University of Cyprus
Slovakia's DATA

3

▪ 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 0.798, a very good 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 0.618, quite satisfactory whereas for the 3rd part of the Harter's instrument, Cronbach's Alpha was found to be 0.924. For the Scenarios' Instrument, Cronbach's alpha reached the value of 0.646, approaching 0.7 and thus satisfactory.

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

		N	%
Cases	Valid	69	86,3
	Excluded[a]	11	13,8
	Total	80	100,0

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

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
,813	36

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

		N	%
Cases	Valid	64	80,0
	Excluded[a]	16	20,0
	Total	80	100,0

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

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
,608	10

Harter's Instrument_for the Teacher_15 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
,930	15

Scenarios' Instrument_for the Child_40 items
Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	51	63,8
	Excluded[a]	29	36,3
	Total	80	100,0

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

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
,638	40

- **Demographics**

The sample of Slovakia 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 22 are boys and 18 are girls. In the group of the exposed to violence children, 18 are 4th graders, 17 are 5th graders and 5 are 6th graders. All children have parents whose maternal language is Slovak.

		gender		Total
		boy	girl	
exposure	child randomly selected	22	18	40
	child exposed to violence	22	18	40
Total		44	36	80

		class			Total
		4th grade	5th grade	6th grade	
exposure	child randomly selected	18	19	3	40
	child exposed to violence	18	17	5	40
Total		36	36	8	80

		gender		Total
		boy	girl	
class	4th grade	20	16	36
	5th grade	21	15	36
	6th grade	3	5	8
Total		44	36	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	38	2,9298	,51499	,08354
	child exposed to violence	40	2,4875	,55263	,08738
Social_Acceptance_Ch	child randomly selected	39	2,9658	,53006	,08488
	child exposed to violence	39	2,5470	,43250	,06926
Athletic_Competence_Ch	child randomly selected	39	2,6838	,53502	,08567
	child exposed to violence	37	2,5901	,50552	,08311
Physical_Appearance_Ch	child randomly selected	38	3,0921	,59992	,09732
	child exposed to violence	38	2,9079	,65036	,10550
Behavioral_Conduct_Ch	child randomly selected	38	2,7368	,53920	,08747
	child exposed to violence	36	2,6713	,50314	,08386
Global_SelfWorth_Ch	child randomly selected	38	3,1316	,50248	,08151
	child exposed to violence	40	2,8542	,49237	,07785

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 3 of the 6 subscales from the self-rating scale, p value is less than 0.05 indicating that there are significant differences between the two samples as far as *the scholastic competence* ($p=0.000<0.05$), *the social acceptance* ($p=0.000<0.05$) and *the global self-worth* ($p=0.016<0.05$) is concerned. Therefore, the hypothesis H0 that all the means are equal can be rejected as far as these three 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 are not so popular among peers and that they are not very happy with their life.

Gender effects

Taking only the sample of **the children exposed to violence**, One Way Analysis of Variance was also conducted 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 all subscales is concerned.

Group Statistics

	gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Scholastic_Competence_Ch	boy	22	2,5076	,51557	,10992
	girl	18	2,4630	,60918	,14358
Social_Acceptance_Ch	boy	21	2,5714	,27168	,05929
	girl	18	2,5185	,57420	,13534
Athletic_Competence_Ch	boy	20	2,6833	,41146	,09200
	girl	17	2,4804	,59185	,14354
Physical_Appearance_Ch	boy	21	2,8333	,67289	,14684

	girl	17	3,0000	,62915	,15259
Behavioral_Conduct_Ch	boy	21	2,5952	,50435	,11006
	girl	15	2,7778	,49868	,12876
Global_SelfWorth_Ch	boy	22	2,8788	,47749	,10180
	girl	18	2,8241	,52229	,12310

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 social acceptance* domain, p value is lower than 0.05 (p=0.006<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 more popular and accepted from peers since they have higher Social Acceptance score (2,90) than the boys exposed to violence (2,57).

Group Statistics

	exposure	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Scholastic_Competence_Ch	child randomly selected	21	2,7937	,55504	,12112
	child exposed to violence	22	2,5076	,51557	,10992
Social_Acceptance_Ch	child randomly selected	22	2,9015	,45326	,09664
	child exposed to violence	21	2,5714	,27168	,05929
Athletic_Competence_Ch	child randomly selected	22	2,8030	,54829	,11690
	child exposed to violence	20	2,6833	,41146	,09200
Physical_Appearance_Ch	child randomly selected	21	3,0397	,62340	,13604
	child exposed to violence	21	2,8333	,67289	,14684
Behavioral_Conduct_Ch	child randomly selected	21	2,7063	,56741	,12382
	child exposed to violence	21	2,5952	,50435	,11006
Global_SelfWorth_Ch	child randomly selected	21	3,1270	,49974	,10905
	child exposed to violence	22	2,8788	,47749	,10180

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 Scholastic competence* domain (p=0.001<0.05) and in *the Social Acceptance* domain (p=0.013<0.05), p value is lower than 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 consider themselves good students since they have significantly higher Scholastic Competence score (3,09) than the girls exposed to violence (2,46). In addition, girls randomly selected consider themselves more popular and accepted from peers since they have again higher Social Acceptance score (3,04) than the girls exposed to violence (2,51).

Group Statistics

	exposure	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Scholastic_Competence_Ch	child randomly selected	17	3,0980	,41691	,10112
	child exposed to violence	18	2,4630	,60918	,14358
Social_Acceptance_Ch	child randomly selected	17	3,0490	,62016	,15041
	child exposed to violence	18	2,5185	,57420	,13534
Athletic_Competence_Ch	child randomly selected	17	2,5294	,49031	,11892
	child exposed to violence	17	2,4804	,59185	,14354
Physical_Appearance_Ch	child randomly selected	17	3,1569	,58176	,14110

	child exposed to violence	17	3,0000	,62915	,15259
Behavioral_Conduct_Ch	child randomly selected	17	2,7745	,51687	,12536
	child exposed to violence	15	2,7778	,49868	,12876
Global_SelfWorth_Ch	child randomly selected	17	3,1373	,52120	,12641
	child exposed to violence	18	2,8241	,52229	,12310

