

TURKISH PARENTS' VIEWS ON QUALITY STANDARDS FOR CHILDREN'S TELEVISION PROGRAMMES

Prof. Dr. Alev ÖNDER, Marmara University
Asude Balaban DAĞAL, Marmara University

ABSTRACT

The main purpose of this study was to evaluate the opinions of parents of pre-school children about children's programmes on TV. The study had two phases: In the first step "The Evaluation Scale for Children's Programmes" was translated into Turkish, the reliability and validity of the scale was tested through analyzing of the data collected from parents of preschool children.

The Cronbach Alpha coefficient of the whole scale was: $\alpha=0.95$; $p<0.001$. Thus it was concluded that the Turkish version of the scale had sufficient internal reliability. Test-retest reliability of the scale was found to be high ($r=0.99$; $p<0.0001$). Content validity of the scale was calculated by relating each item to other items in the relevant subscale and the correlation coefficients were found statistically significant as changing between .01 and .05.

In the second step of the study; 189 parents were asked to evaluate the Turkish TV programmes for children on the basis of 9 quality criteria (credibility, comprehensibility, entertainment, aesthetic quality, involvement, presence of role models, innocuousness, restfulness, thought provocation) of the scale. The variables of educational level of parents, the gender and age of children, socio-economic-status of the families were assessed in relation to parents' opinions about the quality of TV programmes for children. The data were analyzed by ANOVA'S.

The results indicated that, the educational level of the mother and the gender of the child were found to be related to the "thought provocation" criteria evaluated by parents. In addition, the age of children was related to the quality criteria of "entertainment" and "involvement". The results were discussed in terms of the suitability and the importance of quality criteria for TV programmes produced for children. Besides, the opinions of parents on those criteria were also discussed.

ÖZET

Bu çalışmanın genel amacı, Televizyon'daki Çocuk Programlarını Değerlendirme Ölçeğinin Türkçeye uyarlanması ve farklı demografik niteliklere sahip anne-babalara uygulanarak, anne-babaların çocuk programları hakkındaki görüşlerinin değerlendirilmesidir. Çalışma iki aşamada gerçekleştirilmiştir. İlk aşamada ölçek Türkçeleştirilmiş, güvenilirliği ve geçerliği çeşitli çalışma gruplarından toplanan verilere dayanılarak kanıtlanmıştır. İç tutarlılık (Cronbach alfa=0.95; $p<0.001$); test tekrar test güvenilirliği ($r=0.99$; $p<0.0001$) hesaplanmış ve yeterli bulunmuştur. Kapsam geçerliği, her maddenin diğer maddelerle ilişkileri için .01 ve .05 düzeyleri arasında değişen değerlerde anlamlı bulunmuştur.

Araştırmanın ikinci aşamasında; 189 anne-babadan, Türkiye'de yayımlanan TV programlarını, Çocuk Programlarını Değerlendirme Ölçeğini kullanarak değerlendirmeleri istenmiştir. Araştırmaya katılan anne-babalar 9 alt boyut yani kalite kriteri (zararsız bulma, rahatlatıcı bulma, model olma, güvenilir bulma, gerekli bulma, estetik bulma, eğlendirici bulma, düşünce uyarımı, anlaşılır bulma) temelinde TV çocuk programlarını değerlendirmişlerdir.

Anne-baba Eğitim düzeyi, ailenin SED'i, çocuğun yaşı, çocuğun cinsiyeti değişkenlerinin çocuk programlarını değerlendirme üzerindeki etkileri incelenmiştir. Toplanan veriler çok boyutlu varyans analizi tekniği uygulanarak değerlendirilmiştir. Araştırmanın bulgularına göre; Anne eğitim düzeyi ve çocuğun cinsiyeti değişkenlerinin "düşünce uyarımı" kriteri üzerinde etkili olduğu belirlenmiştir. Ayrıca "çocuğun yaşı" değişkeni, "eğlendirici bulma" ve "gerekli bulma" kriterleri ile ilişkili bulunmuştur. Bulgular, TV'deki çocuk programlarının hazırlanmasında kalite kriterlerinin uygunluğu, önemi açısından anne-babaların kalite kriterleri hakkındaki düşünceleri ve bilgileri temelinde tartışılmıştır.

