

# Historical Controversy: Gangster Rap and its Relation to Aggression from a Psychological

Perspective

Pilar Fernandez Salgado

# 20117612

Supervisor: Dr. Fearghal O'Brien

B.A. (Hons) in Psychology

National College of Ireland

March 2023

# Submission of Thesis and Dissertation

# National College of Ireland Research Students Declaration Form (Thesis/Author Declaration Form)

Name: Pilar Fernandez Salgado Student Number: 20117612 Degree for which thesis is submitted: B.A. (Hons) in Psychology

Title of Thesis: Historical Controversy: Gangster Rap and its Relation to Aggression from a Psychological Perspective

Date: 13/03/2023

# Material submitted for award

A. I declare that this work submitted has been composed by myself.

- B. I declare that all verbatim extracts contained in the thesis have been distinguished by quotation marks and the sources of information specifically acknowledged.
- C. I agree to my thesis being deposited in the NCI Library online open access repository NORMA.
- D. *Either* \*I declare that no material contained in the thesis has been used in any other submission for an academic award.
  Or \*I declare that the following material contained in the thesis formed part of a submission for the award of

(State the award and the awarding body and list the material below)

**N** 

M

J

#### Acknowledgements

I wish to thank all those who were part of this process. First, I would like to thank my mother Paula for her kindness and unconditional love and support she shows every day to me all the way from Argentina. Thank you mum, I could have not done this without you. I sincerely want to thank Dr. Fearghal O'Brien for his patience, constant support provided throughout the completion of the thesis and for answering many of my questions. In addition to all of the NCI lecturers for their support throughout this process.

I would also like to thank my friend Marcia, Victor, Micaela, Olivia, and my boyfriend Carlos, for always encouraging me to don't give up and trust myself even through tough times. Thank you guys, you are my family.

Lastly, I want to thank all the participants who took time to become part of this study, and of course I want to thank the whole Rap music, and the Hip Hop culture for playing a major role in my life.

Gracias!

#### Abstract

The present study examined the relationship between Gangster Rap exposure and different aggressive outcomes. Past research has suggested a relationship between preference for Gangster rap music and several antisocial, aggressive behaviours, it was even suggested that exposure to aggressive music had long and short term cognitive and behavioural effects. Yet they seemed to overly rely on experimental settings or did not seem to take into consideration the assessment of actual engagement with the musical genre to generate conclusions. Therefore, the present study sought to examine in depth these findings, by focusing on whether the current (hours per week) or overall (how many years) exposure to Gangster Rap (videos and lyrics) could predict; physical, verbal, overall aggression, anger, and hostility. A total of 105 participants completed their questionnaires measuring their Gangster Rap exposure and Aggression. Findings from 10 multiple regression analyses revealed that gender was the only significant predictor variable that explained variations in one criterion variable (physical aggression), where being a male explained higher scores in Physical Aggression. Because findings are inconsistent with previous research, implications for this study, along with limitations and best practices are later discussed.

# **Table of Contents**

| Introduction  |
|---|
| Methodology13   |
| Results17   |
| Discussion  |
| Limitations   |
| Conclusion  |
| References  |
| Appendices  |
| Appendix A Proof of analysis                              |
| Appendix B Gangster Rap Exposure questionnaire40          |
| Appendix C Buss & Perry Aggression Questionnaire (1992)40 |
| Appendix D Information Sheet and Consent Form47           |
| Appendix E Debriefing Form                                |

#### Introduction

Hip Hop Culture with its musical expression of rap music, specially Gangster Rap, has become increasingly popular in the last decade (Dankoor et al., 2023). By February 2023, old school Gangster rap artists such as Ice Cube had 14 million monthly listeners on Spotify, as well as the newer generation of Gangster rap artists such as 21 Savage with 60 million, and Freddie Gibbs with 4 million monthly listeners overall which suggests how popular this music genre is nowadays (Spotify, 2023). Yet, the popularity of this genre with its lyrical and video compound comes along with historical controversy (Tanner et al., 2009).

From a historical perspective, according to Kubrin (2005), Gangster Rap appeared early in the 1980s in the deprived areas of the United States, suggesting that its lyrical content is highly influenced by the street codes found in this social context. Although its lyrics mostly rely on aggressive gang-related activities in a first-person narrative, it can be understood that is not always the case of being the real life of the rapper itself (Harkness, 2014). If not, it is suggested to be an artistical expression, that reflects the reality of a vulnerable, oppressed society (Dunbar,2019) where Gangster Rap responds to inequalities and violence in the community in an artistic form (Emdin, 2010). Therefore, it is not uncommon to find violence as a remarkable lyrical theme and shooting gestures or guns prevalent in Gangster rap music videos (Lauger & Densley, 2017).

Gangster Rap music and videos, along with Heavy Metal music and other types of media that carry violent imagery in general, have always been a focus of attention in the psychology research field (Bartol & Bartol, 2017). The reason being is the interest in the relationship between consuming violent media and different aggression-related outcomes (Giles, 2010). As a result, to address this controversial topic, several theoretical explanations were developed, aiming to explain this phenomenon if it is happening.

6

Bandura and Walters' (1977) work brought up the concept of modelling, this one specifically saying that the media provides role models where if this one is aggressive, and rewarded for behaving aggressively, through constant observational learning these behaviours are more likely to be acquired and perpetuated. They additionally suggested aggressive media consumption teaches aggressive styles of conduct and disinhibits or habituates people to violence (Bandura & Walters, 1977). From a social cognitive perspective, Huessman and Taylor (2006) provided the cognitive scripts model. Here it is suggested that those witnessing violent media (in this case Gangster Rap music and videos) through cognitive priming, develop social scripts of aggression and apply them to respond to future events. Therefore, by constantly listening to these messages, the constant activation of these antisocial schemas could further develop into social heuristics and therefore possibly into antisocial behaviour (Hansen, 1995). Yet a limitation of both Bandura and Walters' (1977) and Huessman and Taylor's (2006) model is that they place the media consumer in a passive, even unconscious learning role when being exposed to aggressive media (Giles, 2010). Rather than in an active position of media processing which could be the case of real-life media consumption (Ferguson and Dyck, 2012; Ferguson, 2013).

More recently, in an attempt to incorporate features of several theories (including the previously mentioned ones), Anderson and Bushman (2018) proposed the General Aggression Model to explain how different processes combine, increasing the likelihood of aggressive behaviour occurring (Branscombe & Baron,2017). The General Aggression Model suggests that aggressive media exposure can have short and long-term effects on the individual (Branscombe & Baron, 2017) where an individual (person factor) and the situational factor (i.e., aggressive music video) affect the individual's internal state through a

priming effect. For example, if the individual is exposed to a Gangster rap video, this may evoke hostile thoughts (cognitive component), anger (affect component), and increased arousal (arousal component). This leads to the appraising and committing of aggressive behaviours after the exposure (Anderson & et al., 2003). As the GAM model takes this "person situation" episode as a learning trial, it is suggested that if happening several times, this exposure to violent media ends up altering the individual's knowledge structures (such as becoming more acceptant of violence usage or having a hostile view of the world) and therefore, developing an aggressive personality in the long run (Anderson & Bushman, 2018).

Several studies aimed to find a relation between the youths' Rap preference and their behavioural outcomes. Rap musical preference was found to be correlated to deviant behaviour, such as theft and violence (Miranda & Claes, 2004), aggressive behaviours (Chen et al., 2006), and violent crime (Tanner et al., 2009) in adolescents. In addition, two longitudinal studies found that preference for rap music predicted later externalising behaviour problems in boys and girls (Selfhout et al., 2008) and predicted minor delinquency concurrently and longitudinally (Tet Bogt et al., 2013) among adolescents.

Looking more closely at the relationship between consuming aggressive music and its consequences, rather than the overall preference for the musical genre, different research focused on whether the lyrical component of the music itself, when being exposed to, could impact the participants. Anderson et al. (2003) highlighted that the lyric without the visual media plays an important role as it requires participants to imagine details when listening. Therefore, after conducting an experiment Anderson et al. (2003) found that participants who were exposed to a song with violent lyrics rated higher similarity and association of meaning among two lists of words (one aggressive and another ambiguous). Similarly, males after being exposed to misogynistic lyrics in songs recalled more negative attributes about women

than the control group (Fischer & Greitemeyer, 2006). This could be explained as a result of the priming process, where the lyrics provided accessibility to these aggressive cognitions in the participants (Anderson et al., 2003). In addition, much experimental research relied on the Hot Chilli Test paradigm to find aggressive behaviour as an outcome of lyrical exposure, as participants added more hot chilli sauce to be given to a woman after being exposed to a misogynistic, lyrical heavy metal song (Fischer & Greitemeyer, 2006). Similarly, males who were exposed to Heavy metal music with violent lyrics put more hot chilli sauce in the water than those who were exposed to Heavy metal music without violent lyrics (Mast & McAndrew, 2011). The lyrical effect of a violent song was the strongest predictor of allocating more grams of hot chilli sauce to a supposed subsequent participant (Lennings & Warburton, 2011). However, other studies failed to show this lyrical effect on participants (Ballard & Coates, 1995; Wanamaker & Reznikoff, 1989) or found that the aggressive tone of the bass (heavy metal being the genre experimented with) had a greater effect than the lyrical component on acceptance of violence against women (St. Lawrence & Joyner, 1991).

The second component of aggressive music that has been researched is the video graphical content. Anderson et al. (2003) suggested that music videos themselves are like any other video media, therefore it is expected for them to cause a greater effect on people when being exposed to them. Roberts et al. (2003) suggest that exposure to music videos is thought to be impactful through their explicit imagery and presence of violent cues, as they require less usage of imagination and instead of being a background activity (like listening to the music itself can be), it requires more attention. Johnson et al. (1995) found out that males and females after being exposed to violent rap videos that contained images of women in subordinate roles became more acceptant of dating violence. In addition, subjects who were briefly exposed to violent rap music videos showed greater acceptance of using violence for

solving interpersonal problems, as well as using violence towards a woman (Johnson et al., 1995).

Although there seems to be substantial evidence to link the consumption of Rap Music (along with other types of music known as aggressive) and aggressive outcomes (Morizot & Kazemian, 2015), and even the creators of the GAM model suggested that the discussion of whether aggressive media has a negative impact on consumers should be over (Anderson & Bushman, 2018). There are several flaws found within the literature that leads us to question whether this topic has been explored in depth. First, correlational studies (such as Chen et al., 2006; Tanner et al., 2009; Miranda & Claes, 2004) which suggested having found a relationship between adolescents preferring rap music and committing aggressive, deviant behaviours usually had one main limitation, third, or well-known co-founding variables. For instance, Miranda and Claes (2004) did not consider the gender differences in aggression scores, which are known to play an important role in aggression levels (Bartol & Bartol, 2017). Also, basing its research on adolescents, where personality traits such as sensation seeking seemed to be a possible co-founding variable for explaining this externalizing behavioural problem (Romero et al., 2001) rather than the music preference itself (Chen et al., 2006). Even race seemed to be a factor that explained this relationship in the Tanner et al. (2009) study; where White and Asian adolescents' minor delinquency seemed to predict a preference for rap music, it did not for African American adolescents. This overall suggests that other variables could have also explained the supposed link between antisocial, aggressive behaviour and preference for a musical genre.

Longitudinal designs, which are suggested to have stronger validity at evaluating relationships among different constructs (Caruana et al., 2015) showed small effects of the relationship between preference for rap music and later engagement in violent, behavioural problems (Selfhout et al., 2008; Tet Bogt et al., 2013). Even Huesmann et al. (1997)

suggested that the effect of media explaining variations in problematic behaviours will always remain small as there are other factors involved, leading us to question whether this discussion is over.

Leaving the focus on previously mentioned studies which seemed to draw conclusions upon teenagers' "musical preferences" such as preferred musical genre (Chen et al, 2006; Miranda & Claes, 2004; Tanner et al., 2009; Tet Bogt et al., 2013) or identified crowd affiliation (Selfhout et al., 2008) they seem to leave out the importance of the actual music engagement with the genre. Therefore, how much does preferring Rap over Country music really explain these variations in problematic, aggressive behaviour? While other studies focused explicitly on graphical videos and lyrical components of aggressive music (usually rap or heavy metal) and seemed to all have found a negative cognitive and behavioural effect on participants (Anderson & Bushman 2002; Fischer & Greitemeyer, 2006; Johnson et al. 1995; Lennings & Warburton, 2011; Mast & McAndrew, 2011), they all have a major flaw. This is the fact that they test this paradigm with one-time intense exposure to the violent content in an experimental setting, making it difficult to define whether the behavioural and cognitive aggressive responses found were just a result of a short time exposure, as it has been suggested that laboratory settings in media and aggression research are unlikely to provide results generalizable to real life (Ferguson, 2013).

Therefore, the following study will try to address, from an observational point of view, how well does current (hours per week), and overall (years) exposure of the two main elements of Gangster Rap music (lyrics and videos) predict several components of aggression; verbal, physical (behavioural components), anger (affect component) and hostility (cognitive component). Based on the General Aggression Model (Anderson & Bushman, 2002; 2018), the constant exposure to aggressive music, alters the individual's

cognitive, affective, and arousal components of their internal state, which as a short time effect leads to a higher likelihood of behaving aggressively, but in the long term it leads to developing an aggressive personality, therefore in order to test this theory the following questions will be addressed.

