

[Start] [★41.124] [^0] [^0] [★05:56.870] [^0] ★★★★★okay, let's start the media and violence mh... i don't know... so there is some sort of link but it seems that many studies don't stop to think if it is the other way around: so that maybe aggressive people also watch more violence and prefer it to nonviolent media than people who aren't aggressive in the first place instead of the media making people aggressive. Furthermore, I don't know how... ham aähm ehm what am I going to write. it's a difficult topic there are probably many different conclusions... probably it's something in the middle: so that rthere is something like ehm what was I going to write something in the line of: somevion no slots of violence in the media will actually make you more aggressive especially children as their habits are still forming, but that's less so with grown ups so maybe censoring it with an age limit would be good... w'fand then there is: the following point that there are lots of other factors: for example socialisation: if the kids have a good, caring loving family they won't get violent: as the last study says of somebody: dit's the EN INSTELLUNG of the parents toward violence that influences kids... so if parents don't like violence on TV they will teach that to their kids and they will also dislike violence... I have to stop correcting myself there must be another point there must be something else... m some studies don't see any connection between w there's an w missing n ★★★★★ [^0] ★★★★★ [^0] ★★★★★ With so many different conclusions from different [★12.807] studies it is hard to say whether violence in the media really has a direct influence on aggressive behaviour of children. For example [★10.170] Professor Huesma n of the University of Toronto [★28.519] argues that there is a d link direct link between exposure to MEDIA VIOLENCE and aggressive ha ness as an adult [^0] as a child →→→→→ [^0] ← Michigan ↓ Pro

Jonath Ho Jonathan Freedman of the University of Toron
to claims the opposite. [11.397] So To the problem of indes
ambig INDECISION another comes another
point: many studies seem to to VERNACHLÄSSIGEN the way the
the way the link works: [26.230] It is possible that violence in the
media does not cause aggressiveness, but that the two aer re st
ill proportional in so w far that aggressive people generally prefer watching
violent programmes or playing violent computer games. How Wi
th this uncle unclear conclusion from studies
Ho However, even t with this u unclear conclusion from studi
the studies it is al ways better to "play safe". [13.390] [1]
may be better [2] [1] and censor exes
sive violence in computer games. T Another point concerning censorsh
ip is the question what should be censored: different studies have defin ed
violence differently: [51.413] Geroge G erbner of Temple University, for exa
mple, includes ca violent ce in cartoon s who [1] [1] which is often
exclu ded
in his study for
it s com unrealistic presentaiton. tion. Cernt
tainly only some violence on [1] [1] [1] in the media ca
n be made responsible for agg ressive behaviour. [31.003] Thirdly, there a
re th a Norwegian study has shown that there are alway
s more factors than exposure to fictional violence. Especially t the l
ack of parental rul es s of what was allowed to be watched
made a n impact of [13.079] n aggressice ve behaviour of teenager
s. So it's the parents' [26.313] EINSTELLUNG toward violence that [1]
[1] i [1] influences th e a teenager's beha vior

and habits. This implies that not censoring hip-hop is not the sole solution to the problem, but that a successful socialisation is a much more important key to non-aggressive behaviour. [13.817] This leads to the conclusion, that children should certainly be protected from violence in the media, but only to a certain degree. Age limits like the ones already in place, certainly make sense, but banning all violence of fictional violence, or displaying publically of "killer games" as it has been done by the 'Aktionsm bündnis Amoklauf Winnenden' will not make a difference. [1] s [1] no [1] A successful socialisation in a caring family is a [1] that teaches [1] Growing up in a caring family that teaches its children a non-negative EINSTELLUNG against [1] aggressive behaviour is [1] is [1] a more promising key to [1] is the most [11.077] certain [1] safest way [1] of preventing a violence. [29.103] [1] fictional [1] violence [17.532] [1] is inconclusiveness [1] [38.614] [1] the media [1] [20.691] [1] of [18.113] [1] presentation [1] [1] [1] while other [1] exclude it [1] [1] for being [1] [29.626] [1] [14.226] And even admitting that especially excessive violence must be censored there is still [1] the [1] problem of violation of [1] [1] [1]

freedom of the media -

as a problem as important as attitude attitude [14.837] violence. There can be no authority claiming authority can claim the give the ultimate answer to what is bad violence and what good violence in the media. [12.254] V Fictional Censoring fictional violence? in the media [25.645] This way For decisions about extreme violence it may still be possible D, but in the grey area between it and moderate violence a presentation of aggression, it would be best to would be best to err on the side of freedom. is unclear if one should or safe ety [31.746] So censorship can to some extent within a limited scope be a method of protecting the society. But there are many more [19.650] [Stop]