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Abstract:
Cultural homogenization is a contentious part of the globalization debate. Critics concerned with cultural homogenization fear the “McDonaldization” of global culture, usually described as a mono-directional outward wave of American pop culture swamping alternate views and traditional value systems. Less skeptical analysts of cultural globalization focus on the concept of cultural hybridization. This project uses the apparently innocuous measure of children’s TV programming in the US as a window onto the globalization debate. While globalization critics generally assume the forces of culture to be predominantly monodirectional (US/West outward), arguments for hybridity argue for a mixing of cultures. We examine more than 50 different examples of children’s TV programming in an effort to peel away the layers of the globalization debate, exposing not just levels of hybridity, but a more complex vision of global cultural hybridization. Doing this provides a meaningful and more nuanced tool for teaching about globalization.

This approach also provides a means of teaching about cultural socialization and values change (drawing on data from the World Values Survey and generational value change), which indicates that different generational experiences frame new expectations for behavior. We use this to argue that changes in children’s media environment (TV programming in particular) are producing a more multicultural and “globalized” childhood for modern generations of children in the US. Specifically, we look at not just the countries of origin of children’s TV shows, but also production companies producing content, and the presence or emphasis on “global” or multicultural messaging in the programs. Further, as many programs are overtly educational and post curricular goals on program websites (e.g., ‘Dora the Explorer’, ‘Go, Diego, Go!’; ‘Ni-Hao, Kai-Lan’). These cultural ‘lessons’ are used anecdotally to bolster claims that a “generational shift” is in progress. We conclude by arguing (contra the basic “globalization thesis”) that children in the US are being raised in a culturally hybridized TV media environment, and may be in the process of becoming a more globally-oriented generation.

I. Introduction: Dora and Other Nefarious Characters

Dora, the bold Latina cartoon exploradora, was recently dragged into the national debate surrounding the issue of illegal immigration. The pint-sized heroine, the face of a global franchise with shows airing on Nickelodeon and Nick Jr., was depicted in several doctored photos and editorial cartoons. These images – many still widely available on the internet – imply that Dora is an illegal immigrant from Mexico, suspected of violating Arizona’s controversial 2010 immigration law. This portrayal stirred up a surprising amount of national media coverage (cf., Gallafent and Werman 2010).

Yet this portrayal is not as clear cut as one might imagine, as Nickelodeon’s representatives have been hesitant to comment on Dora’s “real” background – they purposefully have created a ‘general’ Hispanic character to appeal to a wide audience. Her place of birth has never been clear, and the locale (jungle, forests, pyramids, occasional snow) for the show is sufficiently vague to be almost anywhere in middle or southern America. Voice actresses who have played the character have been of Cuban descent and of Peruvian descent, and some who watch the show say Dora speaks Spanish with an American accent. In addition to a talking map, her compatriots in the show include a monkey, a fox, and an iguana – often found in different ecological climes. Yet all of this is to say, Dora is a blank Hispanic screen against which political angst can be projected and played out (KVOA.com).

Figure 1. This composite image is Nickelodeon cartoon Dora the Explorer, created by Debbie Groben of Sarasota, Fla., in early 2010 for a contest for the fake news site FreakingNews.com. (AP Photo/Courtesy of Debbie Broben and FreakingNews.com)
This is not the first time cartoon characters have found themselves involved in a heated political debate. Some more serious research frequently addresses violence in cartoons, with the *Teenage Mutant Ninja Turtles* and the *Mighty Morphin Power Rangers* having received a notable amount of attention. In fact, “field experiments have consistently shown that aggressive behavior towards peers increases following the viewing of non-comedic violent cartoons. Similarly, object-oriented aggressive behavior tends to increase following the consumption of noncomedic, violent cartoons” (Kirsh 2006: 555). Yet it is not our purpose to reopen the debate over impacts of cartoon violence, rather just illustrate that there can be “real world” consequences of children’s television.

Other cartoon characters also have been bizarrely used as ‘stalking horses’ for political issues *du jour*. Tinky Winky – the purple Teletubby – was notably ‘outed’ in 1999 by American televangelist Jerry Falwell as being a gay role model for children – due to being purple, having a triangle symbol, and carrying a magic purse-like bag (BBC News). *Sesame Street*’s long co-habitating, bedroom-sharing friends Bert & Ernie are often mentioned in context of being TVs longest serving gay couple (*cf.*, Reals 2010), or used in relation to the current issue of same-sex marriage (KVOA.com). Notably, both shows’ producers continue to say the characters are not gay. Similarly, the *Smurfs* have somewhat tongue-in-cheekily been described as a Marxist fable or metaphor for socialism, and also inclusive of obvious gay archetypes (*viz.*, Vanity, Handy, and Hefty Smurf) (Chung 2008). And while Chinese immigration is hardly the hot-button issue as is Hispanic immigration, Kai-Lan, Nickelodeon’s Chinese-American colleague of Dora, also has been caught up in the angst of the immigration debate (*cf.*, Gallafent and Werman 2010). Clearly children’s TV is able to strike a chord when it comes to political issues, childhood learning, and potential for cultural and sub-cultural messaging.

II. Active Learning & Children’s TV

So can we, in an admittedly light-hearted way, use children’s TV as a lever to open up some issues of identity and culture related to the debates surrounding globalization? We hope so, yet will leave it to the reader to judge the effectiveness of transferring this to a classroom setting. We attempt to use children’s television as a way to improve classroom engagement with the topic, and spur additional interest in our students to view other elements of their day to day lives though the lens of cultural globalization. Finally, this is designed to serve as a ‘classroom module’ with guided discussion as a way to facilitate a more active and engaged classroom (*cf.*, Carlson 2009).

