University of Cyprus

Italy's DATA

▪ 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 0.844, 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 0.541, not very satisfactory whereas for the 3rd part of the Harter's instrument, Cronbach's Alpha was found to be 0.871. For the Scenarios' Instrument, Cronbach's alpha reached the value of 0.653, approaching 0.7 and thus satisfactory.

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

		N	%
Cases	Valid	80	100,0
	Excluded[a]	0	,0
	Total	80	100,0

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

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
,844	36

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

		N	%
Cases	Valid	80	100,0
	Excluded[a]	0	,0
	Total	80	100,0

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

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
,541	10

Harter's Instrument_for the Teacher_15 items
Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	80	100,0
	Excluded[a]	0	,0
	Total	80	100,0

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

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
,871	15

Scenarios' Instrument_for the Child_40 items
Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	73	91,3
	Excluded[a]	7	8,8
	Total	80	100,0

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

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
,639	40

▪ Demographics

The sample of Italy consists of 80 persons, 40 children who were identified being exposed to violence and 40 children randomly selected from a larger sample. In the group of children randomly selected 20 are boys and 20 are girls whereas 12 of them are 4th graders, 21 are 5th graders and 7 are 6th graders. In the group of children exposed to violence, 29 are boys and 11 are girls whereas 11 are 4th graders, 15 are 5th graders and 14 are 6th graders. 32 are the exposed to violence children whose both parents speak Italian and thus come from Italy. In each group of children, 6 have parents who have other maternal language than Italian whereas 2 have only their mother not speaking Italian.

		gender		Total
		boy	girl	
exposure	child randomly selected	20	20	40
	child exposed to violence	29	11	40
Total		49	31	80

		class			Total
		4th grade	5th grade	6th grade	
exposure	child randomly selected	12	21	7	40
	child exposed to violence	11	15	14	40
Total		23	36	21	80

		gender		Total
		boy	girl	
class	4th grade	15	8	23
	5th grade	22	14	36
	6th grade	12	9	21
Total		49	31	80

		motherLang			T
		Italian for mother and father	no Italian for mother and father	no Italian for mother and Italian for father	
exposure	child randomly selected	32	6	2	40
	child exposed to violence	32	6	2	40
Total		64	12	4	80

		fatherLang			T
		Italian for mother and father	no Italian for mother and father	no Italian for mother and Italian for father	
exposure	child randomly selected	32	6	2	40
	child exposed to violence	32	6	2	40
Total		64	12	4	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 2.5, 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	40	2,8667	,66259	,10477
	child exposed to violence	40	2,5708	,49770	,07869
Social_Acceptance_Ch	child randomly selected	40	2,9208	,64824	,10250
	child exposed to violence	40	2,7458	,56612	,08951
Athletic_Competence_Ch	child randomly selected	40	2,6833	,56336	,08908
	child exposed to violence	40	2,7708	,48140	,07612
Physical_Appearance_Ch	child randomly selected	40	2,8542	,84157	,13306
	child exposed to violence	40	2,8042	,72293	,11431
Behavioral_Conduct_Ch	child randomly selected	40	2,7000	,61695	,09755
	child exposed to violence	40	2,6542	,57906	,09156
Global_SelfWorth_Ch	child randomly selected	40	3,0958	,65360	,10334
	child exposed to violence	40	3,0167	,53616	,08477

Independent samples T-test were performed so as to compare the subscale means between the two samples, the children randomly selected and the children exposed to violence. As it seems, in only 1 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* ($p=0.027<0.05$) is concerned. Therefore, the hypothesis H0 that all the means are equal can be rejected as far as this subscale is concerned since the sample of the children exposed to violence has lower means in the specific subscale. More specifically, children exposed to violence tend to believe that they have lower ability or competence within the realm of their scholastic performance.

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 all the 6 subscales p value is greater than 0.05 indicating that there are no significant differences between boys and girls as far as the 6 subscales is concerned.

Group Statistics

	gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Scholastic_Competence_Ch	boy	29	2,5575	,54423	,10106
	girl	11	2,6061	,36722	,11072
Social_Acceptance_Ch	boy	29	2,7816	,47996	,08913
	girl	11	2,6515	,76903	,23187
Athletic_Competence_Ch	boy	29	2,7414	,51290	,09524
	girl	11	2,8485	,39759	,11988
Physical_Appearance_Ch	boy	29	2,8276	,78108	,14504
	girl	11	2,7424	,56942	,17169
Behavioral_Conduct_Ch	boy	29	2,6724	,60991	,11326
	girl	11	2,6061	,51247	,15452

Global_SelfWorth_Ch	boy	29	3,0115	,55085	,10229
	girl	11	3,0303	,52078	,15702

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 all the domains, p value is greater than 0.05 indicating that there are no significant differences between boys exposed to violence and boys randomly selected.

Group Statistics

	exposure	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Scholastic_Competence_Ch	child randomly selected	20	2,8250	,60329	,13490
	child exposed to violence	29	2,5575	,54423	,10106
Social_Acceptance_Ch	child randomly selected	20	2,8833	,60238	,13470
	child exposed to violence	29	2,7816	,47996	,08913
Athletic_Competence_Ch	child randomly selected	20	2,7667	,57328	,12819
	child exposed to violence	29	2,7414	,51290	,09524
Physical_Appearance_Ch	child randomly selected	20	2,9833	,75877	,16967
	child exposed to violence	29	2,8276	,78108	,14504
Behavioral_Conduct_Ch	child randomly selected	20	2,6083	,64950	,14523
	child exposed to violence	29	2,6724	,60991	,11326
Global_SelfWorth_Ch	child randomly selected	20	3,1333	,53966	,12067
	child exposed to violence	29	3,0115	,55085	,10229

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 all the domains, p value is greater than 0.05 indicating that there are no significant differences between girls exposed to violence and girls randomly selected.

