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**Abstract**

The Third Person Effect is a phenomenon that explains why many people do not believe that they are impacted in the same way or to the same degree by media as others. This can explain why some are not concerned about consuming violent media themselves even as they claim it has harmful effects. This study explores the relationship between the form of media consumed and Third Person Effect experienced. With violence being common in television news and video games, these two forms of media will be studied and compared. It seems logical that this phenomenon would be more prevalent in video games as opposed to television, simply because of the active nature of the consumption of video games as opposed to television being consumed more passively. This study will test this hypothesis with surveys and attempt to understand potential causes of this difference, if it does indeed exist. It can then be determined if there is a correlation between active forms of media and the Third Person Effect. This analysis will add to research done on the Third Person Effect on its potential causes, and why one can be perfectly fine in engaging in the consumption of violent media while prohibiting or strongly discouraging others from doing so in fear of the effects.

**Introduction**

There is a phenomenon in media consumption known as the Third Person Effect which refers to the tendency of individuals to assume that messages that they see, hear, or read will not have as much of an impact on them as it does on others. This hypothesis predicts that a given person will feel as if they have a greater degree of immunity than someone else, and that personal biases about their own knowledge will lead to this perceived invincibility. Many feel that they are stuck in their ways, and that no message will alter their viewpoints. What so many media consumers fail to recognize is the content’s potential to influence them without them being aware. Many other potential explanations for this hypothesis will be detailed in pages to come, as well as the results of a new survey centered around the idea.

The purpose of this paper is threefold, as it seeks to define the Third Person Effect, pinpoint potential causes, and demonstrate through survey the degree to which it exists. A literature review will contribute to each objective, seeking to define, explain, and analyze through a meta-analysis of previous research. This review of previous literature will establish a base of context for new findings to be added to. Methods and results of a new survey will then be detailed, as we find evidence to either further support or evidence to conflict with what has been found thus far. Following the survey’s results, a discussion portion of the text will further analyze what we notice from the survey and seek to explain potential reasons for why we see what we see. Ultimately, we cannot take this research and immediately understand why the Third Person Effect exists, but the objective of this paper is to better understand why it might.

**Literature Review**

Scholars of communication have conducted substantial research in support of the Third Person Effect, as meta-analyses typically find a statistically significant difference between how people feel that they are impacted by media messages and how they feel others are impacted. A meta-analysis conducted by Paul, Salwen, and Dupagne found that there is legitimacy to this theory backed by a wide variety of research of many different media messages and demographics and psychographics of participants. They took 32 studies and found an overall strong correlation with varying ranges. What they found that was most striking of these studies was how it was reported that college students and college age individuals experienced the Third Person Effect significantly more than older adults. This supports the conclusion that college age individuals perceive themselves as wiser than others, or simply that they do not feel that media has as much of an impact on them as it does on others. One potential flaw of this finding is the amount and types of media consumed by these younger individuals. It is possible that they could feel this way because they know they have grown up in an environment of violent video games, for example, or polarized television news. Knowing that older individuals may have had different upbringings when it comes to media consumption may lead these younger people to feel the need to shelter them from this content that only they can understand and not be effected by, only because they have grown up with it. Regardless, this is only one possible explanation, and while it would present a flaw in the research as it would change the ramifications of their overall correlation that they found, it still is relevant information to take in to account, as it shows that the Third Person Effect, while undeniable by research thus far, may look drastically different depending on who is surveyed or researched. (Paul et. al, 2009).