While hard scientific findings on the benefits of active learning are somewhat mixed (Powner and Allendoerfer 2008), and efforts to evaluate the effect of various techniques of active teaching are similarly unstable (Prince 2004) the literature on the benefits of active learning proliferates. Despite problems with experimentation methodology (*cf.*, Powner and Allendoerfer 2008), there is support for engaging students on a more diversified and active level of teaching than that offered by traditional lecturing. For example, one of the most common forms of engaging students is through simulations or role-playing, especially moot court or mock trial in law schools (Carlson and Skaggs 2000), undergraduate constitutional law courses (Ringel 2004), or even undergraduate international law classes (Jefferson 1999, Ambrosio 2006). Though simulations have also been used with regard to ethnic conflict (Ambrosio 2004), international intervention (Belloni 2008), and in conjunction with International Organizations or International Relations courses via the use of Model United

Instructor-led discussion around shared readings (or here – perhaps shared viewings of TV clips) such as the case method pioneered by the Harvard Business School, can also be a serviceable means of increasing student engagement. Cooperative team learning is another effective interactive teaching strategy (cf. Occhipinti 2003). Research even supports using active learning as a strategy to increase institutional student retention rates (Braxton, Milem, and Sullivan 2000), arguing that active learning increases comprehension, resulting in increased personal reward received from education, resulting in a higher likelihood of social integration in college, resulting in higher student retention rates for institutions. Overall, while there is some question as to actual effect, causality, and percentage benefit of active learning, an actively engaged learning process is generally seen as: 1) benefiting students, 2) possibly benefiting faculty via higher evaluations, and 3) benefiting educational institutions via potentially fewer student departures. This paper offers a way of moving toward an engaged classroom setting, through the integration of learning modules during the class term.

Building on an “active learning module” approach (cf. Hamlin and Janssen 1987), which integrates a variety of active learning methods, this paper recaps an effective international politics teaching module that may be implemented in class as a way of getting past the pure ‘lecture-based’ model of teaching that tends to predominate in university, and especially large-class, settings. This approach has been used to develop a similar module on clothing and globalization (Carlson 2009). Further, the active learning module encapsulates the “Four Es” identified as necessary for effective learning: Engaging interest, Encoding information, Elaborating meaning, and Evaluating progress (Nevid 2006). The class this module is designed for enrolls approximately 65-120 students, is an introductory course for political science and includes political science majors, international relations majors, as well as general enrollment students. It is entitled “Introduction to International Relations” and usually covers numerous “issue” areas of IR and includes a separate weekly discussion section. However, the material would also easily be transferable to any undergraduate course on globalization, world politics, international political economy, global culture, or related topic such as political communication, media studies or current global issues.

III. The Globalization Debate

As most instructors know, globalization has become a somewhat vague buzzword encompassing economics, politics, and social interactions. Yet while economic interdependence has become largely a given, the socio-cultural – or identity related – elements of globalization have become more contentious. Contrary to the initial “global village” vision of harmonious aspects of globalization, worries about cultural homogenization have supplanted the innocuous nature of global interactions.

Cultural homogenization is a contentious part of the globalization debate. Critics concerned with cultural homogenization fear the “McDonaldization” of global culture, usually described as a mono-directional outward wave of American pop culture swamping alternate views and traditional value systems. Indeed, when we think about the globalization of culture,
we usually think about the consumption of cultural goods produced in the West and the way in which these goods impact the values or culture of non-Western consumers, as well as how they modify local systems of cultural production for consumption by the West (Adams 2008). This has the dual effect of overlooking the counter-flow of culture from the non-West to the West, but also the way cultural goods may be modified or mediated in or by the agents of a particular culture. Indeed globalization is a set of complex, multidimensional processes that contain often contradictory interactions of global, regional, and local life (Crothers 2010). Because of these contradictions, other critics often use Huntington’s (1993, 1996) “Clash of Civilizations” as a more apt, and conflictual, image of cultural globalization (cf., Nederveen Pieterse 2009: 44-50).

Less skeptical analysts of cultural globalization focus on the concept of cultural hybridization. And while hybridization is not parity, it is inherent in the mixing of global cultural forms. Cultural communication and hybridization are two-way processes – Western societies are also likely to be influenced by non-Western ones, yet certain cultural forms may have predominance. Yet still, there is variation within “western” culture, and cross-cultural influence between non-western cultures. The Global South can infiltrate and shape cultures of the Global North, and the “final product of these interactions is not corruption, imperialism, or homogenization, but is instead something entirely new” (Crothers 2010:192-3). This is what Nederveen Pieterse (2009) calls the global mélange: globalization is braided and characterized by cultural osmosis.

Global media is usually pointed to as the means of this osmosis, or cultural cross-fertilization. And just as there are recurrent concerns in the US with media having a negative impact on the morality of America’s youth, these concerns are shared around the world. Mass media is often treated as one of the standard agencies of socialization. This then presumes that a wide range of social values and behaviors can be transmitted and learned from the images consumed on television, music, magazines, web sites, feature films and even consumer advertising. Traditional values (however they are defined by those that speak for a given “traditional” culture) are under assault, not just in America’s heartland, but around the world! (cf., Norris and Inglehart 2009).

IV. Research “Method” and Data Gathering

It is within this framework of globalization that we undertake an investigation of children’s TV shows. Findings previously indicate that the global preschool children’s television market is dominated by productions from the West (cf., von Feilitzen and Carlsson). So we are focusing only on children’s TV shows in the United States, in part to explicitly look for elements of hybridism or counter-globalization. As the discussion progresses, we hope to unpack additional questions to be raised in the classroom. For example, are some forms of cultural globalization more threatening than others, and if so, why? More concretely, am I more likely to be culturally threatened by Dora, Diego, or Kai Lan? Certainly issues of gender may be at play, but elements of cultural ‘favoritism’ also influence perceptions of threat.

So why children’s TV, and specifically television programs aimed at young children (roughly 5 and under)? First, this seems like an interesting way to get at aspects of globalization, culture, and socialization. Second, it is hoped that this approach could be a way to perk-up students and make the topic slightly more accessible and relevant. Third, the author had an inordinate amount of exposure to some of the material, via children of that age inflicting this programming on the viewing household. Fourth, the purposeful re-packaging and politicization of Dora in the 2010 immigration debate piqued some interest about how we conceptualize
children’s TV as inherently non-political, when it has tremendous socio-cultural access and sway. Finally, the overt self-representation of children’s television – especially young children’s television programming – as an instrument of learning appeared to be a productive avenue for addressing issues of learning about culture and how these are purposefully or inadvertently presented. What are the lessons being presented, either overtly or passively? What are the images being readily, even greedily, consumed by legions of four-year-olds? Since many of the programs seek to be formally educational, they include curricular goals on their websites. In turn, this provides a means of objectively (rather than subjectively) discussing the content and curricular intent for specific shows.

