table below, children exposed to violence tend to react more aggressively while exposed directly to violence and thus adopt a violent behavior whereas children randomly selected react more assertively preferring a constructive solution. As far as the passiveness variable is concerned, no significant differences are found between the 2 samples (p=0.444>0.05), thus both children exposed to violence and those who are not may behave passively and adopt a tolerant behavior while exposed directly to violence.

Group Statistics

	exposure	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Aggressiveness_Group2	child randomly selected	40	,0972	,10731	,01697
	child exposed to violence	40	,3278	,28793	,04553
Passiveness_Group2	child randomly selected	40	,3500	,20833	,03294
	child exposed to violence	40	,3139	,21185	,03350

Assertiveness_Group2	child randomly selected	40	,6219	,20508	,03243
	child exposed to violence	40	,4000	,25032	,03958

Gender effects

Taking only the sample of **the children exposed to violence**, Independent samples T-test were also performed so as to compare the means **between boys and girls** in the three variables (aggressiveness, passiveness, assertiveness) of the scenarios' 2nd group. As it seems, in 2 of the 3 new variables computed, p value is greater than 0.05 indicating that there are no significant differences between boys and girls as far as the aggressiveness (p=0.159>0.05) and the passiveness (p=0.579>0.05) is concerned. In the variable of *assertiveness*, as it can be seen in the table below, p value is lower than 0.05 (p=0.012<0.05) indicating that there are significant differences between boys and girls. More specifically, girls tend to react more assertively preferring more constructive solutions while being exposed to violence.

Group Statistics

	gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Aggressiveness_Group2	boy	25	,3778	,29745	,05949
	girl	15	,2444	,25956	,06702
Passiveness_Group2	boy	25	,3289	,21631	,04326
	girl	15	,2889	,20914	,05400
Assertiveness_Group2	boy	25	**,3250**	,22244	,04449
	girl	15	**,5250**	,25089	,06478

Independent samples T-test were also performed so as to compare the means between **boys randomly selected and boys exposed to violence** in the three variables (aggressiveness, passiveness, assertiveness). As it seems, in 2 of the 3 new variables computed, p value is lower than 0.05 indicating that there are significant differences between boys exposed to violence and boys randomly selected as far as *the aggressiveness* (p=0.000<0.05) and *the assertiveness* (p=0.000<0.05) is concerned. As it can be seen from the Descriptives table below, boys exposed to violence tend to react more aggressively while exposed directly to violence and thus adopt a violent behavior whereas boys randomly selected react more assertively preferring a constructive solution. As far as the passiveness variable is concerned, no significant differences are found between the 2 groups (p=0.942>0.05), thus both boys exposed to violence and those who are not may behave passively and adopt a tolerant behavior while exposed directly to violence.

Group Statistics

	exposure	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Aggressiveness_Group2	child randomly selected	25	**,1067**	,11776	,02355
	child exposed to violence	25	**,3778**	,29745	,05949
Passiveness_Group2	child randomly selected	25	,3244	,21257	,04251
	child exposed to violence	25	,3289	,21631	,04326
Assertiveness_Group2	child randomly selected	25	**,6400**	,17795	,03559
	child exposed to violence	25	**,3250**	,22244	,04449

Independent samples T-test were also performed so as to compare the means between **girls randomly selected and girls exposed to violence** in the three variables (aggressiveness, passiveness, assertiveness). As it seems, in 1 of the 3 new variables computed, p value is lower than 0.05 indicating that there are significant differences between girls exposed to violence and girls randomly selected as far as *the aggressiveness* (p=0.029<0.05) is concerned. As it can be seen from the Descriptives table below, girls exposed to violence tend to react more aggressively while exposed directly to violence and thus adopt a violent behavior whereas girls randomly selected do not. Concerning the variables of passiveness and assertiveness, no significant differences are found between the 2 groups.

Group Statistics

	exposure	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Aggressiveness_Group2	child randomly selected	15	**,0815**	,08876	,02292
	child exposed to violence	15	**,2444**	,25956	,06702
Passiveness_Group2	child randomly selected	15	,3926	,20082	,05185
	child exposed to violence	15	,2889	,20914	,05400
Assertiveness_Group2	child randomly selected	15	,5917	,24761	,06393
	child exposed to violence	15	,5250	,25089	,06478

C

Regarding the Group 3 of the scenarios that investigates the child's views/attitudes on violence and specifically the child's reaction while witnessing violence, where the scenarios 4, 12 and part of 11 (variables = sc4q1, sc4q2, sc4q3, sc12q1, sc12q2, sc11q3) are included, the new variables computed are again those of a) aggressiveness, b) passiveness and c) assertiveness.

Independent samples T-test were performed so as to compare the means between the two samples in the way they view violence while witnessing it (Group 3 = Scenarios 4, 12 and part of 11). As it seems, in all the 3 new variables computed, p value is lower than 0.05 indicating that there are significant differences between the two samples as far as *the aggressiveness* ($p=0.000<0.05$), *the passiveness* ($p=0.041<0.05$) and the assertiveness ($p=0.000<0.05$) is concerned. As it can be seen from the Descriptives table below, children exposed to violence tend to react more aggressively while witnessing violence and thus adopt a violent behavior whereas children randomly selected react more assertively preferring constructive solutions. As far as the passiveness variable is concerned, means do not greatly differ between the two samples but still it seems that children exposed to violence behave more passively than the children randomly selected.

Group Statistics

	exposure	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Aggressiveness_Group3	child randomly selected	40	**,0250**	,10316	,01631
	child exposed to violence	40	**,2650**	,26559	,04199
Passiveness_Group3	child randomly selected	40	**,0625**	,11124	,01759
	child exposed to violence	40	**,1250**	,15447	,02442
Assertiveness_Group3	child randomly selected	40	**,9167**	,13074	,02067
	child exposed to violence	40	**,6542**	,29571	,04676

Gender effects

Taking only the sample of **the children exposed to violence**, Independent samples T-test were performed so as to compare the means **between boys and girls** in the three variables (aggressiveness, passiveness, assertiveness) of the scenarios' 3rd group. As it seems, in all the 3 new variables computed, p value is greater than 0.05 indicating that there are no significant differences between boys and girls as far as the aggressiveness ($p=0.091>0.05$), the passiveness ($p=0.257>0.05$) and the assertiveness ($p=0.061>0.05$) is concerned.