Q1- How well does Current Exposure ( hours per week) to Lyrical (Gangster Rap Music) and Video graphical (Gangster Rap videos) predict different aggression components?

H1- There will be a relationship between current exposure to Lyrical and Video graphical and different aggression components

Q2; How well does overall, past exposure (years listening ) to Lyrical (Gangster Rap Music) and Video graphical (Gangster Rap videos) predict different aggression components?

H2- There will be a relationship between overall, past exposure to Lyrical and Video graphical and different aggression components

### Methodology

## **Participants**

The sample for the current study was comprised of 105 participants, which consisted of 44 females (41.9%) and 61 males (58.1%). The sample size was calculated using the Tabachnick and Fidell (2013) formula for multiple regression analysis, this one being (N > 50 + 8m) where N= number of participants and M= predictor variables. Because this study had a total of 6 predictor variables, the minimum sample size required was (N> 50+8(6)) = 50 + 48= 98 participants. Participants' ages ranged from 18 to 63 years (M=27.22, SD= 7.98). A non-probability, convenience sample technique was implemented as the sampling strategy to gather participants. This is because the recruitment was mainly done through online social media platforms and reached those available to participate and close enough to the researcher.

# Materials

The questionnaires for the study were administered through Google Forms survey administrator platform. Demographical questions such as Gender and Age were first administered to participants in order to have a broad idea of their profiles.

#### **Gangster Rap Exposure**

This questionnaire was comprised of four sets of open-ended questions where participants were asked to fill in numerical values to the following questions (See Appendix B)

**Current Exposure:** "Please type in an estimate of how many hours per week you listen to Gangster Rap music (in numbers) If you never do, just type in 0" and "Please type in

an estimate of how many hours per week you watch Gangster Rap music videos (in numbers) If you never do, just type in 0"

**Overall, Past exposure:** "Please type in an estimate of how many years ago you started listening to Gangster Rap music (in numbers) If you never did, just type in 0" and "Please type in an estimate of how many years ago you started watching Gangster Rap music videos (in numbers) If you never do, just type in 0".

The Aggression Questionnaire (AGQ) ( $\alpha = .89$ ) developed by Buss and Perry (1992) is a 29-item self-report questionnaire used to measure the level of aggression in participants. It is composed of four subscales; Physical Aggression (items 1-9), Verbal Aggression (items 10-14), Hostility (items 15-21), and Anger (items 21-28). Each item was measured using a 5point Likert scale, from 1= *extremely uncharacteristic of me* to 5=*extremely characteristic of me*. With items 7 " *I can think of no good reason for ever hitting a person*" and 18 "*I am an even-tempered person*" being reversed scored. Total scores were computed by adding up the 29 items, where the lowest score is 29 and the highest 145. Therefore, higher scores mean higher aggression (see appendix C). The Cronbach's Alpha for this sample was ( $\alpha = .88$ ) overall suggesting a high level of internal consistency and reliability. In addition, Buss and Perry (1992) suggested a strong to moderate construct validity based upon positive correlation results between self-report and peer nominations scores of the four scales. This degree of construct validity was later supported by positive correlation results found between the Aggression Questionnaire scores and other measures of aggression (Harris, 1997).

## Design

The study implemented a non-experimental, cross-sectional, within-subjects design with a quantitative approach. There were 6 Predictor Variables. These being; Gangster Rap Music Hours listened per week, Years ago Listening to Gangster Rap Music, Gangster Rap Video hours watched per week, Years ago watching Gangster Rap videos, Age, and Gender. Criterion variables were 5; Total Aggression and its four subscales, Physical Aggression, Verbal Aggression, Anger, and Hostility. For hypothesis one, predictor variables were Gangster Rap Music Hours listened to per week and Gangster Rap Video hours watched per week while controlling for age and gender, with its Criterion variables being Total Aggression Scores and its four subscales, Verbal Aggression, Physical Aggression, Hostility and Anger. While for hypothesis two, the predictor variables are Years Ago listening to Gangster Rap music, Years ago watching Gangster Rap Videos, age and gender. While criterion variables remain the same as the previous the hypothesis, being Total Aggression Scores and its four subscales.

## Procedure

Because the Gangster Rap exposure questionnaire was first applied in this study, a pilot study was required to ensure items were understood and assessing correctly the construct for participants. A total of 5 participants took part, once they provided feedback and items were understood, researcher proceeded with the study.

The majority of participants were recruited through a link posted on several online platforms such as; Twitter, Instagram, Facebook, Snapchat, and WhatsApp. An information sheet and a Consent form were attached before participants could initiate the survey (See Appendix D). In the information sheet, participants were given general information about the study, such as the age requirements and time frame expected to complete it, with an average of approximately five minutes. The consent form stated for participants their right to withdraw at any time before answers were submitted. Because of the anonymous nature of the data, it would not be possible to withdraw it once submitted. Subsequently, participants were asked to tick the box stating that they have read and agreed with all the information given, and also tick the box stating that they were providing informed consent to participate. GANGSTER RAP AND AGGRESSION

Once consent was given and participants were fully informed, they were able to proceed with the questionnaire. Participants were first asked to give their age and Gender, followed by the Gangster Rap Exposure questions, and lastly were required to complete the Buss and Perry (1992) Aggression Questionnaire. Once completed, a debrief form was given where the purpose of the study was stated, along with the researcher's institutional email and a free, anonymous helpline was attached in case any distress was caused by the questionnaire provided (see Appendix E).

Regarding the ethical considerations, all data was collected in accordance with the ethical guidelines of NCI. Risk and benefits of taking part in the study were written in the Information Sheet. In addition, participants were informed about their data being treated with strict confidence but being retained for five years in accordance to the NCI data retention policy in the Consent form. Lastly, in the debriefing sheet, participants were encouraged if any distress was caused as a result of participating, to contact a free, 24-hour mental health helpline text support.

#### Results

## **Descriptive Statistics**

# Gender

The current data is taken from a sample of 105 participants who completed the questionnaires (n=105) of which 41.9% were females (n=44) and 58.1% were males (n=61).

# **Continuous Variables**

There are 10 continuous variables. Age, Total Aggression (AGQ\_TOTAL) and its four subscales; Physical Aggression (SUB\_PAT), Verbal Aggression (SUB\_VAT), Anger (SUB\_ANGT) and Hostility (SUB\_HOST). In addition, Gangster Rap Music Hours listened to per week (RMPW), Years ago Listening to Gangster Rap Music (RMYA), Gangster Rap Video hours watched per week (RVPW) and Years ago watching Gangster Rap videos (RVYA). These will all be displayed in Table 1 with their respective Means, Standard Deviations and Ranges.

# Table 1

Descriptive Statistics table for all continuous variables

| 7.98<br>7.72<br>2.22 | 18-63<br>0-48 |
|----------------------|---------------|
|                      | 0-48          |
| 2.22                 |               |
|                      | 0-20          |
| 7.19                 | 0-29          |
| 7.52                 | 0-30          |
| 5.67                 | 9-37          |
| 3.69                 | 5-22          |
| 5.06                 | 7-28          |
| 5.68                 | 8-31          |
|                      | 35-96         |
|                      | 3.69<br>5.06  |

RMPW= Gangster Rap Music Hours listened per week. RVPW= Gangster Rap Video Hours watched per week, RMYA= Years Ago listening to Gangster Rap Music, RVYA = Years Ago watching Gangster Rap videos

## **Inferential Statistics**

Preliminary analyses were performed to ensure no violation of the assumptions of normality. Nine out of the 10 variables of interest were not normally distributed (Shapiro-Wilk p < 0.05), therefore, it was necessary to carry Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient as the non-parametric alternative of Pearson Correlation to assess the relationship, strength and direction among the variables. Results suggest that r values between the predictor variables ranged from .23 to 84 and that r values among the different criterion variables ranged from .38 to .77. Relationships among predictor and criterion variables will be examined later. (see table 2 for full details).

## Table 2

| S | pearman | S | Rho | correl | lations | among | the | 10 | continuous variables |
|---|---------|---|-----|--------|---------|-------|-----|----|----------------------|
|   |         |   |     |        |         |       |     |    |                      |

| Variable                        | 1     | 2     | 3     | 4     | 5   | 6     | 7     | 8     | 9     | 10 |
|---------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-----|-------|-------|-------|-------|----|
| <b>1</b> Age                    | 1     |       |       |       |     |       |       |       |       |    |
| <b>2</b> RMPW                   | -37** | 1     |       |       |     |       |       |       |       |    |
| <b>3</b> RVPW                   | .06   | .47** | 1     |       |     |       |       |       |       |    |
| <b>4</b> RMYA                   | .13   | .50** | .46** | 1     |     |       |       |       |       |    |
|                                 |       |       |       |       |     |       |       |       |       |    |
| 5 RVYA                          | .23*  | .29** | .52** | .84** | 1   |       |       |       |       |    |
| <b>6</b> Physical<br>Aggression | 03    | .21*  | .19*  | .12   | .07 | 1     |       |       |       |    |
| <b>7</b> Verbal<br>Aggression   | .10   | 00    | 01    | .07   | .02 | .38** | 1     |       |       |    |
| 8 Anger                         | .19   | 03    | .13   | .01   | .01 | .50** | .41** | 1     |       |    |
| <b>9</b> Hostility              | 16    | .01   | 06    | 06    | 09  | .42** | .41** | .45** | 1     |    |
| <b>10</b> Total<br>Aggression   | .01   | .07   | .07   | .05   | 00  | .77** | .69** | .76** | .78** | 1  |

Note: Statistical significance (\* = p < .05; \*\* = p < .01; \*\*\* = p < .01). RMPW= Gangster Rap Music Hours listened per week. RVPW= Gangster Rap Video Hours watched per week, RMYA= Years Ago listening to Gangster Rap Music, RVYA = Years Ago watching Gangster Rap videos

# Q1- How well does Current Exposure (hours per week) to lyrical (Gangster Rap Music) and video graphical (Gangster Rap videos) predict different aggression components?

Five multiple regression models were run to see how well Gangster Rap Hours listened per week and Gangster Rap videos Hours watched per week, (while controlling for age and gender) could predict different Aggression Outcomes. These being Physical Aggression, verbal aggression, Anger, Hostility, and lastly Total Aggression. Preliminary analyses were conducted to ensure no violation of the assumptions of normality, linearity, and homoscedasticity. Correlations among the predictor variables were assessed, and *r* values ranged from 0.02 to .40. Tests for multicollinearity also indicated that all Tolerance and VIF values were in an acceptable range. These results indicate that there was no violation of the assumption of multicollinearity, and that data were suitable for examination through multiple regression analysis.

Model 1 explains 12.2% of the variance in Physical Aggression Scores (F (4,100) =3.47, p =.011) suggesting that the model was statistically significant. Within the predictor variables, Gender (control variable) was the strongest and only statistically significant variable to explain variations in Physical Aggression Scores ( $\beta$ = .28, p =.004.). While the rest of the models are not statistically significant, Gender showed to be the strongest PV ( $\beta$ = .18, p =.076) for model 2 of Verbal Aggression Scores (F (4,100) = 1.39, p = .241) and Model 3 of Anger Scores (F (4,100) = 15.64, p =.662) ( $\beta$ = -.12, p =.254). Meanwhile, for model 4 of Hostility Scores (F (4,100) = 46.70, p = .215) Age was the strongest PV ( $\beta$ = .17, p = .085). Lastly, in model 5 of Total Aggression Scores (F (4,100) = 208.30, p =.470) Gangster Rap music hours listened to per week (RMPW) was the strongest ( $\beta$ = .12, *p* = .273) yet, like the rest, not statistically significant.

Overall, results suggest that men (as males were coded as 2 in SPSS, and therefore scored "higher" in Gender) predicted higher levels of Physical Aggression Scores in Model 1. While variables of interest were not found to be statistically significant for predicting any variations among the different aggression scores at any point. With Gangster Rap music hours listened to per week (RMPW) standardised beta values ranged from ( $\beta$ = -.06, p = .561) in model 2 to ( $\beta$ = .14, p = .204) in model 4 and Gangster Rap videos hours watched per week (RVPW) with its standardised beta values ranged from ( $\beta$ = .00, p = .989) in model 3 to ( $\beta$ = .14, p =.200) in model 2 (see table 3 for full details).