So how did we go about collecting our information? Our rigorous scientific sampling began by simply taking note of particular programs as they were being watched by the aforementioned four-year-old. This was quickly deemed insufficient. If we are concerned with globalization and cultural hybridization, should we focus on image content, message, or production company? This parallels what others studying cosmopolitan communications have found; layers of analysis include production, distribution, content, and audience impact (Norris and Inglehart 2009:13). To get at the multi-layered nature of cultural globalization, as we compiled a list of children’s shows we made note of show name, country of production, broadcast channel, and show focus (e.g., geographic locale or particular culture, main message content). Later attention was given to show websites and the evaluation of specific curricular goals, and we also included a category for source origination. For example, if a television show was based on other media, such as a book, we sought to determine the national origin of the author or source media.

With this approach, and by surfing the television programming guide of major networks and children’s-oriented television channels (e.g., Nickelodeon, Nick Jr., Disney, PBS) we compiled a list of roughly 55 children’s shows that display elements of cultural globalization or hybridization. Also, the list is limited to contemporary shows in current broadcast. And while we agree that this approach is by no means scientific, and that one or two shows could be dismissed as anomalous, the fact that more than 50 shows from a narrow range of programming (i.e., preschool children’s TV) exhibit elements of non-US origination indicates that something is going on in the world of children’s TV programming. Certainly non-US does not equate with non-Western, as most programs are still “Western” in origin, originating predominantly in Canada, the United Kingdom, and Australia. Non English-language countries such as Japan, Switzerland, Iceland and Belgium also make an appearance on our list. Yet the “non-US” distinction does allow us to discuss why some cultural messages are seen as acceptable, and why others may not be, while simultaneously illustrating the lack of ‘alternative’ sources of production.

********** Figure 2 About Here **********

A. Production & Broadcast

As Westcott (2002) has illustrated, children’s television production, especially children’s animation, is dominated by three US-based companies: Cartoon Network, Disney

---

1 Many of these were looked up after the list was compiled, as many shows are not readily identifiable by country of origin.
2 Our universe of sampling from broadcast channels was inclusive of the Fresno, CA market, and supplemented with channels available via satellite (DirecTV).
and Nickelodeon. Cartoon Network is part of an even bigger media group, Time-Warner. Children’s cable-channel pioneer Nickelodeon is owned by media conglomerate Viacom, Inc. Disney, perhaps the paradigm of global children’s media, owns ABC and various other outlets across the spectrum of media activity. Adding a bit of intrigue to our sub-set of shows, Westcott (2002:72) observes that the ‘Public Broadcasting Service (PBS) is the only major US broadcasting outlet not dominated by the ‘big three’. [...] PBS dominates the preschool market, one of the more lucrative sectors for licensing and merchandising. However, with the launch of a Nick Junior block on Nickelodeon and the Noggin network, a joint venture between Nickelodeon and Sesame Workshop, this market is also under siege.”

Going on ten years later –do we see evidence of counter-globalization taking place? Has the “siege” been effective?

Certainly the majority of children’s shows in the US are produced by US companies. But our ‘Reverse Globalization’ list (see Figure 2) contains a surprising number of non-US produced (or at least co-produced) shows. It also exposes some surprising countries of origin. Canada, in no small part due to government regulation requiring locally-produced content for national media, has emerged as a significant partner for show production. 19 shows are Canadian produced or co-produced. This outstrips the 16 shows produced or co-produced by firms from the UK. Australia has 5 shows. While it may not be surprising that English-speaking countries dominate the list, we should recall the relative ease with which TV, particularly animation, can be dubbed across linguistic barriers.

The smaller countries that showed up on the list are some that we find to be of special interest. For example, Iceland is the country of origin for LazyTown, a mixed media show emphasizing physical fitness and activity which was broadcast on NickJr from 2004-2007. Switzerland (with the UK) gave us Pingu. But perhaps most intriguing is the new (2010-present), major-network (NBC) broadcast of Shelldon. Produced and originating in Thailand, Shelldon is “set in the idyllic coral reef community called Shell Land, follows the adventures of Shelldon, a Yoka Star Shell, and his lively sea-creature friends on their underwater exploits.” It seeks to emphasize environmental and water use issues, while promoting individual giving and self-esteem. Purposefully made to appeal to and break into the global children’s animation market, it is a singular example of content originating in the non-Western developing world.

Yet focusing on countries of production or production companies can be a bit deceiving. In no small part this is due to the growth in international partnerships involved in the production, distribution, and licensing associated with television shows, their characters, and associated merchandise. For example, Mike Young Productions (MYP) is an independent animation studio responsible for shows like Jakers! The Adventures of Piggley Winks. Yet MYP has its headquarters in Los Angeles and an international production studio in Wales. Furthermore, MYP partners with a French company (MoonScoop Group), which owns Taffy Entertainment, which handles distribution and licensing of MYP properties as well as other studios’ brands. The question of where a show originates quickly becomes a multinational, many-layered puzzle.

Examining Jakers! The Adventures of Piggley Winks gives us more insight into the hybridization associated with global media and its production & consumption. Apart from the international aspects of the show’s production, its setting qualifies it as “non-US” as it is

---

3 Information from website, accessed 01/15/2011: http://mikeyoungproductions.com/content.cfm?ContentID=271
set in rural 1950s Ireland. And, as one of Carlson’s favorite new kids’ shows,⁴ he was looking forward to watching it as part of this project. Yet in the Fresno market, the show was no longer available through its original US broadcast channel (PBS). It was only available in a rebroadcast syndicated form, through Univision. In Spanish. So here we have a US (and Welsh) produced show, set in Ireland, distributed in partnership with a French company, being broadcast by an American-owned Spanish-language television broadcaster, for re-consumption in the US. Lovely.

B. Origin Material

Somewhat overlooked in discussion about the globalization of children’s television is the discussion of where ideas for the material originates. Certainly Disney is rather notorious for re-purposing traditional fairy tales or children’s stories for the global marketplace. The recent movie, *The Princess and the Frog*, is a good example. Inspired by the Grimm brothers’ fairy tale, *The Frog Prince*, the setting is changed to a multicultural New Orleans, and the princess is notable as Disney’s first black princess. Without giving away too many plot points, suffice it to say the ending is happy. This differs from the original version, wherein the princess broke the spell on the frog by throwing it against a wall in disgust, killing the frog, but releasing it from the spell.