Group Statistics

	exposure	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Scholastic_Competence_Ch	child randomly selected	20	2,9083	,73045	,16333
	child exposed to violence	11	2,6061	,36722	,11072
Social_Acceptance_Ch	child randomly selected	20	2,9583	,70478	,15759
	child exposed to violence	11	2,6515	,76903	,23187
Athletic_Competence_Ch	child randomly selected	20	2,6000	,55515	,12413
	child exposed to violence	11	2,8485	,39759	,11988
Physical_Appearance_Ch	child randomly selected	20	2,7250	,91810	,20529
	child exposed to violence	11	2,7424	,56942	,17169
Behavioral_Conduct_Ch	child randomly selected	20	2,7917	,58459	,13072
	child exposed to violence	11	2,6061	,51247	,15452
Global_SelfWorth_Ch	child randomly selected	20	3,0583	,76333	,17069
	child exposed to violence	11	3,0303	,52078	,15702

Grade effects

For the sample of **the children exposed to violence**, there weren't grade effects favoring any group of children of different class as it can be seen from the table ANOVA below.

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Scholastic_Competence_	Between Groups	1,302	2	,651	2,882	,069

	Within Groups	8,358	37	,226		
	Total	9,660	39			
Social_Acceptance_Ch	Between Groups	,615	2	,307	,957	,393
	Within Groups	11,884	37	,321		
	Total	12,499	39			
Athletic_Competence_Ch	Between Groups	,278	2	,139	,587	,561
	Within Groups	8,760	37	,237		
	Total	9,038	39			
Physical_Appearance_Ch	Between Groups	1,860	2	,930	1,858	,170
	Within Groups	18,522	37	,501		
	Total	20,383	39			
Behavioral_Conduct_Ch	Between Groups	1,150	2	,575	1,783	,182
	Within Groups	11,927	37	,322		
	Total	13,077	39			
Global_SelfWorth_Ch	Between Groups	,441	2	,221	,758	,476
	Within Groups	10,770	37	,291		
	Total	11,211	39			

Harter's Instrument 3rd part_for the child_36 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 2.5, which is above the midpoint of the scale. In addition, 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	**2,9000**	,96727	,15294
	child exposed to violence	40	**2,2833**	,89172	,14099
Social_Acceptance_T	child randomly selected	40	**3,3167**	,71592	,11320
	child exposed to violence	40	**2,5833**	,90188	,14260
Athletic_Competence_T	child randomly selected	40	**3,0833**	,53775	,08503
	child exposed to violence	40	**2,5000**	,78446	,12403
Physical_Appearance_T	child randomly selected	40	3,2750	,70362	,11125
	child exposed to violence	40	3,0917	,76975	,12171
Behavioral_Conduct_T	child randomly selected	40	**3,2750**	,87994	,13913
	child exposed to violence	40	**2,5250**	1,07520	,17000

Regarding the subscale means from the **teacher rating scale**, significant differences between the two samples are observed in *the scholastic competence* ($p=0.004<0.05$), in *the social acceptance* ($p=0.000<0.05$), *in the athletic competence* ($p=0.000<0.05$) and in *the behavioral conduct* ($p=0.001<0.05$). As it seems from the means, teachers give lower values for the children exposed to violence than for the others in these four 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 not so athletic and give them low 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 all the 5 subscales p value is greater than 0.05 indicating that there are no significant differences between boys and girls as far as the five subscales is concerned. But, still, as it seems from the means, teachers give slightly lower values for the boys than for the girls in all the subscales, especially in the subscale of the behavioral conduct.

Group Statistics

	gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Scholastic_Competence_T	boy	29	2,1954	,88424	,16420
	girl	11	2,5152	,91121	,27474
Social_Acceptance_T	boy	29	2,4828	,84321	,15658
	girl	11	2,8485	1,03670	,31258
Athletic_Competence_T	boy	29	2,4943	,76439	,14194
	girl	11	2,5152	,87386	,26348
Physical_Appearance_T	boy	29	2,9770	,77116	,14320
	girl	11	3,3939	,71209	,21470
Behavioral_Conduct_T	boy	29	2,3218	1,00191	,18605
	girl	11	3,0606	1,12367	,33880

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 social acceptance* domain (p=0.001<0.05), in *the athletic competence* (p=0.002<0.05), and in *the behavioral conduct* domain (p=0.039<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 more popular and accepted by peers since they evaluate them with significantly higher Social Acceptance score (3,31) than the boys exposed to violence (2,48). In addition, in the behavior domain teachers give lower scores to children exposed to violence (2,32) than to the children randomly selected (2,95) whereas they rate children exposed to violence as less athletic (2,49) than the others (3,13).

Group Statistics

	exposure	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Scholastic_Competence_T	child randomly selected	20	2,7500	1,04224	,23305
	child exposed to violence	29	2,1954	,88424	,16420
Social_Acceptance_T	child randomly selected	20	**3,3167**	,66205	,14804
	child exposed to violence	29	**2,4828**	,84321	,15658
Athletic_Competence_T	child randomly selected	20	**3,1333**	,50029	,11187
	child exposed to violence	29	**2,4943**	,76439	,14194
Physical_Appearance_T	child randomly selected	20	3,2667	,84189	,18825
	child exposed to violence	29	2,9770	,77116	,14320
Behavioral_Conduct_T	child randomly selected	20	**2,9500**	1,04448	,23355
	child exposed to violence	29	**2,3218**	1,00191	,18605

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	20	3,0500	,88704	,19835
	child exposed to violence	11	2,5152	,91121	,27474
Social_Acceptance_T	child randomly selected	20	3,3167	,78342	,17518

	child exposed to violence	11	2,8485	1,03670	,31258
Athletic_Competence_T	child randomly selected	20	3,0333	,58139	,13000
	child exposed to violence	11	2,5152	,87386	,26348
Physical_Appearance_T	child randomly selected	20	3,2833	,55436	,12396
	child exposed to violence	11	3,3939	,71209	,21470
Behavioral_Conduct_T	child randomly selected	20	3,6000	,52538	,11748
	child exposed to violence	11	3,0606	1,12367	,33880

Grade effects

Concerning teacher's rating scale for the sample of **the children exposed to violence**, there weren't grade effects 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	,299	2	,149	,180	,836
	Within Groups	30,712	37	,830		
	Total	31,011	39			
Social_Acceptance_T	Between Groups	,147	2	,074	,086	,918
	Within Groups	31,575	37	,853		
	Total	31,722	39			
Athletic_Competence_T	Between Groups	,437	2	,218	,343	,712
	Within Groups	23,563	37	,637		
	Total	24,000	39			
Physical_Appearance_T	Between Groups	2,850	2	1,425	2,602	,088
	Within Groups	20,259	37	,548		
	Total	23,108	39			
Behavioral_Conduct_T	Between Groups	,326	2	,163	,135	,874
	Within Groups	44,760	37	1,210		
	Total	45,086	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 ($r_s(38) = .481$, $P = .002$).

