

Sandra Liliana Cuervo
Concepción Medrano
Ana Aierbe
Universidad del País Vasco

DOI: 10.5944/educXX1.16472

Cómo referenciar este artículo/How to reference this article:

Cuervo, S. L., Medrano, C. y Aierbe, A. (2016). Televisión y valores percibidos por los adolescentes: Diferencias transculturales y de género. *Educación XXI*, 19(2), 383-404, doi: 10.5944/educXX1.16472

Cuervo, S. L., Medrano, C., & Aierbe, A. (2016). Values perceived by adolescents on television: Cross-cultural and gender differences. *Educación XXI*, 19(2), 383-404, doi: 10.5944/educXX1.16472

RESUMEN

La percepción de los valores en la adolescencia continua generando interrogantes que se amplían cuando los grupos de análisis cambian patrones contextuales y se analizan teniendo en cuenta la variable género, por ello el objetivo de este trabajo fue conocer las diferencias en los valores percibidos por los adolescentes en el personaje de su programa favorito en relación al origen cultural y el género, en una muestra de 1221 adolescentes latinoamericanos, irlandeses y españoles entre los 14 y 19 años. El instrumento utilizado fue el cuestionario Val. Tv 0.2 que es una adaptación de la escala de Schwartz. Nuestros hallazgos apuntan a que las diferencias culturales son mayores que las relacionadas con el género, a favor de las adolescentes. Por géneros, las mujeres puntúan más alto en todos los valores que los hombres, a excepción del valor de poder donde las puntuaciones de ellos son superiores.

PALABRAS CLAVE

Valores; adolescentes; televisión; diferencias de género; estudios culturales.

ABSTRACT

The perception of values during adolescence continues to raise important questions, the scope of which becomes even broader when the groups analyzed come from different cultural contexts and the gender variable is taken into consideration. Consequently, the aim of this study was to explore the differences in the values perceived by adolescents in a character from their favorite television show in relation to cultural origin and gender, in a sample group of 1,221 Latin American, Irish and Spanish adolescents aged between 14 and 19. The instrument used was the *Val. Tv 0.2* questionnaire, which is an adaptation of Schwartz's scale. The results indicate that cultural differences are more acute than gender-based ones. In relation to gender, girls scored higher than boys in all values, with the exception of the value «power», in which boys scored higher than girls.

KEY WORDS

Values; adolescents; television; gender differences; cross cultural studies.

INTRODUCCIÓN

Today, the communicative context of young people from the vast majority of cities is made up of a series of communications devices, in which images, text and sound blend together indiscriminately. Thus we are faced with human beings who are immersed in a new perceptive capacity, constructed through interaction with a high-tech world.

Family, church and school have lost their exclusive dominion over cultural transmission, both in the field of morals and as regards knowledge, while information networks and the audiovisual media strengthen new symbolic and cultural structures in society through entertainment.

Young people identify with and subjectively construct their identities through these complex symbolic networks, which transmit both local and global values, knowledge and behavior. Adolescents assimilate and exchange this symbolic construct through computers, virtual social networks, television shows and multifunctional cell phones.

However, the wide range of high-tech alternatives currently on offer today has not managed to topple television from its predominant position. This position is not just due to the nature of the device, but also to the fact that it is a medium which socializes imaginaries, behaviors and values. It is a social-cultural tool in which society is reflected and behavioral patterns established (Medrano et al. 2009; Rabrenovic, 2006). Television is

a means of entertainment from which one learns and makes sense of the world (Barbero, 2007; García, 2009; Hoskins and Deakin, 2010). Thus, it could be claimed that one effect of television is its direct repercussion on adolescents, as another context which contributes to the construction of their identities and the formation of their values (Aierbe *et al.* 2008; Lealand, 2005; Medrano and Cortés, 2007; Medrano *et al.* 2010), and which may serve to perpetuate beliefs or value judgments.

Social values are part of personal development, and since television is such a persuasive medium and since young people spend so much time watching it, there is a strong feedback from screen to viewer which influences the construction of identity and values in adolescents.

Different studies linking the media with values in adolescents have generally tended to focus their research on two aspects: the influence of family, social, cultural and economic contexts on the way in which adolescents receive information from television (Medrano *et al.* 2010); and the different types of values which adolescents cite most frequently when talking about television (De Macedo, 2006; McInnis, 2004; Orozco, 2001).

The analysis of the values conveyed through television has been the object of empirical research for over three decades now. Nevertheless, as diverse studies have shown, these values have gradually changed at both an international and local level (Bauman, 2003; Bryant *et al.*, 2006; Del Río *et al.*, 2004; Lee, 2006; Murray *et al.*, 2008). In general, a review of existing literature reveals a tendency to find fewer prosocial values and more materialistic values in television contents (Dates *et al.*, 2008), although some studies also highlight the fact that, for example, American television transmits altruistic behaviors (Smith *et al.*, 2006).

However, a more detailed review of published findings regarding the values conveyed by television reveals that the results are disparate and complex. For example, Potter (1990), Tan, and Nelson, Dong and Tan (1997) found that television conveys the conventional values of the American middle class, while other authors such as Raffa (1983) calculated that antisocial values appeared with greater intensity than positive ones in television contents. Finally, a third group of authors (Blood *et al.* 1983; Carneiro and Draxler, 2008; Muir, 1983, Pasquier, 1996) argue that television transmits both positive and negative values (or counter-values).

