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Abstract

The Japanese animated series, "Pokemon" (short for "Pocket Monster"), was a popular TV cartoon introduced in Japan in 1997. Since Warner Brothers began airing "Pokemon" in the U.S. in September 1998, "Pokemon" has strongly attracted U.S. children aged 2 to 11. What does "Pokemon" present to American children on TV? Pokemon's cross-cultural appeal may stem from its cultural themes. The goal of this study is to compare the English-language edition of "Pokemon" to the American-produced cartoons, "Men in Black" for the cross-cultural themes of "individualism versus collectivism," the associated communication approaches of "disruption versus cooperation," and the consequences of "winning versus losing."

Regarding the idea of similarity and differentiation, "Men in Black" was thought to contain enough characteristics similar to "Pokemon" to qualify it to serve as a comparison in this study. Ten "Pokemon" and ten "Men in Black" episodes were coded systematically by 330 Character Description Code Sheets and 60 Content Code Sheets.

This study found that the popular Japanese-made "Pokemon" in the United States may present its in-group's relationship through collectivistic perspectives, but these perspectives also could be found in the American-produced, team-based action cartoon, "Men in Black." In addition, in five out of ten "Men in Black" episodes the bad guys were killed at the end of the show. By contrast to "Men in Black," the bad guys in the ten "Pokemon" episodes never suffered the penalty of death. Furthermore, "Pokemon" allowed the good guys to be accidental losers, but "Men in Black" did not.
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Chapter 1
Introduction

The Daily News (New York) reported that “‘Pokemon’ is Tokyo’s highest-rated show for the 6:30 p.m. slot. ‘Pocket Monster’ merchandizing, such as action figures, toys and even food products, was projected to have yearly sales of $3.14 billion” (1997, News, p. 4) These phenomena indicate how Japanese children welcomed “Pokemon” when it was aired in Japan.

The Japanese animated series “Pokemon” (short for “Pocket Monster”) was a popular TV cartoon introduced in Japan in 1997. Japanese games designer Satoshi Tajiri, who poured his childhood passion of collecting insects into his work, created Pokemon. Most parents, in or outside of Japan, learned about the animated series “Pokemon” from either their children’s daily conversations or the dramatic TV news headlines on Dec. 16, 1997. According to news records, nearly seven hundred Japanese children were hospitalized for convulsion and nausea after watching “Pokemon.” In an article in the San Diego Union—Tribune, the researchers indicated that “rapid, high-contrast changes of blue and red in the background of the Pokemon cartoon triggered brain cells in some viewers to begin firing nerve impulses more rapidly than usual” (1999, Lifestyle E5). The makers of “Pokemon” toned down the show’s colors and flashy images after the incident. Even though some parents forbade their children to watch the show, Japanese children still wanted to watch the fascinating adventure story.

Since Warner Brothers purchased and began airing “Pokemon” in the U.S. in September 1998, “Pokemon” has strongly attracted U.S. children. An article in the Los Angeles Times reports that “‘Pokemon’ currently airs 11 times a week on the WB
network and is the most-watched cartoon show for kids ages 2-11" (1999, Part F, p. 2).
The show has made millions of dollars from its trading cards, toys and video games in the
United States. The popularity of “Pokemon” not only caused the mass media to pay
attention to how the toy producers successfully developed Pokemon monster cards, video
games, and other Pokemon products, but it also created anxiety for many parents and
schoolteachers.

Many people are concerned about how many children devote their time to
watching the show and how they react to the products. For example, many Pokemon
fans persuaded their parents to spend a considerable amount of money on Pokemon
collector cards. The Ottawa Citizen reported that “Pokemon is a multibillion-dollar
marketing phenomenon that grew out of a Nintendo video game created in 1996. It is
estimated the Pokemon will generate approximately $6 billion U.S. just in North America
by the end of this year [1999] from books, cards, toys, television shows and a full-length

Many schoolteachers even banned Pokemon products from the classroom,
because children were ignoring the lectures and playing “Pokemon” instead. According
to a report in the Daily News (New York), “local schools are doing what they can to keep
their Pokemon-crazed (mostly young boys) focused on schoolwork. Many schools have
banned students from bringing cards into the classroom. Scores of the popular trading
cards have been seized by teachers since the start of school” (1999, Suburban, p. 2)

Few parents like Pokemon or have the patience to understand what the TV series
“Pokemon” says to their children. If one asks an adult why he or she likes or dislikes
“Pokemon,” he or she may complain about how excessive merchandizing However,
how successful can the English-language edition “Pokemon” be? In Broadcasting & Cable, Kim McAvoy (2000) states, “all it takes is one hit to turn a network around. That certainly is the case at Kids’ WB!, which after a year of “Pokemon,” has taken the lead in the children’s television marketplace” (p. 30)

The goal of this study is to compare the English-language edition of “Pokemon” to “Men in Black” for the cross-cultural themes of “individualism versus collectivism,” the associated communication approaches of “disruption versus cooperation,” and the consequences of “winning versus losing.”

“Pokemon” delivers many messages to young audiences; different children may interpret the meanings differently. Therefore, it will be very challenging for researchers to overcome psychological factors in determining the specific effects on children. If communication researchers do not clearly understand the content of “Pokemon”, they may lose their way in discovering the resulting effects on the receivers. In Clarifying Communication Theories, Shannon and Weaver’s communication transmission model brings me to the initial question: What does “Pokemon” present to American children on TV? The themes of “Pokemon” are worthy of discussion because American children have built a niche for “Pokemon” in their own social groups.

Withey & Abeles (1980) state the following in “What’s the Story about Anyway:”

Most of what children watch on television is plotted. Although the models for plot lines may differ somewhat from writer to writer, at base each contains an initiating event or problem, the internal responses of the protagonists to it, attempts at resolving the problem, the consequences of the attempts, and reactions to them (p 204).

“Pokemon” follows this pattern in a Japanese-made adventure story. It portrays the adventures of several children who want to become professional monster trainers,
Pokemon breeders, or Pokemon watchers. The monster trainer's job is similar to that of pet trainers. Pokemon breeders understand how to raise Pokemon animals very well; Pokemon watchers like to observe the activities of Pokemon monsters and draw pictures for the monsters.

Like most children’s TV programs, Pokemon may shape the heroes, distinguish the good characters from the bad ones, and put the good characters on the winning side. The consistency of content allows viewers to figure out who will be the winners at the end of each episode. In addition, I believe some children’s TV stories help create in younger audiences the values needed for problem solving. As Withey and Abeles (1980) pointed out, “‘Sesame Street’ can teach cooperation better, [and] ‘Mister Rogers’ can better help children explore their feelings (p. 223). The statement leads me to wonder what type of goal-oriented and problem-oriented processes exist in the “Pokemon” series, especially since “Pokemon” was originally created for Japanese children, who are raised in a collective rather than an individualistic culture.

Is any Japanese cultural theme involved in the English-language edition of “Pokemon”? The implications of cross-cultural studies are wide-ranging, including such fields as communications, social psychology, sociology, and education. “Individualistic versus Collective” is one major theme that can cross the boundary between Japanese and American. As Singelis and Brown (1995) state in “Culture, Self, and Collectivist Communication,” “the popular use of individualism-collectivism requires an explanation of the mechanisms and intermediate steps through which the various pressures inherent in this broad-based construct shapes individual behavior” (p. 355).
In other words, cultural perspectives may impact one individual's behavior differently than they impact the behavior of another. Culture is flexible and mutable on some level; any conditional factors may influence the results of the study. In order to define the general behavior, concepts, and belief of a specific culture, researchers frequently use cultural comparisons to determine differences among cultures. Regarding the idea of similarity and differentiation, culture should not be either extremely “collective” or “individualistic” (p. 358). As Scott and Brydon (1997) suggest in “Dimensions of Communication,” “all cultures can be located somewhere on the continuum between collectivism and individualism” (p. 155). The cultural gap is oriented by the tendency of an opposite common behavior or by beliefs that are rarely shared with another culture. Although collectivism and individualism are both subjective themes that never thoroughly equal the name of a country, in my study I would like to define collectivism and individualism based on the concepts that are applied when comparing Japan and the United States.

Ideally, Japanese culture is more likely to teach children to reach a group-oriented goal instead of an individual goal. In contrast to Japanese culture, American culture is characterized by individualism. An American person sees “self” separate from the group. As Ting-Toomey (1991) noted, an individual culture “emphasize(s) the importance of individual rights, individual wants, and individual goals” (p. 31).

People may question why research on “Pokemon” should involve an approach that considers Japanese collectivism and American individualism. First, according to Greet Hofstede’s research on Individualism-Collectivism in forty-one countries, the United States is the most individualistic nation in the world and Japan is one of most
collectivistic countries in the ranking. Second, the English-language edition of
"Pokemon" originally was produced in Japan, yet it successfully appeals to American
children. Pokemon's cross-cultural appeal may stem from a cultural theme. As Karjala
(1993) analyzes in a cross-cultural study, Japanese educational and social systems
emphasize cultural values based on collective attitudes instead of individualistic
perspectives. The characters of "Pokemon" either may undergo different personal
problems or struggle with a group-oriented issue in each series, because each Pokemon
center character has to interact with group members in this team-based story. As Triandis,
Bontempo, Villareal, Asai, and Lucca (1988) stated, "In collectivist cultures people share
and show harmony within ingroups, but the total society may be characterized by much
disharmony and nonsharing, because so many interpersonal relationships are individual-
outgroup relationships" (p. 326). In addition, the characteristics of U.S. individualism is
reflected in the "low concern for ingroups" (p. 323). An individualist may see his or her
goal as greater and more valuable than his or her group goal, because an individualist
does not expect that an individual should sacrifice his or her personal interests. In other
words, the characters of "Pokemon" should not only be viewed as pure individualists or
collectivists, but they also should be distinguished on an ingroup or an outgroup basis.

Furthermore, as Guzley, Araki, and Chalmers (1998) note, "Collectivist cultures
are characterized by a high-context style of communication; that is, the context is of
primary consideration in every interaction as is preserving harmony in the relationship"
(p. 4). In order to keep a harmonious relationship with others, collectivists are more
likely to reduce conflict by indirect expressions.
How does each character of “Pokemon” interact the problems? Do the characters of “Pokemon” sacrifice themselves to accomplish their group goal? If most characters of “Pokemon” stand for a group-oriented goal as their personal goal, does that conflict with American’s culture? These unanswered questions encouraged me to explore “the individualism versus the collectivism” of this Japanese animated cartoon “Pokemon.”

Another issue relevant to this study is children’s television and violence. The topic of “children’s television and violence” has been discussed in the communication fields for more than forty years. Violence on children’s TV programs seems to provide a formula for children to understand how violence works in their society. Even though there is considerable disagreement about the nature and direction of the relationship between viewing violence and children’s aggressive behaviors, most researchers believe that there is a strong correlation (Evra, 1998, p. 56). “Media Violence Should be treated as a Public Health Problem” indicated that cartoons contain the most violent scenes compare to other children’s TV programs (Disney, 1995).

These academic findings encourage me to consider problem-solving processes in “Pokemon.” For instance, do the characters of “Pokemon” fight with each other verbally or physically when conflicts occur? Or, do the characters cooperate either verbally or physically to overcome their difficulties? The second approach of this research discovers how the cartoon characters of “Pokemon” react to each other when the conflict or the difficulty occurs in their journey. This may be called “disruption versus cooperation.” Although violence is not accepted the only way to solve problems in our daily lives, violence is one of the most frequently used methods of problem solving in cartoons. Evra (1998) cited Lamson’s study in Television and Child Development; Lamson reported that
thirty-two violent acts occur during one hour of children’s TV programming. The above research result was conducted by the Annenberg School of Communication at the University of Pennsylvania (p. 55). In Huesmann’s “Television Violence and Aggressive Behavior,” he emphasizes that “the way violence is defined will directly determine the amount and nature of the violence that is coded in any study. Consequently, the definition of violence has been a sensitive and controversial issue” (1982, p. 163). People usually define fighting actions as a type of violence. However, verbal and physical fighting are not always ugly and hideous to the general public if fighting is considered to be a moral and ethical action, a presentation of honesty and justice, self-protection, or a fair race and sport. Either violence or fighting in cartoons can be misinterpreted, especially when the essential plot defines the function of characters’ behavior in each “Pokemon” episode. Because the storyline of “Pokemon” involves training monsters to be warriors in different competitions, Pokemon trainers have to battle with different monsters in their journeys. The function of each Pokemon character could be viewed either representative of violence participant in a fighting race. It would be difficult to judge any Pokemon character only based on the norm of our real world without reconsidering the character’s needs and wants in his or her society as a whole. However, I believe that the motives are vital considerations when determining whether the Pokemon characters are acting ethically when they decide whether to fight or cooperate with each other.

Because motive and context are crucial, simply counting the numbers of violent acts to determine “violent” is counter-productive. In other words, fighting and cooperation in “Pokemon” can be observed in context. “Fighting” decisions may be
judged correct for certain situations. "Disruption versus cooperation" will be the second factor in my study.

I believe that comparing the themes of "Individualism versus Collectivism" and "Disruption versus Cooperation" in "Pokemon" will lead to different outcomes at the end of each show. Does the programs tend to emphasize "collectivism"? Do the collective characters have a high probability of overcoming difficulties? Does the content of the shows suggest that the winner never fail in a problem-solving process? If verbal fighting and physical fighting are necessary in a problem solving process, then what are the motives of the characters?

If we observe most U.S. cartoons, we could find that the good characters never lose in a battle because they are heroes. In other words, the writers tend to give children the preconception that good characters win because they are just. However, in reality no one can guarantee that good behavior leads to "winning." For instance, some people lose in a competition not because they need more experience and knowledge in their field but because they lack the ability to adapt to situations. Sometimes it is hard to tell why some people lose and others not, but in the cartoon world the good characters always win. Everything comes from the storywriters' imagination. We should see the problems, the communication processes, and the story outcomes as a whole. Although this study only focuses on a comparative content analysis of "Pokemon" and "MIB," it can be a foundation of further study into how or why cartoons affect children in certain areas.

Research Approach, Questions and Expectations

The research in this study examines whether the characters of "Pokemon" involve or present Japanese cultural perspectives and whether the characters of MIB involve or
present our cultural perspectives. Even if I assume that the Japanese put their cultural perspectives into their TV shows, I will not make any judgment that most U. S. children appreciate “Pokemon” because of certain cultural themes. As Annalee Newitz (1995) emphasizes in Film Quarterly, “that Americans might be interested in looking at their own culture through Japanese eyes tells us that Americans’ feelings about their own culture are deeply bound up with America’s evolving relationship with Japan” (p. 3).

Should I separate visual image and dialogue when I measure individualism and collectivism? According to “Visual Processing or Televised Information by Japanese and American Children,” visual segments especially appeal to Japanese children, because the Japanese language depends on graphic symbols rather than phonetic differentiation (Rolandelli, Sugihara, and Wright, 1992, p. 6). Japanese TV programmers tend to communicate with children through intensive visual segments. In other words, they may present their cultural themes via visual images. Because the English-language edition of “Pokemon” went through a language translation process, the tone and the dialogue were changed from the original cultural themes. Even though viewers can see the original visual segments of “Pokemon,” it is still impossible for viewers to identify the original themes of the show because audio segments can also influence viewers’ understandings. However, the goal of this research focuses on what the English-language edition of “Pokemon” represents in the U.S. It may not be necessary to measure characters’ conversations and visual images of “Pokemon” separately because the topic does not focus on how the cultural theme of Japanese “Pokemon” is different from the English-language “Pokemon.” The research tends to identify and analyze what the embedded messages in the English-language edited “Pokemon” on TV.
One of the most controversial issues of the cross-cultural study is defining the measurement model and variables. How do I approach Japanese collectivism and American individualism in my study? What standards do I set? First, the characters of “Pokemon” are not real people who live in a real society. These characters’ behaviors were created by certain story norms. These story formats not only built a story character’s personality but also constructed his or her personal relationship either within or without his or her group. Secondly, I believe that there is no “absolute truth” that can define or cover any culture exactly. Cultural themes are mutable and subjective on some levels. However, it would be possible for the researcher to analyze different cultural themes through a specific comparison.

