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Abstract

Social Cognitive Theory posits that children can learn from observations specially if repeated, directly or indirectly reinforced, and the audience feels competent in doing them. While much of the focus of research was on the negative aspects or the antisocial content specially in the Arab region, the present study studies prosocial content. Prosocial behaviors is a socially desirable intended behavior that in some way benefits another person or society at large. A content analysis was used to examine the content of the popular cartoons of children aged 7-12 years old who based on research are able to comprehend the messages conveyed in cartoons. The study examined 87 cartoons that were shown during prime time on the three free networks that target that age which are: Cartoon Network Arabia, Spacetoon Arabic and MBC3. A total of around 42 hours was studied. The findings showed that children are exposed to around 10 acts of prosocial behavior every hour they watch television. More than half of the prosocial behavior was classified as physical behaviors. Altruism was the most common prosocial behavior portrayed, followed by positive interaction. The main motive for the prosocial behavior was clear need which was present in 249 of the acts out of 443, followed by altruistic motivation then, demonstration of friendship. Approximately 75% of prosocial acts were conducted by male characters mostly adults and teenagers. Overall, there were more prosocial acts by high social economic status characters 46.5% as compared to middle (34.09%). Most prosocial acts were conducted by average (49.89%) or attractive (41.76%) characters in comparison with unattractive (6.55%). Most of the prosocial acts were between friends (46.05%) followed by family. Most of the acts had a low cost to the initiator; were rewarded; there was a clear need and it was done with pure intentions. The different elements of the theory were present in the results which makes the probability of children learning positive behaviors very high.
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Chapter One

I. Introduction

Throughout the past decades, parents, policy makers, educators and researchers worldwide have been alarmed by the negative implications that occur due to exposure to television messages. Numerous studies were made on the antisocial influence of the media, such as violence and aggression. Some results have shown that watching specific kinds of negative content can lead to harmful or antisocial effects on the viewers specially children. However, others have argued that television can also be used to teach prosocial behaviors. For instance, U.S. Surgeon General William Stewart said to Congress in 1969, “If television can have a negative effect on children, it can also be a positive stimulus. We must learn more about how to promote this latter capacity while we learn how to avoid the hazards of the former” (Libert & Sprafkin, 1988, p. 229). Therefore, television viewing is a very important activity and has meaningful effects on the development of children. It also gives them a wide range of general information about the world. It teaches them the values of their culture. In 2009, Nielsen Co. reported that children in USA ages 2-5 watched more than 32 hours of television a week. Children 6-8 watched 28 hours a week. Children 8-18 watch 4.5 hours daily watching television in its different forms such as phones and computers (Uzoma, 2015). In 2015, a market research company called Childwise reported that children aged 5 to 16 spend around 6.5 hours daily infront of a screen. In Egypt and the Arab word, children spend around 3-4 hours or more daily watching television and around 33 hours a week in the summer and 24 hours a week during the winter (Al Fowaz, 2003; Abbas, 2003). So a year, an Egyptian child watches around 1460 hours of television. It is expected that this number has grown in the last couple of years. Therefore, the content that the child is exposed to is important
to study since he spends all this amount of time and more watching television. There are a number of studies that support the idea of cartoons having a positive impact on the behavior. However, in order for that to take place, there are important characteristics that should be present in these shows. It is worth noting that the frequency of having pro-social acts in the programs is not the sole reason for acquiring the behavior. The contexts where these acts occur are important as well in addition to other elements that will be explained below. Liebert and Schwartzberg (1977) said, “All television is educational, the only question is: what is it teaching?” (p. 170). Television can be an excellent educator as well as an entertainer. Dorr (1986) said that the studies conducted in the last 30 years showed that children like all cartoon characters irrespective of how close they are to the child’s cultural background as long as the character is the main character in the cartoon. However, if the character happens to have common traits or cultural background to the child, this will attract more the attention of the child to the character and he will like it more and learn from it faster his role in social life and makes him understand more the content of the cartoon and its messages. Therefore, cartoons have an effect on the feelings and psychological make up of the children more than any other medium (Abdel Raouf, 1998).

Rushton announced that, “television does have the power to affect the social behavior of viewers in positive, pro-social direction. This suggests that television is an effective agent of socialization, that television entertainment is modifying the viewer’s perceptions of the world and how to live in it” (p.255). Mares & Woodard (2005) said that “… television has the potential to foster positive social interactions, reduce aggression, and encourage viewers to be more tolerant and helpful” (p. 316).
This is an opportunity to explore the pro-social content of popular animated cartoons viewed by the Egyptian children to build a new generation that is emotionally well balanced and behaves in a positive manner. Television has become an integral part of the daily lives of children and therefore has the ability to have a role in developing the character. It is the way through which children learn values, gain information, and experiences in addition to being a source of entertainment and fun. Therefore, the content that the children are exposed to shapes the child’s views and how he sees the world. It has an effect on nurturing and developing young influential minds. Thus, it is an opportunity to encourage the people in the media industry and producers of the shows to either produce their own cartoons or programs or focus on the pro-social ones or importing programs that have pro-social content. There are many children channels in Egypt that are mostly for cartoons and most of the cartoons are not produced in Egypt. They are either shown in English or dubbed in Arabic. The problem with these is that usually the story being told represents the culture it is coming from and not Egypt. Therefore, many of the reactions and actions would be different. And as mentioned above, local shows have a great impact on the children’s acquiring the behavior because they can identify with the situations and the characters which is difficult when watching foreign programs. When talking about television, we need to remember that this has been extended over the years to include other screens such as computers, iPads, smart phones and so on. What is important is what the children are watching and not how they watch it. Therefore, the focus should be on the content viewed. Children spend a lot of their time watching television and other screen-based technologies and no doubt that they learn from what they are exposed to. Even with the technological advancements, we can’t forget that the children in rural areas in Egypt still consider television as their main source of
entertainment and information (Ibrahim, 2013). There was an increase in the number of studies in the 1990’s in Egypt when compared with the 1980’s and 1970’s with regards to children’s media in general. This was possibly because the Arab countries governments started to consider it important. A lot of children’s associations started whether governmental or non-governmental. In addition to the existence of academic and scientific centers specifically for childhood research (Tayie, 2008). People are usually concerned about the harmful effects of media though there is evidence that media can also be beneficial.

1. Importance of the Study:

This study aims to draw the attention of the producers of cartoons in Egypt to the type of values and behaviors that these shows should include. The study will also draw the attention of the parents and teachers to the types of cartoons that the children should be watching. The results of the study will also help animated cartoon producers to identify the attractive aspects to the children that made the cartoon popular and be useful when designing educational messages or health awareness issues as well. The study will also draw the parents’ attention to their role in how the media can affect their children’s’ lives. Parents can then watch the prosocial programs with their children and help explain and try to reinforce the messages in different formats. This can enhance the children’s learning of the prosocial behavior. Also parents can reduce the risks of the exposure to aggression and violence in the programs. They can assist the children to think critically about the harmful content they watch and therefore, reducing the influence of the media violence on children. Studies have also shown that the best way to avoid aggression in adults is to concentrate on prosocial behaviors during childhood.
I. 2  Statement of the Problem

Most of the research focus more on individual aspects of the social cognitive theory and not all the aspects needed to establish a true test of theory. Therefore, this study is done to explore the prosocial content of the popular cartoons that are shown during prime time and to determine if the main components of the theory exist in the popular cartoons of children. This will in turn pave the way to a positive change in the behavior of the children. Children spend a lot of their time watching cartoons and therefore it would be better if that would have a positive effect on them. Shepard & Speelman (1986) said that the majority of a person’s basic attitudes are formulated between the ages of 7 and 12. Also there are not any studies in Egypt that study the content of all popular cartoons that are shown during prime time. Most studies only focus on one animated cartoon such as Detective Conan or Bakkar.

I. 3  Research Questions

In light of the social cognitive theory, there are three main research questions for this study:

RQ1: What is the multidimensional frequency of prosocial behavior in the popular animated cartoons viewed in Egypt?

RQ2: What are the characteristics of the the characters who tend to be prosocial?

RQ3: How is the context of the pro-social act portrayed in the cartoons?
Chapter Two

II. Literature Review

II.1 Cartoons

Cartoons have been a part of the entertainment environment since the beginning of the cinema. They are animated programs made to entertain using rapid action and pace, constant change of setting in a short time segment. In the beginning, they were used to ‘warm-up’ audience before the movies start. They were originally designed for adults. As soon as television became available at homes, they became a part of television as humorous, short interlude between programs for all ages. Cartoons became specifically for children since mid 1960s. Later on, specific channels devoted exclusively for children like Disney and Nickelodeon started to emerge. Anderson (1997) mentioned that there were certain genres and character types that became only successful if they were presented in cartoon form.

II.2 What is Prosocial

Children can learn from viewing television certain behaviors but in addition to that they learn ideas and attitudes that will direct their behavior in their life (Gerbner et al.,1980; Murray, 1980; Palmer & Dorr, 1980). The term prosocial was defined in various ways by researchers. Sociologists defined it as pro-societal and affecting the socialization. While the psychologists defined it more narrowly as a voluntary type of behavior that benefits people (Eisenberg & Mussen, 1989). However, in television research, the term combined both views and was then broadly defined as “that which is socially desirable and which in some way benefits another person or society at large” (Rushton, 1982). Pro-social behavior can be defined as any intended behavior to benefit
others. Pro-social programs are ones that promote constructive morals and encourage socially desired behaviors (Boulton, 2012). Harris (1999) defined a prosocial program as “one that is specifically designed to produce socially positive outcomes and encourage positive social change.” Examples of pro-social behavior are altruism, friendliness, sharing, cooperation, sympathy, and acceptance of others from different groups. Gaining knowledge on how to act in a pro-social manner is an essential and challenging developmental task for children.

A pro-social behavior is “associated with many positive outcomes in children, including the development of positive peer relationships, academic achievement, and good psychological functioning,” Williamson said (2013). It is a collective effort where television plays an important role but also parents, teachers, and the community help in reinforcing them.

II. 3 Social Cognitive Theory

Bandura described television saying that it has become a “superb tutor” for children to gain a number of behaviors (Bandura, 1973). Children generally look for role models to guide them and their behaviors. Technology and media have given the children the opportunity to learn beyond their real-life models to symbolic models from television (Bandura, 1986). Television expands the scope of people’s experiences in televised representations of relationships in the society. The social cognitive theory of mass communication emphasizes “the central role of the symbolic environment of mass media in influencing and shaping peoples’ thoughts, attitudes, beliefs and behavioral patterns in an era of information and communication revolution” (Bandura, 1994, 2002).
Bandura’s conceptualization of social learning is an outcome of numerous experiments, studies and theatrical journeys. It all started in 1941 when Neal Miller and John Dollard introduced their book ‘Social Learning and Imitation Theory’ where they mentioned that there are four aspects that contribute to learning. These were: drives, cues, responses and rewards. Social motivation is one of the drives which include imitativeness. Imitation depends on whether the model receives a positive or negative consequences. They explained that if the person was motivated to learn a certain behavior, then that would be through clear observations. By imitating that behavior, the person would strengthen that behavior and be rewarded with positive reinforcement.

The concept of social learning was then expanded and developed by Canadian psychologist Albert Bandura. Bandura and Walters did a lot of research that led to Bandura’s first book about adolescence and aggression in 1959 and then another book called; Aggression: A Social Learning Analysis in 1973. In 1961 and 1963, he conducted a number of studies with his students and colleagues known as the Bobo doll experiment. They were trying to know the reason why and when the children display aggressive behaviors. They also wanted to show that similar behaviors were learned by individuals influencing their own behaviors based on the actions of models. These studies showed the importance of modeling for acquiring new behaviors. The results of the studies also helped in changing the focus in academic psychology from pure behaviorism to cognitive psychology. These studies were the base for Bandura to publish his influential article and book in 1977 that elaborated on the concept of how behavior is acquired. In his article, he demonstrated that Social Learning Theory exhibits a direct relationship between an individual’s perceived self efficacy and behavioral change (Bandura, 1977).
Bandura introduces and proves in his Social Learning Theory the idea of observational learning based on modeling. It assumes that people can learn from watching others and they can acquire new behaviors accordingly without actually experiencing them. Learning occurs in social context and a lot of what we learn comes from observation. Therefore, social learning is based on the social mechanism that shapes the personality (Libert & Libert, 1998).

There is a number of elements of modeling identified in the social learning process: attention to the model, retention of modeled content, behavioral reproduction and incentive motivation (Bandura, 1977, 1986). Children can learn from models in their family, school and also from their community and surrounding social environment. Electronic media also present numerous role models either prosocial or antisocial ones. First, children must attend to or notice the behavior being depicted by the media, and then they must encode the content into their existing memory. The child’s restructured memory of the observation can then be reflected in both the child’s behavior and his or her motivational processes which are the reasons for attempting to do the previous processes. Motivational processes help define if the behaviors are indorsed based on the nature of the reinforcement. Reinforcement may come from the feedback produced by one’s behavior. These functions are related to the amount of media exposure a child has, the characteristics of the characters, as well as the contextual factors surrounding the behavior (Padilla-Walker et al., 2013).

In order for the modeled behavior to be effective, there are a number of factors that should be considered. These are the willingness of the child to act in agreement with the model, the model’s characteristics, the similarity between the observer and the model, the
characteristics of the observer, the social setting and the reinforcement of the modeled behavior (Bandura, 1969, 1977; Bandura & McDonald, 1963).

Since the social learning framework didn’t encompass cognitive aspects of the learning process, therefore Bandura broadened the scope of the concept of observational learning and revised his social learning theory. By the mid 1980’s, his research tended to be more holistic giving attention to the role of human cognition in the context of social learning. He published his second book in 1986 called ‘Social Foundations of Thought and Action: A Social Cognitive Theory’ which expanded and renamed his original Social Learning Theory to become known as the Social Cognitive Theory. The change in the name was done to highlight the major role cognition has in encoding and performing the behavior. He argued that the behavior of the person is caused by the relationship among three major groups of determinants: personal, behavioral and environmental factors (Bandura, 1986). Bandura viewed individuals as self organizing, proactive, self reflecting and self regulating which was opposing the historic view of humans as governed by external forces. Therefore, the SCT shows the inter-relationship between behavioral and cognitive processes that affect social learning.

Social Cognitive Theory suggests that “children are socialized by observing models (including the media), and that this socialization may be reflected in children’s judgments, cognitions, and/or behaviors,” (Bandura, 1989).

