

**Main Study – Analysis' Results**

University of Cyprus  
**Romania's DATA**

▪ **Reliability**

Measuring the scale reliability of the 4 instruments used in Romania's main study, in the Harter's Instrument (1<sup>st</sup> part with 36 items), Cronbach's alpha was found to be 0.666, a satisfactory value of reliability since values of 0.7-0.8 are widely acceptable in the research literature. For the 2<sup>nd</sup> part of the Harter's Instrument, Cronbach's alpha was found to be 0.257, not satisfactory whereas for the 3<sup>rd</sup> part of the Harter's instrument, Cronbach's Alpha was found to be negative -0.668. For the Scenarios' Instrument, Cronbach's alpha reached the value of 0.215, which is rather disappointing.

**(Harter's Instrument\_for the Child\_36 items)**  
**Case Processing Summary**

		N	%
Cases	Valid	86	100,0
	Excluded <sup>a</sup>	0	,0
	Total	86	100,0

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

**Reliability Statistics**

Cronbach's	
Alpha	N of Items
,666	36

**(Harter's Instrument\_for the Child\_10 items)**  
**Case Processing Summary**

		N	%
Cases	Valid	86	100,0
	Excluded <sup>a</sup>	0	,0
	Total	86	100,0

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

**Reliability Statistics**

Cronbach's	
Alpha	N of Items
,257	10

**Harter's Instrument\_for the Teacher\_15 items)**  
**Case Processing Summary**

		N	%
Cases	Valid	86	100,0
	Excluded <sup>a</sup>	0	,0
	Total	86	100,0

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

**Reliability Statistics**

Cronbach's	
Alpha <sup>a</sup>	N of Items
-,668	15

a. The value is negative due to a negative average covariance among items. This violates reliability model assumptions. You may want to check item codings.

**Scenarios' Instrument\_for the child\_40 items)**  
**Case Processing Summary**

		N	%
Cases	Valid	84	97,7
	Excluded <sup>a</sup>	2	2,3
	Total	86	100,0

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

**Reliability Statistics**

Cronbach's	
Alpha	N of Items
,654	28

▪ **Demographics**

The sample of Romania consists of 86 persons, 43 children who were identified being exposed to violence and 43 children randomly selected from a larger sample. In the group of children randomly selected 28 are boys and 15 are girls whereas in the group of the exposed to violence children, 30 are boys and 13 are girls. The Romanian educational system is different from the other countries since the child's age does not necessarily correspond to the class and thus children between 9-11 years old may be in the 2nd grade or 3rd grade or 4th grade. As it can be seen from the tables below, the majority of both of the children exposed to violence and of those randomly selected are either 9 or 10 years old. At least 40 children from each group of children have both parents speaking Romanian.

		gender		Total
		boy	girl	
exposure	child randomly selected	28	15	43
	child exposed to violence	30	13	43
Total		58	28	86

**exposure \* class\_ROMANIAN\_system Crosstabulation**

		class_ROMANIAN_system			Total
		2,00	3,00	4,00	
exposure	child randomly selected	9	18	16	43
	child exposed to violence	9	23	11	43
Total		18	41	27	86

		gender		Total
		boy	girl	
age	9,00	23	15	38
	10,00	28	9	37
	11,00	7	4	11
Total		58	28	86

		age			Total
		9,00	10,00	11,00	
exposure	child randomly selected	16	20	7	43
	child exposed to violence	22	17	4	43
Total		38	37	11	86

		gender		Total
		boy	girl	
class_ROMANIAN_system	2,00	10	8	18
	3,00	27	14	41
	4,00	21	6	27
Total		58	28	86

		motherLang			Total
		hungarian	roma	romanian	
exposure	child randomly selected	2	1	40	43
	child exposed to violence	1	1	41	43
Total		3	2	81	86

		fatherLang			Total
		hungarian	roma	romanian	
exposure	child randomly selected	1	1	41	43
	child exposed to violence	2	1	40	43
Total		3	2	81	86

## Harter's Instrument Data Analysis

### *Harter's Instrument 1<sup>st</sup> 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 2.0, which is the midpoint of the scale. In addition, means in all subscales do not differ a lot for children exposed to violence and for children randomly selected.

Group Statistics					
exposure	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	
Scholastic_Competence_Ch	child randomly selected	43	2,4070	,40874	,06233
	child exposed to violence	43	2,3450	,39069	,05958
Social_Acceptance_Ch	child randomly selected	43	2,2868	,47326	,07217
	child exposed to violence	43	2,2907	,51189	,07806
Athletic_Competence_Ch	child randomly selected	43	2,4574	,43047	,06565
	child exposed to violence	43	2,3256	,36361	,05545
Physical_Appearance_Ch	child randomly selected	43	2,5155	,32695	,04986
	child exposed to violence	43	2,4031	,42137	,06426
Behavioral_Conduct_Ch	child randomly selected	43	2,2403	,36786	,05610
	child exposed to violence	43	2,2481	,40723	,06210
Global_SelfWorth_Ch	child randomly selected	43	2,3450	,30078	,04587
	child exposed to violence	43	2,2868	,52368	,07986

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 all the 6 subscales from the Instrument for the child, p value is greater than 0.05 indicating that there are no significant differences between the two samples as far as the 6 subscales is concerned. Therefore, the hypothesis H0 that all the means are equal cannot be rejected as far as these six subscales are concerned.

### *Gender effects*

Taking only the sample of **the children exposed to violence**, Independent samples T-test were also performed so as to compare the **means between boys and girls** in the six subscales of the child's self-rating scale. As it seems, in 5 of the 6 subscales p value is greater than 0.05 indicating that there are no significant differences between boys and girls as far as these subscales is concerned. In the *Global Self-Worth* domain though p value is lower than 0.05 ( $p=0.008<0.05$ ) indicating that there are significant differences between boys and girls. As it seems from the means, boys exposed to violence tend to be happier with their lives than girls.

Group Statistics					
gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	
Scholastic_Competence_Ch	boy	30	2,2944	,42364	,07735
	girl	13	2,4615	,28181	,07816
Social_Acceptance_Ch	boy	30	2,2722	,44525	,08129
	girl	13	2,3333	,65969	,18296
Athletic_Competence_Ch	boy	30	2,3278	,38278	,06989
	girl	13	2,3205	,32957	,09141
Physical_Appearance_Ch	boy	30	2,4222	,41921	,07654
	girl	13	2,3590	,44015	,12208
Behavioral_Conduct_Ch	boy	30	2,2833	,38194	,06973

	girl	13	2,1667	,46647	,12938
Global_SelfWorth_Ch	boy	30	<b>2,4222</b>	,48883	,08925
	girl	13	<b>1,9744</b>	,48038	,13323

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	28	2,3452	,42535	,08038
	child exposed to violence	30	2,2944	,42364	,07735
Social_Acceptance_Ch	child randomly selected	28	2,3155	,49345	,09325
	child exposed to violence	30	2,2722	,44525	,08129
Athletic_Competence_Ch	child randomly selected	28	2,4226	,39670	,07497
	child exposed to violence	30	2,3278	,38278	,06989
Physical_Appearance_Ch	child randomly selected	28	2,4762	,37874	,07158
	child exposed to violence	30	2,4222	,41921	,07654
Behavioral_Conduct_Ch	child randomly selected	28	2,2202	,39035	,07377
	child exposed to violence	30	2,2833	,38194	,06973
Global_SelfWorth_Ch	child randomly selected	28	2,3214	,31729	,05996
	child exposed to violence	30	2,4222	,48883	,08925

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 global self-worth* domain, p value is lower than 0.05 ( $p=0.008<0.05$ ) indicating that there are significant differences between girls exposed to violence and girls randomly selected. As it seems from the means, girls randomly selected like themselves and are happier with their lives since they have significantly higher Global Self-Worth score (2,38) than the girls exposed to violence (1,97).