The first research question guiding my research attempts to discover how cartoon characters portray individualism and collectivism in “Pokemon” and “MIB.” Most parents and school teachers may ask whether “Pokemon” presents to children the value of teamwork. It would be interesting to analyze whether the Japanese-made “Pokemon” in the United States may present its individualistic or collectivistic perspectives that may or may not in the American-produced cartoon, “Men in Black.”

RQ1: Do the ingroup cartoon characters of “Pokemon” and “MIB” present more often collectivism than individualism in a goal-oriented task?

RQ 2: When they confront their conflicts, do the major Pokemon and MIB characters react cooperatively or disruptively?

The second research question will help me identify the tendency of disruption and cooperation under certain situations through a judgment of the cartoon characters’ behavior. Do the characters of “Pokemon” and “MIB” cooperate with each other during
a problem-solving process? In comparison to the characters in “Men in Black,” what do the Pokemon characters present in a conflict situation? These questions will be discussed in my second research question. Whether the characters fight for the sake of fighting is a vital key. Viewers may define so-called violence and disharmony images differently, depending on how they evaluate the characters’ motives; younger children usually lack the ability to make “right and wrong” judgments of their understanding. Moreover, how “Pokemon” and “MIB” present their stories and how the younger viewers receive the meanings of its messages are two different issues.

The Third question involves the endings of each “Pokemon” and “MIB” episode.

RQ3: What do the main “Pokemon” and “MIB” characters reveal about their perspectives on winning and losing?

If the ending is the most significant part of a story, the values and processes that lead to outcomes are worth discussing in this content analysis. This third research question may not identify whether the children can understand these consequences of the plots. However, it may identify what “Pokemon” and “MIB” present from both the content and the context aspects. For example, based on the previous two research questions, is there any positive correlation between winning characters and cooperation plots? Does the villain have a high potential to be the loser in the show? The third research results will compare how “Pokemon” and “Men in Black” present prosocial or antisocial images. If the content suggests that both villains and heroes use similar methods to solve conflicts, should the story be counted as prosocial? Most researchers conclude that a show is prosocial if the villains are punished at the end. The concept of
punishment is useful for the prosocial judgment at either a microlevel or macrolevel; however, few researchers explain how the idea works if the heroes also adapt violence as a way to solve their problems in the show. The third research question attempts to examine “prosocial” and “antisocial” concepts based on the context of the shows.

This study will attempt to determine whether there is a significant cultural difference between the Japanese-made “Pokemon” and the American produced adventure cartoon, “MIB.” Both attract to children aged 2 to 11 viewers.
Chapter 2  
Literature Review

In this chapter, I will review previous findings in four areas: current perspectives on “Pokemon,” cross-cultural perspectives on Japanese animation, cross-cultural perspectives on collectivism and individualism, the relationships between cartoon content and children. Each area of the literature review may present certain valuable contributions explored by previous researchers and scholars. This literature review may not cover every finding in these four areas; however, this literature review will concentrate on vital findings connected to this study.

Current Perspectives on “Pokemon”

According to the Toronto Star, psychologists indicate, “it [Pokemon] builds math muscles, promotes teamwork, treats girl as equals and may even instill a sensitivity to traditional Japanese values such as compassion and responsibility. But above all, say experts, Pokemon is pure left-brain candy” (1999, News). If “Pokemon” really promotes teamwork and traditional Japanese values among American children, as the psychologists claimed, how “Pokemon” presents its cultural themes to its viewers would be a significant question.

little of the Japanese philosophy of self-mastery and cooperation without knowing they're doing it" (Life, p D1). What is the Japanese philosophy of “Pokemon”? Do the characters of “Pokemon” involve teamwork in the show? These interesting phenomena not only draws parents' attention to the show but also prompts the media to spotlight what they saw and heard about “Pokemon.”

**Cross-cultural Perspectives on Japanese Animation**

Cultural themes are always so sensitive and complicated that they prompt researchers to define not only what they can see from their cultures but also what they cannot observe with their own eyes. Japan and the United States are both preeminent cartoon kingdoms where global children can share their dreams and joys together. Japanese cartoons are usually referred to as animation, and “Japanese animation is available mostly on videocassette or laserdisc, and it is far more than just cartoons for children” (Newitz, 1996, p. 2). In contrast to U.S. cartoons, most Japanese animation comes from either copies of comic books or images of video games. In the *Independent* (London), an article indicates that “the dynamic drawing style, fantastic settings and wired storylines are virtually a language unto themselves, and seem to operate in a separate dimension to their western equivalents” (2000, Features p 2, 21, 22, 23) In cross-cultural studies, Japanese animation is not a new issue; it has been much argued and discussed.

In “Magical Girls and Atomic Bomb Sperm,” Newitz emphasized that American animation fans are transforming Japanese culture for their own uses, which are different from the uses of animation in Japan. In contrast to the Japanese audience for animation, American audiences see animation as an “alternative culture.” For instance, some
animation videotapes are unavailable in video shops. Animation is not mainstream culture for both most American adults in their daily lives; interestingly, animation is created for both adults and children in Japanese society. Considering these differences in perspective, why do some American adults come to be Japanese animation fans? As Newitz points out, “American fans enjoy anime partly because it allows them to feel as if they have specialized knowledge ordinary Americans do not. On another level, the fans’ appropriation of anime involves translating and duplicating it so that it is accessible to a wider audience in the West. This is allows [Americans fans] to convert a Japanese product into a uniquely American one” (1996, p 3) If American audiences have a desire to see their own national culture in Japanese animation, there should be some cultural themes that link these two countries.

Interestingly, as Newitz states, “Japanese political and cultural leaders, in general, do not wish to define their culture as ‘multi’in any way” (p. 9). This contrasts American culture, in which American people are comfortable with viewing their country as multicultural. Do U.S. audiences really adopt the multicultural themes well? Or were the Japanese animation artists influenced by American culture in the early 20th century?

According to Annalee Newitz’s assumption about the popular Japanese animation Ranma1/2, “we must also remember that the Japanese are not multicultural... What these anime suggest is that a very American-looking multicultural is in fact Japanese. And it also suggests that the Japanese are quite aware that part of their target audience for this anime is outside Japan, in multicultural America” (p 13).

This statement may be controversial, for it suggests that there should be certain cultural themes, combining and separating these two different countries as they view
animation, that they are unaware of. Furthermore, based on the interview record of the 
*Anime Interviews* in 1993, Rumiko Takahashi (who is both the storywriter and illustrator 
for *Ranma 1/2*) said, “manga [refers to Japanese cartoon and comic books] is 
entertainment, after all. And because it’s a form of entertainment rather than a separate 
culture, it is inevitable for cultural elements to creep in. It depicts the world we live in” 
(1997, p. 21). Rumiko Takahashi’s statement suggests that a story writer and animation 
illustrator may bring culture themes into his or her works. In the *Washington Post*, Hank 
Stuever said, “the Japanese animation scene seems to the place the highest priority on 
participation: Draw it yourself, act it our, become the cartoon” (2000, p. C1).

Furthermore, Mike Lazzo (vice president of programming for the Cartoon network) states 
in *USA Today*, “Japan animation is so different from what airs there” (1997, Life p. 1D).

In “Beyond the Border: the Debut of “Japanimation in the West,”” Kaori Yoshida 
contends that Japanese cultural themes should be evaluated on how the audience receives 
the meanings of its own culture, not on the content itself. For instance, Yoshida said, “in 
Japan, nudity is not equated with sexuality, whereas in North American society nudity 
represents sex or sexuality” (1998, p. 142). In other words, Yoshida emphasizes that 
non-Japanese viewers may perceive the Japanese animation differently. The differences 
of the audiences’ interpretations define the various cross-cultural themes, so the Japanese 
cultural themes may be observed differently based on each audience’s understanding 
Yoshida’s study focuses on an applied function about how North American audiences 
interact with Japanese animations instead of using pure cross-cultural content analysis
Cross-Cultural Perspectives on Collectivism and Individualism

Many cross-cultural researchers are interested in identifying the cultural differences between Japanese and North Americans; there is a distinct gap between these two groups. Enhancing the understanding of cross-cultural perspectives may close this gap on some level, but it also has the potential to build a definite stereotype for different groups. "Collectivism and Individualism" is one of the popular themes that is frequently used by many researchers in comparing the cultural differences between Japanese and Americans. However, "Collectivism and Individualism" is not a superficial term because the definition that collectivism refers to the teamwork and individualism emphasizes the individual achievement that characterizes each person within the country.

In "Cross-Cultural Perspectives of Commitment: Individualism and Collectivism as a Framework for Conceptualization," Guzley, Araki, and Chalmers (1998) define the perspectives of commitment in "Collectivism and Individualism" by asking the question "what does 'commitment' mean to you?" to both U.S. and Japanese participants (p. 9). In this cross-cultural study, the researchers found that the four major cultural themes involved in the commitment issues of U.S. individualism were dedication, obligation, integrity, and determination (p.11). For instance, according to the American participants' definition of integrity, "the theme was characterized by a view of commitment as a personal quality of the individual, a characterization which is consistent with an independent self-construal" (p. 10).

By contrast, Japanese are more likely to define commitment based on ingroup relationships, such as connection, membership, responsibility, cooperation, and interest. For instance, as the researchers point out, "responsibility is inextricably linked to
commitment, which is consistent with a collectivist orientation and specifically with an interdependent self-construal” (p. 13) Guzley, Araki, and Chalmers’s study not only provides a cultural dimension, but it also indicates that “Individualism and Collectivism” is represented in cultural perspectives of commitment (p. 15).

In “Individualism and Collectivism: Cross-cultural Perspectives on Self-ingroup Relationships,” the researchers examine U.S. individualism and Japanese collectivism in three specified areas: self-reliance with competition, distance from ingroups, and concern for ingroup members (Triandis, Bontempo, Villereal, Asai, and Lucca, 1988, p. 323). As the researchers note in the article, whether an individual person within his or her group is willing to sacrifice his or her personal goals in order to enforce ingroup goals is worth considering in U.S. individualism. According to the results on U.S. individualism, “when ingroup and the individual are in conflict[,] there is a general trend for subjects in individualistic cultures to anticipate that people will do their own thing[s] rather than what is expected by the ingroup” (1988, p. 331).

On the other hand, Japanese collectivists subordinate their goals of some ingroups, and they feel honored when their ingroups are honored. But the phenomenon does not suggest that Japanese feel more similar to others or more conforming within the ingroup. Triandis, Bontempo, Villereal, Asai, and Lucca explain how this specified phenomenon exists in collective cultures:

The data suggest that we must consider each ingroup and each domain of social behavior separately, and collectivism defined as subordination to the ingroup's norms, needs, views, and emotional closeness to ingroups is very specific to ingroup and to domain. Collectivism takes different forms, such as the greater sense of doing one's duty or not disrupting interpersonal relationships within the ingroup, that are specific to each culture (p. 334).
The above phenomenon refines the cultural dimension of collectivism-individualism by certain self-ingroup relationships. According to the findings in this study, self-reliance in the individualistic cultures refers to a person who has the freedom to do his or her own things. But collective cultures encourage people to "not [be] a burden" within the ingroup (p. 335). Furthermore, in "Culture, Self, and Collectivist Communication" Singelis and Brown (1995) suggest that many researchers agree that cultures can influence the concepts of self, and these individual differences may shape behavior (p. 354).

In "Culture, Self, and Collectivist Communication," Singelis and Brown evaluate "how culture affects individual level processes and, subsequently, how these processes affect communication" (p. 354). According to the research results, collectivism has a positive relation with an interdependent self and a negative relation with an independent self. This research result also indicates that high-context communication is associated with the interdependent self but not the independent self (p. 378).

According to Dimensions of Communication, Scott and Brydon explain that "the United States, for example, is a low context culture. The rule in low context culture is that the content of the messages carries the most meaning. In high context cultures such as Japan, however, meaning seldom is derived from only the content of what is said. Meaning depends more on the context in which something is said" (1997, p. 40). Singelis and Brown's study encourages the researchers to further examine how high context cultures such as Japan coordinate the meanings of their transactions by interdependent self in either the highly collective or the lower collective society.
Can the researchers observe verbal communication differences between individualists and collectivists? In “Cross-Cultural Comparisons of Perceived Importance of Conversational Constraints,” Kim categorizes the cultural differences among nations according to five conversational constraints: (a) concern for clarity, (b) concern for avoiding hurting the hearer’s feelings, (c) concern for nonimposition, (d) concern for avoiding negative evaluation by the hearer, and (e) concern for effectiveness (1994, p. 128). In this study, Kim creates six “request” situations for participants because “request” relates to many communication factors such as desires, directives, attentions, and so on (p. 137). According to Kim’s research results, the participants of more collectivistic cultures would pay significant attention to “not hurting the hearer’s feelings in the pursuit of interaction goals” (p. 141). In addition, Kim emphasizes that “people in every culture have an equal strong preference for managing the interaction in a way that avoids negative evaluation by hearer” (p. 141). Moreover, it is not surprising to see that the participants of more individualistic cultures would “attribute greater importance to clarity” (p. 143).

Kim, Hunter, Miyahara, Horvath, Bresnahan, and Yoon concluded “the more collectivistic the culture, the more likely it is that people will sample the interdependent self” and “cultural variability does indeed influence the perceived importance of three of the five conversational constraints.” They started to investigate the individualism and collectivism link between individual values and the perceptions of conversational constraints, but in order to test the corrections among cultural differences, individual values, and conversational constraints, the researchers designed a mediation model for observing these relationships. The mediation model here refers to certain request
situations among people, such as "repay loan situation," "borrow money situation," and "homework extension situation" which are made and set up by the researchers. When the participants were placed in these framing situations, the researchers had opportunities to observe and record the participants' oral behavior in a mediation process. Based on this mediation model, the research results consistently illustrate that "cultural-level individualism and collectivism were systematically related to individual-level cultural orientations (independent and interdependent self-construals), which, in turn, were systematically related to the perceived importance of conversational constraints" (p. 45).

This study's most valuable contribution is that the research overcomes the difficulties in describing the characteristics of individual values by both classifying "self" as interdependent or independent and carefully including "self" as a possibly bicultural (high association with both independent and interdependent characteristics) or marginal (low association with both independent and interdependent characteristics) type in reality. An interesting phenomenon of the study is that the researchers chose Hawaiian people as a cultural sample. Hawaiian people, who had a tendency to be bicultural (association with independent and interdependent characteristics), present their cultural identity to varying degrees. This suggests that cultural themes do not exist in discrete countries, but special locations and ethnic groups can also be distinguished within cultures in many ways.

If researchers examine "Individualism and Collectivism" based on the differences among interpersonal relationships, they would find that "uncertainty reduction" may play a role in establishing an interpersonal relationship. "Uncertainty reduction" can refer to two people who are willing to understand the dissimilarities and similarities between each
other, and then use this information either to develop an acceptable relationship or to break down the relationship. In "Cultural Dissimilarities and Uncertainty Reduction Process," Gudykust and Gray (1987) test whether cultural dissimilarities in individualism-collectivism interaction influence the use of uncertainty reduction strategies, attributional confidence, attraction, and so on. The researchers found certain variables that can influence the uncertainty reduction of "individualism and collectivism," such as self-disclosure, low-context attributional confidence interrogation, and shared networks. The findings do not provide a specific explanation about how the uncertainty reduction works on "Individualism and Collectivism," but "the data suggest that as relationships become more intimate, cultural dissimilarities have less effect on uncertainty reduction processes" (p. 467).

According to previous cross-cultural studies, "Individualism and Collectivism" is well explored individually both in verbal and in nonverbal communications. In addition, many researchers may use cultural themes as variables to measure how audiences receive messages across national boundaries. However, none of them have applied "American Individualism and Japanese Collectivism" to examine how the cartoons present their cultural themes to the younger audiences.

The Relationships between the Cartoon Content and Children

Why do children love cartoons? Adults may have already forgotten the special feeling of being a child who can join cartoon characters in a fascinating world. According to Wells' Understanding Animation, "to animate, and the related words, animation, animated and animator all derive from the Latin verb, animare, which means 'to give life to', and within the context of the animate film, this largely means the
artificial creation of the illusion of movement of inanimate lines and forms" (1998, p 10). Simply speaking, cartoonists give their cartoon characters lives to communicate with children in verbal and nonverbal ways.