# Table 3

# Multiple Regression models predicting Total Aggression, Physical Aggression, Verbal

| Variable                      | R <sup>2</sup> | В     | SE   | β   | t     | Р     |
|-------------------------------|----------------|-------|------|-----|-------|-------|
| Model 1 (Physical Aggression) | .122*          |       |      |     |       | .011  |
| Age                           |                | 03    | .07  | 04  | 42    | .679  |
| Gender                        |                | 3.25  | 1.11 | .28 | 2.92  | .004* |
| RMPW                          |                | .09   | .08  | .13 | 1.21  | .230  |
| RVPW                          |                | .00   | .26  | .00 | .02   | .988  |
| Model 2 (Verbal Aggression)   | .053           |       |      |     |       | .241  |
| Age                           |                | .03   | .05  | .06 | .63   | .532  |
| Gender                        |                | 1.35  | .75  | .18 | 1.80  | .076  |
| RMPW                          |                | 03    | .05  | 06  | 58    | .561  |
| RVPW                          |                | .23   | .18  | .14 | 1.29  | .200  |
| Model 3 (Anger)               | .024           |       |      |     |       | .662  |
| Age                           |                | .04   | .06  | .07 | .64   | .521  |
| Gender                        |                | -1.20 | 1.05 | 12  | -1.15 | .254  |
| RMPW                          |                | .08   | .07  | .11 | 1.02  | .310  |
| RVPW                          |                | .00   | .25  | .00 | .01   | .989  |
| Model 4 (Hostility)           | .056           |       |      |     |       | .215  |
| Age                           |                | 12    | .07  | 17  | -1.74 | .085  |
| Gender                        |                | -1.00 | 1.15 | 09  | 87    | .387  |
| RMPW                          |                | .10   | .08  | .14 | 1.28  | .204  |
| RVPW                          |                | 06    | .27  | 02  | 201   | .841  |
| Model 5 (Total Aggression)    | .035           |       |      |     |       | .470  |
| Age                           |                | 08    | .19  | 04  | 42    | .673  |
| Gender                        |                | 2.40  | 3.13 | .08 | .77   | .446  |
| RMPW                          |                | .24   | .22  | .12 | 1.10  | .273  |
| RVPW                          |                | .18   | .74  | .03 | .25   | .806  |

Aggression, Anger and Hostility

Note: Statistical significance (\* = p < .05; \*\* = p < .01; \*\*\* = p < .001). RMPW= Gangster Rap Music Hours listened per week. RVPW= Gangster Rap Video Hours watched per week.

Q2; How well does overall, past exposure (years listening ) to lyrical (Gangster Rap Music) and Video graphical (Gangster Rap videos) predict different aggression components?

Five multiple regression models were run to see how well Years ago Listening Gangster Rap Music (RMYA) and Years ago watching Gangster Rap videos (RVYA) (while controlling for Age and Gender) could predict different Aggression Outcomes. These are Physical Aggression, Verbal Aggression, Anger, Hostility and lastly Total Aggression. Preliminary analyses were conducted to ensure no violation of the assumptions of normality, linearity, and homoscedasticity. Correlations among the predictor variables were assessed, and *r* values ranged from -.13 to .89. Tests for multicollinearity also indicated that all tolerance and VIF values were in an acceptable range. These results indicate that there was no violation of the assumption of multicollinearity, and that data were suitable for examination through multiple regression analysis.

Model 1 explains 11.1% of variance in Physical Aggression Scores (F (4,100) = 93.12, p = .018) this one being the only statistically significant among the five models. Gender was the strongest and only statistically significant predictor variable to explain variations in Physical Aggression Scores ( $\beta = .31$ , p = .003). Similarly, Gender ( $\beta = .18$ , p = .095) was the strongest, but not statistically significant PV in model 2 of Verbal Aggression (F (4,100) =13.38, p = .420). While Years Ago listening to Gangster Rap Music (RMYA) was the strongest PV ( $\beta = .14$ , p = .536) for model 3 of Anger (F (4,100) =10.31, p = .813). Age showed to be the strongest PV ( $\beta = ..18$ , p = .074) in model 4 for Hostility Scores (F (4,100) =36.11, p = .348). Lastly, Years Ago Watching Gangster Rap videos (RVYA) was the strongest PV ( $\beta = ..15$ , p = .501) in model 5 of Total Aggression Scores (F (4,100) = 134.37, p = .685) Overall, results suggest that Gender was the only Predictor variable to uniquely contribute to variations in Physical Aggression Scores in model 1. This suggests that males predicted higher levels of Physical Aggression. Meanwhile, the variables of interest as Years ago Listening to Gangster Rap Music (RMYA) with its standardised beta values ranging from ( $\beta$ = .07, p = .773) in model 2 to ( $\beta$ = .14, p = .534) in model 3. In addition to Years Ago Watching Gangster Rap videos (RVYA) with its standardised beta values ranging from ( $\beta$ = -.06, p = .778) in model 2 to ( $\beta$ = .15, p = .501) in model 5. Although both showed to be the strongest in two out of five models, they were not statistically significant enough to explain a variation in any of the aggression outcomes (see table 4 for full details).

# Table 4

# Multiple Regression models predicting Total Aggression, Physical Aggression, Verbal

Aggression, Anger and Hostility

| Variable                      | R <sup>2</sup> | В     | SE   | β   | t     | Р      |
|-------------------------------|----------------|-------|------|-----|-------|--------|
| Model 1 (Physical Aggression) | .111*          |       |      |     |       | .018   |
| Age                           |                | 03    | .07  | 05  | 45    | .651   |
| Gender                        |                | 3.60  | 1.17 | .31 | 3.08  | .003** |
| RMYA                          |                | .07   | .17  | .08 | .38   | .704   |
| RVYA                          |                | 10    | .16  | 13  | 62    | .537   |
| Model 2 (Verbal Aggression)   | .038           |       |      |     |       | .420   |
| Age                           |                | .04   | .05  | .08 | .74   | .459   |
| Gender                        |                | 1.33  | .79  | .18 | 1.69  | .095   |
| RMYA                          |                | .03   | .12  | .07 | .29   | .773   |
| RVYA                          |                | 03    | .11  | 06  | 28    | .778   |
| Model 3 (Anger)               | .016           |       |      |     |       | .813   |
| Age                           |                | .03   | .07  | .05 | .45   | .657   |
| Gender                        |                | -1.17 | 1.10 | 12  | -1.07 | .289   |
| RMYA                          |                | .10   | .16  | .14 | .62   | .534   |
| RVYA                          |                | 07    | .15  | 11  | 49    | .625   |
| Model 4 (Hostility)           | .043           |       |      |     |       | .348   |
| Age                           |                | 13    | .07  | 18  | -1.81 | .074   |
| Gender                        |                | 75    | 1.21 | 07  | 62    | .540   |
| RMYA                          |                | .09   | .18  | .11 | .48   | .635   |
| RVYA                          |                | 10    | .17  | 14  | 61    | .546   |
| Model 5 (Total Aggression)    | .022           |       |      |     |       | .685   |
| Age                           |                | 10    | .20  | 05  | 50    | .618   |
| Gender                        |                | 3.02  | 3.29 | .10 | .92   | .361   |
| RMYA                          |                | .29   | .48  | .14 | .59   | .558   |
| RVYA                          |                | 31    | .45  | .15 | 68    | .501   |

Note: Statistical significance (\* = p < .05; \*\* = p < .01; \*\*\* = p < .001). RMYA= Years Ago listening to Gangster Rap Music, RVYA = Years Ago watching Gangster Rap videos

#### Discussion

The current study aimed to investigate whether two types of exposure (current hours per week, and overall years) to two main elements of Gangster Rap music (Lyrics and video) could predict Aggression with its four components (physical, verbal, anger and hostility) to have a full understanding of which element of Gangster Rap, and what type of exposure could really predict or explain any variation in aggressive outcomes. Prior findings have suggested that having a preference for listening to Rap Music was related to several externalizing behaviours, such as aggression, violence and minor delinquency (Chen et al., 2006; Miranda & Claes, 2004; Selfhout et al., 2008; Tanner et al., 2009; Ter Bogt, 2013). In addition, experimental designs which showed the immediate effect of both lyrical and videographical content of aggressive music in participants' cognitions and behaviours (Anderson et al., 2003; Fischer & Greitemeyer, 2006; Johnson, Adams et al., 1995; Johnson, Jackson et al.,1995; Lennings & Warburton, 2011; Mast & McAndrew, 2011). While theoretical models such as GAM suggested that aggressive music, provides aggressive messages, or video images that alter the internal state of the individual, evoking aggression-related thoughts (cognition), negative affect (i.e. anger) and increased arousal. This not only increases the likelihood of appraising negative behaviours to be committed, but also, with repetitive exposure the individual's knowledge structures are altered and they can develop an aggressive personality (Anderson & Bushman, 2002; 2018). Therefore through this research, two hypotheses were formulated to explore in depth this phenomena.

Hypothesis 1 stated that there was going to be a relation between the current level of hours listening to Gangster Rap Music per week and the current level of hours watching Gangster Rap videos and its aggression outcomes (previously described). While hypothesis 2 GANGSTER RAP AND AGGRESSION

stated that there was going to be a relationship between the years spent listening to Gangster Rap music and watching Gangster Rap videos with the aggression outcomes. In order to address these two hypotheses, 10 multiple regressions were run to see how well different levels of exposure to Lyrical and Video graphical content of Gangster Rap predicted different levels of Aggression components.

For hypothesis one, Gangster Rap Hours listened per week(RMPW) and Gangster Rap videos Hours watched per week (RVPW), in addition to age and gender were taken as predictor variables in each of the five models of multiple regression, where the criterion variables for each one were the aggression components measured. For hypothesis two Years ago Listening Gangster Rap Music (RMYA) and Years ago watching Gangster Rap videos (RVYA) along with age and gender were the predictor variables for the additional five multiple regressions, where each aggression outcome (including total aggression) were the criterion variables.

Results of the ten Multiple Regressions ran revealed that gender was the only strongest and significant predictor variable that explained variations in Physical Aggression scores when testing both hypotheses. This suggests that being male, was the strongest predictor for higher scores in Physical Aggression while taking into account their current, or overall exposure to Lyrics and Videos of Gangster Rap. These findings are consistent with previous research which suggests that males tend to engage more in overt aggression (Shaver & Mikulincer, 2011). Where their behavioural patterns are linked with engaging in physical confrontation as well as showing higher levels of arousal and anger (Bartol & Bartol, 2017). In this research, gender also showed to be (although not statistically significant) the strongest predictor for Verbal Aggression Scores and Anger scores while testing hypothesis one. In addition, the fact that being a male was the strongest predictor variable in explaining higher

27

scores of Physical Aggression in the two models is consistent with Buss and Perry's (1992) findings where males showed significantly higher scores on Physical and Verbal Aggression.

In regard to the variables of interest, because no current (hours per week) or overall (Years ago) exposure to lyrical and video graphical components of Gangster Rap music predicted any significant variations in aggression outcomes, both hypotheses have to be rejected. This means that our findings are inconsistent with previous findings where the immediate negative cognitive and behavioural effects of exposure to aggressive media were found in participants (Anderson & Bushman, 2002; Fischer & Greitemeyer, 2006; Johnson et al., 1995; Lennings & Warburton, 2011; Mast & McAndrew, 2011), and where preferring Rap music predicted problematic, aggressive behavioural outcomes (Selfhout et al., 2008; Tet Borg et al., 2013). Results lead us to question once again how much aggressive music consumption influences aggressive outcomes, and if not, other co-founding variables could explain better the aggression outcomes, such as race, gender, and personality traits like sensation seeking did in past research (Miranda & Claes, 2004; Chen et al., 2006; Tanner et al., 2009). And alternatively take into consideration how the role of passion in fans of violent music, when being exposed to it, provides a number of positive affective outcomes, such as joy, peace and empowerment (Thompson et al., 2019) or even helps to decrease stress and negative affect responses (Sharman & Dingle, 2015). This provides an alternative explanation where those who consistently engage with their favourite genre, even with aggressive themes, are actually benefited with positive psychological outcomes rather than the development of aggressive ones (Olsen et al., 2022).

From this point of view, this study prompts researchers to question the theoretical approach taken by previous research as Anderson and Bushman (2002; 2018) suggested supposedly a major effect that aggressive media had on the individual's cognition, affect and

behavioural components in the short and long-term run. This leads us to take into consideration Ferguson and Dyck's (2012) limitations addressed on the General Aggression Model, where for instance this model, although it superficially mentions individuals' biological and environmental risk factors for developing aggressive outcomes, such as witnessing domestic violence, which it has been suggested to be a major risk (Bartol & Bartol, 2017). It places both real-life, and media violence as having the same strong deleterious effects whereby being exposed to it, through an automatic learning process people becomes aggressive. This leads to an over- empathizing on the cognitive process as being a key role in the development aggression. Where aggression seems to be something mainly learned, underestimating the role that affective and physiological processes even individual, biological, and environmental factors have on predicting aggression outcomes (Ferguson and Dyck, 2012).

In conclusion, it is important to consider that even though Anderson and Bushman (2018) suggest that the discussion of whether being exposed to aggressive media (including aggressive music lyrics and videos) leads to aggressive cognitive behavioural, and even personality outcomes should be ended. It is important to highlight that much of the research that supports this model has relied on experimental research designs, in laboratory settings with low ecological validity, and even longitudinal and correlational studies with low effect sizes (Ferguson and Dyck, 2012). Where even having included fans of the actual violent genre to their experimental research, could have provided another direction for the results (Olsen et al., 2022).

29

#### Limitations

The study identifies several limitations. The first limitation to address is that many participants in our sample did not engage into listening or watching Gangster Rap videos and music at all. This suggests being a limitation because as it was aimed to see any correlation among Gangster Rap exposure and Aggressive outcomes, less generalizable results could be done due to the low number of participants who were exposed to this genre. This limitation could be addressed by more specifically carrying out future research on people who are fans of Gangster Rap music, meaning that they engage substantial time with Gangster Rap music and videos.