Bandura (1986) explains that people learn from observations specially if repeated, directly or indirectly reinforced, and the audience feels competent in doing them. Thus, the majority of the content on TV can be learnt. Social cognitive theory defines the cognitive and motivational processes needed for acquiring these behaviors from
observation. Bandura (1986) has discussed the cognitively based motivators of behavior to help us understand the TV’s socialization effect based on that:

“Through symbolic representation of foreseeable consequences, future outcomes can be converted into current guides and motivators of behavior. Here, the instigator to action is forethought rather than the sight of the actual incentives. The outcome expectations may be material (e.g., consumable, physically painful), sensory (e.g., novel, enjoyable, or unpleasant sensory stimulation), token (e.g., grades, money), or social (positive and negative interpersonal reactions).” (p.233)

The importance of repeated exposure to pro-social behavior increases the likelihood that the viewer will actually see and remember that behavior (Bandura, 1989). Also, the qualities of the characters influence the viewer’s possibility to pay attention to specific behaviors on television. He is also more inclined to remember behavior that reflects reality, in regards to sharing similar traits with the character and the behavior. This will make it easier for the child to retrieve this information when applicable.

Bandura appreciates that people would encompass a behavior based on the “forethought” which is the prospect of being rewarded (O’Bey & Charlton, 1997)

In 2001, Bandura has brought SCT to mass communication where the theory was referred to as social cognitive theory of mass communication. It pinpoints the role of print and electronic media which is symbolic communication that influence the thought, affect and action of people. According to Bandura (1994), “through symbols, people give meaning, form and continuity to the experiences they have” (p.62). Modern technologies create a variety of society and community environments where observational learning can
occur. He highlighted the importance of symbolic modeling and vicarious learning from televised models that have the power to reach a huge number of people in a big variety of places (Bandura, 2002). Bandura believes that the continuous technological advancements will enable the people to be both “producers and products of their environment” and it will also help them “break out of the current mediated filter-down system of persuasion and enlightenment controlled by institutional and moneyed gatekeepers” (Bandura, 2002). We can now see that what he believed was true since with the new technologies of internet, Youtube, video games people are exposed to different kinds of information, cultures, beliefs and environments that definitely have an influence on them.

However, there were a number of criticisms to the Social Cognitive Theory. One of the main criticisms of the social-cognitive theory is that it is not a unified theory. This means that the different aspects of the theory may not be connected. For example, researchers currently cannot find a connection between observational learning and self-efficacy within the social-cognitive perspective. The theory is so broad that not all of its component parts are fully understood and integrated into a single explanation of learning and personality. The findings associated with this theory are still, for the most part, preliminary. It does not provide a full explanation or description of how social cognition, behavior, environment, and personality are related, although there are several hypotheses (Flamand, 2009).

Another limitation is that not all social learning can be directly observed. Because of this, it can be difficult to quantify the effect that social cognition has on development. Similarly, many aspects of personality are subjective and can be equally hard to measure
and quantify. Also, the theory tends to ignore maturation throughout the lifespan. Because of this, the understanding of how a child learns through observation and how an adult learns through observation are not differentiated, and factors of development are not included (Hart et al, 2006).

Because social cognitive theory posits a dynamic interaction between the environment and the individual, it supposes that one is largely determined by one's situation and that changes in that situation will thus change behavior. However, it has been argued that for many people, behavior is much more consistent regardless of situation and that simple changes in environment do not always lead to changes in behavior (Flamand, 2009).

It has been argued that because social cognitive theory places so much emphasis on cognitive abilities such as modeling and forming expectations, it ignores biological or hormonal determinants. Some psychologists argue that biological or hormonal processes can largely shape the way people reason and make decisions regardless of past experiences or cognition (Myers, 2010).

It also ignores innate genetic differences and differences in learning ability. For instance, it has been argued that some people may be innately better at learning some skills than others. Additionally, some people with learning deficiencies may not be as good at observing and modeling behavior. Social cognitive theory has been criticized for ignoring these differences (Rootman, 2013).

The Bobo doll experiment was also criticized for being too artificial and that if an adult was acting violently to a child, other children would not repeat the behavior; or that
children were manipulated into repeating the aggressive behavior; or that children were only playing rather then aggressing the doll (Durkin, 1995).

Bandura's ideas on violent behavior acquisition through media were also subjected to criticisms. Some authors have found that watching television actually reduces the amount of aggressive behavior since children can relate themselves with characters involved in a violent act and release their violent thoughts (the Catharsis effect) (Hart et al, 2006).

Although there were lots of criticism to the social cognitive theory, however over the past decades, the SCT has been used in numerous studies. It also served as the basis for a number of studies related to effects of televised portrayals of violence, positive effects of prosocial content and media health campaigns. Huston and Wright (1998) said that the social learning theory was the base for the majority of studies in the 1970’s-1990’s that related to television content and its effects specially violence. The social cognitive theory of mass communication has been greatly used in understanding media effects, media consumption, advertising, diffusion of information and public communication campaigns. The SCT applied to a number of areas other than mass communication such as career development and work adjustments, academic motivation and performance, health promoting behavior and coping with physical and psychological problems.
II. 4 Overview of Research Interests

There was some research in the 1950’s which provided an initial database for researchers. Television penetration in the US in 1960s has reached 87% as opposed to 10% in 1950 (Nielsen Media Research, 2000) and therefore researchers were concerned about the possible effects of television on the audience specially children. Programs such as Mister Rogers’ Neighborhood and Sesame Street started to exist in the late 1960’s. They became very popular and were recognized by the community and inspired many productions. The shows contained many prosocial and educational messages. The idea of prosocial programs targeting children began at the end of the 1960’s. Though the 1960’s witnessed a growing level of violence and therefore researchers started a new direction in research which is studying aggression and television’s antisocial influence on children. Research on prosocial programs was then further developed in the 1970’s as a consequence of the Surgeon General’s Report *Television and growing up: The impact of televised violence* in 1972. The report concluded that TV violence is one of the factors that may affect the aggressive behavior of children after a series of experiments and investigations to see the effects of television on thousands of children. It also highlighted that other factors such as contextual, developmental and societal should be noticed. It also encouraged researchers to study the modeling and imitation of prosocial behavior that can counterbalance the antisocial effects of television (Surgeon General’s Scientific Committee, 1972). Therefore, the 1970’s witnessed the vast majority of research on prosocial television programs for children. However, the 1980’s witnessed a decline in the productions of children’s programs caused by the deregulation of the television industry and accordingly a decrease in the research in that area (Wimmer & Dominick, 2003). In 1990’s, the interest of the public and researchers in prosocial programs revived after the
adoption of the Children’s Television Act in 1990 and the Federal Communications
Commission regulations in 1996 related to children’s television. Nowadays the focus of
research extended to include video games and other newer technologies.

II. 4. 1. The 1950’s: The Very Beginning

The main areas of interest for the researchers in the 1950’s were: whether children
identified with the heroes on TV; whether they imitated aggressive behaviors; which
programs were popular and which were frightening; and how children used TV in their
lives. Below are some examples of the studies conducted in the 1950’s.

Siegel (1956) studied the effect of a film that contained a lot of aggressive
behaviors on children. She did an experiment to study the behavior of children 3-5 year-
old playing after watching the film. The children were provided with a variety of toys to
play with after watching the film. The toys contained rubber daggers, dolls, balloons,
punching toys, etc. Although the experiment showed no significant differences in the
behavior but she suggested that films “may have an effect on children’s’ beliefs, their
role perceptions and perhaps their values and attitudes” (1956: 377). This type of
experiment was used by many researchers in the following years to study the effects of
watching films on children’s prosocial and aggressive behavior.

Maccoby and Wilson (1957) studied the difference between girls and boys and
how they identified with and learned from television through observation. They used a
questionnaire given to the children a week after viewing. The results of the study
indicated that boys remembered the aggressive acts and the girls remembered the non-
aggressive acts. In addition to that, they mentioned that the boys and girls identified with
the main characters of the films from the same sex and the social class that they aspire
and not their current social class. This study paid the attention of the researchers to the idea of identifying with models on television.

There was another research done in 1958 regarding children and television which was considered the first large scale research. It was done by Himmelwit et al. using data from 4,500 children in England. The data was collected from diaries, questionnaires, essays and comments from teachers. The study concluded that viewing television was related to the child’s emotional and intellectual maturity and his own needs. It also suggested that less intelligent children and the ones socially insecure were the ones who watched television more intensely.

Himmelweit et al did a number of other studies and concluded that in general, there is a small influence of television and that it was “the child’s emotional make up and total of his environmental influences that determine his behavior” (1958, p.215). They also added that television might not influence a stable child but it may evoke a response in a disturbed child. They added that the amount of television viewed and the enjoyment of it reinforce any messages the child might absorb specially if they are repeated and seen often.

II. 4. 2. The 1960’s: Bobo Doll Experiments

In 1961, Schramm et al used a similar approach like that of Himmelweyt but on American children. It was the first major American study using over 6000 children. The results of the study suggested that children who were bright were more selective about what they watched and chose ones that would fit with their other activities than low ability ones who also watched more television. They also identified three categories of television usage for children. The first usage was using it as passive entertainment,
escape from real-life problems, identify with exciting people, etc. The second was a source of information regarding the society and how people dress, behave and so on. The third category was a social utility one where television programs provided the children with a common experience that can help them in conversation and discussions with their friends. They concluded from their research that the child’s character and previous experience affect the extent to which television would have an influence on them. Their findings opposed the idea that television is a major reason for violence (Schramm et al., 1961).

In the 1960’s, Bandura studied the way children learned certain physical and verbal responses. He explained that by observing others, children could acquire new behaviors. He also added that to reinforce the behavior, it should be rewarded (Bandura, Walters, 1963). Schramm et al. and Himmelweit et al. all agreed that television and its symbolic representation could be more influential on the child than learning from real models like parents and that is due to the amount of time spent watching television (Himmelweit et al., 1958; Schramm et al., 1961).

Bandura and his associates did a number of experiments called Bobo doll where the children watched a special made film where adults expressed aggressive behaviors towards a large inflatable doll. The children who watched the film, imitated the aggressive behavior towards the doll after the film. The children who haven’t seen the aggressive behavior, didn’t react this way. The experiment showed that models in films are as effective in transmitting behavior as in real-life models (Bandura, 1963). Therefore, Bandura & Walters developed the work of Schramm et al. and Himmelweit et al. into television as a further source of behavioral models.
There are other number of experiments done relating to the children’s reactiveness to aggression on television. One of these experiments was by Mussen & Rutherford (1961). It was like a follow up to the experiment done by Siegel in 1956. The experiment was to study the effect of aggressive cartoons on children. The experiment involved 36 children aged 6-7 years old. They were divided into 6 groups. Three groups were given a frustrating task to complete. Then they either watched an aggressive cartoon, a non aggressive cartoon or no cartoon. The other three groups watched the same films but weren’t given a frustrating task to do. The study revolved around the verbal desire to destroy a balloon. The results of the study showed that the children who watched the aggressive cartoons expressed more aggressive impulses than the other ones. These results supported the idea that watching cartoon violence could trigger aggression in the child in permissive situation.

II. 4. 3. The 1970’s: Consequences of the Surgeon General’s Report

During the 1970’s, Halloran (1970) said that many people regarded television as “all powerful, all persuasive, manipulating force which is entirely outside their control.” He added that research concentrated more on the short term effects of television on behavior. He supported the idea that television can influence the attitudes and behaviors but he added that children responded differently based on each child’s individual differences.

In 1972, the US government (under the auspices of the Surgeon General’s Scientific Advisory Committee) requested investigations to examine the effects of television on thousands of children. Twenty experiments revealed that most children imitated aggressive behavior shown on films and the other thirty experiments showed that
there was increased aggressiveness by both children and adults. However, it was not proved that this was a general consequence. The report was criticized by many people claiming that some of the members of the committee had interests in television companies (Cattermole, 1988).

One of the experiments done in the investigations was by Stein & Friedrich (1971) who examined the behavior of children after viewing aggressive, neutral and prosocial programs over a period of four weeks. The results showed there was no consistency in the effect on the children who were originally non-aggressive after watching the violent programs. They already knew how to control their aggressive impulses. However, the children who were already aggressive were affected by the violent programs. As for the children who watched the prosocial programs, there was a slight increase in their prosocial behavior. This study showed that television has an effect on children even if the exposure was for a short time but that effect differed from one child to another.

The 1970’s witnessed a lot of studies on children’s responses to television violence. Gerbner (1972) was concerned about the amount of violence children are exposed to and thought that they had a little chance of escaping them because cartoons at that time contained a lot of violent scenes.

Prosocial TV and prosocial effects research in that period focused on studying the short term prosocial effects of positive messages targeting the children (Comstock et al., 1978). Important data and information were collected and helped in building new theoretical models specially the Social Learning Theory.
Sprakin, Liebert, and Poulos (1975) wanted to examine the association between the regular exposure of entertainment programs and facilitating prosocial behavior in children. They experimented on children using parts from Lassie. One group watched a prosocial clip and the other group watched a neutral clip from Lassie. They had the children in an experimental condition where the help of a child was requested. The group who watched the prosocial clip were more tending to assist for a longer time than the other group.

In Australia, a filed study was done in 1979 which concluded that there was a significant positive relationship between children’s exposure to concentrated prosocial messages on television and their behavior in school. The study involved 97 kindergarten children in five schools after watching prosocial programs such as Lassie, I Love Lucy, Happy Days, etc. The control group watched neutral programs. The study revealed that the children who viewed the prosocial programs showed an increase in the scores in cooperation and the positive attitudes (Ahammer & Murray, 1979).

A field experiment using also kindergarten children in a naturalistic setting wanted to experiment whether the short term imitation of a prosocial behavior would persist after the viewing of the program. The study divided the children into 2 groups. It assigned one group to watch a prosocial program called ‘Mister Rogers Neighborhood’ and another group watched a neutral program that didn’t contain prosocial content. This was over the course of four sessions. In addition to that, a part of the group who watched the prosocial program, were given a training using a puppet role playing that repeated and included main incidents and dialogue from the episodes they watched. Three days later, all the children had the option of either working on an art project or assisting someone.
else who had difficulty doing the project. The results showed that the children who watched *Mister Rogers Neighborhood* were more helpful than the children who had watched the neutral program especially if the prosocial program was reinforced by role playing (Friedrich and Stein, 1975). Therefore, regular viewing of a particular program would have a long-term effect on the prosocial behavior of the children.