Grade effects

Concerning the child's self-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_Ch	Between Groups	1,664	2	,832	3,004	,062
	Within Groups	10,247	37	,277		
	Total	11,910	39			
Social_Acceptance_Ch	Between Groups	,715	2	,358	2,014	,148
	Within Groups	6,393	36	,178		
	Total	7,108	38			
Athletic_Competence_Ch	Between Groups	,451	2	,226	,877	,425
	Within Groups	8,748	34	,257		
	Total	9,200	36			
Physical_Appearance_Ch	Between Groups	1,682	2	,841	2,108	,137
	Within Groups	13,968	35	,399		
	Total	15,650	37			
Behavioral_Conduct_Ch	Between Groups	,317	2	,158	,612	,548
	Within Groups	8,544	33	,259		
	Total	8,860	35			
Global_SelfWorth_Ch	Between Groups	,820	2	,410	1,757	,187
	Within Groups	8,635	37	,233		
	Total	9,455	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 3.0, 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	38	3,3860	,71251	,11558
	child exposed to violence	40	2,4750	,81959	,12959
Social_Acceptance_T	child randomly selected	39	3,5043	,70864	,11347
	child exposed to violence	40	2,6333	,82965	,13118
Athletic_Competence_T	child randomly selected	39	3,1282	,77842	,12465
	child exposed to violence	40	2,6583	,80768	,12771

Physical_Appearance_T	child randomly selected	38	3,7105	,71941	,11670
	child exposed to violence	40	3,0500	,86578	,13689
Behavioral_Conduct_T	child randomly selected	38	3,4474	,80268	,13021
	child exposed to violence	39	2,5214	1,00814	,16143

Regarding the subscale means from the **teacher rating scale**, significant differences between the two samples are observed in all 6 subscales, in *the scholastic competence* (p=0.000<0.05), in *the social acceptance* (p=0.000<0.05), in *the athletic competence* (p=0.010<0.05), in *the physical appearance* (p=0.000<0.05) and in *the behavioral conduct* (p=0.000<0.05). As it seems from the means, teachers give lower values for the children exposed to violence than for the others in all six 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, athletic and good-looking 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 1 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 *behavioral conduct* (p=0.007<0.05) is concerned. As it seems from the means, teachers give lower values for the boys than for the girls in the behavior domain.

Group Statistics

	gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Scholastic_Competence_T	boy	22	2,2727	,76037	,16211
	girl	18	2,7222	,84211	,19849
Social_Acceptance_T	boy	22	2,6515	,70130	,14952
	girl	18	2,6111	,98518	,23221
Athletic_Competence_T	boy	22	2,6970	,79622	,16975
	girl	18	2,6111	,84211	,19849
Physical_Appearance_T	boy	22	2,9697	,86623	,18468
	girl	18	3,1481	,87986	,20738
Behavioral_Conduct_T	boy	22	2,1515	1,01172	,21570
	girl	17	3,0000	,79931	,19386

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), in *the social acceptance* domain (p=0,007<0.05), in *the physical appearance* domain (p=0.042<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 (3,09) than the boys exposed to violence (2,27). In addition, teachers consider boys exposed to violence less popular and accepted by peers (2,65) and less good looking (2,96) than the boys randomly selected whereas in the behavior domain teachers give lower scores to boys exposed to violence (2,15) than to the boys randomly selected (3,12).

Group Statistics

	exposure	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Scholastic_Competence_T	child randomly selected	21	3,0952	,78275	,17081
	child exposed to violence	22	2,2727	,76037	,16211
Social_Acceptance_T	child randomly selected	21	3,3175	,83317	,18181

	child exposed to violence	22	2,6515	,70130	,14952
Athletic_Competence_T	child randomly selected	21	3,0000	,91287	,19920
	child exposed to violence	22	2,6970	,79622	,16975
Physical_Appearance_T	child randomly selected	21	3,5397	,91576	,19984
	child exposed to violence	22	2,9697	,86623	,18468
Behavioral_Conduct_T	child randomly selected	21	3,1270	,93379	,20377
	child exposed to violence	22	2,1515	1,01172	,21570

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 the domains, in *the scholastic competence* domain (p=0.000<0.05), in *the social acceptance* domain (p=0,000<0.05), in *the athletic competence* domain (p=0,009<0,05), in *the physical appearance* domain (p=0.001<0.05) and in *the behavioral conduct* domain (p=0.000<0.05) p value is lower than 0.05 indicating that there are significant differences between girls exposed to violence and girls randomly selected. As it seems from the means, teachers consider girls randomly selected better students since they evaluate them with significantly higher Scholastic Competence score (3,74) than the girls exposed to violence (2,72). In addition, teachers consider girls exposed to violence less popular and accepted by peers (2,61), less athletic (2,61) and less good looking (3,14) than the girls randomly selected whereas in the behavior domain teachers give lower scores to girls exposed to violence (3,00) than to the girls randomly selected (3,84).

Group Statistics

	exposure	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Scholastic_Competence_T	child randomly selected	17	3,7451	,40016	,09705
	child exposed to violence	18	2,7222	,84211	,19849
Social_Acceptance_T	child randomly selected	18	3,7222	,46089	,10863
	child exposed to violence	18	2,6111	,98518	,23221
Athletic_Competence_T	child randomly selected	18	3,2778	,57451	,13541
	child exposed to violence	18	2,6111	,84211	,19849
Physical_Appearance_T	child randomly selected	17	3,9216	,25082	,06083
	child exposed to violence	18	3,1481	,87986	,20738
Behavioral_Conduct_T	child randomly selected	17	3,8431	,31441	,07626
	child exposed to violence	17	3,0000	,79931	,19386

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	,095	2	,048	,068	,935
	Within Groups	26,102	37	,705		
	Total	26,197	39			
Social_Acceptance_T	Between Groups	,306	2	,153	,214	,809
	Within Groups	26,538	37	,717		
	Total	26,844	39			
Athletic_Competence_T	Between Groups	1,240	2	,620	,948	,397
	Within Groups	24,202	37	,654		
	Total	25,442	39			

Physical_Appearance_T	Between Groups	2,032	2	1,016	1,382	,264
	Within Groups	27,201	37	,735		
	Total	29,233	39			
Behavioral_Conduct_T	Between Groups	,372	2	,186	,175	,840
	Within Groups	38,249	36	1,062		
	Total	38,621	38			

Correlations

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 ($r_s(35) = 0.529$, $P = 0.001$).