While one meta-analysis made striking conclusions about age in relation to the Third Person Effect, another focused on content. It was found that much like age, content type is a strong predictor for the strength of the Third Person Effect. According to a 2017 meta-analysis of hundreds of studies, entertainment and informational content lead to a stronger phenomenon, as opposed to advertising. While the Third Person Effect was prominent in all forms of media content studied, advertising, whether through print, radio, or television, was less likely to cause the effect. On the contrary, movies, video games, and other forms of entertainment did yield a strong effect. The potential explanations described included the gratifications of content with the purpose of entertainment in comparison to that of advertising. Both forms of media can be enjoyed, and even sought after, but typically what is observed is that entertainment is what people seek. Advertising is either a cost of that entertainment, or merely passively consumed as a result of convenience or even obliviousness. This follows the concepts established by the Uses and Gratifications Theory, explaining that media consumers naturally seek out media which is either useful to them or gratifying to them. All other media is purposeless. To take it a step further and provide a reason this meta-analysis could show this, we must consider the active and passive nature of these forms of media. Advertising, because it is not often actively sought out by consumers, is taken in more passively. Entertainment, on the other hand, is an active way people are involved with media. They choose the movies they want to watch, and the video games they want to play. The difference between these is significant not only because of the way they are introduced to consumers and taken in by them, but the degree to which they facilitate feelings associated with the Third Person Effect as well. This European meta-analysis hypothesizes based on these findings that passively consumed media will create less of a Third Person Effect than actively consumed media. This means that consumers will not feel that others are as impressionable by advertising as they feel they are by movies and video games. Discovering the types of content that are likely to produce more of a Third Person Effect is very relevant to this research. However, what may be a more important takeaway of this meta-analysis is that content type itself is a major predictor of the magnitude of this phenomenon, suggesting that the Third Person Effect may be more a result of the media itself than a human reaction to media messages. (Eisend, 2017).

Typically, research in communication not only highlights a phenomenon to simply note its existence, but attempts to explain and/or predict social consequences of it. Findings related to the Third Person Effect are no exception. A meta-analysis of four studies conducted by Davison Phillips finds that this hypothesis is closely related to a fear of propaganda and the concept of censorship. These relationships are strong in this research, and can be logically explained. Wheb propaganda is spread through media messages, many fear its potential consequences on their society or community not because they feel that they themselves will be impacted, but because they are worried about others being brainwashed. After all, if they themselves were impacted, they likely wouldn’t consider it to be propaganda to begin with. Similarly, censoring content is very clearly sending a viewer a message that whoever produced this content is perfectly fine with spewing profanities, or at the very least being exposed to them, while consumers of the content can’t handle these awful messages. Ultimately, we take away from this meta-analysis that the Third Person Effect is not just a meaningless phenomenon, but instead leads to very real behaviors in our world. Additionally, this research opens up the possibility of further findings in relation to the potential social consequences of the phenomenon. Are there more harmful behaviors or fears that could result from this effect? Only further research will be able to broach this inquiry. (Phillips, 1983).

Another relevant question posed by researchers involves how the Third Person Effect changes behavior. Clearly, individuals with a great deal of concern for the effects of certain media on others while easily justifying their own consumption of that same media to themselves feel that the behavior of others may be changed by the media. On the contrary, they feel that they won’t act any differently as a result of the media. The question much communication research on this topic seeks to answer is how this will impact the behavior of these individuals who feel this way, if at all. Are they right? Does consuming certain media actually not impact them but does others? Or is this a foolish and possibly dangerous way of thinking? Obviously, these questions cannot be answered in full with each situation being unique and dependent on the individuals and media involved. Even so, we can study trends to determine how detrimental or harmless the Third Person Effect is in the consumption of media. This research runs under the assumption that this phenomenon exists, and seeks to answer a deeper question. (Perloff, 1999). Building on research that suggests that younger individuals tend to be more vulnerable to experience the Third Person Effect, as well as research that suggests that content type is a significant predictor, and that behavior is a very real result, further research can be built on this context. This research will seek to move the needle slightly further to understanding this phenomenon as a whole; how prevalent it is, the reasons it exists, and more of its potential ramifications on consumers of media.

**Research**

As is the case with much research done in the field of communications, this research was conducted through survey. The potential issues with this method include varying types of response biases, from those conscious to unconscious. Regardless, this is the most effective way of taking a qualitative idea and formulating quantitative data. The following set of data continues the trend of communications research done in survey format, including the studies examined in the literature analysis.

This research attempts to identify the degree to which the Third Person Effect exists in the Brockport community. Surveying a cross-section of the demographics and psychographics of the greater Brockport area, 112 respondents were identified to represent the community as accurately as possible. They were asked about their violent media consumption habits and their thoughts about the habits of others. With so much room for interpretation in this area, it was important to define what violent media is in order for these very different individuals to begin from a place of common ground.