Coates, Pusser & Goodman (1976) did a field study to examine preschool children’s responses to television. They used fifteen minutes of either Sesame Street or Mr Rogers’ neighborhood for the duration of four days. The scenes selected did not include any acts of violence. The study involved 26 children. Observation of the children took place during their free play before and after watching the segments. The Sesame Street parts were chosen to include problem solving techniques, cognitive behaviors and punishment. As for Mr Rogers’, they focused more on social and emotional developments, cooperation and didn’t include punishment. Sesame Street increased the social contacts and problem solving in the children who had low scores on the baseline levels of behaviors measured previously. The children with high scores were not affected. As for Mr Rogers’ Neighorhood, all the children were affected and there was an increase in the social contacts and positive reinforcements. The study showed that programs like these can affect the behavior of the preschool children. However, the degree of the change depends on the type of character of the child.

Sesame Street and Mr Rogers’ Neighborhood were very successful in the late 60’s and 70’s. They included a lot of prosocial aspects that help in the children’s socialization such as rejection, disappointments, going to the dentist, etc. Sesame Street taught preschool children how to read and count in addition to helping them gain positive social
skills and attitudes. Sesame Street merged education with entertainment. It is also one of the most researched program for children in the history of television (Fisch & Truglio, 2001). A whole generation of programs appeared in the 1970’s building on the success of Sesame Street.

Some researchers decided to take an active role in the development of prosocial television. Some of these researchers were George Gerbner, Ithiel de Sola Pool and Eleanor Maccoby. They cooperated with Kaiser Broadcasting Company in reviewing the existing children’s programs and helped to make prosocial educational ads to be aired between cartoons (Carter & Strickland, 1975).

II. 4. 4. The 1980’s: Redirection of Prosocial TV Research

The 1980’s saw a decrease in the amount of research done on prosocial television. This was due to the deregulation of the television industry and television commercialization. The Federal Communication Commission had taken back the attention that was given to children’s welfare and withdrew all previous policies regarding children’s programming. (Ginsburg, Botein, & Director, 1998). This led to a drastic decrease in the amount of children’s programs and educational programs on commercial networks. Although, public television still devoted a big portion of its air time to educational programs. As for channels such as Disney and Nickelodean, they had a good amount of general entertaining and informative content but these were only accessible by subscription. Overall, “entertainment was emphasized in program offerings instead of pro-social content” (Schneider, 2001, p.87)

The direction of the research in the 1980’s changed. Researchers weren’t questioning if television can have an effect on the prosocial behavior of children.
Actually the 1970’s already provided a lot of evidence regarding that. There was an update after ten years for the Surgeon General Report. It mentioned that the studies of prosocial television effects became one of the most significant developments after the report (Pearl, Bouthilet, & Lazar, 1982). The question in the 1980’s was whether they should use the television’s power. Liebert (1986) said “whether this is progressive education or a chilling new form of brainwashing, and what if anything we will do with TV’s great potential power over the young have become the great unanswered questions” (p.47)

A number of scientific analyses focused on the exploration of the content on television and its effect on the socialization of children (Barcus, 1983; Gerbner, Gross, Signorielli, & Morgan, 1980). It was said that children can learn different types of behaviors from TV and in addition to that, they learn attitudes and ideas that guide their behavior throughout life.

There were some studies on measuring the prosocial dimension of television content but that was stopped because of funding. Also the annual evaluation of prosocial content was also stopped along with the annual evaluation of TV violence that was done by Gerbner and his associates.

Other studies were done as content analysis of the prime time TV and Saturday mornings. The aspects that were interesting to the researchers were family role, gender role portrayals, women and minority representation, occupations, etc. (Greenberg, Korzenny, & Atkin, 1980). Lovelace and Huston (1983) recommended that the best way to transmit prosocial messages is to do it without any antisocial behavior accompanying it.
Singer, Singer and Zuckerman (1981) wanted to study whether using certain ideas from television programs and developing ideas or concepts related to them in the lessons that teachers can teach would increase the prosocial skills of children such as cooperation, sharing and turn-taking. The study used 200 preschoolers. The results of the study showed that the ideas were reinforced through the classroom discussions. Children displayed an increase in the interaction and cooperation with peers, reduction of aggression and leadership when they watched the television program with the certain ideas in addition to the teacher’s reinforcement.

In 1984, Eron and Heusmann did a longitudinal study involving 800 children for 22 years since they were eight years old. They measured aggression and prosocial behavior stability over the years. The results showed that problem solving styles are learned early in life and continue to adulthood. They added that aggressive and prosocial behaviors are on opposite ends. When a child learns prosocial problem solving style early and learn it well, this will in turn not allow him to learn the aggressive problem solving style well since they are in opposition. Children who care about others and have social skills tend not be involved in aggressive actions. The results of the study also showed that the most consistent predictor of prosocial behaviors in adults was the presence of prosocial behavior at age 8. They highlighted that prosocial and antisocial behaviors were always negatively related. The study concluded that the measurement of the prosocial and antisocial behaviors was stable throughout the 22 years. They pointed out that one of the best ways to avoid aggression in adults is to concentrate on prosocial behaviors during childhood.
Eron and Heusmann (1986) once again studied the relationship between prosocial television and its effect on the children’s and adolescents’ behaviors. They explained that the relationship is complicated and it would be difficult to say that observational learning is the only reason for that. A number of other factors contribute to that. These include the child’s personal characteristics, age, gender, intelligence, social class, in addition to identification with the characters on TV and the amount of television watched. They confirmed from their study that television has the ability to affect the prosocial behaviors of children. Hearold (1986) believed that “the potential for prosocial effects overrides the smaller but persistent negative effects of antisocial programs” (p. 116)

II. 4. 5. The 1990’s: Concept Re-evaluation

Kunkel (1998) believed that the Children’s Television Act (CTA) that was passed by the Congress in 1990 was a landmark for having the commercial broadcasters provide children programs. The act stated that commercial broadcasters should provide programs that suit children’s educational and informational needs for each specific age as part of their obligation to the public. This was the condition for their license to be renewed. Another aspect of the act was establishing a National Endowment for Children’s Educational Television to support the development of educational programs especially intellectual skills (Kunkel & Canepa, 1994; Wartella, 1994).

The early 1990’s have been marked by the great success of Barney and Friends directed for preschool children to help them be prepared for school emotionally and socially in addition to cognitively (Huston & Wright, 1998; Singer & Singer, 1998).

Singer & Singer (1998) conducted a series of studies of Barney & Friends to measure its effectiveness in helping children be ready for school. They used content
analysis and followed by experimental studies. The themes of the show included family, friends, neighborhood and focused on concepts such as sharing, helping and positive interaction through creative plot, music and songs.

The late 1990’s witnessed a huge focus on educational programs on television from policy makers, action groups, and industry professionals in addition to researchers. Many academic television research centers such as Yale University Family Television Research and Consultation Center, Center for Research on the Effects of Television at Cornell University and many others focused on studying issues related to the educational and informational television of children. Only a small number of researchers continued focusing in prosocial television.

However, in 1996 when the Federal Communications Commission passed new regulations related to children’s television based on the Children’s television Act, then researchers started to return to the concept of prosocial programs on television. Calvert (1999) mentioned that the implementation of the three-hour rule in 1997 made prosocial programs more widespread. Public and commercial stations offered a lot of new prosocial programs for children and adolescents.

A few studies tried to see the effect of television on children through comparing children who are exposed to television with children who didn’t have television in their communities. When researchers argue that watching TV increases antisocial behavior, this can be debated based on the results of a study made in St. Helena which is an isolated British colony in the South Atlantic which had no access to TV at all. The study has monitored the social behavior of children in classes and playgrounds before and after 18 months since the introduction of television to St. Helena. The study revealed that the
introduction of television hasn’t increased the level of antisocial behavior but it kept it the same (low as it originally was). Also, the frequency of children doing anti-social acts, for example teasing and fighting, has decreased to a great extent. The study used video recording in playgrounds, teachers’ evaluations and discussions with older students recorded regarding the influence of television. The study used before and after monitoring and a variety of stakeholders. In addition, it brought up the idea that TV might not be the only reason for maintaining the low level of antisocial behavior and that other factors such as ‘neighborhood watch’ or teachers and parents can be the reason that existed also before TV was introduced. The results of this study contradict other studies that show that the appearance of TV has had a great impact on the increase of antisocial behavior specially aggression. This study confirms the fact that TV doesn’t at least deteriorate the behavior (O’Bey & Charlton, 1997)

Since the focus on children’s program became of great interest, the Annenberg Public Policy Center (APPC) of the University of Pennsylvania started a comprehensive study children’s television since 1996. They did several content analyses of the different offerings, large scale surveys, meta-analysis of the positive effects of television on social behavior. There is also the annual scholarly conference they initiated that concentrate on issues related to children and television (Allen & Woolf, 2001; Davis, 1997).

II. 4. 6. Current State of Research

Since research on prosocial television revived, a number of studies were done to confirm the relationship between prosocial content and the behavior of children. Some of these studies are shown below.
A meta-analysis of 34 studies confirmed the fact that children’s exposure to pro-social content had a positive effect on their behavior in terms of social interactions, level of aggression, altruism and levels of stereotyping. The result of the study draws attention to the TV’s potential to assist children in feeling and acting more nicely towards one-another (Mares & Woodard, 2005).

Padilla-Walker and colleagues (2013) found that Disney animated films were surprisingly high in the frequency of pro-social behavior (approximately 1 act per minute). Characters were most pro-social toward friends, and tended to aid the people similar to them. Pro-social behavior was generally presented in a manner comparable to real life, which, according to Social Cognitive Theory, might enhance the likelihood of imitation by children.

Research has found that people are not inclined to be involved in pro-social behavior in situations that are unclear. This is due to fear of failure or looking foolish (Padilla-Walker et al., 2013). Therefore, the beneficiary of prosocial behavior should be undoubtedly in need.

Toddlers also acquire pro-social behavior from television. Williamson (2013) found that two-year old children watched a video of a grown-up doing a new pro-social behavior in reaction to the distress of someone else. Afterwards, the children watched their parents’ in distress which gave them the opportunity to mimic the behavior they learnt. The ones who watched the video actually made the gesture seen on TV in comparison to the others who haven’t seen the video and watched their mother in distress. These conclusions highlight that even toddlers can imitate pro-social behaviors and apply them in similar occasions.
A number of studies were done that highlight the important factors that help the children be influenced by the pro-social messages and its effect on their behavior. For children to acquire pro-social behavior from television, it is important to make sure that they understand the messages contained in the programs. The majority of children age 5-6 in a study testing a program that promoted attitudes toward people with disabilities found that they misunderstood the intended message and weren’t able to generalize beyond the program tested. A number of studies have shown that children below fourth grade couldn’t extract lessons from stories and tend to repeat parts of it instead of the overall moral (Acosta & Mares, 2008).

A study was done using 4-10-year-old children who viewed an episode of ‘Power Rangers. Then they were requested to highlight some possible morals or lessons in the episode. The majority of the children agreed that there was indeed a moral. However, only the children 8-10-year-olds were able to identity that. The moral was actually that work should come before play. The younger children concentrated more on the fighting in the episode (McKenna and Ossoff, 1998)

Therefore, it is vital for producers of TV shows to know that pro-social behavior can best be learnt from cartoon and TV for age groups above fourth graders. It is also worth noting that the producer’s focus shouldn’t solely be the message or the moral intended since that message might or might not be interpreted by the audience as originally intended. Children may interpret these messages differently based on their own comprehension of the content.

Another important element is that the more the situation portrayed on TV relates to real life situations, the more effect it would have on children (Mares & Woodard,
Children usually pay more attention to the programs they are watching if the storyline is realistic. In that case, children use more their cognitive skills for processing the information. Programs that seem real usually encourages them to imagine themselves in similar situations and in the characters’ place (Wilson, 2008). This would help the producers to make the context of the behaviors seems relevant and realistic to the viewers so that children can use the modeled behavior in real life.

Identification with the character in the pro-social program is also an important aspect in determining the influence on children’s beliefs and behaviors. Children start having attachments with favorite cartoon characters during the preschool years. This attachment and love may last throughout childhood and adolescence. Forty percent of the teens who were the respondents of a survey done by Yancey & Co (2002) named a media character as their role model. Almost the same percentage named a parent or relative. This is in accordance with the social cognitive theory that mention that children are more likely to learn from the characters or figures they believe are attractive role models. Accordingly, behavior is more likely to be used if the characters are realistic (human vs. nonhuman). Other factors that help are if they are close to the viewer in gender, age, and socioeconomic status.

Also, the initiator needs to be attractive (Padilla-Walker et al., 2013). This was clear in a study involving children from Nepal watching an entertainment education television program, *Khushi Ko Sansar (Happy World)*. This program is originally Indian but another version was done in Nepalian language. Surveys were conducted before and after the test. They were done on 357 Nepali students from seven different communities in Nepal. The test focused on the effects of two episodes of *KKS* that addressed the issue
of disabilities. It also wanted to determine if there is a role for identification and to what extent does it affect children’s beliefs and behavior regarding people with disabilities. Results showed that children role-modeled the actions and positive attitudes of the main character of the show. Being exposed to pro-social content had a great effect on identification and therefore influencing the thinking and perceptions of the subjects with regard to people with disabilities. This was mainly due to being able to create a high level of positive beliefs and intended behavior towards people with disabilities. The results of this research are encouraging and optimistic in the realm of using entertainment-education television programs to encourage positive thinking and behavior towards people with disabilities (Strong, 2008)

Nabi (2009) said that identification with a character, in addition to positive outcomes of the prosocial behavior can increase the possibility of the children to model the portrayed behaviors.

One of the reasons for a pro-social program to have a great impact on the behavior of children is having a local children’s television program. There was a case study of News Six produced by WBGU-TV done with an aim to identify and assess pro-social content of these series. It covers news related to the community. It includes news and information regarding the school, local traditions, attractions and different occasions. This is why all stakeholders such as the students, teachers, families and television producers help produce a program that spreads social and community awareness. It also contributes to the children’s social growth (Dumova, 2007). The sample used was 114 programs (228 news stories) broadcast between 1972-2002 was coded for story setting, theme, pro-social messages, and primary message attributes. The research questions were
regarding the patterns of distribution of pro-social content in the series and the changes in
the distribution of them over time. The results indicated that the representation of
altruistic behaviors, such as helping, sharing, caring, and cooperation, were the most
dominant in the themes of the stories. The advantage of having a local program is that its
content reflects its community (Dumova, 2007).

Zielinskan & Chambers (1995) found that the pro-social effects on the behavior of
children can also take place when watching pro-social programs in groups. A study was
done to examine if watching television in a group at a day-care setting would enhance the
children’s pro-social behavior. The children used in the study were aged 3-5 years. Four
short-term programs were produced and tested building on the social learning theory and
cognitive-developmental stage theory. There were free-play observations, a perspective-
taking ability test, and two qualitative measures describing the context. The result of the
study showed a strong positive correlation between watching the video and pro-social
behavior. Watching television or video promoting pro-social behavior in a group has a
chance of improving pro-social modeling effects. Whether these effects will be long term
ones is another aspect that should be considered.