**Group Statistics**

exposure		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Scholastic_Competence_Ch	child randomly selected	15	2,5222	,36114	,09325
	child exposed to violence	13	2,4615	,28181	,07816
Social_Acceptance_Ch	child randomly selected	15	2,2333	,44454	,11478
	child exposed to violence	13	2,3333	,65969	,18296
Athletic_Competence_Ch	child randomly selected	15	2,5222	,49548	,12793
	child exposed to violence	13	2,3205	,32957	,09141
Physical_Appearance_Ch	child randomly selected	15	2,5889	,18758	,04843
	child exposed to violence	13	2,3590	,44015	,12208
Behavioral_Conduct_Ch	child randomly selected	15	2,2778	,33134	,08555
	child exposed to violence	13	2,1667	,46647	,12938
Global_SelfWorth_Ch	child randomly selected	15	<b>2,3889</b>	,27217	,07027
	child exposed to violence	13	<b>1,9744</b>	,48038	,13323

#### *Grade/age effects*

One way Analysis of Variance was conducted so as to compare the means between the children of different age (9,10,11) in the six subscales of the child's rating scale. Concerning child's rating scale for

the sample of **the children exposed to violence**, there weren't grade/age 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	,346	2	,173	1,142	,329
	Within Groups	6,065	40	,152		
	Total	6,411	42			
Social_Acceptance_Ch	Between Groups	,282	2	,141	,527	,595
	Within Groups	10,723	40	,268		
	Total	11,005	42			
Athletic_Competence_Ch	Between Groups	,226	2	,113	,850	,435
	Within Groups	5,327	40	,133		
	Total	5,553	42			
Physical_Appearance_Ch	Between Groups	,270	2	,135	,751	,478
	Within Groups	7,188	40	,180		
	Total	7,457	42			
Behavioral_Conduct_Ch	Between Groups	,928	2	,464	3,073	,057
	Within Groups	6,037	40	,151		
	Total	6,965	42			
Global_SelfWorth_Ch	Between Groups	,910	2	,455	1,716	,193
	Within Groups	10,608	40	,265		
	Total	11,518	42			

*Harter's Instrument 3<sup>rd</sup> part\_for the teacher\_15 items*

The subscales' means and standard deviations, calculated from the data given in **the third part of the Harter's Instrument (for the teacher-15 items)** for the children randomly selected and for the children exposed to violence, are presented in the table below. There, it can be seen that the means in general fluctuate around the value 2.5, which is above the midpoint of the scale.

**Group Statistics**

exposure		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Scholastic_Competence_T	child randomly selected	43	2,6512	,37764	,05759
	child exposed to violence	43	2,4496	,40423	,06165
Social_Acceptance_T	child randomly selected	43	2,3411	,42717	,06514
	child exposed to violence	43	2,5969	,38872	,05928
Athletic_Competence_T	child randomly selected	43	2,3023	,36957	,05636
	child exposed to violence	43	2,3333	,34118	,05203
Physical_Appearance_T	child randomly selected	43	2,1240	,24150	,03683
	child exposed to violence	43	2,2326	,27732	,04229
Behavioral_Conduct_T	child randomly selected	43	2,3721	,47814	,07292
	child exposed to violence	43	3,0000	,61721	,09412

Regarding the subscale means from the **teacher rating scale**, significant differences between the two samples are observed in *the scholastic competence* ( $p=0.019<0.05$ ), in *the social acceptance* ( $p=0.005<0.05$ ) and in *the behavioral conduct* ( $p=0.000<0.05$ ). As it seems from the means, teachers evaluate with lower values children exposed to violence as far as the school performance is concerned. **But**, the interesting result is that teachers rate children exposed to violence as more popular and give them greater 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 only 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* ( $p=0.010<0.05$ ) is concerned. As it seems from the means, teachers give lower values for the girls than for the boys in this subscale. More specifically, teachers consider boys exposed to violence better than girls in the behavior domain.

**Group Statistics**

	gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Scholastic_Competence_T	boy	30	2,4889	,38886	,07100
	girl	13	2,3590	,44015	,12208
Social_Acceptance_T	boy	30	2,6000	,39538	,07219
	girl	13	2,5897	,38858	,10777
Athletic_Competence_T	boy	30	2,2778	,32851	,05998
	girl	13	2,4615	,34797	,09651
Physical_Appearance_T	boy	30	2,2444	,30240	,05521
	girl	13	2,2051	,21681	,06013
Behavioral_Conduct_T	boy	30	<b>3,1556</b>	,53055	,09686
	girl	13	<b>2,6410</b>	,67305	,18667

Independent samples T-test were 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 ( $p=0.016<0.05$ ) 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 boys exposed to violence and boys randomly selected. As it seems from the means, teachers consider boys exposed to violence more popular and accepted by peers since they evaluate them with higher Social Acceptance score (2,60) than the boys randomly selected (2,33). In addition, in the behavior domain teachers give higher scores to children exposed to violence (3,15) than to the children randomly selected (2,44).

**Group Statistics**

	exposure	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Scholastic_Competence_T	child randomly selected	28	2,6667	,37406	,07069
	child exposed to violence	30	2,4889	,38886	,07100
Social_Acceptance_T	child randomly selected	28	2,3333	,42552	,08042
	child exposed to violence	30	2,6000	,39538	,07219
Athletic_Competence_T	child randomly selected	28	2,3214	,40043	,07567
	child exposed to violence	30	2,2778	,32851	,05998
Physical_Appearance_T	child randomly selected	28	2,1190	,24367	,04605
	child exposed to violence	30	2,2444	,30240	,05521
Behavioral_Conduct_T	child randomly selected	28	2,4405	,55964	,10576
	child exposed to violence	30	3,1556	,53055	,09686

Independent samples T-test were 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 *the behavioral conduct domain* ( $p=0.042<0.05$ ), p value is lower than 0.05 indicating that there are significant differences between girls exposed to violence and girls randomly selected as rated from their teachers. As it seems from the means, in the behavior domain teachers give higher scores to girls exposed to violence (2,64) than to the girls randomly selected (2,24).

**Group Statistics**

exposure	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Scholastic_Competence_T	child randomly selected	15	2,6222	,39574
	child exposed to violence	13	2,3590	,44015
Social_Acceptance_T	child randomly selected	15	2,3556	,44484
	child exposed to violence	13	2,5897	,38858
Athletic_Competence_T	child randomly selected	15	2,2667	,31371
	child exposed to violence	13	2,4615	,34797
Physical_Appearance_T	child randomly selected	15	2,1333	,24560
	child exposed to violence	13	2,2051	,21681
Behavioral_Conduct_T	child randomly selected	15	<b>2,2444</b>	,23458
	child exposed to violence	13	<b>2,6410</b>	,67305

*Grade/age effects*

One way Analysis of Variance was conducted so as to compare the means between the children of different age (9,10,11) in the five subscales of the teacher's rating scale. Concerning teacher's rating scale for the sample of **the children exposed to violence**, there weren't age 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	,748	2	,374	2,448	,099
	Within Groups	6,115	40	,153		
	Total	6,863	42			
Social_Acceptance_T	Between Groups	,322	2	,161	1,071	,352
	Within Groups	6,024	40	,151		
	Total	6,346	42			
Athletic_Competence_T	Between Groups	,059	2	,029	,244	,784
	Within Groups	4,830	40	,121		
	Total	4,889	42			
Physical_Appearance_T	Between Groups	,046	2	,023	,289	,750
	Within Groups	3,184	40	,080		
	Total	3,230	42			
Behavioral_Conduct_T	Between Groups	1,709	2	,854	2,391	,104
	Within Groups	14,291	40	,357		
	Total	16,000	42			

## 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 negative correlation between *Scholastic Competence* subscale as rated from the child randomly selected and as rated from the teacher, *which is not statistically significant* ( $r_s(41) = -0.046, P = 0.770$ ).