Before proceeding directly into the questions, respondents were asked to identify their name, age, and gender. This was to ensure that respondents were different enough to continue the study without unreasonably favoring men, women, younger, or older individuals. Note that nearly half of respondents were under the age of 30. This is due to the demographics of the Brockport community. the area being studied. With The College at Brockport nearby, these individuals are well represented. Respondents were then asked to state an estimated weekly amount of potentially violent media exposure in hours. It was made clear on the form that media violence can range from a bloody scene in a film to a video game containing these images, even to news coverage of violent crimes. It was also noted that potentially violent media content has the potential to encompass nonviolent parts. For example, a lengthy movie or newscast containing images with extensive bloodshed will likely have parts without violence. Even this time must be considered for the sake of accuracy, as research in psychology and communications has revealed to us that violent images can trigger responses within us that skew our perceptions of time. (Aluja-Fabregat, 1998). This would make estimating media violence intake difficult to impossible and introduce significant error. The goal of identifying the amount of potentially violent media consumed weekly was to further filter the following data to determine if exposure alters the Third Person Effect.

The main portion of the survey presented a series of prompts that were to be rated on a scale of one to 10. This scale was kept consistent throughout the questions so that they could be cross-examined. A full list of questions is detailed in Appendix A, however the ratings asked respondents to explore their personal comfort level with violent media, their friends and/or family members’ comfort level, followed by the respondent’s level of comfort with their friends’ and family’s exposure. They were then asked to identify their ten closest friends or family members and determine whether they felt they personally consumed potentially violent media on average. The purpose of these questions was to identify respondents’ feelings on their degree of immunity to this content in relation to others, and again, if the amount consumed has an impact on feelings of immunity. This combined with demographic details combined to reveal enlightening results allowing us to better understand the Third Person Effect.

**Results**

Strong evidence of the Third Person Effect in the Brockport community is presented through this research. Survey results displayed a difference between how respondents felt that media violence impacted them in comparison to how they felt it impacted others. Specifically, when rating self-concern over media violence, we see an average rating of 3.2 on the survey’s scale of one to ten. (One, meaning that there is no concern whatsoever, and ten, fear that drives someone to take extensive actions to avoid this content). The difference of this 3.2 average from the 3.9 average rating of concern for others and their exposure to potentially violent media is statistically significant for this population. It suggests that there is a Third Person Effect of some sort contributing to this difference among participants of the survey. These findings are consistent with earlier research regarding the topic. (Perloff, 1999). (Eisend, 2017). (Phillips, 1987).

Additional findings through this research identify potential causes for this discrepancy and reveal patterns of thinking surrounding media violence. A strong positive correlation was discovered between personal level of comfort with media violence and a sense that it has either a neutral or positive effect. The majority of those who responded with ratings between seven and ten when asked about their comfort level also claimed that the content had either a neutral or positive effect on them. Those responding of a rating between one and three not only felt uncomfortable with the content, but also felt that it had negative impacts on their overall well-being. This is logical given the idea that individuals feel violent media is consequential to their well-being.

There was also a positive correlation identified between level of concern for oneself and level of concern for others. Those that felt that exposure to potentially violent content had negative impacts on themselves typically felt similarly about its impacts on others. However, as detailed initially, this concern for others surpassed that of themselves, even though they were found to be positively correlated.

Another revealing survey result was the numerous “5” responses received. When the 112 participants were asked to rate their comfort level with media violence on a scale of one to ten, 27 rated it a five. When asked about the positive or negative impact of this content, 45 responded with a five, interpreted as a neutral rating. The rating for the impact on the well-being of others showed similar results, with 38 respondents giving this neutral five rating. While there is potential of survey fatigue to consider for these results (Porter et al, 2004), the findings still suggest a degree of indifference when it comes to media violence. The participants seem to be communicating that it is certainly not regarded as the healthiest activity for one to engage in, but the numbers do not reveal too many strong feelings in either direction.

Other interesting findings involved the correlation between youth and strength of the Third Person Effect. Over half of those surveyed age 24 and under considered themselves to be less vulnerable to violent media than others, including their elders. This is consistent with Paul, Salwen, and Dupagne’s 2009 study. While this shows that the Third Person Effect is strong in the younger segment of this population, survey results also revealed a more positive view of violent media overall from these younger individuals. On the contrary, those surveyed that fit into the older population had less amiable views of this content. In fact, of the 18 respondents who claimed that violent media has a moderately positive to very positive effect on them, just four are over the age of 30.