In addition, there is also the aspect of the continuity of watching pro-social
programs over the years. A study done by Wool (2011) involved children age three to
twelve and measured the results twice with 5 years apart. The study examined predictors
for different types of programs entertainment and educational programs. The study used
the analysis of secondary data of the 1997 and 2002. The study found out that age was the
main predictor of viewing pro-social programming. Having a younger sibling present also
has an influence on viewing. However, age is the main source of variance. The study
showed that watching pro-social content is highest among children aged three, and decreases through adolescence. One of the limitations of the study was the definition of pro-social viewing that allowed the inclusion of shows that included traditional educational content, in addition to pro-social content (e.g., *Barney, Sesame Street*). The majority of such shows were intended for preschool-age children. However, viewing pro-social content declines dramatically with age which affects the possibility of having long term effects on the behavior, irrespective of whether they have started watching early on in their lives or not. Short-term effect on behavior may occur from watching one quality program but for long term effects, this will need repeated viewings over time.

A number of the APPC analyses highlighted that there were new trends in children’s television situation. Although the 1980’s had limited offerings of prosocial programs, nowadays, the broadcasters prefer prosocial programs to educational programs. Jordan (2000) said that “while implementing the three-hour rule guidelines, networks choose to provide their affiliates with prosocial programs that tend to explore themes about friendship, cooperation and honesty rather than science, math and literature” (p.3).

Another trend was related to the breakdown of the children’s audience to include a segment of adolescents targeted by major networks. It was clear that the 1970’s and 1980’s programs were mainly targeting young children. However, new programs appeared in mid 1990s for early adolescents and teenagers. (Jordan, 2000).

Nowadays, television is no longer dominated by a small number of networks; children can now choose from thousands of shows on different channels and cables. In addition to television, children can also choose to watch the programs on i-pads, mobile phones, computer and so on. These new screens allow them to choose what to watch and
when to watch them and also repeat the parts they want any number of times. Accordingly, research has extended to include a number of studies on video games whether violent or prosocial games, YouTube viewership and the effect of the technology of media on the children’s socialization in addition to studies on the eating habits or consumption behaviors of children.

A sample of these studies was done in 2008 to examine the relation between prosocial behavior and prosocial computer games. Researches studying the possible positive effects of computer games could encourage the gaming industry to enter this area and provide more prosocial games which would in turn develop a positive image of society and hopefully benefit the society in prosocial areas. The study used 42 children 6-7 years old. Half the children in the study played a prosocial computer game to measure prosocial responses. The rest of the children played an educational computer game as a control group. A questionnaire was then used to examine if the repeated short term participation in the games makes a difference in the prosocial behavior responsiveness. The results showed a slight increase in the prosocial behavior response of the experimental group. There a number of limitations of the study that could have affected the results such as that the study was done during school days, some of the laptops were old and made them slow, some of the children were disruptive. Therefore, more studies in that field are needed.
II. 5 The Arab Region

Most of the studies done in the region related to the cartoons and behavior were about violence and antisocial behaviors. Only a small number of studies examined the prosocial part of the cartoons. Here are some examples that could be found.

El Guindi (2002) found that children in Qatar prefer watching cartoons more than children’s programs, series and movies. The study also confirmed that children are influenced by cartoons. They imitate some of the actions and repeat some words and expressions that they see in those cartoons. The study was done through surveys and 55 interviews targeting mothers, mass communication students and employees working at Qatar television.

A content analysis was done on all children’s programs aired on Oman’s TV in June 1999 in addition to surveying a sample of children aged 9-12 to examine the relationship between the Omanian child and the children’s programs. In addition to studying the nature and characteristics of the programs and the usage of the children to those programs through the uses and gratification theory. The results showed that 95.5 percent of the content was cartoons (either dubbed or in Arabic or some other foreign language). As for the survey, 97% of the children watch the programs aired on the Omanian TV. They watch television mainly for entertainment (67.7%) (Ghawas, 2001).

Edbais (2001) studied the effects of prosocial cartoon television programs on the social behavior of gifted and non-gifted children in kindergarten schools in Kuwait. This was a study involving 115 children. She found that children who viewed the violent cartoons, displayed more violent and antisocial behaviors. However, the group who viewed prosocial cartoons, displayed more prosocial behavior. The study also showed
that gender played a role. Boys showed more aggressive behaviors. Girls showed more prosocial behaviors. As for the gifted children, the group who watched the prosocial cartoons showed more prosocial behavior and less violent behavior than the non-gifted children. Therefore, the study confirmed that there is a strong relationship between the behavior of the children and the type of programs watched.

Mohamed (1994) studied the content of the main channel of Lybian television using a composite week. He found that the majority of the programs are imported and that only 18.5% were Lybian in comparison to 59.2% that are imported from non Arabian countries. The results showed that most of the imported programs were cartoons whereas the local ones were mainly live conversations and discussions. The entertainment aspect was the dominant one in the programs shown.

Al Falah (1991) did a survey using 280 students who were between 10-12 years old. The study revealed that 100% of the sample watch television in general and 99.3% of them watch children’s programs. The main program that they watch is cartoons. He added that being a child is the same regardless of the differences in culture, nationality, race, etc..

A study done in Kuwait about animated cartoons confirmed that cartoons contain valuable messages that are conveyed through the sound, picture, color, movement and the way the story is told with the aim of either having the child gain specific values or resent them. The researcher added that having these messages indirectly conveyed was a bit dangerous because they depend on the child’s reactions and feelings that he has while watching the cartoon and enjoying it. This makes him ready to accept the messages irrespective of being useful or not (Al Gehani, 2004).
A content analysis was done to study the children’s programs of the Gulf Radio and TV Organization of the member countries which represent 40% of the population of the Gulf area (Al Fikawy, 2012). The results of the study showed that the majority of the programs showed on the different channels of the Gulf Radio and TV organization were animated cartoons dubbed in Arabic. In Saudi Arabia and Kuwait, they represented 73% and Oman 50% of the content was cartoons. This was mainly due to its being inexpensive in addition to using cartoons to fill in the gaps and filling the air time. It was found that there were 6 shots on average in each scene which makes it exciting and grabs the attention of the viewer. The results also showed that almost all the programs were imported except only one locally produced cartoon in Kuwait that is shown also in Abu Dhabi and Emirates. Other local programs were based on competitions and discussions. None of the cartoons contained aggression or killing except only one program (Ninja Turtles) that had a few scenes containing hitting. It was found that the goals of the these channels were either to provide information or teach skills and behaviors. Channel one in Kuwait, Qatar channel 2 and Bahrain provided information and general knowledge through its imported programs whereas Kuwait channel 2, Qatar channel 1 and Oman taught behaviors. As for Abu Dhabi, it worked on teaching skills. As for Al Sharka and Saudi Arabia 2, they focused on both providing information and teaching skills (Al Fikawy, 2012)

II. 6 Egypt

II. 6. 1. Children Television Viewership

A number of studies were done in Egypt to find out the number of hours children spend watching television daily. Nada (2012) found out that 92% of the sample watched cartoons on television and that 53.6% watch it on a daily basis. It also found that the
cartoon characters that are helpful are the most favorite ones for the children in the sample followed by good hearted characters who are loved by the other characters in the cartoon followed by courageous characters.

A study done by Al Latif (2007) found that 86.7% of the 400 children in the study aged 6-9 watch three hours of television daily whereas, 8.86% watch from an hour to three hours daily; 3.5% watch television for less than an hour and only 1.5% watch it irregularly. Another study was done using 400 children found that 51.4% of the children watch TV from 2-4 hours daily; 29.5% watch it for less than two hours while 19.1% watch it for more than 4 hours (Al Morsy, 2000).

A sample of 400 children aged 12-14 was studied and found that around 60.7% watch television for two hours or more while 39.3% watch it for less than two hours. The study showed that that the average viewership of television is from 3-4 hours daily (Mohamed, 1998)

Results from a study showed that 94.4% of a sample of 450 children aged 10-12 watch television in general and that 94.24% watch imported cartoons (Mohamed, 1992)

A study was done to know the television usage of Egyptian children where it found that all the children in the sample watch satellite channels where 43% of the sample watched Arabic Satellite channels and 21.9% watch English satellite channels (Al Abd, 2003).

Mahmoud (2007) found that children aged 9-14 in the sample studied preferred to watch their favorite cartoons and characters on television this was followed by the website of the channel and then followed by printed magazines of those channels such as
Spacetoon, ART and Sesame Street. This also was in agreement with another study that showed that cartoons are the most favorite program for children (9-12 years old), then it is followed by movies and then stories (Hamed, 1998).

Khedr (1993) found that 80% of the children’s content on the Egyptian Television was devoted to cartoons. The majority of the cartoons were imported cartoons. Forty-six percent was from the United State, 36% European and the Arab countries 18%. This was done through a content analysis using a composite week from January to March 1993. This also was confirmed in another study by Mohamed (1992) where he found that exported cartoons and programs constitute the majority of the offerings in the children’s channels.

II. 6. 2. Behaviors Present in Cartoons

A study of the foreign cartoons displayed on the Egyptian national television channels and the types of behaviors and values they portray was done in 1994. A content analysis was done on all cartoons aired on the 3 governmental channels for three months. The study found that the most values portrayed are the ones related to the behavior, then came the social values and followed by political values. Religious values were not present at all in the programs (Abdel Khalek, 1996)

Mazeed (2004) studied the relationship between the exposure of children to the Egyptian cartoons in regards to the patriot feelings in children and how close are the concepts aired on television to reality. The study found that 57.95% of the sample studied learned to love the country from watching Bakkar (an Egyptian produced cartoon). A 45.7% learned to respect the law and 43.2% learned how to preserve national property.
A content study was done on Spacetoon Arabic Channel to find out the main values that are portrayed in the 19 movies and 11 cartoons aired. The study revealed that 49.285% of the content contained positive or prosocial values while the negative values were 50.72% (Asran, 2004). However, another content study was done by Zein Al Abdeen (2004) to determine the positive and negative behaviors that are portrayed in the cartoons on national television on the first and second channels for the duration of six months. The study found that the percentage of the positive values portrayed is 65.1% versus 34.9% for the negative behaviors.

A comparative study to identify the values and concepts directed to the children through television versus radio was implemented. The study identified the main recurring concepts on both TV and radio in children’s programs to be: knowledge, success, beauty, belonging, health, and faith. These concepts were actually present more in radio than on TV (Al Dakroury, 1990).

A number of studies were done that showed that there is no difference in the amount of viewership of television between girls and boys. A sample of 400 children found that gender didn’t have an effect on the viewership of television ads (Al Latif, 2007). Ibrahim (2004) also found out that gender didn’t affect the amount of viewership cartoons on television. A study using 504 children showed that there is no difference in viewership of cartoons between boys and girls (Al Husseiny, 2001).

II. 6. 3. Cartoon Effects

In an experiment done by Awad (1997) where 24 children 9-12 years old were divided into an experimental group and a control group to test whether the exposure to cartoons with values such as cooperation and honesty had an effect on the children or not.
The experiment showed that there was a difference between the two groups and that the experimental group was affected by the values they were exposed to in the experiment. The researcher concluded that exposure to these prosocial behaviors had an effect on the children and can influence their behavior.

Another experiment was done using ads and whether the exposure to ads had an effect on the children. The children in the study were 4-6 years old. The study showed that the experimental group acquired skills and behaviors such as imitation, consumption and cooperation after being exposed to ads that contained such behaviors (Mazeed, 1998).

A study found that the children in the sample identified with the cartoon characters irrespective of the age and gender of the children. It also concluded that the children identified with the characters to the extent that they felt sad whenever the cartoon character did something wrong and that they felt that they are friends with the cartoon characters. The children felt that they are similar to their favorite cartoon character and that they have gone through the same situations and incidents that the cartoon character witnessed. The biggest percentage of the children in the study felt that they would do the same behaviors and actions that the cartoons characters did specially if the cartoon character is loved by people and is rewarded. Most of the children in the sample didn’t want to do actions or behaviors of the characters who get beaten in the cartoons (Nada, 2012). Therefore, we can see that whether the action is rewarded or punished has an effect on the children acquiring the behavior.

In order to study the effects of children television programs on the social behavior of children, a study was done using 24 students aged 9-12. The study used Ain Shams
Intelligence test to measure the intelligence of the sample and their behavior. The results of the study showed that the programs had a positive effect on the children and that they should be utilized and capitalized on since they are one of the important factors of social upbringing through the children’s acquisition of values and desired behaviors from the TV programs (Awad, 1997).

Birat (2008) studied the content of the two popular cartoons in Egypt, Detective Conan and Dragon Ball. The study used content analysis and interviews with children aged 10-11 years old and 13-14 years old. The results showed that Detective Conan (which is a Japanese cartoon series dubbed in Arabic) depended on the intelligence of the detective in solving criminal cases. Most of the scenes encouraged children to develop their intelligence, cognition, creativity, brain storming and discussions with friends in handling problems. The study also highlighted that the program included musical and sound effects, attractive images and pictures that grabbed the attention of the children and at the same time helped him to absorb the content easily. As for the results of Dragon Ball, the study showed that the program was filled with violent scenes whether verbal or physical. It also contained a lot of music and scenes with yelling, anger, fear that attracted children’s attention.

A study was done in Egypt on the content of imported children programs and cartoons that are shown on television. The children of the sample took a knowledge test as well. The sample used was 450 children in grades 4 and 5. The results of the study confirmed that 94% of the children in the sample do watch the imported programs and cartoons extensively. 72.6 from the Bedouins sample, 96% of the suburb and 100% of the urbans. It also showed that the children in the sample who watched the selected programs
were more knowledgeable and that they remembered more the new information they were exposed to. More than half of the sample were able to correctly answer the knowledge test and most of them were viewers of the television. However, the children who didn’t watch the television, were not able to get the right answers to the questions in the test. Ninety percent of the imported cartoons were from the United States. And 87.6% of the sample preferred cartoons rather than the other programs (Mohamed, 1992).