Group Statistics

	gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Aggressiveness_Group3	boy	25	,3200	,27080	,05416
	girl	15	,1733	,23745	,06131
Passiveness_Group3	boy	25	,1467	,15456	,03091
	girl	15	,0889	,15258	,03940

Assertiveness_Group3	boy	25	,5867	,29313	,05863
	girl	15	,7667	,27314	,07052

Independent samples T-test were also performed so as to compare the means between **boys randomly selected and boys exposed to violence** in the three variables (aggressiveness, passiveness, assertiveness). As it seems, in all the 3 new variables computed, p value is lower than 0.05 indicating that there are significant differences between boys exposed to violence and boys randomly selected as far as *the aggressiveness* (p=0.000<0.05), *the passiveness* (p=0,045<0,05) and *the assertiveness* (p=0.000<0.05) is concerned. As it can be seen from the Descriptives table below, boys exposed to violence tend to react more aggressively while witnessing violence and thus adopt a violent behavior whereas boys randomly selected react more assertively preferring a constructive solution. As far as the passiveness variable is concerned, it seems that boys exposed to violence scored slightly higher (0,1467) thus they may behave more passively and adopt a tolerant behavior while witnessing violence.

Group Statistics

	exposure	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Aggressiveness_Group3	child randomly selected	25	**,0400**	,12910	,02582
	child exposed to violence	25	**,3200**	,27080	,05416
Passiveness_Group3	child randomly selected	25	**,0667**	,11785	,02357
	child exposed to violence	25	**,1467**	,15456	,03091
Assertiveness_Group3	child randomly selected	25	**,9000**	,14434	,02887
	child exposed to violence	25	**,5867**	,29313	,05863

Independent samples T-test were performed so as to compare the means between **girls randomly selected and girls exposed to violence** in the three variables (aggressiveness, passiveness, assertiveness). As it seems, in 2 of the 3 new variables computed, p value is lower than 0.05 indicating that there are significant differences between girls exposed to violence and girls randomly selected as far as *the aggressiveness* (p=0.009<0.05) and *the assertiveness* (p=0.026<0.05) is concerned. As it can be seen from the Descriptives table below, girls exposed to violence tend to react more aggressively while witnessing violence and thus adopt a violent behavior whereas girls randomly selected react more assertively preferring constructive solutions. Concerning the variable of passiveness, no significant differences were found between the 2 groups of girls.

Group Statistics

	exposure	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Aggressiveness_Group3	child randomly selected	15	,0000	,00000	,00000
	child exposed to violence	15	,1733	,23745	,06131
Passiveness_Group3	child randomly selected	15	,0556	,10287	,02656
	child exposed to violence	15	,0889	,15258	,03940
Assertiveness_Group3	child randomly selected	15	,9444	,10287	,02656
	child exposed to violence	15	,7667	,27314	,07052

D

Regarding the Group 4 of the scenarios that investigates the child's view on his/her mother as a role model, where parts of the scenarios 11 and 13 (variables = sc11q1, sc13q1) are included, the new variables computed are those of a) mother as an ideal role model, b) mother as a non ideal role model and c) protecting mother.

Independent samples T-test were performed so as to compare the means between the two samples in the way they view violence while witnessing it (Group 4 = Scenarios 11, 13). As it seems, in 2 of the 3 new variables computed, p value is greater than 0.05 indicating that there are no significant differences

between the two samples as far as the "mother as an ideal role model" (p=0.671>0.05), and the "protecting mother" (p=0.222>0.05) is concerned. As far as *the "mother as a non ideal role model"* variable is concerned, significant differences are found between the 2 samples (p=0.043<0.05). As it can be seen from the Descriptives table below, the mean for children exposed to violence concerning the variable "mother as a non ideal role model" is greater than the one for children randomly selected indicating that it is more possible for children exposed to violence not to consider their mother as an ideal role model.

Group Statistics

	exposure	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
MotherIdealModel_Group4	child randomly selected	40	,8000	,24807	,03922
	child exposed to violence	40	,7750	,27619	,04367
MotherNonIdealModel_Group4	child randomly selected	40	**,0250**	,11036	,01745
	child exposed to violence	40	**,1000**	,20255	,03203
ProtectingMother_Group4	child randomly selected	40	,1750	,24152	,03819
	child exposed to violence	40	,1125	,21145	,03343

Gender effects

Taking only **the sample of the children exposed to violence**, Independent samples T-test were also performed so as to compare the means **between boys and girls** in the three variables ("mother as an ideal role model", "mother as a non ideal role model" and "protecting mother") of the scenarios' 4th group. As it seems, in all the 3 new variables computed, p value is greater than 0.05 indicating that there are no significant differences between boys and girls as far as the "mother as an ideal role model" (p=0.307>0.05), the "mother as a non ideal role model" (p=0.427>0.05) and the "protecting mother" (p=0.066>0.05) variables is concerned. But, still, as it seems from the Descriptives table below, boys exposed to violence scored higher into protecting their mother than girls whereas girls' mean is greater than the one for boys concerning the "mother as an ideal role model" variable.

Group Statistics

	gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
MotherIdealModel_Group4	boy	25	,7400	,29297	,05859
	girl	15	,8333	,24398	,06299
MotherNonIdealModel_Group4	boy	25	,0800	,18708	,03742
	girl	15	,1333	,22887	,05909
ProtectingMother_Group4	boy	25	,1600	,23805	,04761
	girl	15	,0333	,12910	,03333

Independent samples T-test were performed so as to compare the means between **boys randomly selected and boys exposed to violence** in the three variables ("mother as an ideal role model", "mother as a non ideal role model" and "protecting mother"). As it seems, in all the 3 new variables computed, p value is greater than 0.05 indicating that there are no significant differences between boys exposed to violence and boys randomly selected as far the three variables is concerned.