In research carried out by Medrano, Morentin Aierbe and Martínez (2011), using the same sample group as the present study, as regards the analysis of cross-cultural differences in perceived values of teens on television, no significant differences were observed. However, the greatest ob-

served differences were in the values of conformity, tradition, benevolence and universalism. With regard to hedonism and achievement, no significant differences were found at all between the different contexts.

In relation to gender differences, it is generally agreed that the socialization of social roles influences the way in which individuals perceive values. Thus, the primary interests of men tend to be related to those values which enable them to achieve their individual goals, while women tend to be more interested in personal relationships. However, this duality is called into question by the study of values, since some authors maintain that no significant differences exist in the importance attached to values by men and women during either adulthood or adolescence. The reason for this is that by nature, values are based on *ideal* concepts within any given society, and are therefore universal principles regarding morality and ethics (Jayme *et al.*, 1996; Musitu, 2000).

Very few studies focus on how gender may influence the way in which adolescents perceive values in characters from their favorite television shows. Although numerous publications focus on this question, hardly any take gender into account when analyzing adolescents and the conceptualizations developed in relation to them. This makes it difficult to establish a conceptual framework regarding the values perceived by adolescent girls and boys during exposure to television contents.

Approaches to the psychological and social construction of gender in relation to individuals' personalities tend to state that masculinity is linked to activity, dominance, emotional control, aggressiveness and logical intelligence, whereas femininity is characterized by passivity, obedience, inhibition and intuition.

These dimensions interact differently in each individual in accordance with four factors: internal factors such as life experiences, external factors such as social role, and the public and private spheres (*ágora* and *oikos*) (Jayme *et al.*, 1996).

What is evident from existing literature is that gender, like values, is structured within the social field. It is for this reason that the two concepts are so closely linked to stereotypes, such as society's ideals, and individuals respond to them differently in each different stage of their lives.

An analysis of studies on adolescence and gender differences reveals contradictory results. Some authors defend the existence of notable differences between girls and boys in accordance with the instrumental roles of men as independent, strong, successful providers, and women as expressive, emotionally aware, dependent and submissive. This occurs either because

the adolescents in question belong to a patriarchal society or because they return to the dual gender role models instilled them during their childhood. Other authors, however, claim that during adolescence, these differences fade almost completely, either as the result of the social change which has taken place in the role of women in the post-industrial world, or because the globalized media have unified the idea of social roles in favor of the feminine sphere (Plaza, 2004).

Thus, for example, studies which relate social values, attitudes and behaviors to self-concept in adolescents from different schools or sports centers identify boys with characteristics such as aggression, moral immaturity and withdrawal in social activities, and find them to be much more individualistic in their actions and more likely to engage in self-confidence behavior and competitiveness. Girls, on the other hand, tend to limit themselves in relation to active participation and decision-making, thus fostering submission stereotypes. Similarly, shyness, insecurity and hypersensitivity are characteristics attributed to them by others, such as parents, thus reducing their autonomy and leadership (Fleming, 2005). Women are also believed to have a greater inclination towards values, prosocial attitudes and conflict resolution, as well as towards artistic values and the tendency to view human relationships from the perspective of care ethics and responsibility, while men base their ethics on the values of justice and equality (Gilligan, 2006; Josephs *et al.*, 1992; Muñoz *et al.*, 2008; Schwartz *et al.*, 2001).

The conceptual reference point for this present study is Schwartz's theoretical model for assessing the perception of values. In a cross-cultural study of 44 different countries, Schwartz argues that there is a basic structure of ten personal values in the human condition, these values being: self-direction, stimulation, hedonism, achievement, power, security, conformity, tradition, benevolence and universalism. As will be explained later in the procedures section, these values can be grouped into four dimensions, namely: Openness to Change, Self-promotion, Conservatism and Self-transcendence. In this framework of reference, values are defined as objectives towards which individuals should strive in any given society, and serve as guiding principles and sources of motivation in their everyday lives.

Within this theoretical framework, in a study carried out in Israel with a sample group of 480 men and 519 women aged between 19 and 45, Gibson and Schwartz (1998) found that the significance attached to values by men and women was similar. This finding is confirmed by a review of existing literature, in which insufficient empirical evidence exists in relation to alleged gender differences. From the conceptual framework of constructivist and interactionist theories, Schwartz argues that gender is not a variable which influences the construction of values, but that rather, it is other var-

iables such as age, educational level and geopolitical and cultural situation which are responsible for generating differences between men and women in relation to values.

His study found that, although the differences observed between men and women were not particularly significant, they nevertheless indicated that men had a more positive inclination towards the values of power, self-promotion, achievement, hedonism, stimulation and self-direction, while women were inclined more towards benevolence, conformity and tradition. No gender differences whatsoever were found in the values of universalism and security. These results were basically the result of cultural attitudes regarding gender roles and their influence during upbringing and immersion in adult society.

Similarly, other aspects such as age may trigger changes in the level of priority a woman or a man may attach to a certain value, in accordance with their current stage in the life cycle. The values most closely related to age are achievement, power and benevolence, while the values of tradition, conformity, self-direction and stimulation tend to differ more in accordance with ethnicity or gender differences.

Attempts to understand the importance of gender in the examination of how adolescents perceive values continue to raise many questions, especially when the groups analyzed have different contextual patterns. Therefore, and based on the theoretical review conducted for the purposes of this study, we pose the following question:

What differences can be observed in the values perceived by adolescents in the characters from their favorite television shows, in relation to cultural origin and gender?