Abdel Aziz (2007) studied the content of Spacetroon Arabic network. Her study took place in 2005 using a composite week from January 1st to February 18th of the same year. The results showed cartoons are the most aired programs on the network whereas programs are the least aired. It was also found that almost all the cartoons and programs were imported with a ratio of 50 imported to 1 Arab production. Advertisements, on the other hand, the majority weren’t imported. The songs were produced by Spacetroon in classical Arabic. She also found that classical Arabic was the main language for most of the programs shown. Male characters (62.9%) in the cartoons exceed the number of females (37.1%). The majority of the characters who appear on Spacetroon whether in cartoons or programs were children. Spacetroon’s main objective is to reinforce positive behaviors and then to provide useful information. Positive prosocial behaviors accounted for 78.4% in contrast with the antisocial behaviors (21.5%). The most common prosocial behavior portrayed were cooperation and helping whereas lying and deception were the most common antisocial behaviors. The study also included a survey using children 9-12 years old. The results of the survey were that all the sample watch television regularly. They like to watch Spacetroon and they prefer to stay home watching it rather than going out. Cartoons were the favorite program they watch on Spacetroon followed by ‘Salma is Asking’ program. There no difference in the viewership of both girls and boys to the
network. Both genders watch it irrespective of their social classes and age. The study also found that the children of the sample like to imitate the main characters of the cartoons on Spacetoon mostly Superman and there the percentage of actually doing that was high. Children also tend to buy products that have the main characters of the cartoons they watch on Spacaetoon like Super Sonic Spinner, Bee blade, Fola doll, Spiderman, Yougi Yo. The main times that the children of the sample watch Spacetoon is from 5pm to 9pm. The parents surveyed believed that the content contained a lot of violence which was reflected in their interaction with their siblings. Parents also highlighted that advice given through the network during breaks actually influenced their children such as brushing their teeth, respecting older people, etc. However, they would recommend if the content included religious issues, Arab cultural values and traditions.

II. 6. 4. The Case of Bakkar Cartoon

El Sayed (2003) did a study on Bakkar which is one of the most famous Egyptian made cartoons that is mainly being broadcast during the month of Ramadan and repeated afterwards. It is trailer song is being sung by one of the most popular singers in Egypt Mohamed Mounir who is actually Nubian like Bakkar, the main character of the cartoon. The song has become well known and loved by both children and adults. Bakkar first started in 1998 for nine years every Ramadan and then faced production problems in 2007. The series resumed again in 2015. A study was made using surveys and content analysis trying to find out the values that are portrayed in Bakkar and to what extent the children accept the character. The children in the sample were aged 5-9. The study showed that actually all of them have watched Bakkar. There were certain aspects that almost all children agreed on which made them like watching the cartoon. These were his name, how he looks, his clothes, the way he talks, the way he deals with people, the way
he solves problems, his sense of humor, his stories and adventures that he told, his manners and the trailer song. This actually confirms what has been mentioned earlier that what attract the children to the cartoons are aspects such as the character himself and his physical characteristics and behavior. The character is the main source of attraction, then comes the content, messages, linking the characters to the time and place, etc.

Rashida, Bakkar’s goat was second favorite character in the cartoon after Bakkar. This actually agrees with what has been mentioned in earlier studies that children prefer to watch cartoons that have animal characters familiar to them. The more these animals carry human characteristics, the more they are loved by the children. This is the case with Rashida, Bakkar’s loyal friend who saves him in difficult times or situations and helps him in his adventures.

Only 2% of the sample liked a negative character like Samaan or Mashrat. Though it was only a small percentage but it might have a connotation that should be studied to find out what were the reasons the children liked these characters because this might have a negative effect on the child and his behavior if they identify with these characters or try to imitate them.

The results also showed that most of the children in the sample agreed on inviting Bakkar to their birthday parties. This shows how the character is accepted socially and loved by them. The researcher believed that this acceptance would result in having the children imitate Bakkar’s behaviors or values.

With regards to the aspects that the sample didn’t like in Bakkar, it is worth mentioning that 48% of the sample liked the cartoon as a whole. However, the rest didn’t
like some aspects like the evil characters, Bakkar not obeying some of his mother’s orders and that the episodes are short.

The content analysis of the show showed that most of the values portrayed in the cartoon were religious values, followed by social values, then knowledge or information, then spiritual values then came the rest such as health, patriotism, economic, sports, etc.

II. 7 Summary

Bandura expanded the scope of the concept of observational learning and revised his social learning theory since it didn’t encompass the cognitive aspects of learning. By mid 1980’s, he expanded and renamed his original Social Learning Theory to become known as the Social Cognitive Theory.

Research on prosocial content started since the early 1950’s. After the high penetration of television in 1960’s, researchers were concerned about the possible effects of television specially on children. Researchers in the 1960’s started studying aggression and television’s antisocial influence on children since this period witnessed high levels of violence. Research on prosocial programs was then further developed in the 1970’s as a consequence of the Surgeon General’s Report *Television and growing up: The impact of televised violence* in 1972. The recommendations of the report encouraged researchers to study the modeling and imitation of prosocial behavior that can counterbalance the antisocial effects of television (Surgeon General’s Scientific Committee, 1972). Therefore, the 1970’s witnessed the vast majority of research on prosocial television programs for children. However, the 1980’s witnessed a decrease in the research caused by the deregulation of the television industry (Wimmer & Dominick, 2003). In 1990’s, the interest of the public and researchers in prosocial programs revived after the adoption of

As for research in Egypt and the Arab region, there isn’t enough research made specially on prosocial behaviors though a big number of studies could be found focusing on negative effects of television or portrayal of antisocial behaviors and not prosocial ones. Most of the studies in Egypt and the Arab region focused on the viewership of children to television and its effects on the children. The methods used were mainly content analysis, surveys and interviews. A lot of research was done on the governmental channels. A few studies examined the types of children’s programs that are shown. Others analyzed the content. Other studies used interviews to get to know the children’s preference to specific programs or channels. Other interviews were made with parents to find out to what extent the exposure to television influenced their children and the involvement of the parents with the viewing choices of the children. There is a need to explore the prosocial content of the popular animated cartoons nowadays. This is because the studies done in Egypt were old and many new cartoons are produced that children love and identify with since the psychological make up and characteristics of children now is different than what it was a few years ago due to the technological advancements, education and so on. Accordingly, their preferences may differ as well as their reactions.
Chapter Three

III. Methodology

Most of the research focus more on individual aspects of the social cognitive theory and not all the aspects needed to establish a true test of theory. Therefore, this study is an exploratory descriptive research done to study the prosocial content in the popular cartoons viewed in Egypt and determine if the main components of the theory (attention, retention, production and motivation) exist in the popular cartoons of children.

Social Cognitive Theory suggests that for media content to have a positive effect on the person’s behavior, the person should pay attention to attractive or similar models that are realistically doing relevant behaviors. The models performing the prosocial behavior should be positively reinforced and the ones engaging in antisocial behaviors must be negatively reinforced (Austin & Meili, 1994; Bandura, 2002; Stiff, 1986). Lots of studies have used the methodology of content analysis in light of the social cognitive theory for studying the prosocial content in television such as the study done on Disney movies by Padilla-Walker in 2013. Another study was done by Klein and Shiffman in 2011. Another study was done to examine altruism on television by Smith et al in 2006. Dumova (2003) also had a study in that regards. Other studies were done also when studying aggression such the one done by Coyne and Archer in 2004 who studied British television programs.

Therefore, for the purpose of this study, a content analysis will be used to study the content of the cartoons aired during prime time on three channels that target the age group of 7-12. These channels are on the Nile Sat that are free-to-air and therefore accessible to the majority of the children. TNS provided a list of channels that are viewed by Egyptian children in general. However, from the description provided online for each
channel, the ones targeting the age group of 7-12 were chosen accordingly. Rating of cartoons was not available at Ipsos. However, TNS had a list of the cartoons watched but not for the specific age group of 7-12. They consider all children below 15 based on the feedback from their parents since legally they can’t ask children themselves. Therefore, popular cartoons were considered the ones sired during prime time.

Described by Stempel and Westley (1981) as “a formal system for doing something that we all do informally rather frequently, drawing conclusions from observations of content” (p. 119), content analysis is “currently one of the dominant methodologies employed in public communication, journalism, and mass media research” (Frey et al., 1991, p. 213).

Greenberg (1998) children will be more influenced by content they like to watch rather than content they don’t prefer. Also regular viewing of a particular program may have a long-term effect on the prosocial behavior of the children (Wilson, 2008). Based on that, the programs aired on prime time are the ones that will be studied since this the time that the majority of the children watch television. The prime time is from 5 to 6pm and from 8-10pm as per the TNS study on urban Egypt. Apparently children watch television after they come from school and then they study and after they finish, they watch television again before they sleep. The children channels that are free and viewed heavily by the age group of 7-12 are: Cartoon Network Arabic, MBC 3 and Spacetoon Arabic (TNS report, 2015). It is worth noting to mention that MBC3 is owned by Saudis, Spacetoon by a Syrian family and Cartoon Network Arabia is done with a deal between Turner Broadcasting and Dubai Media City. The age group of 7-12 is the age group that would understand the messages intended from the producers of the cartoons. Prosocial messages can be hard for children to grasp. Programs portraying prosocial behaviors
usually have less action and more dialogue than scenes with violent actions. Having more dialogue makes the program more challenging to follow and understand for younger children. Mandler and Johnson (1977) said that most children at the age of 7 can understand the schemata of the story while children aged 2-6 need the simple story content and links that are very clear. Young children too they have a hard time differentiating between fantasy and reality. This was also confirmed by Doubleday and Droge (1993) when they said that attention to television peaks around age 10. They added that two years around this age on either side are important ages where children learn to make inferences, and have more complete and organized interpretation of the story and can understand the message intended. They also claimed that a lot of the programs shown during primetime and weekends are targeted for the age group of 7-12.
III. 1 Sample

The sample for the content analysis is the probability sample using a simple random sample of the cartoons aired for a composite week during prime time on the three networks of Cartoon Network Arabic, Spacetoon and MBC3. Dominick and Wimmer (2011) described the way to construct a composite week through using a sample of each day of the week like for example a one Monday drawn from possible Mondays of the time frame. Then choosing a Tuesday and so on until all days of the week are represented. Riffe, Aust and Lacy (1993) emphasized that for a random sample and a consecutive day sample a composite week was ideal. Also Gerbner, Gross, Jackson-Breck, Jeffries-Fox and Signorielli (1997) confirmed that a sample of one week of programming yielded comparable results for measuring violent behavior. The composite week for this research was during January and February 2016 which was within the time frame of the study. The composite week guaranteed an accurate overview of the programs rather than being limited to studying episodes selected by YouTube or DVD distributors. A table was made with the days of the week and each day has the dates that fall in this week during the month from 15 January till 15 February 2016. Then the dates were coded from 1 to 4 to represent the 4 weeks. Then, the sample was a chosen through an online random calendar date generator (www.randomizer.org). The final sample consisted of the following days where the three networks will be recorded at the same time:

Sunday 17 January 2016
Monday 1 February 2016
Tuesday 9 February 2016
Wednesday 27 January 2016
Thursday 11 February 2016
Friday 22 January 2016
Saturday 30 January 2016
### III. 2 Independent Variables

These are the variable controlled and manipulated by the researcher to examine its effect on the dependent variable. According to Wimmer and Dominick (2011) these are the variables that are systematically varied by the researcher. In this study, the independent variables are the following children’s networks

1. Cartoon Network Arabic
2. Spacetoon Arabic
3. MBC3

### III. 3 Dependent Variables

Wimmer and Dominick (2011) agreed that the dependent variables are studied and their values are assumed to depend on the influence of the independent variable. They added that “the dependent variable is what the researcher wishes to explain” (p.44). In this study, the depend variables are:

1. The types of prosocial behaviors
2. Frequency of prosocial behaviors
3. Characteristics of the initiator of the prosocial behavior
4. Context of the prosocial behavior
III. 4 Unit of Analysis

The unit of analysis according to Dominick and Wimmer (2011) is the smallest element but the most important one in the content analysis. They added that in television and movies analysis, it can be characters, acts or entire programs. The unit of analysis for this study is a prosocial act. It was coded when an initiator was involved in a physical or verbal prosocial act toward a target. A new act is considered for coding when the initiator, target, or type of act changed. In case a number of acts took place and nothing changed in the target or initiator, this was considered as one prosocial act.

III. 5 Procedure

Each act of prosocial behavior was coded and assessed. The demographic characteristics of the initiator of the prosocial behavior were noted. The length of the episode was also classified. A coding sheet was prepared listing the different variables to be coded. Only cartoons were examined. Other children programs or movies aired during the prime time were excluded. Also repetitions of the cartoons were excluded (some networks repeated the same episode of the cartoon same day at night or on the weekend).

III. 6 Coding Sheet Design

The content analysis is designed to answer the research questions. Therefore, the coding sheet was developed according to three categories: frequency, characteristics of the character and context. Each category contained a number of variables to measure. To be able to answer the first research question, the frequency had to measured. This consisted of the number of acts, whether the act was verbal or physical, the type of the prosocial behavior and the motivation for it. The second research question is a description of the characteristics of the person performing the behavior such as measuring the age,
gender, attractiveness, and social economic status. The last category was designed to answer the third research question regarding the context of the prosocial act. Therefore, it was essential to know if the act was rewarded, the relationship between the initiator and the target, the cost of the act to the initiator, whether a clear need was evident and at the end if the prosocial act was done for the sake of goodness and not negative elements accompanying the motive. All the variables measured were nominal. A number of previous studies was used as a guide to come up with the different types of motivations and prosocial behaviors and the coding book such as Coyne and Archer (2004), Klein and Shiffman (2011), Padilla-Walker et al (2013) and Mares (1996).

III. 7 Pilot Study

A pilot study is a small scale version or trial run in preparation for a major study to help spot any confusion in the information given to the coders (Wimmer and Dominick (2011). It is done to pretest the research instruments and to help spot any confusion in the information given to the coders. It is usually done to check that the instructions are comprehensible; check the wording of the code book and check the reliability and validity of the results. The pilot study was done to test all the below and to ensure that the categories and variables were well constructed and clear. The coding sheet was distributed among graduate students to check if the sheet was clear and easy to understand and is measuring what it is supposed to measure. Also a pilot was done using cartoons recorded for one day on one network but not included in the sample studied. Based on that amendments were made in the coding sheet and coding book to make the descriptions of the categories and choices clearer.
III. 8 Operational Definitions

Cartoons:
Cartoons were defined as televised fictional stories depicted by animated characters and scenery.

Prosocial behavior
It is a socially desirable intended behavior that in some way benefits another person or society at large.

Multidimensional frequency of prosocial behavior
The children’s behavior has a better chance to be imitated if there is repeated exposure to this behavior (Bandura, 2002). Therefore, it is important to assess the frequency of the prosocial act. Prosocial behavior in this study refers to any voluntary action intending to benefit someone else (Eisenberg, Fabes, & Spinard, 2006). Carlo & Randall (2002) found that families engage in both verbal and physical prosocial behaviors. Both are vital elements of positive child development. Therefore, in this study both verbal (e.g., complimenting, encouraging) and physical (e.g., helping, sharing) prosocial behaviors were assessed. The acts were also coded for the types of motivations for the prosocial behavior.