The second limitation is that by using the Buss and Perry (1992) Aggression Questionnaire, the measures of aggressive outcomes depended on self-reported responses, this meaning that participants had to report how characteristic of them they felt the statements provided were. Because of the nature of the assessment, one main flaw of relying on selfreported assessments is known as social desirability bias, which is known as the tendency to underreport socially undesirable attitudes about oneself (Latkin et al., 2017). Therefore, one possibility could be that the levels of self-reported aggression could have been underestimated. Additionally, regarding this underestimation of the aggression scores is that many participants approached were native Spanish speakers, who raised questions regarding the meaning of the words provided in the scale to the researcher. Although these doubts were addressed, this could have left several misunderstandings from the participants and lead to providing less accurate results.

On the other hand, a strength of this study is that the concept of Gangster Rap was assessed by differentiating both lyrical and video graphical components, while exposure was also assessed by taking into consideration their current exposure and their past exposure overall, to provide a better understanding of which specific aspect of their exposure could have predicted several aggressive outcomes.

## Conclusion

To conclude, the results of this study showed inconsistency with previously mentioned research that supports the relationship between consuming aggressive music and aggressive cognitive and behavioural outcomes. Therefore, these results could provide another optimistic view of consuming Gangster Rap music and suggest that future research should focus on the positive psychological outcomes that Gangster Rap music could provide. Experimental, or even qualitative research on those who consider themselves as fans, that actively engage in the genre, could bring insight into the role that Gangster rap music plays for them and a number of positive cognitive, affective, and behavioural outcomes, rather than continuously aiming to correlate it with aggressive outcomes. This suggestion could be particularly interesting due to the popularity that Gangster Rap has nowadays, and how past research, although having several methodical flaws, along with theoretical frameworks like GAM, contributed to reinforce concerns in the policy-making and banning of artists (Olsen et al., 2022).

#### References

- Anderson, C. A., & Bushman, B. J. (2002). Human aggression. Annual Review of Psychology, 53, 27-51. <u>https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.53.100901.135231</u>
- Anderson, C. A., & Bushman, B. J. (2018). Media violence and the general aggression model. *Journal of Social Issues*, 74(2), 386–413. https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12275
- Anderson, C. A., Carnagey, N. L., & Eubanks, J. (2003). Exposure to violent media: The effects of songs with violent lyrics on aggressive thoughts and feelings. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84 (5), 960-971. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.84.5.960</u>.
- Ballard, M. E., & Coates, S. (1995). The immediate effects of homicidal, suicidal, and nonviolent heavy metal and rap songs on the moods of college students. *Youth & Society*, 27(2), 148-168. <u>https://doi.org/10.1177/0044118X95027002003</u>
- Bartol, C. R., & Bartol, A. M. (2017). *Criminal behavior: A psychological approach* (11th ed.). Pearson Education Limited.

Bandura, A., & Walters, R. H. (1977). Social learning theory (vol. 1). Prentice Hall.

Branscombe, N. R., & Baron, R. A. (2017). *Social psychology* (14<sup>th</sup> ed.). Pearson Education Limited.

- Buss, A. H., & Perry, M. (1992). The Aggression Questionnaire. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 63(3), 452–459. <u>https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.63.3.452</u>
- Caruana, E. J., Roman, M., Hernández-Sánchez, J., & Solli, P. (2015). Longitudinal studies. Journal of Thoracic Disease, 7(11), E537–E540. https://doi.org/10.3978/.issn.2072-1439.2015.10.63
- Chen, M.-J., Miller, B. A., Grube, J. W., & Waiters, E. D. (2006). Music, Substance Use, and aggression. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 67*(3), 373–381. <u>https://doi.org/10.15288%2Fjsa.2006.67.373</u>
- Dankoor, K., Stephens, D. & Bogt, T.T. Drip Too Hard? Commercial Rap Music and Perceived Masculinity Ideals and Actual Self-Evaluations among Black U.S. and Dutch Adolescent Men. *Sexuality & Culture* 27, 57–77 (2023). https://doi.org/10.1007/s12119-022-10003-9
- Dunbar, A. (2019). Rap music, race, and perceptions of crime. *Sociology Compass*, *13*(10), e12732. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/soc4.12732</u>

Emdin, C. (2010). Affiliation and alienation: Hip-hop, Rap, and Urban Science Education. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 42(1), 1–25. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220270903161118

- Ferguson, C. J., & Dyck, D. (2012). Paradigm change in aggression research: The time has come to retire the General Aggression Model. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 17(3), 220–228. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2012.02.007
- Ferguson, C. J. (2013). Violent video games and the Supreme Court: Lessons for the scientific community in the wake of Brown v. Entertainment Merchants Association. *American Psychologist*, 68(2), 57–74. <u>https://doi.org/10.1037/a0030597</u>
- Elson, M., & Ferguson, C. J. (2014). Does doing media violence research make one aggressive? The ideological rigidity of social-cognitive theories of media violence and a response to Bushman and Huesmann (2013), Krahé (2013), and Warburton (2013). *European Psychologist, 19*(1), 68–75. <u>https://doi.org/10.1027/1016-9040/a000185</u>
- Fischer, P., & Greitemeyer, T. (2006). Music and aggression: The impact of sexualaggressive song lyrics on aggression-related thoughts, emotions, and behavior toward the same and the opposite sex. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 32(9), 1165-1176. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0146167206288670
- Giles, D. (2010). Psychology of the media. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hansen, C. H. (1995). Predicting cognitive and behavioral effects of gangsta rap. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, *16*(1-2), 43–52.
   https://doi.org/10.1080/01973533.1995.9646100

- Harkness, G. (2014). *Chicago hustle and flow: Gangs, gangsta rap, and social class*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Harris, J. A. (1997). A further evaluation of the Aggression Questionnaire: Issues of validity and Reliability. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 35(11), 1047–1053. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0005-7967(97)00064-8

Huesmann, L. R., Moise, J. F., Podolski, C. L. (1997). The effects of media violence on the development of antisocial behavior. In D. M. Stoff, J. Breiling, & J. D. Maser (Eds.), *Handbook of antisocial behavior* (pp. 181–193). John Wiley & Sons.

- Huesmann, L. R., & Taylor, L. D. (2006). The role of media violence in violent behavior. Annual Review of Public Health, 27(1), 393–415. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.publhealth.26.021304.144640
- Johnson, J. D., Adams, M. S., Ashburn, L., & Reed, W. (1995). Differential gender effects of exposure to rap music on African American adolescents' acceptance of teen dating violence. Sex Roles: A Journal of Research, 33(7-8), 597–605. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01544683
- Johnson, J. D., Jackson, L. A., & Gatto, L. (1995). Violent attitudes and deferred academic aspirations: Deleterious effects of exposure to rap music. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 16(1-2), 27–41. <u>https://doi.org/10.1207/s15324834basp1601&2\_2</u>

- Kubrin, C. E. (2005). Gangstas, thugs, and hustlas: Identity and the code of the street in rap music. *Social Problems*, 52(3), 360–378. <u>https://doi.org/10.1525/sp.2005.52.3.360</u>
- Lauger, T. R., & Densley, J. A. (2017). Broadcasting badness: Violence, identity, and performance in the online gang rap scene. *Justice Quarterly*, 35(5), 816–841. https://doi.org/10.1080/07418825.2017.1341542
- Latkin, C. A., Edwards, C., Davey-Rothwell, M. A., & Tobin, K. E. (2017). The relationship between social desirability bias and self-reports of health, substance use, and social network factors among urban substance users in Baltimore, Maryland. *Addictive Behaviors*, 73, 133–136. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addbeh.2017.05.005
- Lennings, H. I. B., & Warburton, W. A. (2011). The effect of auditory versus visual violent media exposure on aggressive behaviour: The role of song lyrics, video clips and musical tone. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 47(4), 794-799. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2011.02.006</u>
- Mast, J. F., & McAndrew, F. T. (2011). Violent lyrics in heavy metal music can increase aggression in males. *North American Journal of Psychology*, *13*(1), 63-64.
- Miranda, D., & Claes, M. (2004). Rap music genres and deviant behaviors in French-Canadian adolescents. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 33, 113–122. <u>https://doi.org/10.1023/B:JOYO.0000013423.34021.45</u>
- Morizot, J., & Kazemian, L. (Eds.). (2015). *The development of criminal and antisocial behavior: Theory, research and practical applications*. Springer.
- Olsen, K. N., Powell, M., Anic, A., Vallerand, R. J., & Thompson, W. F. (2020). Fans of violent music: The role of passion in positive and negative emotional experience. *Musicae Scientiae*, 26(2), 364–387. https://doi.org/10.1177/1029864920951611
- Roberts, D. F., Christenson, P. G., & Gentile, D. A. (2003). The effects of violent music on children and adolescents. In D. A. Gentile (Ed.), *Media violence and children: A complete guide for parents and professionals* (pp. 153–170). Praeger.
- Romero, E., Luengo, M. A., and Sobral, J. (2001) Personality and antisocial behaviour: Study of temperamental dimensions. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 31(3), 329–348. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869(00)00139-2</u>
- Selfhout, M. H. W., Delsing, M. J. M. H., ter Bogt, T. F. M., & Meeus, W. H. J. (2008). Heavy metal and hip-hop style preferences and externalizing problem behavior: A two-wave longitudinal study. *Youth & Society*, 39(4), 435–452. https://doi.org/10.1177/0044118X07308069
- Shaver, P. R., & Mikulincer, M. (Eds.). (2011). *Human aggression and violence: Causes, manifestations, and consequences*. American Psychological Association.
- Sharman, L., & Dingle, G. A. (2015). Extreme metal music and Anger Processing. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, *9*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2015.00272

- St. Lawrence, J. S., & Joyner, D. J. (1991). The effects of sexually violent rock music on males' acceptance of violence against women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 15(1), 49–63. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.1991.tb00477.x</u>
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2013). Using multivariate statistics (6th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Tanner, J., Asbridge, M., & Wortley, S. (2009). Listening to rap: Cultures of crime, cultures of resistance. *Social Forces*, 88(2), 693–722. <u>https://doi.org/10.1353/sof.0.0271</u>
- Ter Bogt, T. F. M., Keijsers, L., & Meeus, W. H. J. (2013). Early adolescent music preferences and minor delinquency. *Pediatrics*, 131(2), e380–e389. https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2012-0708
- Thompson, W. F., Geeves, A. M., & Olsen, K. N. (2019). Who enjoys listening to violent music and why? *Psychology of Popular Media Culture*, 8(3), 218–232. https://doi.org/10.1037/ppm00 00184
- Wanamaker, C. E., & Reznikoff, M. (1989). Effects of aggressive and nonaggressive rock songs on projective and structured tests. *Journal of Psychology*, 123(6), 561–570. <u>https://doi.org/10.1080/00223980.1989.10543011</u>
- Web player: Music for everyone. Spotify. (2023). Retrieved March 9, 2023, from https://open.spotify.com

