KIJKWIJZER

The Dutch Rating System for Audiovisual Productions

Kijkwijzer: An overview and account of the various principles underlying Kijkwijzer

Kijkwijzer is the name of the Dutch rating system in use since early 2001 to provide information about the possible harmful effects of movies, videos, DVDs and television programmes including Music videos on young people.

Kijkwijzer is based on the principle of co-regulation, which means that it is the industry itself and the government together that are responsible for measures to protect young people against harmful influences from the media. The rating of media products is done by coders employed by media producers or distributors. At present, co-regulation is seen by policymakers in the Netherlands and elsewhere in Europe as an effective means of protecting underage viewers against the harmful effects of visual material.

Using *Kijkwijzer*, NICAM gives parents and other consumers information on the possible harmful effects of media productions. Harmfulness is a problematic term in general, but possible harmfulness is particularly difficult, because there is no objective definition of what can be termed possibly harmful. Academic research has demonstrated, for example, that media violence may lead to aggressive behaviour (see Paik & Comstock, 1994; Nikken, 2007). Whether or not this effect is considered harmful depends on how strong one's feelings are about the use of violence in human interaction. Judgements about possible harmfulness depend on the morals and standards of a particular time and place. Because of this the decisions taken in the ratings are transparent. The subjectivity and culture-dependent nature of *Kijkwijzer* also demand that the system be flexible, in the sense that it must be open to criticism and that it must adapt to new scientific insights and changing social mores and values.

The rest of this article is divided into six sections. First, we touch on a number of preconditions with which we believe a rating system based on co-regulation must comply. Then we discuss the principles underlying the creation of *Kijkwijzer* and provide an explanation of the various content and age categories. We also explain the coding form and the rating key. In the sixth and final section we make a number of comments and suggestions for the further development of *Kijkwijzer*.

1. Preconditions for a successful rating system

In practice, the rating of a given media production takes place by one coder working for the media producer or distributor. A rating system based on individual opinions can work only if the criteria below are fulfilled.

1. Transparency: As explained above, interpretation in *Kijkwijzer* plays a considerable role at several levels. Not only has the existing scientific research literature been interpreted by the members of the academic committee, the coding itself is an interpretative process. Although the system is not objective, it is, however, transparent. Both consumers and coders can check how a particular rating came about and have access to the underlying mechanisms of the coding process.

2. Validity: The rating system must be valid. Robust validity of the system means that the questions in the coding form are drawn up in such a way that they result in the intended and desired age ratings. In *Kijkwijzer*, coders are not asked to give an age rating to media productions. They are asked to answer questions on the *content* of the production, and it is the answers to these questions about the content that determine the final age ratings. Robust validity also means that the answers about the content of the production lead to the age rating most parents would give to the media production in question on the basis of their experience with children. If, for example, the content codes for films containing graphic scenes of violence, such as *Hannibal*, lead to an Age 16 rating, the validity of the system is robust. If such a film were to lead to an age rating of Age 12, Age 6 or All Ages, the validity of *Kijkwijzer* would be questionable.

3. Reliability: The system must be reliable, i.e. consistent. This means that if various coders code one film or television programme, they should arrive at the same coding result. The coding form is designed in such a way that every question has direct consequences for the age rating that follows from the answers. So the system has to be set up so that the chance of coders filling in the same response to any particular question is optimised. A great deal of time was spent on the reliability aspect during the development of the system. Some questions in the form were tested several times, with students from the universities of Amsterdam and Nijmegen as coders, and with NICAM's own coders. In addition, in government-commissioned research the Intomart agency has investigated inter-coder consistency for a number of passages.

Although the creators of the coding form have done – and still are doing – their best to make the coding form as clear as possible, coding is not so simple that anyone can do it without effort and knowledge. It is therefore very important that the coders are trained. This is confirmed by the results of the Intomart research: practised coders achieved more or less consistent results for most passages, whereas the ratings given to the same passages by a group of teachers varied quite widely (Intomart, 2002). In order to arrive at a correct rating, it is essential that coders have a feel for children's cognitive level and perception of their environment at different ages.

4. Openness to criticism: *Kijkwijzer* was initially developed for fiction on television and in the cinema. The application of the system to other genres and media productions may create surprises, as less research has been conducted into these genres and productions. If these unforeseen circumstances have consequences for the validity or reliability of the ratings, *Kijkwijzer* will have to be adjusted or extended accordingly. This has already been done on a number of occasions, e.g. the addition of questions in the fear category for the Age 9 category. Alongside possible surprises, there are other reasons why *Kijkwijzer* must be open to criticism. The first of these is that new media content is always being developed. Second, academic knowledge itself increases and changes over time, albeit much more slowly than the development of new media contents. Finally, we must also take account of how the results of *Kijkwijzer* are received by the public. If a large section of the general public is unhappy with the ratings produced by *Kijkwijzer*, it may be necessary to adjust the instrument.

5. Training the coders: *Kijkwijzer* is based on the concept of co-regulation and ratings are arrived at by individual coders employed by parties that have an immediate interest in the outcomes of the ratings. In our opinion, the system is not so easy that any coder can use it without prior practice and knowledge. In other words, the system only works if coders are carefully trained. It is essential for them to have a feel for the cognitive and emotional level of children of different ages. We firmly believe that incorrect ratings can be minimised in future versions of *Kijkwijzer* by including audiovisual examples in the form of film clips linked to the possible answers on the coding form, rather than textual examples. One audiovisual example of severe or graphic violence will clearly be much more effective than several pages of written text.

2. Kijkwijzer's starting point: consumer research

The goal 9 of a rating system is to inform parents about the possible harmful effects of media productions and to help them supervise their children's use of the media. *Kijkwijzer* therefore focuses on parents. Because estimating the level of harmfulness of media productions is a subjective question, it is important to gauge the opinions of parents and use these in the development of a rating system. After all, a rating system can only be successful if it fulfils the requirements of its users.

Parents' wishes and opinions were assessed by means of two consumer surveys. In 1997, the Dutch Broadcasting Audience Research Department [NOS-KLO] asked parents to indicate their major concerns about children and the media. This survey revealed that parents were worried in particular about their children picking up bad language from the media, becoming frightened or having nightmares, imitating media violence, becoming more aggressive in dealing with other children, and being exposed to sexual content too early (Valkenburg, 1997).

A new survey asked parents whether they would like to see a rating system, and if so, what sort of rating system they wanted. This survey revealed that more than three-quarters of parents would like a rating system, and that 70% of them reported that they would actually use such a system. The majority of parents wanted to see the system include information on the content of media productions. In particular, they wanted to be informed about violence, frightening scenes, sexual content, discrimination, drug abuse, and coarse language. In addition, parents wanted age ratings (Peeters & Valkenburg, 1999). *Kijkwijzer* provides for both these requirements, giving both age and content ratings.

In sum, the decisions taken concerning *Kijkwijzer* were largely guided by consumer research among parents, the users of the system. As already observed, consumer research is of great significance, particularly because academic studies of children and the media can form only a limited basis for the development of a rating system. The academic research performed to date has concentrated predominantly on the effects of media violence in two content categories, *violence* and *frightening content*. Studying the impact of the media in the field of *sexuality* has entered the academic agenda only in recent years (Nikken, 2009).