INTRODUCTION

When television entered mainstream society in the 1940's, its most conspicuous effect was to bring families and friends together for an evening of entertainment. However, as television viewing became more prevalent, so did speculation regarding its other, less beneficial, effects (Clarke; Kurtz-Costes; 1997).

John Dewey who was the great educator innovator once said, “The environment teaches.” He meant by that simple statement that what surrounds the child also teaches the child. In today’s world, television is one of the most important effects that surround children. So, it may be said that television becomes the first teacher of the child.

“When a baby was born, it does not only communicate with its family but also communicates with TV”(Yeşiltuna,1999). The development psychologists state that; the children are taking an interest in the sound effects of radio and active images on television and hard watching effect appears as soon as the ages of preoperational stage comes (Özgen; Özgün,1985). For instance, according to a research, which involved 6614 parents in Turkey; the children were watching TV for about 3 hours and 42 minutes per day. Especially; most of the “0” to “6” years-old children were watching TV daily (Özdiker, 2002).

The effects of television watching on children have been studied and discussed since many years and it was concluded that there are both positive and negative aspects related to those effects. Although various researches indicated that television watching had some positive influences on children (Evra, 1998; Koutsouvanov, 1993; Groot, 1994; Steiner, 1999), there are also some other researches that point out the negative effects (Batur, 1998; Buckingham, 1993; Cullingford, 1984; Greenberg, 1976; Gunter VeMcleer, 1990; Singer, 1980). On the positive side of the ledger, research does indicate that well-designed educational programs, such as *Sesame Street*, can help 4- and 5-year-olds read and count and that children that age also benefit from pro-social messages on TV that teach them about kindness and sharing. *Sesame Street* was also found to be a very motivating educational program (Bayram, 1991). On the other hand, studies have also indicated that exposure to television violence can increase the risk of children’s behaving aggressively and that media use in early childhood may be related to attentional problems later in life. And while the producers of early childhood media believe their products can help children learn even at the earliest ages, other experts worry that time spent with media may detract from time children spend interacting with their parents, engaging in physical activity, using their imaginations, or exploring the world around them (Rideout & Hamel, 2006). In a longitudinal study (Anderson, Huston, Schmitt, Linebarger, and Wright’s, 2001) it was found that Preschoolers who viewed educational TV programs had higher grades and read more books in high school. Another result of the study was also interesting: Among girls, viewing violent programs in preschool was associated with lower high school grades.

Since watching television is so widespread and its influences on children both in positive and negative directions are so controversial, it seems meaningful to evaluate the TV programmes for children in relation to some quality criteria. Peter Nikken and his colleagues identified nine quality criteria in evaluating children’s television programmes. These are; comprehensibility: to understand the main messages in the program easily, credibility: to decide if the program has a significant value; entertainment: to find the program joyful; aesthetic quality: to evaluate the program as artistically well designed; involvement: programme’s getting attention of the children easily; presence of role models: to find positive role models for children in the programme, innocuousness: to find the programme not harmful for children, restfulness: to find the programme making children relaxed and thought provocation: to evaluate the programme to stimulate creative thinking of children (Nikken, 1997).

The idea of evaluating children’s programmes on TV on the basis of some quality criteria, stems from some critics about public television. According to those critics, public television promised to educate the nation through formal instruction and enrichment programming emphasizing culture, arts, science, and public affairs. In addition, it would provide programming for "underserved" audiences (those ignored by commercial broadcasters) such as minorities and children. Ultimately, public television promised to be the democratization of the medium. Sadly, however, these public service imperatives could never flourish as originally intended in a historically commercial system (Zechowski, 2006).