One of the most revealing results from this study were responses to a question that was intended to be used as only a measuring stick to establish context. Nearly 75% of those surveyed considered their consumption of violent media to be below average in comparison to that of their ten closest family members and/or friends. This is intriguing because normally, around half of a population would be above average, and around half below average. It is possible that this sample of 112 could simply consume less violent media. Or, it is possible that this response introduces another possible cause of the Third Person Effect.

**Discussion**

As a result of this survey, we make three major conclusions about the Third Person Effect in the Brockport community. First, we can estimate that it is legitimate. This is based on the statistically significant difference in ratings of self-concern and concern for others over potentially violent media consumption. This finding is consistent with most previous research conducted by scholars of communication. However, the findings of this study do not stop there. Instead, they raise further questions as a result of some supplemental statistics gathered based on responses.

One of these findings supports earlier research about age. Younger individuals are not only exposed to more media violence on a weekly basis according to this survey, but they often don’t consider it to be detrimental to their well-being. They also feel a greater sense of immunity to it. Previous research has found similar results on a more extensive scale. (Paul et al, 2009).

Quite possibly the most peculiar statistic coming from these survey results is the fact that three-fourths of respondents consider themselves to be below average in the amount of potentially violent media they consume. This forces us to re-explore the fundamental cause of the Third Person Effect. Does it come as a result of perceptions of varying abilities to deal with content, as originally thought, (Gunther, 1991), or is it a result of an incorrect perception of how much violent media we actually consume? This question must be raised, as the vast majority of this survey’s participants claim that others consume more violent media than themselves. If this is the case, since more than half of respondents feel that violent media has a negative impact on well-being, increased concern for these individuals is inevitable. It does not appear that previous research has considered the possibility that one reason the Third Person Effect could be so strong is the idea that many have that those around them consume more violent media than they do. It seems natural to feel concern for the average and above average individuals more than oneself when oneself perceptually is below average. This challenges the idea that this phenomenon is a result of an idea people have that they are better equipped to handle the effects of media than others. (Rojas et al, 1996). Instead, it introduces another possible idea, that people feel this way only because they are generally wrong in how much media they consume in comparison to others. Either they overestimate how much others consume, they underestimate how much they themselves consume, or a combination of both. Further research must be conducted to determine if this challenge to the traditional way of understanding this phenomenon is a legitimate cause of the Third Person Effect.

**Concluding Remarks**

Ultimately, violence in media is just one area of media. By definition, the Third Person Effect does not merely relate to media violence, but all media content in general. This could include a perception of immunity to political bias, gender roles and societal roles, or any of the wide variety of concepts media content encompasses. Therefore, the Third Person Effect could have varying causes which could depend on the type of media content. Violence is just one area to research. Even so, understanding this new potential cause for the effect can at the very least encourage communications scholars to consider this question before moving forward with research under the assumption of traditional Third Person Effect thinking. It is important to identify an individual’s perception of where they stand when it comes to media consumption to understand if this context can provide any clues as to what may be leading to this phenomenon.
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**Appendix A**

**Survey Questions**

1. What is your name, your age, and your gender?
2. How many hours weekly do you estimate you are exposed to potentially violent media content?
3. On a scale of 1-10 (1 lowest level of comfort, 10 highest level of comfort), rate your overall level of comfort with violent media content.
4. On a scale of 1-10 (1 very negative, 10 very positive), rate how positive or negative of an impact you feel this has on your well-being.
5. Consider your ten closest family members and/or friends. Compared to them, do you feel that you are (A), above average in consuming potentially violent media content, or (B), below average in consuming potentially violent media content.
6. Consider these same ten individuals. On a scale of 1-10 (1 lowest level of comfort, 10 highest level of comfort), how comfortable are you with their consumption of potentially violent media as a whole?
7. On a scale of 1-10 (1 very negative, 10 very positive), rate how positive or negative of an impact you feel this has on their well-being.

