

**Influences Exerted on the Child Viewer When Exposed to Violent Imagery
in Television and Print Advertising**

Michael Shimanovskyⁱ & Barbara Jo Lewis, Ph.D.ⁱⁱ

Department of Television & Radio
Brooklyn College (of the City University of New York)
Brooklyn, New York, U.S.A.

Presentation to the XIV International Economic History Congress
21 to 25 August 2006, Helsinki, Finland

Good judgment comes from experience, and experience comes from bad judgment.

∩ Barry LePatner

Abstract

A great deal of concern exists regarding the exposure of the child viewer/reader to mediated violent imagery. Studies have suggested that the viewer learns aggressive behavior and becomes desensitized to such expression. Is the genre of violence magnified for marketing purposes to entice and capture this demographic? This study considers expressions of violence contained within television and print advertising that specifically target young children (i.e., video games, action heroes, and film merchandising), explores the possible reasons for an upsurge in violent advertising aimed at younger audiences, and examines some proposed remedies to this supposed crisis.

Foundations

Every new mass medium has brought with it concerns over its impact on society and such debates frequently focus on the medium's potential to negatively influence children. Many critics argue that mediated violence leaves children with the impression that force is an acceptable means of problem-solving (i.e., Anders, 1999). Occasional dissenting views are offered, such as the arguments of Fowles (1999), that such violent spectacles serve as cathartic moments for the viewer, regardless of his or her age, in that "fantasy mayhem on the television screen – sometimes in the form of cartoons and sometimes not – helps the child discharge tensions and animosities" (ix). This research will seek to examine the issue of television violence in terms of advertising, searching for a deeper understanding of the means by which advertisements for violent entertainment products work to capture the child viewer's attention.

Debates about the media's impact on children are often based on theories of developmental psychology, in that children are said to lack the cognitive ability to distinguish commercial messages from other media content, and so are seen as especially impressionable (Kunkel, Wilcox, Cantor, Palmer, Linn, & Dowrick, 2004). Such discussions estimate that the

average child is exposed to more than 40,000 television commercials in a single year. The youth market is thus yearly targeted by over 12 billion advertiser dollars, in hopes of accessing the \$24 billion that children 14 years and younger directly spend, and manipulating the \$190 billion in family purchases that youths are said to influence. Additional data has shown that 53% of 2-18 year-old children have television sets in their bedrooms, with even 2-4-year-olds (26%) and 5-7-year-olds (39%) enjoying such freedom to control their media consumption. This “privatization” of media exposure, whereby young children are given the opportunity to choose the media products they will interact with, with little, if any, parental supervision, limits a parent’s ability to serve as a “buffer” between the child and the advertiser appeals that television conveys (Kunkel et. al., 2004).

Numerous studies have examined the effects of mediated violence, often concluding that a link, either correlative or causal, exists between a child’s exposure to mediated aggression and his/her later manifestations of actual physical violence (Anderson, Berkowitz, Dennerstein, Huesmann, Johnson, Linz, Malamuth, & Wartella, 2003). Such analyses typically argue that children exposed to media violence will eventually come to accept expressions of violence in real-world contexts, be they actual physical assaults or violent thoughts and emotions. Participants in such experiments are usually screened either a violent or non-violent film or television series; afterwards, their interactions with fellow research subjects are analyzed (Anderson et. al., 2003). To date, most such research has thus focused on violence contained in the entertainment vehicles themselves, disregarding advertisements for, and embedded within such programs. Only recently have the marketing messages for and within entertainment products been given any detailed examination.

Legal Concerns

Joel Timmer (2002) notes that earlier critiques of media violence have confronted perceived increases in violent programming, or the establishment of labeling and ratings systems for such content, whereas that debate has only recently begun to take the marketing of such entertainment products into account. Timmer notes that this shift in the discussion was precipitated by a 2000 Federal Trade Commission (FTC) report, in which the agency found that the movie, music, and video game industries routinely targeted their marketing campaigns to reach children, in spite of any content warnings meant to preclude children from watching, hearing, or playing with such products. Specifically, the FTC found that marketing plans for

violent entertainment products called for advertising to be placed in media likely to reach children, thereby nullifying the desired effects of the industries' rating systems and warning labels. But the FTC also noted that legal restrictions prohibiting such advertising campaigns are unlikely to survive challenges on First Amendment grounds. Timmer explains that, since the 1970s, the U.S. Supreme Court has specifically recognized the free speech value of commercial messages:

Advertising, however tasteless and excessive it sometimes may seem, is nonetheless dissemination of information as to who is producing and selling what product, for what reason, and at what price. So long as we preserve a predominantly free enterprise economy, the allocation of our resources in large measure will be made through numerous private economic decisions. It is a matter of public interest that those decisions, in the aggregate, be intelligent and well informed. To this end, the free flow of commercial information is indispensable. (*Virginia State Bd. of Pharmacy v. Virginia Citizens Consumer Council*, 425 U.S. 748, 765 (1976), qtd. in Timmer, 2002, 161).

Unless commercial messages are factually misleading, or venture into the realms of obscenity, libel, or indecency, they are given First Amendment protection. Furthermore, the Supreme Court has frequently struck down content-based speech restrictions. Such restrictions could only be upheld if the regulating agent can show that the regulation serves an "important" or "substantial" government interest, and is "narrowly-tailored" to achieve the interest (Timmer, 2002, 162). The advertising of violent media products to children is said to "increase their demand for, and thus consumption of and exposure to, violent entertainment, and the negative effects it might cause (Timmer, 2002, 162). As attempts to restrict such commercial speech are inherently founded upon a desire to limit such speech's impact on children, American courts would almost certainly find such prohibitions to be content-based. Even if the marketing of such products failed to contain violent imagery, it is the "presence of violence" in the entertainment product itself that would likely direct its marketing to be censored. Timmer fails to conceive of a law which could conceivably prohibit the advertising of violent materials without reference to the content of the entertainment product being marketed, such would make any restrictions subject to First Amendment challenge and an eventual judicial finding of their unconstitutionality.

Additionally, even though social scientists and developmental psychologists have shown a correlation between exposure to violent entertainment and increased aggression and/or violent behavior in children, a clear causal link has never been absolutely proven (Timmer, 2002;

Bushman & Phillips, 2001). Such would also make legal restrictions of advertising difficult to defend in a court of law. Even the 2000 FTC report noted the paradox that correlation cannot necessarily prove causation. Though studies have frequently concluded that a correlation exists between one's exposure to mediated violence and an "increased acceptance of violent behavior in others, as well as an exaggerated perception of the amount of violence in society," such has not been proven to be the deciding factor causing correspondingly violent acts in children (i.e., such has not even been shown to be the sole, or even the primary factor, of youth violence) (Timmer, 2002, 167). Though there may be more television sets in use in the U.S. than there are toilets; and the average American elementary school graduate may eventually see as many as 8,000 murders and over 100,000 miscellaneous acts of violence (i.e., rapes and assaults) before entering junior high school (Bushman & Phillips, 2001); such circumstances have never been absolutely proven to result in greater societal violence.

Thus, there is no conclusive data by which legislators could determine which, if any, forms of violent programming result in violent behavior. Whereas judicial scrutiny would require any content-based regulation be limited to restricting only that entertainment or advertising content which could be proven to result in actual violence, without unnecessarily censoring otherwise protected speech (Timmer, 2002). States' attempts at crafting such narrowly-tailed laws have met with First Amendment challenges, and have almost always been found unconstitutionally vague (for failing to clearly specify the types of mediated violence they sought to restrict), or unconstitutionally over-broad (in prohibiting more speech than was necessary to further the governmental interest they sought to serve) (Timmer, 2002).