Correlations

			Z_Scholastic_Comp_Ch	Z_Scholastic_Comp_T
Spearman's rho	Z_Scholastic_Comp_Ch	Correlation Coefficient	1,000	**,481****
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	**,002**
		N	40	40
	Z_Scholastic_Comp_T	Correlation Coefficient	**,481****	1,000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	**,002**	.
		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 moderate, positive correlation between ***Scholastic_Competence*** subscale as rated from the child and as rated from the teacher, which is statistically significant ($r_s(38) = 0.332$, $P = 0.036$).

Correlations

			Z_Scholastic_Comp_Ch	Z_Scholastic_Comp_T
Spearman's rho	Z_Scholastic_Comp_Ch	Correlation Coefficient	1,000	**,332***
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	**,036**
		N	40	40
	Z_Scholastic_Comp_T	Correlation Coefficient	**,332***	1,000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	**,036**	.
		N	40	40

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

Taking only the sample of **the children randomly selected,** 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 though statistically significant* ($r_s(38) = 0.216$, $P = 0.182$).

Correlations

			Z_Social_Accept_Ch	Z_Social_Accept_T
Spearman's rho	Z_Social_Accept_Ch	Correlation Coefficient	1,000	,216
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	,182
		N	40	40
	Z_Social_Accept_T	Correlation Coefficient	,216	1,000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	,182	.
		N	40	40

Taking only the sample of **the children exposed to violence,** it seems that there is a negative correlation between ***Social_Acceptance*** subscale as rated from the child and as rated from the teacher, *which is not statistically significant* ($r_s(38) = -0.020$, $P = 0.901$).

Correlations

			Z_Social_Accept_Ch	Z_Social_Accept_T
Spearman's rho	Z_Social_Accept_Ch	Correlation Coefficient	1,000	-,020
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	,901
		N	40	40
	Z_Social_Accept_T	Correlation Coefficient	-,020	1,000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	,901	.
		N	40	40

Taking only the sample of **the children randomly selected**, 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* ($r_s(38) = 0.138$, $P = 0.395$).

Correlations

			Z_Athletic_Comp_Ch	Z_Athletic_Comp_T
Spearman's rho	Z_Athletic_Comp_Ch	Correlation Coefficient	1,000	,138
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	,395
		N	40	40
	Z_Athletic_Comp_T	Correlation Coefficient	,138	1,000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	,395	.
		N	40	40

Taking only the sample of **the children exposed to violence,** it seems that there is a negative correlation between ***Athletic_Competence*** subscale as rated from the child and as rated from the teacher, *which is not statistically significant* ($r_s(38) = -0.017$, $P = 0.918$).

Correlations

			Z_Athletic_Comp_Ch	Z_Athletic_Comp_T
Spearman's rho	Z_Athletic_Comp_Ch	Correlation Coefficient	1,000	-,017
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	,918
		N	40	40
	Z_Athletic_Comp_T	Correlation Coefficient	-,017	1,000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	,918	.
		N	40	40

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* ($r_s(38) = 0.270$, $P = 0.092$).

Correlations

			Z_Physical_Appear_Ch	Z_Physical_Appear_T

Spearman's rho	Z_Physical_Appear_Ch	Correlation Coefficient	1,000	,270
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	,092
		N	40	40
	Z_Physical_Appear_T	Correlation Coefficient	,270	1,000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	,092	.
		N	40	40

Taking only the sample of **the children exposed to violence,** it seems that there is a positive correlation between ***Physical_Appearance*** subscale as rated from the child and as rated from the teacher, *which is not statistically significant* ($r_s(38) = 0.273$, $P = 0.088$).

Correlations

			Z_Physical_Appear_Ch	Z_Physical_Appear_T
Spearman's rho	Z_Physical_Appear_Ch	Correlation Coefficient	1,000	,273
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	,088
		N	40	40
	Z_Physical_Appear_T	Correlation Coefficient	,273	1,000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	,088	.
		N	40	40

Taking only the sample of **the children randomly selected,** it seems that there is a positive correlation between ***Behavioral_Conduct*** subscale as rated from the child and as rated from the teacher, *which is not statistically significant* ($r_s(38) = 0.155$, $P = 0.341$).

Correlations

			Z_Behavioral_Conduct_Ch	Z_Behavioral_Conduct_T
Spearman's rho	Z_Behavioral_Conduct_Ch	Correlation Coefficient	1,000	,155
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	,341
		N	40	40
	Z_Behavioral_Conduct_T	Correlation Coefficient	,155	1,000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	,341	.
		N	40	40

Taking only the sample of **the children exposed to violence,** it seems that there is a positive correlation between ***Behavioral_Conduct*** subscale as rated from the child and as rated from the teacher, *which is not statistically significant* ($r_s(38) = 0.236$, $P = 0.142$).

Correlations

			Z_Behavioral_Conduct_Ch	Z_Behavioral_Conduct_T
Spearman's rho	Z_Behavioral_Conduct_Ch	Correlation Coefficient	1,000	,236
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	,142
		N	40	40
	Z_Behavioral_Conduct_T	Correlation Coefficient	,236	1,000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	,142	.
		N	40	40

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 relationship 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 1 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 assertiveness* ($p=0.033<0.05$) is concerned. As it can be seen from the Group Statistics table below, children exposed to violence tend to react less assertively in an ordinary situation . As far as the passiveness and the aggressiveness variables is concerned, no significant differences are found between the 2 samples ($p=0.155>0.05$, $p=0.160>0.05$), thus both children exposed to violence and those who are not may behave passively and/aggressively in an ordinary situation. Nevertheless, children exposed to violence have greater mean in the aggressiveness variable than the others.