**Appendix B**

**Survey Data Charted**

**Sorted by concern for others (Question 7 in ascending order)**

**P# Q3 Q2 Q4 Q5 Q7 Age Gender**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2 | 1 | 8 | 1 | B | 1 | 58 | F |
| 5 | 1 | 12 | 1 | A | 1 | 63 | F |
| 8 | 1 | 6 | 1 | B | 1 | 27 | F |
| 9 | 1 | 18 | 1 | B | 1 | 53 | M |
| 10 | 1 | 20 | 1 | B | 1 | 24 | F |
| 11 | 1 | 10 | 1 | B | 1 | 19 | F |
| 14 | 1 | 5 | 1 | B | 1 | 29 | M |
| 15 | 1 | 7 | 1 | B | 1 | 20 | M |
| 18 | 1 | 2 | 1 | B | 1 | 58 | M |
| 19 | 1 | 3 | 1 | B | 1 | 25 | M |
| 22 | 2 | 6 | 1 | B | 1 | 32 | M |
| 25 | 2 | 14 | 1 | B | 1 | 49 | F |
| 26 | 2 | 5 | 1 | B | 1 | 18 | M |
| 27 | 3 | 7 | 1 | B | 1 | 23 | M |
| 28 | 3 | 7 | 1 | B | 1 | 64 | F |
| 29 | 3 | 10 | 1 | B | 1 | 24 | M |
| 50 | 5 | 14 | 1 | B | 1 | 21 | F |
| 53 | 5 | 21 | 1 | A | 1 | 21 | M |
| 54 | 5 | 27 | 1 | B | 1 | 40 | M |
| 61 | 5 | 14 | 1 | A | 1 | 24 | F |
| 64 | 5 | 25 | 1 | B | 1 | 29 | F |
| 65 | 5 | 10 | 1 | B | 1 | 47 | M |
| 66 | 5 | 15 | 1 | A | 1 | 21 | M |
| 82 | 6 | 14 | 1 | B | 1 | 19 | M |
| 91 | 7 | 16 | 1 | A | 1 | 28 | M |
| 112 | 10 | 20 | 1 | A | 1 | 21 | M |
| 20 | 1 | 15 | 2 | B | 1 | 57 | F |
| 24 | 2 | 30 | 3 | B | 1 | 26 | M |
| 36 | 4 | 14 | 3 | B | 1 | 23 | F |
| 58 | 5 | 8 | 3 | B | 1 | 35 | F |
| 80 | 6 | 10 | 3 | A | 1 | 49 | F |
| 63 | 5 | 20 | 4 | B | 1 | 21 | M |
| 42 | 5 | 12 | 5 | B | 1 | 41 | M |
| 44 | 5 | 16 | 5 | B | 1 | 62 | F |
| 49 | 5 | 6 | 5 | A | 1 | 20 | F |
| 52 | 5 | 15 | 5 | B | 1 | 21 | M |
| 75 | 5 | 21 | 5 | B | 1 | 41 | M |
| 109 | 10 | 25 | 5 | B | 1 | 41 | M |
| 13 | 1 | 10 | 1 | A | 2 | 21 | F |
| 16 | 1 | 7 | 2 | B | 2 | 26 | F |
| 40 | 5 | 10 | 2 | B | 2 | 23 | M |
| 56 | 5 | 15 | 2 | B | 2 | 21 | M |
| 7 | 1 | 4 | 3 | B | 2 | 68 | M |
| 31 | 3 | 6 | 3 | A | 2 | 75 | F |
| 33 | 3 | 14 | 3 | B | 2 | 42 | F |
| 57 | 5 | 10 | 3 | B | 2 | 19 | M |
| 21 | 1 | 12 | 5 | B | 2 | 23 | M |
| 107 | 10 | 80 | 5 | A | 2 | 28 | M |
| 30 | 3 | 2 | 3 | B | 3 | 61 | M |
| 35 | 3 | 9 | 3 | B | 3 | 67 | M |
| 100 | 9 | 25 | 3 | A | 3 | 18 | M |
| 4 | 1 | 10 | 4 | B | 3 | 45 | F |
| 38 | 4 | 7 | 5 | B | 3 | 41 | M |