# Appendices

# Appendix A

# **Proof of analysis**

# Evidence of data and SPSS output

|             |   |  |                                       |           |  |   |  | I4 <b>(</b> )  |   | Q   |  |  |  |   |  |   |                             |  |
|-------------|---|--|---------------------------------------|-----------|--|---|--|--|---|---|--|--|--|---|--|---|-----------------------------|--|
|             | Name  | Type   | Width                                 | Decimals  | Label  | Values  | Missing  | Columns  | Align   |   |  | Role   |  |   |  |   |                             |  |
|             | lge<br>Gender   | Numeric<br>Numeric   | 11                                    | 0         | Age<br>Gender  | None<br>{1, Female  | None<br>None   | 11<br>17   | 疆 Right<br>疆 Right  | Scale Scale Scale   |  | Input<br>Input   |  |   |  |   |                             |  |
|             | lours_List  |  | 8                                     | 1         | Hours_Listeni  |   | None   | 11   | Right   | Scale   |  | Input  |  |   |  |   |                             |  |
|             | 'ears_ago   | Numeric  | 11                                    | 0         | Years_ago_list   |   | None   | 11   | Right   | Scale   |  | Input  |  |   |  |   |                             |  |
|             | lours_Wat   | Numeric  | 11                                    | 0         | Hours_Watchi   | 1   | None   | 11   | 🔳 Right   | 🛷 Scale   |  | Input  |  |   |  |   |                             |  |
| Y           | 'ears_ago   | Numeric  | 11                                    | 0         | Years_ago_wa   | . None  | None   | 11   | 🔳 Right   | 🛷 Scale   | N 1  | Input  |  |   |  |   |                             |  |
| A           | GQ1   | Numeric  | 11                                    | 0         | Once in a whil   | . None  | None   | 11   | 🗮 Right   | 🛷 Scale   | N 1  | Input  |  |   |  |   |                             |  |
|             | GQ2   | Numeric  | 11                                    | 0         | Given enough   | None  | None   | 11   | 🗮 Right   | 🛷 Scale   |  | Input  |  |   |  |   |                             |  |
|             | AGQ3  | Numeric  | 11                                    |           | If somebody  | 1   | None   | 11   | Right   | Scale   |  | Input  |  |   |  |   |                             |  |
|             | GQ4   | Numeric  | 11                                    | 0         | I get into fight   |   | None   | 11   | Right   | Scale   |  | Input  |  |   |  |   |                             |  |
|             | GQ5   | Numeric  | 11                                    | 0         | If I have to re  |   | None   | 11   | Right   | Scale   |  | Input  |  |   |  |   |                             |  |
|             | AGQ6<br>AGQ7  | Numeric<br>Numeric   | 11                                    | 0         | There are pe<br>I can think of   |   | None<br>None   | 11<br>11   | Right 🚟 Right   | Scale   |  | Input<br>Input   |  |   |  |   |                             |  |
|             | AGQ8  | Numeric  | 11                                    |           | I have threate   |   | None   | 11   | Right   | Scale Scale   |  | Input  |  |   |  |   |                             |  |
|             | AGQ8<br>AGQ9  | Numeric  | 11                                    | 0         | I have becom   |   | None   | 11   | Right   | Scale   |  | Input  |  |   |  |   |                             |  |
|             | GQ10  | Numeric  | 11                                    |           | I tell my frien  |   | None   | 11   | Right   | Scale Scale   |  | Input  |  |   |  |   |                             |  |
|             | GQ11  | Numeric  | 11                                    | 0         | I often find m   |   | None   | 11   | Right   | Scale   |  | Input  |  |   |  |   |                             |  |
|             | GQ12  | Numeric  | 11                                    | 0         | When people  |   | None   | 11   | a Right   | 🛷 Scale   |  | Input  |  |   |  |   |                             |  |
| A           | GQ13  | Numeric  | 11                                    | 0         | I can't help ge  |   | None   | 11   | 🔳 Right   | 🛷 Scale   | >  | Input  |  |   |  |   |                             |  |
|             | GQ14  | Numeric  | 11                                    | 0         | My friends sa  |   | None   | 11   | 🚎 Right   | 🛷 Scale   |  | Input  |  |   |  |   |                             |  |
|             | GQ15  | Numeric  | 11                                    |           | I flare up quic  |   | None   | 11   | 🚟 Right   | 🛷 Scale   |  | Input  |  |   |  |   |                             |  |
|             | GQ16  | Numeric  | 11                                    | 0         | When frustrat  |   | None   | 11   | a Right   | Scale   |  | Input  |  |   |  |   |                             |  |
|             | GQ17  | Numeric  | 11                                    | 0         | I sometimes f  |   | None   | 11   | Right   | Scale   |  | Input  |  |   |  |   |                             |  |
|             | GQ18  | Numeric  | 11                                    | 0         | I am an even   |   | None   | 11   | Right   | Scale   |  | Input  |  |   |  |   |                             |  |
|             | 4GQ19<br>4GQ20  | Numeric<br>Numeric   | 11                                    | 0         | Some of my fr<br>Sometimes I fl  |   | None   | 11<br>11   | 温 Right<br>温 Right  | Scale   |  | Input<br>Input   |  |   |  |   |                             |  |
|             | 4GQ20<br>4GQ21  | Numeric  | 11                                    | 0         | I have trouble   |   | None   | 11   | Right   | Scale Scale   |  | Input  |  |   |  |   |                             |  |
|             | GQ21  | Numeric  | 11                                    | 0         | I am sometim   |   | None   | 11   | Right   | Scale Scale   |  | Input  |  |   |  |   |                             |  |
|             | GQ22  | Numeric  | 11                                    | 0         | At times I feel  |   | None   | 11   | Right   | Scale Scale   |  | Input  |  |   |  |   |                             |  |
| •           | Nonparame   | 🔯 🤞  | tions                                 |           | u 🔀 🖁  | 1 <b>* =</b>  | Carl Outpu   | ttr.spv [D   | ocument2  | Variable View<br>] - IBM SPSS St  | IBM Statistics   | SPSS Statist<br>Viewer   | ics Processor i  | s ready 🕌   | Unie                                   | code:ON                                       | Classic                     |  |
| _           | Reference Notes Correlations  | tric Correla   | tions                                 |           | ¥ 🔀 🎇  | 1   | Control Contro   |  | ocument2  |   | IBM S<br>atistics  | SPSS Statist<br>Viewer   | ics Processor i  | s ready 🛃   | Unie                                   | code:ON                                       | Classic                     |  |
| E           | Correlations  | tric Correla   |                                       |           | u 🔀 🗜  | Sum of  | ANOVA  | a  | •   | ] - IBM SPSS St   | IBM S  | SPSS Statist<br>Viewer   | ics Processor i  | s ready 🛃   | Unie                                   | code:ON                                       | Classic                     |  |
| <u>.</u>    | Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Notes<br>Nonparame  | etric Correla  |                                       |           | del  | Squares   | ANOVA<br>df  | a<br>Mean S  | quare   | J - IBM SPSS St   | atistics   | SPSS Statist<br>Viewer   | ics Processor i  | s ready 🖪   | Unie                                   | code:ON                                       | Classic                     |  |
| <u>.</u>    | Correlations<br>Notes<br>Nonparame<br>Notes<br>Correlations   | etric Correla  |                                       | <u>Mc</u> | del<br>Regression<br>Residual  | Squares   | ANOVA<br>df  | a<br>Mean S<br>4 20  | •   | ] - IBM SPSS St   | atistics   | SPSS Statist<br>Viewer   | ics Processor i  | s ready 🕌   | Unio                                   | code:ON 1                                     | Classic                     |  |
| 6           | Notes<br>Correlations<br>Notes<br>Nonparame<br>Notes<br>Correlations<br>Notes<br>Nonparame  | etric Correla<br>etric Correla   | tions                                 | 1         | Regression<br>Residual<br>Total  | Squares<br>n 833.<br>23267.<br>24101.   | ANOVA<br>df<br>218<br>282 10<br>200 10   | a<br>Mean S<br>4 20<br>0 23  | quare<br>8.304  | J - IBM SPSS St   | atistics   | SPSS Statist<br>Viewer   | ics Processor i  | s ready 🔀   | Uni                                    | code:ON                                       | Classic                     |  |
| 6           | Notes     Correlations     Nonparame     Notes     Correlations     Notes     Correlations     Notes     Notes     Nonparame     Notes     Regression     Charts     Regression   | etric Correla<br>etric Correla   | tions                                 | 1         | Regression<br>Residual   | Squares<br>n 833.<br>23267.<br>24101.<br>ariable: AGQ_T   | ANOVA<br>df<br>218<br>200 10<br>OTAL   | a<br>Mean S<br>4 20<br>0 23<br>4   | quare<br>8.304<br>2.680   | F Sig.<br>.895 .470   | b  | SPSS Statist<br>Viewer   | ics Processor i  | s ready 📕   | Unio                                   | code:ON                                       | Classic                     |  |
| 6           | Notes<br>Correlations<br>Nonparame<br>Notes<br>Correlations<br>Notes<br>Nonparame<br>Notes<br>Regression<br>Notes<br>Regression<br>Charts<br>Regression<br>Notes<br>Regression  | etric Correla<br>etric Correla   | tions                                 | 1         | Regression<br>Residual<br>Total  | Squares<br>n 833.<br>23267.<br>24101.<br>ariable: AGQ_T   | ANOVA<br>df<br>218<br>200 10<br>OTAL   | a<br>Mean S<br>4 20<br>0 23<br>4   | quare<br>8.304<br>2.680<br>9_Rap_Vide   | F Sig.<br>.895 .470<br>.00_per_week,<br>Coeffi  | atistics   | SPSS Statist<br>Viewer   | ics Processor i  | s ready 🖻   | Unie                                   | code:ON                                       | Classic                     |  |
| 6           | Notes<br>Correlations<br>Nonparame<br>Notes<br>Correlations<br>Nonparame<br>Notes<br>Correlations<br>Notes<br>Regression<br>Notes<br>Regression<br>Notes<br>Charts<br>Regression  | etric Correla<br>etric Correla   | tions                                 | 1         | Regression<br>Residual<br>Total<br>A. Dependent Va<br>D. Predictors: (Co<br>Hours_Listenin   | Squares<br>n 833.<br>23267.<br>24101.<br>ariable: AGQ_T   | ANOVA<br>df<br>218<br>282 10<br>200 10<br>00TAL<br>er, Age, Hou<br>ap_Music_per  | A<br>Mean S<br>4 20<br>0 23<br>4<br>rs_Watching<br>week  | quare<br>8.304<br>2.680<br>g_Rap_Vide   | F Sig.<br>.895 .470<br>kos_per_week,<br>Coefficients  | b  | Viewer   | 95.0% Confidence   | :e Interval for B   | c                                      | orrelations                                   |                             |  |
| 6           | Notes Correlations     Notes Correlations     Notes Correlations     Notes Correlations     Notes Correlations     Notes Regression     Notes     Correlations     Notes     Notes     Notes     Notes     Notes     Notes     Notes     Notes  | etric Correla<br>etric Correla   | tions                                 | 1<br>     | Regression<br>Residual<br>Total<br>Dependent Va<br>Dependent Va<br>Predictors: (Cr<br>Hours_Listenin<br>del  | Squares<br>n 833.<br>23267.<br>24101.<br>uriable: AGQ T<br>onstant), Gend<br>ng_Gangster_R  | ANOVA<br>df<br>218<br>820 10<br>200 10<br>OTAL<br>er , Age, Hou<br>ap_Music_per<br>Unstandaa<br>B  | A<br>Mean S<br>4 20<br>0 23<br>4<br>5<br>week<br>rdized Coe<br>Std.  | quare<br>8.304<br>2.680<br>g_Rap_Vide   | F Sig.<br>.895 .470<br>tos_per_week,<br>Coeffit   | ob<br>ccients <sup>a</sup>   | Viewer<br>Sig.   | 95.0% Confidenc<br>Lower Bound   | :e Interval for B<br>Upper Bound                                    |  |   | Part                        |  |
|             | Notes     Correlations     Notes     Nonparame     Notes     Nonparame     Notes     Notes     Notes     Notes     Notes     Notes     Notes     Notes     Correlations     Notes     Correlation     Notes     Correlation     Notes     Constance     Charts     Regression     Notes     Charts     Regression     Regressid     Regression     Regresid     Regressid     Regress   | etric Correla<br>etric Correla   | tions                                 | 1         | Regression<br>Residual<br>Total<br>a. Dependent Va<br>b. Predictors: (C,<br>Hours_Listenin<br>del<br>(Constant)  | Squares<br>n 833.:<br>23267.:<br>24101.:<br>triable: AGQ_T<br>onstant), Gend<br>ng_Gangster_R   | ANOVA<br>df<br>218<br>282 10<br>200 10<br>007AL<br>er, Age, Hou<br>ap_Music_per<br>Unstanda<br>8<br>60.7   | A<br>Mean S<br>4 20<br>0 23<br>4<br>5<br>week<br>rdized Coe<br>Std.  | quare<br>8.304<br>2.680<br>g_Rap_Vide   | F Sig.<br>.895 .47(<br>.895 .47(<br>  | b  | Viewer   | 95.0% Confidence<br>Lower Bound<br>45.562  | :e Interval for B   | C<br>Zero-order                        | orrelations<br>Partial                        | Part                        | Toleran  |