Group Statistics

	exposure	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Aggressiveness_Group1	child randomly selected	40	,1938	,24011	,03796
	child exposed to violence	40	,2781	,28935	,04575
Passiveness_Group1	child randomly selected	40	,1321	,14244	,02252
	child exposed to violence	40	,1821	,16806	,02657
Assertiveness_Group1	child randomly selected	40	**,6844**	,24183	,03824
	child exposed to violence	40	**,5625**	,25944	,04102

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 exposed to violence as far as the aggressiveness ($p=0.937>0.05$), the passiveness ($p=0.762>0.05$) and the assertiveness ($p=0.933>0.05$) is concerned.

Group Statistics

	gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Aggressiveness_Group1	boy	29	,2759	,29576	,05492
	girl	11	,2841	,28554	,08609
Passiveness_Group1	boy	29	,1872	,17119	,03179
	girl	11	,1688	,16682	,05030
Assertiveness_Group1	boy	29	,5603	,26011	,04830
	girl	11	,5682	,27021	,08147

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 greater than 0.05 indicating that there are no significant differences between boys exposed to violence and boys randomly selected.

Group Statistics

	exposure	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Aggressiveness_Group1	child randomly selected	20	,2625	,27175	,06077
	child exposed to violence	29	,2759	,29576	,05492
Passiveness_Group1	child randomly selected	20	,1571	,15989	,03575
	child exposed to violence	29	,1872	,17119	,03179
Assertiveness_Group1	child randomly selected	20	,6000	,26470	,05919
	child exposed to violence	29	,5603	,26011	,04830

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 only 1of 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 assertiveness* ($p=0.021<0.05$) is concerned. As it can be seen from the table below, girls exposed to violence tend to react less assertively than girls randomly selected and do not prefer constructive solutions.

Group Statistics

	exposure	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Aggressiveness_Group1	child randomly selected	20	,1250	,18585	,04156
	child exposed to violence	11	,2841	,28554	,08609
Passiveness_Group1	child randomly selected	20	,1071	,12153	,02717
	child exposed to violence	11	,1688	,16682	,05030
Assertiveness_Group1	child randomly selected	20	**,7688**	,18706	,04183
	child exposed to violence	11	**,5682**	,27021	,08147

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 all 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 aggressiveness ($p=0.152>0.05$), the passiveness ($p=0.714>0.05$) and the assertiveness ($p=0.054>0.05$) is concerned. Nevertheless, as it can be seen from the Descriptives table below, children exposed to violence have greater means in the aggressiveness and the passiveness variables than the others.

Group Statistics

	exposure	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Aggressiveness_Group2	child randomly selected	40	,2972	,22277	,03522
	child exposed to violence	40	,3778	,27309	,04318
Passiveness_Group2	child randomly selected	40	,2861	,20112	,03180
	child exposed to violence	40	,3028	,20440	,03232
Assertiveness_Group2	child randomly selected	40	,4406	,21556	,03408
	child exposed to violence	40	,3469	,21275	,03364

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 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 ($p=0.363>0.05$), the passiveness ($p=0.854>0.05$) and the assertiveness ($p=0.121<0.05$) is concerned. But still, looking at the means, it seems that girls react more assertively and passively than boys while being exposed to violence.

Group Statistics

	gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Aggressiveness_Group2	boy	29	,4023	,26629	,04945
	girl	11	,3131	,29321	,08841
Passiveness_Group2	boy	29	,3065	,21548	,04001
	girl	11	,2929	,18103	,05458
Assertiveness_Group2	boy	29	,3147	,17237	,03201
	girl	11	,4318	,28703	,08654

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 only 1 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 assertiveness* (p=0.000<0.05) is concerned. As it can be seen from the table below, boys randomly selected tend to react more assertively preferring constructive solutions since they scored slightly higher in that variable than the boys randomly selected. As far as the other variables are concerned, no significant differences are found between the 2 groups.

Group Statistics

	exposure	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Aggressiveness_Group2	child randomly selected	20	,3222	,24688	,05520
	child exposed to violence	29	,4023	,26629	,04945
Passiveness_Group2	child randomly selected	20	,2889	,20520	,04588
	child exposed to violence	29	,3065	,21548	,04001
Assertiveness_Group2	child randomly selected	20	**,4313**	,22753	,05088
	child exposed to violence	29	**,3147**	,17237	,03201

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 all the 3 new variables computed, p value is greater than 0.05 indicating that there are no significant differences between girls exposed to violence and girls randomly selected.

Group Statistics

	exposure	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Aggressiveness_Group2	child randomly selected	20	,2722	,19901	,04450
	child exposed to violence	11	,3131	,29321	,08841
Passiveness_Group2	child randomly selected	20	,2833	,20225	,04522
	child exposed to violence	11	,2929	,18103	,05458
Assertiveness_Group2	child randomly selected	20	,4500	,20838	,04659
	child exposed to violence	11	,4318	,28703	,08654

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 greater than 0.05 indicating that there are no significant differences between the two samples as far as the aggressiveness (p=0.065>0.05), the

passiveness (p=0.614>0.05) and the assertiveness (p=0.414>0.05) is concerned. But, still, children exposed to violence have greater means in the aggressiveness variable.

Group Statistics

	exposure	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Aggressiveness_Group3	child randomly selected	40	,1850	,20450	,03233
	child exposed to violence	40	,2750	,22504	,03558
Passiveness_Group3	child randomly selected	40	,1417	,18701	,02957
	child exposed to violence	40	,1667	,25036	,03958
Assertiveness_Group3	child randomly selected	40	,6542	,27834	,04401
	child exposed to violence	40	,6000	,31078	,04914

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' 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=0.969>0.05), the passiveness (p=0.643>0.05) and the assertiveness (p=0.654>0.05) is concerned.

Group Statistics

	gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Aggressiveness_Group3	boy	29	,2759	,22937	,04259
	girl	11	,2727	,22401	,06754
Passiveness_Group3	boy	29	,1782	,23116	,04293
	girl	11	,1364	,30567	,09216
Assertiveness_Group3	boy	29	,5862	,31377	,05827
	girl	11	,6364	,31463	,09486

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 greater than 0.05 indicating that there are no significant differences between boys exposed to violence and boys randomly selected.