METHOD

This research project is an *ex post-facto*, descriptive-correlational study. Its aim is to study the values perceived by a sample group of adolescents from different cultural contexts, aged between 14 and 19, in the characters from their favorite television shows.

Participants

The final sample group was established after subjects and responses that were inconsistent or indicated extreme values had been eliminated.

This procedure was applied to the different cultural contexts and the final sample group was distributed as follows:

Table 1.
Distribution of the sample group in accordance with region

Region		Frequency	P%	Frequency	Percentage
The Basque Country (Spain)	Boys	100	54.3	184	15.01
	Girls	84	45.7		
Aragon (Spain)	Boys	82	45.3	181	14.12
	Girls	99	54.7		
Andalusia (Spain)	Boys	58	50.4	115	9.42
	Girls	57	49.6		
Dublin (Ireland)	Boys	46	43.4	106	8.64
	Girls	60	56.6		
Jalisco (Mexico)	Boys	63	42.6	148	12.12
	Girls	85	57.4		
Cibao (Dominican Republic)	Boys	41	28.1	146	12.76
	Girls	105	71.9		
Oruro (Bolivia)	Boys	103	52.6	196	16.05
	Girls	93	47.4		
O'Higgins (Chile)	Boys	52	35.9	145	11.88
	Girls	93	64.1		
Total		1221			100.0

Thus, the total sample group encompassed 1221 subjects from 8 different cultural contexts; three from Spain, four from Latin America and one from Ireland. As shown in table 1, in the majority of cases gender distribution was balanced.

The criteria for data collection were based on convenience, although variables such as age, level within the education system, socio-economic status and cultural context were also taken into account. Consequently, in Spain, the selected students were in 4th grade of secondary school and 2nd year of the Spanish Baccalaureate (higher education) system; in Mexico, the Dominican Republic, Bolivia and Chile they were in PREPA and/or Baccalaureate years 1 and 3; and in Ireland, they were in the 3rd year of Junior Cycle and Senior Cycle of Second Level and Further Education.

In each cultural context adolescents were selected from two or more schools or colleges. A total of 23 schools participated in the research study.

These schools were selected specifically to avoid extreme socio-economic and cultural levels.

The 23 schools and colleges from which the sample group was selected were distributed as follows: the Basque Country (2 schools, one state and the other private with some state funding); Aragon (2 schools, one state and the other private); Andalusia (2 schools, one state and the other private); Dublin (2 schools, one state and the other private); Jalisco (one private middle-class school); Cibao (2 schools, one state and the other private); Oruro (10 state and private schools) and O'Higgins (2 schools, one state and the other private).

Variables and measurement instruments

To assess the values perceived in the characters of subjects' favorite TV shows we used the PVQ-21 scale by Schwartz (2003), adapted to the Spanish language within the Val. Tv 0.2 questionnaires. This instrument measures the values perceived in subjects' favorite characters, grouped into 10 basic values: self-direction, stimulation, hedonism, achievement, power, security, conformity, tradition, benevolence and universalism. The questionnaire contains 21 questions, with responses given on a 6-point Likert-type scale.

In order to check the reliability of the instrument, the spatial configuration of these items was verified using the «multidimensional scaling» technique presented by the SPSS, which is equivalent to the SSA (Small Space Analysis). As expected, the configuration obtained was circular, very similar to that proposed by Schwartz and Boehnke (2004).

Nevertheless, one exception should be highlighted: the value «power» was found to have an inadequate spatial configuration.

This spatial configuration, which is similar to that proposed by Schwartz, coupled with the fact that this instrument is comparable to those used in international studies, enables us to calculate the scores for each subscale or dimension. The internal consistency analyses of each dimension using Cronbach's alpha coefficient resulted in reliability indexes of over .50 (the maximum was obtained for *universalism* $\alpha = .798$ and the minimum for *security* $\alpha = .529$), with the exception of the value *power*, which had an $\alpha = .389$. Consequently, this value was not included in the Self-promotion dimension.

RESULTS

The results were analyzed in order to establish any possible differences between the values perceived in respondents' favorite characters in accordance with either gender or cultural context.

The results are presented here firstly for the sample group as a whole, in accordance with each gender's perception of the ten values analyzed, namely: 1. Self-direction, 2. Stimulation, 3. Hedonism, 4. Achievement, 5. Power, 6. Security, 7. Conformity, 8. Tradition, 9. Benevolence and 10. Universalism; with the four dimensions being: 1. Openness to Change, 2. Self-promotion, 3. Conservatism and 4. Self-transcendence.

Table 2.
Grouping of values into dimensions

Dimensions	Values
Openness to Change	Self-direction Stimulation Hedonism
Self-promotion	Achievement Power
Conservatism	Security Conformity Tradition
Self-transcendence	Benevolence Universalism

Next, the ten values are grouped into four dimensions (see Table 2) and the gender differences are presented for each of the eight regions: 1. The Basque Country, 2. Aragon, 3. Andalusia, 4. Dublin, 5. Jalisco, 6. Cibao, 7. Oruro and 8. O'Higgins.

Gender differences in relation to the ten values and four dimensions

Table 3 shows the results for the whole sample divided into gender groups. The results reveal that all values and dimensions present moderate deviations from the norm. As regards the ten values studied, significant differences were observed in Conformity, Tradition, Benevolence and Universalism; and in relation to the four dimensions, the most important gen-

der differences were found in Conservatism and Self-transcendence, while the differences observed for Openness to Change and Self-promotion were hardly significant at all.