Educational television (ETV) as an important part of public television provides programming, which emphasizes formal instruction for children and adults. Literacy, mathematics, science, geography, first and second (foreign) language and high school equivalency are a few examples of ETV’s many offerings. The most successful ETV initiatives in the United States are public television’s children’s programs. Staples such as *Sesame Street*, *3-2-1 Contact*, *Mister Rogers Neighborhood* and *The Reading Rainbow* teach children academic fundamentals as well as social skills (Zechowski, 2006).

Peter Nikken (1997), one of the leading researcher’s in this area had developed a scale for quality criteria for children programmes on TV. It would be interesting to evaluate these criteria in terms of Turkish parents opinions since there is not a research dealing with quality criteria of TV programmes’ for children in Turkey. Thus the main purpose of the current study was to standardize Peter Nikken’s scale into Turkish and also it was addressed on the parents’ views about quality standards for children’s television programmes in Turkey.

METHOD

Research Model

“Survey Model” was employed in this research by using the questionnaire, which had been developed in Netherlands. That questionnaire which was standardized into Turkish evaluates children’s programmes in terms of parents’ opinions according to so called nine quality criteria.

In the first step of the standardization study the questionnaire was translated into Turkish. Reliability and validity analyzes were carried out. For internal reliability; the technique of “Cronbach-Alfa”, “Item-total Correlation”, “item-total remainder” techniques were used. Test-retest reliability of the scale was also calculated through indepented applications of the scale with two weeks interval. “Face validity” was tested through evaluations of the scale by independent experts in the field and “content validity” of the scale was analyzed through calculations of correlations between the items of each subscale.

Sample of Reliability and Validity Study

The sample was randomly chosen from the schools, which were listed in a catalogue issued by the Istanbul National Education Directorate. Those schools represented two main regions of Istanbul, namely Anatolian and European. The sample consisted of 500 parents, who had 3 to 6 years-old preschool children attending kindergartens in Istanbul. The parents were chosen from lower-middle and higher socio-economic statues on the basis of the amount of tuition-fees they paid for the kindergarten.

Survey Sample

The sample was randomly chosen from the schools located on both Anatolian and European regions of Istanbul. They were listed in a catalogue issued by the Istanbul National Education Directorate. Data were collected, between 2002 and 2003, from 19 preschool education institutes. The sample consisted of 195 parents of 3 to 6 year-olds who were from lower, middle, and higher income levels and also different educational backgrounds. Income levels of parents were identified by the amount of tuition-fees they paid for the kindergarten.

The scale

“The Evaluation Scale for Children’s Programmes” which was developed by Nikken at all’s (1997) was standardized into Turkish. “The questionnaire of Children’s Television Programmes” consists of nine quality criteria for evaluating TV programmes produced for children. The nine quality criteria which were represented in the questionnaire are as follows: Credibility, comprehensibility, entertainment, aesthetic quality, involvement, presence of role models, innocuousness, restfulness, thought provocation.

A five-point scale was used in the questionnaire like in the original scale. The scale ranged from “strongly disagree (1)” to “strongly agree (5)”. Thus the possible lowest score which can be available from the scale is “52”, the highest score which can be taken from the scale is “260”. As the score will be higher so the parents’ positive evaluation will be higher, too. The parents filled out the questionnaire according to how they felt about each item (statement). The forms of questionnaire were presented to the parents by the help of the directors of the contributing pre-school institutions.

RESULTS

Psychometric properties of the Turkish version of the questionnaire were tested and it was found that it had satisfactory properties such as a high internal reliability ($\alpha=.95$; $p<0,001$) and test-retest reliability ($r=.99$; $p<0,0001$). Means and standard deviations for all the items of the questionnaire were presented in Table 1 below.