Group Statistics

	exposure	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
MotherIdealModel_Group4	child randomly selected	25	,8200	,24495	,04899
	child exposed to violence	25	,7400	,29297	,05859
MotherNonIdealModel_Group4	child randomly selected	25	,0400	,13844	,02769
	child exposed to violence	25	,0800	,18708	,03742
ProtectingMother_Group4	child randomly selected	25	,1400	,22913	,04583
	child exposed to violence	25	,1600	,23805	,04761

Independent samples T-test were also performed so as to compare the means between **girls randomly selected and girls exposed to violence** in the three variables (mother as an ideal role model", "mother as a non ideal role model" and "protecting mother"). As it seems, in 2 of the 3 new variables computed, p value is lower than 0.05 indicating that there are significant differences between girls exposed to violence and girls randomly selected as far as *the mother as a non ideal role model* (p=0.032<0.05) and *the protecting mother* (p=0.012<0.05) is concerned. As it can be seen from the Descriptives table below, girls exposed to violence scored higher in not having their mother as an ideal role model whereas girls randomly selected scored higher in the need of protecting their mother.

Group Statistics

	exposure	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
MotherIdealModel_Group4	child randomly selected	15	,7667	,25820	,06667
	child exposed to violence	15	,8333	,24398	,06299
MotherNonIdealModel_Group4	child randomly selected	15	**,0000**	,00000	,00000
	child exposed to violence	15	**,1333**	,22887	,05909
ProtectingMother_Group4	child randomly selected	15	**,2333**	,25820	,06667
	child exposed to violence	15	**,0333**	,12910	,03333

E

Regarding the Group 5 of the scenarios that investigates the child's views regarding his/her self-image and self-confidence, where scenarios 2 and 10 (variables = sc2q1, sc10q1, sc10q2) are included, the new variables computed are those of a) high self image and b) low self image.

Independent samples T-test were performed so as to compare the means between the two samples concerning their self-image and self-confidence (Group 5 = Scenarios 2,10). As it seems, in all the 2 new variables computed, p value is lower than 0.05 indicating that there are significant differences between the two samples as far as the "high self-image" (p=0.003<0.05), and the "low self-image" (p=0.003<0.05) is concerned. As it can be seen from the Descriptives table below, children exposed to violence tend to believe that they have lower levels of self-image than the children randomly selected.

Group Statistics

	exposure	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
HighSelfImage_Group5	child randomly selected	40	**,9167**	,18101	,02862
	child exposed to violence	40	**,7667**	,25262	,03994
LowSelfImage_Group5	child randomly selected	40	**,0833**	,18101	,02862
	child exposed to violence	40	**,2333**	,25262	,03994

Gender effects

Taking only the groups of **children exposed to violence**, Independent samples T-test were also performed so as to compare the means **between boys and girls** in the two variables ("high self-image" and "low self-image") of the scenarios' 5th group. As it seems, in both new variables computed, p value is greater than 0.05 indicating that there are no significant differences between boys and girls as far as the "high self-image" (p=0.287>0.05), and the "low self-image" (p=0.287>0.05) is concerned.

Group Statistics

	gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
HighSelfImage_Group5	boy	25	,7333	,28868	,05774
	girl	15	,8222	,17213	,04444

LowSelfImage_Group5	boy	25	,2667	,28868	,05774
	girl	15	,1778	,17213	,04444

Independent samples T-test were also performed so as to compare the means between **boys randomly selected and boys exposed to violence** in the two variables ("high self-image" and "low self-image"). As it seems, in both new variables computed, p value is lower than 0.05 indicating that there are significant differences between boys exposed to violence and boys randomly selected as far *the high self image* (p=0.029<0.05) and *the low self image* (p=0.029<0.05) is concerned. As it seems from the Descriptives table below, boys exposed to violence have lower levels of self-esteem than boys randomly selected.

Group Statistics

	exposure	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
HighSelfImage_Group5	child randomly selected	25	,8933	,20905	,04181
	child exposed to violence	25	,7333	,28868	,05774
LowSelfImage_Group5	child randomly selected	25	,1067	,20905	,04181
	child exposed to violence	25	,2667	,28868	,05774

Independent samples T-test were also performed so as to compare the means between **girls randomly selected and girls exposed to violence** in the two variables ("high self-image" and "low self-image"). As it seems, in both new variables computed, p value is lower than 0.05 indicating that there are significant differences between girls exposed to violence and girls randomly selected as far as *the high self image* (p=0.019<0.05) and *the low self image* (p=0.019<0.05) is concerned. As it seems from the Descriptives table below, girls exposed to violence have lower levels of self-esteem than girls randomly selected.

Group Statistics

	exposure	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
MotherIdealModel_Group4	child randomly selected	15	,7667	,25820	,06667
	child exposed to violence	15	,8333	,24398	,06299
MotherNonIdealModel_Group4	child randomly selected	15	,0000	,00000	,00000
	child exposed to violence	15	,1333	,22887	,05909
ProtectingMother_Group4	child randomly selected	15	,2333	,25820	,06667
	child exposed to violence	15	,0333	,12910	,03333

F

Regarding the Group 6 of the scenarios that investigates the child's views regarding his/her school performance and school in general, where scenarios 6 and 8 (variables = sc6q1, sc6q2, sc8q1, sc8q2, sc8q3) are included, the new variables computed are those of a) excellent school performance, b) very good school performance, c) good school performance and d) poor school performance and failure.
Independent samples T-test were performed so as to compare the means between the two samples concerning their views regarding their school performance and school in general (Group 6 = Scenarios 6, 8). As it seems, in 3 of the 4 new variables computed, p value is greater than 0.05 indicating that there are no significant differences between the two samples as far as the "excellent school performance" (p=0.397>0.05), the "very good school performance" (p=0.190>0.05) and the "good school performance" (p=0.635>0.05) is concerned. Regarding the variable *"poor school performance and failure"*, p value is lower than 0.05 indicating that there are significant differences between the two samples (p=0.00<0.05). As it can be seen from the Descriptives table below, children exposed to violence tend to believe that they have lower school performance and consider themselves as failures.