Group Statistics

	exposure	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Aggressiveness_Group3	child randomly selected	20	,1800	,20417	,04565
	child exposed to violence	29	,2759	,22937	,04259
Passiveness_Group3	child randomly selected	20	,1250	,21545	,04818
	child exposed to violence	29	,1782	,23116	,04293
Assertiveness_Group3	child randomly selected	20	,6500	,30541	,06829
	child exposed to violence	29	,5862	,31377	,05827

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 all the 3 new variables computed, p value is greater than 0.05 indicating that there are no significant differences between girls exposed to violence and girls randomly selected.

Group Statistics

	exposure	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Aggressiveness_Group3	child randomly selected	20	,1900	,21001	,04696
	child exposed to violence	11	,2727	,22401	,06754
Passiveness_Group3	child randomly selected	20	,1583	,15742	,03520
	child exposed to violence	11	,1364	,30567	,09216
Assertiveness_Group3	child randomly selected	20	,6583	,25635	,05732
	child exposed to violence	11	,6364	,31463	,09486

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 lower than 0.05 indicating that there are significant differences between the two samples as far as *the "mother as an ideal role model"* ($p=0.021<0.05$), and the *"protecting mother"* ($p=0.009<0.05$) is concerned. As it can be seen from the table below, the mean for children exposed to violence concerning the variable "mother as an ideal role model" is lower 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. In addition, children exposed to violence seem to feel the need to protect their mother. As far as the "mother as a non ideal role model" variable is concerned, no significant differences are found between the 2 samples ($p=0.784<0.05$).

Group Statistics

	exposure	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
MotherIdealModel_Group4	child randomly selected	40	**,8000**	,29526	,04668
	child exposed to violence	40	**,6375**	,32001	,05060
MotherNonIdealModel_Grou	child randomly selected	40	,0750	,18081	,02859
p4	child exposed to violence	40	,0875	,22325	,03530
ProtectingMother_Group4	child randomly selected	40	**,1250**	,21926	,03467
	child exposed to violence	40	**,2750**	,27619	,04367

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" ($p=0.268>0.05$), the "mother as a non ideal role model" ($p=0.953>0.05$) and the "protecting mother" ($p=0.216>0.05$) variables is concerned.

Group Statistics

	gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
MotherIdealModel_Group4	boy	29	,6724	,30694	,05700
	girl	11	,5455	,35032	,10563
MotherNonIdealModel_Grou p4	boy	29	,0862	,19221	,03569
	girl	11	,0909	,30151	,09091
ProtectingMother_Group4	boy	29	,2414	,25427	,04722
	girl	11	,3636	,32333	,09749

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 ("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	20	,7500	,34412	,07695
	child exposed to violence	29	,6724	,30694	,05700
MotherNonIdealModel_Grou	child randomly selected	20	,1250	,22213	,04967
p4	child exposed to violence	29	,0862	,19221	,03569
ProtectingMother_Group4	child randomly selected	20	,1250	,22213	,04967
	child exposed to violence	29	,2414	,25427	,04722

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 an ideal role model* ($p=0.007<0.05$) and *the protecting mother* ($p=0.021<0.05$) is concerned. As it can be seen from the table below, girls exposed to violence scored higher in the need of protecting their mother whereas girls randomly selected scored higher in having their mother as an ideal role model.

Group Statistics

	exposure	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
MotherIdealModel_Group4	child randomly selected	20	**,8500**	,23508	,05257
	child exposed to violence	11	**,5455**	,35032	,10563
MotherNonIdealModel_Grou	child randomly selected	20	,0250	,11180	,02500
p4	child exposed to violence	11	,0909	,30151	,09091
ProtectingMother_Group4	child randomly selected	20	**,1250**	,22213	,04967
	child exposed to violence	11	**,3636**	,32333	,09749

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 both 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 "high self-image" ($p=0.541>0.05$), and the "low self-image" ($p=0.350>0.05$) is concerned. But still, as it can be seen from the Descriptives table below, children

exposed to violence seem to have lower mean in the high self image variable and greater mean in the low self-image variable than the others.

Group Statistics

	exposure	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
HighSelfImage_Group5	child randomly selected	40	,7917	,25806	,04080
	child exposed to violence	40	,7583	,22630	,03578
LowSelfImage_Group5	child randomly selected	40	,1917	,24907	,03938
	child exposed to violence	40	,2417	,22630	,03578

Gender effects

Taking separately **the sample of children exposed to violence**, Independent samples T-test were 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 lower than 0.05 indicating that there are significant differences between boys and girls as far as the *"high self-image"* (p=0.034<0.05), and the *"low self-image"* (p=0.034<0.05) is concerned. From the Descriptives table below it seems that boys exposed to violence have greater levels of self-image than girls.

Group Statistics

	gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
HighSelfImage_Group5	boy	29	**,8046**	,20925	,03886
	girl	11	**,6364**	,23355	,07042
LowSelfImage_Group5	boy	29	**,1954**	,20925	,03886
	girl	11	**,3636**	,23355	,07042

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 greater than 0.05 indicating that there are no significant differences between boys exposed to violence and boys randomly selected.

Group Statistics

	exposure	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
HighSelfImage_Group5	child randomly selected	20	,7667	,26710	,05973
	child exposed to violence	29	,8046	,20925	,03886
LowSelfImage_Group5	child randomly selected	20	,2167	,24839	,05554
	child exposed to violence	29	,1954	,20925	,03886

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 1 of the 2 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 low self image* (p=0.042<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
HighSelfImage_Group5	child randomly selected	20	,8167	,25305	,05658

	child exposed to violence	11	,6364	,23355	,07042
LowSelfImage_Group5	child randomly selected	20	**,1667**	,25363	,05671
	child exposed to violence	11	**,3636**	,23355	,07042

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 all 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=0.323>0.05), the "very good school performance" (p=0.362>0.05), the "good school performance" (p=0.539>0.05) and the poor school performance and failure (p=0.208>0.05) is concerned. But still, ss it can be seen from the Descriptives table below, children exposed to violence have lower means in the high levels of school performance than the children randomly selected.