Table 1. Means and standard deviations for all the items of the questionnaire

| Item | mean | s. e | s. d |
|------|--------|-----------|--------|
| 1 | 3,0620 | 4,834E-02 | 1,0810 |
| 2 | 2,8800 | 5,338E-02 | 1,1935 |
| 3 | 2,7760 | 4,560E-02 | 1,0198 |
| 4 | 3,8060 | 4,295E-02 | ,9603 |
| 5 | 3,1720 | 4,917E-02 | 1,0995 |
| 6 | 3,6220 | 4,616E-02 | 1,0321 |
| 7 | 2,8260 | 4,529E-02 | 1,0128 |
| 8 | 3,0020 | 4,605E-02 | 1,0296 |
| 9 | 3,0480 | 4,525E-02 | 1,0118 |
| 10 | 3,5520 | 4,502E-02 | 1,0066 |
| 11 | 3,8120 | 3,965E-02 | ,8867 |

| | | | |
|----|--------|-----------|--------|
| 12 | 3,7740 | 4,011E-02 | ,8970 |
| 13 | 3,4440 | 4,893E-02 | 1,0942 |
| 14 | 2,2780 | 4,970E-02 | 1,1114 |
| 15 | 2,3900 | 4,552E-02 | 1,0178 |
| 16 | 2,8280 | 4,623E-02 | 1,0337 |
| 17 | 3,0280 | 4,719E-02 | 1,0552 |
| 18 | 3,2180 | 4,802E-02 | 1,0737 |
| 19 | 2,8160 | 4,481E-02 | 1,0021 |
| 20 | 3,4460 | 4,329E-02 | ,9680 |
| 21 | 2,6060 | 4,438E-02 | ,9923 |
| 22 | 3,8800 | 3,886E-02 | ,8690 |
| 23 | 3,4060 | 4,183E-02 | ,9354 |
| 24 | 3,0600 | 4,636E-02 | 1,0366 |
| 25 | 3,7220 | 7,379E-02 | 1,6499 |
| 26 | 3,1060 | 4,606E-02 | 1,0300 |
| 27 | 3,0960 | 4,693E-02 | 1,0493 |
| 28 | 2,9060 | 4,898E-02 | 1,0952 |
| 29 | 3,1460 | 4,305E-02 | ,9626 |
| 30 | 3,2900 | 4,345E-02 | ,9715 |
| 31 | 3,3720 | 4,372E-02 | ,9775 |
| 32 | 2,9160 | 4,425E-02 | ,9894 |
| 33 | 3,1040 | 4,425E-02 | ,9895 |
| 34 | 3,7240 | 3,871E-02 | ,8656 |
| 35 | 2,6200 | 4,013E-02 | ,8973 |
| 36 | 2,6660 | 5,077E-02 | 1,1354 |
| 37 | 3,8040 | 3,907E-02 | ,8736 |
| 38 | 3,1220 | 4,384E-02 | ,9803 |
| 39 | 2,7220 | 4,523E-02 | 1,0113 |
| 40 | 3,4540 | 4,547E-02 | 1,0168 |
| 41 | 3,9920 | 3,513E-02 | ,7856 |
| 42 | 2,9140 | 4,785E-02 | 1,0700 |
| 43 | 3,0440 | 4,508E-02 | 1,0080 |
| 44 | 3,3880 | 4,707E-02 | 1,0525 |
| 45 | 3,1120 | 4,634E-02 | 1,0361 |
| 46 | 3,0220 | 5,076E-02 | 1,1349 |
| 47 | 3,6700 | 3,812E-02 | ,8524 |
| 48 | 3,4140 | 4,215E-02 | ,9425 |
| 49 | 2,8620 | 4,254E-02 | ,9512 |
| 50 | 3,2500 | 4,677E-02 | 1,0458 |
| 51 | 3,1460 | 4,815E-02 | 1,0766 |
| 52 | 3,3360 | 4,310E-02 | ,9638 |

In the following table (Table 2) the results of “item-total correlations” and the “reliability coefficients if item deleted” related to the scale were presented:

Table 2. Results of “Item-Total Correlations” and “Reliability Coefficients if Item deleted”

| Corrected items | Squared Multiple Correlation | Alpha if item deleted |
|-----------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1 | 0,5608 | 0,9484 |
| 2 | 0,5230 | 0,9486 |
| 3 | 0,4618 | 0,9489 |
| 4 | 0,4071 | 0,9492 |
| 5 | 0,5527 | 0,9485 |
| 6 | 0,5214 | 0,9486 |
| 7 | 0,6339 | 0,9481 |
| 8 | 0,2110 | 0,9502 |
| 9 | 0,5348 | 0,9486 |
| 10 | 0,6378 | 0,9480 |
| 11 | 0,5283 | 0,9486 |
| 12 | 0,4602 | 0,9489 |

| | | |
|----|--------|--------|
| 13 | 0,2436 | 0,9502 |
| 14 | 0,5369 | 0,9486 |
| 15 | 0,5173 | 0,9487 |
| 16 | 0,6476 | 0,9480 |
| 17 | 0,6494 | 0,9479 |
| 18 | 0,6586 | 0,9479 |
| 19 | 0,5075 | 0,9487 |
| 20 | 0,5231 | 0,9486 |
| 21 | 0,0608 | 0,9509 |
| 22 | 0,1254 | 0,9504 |
| 23 | 0,5703 | 0,9484 |
| 24 | 0,3926 | 0,9493 |
| 25 | 0,2056 | 0,9517 |
| 26 | 0,6737 | 0,9478 |
| 27 | 0,5330 | 0,9486 |
| 28 | 0,5908 | 0,9483 |
| 29 | 0,6909 | 0,9478 |
| 30 | 0,3434 | 0,9495 |
| 31 | 0,6411 | 0,9480 |
| 32 | 0,6832 | 0,9478 |
| 33 | 0,3270 | 0,9496 |
| 34 | 0,6128 | 0,9483 |
| 35 | 0,4359 | 0,9491 |
| 36 | 0,5504 | 0,9485 |
| 37 | 0,4884 | 0,9488 |
| 38 | 0,3720 | 0,9494 |
| 39 | 0,6289 | 0,9481 |
| 40 | 0,5831 | 0,9483 |
| 41 | 0,3867 | 0,9493 |
| 42 | 0,5422 | 0,9485 |
| 43 | 0,5403 | 0,9485 |
| 44 | 0,5254 | 0,9486 |
| 45 | 0,5819 | 0,9483 |
| 46 | 0,5938 | 0,9482 |
| 47 | 0,4963 | 0,9488 |
| 48 | 0,5578 | 0,9485 |
| 49 | 0,6111 | 0,9482 |
| 50 | 0,6779 | 0,9478 |
| 51 | 0,5932 | 0,9482 |
| 52 | 0,4906 | 0,9488 |

Internal reliability coefficients (Cronbach Alpha) related to the subscales of Turkish And Deutsch versions of the scale were presented below in Table 3

Table 3. Internal Reliability Coefficients of Turkish and Deutsch Versions of the subscales of the scale

| Subscales | Turkish | Netherlands |
|-------------------------|---------|-------------|
| Comprehensibility | 0.86 | 0.84 |
| Credibility | 0.71 | 0.86 |
| Entertainment | 0.76 | 0.79 |
| Aesthetic quality | 0.75 | 0.80 |
| Involvement | 0.70 | 0.71 |
| Presence of role models | 0.55 | 0.91 |
| Innocuousness | 0.68 | 0.66 |
| Restfulness | 0.70 | 0.67 |
| Thought provocation | 0.75 | 0.64 |

Test-re test reliability coefficient of the scale was presented below in Table 4

Table 4. Test retest reliability coefficient

| | mean | ss | t | r | N |
|------------|--------|-------|-------|--------|----|
| 1.uygulama | 3,3734 | ,5136 | 1,461 | ,995** | 36 |
| 2.uygulama | 3,1977 | ,5064 | | | |

** .0001 signification level

Validity

Face validity of the questionnaire had been evaluated by five independent TV producers and two experts from the faculty of mass media and communication. They evaluated each items' appropriateness to its subscale. All producers and experts agreed upon appropriateness of each item to its relevant subscale.