Correlations			Z_Scholastic Comp_Ch	Z_Scholastic Comp_T
Spearman's rho	Z_Scholastic_Comp_Ch	Correlation Coefficient	1,000	-,046
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	,770
		N	43	43
	Z_Scholastic_Comp_T	Correlation Coefficient	-,046	1,000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	,770	.
		N	43	43

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* ( $r_s(41) = 0.116, P = 0.461$ ).

Correlations			Z_Scholastic Comp_Ch	Z_Scholastic Comp_T
Spearman's rho	Z_Scholastic_Comp_Ch	Correlation Coefficient	1,000	,116
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	,461
		N	43	43
	Z_Scholastic_Comp_T	Correlation Coefficient	,116	1,000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	,461	.
		N	43	43

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* ( $r_s(41) = 0.134, P = 0.390$ ).

Correlations			Z_Social_A ccept_Ch	Z_Social_A ccept_T
Spearman's rho	Z_Social_Accept_Ch	Correlation Coefficient	1,000	,134
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	,390
		N	43	43
	Z_Social_Accept_T	Correlation Coefficient	,134	1,000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	,390	.
		N	43	43

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* ( $r_s(41) = -0.131, P = 0.403$ ).

Correlations			Z_Social_A cept_Ch	Z_Social_ Accept_T
Spearman's rho	Z_Social_Accept_Ch	Correlation Coefficient	1,000	-,131
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	,403
		N	43	43
	Z_Social_Accept_T	Correlation Coefficient	-,131	1,000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	,403	.
		N	43	43

Taking only the sample of **the children randomly selected**, it seems that there is a positive correlation between *Athletic\_Compotence* subscale as rated from the child and as rated from the teacher, *which is not statistically significant* ( $r_s(41) = 0.103, P = 0.510$ ).

Correlations			Z_Athletic_ Comp_Ch	Z_Athletic_ Comp_T
Spearman's rho	Z_Athletic_Comp_Ch	Correlation Coefficient	1,000	,103
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	,510
		N	43	43
	Z_Athletic_Comp_T	Correlation Coefficient	,103	1,000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	,510	.
		N	43	43

Taking only the sample of **the children exposed to violence**, it seems that there is a positive correlation between *Athletic\_Compotence* subscale as rated from the child and as rated from the teacher, *which is not statistically significant* ( $r_s(41) = 0.020, P = 0.899$ ).

Correlations			Z_Athletic_ Comp_Ch	Z_Athletic_ Comp_T
Spearman's rho	Z_Athletic_Comp_Ch	Correlation Coefficient	1,000	,020
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	,899
		N	43	43
	Z_Athletic_Comp_T	Correlation Coefficient	,020	1,000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	,899	.
		N	43	43

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* ( $r_s(41) = -0.136, P = 0.385$ ).

Correlations			Z_Physical_ Appear_Ch	Z_Physical_ Appear_T
Spearman's rho	Z_Physical_Appear_Ch	Correlation Coefficient	1,000	-,136

	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	,385
	N	43	43
Z_Physical_Appear_T	Correlation Coefficient	-,136	1,000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,385	.
	N	43	43

Taking only the sample of **the children exposed to violence**, it seems that there is a negative correlation between *Physical Appearance* subscale as rated from the child and as rated from the teacher, *which is not statistically significant* ( $r_s(41) = -0.023, P = 0.882$ ).

**Correlations**

			Z_Physical_Appear_Ch	Z_Physical_Appear_T
Spearman's rho	Z_Physical_Appear_Ch	Correlation Coefficient	1,000	-,023
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	,882
		N	43	43
	Z_Physical_Appear_T	Correlation Coefficient	-,023	1,000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	,882	.
		N	43	43

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* ( $r_s(41) = 0.206, P = 0.185$ ).

**Correlations**

			Z_Behavioral_Conduct_Ch	Z_Behavioral_Conduct_T
Spearman's rho	Z_Behavioral_Conduct_Ch	Correlation Coefficient	1,000	,206
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	,185
		N	43	43
	Z_Behavioral_Conduct_T	Correlation Coefficient	,206	1,000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	,185	.
		N	43	43

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 though statistically significant* ( $r_s(41) = 0.141, P = 0.368$ ).

**Correlations**

			Z_Behavioral_Conduct_Ch	Z_Behavioral_Conduct_T
Spearman's rho	Z_Behavioral_Conduct_Ch	Correlation Coefficient	1,000	,141
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	,368
		N	43	43
	Z_Behavioral_Conduct_T	Correlation Coefficient	,141	1,000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	,368	.
		N	43	43

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*) were performed 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 subscales of Harter's instrument.

Independent samples T-test were performed so as to compare the means between the two samples regarding a possible adoption of violent behavior reacting in an ordinary situation (Group 1 = Scenarios 1, 5, 7). As it seems, in 2 of the 3 new variables computed, p value is lower than 0.05 indicating that there are significant differences between the two samples as far as *the aggressiveness* ( $p=0.037<0.05$ ) and *the assertiveness* ( $p=0.011<0.05$ ) is concerned. As it can be seen from the Descriptives table below, children exposed to violence tend to react more aggressively in an ordinary situation and thus adopt a violent behavior whereas children randomly selected react more assertively preferring a constructive solution. As far as the passiveness variable is concerned, no significant differences are found between the 2 samples ( $p=0.135>0.05$ ), thus both children exposed to violence and those who are not may behave passively and adopt a tolerant behavior in an ordinary situation.

Group Statistics

exposure		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Aggressiveness_Group1	child randomly selected	43	,1163	,17337	,02644
	child exposed to violence	43	,1977	,18345	,02798
Passiveness_Group1	child randomly selected	43	,1130	,15131	,02307
	child exposed to violence	43	,1694	,19282	,02940
Assertiveness_Group1	child randomly selected	43	,7820	,20790	,03171
	child exposed to violence	43	,6512	,25669	,03915

### Gender effects

Taking only the sample of **the children exposed to violence**, Independent samples T-test were also performed so as to compare the means **between boys and girls** in the three variables (aggressiveness, passiveness, assertiveness). As it seems, in the 3 new variables computed, p value is greater than 0.05 indicating that there are no significant differences between boys and girls as far as the aggressiveness ( $p=0.147>0.05$ ), the passiveness ( $p=0.407>0.05$ ) and the assertiveness ( $p=0.665>0.05$ ) is concerned.

Group Statistics

gender		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Aggressiveness_Group1	boy	30	,1708	,15565	,02842
	girl	13	,2596	,23084	,06402
Passiveness_Group1	boy	30	,1857	,19905	,03634
	girl	13	,1319	,17939	,04975
Assertiveness_Group1	boy	30	,6625	,24816	,04531
	girl	13	,6250	,28413	,07880

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 assertiveness* ( $p=0.047<0.05$ ) is concerned. As it can be seen from the Descriptives table below, boys exposed to violence scored slightly lower in the variable of assertiveness, thus they tend to react less assertively than boys randomly selected who prefer more constructive solutions. Concerning the variables of aggressiveness and passiveness, no significant differences were found between the 2 groups.