Group Statistics

	exposure	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Excellent_Sch.Perf_Group6	child randomly selected	40	,2917	,29417	,04651
	child exposed to violence	40	,2250	,30557	,04832
VeryGood_Sch.Perf_Group 6	child randomly selected	40	,3375	,25032	,03958
	child exposed to violence	40	,2875	,23717	,03750
Good_Sch.Perf_Group6	child randomly selected	40	,4800	,23005	,03637
	child exposed to violence	40	,5150	,27508	,04349
Poor_Sch.Perf_Failure_Group6	child randomly selected	40	,0750	,13349	,02111
	child exposed to violence	40	,1200	,18003	,02847

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 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 all the 4 new variables computed, p value is greater than 0.05 indicating that there are no significant differences between boys and girls exposed to violence as far as the "excellent school performance" (p=0.087>0.05), the "very good school performance" (p=0.898>0.05), the "good school performance" (p=0.086>0.05) and the "poor school performance and failure" (p=0.136>0.05) is concerned. But still, as it seems from the Descriptives table below, more the boys exposed to violence tend to believe that they have an excellent school performance rather than the girls.

Group Statistics

	gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Excellent_Sch.Perf_Group6	boy	29	,2759	,33415	,06205
	girl	11	,0909	,15570	,04695
VeryGood_Sch.Perf_Group 6	boy	29	,2845	,23834	,04426
	girl	11	,2955	,24541	,07399

Good_Sch.Perf_Group6	boy	29	,4690	,28423	,05278
	girl	11	,6364	,21574	,06505
Poor_Sch.Perf_Failure_Group6	boy	29	,1379	,20074	,03728
	girl	11	,0727	,10090	,03042

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 all the 4 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.

Group Statistics

	exposure	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Excellent_Sch.Perf_Group6	child randomly selected	20	,2000	,25131	,05620
	child exposed to violence	29	,2759	,33415	,06205
VeryGood_Sch.Perf_Group6	child randomly selected	20	,3125	,27951	,06250
	child exposed to violence	29	,2845	,23834	,04426
Good_Sch.Perf_Group6	child randomly selected	20	,5300	,26178	,05853
	child exposed to violence	29	,4690	,28423	,05278
Poor_Sch.Perf_Failure_Group6	child randomly selected	20	,1000	,15218	,03403
	child exposed to violence	29	,1379	,20074	,03728

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 2 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 excellent school performance* (p=0.007<0.05) and *the good school performance* (p=0.009<0.05) are concerned. As it seems from the Descriptives table below, girls randomly selected scored higher in the excellence variable than gilrs exposed to violence who are satisfied with a good school performance.

Group Statistics

	exposure	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Excellent_Sch.Perf_Group6	child randomly selected	20	**,3833**	,31110	,06956
	child exposed to violence	11	**,0909**	,15570	,04695
VeryGood_Sch.Perf_Group6	child randomly selected	20	,3625	,22176	,04959
	child exposed to violence	11	,2955	,24541	,07399
Good_Sch.Perf_Group6	child randomly selected	20	**,4300**	,18666	,04174
	child exposed to violence	11	**,6364**	,21574	,06505
Poor_Sch.Perf_Failure_Group6	child randomly selected	20	,0500	,11002	,02460
	child exposed to violence	11	,0727	,10090	,03042

DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSES
(crosstabulation with chi square)

Scenarios' Instrument Data Analysis

A

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

1) In Sc1q1, 8 children out of the 40 exposed to violence responded aggressively whereas 10 children randomly selected did the same. With a chi-square (x^2) = 5,510 (p =0.595>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.262 (p=0.598>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	3	3	10	6	14	4	40
	child exposed to violence	3	3	5	9	18	2	40
Total		6	6	15	15	32	6	80

2) In Sc1q2, 12 children out of the 40 exposed to violence children responded aggressively whereas the majority of children randomly selected answered also in a similar way. With a chi-square (x^2) = 0.432 (p =0.980>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.074 (p=0.980>0.05), it seems that there isn't a relationship between the two variables.

2		sc1q2					
		AGGRESS verbally violent behavior	AGGRES physically violent behavior	ASSERT constructive solution	PASS tolerant behavior	ASSERT call of a third party	T
exposure	child randomly selected	9	2	18	8	2	39
	child exposed to violence	10	2	18	9	1	40
Total		19	4	36	17	3	79

3) In Sc5q1, 12 children out of the 40 exposed to violence responded aggressively whereas the majority of children randomly selected preferred a constructive solution as an answer. With a chi-square (x^2) = 5.213 (p =0.290>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.255 (p=0.390>0.05), it seems that there isn't a relationship between the two variables.

3		sc5q1						
		AGGRES verbally violent behavior	AGGRES verbally violent behavior	PASS tolerant behavior	AGGRES verbally and physically violent	ASSERT constructi ve solution	ASSERT constructive solution	T
exposure	child randomly selected	3	4	6	2	3	22	40
	child exposed to violence	3	4	11	5	4	13	40
Total		6	8	17	7	7	35	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 solution as an answer. With a chi-square (x^2) = 10.233 (p =0.069>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.360 (p=0.069>0.05), it seems that there isn't a relationship between the two variables.

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	4	2	13	9	11	0	39
	child exposed to violence	3	6	15	13	2	1	40
Total		7	8	28	22	13	1	79

5) In Sc5q3, only 8 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) = 4.940 (p =0.423>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.248 (p=0.423>0.05), it seems that there isn't a relationship between the two variables.

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	1	3	2	3	6	25	40
	child exposed to violence	1	1	3	7	10	18	40
Total		2	4	5	4	16	43	80

6) In Sc7q1, 11 children out of the 40 exposed to violence responded aggressively whereas the others preferred a constructive solution as an answer. With a chi-square (x^2) = 4.561 (p =0.335>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.239 (p=0.335>0.05), it seems that there isn't a relationship between the two variables.

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	3	19	2	2	14	40
	child exposed to violence	7	16	4	0	13	40
Total		10	35	6	2	27	80

7) In Sc7q2, 16 children out of the 40 exposed to violence responded aggressively whereas the others preferred a constructive solution as an answer. On the contrary, the majority of the children randomly selected preferred assertiveness as an answer. With a chi-square (x^2) = 4.383 (p =0.223>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.234 (p=0.223>0.05), it seems that there isn't a relationship between the two variables.