| 45 | 5 | 25 | 5 | B | 3 | 27 | M |
| 59 | 5 | 14 | 5 | B | 3 | 19 | F |
| 69 | 5 | 10 | 5 | B | 3 | 26 | F |
| 79 | 6 | 25 | 5 | B | 3 | 29 | M |
| 90 | 7 | 20 | 5 | A | 3 | 23 | F |
| 32 | 3 | 20 | 4 | B | 4 | 19 | M |
| 37 | 4 | 7 | 4 | A | 4 | 54 | M |
| 41 | 5 | 14 | 4 | A | 4 | 56 | F |
| 108 | 10 | 32 | 4 | B | 4 | 22 | M |
| 55 | 5 | 12 | 5 | B | 4 | 37 | F |
| 71 | 5 | 20 | 5 | B | 4 | 21 | M |
| 17 | 1 | 10 | 6 | B | 4 | 37 | F |
| 72 | 5 | 14 | 1 | B | 5 | 26 | M |
| 86 | 7 | 28 | 4 | A | 5 | 27 | F |
| 3 | 1 | 5 | 5 | B | 5 | 50 | M |
| 6 | 1 | 5 | 5 | B | 5 | 17 | F |
| 12 | 1 | 7 | 5 | B | 5 | 41 | M |
| 23 | 2 | 10 | 5 | A | 5 | 20 | M |
| 34 | 3 | 7 | 5 | B | 5 | 30 | M |
| 39 | 5 | 5 | 5 | B | 5 | 60 | M |
| 43 | 5 | 10 | 5 | B | 5 | 25 | M |
| 46 | 5 | 7 | 5 | A | 5 | 31 | F |
| 47 | 5 | 32 | 5 | B | 5 | 29 | M |
| 48 | 5 | 24 | 5 | B | 5 | 25 | F |
| 51 | 5 | 10 | 5 | B | 5 | 52 | F |
| 60 | 5 | 19 | 5 | B | 5 | 21 | M |
| 62 | 5 | 7 | 5 | B | 5 | 31 | M |
| 67 | 5 | 23 | 5 | B | 5 | 21 | F |
| 68 | 5 | 25 | 5 | B | 5 | 20 | M |
| 70 | 5 | 24 | 5 | B | 5 | 28 | F |
| 73 | 5 | 17 | 5 | B | 5 | 24 | F |
| 74 | 5 | 15 | 5 | A | 5 | 27 | M |
| 81 | 6 | 35 | 5 | B | 5 | 20 | M |
| 83 | 7 | 20 | 5 | A | 5 | 24 | M |
| 87 | 7 | 25 | 5 | A | 5 | 20 | M |
| 96 | 8 | 31 | 5 | B | 5 | 24 | M |
| 97 | 8 | 10 | 5 | B | 5 | 29 | F |
| 99 | 9 | 28 | 5 | B | 5 | 46 | M |
| 104 | 10 | 35 | 5 | A | 5 | 32 | M |
| 105 | 10 | 24 | 5 | A | 5 | 21 | F |
| 106 | 10 | 40 | 5 | A | 5 | 34 | M |
| 111 | 10 | 28 | 5 | B | 5 | 26 | M |
| 76 | 6 | 5 | 6 | B | 5 | 23 | F |
| 84 | 7 | 15 | 7 | B | 5 | 26 | M |
| 88 | 7 | 45 | 7 | B | 5 | 45 | M |
| 92 | 7 | 7 | 7 | A | 5 | 22 | M |
| 93 | 7 | 15 | 7 | B | 5 | 20 | M |
| 102 | 9 | 30 | 8 | A | 5 | 25 | F |
| 110 | 10 | 15 | 8 | A | 5 | 28 | M |
| 101 | 9 | 14 | 9 | A | 5 | 21 | M |
| 78 | 6 | 12 | 5 | B | 6 | 25 | M |
| 77 | 6 | 10 | 6 | B | 6 | 28 | M |
| 89 | 7 | 12 | 6 | B | 6 | 26 | F |
| 98 | 8 | 35 | 6 | A | 6 | 17 | M |
| 85 | 7 | 30 | 7 | B | 7 | 27 | F |
| 94 | 7 | 22 | 7 | B | 7 | 20 | F |
| 103 | 10 | 18 | 7 | B | 7 | 19 | M |
| 95 | 8 | 24 | 8 | A | 8 | 25 | M |