Group Statistics

exposure		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Aggressiveness_Group1	child randomly selected	28	,1295	,16131	,03048
	child exposed to violence	30	,1708	,15565	,02842
Passiveness_Group1	child randomly selected	28	,1071	,13257	,02505

	child exposed to violence	30	,1857	,19905	,03634
Assertiveness_Group1	child randomly selected	28	,7768	,17131	,03238
	child exposed to violence	30	,6625	,24816	,04531

Independent samples T-test were performed so as to compare the means between **girls randomly selected and girls exposed to violence** in the three variables (aggressiveness, passiveness, assertiveness). As it seems, in 1 of the 3 new variables computed, p value is lower than 0.05 indicating that there are significant differences between girls exposed to violence and girls randomly selected as far as *the aggressiveness* ( $p=0.048<0.05$ ) is concerned. As it can be seen from the Descriptives table below, girls exposed to violence tend to react more aggressively in an ordinary situation and thus adopt a violent behavior whereas girls randomly selected do not. Concerning the variables of passiveness and assertiveness, no significant differences were found between the 2 groups.

**Group Statistics**

exposure		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Aggressiveness_Group1	child randomly selected	15	<b>,0917</b>	,19745	,05098
	child exposed to violence	13	<b>,2596</b>	,23084	,06402
Passiveness_Group1	child randomly selected	15	,1238	,18600	,04803
	child exposed to violence	13	,1319	,17939	,04975
Assertiveness_Group1	child randomly selected	15	,7917	,27003	,06972
	child exposed to violence	13	,6250	,28413	,07880

**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 ( $p=0.348>0.05$ ), the passiveness ( $p=0.419>0.05$ ) and the assertiveness ( $p=0.079>0.05$ ) is concerned. But, still, as it can be seen from the Descriptives table below, children exposed to violence have greater means in the aggressiveness and passiveness variables whereas they have lower mean in the assertiveness variable than the children randomly selected.

**Group Statistics**

exposure		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Aggressiveness_Group2	child randomly selected	43	,1292	,18454	,02814
	child exposed to violence	43	,1680	,19604	,02990
Passiveness_Group2	child randomly selected	43	,3928	,19898	,03034
	child exposed to violence	43	,4289	,21356	,03257
Assertiveness_Group2	child randomly selected	43	,5203	,25578	,03901
	child exposed to violence	43	,4273	,22860	,03486

*Gender effects*

Taking only the sample of **the children exposed to violence**, Independent samples T-test were performed so as to compare the means **between boys and girls** in the three variables (aggressiveness, passiveness, assertiveness) of the scenarios' 2<sup>nd</sup> 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 ( $p=0.499>0.05$ ), the passiveness ( $p=0.758>0.05$ ) and the assertiveness ( $p=0.921>0.05$ ) is concerned.

**Group Statistics**

	gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Aggressiveness_Group2	boy	30	,1815	,19241	,03513
	girl	13	,1368	,20863	,05786
Passiveness_Group2	boy	30	,4222	,19443	,03550
	girl	13	,4444	,26058	,07227
Assertiveness_Group2	boy	30	,4250	,22885	,04178
	girl	13	,4327	,23726	,06580

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	28	,1667	,20621	,03897
	child exposed to violence	30	,1815	,19241	,03513
Passiveness_Group2	child randomly selected	28	,3690	,20522	,03878
	child exposed to violence	30	,4222	,19443	,03550
Assertiveness_Group2	child randomly selected	28	,5089	,26337	,04977
	child exposed to violence	30	,4250	,22885	,04178

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	15	,0593	,11005	,02841
	child exposed to violence	13	,1368	,20863	,05786
Passiveness_Group2	child randomly selected	15	,4370	,18529	,04784
	child exposed to violence	13	,4444	,26058	,07227
Assertiveness_Group2	child randomly selected	15	,5417	,24851	,06416
	child exposed to violence	13	,4327	,23726	,06580

**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 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 ( $p=0.017<0.05$ ) and the assertiveness ( $p=0.037<0.05$ ) is concerned. Regarding aggressiveness ( $p=0.482>0.05$ ) no significant differences were

found between the two samples. As it can be seen from the Descriptives table below, children exposed to violence tend to react more passively while witnessing violence and thus adopt a violent behavior, whereas children randomly selected react more assertively preferring constructive solutions. As far as the aggressiveness variable is concerned, means do not greatly differ between the two samples.

Group Statistics					
exposure		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Aggressiveness_Group3	child randomly selected	43	,1209	,15820	,02413
	child exposed to violence	43	,0977	,14718	,02244
Passiveness_Group3	child randomly selected	43	,1008	,14151	,02158
	child exposed to violence	43	,1899	,19444	,02965
Assertiveness_Group3	child randomly selected	43	,7946	,19531	,02978
	child exposed to violence	43	,6938	,24379	,03718

### 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' 3<sup>rd</sup> 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 ( $p=0.549>0.05$ ), the passiveness ( $p=0.142>0.05$ ) and the assertiveness ( $p=0.486>0.05$ ) is concerned.

Group Statistics					
gender		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Aggressiveness_Group3	boy	30	,1067	,15522	,02834
	girl	13	,0769	,13009	,03608
Passiveness_Group3	boy	30	,1611	,17770	,03244
	girl	13	,2564	,22169	,06149
Assertiveness_Group3	boy	30	,7111	,23133	,04223
	girl	13	,6538	,27606	,07657

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	28	,1429	,17090	,03230
	child exposed to violence	30	,1067	,15522	,02834
Passiveness_Group3	child randomly selected	28	,1012	,13862	,02620
	child exposed to violence	30	,1611	,17770	,03244
Assertiveness_Group3	child randomly selected	28	,7798	,17600	,03326
	child exposed to violence	30	,7111	,23133	,04223

Independent samples T-test were performed so as to compare the means between **girls randomly selected and girls exposed to violence** in the three variables (aggressiveness, passiveness, assertiveness). As it seems, in 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 passiveness* ( $p=0.037<0.05$ ) is concerned. As it can be seen from the Descriptives table below, girls exposed to violence tend to react more passively while witnessing violence and thus adopt a more tolerant behavior than girls randomly selected. Concerning the variables of aggressiveness and assertiveness, no significant differences were found between the 2 groups of girls.

**Group Statistics**

exposure		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Aggressiveness_Group3	child randomly selected	15	,0800	,12649	,03266
	child exposed to violence	13	,0769	,13009	,03608
Passiveness_Group3	child randomly selected	15	,1000	,15171	,03917
	child exposed to violence	13	,2564	,22169	,06149
Assertiveness_Group3	child randomly selected	15	,8222	,23117	,05969
	child exposed to violence	13	,6538	,27606	,07657

**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 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 “mother as an ideal role model” ( $p=0.451>0.05$ ), the “mother as a non ideal role model” ( $p=0.54>0.05$ ) and the “protecting mother” ( $p=0.844>0.05$ ) is concerned. But, still, as it can be seen from the Descriptives table below, the mean for children exposed to violence concerning the variable “mother as a non ideal role model” is greater than the one for children randomly selected indicating that it is more possible for children exposed to violence not to consider their mother as an ideal role model.

