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Introduction
This research sought to find if there is a correlation between the independent variables of political affiliation and parental status and the dependent variable of support for censoring violent media. Religiosity and gender also serve as independent variables for censorship support. This study looks at a part of the amendment right to free speech and expression, because there are limits to what one can and cannot display. What can and cannot be displayed will be debated for years to come, so censorship is relevant and important to research.

Hypothesis 1: Socially conservative IPFW students will be more likely to support censoring violent media.

Hypothesis 2: Regardless of political leanings, IPFW students who are parents will be more likely to support censoring violent media.

Methods
The study instrument was a survey:
- Study Population: IPFW
- Population Sample: 705 students
- 33% sampled did not fill out the survey
- Final sample: 534 students

Ordinal variables were converted to nominal variables using STATA.

Data is analyzed using multivariate analysis.

Results
According to Table 1, most students do not believe in censorship.

According to Table 2, conservative IPFW students are more likely to support censorship than liberal/moderate IPFW students, but the relationship is not statistically significant.

IPFW students who are parents are more likely to support censorship, but this relationship is also not statistically significant.

Religious IPFW students are more likely to support censorship and the relationship is strong and statistically significant.

Females are strongly and more significantly more likely to support censorship than their male counterparts.

For the first hypothesis, the variance of 2.30% demonstrates a weak positive correlation.

For the second hypothesis, the variance of 2.27% demonstrates another weak positive correlation.

Conclusion
Future research regarding politics may have to approach it differently, as most of my respondents said they were "moderate" when it came to politics.

They may have done this to avoid any stigma attached to the words "liberal" and "conservative".

Future Directions
- Both of the hypotheses must be rejected.
- The results demonstrated positive correlations between all of the independent variables and the dependent variable.
- Political affiliations and parental status did not have strong significance in regards to censorship.
- Gender and religiosity have strong significance in regards to censorship.
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Abstract
This study sought to find if conservative IPFW students or students who are parents are more likely to support the censorship of violent media (video games, movies, music, etc.) than liberal or moderate students or students who do not have children. Data was gathered from 534 students during the fall semester of 2015 by administering a survey on political beliefs regarding social issues (gay marriage, abortion rights, equal pay, etc.), whether or not the respondent was religious, and the respondent’s gender. Multivariate logistic regression analysis indicates that more religious respondents and females are significantly more likely to support censoring violent media, while political affiliation and parental status were not statistically significant predictors of attitudes regarding censorship.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political Affiliation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>0.180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal/Neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>-0.298</td>
<td>-0.304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>-0.104</td>
<td>-0.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.304</td>
<td>0.538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political Affiliation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal/Neutral</td>
<td>-0.019</td>
<td>-0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>-0.022</td>
<td>-0.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>-0.196</td>
<td>-0.192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.421***</td>
<td>0.244***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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