Yet many of the children’s shows on our list are based on children’s books or cartoons. Quite often, they are then adapted within their country of origin to become television programs. This is understandable, as it is a way for television producers to make sure that they have a built-in audience for new shows, and thereby reduce the risk associated with creating entirely new characters. For example, the Canadian television series *Franklin* is adapted from the *Franklin the Turtle* series of books. Dr. Seuss’ *The Cat in the Hat* is presently a US/Canadian co-production, with Canadian comedian Martin Short voicing the Cat. Cartoons have also been developed into shows, as the television version of the *Smurfs* is based on cartoons by Belgian artist, Peyo. Even video games, such as Nintendo’s *Pokémon*, have inspired television shows, and become truly global phenomena in their own right.

Like prime-time television, children’s television programs also have occasional ‘spin-offs’. *Postcards from Buster* was a travel-oriented multi-cultural program based on the character of Buster, originally from the show, *Arthur* (based on a series of books by American author, Marc Brown). *Arthur* is also on our list, as it is co-produced with Canada. *Go, Diego, Go!* is also a spinoff, inspired by the success of *Dora the Explorer*. Inspiration for shows has come from disparate other sources. Chinese-American author Amy Tan was the author of *Sagwa, The Chinese Siamese Cat*, and its subsequent transition into an animated series. National Geographic has even gotten in on the act, producing the global travel and multicultural-oriented *Toot & Puddle*, which airs on NickJr. Needless to say, the origins of ideas for shows are fairly varied.

This should be promising for the production prospects of non-Western cultural content. If we are interested in seeing a wider variety of ideas or cultures represented, then there should be a wealth of fairy tales, children’s books, or popular figures that can be inspiration for children’s programming. Gaining access to production capital and distribution networks is likely the largest stumbling block, but one that governmental policies oriented toward content quotas or local production may be able to address.

---

⁴ It has Mel Brooks as the voice of a trouble-making sheep. And admittedly, a “new” children’s show to Carlson is any made after roughly 1982.
V. Curricular Content and Cultural Learning

As mentioned previously, the cultural element of globalization is one of the most contentious. In no small part, this could be because of how culture interacts with notions of core identity, who we are or think ourselves to be. Other work has focused on gender roles and expectations, particularly with regard to the Disney “princess phenomenon” (cite here). Racial stereotypes have also received scrutiny (cite re: Warner Bros here). Yet here we are concerned with the purposeful and overt messaging associated with learning about, and possibly internalizing, cultural outlooks and standards. Should Americans be worried about ‘reverse globalization’ in the same way the rest of the world is concerned with the McDonaldization of their culture? We argue that there is a source of concern, but it is not the one that we would first suspect.

Since many preschool-targeting children’s shows are intentionally packaged as instruments of learning, they often have companion websites with additional activities or classroom-type accessories (e.g., games, workbooks, puzzles, ancillary materials). Conveniently, many also include stated curricular goals or educational philosophies for the programs. We examine several of these program-specific sites to bolster our claim that counter-globalization is occurring in the US. This is also an attempt to measure the “audience impact” level of cosmopolitan communications.

A. Dora the Explorer

Since our story started with Dora, it seems fitting to use her as a starting point. Is she really the menace that she has been made out to be, either in terms of illegal immigration or in terms of cultural globalization? *Dora the Explorer* is a Nickelodeon product, hence American made and marketed. Yet speaking to the insidious nature of children’s programming, the show’s curricular goals (clearly stated on the show website) indicate that cultural learning takes place alongside other problem solving:

*Dora the Explorer* teaches children how to observe situations and solve problems as they explore Dora’s world with her. Along the way, kids learn basic Spanish words and phrases, as well as math skills, music, and physical coordination. The show is highly interactive, and Dora’s young viewers are encouraged throughout the show to respond to Dora and to actively participate in the adventure through physical movement.

“Along the way” – almost accidently – kids learn basic Spanish words and phrases. Sure, there are ‘traditional’ skills being taught like math and music, but the bilingualism is an overt part of the program. Shocking! Dora is teaching millions of her young minions to “actively participate” in the adventure of learning Spanish. Yet mere bilingualism may be nothing to be too worried about, as the exemplar of children’s television globalization, *Sesame Street,* has long emphasized teaching Spanish.

---


6 Sesame Street has broadcast from 1969 to the present, in some 120+ countries. It has also spawned 20 independent international versions. Basically, it is ‘franchising’ the production of the show, allowing for content to be generated locally, yet within the “form” and style of the original program.
B. Ni Hao, Kai-Lan

Perhaps more nefarious than Dora, is the ‘next generation’ of preschool television programming, as illustrated by Ni Hao, Kai-Lan. Also a Nickelodeon product, Ni Hao, Kai-Lan applies the Dora formula to Chinese language and culture. Yet the purpose is not merely to teach Mandarin Chinese words or phrases. Instead, there is an overt attempt to teach cultural values. For those not familiar with the show, Kai-Lan Chow is absurdly cute, and “is a playful, adventurous preschooler with a big heart. She speaks both English and Mandarin Chinese, and she's super excited to share her language, her culture, and her playtime with her animal friends and the viewers at home.” As part of this “super excited” desire to share, you have already learned to say “Hi” in Mandarin: it is “Ni Hao”. Tricky.

So what does the show’s curriculum offer as far as understanding potential cultural counter-globalization? What are its stated goals? Ni Hao, Kai-Lan presents itself as the “next generation of preschool television that introduces the psychology of biculturalism.” Furthermore, “if Dora and Diego popularized bilingualism, Kai-lan will weave together being bilingual and bicultural. Ni Hao, Kai-lan reinforces the idea that being bicultural and bilingual is being American.” So, the show seems to be engaging in a re-imagining of what it means to be American, by overtly embracing elements of Chinese culture, or what is often termed a ‘Confucianist’ ethic. Scholars differ over the likely impact of Confucian traditions. For example, Huntington (1991) has argued that “Confucian democracy” is a contradiction in terms, while Fukuyama (1995) argues that the two are not fundamentally incompatible. Clearly there is some heated debate here, and Kai-Lan may just be scratching the surface.