**Group Statistics**

exposure		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
MotherIdealModel_Group4	child randomly selected	43	,7791	,27391	,04177
	child exposed to violence	43	,7326	,29578	,04511
MotherNonIdealModel_Group4	child randomly selected	43	,0000	,00000	,00000
	child exposed to violence	43	,0581	,19546	,02981
ProtectingMother_Group4	child randomly selected	43	,2209	,27391	,04177
	child exposed to violence	43	,2093	,27239	,04154

*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’ 4<sup>th</sup> 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” ( $p=0.599>0.05$ ), the “mother as a non ideal role model” ( $p=0.669>0.05$ ) and the “protecting mother” ( $p=0.791>0.05$ ) 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 concerning the “mother as an ideal role model” variable.

**Group Statistics**

gender		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
MotherIdealModel_Group4	boy	30	,7167	,31303	,05715
	girl	13	,7692	,25944	,07195
MotherNonIdealModel_Group4	boy	30	,0667	,21709	,03963
	girl	13	,0385	,13868	,03846

ProtectingMother_Group4	boy	30	,2167	,28416	,05188
	girl	13	,1923	,25318	,07022

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

**Group Statistics**

exposure		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
MotherIdealModel_Group4	child randomly selected	28	,7679	,28810	,05445
	child exposed to violence	30	,7167	,31303	,05715
MotherNonIdealModel_Group4	child randomly selected	28	,0000	,00000	,00000
	child exposed to violence	30	,0667	,21709	,03963
ProtectingMother_Group4	child randomly selected	28	,2321	,28810	,05445
	child exposed to violence	30	,2167	,28416	,05188

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 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
MotherIdealModel_Group4	child randomly selected	15	,8000	,25355	,06547
	child exposed to violence	13	,7692	,25944	,07195
MotherNonIdealModel_Group4	child randomly selected	15	,0000	,00000	,00000
	child exposed to violence	13	,0385	,13868	,03846
ProtectingMother_Group4	child randomly selected	15	,2000	,25355	,06547
	child exposed to violence	13	,1923	,25318	,07022

**E**

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

Independent samples T-test were performed so as to compare the means between the two samples concerning their self-image and self-confidence (Group 5 = Scenarios 2, 10). As it seems, in all the 2 new variables computed, p value is greater than 0.05 indicating that there are no significant differences between the two samples as far as the “high self-image” ( $p=0.207 < 0.05$ ), and the “low self-image” ( $p=0.265 < 0.05$ ) is concerned.

**Group Statistics**

exposure		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
HighSelfImage_Group5	child randomly selected	43	,7829	,22868	,03487
	child exposed to violence	43	,7132	,27776	,04236
LowSelfImage_Group5	child randomly selected	43	,2171	,22868	,03487
	child exposed to violence	43	,2791	,28106	,04286

*Gender effects*

Taking only the group of children exposed to violence, Independent samples T-test were also performed so as to compare the means **between boys and girls** in the two variables (“high self-image” and “low self-image”) of the scenarios’ 5<sup>th</sup> group. As it seems, in all the 2 new variables computed, p value is greater than 0.05 indicating that there are no significant differences between boys and girls in each group as far as the “high self-image” ( $p=0.208>0.05$ ), and the “low self-image” ( $p=0.261>0.05$ ) is concerned.

**Group Statistics**

	gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
HighSelfImage_Group5	boy	30	,6778	,28343	,05175
	girl	13	,7949	,25598	,07100
LowSelfImage_Group5	boy	30	,3111	,28945	,05285
	girl	13	,2051	,25598	,07100

Independent samples T-test were 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	28	,7857	,24367	,04605
	child exposed to violence	30	,6778	,28343	,05175
LowSelfImage_Group5	child randomly selected	28	,2143	,24367	,04605
	child exposed to violence	30	,3111	,28945	,05285

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 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
HighSelfImage_Group5	child randomly selected	15	,7778	,20574	,05312
	child exposed to violence	13	,7949	,25598	,07100
LowSelfImage_Group5	child randomly selected	15	,2222	,20574	,05312
	child exposed to violence	13	,2051	,25598	,07100

**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” ( $p=0.092>0.05$ ), the “very good school performance” ( $p=0.140>0.05$ ), the “good school performance” ( $p=0.143>0.05$ ) and the “poor school performance and failure” ( $p=0.118>0.05$ ) is concerned. As it can be seen from the Descriptives table below, children exposed to violence tend to believe that they have lower school performance and consider themselves as failures.

**Group Statistics**

exposure		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Excellent_Sch.Perf_Group6	child randomly selected	43	,3333	,32530	,04961
	child exposed to violence	43	,2171	,30761	,04691
VeryGood_Sch.Perf_Group6	child randomly selected	43	,3837	,24609	,03753
	child exposed to violence	43	,3081	,22385	,03414
Good_Sch.Perf_Group6	child randomly selected	43	,4372	,26279	,04008
	child exposed to violence	43	,5163	,23190	,03536
Poor_Sch.Perf_Failure_Group6	child randomly selected	43	,0558	,15322	,02337
	child exposed to violence	43	,1070	,14703	,02242

*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’ 6<sup>th</sup> 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” ( $p=0.368>0.05$ ), the “very good school performance” ( $p=0.138>0.05$ ), the “good school performance” ( $p=0.491>0.05$ ) and the “poor school performance and failure” ( $p=0.671>0.05$ ) is concerned.

**Group Statistics**

gender		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Excellent_Sch.Perf_Group6	boy	30	,1889	,31175	,05692
	girl	13	,2821	,29957	,08309
VeryGood_Sch.Perf_Group6	boy	30	,3417	,22248	,04062
	girl	13	,2308	,21558	,05979
Good_Sch.Perf_Group6	boy	30	,5000	,22743	,04152
	girl	13	,5538	,24703	,06851
Poor_Sch.Perf_Failure_Group6	boy	30	,1133	,16344	,02984
	girl	13	,0923	,10377	,02878

Independent samples T-test were 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	28	,3095	,35053	,06624
	child exposed to violence	30	,1889	,31175	,05692
VeryGood_Sch.Perf_Group6	child randomly selected	28	,3929	,23002	,04347
	child exposed to violence	30	,3417	,22248	,04062
Good_Sch.Perf_Group6	child randomly selected	28	,4286	,27603	,05216
	child exposed to violence	30	,5000	,22743	,04152
Poor_Sch.Perf_Failure_Group6	child randomly selected	28	,0714	,18228	,03445
	child exposed to violence	30	,1133	,16344	,02984

Independent samples T-test were 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 lower 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	15	,3778	,27794	,07176
	child exposed to violence	13	,2821	,29957	,08309
VeryGood_Sch.Perf_Group6	child randomly selected	15	,3667	,28137	,07265
	child exposed to violence	13	,2308	,21558	,05979
Good_Sch.Perf_Group6	child randomly selected	15	,4533	,24456	,06315
	child exposed to violence	13	,5538	,24703	,06851
Poor_Sch.Perf_Failure_Group6	child randomly selected	15	,0267	,07037	,01817
	child exposed to violence	13	,0923	,10377	,02878

**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, 12 children out of the 43 exposed to violence responded aggressively whereas 10 children randomly selected did the same. With a chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) = 13,768 ( $p = 0.055 > 0.05$ ) and a Cramer's V = 0.400 ( $p = 0.055 > 0.05$ ), it seems that there isn't any relationship between the two variables.