Many researchers pay attention to child reactions to cartoon content, because they are curious to know what children understand about the relationship between reality and illusion. As Gunter and McAleer suggest in Children and Television, “most of the research on children’s understanding of television has focused on developmental change with age” (1997, p. 41). Although cartoon characters are not real to adults, when a child observes his or her favorite cartoon character, he or she may perceive it differently.

According to Gunter and McAleer (1997), “fantastic heroes” and the “funny situation” are two important elements that induce younger children to watch cartoons. Based on young viewers' understanding, although the cartoon characters Tom and Jerry hit each other in each show, “younger viewers are able to enjoy such cartoons in a playful, make-believe way” (p. 46). Depending on the plots of Tom and Jerry, the younger children do not think that cartoon characters will get hurt from fighting because the cartoon characters never die from fighting. By extension, children may not realize that they may get hurt from fighting in reality. As Gunter and McAleer emphasize, “Older children, aged 7 to 8 years, may be confused about how certain characters are made. They can, however, usually discriminate between human and animated characters” (p. 48). Interestingly, before children are ten years old, they have “an incomplete understanding of the functioning of cartoon or puppet characters” (p. 53). For instance, Gunter and McAleer explain that “it seems that, as they grow older, children increasingly tend to organize pictures of television characters into discrete groups of
human, animated and puppet characters. However, it is not until the age 9 or 10 that children begin to realize that being alive and able to move autonomously are characteristics found only in human characters” (p.53).

According to Andrew Collins’s study, Gunter and McAleer believe that younger children may not make accurate moral judgments about cartoon characters (p. 54). In *Children’s Understanding of Television*, Bryant and Anderson made similar observations and conclusions about how children judge content (1983, p. 138-141). These findings tend to focus on how children would react to the cartoon situations in reality rather than interpreting what cartoon characters represent in a show.

Based on the articles in *Why We Watch*, although one of the fundamental functions of cartoons is simply to entertain children, it seems that violence is not divorced from many cartoons. Joanne Cantor (1998) notes in “Children’s Attraction to Violent Television Programming”:

If violence were a necessary and sufficient condition for popularity with children, all popular programs would be violent and all violent programs would be popular. A more reasonable question to ask is whether violence is an important feature in the attractiveness of programs to children (p.88-89).

According to the Nielsen TV ratings in 1995, “programs that draw the greatest number of children are predominately of the action/ violence type, particularly in cartoon form” (Cantor, p. 94) This Nielsen ratings data, “provides powerful support for the argument that the best way to attract a child audience is through violent programs” (p. 94). However, Cantor argues those children like to watch both action cartoons on Saturday morning and family-oriented situation comedies in the evening. There are many factors that could encourage children to watch action/ violent cartoons (p 95-96).
Violence is not an aspect of the nature of children, and “there is no difference between male and female children’s preferences for classic cartoons or for reality-based action shows” (p. 112). Cantor suggests that a child who is attracted by “very violent” scenes has been exposed to violence in his or her own life (p. 114).

In “Predictors of Children’s Interest in Violent Television Programs,” Cantor and Nathanson discussed “why children are willing—even eager—to experience violence through television” (1997, p. 155). Cartoon and Nathanson collected different samples of shows, including classic cartoons and action cartoons. The results of the study, indicate that children who have been frightened by television would be more interested in violent TV than children who had not been frightened by TV (p. 161). Significantly, the study implied that “male children seem to be attracted to shows in which violence is used to accomplish larger goals. This finding suggests that observed differences between males and females in attraction to violence may really be a function of their interest in the theme of justice-restoration” (p. 164). This study presents a different vision in discussing how violent content attracts male and female children. “Justice-restoration” may be one important factor to consider when evaluating violent content.

As Potter and Smith (1999) suggest, many researchers evaluate violent occurrences on the microlevel instead of the macrolevel. “Microlevel” refers to the violent interaction of specific incidents; “macrolevel” compares the contextual cues of the entire program (p. 121). For instance, a content analysis usually counts how many acts relate to violent behavior. As Potter and Smith state, “at the most macrolevel, some researchers have used the entire program as the unit of analysis and have examined all the contextual information throughout the program narrative or draw conclusions about the
meaning of violence in television show” (p. 121). For instance, the researchers who apply their studies at the macrolevel conclude that violence results in harm to victims and criminals will be punished eventually (p. 122). In “Consistency of Contextual Cues about Violence across Narrative Levels”, Potter and Smith look at the entire narrative, which may make audiences believe that “troublemakers are eventually punished” (p. 123). Even though there is no punishment linked with the individual acts of violence, the entire narrative still can persuade the audiences to believe that violence is bad (p. 123).

Based on the analysis on the study at microlevel and macrolevel:

There are some high proportions of prosocial patterns in children’s programming. With the inconsistent-prosocial pattern, there are antisocial cues at the microlevel. The prosocial cues do not show up until viewers have processed the entire program narrative. Children have more trouble processing the larger narrative, and younger children are incapable of this. So, it is misleading to give the children’s genre credit for prosocial messages unless those messages are presented consistently. Given this perspective, it appears that children’s programming directs viewers to think that violence is harmless, painless, and punishment free (p. 130).

This study provides some suggestions on how to develop a content analysis at different levels. A researcher may spotlight different explanations, depending on whether he or she observes children’s cartoons at the microlevels or macrolevels.

In fact, not every popular cartoon’s content includes violence; for instance, Jaffe explains in “Coming Up Next ..A Brighter Tomorrow for Kids’ TV,” the animators for Clarissa, Doug, and especially the Rugrats series, use special camera angles [within drawings] to show the world from the toddler’s perspective. Jaffe cites Zarghami’s suggestion, “if Kids feel good about themselves and if they see kids on TV with the same experiences as they have, their self-esteem goes up” (1994, np). In “Smarter Than We
Think—**Kids, Passivity and the Media,**" Heintz points out Kinder's claims that "images and narrative elements can be combined and recombined to fit [children's] creative needs. The meaning attached to any particular image or narrative is 'slippery,' and children are encouraged to fashion new meanings out of the existing symbols" (1994, np). Based on the above statement, a cartoon does not necessary mirror people's lives in reality instead of creating an imaginable space for viewers.

How do children evaluate cartoons from their own perspective? In "What Do Children Value in Entertainment Programs? A Cross-Cultural Investigation," Valkenburg and Janssen investigate the important characteristics of children's TV programs for both Dutch and U.S children aged six to eleven. Even though Valkenburg and Janssen do not focus their research only on animated children's programs, the findings still contribute to what we know about what children value in children's entertainment programs.

Valkenburg and Janssen used eight different characteristics to evaluate interest in cartoons—interestingness, romance, realism, violence, humor, innocuousness, comprehensibility and action—to test the cartoon's popularity with children. According to the research results:

Children in Netherlands and the U.S. attached the same value to five [program characteristics] out of eight program characteristics [interestingness, romance, realism, violence, humor, innocuousness, comprehensibility, action]: comprehensibility, action, humor, violence, and romance. This result suggests that there are certain elements in children's entertainment programs that universally attract children, irrespective of their cultural background (1999, p 16).

Based on the above conclusion, we can assume that there is potential for a cartoon to break successfully encoded cultural boundaries. Even though many imported cartoons
may present different national identities, animated characters may share some common characteristics that can appeal to children worldwide.

From a producer's perspective, cartoons not only cater to child preferences, but cartoons also are vehicles for advertisers and toy manufactures. It is not a new phenomenon for cartoon characters to help sell merchandise. As Eaton and Dominick said, “preexisting toy products have now become the source for television cartoons and other programs” (1991, p. 67). And, if cartoon contents emphasize several characters in a team, the advertisers and toy manufactures have opportunities to sell even more toys. In “Product-Related Programming and Children’s TV: A Content Analysis,” Dominick and Eaton compared the content of toy-linked cartoon programs with non toy-based cartoons. The study confirms that the toy-based cartoons are more violent than non toy-based cartoons. As Dominick and Eaton suggest, “children who watched toy-based shows were exposed to higher levels of antisocial acts, shooting in particular, than those children who watched non toy-connected shows” (p. 74) These findings suggest how the televised “Pokemon” series presents its contents, because “Pokemon” contains hundreds of animated characters, and it also highly commercialized by toy manufactures. Based on these factors, “Pokemon” has great potential to present violent scenes.

What do most animated cartoons suggest through their stories? Many researchers have examined influences on viewers' perceptions of male and female gender roles. In the U.S., Walt Disney has produced both televised cartoons and animated films for worldwide distribution, and many researchers believe that what Walt Disney presents in its works should be meaningful for children. In “Gender Role in Disney Films: Analyzing Behaviors from Snow White to Simba,” Hoerrner cites Downs’ idea that
children have learned from animation messages that women are incapable of solving their own problems (1996, p. 213). However, according to Hoerrner’s study, “Ariel, Belle, and The Lion King’s Nala are examples of Disney’s contemporary independent female characters…. They are strong characters with problem-solving abilities and actions on a more equal footing with their male peers” (p. 224-225). The findings of the study also indicate that animated Disney films provide more prosocial behavior than most Saturday morning television’s animated cartoons. Furthermore, female characters are leading protagonists or antagonists much less often than male characters. In other words, when children watch “good guys” in Disney’s animated films, the “good guys” refer to males instead of females. The study suggests that gender can play a role in shaping different images in a problem solving process. The finding indicates the importance for researchers to identify whether animation contains gender stereotypes in a problem solving process.

Implications from Literature Review

Newspapers and magazines have highlighted this unusual phenomenon—a Japanese-produced animated series, “Pokemon” that can attract U.S children. In turn, some child psychologists and educators’ attention has been drawn to the content of “Pokemon.” However, few sources really explain how “Pokemon” relates to Japanese cultural themes and what type of content causes some people to believe that “Pokemon” improves the concepts of teamwork. None of the academic research examines how Japanese present their values in “Pokemon” in the United States. Most sources tend to summarize different opinions from the public. How the cultural values are in “Pokemon” differ from American values may be an issue worth discussing.
According to the above findings, Japanese collectivism and American individualism can be defined variously through both verbal and nonverbal communication. Nonverbal and verbal expressions both play a vital role in shaping specific cultural themes in society. Because “Pokemon” characters are not real human beings, their facial expressions may be exaggerated and manipulated for the purpose of humor. Therefore, it should be difficult to apply the “facial expressions” of Pokemon characters as a key to measure cultural differences between individualism and collectivism. Secondly, there is no way to determine the nationalities of Pokemon characters from their physical characteristics, such as eye color, hair color, or skin color. For instance, the main character Ash has black hair and deep brown eyes in the show, and the characteristics may suggest that Ash is an Asian.

In contrast to Ash, Misty and Jessie both have bright blue eyes with hair color that is a varying shade of red. Do the characteristics indicate the nationalities for the characters? Importantly, these physical characteristics may not shape nationalities for the “Pokemon” monsters. On the other hand, the tendencies of communication behavior may build a more objective and thorough image for “Pokemon.” People cannot deny that an imported Japanese cartoon may have a potential to bring its own cultural perspective. Based on the literature review, however, no researcher really has applied the major theme of “Japanese individualism and American collectivism” to examine this popular imported cartoon.

In addition, many researchers apply different methods to evaluate the violent behavior of cartoon characters compared to violence in other types of children’s shows. But only a few of them focus on one cartoon in order to compare how villains behave.
differently from heroes in a problem-solving process. How an individual character reacts to a group’s request indicates that character’s sense of duty, responsibility, obligation, and so on. In other words, researchers are likely to overlook motive-based decisions when they study content or context as a whole.

Moreover, many researchers would agree that storywriters like to make a common conclusion for the cartoon heroes who should be always on the winning side. It is difficult to see any exception in cartoons. Furthermore, whether the villains get any punishment for their wickedness is an important issue in the eyes of the researchers. According to the literature review, “Pokemon” has a great potential to be examined and compared at both the microlevel and macrolevel based on its characters’, story contents, and story context as a whole. Therefore, the study of “Pokemon” may not only relate to cross-cultural perspectives, but it also can indicate multiple functions of its story.
Chapter 3
Research Design and Methodology

In *Mass Media Research*, Wimmer and Dominick collect different definitions for content analysis.

There are many definitions of content analysis. Walizar and Wienir (1978) define it as any systematic procedure devised to examine the content of recorded information; Krippendorf (1980) defines it as a research technique for making replicable and valid references from data to their context. Kerlinger's (1986) definition is fairly typical: Content analysis is a method of studying and analyzing communication in a systematic, objective, and quantitative manner for the purpose of measuring variable. (2000, p. 135)

Based on these definitions, content analysis can play a fundamental role in establishing a systematic pattern for observing research materials, especially when a researcher faces a new resource that has never been explored by other researchers. However, as Wimmer and Dominick assert, "content analysis alone cannot serve as a basis for making statements about the effects of content on an audience" (p. 138). In other words, the limitation of content analysis lies in its application to audience behavior. When researchers adopt different dimensions to define their samples, they may get various conclusions from their studies. In order to increase the validity of the research results, researchers have to collect large volumes of content and to classify the items more precisely. In addition, a content analysis study may provide the misconception that the coders always perceive the content in the same way the audiences do. It would be especially dangerous to claim that younger viewers perceive content as the coders do because children's comprehension is usually lower than adults. Although content
analysis has certain limitations, it is still important for the researchers to establish a starting point for measuring the nature of the message of the mass media. From this view, “Pokemon” should be explored step by step with a systematic and quantitative observation of its content.

A review of the relevant literature can provide the researchers with the essentials for how to produce valuable research questions. Significantly, as Wimmer and Dominick point out, “one problem to avoid in content analysis is the ‘counting for the sake of counting’ syndrome. The ultimate goal of the analysis must be clearly articulated to avoid aimless exercises in data collection that have little utility for mass media research” (p. 140). In order to carry out the primary goals of this study, these research questions were addressed:

(1) In comparison to “Men in Black,” do the ingroup cartoon characters of “Pokemon” present collectivism more often than individualism in goal-oriented tasks? (The ingroup here refers to the team members’ relationships within a specific team or organization).

(2) In comparison to “Men in Black,” do characters in “Pokemon” act cooperatively or disruptively when they faced with conflict?

(3) In comparison to “Men in Black,” what do the performances of the main “Pokemon” characters suggest about their perspectives on winning and losing?