7		sc7q2				
		AGGRESS	ASSERT exonerating self	ASSERT	AGGRESS	T
exposure	child randomly selected	2	6	26	6	40
	child exposed to violence	2	4	20	14	40
Total		4	10	46	20	80

8) In Sc7q3, 11 children out of the 40 exposed to violence responded aggressively whereas more of them preferred a constructive solution as an answer. On the contrary, more children randomly selected preferred assertiveness as an answer. With a chi-square (x^2) = 9.993 (p =0.041<0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.353 (p=0.041<0.05), it seems that there is a relationship between the two variables.

8		sc7q3					
		ASSERT constructive solution	AGGRES	PASS avoidance	ASSERT constructive solution	AGGRES	T
exposure	child randomly selected	25	1	0	11	3	40
	child exposed to violence	23	7	2	4	4	40
Total		42	8	2	28	7	80

B

9) In Sc3q1, 22 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 17 of the children randomly selected preferred a violent behavior as an answer. With a chi-square (x^2) = 7.021 (p =0.319>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.296 (p=0.319>0.05), it seems that there isn't a relationship between the two variables.

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	5	3	5	12	0	1	14	40
	child exposed to violence	5	3	7	14	3	2	6	40
Total		10	6	12	26	3	3	20	80

10) In Sc3q2, the same number of children exposed to violence and of children randomly selected responded aggressively whereas the others preferred either a constructive or a passive solution as an answer. With a chi-square (x^2) = 1.166 (p =0.948>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.121 (p=0.948>0.05), it seems that there isn't a relationship between the two variables.

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	11	7	4	10	5	2	39

	child exposed to violence	12	6	2	13	5		40
Total		23	13	6	23	10		79

11) In Sc3q3, only 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, also 11 preferred aggressiveness. With a chi-square (x^2) = 3.646 (p =0.601>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.218 (p=0.601>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	AGGRESS Verbally and physically violent	T
exposure	child randomly selected	7	4	12	9	6	0	38
	child exposed to violence	7	3	7	11	10	1	39
Total		14	7	19	20	16	1	77

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 randomly selected being angry though. With a chi-square (x^2) = 5.333 (p =0.149>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.258 (p=0.149>0.05), it seems that there isn't a relationship between the two variables.

12 (not included in the grouping)		sc3q4				
		angry	upset	happy	stupid	Total
exposure	child randomly selected	30	4	3	3	40
	child exposed to violence	20	8	6	6	40
Total		50	12	9	9	80

13) In Sc9q1, 9 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) = 7.932 (p =0.243>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.315 (p=0.243>0.05), it seems that there isn't a relationship between the two variables.

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	9	2	14	3	12	40
	child exposed to violence	5	6	4	13	2	9	40
Total		5	15	6	27	5	21	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 but still 12 of them answered aggressively. With a chi-square (x^2) = 4.109 (p =0.534>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.231 (p=0.534>0.05), it seems that there isn't a relationship between the two variables.

14		sc9q2						
		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	7	8	11	7	2	38
	child exposed to violence	6	10	9	9	5	0	39
Total		9	17	17	20	12	2	77

15) In Sc9q3, both the majority of children exposed to violence and randomly selected preferred avoiding violence as an answer whereas also plenty of them seemed that they had fear of violence. With a chi-square (x^2) = 0.660 (p =0.719>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.091 (p=0.719>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	15	23	2	40
	child exposed to violence	13	26	1	40
Total		28	49	3	80

16) In Sc9q4, the majority of children randomly selected preferred a non tolerant behavior whereas some children exposed to violence chose also passiveness as an answer. With a chi-square (x^2) = 16.839 (p =0.001<0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.459 (p=0.001<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	3	30	4	3	40
	child exposed to violence	9	13	4	14	40
Total		12	43	8	17	80

17) In Sc14q1, preferred answers vary. More children exposed to violence chose aggressiveness (17 out of 40) whereas the others chose passiveness. With a chi-square (x^2) = 2.644 (p =0.755>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.182 (p=0.755>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	4	5	5	3	5	40
	child exposed to violence	12	5	5	7	6	5	40
Total		30	9	10	12	9	10	80

18) In Sc14q2, 22 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 also aggressiveness. With a chi-square (x^2) = 3.257 (p =0.516>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.204 (p=0.516>0.05), it seems that there isn't a relationship between the two variables.

18		sc14q2					
		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	3	13	2	14	6	38
	child exposed to violence	8	14	1	16	4	40
Total		11	24	3	30	10	78

19) In Sc14q3, approximately the approximately the same numbers of children exposed to violence and randomly selected chose either aggressiveness or passiveness/ assertiveness as an answer. With a chi-square (x^2) = 1.405 (p =0.843>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.136 (p=0.843>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	6	6	7	10	9	38
	child exposed to violence	5	3	8	11	11	38
Total		11	9	15	21	20	76

C

20) In Sc4q1, approximately the same numbers of children exposed to violence and randomly selected disagree with violence. With a chi-square (x^2) = 0.040 (p =0.980>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.022 (p=0.980>0.05), it seems that there isn't a relationship between the two variables.

20		sc4q1			
		PASS ignoring violence	ACTIVE disagreeing with violence	ACTIVE call of a third party	T
exposure	child randomly selected	9	28	2	39
	child exposed to violence	10	18	2	40
Total		19	56	4	79

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) = 2.325 (p =0.502>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.171 (p=0.503>0.05), it seems that there isn't a relationship between the two variables.

21		sc4q2				
		PASS agreeing with violence	PASS ignoring violence	ACTIVE disagreeing with violence/ constructive solution	PASS ignoring violence	T
exposure	child randomly selected	5	6	28	1	40

	child exposed to violence	7	3	27	3	40
Total		12	9	55	4	80

22) In Sc4q3, 23 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) = 3.313 (p =0.507>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.209 (p=0.507>0.05), it seems that there isn't a relationship between the two variables.