1		Sc1q1						T
		AGGRES verbally violent behavior	AGGRES physically violent behavior	ASSERT constructive solution	PASS avoidance /escape	ASSERT constructive solution	AGGRES verbally violent behavior	
exposure	child randomly selected	3	1	15	3	15	6	43
	child exposed to violence	4	3	5	9	17	5	43
Total		7	4	20	12	32	11	86

2) In Sc1q2, 14 children out of the 43 exposed to violence responded aggressively whereas the majority of children randomly selected preferred a more constructive solution as an answer. With a chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) = 2.413 ( $p = 0.660 > 0.05$ ) and a Cramer's V = 0.168 ( $p = 0.660 > 0.05$ ), it seems that there isn't a relationship between the two variables.

2		sc1q2					T
		AGGRES verbally violent behavior	AGGRES physically violent behavior	ASSERT constructive solution	PASS tolerant behavior	ASSERT Call of a third party	
exposure	child randomly selected	9	1	23	10	0	43
	child exposed to violence	12	2	18	9	1	42
Total		21	3	41	19	1	85

3) In Sc5q1, 12 children out of the 43 exposed to violence responded aggressively whereas the majority of children randomly selected preferred a constructive solution as an answer. With a chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) = 7.104 ( $p = 0.311 > 0.05$ ) and a Cramer's V = 0.287 ( $p = 0.311 > 0.05$ ), it seems that there isn't a relationship between the two variables.

3		sc5q1						T	
		AGGRES verbally violent behavior	AGGRES verbally violent behavior	PASS tolerant behavior	PASS tolerant behavior	ASSERT constructive solution	ASSERT constructive solution		AGGRES verbally- physically violent
exposure	child randomly selected	0	6	1	7	3	26	0	43
	child exposed to violence	2	8	0	10	2	19	2	43
Total		2	14	1	17	5	45	2	86

4) In Sc5q2, 6 children out of the 43 exposed to violence responded aggressively whereas the others 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 ( $\chi^2$ ) = 2.451 ( $p=0.653>0.05$ ) and a Cramer's V = 0.169 ( $p=0.653>0.05$ ), it seems that there isn't a relationship between the two variables.

		sc5q2					T
		AGGRES verbally violent behavior	AGGRES physically violent behavior	ASSERT constructive solution	PASS tolerant behavior	ASSERT call of a third party	
4							
exposure	child randomly selected	3	1	22	9	8	43
	child exposed to violence	4	2	15	12	10	43
Total		7	3	37	21	18	86

5) In Sc5q3, the majority of both groups of children preferred a constructive solution as an answer. With a chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) = 5.452 ( $p=0.366>0.05$ ) and a Cramer's V = 0.251 ( $p=0.366>0.05$ ), it seems that there isn't a relationship between the two variables.

		sc5q3					T
		AGGRES blaming father's behavior	PASS Tolerance/ blaming mother's behavior	PASS tolerance/ avoidance	AGGRES violent behavior	ASSERT constructive solution	
5							
exposure	child randomly selected	0	0	1	1	11	30
	child exposed to violence	2	1	4	1	8	27
Total		2	1	5	2	19	57

6) In Sc7q1, only 6 children out of the 43 exposed to violence responded aggressively whereas the others preferred a constructive solution as an answer. On the contrary, almost all the children randomly selected preferred a constructive as an answer. With a chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) = 4.974 ( $p=0.290>0.05$ ) and a Cramer's V = 0.241 ( $p=0.290>0.05$ ), it seems that there isn't a relationship between the two variables.

		sc7q1					T
		AGGRES verbally violent behavior	ASSERT constructive solution	AGGRES verbally and physically violent behavior	AGGRES physically violent behavior	ASSERT constructive solution	
6							
exposure	child randomly selected	1	22	0	0	20	43
	child exposed to violence	2	17	1	3	20	43
Total		3	39	1	3	40	86

7) In Sc7q2, 11 children out of the 43 exposed to violence responded aggressively whereas the others preferred a constructive solution as an answer. With a chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) = 3.303 ( $p=0.347>0.05$ ) and a Cramer's V = 0.196 ( $p=0.347>0.05$ ), it seems that there isn't a relationship between the two variables.

7		sc7q2				T
		AGGRESS	ASSERT exonerating self	ASSERT	AGGRESS	
exposure	child randomly selected	0	3	34	6	43
	child exposed to violence	1	5	27	10	43
Total		1	8	61	16	86

8) In Sc7q3, only 3 children out of the 43 exposed to violence responded aggressively whereas most of them preferred a constructive solution as an answer. With a chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) = 3.470 ( $p = 0.482 > 0.05$ ) and a Cramer's V = 0.202 ( $p = 0.482 > 0.05$ ), it seems that there isn't a relationship between the two variables.

8		sc7q3				T	
		ASSERT constructive solution	AGGRES	PASS avoidance	ASSERT constructive solution		AGGRES
exposure	child randomly selected	24	2	0	16	0	42
	child exposed to violence	20	2	2	18	1	43
Total		44	4	2	34	1	85

## B

9) In Sc3q1, approximately the same numbers of exposed and randomly selected children responded aggressively or preferred either a constructive or a passive solution as an answer. With a chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) = 4.920 ( $p = 0.554 > 0.05$ ) and a Cramer's V = 0.239 ( $p = 0.554 > 0.05$ ), it seems that there isn't a relationship between the two variables.

9		sc3q1						T	
		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
exposure	child randomly selected	2	0	3	7	2	8	21	43
	child exposed to violence	2	4	2	6	2	10	17	43
Total		4	4	5	13	4	18	38	86

10) In Sc3q2, both children exposed to violence and randomly selected responded approximately in the same way. With a chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) = 3.101 ( $p = 0.684 > 0.05$ ) and a Cramer's V = 0.192 ( $p = 0.684 > 0.05$ ), it seems that there isn't a relationship between the two variables.

10		sc3q2					T	
		AGGRES verbally violent behavior	AGGRES physically violent behavior	ASSERT constructive solution	PASS tolerant behavior	ASSERT call of a third party		AGGRES physically & verbally violent behavior
exposure	child randomly selected	3	3	13	17	5	1	42
	child exposed to violence	4	1	11	15	10	1	42
Total		7	4	24	32	15	2	84

11) In Sc3q3, only 6 children out of the 43 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 a passive solution. With a chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) = 2.768 ( $p=0.736>0.05$ ) and a Cramer's V = 0.179 ( $p=0.736>0.05$ ), it seems that there isn't a relationship between the two variables.

11		sc3q3					T	
		Missing	AGGRES verbally violent behavior	AGGRES physically violent behavior	ASSERT constructive solution	PASS tolerant behavior		ASSERT call of a third party
exposure	child randomly selected	0	4	1	9	19	10	43
	child exposed to violence	1	3	3	6	20	10	43
Total		1	7	4	15	39	20	86

12) In Sc3q4, both the majority of children 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 ( $\chi^2$ ) = 1.120 ( $p=0.772>0.05$ ) and a Cramer's V = 0.114 ( $p=0.772>0.05$ ), it seems that there isn't a relationship between the two variables.

12 (not included in the grouping)		sc3q4				Total
		angry	upset	happy	stupid	
exposure	child randomly selected	7	22	3	11	43
	child exposed to violence	5	24	5	9	43
Total		12	46	8	20	86

13) In Sc9q1, only 7 children out of the 43 exposed to violence responded aggressively whereas the others preferred either a constructive or a passive solution as an answer. From the children randomly selected, the majority preferred an assertive solution. With a chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) = 7.567 ( $p=0.182>0.05$ ) and a Cramer's V = 0.297 ( $p=0.182>0.05$ ), it seems that there isn't a relationship between the two variables.