Samples Selecting

Journalists frequently use content analysis as a traditional method of conducting investigative research. Selecting useful samples from the large amount of available data is a central concern. However, a purposive that is, nonrandom sample cannot represent an entire population well. In “Product-Related Programming and Children’s TV: A Content Analysis,” Eaton and Dominick noted that although the purposive sample did not
allow researchers to generalize about all cartoon shows, it did help researchers classify the differences between two types of cartoons (1991, p. 69). The purposive sample is more useful than the random sample in comparing the differences among different types of programs. On the other hand, random samples can decrease the possibility of measurement error. Each random sample has an equal chance of being selected from the population. In order to reflect the major character’s behavior of “Pokemon,” it is necessary to provide the major character an equal opportunity to be represented on the show. Ash, Brock, Misty, Pikachu, James, Jessy, and Meowth are the most frequently seen cartoon characters of “Pokemon.” These seven main characters were coded separately by different character code sheets. In addition, each episode was a coding unit for measuring the theme and content of each episode. Each coder filled out another content code sheet after he or she completed the character code sheets for each episode. Each “Pokemon” episode was randomly drawn from five six-hour videotapes. Each episode length is thirty minutes including the advertising time, but the advertising content was not included in the measurement. These five videotapes were randomly recorded from episodes on the WB Kid’s channel airing Monday to Friday at 4:00 p. m. (ET) and Saturday morning at 9:00 between November 1999 and February 2000. Any repeated “Pokemon” episodes were deleted from these five videotapes, and fifty-four “Pokemon” episodes were successfully recorded. According to the order in which they were recorded, episodes were assigned a number from one to fifty-four, and ten of these “Pokemon” episodes were drawn as the random sample in the measurement. The following list includes fifty-four “Pokemon” episode titles and their assigned numbers (See Table 1).
## Table 1

### "Pokemon" Episode Titles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Videotape #:</th>
<th>Number with Episode Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Videotape I** | (1) The Breeding Center Secret  
(3) Who Gets to Keep Togepi?  
(5) Abra and the Psychic Showdown  
(7) Haunter Versus Kadabra  
(9) Electric Shock Showdown |
|              | (2) The Bridge Bike Gang  
(4) The Ghost of Maiden’s Park  
(6) The Tower of Terror  
(8) Mystery at the Lighthouse  
(10) Pokemon Scent-Station |
| **Videotape II** | (11) The Battle of the Badge  
(13) The March of the Exeggutor Squad  
(15) The Flame Pokemon-a-thon  
(17) The Fourth Round Rumble  
(19) It’s Mr. Mime Time  
(21) Attack of Prehistoric Pokemon |
|              | (12) Bad to the Bone  
(14) The Evolution Solution  
(16) Bulbasaur’s Mysterious Garden  
(18) Pokemon—I Choose You  
(20) The Problem with Paras  
(22) Riddle Me This |
| **Videotape III** | (23) Volcanic Panic  
(25) The Punchy Pokemon  
(27) Showdown at Dark City  
(29) The Ancient Puzzle of Pokemopolis  
(31) All Fired Up! |
|              | (24) A Friend in Deed  
(26) Princess VS Princess  
(28) The Path to the Pokemon League  
(30) Friend and Foe Alike |
| **Videotape IV** | (33) Wake Up Snorlax!  
(35) Holding Hi-Jynx  
(37) Ditto’s Mysterious Mansion  
(39) Beach Blank-Out Blastoise  
(41) The Song of Jigglypuff  
(43) Hypno’s Naptime |
|              | (32) Fire and Ice  
(34) The Pi-Kahuna  
(36) Pokemon Fashion Flash  
(38) Pokemon Paparazzi  
(40) Lights, Camera, Quack-tion  
(42) A Chansey Operation |
| **Videotape V** | (45) The Lost Lapras  
(47) Go West Young Meowth  
(49) Tit to Be Tide  
(51) The Crystal Onix  
(53) In the Pink |
|              | (44) Sparks Fly for Magnemite  
(46) the Purr-fect Hero  
(48) Snow Way Out  
(50) Pikachu Re-Volts  
(52) Primeape Goes Bananas  
(54) Stage Fight |
The coders only needed to code ten randomly selected “Pokemon” episodes after these assigned numbers were drawn randomly without any replacement in a drawing process. Some of the other episodes on the list were used as training material in the coding training section. These selected samples were watched and coded systematically by self-designed code sheets. In order to identify whether there was a significant cultural difference between animations made in Japan and the United States, it is necessary to examine an American-produced cartoon as a comparison.

Ten episodes of “Men in Black” were convenience samples collected from four videotapes, and each episode of these videotapes recently had aired on the WB Kid’s channel in the past. Unlike “Pokemon” (aired eleven times per week), “Men in Black” is only aired once per week. Based on time constraints, convenience samples were judged to be the most efficient in collecting samples. “Men in Black” was thought to contain enough characteristics similar to “Pokemon” to qualify it to serve as a comparison in the study. For example, “Men in Black” is a half-hour adventure show, which premiered on WB Kid’s channel on October 11, 1997. “Pokemon” was also a half-hour adventure show aired in Japan in 1997. Secondly, according to Broadcasting & Cable, “the [Kids’ WB] network has five out of top 10 Saturday morning shows among Kids 2 to 11, including Pokemon (which runs twice), Batman Beyond, Men in Black and Detention” (2000, Kim McAvoy, p. 32). In other words, “Pokemon” and “Men in Black” not only attract viewers age 2 to 11, but also both are adventure cartoons. Finally, the main characters of “Men in Black” and “Pokemon” both involve team-based relationships that may create an appropriate standard for the coders to compare the themes of the shows.
The four main characters of "Men in Black"—Jay, Kay, Elle, and Zed—were coded separately on the code sheets. After that, the coders filled out another content code sheet to examine the theme and the content of each "Men in Black" episode.

**Constructing Coding Categories**

A well-developed coding system should be mutually exclusive, exhaustive, and reliable. As Wimmer and Dominick suggest, "a category system is mutually exclusive if a unit of analysis can be placed in one and only one category. If the research discovers that certain units fall simultaneously into two categories, then the definitions of those categories must be revised" (p. 145) In other words, the predefined coding categories should fit into the needs of each measurement sample.

**Intercoder Reliability**

In order to reach a higher measurement quality among different coders, intercoder reliability was required in the study. Intercoder reliability not only indicates the agreement among different coders, but also it provides a precise way to test how the coding system works in the study. Holsti's intercoder reliability formula was used in this measurement process, because the formula allowed researchers to see how the coders agreed with each nominal category on the Pokemon Episode Description Code Sheet. The reliability is presented in terms of percentage of agreement.

\[
\text{Reliability} = \frac{2M}{N1+N2}
\]

\(M=\) the number of coding agreements

\((2M\text{ here refers to two coders})\)

\(N1=\) the total number of coding decisions by the first coder

\(N2=\) the total number of coding decisions by the second coders
(N1+N2) refers to the total number of coding decisions by the first and second coders. Because there are three coders involved in this study, the Holsti's intercoder reliability formula was reconstructed as Reliability = 3M/(N1+N2+N3).

Why should three coders be involved in the coding process? It is difficult for the researchers to be objective in the study, especially when the definitions involve a cross-cultural perspective. Therefore, I have selected coders with different cultural backgrounds: One of the coders was Japanese; the other was American, and I am Taiwanese. If the three coders can agree with sample categories, then naturally, the research results will be more valid.

The coding categories of the Character Description Code sheets were classified and in the order of these three main themes: Individualism vs. Collectivism, Cooperation vs. Disruption, and Winning vs. Losing. Here is a sample of a Character Description Code Sheet (See Figure 1):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character Description Code Sheet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Basic Information</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Title:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Episode Title:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The coder has to complete numbers of "Character Description Code Sheets" for each "Pokemon" or "Men in Black" episode. Each major character has to be coded on a separate code sheet followed by the "Character Description Code Sheet Instruction."

*There are two major team-based characters in each episode of "Pokemon" Please code only the following selected characters that are likely to appear on every episode

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ash’s Major Team Members/ Code</th>
<th>Team Rocket’s Major Team Members/ Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ash</td>
<td>James</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brock</td>
<td>Jessy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misty</td>
<td>Meowth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pikachu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There is one major team-based character in each episode of "Men in Black." Please code only the following selected characters that are likely to appear in every episode.

**“MIB” Agent Team**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agent</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agent Jay</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agent Kay</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agent Elle</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agent Zed</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A: Character Code

Basic Genders and Species (Male= M/ Female= F):
B1--Human M ( )  B2--Human F ( )  B3--Pokemon Monster ( )

C. According to the following definition of Sacrifice, please check “the willing of this character to sacrifice” in this episode.

Sacrifice: Here refers to a character that is willing to do something voluntarily for his/ her/ its team, even though he/ she/ it has to give up his/ her/ its personal desires, goals, or values.


D. According to the following definition of Pride, please check one of the descriptions for the character in this episode.

Pride: the character is proud of his/ her/ its ingroups when they are rewarded from their achievements. *DNA=Do Not Applicable


E. According to the following definition of Trust, please check one of the descriptions for the character in this episode.

Trust: the character was likely to rely on his/ her/ its team members when his/ her/ its team was in danger or difficulty.


F. Based on the following definition of a team-based cooperation, please check one of the descriptions for the character in this episode.

Cooperate: to work with another toward a common end. Here it refers to the cooperation among team members. (Please do not evaluate the character’s performance based on the effectiveness of his/ her/ its cooperation.)

Highly Cooperative : : Highly Uncooperative : DNA
Please circle any of the descriptions that apply to the ending of this episode.

G1: This character was on a winning team (the team received the positive outcome).

G2: This character was on a losing team (the team received the negative outcome).

Figure 1: Character Description Code Sheet (Cont.)

At the beginning of the code sheet is the program title, episode title, character code, and the genders and species of the Pokemon characters. These four basic categories helped the researcher identify the characters in “Pokemon” and minimized confusion. Genders and species may relate to the tendency of cooperation vs. disruption in “Pokemon”, even though they do not directly relate to the other two themes of Individualism vs. Collectivism and Winning vs. Losing. However, the depictions of gendered characteristics in “Pokemon” or “Men in Black” may be shaped differently based on different cultural perspectives.

The character code sheet was designed based on Likert scales. The Likert scales present each category systematically through five different answering options, such as highly willing, willing, neutral, reluctant, and very unwilling. In addition, in order to create a flexible selection, “not applicable” is added as an extra scale in each category. As Wimmer and Dominick state, “at the interval level, it is possible to develop scales for coders to use to rate certain attributes of characters or situations” (2000, p. 146). In addition, “scales such as these add depth and texture to a content analysis and are perhaps more interesting than the surface data obtained through nominal measurement” (p. 146).

Category C to category E on the code sheet focus on the cartoons’ tendencies toward individualism or collectivism. A written statement clearly defines each category.
The category C adopts “sacrifice” as one potential factor to measure the tendency toward individualism or collectivism. The collective ingroup more often sacrifice his or her personal goal for the team, in order to keep a harmony relationship with ingroups or to accomplish teamwork. Category D and E also were built according to the prior research findings of the cross-cultural studies. Based on Triandis, Bontempo, Villareal, Asai, and Lucca’s study on “Individualism and Collectivism: Cross-cultural Perspectives on Self-ingroup Relationship,” “sense of honor” and “reliance” were found to be two other major themes identifying how Japanese collectivism is different from American individualism. Collectivists are honored if their ingroups are honored by a certain achievement. “Reliance” is a factor to measure how an individual relies on or trusts his or her group member, especially when he or she is working in a team (1988, p.323-331).

Cooperation vs. disruption was be measured in category F. In category F, the measurement not only focused on the second research question, but it also functioned as an indicator to tell how the characters in “Pokemon” reacted to the ingroups during a team-based tasks. Therefore, category F could potentially find the correlation between the first and the second research questions.

The final category G straightforwardly tested for any positive relationship between a cooperative character and a successful outcome. It would be useful if the research could apply the category G as a key to examine the relationships among three research questions.

When the coders measured “Men in Black,” they used the same code sheets as with “Pokemon,” because it provided an equal chance for both shows to speak out for themselves through the cartoon characters. In addition, there is another self-designed
content code sheet that can help the coders generate the tendency of the three themes—individualism vs collectivism, cooperation vs disruption, and winning vs losing—based on the overall content of each episode in “Pokemon” and “Men in Black”. Here is a content code sheet (See Figure 2):

**Content Code Sheet**

*Program Title:*  
*Episode Title:*  

A. Which does the content of this episode emphasize more teamwork or individual work?  

Teamwork Emphasized: ___________  
Individuality Emphasized: ___________  

B. Which does the plot of this episode present the cooperation among Ash/ BIM team members or disruption among the team members?  
(Cooperation refers to aim at the common goal without oral or physical fighting within Ash/ BIM team members. Disruption refers to either aim at the common goal with oral or physical fighting within Ash/ BIM team members or without the common goal with oral or physical fighting within Ash/ BIM team members.)  

Figure 2: Content Code Sheet  
Highly Cooperative: ___________  
Highly Disruptive: ___________  

C. Is there a clear-cut winner between the “good guys” and the “bad guys”?  
Yes ( )  
No ( )  

D. According to the plot, who are the “good guys” in this episode? (Please check the following categories.)  

Ash's Team Members( )  
MIB Team Agents( )  
Team Rocket's Members( )  
Others Aliens of “Men in Black”( )  

E. Do the “good guys” win?  
Yes ( )  
No ( )  

F. According to the plot, who are the “bad guys” in this episode? (Please check the following categories.)  

Ash's Team Members( )  
MIB Team Agents( )  
Team Rocket's Members( )  
Others Aliens of “Men in Black”( )
G. Is the loser(s) punished?  
Yes ( ) No ( )
If so, what is the punishment? (Please summarize it within 1 to 2 sentences.)

H. Is the winner(s) rewarded?  
Yes ( ) No ( )
If so, how? (Please summarize it within 1 to 2 sentences)

I. How do the winner(s) achieve victory? 

By Teamwork : : : : : : By Individual Effort

J. What is the moral or the lesson of the story? (Please summarize it within 1 to 2 sentences)

Figure 2: Content Code Sheet (Cont.)

The beginning of the “Content Code Sheet” includes the program and the episode titles, to help the researcher divide “Pokemon” and “Men in Black” into two groups without confusion. In category A, the 5-point scale attempted to indicate how “Pokemon” or “Men in Black” structured the content toward teamwork or individual work in each episode. Category B focused on an overall performance of cooperation or disruption among Ash or MIB team members in each episode. In other words, it was hoped that category A and B could help to verify the general findings on individualism vs. collectivism and cooperation vs. disruption.

Category C through category K concentrated on identifying perspectives on winning and losing. Category J significantly related to all of three research questions by measuring how the winner achieved victory. Except category A, B, and J, which adopted
the Likert scale, the rest of the categories used close-ended and open-ended question formats. For instance, "Is there a clear-cut winner between the 'good guys' and the 'bad guys'?" is a straightforward "yes" or "no" question. "What is the moral or the lesson of the story?" should be an open-ended question, because there is no way to list all of the possible selections for the coders. The open-ended questions, which could be entered into SPSS package while summarizing the results, were reorganized and interpreted by the researcher from beginning to end in the study. However, the open-ended questions could help close-ended questions reveal more meaningful research results. Category D and E determined whether good guys won in each episode. "Content Code Sheet" could bring more clear-cut results than "Character Description Code Sheet" did in reviewing the overall tendency among the three major themes in the study. By contrast to "Content Code Sheet," "Character Description Code Sheet" suggested which type of character was likely to be emphasized in certain cultural themes of the show.

**Measurement and Training Coders**

The content analyses were done in the Audio Visual department of Hodges library at the University of Tennessee. In order to enhance the quality of measurement, the two code assistants were be given "Character Code Sheet Instruction" (Appendix 1), a two-hour training section to learn how to work efficiently and accurately in every coding step. In addition, there was a sample episode of "Pokemon" and "Men in Black" on which the two coding assistants could practice their coding skills. In a formal coding process, three coders watched the "Pokemon" and "Men in Black" series together but coded the characters and content individually. The whole coding process took at least thirty to forty hours of coding, each coder, including me, spent hours per day on samples.
Analyzing Data

The coding data was entered and calculated on the nominal and ratio measurement levels by the SPSS (the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) computer program. “Frequency” and “Correlation” were be used to calculate the tendencies of the data. In *Mass Media Research*, it is pointed out that “descriptive statistics are intended to reduce data sets to allow for easier interpretation.... These statistical methods allow researchers to take random data and organize them into some type of ordered fashion” (p. 233). In other words, SPSS may organize the research data efficiently and systematically but cannot interpret the research; that has to be done by the researchers. Furthermore, as Wimmer and Dominick state, “researchers analyzing television program preferences or newspaper circulation are probably concerned only with discovering general indications, not with gathering data for statistical testing. However, research questions can be tested for statistical significance” (p. 255).

Researchers may question why “Pokemon” was conducted based on research questions instead of hypotheses at the beginning. Hypotheses can be well constructed and supported by the previous research if the research subject has been well discussed in its field. When the results of the “Pokemon” and “Men in Black” study are compared, the null hypotheses were specifically addressed:

1. There was no statistically significant difference of teamwork-emphasized content between “Pokemon” and “Men in Black.”
2. There was no statistically significant difference between the MIB cooperative performance and Ash team members’.
3. There was no statistically significant difference between how the winners achieve victory by teamwork in “Pokemon” and “Men in Black.”
When the research data were completely recorded by the coders, the data were input into SPSS by the order of sampling numbers. Each category on the code sheet was assigned different codes systematically (Appendix 2). Finally, each category, comprised of closed-ended questions on "Character Description Code Sheet" and "Content Code Sheet" was represented in the term "percentage of frequency." On the "Character Description Code Sheet," category G was an important variable for measuring the correlation among B, C, D, E, and F separately. The interval level was .05 (significant level < .05) in the study. In Mass Media Research, it is stated that, "Numerical expressions of the degree to which two variables change in relation to each other are called measures of association, or correlation" (p. 279). The degree of relationship between two variables was tested under the Pearson of SPSS (significant level < .01). In addition, each open-ended response on the "Content Code Sheet" was summarized and presented in a text summary.