22		sc4q3					T
		AGGRESS verbally violent behavior	AGGRESS physically violent behavior	ASSERT constructive solution	PASS tolerant behavior	ASSERT call of a third party	
exposure	child randomly selected	4	12	8	9	4	37
	child exposed to violence	6	17	7	4	5	39
Total		1	29	15	13	9	76

23) In Sc11q3, 19 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) = 2.283 (p =0.684>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.169 (p=0.684>0.05), it seems that there isn't a relationship between the two variables.

23		sc11q3					T
		AGGRESS physically violent behavior	PASS tolerance	AGGRESS physically violent behavior	ASSERT constructive solution	PASS tolerance	
exposure	child randomly selected	12	1	4	21	2	40
	child exposed to violence	17	2	2	17	2	40
Total		29	3	6	38	4	80

24) In Sc12q1, the majority of the two samples seem to disagree with violence. But, still 10 out of 80 children preferred aggressiveness as an answer. With a chi-square (x^2) = 5.838 (p =0.212>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.270 (p=0.212>0.05), it seems that there isn't a relationship between the two variables.

24		sc12q1					T
		Activeness disagreeing with violence	Activeness disagreeing with violence	Passiveness ignoring violence	Activeness aggressiveness	Pass Agreeing with violence	
exposure	child randomly selected	19	16	0	3	2	40
	child exposed to violence	12	19	4	3	2	40
Total		31	35	4	6	4	80

25) In Sc12q2, the majority of children disagree with violence and prefer assertiveness and constructive solutions. On the contrary, 10 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) = 9.755 (p =0.045<0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.356 (p=0.045<0.05), it seems that there is 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	1	0	18	15	3	37
	child exposed to violence	1	2	21	6	10	40
Total		2	2	39	21	13	77

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

26 (not included in the grouping)		sc12q3		
		positive evaluation	negative evaluation	T
exposure	child randomly selected	0	35	35
	child exposed to violence	0	40	40
Total		0	75	75

D

27) In Sc11q1, more children randomly selected than those exposed to violence consider their mother as an ideal role model. With a chi-square (x^2) = 5.978 (p =0.201>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.273 (p=0.201>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	3	17	1	4	15	40
	child exposed to violence	11	15	1	2	11	40
Total		14	43	2	6	26	80

28) In Sc11q2, most children exposed to violence just choose to be passive adopting a violent behavior But, still approximately the same numbers of children randomly selected and exposed to violence preferred the first choice as an answer ("we were just playing"). With a chi-square (x^2) = 11.822 (p =0.008<0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.384 (p=0.008<0.05), it seems that there is 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	8	16	2	14	40
	child exposed to violence	7	4	7	22	40
Total		15	20	9	36	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 4 children exposed to violence consider their mother as a non ideal role model. With a chi-square (x^2) = 3.562 (p =0.313>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.211 (p=0.313>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	20	7	12	1	40
	child exposed to violence	16	11	9	4	40
Total		36	18	21	5	80

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) = 2.015 (p =0.569>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.162 (p=0.569>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	22	4	10	2	38
	child exposed to violence	23	2	9	5	39
Total		53	6	19	7	77

31) In Sc13q3, more children randomly selected preferred an assertive answer whereas 9 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) = 4.011 (p =0.404>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.224 (p=0.404>0.05), it seems that there isn't 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	8	15	3	4	10	40
	child exposed to violence	9	10	5	9	7	40
Total		17	25	8	13	17	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) = 5.382 (p =0.250>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.259 (p=0.250>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	6	6	18	10	0	40

	child exposed to violence	4	5	14	13	4	40
Total		10	11	32	23	4	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. With a chi-square (x^2) = 2.231 (p =0.693>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.167 (p=0.693>0.05), it seems that there isn't a relationship between the two variables.

33		sc10q1					T
		Passiveness low self image	Activeness high self image	Passiveness low self image	Passiveness low self image	Activeness high self image	
exposure	child randomly selected	2	15	4	2	17	40
	child exposed to violence	4	10	3	2	21	40
Total		6	25	7	4	38	80

34) In Sc10q2, answers of both groups are similar. With a chi-square (x^2) = 0.679 (p =0.712>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.093 (p=0.712>0.05), it seems that there isn't a relationship between the two variables.

34		sc10q2			T
		Passiveness low self-image	Activeness high self-image	Activeness call of a third party-high self-image	
exposure	child randomly selected	5	26	7	38
	child exposed to violence	3	29	8 15	40
Total		8	55		78

F

---

35) In Sc6q1, approximately the same numbers of children randomly selected and exposed to violence have neither good nor bad school performance. With a chi-square (x^2) = 3.068 (p =0.381>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.196 (p=0.381>0.05), it seems that there isn't a relationship between the two variables.

35		sc6q1				T
		neither good nor bad school performance	good school performance	poor school performance	neither good nor bad school performance	
exposure	child randomly selected	24	6	1	9	40
	child exposed to violence	19	4	3	14	40
Total		43	10	4	23	80

36) In Sc6q2, both children exposed to violence and randomly selected answer in a similar way. With a chi-square (x^2) = 1.849 (p =0.604>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.152 (p=0.604>0.05), it seems that there isn't a relationship between the two variables.

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	5	12	21	2	40
	child exposed to violence	7	7	24	2	40
Total		12	19	45	4	80

37) In Sc6q3, 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) = 12.672 (p =0.005<0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.398 (p=0.005<0.05), it seems that there is 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	12	29	7	2	40
	child exposed to violence	4	13	12	11	40
Total		16	32	19	13	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) = 6.875 (p =0.143>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.293 (p=0.143>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	11	15	6	7	1	40
	child exposed to violence	8	8	11	13	0	40
Total		19	23	17	20	1	80

39) In Sc8q2, both children exposed to violence and children randomly selected answer approximately in the same way. With a chi-square (x^2) = 1.129 (p =0.770>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.119 (p=0.770>0.05), it seems that there isn't 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	4	15	17	4	40
	child exposed to violence	6	16	16	2	40
Total		10	31	33	6	80

40) In Sc8q3, more children randomly selected have a sense of success or mananging to succeed at school whereas 10 children exposed to violence feel that they are failures. With a chi-square (x^2) = 8.180 (p =0.042<0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.320 (p=0.042<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	2	20	18	0	40
	child exposed to violence	4	13	17	6	40
Total		6	33	35	6	80