The correlation between items under the same subscale (criterion) had also been calculated in order to evaluate "content validity" of the scale. The analysis revealed that correlation between each item under the same subscale was acceptable with significance levels of 0,01 or 0,05. Unfortunately, the "criteria validity" could not be tested due to the lack of a similar scale in Turkish.

Demographic Variables

The parents were asked to indicate their educational background (level), their children's sex and age and also the money that they spend for their children's education. The participant mothers and fathers are evenly distributed according to their educational levels, to their income levels and also to their children's gender.

RESULTS

After the scale was standardized into Turkish, the Turkish version administered parents of pre-school children who were from different income and educational classes in order to evaluate the children's TV programmes.

One of our research questions was if there was any significant differences in the criterion of "thought provocation" related to mother's education level, social class and gender of the children. A three-ways ANOVA was carried out in analyzing related data. The analysis related to "thought provocation" criterion depending on mother's education level, socio-economic status and gender of the children are given on Table 5-6.

Table 5. The mean scores and standard deviations for the criterion of "thought provocation"

| Mother's education | Socio-economic status | Gender | mean | sd |
|--------------------|-----------------------|--------|------|------|
| Lower | Lower | Girl | 21.0 | . |
| | | Boy | 25.0 | 1.41 |
| | | Total | 23.6 | 2.51 |
| | Middle | Girl | 24.7 | 5.42 |
| | | Boy | 23.6 | 3.51 |
| | | Total | 24.5 | 5.01 |
| | Higher | Girl | 23.1 | 3.06 |
| | | Boy | 24.1 | 4.15 |
| | | Total | 23.8 | 3.83 |
| | Total | Girl | 23.8 | 4.33 |
| | | Boy | 24.1 | 3.91 |
| | | Total | 24.0 | 4.07 |
| Middle | Lower | Girl | 26.2 | 3.30 |
| | | Boy | 23.0 | 3.49 |
| | | Total | 24.0 | 3.68 |
| | Middle | Girl | 25.4 | 4.27 |
| | | Boy | 23.1 | 4.32 |
| | | Total | 24.7 | 4.34 |
| | Higher | Girl | 23.2 | 2.84 |
| | | Boy | 21.3 | 6.47 |

| | | | | |
|--------|--------|-------|------|------|
| | | Total | 22.7 | 4.16 |
| | Total | Girl | 24.8 | 3.75 |
| | | Boy | 22.7 | 4.28 |
| | | Total | 23.9 | 4.10 |
| Higher | Lower | Girl | 24.8 | 2.20 |
| | | Boy | 25.0 | 3.83 |
| | | Total | 24.9 | 3.32 |
| | Middle | Girl | 23.9 | 2.84 |
| | | Boy | 24.6 | 3.13 |
| | | Total | 24.2 | 2.92 |
| | Higher | Girl | 26.3 | 3.14 |
| | | Boy | 26.3 | 3.14 |
| | | Total | 26.3 | 3.14 |
| | Total | Girl | 24.7 | 2.72 |
| | | Boy | 24.9 | 3.59 |
| | | Total | 24.8 | 3.18 |
| Total | Lower | Girl | 25.1 | 2.77 |
| | | Boy | 24.2 | 3.69 |
| | | Total | 24.5 | 3.42 |
| | Middle | Girl | 24.8 | 4.24 |
| | | Boy | 23.9 | 3.56 |
| | | Total | 24.5 | 4.02 |
| | High | Girl | 23.8 | 3.13 |
| | | Boy | 23.6 | 4.68 |
| | | Total | 23.7 | 3.95 |
| | Total | Girl | 24.5 | 3.62 |
| | | Boy | 23.9 | 3.99 |
| | | Total | 24.2 | 3.81 |