So what does a Confucianist ethic entail? In general terms, a Confucianist ethic places great importance on the past and on maintaining traditions. This gives rise to what some term ‘ancestor worship’ and the need to ritually observe tradition. Inherently, this tends to view innovation as somewhat disrespectful. Social stability and the maintenance of a harmonious social order is tremendously important, as is knowing one’s position within society and acting in accordance to the proper role of that position. Deference should be given to elders and those in authority, in part as a means of maintaining this social discipline. Finally, there is also a different vision of ‘action’ as potentially unsettling; instead, the notion of dynamic non-action (wu wei) and letting things act in accordance to their own role is seen as a desirable quality. While this is a drastic simplification of an entire cultural ethic, it should serve as a means of engaging Ni Hao, Kai-lan’s bicultural enterprise.

Surely, Ni Hao, Kai-lan cannot be so ambitious as to seek to change America’s children into an amalgam of East and West, can it? Indeed, it can. Kai Lan is nefariously overt in wanting to “familiarize the viewing audience with elements of Chinese and Chinese American cultures to promote multicultural understanding in the next generation and goes beyond featuring ‘culture’ as only ethnic food and festivals.” It is intentionally engaging in an attempt at generational education and value change. The values in question include:

Mind-body connection: Typically, television portrays excitement as the good emotion to feel. In many Chinese-American communities, the good thing to feel is often calmness and contentment. Feeling excited and feeling calm can both be happy feelings, but they differ in how aroused the body is.

---

7 Unless otherwise noted, quotes are taken from the portion of the show’s website, “Ni Hao, Kai-Lan’s Curriculum”: http://www.nickjr.com/ni-hao-kai-lan/about-ni-hao-kai-lan/ni-hao-kai-lan-curriculum_ap.html, last accessed 02/05/2011.
Perspective-taking: In many Chinese and other East Asian families, children are encouraged to take the perspective of others to maintain harmony in relationships with other people.

Being a good member of the group: *Ni Hao, Kai-lan* also emphasizes the Chinese and Chinese American value of being a good member of a group.

It is as if the Manchurian Candidate was a five (almost six) year-old girl! Be a good group member (downplay individualism), maintain harmony (do not rebel), and do not get aroused (take no action). The only elements of Confucianism missing are the deference to elders or authority. Or is it missing? If we look at the characters on the show, YeYe (Kai-Lan’s grandfather) plays an instrumental role. As the show admits, YeYe “was born in China and lovingly passes on his exciting traditions to his granddaughter. He provides Kai-lan with gentle guidance, leading her to find her own answers, at her own pace.”

All of this may pose some concern, yet the producers of *Kai-Lan* are overt and fully cognizant of the cultural change they set out to accomplish. Furthermore, Confucianism and Chinese culture is readily recognized as a cultural “other”. While some may worry about America’s undermanned southern border and the influence of bold Latina exploradoras, or the potential for perky fifth-column Chinese-American girls like Kai-Lan. These are not the real threats to American culture, as they are readily recognizable. Instead, we should focus on our unguarded northern border, and our overly-polite neighbor to the north, Canada.

C. *Caillou – The (French) Canadian menace*

While many Canadian shows are worth examining (recall, we have 19 Canadian produced or co-produced shows), we will focus briefly on *Caillou*. Why *Caillou*? In part, this is because he embodies the recognizable ‘otherness’ of a French-Canadian influence. But also, it is because *Caillou* is a means to draw our attention to the oft-unquestioned importation of most Canadian shows. If we can recognize *Caillou* as foreign, it is only because of the French-Canadian influence. This bespeaks the truly subtle nature of the Canadian cultural menace; it is so subtle that we do not even recognize it as foreign, and thus cannot properly guard ourselves against the Canadian counter-globalization cultural threat. And so, we can use this as a teaching mechanism for how and why we view some foreign cultures as OK, and others as ‘foreign’ (and students usually find it humorous to think of Canada as a threat – but that’s exactly what they’d want us to think, *n’est pas?).

*Caillou* is a Quebec-produced program, featuring the four-year-old titular hero. It is based on books by author Christine L’Heureux and illustrator Hélène Desputeaux. Suspiciously, they seem to be of French-Canadian descent. Further giving us pause is an examination of the show’s “Educational Philosophy”.

Emphasizing ‘make believe’ and imagination, the show seems to want us to believe nothing is wrong:

---

8 *Ni Hao, Kai-Lan* website, “Meet the Characters”: [http://www.nickjr.com/ni-hao-kai-lan/about-ni-hao-kai-lan/ni-hao-kai-lan-characters.html](http://www.nickjr.com/ni-hao-kai-lan/about-ni-hao-kai-lan/ni-hao-kai-lan-characters.html), accessed 02/05/2011. Also worth mentioning – “The Ants: In one corner of Kai-lan’s backyard is a teeming mini-metropolis of ants called Ant City. The ants serve very important roles in the community: they deliver mail, they build things, and they love to play with Kai-lan and her friends. San San is their leader with two right-hand ants Bubu and Fufu.” Even ants play “very important roles in the community.” Naturally, the ants are red. No symbolism here.

Why bother validating a game that children play instinctively? Because today, society does not value games of “make believe” as much as it used to. Children are encouraged to learn to play the violin, take dance or karate lessons, use the computer or watch educational television programs, in short, to develop their intellect. Parents often prefer activities that teach children, for instance, to recognize numbers and letters. By comparison, purely imaginative play may seem less "useful" for the child. Yet, developing a fertile imagination is fundamental to bringing up the next generation of inventors, artists and a host of other talented visionaries who will shape the world we live in.

Sure, don’t pay as much attention to tasks like learning numbers and letters! Educational television and skill-based lessons are overrated. Work on your imagination and become the next-generation’s “artist” or imaginer. Then you can also imagine that Canada (or Mexico, or China) is not slowly taking over! Just sit back and imagine that everything is fine…

Hopefully, this all too brief perusal of an admittedly select few television shows illustrates the point we are trying to make. Children’s television can be a useful entry point into a classroom dialogue about cultural globalization. Why are some cultures valued and others viewed with suspicion? What role do global media play in the global culture wars? Who controls the message creation and dissemination? What kind of impact are we likely to see? Does cultural difference really matter? Another way to address this in class is, after a response indicating culture does not matter, is to enquire how students would feel if ALL their childhood cartoons were overtly Confucianist and/or produced in China. This then, is the tide of media that much of the rest of the world is grappling with, one in which the United States is the easily recognizable ‘other’. And to link this to larger, real world issues, we can use the culture and globalization discussion to transition to a more data-based treatment of the issues at hand.