**Sorted by self-concern (Question 3 in ascending order)**

**P# Q3 Q2 Q4 Q5 Q7 Age Gender**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Column1** | **Column2** | **Column3** | **Column4** | **Column5** | **Column6** | **Column7** | **Column8** |
| 2 | 1 | 8 | 1 | B | 1 | 58 | F |
| 3 | 1 | 5 | 5 | B | 5 | 50 | M |
| 4 | 1 | 10 | 4 | B | 3 | 45 | F |
| 5 | 1 | 12 | 1 | A | 1 | 63 | F |
| 6 | 1 | 5 | 5 | B | 5 | 17 | F |
| 7 | 1 | 4 | 3 | B | 2 | 68 | M |
| 8 | 1 | 6 | 1 | B | 1 | 27 | F |
| 9 | 1 | 18 | 1 | B | 1 | 53 | M |
| 10 | 1 | 20 | 1 | B | 1 | 24 | F |
| 11 | 1 | 10 | 1 | B | 1 | 19 | F |
| 12 | 1 | 7 | 5 | B | 5 | 41 | M |
| 13 | 1 | 10 | 1 | A | 2 | 21 | F |
| 14 | 1 | 5 | 1 | B | 1 | 29 | M |
| 15 | 1 | 7 | 1 | B | 1 | 20 | M |
| 16 | 1 | 7 | 2 | B | 2 | 26 | F |
| 17 | 1 | 10 | 6 | B | 4 | 37 | F |
| 18 | 1 | 2 | 1 | B | 1 | 58 | M |
| 19 | 1 | 3 | 1 | B | 1 | 25 | M |
| 20 | 1 | 15 | 2 | B | 1 | 57 | F |
| 21 | 1 | 12 | 5 | B | 2 | 23 | M |
| 22 | 2 | 6 | 1 | B | 1 | 32 | M |
| 23 | 2 | 10 | 5 | A | 5 | 20 | M |
| 24 | 2 | 30 | 3 | B | 1 | 26 | M |
| 25 | 2 | 14 | 1 | B | 1 | 49 | F |
| 26 | 2 | 5 | 1 | B | 1 | 18 | M |
| 27 | 3 | 7 | 1 | B | 1 | 23 | M |
| 28 | 3 | 7 | 1 | B | 1 | 64 | F |
| 29 | 3 | 10 | 1 | B | 1 | 24 | M |
| 30 | 3 | 2 | 3 | B | 3 | 61 | M |
| 31 | 3 | 6 | 3 | A | 2 | 75 | F |
| 32 | 3 | 20 | 4 | B | 4 | 19 | M |
| 33 | 3 | 14 | 3 | B | 2 | 42 | F |
| 34 | 3 | 7 | 5 | B | 5 | 30 | M |
| 35 | 3 | 9 | 3 | B | 3 | 67 | M |
| 36 | 4 | 14 | 3 | B | 1 | 23 | F |
| 37 | 4 | 7 | 4 | A | 4 | 54 | M |
| 38 | 4 | 7 | 5 | B | 3 | 41 | M |
| 39 | 5 | 5 | 5 | B | 5 | 60 | M |
| 40 | 5 | 10 | 2 | B | 2 | 23 | M |
| 41 | 5 | 14 | 4 | A | 4 | 56 | F |
| 42 | 5 | 12 | 5 | B | 1 | 41 | M |
| 43 | 5 | 10 | 5 | B | 5 | 25 | M |
| 44 | 5 | 16 | 5 | B | 1 | 62 | F |
| 45 | 5 | 25 | 5 | B | 3 | 27 | M |
| 46 | 5 | 7 | 5 | A | 5 | 31 | F |
| 47 | 5 | 32 | 5 | B | 5 | 29 | M |
| 48 | 5 | 24 | 5 | B | 5 | 25 | F |
| 49 | 5 | 6 | 5 | A | 1 | 20 | F |
| 50 | 5 | 14 | 1 | B | 1 | 21 | F |
| 51 | 5 | 10 | 5 | B | 5 | 52 | F |
| 52 | 5 | 15 | 5 | B | 1 | 21 | M |
| 53 | 5 | 21 | 1 | A | 1 | 21 | M |
| 54 | 5 | 27 | 1 | B | 1 | 40 | M |