Research into media effects in the area of the other four content categories, *sexual content*, *discrimination*, *drug abuse* and *coarse language* has either yet to be carried out or is at a very early stage. This means that the scientific basis for *Kijkwijzer* is particularly strong in the categories *violence* and *frightening content*. In the case of the other content categories we start from expectations based on general media effect studies. It is precisely when it comes to these last content categories that it is important to take note of the results of consumer research.

3. The age categories

Kijkwijzer has five age categories: AL (all ages), 6 (not recommended for children below the age of 6), 9 (not recommended for children below the age of 9), 12 (not recommended for children below the age of 12), and 16 (not recommended for children below the age of 16). The choice for four age limits below which a production may be harmful is clear, but also somewhat misleading. In the first place it may create the impression that the age of a child *within* a particular age group is of no importance. However, there are considerable differences between, for example, children of 7 and 10 and between children of 12 and 15. Second, the development of cognitive and emotional capacities can vary dramatically from child to child. However, it is not practical to create a system with more age categories and impossible to take account of all possible differences between individual children. The age categories must therefore be seen as a guideline. In practice, parents will have to find out for themselves how the age categories relate to their children. A variety of arguments can play a role in such decisions. Below, we summarise a number of arguments used to make a distinction between the three age categories.

Age 6

The Age 6 category was developed to protect young children against certain forms of frightening and violent media content to which younger children are more sensitive. It is generally recognised in the literature that children up to the age of seven do not distinguish adequately between fantasy and reality in the media (Davies, 1997). Children below this age are therefore just as susceptible to frightening or violent cartoons or animated films as to realistic media contents. For this reason, cartoon and animated films that depict certain types of violence are rated Age 6. It is assumed that children older than seven are able to discount the violence that occurs in these types of film, so that the risk of possible negative effects is smaller.

Research has shown that children below the age of seven are highly visually oriented and can be frightened by specific categories of images (Cantor, 2001), such as images of grotesque fantasy beings or animals that behave in a threatening way or which look threatening, shape-shifting (e.g. the *Hulk* or *Power Rangers*), and images of animals and children being subjected to physical threat or abuse. The coding form includes specific questions on the occurrence of each of these elements. As soon as one of these is answered in the affirmative the production is rated Age 6 (if not higher).

Age 9

Children start to recognise animated films/cartoons as not being real around the age of 6 years, during the change from toddler to child. An important transition occurs around 9 years of age. It is then that children acquire insight into the artificial

nature of all media productions. From this age, it becomes clear to them that fantasy fiction is different from realistic fiction and reality. From their ninth year, children are better able than children aged 6 to 9 to make connections and think logically about media content. Although children from the age of 9 therefore do understand that all fiction 'is made up and not real', this does not mean that they can simply deal with all content they may come across. Children do see realistic fiction as a realistic and credible representation or simulation of reality. It is only from the age of 12 that children can achieve sufficient distance from the most realistic fictional productions.

The ability to empathise with others and the ability to view content objectively are important factors in the potential influence exerted by media productions. Up to around the age of nine, children are less able to put themselves in another person's shoes. This is of great importance in processing potentially harmful images, as up to this age children are unable to understand the motives underlying actors' actions and cannot identify the consequences of behaviour.

Children up to the age of nine also often have less well-developed self-control than older children. This means they can more easily be tempted to imitate behaviour seen in media productions and thus place a positive value on the behaviour that they see in media productions. A range of studies have shown that children aged nine and older are considerably more critical of advertisements, violent films and other media productions than children aged eight and under (Valkenburg, 2008).

Age 12

Because children undergo such radical changes between the ages of ten and twelve, twelve years is an important cut-off point when considering violence, frightening scenes, sexual content, discrimination and drug abuse. Between the ages of ten and twelve, children start to see the world differently. They begin to realise that people belong to certain social groups and that these groups differ from one another (Hoffman, 2000). They are also able to understand other people's behaviour within the perspective of their social background (Hoffman, 2000). From the age of ten, children's capacity for abstract thinking rapidly increases, and they are able to appreciate more abstract types of humour such as parody, irony, and satire (McGhee, 1979; Selman, 1980). Children aged nine to approximately twelve are also able to make a visual representation of what they see and relate the abstract meaning of this to their general (as yet still limited) knowledge of the world around them.

During the same life phase, children also become more critical of what they see and hear, thanks to the development of their emotional capabilities. They start to expect increasingly convincing acting, look for characters with psychological similarities to themselves and have an increasing requirement for 'social lessons' for their own social and emotional development.

Thanks in part to an increased capacity for abstract thought, children of this age

are more able to identify the core message of a film and make connections between earlier and later scenes in media productions. They are also no longer frightened by immediately recognisable threats and use cognitive means of reducing fear more readily than younger children. They are therefore able to understand their fear, to judge the risk posed by pretended or imitated threats and, if there are sufficient indications that they are not real, to stand back and take an objective view of them. Nine-to-twelve-year-olds are however still more susceptible to influence than young teenagers. It is not until the age of approximately twelve that children are also adequately and rationally capable of taking an objective view of more abstract threats, such as the threat of war in faraway countries, or other seemingly very realistic dangers. Substance use, discriminatory behaviour and viewing sexual acts can also still lead to undesirable effects and feelings in children under the age of twelve because they still lack an adequate frame of reference.

Age 16

From the age of ten, children predominantly like to watch media productions intended for adults. From this age, they increasingly use movies and television programmes to learn social lessons and to see how the characters solve the same kinds of everyday problems they experience themselves. Young adolescents in particular are able to identify strongly with realistic characters. Late childhood and adolescence are periods in which children are likely to idealise particular psychological and social characteristics of media figures, heroes and idols.

It is only from the age of approximately twelve that children are able to adequately distinguish empathy for others from their own feelings, and to place these feelings within a framework of moral understanding. Older children are also better able than children under the age of twelve to relate adult concepts of good and bad to watching all manner of media content. This does not mean, however, that young people are able to follow all content without difficulty.

The media hold up to young people countless examples of criminal behaviour, and we know that young people, particularly boys, can identify strongly with criminal media heroes (Nikken, 2007). Research shows that criminal behaviour among young people peaks during adolescence and then declines. Most youthful delinquents participate in opportunistic delinquency: vandalism, shoplifting and fighting (Junger Tas, 2000). Risky delinquent behaviour is attractive to young people because they are by definition somewhat on the edge of society and do not yet have as much to lose as adults. They are looking for a new identity and are deliberately searching for information and ideas they can use to this end. The media and media heroes play an important role in this process (Strasburger, 1995). This is why in *Kijkwijzer* we give certain types of violence an Age 16 rating.