Furthermore, the t-test of SPSS was used to examine whether there was a significant cultural difference between the characters and the content of "Pokemon" and "Men in Black." The content of "Pokemon" and "Men in Black" was tested at the .05 level significance, and a two-tailed t-test will be applied. Why should the content conduct under a two-tailed test? Because based on the statements of the null hypotheses in this study, there could be more than one possibly statistical answer. The statistical results may imply that the content of "Pokemon" was no statistically different from the content of "Men in Black." Or, the content of "Men in Black" was no statistically different from the content of "Pokemon." In addition, the test results may indicate the
content of “Pokemon” was statistically different from the content of “Men in Black,” or the content of “Men in Black” was statistically different from the content of “Pokemon.” When a one-tailed test or a two-tailed test should be used in the study, the decision was depended on how the null hypotheses were addressed. In this case, the null hypotheses were addressed “there was no statistically significant difference of teamwork-emphasized content between ‘Pokemon’ and ‘Men in Black,’” “there was no statistically significant difference between the MIB cooperative performance and Ash team members,” and “there was not statistically significant difference between how the winners achieve victory by teamwork in ‘Pokemon’ and ‘Men in Black.’” Therefore, a two-tailed test was used in the study.
Chapter 4
Research Results

Based on the research results itemized according to the "Character Description Code Sheet" and the "Content Code Sheet," each category binding to my three research questions were represented in this chapter in terms of percentage of frequency. The three coders used 210 Character Description Code Sheets when coding the seven main characters in the ten different episodes of "Pokemon." One hundred twenty (120) Character Description Code Sheets were used in coding the four major characters in the ten episodes of "Men in Black." There were a total 330 Character Description Code Sheets and 60 Content Code Sheets used in coding the content, analyzing the data, and calculating the reliability of the study.

Collectivism vs. Individualism

Category A on the Content Code Sheets, "collectivism vs. individualism" of the first research question, was first examined. The following results describe how the content of "Pokemon" and "Men in Black" tended to emphasize teamwork or individuality under the 5 point Likert scale test (Table 2). As shown in Table 2, "Pokemon" emphasizes teamwork more than individualism in its content, and "Men in Black" presents a teamwork-emphasized content that is even slightly higher than the content of "Pokemon." However, the distribution pattern of the teamwork-emphasized content of "Pokemon" is different from "Men in Black." According to the coding results on the content coding sheets, "Pokemon" is likely to present its themes through teamwork highly emphasized content. In "Men in Black," the content contributed to teamwork more than highly teamwork-emphasized content on the Likert scale. For instance, 33.3%
Table 2

Teamwork or Individuality Content (Category A) of “Pokemon” & “Men in Black”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Description</th>
<th>Pokemon (%)</th>
<th>Men in Black(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highly Individual</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuality Emphasized</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Individuality Nor Teamwork Emphasized</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teamwork Emphasized</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teamwork Highly Emphasized</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

of overall performance in “Pokemon” was teamwork highly emphasized, but, only 13.3 % of overall performance was teamwork-emphasized. In compare to “Pokemon,” 36.7 % of overall performance in “Men in Black” was teamwork-emphasized, 26.7 % of overall performance was teamwork highly emphasized. Interestingly, there is a similar distribution pattern on the category I (Table 3) that victory is achieved in “Pokemon” predominantly through teamwork; other types of effort are not acknowledged or attempted as often as those in “Men in Black.” In the study, the winners of “Men in Black” achieve their victory through teamwork after attempting other types of efforts on the Likert scale.

The research result of category A and I on the content code sheets indicated only that “Pokemon” and “Men in Black” both contained more teamwork content than individuality-emphasized content. However, measuring teamwork that could be counted as one of the traditional concepts of collectivism may not be precise enough to conclude
Table 3

Teamwork or Individual Effort of Victory (Category D) of “Pokemon” & “Men in Black”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Description</th>
<th>Title Pokemon (%)</th>
<th>Title Men in Black (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highly Individual Effort</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Effort</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>6.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Individual nor Teamwork Effort</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teamwork Effort</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly Teamwork Effort</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

how “Pokemon” presented collectivism rather than individualism compared to “MIB.” It might be necessary in future research to pay attention to certain cultural cues of the cartoon characters, such as sacrificing for ingroups, taking pride in team members, and trusting ingroups through difficulties.

According to the coding results (category C) on character description code sheets, the three coders indicated that 67.6% of the seven main characters’ actions in the ten “Pokemon” episodes did not provide enough evidence for the coders to judge how sacrifice was used in the show. In other words, 142 out of 210 input data in category C refer to non-applicable content, while in “Men in Black,” 46.7% of the four major characters’ overall performance was not applicable to sacrifice. However, it would be too soon to judge that “Pokemon” attempted to present individualism or collectivism based on the lack of a sacrifice theme because one cultural element could not present the entire face of collectivism or individualism. Based on the applicable content of sacrifice
in “Pokemon,” 14.3% of the seven main characters’ actions were sacrificial and 26.1% of their actions could be described as highly self-sacrificing. In contrast to “Pokemon,” 29.6% of the major characters’ actions in “Men in Black” were self-sacrificing, and an average of 45.4% of their actions were highly self-sacrificing. It would not be difficult to see an obvious gap between presenting self-sacrificing actions between “Pokemon” and “Men in Black.” “Men in Black” put more energy than “Pokemon” in depicting how ingroups sacrifice their own desires and lives in trying to defeat enemies or reach group-oriented goals. The content of “Pokemon” emphasized self-sacrifice less than “Men in Black” did.

Are the ingroups of “Pokemon” proud of their team members? According to the research results of category D on the character description code sheets, 33.8% of the seven main characters’ actions in “Pokemon” and 42.5% of the four major characters’ overall actions in “Men in Black” were non-applicable. (In other words, 66.2% of the seven main characters’ actions in “Pokemon” and 57.5% of the four main characters’ actions in “Men in Black” were applicable). While only counting the applicable performance of pride in “Pokemon,” the coders concluded that 33.8% of the seven main characters’ actions were highly proud of their teams, 25.2% of their actions were proud of their teams, and 19.5% of their actions were neither proud of their teams nor not proud of their teams. In comparison with “Pokemon,” the average segment of “Men in Black” also reached 29% on “highly proud of team” category and 30% on “proud of team” category. The above frequency suggests that the ingroup team members of “Pokemon” and “Men in Black” had a “proud of team” philosophy. Although most ingroups in “Pokemon” or “Men in Black” tended to be proud of their teams, however,
there were still some differences between the characters’ motivations. For instance, “Pokemon” contains two major teams (Ash’s team & Team Rocket) that play different roles in the show. Ash’s team usually achieved victories in the show, and Team Rocket did not; if the team members were on the losing side, they were less likely to be proud of their team. The frequencies of the term of percentage, 33.8% (highly proud of team) and 25.2% (proud of team) represent both Ash’s team and Team Rocket as an entire unit, so it is necessary to examine the difference between Ash’s team members and Team Rocket members (Table 4).

The data on Table 4 allows us to see how an individual team member contributes to the pride tendency. Ash, Brock, Misty, and Pikachu have a high tendency to be proud of their team. However, James, Jessy and Meowth are less likely to be proud of their team in the show. Meowth and Pikachu are an especially evident contrast: 85.8% of Pikachu’s actions in the show indicate that it was likely to be proud of its team. But nearly 79% of Meowth’s actions imply that it was not likely to be proud of its team. Moreover, Ash’s team never indicated in the study that they were not proud of their team. In comparison with Ash’s team members, the four main agents of MIB team had certain similar attitudes in the show. Although MIB team members also behaved as if they were proud of their team, the tendency for ingroups to be proud of their team in “Men in Black” is less frequent than the tendency of Ash’s team members in “Pokemon” (Table 4).
Table 4  
*Proud of Team Tendency (Category D) among Ingroups in “Pokemon”*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Description</th>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Ash’s Team</th>
<th>Team Rocket</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highly Proud of Team</td>
<td>Ash</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brock</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Misty</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pikachu</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>James</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jessy</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meowth</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proud of Team</td>
<td>Ash</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brock</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Misty</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pikachu</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>James</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jessy</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meowth</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Proud of Team</td>
<td>Ash</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nor not Proud of Team</td>
<td>Brock</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Misty</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pikachu</td>
<td>9.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>James</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jessy</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meowth</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Not Proud of Team</td>
<td>Ash</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brock</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Misty</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pikachu</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>James</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jessy</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meowth</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Proud of Team</td>
<td>Ash</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brock</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Misty</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pikachu</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>James</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jessy</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meowth</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5

Summary Tendency of Pride between MIB and Ash's Ingroups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character</th>
<th>MIB Team (%)</th>
<th>Ash's Team (%)</th>
<th>Highly Proud of Team (%)</th>
<th>Proud of Team (%)= Sum (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jay</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elle</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zed</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>85.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ash</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>77.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brock</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>79.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misty</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>79.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pikachu</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>85.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Did the Pokemon characters trust their ingroups when their teams were going through conflict? Did the Pokemon characters develop their interpersonal relationships within their group through trust? If the character appeared to trust or rely on his or her ingroups in a group-oriented task, he or she could be considered to have a collective attitude. Based on the summary frequency described in category E on the character description code sheets, 20.5% of the seven main characters' actions in "Pokemon" and 23.3% of four major characters' actions in "Men in Black" were non-applicable to evaluate the tendency of trust. There was still a large amount of content in "Pokemon" and "Men in Black" that could be used in the study. In other words, trust in team members could be a significant value that was in both cartoon shows. According to applicable content, the characters of "Men in Black" exhibited a more frequent trust within groups than those in "Pokemon" (76% of the four main characters' actions in "Men in Black" indicated that they were likely to trust their ingroups). By contrast, only 58% of the seven main characters' overall actions in "Pokemon" indicated that they were
likely to trust their ingroups.) Conversely, 14.8% of the seven main characters’ overall actions in “Pokemon” fell into “unwilling to trust their ingroups” category, and even 3.3% of their performances was identified as “very unwilling to trust their ingroups” in the show. In “Men in Black,” only 5% and 2.5% of the four main characters’ performance were recognized as “unwilling to trust their ingroups” and “very unwilling to trust their ingroups,” respectively. However, if the data in category E were analyzed only according to the overall performance of Ash’s team, there would not be a significant gap between the performances of “Pokemon” and “Men in Black” (Table 6). Just as Team Rocket was less likely to take pride in team members, Team Rocket was also less likely to trust team members, which decreased “Pokemon” average frequency of the trust tendency.

Significantly, Team Rocket members are supposed to be villains in the show. In contrast to the ingroups of Team Rocket, both Ash’s and MIB ingroups were very likely to trust a team-oriented decision.

Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Highly Willing to Trust (%)</th>
<th>Willing to Trust (%) = Sum (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Ash’s Team</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ash</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brock</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misty</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pikachu</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>8.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>MIB Team</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elle</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zed</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The ingroups of Ash's team or MIB team will do what the team is supposed to do in a team-oriented task, but the ingroups of Team Rocket tended to doubt and to complain about what they were going to do in team-oriented tasks.

Based on the coding data of the category A and I on the content code sheets, I concluded that both "Men in Black" and "Pokemon" were likely to present the teamwork as valuable rather than the individual achievement. Although "Pokemon" presented more teamwork than individuality-emphasized content, 33.3% of the content in the ten "Pokemon" episodes indicated was "neither close to teamwork-emphasized nor individuality emphasized content." In order to decide whether there is a statistically significant difference between "Pokemon" and "Men in Black" on the category A and I, t-test (Paired Samples Statistics) of SPSS was used in analyzing data. A 95% confidence level was applied in the test. Based on the basic understanding of coding results, the null hypothesis could be addressed logically as "there is no statistically significant difference of teamwork-emphasized content between "Pokemon" and "Men in Black." According to the analyzing results on t-test, there was no significant difference of teamwork-emphasized content between "Pokemon" and "Men in Black" (sig. two-tailed = 0.528 > p = 0.05). In addition, there was no statistically significant difference between how the winners achieved victory by teamwork (category I) in "Pokemon" and "Men in Black" (sig. two-tailed = 0.506 > p = 0.05).

Furthermore, according to the data analyses of category C, D, & E on the character description code sheet, Ash's team members frequently exhibited tendencies to be "proud of their team" and to "trust their ingroups in a group-oriented task." By contrast, "Team Rocket," portrayed just the opposite image of Ash's team, especially
when the ingroup characters attempted to accomplish their group-oriented task. In comparison to Ash’s team members, MIB team members also presented certain aspects of collectivism, such as tendencies to be “proud of their team,” to “trust their ingroups,” or even to “sacrifice their lives for their ingroups.” In “Pokemon,” the content presented more collective behavior than individualistic behavior through Ash’s team members, but Team Rocket members tended to be more individualistic than collective in a goal-oriented teamwork. When comparing “Men in Black” with “Pokemon,” there is no significant difference between MIB team members and Ash’s team members, who are more likely to present a collective philosophy and goal-oriented teamwork.

Cooperation vs. Disruption

In order to determine whether the characters in “Pokemon” act tended to cooperatively or disruptively when face with conflict, the coding data of category B on the content code sheets (n= 60) was examined as a primary source. According to the coding results of category B, 53.3% of the plots in “Pokemon” highly emphasized cooperation among Ash’s team members, and 23.3% of the plots emphasized moderate cooperation among Ash’s team members. Surprisingly, only 6.7% of the plots concerning Ash’s team members fell into the “disruptive-emphasized” content, and no plots among Ash’s team members in “Pokemon” exhibited highly disruptive-emphasized content. MIB team members also tended to be cooperative rather than disruptive in the show, but Ash’s team members were more cooperative than MIB team members were when faced with conflict (Figure 3).
The above coding results of category B (on the content code sheet) do not include the responses for the actions of Team Rocket in “Pokemon.” For coding results on Team Rocket, it is necessary to look at the coding data of the category F on the character description code sheets, which included not only the performance of Team Rocket but also provided the details about how each character acted during team-based cooperation. According to coding results of the category F, James, Jessy, and Meowth tended to act neutral (but slightly close to disruptive) on the Likert scale. In “Pokemon,” Pikachu was evaluated as an extremely cooperative team member: 79.3% of its performance fell into “highly cooperative” category, and 20.7% of its performance was identified as “cooperative.” By contrast to Pikachu, only 6.9% of Meowth’s performance was judged as “high cooperative.” In other words, all of the coders in the study agreed that the
mouse-like Pikachu was highly cooperative compared to the cat-like Meowth in the
show.

After reaching a basic understanding of “Pokemon” from the coding results, then
the simple null hypothesis may be addressed as “there was no statistically significant
difference between the MIB cooperative performance and Ash team members’. If MIB
team members and Ash’s team members both acted cooperatively in the shows, was there
a significant difference between these two coding data? Based on the t-test (Paired
Samples Statistics) results on category B, there is no statistically significant difference
between the MIB team members’ cooperative performance and the Ash team members’
(sig. two-tailed = 0.155 > p = 0.05).

Winning vs. Losing
Before evaluating what the main Pokemon characters’ actions suggested about their
perspectives on winning and losing, it is important for us to know who the “good guys”
and “bad guys” are in “Pokemon.” Based on the coding results of category D (on the
content coding sheets), all of the plots indicated that Ash’s team members are portrayed
as “good” and Team Rocket members are supposed to be “villains” in the ten randomly
selected episodes. However, in one episode Team Rocket changed its behavior pattern at
the end of the episode. For instance, in most cases Team Rocket usually loved to steal
others’ Pokemon for illegal profit. But at the end of this particular episode, Team Rocket
tried to run its own business and earn their incomes in a legal way. In other words, Team
Rocket was not extremely “bad.”

By asking “do the ‘good guys’ win at the end of the episode?” (category E) on the
content coding sheet, nine out of the ten episodes presented that good guys won at the
end of the shows. One of the ten episodes created certain content conflict for the coders to judge whether Ash's team received victory at the end of the show. For instance, a Pokemon trainer defeated Ash in the Pokemon competition, so Ash should be a loser in the show. However, Ash successfully broke Team Rocket's evil plan, and saved himself from the dirty trap. Even though Ash lost in the Pokemon battle, he still could be a winner in a problem-solving process.