Table 6. “Thought Provocation” Related to the Variables of Mother’s Education, Child’s Gender and socio-economic status

| | Sum of squares | Df | Mean Square | F | p |
|-----------------------|----------------|----|-------------|------|---------|
| Mot.Edu(A) | 43,5 | 2 | 21.75 | 1.49 | - |
| Social Class(B) | 1,72 | 2 | 0.86 | 0.06 | - |
| Gender(C) | 1.97 | 1 | 1.97 | 0.14 | - |
| M.E x s.C(A)X(B) | 69.43 | 4 | 17.36 | 1.19 | - |
| M.E x gen.(A)X(C) | 94.47 | 2 | 47.23 | 3.24 | *<0.041 |
| S.C x Gen.(B)X(C) | 6.82 | 2 | 3.41 | 0.23 | - |
| M.Exs.Cxg.(A)X(B)X(C) | 16.17 | 3 | 5.4 | 0.37 | - |

*significant at $p < 0.041$

As it is seen on Table 6; mother’s education, socio-economic statue and gender of the children are not significant for the criterion of thought provocation. However; mother’s education and gender are significant for this criterion. High educational level mothers who have a male child found TV programmes as having more thought provocation than mother’s with middle educational level.

Another question of the study was if there were any significant differences in the criterion of “innocuousness” related to father’s education level, child’s age and gender of the child. A three-ways ANOVA was carried out in analyzing related data. The analysis related to “innocuousness” criterion depending on father’s education, child age and gender was given on Table 7-8.

Table 7. The mean scores and standard deviations for the criterion of “innocuousness”

| Father's education | gender | age | mean | sd |
|---------------------------|---------------|------------|-------------|-----------|
| lower | Girl | 3.00 | 18.00 | 2.00 |
| | | 4.00 | 17.80 | 3.70 |
| | | 5.00 | 19.72 | 5.21 |
| | | 6.00 | 16.50 | 4.20 |
| | | Total | 18.39 | 4.28 |
| | Boy | 3.00 | 20.00 | 7.07 |
| | | 4.00 | 19.33 | 3.78 |
| | | 5.00 | 20.45 | 3.83 |
| | | 6.00 | 14.30 | 4.60 |
| | | Total | 17.55 | 5.11 |
| | Total | 3.00 | 18.80 | 3.96 |
| | | 4.00 | 18.15 | 3.62 |
| | | 5.00 | 20.09 | 4.48 |
| | | 6.00 | 14.82 | 4.48 |
| | | Total | 17.96 | 4.69 |
| | Girl | 3.00 | 16.50 | 2.12 |
| | | 4.00 | 17.00 | 3.19 |
| | | 5.00 | 18.26 | 3.69 |
| | | 6.00 | 20.16 | 1.94 |
| | | Total | 18.07 | 3.35 |
| Middle | Boy | 3.00 | 12.50 | 2.51 |
| | | 4.00 | 18.71 | 4.34 |
| | | 5.00 | 19.00 | 2.75 |
| | | 6.00 | 16.00 | 1.41 |
| | | Total | 17.21 | 4.07 |
| | Total | 3.00 | 13.83 | 2.99 |
| | | 4.00 | 17.63 | 3.63 |
| | | 5.00 | 18.44 | 3.45 |
| | | 6.00 | 19.12 | 2.58 |
| | | Total | 17.79 | 3.59 |
| Higher | Girl | 3.00 | 16.16 | 4.60 |
| | | 4.00 | 15.50 | 1.77 |
| | | 5.00 | 15.75 | 2.50 |
| | | 6.00 | 21.33 | 3.05 |
| | | Total | 16.48 | 3.79 |
| | Boy | 3.00 | 16.53 | 5.30 |
| | | 4.00 | 15.64 | 3.58 |
| | | 5.00 | 19.44 | 4.92 |
| | | 6.00 | 17.77 | 4.02 |
| | | Total | 17.06 | 4.59 |
| | Total | 3.00 | 16.37 | 4.91 |
| | | 4.00 | 15.59 | 3.00 |
| | | 5.00 | 18.30 | 4.57 |
| | | 6.00 | 18.66 | 4.00 |
| | | Total | 16.85 | 4.30 |
| Total | Girl | 3.00 | 16.52 | 3.98 |
| | | 4.00 | 16.86 | 3.11 |
| | | 5.00 | 18.44 | 4.20 |
| | | 6.00 | 19.30 | 3.40 |
| | | Total | 17.71 | 3.81 |
| | Boy | 3.00 | 16.09 | 5.23 |
| | | 4.00 | 17.00 | 4.02 |
| | | 5.00 | 19.76 | 3.94 |
| | | 6.00 | 15.75 | 4.42 |
| | | Total | 17.24 | 4.62 |