Fear of violent and horror films often occurs during adolescence. This can be explained in two ways. First, children's need for excitement and sensation is at its

peak during adolescence (Zuckerman, 1979). Young people test their limits, seeking exciting, risky activities. Watching violent films offers them an opportunity to fulfil their demand for sensation. Second, it is during adolescence that the influence of peer groups is at its peak (Durkin, 1997). Young people sometimes have a competitive attitude when it comes to watching violent films (Goldstein, 1998). However, they are likely to overrate their limits and to remain frightened after watching certain horror films (Cantor, 2001). Many of these films, such as *Hannibal* or *The Exorcist*, are difficult even for many adults to stomach, and these are rated Age 16 because since the enactment of the Film Performances Act it is assumed that older adolescents and adults who are not up to movies of this kind must be allowed to take the responsibility of deciding whether or not they are going to watch them.

From puberty onwards, young people often use the media to obtain information in the area of sexuality and forming relationships. Television programmes and films, however, do not always give an accurate impression of what life is really like. As young people have yet to accumulate enough experience of life, some presentation of sexuality to young people under the age of 16 can give an inaccurate impression of appropriate sexual behaviour or of appropriate attitudes to men and women (Nikken, 2009).

4. The content categories

Based on the results of the consumer survey conducted in 1999, we have recognised six categories of content that may have harmful effects on young people. These are violence, frightening content, sexual content, discrimination, substance abuse, and coarse language. Let us consider each of these content categories in more detail.

Violence
Audiovisual violence can have several harmful consequences. Watching media violence can (a) promote aggressive behaviour in children, (b) desensitise children to violence, and (c) make children fearful (Potter, 1999). With respect to the violent content category, we have focused on theories regarding the first two effects of media violence: (a) aggressive behaviour and (b) desensitisation. The third effect of media violence will be addressed in the next section on frightening media content. We know that watching media violence does not always result in aggressive behaviour and desensitisation (Potter, 1999). A documentary about the increase in violence among young people in which scenes of violence are used to point up what is happening can obviously not be compared with a horror movie in which one of the protagonists attacks his enemies with a chainsaw. The documentary may well have been made in order to discourage violence, whereas in the horror movie the violence is portrayed as exciting and enjoyable. Viewers naturally use the context in which the violence is placed as a means of constructing meaning from the images. Research has demonstrated that various context characteristics of media violence may increase the danger of aggressive behaviour and/or desensitisation. The most important characteristics are discussed below.
Degree of realism: The first context characteristic that may increase aggression and desensitisation is the degree of realism of the violence (Paik & Comstock, 1994). In this rating system, we assume that violence that is not credible will have comparatively little harmful effect on children. It should be borne in mind, however, that credibility is age-related. What adults may consider innocent (*Power Rangers, Pokémon*) or deliberately exaggerated (*James Bond*), may in fact be realistic to young children.
Serious injury: A second context characteristic of media violence that may stimulate desensitisation is the extent to which the consequences of the violence are shown (blood, serious wounds or injuries, mutilation). Such images increase the risk of viewers becoming desensitised or indifferent to violence (Linz, Donnerstein & Penrod, 1984).
Sympathetic protagonist: A third context characteristic that is known to increase aggression is the extent to which the perpetrator of the violence is attractive. Although the violence used by villains or maniacs is often more impressive, aggres-

sive behaviour is principally encouraged by violence on the part of characters with whom children can identify (Paik & Comstock, 1994).

Justified violence: A fourth context characteristic is the extent to which the violence is justified. In many media productions, there is a legitimate reason for the perpetrator to use violence, e.g. to prevent natural disasters or save innocent victims. Seeing justified violence can stimulate children to take real-life violence less seriously (Paik & Comstock, 1994).

Rewarded violence: A fifth context characteristic is the extent to which the media violence is punished. If violence is punished one way or another, the risk of aggression in the viewer is decreased. However, content analysis has shown that in the majority of media productions, the violence is rewarded (Wilson et al., 1998). Children's heroes are usually clever, powerful and attractive and they are rarely reprimanded for their violent acts. Various studies suggest that rewarded violence on the part of the good character tends to increase aggressive behaviour (e.g. Bandura, 1986).

The first two context characteristics, *degree of realism* and *serious injury*, have been incorporated in *Kijkwijzer.* The latter three, however, have been left out because in almost all fictional media productions, a large part of the violence is justified, rewarded or committed by an attractive protagonist (Potter, 1999), so that these context characteristics were not sufficiently discriminating and difficult to reconcile with the age ratings.

Frightening content

Fear is strongly dependent on the viewer's level of cognitive development. Research shows that adults and older children can watch a scary film in two ways. They can give emotions free reign and enjoy the scary sensation, or they can 'opt out' emotionally by adopting the attitude that what they are seeing is not real. In these cases, mature viewers and older children are using a coping mechanism referred to as 'adult discount'. Research has shown that children under the age of seven are not able to apply this 'adult discount' when they watch fiction. Children under the age of seven, even when they are fully aware that what they are seeing is fantasy, may not yet be able to use this knowledge to cope with frightening media content (Harris, 2000). In *Kijkwijzer*, we have taken this specific characteristic of young children into account. Questions are included that concern a number of typical fears of children below the age of seven, as well as questions about frightening content that may apply to all children.

Research has shown that people are more frightened by dangers that are close to home, or in any event plausible, than by threats that are more remote and less plausible. Frightening images placed in an everyday context are easily associated with objects or events that commonly occur in the everyday lives of children, such as toys, a school building or a trip to the seaside. For example, in *Poltergeist* the

fear is associated with the television set and toys are possessed by malevolent spirits. In *Jaws*, the fear is associated with the sea and the beach. Fear responses to media contents seem to be more intense and longer lasting if they are evoked again during a confrontation with the same situations or objects that have been seen in the frightening media production. This explains why some films, such as *Jaws* and *Psycho*, are more likely to provoke long-term, intense fears than films with a more remote context, such as *Alien*. In addition, specific questions are included about the incidence of characters with fantasy characteristics, as the presence of such characters offers an extra opportunity to consider a frightening production in a more rational light.

In order to classify productions for frightening content, another three types of question are included: questions about things that look frightening, questions about people in the production who are frightened or suffering, and questions about sounds, scary and horror effects. These questions are included because we know from research that these are the three main causes of children becoming frightened by media productions (Valkenburg, 2008): fear through observing 'scary' things, through empathy with other people and through the interpretation of (learned) signals that herald or accompany frightening elements.

The questions dealing with observable danger concern things such as wounds/injuries, dead bodies, self-mutilation and suicide. Questions are also asked dealing with conspicuous features that are known to have the potential to cause fear, particularly in very young children, e.g. monsters, witches, scary creatures and physical threats to children or animals. Finally, typical horror effects are included as observable dangers. Watching such situations and effects can lead to children 'jumping out of their skins', feeling insecure and possibly even having nightmares. Depending on the intensity of such images and their context (type of production and degree of realism), the presence of frightening elements will lead to age recommendations of Age 6, 9, 12 or 16.

A second important factor is whether frightened people are shown or whether people are visibly or audibly undergoing serious suffering. Danger is often illustrated in the media through fear as reflected in the faces and behaviour of the main characters. In this way, the actual threat does not have to be explicitly depicted – the fear experienced by the protagonists is enough to terrify the viewers. The mechanism underlying this process is empathy with the main character.