Correlations

			Z_Scholastic_Comp_Ch	Z_Scholastic_Comp_T
Spearman's rho	Z_Scholastic_Comp_Ch	Correlation Coefficient	1,000	**,529****
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	**,001**
		N	38	37
	Z_Scholastic_Comp_T	Correlation Coefficient	**,529****	1,000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	**,001**	.
		N	37	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 ***Scholastic_Competence*** subscale as rated from the child and as rated from the teacher, *which is not statistically significant* ($r_s(38) = 0.131$, $P = 0.420$).

Correlations

			Z_Scholastic_Comp_Ch	Z_Scholastic_Comp_T
Spearman's rho	Z_Scholastic_Comp_Ch	Correlation Coefficient	1,000	,131
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	,420
		N	40	40
	Z_Scholastic_Comp_T	Correlation Coefficient	,131	1,000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	,420	.
		N	40	40

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 statistically significant* ($r_s(36) = 0.275$, $P = 0.094$).

Correlations

			Z_Social_Accept_Ch	Z_Social_Accept_T
Spearman's rho	Z_Social_Accept_Ch	Correlation Coefficient	1,000	,275
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	,094
		N	39	38
	Z_Social_Accept_T	Correlation Coefficient	,275	1,000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	,094	.
		N	38	39

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* ($r_s(37) = 0.155$, $P = 0.345$).

Correlations

			Z_Social_Accept_Ch	Z_Social_Accept_T
Spearman's rho	Z_Social_Accept_Ch	Correlation Coefficient	1,000	,155
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	,345
		N	39	39
	Z_Social_Accept_T	Correlation Coefficient	,155	1,000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	,345	.
		N	39	40

Taking only the sample of **the children randomly selected,** 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* ($r_s(36) = -0.042$, $P = 0.803$).

Correlations

			Z_Athletic_Comp_Ch	Z_Athletic_Comp_T
Spearman's rho	Z_Athletic_Comp_Ch	Correlation Coefficient	1,000	-,042
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	,803
		N	39	38
	Z_Athletic_Comp_T	Correlation Coefficient	-,042	1,000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	,803	.
		N	38	39

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* ($rs(35) = 0.226$, $P = 0.178$).

Correlations

			Z_Athletic_Comp_Ch	Z_Athletic_Comp_T
Spearman's rho	Z_Athletic_Comp_Ch	Correlation Coefficient	1,000	,226

		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	,178
		N	37	37
	Z_Athletic_Comp_T	Correlation Coefficient	,226	1,000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	,178	.
		N	37	40

Taking only the sample of **the children randomly selected,** it seems that there is a negative correlation between ***Physical_Appearance*** subscale as rated from the child and as rated from the teacher, *but it is not statistically significant* ($r_s(34) = -0.044$, $P = 0.797$).

Correlations

			Z_Physical_Appear_Ch	Z_Physical_Appear_T
Spearman's rho	Z_Physical_Appear_Ch	Correlation Coefficient	1,000	-,044
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	,797
		N	38	36
	Z_Physical_Appear_T	Correlation Coefficient	-,044	1,000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	,797	.
		N	36	38

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* ($r_s(36) = 0.061$, $P = 0.715$).

Correlations

			Z_Physical_Appear_Ch	Z_Physical_Appear_T
Spearman's rho	Z_Physical_Appear_Ch	Correlation Coefficient	1,000	,061
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	,715
		N	38	38
	Z_Physical_Appear_T	Correlation Coefficient	,061	1,000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	,715	.
		N	38	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* ($r_s(34) = 0.193$, $P = 0.258$).

Correlations

			Z_Behavioral_Conduct_Ch	Z_Behavioral_Conduct_T
Spearman's rho	Z_Behavioral_Conduct_Ch	Correlation Coefficient	1,000	,193
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	,258
		N	38	36
	Z_Behavioral_Conduct_T	Correlation Coefficient	,193	1,000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	,258	.
		N	36	38

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 ($r_s(33) = .431$, $P = .010$).

Correlations

			Z_Behavioral_Conduct_Ch	Z_Behavioral_Conduct_T
Spearman's rho	Z_Behavioral_Conduct_Ch	Correlation Coefficient	1,000	**,431****
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	**,010**
		N	36	35
	Z_Behavioral_Conduct_T	Correlation Coefficient	**,431****	1,000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	**,010**	.
		N	35	39

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

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 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 passiveness* (p=0.004<0.05) and *the assertiveness* (p=0.016<0.05) is concerned. As it can be seen from the table below, children exposed to violence tend to react more passively in an ordinary situation and thus adopt a tolerant behavior whereas children randomly selected react more assertively preferring a constructive solution. As far as the aggressiveness variable is concerned, no significant differences are found between the 2 samples (p=0.674>0.05), thus both children exposed to violence and those who are not may behave aggressively and adopt a violent behavior in an ordinary situation.

Group Statistics

	exposure	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Aggressiveness_Group1	child randomly selected	40	,1094	,15808	,02499
	child exposed to violence	40	,1250	,17218	,02722
Passiveness_Group1	child randomly selected	40	,1321	,13096	,02071
	child exposed to violence	40	,2429	,19995	,03161
Assertiveness_Group1	child randomly selected	40	,7656	,20449	,03233
	child exposed to violence	40	,6406	,24708	,03907

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Aggressiveness_Group1	Equal variances assumed	,459	,500	-,423	78	,674	-,01563	,03696	-,08920	,05795
	Equal variances not assumed			-,423	77,437	,674	-,01563	,03696	-,08921	,05796
Passiveness_Group1	Equal variances assumed	6,555	,012	-2,930	78	**,004**	-,11071	,03779	-,18595	-,03548
	Equal variances not assumed			-2,930	67,260	,005	-,11071	,03779	-,18614	-,03529
Assertiveness_Group1	Equal variances assumed	1,615	,208	2,465	78	**,016**	,12500	,05071	,02404	,22596
	Equal variances not assumed			2,465	75,366	,016	,12500	,05071	,02399	,22601

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=1.000>0.05), the passiveness (p=0.302>0.05) and the assertiveness (p=0.553>0.05) is concerned.

Group Statistics

	gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Aggressiveness_Group1	boy	22	,1250	,18094	,03858
	girl	18	,1250	,16605	,03914
Passiveness_Group1	boy	22	,2727	,21557	,04596
	girl	18	,2063	,17817	,04200
Assertiveness_Group1	boy	22	,6193	,26299	,05607
	girl	18	,6667	,23089	,05442

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 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 passiveness* (p=0.020<0.05) is concerned. As it can be seen from the table below, boys exposed to violence tend to behave more passively and adopt a tolerant behavior in an ordinary situation than the boys randomly selected. Regarding the other variables, no significant differences were found between the two groups.