Because of certain content conflicts such as these in the two "Pokemon episodes," 20% of the plots suggested that there was not a clear-cut winner between the "good guys" and the "bad guys." However, in "Men in Black," MIB agents who had to eliminate harmful aliens (monsters) from the outer space were consistently recognized as "good guys," so the coders had no difficulty figuring out that MIB teams always win at the end of each episode. In other words, there was no exception for the outcome in each episode. By contrast to "Pokemon," 100% of the plots in "Men in Black" presented a clear-cut winner between the "good guys" and the "bad guys." Even though 20% of the plots in "Pokemon" were a small portion in the study, the exception broke the traditional preconception on how the good guys were supposed to receive victory at the end of the show.

Were the losers punished? All of the losers in "Men in Black" were punished at the end of show, yet, 20% of the plots in "Pokemon" suggested that the losers were not punished. Furthermore, the nature of the punishment in both shows was a vital key understanding how the show is perspective on winning and losing. For example, in five out of ten "Men in Black" episodes losers were killed or destroyed at the end of the
show. The bad guys apparently deserved the punishment of death, usually by explosion or shooting.

The remaining five “Men in Black” episodes presented the justice and the punishment in a milder ways, such as arrest by MIB team, detainment in the MIB jail, or entrapment under ice. The MIB team played a role equivalent to police officers when chasing the harmful aliens in the show. By contrast to “Men in Black,” the bad guys in the ten “Pokemon” episodes never suffered the penalties of death or imprisonment. Punishments in “Pokemon” included: having a carbon-blacked faced in an explosion, being punched or shocked by Pokemon; being stuck in the ocean or underground; or being blasted off to the sky. Although the bad guys in “Pokemon” suffered different physical or mental damages, the story never required their lives as a type of compensation. For instance, six out of the ten “Pokemon” episodes in the study used “blasted off in the sky” as an ending punishment for Team Rocket members. Essentially, no matter what types of roles the Pokemon characters were supposed to be—heroes, thefts, or pokemon monsters—there was no penalty of death in these ten randomly selected “Pokemon” episodes.

Are the winners rewarded? Based on the coding results of category H, 63% of the plots in this study indicated that winners received rewards in “Pokemon,” while 36.7% of the plots did not. In comparison with “Pokemon,” half of the “Men in Black” plots presented winners who received rewards. Most of the rewards were non-monetary. In “Pokemon,” the rewards could be described simply as the following: (1) solidification of team members; (2) solidification of friendship; (3) new knowledge of Pokemon; (4) addition of new friends, (5) addition of new Pokemon; (6) satisfaction of helping others;
(7) receiving honor from competitions. In “Men in Black,” the rewards were identified as: (1) glorious victory over aliens; (2) solidification of partnerships; (3) solidification of parental relationships, (4) satisfaction of saving others’ lives; (5) MIB members’ respect, (6) protection under truths and justice. In the study, both “Pokemon” and “Men in Black” presented mental rewards rather than real monetary rewards into the show. The rewards were not only deeply associated with the spiritual faith of human beings, but they also related to parts of the moral lessons in the story.

If there was a moral theme in “Pokemon,” what was the lesson of the story? Based on the category J on the content code sheet, moral lessons were the most controversial and critical questions that the coders had to judge. The content of the ten “Pokemon” episodes (Table 7) emphasized trust and teamwork as moral ways to achieve goals. In addition, helping others (outside of them) with a goodwill was an admirable virtue in the show. Similarly, “Men in Black” also pointed out how trust can help people build a better partnership through teamwork (Table 8). However, unlike “Pokemon” in the study, “Men in Black” not only focused on a friend-like or a pet-and-owner relationship but also covered certain conflicts (or anxieties) concerning parental, romantic, or subordinate-and-supervisor relationships. Therefore, the conflict in the ten “Men in Black” episodes in the study were more complex and more difficult for the coders to make quick decisions regarding moral themes.

The moral or lesson of “Pokemon” emphasized helping other people and building a trusting relationship with ingroup teammates and Pocket monsters, both important themes in the show. Importantly, when “Pokemon” characters presented their perspectives on winning and losing in a “Pokemon” competition, the good guys tended to
Table 7

The Moral of Ten "Pokemon Episodes"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample No.</th>
<th>Episode's Title</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>The Flame Pokemonathon</td>
<td>Trust is highly effective in teamwork Perseverance is a great virtue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Attack of Prehistoric Pokemon</td>
<td>Do not disturb the prehistoric creatures. Keep nature peaceful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>The Evolution Solution</td>
<td>There is no obvious moral lesson. However, appearances can be deceiving.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>A Friend in Deed</td>
<td>The beautiful faiths of Friendship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Friend and Foe Alike</td>
<td>Friendship can endure opposition. Trust is more important than winning or losing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>A Chansey Operation</td>
<td>Being grateful for what others do for you when you need help. In addition, a doctor's duty is to treat patients, not to judge the differences between good and bad men.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Beach Blank-Out Blastoise</td>
<td>Teamwork can defeat foes. Helping others with a goodwill make you cheerful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>The Song of Jigglypuff</td>
<td>Everyone needs a good rest In addition, helping others with a goodwill is such a wonderful thing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>All Fired Up</td>
<td>Gaining courage is important. Any honor is more valuable than the actual reward You should always be satisfied with your personal best on or off the team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>The Fourth Round Rumble</td>
<td>Be confident, believe in your ability.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8

The Moral of Ten “Men in Black” Episodes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title (or Aired Dates on WB’s Kid Channel)</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Irritable Bow-Wow Syndrome</td>
<td>Learn to understand and to trust your teammates through teamwork. In addition, telling the truth will solve many troubles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Neuralyzer Syndrome</td>
<td>Things are not always what they seem. No one can forget or change one’s past. Parental relationships are like a treasure for us.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Elle of My Dream Syndrome</td>
<td>Trusting teammates &amp; sacrificing oneself to save others are important themes. Your enemy may be closer than your friend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Alpha Syndrome</td>
<td>Opening up your heart to your teammate is an important lesson. Justice always stands for the truth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Inanimate Syndrome</td>
<td>Sometimes, work is more important than personal life. However, it is hard to make choices among work, love &amp; friendship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Bye-Bye Worm Syndrome</td>
<td>Believe your friends and search carefully for the truth. Justice should always protect goodness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Out to Pasture Syndrome</td>
<td>Do not underestimate the power of newcomers. The worst punishment is not death.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Sardines and Ice Cream Syndrome</td>
<td>Motherhood is something to be cherished. But being a mother is not an easy thing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Lost Continent Syndrome</td>
<td>Do not be afraid to try new things. Everyone needs to learn how to communicate with others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Cold Sweat Syndrome</td>
<td>Teamwork is important for achieving a task. Kindness brings good luck.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: These 10 samples were convenient samples.
treat their competitions as an honorable game. The good competitors in the show cared about the results of winning or losing, but they also appeared to care more about how to be true winners in their competition. In the study, neither the honorable Pokemon competitors nor dishonest ones attempted to kill or destroy their opponents or opponents' pet-like Pocket monsters. In other words, the outcome of "winning and losing" was never associated with death in these ten episodes. The show allowed the good guys to be losers accidentally, and the bad guys sometimes chose to be good. "Pokemon" pointed out that "winning and losing" is not a black-and-white theme; there was always a gray area.

In "Men in Black," the moral or the lesson behind the mission was complicated because the characters were adults whose world was portrayed as having more conflict than a child's world. However, it was not difficult for the coders to indicate that teamwork, cooperation, and saving human beings from the harmful aliens were two major frames in the show. The MIB agents of the show had to be winners if they want to survive in a task. "Winning and losing" tended to be a clear-cut outcome, because the losers frequently died, and winners were always survivors. It was inevitable that they would encounter death scenes because the MIB agents' roles were similar to police officers. The story did not allow the good guys on a loser's team, because the good guys represented a form of the justice. Finally, according to the testing results under Pearson Correlation, several statistically correlations exist between "Pokemon" and "Men in Black" among the categories A, B, & I on the content code sheet. When the coding data (n=30) of "Pokemon" or "Men in Black" were tested individually under Pearson
Correlation (Sig. 2-tailed) at the 0.01 level, there was a correlation between “the teamwork emphasized content tendency” (category A) and “the cooperative plots among Ash’s team members and MIB members” (category B). In addition, as the coding results showed, “how the winners achieved victory by teamwork or individual effort” (category I) also had a positive correlation with “the teamwork emphasized content tendency” (category A) and “the cooperative plots among Ash’s team members/ MIB members.”

The above correlation may only suggest that the teamwork tendency, the cooperative acts of the good guys, and the outcomes of the winners related to each other in “Pokemon” or “Men in Black” as a whole.

**Intercoder Reliability**

The agreements and the number of coding decisions of intercoder reliability in this study were counted based on the unit of each episode. In “Pokemon,” there were a total of 59 coding decisions in each episode: 49 coding decisions were on the character description code sheet and 10 were on the content code sheet. In “Men in Black,” a total of 38 coding decisions were included in each episode. 28 coding decisions were on the character description code sheet and 10 were on the content code sheet. After calculating the reliability of each episode in “Pokemon” and “Men in Black,” there should be ten different reliability numbers in terms of percentage in “Pokemon” and ten in “Men in Black” (Appendix 3). The three coders reached an average of 73.6 % agreement in 590 coding decisions in the ten “Pokemon” episodes but only reached an average of 68.4 % agreement in 380 coding decisions in the ten “Men in Black” episodes. The average intercoder reliability in this study reached 71 %, and the number was still lower than what most researchers expect to see in their studies. The measurement scale in the study was
one of the major factors that caused the average intercoder reliability to reach just ever the standard of value 70 % because both the character description code sheet and the content code sheet were designed based on the 5-point Likert scale. The 5-point Likert scale could help the coders present what they viewed in detail, but it could not standardize the coders' feelings, emotions, and values through the scale. In addition, the main advantage of the 5-point Likert scale was measurement flexibility, and the measurement would not force the coders to evaluate the content through black-and-white sights. In order to present the true responses of the content through the coders' eyes, it would be reasonable to receive the average 71 % reliability rate in the study.

According to the first research question (in comparison to “Men in Black,” do the ingroup cartoon characters of “Pokemon” present collectivism more often than individualism in goal-oriented tasks?), some ingroup characters of “Pokemon” (Ash, Brock, Misty, and Pikachu) presented collectivism more often than individualism. In “Men in Black,” the main ingroup characters also presented collectivism more often than individualism. Based on the research question (in comparison to “Men in Black,” do characters in “Pokemon” act cooperatively or disruptively when they faced with conflict?), Ash's ingroup team members act cooperatively when they faced with conflict. However, Team Rocket ingroup members tended to act disruptively rather than cooperatively. Moreover, by asking “in comparison to ‘Men in Black,’ what do the performances of the main ‘Pokemon’ characters suggest about their perspectives on winning and losing?”, the performance of the main “Pokemon” characters suggested that nobody could be the eternal winner or loser in every trial, and the “good guys” in the study were not always winners in every competition.
As several psychologists have observed, “Pokemon” presented its teamwork philosophy through its team-based characters. The seven main Pokemon characters (Ash, Brock, Misty, Pikachu, James, Jessy, & Meowth) all were involved in certain group-oriented tasks, but the qualities and the functions of their existences were quite different in the show.

**Collectivism vs. Individualism**

Guzley, Araki & Chalmers (1998) summarized what commitment means to the Japanese as “the sense of commitment as a relationship phenomenon as opposed to an individual phenomenon” and also “a sense of membership or belonging” (p. 12). Although these cartoon characters are not real human beings, in this study Ash, Brock, Misty, and Pikachu generally reflected a highly interdependent partnership, especially when the ingroups faced a common difficulty or suffered a great danger. Interdependent partnerships here refer to the ingroup team members reliance on each other—physically and emotionally—through the teamwork.

Based on the generalized coding results in the study, teamwork in “Pokemon” tended to manifest as in a spiritual form of trust and a group-oriented pride. But “sacrifice” was not evident as heavily as other themes in these ten randomly selected episodes. As the coding results indicated, most content did not release enough clues for the coders to make a reasonable judgment about the willingness of these seven main Pokemon characters to sacrifice themselves for their team. In comparison to “Pokemon,” “Men in Black” presented a clear image of sacrifice, and generally the main characters
were highly willing to be self-sacrificial in group goal-oriented tasks. In this study, sacrifice has a potential to indicate the characters’ behavior toward individualism or collectivism, because the Japanese usually will sacrifice or subordinate their personal values or desires for their teams. But “sacrifice” was critical yet inconvenient for measuring the tendency toward collectivism or individualism.

Although “sacrifice” in the study was defined as a type of voluntary behavior for the team, the coding results were unable to distinguish what types of motives could be called “sacrificial.” In collective culture “sacrifice” may be part of a sense of duty under its social norm. However, in an individualistic culture, people may also “sacrifice” their personal values for different reasons, such as deep friendships or love with ingroup members. Based on the coding results in the study, “willingness to sacrifice” was too difficult for the researcher to conclude from the characters’ actions toward collectivism or individualism. However, the results showed that the characters had more sacrificial actions in “Men in Black” than in “Pokemon.”

James, Jessy, and Meowth tended to develop an independent rather than an interdependent relationship through teamwork. “Independent relationships” here refer to the ingroup members ease in thinking about “themselves” rather than relying on “other ingroups” during their conflict. As Triandis, Bontempo, Villareal, Asai, & Lucca (1989) stated, “when ingroup and individual are in conflict there is a general trend for subjects in individualistic cultures to anticipate that people will do their own thing rather than what is expected by the ingroup, and the perceived cause of that behavior is hedonism” (p.331). In addition, their selfish personalities and stealing made Team Rocket compare negatively to Ash’s team, so the existence of Team Rocket in the show may be used as an
example of a lower standard of teamwork. Team Rocket's actions indicated a lower
tendency to trust and to be proud of their team, which is all reflected on the character
description code sheet.

On the content code sheet, the coding results of the study indicated that the
content of “Pokemon” tended to emphasize teamwork rather than individuality. In
addition, as the coding results suggested that the winners in “Pokemon” achieved victory
by teamwork rather than individuality. If teamwork is seen as a unique characteristic of
collectivism that cannot be found in any individualistic culture, then the researcher can
use “teamwork” to represent or explain the tendency of collectivism. Yet teamwork may
not only belong to Japanese society; it may also exist in the United States. For instance,
Ford Company and some corporations encourage their employees to work together as a
team. When the firefighters try to save people’s lives, they cooperate as a team.
Therefore, even though the Japanese greatly emphasize the value of teamwork in their
society, there are still some teamwork-emphasized phenomena that can be observed in
the United States. In other words, “teamwork” alone cannot explain the specific
differences among the ingroups’ tendencies toward collectivism or individualism. The
image of teamwork strongly relates to collectivism, but is not necessary equivalent to
collectivism. The researcher needs to evaluate what characteristics are covered under this
umbrella.

Why is “teamwork” a traditional image used to represent Japanese culture? Even
though teamwork may exist in any culture, the potential of its characteristics and qualities
may be different from one culture to another. The potential characteristics and qualities
of teamwork are vital keys to discover what is so-called Japanese collectivism or
American individualism. The study would be more appropriate to exhibit the tendency of teamwork toward collectivism or individualism through the “potential characteristics” among ingroups’ relationships. Ash, Brock, Misty, and Pikachu were evaluated as collective rather than individualistic in “Pokemon,” when these characters frequently exhibited certain culture characteristics—highly trusting their ingroup team members and being proud of their ingroups—that were discussed by some cross-cultural researchers (Triandis, Bontempo, Villareal, Asai, & Lucca). In this study, Ash, Brock, Misty, and Pikachu usually cared about and thought of each other, and they created an interdependent relationship among team members in conflict. As most researchers (Triandis, Johnson, Ting-Toomey, Markus, et al.) agreed, the “interdependent self” has usually been found in the collective culture; the “independent self” is more often seen in the individualistic culture. From this point of view, Ash, Brock, Misty, and Pikachu met the certain standards of collectivism based on their ingroups’ relationship.