Empathy with others is a natural human trait and becomes active at a very early age. Seeing frightened people in a media production can lead to feelings of unease in the viewer owing to the empathy generated. The viewer empathises with the characters in the production and takes on their feelings of fear. Observing someone who is suffering, for example, can also lead to fear in the viewer, through empathy. This suffering is something out of the ordinary and brings with it uncertainty about the future. This process of identification applies not only to people, but also to 'others',

including humanoid characters and animals. The identification is with the psychological characteristics of the characters. The viewer recognises himself or herself in the characters and empathises. Particularly in the case of children, these may also be unrealistic characters, provided they have human-like characteristics.

The third feature that can contribute to the degree to which a production causes fear is the sound effects and music. As early as the nineteen-fifties, Himmelweit, Openheim and Vince (1958) discovered that children considered specific sound effects, especially music, to be frightening elements in films. Other studies have also shown that the addition of frightening music to a film can increase fear responses to it. A study by Thayer and Levenson (1983), for example, revealed that the addition of 'horror music' to a documentary on industrial accidents caused more fear than the addition of ordinary 'documentary music'.

Sexual content

Sexuality is a content category that is used in virtually all rating systems. The two consumer surveys underlying *Kijkwijzer* revealed that Dutch parents consider it important to know whether a media product contains sexual content or not. Many parents are convinced that it is undesirable to allow children to see sexual acts at a young age (Valkenburg, 1997). Content analyses of the nature and frequency of sex in the media have found that, at the end of the nineteen-nineties, there was more sexual content in the media than ever before and that the sex was also depicted more explicitly (Donnerstein & Smith, 2001; Kunkel et al., 2005). It should be noted, however, that the term sexual content in these analyses was interpreted quite broadly, including as it did images of scantily clad or seductively dressed people and conversations about sex in addition to acts such as petting, kissing and sexual intercourse.

The potentially harmful effects of sex in television programmes or films on children younger than 16 is currently an item of significant interest on the academic agenda. Over the past decade, dozens of studies have been carried out into the relationship between seeing sex on television or in films and the attitudes and behaviour of children and young people (Nikken, 2009). These studies indicate that children or young people seeing sex in the media is entirely without risk (Peter & Valkenburg, 2008, 2009).

Due to the lack of effect studies, in the case of sexual content we are forced to fall back on educated guesses. Although there are no empirical grounds for such an assumption, it is assumed that young children are not yet able to correctly interpret graphic scenes of sexual activity because they do not yet themselves have any experience of sex. One possible misunderstanding is that they see such actions as violence, and become afraid of them: clearly a harmful effect. Another possible harmful effect is that they become uncomfortable about the sexual behaviour of adults in their environment. A number of studies among children between eight to twelve have shown that they can feel uncomfortable when seeing images of sex and other intimate behaviour (Wartella et al., 2000; Cantor, Mares & Hyde, 2003). Children who are not yet sexually mature say that they would rather not be confronted by kissing, petting and excessively intimate cuddling on the part of adults.

Another potentially harmful consequence for children is that they may form an undesirable idea of what sex is all about on the basis of what they see in audiovisual productions. After all, sex is often presented in ways that are far removed from reality. Sex in fiction, for example, is rarely planned. The participants, who are often perfectly formed, jump on one another in a frenzy of passion as soon as they are alone together in a room. Contraceptives are rarely used and women who initially are unwilling often yield completely to just a little persuasion. To the extent that the research permits, we can assume that young people may adopt this attitude and develop a more liberal attitude to sexuality (Nikken, 2009). In addition, we cannot exclude the possibility that some youngsters may be influenced by the media to adopt sexual behaviour earlier, and in particular deviant sexual behaviour. The risk that young viewers will pick up incorrect ideas from sexual media presentations is particularly present in the case of adolescents, who consider the image presented by the media convincing and relevant to their development. Because at this time of life children are still forming their sexual identity, they are eagerly in search of information about sexual relations.

Discrimination

Our consumer research made it clear that parents would like to be informed about discrimination in the media on the basis of gender, race, religion, nationality or ethnic background. *Kijkwijzer* applies a broad definition of discrimination. By discrimination, we mean all behaviour (including utterances) in which particular sections of the population are portrayed as inferior, whether on the grounds of race, religion, skin colour, sex, nationality or ethnicity. A distinction can be made between direct and indirect discrimination. Forms of indirect discrimination include insults, bullying, physical intimidation and attacks. Forms of direct discrimination include contributing to negative stereotypes, calling for discrimination or denying the right to exist (Tan, 2003). *Kijkwijzer* operates on the general basis that discrimination is behaviour calculated to promote discrimination by others against a group. An example of direct discrimination is a scene from *As Good As It Gets*, in which the main character meets a Jewish couple in a restaurant. The man and woman are talking animatedly, and the main character says, 'Appetites are not as big as your noses, huh?'

Sexism or misogyny are also forms of discrimination, as people are treated as inferior on the basis of their gender. Research (Hansen & Hansen, 2000) has shown that sexism in the media may have harmful effects on both boys and girls. For example, watching video clips can contribute to the formation of sexist attitudes. Sexism is often portrayed in a positive light in these clips – it is displayed by idols, which is a

significant precondition for major media effects. This can lead to negative attitudes to women (see Hansen & Hansen, 2000, for an overview). The 'sexual objectification' of women in video clips has received particular attention in this type of survey. Sexual objectification means that, in these clips, women are reduced to sex objects. They are depicted in willing, submissive roles and their only function is to entertain the male main character or the audience or provide sexual stimulation. Exposure to the sexual objectification of women in the media is found to have a negative effect on girls in early adolescence in particular (Aubrey, 2006; Slater & Tiggemann, 2002). The objectification of women in these clips can have a range of effects. In the first place, the sexist standards promoted by these clips can become internalised by a process of priming. This can take place in both men and women (Hansen & Hansen, 2000; Nikken, 2009). Even though the research seems to demonstrate that sexism in the media can have potentially harmful effects on both boys and girls, the question remains of what age categories best correspond to these harmful effects. On the basis of the literature on the development of identity in adolescence, there are grounds for believing that pre-adolescence and the early years of adolescence are a particularly sensitive time in the adoption of sexist and sexual objectifying standards. Early adolescence is characterised by great uncertainty concerning sexuality and sexual identity. If sexism is to be associated with an age category, Age 12 would therefore seem most appropriate.

One possible harmful effect of discrimination in audiovisual media is that children come to see such actions as normal. If discrimination is presented as being tough or macho, it is even possible that it will be seen as deserving of imitation. Productions in which acts of discrimination take place are rated Age 12 unless the discrimination is by a character who cannot be regarded as realistic and with whom children are unlikely to identify, or where there is express condemnation of discrimination.