In addition to challenges vis-à-vis the definitions of violence used in such legislative efforts, restrictions on the advertising of violent entertainment products cannot unduly restrict adults' access to such media, in that the Supreme Court has often ruled that "the adult population may not be restricted to receiving only that speech which is fit for children" (Timmer, 2002, 170). In other words, though the government may have a "compelling interest" in protecting children from the possible negative effects of consuming violent entertainment programming, this alone would not justify infringing on the First Amendment rights of media producers or adult audiences (Timmer, 2002). Only speech which expressly incites violent conduct, wherein the speaker's intent is to cause violence, and where violence occurs, or is likely to occur, immediately following the speech, as per the Supreme Court's 1969 Brandenburg test, can be

restricted. Courts have been reluctant to find mediated violence rising to the level of incitement: “generally refus[ing] to hold filmmakers, producers, directors, and/or promoters liable for injuries allegedly sustained from others imitating actions or scenes depicted in a film, television broadcast, magazine, or described in a song” (Timmer, 2002, 176). And, because the advertising messages for media products typically accentuate the ideas and images found in the works being marketed, such promotional efforts are often awarded the same free speech protections granted to the artistic expressions in the works themselves. As it would be practically impossible to separate depictions of violent imagery in advertisements for a film, television program, or video game, from linkage with such depictions in the entertainment product itself, such advertisements would requisitely be given the same First Amendment protection as the works they are promoting (Timmer, 2002).

With this being the case, parents and government regulators have no legal recourse for dealing with violent media programming, or its promotional efforts. The only available solutions remain the industries’ voluntary content warnings, technologies such as television’s “V” (as in violence) chip, and strict parental oversight of children’s media consumption. Yet such efforts are frustrated when the media industries (film, television, music, and video game producers) spend over \$3 billion, annually, marketing violent content to young audiences (Hemphill, 2003). When critics complain about the occasional ineffectiveness of existing content warning systems, the entertainment industries counter with threats to terminate their voluntary participation in such endeavors. For example, in 2001, Motion Picture Association of America (MPAA) President Jack Valenti argued that media producers might abandon their self-regulation schemes altogether if faced with increased governmental scrutiny of their content warnings. Valenti’s statement prompted Congressional reaction, i.e., New York Senator Hillary Clinton, a supporter of a “universal rating system” for entertainment media, threatened federal retaliation if the entertainment industries made such a move. Despite fiery rhetoric from both sides of the debate, neither the cessation of voluntary content warnings nor government intervention are realistically expected. Self-regulation remains the preferred answer to media violence questions (Hemphill, 2003).

Marketing Considerations and Developmental Psychology

Yet few discussions have taken the marketing efforts of violent content into proper account. V-chips give parents the opportunity to prevent their children from viewing television

programming of a violent nature. The technology, designed to work in concert with television programmers' voluntarily-designed content ratings, reads information about violent and/or sexual content encoded in the program's rating, and blocks programs according to parentally-set preferences. The system was designed to shift control over children's access to such programming from the programmer's hands to the parent's (FCC, 2006; Shanahan, Hermans, & Hyman, 2003, 61). Yet violently-themed commercial messages, whether or not they are aired during children's programs, are not rated, and thus not subject to blocking by the V-chip (Shanahan et. al., 2003). Parents can thus be left with the mistaken impression that "selecting non-violent programs [for their children's viewing] ensures minimal exposure to televised violence," when the opposite may actually be true (Shanahan et. al., 2003, 62). Shanahan et. al. (2003) note how a 1997 study of commercials aired during the *1996 Major League Baseball Playoffs* revealed that, in spite of the family-friendly nature of such an event, 6.8% (104 of 1,528) of the commercial messages featured violent content, and that 67% of the violent commercials were promotional spots for upcoming programming.

Such statistics requisitely return to issues of media impact, specifically, the extent to which media violence, whether in the actual programming or the embedded advertisements, increases children's aggression. Media critics, social scientists, and developmental psychologists frequently argue that mediated violence affects real-world behavior when children model actions depicted in the media they consume. Such voices claim that media violence, when it is shown to cause little, if any, permanent injuries or property damage, "teaches and validates violent behavior" (Shanahan et. al., 2003, 62). Commercial spots are now said to further aid in this desensitization process, by offering up even more violent spectacles than the programs within which the advertisements are placed. In their study, Shanahan et. al (2003) found that commercial messages are often more violent than actual programs, i.e., one particularly violent 30-minute block of Saturday morning programming featured 101 "violent acts" in just eight advertisements for upcoming entertainment fare, whereas only 17 "acts of violence" were found in the six sponsor/product ads (any act which would result in legal consequences for a real-world actor, i.e., assault, battery, homicide, or property damage, was deemed to be a violent act for purposes of the Shanahan et. al. study). With a total of 118 "acts of violence" in seven minutes of commercial time, this meant that there were 16.88 "violent acts" per commercial minute. This was found to be more than double the overall 7.57 rate per actual program minute. Shanahan et.