Group Statistics

	exposure	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean

Excellent_Sch.Perf_Group6	child randomly selected	40	,2583	,26675	,04218
	child exposed to violence	40	,2083	,25806	,04080
VeryGood_Sch.Perf_Group 6	child randomly selected	40	,4375	,20993	,03319
	child exposed to violence	40	,3688	,25311	,04002
Good_Sch.Perf_Group6	child randomly selected	40	,4800	,22555	,03566
	child exposed to violence	40	,4550	,24385	,03856
Poor_Sch.Perf_Failure_Gro up6	child randomly selected	40	**,0150**	,05335	,00844
	child exposed to violence	40	**,1200**	,17424	,02755

Gender effects

Taking only **the sample of the children exposed to violence**, Independent samples T-test were performed so as to compare the means **between boys and girls** in the four variables ("excellent school performance", "very good school performance", "good school performance" and "poor school performance and failure") of the scenarios' 6th group. As it seems, in 3 of the 4 new variables computed, p value is greater than 0.05 indicating that there are no significant differences between boys and girls as far as the "excellent school performance" ($p=0.157>0.05$), the "very good school performance" ($p=0.968>0.05$) and the "poor school performance and failure" ($p=0.136>0.05$) is concerned. But, p value is lower than 0.05 in *the "good school performance"* ($p=0.033<0.05$) variable indicating that there are significant differences between boys and girls. As it seems from the Descriptives table below, more the girls than the boys exposed to violence tend to believe that they have just a good school performance whereas boys have greater means in the "excellent school performance" and "very good school performance" variables.

Group Statistics

	gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Excellent_Sch.Perf_Group6	boy	25	,2533	,25963	,05193
	girl	15	,1333	,24560	,06341
VeryGood_Sch.Perf_Group 6	boy	25	,3700	,25125	,05025
	girl	15	,3667	,26502	,06843
Good_Sch.Perf_Group6	boy	25	**,3920**	,23438	,04688
	girl	15	**,5600**	,22928	,05920
Poor_Sch.Perf_Failure_Gro up6	boy	25	,1520	,19391	,03878
	girl	15	,0667	,12344	,03187

Independent samples T-test were also performed so as to compare the means between **boys randomly selected and boys exposed to violence** in the four variables ("excellent school performance", "very good school performance", "good school performance" and "poor school performance and failure"). As it seems, in 2 of the 4 new variables computed, p value is lower than 0.05 indicating that there are significant differences between boys exposed to violence and boys randomly selected as far as *the very good school performance* ($p=0.05=0.05$) and *the poor school performance and failure* ($p=0.003<0.05$) is concerned. As it seems from the Descriptives table below, boys exposed to violence scored higher in the failure variable than boys randomly selected.

Group Statistics

	exposure	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Excellent_Sch.Perf_Group6	child randomly selected	25	,2800	,28350	,05670
	child exposed to violence	25	,2533	,25963	,05193
VeryGood_Sch.Perf_Group 6	child randomly selected	25	**,5000**	,20412	,04082
	child exposed to violence	25	**,3700**	,25125	,05025
Good_Sch.Perf_Group6	child randomly selected	25	,4080	,22716	,04543
	child exposed to violence	25	,3920	,23438	,04688

	exposure	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Poor_Sch.Perf_Failure_Group6	child randomly selected	25	**,0240**	,06633	,01327
	child exposed to violence	25	**,1520**	,19391	,03878

Independent samples T-test were also performed so as to compare the means between **girls randomly selected and girls exposed to violence** in the four variables ("excellent school performance", "very good school performance", "good school performance" and "poor school performance and failure"). As it seems, in only 1 of the 4 new variables computed, p value is lower than 0.05 indicating that there are significant differences between girls exposed to violence and girls randomly selected as far as *the poor school performance and failure* (p=0.046<0.05) is concerned. As it seems from the Descriptives table below, girls exposed to violence scored slightly higher in the failure variable than gilrs randomly selected.

Group Statistics

	exposure	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Excellent_Sch.Perf_Group6	child randomly selected	15	,2222	,24125	,06229
	child exposed to violence	15	,1333	,24560	,06341
VeryGood_Sch.Perf_Group6	child randomly selected	15	,3333	,18094	,04672
	child exposed to violence	15	,3667	,26502	,06843
Good_Sch.Perf_Group6	child randomly selected	15	,6000	,16903	,04364
	child exposed to violence	15	,5600	,22928	,05920
Poor_Sch.Perf_Failure_Group6	child randomly selected	15	,0000	,00000	,00000
	child exposed to violence	15	,0667	,12344	,03187

Scenarios' Instrument Data Analysis

A

The results are organized according to the theoretical grouping of the scenarios.

1) In Sc1q1, 11 children out of the 40 exposed to violence responded aggressively whereas only 1 child randomly selected did the same. With a chi-square (x^2) = 10,817 (p =0.055>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.368 (p=0.055>0.05), it seems that there isn't any relationship between the two variables.

1		Sc1q1						
		AGGRES verbally violent behavior	AGGRES physically violent behavior	ASSERT constructive solution	PASS avoidance /escape	ASSERT constructive solution	AGGRES verbally violent behavior	T
exposure	child randomly selected	0	0	8	9	22	1	40
	child exposed to violence	5	2	5	9	15	4	40
Total		5	2	13	18	37	5	80

2) In Sc1q2, 17 children out of the 40 exposed to violence responded aggressively whereas the majority of children randomly selected preferred a more constructive solution as an answer. With a chi-square (x^2) = 21.657 (p =0.00<0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.520 (p=0.00<0.05), it seems that there is a relationship between the two variables.

2		sc1q2				
		AGGRES verbally violent behavior	AGGRES physically violent behavior	ASSERT constructive solution	PASS tolerant behavior	T
exposure	child randomly selected	1	0	32	7	40
	child exposed to violence	10	7	14	9	40
Total		11	7	46	16	80

3) In Sc5q1, 12 children out of the 40 exposed to violence responded aggressively whereas the majority of children randomly selected preferred either a constructive or a passive solution as an answer. With a chi-square (x^2) = 17.411 (p =0.004<0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.467 (p=0.004<0.05), it seems that there is a relationship between the two variables.