|             | Notes     Correlations     Notes     Nonparame     Notes     Norparame     Notes     Nonparame     Notes     Nonparame     Notes     Notes     Notes     Notes     Correlations     Notes     Notes     Notes     Correlations     Correlations     Correlations     Correlations     Correlations     Notes     Correlations   | etric Correla<br>etric Correla   | tions                                 | 1<br>     | Regression<br>Residual<br>Total<br>I. Dependent Va<br>O. Predictors: (C<br>Hours_Listenin<br>del<br>(Constant)<br>Hours_List<br>_Rap_Mus   | Squares<br>n 833.<br>23267.<br>24101.<br>uriable: AGQ T<br>onstant), Gend<br>ng_Gangster_R  | ANOVA<br>df<br>df<br>1082<br>100<br>000<br>100<br>007AL<br>007AL<br>8<br>Unstandaa<br>8<br>00.7<br>10<br>10<br>10<br>10<br>10<br>10<br>10<br>10<br>10<br>10  | A Mean S<br>4 200<br>0 23<br>4 rs_Watching<br>week std.<br>76<br>42  | quare           8.304           2.680           guare           guare           fficients           Error           7.668           .220  | F Sig.<br>.895 .470<br>.005_per_week,<br>Coefficients<br>Beta<br>.123   | t<br>7.926<br>1.101  | Sig.<br><.001<br>.273  | 95.0% Confidenc<br>Lower Bound<br>45.562<br>194  | :e interval for B<br>Upper Bound<br>75.989<br>.678                  | C<br>Zero-order<br>.161                | orrelations<br>Partial<br>.109                | Part<br>.108                | Toleran  |
|             | Notes     Correlations     Notes     Nonparame     Notes     Nonparame     Notes     Notes     Notes     Notes     Notes     Notes     Notes     Notes     Correlations     Notes     Correlation     Notes     Correlation     Notes     Constance     Charts     Regression     Notes     Charts     Regression     Regressid     Regression     Regresid     Regressid     Regress   | etric Correla<br>etric Correla   | tions                                 | 1<br>     | Regression<br>Residual<br>Total<br>Dependent Va<br>Predictors: (C<br>Hours_Listenin<br>del<br>(Constant)<br>Hours_List<br>_Rap_Mus<br>Age  | Squares<br>n 833.:<br>23267.:<br>24101.:<br>triable: AGQ_T<br>onstant), Geno<br>ng_Gangster_R<br>tening_Gangster  | ANOVA<br>df<br>218 df<br>218 0200 10<br>000 10<br>000 10<br>00TAL<br>er, Age, Housic, per<br>Unstanda<br>ap_Music, per   | a<br><u>Mean S</u><br>4 20<br>0 23<br>4<br>  | quare           8.304           2.680           gare           gare           8.304           2.680           gare  | F         Sig.           .895         .47C           .895         .47C           .605_per_week,         Coefficients           Beta         .123           .043        043  | t<br>7.926<br>1.101<br>423   | Sig.<br><.001<br>.273<br>.673  | 95.0% Confiden<br>Lower Bound<br>45.562<br>194<br>463  | :e Interval for B<br>Upper Bound<br>75.989<br>.678<br>.300          | C<br>Zero-order<br>.161<br>077         | Forrelations<br>Partial<br>.109<br>042        | Part<br>.108<br>042         | Toleran  |
|             | Avotes     Correlations:     Avotes     Nonparame     Notes     Nonparame     Notes     Nonparame     Notes     Nonparame     Notes     Notes     Notes     Correlations:     Notes     Notes     Notes     Notes     Correlations     Avotes     Correlations     Avotes     Correlations     Avotes     Correlations     Avotes     Correlations     Avotes     Correlations     Avotes     Correlations     Correlatio   | tric Correla   | tions                                 | 1<br>     | Regression<br>Residual<br>Total<br>Dependent Va<br>Predictors: (C.<br>Hours_Listenin<br>del<br>(Constant)<br>Hours_List<br>Rap_Mus<br>Age<br>Hours_Wat<br>eos_per_w  | Squares<br>n 833.<br>23267.<br>24101.<br>triable: AGQ_T<br>agGangster_R<br>mg_Gangster_R<br>tching_Gangster<br>k_per_week   | ANOVA<br>df<br>218<br>282 10<br>200 10<br>070L<br>Unstanda<br>8<br>60.7.<br>cr<br>2.2<br>4<br>   | Mean S           4         20           0         23           4         20           76         42           81         82  | quare           8.304           2.680           guare           guare           8.304           2.680           guare           guare           guare           8.304           2.680           guare           guare           8.304           2.680           guare           guare </td <td>F         Sig.           .895         .47C           .895         .47C           .605_per_week,         .20efficients           Beta         .123           .043         .026</td> <td>t<br/>7.926<br/>1.101<br/>423<br/>.246</td> <td>Sig.<br/>&lt;.001<br/>.273<br/>.673<br/>.806</td> <td>95.0% Confiden<br/>Lower Bound<br/>45.562<br/>194<br/>463<br/>-1.284</td> <td>:e interval for B<br/>Upper Bound<br/>75.989<br/>.678<br/>.300<br/>1.647</td> <td>C<br/>Zero-order<br/>.161<br/>077<br/>.088</td> <td>orrelations<br/>Partial<br/>.109<br/>042<br/>.025</td> <td>Part<br/>.108<br/>042<br/>.024</td> <td>Toleran<br/>.77<br/>.99<br/>.83</td>   | F         Sig.           .895         .47C           .895         .47C           .605_per_week,         .20efficients           Beta         .123           .043         .026   | t<br>7.926<br>1.101<br>423<br>.246   | Sig.<br><.001<br>.273<br>.673<br>.806  | 95.0% Confiden<br>Lower Bound<br>45.562<br>194<br>463<br>-1.284  | :e interval for B<br>Upper Bound<br>75.989<br>.678<br>.300<br>1.647 | C<br>Zero-order<br>.161<br>077<br>.088 | orrelations<br>Partial<br>.109<br>042<br>.025 | Part<br>.108<br>042<br>.024 | Toleran<br>.77<br>.99<br>.83                     |
|             | Notes     Orrelations     Notes     Nonparame     Notes     Nonparame     Notes     Nonparame     Notes     Nonparame     Notes     Correlations     Notes     Correlation     Correlation     Correlation     Notes     Correlation     Notes     Correlation     Notes     Correlation     Correlatio     Correlation     Correlation     Correlatio     Correlation  | usic_per_we  | tions                                 | 1<br>     | Regression<br>Residual<br>Total<br>Dependent Va<br>Dependent Va<br>Predictors: (Cr<br>Hours_Listenin<br>del<br>(Constant)<br>Hours_List<br>_Rap_Mus<br>Age<br>Hours_Wat<br>eos_per_w<br>Gender                             | Squares<br>n 833.:<br>23267.:<br>24101.:<br>riable: AGQ T<br>onstant), Gen<br>g_Gangster_R<br>ening_Gangster<br>Ic, per_week<br>tching_Rap_Vireeek  | ANOVA<br>df<br>218<br>282 100<br>200 10<br>OTAL<br>Unstanda<br>B<br>0<br>0<br>0<br>0<br>0<br>0<br>0<br>0<br>0<br>0<br>0<br>0<br>0<br>0<br>0<br>0<br>0<br>0   | Mean S           4         20           0         23           4         20           76         42           81         82  | quare           8.304           2.680           gare           gare           8.304           2.680           gare  | F         Sig.           .895         .47C           .895         .47C           .605_per_week,         Coefficients           Beta         .123           .043        043  | t<br>7.926<br>1.101<br>423   | Sig.<br><.001<br>.273<br>.673  | 95.0% Confiden<br>Lower Bound<br>45.562<br>194<br>463  | :e Interval for B<br>Upper Bound<br>75.989<br>.678<br>.300          | C<br>Zero-order<br>.161<br>077         | Forrelations<br>Partial<br>.109<br>042        | Part<br>.108<br>042         | Toleran<br>.77<br>.99<br>.83                     |
| e<br>e<br>e | Avotes   | usic_per_we  | tions                                 | 1<br>     | Regression<br>Residual<br>Total<br>Dependent Va<br>Predictors: (C.<br>Hours_Listenin<br>del<br>(Constant)<br>Hours_List<br>Rap_Mus<br>Age<br>Hours_Wat<br>eos_per_w  | Squares<br>n 833.:<br>23267.:<br>24101.:<br>riable: AGQ T<br>onstant), Gen<br>g_Gangster_R<br>ening_Gangster<br>Ic, per_week<br>tching_Rap_Vireeek  | ANOVA<br>df<br>218<br>282 100<br>200 10<br>OTAL<br>Unstanda<br>B<br>0<br>0<br>0<br>0<br>0<br>0<br>0<br>0<br>0<br>0<br>0<br>0<br>0<br>0<br>0<br>0<br>0<br>0   | Mean S           4         20           0         23           4         20           76         42           81         82  | quare           8.304           2.680           guare           guare           8.304           2.680           guare           guare           guare           8.304           2.680           guare           guare           8.304           2.680           guare           guare </td <td>F         Sig.           .895         .47C           .895         .47C           .605_per_week,         .20efficients           Beta         .123           .043         .026</td> <td>t<br/>7.926<br/>1.101<br/>423<br/>.246</td> <td>Sig.<br/>&lt;.001<br/>.273<br/>.673<br/>.806</td> <td>95.0% Confiden<br/>Lower Bound<br/>45.562<br/>194<br/>463<br/>-1.284</td> <td>:e interval for B<br/>Upper Bound<br/>75.989<br/>.678<br/>.300<br/>1.647</td> <td>C<br/>Zero-order<br/>.161<br/>077<br/>.088</td> <td>orrelations<br/>Partial<br/>.109<br/>042<br/>.025</td> <td>Part<br/>.108<br/>042<br/>.024</td> <td>Toleran<br/>.77<br/>.95<br/>.83</td>   | F         Sig.           .895         .47C           .895         .47C           .605_per_week,         .20efficients           Beta         .123           .043         .026   | t<br>7.926<br>1.101<br>423<br>.246   | Sig.<br><.001<br>.273<br>.673<br>.806  | 95.0% Confiden<br>Lower Bound<br>45.562<br>194<br>463<br>-1.284  | :e interval for B<br>Upper Bound<br>75.989<br>.678<br>.300<br>1.647 | C<br>Zero-order<br>.161<br>077<br>.088 | orrelations<br>Partial<br>.109<br>042<br>.025 | Part<br>.108<br>042<br>.024 | Toleran<br>.77<br>.95<br>.83                     |
|             | Notes     Orrelations     Notes     Nonparame     Notes     Nonparame     Notes     Nonparame     Notes     Nonparame     Notes     Correlations     Notes     Correlation     Correlation     Correlation     Notes     Correlation     Notes     Correlation     Notes     Correlation     Correlatio     Correlation     Correlation     Correlatio     Correlation  | usic_per_we<br>deos_per_w<br>OTAL  | tions                                 | 1<br>     | Regression<br>Residual<br>Total<br>Dependent Va<br>Dependent Va<br>Predictors: (Cr<br>Hours_Listenin<br>del<br>(Constant)<br>Hours_List<br>_Rap_Mus<br>Age<br>Hours_Wat<br>eos_per_w<br>Gender                             | Squares<br>n 833.:<br>23267.:<br>24101.:<br>riable: AGQ T<br>onstant), Gen<br>rg_Gangster_R<br>ening_Gangster<br>Ic, per_week<br>tching_Rap_Vireeek   | ANOVA<br>df<br>218<br>282 10<br>200 10<br>007AL<br>Unstanda<br>8<br>660.7<br>cr<br>2.3<br>0<br>d<br>.1<br>2.3<br>OTAL  | a<br>Mean S<br>4 20<br>0 23<br>4<br>rs_Watching<br>week<br>rdized Coe<br>Std.<br>76<br>42<br>81<br>82<br>95  | Quare<br>8.304<br>2.680<br>A_Rap_Vide<br>fficients<br>Error<br>7.668<br>.220<br>.192<br>.739<br>3.130   | F         Sig.           .895         .470           .895         .470           .005.per_week,         Coefficients           Beta         .123           .026         .078  | t<br>7.926<br>1.101<br>423<br>.246   | Sig.<br><.001<br>.273<br>.673<br>.806  | 95.0% Confiden<br>Lower Bound<br>45.562<br>194<br>463<br>-1.284  | :e interval for B<br>Upper Bound<br>75.989<br>.678<br>.300<br>1.647 | C<br>Zero-order<br>.161<br>077<br>.088 | orrelations<br>Partial<br>.109<br>042<br>.025 | Part<br>.108<br>042<br>.024 | Toleran<br>.77<br>.95<br>.83                     |
|             | Notes     Correlations     Notes     Nonparame     Notes     Nonparame     Notes     Nonparame     Notes     Nonparame     Notes     Nonparame     Notes     Notes     Correlations     Notes     Correlation     Notes     C   | usic_per_we<br>deos_per_w<br>OTAL  | tions                                 | 1<br>     | Regression<br>Residual<br>Total<br>Dependent Va<br>Dependent Va<br>Predictors: (Cr<br>Hours_Listenin<br>del<br>(Constant)<br>Hours_List<br>_Rap_Mus<br>Age<br>Hours_Wat<br>eos_per_w<br>Gender                             | Squares<br>n 833.:<br>23267.:<br>24101.:<br>riable: AGQ T<br>onstant), Gen<br>rg_Gangster_R<br>ening_Gangster<br>Ic, per_week<br>tching_Rap_Vireeek   | ANOVA<br>df<br>218<br>282 10<br>200 10<br>007AL<br>Unstanda<br>8<br>660.7<br>cr<br>2.3<br>0<br>d<br>.1<br>2.3<br>OTAL  | Mean S           4         20           0         23           4         20           76         42           81         82  | Quare<br>8.304<br>2.680<br>A_Rap_Vide<br>fficients<br>Error<br>7.668<br>.220<br>.192<br>.739<br>3.130   | F         Sig.           .895         .47C           .895         .47C           .605_per_week,         .005           Beta         .123          043         .026           .078         .078  | t<br>cients <sup>a</sup><br>7.926<br>1.101<br>423<br>.246<br>.765  | Sig.<br><.001<br>.273<br>.673<br>.806<br>.446  | 95.0% Confiden<br>Lower Bound<br>45.562<br>194<br>463<br>-1.284  | :e interval for B<br>Upper Bound<br>75.989<br>.678<br>.300<br>1.647 | C<br>Zero-order<br>.161<br>077<br>.088 | orrelations<br>Partial<br>.109<br>042<br>.025 | Part<br>.108<br>042<br>.024 | Toleran<br>.77<br>.95<br>.83                     |
|             | Notes     Correlations     Notes     Nonparame     Notes     Nonparame     Notes  | usic_per_we<br>deos_per_we<br>OTAL   | tions                                 | 1<br>     | Regression<br>Residual<br>Total<br>Dependent Va<br>Dependent Va<br>Predictors: (Cr<br>Hours_Listenin<br>del<br>(Constant)<br>Hours_List<br>_Rap_Mus<br>Age<br>Hours_Wat<br>eos_per_w<br>Gender                             | Squares<br>n 833.:<br>23267.:<br>24101.:<br>riable: AGQ T<br>onstant), Gen<br>rg_Gangster_R<br>ening_Gangster<br>Ic, per_week<br>tching_Rap_Vireeek   | ANOVA<br>df<br>218<br>282 10<br>200 10<br>007AL<br>Unstanda<br>8<br>660.7<br>cr<br>2.3<br>0<br>d<br>.1<br>2.3<br>OTAL  | a<br>Mean S<br>4 20<br>0 23<br>4<br>rs_Watching<br>week<br>rdized Coe<br>Std.<br>76<br>42<br>81<br>82<br>95  | Quare<br>Quare<br>3.3.304<br>2.680<br>2.680<br>2.680<br>2.680<br>2.680<br>2.680<br>2.680<br>2.680<br>2.739<br>3.130<br>Diagnos<br>Hou   | F Sig.<br>.895 .470<br>.895 .470<br>.005_per_week,<br>.005_per_week,<br>.006<br>.006<br>.0078<br>.026<br>.078<br>.026<br>.078<br>.026<br>.078   | t<br>cients <sup>a</sup><br>7.926<br>1.101<br>423<br>.246<br>.765  | Sig.<br><.001<br>.273<br>.673<br>.806<br>.446  | 95.0% Confiden<br>Lower Bound<br>45.562<br>194<br>463<br>-1.284  | :e interval for B<br>Upper Bound<br>75.989<br>.678<br>.300<br>1.647 | C<br>Zero-order<br>.161<br>077<br>.088 | orrelations<br>Partial<br>.109<br>042<br>.025 | Part<br>.108<br>042<br>.024 | Toleran<br>.77<br>.99<br>.83                     |