al. thus argue that it seems apparent that program advertisers routinely foreground the most violent scenes from their upcoming shows when editing together promotional spots (67). Such a thesis certainly holds up in spot-checks undertaken for this project, i.e., promotional montage spots for Cartoon Network's upcoming programming routinely feature scenes of animated characters crashing into one another and exploding, being purposefully assaulted (hit) with baseballs and countless other objects, firing lightning and/or bombs at one another, and so forth.

What then could explain the apparent over-saturation of advertising, particularly the advertisements for upcoming episodes of new and/or existing shows, with violent imagery? Bushman & Phillips (2001) argue that the answer lies in the fact that, "if the television program bleeds, then memory for the ad recedes" (46). They explain that mediated violence might create a "bad mood" in audiences; in that anger, a typical such negative emotion, interferes with the brain's ability to properly encode information. Such an angry or aggressive state, insofar as the violent programming has produced "aggressive thoughts" in audience members, prohibits the following advertising messages from being attended to. Whereas advertisers need the audience to concentrate on processing and retaining the various sales pitches offered during the commercial break, viewers may actually spend such time calming any negative emotions brought about as a result of seeing violent program imagery (Bushman & Phillips, 2001). Thus, to keep the viewer's attention during the advertising break, advertisers may be attempting "run even higher arousal commercials," in hopes of overcoming the effects of "cognitive deficits incurred during high-violence programs" (Shanahan et. al., 2003, 64). Shanahan et. al. do not propose any revolutionary solutions for dealing with this apparent upsurge in violent advertising, they simply suggest that the current V-chip-based ratings scheme be extended to cover commercial messages. If the commercials embedded within entertainment programs are similarly rated, then parents would have the option to screen out violent marketing appeals by the same means they currently use to restrict their children's access to violent entertainment programming.

A spot-check of advertisements aired during children's programming would seem to demonstrate a need for such commercial spot content ratings. For example, *Foster's Home for Imaginary Friends*, which airs on cable's Cartoon Network, is rated "TV-Y7." This rating designates the program as being appropriate for children age 7 and above, while noting that such a program "may be more appropriate for children who have acquired the developmental skills needed to distinguish between make-believe and reality" (FCC, 2006). Some of the

advertisements embedded in the program begin to paint a different picture of the rating's relevance: i.e., one of the first ads in a recent airing promotes the upcoming theatrical release of *X-Men 3*, a film rated PG-13. The ad features the X-Men characters being thrown through the air, shot with projectile weapons, and battling their enemies during what appears to be a violent hurricane (the same ad appears in frequent rotation during commercial breaks on the Cartoon Network). Another ad, for the film *Cars*, features its talking/animated automobiles smashing into each other along a racetrack. Yet another commercial, for a video game titled *Over the Hedge*, notes how its players can "trash, crash, and bash, as [they] turn the town upside down." The game ad similarly features its cartoon characters being chased and mauled by dogs while they use golf clubs to destroy several pieces of property. A later ad, for Hasbro's *Stars Wars*-inspired combat fighters, features battle imagery from the film inter-cut with scenes of children using the toys to shoot missiles at their opponents. Another *X-Men* promo follows, complete with characters crashing through walls, a bridge collapse, and exploding buildings. Children are also told to stay tuned to the channel for a chance to win a complete set of Super-Soaker water rifles. All of the above ads were embedded into a single episode of *Foster's Home for Imaginary Friends* promoting media products and toys potentially inappropriate for audiences of the program itself. A child's exposure to such advertisements could go unnoticed by a parent using television content ratings to control their child's viewing, unbeknownst to the fact that the child is also exposed to such violently-themed commercial messages, none of which are rated for blocking by the V-chip.