13		sc9q1					T	
		AGGRES verbally violent behavior	PASS tolerant behavior	AGGRES verbally and physically violent behavior	ASSERT constructive solution	PASS tolerant behavior/avoidance		ASSERT constructive solution
exposure	child randomly selected	1	4	2	25	3	8	43
	child exposed to violence	5	8	2	15	6	7	43
Total		6	12	4	40	9	15	86

14) In Sc9q2, more children exposed to violence responded passively whereas the others preferred either a constructive or an aggressive solution as an answer. With a chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) = 12.501 ( $p=0.014<0.05$ ) and a Cramer's V = 0.386 ( $p=0.014<0.05$ ), it seems that there is a relationship between the two variables.

14		sc9q2				T	
		AGGRES verbally violent behavior	AGGRES physically violent behavior	ASSERT constructive solution	PASS tolerant behavior		ASSERT call of a third party
exposure	child randomly selected	1	6	16	14	6	43

child exposed to violence	5	1	6	19		41
Total	6	7	22	33		84

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 ( $\chi^2$ ) = 0.246 ( $p = 0.884 > 0.05$ ) and a Cramer's V = 0.054 ( $p = 0.884 > 0.05$ ), it seems that there isn't a relationship between the two variables.

15 (not included in the grouping)		sc9q3			T
		fear of violence	assertiveness-avoiding violence	non explicit fear of violence	
exposure	child randomly selected	14	23	6	43
	child exposed to violence	16	22	5	43
Total		30	45	11	86

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. 11 of the children exposed to violence preferred passiveness whereas also 14 of the children randomly selected chose it as an answer. With a chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) = 4.001 ( $p = 0.261 > 0.05$ ) and a Cramer's V = 0.216 ( $p = 0.261 > 0.05$ ), it seems that there isn't a relationship between the two variables.

16		sc9q4				T
		Passiveness tolerant behavior	Activeness non tolerance assertiveness	Passiveness tolerant behavior	Activeness non tolerance aggressiveness	
exposure	child randomly selected	12	27	2	2	43
	child exposed to violence	7	26	4	6	43
Total		19	53	6	8	86

17) In Sc14q1, preferred answers vary. More children exposed to violence chose aggressiveness (14 out of 43) whereas the others chose passiveness. With a chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) = 7.524 ( $p = 0.184 > 0.05$ ) and a Cramer's V = 0.296 ( $p = 0.184 > 0.05$ ), it seems that there isn't a relationship between the two variables.

17		sc14q1					T	
		PASS tolerance	AGGRES verbally violent behavior	AGGRESS physically violent behavior	AGGRESS verbally and physically violent behavior	PASS tolerance		PASS tolerance
exposure	child randomly selected	17	3	2	2	11	8	43
	child exposed to violence	16	5	6	3	3	10	43
Total		33	8	8	5	14	18	86

18) In Sc14q2, 9 out of 43 children exposed to violence preferred aggressiveness as an answer whereas most of the children randomly selected chose firstly passiveness and then assertiveness. With a chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) = 12.127 ( $p = 0.016 < 0.05$ ) and a Cramer's V = 0.378 ( $p = 0.016 < 0.05$ ), it seems that there is a relationship between the two variables.

18		sc14q2					T
		AGGRES verbally violent behavior	AGGRES physically violent behavior	ASSERT constructive solution	PASS tolerant behavior	ASSERT call of a third party	
exposure	child randomly selected	0	2	9	21	10	42
	child exposed to violence	5	4	1	22	11	43
Total		5	6	10	43	21	85

19) In Sc14q3, approximately the same numbers of children exposed to violence and randomly selected chose either passiveness or assertiveness as an answer. But, still 6 of the children randomly selected and not of the exposed preferred to adopt a violent behavior. With a chi-square ( $x^2$ ) = 6.135 ( $p = 0.189 > 0.05$ ) and a Cramer's V = 0.282 ( $p = 0.189 > 0.05$ ), it seems that there isn't a relationship between the two variables.

19		Sc14q3					T
		AGGRES verbally violent behavior	AGGRES physically violent behavior	ASSERT constructive solution	PASS tolerant behavior	ASSERT call of a third party	
exposure	child randomly selected	2	4	7	16	10	39
	child exposed to violence	1	0	4	22	11	38
Total		3	4	11	38	21	77

**C**

20) In Sc4q1, approximately the same numbers of children exposed to violence and randomly selected disagree with violence. With a chi-square ( $x^2$ ) = 4.403 ( $p = 0.111 > 0.05$ ) and a Cramer's V = 0.228 ( $p = 0.111 > 0.05$ ), it seems that there isn't a relationship between the two variables.

20		sc4q1			T
		PASS ignoring violence	ACTIVE disagreeing with violence	ACTIVE call of a third party	
exposure	child randomly selected	0	36	6	42
	child exposed to violence	4	35	4	43
Total		4	71	10	85

21) In Sc4q2, approximately the same numbers of children exposed to violence and randomly selected disagree with violence and prefer a constructive solution to deal with it. With a chi-square ( $x^2$ ) = 5.165 ( $p = 0.160 > 0.05$ ) and a Cramer's V = 0.245 ( $p = 0.160 > 0.05$ ), it seems that there isn't a relationship between the two variables.

21		sc4q2				T
		PASS agreeing with violence	PASS ignoring violence	ACTIVE disagreeing with violence/ constructive solution	PASS ignoring violence	
exposure	child randomly selected	1	2	38	2	43
	child exposed to violence	1	2	31	9	43
Total		2	4	69	11	86

22) In Sc4q3, it is interesting that 11 out of 43 children randomly selected preferred aggressiveness and especially a physically violent behavior as an answer. On the contrary, more children exposed to violence preferred passiveness. With a chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) = 10.867 ( $p = 0.028 < 0.05$ ) and a Cramer's V = 0.358 ( $p = 0.028 < 0.05$ ), it seems that there is 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	1	10	12	10	10	43
	child exposed to violence	1	2	11	22	6	42
Total		2	12	23	32	16	85

23) In Sc11q3, 8 of the children exposed to violence preferred aggressiveness and especially a physically violent behavior as an answer. But, most children from both groups preferred a constructive solution as an answer. With a chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) = 4.496 ( $p = 0.343 > 0.05$ ) and a Cramer's V = 0.229 ( $p = 0.343 > 0.05$ ), 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	1	2	2	33	5	43
	child exposed to violence	3	4	5	29	2	43
Total		4	6	7	62	7	86

24) In Sc12q1, the majority of the two samples seem to disagree with violence. But, still 10 children from both groups preferred aggressiveness as an answer. With a chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) = 2.094 ( $p = 0.719 > 0.05$ ) and a Cramer's V = 0.156 ( $p = 0.719 > 0.05$ ), 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	Pass Agreeing with violence	Activeness aggressiveness	
exposure	child randomly selected	17	18	2	0	6	43
	child exposed to violence	21	15	2	1	4	43
Total		38	33	4	1	10	86

25) In Sc12q2, all children from both groups answered in the same way. With a chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) = 3.700 ( $p = 0.448 > 0.05$ ) and a Cramer's V = 0.207 ( $p = 0.448 > 0.05$ ), it seems that there isn't a relationship between the two variables.