Hard drugs and abuse of soft drugs and alcohol
As in the case of discrimination, a possible harmful effect of the use of hard drugs (e.g. heroine, cocaine) and abuse of soft drugs (hashish, marihuana) and alcohol in audiovisual media is that children accept these as normal. If such use is shown in a positive light, children and adolescents may even see it as worth imitating. It is well known that many characters in films and television series drink alcohol. Often, these are characters with whom young adolescents can identify. Research has shown that alcohol and drug abuse often starts during adolescence (Strasburger, 1995). It is therefore plausible to suppose that children are particularly susceptible during this period to information about alcohol and drugs. Whenever the taking of hard drugs or the abuse of soft drugs or alcohol is shown in a favourable light, the production is rated Age 16. If it is shown as not advisable or implicitly discouraged, the production is rated Age 12. If it is explicitly discouraged, the production is rated All Ages.

Coarse language
Consumer research has shown that parents are quite worried about the large amount of coarse language in the media and want to be informed about it. Although coarse language is included as a content category, unlike the other content categories coarse language is not given an age rating. In the test ratings, we found many examples of coarse language, including coarse language by characters with whom children could identify. It is conceivable that children will follow this example, which constitutes a possible harmful effect. However, it is uncertain at what age children are most sensitive to the effects of coarse language. After all, even at the age of two children regularly imitate slogans and phrases they have heard on television. Bad and obscene language also appears to be frequently adopted within subcultures of older children and adolescents. For this reason, we have chosen to inform parents about the presence of coarse language, but not to link this to a particular age rating.

5. The coding form and the rating key

The *Kijkwijzer* coding form, which may be downloaded from www.kijkwijzer.nl, consists of a series of questions on the *content* of the audiovisual production. These questions are presented to the coder online via the Internet. Coders use a password to access the Internet site to rate their media productions. A computer program then automatically calculates the age rating of the production (i.e., All Ages, Age 6, Age 9, Age 12, Age 16).

Naturally, not all of the questions in the coding form apply to all media productions. For example, if the production is a slapstick cartoon (e.g. *Tom & Jerry*), the coder need not answer the other questions in the form. If one or more questions are not relevant, the computer automatically moves on to the next relevant question. The number of questions to be completed therefore depends on the nature and content of the production.

Generally speaking, the questions are accompanied by very explicit examples. This may appear somewhat comical, but these explicit examples have proved necessary for achieving a reasonable degree of reliability between coders. In future versions of *Kijkwijzer*, it will be desirable for the examples accompanying the questions not to be presented in print but in audiovisual form. The website will then show the coder a number of film fragments along with the various answer options. Inter-coder reliability will undoubtedly benefit from such audiovisual examples.

The *Kijkwijzer* coding form is accompanied by a specific rating key. In the section below, we discuss not only the coding form, but also the most significant elements of this rating key. A complete description of the rating key can be obtained from NICAM. The questions in the coding form for *Kijkwijzer* concern seven categories: (1) type of media production, (2) violence, (3) frightening content, (4) sexual content, (5) discrimination, (6) hard drugs and abuse of soft drugs/alcohol (substance abuse), and (7) coarse language. These categories are discussed below.

The type of media production

Kijkwijzer starts with a question about whether a production is completely free of harmful elements. This question may only be answered with 'yes' if the coder is absolutely sure that the production contains no harmful elements, including coarse language. The first question on the questionnaire, if answered in the affirmative, ensures that a production will immediately be classified for All Ages (AA). The other questions do not then need to be answered, only the production details need then be entered.

A number of questions about the type of media production are then asked; two questions concern fictional productions and two non-fiction productions. In the questions on the nature of fictional productions, coders are asked whether the production is (a) a type of cartoon or animation (e.g. *Pokémon*), or (b) another fiction/

drama product. These two questions are intended to ascertain the reality status of the production. As made clear above, the reality status of a production plays an important role in terms of effects on aggression, desensitisation, and fear. Research has shown that children above the age of seven see physical violence in cartoons and animated films as less credible and therefore do not take this violence as seriously as violence in productions featuring real people. It has also been demonstrated that cartoon violence has less effect in terms of fear and aggression on children aged seven and older. Children under seven do take cartoon violence seriously, because they are not yet able to distinguish effectively between violence in cartoons and realistic films. For this reason, the violence in cartoon and animated films is coded, but this type of violence is not rated higher than Age 6. An exception is made for slapstick cartoons.

Nevertheless, developments in technical possibilities are leading in some cases to a blurring of the difference between animation and live action. A film such as *Beowulf* is an almost completely hybrid mix of live action and animation. It features real, live actors, who are then animated to a certain degree; one main character, for example, has a tail and a golden skin. The movements of the human characters in the film look realistic and are 'natural'. The film is therefore clearly different from traditional, drawn 2D animations and has more in common with live action productions such as fantasy fiction films. For this reason, if hyper-realistic animation is used, the same criteria will apply as for live action.

It should be noted that the two questions about fictional productions are not intended to identify the various genres. We initially attempted to base the coding on genre (e.g. Western, art-house film, documentary), but this proved impossible. In recent years, there has been an increasing *hybridisation* of genres. Whereas in the past the content of a cartoon, for example, could be predicted with a reasonable degree of accuracy, this is no longer the case at all. Cartoons such as *South Park* and *Beavis And Butthead*, for example, contain forms of language, discrimination, and sexuality that do not belong to traditional cartoons. Nor do contemporary cartoons necessarily consist of drawn pictures. In *South Park*, for instance, images of real people are used on occasion. Due to this increasing blurring of genre boundaries, it was decided to make the ratings not entirely dependent on genre.

A second reason not to classify media productions by genre is the fact that, in the case of television, children often zap back and forth between channels. This means that they can be confronted by scenes that have nothing whatever to do with the nature or character of the production they are supposed to be watching. Neither can possible harmful effects of such out-of-context scenes be viewed in the perspective of the specific genre of the production. In other words, it is irrelevant whether a violent or frightening scene, which children come across while zapping, occurs in an action adventure film, an art-house film or an educational documentary.

Kijkwijzer is also designed to accommodate the rating of non-fiction productions,

including reality TV, documentaries and talk shows, since such productions can include elements that may be harmful to young viewers. The programmes in question are all pre-recorded. Live productions, news, and current affairs productions are not classified using *Kijkwijzer*. The last two questions in this section concern these non-fiction productions.

Violence

The rating of violence is done in seven blocks. The first block, *Talk shows*, concerns a specific type of violence that occurs in talk shows and that cannot be dealt with in the other questions about violence in this section. The starting-point for the questions about talk shows is that the violence in these shows is realistic. A characteristic of violent talk shows is that physical violence is used, that threats of physical violence are made, or that *psychological* violence is used in the sense that people are subjected to public humiliation. Another characteristic of such shows is that the physical or psychological violence is approved or even stimulated by the presenter and/or audience. This sanctioning of violence by the presenter or audience is seen as a possible harmful effect. In one of the most widely accepted effect theories, Bandura's social cognitive theory (1986), it is assumed that the risk of aggressive behaviour increases if the violence is rewarded or approved of. Talk shows in which physical or psychological violence is approved of or stimulated by the presenter or audience are therefore rated Age 12. If the presenter explicitly condemns the violence, the harmful effect may be neutralised, in which case the show is rated Age 6.