Ads during Nickelodeon's *SpongeBob SquarePants* are no different, i.e., a promotion for Lego's latest 'Batman' action figures features a pint-sized 'Caped Crusader' dodging falling missiles as his car explodes. Meanwhile, audiences are told to "strike back" with the aid of Lego's new missile-equipped toy fighter jet: "Take control, load the weapon, and hunt down 'The Joker,'" child audiences as told, as the ad depicts air combat complete with several more rocket attacks. And this occurs during a program, *SpongeBob*, rated "TV-Y," which means that the program's themes are "specifically designed for a very young audience, including children from ages 2-6" (FCC, 2006). The program content may be akin to *Sesame Street*, whereas the ads are reminiscent of *Top Gun*. This same series also aired a version of the *Over the Hedge* video game ad, despite the fact that the announcer mentions how the game is actually rated for an audience over the age of ten. While the program content of children's serials may be appropriate

for an extremely young audience, the shows' commercial sponsors are advertising combat-based toys, films, and video games, using battle themes many would find inappropriate for the audience being thus exposed. Even the producers of public service announcements cannot refrain from showcasing violent spectacle, or at least hinting at it. A PSA, frequently airing on both Cartoon Network and Nickelodeon, urges children to "Choose Breakfast." In support of the ad's driving thesis, a child boxer is shown preparing for a bout in the ring by taking a moment to consume a healthy breakfast, while his adult opponent practices several boxing moves to be used in the off-screen match both are preparing for.

Such circumstances are particularly worrisome to critics familiar with Cognitive-Information Processing Theory, which holds that children "learn an aggressive script from observing aggressive behavior and encoding this behavior in an internal representation," whereby the script is later retrieved during other instances (i.e., play), when cued by specific toys, programs, or games (Klinger, Hamilton, & Cantrell, 2001, 12-13). It is argued that children will ultimately learn to "generalize" this script, applying it to real-world situations where it might otherwise have been found inappropriate. Film and television-inspired toys, especially, are said to contribute to this generalization process. Many such toys are male-oriented, and seen by children of both sexes as requiring more aggressive acts when used in play. After being shown commercials for several toys, Klinger et. al. (2001) found that a majority (74%) of their sample children, both boys and girls, stated a desire to play with at least some of the aggressive boy-toys being marketed. Whereas 74% of the sample children were attracted to the boy-toys being advertised, only 33% stated a desire to play with the less-violent, girl-toys available. Klinger et. al. claim that that these children were essentially saying that, while male-oriented toys and commercials are characterized by a greater degree of aggression (i.e., that playing with such toys will require them to act aggressively), such instances of aggression made the toys appealing. Klinger et. al. further argue that such toys and toy commercials are a cause for concern, in that, by teaching both sexes the value of exaggerated aggression, they could affect children's understandings of the nature of aggression, leading to later modeling in inappropriate contexts.

Ads embedded in another Cartoon Network staple, *The Grim Adventures of Billy and Mandy*, also typify the violent nature of modern-day television advertising aimed at children. In one spot, a suburban resident is attacked, and ultimately dragged underground to his (off-screen) death, by a dog-sized ant desiring his Wrigley's chewing gum. A spot for Kellogg's new

cinnamon-flavored cereal depicts children undergoing karate training, as they prepare to do battle with the cereal's "bold flavor." Another spot, this time for General Mills' French Toast Crunch, casts children consuming the cereal at a wrestling match: the child spectators are seen crunching on the cereal, as the wrestlers in the ring collide with one another (off-screen, one can expect the wrestlers' bones are making a similar crunching sound). Commercial breaks also feature *X-Men* and *Over the Hedge* spots, despite the fact that *Billy & Mandy* is also rated "TV-Y7."