25		sc12q2					T
		missing	PASS ignoring violence	ASSERT disagreeing with violence	ASSERT call of a third party	AGGRESS verbally and/or physically violent behavior	
exposure	child randomly selected	0	2	18	17	6	43

child exposed to violence	3	3	14	17	6	43
Total	3	5	32	34	12	86

26) In Sc12q3, both children exposed to violence and randomly selected evaluated negatively the violent behavior of the scenario's hero. With a chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) = 2.275 ( $p = 0.132 > 0.05$ ) and a Cramer's V = 0.171 ( $p = 0.132 > 0.05$ ), it seems that there isn't a relationship between the two variables

26 (not included in the grouping)		sc12q3		T
		negative evaluation	Positive evaluation	
exposure	child randomly selected	41	0	41
	child exposed to violence	35	2	37
Total		76	2	78

### D

27) In Sc11q1, more children randomly selected than those exposed to violence consider their mother as an ideal role model whereas 5 children exposed to violence consider their mother as a non ideal role model. With a chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) = 3.170 ( $p = 0.366 > 0.05$ ) and a Cramer's V = 0.192 ( $p = 0.366 > 0.05$ ), 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 ideal role model	
exposure	child randomly selected	3	15	0	25	43
	child exposed to violence	5	9	1	28	43
Total		4	24	1	53	86

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 ( $\chi^2$ ) = 2.105 ( $p = 0.551 > 0.05$ ) and a Cramer's V = 0.156 ( $p = 0.551 > 0.05$ ), 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	4	7	1	31	43
	child exposed to violence	8	7	2	26	43
Total		12	14	3	57	86

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 ( $\chi^2$ ) = 4.782 ( $p = 0.188 > 0.05$ ) and a Cramer's V = 0.236 ( $p = 0.188 > 0.05$ ), 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	17	16	10	0	43

	child exposed to violence		13	12	4	43
Total			29	22	4	86

30) In Sc13q2, children randomly selected and exposed to violence answered approximately in the same way, with the prohibition of enjoyable activities being the first choice as a punishment for turning on the television, according to the scenario. With a chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) = 1.059 ( $p = 0.787 > 0.05$ ) and a Cramer's V = 0.114 ( $p = 0.787 > 0.05$ ), it seems that there isn't a relationship between the two variables.

30 (not included in the grouping)		sc13q2				T
		prohibition of enjoyable activities	assigning of undesirable task	scolding from parents	no punishment	
exposure	child randomly selected	29	2	8	2	41
	child exposed to violence	27	4	8	1	40
Total		56	6	16	3	81

31) In Sc13q3, more children randomly selected preferred an assertive answer whereas 15 out of 43 children exposed to violence would be worried about father's nerves thus indicating a hot-tempered profile of his. With a chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) = 4.028 ( $p = 0.402 > 0.05$ ) and a Cramer's V = 0.216 ( $p = 0.402 > 0.05$ ), it seems that there isn't a relationship between the two variables.

31 (not included in the grouping)		sc13q3				T	
		father's profile hot tempered	assertiveness	violence in family	mother's profile tolerant		
exposure	child randomly selected	5	28	2	1	7	43
	child exposed to violence	15	21	7	1	9	43
Total		10	49	9	2	16	86

## E

32) In Sc2q1, approximately the same numbers of children randomly selected and exposed to violence have a sense of medium acceptance from peers. With a chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) = 1.224 ( $p = 0.874 > 0.05$ ) and a Cramer's V = 0.119 ( $p = 0.874 > 0.05$ ), it seems that there isn't a relationship between the two variables.

32		sc2q1				Total	
		very strong sense of acceptance	strong sense of acceptance	sense of medium acceptance	sense of partial acceptance		sense of rejection
exposure	child randomly selected	4	3	19	12	5	43
	child exposed to violence	3	2	23	12	3	43
Total		7	5	42	24	8	86

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 11 children exposed to violence seem to be passive and have a low-self image. With a chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) = 4.778 ( $p = 0.311 > 0.05$ ) and a Cramer's V = 0.236 ( $p = 0.311 > 0.05$ ), 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	10	2	0	29	43
	child exposed to violence	4	7	5	2	25	43
Total		6	17	7	2	54	86

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 ( $\chi^2$ ) = 3.959 ( $p = 0.138 > 0.05$ ) and a Cramer's V = 0.217 ( $p = 0.138 > 0.05$ ), 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	7	25	11	43
	child exposed to violence	11	15	15	41
Total		18	40	28	84

**F**

35) In Sc6q1, approximately the same numbers of children randomly selected and exposed to violence have neither good nor bad school performance. In addition, more children exposed to violence seem to have a good and/or poor school performance. With a chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) = 4.309 ( $p = 0.230 > 0.05$ ) and a Cramer's V = 0.224 ( $p = 0.230 > 0.05$ ), 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	20	6	2	12	43
	child exposed to violence	27	9	4	6	43
Total		47	15	6	18	86

36) In Sc6q2, it is interesting that more children randomly selected feel that they have failed at school. With a chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) = 3.553 ( $p = 0.314 > 0.05$ ) and a Cramer's V = 0.203 ( $p = 0.314 > 0.05$ ), 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	2	10	26	5	43
	child exposed to violence	3	14	25	1	43

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	2	10	26	5	43
	child exposed to violence	3	14	25	1	43
Total		5	24	51	6	86

37) In Sc6q3, children exposed to violence and randomly selected answered approximately in the same way. With a chi-square ( $x^2$ ) = 0.764 ( $p = 0.858 > 0.05$ ) and a Cramer's V = 0.094 ( $p = 0.858 > 0.05$ ), it seems that there isn't a relationship between the two variables.

37 (not included in the grouping)		sc6q3				T
		not at all	a little	much	very much	
exposure	child randomly selected	6	25	5	7	43
	child exposed to violence	7	24	7	5	43
Total		13	49	12	12	86

38) In Sc8q1, less children exposed to violence feel that they are either great or very well/well prepared for the test according to the scenario. With a chi-square ( $x^2$ ) = 10.606 ( $p = 0.031 < 0.05$ ) and a Cramer's V = 0.351 ( $p = 0.031 < 0.05$ ), it seems that there is a relationship between the two variables.

38		sc8q1					T
		great	very well	well	a little	not at all	
exposure	child randomly selected	15	17	10	1	0	43
	child exposed to violence	10	10	13	9	1	43
Total		25	27	23	10	1	86

39) In Sc8q2, more children randomly selected feel that they have an excellent and a good school performance whereas 10 children exposed to violence feel that they are failures. With a chi-square ( $x^2$ ) = 11.830 ( $p = 0.008 < 0.05$ ) and a Cramer's V = 0.371 ( $p = 0.008 < 0.05$ ), it seems that there is a relationship between the two variables.

39		sc8q2				T
		sense of excellent school performance	sense of good school performance	sense of medium school performance	no good school performance failure	
exposure	child randomly selected	9	20	13	1	43
	child exposed to violence	6	10	17	10	43
Total		15	30	30	11	86

40) In Sc8q3, more children randomly selected have a sense of success or managing to succeed at school whereas 4 children exposed to violence feel that they are failures. With a chi-square ( $x^2$ ) = 3.091 ( $p = 0.378 > 0.05$ ) and a Cramer's V = 0.190 ( $p = 0.378 > 0.05$ ), it seems that there isn't a relationship between the two variables.

40	sc8q3	T
----	-------	---

		sense of school failure	sense of school success	sense of managing success at school	sense of school failure/failure in general	
exposure	child randomly selected	1	19	22	1	43
	child exposed to violence	3	12	27	1	43
Total		4	31	49	2	86