Table 3.
Means according to gender

Items Val. Tv 0.2	Values	Means				η^2
		1 Boys	2 Girls	Total	S. D.	
1.11	Self-direction	4.958	5.051	5.010	1.0063	.002
6.15	Stimulation	4.569	4.689	4.636	1.2092	.002
10.21	Hedonism	4.622	4.680	4.654	1.3066	.000
413	Achievement	4.368	4.338	4.351	1.2831	.000
5.14	Security	3.728	3.898	3.822	1.3194	.004
7.16	Conformity	3.599	3.757	3.687	1.3796	.003
9.20	Tradition	3.914	4.208	4.077	1.3324	.012
12.18	Benevolence	4.464	4.952	4.735	1.2114	.040
3.8,19	Universalism	4.087	4.545	4.341	1.2422	.034
Dimensions	Openness to Change	4.721	4.802	4.766	.9599	.002
	Self-promotion	4.058	3.958	4.003	1.0756	.002
	Conservatism	3.756	3.944	3.861	1.0998	.007
	Self-transcendence	4.237	4.705	4.497	1.1476	.041

The items that were significant in relation to gender can be divided into three groups, in accordance with their significance level (from lowest to highest). Thus, the first group is made up of items 6, 5 and 19, which represent the values of Stimulation, Security and Universalism (respectively). The results of the Anova are as follows: item 6 ($F_{(1,114)} = 5,482$; $p = .019$), item 5 ($F_{(1,1138)} = 6,049$; $p = .014$); item 19 ($F_{(1,1135)} = 13,137$; $p = .000$).

In the mid-level significance group are items 2, 8 and 9, which represent the values Power, Universalism and Tradition (respectively). Finally, the items for which the greatest gender differences were found are 18, 12 and 3, which represent the values of Benevolence (18 and 12) and Universalism (3). The results of the Anova were as follows: item 2 ($F_{(1,1146)} = 21,169$; $p = .000$); item 8 ($F_{(1,1136)} = 28,561$; $p = .000$); item 9 ($F_{(1,1137)} = 32,327$; $p = .000$); item 18 ($F_{(1,1127)} = 37,039$; $p = .000$); item 12 ($F_{(1,1140)} = 40,078$; $p = .000$); and item 3 ($F_{(1,1147)} = 45,714$; $p = .000$).

In all cases in which a significant difference was found between the genders, girls always scored higher, particularly in relation to the values of

Benevolence, Universalism and Self-transcendence. The only exception was the value Power, in which the mean for boys in item 2 was 3.37, while the mean for girls was 2.95; the effect size was negligible ($\eta^2 = 0.018$).

Differences in the dimensions in each of the regions

The differences observed in each of the four dimensions in all the contexts studied are shown in Table 4. The first thing to note is that in Openness to Change, the region of Cibao stands out from the rest (Girls = 4.997) (Boys = 4.695), with the distance between the genders being greater in this region than in the others. Adolescent boys from Aragon (4.794) were the only ones who scored higher than girls (4.747) in this dimension (although only by a very little).

As regards Self-promotion, the region of Aragon once again stands out due to the very low scores obtained by girls (3.678) in this dimension, in comparison with both the general mean and the boys in that same region (4.046). The opposite was found in Dublin, where girls scored higher (4.226) in this dimension than both the general mean for girls and the boys in that same region (3.944).

Table 4.

Means in the different dimensions, in accordance with cultural context

	Gender	Openness to Change	Self-promotion	Conservatism	Self-transcendence
The Basque Country (Spain)	Boys	4.717	3.923	3.676	4.274
	Girls	4.860	3.865	3.744	4.607
Aragon (Spain)	Boys	4.794	4.046	3.553	4.182
	Girls	4.747	3.678	3.599	4.668
Andalusia (Spain)	Boys	4.567	3.998	3.670	4.158
	Girls	4.798	3.816	3.810	4.660
Dublin (Ireland)	Boys	4.568	3.944	3.149	3.246
	Girls	4.598	4.226	3.752	4.240
Jalisco (Mexico)	Boys	4.706	4.043	3.986	4.195
	Girls	4.779	4.174	3.893	4.373
Cibao (Dominican Republic)	Boys	4.695	3.986	4.213	4.720
	Girls	4.997	4.105	4.586	5.165

	Gender	Openness to Change	Self-promotion	Conservatism	Self-transcendence
Oruro (Bolivia)	Boys	4.911	4.297	3.882	4.509
	Girls	4.916	3.943	4.029	4.930
O'Higgins (Chile)	Boys	4.541	4.063	3.956	4.284
	Girls	4.633	3.909	3.985	4.744

In Conservatism, the Basque Country (Girls = 3.744) (Boys = 3.676), Aragon (Girls = 3.599) (Boys = 3.553) and O'Higgins (Girls = 3.985) (Boys = 3.956) all stand out for the very similar scores obtained by boys and girls in this dimension. The adolescent boys of the region of Jalisco were the only ones in the sample group to score higher than the girls in their region in this dimension (3.986 and 3.893 respectively). The case of Dublin is striking due to the large difference observed between the mean scores for boys (3.149) and girls (3.752).

In relation to Self-transcendence, Dublin stands out due to the large difference observed between boys (3.246) and girls (4.240). Irish adolescent boys scored lower in this dimension than their counterparts in other regions, and the difference between boys' and girls' scores in this region was significant. It should also be noted that only a very small gender difference was observed for this dimension in the region of Jalisco (Girls = 4.373) (Boys = 4.195).