In comparison to James, Jessy, and Meowth’s actions, Ash, Brock, Misty, and Pikachu presented collectivism more often than individualism in goal-oriented tasks. At the microlevel, Ash, Brock, Misty, and Pikachu acted collectively more often than individually. When the Pokemon characters’ actions related to “trust” or being “proud of team” were compared to the same traits of characters’ actions in “Men in Black,” there was no statistically significant gap on frequency between the Pokemon characters’ and MIB characters’ actions. In addition, there is no statistically significant difference in teamwork-emphasized content between “Pokemon” and “Men in Black,” so at the macrolevel Pokemon characters did not present collectivism more often than “Men in Black” did. (The characters of “Pokemon” and “Men in Black” both presented
tendencies to be collective rather than individualistic.) However, this finding did not necessary mean that American-made cartoons shared similar cultural perspectives with Japanese produced cartoons, or that Japanese collectivism has invaded the American society. The study result may break people’s pre-conceptions about the Japanese produced adventure-action cartoon, “Pokemon,” and its Japanese cultural theme “collectivism.” By answering the first research question, the study may help people to consider that the content of cartoons may have a potential to cross cultural borders if the different cultural perspectives can be found and accepted in another culture.

**Cooperation vs. Disruption**

As the coding results showed, both the characters in “Pokemon” and in “Men in Black” tended to act cooperatively rather than disruptively in teamwork, (but the cooperative tendency among MIB ingroups were still a little below the tendency among Ash’s ingroups.) Statistically, there was no significant difference on cooperation between the characters of Ash’s team and the characters of MIB team. When comparing Ash’s team members to Team Rocket, Ash, Brock, Misty, and Pikachu tended to act cooperatively rather than disruptively when faced with conflict. As Guzley, Araki, and Chalmers (1998) pointed out, “the theme of cooperation revolves around the notion of helping one another and indicates cooperation as a commitment behavior. In other words, cooperation maintains the ingroup relationship and thus the commitment” (p.13). In addition, the researchers also suggested that “cooperation” is an important conceptualization of commitment which emerged as part of Japanese collectivism.

If “cooperation” was an important element to maintain the characters’ ingroup relationship in “Men in Black” or “Pokemon,” how the ingroups’ relationship portrayed
cooperation in the show was worth discussing. As the results showed, the main
characters of “Pokemon” or “Men in Black” who tended to trust their ingroups also acted
cooperatively. For instance, Pikachu was the most cooperative character in the ten
“Pokemon” episodes and was also most likely to trust its ingroups in conflict; conversely,
Meowth acted disruptively and was less likely to trust its ingroups in samples. In ten
“Men in Black” episodes, Zed was less willing to trust his ingroups in conflict comparing
to his ingroups, Jay, Kay and Elle. Meanwhile, Zed was evaluated as less cooperative
than his ingroups were in the study. Significantly, “cooperation” not only may maintain
the characters’ relationships in the show, but also turn an independent relationship into an
interdependent relationship.

Some people may perceive “cooperation” as a positive behavior and “disruption”
as a negative behavior because they may think that “disruption” brings disharmony.
“Cooperation” and “disruption” themselves do not suggest any moral theme, but they
may suggest something when they are evaluated under specific content in the show. In
the ten “Pokemon” episodes, Ash’s team members (Ash, Brock, Misty, & Pikachu) were
identified as “good guys” who tended to act cooperatively among team members when
faced with conflict.

By contrast, Team Rocket members (James, Jessy, & Meowth) usually were
identified as “bad guys” in the study, and they were likely to be disruptive among team
members when faced with conflict. In comparison, the characters of “Pokemon,” and the
agents Jay, Kay, Elle, and Zed in “Men in Black” were also identified as “good guys”
who tended to cooperate with each other rather than to be disruptive when faced with
conflict. Did the content of “Pokemon” and “Men in Black” suggest that “good guys”
were cooperative ingroup team members rather than disruptive ingroups who reacted to conflict individually? In the ten “Men in Black” episodes, the “bad guy” could be either a single alien or a group of aliens.

It was unfair for the researcher to make certain conclusions on whether the content suggested that the “good guys” tended to act cooperatively on a team but the “bad guy (s)” did not. In the ten “Pokemon” episodes, the “bad guys” were consistent as a team, so it was not difficult to see how the content presented its value within a group. In the study, the content of “Pokemon” may imply that the “good guys” acted more cooperatively on their team then the “bad guys” did. “Cooperation” may involve into its content as a morally theme in the show. In reality, “cooperation” could be a moral neutral theme, because people have the choices to cooperate with their ingroups to do things both ethical and unethical.

When people see “cooperation” as a Japanese cultural theme in any story, they needed to consider certain contextual phenomena. Traindis, Bontempo, Villareal, Asai, & Lucca (1989) emphasized that “the sharp difference in behavior toward ingroups and outgroups in collectivist cultures, which does not occur as sharply in individualistic cultures, can confuse observers who are not examining these cultures with the ingroup-outgroup distinction in mind” (p. 326).

In other words, Japanese people tended to act cooperatively among ingroups members, but that did not guarantee that they would act always cooperatively with outgroups in their society. Secondly, cooperation with their ingroups for their ingroups’ needs and good is a “virtue,” in Japanese society, but an ingroups’ concern may not always benefit other groups in society. In “Pokemon,” “cooperation” was a complex
moral-and-cultural theme because the story needed to present "cooperation" as a virtue that benefited other groups in society.

**Winning vs. Losing**

Reality is always crucial, because nobody will be the eternal winner in every trial. As Heintz (1994) stated, "children's decisions to pay attention to the television screen are influenced by program content. Attention levels are lowest for content that is either too easy and redundant or too difficult and complex, highest when programs are challenging and somewhat unpredictable" (p.209). To attract the child audience, "winning and losing" should not be a simplistic outcome but a cause-and-effect process.

In the ten "Pokemon" episodes, the "good guys" (Ash, Brock, Misty, and Pikachu) had a high probability of winning at the end of the show; however, they were not always winners or heroes in every episode. The "good guys" had the potential to suffer with their own failure in the show, and they had to learn to respect their opponents. The way of portraying the philosophy of "winning and losing" in "Pokemon" was very different from the American action-adventure cartoon, "Men in Black." In "Why I Love Pokemon and Harry Potter," the writer pointed out an important "winning and losing" perspective in the "Pokemon" cartoon:

The battle is one of strength and courage. It's not about destroying an enemy—pocket monsters that fight can't be killed. The relationship between a trainer and his or her Pokemon is a symbiotic friendship. Only if the trainer and Pokemon trust and teach each other can both evolve, or grow. Ash fights hard—and loses. My son is in shock. Ash is in shock, too.... But then Richard (the winner in this battle) loses the next round of battles. To Ash's surprise, Richard isn't bitter. He says losing has taught him some lessons and will help him be a Pokemon master some day.... I think it's kinda sweet, and I look at my son. He's crying (1999, p. E5).
In contrast to the “winning and losing” philosophy of “Pokemon,” “Men in Black” presented a consistent pattern that “good guys” should be victorious at the end of the show. The “good guys” had to defeat the “bad guys” not because “winning and losing” was an outcome of a competition but because it represented justice in society. The “bad guys” in MIB (the losers) had a 50% of possibility of being killed at the end of the show, so the “winning and losing” philosophy of MIB agents also included the issue of life and death. In the study, the characters in “Men in Black” performed more aggressively and violently than the characters of “Pokemon” did when they pursued their victories. The content presented a clear-cut winner between the “good guys” and “bad guys.” The “bad guys” always were punished in the show. Thus, the story presented pro-social images for its audiences. However, these types of pro-social image may not always reflect reality in society. By contrast, 20% of the plots of the ten Pokemon episodes in the study did not present a clear-cut winner between the “good guys” and the “bad guys.” In the study, the police or legal institution in the show never caught or imprisoned the bad guys who tried to steal Pokemon. The “bad guys” naturally were punished by their own failures. Although the content itself placed a great value on “winning and losing” to its audiences, its context had potential to present a negative image by absence of justice.

Significantly, the characters’ actions in “Pokemon” and “Men in Black” tended to emphasize the value of intangible rewards rather than monetary rewards. In the ten “Pokemon” episodes, the good characters tended to win their battles in an honorable way, and honor was more valuable than monetary rewards. Similarly, in the ten “Men in Black” episodes, the good characters tended to perform their duties, and the rewards only
could be seen in an abstract way, such as solidification of team members and friendships and saving the world. Both shows presented teamwork as the primary effort to lead victory in the show and that the group’s power is always stronger than the individual’s.

Conclusions

Looking at the “interpersonal relationships” among ingroups’ members, both Ash’s team members of “Pokemon” and MIB agents in “Men in Black” presented collectivism more often than individualism. However, Team Rocket members in “Pokemon” acted individually more often than collectively. Secondly, the ingroups among Ash’s team tended to act cooperatively when faced with conflict. But, there was no statistically significant difference between the “cooperation” among Ash’s team and the “cooperation” among MIB agents.

On “winning vs. losing” perspectives, “Pokemon” tended to present competitors as not enemies but opponents. Losing was not shameful but an opportunity for the characters to learn something from their failures. Every character of “Pokemon” may have a possibility to be a loser in a competition. The different cultural or moral perspectives of the televised “Pokemon” show may not be as sensitive as some American parents thought, but the great danger may exist in how the viewers interpret its message: what types of perspectives they need to learn, and what kind of society they have. This study said that the popular Japanese-made “Pokemon” in the United States may present its ingroups’ relationship through collectivistic perspectives, but these perspectives also could be found in an American-produced, team-based action cartoon, such as “Men in Black.” However, a single cultural phenomenon existing in the cartoon world may not present the entire picture of how most American-produced or Japanese-made adventure
cartoons present their cultural values about teamwork. In order to analyze how the general cultural perspectives were presented through team-based content, a further study may be required to compare more samples of American-produced and Japanese-made adventure-action cartoons. Furthermore, as Milton Chen (1994) stated, “television’s effects do depend on how much we watch and, more importantly, on what we watch” (p.105). When people discuss how the cultural effects of cartoon content might impact their younger generations, they need at least to understand the similarities between one culture and another to correctly interpret the cartoons.
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APPENDICES
APPENDIX 1

Training Coder Instruction Package

Thank you for your participation in this study. Each coder will receive a cash reward of ten dollars per hour following your training and after each coding section, and there will be at least thirty coding hours. However, in order to become a coder, you must agree to the following stipulations. Each coder is required to obey the training and the coding rules during working hours. In addition, each coder must agree that he or she will not divulge any training and coding information by any written, oral or physical form before the study is fully accomplished. Again, thank you very much for your time and cooperation!

Coder #1: If you agree to abide by the above statement, please print & sign your full name

Print-------------------------------------------------Sign--------------------------------------------------
Date-------------------------------------------------

Coder #2: If you agree to abide by the above statement, please print & sign your full name

Print-------------------------------------------------Sign--------------------------------------------------
Date-------------------------------------------------

I. Please read the basic plot descriptions of the cartoons, “Pokemon” and “Men in Black:”

“Pokemon”

“Pokemon” is a term name that refers to pocket monsters. In the story, pocket monsters are special organisms that contain different inborn powers and personalities. People like to use these pocket monsters for Pokemon competitions, and the trainers and the winners of the Pokemon competitions receive society's admiration and honor. However, some pocket monsters are wild creatures that need to be collected and trained by people. One such trainer is Ash, a child who has a dream to be the best pokemon trainer in the world. In order to make his dream come true, Ash needs to learn how to
collect Pokemon monsters and how to train his monsters to be a competitive candidates in the competitions. The story begins with Ash’s adventure.

Pikachu is an electronic type of Pokemon who can shake people by its natural power. Ash selects Pikachu as his first team member. Later, in his adventure, he meets his other team members, Misty and Brock. In contrast to Ash’s team, Team Rocket is a group whose members try to steal or to catch Pokemon for economic benefits. James, Jessy and Meowth are the three main members of Team Rocket.

“Men in Black”

MIB is the short term for “Men in Black.” (“Men in Black” was one of popular action movie that is already familiar to the American public.) MIB refers to an alien immigration organization, which not only keeps the aliens being a secret from the public but also eliminates the harmful aliens from the earth. The MIB organization requires each agent to forget his or her past completely, and each MIB member has to separate his or her personal life from society. In the story, agents Jay and Kay are partners who usually work together in the mission. In the MIB team, Kay is the professional agent who understands different types of aliens, and has a lot of experience in catching and fighting the harmful aliens. On the other hand, agent Jay is a rookie who is still learning the professional skills of his assignment. Agent Elle is a confident female researcher who understands medical and scientific technology very well. Agent Zed is the chairman who commands the MIB agents’ action. These four characters are the soul of the MIB team.

II. Please recognize the seven major characters in “Pokemon” & the four main characters in “Men in Black.”
“Pokemon”
Ash’s Major Team Members: Ash, Brock, Misty, and Pikachu.
Team Rocket’s Major Team Members: James, Jessy, and Meowth

“Men in Black:”
MIB team: Agent Jay, Agent Kay, Agent Elle, & Agent Zed

*The trainer will play one “Pokemon” episode and one “Men in Black” videotape for the coders. In addition, she will point out the main characters on the TV screen for the coders. Please pay attention to the seven characters of “Pokemon” and the four main characters of “Men in Black” while you watch the show. When the trainer stops the videotape each time during the show, please try to identify the characters’ names and to match their names with their faces. *Please feel free to ask questions if you miss some parts of the show.

III. Review the “Character Description Code Sheet” and “Content Code Sheet” carefully. If there are any terms or definitions on the “CDCS” or “CCS” that you do not understand, please ask for clarification before commencement of study.

Character Description Code Sheet Instructions

Code the chosen characters in each “Pokemon” or “Men in Black” episode. The character has to appear on the TV screen for at least 30 seconds in each series to be coded. The coder has to complete each “Character Description Code Sheet” for each selecting character followed by the “Character Description Code Sheet Instruction.”

A. Character Code—Please fill out the character’s code number according to the following “Characters Index” on the code sheet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ash’s Major Team Members/ Code</th>
<th>Team Rocket’s Major Team Members/ Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ash ...</td>
<td>James...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brock...</td>
<td>Jessy ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misty...</td>
<td>Meowth. ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pikachu ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“MIB” Agent Team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agent Jay ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agent Kay ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agent Elle ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agent Zed ...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There are two major team-based characters in each episode of “Pokemon” Please code only the following selected characters that are likely to appear on every episode

There is one major team-based characters in each episode of “Men in Black”. Please code only the following selected characters that are likely to appear in every episode

“MIB” Agent Team
Agent Jay ... 8
Agent Kay ... 9
Agent Elle ... 10
Agent Zed ... 11
B. Character Description—Based on the character’s gender and the species, please put a mark on B1 ( ), B2 ( ), or B3 ( ) to indicate the description for the character.

B1—Human Male
B2—Human female
B3—Pokemon Monster

C. Definition:
“Tendency to Sacrifice”
Here refers to an individual did something for the sake of his/ her /its ingroups, and he/ she/ it may have to risk physically or emotionally. In addition, he/ she/ it may also have to give up his personal goals, values, or desires.

*Please mark one proper description on the Likert scale according to the character’s overall performance in this episode.

Neutral Lack of clues for judgment

D. Definition:
“Pride” here refers to an ingroup that is proud of his/ her/ its ingroups’ achievements.

*Please mark one proper description on the Likert scale according to the character’s overall performance in this episode.

Highly Proud of Team : : : : : : Not Proud of Team DNA

Neutral Less Proud of Team Lack of clues for judgment

E. Definition:
Trust: the character was likely to rely on his/ her/ its team members when his/ her/ its team was in danger or difficulty.

*Please mark one proper description on the Likert scale according to the character’s overall performance in this episode.

Neutral Lack of clues for judgment

F. Definition:
“Team-Based Cooperation” refers to a group member’s willingness to work with others toward a common end. Here it refers to cooperation among team members. (Please do not evaluate the character’s performance based on the effectiveness of his/ her/ its cooperation)

*Please mark one proper description on the Likert scale according to the character’s overall performance in this episode.
Neutral

*After reviewing each category on the character description code sheet, please feel free to ask any question that is not clear to you. If you understand thoroughly how to fill out the character description code sheet based on the category definition and brief explanation, please move to next instruction section—Content Code Sheet Instruction.

Content Code Sheet Instruction

Before responding to any category on the content code sheet, please carefully fill out “Program Title” and “Episode Title” According to the overall content of each episode in “Pokemon” or “Men in Black,” each coder needs to fill out one content code sheet after watching one particular episode of “Pokemon” or “Men in Black.

K. Which does the content of this episode emphasize more teamwork or individual work?
*Please mark one proper description on the Likert scale according to the overall performance in this episode.