Group Statistics

	exposure	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Aggressiveness_Group1	child randomly selected	22	,1477	,18755	,03998
	child exposed to violence	22	,1250	,18094	,03858
Passiveness_Group1	child randomly selected	22	,1429	,13226	,02820
	child exposed to violence	22	,2727	,21557	,04596
Assertiveness_Group1	child randomly selected	22	,7102	,23269	,04961
	child exposed to violence	22	,6193	,26299	,05607

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Aggressiveness_Group1	Equal variances assumed	,224	,638	,409	42	,685	,02273	,05556	-,08940	,13485
	Equal variances not assumed			,409	41,946	,685	,02273	,05556	-,08940	,13486
Passiveness_Group1	Equal variances assumed	2,601	,114	-2,409	42	**,020**	-,12987	,05392	-,23869	-,02105
	Equal variances not assumed			-2,409	34,848	,021	-,12987	,05392	-,23935	-,02039
Assertiveness_Group1	Equal variances assumed	,276	,602	1,214	42	,231	,09091	,07487	-,06018	,24200
	Equal variances not assumed			1,214	41,386	,232	,09091	,07487	-,06024	,24206

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 assertiveness* ($p=0.013<0.05$) is concerned. As it can be seen from the table below, girls exposed to violence tend to react less assertively than girls randomly selected who seem to prefer constructive solutions in ordinary situations.

Group Statistics

	exposure	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Aggressiveness_Group1	child randomly selected	18	,0625	,09824	,02315
	child exposed to violence	18	,1250	,16605	,03914
Passiveness_Group1	child randomly selected	18	,1190	,13194	,03110
	child exposed to violence	18	,2063	,17817	,04200
Assertiveness_Group1	child randomly selected	18	,8333	,14220	,03352
	child exposed to violence	18	,6667	,23089	,05442

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 ($p=0.878>0.05$), the passiveness ($p=0.663>0.005$) and the assertiveness ($p=0.201>0.05$) is concerned.

Group Statistics

	exposure	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Aggressiveness_Group2	child randomly selected	40	,1444	,14498	,02292
	child exposed to violence	40	,1500	,17532	,02772
Passiveness_Group2	child randomly selected	40	,3750	,16440	,02599
	child exposed to violence	40	,3944	,22778	,03602
Assertiveness_Group2	child randomly selected	40	,5188	,19519	,03086
	child exposed to violence	40	,4594	,21630	,03420

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 ($p=0.095>0.05$) and the passiveness ($p=0.126>0.05$) is concerned. In the variable of *assertiveness*, as it can be seen in the table below, p value is lower than 0.05 ($p=0.016<0.05$) indicating that there are significant differences between boys and girls. More specifically, girls exposed to violence 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	22	,1919	,19452	,04147
	girl	18	,0988	,13682	,03225
Passiveness_Group2	boy	22	,4444	,23256	,04958
	girl	18	,3333	,21219	,05001
Assertiveness_Group2	boy	22	,3864	,20379	,04345
	girl	18	,5486	,20173	,04755

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Aggressiveness_Group2	Equal variances assumed	5,995	,019	1,713	38	,095	,09315	,05439	-,01695	,20326
	Equal variances not assumed			1,773	37,250	,084	,09315	,05254	-,01327	,19958
Passiveness_Group2	Equal variances assumed	,946	,337	1,563	38	,126	,11111	,07109	-,03280	,25503
	Equal variances not assumed			1,578	37,508	,123	,11111	,07043	-,03152	,25374
Assertiveness_Group2	Equal variances assumed	,064	,801	-2,516	38	**,016**	-,16225	,06448	-,29278	-,03172
	Equal variances not assumed			-2,519	36,590	,016	-,16225	,06441	-,29280	-,03169

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_Group2	child randomly selected	22	,1667	,16355	,03487
	child exposed to violence	22	,1919	,19452	,04147
Passiveness_Group2	child randomly selected	22	,3737	,15160	,03232
	child exposed to violence	22	,4444	,23256	,04958
Assertiveness_Group2	child randomly selected	22	,4943	,21643	,04614
	child exposed to violence	22	,3864	,20379	,04345

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	18	,1173	,11729	,02765
	child exposed to violence	18	,0988	,13682	,03225
Passiveness_Group2	child randomly selected	18	,3765	,18332	,04321
	child exposed to violence	18	,3333	,21219	,05001
Assertiveness_Group2	child randomly selected	18	,5486	,16682	,03932
	child exposed to violence	18	,5486	,20173	,04755

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 ($p=0.781>0.05$), the passiveness ($p=0.466>0.05$) and the assertiveness ($p=0.273>0.05$) is concerned.

Group Statistics

	exposure	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Aggressiveness_Group3	child randomly selected	40	,1250	,17357	,02744
	child exposed to violence	40	,1350	,14597	,02308
Passiveness_Group3	child randomly selected	40	,1625	,15325	,02423
	child exposed to violence	40	,1875	,15185	,02401
Assertiveness_Group3	child randomly selected	40	,7250	,21200	,03352
	child exposed to violence	40	,6750	,19226	,03040

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 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 passiveness ($p=0.797>0.05$) and the assertiveness ($p=0.400>0.05$) is concerned. But, there are significant differences between boys and girls in *the aggressiveness* ($p=0.023<0.05$) variable since, as it seems from the Descriptives table below, boys seem to react more violently while witnessing violence than girls who seem to be more assertive.