3		sc5q1						
		AGGRES verbally violent behavior	AGGRES verbally violent behavior	PASS tolerant behavior	PASS tolerant behavior	ASSERT constructive solution	ASSERT constructive solution	T
exposure	child randomly selected	0	0	0	18	3	19	40
	child exposed to violence	6	6	2	10	3	13	40
Total		6	6	2	28	6	32	80

4) In Sc5q2, 10 children out of the 40 exposed to violence responded aggressively whereas the other 30 preferred either a passive or a constructive solution as an answer. On the contrary, the majority of children randomly selected preferred a constructive as an answer. With a chi-square $(x^2) = 13.097$ (p $=0.022<0.05$) and a Cramer's V $= 0.407$ (p$=0.022<0.05$), <u>it seems that there is a relationship between the two variables.</u>

4		sc5q2						
		AGGRES verbally violent behavior	AGGRES physically violent behavior	ASSERT constructive solution	PASS tolerant behavior	ASSERT call of a third party	AGGRES verbally and physically violent behavior	T
exposure	child randomly selected	0	0	24	13	2	0	40
	child exposed to violence	6	1	14	15	1	3	40
Total		6	1	38	28	3	3	80

5) In Sc5q3, only 5 children out of the 40 exposed to violence responded aggressively whereas the majority of them preferred a constructive solution as an answer. The big majority of the children randomly selected preferred also a constructive solution as an answer. With a chi-square $(x^2) = 13.552$ (p $=0.019<0.05$) and a Cramer's V $= 0.412$ (p$=0.019<0.05$), <u>it seems that there is a relationship between the two variables.</u>

5		sc5q3						
		AGGRES blaming father's behavior	PASS Tolerance/ blaming mother's behavior	PASS tolerance/ avoidance	AGGRES violent behavior	ASSERT constructive solution	ASSERT constructive solution	T
exposure	child randomly selected	0	1	1	0	3	35	40
	child exposed to violence	1	1	8	4	4	22	40
Total		1	2	9	4	7	57	80

6) In Sc7q1, 14 children out of the 40 exposed to violence responded aggressively whereas the others preferred a constructive solution as an answer. On the contrary, all the children randomly selected preferred a constructive as an answer. With a chi-square $(x^2) = 17.330$ (p $=0.002<0.05$) and a Cramer's V $= 0.465$ (p$=0.002<0.05$), <u>it seems that there is a relationship between the two variables</u>.

6		sc7q1					
		AGGRES verbally violent behavior	ASSERT constructive solution	AGGRES verbally and physically violent behavior	AGGRES physically violent behavior	ASSERT constructive solution	T
exposure	child randomly selected	0	29	0	0	11	40
	child exposed to violence	5	17	5	4	9	40
Total		5	46	5	4	20	80

7) In Sc7q2, 15 children out of the 40 exposed to violence responded aggressively whereas the others preferred a constructive solution as an answer. On the contrary, all the children randomly selected preferred assertiveness as an answer. With a chi-square $(x^2) = 23.785$ (p $=0.000<0.05$) and a Cramer's V $= 0.545$ (p$=0.000<0.05$), <u>it seems that there is a relationship between the two variables.</u>

7		sc7q2				
	AGGRESS	ASSERT exonerating self	ASSERT	AGGRESS		T
exposure child randomly selected	0	1	39	0		40
child exposed to violence	8	5	20	7		40
Total	8	6	59	7		80

8) In Sc7q3, 8 children out of the 40 exposed to violence responded aggressively whereas most of them preferred a constructive solution as an answer. On the contrary, all the children randomly selected preferred assertiveness as an answer. With a chi-square (x^2) = 13.571 (p =0.009<0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.412 (p=0.009<0.05), <u>it seems that there is a relationship between the two variables</u>.

8		sc7q3					
	ASSERT constructive solution	AGGRES	PASS avoidance	ASSERT constructive solution	AGGRES		T
exposure child randomly selected	27	0	0	13	0		40
child exposed to violence	15	6	2	15	2		40
Total	42	6	2	28	2		80

B

9) In Sc3q1, 23 children out of the 40 exposed to violence responded aggressively whereas the others preferred either a constructive or a passive solution as an answer. The interesting is that also 16 of the children randomly selected preferred a verbally violent behavior as an answer; this can be explained by the fact that the particular answer wasn't that aggressive as the others. With a chi-square (x^2) = 13.324 (p =0.038<0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.408 (p=0.038<0.05<u>), it seems that there is a relationship between the two variables.</u>

9		sc3q1							
	AGGRES Physically - verbally violent behavior	PASS avoidance /tolerance	ASSERT constructive solution	AGGRES verbally violent behavior	AGGRES physically violent behavior	PASS avoidance /tolerance	ASSERT constructive solution		T
exposure child randomly selected	0	5	3	16	0	1	15		40
child exposed to violence	7	7	3	14	2	1	6		40
Total	7	12	6	30	2	2	21		80

10) In Sc3q2, 23 children out of the 40 exposed to violence responded aggressively whereas the others preferred either a constructive or a passive solution as an answer. The interesting is that 5 of the children randomly selected preferred an aggressive solution as an answer whereas the majority of them preferred an assertive solution. With a chi-square (x^2) = 21.086 (p =0.001<0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.513 (p=0.001<0.05), <u>it seems that there is a relationship between the two variables</u>.

10	sc3q2						
	AGGRES verbally violent behavior	AGGRES physically violent behavior	ASSERT constructive solution	PASS tolerant behavior	ASSERT call of a third party	AGGRES physically and verbally violent behavior	T
exposure child randomly selected	4	1	21	7	7	0	40
child exposed to violence	6	15	9	4	4	2	40
Total	10	16	30	11	11	2	80

11) In Sc3q3, only 6 children out of the 40 exposed to violence responded aggressively whereas the others preferred either a constructive or a passive solution as an answer. From the children randomly selected, the majority preferred an assertive solution. With a chi-square (x^2) = 3.830 (p =0.430>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.220 (p=0.430>0.05), it seems that there isn't a relationship between the two variables.