In the second block, addressing productions other than talk shows, the coder is asked to indicate how often various types of physical violence occur. These include (1) *physical hand-to-hand violence*, (2) *violence with firearms, blunt or bladed weapons*, (3) *violence against criminals*, (4) *physical torture,* and (5) *war violence*, In this block, we have deliberately included a certain amount of redundancy. After all, both *war violence* and *violence against criminals* often imply physical *hand-to-hand violence*. This and other duplications were included to minimise the risk of coders overlooking certain types of violence in the production. Violence against criminals, for example, proved to be easily overlooked if committed by the police.

We have not included questions on psychological violence for fictional productions. We did initially attempt to, but however we phrased them, questions on psychological violence did not result in reliable ratings in the first draft versions of *Kijkwijzer*. In practice, however, it transpired that in any given production psychological violence is almost always accompanied by physical violence, which diminishes the need for rating psychological violence.

It is important to know that it is irrelevant for the rating key what types of violence and how many types of violence are coded. Indicating one type of violence leads to the same age rating as indicating two or more types of violence. It is also irrelevant

how often the violence occurs. The basic assumption is that parents are informed whenever violence is an ingredient in a media production. A single violent scene can be sufficient to make a production unsuitable for young children.

The third block, *severity*, consists of questions that are aimed at measuring the severity or graphic nature of the violence. The questions in this block have been included in order to make nuances in the age ratings. In the case of severe violence, a positive answer is sufficient to ensure that the production will be given an Age 12 rating. The idea behind this question is that graphic violence increases the risk of aggressive behaviour and desensitisation and therefore requires a higher age rating.

The fourth block, *wounds/injuries*, consists of two questions. Firstly, coders are asked whether wounds or injuries occur in the production. If this is the case, they are asked whether these are *serious* injuries. The question of whether injuries occur at all is intended for realistic productions (documentaries, reality TV). The underlying thought is that an injury in realistic productions is seen as more serious than the same injuries in fictional productions. We are assuming that a child sees injuries ensuing from a shooting as more serious if these occur in a realistic production than if these are shown in a police series.

The fifth block regarding violence is concerned with the *feasibility* of the acts of violence depicted. As with the questions on the type of fictional production, this question has been included in order to distinguish between more and less realistic productions. If there are no acts of violence in a media production that could be performed by people, this is an unrealistic production. As stated above, because children do not take such productions seriously, productions containing violence that is not feasible are given a lower age rating.

The sixth block in *Kijkwijzer* contains questions about *non-consensual sexual acts*. One question determines whether the production contains scenes of non-consensual sexual acts, and a second is designed to elicit whether, if so, they are accompanied by physical violence. Non-consensual sexual acts are included as a separate block in *Kijkwijzer* because they may predicate a decision to issue an Age 16 rating more readily than other forms of violence.

The seventh and last block, *slapstick context*, is intended to prevent the violence in fictional series such as *Laurel And Hardy* and *Home Alone* resulting in excessively high age ratings. Every child over the age of seven realises that violence in this type of production is different from the violence in series such as *Miami Vice*. If the violence is committed in a slapstick context, this results in a lower age rating. A film such as *Home Alone* contains violence that is both feasible and graphically depicted. Such a film would quickly lead to a *Kijkwijzer* age rating of Age 12. However, because the violence is committed in a slapstick context, *Home Alone* is rated Age 6.

Assignment of age ratings for violence in fictional productions.
Kijkwijzer distinguishes between two types of fictional production: (1) cartoons or animations, (2) other fictional productions. Slapstick cartoons or animations are in principle given the rating All Ages.

Other cartoons and animations that contain one or more types of violence are always rated at least Age 6 if they contain any violence. In two cases they are rated Age 12: (1) where the violence is both plausible and severe, in addition to causing serious injury, and (2) where they contain scenes of non-consensual sexual acts. Where non-consensual sexual acts are portrayed in combination with graphic violence or the threat of violence, cartoons and animations are rated Age 16.

In the case of other fictional productions, featuring real people, rating is more complex. If the fictional production contains no violence at all, it is naturally rated All Ages. If it contains violence, it will be rated at least Age 6. In addition, the following key is applied:

- Violence that (a) is feasible, (b) is severe and (c) leads to serious injury, is rated Age 16.
- Non-consensual sexual acts coupled with actual physical violence or the imminent threat thereof, production is rated Age 16.
- Violence that (a) is feasible, (b) is severe but (c) does not lead to serious injury, is rated Age 12.
- Violence that (a) is feasible, (b) is not severe but (c) leads to serious injury, is rated Age 12.
- Violence that (a) is not feasible, (b) is severe and (c) leads to serious injury, is rated Age 12.
- Non-consensual sexual acts not coupled with actual physical violence or the imminent threat thereof: production is rated Age 12.
- Other productions in which violence occurs are rated Age 6.

If the violence described above takes place in a slapstick context, the age ratings are lowered from 16 to 12 and from 12 to 6.

Assignment of age ratings for violence in documentaries and reality TV.
The assignment of age ratings for realistic productions parallels that for fictional productions. One important difference, however, is that the violence in realistic productions is always feasible. Feasibility is therefore not a discriminating factor in realistic productions. It is also true for realistic productions that, if one or more types of violence occur, the production must be rated at least Age 6. Hence, the following key applies.

- Violence that (a) is severe and (b) leads to serious injury, is rated Age 16.
- Non-consensual sexual acts coupled with actual physical violence or the imminent threat thereof: production is rated Age 16.
- Violence that (a) is not severe but (b) leads to serious injury is rated Age 12.
- Violence that (a) is severe and (b) leads to injury is rated Age 12.
- Violence that (a) is not severe but (b) leads to injury, is rated Age 12.
- Violence that (a) is severe but (b) does not lead to injury, is rated Age 12.
- Non-consensual sexual acts not coupled with actual physical violence or the imminent threat thereof, production is rated Age 12.
- Other productions in which violence occurs are rated Age 6.

Assignment of age ratings to talk shows.
Talk shows in which violence occurs are given the age rating 12 or 6. The Age 12 rating is given to talk shows in which the physical or psychological violence (humiliation) is approved of by the presenter or audience. A production in which physical violence is used but not condoned is rated Age 6. Productions in which people are humiliated but in which this is not approved are rated All Ages.

Frightening content
The rating of productions with frightening elements takes place using 18 questions. Although children of different ages can be frightened by different things, the general point of departure is that more intense frightening situations and more realistic, predictable situations lead to the most effects. The question is asked whether frightening elements are present, and if so, whether these are presented intensely. In the first place, there are questions that attempt to find out whether extremely frightened people are present within the production as a result of accidents, disasters or war, or as a result of violent acts by living creatures.