Neutral

L. Which does the plot of this episode present cooperation among Ash/ MIB team members or disruption among the team members “Cooperation” refers to aim at the common goal without oral or physical fighting within Ash/ BIM team members. “Disruption” refers to the ingroup members’ tendency to fight verbally or physically, whether working toward the common goal or not.
*Please mark one proper description on the Likert scale according to the overall performance in this episode.

Neutral

M. Is there a clear-cut winner in the conflict? Yes ( ) No ( )
*Please mark one proper description for the category C according to the overall performance in this episode.
N. According to the plot, who are the “good guys” in this episode? (Please check the following categories.)
Definition: Good guys here refer to people who appear to act morally by helping others and obeying the laws of society.

*Please mark one proper description for the category D. You may mark more than one if it is necessary. (Ash’s team members and Team Rocket’s members are the characters in “Pokemon.” MIB team agents and other aliens are the characters in “Men in Black.”)

- Ash’s Team Members ( )
- Team Rocket’s Members ( )
- MIB Team Agents ( )
- Others Aliens of “Men in Black” ( )

O. Do the “good guys” win? Yes ( ) No ( )

*According to the category D, please mark one proper description for the category E.

P. According to the plot, who are the “bad guys” in this episode? (Please check the following categories.)
Definition: Bad guys here refer to people who have done something harmful to others through antisocial or illegal actions.

*Please mark one proper description for the category D. You may mark more than one if it is necessary. (Ash’s team members and Team Rocket’s members are the characters in “Pokemon.” MIB team agents and other aliens are the characters in “Men in Black.”)

- Ash’s Team Members ( )
- Team Rocket’s Members ( )
- MIB Team Agents ( )
- Others Aliens of “Men in Black” ( )

Q. Is the loser(s) punished? Yes ( ) No ( )

*According to the overall content, please mark one proper description for the category G.
If so, what is the punishment? (Please summarize it within 1 to 2 sentences.)
R. Is the winner(s) rewarded?  Yes ( ) No ( )

*According to the overall content, please mark one proper description for the category H.

If so, how? (Please summarize it within 1 to 2 sentences)

S. How do the winner(s) achieve victory?

*Please mark one proper description on the Likert scale according to the overall performance in this episode.

By Teamwork: __: __: __: __: __ By Individual Effort

T. What is the moral or the lesson of the story? (Please summarize it within 1 to 2 sentences)

__________________________________________________________________________

IV. Coding

In this section, each coder must follow the trainer's instruction to code each category on the code sheet completely.

The trainer and the coders will watch ten "Pokemon" episodes and ten "Men in Black" episodes together. Do not talk during the show. You may take simple notes that relate to the characters or the content.

Second, each coder may not discuss the content with other coders until all of the coders complete their coding sheets. In addition, the coders have to code each selecting character separately on different code sheets. If one of the seven characters does not show up in "Pokemon," please only code the characters appearing on the show. For the same procedure, if one of the four characters does not show up in "Men in Black," please only code the characters appearing on the show.

You may raise your hand if you miss the program title at the beginning of the show. After watching each episode, you need to immediately fill out several character description code sheets and one content code sheet. Please staple the character description code sheets together based on the unit of episode. You may feel free use either pen or pencil to mark your choice, but do make your mark clear and clean enough to read on the code sheet.
*There is no right-and-wrong answers or any penalty regarding to any selection. You may feel free to express what you see when the coding. You have the right to stop the coding process if you feel uncomfortable about the working environment. You may take a 5 minutes break after each hour of coding.

*The goal of this coding is to present what you see in “Pokemon” and “Men in Black,” not your preconception about the shows. Please try to pay attention only to what you view and to present the data accurately.
## APPENDIX 2

### SPSS Input Code Book 1: Character Description Code Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ash’s Major Team Members/ Code</th>
<th>Team Rocket’s Major Team Members/ Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ash</td>
<td>James</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brock</td>
<td>Jessy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misty</td>
<td>Meowth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pikachu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                                |                                        |
|                                | 1                                       |
|                                | 2                                       |
|                                | 3                                       |
|                                | 4                                       |
|                                | 5                                       |
|                                | 6                                       |
|                                | 7                                       |

### “MIB” Agent Team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agent</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jay</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elle</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zed</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### A: Character Code

- **Question Code a1**... “Pokemon”
- **Question Code a2**... “Men in Black”

*The responding code for “Character Code” should be inputted based on the original character code.*

### B. Basic Genders and Species (Male= M/ Female=F):

- **Question Code b1**... “Pokemon”
- **Question Code b2**... “Men in Black”

**Responding Code:** B1—Human M ()  B2—Human F ()  B3—Pokemon Monster ()

### D. According to the following definition of Sacrifice, please check “the willing of this character to sacrifice” in this episode.

- **Question Code c1**... “Pokemon”
- **Question Code c2**... “Men in Black”

--- Highly Willing: ______:____:____:____:____ Very Unwilling: ______:________ Not Applicable

**Responding Code:** 5 4 3 2 1 0
G. According to the following definition of “pride,” please circle one of the descriptions for the character in this episode:

**Question Code d1... “Pokemon”**
**Question Code d2... “Men in Black”**

Responding Code: 5 4 3 2 1 0

H. According to the following definition of “trust,” please circle one of the descriptions for the character in this episode.

**Question Code e1... “Pokemon”**
**Question Code e2... “Men in Black”**

Responding Code: 5 4 3 2 1 0

F. Based on the following definition of “a team-based cooperation,” please circle one of the descriptions for the character in this episode.

**Question Code f1... “Pokemon”**
**Question Code f2... “Men in Black”**

Responding Code: 5 4 3 2 1 0

G. Please Circle any of the description that apply to the ending of this episode:

**Question Code g1... “Pokemon”**
**Question Code g2... “Men in Black”**

Responding Code:

G1: This character was on a winning team (the team received the positive outcome)—1
G2: This character was on a losing team (the team received the negative outcome)—2
A. Which does the content of this episode emphasize more teamwork or individual work?
   Question Code =a1... “Pokemon”
   Question Code =a2... “Men in Black”
   Teamwork Emphasized__:__:__:_:_ Individuality Emphasized
   Responding Code: 5 4 3 2 1

B. Which does the plot of this episode emphasizes more cooperation among Ash/BIM team members or disruption among the team members?
   Question Code =b1... “Pokemon”
   Question Code =b2... “Men in Black”
   Highly Cooperative__:__:__:_:_ Highly Disruptive
   Responding Code: 5 4 3 2 1

C. Is there a clear-cut winner between the “good guys” and the “bad guys”?
   Question Code =c1... “Pokemon”
   Question Code =c2... “Men in Black”
   Responding Code: Yes ( )—1  No ( )—2

D. According to the plot, who are the “good guys” in this episode? (Please check the following categories.)
   Question Code =d1... “Pokemon”
   Question Code =d2... “Men in Black”
   Responding Code:
   Ash’s Team Members( )—1  Team Rocket’s Members ( )—2
   MIB Team Agents( )—3  Other Aliens of “Men in Black” ( )—4

E. Do the “good guys” win at the end of the episode?
   Question Code =e1... “Pokemon”
   Question Code =e2... “Men in Black”
   Responding Code: Yes ( )—1  No ( )—2

F. According to the plot, who are the “bad guys” in this episode? (Please check the following categories).
   Question Code =f1... “Pokemon”
   Question Code =f2... “Men in Black”
   Responding Code:
   Ash’s Team Members( )—1  Team Rocket’s Members ( )—2
   MIB Team Agents( )—3  Others Aliens of “Men in Black” ( )—4
G. Is the loser(s) punished?
   Question Code = g1... “Pokemon”
   Question Code = g2... “Men in Black”
   Responding Code: Yes ( )—1 No ( )—2

H. Is the winner(s) rewarded?
   Question Code = h1... “Pokemon”
   Question Code = h2... “Men in Black”
   Responding Code: Yes ( )—1 No ( )—2

I. How do the winner(s) achieve victory?
   Question Code = i1... “Pokemon”
   Question Code = i2... “Men in Black”
   By Teamwork____:____:____:____:____:By Individual Effort
   Responding Code: 5 4 3 2 1
APPENDIX 3
Intercoder Reliability Calculation

Pokemon: The Flame Pokemonathon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character Description Code Sheet</th>
<th>Content Code Sheet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Code Decisions #: 49</td>
<td>Code Decision #: 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement #: 31</td>
<td>Agreement #: 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M = Agreement #
N1 = Code Decisions # from the Coder A
N2 = Code Decisions # from the Coder B
N3 = Code Decisions # from the Coder C
Each coder made the same # of Code Decisions, so N1 = N2 = N3 in the study.

\[ M = 38, N1 = N2 = N3 = 59 \]
\[ \text{Reliability} = \frac{3 \times M}{3 \times (N1+N2+N3)} \times 100 \% \]
\[ = \frac{3 \times 38}{3 \times 59} \times 100 \% \]
\[ = 64.4 \% \ldots a1 \]

Pokemon: Attack of Prehistoric Pokemon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character Description Code Sheet</th>
<th>Content Code Sheet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Code Decisions #: 49</td>
<td>Code Decision #: 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement #: 36</td>
<td>Agreement #: 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M = 45, N1 = N2 = N3 = 59
\[ \text{Reliability} = \frac{3 \times 45}{3 \times 59} \times 100 \% \]
\[ = 76.3 \% \ldots a2 \]

Pokemon: The Evolution Solution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character Description Code Sheet</th>
<th>Content Code Sheet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Code Decisions #: 49</td>
<td>Code Decision #: 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement #: 31</td>
<td>Agreement #: 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M = 39, N1 = N2 = N3 = 59
\[ \text{Reliability} = \frac{3 \times 39}{3 \times 59} \times 100 \% \]
\[ = 66.1 \% \ldots a3 \]
### Pokemon: A Friend in Deed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character Description Code Sheet</th>
<th>Content Code Sheet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Code Decisions #: 49</td>
<td>Code Decision #: 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement #: 36</td>
<td>Agreement #: 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M=44, N1=N2=N3=59  
Reliability = \( \frac{3 * 44}{3 * 59} \) * 100%  
= 74.6%...a4

### Pokemon: Friend and Foe Alike

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character Description Code Sheet</th>
<th>Content Code Sheet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Code Decisions #: 49</td>
<td>Code Decision #: 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement #: 37</td>
<td>Agreement #: 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M=44, N1=N2=N3=59  
Reliability = \( \frac{3 * 44}{3 * 59} \) * 100%  
= 74.6%...a5

### Pokemon: A Chansey Operation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character Description Code Sheet</th>
<th>Content Code Sheet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Code Decisions #: 49</td>
<td>Code Decision #: 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement #: 31</td>
<td>Agreement #: 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M=40, N1=N2=N3=59  
Reliability = \( \frac{3 * 40}{3 * 59} \) * 100%  
= 67.8%...a6

### Pokemon: Beach Blank-out Blastoise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character Description Code Sheet</th>
<th>Content Code Sheet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Code Decisions #: 49</td>
<td>Code Decision #: 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement #: 40</td>
<td>Agreement #: 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M=48, N1=N2=N3=59  
Reliability = \( \frac{3 * 48}{3 * 59} \) * 100%  
= 81.4%...a7
### Pokemon: The Song of Jigglypuff

**Character Description Code Sheet**  
Code Decisions #: 49  
Agreement #: 34

\[M=42, N_1=N_2=N_3=59\]  
Reliability = \(\frac{3\times42}{3\times59}\) *100 %  
= 71.2 %...a8

### Pokemon: All Fired Up

**Character Description Code Sheet**  
Code Decisions #: 49  
Agreement #: 35

\[M=44, N_1=N_2=N_3=59\]  
Reliability = \(\frac{3\times44}{3\times59}\) *100 %  
= 74.6 %...a9

### Pokemon: The Fourth Round Rumble

**Character Description Code Sheet**  
Code Decisions #: 49  
Agreement #: 43

\[M=50, N_1=N_2=N_3=59\]  
Reliability = \(\frac{3\times50}{3\times59}\) *100 %  
= 84.7 %...a10

### The Average Reliability of “Pokemon”

\[= \frac{(a_1+a_2+a_3+a_4+a_5+a_6+a_7+a_8+a_9+a_10)}{10}\]

\[=(64.4 + 76.3+ 66.1+ 74.6+ 74.6+ 67.8+ 81.4+ 71.2+ 74.6+ 84.7)}{10}\]

=73.57 %
Men in Black: The Irritable Bow-Wow Syndrome

Character Description Code Sheet
Code Decisions #: 28
Agreement #: 16

M=23, N1=N2=N3=38
Reliability = \( \frac{3 \times 23}{3 \times 38} \times 100\% \)
= 60.5\%...b1

Content Code Sheet
Code Decision #: 10
Agreement #: 7

Men in Black: The Neuralyzer Syndrome

Character Description Code Sheet
Code Decisions #: 28
Agreement #: 14

M=19, N1=N2=N3=38
Reliability = \( \frac{3 \times 19}{3 \times 38} \times 100\% \)
= 50.0\%...b2

Content Code Sheet
Code Decision #: 10
Agreement #: 5

Men in Black: The Elle of My Dream Syndrome

Character Description Code Sheet
Code Decisions #: 28
Agreement #: 17

M=26, N1=N2=N3=38
Reliability = \( \frac{3 \times 26}{3 \times 38} \times 100\% \)
= 68.4\%...b3

Content Code Sheet
Code Decision #: 10
Agreement #: 9

Men in Black: The Alpha Syndrome

Character Description Code Sheet
Code Decisions #: 28
Agreement #: 18

M=27, N1=N2=N3=38
Reliability = \( \frac{3 \times 26}{3 \times 38} \times 100\% \)
= 71.4\%...b4

Content Code Sheet
Code Decision #: 10
Agreement #: 9
Men in Black: The Inanimate Syndrome

**Character Description Code Sheet**
- Code Decisions #: 28
- Agreement #: 24

M = 31, N1 = N2 = N3 = 38
Reliability = \((3 \times 31 / 3 \times 38) \times 100\%\)
= 81.6 %...b5

**Content Code Sheet**
- Code Decision #: 10
- Agreement #: 7

Men in Black: The Bye-Bye Worm Syndrome

**Character Description Code Sheet**
- Code Decisions #: 28
- Agreement #: 18

M = 25, N1 = N2 = N3 = 38
Reliability = \((3 \times 25 / 3 \times 38) \times 100\%\)
= 65.8 %...b6

**Content Code Sheet**
- Code Decision #: 10
- Agreement #: 7

Men in Black: The Out to Pasture Syndrome

**Character Description Code Sheet**
- Code Decisions #: 28
- Agreement #: 20

M = 27, N1 = N2 = N3 = 38
Reliability = \((3 \times 27 / 3 \times 38) \times 100\%\)
= 71.1 %...b7

**Content Code Sheet**
- Code Decision #: 10
- Agreement #: 7

Men in Black: The Sardines and Ice Cream Syndrome

**Character Description Code Sheet**
- Code Decisions #: 28
- Agreement #: 18

M = 27, N1 = N2 = N3 = 38
Reliability = \((3 \times 27 / 3 \times 38) \times 100\%\)
= 71.1 %...b8

**Content Code Sheet**
- Code Decision #: 10
- Agreement #: 9
Men in Black: The Lost Continent Syndrome

_Character Description Code Sheet_  
Code Decisions #: 28  
Agreement #: 16

_M=24, N1=N2=N3=38_
Reliability = (3*24 / 3*38) *100 %
= 63.2 %...b9

---

Men in Black: The Cold Sweat Syndrome

_Character Description Code Sheet_  
Code Decisions #: 28  
Agreement #: 22

_M=24, N1=N2=N3=38_
Reliability = (3*31 / 3*38) *100 %
= 81.6 %...b10

---

The Average Reliability of “Men in Black”

= (b1+b2+b3+b4+b5+b6+b7+b8+b9+b10)/ 10

=(60.5 + 50.0+ 68.4+ 71.1+ 81.6+ 65.8+ 71.1+ 71.1+ 63.2+ 81.6)

=68.44 %

---

*The Average Intercoder Reliability in the Study:

(a1+a2+a3+a4+a5+a6+a7+a8+a9+a10) + (b1+b2+b3+b4+b5+b6+b7+b8+b9+b10)

= 71.005 %
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