The analysis of variance, which was conducted by imposing the factor region in each of the dimensions, revealed statistically significant differences in the dimensions Self-transcendence ($F_{7,1137} = 10,834$; $p = ,000$ $\eta^2 = ,063$), Conservatism ($F_{7,1128} = 8,476$; $p = ,000$; $\eta^2 = ,050$) and Openness to Change ($F_{7,1137} = 1,985$; $p = ,054$; $\eta^2 = ,012$). The opposite result was found, however, for the dimension Self-promotion, for which the statistical significance was ($F_{7,1133} = 1,429$; $p = ,190$; $\eta^2 = ,009$).

As regards gender in the analysis of variance, the statistical significance of the differences observed between girls and boys was as follows (from greatest to least): Self-transcendence ($F_{1,1137} = 49,593$; $p = ,000$; $\eta^2 = ,042$); Conservatism ($F_{1,1128} = 6,069$; $p = ,014$; $\eta^2 = ,005$); Openness to Change ($F_{1,1137} = 3,029$; $p = ,082$; $\eta^2 = ,003$) and Self-promotion ($F_{1,1133} = 1,201$; $p = ,273$; $\eta^2 = ,001$).

However, when the variables region and gender were imposed together, the results of the analysis of variance failed to reveal any statically significant differences in any of the dimensions.

Differences between the values perceived in each context

The values encompassed in the four dimensions, in accordance with Schwartz's model, were also analyzed in relation to gender and region. Table 5 shows the means for girls and boys in all eight contexts, in relation to the two dimensions Openness to Change and Self-promotion and their respective values.

Table 5.

Means for the values, grouped into dimensions

Region	Gender	Openness to Change		Self-promotion	
		Self-direction	Stimulation	Hedonism	Achievement
The Basque Country (Spain)	Boys	5.015	4.479	4.655	4.216
	Girls	5.193	4.524	4.878	4.189
Aragon (Spain)	Boys	4.961	4.711	4.711	4.336
	Girls	5.027	4.663	4.554	3.962
Andalusia (Spain)	Boys	4.616	4.393	4.648	4.259
	Girls	4.973	4.764	4.679	4.057
Dublin (Ireland)	Boys	4.573	4.350	4.744	3.927
	Girls	4.702	4.439	4.684	4.482
Jalisco (Mexico)	Boys	5.008	4.524	4.589	4.315
	Girls	4.922	4.566	4.843	4.380
Cibao (Dominican Republic)	Boys	5.386	4.257	4.429	4.500
	Girls	5.411	4.800	4.793	4.672
Oruro (Bolivia)	Boys	5.141	4.908	4.670	4.816
	Girls	5.168	5.082	4.500	4.451
O'Higgins (Chile)	Boys	4.802	4.468	4.362	4.234
	Girls	4.824	4.574	4.540	4.426

In relation to the value Self-direction, the region of Jalisco stands out due to the fact that the results reverse the usual trend, with the mean for boys (5.008) being higher than for girls (4.922). The adolescents in Dublin scored significantly lower in these items than their counterparts in other regions in (Boys = 4.573 and Girls = 4.702), and in Andalusia, male respondents also scored very low in this value (4.616). In Cibao, on the other hand, the means for both boys (5.386) and girls (5.411) were significantly higher than in other regions.

In Stimulation, it is striking that in Aragon, boys scored higher than girls (4.961), when in all other regions the reverse was true. Andalusia (Girls = 4.764) (Boys = 4.393) and Cibao (Girls = 4.800) (Boys = 4.257) stand out due to the notable difference between the scores obtained by boys and girls. It is also interesting that in Oruro, the means for both boys (4.908) and girls (5.082) were very high, with both being above the mean. In relation to Hedonism, the results for all regions are worth highlighting, with the exception of the boys from the Basque Country (4.655) and the boys (4.648) and girls (4.679) from Andalusia. Thus, in Aragon (Girls = 4.554) (Boys = 4.711), Dublin (Girls = 4.684) (Boys = 4.744) and Oruro (Girls = 4.500) (Boys = 4.670), boys, rather than girls, scored higher in this value. In Jalisco (Girls= 4.843) (Boys = 4.589) and Cibao (Girls = 4.794) (Boys = 4.429), boys scored lower than the mean in this value, while girls scored higher, making the gender differences in these regions significantly worth underscoring. In the case of O'Higgins (Girls = 4.540) (Boys = 4.362), the scores for this value were below the mean, with girls scoring higher than boys.

In the value Achievement, the results are significant, since girls had a higher mean than boys, especially in Dublin (Girls = 4.482) (Boys = 3.927) and, although to a lesser extent in O'Higgins (Girls =4.426) (Boys = 4.234) and Cibao (Girls = 4.672) (Boys = 4.500) also. Nevertheless, the girls from Aragon (3.962) and Andalusia (4.027) scored particularly low.

The factorial analysis of variance which was carried out imposing region and gender as factors in each of the values which together make up the dimensions of Openness to Change and Self-promotion revealed that in relation to region, the differences were statistically significant for the values Self-direction ($F_{7,1149} = 6.522$; $p = ,000$; $\eta^2 = ,039$), Stimulation ($F_{7,1142} = 3,807$; $p = ,000$; $\eta^2 = ,023$) and Achievement ($F_{7,1144} = 3,346$; $P = ,002$; $\eta^2 = ,020$); the differences observed for Hedonism however ($F_{7,1140} = 1,049$; $p = ,036$; $\eta^2 = ,001$), were not. As regards gender, the differences between girls and boys were not statistically significant in the following values: Achievement ($F_{1,1144} = ,001$; $p = ,947$; $\eta^2 = ,000$), Hedonism ($F_{1,1140} = ,776$; $p = ,608$; $\eta^2 = ,005$) and Self-direction ($F_{1,1149} = 2,110$; $p = ,142$; $\eta^2 = ,002$). However, significant differences were found in the value Stimulation ($F_{1,1142} = 4,935$; $p = ,027$; $\eta^2 = ,004$), although the effect size was negligible.