It was explained that media productions often use fear on the part of characters to convey fear to the audience. There are questions that attempt to ascertain whether the production features people who are extremely afraid as a result of accidents, disasters or war or as a result of violent acts by living beings. If these questions are answered in the affirmative, the production is rated Age 12, unless there is always an immediate happy outcome for the frightened people in the production. This type of situation can occasionally occur in series such as *Baywatch*, e.g. where someone is in danger of drowning and very frightened. In *Baywatch*, frightening situations are always resolved so quickly that they will hardly have a chance to affect the viewer. In such cases the production is rated Age 9. Alongside images of very frightened people, there are other elements of audiovisual productions that can arouse fear. This is covered by questions on the presence of images of serious suffering in the production. The question about serious suffering is included in the questionnaire because the vulnerability of the body can also be shown without physical wounds or expressions of fear. Observing someone who is seriously suffering can lead to fear in a viewer through empathy.

The questionnaire also determines whether observable frightening elements are present. For example: frightening noises, horror effects, injuries, mutilated bodies, suicide, self-mutilation, victims of disasters, accidents etc., threats of violence and threatening creatures such as monsters, witches and ghosts.
There are also questions concerning the familiarity of the characters and setting in which the frightening events take place, as an everyday setting increases the risk of viewers continuing to be afraid after seeing the production.

Assignment of age ratings. Frightening content in a cartoon or animated film will not normally lead to a rating higher than Age 12. It is important for the classification whether the frightening elements take place in a realistic setting, and whether unrealistic characters appear in frightening scenes.
In certain cases, other sorts of fiction and drama productions may be rated Age 16. These are productions containing strong horror effects in an everyday setting recognisable to children, plus one or more of the following elements:
• Extremely frightened people who are not immediately saved
• Serious suffering
• Extremely frightening sound effects
• Serious injuries
• Self-mutilation
• Mutilated bodies

Other types of fictional or drama production are given an Age 12 rating if one of the above elements or only serious horror effects are present in a realistic environment, whether with realistic characters or not.

Other sorts of fictional or drama productions will be also rated Age 12 if:
- one or more of the following elements are present in an unrealistic environment and in a realistic environment with unrealistic characters:
  • Serious injuries, and/or seriously mutilated bodies, and/or self-mutilation combined with one or more of the following elements:
  • Extremely frightened people who are not immediately saved, and/or serious suffering, and/or extremely frightening sound effects
- or if there are serious horror effects in combination with an unrealistic environment and one or more of the following elements:
  • Serious injuries, and/or serious mutilated bodies, and/or self-mutilation
  • Extremely frightened people who are not immediately saved and/or serious suffering, and/or extremely frightening sound effects

If one or more of the following elements are present, the production will be given an Age 9 rating (irrespective of realistic environment/characters):
• Mutilated bodies
• Threats of violence
• Horror effects, not extreme
• Extremely frightened people, who are immediately saved
• Violence against children or animals
• Victims of accidents, disasters, diseases

Or if one or more of the following elements are present in an unrealistic environment and in a realistic environment with unrealistic characters:
• Serious injuries, and/or severely mutilated bodies, and/or self-mutilation
• Extremely frightened people who are not immediately saved and/or serious suffering, and/or extremely frightening sound effects

All other productions are classified Age 6.

In the case of non-fiction productions (reportage, documentaries, 'reality' TV), no questions are asked about horror effects and an everyday setting. All productions are rated Age 16 if they contain any of the following:
• Extremely frightened people who are not immediately saved and/or serious suffering, and/or extremely frightening sound effects in combination with one or more of the following elements:
• Serious injuries and/or severely mutilated bodies and /or self-mutilation

All productions are rated Age 12 if they contain:
• Extremely frightened people and/or frightening sounds and/ or serious suffering
• Serious injuries and/or severely mutilated bodies and/or self-mutilation

All productions are rated Age 9 if they contain:
• Mutilated bodies
• Threats of violence
• Horror effects, not extreme
• Extremely frightened people, who are immediately saved
• Violence against children or animals
• Victims of accidents, disasters, diseases

All other productions are classified Age 6.

Sexual content

Sexual content rating is different for audiovisual productions and music videos. For audiovisual productions the coding form contains five questions about sexual content. The first of these have to do with sexually oriented language and the frequency of sexual acts. Coders are also asked whether the sexual acts in the production are portrayed in a manner calculated to make the greatest possible impact, e.g. by extended shots of erogenous zones, moving the camera along the body with particular attention to breasts or buttocks, slow motion or close-ups. Finally coders are asked about the visibility of genitalia.

In the literature, rape and other forms of sexual violence are sometimes placed under the heading of sexual content. In *Kijkwijzer*, all forms of non-consensual sexual acts are placed not under the heading of sexual content but under violence, and are rated accordingly.

Assignment of age ratings. There are two sets of circumstances in which a production is rated Age 16:

- Where a production contains frequent sexual acts and where these are portrayed in a manner calculated to make the greatest possible impact.
- Where a production portrays sexual acts during which details of the genitalia are visible.

Productions are rated Age 12 in three cases:

- Where there are one or two instances of clearly visible sexual acts;
- or where there are frequent sexual acts which are not clearly visible;
- or where there are occasional instances of visible sexual acts in addition to sexually oriented language, so that these two elements taken together occur frequently. In such cases both the coarse language pictogram and the sexual content pictogram are used.

One or two sexual acts that are not clearly visible do not result in an age rating. Sexual language that does not occur in conjunction with several sexual acts does not result in an age rating. However, in such a case the coarse language pictogram is used.

The coding form contains three questions about sexual content for music videos. The first question has to do with the frequency of sexual acts. Coders are also asked whether the sexual acts in the production are portrayed in a manner calculated to make the greatest possible impact. Finally coders are asked about the visibility of genitalia.

Assignment of age ratings.
There are two sets of circumstances in which a production is rated Age 16:

- Where a production contains frequent sexual acts and where these are portrayed in a manner calculated to make the greatest possible impact.
- Where a production portrays sexual acts during which details of the genitalia are visible.

Productions are rated Age 12 in two cases:

- Where a production contains frequent sexual acts;
- or where there are instances of clearly visible sexual acts and one or two explicit close-ups of crotches or buttocks.

One or two sexual acts that are not clearly visible do not result in an age rating.

Discrimination

Three questions are asked on the subject of discrimination. Coders are asked whether discriminatory or sexist language or behaviour occurs in the production, whether this language or behaviour is explicitly discouraged, and whether the language and behaviour come from a comic antihero who cannot be taken seriously (such as Al Bundy in *Married With Children*).

Assignment of age ratings.
If the discrimination is not explicitly discouraged, the age rating given is Age 12. If discrimination is explicitly discouraged/condemned the age rating All Ages can be given. Even if the discrimination is not explicitly discouraged, but all discriminatory language comes from an antihero who cannot be taken seriously, e.g. Basil in *Fawlty Towers*, the production can be given the rating All Ages.

Drug abuse and excessive alcohol consumption

This block consists of four questions. The first question is whether the taking of hard drugs or abuse of soft drugs or alcohol is shown in the production. Coders are also asked to what extent it is placed in a favourable light and whether it is explicitly discouraged. The last question is whether the behaviour in question is that of a comic antihero who cannot be taken seriously.