11	sc3q3					
	AGGRES verbally violent behavior	AGGRES physically violent behavior	ASSERT constructive solution	PASS tolerant behavior	ASSERT call of a third party	T
exposure child randomly selected	1	1	18	8	12	40
child exposed to violence	2	4	13	11	9	39
Total	3	5	31	19	21	79

12) In Sc3q4, both the majority ofchildren exposed to violence and randomly selected chose being angry and upset after being pushed by classmates; with more children exposed to violence being upset though. With a chi-square (x^2) = 1.522 (p =0.677>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.138 (p=0.677>0.05), it seems that there isn't a relationship between the two variables.

12 (not included in the grouping)	sc3q4				Total
	angry	upset	happy	stupid	
exposure child randomly selected	14	21	2	3	40
child exposed to violence	19	18	1	2	40
Total	33	39	3	5	80

13) In Sc9q1, 11 children out of the 40 exposed to violence responded aggressively whereas the others preferred either a constructive or a passive solution as an answer. From the children randomly selected, the majority preferred either an assertive or a passive solution. With a chi-square (x^2) = 16.286 (p =0.006<0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.451 (p=0.006<0.05), <u>it seems that there is a relationship between the two variables.</u>

13	sc9q1						
	AGGRES verbally violent behavior	PASS tolerant behavior	AGGRES verbally and physically violent behavior	ASSERT constructive solution	PASS tolerant behavior/ avoidance	ASSERT constructive solution	T
exposure child randomly selected	0	10	0	13	5	12	40
child exposed to violence	8	10	3	13	2	4	40
Total	8	20	3	26	7	16	80

14) In Sc9q2, 16 children out of the 40 exposed to violence responded aggressively whereas the others preferred either a constructive or a passive solution as an answer. From the children randomly selected, the majority preferred either an assertive or a passive solution whereas only 1 preferred a verbally violent behavior as an answer. With a chi-square $(x^2) = 20.634$ (p =0.001<0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.508 (p=0.001<0.05), it seems that there is a relationship between the two variables.

14		AGGRES verbally violent behavior	AGGRES physically violent behavior	ASSERT constructive solution	PASS tolerant behavior	ASSERT call of a third party	AGGRES verbally and physically violent behavior	T
		sc9q2						
exposure	child randomly selected	1	0	17	12	10	0	40
	child exposed to violence	5	8	6	13	5	3	40
Total		6	8	23	25	15	3	80

15) In Sc9q3, both the majority of children exposed to violence and randomly selected preferred avoiding violence as an answer whereas also some of them seemed that they had fear of violence. With a chi-square $(x^2) = 1.000$ (p =0.607>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.112 (p=0.607>0.05), it seems that there isn't a relationship between the two variables.

15 (not included in the grouping)		sc9q3			
		fear of violence	assertiveness- avoiding violence	non explicit fear of violence	T
exposure	child randomly selected	11	26	3	40
	child exposed to violence	13	22	5	40
Total		24	48	8	80

16) In Sc9q4, both the majority of children exposed to violence and randomly selected preferred a non tolerant behavior but simultaneously a constructive solution as an answer whereas some of the exposed to violence children preferred aggressiveness. 6 of the children exposed to violence preffered passiveness whereas none of the children randomly selected chose it as an answer. With a chi-square $(x^2) = 10.724$ (p =0.013<0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.366 (p=0.013<0.05), it seems that there is a relationship between the two variables.

16		sc9q4				
		Passiveness tolerant behavior	Activeness non tolerance assertiveness	Passiveness tolerant behavior	Activeness non tolerance aggressiveness	T
exposure	child randomly selected	0	36	2	2	40
	child exposed to violence	6	26	1	7	40
Total		6	62	3	9	80

17) In Sc14q1, preferred answers vary. More children exposed to violence chose aggressiveness (11 out of 40) whereas the others chose passiveness. With a chi-square $(x^2) = 5.417$ (p =0.367>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.260 (p=0.367>0.05), it seems that there isn't a relationship between the two variables.

17	sc14q1						
	PASS tolerance	AGGRES verbally violent behavior	AGGRESS physically violent behavior	AGGRESS verbally and physically violent behavior	PASS tolerance	PASS tolerance	T
exposure child randomly selected	18	2	2	1	8	9	40
child exposed to violence	18	2	5	4	3	8	40
Total	36	4	7	5	11	17	80

18) In Sc14q2, 15 out of 40 children exposed to violence preferred aggressiveness as an answer – mostly a physically violent behavior - whereas most of the children randomly selected chose firstly passiveness and then assertiveness. With a chi-square (x^2) = 14.336 (p =0.014<0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.423 (p=0.014<0.05), <u>it seems that there is a relationship between the two variables</u>.

18	sc14q2						
	AGGRES verbally violent behavior	AGGRES physically violent behavior	ASSERT constructive solution	PASS tolerant behavior	ASSERT call of a third party	AGGRES verbally and physically violent behavior	T
exposure child randomly selected	3	0	6	25	6	0	40
child exposed to violence	4	10	5	14	6	1	40
Total	7	10	11	39	12	1	80

19) In Sc14q3, approximately the same numbers of children exposed to violence and randomly selected chose either passiveness or assertiveness as an answer. But, still 6 of the children exposed to violence prefer to adopt a violent behavior. With a chi-square (x^2) = 6.436 (p =0.169>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.284 (p=0.169>0.05), it seems that there isn't a relationship between the two variables.

19	Sc14q3					
	AGGRES verbally violent behavior	AGGRES physically violent behavior	ASSERT constructive solution	PASS tolerant behavior	ASSERT call of a third party	T
exposure child randomly selected	0	1	15	16	8	40
child exposed to violence	2	4	8	15	11	40
Total	2	5	23	31	19	80

C

20) In Sc4q1, approximately the same numbers of children exposed to violence and randomly selected disagree with violence. But, still only 1 of the children exposed to violence prefer to adopt an aggressive behavior while witnessing violence. With a chi-square (x^2) = 3.927 (p =0.416>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.222 (p=0.416>0.05), it seems that there isn't a relationship between the two variables.