|             | Notes     Correlations     Notes     Nonparame     Notes     Charts     Regression     Regression     Rotes     Charts     Regression     Regression     Rotes     Charts     Regression     Rotes     Regression     Regression     Rotes     Regression     Rotes     Regression     Regression     Rotes     Regression     Rotes     Regression     Regression     Rotes     Regression     Regression     Rotes     Regression     Regression     Regression     Regression     Rotes     Regression     Regressi     Regresi     Regression     Regresi     Regressi     Regresion   | usic_per_we<br>deos_per_w<br>oTAL  | tions                                 | 1<br>     | Regression<br>Residual<br>Total<br>Dependent Va<br>Dependent Va<br>Predictors: (Cr<br>Hours_Listenin<br>del<br>(Constant)<br>Hours_List<br>_Rap_Mus<br>Age<br>Hours_Wat<br>eos_per_w<br>Gender                             | Squares<br>n 833.:<br>23267.:<br>24101.:<br>riable: AGQ T<br>onstant), Gen<br>rg_Gangster_R<br>ening_Gangster<br>Ic, per_week<br>tching_Rap_Vireeek   | ANOVA<br>df<br>118<br>182<br>200<br>0 TAL<br>er , Age, Hou<br>ap_Music_per<br>Unstanda<br>8<br>6 60.7,<br>rr<br>c.<br>3<br>1<br>2.3<br>OTAL<br>Co  | a<br>Mean S<br>4 20<br>0 23<br>4<br>rs_Watching<br>week<br>rdized Coe<br>Std.<br>76<br>42<br>81<br>82<br>95  | Quare<br>Quare<br>3.3.304<br>2.680<br>2.680<br>2.680<br>2.680<br>2.680<br>2.680<br>2.680<br>2.680<br>2.739<br>3.130<br>Diagnos<br>Hou   | F Sig.<br>.895 .470<br>.895 .470<br>.005_per_week,<br>.005_per_week,<br>.006<br>.006<br>.0078<br>.026<br>.078<br>.026<br>.078<br>.026<br>.078   | t<br>cicents <sup>a</sup><br>t<br>7.926<br>1.101<br>1.01<br>1.02<br>1.02<br>1.02<br>1.01<br>1.02<br>1.01<br>1.01 | Sig.<br><.001<br>.273<br>.673<br>.806<br>.446  | 95.0% Confiden<br>Lower Bound<br>45.562<br>194<br>463<br>-1.284  | :e interval for B<br>Upper Bound<br>75.989<br>.678<br>.300<br>1.647 | C<br>Zero-order<br>.161<br>077<br>.088 | orrelations<br>Partial<br>.109<br>042<br>.025 | Part<br>.108<br>042<br>.024 | Toleran<br>.77<br>.95<br>.83                     |
|             | Avotes     Correlations     Avotes     Notes     Regression     Notes     Correlations     Regression     Notes     Correlation     Solution     Correlation     Correlat   | usic_per_we<br>deos_per_w<br>oTAL  | tions                                 | 1<br>     | Regression<br>Residual<br>Total<br>J. Dependent Va<br>D. Porektors: (C.<br>Hours_Listenir<br>del<br>(Constant)<br>Hours_Listenir<br>(Constant)<br>Hours_Listenir<br>Gender<br>Age<br>Gender<br>J. Dependent Va             | Squares<br>n 833.3<br>23267:<br>23267:<br>24101.3<br>24101.3<br>24101.3<br>24101.3<br>canast<br>rriable: AGQ T<br>rriable: AGQ T  | ANOVA<br>df<br>218<br>282 10<br>200 10<br>007AL<br>Unstanda<br>8<br>660.7<br>cr<br>2.3<br>0<br>d<br>.1<br>2.3<br>OTAL  | a<br>Mean S<br>4 20<br>0 23<br>4<br>rs_Watching<br>week<br>rdized Coe<br>Std.<br>76<br>42<br>81<br>82<br>95  | quare           3.304           2.680           guare           gaare           gaare </td <td>F         Sig.           .895         .470           .895         .470           .895         .470           .895         .470           .895         .470           .895         .470           .895         .470           .895         .470           .895         .470           .026         .026           .078         .026           .078         .026           .078         .026</td> <td>t<br/>cients<sup>a</sup><br/>cients<sup>a</sup><br/>t<br/>7.926<br/>1.101<br/>423<br/>.246<br/>.765</td> <td>Sig.<br/>&lt;.001<br/>.273<br/>.673<br/>.806<br/>.446</td> <td>95.0% Confiden<br/>Lower Bound<br/>45.562<br/>194<br/>463<br/>-1.284</td> <td>:e interval for B<br/>Upper Bound<br/>75.989<br/>.678<br/>.300<br/>1.647</td> <td>C<br/>Zero-order<br/>.161<br/>077<br/>.088</td> <td>orrelations<br/>Partial<br/>.109<br/>042<br/>.025</td> <td>Part<br/>.108<br/>042<br/>.024</td> <td>Toleran<br/>.77<br/>.95<br/>.83</td>  | F         Sig.           .895         .470           .895         .470           .895         .470           .895         .470           .895         .470           .895         .470           .895         .470           .895         .470           .895         .470           .026         .026           .078         .026           .078         .026           .078         .026  | t<br>cients <sup>a</sup><br>cients <sup>a</sup><br>t<br>7.926<br>1.101<br>423<br>.246<br>.765                    | Sig.<br><.001<br>.273<br>.673<br>.806<br>.446  | 95.0% Confiden<br>Lower Bound<br>45.562<br>194<br>463<br>-1.284  | :e interval for B<br>Upper Bound<br>75.989<br>.678<br>.300<br>1.647 | C<br>Zero-order<br>.161<br>077<br>.088 | orrelations<br>Partial<br>.109<br>042<br>.025 | Part<br>.108<br>042<br>.024 | Toleran<br>.77<br>.95<br>.83                     |
|             | Notes     Correlations     Notes     Nonparame     Notes     Charts     Regression     Regression     Rotes     Charts     Regression     Regression     Rotes     Charts     Regression     Rotes     Regression     Regression     Regression     Rotes     Regression     Rotes     Regression     Rotes     Regression     Rotes     Regression     Regression     Rotes     Regression     Regression     Rotes     Regression     Regression     Regression     Regression     Rotes     Regression     Regressi     Regresi     Regression     Regresi     Regressi     Regresion   | usic_per_we<br>deos_per_w<br>oTAL  | tions                                 | 1<br>     | Regression<br>Residual<br>Total<br>Dependent Va<br>Dependent Va<br>Predictors: (Cr<br>Hours_Listenin<br>del<br>(Constant)<br>Hours_List<br>_Rap_Mus<br>Age<br>Hours_Wat<br>eos_per_w<br>Gender                             | Square:<br>n 833.3<br>23267.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>1718b: ACQ<br>nonstant), Gene<br>rinable: ACQ<br>rinable: ACQ<br>triable: ACQ<br>T<br>Eigenvalue<br>3.413   | ANOVA<br>a df<br>218<br>218<br>218<br>218<br>218<br>218<br>218<br>218  | a<br>Mean S<br>4 200<br>233<br>4<br>dized Coe<br>Sed.<br>76<br>42<br>56<br>57<br>59<br>50<br>50<br>50<br>50<br>50<br>50<br>50<br>50<br>50<br>50  | quare           a,304           a,304           2,680           a,Rap_Vide           Fincients           2,680           1,92           7,739           3,130           Diagnos           Hour           0,0  | F Sig.<br>.895 .470<br>.005_per_week,<br>.005_per_week,<br>.005_per_week,<br>.006<br>.0078<br>.0078<br>.0078<br>.0078<br>.0078<br>.0078<br>.0078<br>.0078<br>.0078  | t<br>ccients <sup>a</sup><br>t<br>7.926<br>1.101<br>423<br>.246<br>.765<br>roportion<br>Ht<br>9.<br>9.<br>.01    | Sig.           <.001   | 95.0% Confiden<br>Lower Bound<br>45.562<br>124<br>463<br>-1.284<br>-3.815<br>Gender<br>.01               | :e interval for B<br>Upper Bound<br>75.989<br>.678<br>.300<br>1.647 | C<br>Zero-order<br>.161<br>077<br>.088 | orrelations<br>Partial<br>.109<br>042<br>.025 | Part<br>.108<br>042<br>.024 | Toleran<br>.77<br>.95<br>.83                     |
|             | Notes     Correlations     Notes     Nonparame     Notes     Charts     Regression     Rotes     Regression     Rotes     Charts     Regression     Rotes     Regression     Regression     Rotes     Charts     Regression     Regression     Regression     Rotes     Regression     Regrese     Regression     Regrese     Regression     Regression     R   | tric Correla<br>tric Correla<br>tric Correla<br>usic_per, we<br>deos.per, we<br>usic_per, we   | tions<br>tions<br>rek<br>rek          | Ma        | Regression Residual Total Lopendent Va Dorgendent Va del Constant Hours_Listenir Hours_Listenir Rap_Mus Age Hours_Yea Age Lopendent Va Gender Lopendent Va del Dimension 1 2   | Square:<br>n 833.3<br>23267:<br>23267:<br>24101<br>23267:<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>241.  | ANOVA<br>df<br>218<br>382 100<br>200 10<br>OTAL<br>Unstanda<br>8<br>60.7<br>rr -2.7<br>d -0.1<br>d -0.1<br>2.3<br>OTAL<br>Condition<br>Index<br>1.0<br>1.8   | Mean S           4         20           0         23           4         20           7         75           7         76           42         81           81         20           95         95           Illinearity         (Const           (Const         00           00         00 | quare           3.304           2.680           J.Rap.Vide           fficiens           7.668           .220           .172           3.130           Diagnoss           Bigs           .00           .00   | F         Sig.           .895         .470           .895         .470           .895         .470           .895         .470           .895         .470           .123         .043           .026         .078           standardized         .028           .028         .078           standardized         .123           .026         .078           .026         .078           .026         .02           .12         .02 | t<br>cients <sup>a</sup><br>t<br>7.926<br>1.101<br>  | Sig.<br><.001<br>.273<br>.673<br>.806<br>.446<br>sours.Watchin<br>Rap.Videk<br>.02<br>.46<br>.02<br>.46  | 95.0% Confidenc<br>Lower Bound<br>45.562<br>194<br>463<br>-1.284<br>-3.815<br>Gender<br>.01<br>.00       | :e interval for B<br>Upper Bound<br>75.989<br>.678<br>.300<br>1.647 | C<br>Zero-order<br>.161<br>077<br>.088 | orrelations<br>Partial<br>.109<br>042<br>.025 | Part<br>.108<br>042<br>.024 | Collinea<br>Tolerane<br>.77<br>.95<br>.83<br>.92 |
|             | Correlations<br>Notes<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Notes<br>Correlations<br>Notes<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations<br>Correlations | tric Correla<br>tric Correla<br>tr | tions<br>tions<br>rek<br>rek          | Ma        | Regression<br>Residual<br>Total<br>Dependent Va<br>Predictors: (Chours_Listenin<br>Hours_Listenin<br>Hours_Listenin<br>Hours_Listenin<br>Hours_Listenin<br>Hours_Listenin<br>Age<br>Hours_Wat<br>Gender<br>L. Dependent Va | Squares<br>n 833.3<br>23267.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>2410.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>2410.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>24101.<br>2410.<br>2410.<br>2410.<br>2410.<br>2410.<br>2410.<br>2410.<br>2410.<br>2410. | ANOVA<br>ANOVA<br>a df<br>218<br>218<br>218<br>218<br>200 10<br>00 10<br>00<br>00<br>00 10<br>00<br>00<br>00 10<br>00<br>00<br>00<br>00<br>00<br>00 | a<br>Mean S<br>4 200<br>0 234<br>4 200<br>0 234<br>4 200<br>0 234<br>4 200<br>0 234<br>8 2<br>5 3<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1   | quare           3.304           3.304           2.680           guare           guare </td <td>F         Sig.           .895         .470           .895         .470           .005.per_week,        </td> <td>t<br/>ccients<sup>a</sup><br/>t<br/>7.926<br/>1.101<br/>423<br/>.246<br/>.765<br/>.01<br/>.01<br/>.01</td> <td>Sig.<br/>&lt;.001<br/>.273<br/>.673<br/>.806<br/>.446<br/>s<br/>ours.Watchin<br/>Rap.Wdeos<br/>.per_wdeos<br/>.02<br/>.426<br/>.52<br/>.623<br/>.426<br/>.525<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.625<br/>.62</td> <td>95.0% Confiden<br/>Lower Bound<br/>45.562<br/>194<br/>463<br/>-1.284<br/>-3.815<br/>Cender<br/>.01<br/>.00<br/>.00</td> <td>:e interval for B<br/>Upper Bound<br/>75.989<br/>.678<br/>.300<br/>1.647</td> <td>C<br/>Zero-order<br/>.161<br/>077<br/>.088</td> <td>orrelations<br/>Partial<br/>.109<br/>042<br/>.025</td> <td>Part<br/>.108<br/>042<br/>.024</td> <td>Toleran<br/>.77<br/>.95<br/>.83</td> | F         Sig.           .895         .470           .895         .470           .005.per_week,   | t<br>ccients <sup>a</sup><br>t<br>7.926<br>1.101<br>423<br>.246<br>.765<br>.01<br>.01<br>.01                     | Sig.<br><.001<br>.273<br>.673<br>.806<br>.446<br>s<br>ours.Watchin<br>Rap.Wdeos<br>.per_wdeos<br>.02<br>.426<br>.52<br>.623<br>.426<br>.525<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.625<br>.62 | 95.0% Confiden<br>Lower Bound<br>45.562<br>194<br>463<br>-1.284<br>-3.815<br>Cender<br>.01<br>.00<br>.00 | :e interval for B<br>Upper Bound<br>75.989<br>.678<br>.300<br>1.647 | C<br>Zero-order<br>.161<br>077<br>.088 | orrelations<br>Partial<br>.109<br>042<br>.025 | Part<br>.108<br>042<br>.024 | Toleran<br>.77<br>.95<br>.83                     |
|             | Notes     Correlations     Notes     Notes     Notes     Notes     Notes     Notes     Notes     Correlations     Notes     Correlations     Notes     Correlations     Notes     Correlations     Notes     Correlations  | tric Correla<br>tric Correla<br>tr | tions<br>tions<br>tek<br>reek<br>reek | Ma        | Regression Residual Total Lopendent Va Dorgendent Va del Constant Hours_Listenir Hours_Listenir Rap_Mus Age Hours_Yea Age Lopendent Va Gender Lopendent Va del Dimension 1 2   | Square:<br>n 833.3<br>23267:<br>23267:<br>24101<br>23267:<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>24101<br>241.  | ANOVA<br>df<br>218<br>382 100<br>200 10<br>OTAL<br>Unstanda<br>8<br>60.7<br>rr -2.7<br>d -0.1<br>d -0.1<br>2.3<br>OTAL<br>Condition<br>Index<br>1.0<br>1.8   | Mean S           4         20           0         23           4         20           7         23           7         5           812         95           95         95           Illinearity           (Constr           00         20           20         37           10         0   | quare           3.304           2.680           J.Rap.Vide           fficiens           7.668           .220           .172           3.130           Diagnoss           Bigs           .00           .00   | F         Sig.           .895         .470           .895         .470           .895         .470           .895         .470           .895         .470           .123         .043           .026         .078           standardized         .028           .028         .078           standardized         .123           .026         .078           .026         .078           .026         .02           .12         .02 | t<br>cients <sup>a</sup><br>t<br>7.926<br>1.101<br>  | Sig.<br><.001<br>.273<br>.673<br>.806<br>.446<br>sours.Watchin<br>Rap.Videk<br>.02<br>.46<br>.02<br>.46  | 95.0% Confidenc<br>Lower Bound<br>45.562<br>194<br>463<br>-1.284<br>-3.815<br>Gender<br>.01<br>.00       | :e interval for B<br>Upper Bound<br>75.989<br>.678<br>.300<br>1.647 | C<br>Zero-order<br>.161<br>077<br>.088 | orrelations<br>Partial<br>.109<br>042<br>.025 | Part<br>.108<br>042<br>.024 | Toleran<br>.77<br>.95<br>.83                     |