Group Statistics

	gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Aggressiveness_Group3	boy	22	,1818	,15004	,03199
	girl	18	,0778	,12154	,02865

Passiveness_Group3	boy	22	,1818	,16191	,03452
	girl	18	,1944	,14292	,03369
Assertiveness_Group3	boy	22	,6515	,20515	,04374
	girl	18	,7037	,17671	,04165

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Aggressiveness_Group3	Equal variances assumed	,025	,876	2,372	38	**,023**	,10404	,04386	,01524	,19284
	Equal variances not assumed			2,423	37,999	,020	,10404	,04294	,01711	,19097
Passiveness_Group3	Equal variances assumed	,093	,763	-,258	38	,797	-,01263	,04885	-,11152	,08626
	Equal variances not assumed			-,262	37,751	,795	-,01263	,04823	-,11029	,08503
Assertiveness_Group3	Equal variances assumed	,019	,892	-,851	38	,400	-,05219	,06132	-,17633	,07195
	Equal variances not assumed			-,864	37,878	,393	-,05219	,06040	-,17447	,07009

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	22	,1818	,20386	,04346
	child exposed to violence	22	,1818	,15004	,03199
Passiveness_Group3	child randomly selected	22	,1894	,12905	,02751
	child exposed to violence	22	,1818	,16191	,03452
Assertiveness_Group3	child randomly selected	22	,6439	,21390	,04560
	child exposed to violence	22	,6515	,20515	,04374

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 seems, in only 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 assertiveness* ($p=0.043<0.05$) is concerned. As it can be seen from the table below, girls exposed to violence scored slightly lower in the assertivenss variabke indicating that they

tend to react less assertively while witnessing violence than girls randomly selected, who prefer more constructive solutions.

Group Statistics

	exposure	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Aggressiveness_Group3	child randomly selected	18	,0556	,09218	,02173
	child exposed to violence	18	,0778	,12154	,02865
Passiveness_Group3	child randomly selected	18	,1296	,17671	,04165
	child exposed to violence	18	,1944	,14292	,03369
Assertiveness_Group3	child randomly selected	18	,8241	,16639	,03922
	child exposed to violence	18	,7037	,17671	,04165

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Aggressiveness_Group3	Equal variances assumed	1,956	,171	-,618	34	,541	-,02222	,03595	-,09529	,05084
	Equal variances not assumed			-,618	31,695	,541	-,02222	,03595	-,09549	,05104
Passiveness_Group3	Equal variances assumed	,297	,589	-1,210	34	,235	-,06481	,05357	-,17368	,04405
	Equal variances not assumed			-1,210	32,575	,235	-,06481	,05357	-,17385	,04422
Assertiveness_Group3	Equal variances assumed	1,658	,207	2,104	34	**,043**	,12037	,05721	,00411	,23664
	Equal variances not assumed			2,104	33,878	,043	,12037	,05721	,00409	,23665

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" ($p=0.206>0.05$), and the "mother as a non ideal role model" ($p=0.819>0.05$) is concerned. As far as *the "protecting mother"* variable is concerned, significant differences are found between the 2 samples ($p=0.039<0.05$). As it can be seen from the table below, the mean for children exposed to violence concerning the variable "protecting mother" is greater than the one for children randomly selected

indicating that it is more possible for children exposed to violence to feel that they need to protect their mother.

Group Statistics

	exposure	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
MotherIdealModel_Group4	child randomly selected	40	,8000	,29526	,04668
	child exposed to violence	40	,7125	,31800	,05028
MotherNonIdealModel_Grou p4	child randomly selected	40	,1250	,24677	,03902
	child exposed to violence	40	,1125	,23986	,03792
ProtectingMother_Group4	child randomly selected	40	,0750	,18081	,02859
	child exposed to violence	40	,1750	,24152	,03819

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
MotherIdealMo del_Group4	Equal variances assumed	,885	,350	1,275	78	,206	,08750	,06861	-,04909	,22409
	Equal variances not assumed			1,275	77,575	,206	,08750	,06861	-,04911	,22411
MotherNonIdea lModel_Group4	Equal variances assumed	,162	,688	,230	78	,819	,01250	,05441	-,09583	,12083
	Equal variances not assumed			,230	77,937	,819	,01250	,05441	-,09583	,12083
ProtectingMoth er_Group4	Equal variances assumed	18,807	,000	-2,096	78	**,039**	-,10000	,04770	-,19497	-,00503
	Equal variances not assumed			-2,096	72,266	,040	-,10000	,04770	-,19509	-,00491

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" ($p=0.864>0.05$), the "mother as a non ideal role model" ($p=0.536>0.05$) and the "protecting mother" ($p=0.399>0.05$) variables is concerned. But, still, as it seems from the Descriptives table below, boys exposed to violence tend to protect more their mother than girls whereas girls' mean is greater than the one for boys in the "mother as an ideal role model" variable.

Group Statistics

	gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
MotherIdealModel_Group4	boy	22	,7045	,29516	,06293
	girl	18	,7222	,35240	,08306

MotherNonIdealModel_Grou p4	boy	22	,0909	,19739	,04208
	girl	18	,1389	,28726	,06771
ProtectingMother_Group4	boy	22	,2045	,25162	,05365
	girl	18	,1389	,23044	,05432

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	22	,7045	,33306	,07101
	child exposed to violence	22	,7045	,29516	,06293
MotherNonIdealModel_Grou p4	child randomly selected	22	,2045	,29516	,06293
	child exposed to violence	22	,0909	,19739	,04208
ProtectingMother_Group4	child randomly selected	22	,0909	,19739	,04208
	child exposed to violence	22	,2045	,25162	,05365

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 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 mother as an ideal role model* ($p=0.047<0.05$) is concerned. As it can be seen from the Descriptives table below, girls exposed to violence scored slightly lower in having their mother as an ideal role model whereas girls randomly selected scored higher.

Group Statistics

	exposure	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
MotherIdealModel_Group4	child randomly selected	18	,9167	,19174	,04519
	child exposed to violence	18	,7222	,35240	,08306
MotherNonIdealModel_Grou p4	child randomly selected	18	,0278	,11785	,02778
	child exposed to violence	18	,1389	,28726	,06771
ProtectingMother_Group4	child randomly selected	18	,0556	,16169	,03811
	child exposed to violence	18	,1389	,23044	,05432

Independent Samples Test

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
								95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper

MotherIdealModel_Group4	Equal variances assumed	13,079	,001	2,056	34	**,047**	,19444	,09456	,00228	,38661
	Equal variances not assumed			2,056	26,255	,050	,19444	,09456	,00017	,38872
MotherNonIdealModel_Group4	Equal variances assumed	10,930	,002	-1,518	34	,138	-,11111	,07318	-,25984	,03762
	Equal variances not assumed			-1,518	22,565	,143	-,11111	,07318	-,26266	,04044
ProtectingMother_Group4	Equal variances assumed	7,099	,012	-1,256	34	,218	-,08333	,06635	-,21818	,05151
	Equal variances not assumed			-1,256	30,473	,219	-,08333	,06635	-,21876	,05209

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 lower than 0.05 indicating that there are significant differences between the two samples as far as the *"high self-image"* (p=0.006<0.05), and the *"low self-image"* (p=0.014<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 who seem to have high self-image.