These were six motivations namely: clear need, physical attraction, altruistic, demonstrate friendship, public, and anonymous. If there is more than one motive, then the primary motivation will be coded.

The type of prosocial behavior was also coded. There were four main categories: Positive Interaction which included friendly interactions, cooperation, positive affect, peaceful conflict resolution and expression of affection or praise. The second category was Altruism. It included self sacrificing kindness, generosity, offering help, sharing,
The third category was Self Control which included persistence at a task, resistance to temptation, obedience to rules, ability to work independently and control of aggressive impulses. The fourth category was Acceptance of Others which included attitudes and beliefs. A fifth category was added for Others in case the type is different than the ones listed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form of prosocial behavior:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of prosocial behavior:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self control</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clear need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Verbal** prosocial act but with words such as complimenting, encouraging, etc
- **Physical** prosocial act that is physically performed such as helping, sharing, etc
- **Positive interaction** dealing with others in a positive and peaceful manner
- **Altruism** to achieve positive outcome for someone else rather than for the self
- **Self control** Controlling oneself
- **Clear need** a situation that demands help
- **Altruistic** to achieve positive outcome for someone else rather than for the self
- **Public** to get recognition, approval or praise from others
- **Anonymous** when the person doing the prosocial behavior doesn’t know the identity of the other person
**Characteristics of the characters**

There is a need to study the characteristics of the initiator of the prosocial behavior in each act. The Social Cognitive Theory implies that children are more likely to pay attention to and remember prosocial behavior when they can identify with the characters or find similarities between them (Bandura, 2002) and when the situation is reflective of reality (Shary, 2002; Steele, 2002).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appearance/gender/age</th>
<th>The appearance of the character who did the prosocial act was coded either as human or nonhuman. The gender was coded as male or female. The age was coded either as child (under 12 years of age), or teenager (13-17 years old), adult and elderly (usually a grandparent).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social economic status</td>
<td>This was judged based on clothes, housing, and from the dialogue in the scenes referring to any financial status. There is high, middle class and low social economic status. In case the character is an animal, then identification will be based on his position.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractiveness</td>
<td>The initiator of the act was coded as attractive, average or unattractive. These features were judged based on the common physical features known to either be attractive or unattractive. It can also be based on how they are viewed by other characters. Unhuman characters were usually coded as average except of there is a feature that is very prominent or prevalent present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>The relationship between the initiator and the target was coded either as family, friend, stranger, acquaintance and manager/staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Context of the prosocial act

| **Cost** | The cost of doing the prosocial act was coded as either high or low for the initiator. It was considered high cost if it was inconvenient to him and resulted in punishment or loss. As for the low cost actions, these were minor and had minimal negative impact on him. |
| **Reward/punishment** | Each prosocial act is coded when the initiator was rewarded or punished. It was rewarded, if he gets something positive for his behavior (verbal or physical). It was considered punished if he received anything negative (verbal or physical) or if anything positive was taken away. |
| **Clear need** | This was determined when it was clear that the target needed assistance due to some physical aspect or limitation. |
| **Pure Act** | Each act was judged by whether the reason for engaging in the act was pure or was it due to a certain benefit for the initiator. |
III. 9 Inter-Coder Reliability

Wimmer and Dominick (2011) emphasized that reliability is crucial to content analysis. They clarified that for a research to be reliable, the repeated measurement of the same material should produce similar decisions. Intercoder reliability is defined by Wimmer and Dominick (2011) as the agreement levels between the coders for the same content using the same coding instrument. Two coders, the researcher and a senior student at The American University in Cairo majoring in economics and minoring in mass communication independently coded the total sample of 87 cartoons on the three networks. Training sessions were conducted for variable definitions and identification through jointly coding examples in order to update and fine-tune the coding sheet and agree on specific coding rules. At the end, intercoder reliability was measured using 10% of the cartoons studied independently to make sure that the coders were in agreement in their coding choices. Intercoder reliability was tested using two measures; percentage agreement and Scott’s Pi because it may not be sufficient to use an individual measure of reliability and Riffe et al (2005) recommended content analysts to use supplementary measures. Percentage of agreement formula was developed by Holsti to measure the reliability of nominal data (Wimmer and Dominick, 2011). Although, this method is reliable, it is often criticized since it doesn’t take into account some coder agreement that occurs by chance. For that reason, William A. Scott developed the pi index. The intercoder reliability for this study using Scott’s pi was calculated using an online website developed by researcher Deen Freelon http://dfreelon.org/utils/recalfront/. Reliabilities for all variables were acceptable for each category as follows: The two coders agreed on the form of prosocial behavior in 93.5% (0.859 for Scott’s Pi) of the intercoder reliability.
sample and the type of the prosocial behavior in 93.5% (0.915 for Scott’s Pi). As for the motivation, the coders agreed in 93.5% (0.895 Scott’s Pi); gender 100% ((1.00 Scott’s Pi); realistic appearance 100% (1.00 Scott’s Pi); age 93.5% (0.908 Scott’s Pi); social economic status 96.8% (0.948 Scott’s Pi); attractiveness 90.3% (0.757 Scott’s Pi); relationship between the initiator and the target 90.3% (0.865 Scott’s Pi); cost of the act for the initiator 100% ((1.00 Scott’s Pi); reward 90.3% (0.822 Scott’s Pi); and clear need 90.3% (0.772 Scott’s Pi). “As a rule of thumb, most published content analyses typically report a minimum reliability coefficient of about 90% or above when using Holsti’s formula and about .75 or above when using pi or kappa” (Wimmer and Dominick, 2011). Neuendorf (2002) provided the following guidelines: Coefficients of .90 or above are nearly always acceptable; .80 or greater is acceptable in most situations and .70 maybe appropriate in some exploratory studies for some indices. After the results of the intercoder reliability, the coding guide was reviewed and updated to fine tune the variables that scored relatively lower than others.
Chapter Four

IV. Results

This section includes results of the content analysis with their corresponding tables in addition to cross tabulation tables which show possible relationships between variables.

In the appendix is a complete table that shows all the variable measured.

RQ1: Multidimensional frequency of prosocial behavior

A total of 87 cartoons were analyzed (including repeated cartoons) representing 2,563 minutes of cartoons. This yielded 443 acts of prosocial behavior, at an average of 5 acts of prosocial behavior every 30 minutes which is the average time for each episode.

IV.1 Form

More than half of the prosocial behavior was classified as physical (65.69%) whereas 34.31% were verbal.

Figure 1 Forms of Prosocial Behavior
IV. 2 Types of Prosocial Behavior

The types of prosocial behaviors consisted of five categories; positive interaction (such as cooperation, friendly interaction, praise); Altruism (such as helping, kindness, sharing and generosity); self-control (such as obedience to rules, control of aggressive impulses and resistance to temptation); acceptance of others (such as attitudes and beliefs) and another category called others. The acts of prosocial behaviors resulted from the study fell only under three categories as follows: altruism (52.3%), followed by positive interaction (32.28%) and self-control (15.35%).

Figure 2 Types of Prosocial Behavior
**IV. 3  Motivation**

The main motive for the prosocial behavior was clear need which was present in 249 of the acts out of 443, followed by altruistic motivation in 115 acts, followed by 59 acts with demonstration of friendship motive, then came public with 12 acts, 6 for physical attraction and one for anonymous and one for other.

*Figure 3 Motivation*
RQ2: Characteristics of the characters who perform the prosocial behavior

IV. 4 Gender

Approximately 75% of prosocial acts were conducted by male characters and around 20% by females. There was a 3.6% conducted by mixed groups of males and females and only 0.68% were unidentified.

Figure 4 Gender

IV. 5 Realistic Appearance

Humans had a significant percentage of approximately 85% of the prosocial acts initiated by them. Only 14% were animals and the remaining was divided by the other categories.

Figure 5 Realistic Appearance
**IV. 6 Age**

Teenagers and adults were the main characters who performed the prosocial behaviors with a percentage of 33.8% and 35.4% respectively. Children came next with a around 13%. Age was unidentified with 11.96% and only 5.42% were elders.

*Figure 6 Age*

**IV. 7 Social Economic Status**

Overall, there were more prosocial acts by high social economic status characters 46.5% as compared to middle (34.09%), low (3.61%) and unidentified (16.25%).

*Figure 7 Social Economic Status*
IV. 8 Attractiveness

Most prosocial acts were conducted by average (49.89%) or attractive (41.76%) characters in comparison with unattractive (6.55%) and mixed groups (1.81%).

![Figure 8 Attractiveness](image)

RQ3: Context of the pro-social act

IV. 9 Relationship

Most of the prosocial acts were between friends (46.05%) and family (17.16%). Acquaintance (10.16%) and stranger (9.71%) were close. Boss/employee (6.09%), colleagues (4.06%), competitor/enemy (2.93%) and student/teacher (2.48%) were close. Prosocial behavior toward an intimate relationship (1.13%) and other (0.23%) were rare.

![Figure 9 Relationship](image)
**IV. 10 Cost**

The majority of the prosocial acts were of low cost (92.78%) compared with high cost (7.22%).

*Figure 10 Cost*

**IV. 11 Reward**

Most prosocial behaviors were either rewarded (53.50%) or neither rewarded nor punished (42.44%). Prosocial behaviors were punished rarely (4.06%).

*Figure 11 Reward*
IV. 12 Clear Need

The majority of the prosocial acts were directed by a clear need of the target (86.91%).

Figure 12 Clear Need

IV. 13 Pure Act

Almost all of the prosocial behaviors were driven out of pure and good intention (96.16%) as opposed to only a minority (3.84%) that had negative intentions or connotations for doing the prosocial act.

Figure 13 Pure Act
IV. 14 Overview of Characteristics

This is an overall graph displaying all the characteristics in one place to be easier to visualize. It summarizes that the biggest numbers were for humans, males, adults, high social economic class and average attractiveness.

Figure 14 Characteristics of Characters
IV. 15 Overview of Context
This is a summary of the aspects of context all together. In general, most of the numbers were for prosocial acts were between friends, had a low cost to the initiator, rewarded, there was a clear need and it was done with pure intentions.

Figure 15 Context Overview
IV. 16 Type of prosocial behavior by motivation

Figure 16 Type of Prosocial Behavior by Motivation
**IV. 17 Additional results**

The content study also showed that usually the main character of the cartoon is the one who initiate most of the prosocial acts like in Inspector Gadget, Max Steel, Ben 10, Conan and Grandizer. However, in the cartoons that have teams, the whole team usually does the prosocial behavior together like in Thunderbirds, We Bare Bears and MP4orce. More details are available in appendix 3.

When comparing the three networks together, this showed that Cartoon Network Arabia is the one with the most prosocial behaviors portrayed followed by Spacetoon Arabic and then MBC3.

*Table 1 Ranking of Networks*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Network Name</th>
<th>Number of Prosocial Acts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cartoon Network Arabia</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Spacetoon Arabic</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>MBC3</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ranking of the top 5 cartoons with reference to the prosocial behaviors per network is as follows:

*Table 2 Ranking of Top 5 Cartoons per Network*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Cartoon Network Arabia</th>
<th>Spacetoon Arabic</th>
<th>MBC3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>We Bare Bears</td>
<td>Al Shabah</td>
<td>Thunderbirds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dragons: Defenders of Berk</td>
<td>Jewel Pet Twinkle</td>
<td>The Savage Dragon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mucha Lucha</td>
<td>Les Miserable</td>
<td>MP4orce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Inspector Gadget</td>
<td>Solving</td>
<td>Max Steel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Scooby Doo</td>
<td>Conan</td>
<td>Ninja Turtles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(The rest of the ranking of cartoons is in Appendix 4)
Overall, the cartoon that had the highest prosocial acts all over the three networks were as follows:

*Table 3 Ranking of Top Four Cartoons*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Cartoon Name</th>
<th>Network Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Al Shabah</td>
<td>Spacetoon Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>We Bare Bears</td>
<td>Cartoon Network Arabia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Jewel Pet Twinkle</td>
<td>Spacetoon Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dragons: Defenders of Berk</td>
<td>Cartoon Network Arabia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(The full list is in Appendix 5)
Chapter Five

V. Discussion and Analysis

The purpose of the study was to explore the prosocial behaviors in the popular animated cartoons viewed by Egyptian children and to check if the different aspects of the social cognitive theory to facilitate acquiring prosocial behaviors. This study has shown that in general cartoons shown during prime time contain a great amount of prosocial behaviors. The first research question addressed the multidimensional frequency of the prosocial behaviors. Most of the cartoons had an average of five acts of prosocial behavior per episode which is approximately 30 minutes. On average, children are exposed to 10 prosocial behaviors every hour they spend watching cartoons. Accordingly, they are exposed to a substantial cumulative amount of prosocial content. The effects of watching this amount of prosocial behaviors will definitely be related to the social cognitive theory.

This study didn’t only show the frequency of prosocial behaviors in the animated cartoons but it also showed that these behaviors portrayed are of a great variety and the reasons for performing the behaviors varied as well. The characters who did good things to the other characters did that because they were concerned about them since they were in need also because they are just simply kind hearted or to express their friendship or fondness for them. These were actually the most common motivations for performing the prosocial behavior. All of these convey positive messages to the children watching the cartoons and there is the belief that repeated exposure will likely have a positive influence on how children act and feel about others. Also it was found in the current
study that the most common category of prosocial behavior was altruistic actions such as helping, sharing, generosity, kindness, donating and comforting. The majority of the acts fell in this category. This is in agreement with a lot of the previous studies and researches such as the ones done by Bryan & Walbek in 1970; Collins and Getz in 1976; Poulos, Rubinstein and Liebert in 1975; Hearold in 1986; Mares in 1996 and Paik in 1995. All these have found that altruistic actions were the most common in addition to having a particularly beneficial effect.