# Appendix B

### **Gangster Rap Exposure questionnaire**

## **Instructions**

Please fill out the answers about your experience with Gangster Rap by writing it down in numbers

#### Items

- Please type in an estimate of how many hours per week you listen to Gangster Rap music (in numbers)If you never do, just type in 0
- Please type in an estimate of how many years ago you started listening to Gangster Rap music (in numbers) If you never did, just type in 0
- Please type in an estimate of how many hours per week you watch Gangster Rap music videos (in numbers) If you never do, just type in 0
- Please type in an estimate of how many years ago you started watching Gangster Rap music videos (in numbers) If you never did, just type in 0

# Appendix C

# **Buss & Perry Aggression Questionnaire (1992)**

## Instructions

Please rate each of the following items in terms of how characteristic they are of you.

Please base the rating from 1- Extremely uncharacteristic of me to 5- Extremely characteristic of me

#### Items

1)Once in a while I can't control the urge to strike another person

- 1. Extremely uncharacteristic of me
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5. Extremely characteristic of me

# 2)Given enough provocation, I may hit another person

- 1. Extremely uncharacteristic of me
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5. Extremely characteristic of me

# 3)If somebody hits me, I hit back

- 1. Extremely uncharacteristic of me
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5. Extremely characteristic of me

4)I get into fights a little more than the average person

- 1. Extremely uncharacteristic of me
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5. Extremely characteristic of me

5)If I have to resort to violence to protect my rights, I will

- 1. Extremely uncharacteristic of me
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5. Extremely characteristic of me

6)There are people who pushed me so far that we came to blows

- 1. Extremely uncharacteristic of me
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5. Extremely characteristic of me

7)I can think of no good reason for ever hitting a person\*\*

- 1. Extremely uncharacteristic of me
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5. Extremely characteristic of me

8)I have threatened people I know

- 1. Extremely uncharacteristic of me
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5. Extremely characteristic of me

9)I have become so mad that I have broken things

- 1. Extremely uncharacteristic of me
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5. Extremely characteristic of me

# 10)I tell my friends openly when I disagree with them

1. Extremely uncharacteristic of me

- 2.
- 3.
- 4.

5. Extremely characteristic of me

# 11)I often find myself disagreeing with people

- 1. Extremely uncharacteristic of me
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5. Extremely characteristic of me

# 12)When people annoy me, I may tell them what I think of them

- 1. Extremely uncharacteristic of me
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5. Extremely characteristic of me

# 13)I can't help getting into arguments when people disagree with me

- 1. Extremely uncharacteristic of me
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5. Extremely characteristic of me

# 14)My friends say that I'm somewhat argumentative

1. Extremely uncharacteristic of me

- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5. Extremely characteristic of me

# 15)I flare up quickly but get over it quickly

- 1. Extremely uncharacteristic of me
- 2.
- 3.

4.

5. Extremely characteristic of me

16)When frustrated, I let my irritation show

- 1. Extremely uncharacteristic of me
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5. Extremely characteristic of me

17)I sometimes feel like a powder keg ready to explode

- 1. Extremely uncharacteristic of me
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5. Extremely characteristic of me

18)I am an even-tempered person\*\*

- 1. Extremely uncharacteristic of me
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5. Extremely characteristic of me

19)Some of my friends think I'm a hothead

- 1. Extremely uncharacteristic of me
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5. Extremely characteristic of me

20)Sometimes I fly off the handle for no good reason

1. Extremely uncharacteristic of me

- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5. Extremely characteristic of me

21)I have trouble controlling my temper

- 1. Extremely uncharacteristic of me
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5. Extremely characteristic of me

22)I am sometimes eaten up with jealousy

- 1. Extremely uncharacteristic of me
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5. Extremely characteristic of me

23)At times I feel I have gotten a raw deal out of life

- 1. Extremely uncharacteristic of me
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5. Extremely characteristic of me

# 24)Other people always seem to get the breaks

- 1. Extremely uncharacteristic of me
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5. Extremely characteristic of me

25)I wonder why sometimes I feel so bitter about things.

1. Extremely uncharacteristic of me

2.

3.

4.

5. Extremely characteristic of me

26)I know that "friends" talk about me behind my back

1. Extremely uncharacteristic of me

2.

3.

4.

5. Extremely characteristic of me

27)I am suspicious of overly friendly strangers.

1. Extremely uncharacteristic of me

2.

3.

4.

5. Extremely characteristic of me

28)I sometimes feel that people are laughing at me behind my back.

1. Extremely uncharacteristic of me

2.

3.

4.

5. Extremely characteristic of me

29)When people are especially nice, I wonder what they want.

1. Extremely uncharacteristic of me

2.

3.

4.

5. Extremely characteristic of me

## Appendix D

## **Information Sheet and Consent Form**

#### **Information Sheet**

### **Gangster Rap Study**

You are invited to take part into a research study. Before deciding if taking part, please take time to read this document which explains the reason why the research is done and what it would involve for you to take part. If you have any questions about the information provided do not hesitate to contact me using the contact details at the end of the sheet.

## What is this study about?

I am a final year student in the BA in Psychology programme at the National College of Ireland. As part of our degree, we must carry out an independent research project. Therefore, I decided to investigate whether frequent exposure to the popular genre of Gangster rap will predict different aggressive outcomes.

#### What will be taking part in the study involve?

If you decide to be part of the study, you will be asked to complete two online questionnaires. The first one will measure your current and past exposure to the genre of Gangster Rap, and the second one will assess your level of aggression. Both questionnaires are short in time and may take you around 10 minutes to complete them.

#### Who can take part?

You can take part if you are over 18 years old and have access to a computer to answer the questionnaires

#### Do I have to take part?

Participation in this research is voluntary, there will be no consequences for you not taking part in this research. If you decide to take part, you can withdraw anytime during the participation. However, once you submitted your questionnaire, it will not be possible to withdraw your data from the study, as the study is anonymous, and the individual response cannot be identified to be deleted.

#### What are the possible risks and benefits of taking part?

There are no direct benefits for you as a participant when taking part in this research. However, the information gathered from your participation will benefit you as you are contributing to the general knowledge, helping us understand whether being frequently exposed to gangster rap can predict different aggressive outcomes.

The Aggression questionnaire will be asking about your level of physical aggression, verbal aggression, anger and hostility. Therefore, there is a small risk that these questions may offend you. You should not take part in the study if you feel that these questions may distress you. If you decide to participate and feel any sort of distress you are free to discontinue participation and exit the questionnaire if it is not submitted. Contact information for relevant support services is also provided at the end of the questionnaire.

#### Will taking part be confidential and what will happen to my data?

The questionnaires administered are anonymous, there is no possibility to identify a participant in relation to their responses in the questionnaire. The data collected from the study will be treated with strict confidence. Only the researcher and supervisor will have

access to the data. Data will be retained for 5 years in accordance with the NCI data retention policy.

## What will happen to the results of the study?

The results of the study will be presented in my final dissertation, which will be submitted to the National College of Ireland.

## Who should you contact for further information?

If you precise further information or have any doubt which has not been clarified, please do not hesitate to contact me

Pilar Fernandez Salgado email - x20117612@student.ncirl.ie

## **Consent Form**

In agreeing to participate in this research I understand the following:

- The method proposed for this research project has been approved in principle by the Departmental Ethics Committee, which means that the Committee does not have concerns about the procedure itself as detailed by the student. It is, however, Pilar Fernandez Salgado's responsibility to adhere to ethical guidelines in their dealings with participants and the collection and handling of data.
- If I have any concerns about participation, I understand that I may refuse to participate or withdraw at any stage by exiting my browser.

- I understand that once my participation has ended, that I cannot withdraw my data as it will be fully anonymised.
- I have been informed as to the general nature of the study and agree voluntarily to participate.
- All data from the study will be treated confidentially. The data from all participants will be compiled, analysed, and submitted in a report to the Psychology Department in the School of Business.
- I understand that my data will be retained and managed in accordance with the NCI data retention policy and that my anonymised data may be archived on an online data repository and may be used for secondary data analysis. No participants' data will be identifiable at any point.
- At the conclusion of my participation, any questions or concerns I have will be fully addressed.

Please tick this box if you have read, and agree with all of the above information. Please tick this box to indicate that you are providing informed consent to participate in this study.

## **Appendix E**

## **Debriefing Form**

Thank you for participating in this study. This sheet will provide you with full details of the study in which you participated. The purpose of the study was to investigate if the amount of exposure to Gangster rap can predict different aggressive outcomes, as in the past different research aimed to address this question but the findings were inconsistent throughout the time.

You, as other participants were asked about the frequency of exposure to Gangster Rap and therefore after assessed your aggression levels. All the data obtained from the questionnaires is anonymised, therefore, at this point there is no possibility of withdrawing the data, however, you will not be identified and the data collected from the study will be treated with strict confidence.

If any of the questions given in the Aggression Questionnaire caused you any sort of distress I will attach a free and anonymous helpline service 24 hours available. Thank you again for taking part in this research. If there is anything you would like to discuss in relation to this study, feel free to do so by contacting me.

Mental Health Text Support - Free & Anonymous Service-<u>https://text50808.ie</u> Pilar Fernandez Salgado - email : x20117612@student.ncirl.ie