Group Statistics

	exposure	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
HighSelfImage_Group5	child randomly selected	40	,8333	,25036	,03958
	child exposed to violence	40	,6667	,27217	,04303
LowSelfImage_Group5	child randomly selected	40	,1667	,25036	,03958
	child exposed to violence	40	,3167	,28193	,04458

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
HighSelfImage_Group5	Equal variances assumed	1,089	,300	2,850	78	**,006**	,16667	,05847	,05026	,28307
	Equal variances not assumed			2,850	77,462	,006	,16667	,05847	,05025	,28309

LowSelfImage_Group5	Equal variances assumed	,222	,639	-2,516	78	**,014**	-,15000	,05962	-,26869	-,03131
	Equal variances not assumed			-2,516	76,925	,014	-,15000	,05962	-,26871	-,03129

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 two variables ("high self-image" and "low self-image") of the scenarios' 5th group. As it seems, in both variables computed, p value is greater than 0.05 indicating that there are no significant differences between boys and girls in the "high self-image" (p=0.702>0.05), and the "low self-image" (p=0.740>0.05) is concerned.

Group Statistics

	gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
HighSelfImage_Group5	boy	22	,6818	,29951	,06386
	girl	18	,6481	,24179	,05699
LowSelfImage_Group5	boy	22	,3030	,30704	,06546
	girl	18	,3333	,25565	,06026

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	22	,8030	,28469	,06070
	child exposed to violence	22	,6818	,29951	,06386
LowSelfImage_Group5	child randomly selected	22	,1970	,28469	,06070
	child exposed to violence	22	,3030	,30704	,06546

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=0.005<0.05) and *the low self image* (p=0.012<0.05) is concerned. As it seems from the 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	18	,8704	,20256	,04774
	child exposed to violence	18	,6481	,24179	,05699
LowSelfImage_Group5	child randomly selected	18	,1296	,20256	,04774
	child exposed to violence	18	,3333	,25565	,06026

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
HighSelfImage_Group5	Equal variances assumed	,369	,548	2,989	34	**,005**	,22222	,07435	,07113	,37331
	Equal variances not assumed			2,989	32,988	,005	,22222	,07435	,07096	,37348
LowSelfImage_Group5	Equal variances assumed	,213	,647	-2,650	34	**,012**	-,20370	,07688	-,35994	-,04746
	Equal variances not assumed			-2,650	32,311	,012	-,20370	,07688	-,36024	-,04716

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=0.406>0.05), the "very good school performance" (p=0.715>0.05) and the "good school performance" (p=0.924>0.05) and the "poor school performance and failure" (p=0.364>0.05) is concerned.

Group Statistics

	exposure	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Excellent_Sch.Perf_Group6	child randomly selected	40	,2333	,26366	,04169
	child exposed to violence	40	,1833	,27164	,04295
VeryGood_Sch.Perf_Group6	child randomly selected	40	,3250	,21334	,03373
	child exposed to violence	40	,3063	,24342	,03849
Good_Sch.Perf_Group6	child randomly selected	40	,5150	,21668	,03426
	child exposed to violence	40	,5200	,24724	,03909
Poor_Sch.Perf_Failure_Group6	child randomly selected	40	,0800	,16204	,02562
	child exposed to violence	40	,1150	,18053	,02854

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 as far as the "excellent school performance" (p=0.466>0.05), the "very good school

performance" (p=0.737>0.05), the "good school performance" (p=0.112<0.05) and the "poor school performance and failure" (p=0.415>0.05) is concerned.

Group Statistics

	gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Excellent_Sch.Perf_Group6	boy	22	,2121	,30071	,06411
	girl	18	,1481	,23493	,05537
VeryGood_Sch.Perf_Group 6	boy	22	,3182	,25799	,05500
	girl	18	,2917	,23089	,05442
Good_Sch.Perf_Group6	boy	22	,4636	,24985	,05327
	girl	18	,5889	,23235	,05477
Poor_Sch.Perf_Failure_Group6	boy	22	,1364	,21722	,04631
	girl	18	,0889	,12314	,02902

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	22	,2727	,26500	,05650
	child exposed to violence	22	,2121	,30071	,06411
VeryGood_Sch.Perf_Group 6	child randomly selected	22	,3068	,20313	,04331
	child exposed to violence	22	,3182	,25799	,05500
Good_Sch.Perf_Group6	child randomly selected	22	,5000	,21157	,04511
	child exposed to violence	22	,4636	,24985	,05327
Poor_Sch.Perf_Failure_Group6	child randomly selected	22	,0909	,19250	,04104
	child exposed to violence	22	,1364	,21722	,04631

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 all the 4 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
Excellent_Sch.Perf_Group6	child randomly selected	18	,1852	,26127	,06158
	child exposed to violence	18	,1481	,23493	,05537
VeryGood_Sch.Perf_Group 6	child randomly selected	18	,3472	,22911	,05400
	child exposed to violence	18	,2917	,23089	,05442
Good_Sch.Perf_Group6	child randomly selected	18	,5333	,22752	,05363
	child exposed to violence	18	,5889	,23235	,05477
Poor_Sch.Perf_Failure_Group6	child randomly selected	18	,0667	,11882	,02801
	child exposed to violence	18	,0889	,12314	,02902

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, approximately the same number of children exposed to violence and randomly selected responded aggressively. With a chi-square (x^2) = 5,670 (p =0.461>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.270 (p=0.461>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	1	0	10	10	15	4	40
	child exposed to violence	3	1	13	10	8	3	38
Total		4	1	23	20	23	7	78

2) In Sc1q2, 6 children out of the 38 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) = 5.929 (p =0.205>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.277 (p=0.205>0.05), it seems that there isn't a relationship between the two variables.

2		sc1q2					
		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	2	0	23	14	0	39
	child exposed to violence	3	3	19	11	2	38
Total		5	3	42	25	2	77

3) In Sc5q1, 14 children out of the 40 exposed to violence responded passively whereas the majority of children randomly selected preferred a constructive solution as an answer. With a chi-square (x^2) = 12.731 (p =0.026<0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.399 (p=0.026<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	1	6	1	3	0	29	40
	child exposed to violence	2	2	0	14	1	21	40
Total		3	8	1	17	1	50	80

4) In Sc5q2, 20 children out of the 39 exposed to violence responded passively. On the contrary, the majority of children randomly selected preferred a constructive solution as an answer. With a chi-square (x^2) = 14.407 (p =0.002<0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.430 (p=0.002<0.05), it seems that there is a relationship between the two variables.