The gender and contextual differences observed in the dimensions Conservatism and Self-transcendence are shown in Table 6.

Table 6.
Means for the values, grouped into dimensions

Region	Gender	Conservatism			Self-transcendence	
		Security	Confor-mity	Tradition	Benevo-lence	Universa-lism
The Basque Country (Spain)	Boys	3.624	3.619	3.716	4.216	4.536
	Girls	3.805	3.549	3.896	4.189	5.037
Aragon (Spain)	Boys	3.546	3.388	3.743	4.336	4.434
	Girls	3.620	3.380	3.766	3.962	5.087
Andalusia (Spain)	Boys	3.652	3.518	3.764	4.259	4.361
	Girls	3.837	3.585	4.028	4.057	4.925
Dublin (Ireland)	Boys	2.988	2.939	3.550	3.927	3.737
	Girls	3.728	3.614	3.982	4.482	4.536
Jalisco (Mexico)	Boys	4.024	3.839	4.097	4.315	4.411
	Girls	3.916	3.669	4.084	4.380	4.554
Cibao (Dominican Republic)	Boys	4.071	4.129	4.400	4.500	4.886
	Girls	4.326	4.421	5.083	4.672	5.255
Oruro (Bolivia)	Boys	3.806	3.646	4.209	4.816	4.660
	Girls	3.946	3.848	4.310	4.451	5.120
O'Higgins (Chile)	Boys	4.163	3.755	3.830	4.234	4.426
	Girls	3.892	3.812	4.267	4.426	4.881

In relation to Security, the boys from both Jalisco (4.024) and O'Higgins (4.163) scored appreciably over the mean, and in both cases scored higher in this value than their female counterparts. Equally noteworthy is the low rating of this value by adolescent boys in Dublin (2.988).

In relation to Conformity, the scores for both genders were very similar in the Basque Country (Girls = 3.549) (Boys = 3.619), Aragon (Girls = 3.380) (Boys = 3.388) and Andalusia (Girls = 3.585) (Boys = 3.518). The boys from Dublin, however, scored lower in this value, both in relation to the general mean and in comparison with the girls from that same region. In Cibao though, both boys (4.129) and girls (4.421) scored significantly higher than the mean.

The boys (4.097) (3.743) and girls (4.084) (3.766) of Jalisco and Aragon, respectively, scored similarly in Tradition, while in all other regions, girls scored higher. Cibao stands out for its high scores in this value, with both boys (4.400) and girls (5.083) scoring higher than all other respondents.

In Benevolence, the boys from Dublin (3.927) scored notably low, both in relation to the general mean and in comparison with the girls from that same region (4.482). In Jalisco it is the girls who stand out for their low score in this value (4.380) in relation to the general mean, although in this case the difference in comparison with the boys from that same region is minor (4.315).

In Universalism, the differences are significant for both region and gender. In the Basque Country, the difference between boys (4.536) and girls (5.037) is more significant than in the other regions. Dublin stands out for the low mean obtained by its boys (3.737) and the notable difference between the genders in that region (girls scored 4.536).

The factorial analysis of variance which was conducted by imposing region and gender as factors in each of the values which make up the dimensions Conservatism and Self-transcendence revealed that the regional data are statistically significant, with a $P = 0,000$ in all cases: Security ($F_{7,1141} = 4,712$; $\eta^2 = ,028$); Conformity ($F_{7,1142} = 5,6240$; $\eta^2 = ,033$); Tradition ($F_{7,1142} = 7,999$; $\eta^2 = ,047$); Benevolence ($F_{7,1139} = 6,269$; $\eta^2 = ,037$) and Universalism ($F_{7,1138} = 12,135$; $\eta^2 = ,069$). As regards gender differences, statistically significant differences exist in each of the values which make up these two dimensions. These differences are as follows (from greatest to least): Benevolence ($F_{1,1139} = 42,992$; $p = ,000$; $\eta^2 = ,039$); Universalism ($F_{1,1138} = 41,471$; $p = ,000$; $\eta^2 = ,035$); Tradition ($F_{1,1142} = 10,899$; $p = ,001$; $\eta^2 = ,009$); Security ($F_{1,1141} = 3,422$; $p = ,065$), $\eta^2 = ,003$ and finally, Conformity ($F_{1,1142} = 2,424$; $p = ,120$; $\eta^2 = ,002$).

When the factorial analysis of variance was carried out imposing both region and gender together as factors, no statistically significant differences were observed in any of the ten values.

DISCUSSION

In a global analysis of the data, one of the first conclusions to highlight is that cultural context differences are slightly greater than gender differences.

In previous studies focusing on the differences in how men and women perceive values, Gibson and Schwartz (1998) suggest that said differences are caused by variables such as age, educational level and culture, thus displacing the gender variable as an explanatory factor of the differences observed in relation to value scales. Despite this, however, some studies on stereotypes and social roles have empirically confirmed that men and women tend to characterize values differently.