The results showed that physical forms of prosocial behavior (65.69%) are more than the verbal ones (34.31). This is in agreement with the study in the literature review done on Disney movies where 52% of the prosocial acts were physical and 48% were verbal. As for the type of the prosocial behavior, altruism such as sharing and helping accounted for more than half of the sample with 52.3% of the sample. Greenberg et al.; Kaplan and Baxter; Potter and Ware; Smith et al; Singer and Singer; Dumova and Mares all found in their studies that altruism was the most common prosocial behavior in the content they analyzed. For example, Greenberg et al (2003) found that there were 14 acts/hour; Potter & Ware (1989), 2 acts/hour; Smith (2006), 2.9 acts/hour ; Mares (1996), 1.1 acts/hour and Padilla-Walker et al (2013) found 13/hour. If we consider that in this current study, the average is 10 acts/hour of prosocial behavior in general, then almost half of that would be altruism. Therefore 5 acts/hour would be an acceptable amount when compared to the above. The Social Cognitive Theory highlights the importance of repeated exposure since it relates to imitation (Bandura, 2002). Bandura (1989) also added the repeated exposure to pro-social behavior increases the likelihood that the viewer will actually see and remember that behavior.
The second research question concerned the characteristics of the initiator of the prosocial behavior. The qualities of the characters influence the viewer’s possibility to pay attention to specific behaviors on television. He is also more inclined to remember behavior that reflects reality, in regards to sharing similar traits with the character and the behavior. This will make it easier for the child to retrieve this information when applicable (Bandura, 2002). In the current study, a few characteristics were identified that are associated with being prosocial. The study revealed that generally, males (75.4%) were more likely than females to perform prosocial behaviors. However, there was no difference in the gender in the motivation of physical attraction only. Having males engaging in most prosocial acts agree with the results of Potter and Ware (1989) where 67% of prosocial acts were conducted by males. It also is in agreement with the study by Baxter and Kaplan (1982) were males performed 69% of the prosocial behaviors. Also the study of Abdel Aziz (2007) showed that males did 62.7% of the prosocial behaviors in Spacetoon Arabia network. This I believe is consistent with the representation of males in the society and media at large were males are represented more than females. With regards to the physical appearance, attractive and average humans initiated most of the prosocial behaviors in the study. This is actually in agreement with the earlier literature where Padilla –Walker et al. (2013) found in her study that the initiator needs to be attractive for the children to identify with. Staub (1995) mentioned that attractive and average people initiated and received more help in general rather than unattractive ones which conforms with real life behavior. This is also in accordance with the social cognitive theory that mention that children are more likely to learn from the characters or figures they believe are attractive role models.
Accordingly, behavior is more likely to be used if the characters are realistic (human vs. nonhuman). Prosocial behaviors in the current study were mainly executed by adults and teenagers more than by the elderly or children. The study by Smith et al., (2006) found that the prosocial actions were performed by adult (69.45), male (66.1%) and white (79.3%). As for the social economic status of characters who initiated the prosocial behavior in the current study, they were mostly from a high social class and followed by the middle social class. It was mentioned in the literature review that children identified with the main characters of the films from the social class they aspire and not necessarily their current social class (Maccoby and Wilson, 1957).

Although, these results of the characteristics of the initiator seem objective on the surface, but the problem is that these messages help in stereotyping the initiator of the prosocial behaviors based on the physical appearance. The messages convey that for example high social class attractive people do good things for others. At the same time, this translates to the viewers that unattractive low social class people are not as helpful and kind. There are a number of studies that have shown that the media usually show elderly people in a negative context (McConatha, et al., 1999; Vasil & Wass, 1993). The media also tend to convey the message that being thin and attractive is of great importance (Owen and Laurel-Seller, 2000; Stice, 1994). Therefore, it would be best if story writers and producers have balanced portrayals in terms of the different types of characters with different physical appearances who perform the prosocial behaviors.
The third research question addressed the context. The context surrounding the prosocial behavior is important because it impacts the production and motivation aspects of the social cognitive theory which in turn affect the imitation (Bandura, 2002). In the current study, most of the prosocial behaviors were towards friends 46.05%). This was in agreement with earlier research finding such as Smith et al., (2006) which resulted in 31.7 %; Mares (1996) found 45% and Padilla-Walker (2013) found 45.7% of the prosocial behavior was between friends.

Almost all the prosocial acts in the study were of low cost (92.7%) to the initiator. Most prosocial behaviors were either rewarded (53.50%) or neither rewarded nor punished (42.44%). Prosocial behaviors were punished rarely (4.06%). This was in agreement with the study of Padilla-Walker (2013) were low cost acts accounted for 71% and most of the acts were neither rewarded nor punished. As for Mares (1996), around 42% of the acts were rewarded and around 5% didn’t receive either a reward or punishment. Monroe (2002) and Thomas (2005) mentioned with regards to the social cognitive theory that imitation is more likely to take place if the behavior is not punished. Nabi (2009) also added that positive outcomes of the prosocial behavior can increase the possibility of the children to model the portrayed behaviors. This was also in agreement with Nada (2012) who found that the children in her study would imitate the same behaviors and actions that the cartoons characters did specially if the cartoon character is loved by people and is rewarded. Most of the children in her sample didn’t want to do actions or behaviors of the characters who get beaten in the cartoons. Social cognitive theory and further research suggest that rewards increase the probability of imitation in children (Bandura, 1965; Bandura and Walters, 1963; Lando and Donnerstein, 1978).
The majority of the prosocial acts were directed by a clear need of the target (86.91%). This was actually in contrast with the results of Padilla-Walker (2013) for Disney movies which found that the majority of the prosocial acts were not driven by a clear need of the target.
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VI. Conclusion and Recommendations

The aim of the study was to explore the different characteristics and aspects of the prosocial behaviors portrayed in the popular cartoons viewed in Egypt from a social cognitive perspective. The results of the study show that the elements of the social cognitive theory are in general present in the popular cartoons that are shown during prime time. Regarding repeated exposure, it was found that there was an average of 10 prosocial acts per hour. This is not trivial at all. In that case, if a child watches 3 hours of popular cartoons a day, this means that he will be exposed to around 30 acts of prosocial behaviors daily, 900 monthly and 10,800 a year. This amount of exposure will have an impact on imitating those behaviors. Therefore, television -and in that case all the new screens- play an important role in the children’s development. The characteristics of the initiators mostly conformed with the aspects mentioned in the social cognitive theory. The context of the prosocial acts in the study was presented in ways that help in the learning and imitation processes. What was interesting in some of the animated cartoons viewed was that the idea itself of the cartoon is prosocial in nature where an individual alone or with an accompanying pet or a group of adults or teenagers help save the world in each episode. It is a different disaster each time but the main character(s) in most cases is able to win. This was the case in a number of cartoons such as MP4force, Thunderbirds, Grandizer, Max Steal, Inspector Gadget, Detective Conan and so on.

The study also revealed that although the number of cartoons in Cartoon Network Arabia are less than the other two channels but still they contained the highest number of
prosocial acts. From this we can conclude that the content is again very important. The findings also revealed that the cartoon that had the biggest number of prosocial acts was Al Shabah ‘The Ghost’ which is aired on Spacetoon although from the researcher’s point of view, Spacetoon show very old cartoons produced in the 70’s and 80’s and if they have more recent cartoons, then they show old episodes. This made the network unattractive and not as catchy as Cartoon Network and MBC3 which had updated cartoons with newer technologies and high definition. This is also in agreement with a study done by El Guindi (2011) that stated that Spacetoon contained more social skills than MBC3 in the one composite week of content analysis. Cartoons shown on CN Arabia and MBC3 also had musical and sound effects, attractive images and pictures that grabbed the attention of the viewer. It is very possible then that the cartoon containing the highest number of prosocial behaviors is not viewed by the children because simply it is not attractive enough.

As per the World Bank figures, Egypt has a population of around 85 million where 33% are in the age group of 0-14, thus it is extremely important to pay attention to the build up of this generation and the development of it. We have to be very careful to what they are exposed to on the different screens. It is not preferable to have them exposed to the program strategies of other countries. It is therefore essential to provide them with programs that have our own input, content and reflects our heritage, culture and traditions. Thus, it would be wise enough if Egypt produces its own children’s programs and cartoons. The very successful experience of Bakkar can be replicated. It seems we have the know-how to produce cartoons but we just need to build on that. We also need to have Bakkar and others like that aired on other channels other than on the national television so that they can have an impact on the Arab world as well. It is worth noting
that one of the main reasons that increased the number and variety of the prosocial programs in the United States was the Children Television Act and the regulations set for the networks to renew their licenses. In Egypt, we don’t have any regulations or laws that oblige the networks to produce children’s programs or cartoons. If any laws or regulations are passed, this will ensure a good amount of supply of these. We currently have a lot of privately owned channels that are free-to-air and thus it would be possible to impose that. The private channels don’t produce children’s programs because they don’t think they are profitable. Therefore, regulations will make them produce them. It would be best if we can have an Egyptian network to address this great number of children and compete with the Saudi and Dubai networks. It is worth noting that Al Nahar channel produced the first children program nowadays called Banat we welad (Girls and Boys). This might be the first step in hopefully many more to come.

Based on this exploratory research, a model is suggested for producing animated cartoons that would have the features that facilitate the imitation process based on the social cognitive theory.

It is recommended that the cartoon uses easy Arabic and not classical Arabic to be easier for the children and feel that it reflects the everyday life they live. The main character should be the one doing most of the prosocial behaviors. It would be better if the main character is average in attractiveness, teenager, and from a high social economic class. As for the gender, it would be best if we have both genders males and females as main characters either in the same animated cartoon or different ones to accurately represent reality. Although the main prosocial behavior that the content should convey is usually altruism, however, it is recommended that we have the focus now on acceptance.
of others in addition to altruism. These days and specially after the Arab Spring a lot of disagreements mainly regarding political and social views existed. These disagreements classified people at either end and labeled them. In the researcher’s view, people are not tolerant nowadays to listen to others who have different views. Lots of fights, and arguments happen as a consequence of that. Therefore, it would be better if children learn how to listen and accept other opinions, races, religions and so on.

As for the relationship between the initiator and that benefactor, research has proven that the initiator of the act helps mainly his friends and then his family when there is a clear need for this help. Therefore, the proposed model would better take this in consideration. Since it was proved that the person helps those who similar to them. The plot and storyline should be realistic so that the child can identify with. Prosocial acts should be rewarded to be positively reinforced. The animated cartoon should use modern technologies in its graphics. It should also have musical sounds that are attractive and easy to remember and recognize. It would be great if they contain messages about the Egyptian heritage, values and culture.

The children of today are the men and women of tomorrow. Egypt and the Arab region should pay more attention to their children’s programs. We should invest in the programs production, staff of specialists, qualified producers and high technology. This will actually be an investment in our children. The whole environment of the children programs should be revisited in order to be able to raise a generation that we would be proud of.
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VII. Limitations and Future Research

Limitations

There wasn’t enough research about Egypt and the Arab region. Also the research that was found was old. Statistics is also a major limitation where data such as the children networks viewership, updated number of television sets weren’t available. Also there is no ranking for the children’s animated cartoons nor the channels. Another limitation was the advertisements inside the episodes. They made it difficult to calculate the exact duration of each episode. Prime time in the school days is different than on the weekends or in the summer. This has to be put in consideration when choosing the sample. There might be other popular cartoons but not shown during the specified time maybe because it is mainly targeting another age group but older children might still like watching it. If this study is done later on, in a year for example, the cartoons studied will be different since there is a big possibility that other cartoons are considered popular at the time.

Future Research

There are a lot of possibilities for future research that is specially needed in Egypt. Further research should study the effect of social media on the viewership of children. It is also important to study the effect of video games on Egyptian children or the portrayal of prosocial behaviors in the video games. Research can also study if the children identify with the main characters of the video games. Other studies can examine the content of the
cartoons viewed on Youtube. Lots of children nowadays replace television with youtube on either phones or iPads or computers. Studies can also use different approaches and different theoretical frameworks. More studies can be done on the national networks and the channels that are not free to air like OSN. Other studies can look into policy and interview policy makers and decision makers. The feedback and comments of the children on the cartoons and its characters that are posted on the networks’ websites can also be studied. It would also be beneficial if studies can be done to determine the type of prosocial acts children are most likely to respond to. There are no studies in Egypt or the Arab world that long term effects of watching prosocial behaviors. It would also be important to examine if the portrayal of violence cancels out the impact of the prosocial acts in the cartoons. Finally, future research can study the effect of cartoons on children aged 4-6 because not enough studies are done using that age group.
VIII. Bibliography


Abdel Khalek, Seham. (1996). *Alresoum almotahreka fi al television almasry: Derasa tahlilia* [Animated cartoons on Egyptian television: A content analysis]. (Master’s thesis). Faculty of Mass Communication, Cairo University, Cairo


Al Abd, Noha. (2003). *3laket al tefl al masry belkanawat alfada2ia* [The Egyptian child’s relation with satellite channels]. (Master’s thesis). Faculty of Mass Communication, Cairo University, cairo, Egypt.


Al Guindi, Rehab. (2011). *Al resoum al motahareka bekanawat alatfal alarabia almotakhasesa wama taakesaho men maharat iktmaaia letefl ma kabl almadrasa*
Al Husseiny, Amany. (2001). *Athar moshahadet alatfal leldrama ala tansheathom aleqtmaaia* [The effect of watching drama and its influence on their social development on children]. (PhD Dissertation). Faculty of Mass Communication, Cairo University, Cairo


Awad Salam, Gehan. (1997). *Athar barameg alatfal altelevisionia ala elselouk aleqtmaay lelefl* [The effect of children programs on television on the social behaviors of the child]. (Master’s thesis). Faculty of Mass Communication, Cairo University, Cairo


Birat, Sondos (2008). Alta2thirat almotamthela lelresom almotahreka ala alatfal fi Dragon Ball and Conan [The effects of cartoons represented in children’s cartoon in Dragon Ball and Conan]


Durham University. Available at Durham E-Theses Online: http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/4664/


Ghawas, Amer. (2001). *Estekhdamat altefl alamany lebarameg alatfal altelefisionia* [The uses of the Omani child to the children’s program on television]. (Master’s thesis). Cairo University, Cairo


Ibrahim, Ahmed. (2013). Tatheer altaarod lelkanaWat alFadaia ala tagheer alThawabet alThakafia wa aleGtemaia [The effect of exposure to satellite channels on the change in the inherent culture and societal beliefs]. (Master’s thesis). Faculty of Mass Communication, Cairo University, Cairo


Mahmoud, Inas. (2007). *Estekhdamat altefl lemawake3 alkanawat alfada2ia alcartonia wa 3laketha segelathom alelectronia almofadala* [The use of the websites of the satellite cartoon channels by Egyptian children and its relation to their favorite electronic records]. Cairo University, Cairo, Egypt.