4		sc5q2				
		AGGRES verbally violent behavior	ASSERT constructive solution	PASS tolerant behavior	ASSERT call of a third party	T
exposure	child randomly selected	5	21	5	8	39
	child exposed to violence	1	12	20	6	39
Total		6	33	25	14	78

5) In Sc5q3, only 4 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) = 4.444 (p =0.487>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.237 (p=0.487>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	2	1	2	9	24	39
	child exposed to violence	3	3	3	1	13	17	40
Total		4	5	4	3	22	41	79

6) In Sc7q1, 6 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) = 2.365 (p =0.669>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.172 (p=0.669>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	2	11	0	1	26	40
	child exposed to violence	4	13	1	1	21	40
Total		6	24	1	2	47	80

7) In Sc7q2, 7 children out of the 38 exposed to violence responded aggressively whereas the others preferred a constructive solution as an answer. With a chi-square (x^2) = 6.459 (p =0.091>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.288 (p=0.091>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	4	2	32	2	40
	child exposed to violence	4	9	22	3	38
Total		8	11	54	5	78

8) In Sc7q3, the majority of children from the two samples preferred a constructive solution as an answer. With a chi-square (x^2) = 1.394 (p =0.845>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.132 (p=0.845>0.05), it seems that there isn't a relationship between the two variables.

8		sc7q3					
		ASSERT constructive solution	AGGRES	PASS avoidance	ASSERT constructive solution	AGGRES	T
exposure	child randomly selected	24	1	1	13	1	40
	child exposed to violence	25	0	1	12	2	40
Total		49	1	2	25	3	80

B

9) In Sc3q1, 10 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 7 of the children randomly selected preferred a verbally violent behavior as an answer. With a chi-square (x^2) = 5.375 (p =0.497>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.259 (p=0.497>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	1	2	10	5	1	2	19	40
	child exposed to violence	3	4	4	4	3	2	20	40
Total		4	6	14	9	4	4	39	80

10) In Sc3q2, children from both groups responded approximately in the same way. With a chi-square (x^2) = 6.585 (p =0.253>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.291 (p=0.253>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	1	2	26	9	0	1	39
	child exposed to violence	1	2	21	10	5	0	39
Total		2	4	47	19	5	1	78

11) In Sc3q3, both the majority of children exposed to violence and randomly preferred either a constructive or a passive solution as an answer. With a chi-square (x^2) = 0.994 (p =0.803>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.117 (p=0.803>0.05), it seems that there isn't a relationship between the two variables.

11		sc3q3				
		AGGRES verbally violent behavior	ASSERT constructive solution	PASS tolerant behavior	ASSERT call of a third party	T
exposure	child randomly selected	4	14	14	4	36
	child exposed to violence	2	17	13	4	36
Total		6	31	27	8	72

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) = 0.555 (p =0.907>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.084 (p=0.907>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	16	15	2	6	39
	child exposed to violence	15	17	1	7	40
Total		31	32	3	13	79

13) In Sc9q1, 5 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, all preferred either an assertive or a passive solution. With a chi-square (x^2) = 6.958 (p =0.138>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.295 (p=0.138>0.05), it seems that there isn't a relationship between the two variables.

13		sc9q1					
		PASS tolerant behavior	AGGRES verbally and physically violent behavior	ASSERT constructive solution	PASS tolerant behavior/ avoidance	ASSERT constructive solution	T
exposure	child randomly selected	11	0	9	1	19	40
	child exposed to violence	9	5	9	3	14	40
Total		19	5	18	4	33	80

14) In Sc9q2, 8 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 6 preferred a physically violent behavior as an answer. With a chi-square (x^2) = 1.474 (p =0.688>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.137 (p=0.688>0.05), it seems that there isn't a relationship between the two variables.

14		sc9q2				
		AGGRES physically violent behavior	ASSERT constructive solution	PASS tolerant behavior	ASSERT call of a third party	T
exposure	child randomly selected	6	12	18	4	40

	child exposed to violence	8	9	20	2	39
Total		14	21	38	16	79

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) = 1.867 (p =0.393>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.153 (p=0.393>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	17	19	4	40
	child exposed to violence	13	19	8	40
Total		30	38	12	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. With a chi-square (x^2) = 3.306 (p =0.347>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.203 (p=0.347>0.05), it seems that there isn't 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	6	24	2	8	40
	child exposed to violence	9	22	5	4	40
Total		15	46	7	12	80

17) In Sc14q1, both children exposed to violence and children randomly selected answered approximately the same. With a chi-square (x^2) = 0.885 (p =0.971>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.106 (p=0.971>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	23	2	1	4	3	7	40
	child exposed to violence	20	2	1	5	5	6	39
Total		43	4	2	9	8	13	79

18) In Sc14q2, 9 out of 36 children exposed to violence preferred aggressiveness as an answer whereas children randomly selected who chose also aggressiveness were more. The majority of children though fom both groups selected passiveness as an answer. With a chi-square (x^2) = 3.854 (p =0.571>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.227 (p=0.571>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	AGGRES verbally and physically violent behavior	T
exposure	child randomly selected	9	2	4	19	4	1	39
	child exposed to violence	4	3	2	18	7	2	36
Total		13	5	6	37	11	3	75

19) In Sc14q3, approximately the same numbers of children exposed to violence and randomly selected chose either passiveness/assertiveness or aggressiveness as an answer. With a chi-square (x^2) = 1.292 (p =0.863>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.133 (p=0.863>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	2	2	8	18	9	39
	child exposed to violence	3	2	6	18	5	34
Total		5	4	14	36	14	73

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) = 2.854 (p =0.415>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.190 (p=0.415>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	AGGRESS aggressive behavior	T
exposure	child randomly selected	2	33	3	2	40
	child exposed to violence	4	33	2	0	39
Total		6	66	5	2	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. With a chi-square (x^2) = 1.738 (p =0.629>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.150 (p=0.629>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	2	6	26	5	39
	child exposed to violence	1	5	23	9	38
Total		3	11	49	14	77

22) In Sc4q3, 11 out of 39 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) = 4.694 (p =0.196>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.245 (p=0.196>0.05), it seems that there isn't a relationship between the two variables.