| 55 | 5 | 12 | 5 | B | 4 | 37 | F |
| 56 | 5 | 15 | 2 | B | 2 | 21 | M |
| 57 | 5 | 10 | 3 | B | 2 | 19 | M |
| 58 | 5 | 8 | 3 | B | 1 | 35 | F |
| 59 | 5 | 14 | 5 | B | 3 | 19 | F |
| 60 | 5 | 19 | 5 | B | 5 | 21 | M |
| 61 | 5 | 14 | 1 | A | 1 | 24 | F |
| 62 | 5 | 7 | 5 | B | 5 | 31 | M |
| 63 | 5 | 20 | 4 | B | 1 | 21 | M |
| 64 | 5 | 25 | 1 | B | 1 | 29 | F |
| 65 | 5 | 10 | 1 | B | 1 | 47 | M |
| 66 | 5 | 15 | 1 | A | 1 | 21 | M |
| 67 | 5 | 23 | 5 | B | 5 | 21 | F |
| 68 | 5 | 25 | 5 | B | 5 | 20 | M |
| 69 | 5 | 10 | 5 | B | 3 | 26 | F |
| 70 | 5 | 24 | 5 | B | 5 | 28 | F |
| 71 | 5 | 20 | 5 | B | 4 | 21 | M |
| 72 | 5 | 14 | 1 | B | 5 | 26 | M |
| 73 | 5 | 17 | 5 | B | 5 | 24 | F |
| 74 | 5 | 15 | 5 | A | 5 | 27 | M |
| 75 | 5 | 21 | 5 | B | 1 | 41 | M |
| 76 | 6 | 5 | 6 | B | 5 | 23 | F |
| 77 | 6 | 10 | 6 | B | 6 | 28 | M |
| 78 | 6 | 12 | 5 | B | 6 | 25 | M |
| 79 | 6 | 25 | 5 | B | 3 | 29 | M |
| 80 | 6 | 10 | 3 | A | 1 | 49 | F |
| 81 | 6 | 35 | 5 | B | 5 | 20 | M |
| 82 | 6 | 14 | 1 | B | 1 | 19 | M |
| 83 | 7 | 20 | 5 | A | 5 | 24 | M |
| 84 | 7 | 15 | 7 | B | 5 | 26 | M |
| 85 | 7 | 30 | 7 | B | 7 | 27 | F |
| 86 | 7 | 28 | 4 | A | 5 | 27 | F |
| 87 | 7 | 25 | 5 | A | 5 | 20 | M |
| 88 | 7 | 45 | 7 | B | 5 | 45 | M |
| 89 | 7 | 12 | 6 | B | 6 | 26 | F |
| 90 | 7 | 20 | 5 | A | 3 | 23 | F |
| 91 | 7 | 16 | 1 | A | 1 | 28 | M |
| 92 | 7 | 7 | 7 | A | 5 | 22 | M |
| 93 | 7 | 15 | 7 | B | 5 | 20 | M |
| 94 | 7 | 22 | 7 | B | 7 | 20 | F |
| 95 | 8 | 24 | 8 | A | 8 | 25 | M |
| 96 | 8 | 31 | 5 | B | 5 | 24 | M |
| 97 | 8 | 10 | 5 | B | 5 | 29 | F |
| 98 | 8 | 35 | 6 | A | 6 | 17 | M |
| 99 | 9 | 28 | 5 | B | 5 | 46 | M |
| 100 | 9 | 25 | 3 | A | 3 | 18 | M |
| 101 | 9 | 14 | 9 | A | 5 | 21 | M |
| 102 | 9 | 30 | 8 | A | 5 | 25 | F |
| 103 | 10 | 18 | 7 | B | 7 | 19 | M |
| 104 | 10 | 35 | 5 | A | 5 | 32 | M |
| 105 | 10 | 24 | 5 | A | 5 | 21 | F |
| 106 | 10 | 40 | 5 | A | 5 | 34 | M |
| 107 | 10 | 80 | 5 | A | 2 | 28 | M |
| 108 | 10 | 32 | 4 | B | 4 | 22 | M |
| 109 | 10 | 25 | 5 | B | 1 | 41 | M |
| 110 | 10 | 15 | 8 | A | 5 | 28 | M |
| 111 | 10 | 28 | 5 | B | 5 | 26 | M |
| 112 | 10 | 20 | 1 | A | 1 | 21 | M |