During adolescence, and specifically in relation to the perception of values in the characters of their favorite TV programs, the results of this present study reveal a statistical tendency for girls to score higher than boys in all values, with the exception of Power, in which boys scored higher than girls. In this study, gender differences were mainly observed in the values of Benevolence, Universalism and Tradition. We can therefore conclude that significant differences exist in the dimensions Self-transcendence and Conservatism.

Based on the results obtained in relation to the gender variable, two aspects are particularly worth highlighting. Firstly, the values perceived by the sample group coincide with that found by authors who believe that the psychological development of gender roles in girls is related to pro-social values and attitudes of passivity and obedience, while their development in boys is related to dominance, aggression and individualism (Jayme et al. 1996). This indicates a certain strengthening of traditional gender stereotypes (Lealand, 2005) in all eight contexts studied. And secondly, the low number of values in which differences were observed coincide with studies which conceptualize values as universal ideals within society, and which attach more importance to cultural context (Gibson et al. 1998).

In relation to the context variable, it is worth noting that the statistical analyses revealed significant differences in eight out of the ten values and two out of the four dimensions studied. In other words, cultural context seems to generate a greater number of significant differences than the gender variable. Having said this, it is important to clarify that although these cultural differences were significant in the vast majority of the values studied, they were not particularly notable if the effect size is taken into account. The results should therefore be interpreted with caution.

To sum up, a direct relationship may be established between the results found for the sample group as a whole and three questions discussed in the introduction to this paper. Firstly, the social nature of values, i.e. the fact that they represent ideal behaviors within a society. Secondly, the local nature of the meaning of values, despite the ongoing processes of cultural and technological globalization. And thirdly, the fact that adolescents (both girls and boys) receive television contents actively and individually, interpreting them in accordance with the motivations and networks of meaning they have already built as part of their life experience.

The values perceived by adolescents in television acquire meaning in association with the context in which they are viewed. This suggests that schools, regional state administrations and civil society should view educational programs as tools for fostering the social construction of citizens

from and in the local sphere, despite the globalization of the media (Cabero and Guerra, 2011).

However, the importance of context in the way in which young people perceive values also generates questions regarding the cultural resistance which may exist at a local level, as well as about globalization (Lee, 2006). What do adolescents actually share globally? Could it be that we are experiencing a global spread of communication technology, rather than a global spread of the message? Or is the medium itself the message?

Questions also arise regarding the role of the family, school and peer group in the construction of values, since it is often said that modern technology has displaced these institutions; but if this is really the case, why do such significant context-related differences exist?

To conclude, the results of this research project, alongside those of other studies focusing on the same area (Medrano et al. 2010), reaffirm that, in addition to being an assessment tool, the Scale of Television Value Domains (Val-Tv0.2) also enables the construction of an explanatory framework for the perception of values, in accordance with specific variables such as context and gender. Nevertheless, one of the study's limitations is the susceptibility of its design, which, by using Likert-type scales, may result in answers more related to social desirability than to respondents' true thoughts and feelings.

However, and given that television has its own educational potential, it is important to specify and work on the values perceived by students in that medium, in order to compare them with those values we all agree should be fostered and promoted among the younger generations.

REFERENCES

Aierbe, A., & Medrano, C. (2008). Adolescents Television Viewing Habits and Its Relation with Values. *Comunicar*, 16 (31), 109-114.

Barbero, J. (2007). Sociedad global y cambio cultural. *Revista de ciencias sociales y de la comunicación*, 1, 19-40.

Bauman, Z. (2003). *Comunidad. En busca de seguridad en un mundo hostil*. Madrid: Siglo XXI.

Blood, R., & Galloway, J. J. (1983). Expectancy-Value Measures of Audience Uses Gratifications for Media Content *Annual Meeting of the International Communication Association*. Dallas. May.

Bryant, J., & Vorderer, P. (2006). *Psychology of entertainment*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawerence Erlbaum Associates.

Cabero, J., & Guerra, S. (2011). La alfabetización y formación en medios de comunicación en la formación inicial del profesorado. *Educación XXI*, 14 (1), 89-115.

Carneiro, R., & Draxler, A. (2008). Education for the 21 Century: lessons and challenges. *European journal of education*, 43 (2), 149-160.

Dates, L., Fears, M., & Stedman, J. (2008). An evaluation of Effects of Movies on Adolescent Viewers. In Asamen, J. H., Ellis, M. L. and Berry, G. L. (Eds.) *Child Development, Multiculturalism and Media* (pp. 261-277). London: Sage.

De Macedo, R., Kublikowski, I., & Berthoud, C. (2006). Positive Values and Adolescent Development: A Parents Perspective. *Revista Brasileira de Crescimento e Desenvolvimento Humano*, 16(2), 38-52.

Del Río, P., Álvarez, A., & Del Río, M. (2004). *Pigmalión. Informe sobre el impacto de la televisión en la infancia*. Madrid: Fundación Infancia y Aprendizaje.

Fleming, M. (2005). Género y Autonomía en la Adolescencia: Las diferencias entre chicos y chicas aumentan a los 16 años. *Electronic journal of research in educational psychology*, 3 (6), 33-52.

García, N. (2009). Los campos culturales en la era de convergencia tecnológica, en Aguilar, M. A., Novón, E., Portal, M. A., Winocur, R. (Coords.), *Pensar lo contemporáneo: de la cultura situada a la convergencia tecnológica* (pp. 277-286). Madrid: Anthropos-UAM-I.