20	sc4q1					
	PASS agreeing with violence	PASS ignoring violence	ACTIVE disagreeing with violence	ACTIVE call of a third party	AGGRESS aggressive behavior	T

exposure	child randomly selected	0	2	34	4	0	40
	child exposed to violence	2	3	32	2	1	40
Total		2	5	66	6	1	80

21) In Sc4q2, approximately the same numbers of children exposed to violence and randomly selected disagree with violence and prefere a constructive solution to deal with it. But, still only 7 of the children exposed to violence seem to agree with violence while witnessing it. With a chi-square (x^2) = 13.515 (p =0.004<0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.411 (p=0.004<0.05), <u>it seems that there is a relationship between the two variables.</u>

21		sc4q2				
		PASS agreeing with violence	PASS ignoring violence	ACTIVE disagreeing with violence/ constructive solution	PASS ignoring violence	T
exposure	child randomly selected	0	0	39	1	40
	child exposed to violence	7	4	27	2	40
Total		7	4	66	3	80

22) In Sc4q3, 17 out of 40 children exposed to violence preferred aggressiveness and especially a physically violent behavior as an answer. On the contrary, more children randomly selected prefer either assertiveness or passiveness. With a chi-square (x^2) = 21.046 (p =0.000<0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.513 (p=0.000<0.05), <u>it seems that there is a relationship between the two variables.</u>

22		sc4q3					
		AGGRESS verbally violent behavior	AGGRESS physically violent behavior	ASSERT constructive solution	PASS tolerant behavior	ASSERT call of a third party	T
exposure	child randomly selected	0	1	22	12	5	40
	child exposed to violence	1	17	12	5	5	40
Total		1	18	34	17	10	80

23) In Sc11q3, half of the children exposed to violence preferred aggressiveness and especially a physically violent behavior as an answer. On the contrary, more children randomly selected preferred a constructive solution as an answer. With a chi-square (x^2) = 23.207 (p =0.000<0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.539 (p=0.000<0.05), <u>it seems that there is a relationship between the two variables.</u>

23		sc11q3					
		AGGRESS physically violent behavior	PASS tolerance	AGGRESS physically violent behavior	ASSERT constructive solution	PASS tolerance	T
exposure	child randomly selected	3	0	0	37	0	40
	child exposed to violence	17	2	3	17	1	40
Total		20	2	3	54	1	80

24) In Sc12q1, the majority of the two samples seem to disagree with violence. But, still 9 out of 40 children exposed to violence preferred aggressiveness as an answer. With a chi-square (x^2) = 12.945 (p

=0.005<0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.402 (p=0.005<0.05), <u>it seems that there is a relationship between the two variables.</u>

24	sc12q1				
	Activeness disagreeing with violence	Activeness disagreeing with violence	Passiveness ignoring violence	Activeness aggressiveness	T
exposure child randomly selected	23	16	0	1	40
child exposed to violence	23	6	2	9	40
Total	46	22	2	10	80

25) In Sc12q2, all children randomly selected disagree with violence and prefer assertiveness and constructive solutions. On the contrary, 5 out of 40 children exposed to violence preferred aggressiveness as an answer whereas most of them preferred also assertiveness. With a chi-square (x^2) = 7.771 (p =0.100>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.312 (p=0.100>0.05), it seems that there isn't a relationship between the two variables.

25	sc12q2					
	PASS agreeing with violence	PASS ignoring violence	ASSERT disagreeing with violence	ASSERT call of a third party	AGGRESS verbally and/or physically violent behavior	T
exposure child randomly selected	0	0	16	24	0	40
child exposed to violence	1	1	12	21	5	40
Total	1	1	28	45	5	80

26) In Sc12q3, both children exposed to violence and randomly selected evaluated negatively the violent behavior of the scenario's hero.

26 (not included in the grouping)	sc12q3	
	negative evaluation	T
exposure child randomly selected	40	40
child exposed to violence	39	39
Total	79	79

D

27) In Sc11q1, more children randomly selected than those exposed to violence consider their mother as an ideal role model whereas 5 children exposed to violence consider their mother as a non ideal role model. With a chi-square (x^2) = 4.806 (p =0.308>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.245 (p=0.308>0.05), it seems that there isn't a relationship between the two variables.

27	sc11q1					
	Protecting mother role exchange	Mother ideal role model	Mother non ideal role model	Mother non ideal role model	Mother ideal role model	T
exposure child randomly selected	2	25	0	1	12	40

	child exposed to violence	2	18	3	2	15	40
Total		4	43	3	3	27	80

28) In Sc11q2, more children exposed to violence consider violence as a play and are afraid of losing friends if they react somehow. But, still approximately the same numbers of children randomly selected and exposed to violence preferred the fourth choice as an answer ("I didn't want to beat them back"). With a chi-square (x^2) = 4.392 (p =0.222>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.234 (p=0.222>0.05), it seems that there isn't a relationship between the two variables.

28 (not included in the grouping)		sc11q2				
		Passiveness violence as a play	Passiveness possibility to lose friends	Passiveness violence is learned	Passiveness tolerance	T
exposure	child randomly selected	6	3	1	30	40
	child exposed to violence	11	6	2	21	40
Total		17	9	3	51	80

29) In Sc13q1, approximately the same numbers of children randomly selected and exposed to violence consider their mother as an ideal role model whereas 3 children exposed to violence consider their mother as a non ideal role model. With a chi-square (x^2) = 2.620 (p =0.454>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.182 (p=0.454>0.05), it seems that there isn't a relationship between the two variables.

29		sc13q1				
		Mother ideal role model	Protecting mother role exchange	Mother ideal role model	Mother non ideal role model	T
exposure	child randomly selected	12	12	15	1	40
	child exposed to violence	11	7	18	3	39
Total		23	19	33	4	79

30) In Sc13q2, children randomly selected and exposed to violence answered approximately in the same way, with the prohibition of enjoyable activies being the first choise as a punishment for turning on the television, according to the scenario. With a chi-square (x^2) = 1.549 (p =0.671>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.140 (p=0.671>0.05), it seems that there isn't a relationship between the two variables.