VI. Globalization, Culture Change and the World Values Survey

Up to now, we have covered some of the culturally-related issues at the heart of the globalization debate. Yet if we accept that there is a cultural impact, there should be some mechanism of seeing how or why these ‘external’ threats to identity are manifest. Also, as an instructional tool, I find the cultural globalization discussion a useful transition to talking about cultural difference and perceptions related to political culture. One useful illustration of the very real, measurable presence of cultural difference and the impact this has on popular values is found in the World Values Survey. In turn, the Survey is also a productive way to introduce students to data gathering, cross-national comparison of values, and how one can apply data in the social sciences, even to ‘soft’ questions related to culture.

A. The World Values Survey (WVS)

So what exactly is the World Values Survey? The World Values Survey (WVS) is a series of representative national surveys carried out in five waves from 1981 to 2007, with a sixth taking place during 2010-2011. This provides a thirty-year time-series analysis of social and political change. Representative national samples of each society’s public are interviewed using a standardized questionnaire. Taken together, the surveys have covered 97 societies containing about 90 percent of the world’s population. Incorporating similar

10 Counts taken from the WVS webpage. The first four survey waves are available as an aggregate data file covering 80 countries and consisting of 257,000 respondents. Wave 1 (1981-1984) – 20 countries and 25,000
questions from the Eurobarometer Survey of Western European societies; survey information is available from 1970 onward, allowing a 40-year time-series analysis of sampled societies.

The countries sampled include a full range of regime types (authoritarian to liberal democracy), income level (very poor to very rich), and all major cultural zones. The questionnaire includes questions that tap changing attitudes and values about religion, democracy, good governance, gender roles, social capital, tolerance, trust, political participation, environmental protection, as well as subjective well being. As an instrument, the WVS is situated to provide insight into pervasive cultural, political and generational changes relating to a spectrum of values.

Modernization and Value Change

Aggregate national-level data indicates significant and coherent cross-cultural differences between societies (Inglehart 1997). The two most important dimensions of cross-cultural difference indicate that the worldviews of people in rich societies differ dramatically from those in poor societies, including wide variance across the range of political, social and religious norms and beliefs. This polarization lies along two dimensions: traditional versus secular-rational values, and survival versus self-expression values. Using these two axes, all societies can be plotted on a global map of cross-cultural variation. This approach was expanded using data from all four WVS Waves (Inglehart and Welzel 2005), and is at the heart of our discussion. Using ten items present in all four Survey waves to tap the traditional versus secular-rational dimension and the survival versus self-expression dimension, Inglehart and Welzel “explain 71 percent of the total cross-national variation in these ten variables” (2005: 50).

So how does cultural difference manifest itself in regard to values? Socioeconomic development increases choices available to individuals, and a broader choice range eventually (i.e., generationally) becomes manifest in value change at the social or cultural level. These value shifts are measurable within and between societies, using the matrix of Individual/Self Expression values and Traditional/Secular-Rational value indices. Sampled nation-states are plotted using the composite index scores. Cultural correlation is self-evident; countries are not just randomly distributed on the map.

While modernization theory predicts that economic development is linked to predictable cultural shifts, these shifts are further under-girded by pervasive cultural differences. The impact of a society’s historical-cultural heritage persists, even when factors

---

11 The Eurobarometer began in September 1973 and included nine countries, with the survey series first being given the name Eurobarometer in 1974. In 1970 and 1971 the European Commission carried out similar surveys in the six then-member countries of the European Community (France, West Germany, Italy, Belgium, Netherlands and Luxembourg). These European Communities Studies assessed public opinion on individual national priorities as well as on integrated European functions and organizations, so serve as the immediate predecessor to the Eurobarometer. Similar surveys also now cover significant portions of Africa (Afrobarometer), Latin America (Latinobarometer) and Asia (Asianbarometer).
like per capita GDP and labor force structure are taken into account over multiple regression analyses (Inglehart and Welzel 2005:67). Where a country starts – the values that frame a national worldview – matters for where it lies in relation to other countries in the world. Countries that share a religious, historic, or linguistic experience also tend to share general sets of values. The sheer variety is somewhat striking, and socio-cultural experience leads people of disparate nations to view the world very differently. There are net value changes over time, and these take place across cultural zones. In essence, the average position of a civilization, or culture, changes as the countries within it modernize and/or democratize. Media exposure is a basic part of this process.

**B. Generational Dynamics**

The theory of intergenerational value change is based on two key hypotheses (Inglehart 1977). First, in an overtly Maslowian nod, the *scarcity hypothesis* posits that while people generally aspire to freedom and autonomy, the most pressing needs such as material sustenance and physical security take precedence. When scarce, these ‘materialistic’ goals take priority. In a time of abundance, ‘post-materialistic’ goals like esteem, life satisfaction, and personal belonging become more important. Second, the *socialization hypothesis* posits that value priorities reflect conditions that prevailed during one’s pre-adult, or formative years, and that these values change mainly through intergenerational population replacement.

Generational cohort difference *within* countries can be examined on the WVS cultural map (recall Figure 3). While all countries do not have thirty years of survey data, one can break apart responses by respondents’ age, and see if there are significant differences across the countries surveyed. If the generational socialization hypothesis is true, even within societies at the nation-state level considerable value shifts should be measurable between generations. There is a real reason children may view the world differently than their parents. They may have experienced a significantly different level of socio-economic wealth, historic experience, and overall outlook. Cohorts internalize new expectations of social utility, values, or perceptions of right and wrong. Breaking national responses by age cohort and placing on the cultural map – with the traditional versus secular-rational and the survival versus self-expression indices – allows for national distinction as well as a snapshot of generational change or stagnation.