Most interestingly, *Billy & Mandy*, while designed for children, espouses an adult sensibility. For example, one scene has the series' Grim Reaper give Billy a "man-eating comic book," as the child replies that such violent material "could warp [his] little mind." A later scene features Billy noting how the comic has made him "totally desensitized to gory mayhem," as underscored by his failing to notice the car accident and road-rage-inspired brawl taking place behind him. Child audiences not yet similarly desensitized to violent mayhem after watching episodes of, and commercials embedded within *Billy and Mandy*, may wish to tune in for the Cartoon Network premiere of *SpiderMan*, which was advertised at the end of another episode, complete with a montage of film scenes featuring characters falling from the top of an exploding skyscraper. Those children ready to make use of their desensitization to violence in a real world context are then urged to build their "confidence, coordination, and focus," by enrolling in "Tiger Schulmann's Karate Cubs Program." This ad depicts preschoolers learning how to punch through wooden boards as they improve their karate skills. Though the ad claims that enrollees will improve their "socialization skills," one can assume that they will also be prepared to defend themselves while eating breakfast in the earlier PSA's boxing ring. Or children could put their newfound combat skills to use on the set of another ad spot, i.e., a Super-Soaker spot where armies of water rifle-armed teenagers are shown in battle. Such a response to symbolic violence (i.e., karate training for children), would be consistent with the theories of George Gerbner (1979), who argued that portrayals of mediated violence work by "cultivating a sense of danger" in their audience (241-242). This ultimately leads to what Gerbner (1980) calls a "fear of the mean world out there," and a reliance on a "strong[er] protector" (255-256). After being bombarded by violent commercial imagery, none of which is rated, and all of which is aired repeatedly, children may manifest a need to protect themselves from the dangers of television's "mean world," i.e., by enrolling in the advertised karate-training program. Of course karate

would not protect the viewer of *Sponge Bob* during which a spot airs for Extreme Fruit Roll Up snacks wherein an adolescent's head blows up after sampling the product.

Such circumstances are not unique to television, Erica Scharrer (2004) notes that print/magazine advertisements for video games, and the games themselves, are just as violent. Scharrer references studies which have found that, in the case of E-rated games (E as in "everyone"), "64% included violent acts intentionally designed to harm other characters, and such violence was required or was mandatory for progress" in 60% of games examined (395). Additionally, as advertisements for video games, like ads in general, must show the game and its consumption "in the most positive, idealized terms," marketers are required to accentuate the game's potential to shock or thrill its potential customers. To attract the target audience's attention in an already cluttered marketplace, such ads must use strikingly violent imagery to catch the viewer's eye (Scharrer, 2004). As such, ads typically use violence as a distinct selling point: Of the ads Scharrer (2004) examined, 55.8% featured at least one violent act, using an average of 2.49 weapons in the commission of such acts. The weapons most commonly depicted were guns (49.8%), swords and/or knives (25.5%), fists (17.4%), and bombs (4.1%). The most frequent harm sustained by advertised characters were then shootings (32.6%), punchings (11.5%), stabbings (8.2%), injury from bombs (7.2%), and so forth. A common element of such marketing campaigns sold "the pursuit of danger as [a] thrill" (Scharrer, 2004, 403-404, 409) that players of these games could experience.

Such is made most troubling when one considers the fact that young video game players, by virtue of their age, are still in the process of developing an identity and/or worldview, and as such can be conceptualized as being more receptive to media influence than their more mature counterparts (Scharrer, 2004). The "hypermasculine" world of the modern video game, like that of the action film-inspired toy, teaches players that they must attack and/or annihilate their opponents before they can progress in the game world. In the world of the game, violence and aggression are prerequisites for individual success. The fear is that impressionable players could transfer such a lesson to real world situations. Such ads evoke an ideal of masculinity wherein physical and verbal assault against one's adversaries is the preferred form of pseudo-diplomacy (Scharrer, 2004). And again, while the games themselves may be rated, their marketing campaigns are not, leaving parents with few opportunities to block out or counter-argue the appeals and lessons such ads and games present.

Concluding Remarks

Parents' fears about the potential negative effects of violent program and advertising content are certainly valid in light of Cultural Spillover Theory, which would posit that the validation of aggression for entertainment purposes may be transferred to other social interactions (Klinger, et. al., 2001). Such spillover is exacerbated by the growing torrent of programs, commercials, toys, and video games, many of which incorporate the use of violence as necessary elements of play and social interaction. Parents and critics familiar with Social Learning Theory, in particular, would point to the theory's argument that human behaviors are learned via observations of role models, both real and fictional. When a violent act is rewarded, as when a toy or video game requires aggressive acts be committed before the player can progress in the game world, such increases the probability that such acts will be modeled in other social interactions. Behaviors (i.e., violence) that would normally be considered misbehavior in real life, when validated and required in game play, with no negative consequences (i.e. punishment or injury), teach the ultimate acceptability and necessity of such actions (Klinger, et. al., 2001).