30 (not included in the grouping)		sc13q2				
		prohibition of enjoyable activities	assigning of undesirable task	scolding from parents	no punishment	T
exposure	child randomly selected	26	4	4	6	40
	child exposed to violence	27	6	3	3	39
Total		53	10	7	9	80

31) In Sc13q3, more children randomly selected preferred an assertive answer whereas 12 out of 40 children exposed to violence would worried about father's nerves thus indicating a hot-tempered profile of his. With a chi-square (x^2) = 13.840 (p =0.008<0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.416 (p=0.008<0.05), it seems that there is a relationship between the two variables.

31 (not included in the grouping)	sc13q3					
	father's profile hot tempered	assertiveness	violece in family	assertiveness	mother's profile tolerant	T
exposure child randomly selected	6	25	2	0	7	40
child exposed to violence	12	18	3	6	1	40
Total	18	43	5	6	8	80

E

32) In Sc2q1, approximately the same numbers of children randomly selected and exposed to violence have a sense of medium acceptance from peers whereas more children randomly selected have a strong sense of acceptance. With a chi-square (x^2) = 2.419 (p =0.659>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.174 (p=0.659>0.05), it seems that there isn't a relationship between the two variables.

32	sc2q1					
	very strong sense of acceptance	strong sense of acceptance	sense of medium acceptance	sense of partial accpetance	sense of rejection	Total
exposure child randomly selected	3	10	22	4	1	40
child exposed to violence	2	7	21	8	2	40
Total	5	17	43	12	3	80

33) In Sc10q1, approximately the same numbers of children randomly selected and exposed to violence would rather choose an active way of reacting, indicating in that way a high self-image. But , still 7 children exposed to violence seem to be passive and have a low-self image. With a chi-square (x^2) = 6.371 (p =0.173>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.282 (p=0.173>0.05), it seems that there isn't a relationship between the two variables.

33	sc10q1					
	Passiveness low self image	Activeness high self image	Passiveness low self image	Passiveness low self image	Activeness high self image	T
exposure child randomly selected	1	13	1	0	25	40
child exposed to violence	1	7	6	1	25	40
Total	2	20	7	1	50	80

34) In Sc10q2, more children exposed to violence seem to have a low self-image whereas the answers given by the majority of children randomly selected show that they have a high self-image. With a chi-square (x^2) = 4.553 (p =0.103>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.239 (p=0.103>0.05), it seems that there isn't a relationship between the two variables.

34	sc10q2			
	Passiveness low self-image	Activeness high self-image	Activeness call of a third party- high self-image	T
exposure child randomly selected	3	22	15	40
child exposed to violence	10	17	13	40

34	sc10q2			
	Passiveness low self-image	Activeness high self-image	Activeness call of a third party- high self-image	T
exposure child randomly selected	3	22	15	40
child exposed to violence	10	17	13	40
Total	13	39	28	80

F

35) In Sc6q1, approximately the same numbers of children randomly selected and exposed to violence have neither good nor bad school performance. But, still more children exposed to violence seem to have a good and/or poor school performance. With a chi-square (x^2) = 2.084 (p =0.555>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.161 (p=0.555>0.05), it seems that there isn't a relationship between the two variables.

35	sc6q1				
	neither good nor bad school performance	good school performance	poor school performance	neither good nor bad school performance	T
exposure child randomly selected	17	7	1	15	40
child exposed to violence	12	11	2	15	40
Total	29	18	3	30	80

36) In Sc6q2, 8 children exposed to violence feel that they have failed at school whereas all children randomly selected have a sense of success at school. With a chi-square (x^2) = 8.893 (p =0.031<0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.333 (p=0.031<0.05), <u>it seems that there is a relationship between the two variables</u>.

36	sc6q2				
	sense of failure at school	sense of success at school	sense of managing to succeed at school	sense of failure at school and in general	T
exposure child randomly selected	0	9	31	0	40
child exposed to violence	6	7	25	2	40
Total	6	16	56	2	80

37) In Sc6q3, children exposed to violence and randomly selected answered approximately in the same way. But still, more children exposed to violence feel that Jim's/Jane's catastrophic reaction in the class remind them of themselves. With a chi-square (x^2) = 5.920 (p =0.116>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.272 (p=0.116>0.05), it seems that there isn't a relationship between the two variables.

37 (not included in the grouping)	sc6q3				
	not at all	a little	much	very much	T
exposure child randomly selected	10	27	2	1	40
child exposed to violence	6	23	8	3	40
Total	16	50	10	4	80

38) In Sc8q1, approximately the same numbers of children randomly selected and exposed to violence fell that they are either great or very well/well prepared for the test according to the scenario. With a chi-square (x^2) = 9.226 (p =0.056>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.340 (p=0.056>0.05), it seems that there isn't a relationship between the two variables.

38	sc8q1					
	great	very well	well	a little	not at all	T
exposure child randomly selected	9	22	8	0	1	40
child exposed to violence	12	11	15	2	0	40
Total	21	33	23	2	1	80

39) In Sc8q2, more children randomly selected feel that they have a good school performance whereas 5 children exposed to violence feel that they are failures. With a chi-square (x^2) = 8.098 (p =0.044<0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.320 (p=0.044<0.05), it seems that there is a relationship between the two variables.

39	sc8q2				
	sense of excellent school performance	sense of good school performance	sense of medium school performance	no good school pefromance failure	T
exposure child randomly selected	1	24	15	0	40
child exposed to violence	3	15	16	5	39
Total	4	39	31	5	79

40) In Sc8q3, more children randomly selected have a sense of success or mananging to succeed at school whereas 9 children exposed to violence feel that they are failures. With a chi-square (x^2) = 10.705 (p =0.013<0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.366 (p=0.013<0.05), it seems that there is a relationship between the two variables.

40	sc8q3				
	sense of school failure	sense of school success	sense of managing success at school	sense of school failure/failure in general	T
exposure child randomly selected	0	21	18	1	40
child exposed to violence	3	10	21	6	40
Total	3	31	39	7	80