***Figure 4 about Here***

The suggestions from this representation of the WVS data are surprising, to say the least. Using selected countries, we see significant generational changes, both within and between nations. Using Wave 4 of the WVS (1999-2004), age cohorts are broken apart with arrows moving from oldest cohort (age 65+) to youngest (18-24). 12 West Germany at the top-center carries labels for the data points for each arrow. The six age groupings may be

---

12 Inglehart and Welzel (2005) only provide select countries on the graphic. No rationale for choice or exclusion was mentioned. Certainly more countries – particularly more middle-class, developing, or culturally disparate countries like South Africa, Mexico, Brazil or Iran would be interesting research choices. Iran in particular, since roughly 70% of its population was born after the Islamic Revolution, seems a prime case study for generational value change and its relationship to democratization.
understood in terms of different formative experiences. West Germany\textsuperscript{13} is especially illustrative:

The six West German age groups reflect six decades of different formative experiences: the two oldest groups experienced the Great Depression (which was more severe in Germany than in any other country) and the devastation and massive loss of life of World War II. The four postwar cohorts have grown up in a Germany that has become one of the world’s most prosperous societies with one of the most advanced welfare states and one of the most stable democracies. (Inglehart and Welzel 2005:113)

From this, the importance of different and potentially improving existential experiences between age cohorts becomes evident. The world of 18-24 year old West Germans hardly compares to that of West Germans older than 65, nor does their vision of their own place in the world and what is achievable, desirable, or “natural”. This is manifest in different attitudes toward German nationalism (which had been declining) and younger generations’ attitudes or increasing identification as “European”. The process of value-change is ongoing and does not have a given end-point. Regression is always possible, and supplanting national-level identity is slow. Linear value change is not predestined, nor universal. Economic stresses can produce reversion to survival orientations. For example, currently in Poland and the Czech Republic identification with a broader Europe is declining, not increasing. Both states have anti-EU governments, and Hungary has recently elected an anti-EU party. Even the Germans are becoming more assertive and less Euro-focused as a result of recent economic turmoil. Yet this underscores the causal mechanism of existential security and economic well-being as being central for long-lasting, generational value-change. Without stability and general well-being, regression is possible.

Individuals learn beliefs, values and behaviors that are acceptable in a given society \textit{via} the social institutions of a given society: family, friends, media, schools, churches, courts and other rule-enforcing or value-shaping organizations. Further, society as a structure is mutually constituted and shaped by the individuals within it; there is a recursive and self-referencing aspect to the relationship between individuals and societies. While individuals can change moral outlook over the course of their lives, societies tend to change internalized beliefs only \textit{generationally}. Old people do need to die off for shifting generational value-averages to be manifest. Notably, this change does not have a fixed end point, but continues even when societies have developed “modern” or “postmodern” value systems. Thus, the difference between socio-cultural groups tends to remain, and the cultural value divide may even grow or \textit{widen}. It is not surprising if social values and behaviors stemming from those values become manifest at the state level, because the state and its structures are the formalized embodiment of what a given society (or the ruling elites of a society) deem “right”, “appropriate” or “just” at a given moment.

\textbf{Import of Socialization}

These findings from the WVS should not be glossed over, as they manifestly contradict the “global village” thesis of globalization: the hypothesis that people are being brought closer together and are becoming more alike. Cultural differences persist. What we see is that for many people in the world life is not substantially changing, while for some

\textsuperscript{13} The WVS data continues to treat data from West Germany separate from data from the former East Germany, since each region experienced different formative events and governing regimes. These experiences are reflected in contemporary differences in values and beliefs.
undergoing modernization it is changing quite drastically. Even those who live in industrialized post-modern societies, values continue to change. In simple terms, the “value gap” between rich and poor (and many cultural groupings) is widening and may well continue to do so. Sweden in 50 years will not look like the Sweden of today in terms of social values. The youngest generation of Turkey – arguably one of the most modern and Westernized Muslim countries – is barely on par with the oldest, pre-war generation of Spain in terms of “modern” values. The culture gaps between the West and “the rest” of the world are not just cultural, but generational. And the gaps are getting wider, and not just between the ‘West and the rest,’ but also within it.

As popular media can be a powerful agent of socialization, perhaps we should reevaluate our tongue-in-cheek treatment of preschool television shows. Certainly the television shows designed for preschoolers are more overtly educational than they were when previous generations were watching Saturday morning cartoons. To the extent that they are being designed with global or multicultural lessons, we should expect that they might be indicative of a larger shift regard to how our newest generation of media consumers views the world and their own place in it. Yet this is merely one minor element in a much larger, socio-cultural process.

VII. Concluding Thoughts

There are several goals in this paper. The first is to provide an example of a module, or project, to provide a more active learning environment in the classroom. With that in mind, we chose the topic of children’s television as a means of engaging the globalization debate (McDonaldization & homogenization, Clash of Civilizations, or hybridization). The TV shows we examined serve as select examples of counter-globalization, and as such bolster arguments that cultural globalization is better conceived of as a mélange, or hybrid product (Nederveen Pieterse 2009). Within this process, we have been able to illustrate how an innocuous item like children’s TV can be an effective means of engaging contentious political issues and questions of cultural identity. It also serves as a stepping-stone for examining data from the World Values Survey. There, we get additional support for generational cultural value change, as well as a realization that distances between cultures may be widening and that messaging may be limited to elites or a media-savvy global upper class of Kantian cosmopolitans.