As has been discussed earlier, the obvious concern with regard to violent media imagery is the parent's seeming inability to screen out or block their children's access to such depictions. Even when films, television programs, toys, video games, and so forth, are determined to only be appropriate for children of certain or advanced ages, such rating systems do not preclude marketers from embedding their sales pitches for such products within programs otherwise appropriate for the intended audience. Parents under the impression that the V-chip will screen out all televised violence are incorrect vis-à-vis violent commercials embedded within their children's programming. As legal restrictions precluding such advertisements are impractical in light of Timmer's (2002) discussion of the free speech concerns marketers would certainly raise, the only viable solution would be the extension of the current television rating system to include commercial messages, as some critics (i.e., Shanahan et. al, 2003) have already proposed. While close parental oversight over children's viewing habits is certainly the best means of shielding them from potentially inappropriate content, existing (V-chip) technologies, once they are modified to also monitor commercial messages, could augment the parent's supervisory powers. Until the V-chip is able to detect and block out violent marketing messages, the device's ability to screen out violent content will remain substantially diminished, in that parents hoping its use

will screen out all violent content will find themselves mistaken upon examining the un-rated, and hence unblocked advertising messages.

WORKS CITED

- Anders, K. (1999). 'Marketing and Policy Considerations for Violent Video Games'. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, 18(2): 270-273.
- Anderson, C. A., Berkowitz, L., Donnerstein, E., Huesmann, L. R., Johnson, J. D., Linz, D., Malamuth, N. M., & Wartella, E. (2003). 'The Influence of Media Violence on Youth'. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 4(3): 81-110.
- Bushman, B. J. & Phillips, C. M. (2001). 'If the Television Program Bleeds, Memory for the Advertisement Recedes'. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 10(2): 43-47.
- FCC (Federal Communications Commission). (2006). 'V-Chip: Viewing Television Responsibly'. *FCC Website* <<http://www.fcc.gov/vchip>> [(Accessed 05/19/06)].
- Fowles, J. (1999). *The Case For Television Violence*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Gerbner, G. (1979). 'Living with Television: The Violence Profile'. In M. Morgan (Ed.), *Against the Mainstream: The Selected Works of George Gerbner*, (p. 227-253). 2002: New York: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc.
- Gerbner, G. (1980). 'Death in Prime Time: Notes on the Symblic Function of Dying in the Mass Media'. In M. Morgan (Ed.), *Against the Mainstream: The Selected Works of George Gerbner*, (p. 254-259). 2002: New York: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc.
- Hemphill, T. (2003). 'The Entertainment Industry, Marketing Practices, and Violent Content: Who's Minding the Children'. *Business & Society Review*, 108(2): 263-277.
- Klinger, L. J., Hamilton, J. A., & Cantrell, P. (2001). 'Children's Perceptions of Aggressive and Gender-Specific Content in Toy Commercials'. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 29 (1): 11-20.
- Kunkel, D., Wilcox, B., Cantor, J., Palmer, E., Linn, S., & Dowrick, P. (2004). 'Report of the APA Task Force on Advertising and Children: Psychological Issues in the Increasing Commercialization of Childhood'. *American Psychological Association Report*.
- Scharrer, E. (2004). 'Virtual Violence: Gender and Aggression in Video Game Advertisements'. *Mass Communication & Society*, 7(4): 393-412.
- Shanahan, K. J., Hermans, C. M., & Hyman, M. R. (2003). 'Violent Commercials in Television Programs for Children'. *Journal of Current Issues and Research in Advertising*, 25(1): 61-69.
- Timmer, J. (2002). 'When a Commercial is Not a Commercial: Advertising of Violent Content and the First Amendment'. *Communication Law & Policy*, 7: 157-186.

ⁱ Michael Shimanovsky (M.S., B.A., Brooklyn College, of CUNY) is currently, teaching English as a Foreign Language at Language Link, St. Petersburg, Russia.

ⁱⁱ Barbara Jo Lewis (Ph.D., M.F.A., NYU) is an Associate Professor of Television & Radio and Economics at Brooklyn College (of CUNY), Brooklyn, New York, U.S.A.