22		sc4q3				
		AGGRESS physically violent behavior	ASSERT constructive solution	PASS tolerant behavior	ASSERT call of a third party	T
exposure	child randomly selected	5	14	16	4	39
	child exposed to violence	11	7	16	5	39
Total		16	21	32	9	78

23) In Sc11q3, 13 of the children exposed to violence preferred aggressiveness and especially a physically violent behavior as an answer. With a chi-square (x^2) = 6.627 (p =0.157>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.288 (p=0.157>0.05), it seems that there isn't a relationship between the two variables.

23		sc11q3					
		AGGRESS physically violent behavior	PASS tolerance	AGGRESS physically violent behavior	ASSERT constructive solution	PASS tolerance	T
exposure	child randomly selected	9	0	0	29	2	40
	child exposed to violence	9	1	4	22	4	40
Total		18	1	4	51	6	80

24) In Sc12q1, the majority of the two samples seem to disagree with violence. With a chi-square (x^2) = 5.199 (p =0.268>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.255 (p=0.268>0.05), it seems that there isn't a relationship between the two variables.

24		sc12q1					
		Activeness disagreeing with violence	Activeness disagreeing with violence	Passiveness ignoring violence	Passiveness agreeing with violence	Activeness aggressiveness	T
exposure	child randomly selected	21	11	3	0	5	40
	child exposed to violence	26	11	1	1	1	40
Total		47	22	4	1	6	80

25) In Sc12q2, approximately the same numbers of children randomly selsected and exposed to violence disagree with violence or prefer a constructive solution With a chi-square (x^2) = 0.616 (p =0.893>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.089 (p=0.893>0.05), it seems that there isn't a relationship between the two variables.

25		sc12q2				
		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	3	14	19	4	40

	child exposed to violence		14	19	2	38
Total			28	38	6	78

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	39	39
	child exposed to violence	39	39
Total		78	78

D

27) In Sc11q1, children randomly selected and children exposed to violence answered approximately the same. With a chi-square (x^2) = 2.090 (p =0.719>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.162 (p=0.719>0.05), it seems that there isn't a relationship between the two variables.

27		sc11q1					T
		Protecting mother role exchange	Mother ideal role model	Mother non ideal role model	Mother non ideal role model	Mother ideal role model	
exposure	child randomly selected	3	13	0	2	22	40
	child exposed to violence	5	14	1	1	19	40
Total		8	27	1	3	41	80

28) In Sc11q2, more children exposed to violence consider violence as a play. 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) = 2.953 (p =0.399>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.192 (p=0.399>0.05), it seems that there isn't a relationship between the two variables.

28 (not included in the grouping)		sc11q2				T
		Passiveness violence as a play	Passiveness possibility to lose friends	Passiveness violence is learned	Passiveness tolerance	
exposure	child randomly selected	6	12	2	20	40
	child exposed to violence	7	6	4	23	40
Total		13	18	6	43	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 7 children exposed to violence consider their mother as a non ideal role model. With a chi-square (x^2) = 5.644 (p =0.129>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.266 (p=0.129>0.05), it seems that there isn't a relationship between the two variables.

29	sc13q1	T

		Mother ideal role model	Protecting mother role exchange	Mother ideal role model	Mother non ideal role model	
exposure	child randomly selected	19	3	10	8	40
	child exposed to violence	20	9	4	7	40
Total		39	12	14	15	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) = 3.029 (p =0.387>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.202 (p=0.387>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	0	10	3	39
	child exposed to violence	23	2	9	1	35
Total		49	2	19	4	74

31) In Sc13q3, the same numbers of children randomly selected and children exposed to violence preferred an assertive answer whereas 7 children exposed to violence indicated an existence of violence in their family. With a chi-square (x^2) = 6.985 (p =0.137>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.295 (p=0.137>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	11	10	1	4	14	40
	child exposed to violence	11	12	7	2	8	40
Total		22	22	8	6	22	80

E

32) In Sc2q1, more children exposed to violence have a sense of partial acceptance from peers or even rejection whereas more children randomly selected have a strong sense of acceptance. With a chi-square (x^2) = 9.440 (p =0.051>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.346 (p=0.051>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	4	4	20	10	2	40
	child exposed to violence	2	1	12	16	8	39
Total		6	5	32	26	10	79

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 6 children exposed to violence seem to be passive and have a low-self image. With a chi-square (x^2) = 4.564 (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.

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	1	6	3	0	30	40
	child exposed to violence	2	12	3	1	22	40
Total		3	18	6	1	52	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) = 4.681 (p =0.096>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.243 (p=0.096>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	4	27	9	40
	child exposed to violence	8	17	14	39
Total		12	44	23	79

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) = 2.517 (p =0.472>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.177 (p=0.472>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	21	3	0	16	40
	child exposed to violence	23	5	1	11	40
Total		44	8	1	27	80

36) In Sc6q2, children exposed to violence and children randomly selected answered approximately the same way. With a chi-square (x^2) = 0.195 (p =0.978>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.050 (p=0.978>0.05), it seems that there isn't a relationship between the two variables.

36	sc6q2				T
	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	

exposure	child randomly selected	3	12	21	3	39
	child exposed to violence	3	13	20	4	40
Total		6	25	41	7	79

37) In Sc6q3, children exposed to violence and randomly selected answered approximately in the same way. With a chi-square (x^2) = 1.740 (p =0.628>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.148 (p=0.628>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	15	18	4	3	40
	child exposed to violence	10	23	3	3	39
Total		25	41	7	6	79

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) = 3.115 (p =0.539>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.200 (p=0.539>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	5	19	3	2	40
	child exposed to violence	8	7	14	7	2	38
Total		19	12	33	10	4	78

39) In Sc8q2, children randomly selected and children exposed to violence answered approximately the same way. With a chi-square (x^2) = 3.082 (p =0.379>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.196 (p=0.379>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	1	13	21	5	40
	child exposed to violence	5	10	20	5	40
Total		6	23	41	10	80

40) In Sc8q3, more children randomly selected have a sense of success or mananging to succeed at school whereas 8 children exposed to violence feel that they are failures. With a chi-square (x^2) = 4.337 (p =0.227>0.05) and a Cramer's V = 0.233 (p=0.227>0.05), it seems that there isn't 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	1	16	21	2	40
	child exposed to violence	3	9	23	5	40
Total		4	25	44	7	80