So where are we left with regard to our use of Dora as a political messenger? Clearly television has tremendous socializational impact. Children’s television in particular strives to be overtly educational, and is often viewed as innocuous. Yet the lessons carried by these programs can be quite powerful. One example that we did not fully explore is the prevalence of non-cultural messaging that seems to be fairly prevalent. Shelldon would be a good example here, as many shows do seem to be embracing a more purposefully environmental view. And in addition to promoting environmental awareness, Shelldon is the one example of a ‘developing world’-produced program on our list. And while cultural difference may always call into question core elements of personal identity that are inherently contentious, we should remember that the real threat is not from Dora and Latin America. Nor is it through the subversive Confucianist ethic of Kai-Lan, cutely sneaky as she is. The real threat is the Canadian infiltration of our children’s programming. Canada has already established a children’s TV beachhead, and we ignore our unsecured northern border at our own peril. While notable cartoon patriot Bugs Bunny was able to defy the law of gravity because he had
never studied law, we are conversely ground by the gravity of the topic at hand: the vulnerability of children’s TV in the global culture wars. The next generation is watching, and learning. We must be ready.
## Figure 2: Children’s TV and Reverse Globalization: Program List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Broadcast Channel &amp; Date - USA</th>
<th>Show Title</th>
<th>Production Countries</th>
<th>Country of Origin Material (if any)</th>
<th>Focus/Geo.Area/General? (Area, Issue)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noggin/NickJr 1999-present</td>
<td>64 Zoo Lane</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>An Vrombaut, Belgian Author</td>
<td>Global</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBS/NickJr 2009</td>
<td>Angelina Ballerina - The Next Steps</td>
<td>USA/UK</td>
<td>UK original</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBSKids/Nick</td>
<td>Animalia</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Graeme Base, author (Australia)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBS Kids 1996-present</td>
<td>Arthur</td>
<td>US/Canada</td>
<td>Marc Brown books (US)</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBC/HBO 1989-2000</td>
<td>Babar</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Jean de Brunhoff, author (Fr)</td>
<td>Mult/Gl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Jr. 2004-Present</td>
<td>Backyardigans</td>
<td>Canada/USA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Japanime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cartoon 2009-11</td>
<td>Bakugan</td>
<td>Japan, Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBS Kids 2003-07</td>
<td>Berenstain Bears</td>
<td>Canada/USA</td>
<td>Stan &amp; Jan Berenstain - US</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann 2001-05/PBSKids 2003-05</td>
<td>Bob the Builder</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td></td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-2010, PBS Kids</td>
<td>Caillou</td>
<td>Canada(French)</td>
<td>Lauren Child author, UK</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBC 2005-2008</td>
<td>Charlie &amp; Lola</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td></td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nickleodeon 2000-present</td>
<td>Dora the Explorer</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Lauren Child author, UK</td>
<td>LatAm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NickJr</td>
<td>Ebb and Flo</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td></td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disney</td>
<td>Emperor's New School</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Aztec/LatAm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBS Kids Sprout/NickJr; 2005-08</td>
<td>Fifi and the Flowertots</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td></td>
<td>General/Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NickJr 1997-present</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Paulette Bourgeois author (Can)</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBC 2004-present</td>
<td>Franny's Feet</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Travel/GICult</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nickleodeon 2005-10</td>
<td>Go, Diego, Go!</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Spinoff of Dora</td>
<td>LatAm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBS Kids 2006-10</td>
<td>It's a Big Big World</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Rainforest/Mult</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NickJr 1998-2001</td>
<td>Kipper the Dog</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Mick Inkpen - Ukauthor</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NickJr 2004-2007</td>
<td>LazyTown</td>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>General/Fitness</td>
<td>Polynesian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disney</td>
<td>Lilo &amp; Stich</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nickleodeon 1995-2001</td>
<td>Little Bear</td>
<td>Canada/USA</td>
<td>Else Holmelund Minarik, Author (Danish), in US</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disney 2005-09</td>
<td>Little Einsteins</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mult/Gl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBS</td>
<td>Martha Speaks</td>
<td>USA/Canada</td>
<td>Rosemary Wells (US) author</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NickJr 2002-present</td>
<td>Max &amp; Ruby</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBS Kids, 2004-2008</td>
<td>Maya &amp; Miguel</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td></td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Jr. 2000-present</td>
<td>Miss Spider's Sunny Patch Friends</td>
<td>Canada/UK/US</td>
<td>David Kirk (US) author</td>
<td>General/Mult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KidsWB 2002-2005</td>
<td>¡Mucha Lucha!</td>
<td>USA/Australia</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mexico-Wrestling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NickJr 2008-present</td>
<td>Ni Hao, Kai-Lan</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td></td>
<td>China Lang/Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBS Kids Sprout 2008</td>
<td>Panwapa</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Global Travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qubo 2008</td>
<td>Pearlie</td>
<td>Austral./Canada</td>
<td>Wendy Harmer - author, Australia, Pearlie the Park Fairy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLC 2004-09</td>
<td>Peep and the Big Wide World</td>
<td>USA/Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td>General/UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Jr 2004-present</td>
<td>Peppa Pig</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td></td>
<td>General/UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network/Year</td>
<td>Series</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Creator/Theme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBC 1986-2006</td>
<td>Pingu</td>
<td>Switzerland/UK</td>
<td>Otmar Gutman - Swiss Creator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-present</td>
<td>Pokémon</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Japan - Nintendo video game</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBS 2004-07</td>
<td>Postcards from Buster</td>
<td>USA/Canada</td>
<td>Adventure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBS Kids Sprout; 2007 - now</td>
<td>Roary the Racing Car</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Arthur - spinoff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBS Kids 2001-2002</td>
<td>Sagwa, the Chinese Siamese Cat</td>
<td>USA/Canada</td>
<td>Mult./Travel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBC 2010 - present</td>
<td>Shelldon</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBC 1981-90</td>
<td>Smurfs</td>
<td>USA (Belgium)</td>
<td>Belgian cartoons - by Peyo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBS 2007 - present</td>
<td>Super Why!</td>
<td>USA/Canada</td>
<td>Spelling, some global stories</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick/NickJr 2010-present</td>
<td>Team Umizoomi</td>
<td>USA/Canada</td>
<td>Math, Patterns, Shapes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBS Kids 1998-2005</td>
<td>Teletubbies</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBS Kids 2010</td>
<td>The Cat in the Hat Knows a lot about That!</td>
<td>USA/Canada</td>
<td>Dr Seuss - USA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITV 1984</td>
<td>Thomas &amp; Friends</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disney 2010-present</td>
<td>Timmy Time</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Aardman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>Toot &amp; Puddle</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Jr 2006-07, reruns</td>
<td>Upside Down Show</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>National Geogr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disney 1998-2006</td>
<td>Wiggles</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Gl Culture, Travel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBS Kids 2010-present</td>
<td>Wild Kratts</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2010</td>
<td>Willa's Wild Life</td>
<td>Canada/France</td>
<td>Gl./ Environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NickJr 2006-present</td>
<td>WonderPets</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>General/Zoo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KidsWB 2003-2006</td>
<td>Xiaolin Showdown</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>China/martial arts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3: WVS Cultural Map of the World

Figure 4: National Generational Differences on Cultural Map.

Note: Arrows run from oldest (age 65+) to youngest (age 18-24) age group, using data from Wave 4 of the WVS (1999-2004). Source: Inglehart and Welzel 2005:112.
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