Assignment of age ratings.
If the production depicts the taking of hard drugs or if there is abuse of soft drugs or alcohol, it is rated Age 12. If drug or alcohol abuse is shown in a favourable light, the production is rated Age 16; if it is explicitly discouraged, the production is rated All Ages.

Coarse language

Coarse language refers to Dutch terms and well-known English terms such as *fuck* and *bitch*. In foreign-language productions the rating is based on the Dutch subtitles except in the case of well-known English terms (see above) that Dutch children will understand without subtitling. Coarse language does not lead to an age rating because there is no evidence that coarse language is potentially more harmful to one particular age group than another.

6. Conclusion and future

In our view, *Kijkwijzer* can only function well if the weak points of the system are systematically and regularly identified. Precisely because the system is transparent, it is easy to detect incorrect ratings. An incorrect rating can be caused by a number of factors: it is possible that the coding form was not clear enough, the key not satisfactory, or perhaps the coder, gave an incorrect answer to one or more questions. *Kijkwijzer* is a system in progress that can only be optimised if systematic research demonstrates if and where incorrect ratings are occurring, who is making them, and why they are being made.

Kijkwijzer is a flexible system, in the sense that it must be open to criticism and that it must adapt to new scientific insights and changing social mores and values. A number of consumer surveys conducted over the years have shown that more than ninety per cent of parents are now familiar with *Kijkwijzer*. Of these, 94 per cent think that *Kijkwijzer* is a useful system and 86 per cent of all parents use the *Kijkwijzer* pictograms. (Intomart, 2008).

Kijkwijzer also satisfies parents' desire for reliable information on audiovisual productions.

There is a great deal of interest in *Kijkwijzer*, not only in the Netherlands but in other countries too. In 2006, a version of *Kijkwijzer* was introduced in Turkey. The Dutch *Kijkwijzer* was used as the model for the Turkish classification system, where the system is known as 'Smart Signs' (Akilli Isaretler). Interest has also been expressed in Belgium and Iceland.

References

Aubrey, J. S. (2006). *Exposure to sexually objectifying media and body self-perceptions among college women: An examination of the selective exposure hypothesis and the role of moderating variables. Sex Roles*, 55, 159-172.

Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Cantor, J. (2001). Fright reactions to mass media. In J. Bryant & D. Zillmann (Eds.) *Media effects*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Cantor, J., Mares, M., & Hyde, J. (2003). Autobiographical memories of exposure to sexual media content. *Media Psychology*, 5, 1-31.

Davies, M. M. (1997). *Fake, fact, and fantasy: Children's interpretations of television reality*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Donnerstein, E., & Smith, S. (2001). Sex in the media. In D. G. Singer, & J. L. Singer (eds.), *Handbook of children and the media* (pp. 289-308). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Durkin, K. (1997). *Developmental social psychology: from infancy to old age*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Goldstein, J. H. (1998). *Why we watch: The attractions of violent entertainments*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Hansen, C. H. & Hansen, R.D. (2000). Music and music videos. In D. Zillman & P. Vorderer (Eds.), *Media Entertainment: The psychology of its appeal*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Harris, P. L. (2000). *Understanding children's worlds: The work of the imagination*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Himmelweit, H. T., Oppenheim, A. N., & Vince, P. (1958). *Television and the child: An empirical study of the effect of television on the young*. London, UK: Oxford University Press.

Hoffman, M. L. (2000). *Empathy and moral development: Implications for caring and justice*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Intomart (2002). *Eindrapport onderzoek zelfregulering audiovisuele producten.* Hilversum: Intomart bv.

Intomart (2006). *Meningen van Ouders over de Kijkwijzer.* Hilversum: Intomart bv.

Junger-Tas, J. (2000). The family and criminal behavior. In H. de Frankrijker et al. (eds.), *Gezin, morele opvoeding en antisociaal gedrag* (pp. 19-35). Amsterdam: SWP.

Kunkel, D., Eyal, K., Finnerty, K., Biely, E., Donnerstein, E. (2005). *Sex on TV4.* Menlo Park: Kaiser Family Foundation.

Linz, D.G., Donnerstein, E., & Penrod, S. (1984). The effects of multiple exposures to filmed violence against women. *Journal of Communication, 34*(3), 130-147.

Malamuth, N. M. & Impett, E. A. (2001). Research on sex in the media: What do we know about effects on children and adolescents? In D.G. Singer, & J.L. Singer (eds.), *Handbook of children and the media* (pp. 269-288). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

McGhee, P. E. (1979). *Humor: Its origin and development.* San Francisco: Freeman and Company.

Nikken, P. (2007). *Mediageweld en kinderen*. Amsterdam: SWPbooks.

Nikken, P. (2009). *Seksualisering en de jeugd van tegenwoordig: De media als zondebok?* Tijdschrift voor Seksuologie, 33, 84-96.

Paik, H., & Comstock, G. (1994). The effects of television violence on antisocial behavior: A meta-analysis. *Communication Research, 21*, 516-546.

Peeters, A. L., & Valkenburg, P. M. (1999). *Classificatie van audiovisuele media: Wat willen ouders?* Hilversum: NOS Kijk- en Luisteronderzoek.

Peter, J., & Valkenburg, P. M. (2008). *Adolescents' exposure to sexually explicit internet material and sexual preoccupancy: A three-wave panel study.* Media Psychology, 11, 207-234.

Peter, J., & Valkenburg, P. M. (2009). *Adolescents' exposure to sexually explicit internet material and sexual satisfaction: A longitudinal study.* Human Communication Research, 35, 171-194. Potter, W. J. (1999). *On media violence*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Selman, R. L. (1980). *The growth of interpersonal understanding*. New York: Academic Press

Slater, A., & Tiggemann, M. (2002). *A test of objectification theory in adolescent girls. Sex Roles,* 46, 343-349.

Strasburger, V. (1995). *Adolescents and the media*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Tan, E. (2003). *Discriminatie in de Kijkwijzer*. Unpublished.

Thayer, J. F., & Levenson, R. W. (1983). Effect of music on psychological responses to a stressful film. *Psychomusicology, 3*, 44-52.

Valkenburg, P. M. (1997). *Vierkante ogen: opgroeien met TV en PC*. Amsterdam: Balans.

Valkenburg, P. M., Cantor, J., & Peeters, A. (2000). Fright reactions to Television: A Child Survey. *Communication Research, 27*, 82-99.

Wartella, E., Scantlin, R., Kotler, J., Huston, A.C., & Donnerstein, E. (2000). Effects of sexual content in the media on children and adolescents. In C. Von Feilitzen, & U. Carlsson (eds.), *Children in the new media landscape: Games, pornography, perceptions.* Goteborg: UNESCO International Clearinghouse on Children and Violence on the Screen.

Wilson, B., Kunkel, D., Linz, D., Potter, J., Donnerstein, E., Smith, S., Blumenthal, E., & Berry, M. (1998). Violence in Television programming overall. In Center for Communication and Social Policy (Ed.), *National Television Violence Study 2* (pp. 4-204). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Zuckerman, M. (1979). *Sensation seeking: Beyond the optimal level of arousal*. New York: Wiley.