Mohamed, Ali. (1994). Barameg Alatfal fi aliza3a al mar2ia allybia [Children’s programs on Lybian Television]. (Master’s thesis). Faculty of Mass Communication, Cairo University, Cairo


Nada, Ayman. (2012). Ta3arod Al Tefl Almasry leaflam al cartoon fi al television wa 3lakatho bemostawa altawahod ma3a alshakhsiat wa alnamazeg alcartonia almokadama [The Egyptian child’s exposure to cartoon on television and its relation to the extent of identification with the cartoon characters and models represented]. (Master’s thesis). Cairo University, Cairo

Nada, Ayman. (2012). Ta3arod Al Tefl Almasry leaflam al cartoon fi al television wa 3lakatho bemostawa altawahod ma3a alshakhsiat wa alnamazeg alcartonia almokadama [The Egyptian child’s exposure to cartoon on television and its relation to the extent of identification with the cartoon characters and models represented]. (Master’s thesis). Cairo University, Cairo


IX. Appendices

IX. 1 Appendix A: Coding Book for Each Prosocial Act in an Episode


1- You will need to write down the name of the cartoon, its duration and the character name that performed the prosocial behavior

Cartoon name: ______________

Length of cartoon: ______________  Character name: ______________

Prosocial behavior is a behavior that is socially desirable and which in some way benefits another person or society at large

2- You have to choose the network being studied from the three options below

Network
1=Cartoon Network Arabic (CN Arabia)
2=MBC3
3=Spacetoon

3- This category relates to the form, type and motivation for the prosocial behavior performed to be able to assess the frequency of it

Frequency

Form of prosocial behavior:
1=Verbal (prosocial act but with words such as complimenting, encouraging, etc)
2=Physical (prosocial act that is physically performed such as helping, sharing, etc)

Type of prosocial behavior:
Positive interaction (dealing with others in a positive and peaceful manner)
1=friendly/non-aggressive interactions
2=Cooperation
3=Positive affect
4=Peaceful conflict resolution
5=Expressions of affection/praise
Altruism (to achieve positive outcome for someone else rather than for the self)
6=Self sacrificing kindness
7=Generosity
8=Offering helping
9=Sharing
10=Donating
11=Comforting
**Self control** (Controlling oneself)
12=Persistence at a task
13=Resistance to temptation
14=Obedience to rules
15=Ability to work independently
16=Control of aggressive impulses

**Acceptance of Others**
16=Attitudes
17=Beliefs
18=Other
(Not included: common courtesy)

**Motivation**
**Reason for engaging in prosocial act:**
1=Clear need (a situation that demands help)
2=Physical attraction
3=Altruistic (to achieve positive outcome for someone else rather than for the self)
4=Demonstrate friendship
5=Public (to get recognition, approval or praise from others)
6=Anonymous (when the person doing the prosocial behavior doesn’t know the identity of the o
7= Other

4- **For each prosocial act, the character performing the act will be coded for the characteristics identified below**

**Characteristics of the character**
**Gender:** (based on physical characteristics commonly associated with gender classification)
1=Female
2=Male
3=Unidentified
4=Mixed (if a group or team with females and males)

**Realistic Appearance:** (how the character looks like from his physical appearance)
1=Human
2=Animal
3=Ghost/Monster
4=Animated object
5= Other
6= Mixed (if a group or team)

**Age:**
1=Child (a person in elementary school, usually 12 years of age or below)
2=Teenager (a person in junior high/high school, usually between 13 and 19 years of age)
3=Adult (a person that has attained the age of maturity, usually between 20 and 54 years of age)
4=Elder (a person that is 55 years or older, usually portrayed as a grandparent or retired)
5=Unidentified (if it is not clear)
Social Economic Status (based on dress, housing, and any comments made about the character’s financial situation. Animals should be classified based on their position)  
1=High  
2=Middle  
3=Low  
4=Unidentified  

Character Attractiveness: (Based on the physical features considered commonly as attractive. Animals are classified as average unless they have physical characteristics such as strength, good health)  
1=Attractive  
2=Average  
3=Unattractive  
4=Mixed  

Relationship of initiator and target:  
1=Stranger  
2=Acquaintance  
3=Friends  
4=Family  
5=Student/teacher  
6=Colleagues  
7=Intimate relationship  
8=Boss/employee  
9= Competitor/Enemy  
10=Other  

6- Each prosocial act should be studied for its context in terms of its cost, reward, clear need and if there were any negative connotations to it)  

Context  

Cost of Prosocial act for the initiator  
1=High (these are inconvenient to the initiator and resulted in punishment or loss)  
2=Low (these are minor and had little negative impact for the initiator)  

Was it rewarded?  
1=Yes (if the initiator received anything positive for his/her behavior)  
2= No (punished) (if the initiator received anything negative or if anything positive was taken away)  
3=Neither  

Was the target in clear need? (if it was physically clear that he/she needs assistance due to some physical limitation)  
1=Yes  
2=No  

Was the prosocial act pure and not accompanied by any negative connotations? (if the behavior is purely prosocial without any negative implications associated to it)  
1=Yes  
2=No
### IX. 2 Appendix B: Coding sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cartoon Name</th>
<th>Cartoon Name</th>
<th>Cartoon Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prosocial behavior</th>
<th>Act 1</th>
<th>Act 2</th>
<th>Act 3</th>
<th>Act 4</th>
<th>Act 5</th>
<th>Act 1</th>
<th>Act 2</th>
<th>Act 3</th>
<th>Act 4</th>
<th>Act 5</th>
<th>Act 1</th>
<th>Act 2</th>
<th>Act 3</th>
<th>Act 4</th>
<th>Act 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Character name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form of prosocial behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of prosocial behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realistic Appearance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social economic status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear need</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pure act</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IX. 3 Appendix C: Networks brief

Spacetoon Arabic is an Arabic television channel that specializes in animation and children programs. It began broadcasting in March 2000.


Cartoon Network Arabia is a free-to-air children's channel that is broadcast for a pan-Arabian audience in the MENA region, and it is the official Arabic edition of the American Cartoon Network. Cartoon Network Arabic is considered a free alternative to the subscription-based Cartoon Network channel offered in the Middle East despite the varying differences in programming and available languages. The channel was launched on October 10, 2010. As of March 2012, the channel became available in true high-definition.

MBC3 was launched in 2004 and is the kid’s entertainment channel. It delivers a programming mix of children's education and entertainment that connects with and stimulates the imagination of Arab kids aged between three and thirteen as well as creating the quality viewing time with their parents. The channel focuses on local production in Arabic, from edutainment, to game shows, and reality shows, while also continuing its various long standing international studio deals and partnerships.
### IX. 4 Appendix D: Detailed table of the results

| Class and Physical activity | Prevalence | Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Prevalence | Age Standardized Confidence Interval | Age Standardized Preva...
### IX. 5 Appendix E: Order of cartoons in each network with reference to the amount of prosocial behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cartoon Network Arabia</th>
<th>Acts</th>
<th>% over 3 channels</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Minutes</th>
<th>Freq*minutes</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2=We Bare Bears</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.74%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.05%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7=Mucha Lucha</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.51%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.75%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3=Scooby Doo</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.58%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.30%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>17.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6=Ninjago Go</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.26%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.30%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4=Dragons: Defenders of Berk</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>12.19%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.75%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>24.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1=Inspector Gadget</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>10.84%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.90%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>17.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8=Ben 10 Omniverse</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.48%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.30%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>12.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5=Mansour</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.58%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.30%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>14.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spacetoon Arabic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3=Al Shabah</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.26%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.15%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6=Power Topplate</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.13%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.15%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7=Grandizer</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8.58%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.20%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>15.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8=Tom Sawyer</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.39%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.60%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13=The Visitor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.45%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.15%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12=Coach Maged</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.15%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16=One Piece</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.35%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.30%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2=Al Ashawes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.13%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.30%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10=Conan</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.35%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.15%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15=Al Towfan</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.81%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.15%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>17.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4=Pink Panther</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.15%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1=Jewel Pet Twinkle</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.16%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.30%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9=Les Miserable</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.51%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.60%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14=Solyng</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.13%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.15%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11=Monsuno</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.81%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.30%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>16.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBC3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2=MP4orce</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7.22%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.90%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>17.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1=Thunderbirds</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>12.42%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.64%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3=The Savage Dragon</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.13%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.15%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4=Max Steel</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.48%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.45%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>14.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5=Ninja Turtles</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.48%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.45%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>14.67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### IX. 6 Appendix F: Characters performing the prosocial behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cartoon</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent over 3 channels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1=Inspector Gadget</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>10.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2=Panda</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3=Nom-Nom</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4=Ice Bear</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5=The team</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6=Emy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7=Mother</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8=Grizzly</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9=Chole</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10=Man</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2=We Bare Bears</strong></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1=Velma</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2=Fred</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3=Scooby Doo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3=Scooby Doo</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1=Hiccup</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2=Toothless</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3=Stoick</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4=Astrid</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5=Snout</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6=Fetr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7=Hiccup’s team</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8=Fishleg</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9=Tuffnet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10=Gobber</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4= Dragons: Defenders of Berk</strong></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>12.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5=Mansour</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1=Kai</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2=Nya</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3=Cole</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4=Zane</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5=The team</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6=Rocky-Earth Dragon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6=Ninjago</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1=Richochet</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2=Buena</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3=Singer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4=Grandfather</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5=Fantasmo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6=Chinche</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7=Flea</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8=Snow Pea</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7=Mucha Lucha</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1=Ben 10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2=Cooper</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3=Professor Paradox</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4=The team</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8=Ben 10 Omniverse</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Cartoon Network</strong></td>
<td>178</td>
<td>40.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1=John</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2=Penelope</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3=Parker</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4=Gordon</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5=Virgil</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6=Allen</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7=Grandma</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8=Brain</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9=Professor Moffat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10=Scott Tracy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1=Thunderbirds</strong></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>12.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1=Scream</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2=Reverb</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3=Cooder</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4=Kickblast</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5=The team</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6=Thrash</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Klaxxon</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>MP4orce</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dragon</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The Savage Dragon</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Steel</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Kirby</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fares</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Max Steel</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>All the team</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Casey</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Don</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>April</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Splinter</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Raphael</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ninja Turtles</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total MBC 3</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Amira</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Green eyes cat</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hayan</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Nabil</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Souad</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Marwan</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Jewel Pet Twinkle</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Al Za3eem</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Journalist</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Al Ashawes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Al Shabah</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Old Man (Apple seller)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mazen</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Pascal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Pierre</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Yassin</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Al Shabah</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Character 1</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pink Panther</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Pink Panther</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Dorebi</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Power Topplate</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Grandizer</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Tom Sawyer</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Les Miserable</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Conan</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Monsuno</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Coach Maged</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Characters:**
- Lloyd
- Amira
- Ro’a
- Selim
- Mohanad
- Coach
- Wassim
- Dukefleed (Grandizer)
- Koji
- Yara
- Tom
- Hak
- Douglas
- Benny
- Syrus
- Eponline
- Javert
- Eroshel
- Cassette
- Tossane
- Kouviral
- Marius
- Altimus
- Conan
- Yan
- Dax
- John
- Drog
- The team
- Raad
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mika</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>The Visitor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Grandfather</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Solyng</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Chein</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Solyng</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yokishi</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tamaki</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Samurai</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Al Towfan</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Loofy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Crocs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>One Peiece</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>Space toon</strong></td>
<td><strong>151</strong></td>
<td><strong>34.09%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>443</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Appendix G: Intercoder reliability results**

ReCal 0.1 Alpha for 2 Coders
results for file "Intercoder Reliability2.csv"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Percent Agreement</th>
<th>Scott's Pi</th>
<th>Cohen's Kappa</th>
<th>Krippendorff's Alpha (nominal)</th>
<th>N Agreements</th>
<th>N Disagreements</th>
<th>N Cases</th>
<th>N Decisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (cols 1 &amp; 2)</td>
<td>93.5%</td>
<td>0.859</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.861</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (cols 3 &amp; 4)</td>
<td>93.5%</td>
<td>0.915</td>
<td>0.916</td>
<td>0.917</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (cols 5 &amp; 6)</td>
<td>93.5%</td>
<td>0.895</td>
<td>0.895</td>
<td>0.896</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (cols 7 &amp; 8)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (cols 9 &amp; 10)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 (cols 11 &amp; 12)</td>
<td>90.6%</td>
<td>0.724</td>
<td>0.726</td>
<td>0.728</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 (cols 13 &amp; 14)</td>
<td>96.8%</td>
<td>0.948</td>
<td>0.948</td>
<td>0.949</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 (cols 15 &amp; 16)</td>
<td>90.3%</td>
<td>0.757</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.761</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 (cols 17 &amp; 18)</td>
<td>90.3%</td>
<td>0.865</td>
<td>0.865</td>
<td>0.867</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 (cols 19 &amp; 20)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 (cols 21 &amp; 22)</td>
<td>90.3%</td>
<td>0.822</td>
<td>0.823</td>
<td>0.825</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 (cols 23 &amp; 24)</td>
<td>90.3%</td>
<td>0.772</td>
<td>0.773</td>
<td>0.775</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 (cols 25 &amp; 26)</td>
<td>96.8%</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
<td>-0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IX. 8 **Appendix** H: TNS Cartoon Channels TRPs across Hours

[PERIODS] (Urban Egypt/ TRP [15 min.]| All)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timebands</th>
<th>CARTOON ARABIC</th>
<th>MBC 3</th>
<th>SPACE TOON</th>
<th>CARTOON ARABIC</th>
<th>MBC 3</th>
<th>SPACE TOON</th>
<th>CARTOON ARABIC</th>
<th>MBC 3</th>
<th>SPACE TOON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>03:00 - 04:00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04:00 - 05:00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05:00 - 06:00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06:00 - 07:00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07:00 - 08:00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08:00 - 09:00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:00 - 10:00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 - 11:00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 - 12:00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 - 13:00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:00 - 14:00</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:00 - 15:00</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:00 - 16:00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:00 - 17:00</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:00 - 18:00</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:00 - 19:00</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:00 - 20:00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:00 - 21:00</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:00 - 22:00</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:00 - 23:00</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23:00 - 24:00</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24:00 - 25:00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25:00 - 26:00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26:00 - 27:00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Day</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### IX. 9 Appendix I: TNS List of Children’s Cartoon Channels

[PERIODS] (Urban Egypt|Total Day|All)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Targets &gt;&gt;</th>
<th>Channels</th>
<th>March 15</th>
<th></th>
<th>April 15</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A,B,C1(1) Gender(Male)</td>
<td>A,B,C1(1) Gender(Female)</td>
<td>A,B,C1(1) Gender(Male)</td>
<td>A,B,C1(1) Gender(Female)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TRP [15 min.]</td>
<td>TRP [15 min.]</td>
<td>TRP [15 min.]</td>
<td>TRP [15 min.]</td>
<td>TRP [15 min.]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BARAEM</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CARTOON NETWORK ARABIC</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JEEM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KARAMEESH</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MBC 3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SEMSEM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPACE TOON</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOYOR BABY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOYOR ELJANAH</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>