Gibson, P., & Schwartz, H. (1998). Value priorities and gender. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 61 (1), 49-67.

Gilligan, C. (2006). Con otra voz: las concepciones femeninas del yo y de la moralidad. En M. T. Lopéz de la Vieja, (Ed.), *Bioética y feminismo: estudios multidisciplinares de género* (pp. 15-56). Salamanca: Universidad de Salamanca.

Hoskins, B., & Deakin, R. (2010). Competences for learning to learn and active citizenship: different currencies or two sides of same coin? *European journal of education*, 45 (1), 121-137.

Jayme, M., & Sau, V. (1996). *Psicología diferencial del sexo y el género: fundamentos*. Barcelona: Icaria.

Josephs, R., Hazel, R., & Romin W. 1992. Gender and Self-Esteem. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 63, 391-402.

Lealand, G. (2005). Book Review: Teen TV: Genre, Consumption and Identity.

European Journal of Communication, 20, 135-137.

Lee, P. (2006). Who Owns the Media? Global Trends and Local Resistances. *European Journal of Communication*, 21, 104-107.

McInnis, C. (2004). Studies of student of education. *European journal of education*, 39(4), 383-394.

Medrano, C., Aierbe, A., & Martinez de Morentin, J. (2011). Valores percibidos en el medio televisivo por adolescentes en contextos transculturales. *Comunicar*, 37, 117-124.

Medrano, C., Aierbe, A., & Orejudo, S. (2009). El perfil de consumo televisivo en adolescentes: diferencias en función del sexo y estereotipos sociales. *Infancia y aprendizaje*, 32(3), 293-306.

Medrano, C., & Cortés, A. (2007). The Teaching and Learning of Values Through Television. *International review of education*, 53 (1), 5-21.

Medrano, C., & Martínez de Morentin, J. (2010). *Medios de Comunicación. Valores y Educación*. Guipuzcoa: Universidad del País Vasco.

Muir, S. (1993). *Visual Argument for Social ends: Captain Planet and the integration of environmental values*. Miami Beach: Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association

Muñoz, M., Jiménez, I., & Moreno, M. (2008). Reputación conductual y género en la adolescencia. *Anales de Psicología*, 24 (2), 334-340.

Murray, P., & Murray, D. (2008). *Television: Uses and Effects* I En M. M. Haith, and J B. Benson, (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Infant and Early Childhood Development* (pp. 309-318). Oxford: Elsevier.

Musitu, G. (2000). Socialización familiar y valores en el adolescente: Un análisis intercultural. *Anuario De Psicología*, 31(2), 15-32.

Orozco, G. (2001). Audiencias, televisión y educación: Una deconstrucción pedagógica de la «televidencia» y sus mediaciones. *Revista iberoamericana de Educación*, 27, 155-178.

Pasquier, D. (1996). Teen Series Reception: Television, Adolescent & Culture of Feelings. *Childhood: A Global Journal of Child Research*, 3 (3), 351-373.

Plaza, J. (2004). Mecanismos de formación de estereotipos de género en los medios: análisis de dos casos paradigmáticos. En M. García, & T. Lara, (Coords.), *Convergencia multimedia y alfabetización digital: ponencias del Seminario Internacional Complutense Nuevos Retos de la Convergencia y la Mundialización de los Contenidos Informativos* (pp. 363-376). Madrid: Universidad Complutense.

Potter, J. (1990). «Adolescents» perceptions of the primary values of television programming. *Journalism Quarterly*, 67, 843-853.

Rabrenovic, G. (2006). Mediating the Family: Gender, Culture and Representation. *European Journal of Communication*, 21, 117-118.

Raffa, B. (1983). Television: The Newest Moral Educator?, *Phi Delta Kappan*, 65(3), 214-215.

Schwartz, H., Melech, G., Lehmann, A., Burgess, S., & Harris, M. (2001). Extending the cross-cultural validity of the theory of basic human values with a different method of measurement. *Journal of Cross Cultural Psychology*, 32, 519-542.

Smith, W., Smith, L., Pieper, M., Yoo, H., Ferris, L., Downs, E., & Bowden,

B. (2006). Altruism on American Television: Examining the Amount of, and Context Surrounding, Acts of Helping and Sharing. *Journal of Communication*, 56(4), 707-727.

Tan, A., Nelson, L., Dong, Q., & Tan, G. (1997). Value acceptance in adolescent socialization: A test of a cognitive-functional theory of television effects. *Communication Monographs*, 64, 82-97.

PERFIL ACADÉMICO Y PROFESIONAL DE LOS AUTORES

Sandra Liliana Cuervo. Estudiante de doctorado en la Universidad del País Vasco.

Concepción Medrano. Directora de la Cátedra UNESCO de Comunicación y valores educativos y profesora en el Departamento de Psicología Evolutiva y de la Educación.

Ana Aierbe. Profesora en el Departamento de Psicología Evolutiva y es investigadora titular de la Cátedra UNESCO de Comunicación y valores educativos.

Dirección de las autoras: Centro Carlos Santamaría
Elhuyar plaza n.º 2
20018 San Sebastián
Gipuzkoa-España
E-mail: diciembre2027@gmail.com
mariaconcepcion.medrano@ehu.es
ana.aierbe@ehu.es

Fecha Recepción del Artículo: 15. Abril. 2013

Fecha Modificación Artículo: 17. Junio. 2013

Fecha Aceptación del Artículo: 29. Agosto. 2013

Fecha Revisión para publicación: 15. Febrero. 2016