| | | | | |
|--|-------|------|-------|------|
| | Total | 3.00 | 16.28 | 4.66 |
| | | 4.00 | 16.92 | 3.51 |
| | | 5.00 | 19.01 | 4.11 |
| | | 6.00 | 17.00 | 4.39 |
| | Total | | 17.47 | 4.23 |

Table 8. “Innocuousness” Related to the Variables of Father’s Education, Child’s Age and Gender

| | Sum of squares | Df | Mean Square | F | P |
|-----------------------|----------------|----|-------------|------|--------|
| Fat.Edu(D) | 25.58 | 2 | 12.79 | 0.79 | - |
| Gender(C) | 1.88 | 1 | 1.88 | 0.12 | - |
| Child Age(E) | 83.38 | 3 | 27.79 | 1.72 | - |
| F.E(D)Xgender(C) | 19.40 | 2 | 9.70 | 0.60 | - |
| F.Exage.(D)X(E) | 243.13 | 6 | 40.52 | 2.51 | *0.024 |
| Agex Gen.(E)X(C) | 116.01 | 3 | 38.67 | 2.39 | - |
| F.Exagexg.(D)X(E)X(C) | 51.9 | 6 | 8.65 | 0.53 | - |

*significant with $p < 0.024$

As it is seen on Table 8; father’s education, child’s age and gender are not significant. However; father’s education and child’s age are significant at the “innocuousness” criterion. ($F=2.506$; $p < 0.024$)

The variables of; child’s age and father’s education were evaluated; it was seen that the lower educational level father’s who have “5” years-old children find TV programmes for children less innocuous than the lower educational father’s who have “6” years-old children. In this occasion, parent’s who had “6” years-old children might have thought that their children could do beneficial activities rather than TV viewing.

The educational level of father’s who have “6” years-old children was evaluated in the same criterion, and it was calculated that; the father’s who were with middle or high educational levels perceived TV programmes for children less innocuous than the father’s with lower educational level.

Another question of the study was if there were any significant differences in the criterion of “involvement” related to father’s education level, child’s age and gender of the child. A three-ways ANOVA was carried out in analyzing related data. The analysis related to “involvement” criterion depending on father’s education, child age and gender was given on Table 9-10.

Table 9. The mean scores and standard deviations for the criterion of “involvement”

| Gender | Father’s Education | Age | Mean | sd |
|--------|--------------------|-------|---------|--------|
| Girl | Lower | 3.00 | 26.3333 | 4.5092 |
| | | 4.00 | 29.3000 | 3.2335 |
| | | 5.00 | 30.0909 | 5.7001 |
| | | 6.00 | 24.5000 | 2.6458 |
| | | Total | 28.6071 | 4.6852 |
| | Middle | 3.00 | 27.0000 | 4.2426 |
| | | 4.00 | 25.8333 | 5.9671 |
| | | 5.00 | 30.3158 | 4.9335 |
| | | 6.00 | 25.3333 | 4.5461 |
| | | Total | 28.0000 | 5.5108 |
| Boy | Higher | 3.00 | 28.5833 | 2.9987 |
| | | 4.00 | 30.8750 | 3.1368 |
| | | 5.00 | 33.5000 | 2.3805 |
| | | 6.00 | 28.3333 | 4.9329 |
| | | Total | 29.9630 | 3.5135 |
| | Total | 3.00 | 28.0000 | 3.2787 |
| | | 4.00 | 28.3333 | 4.8802 |
| | | 5.00 | 30.6176 | 4.9788 |

| | | | | |
|-------|--------|-------|---------|--------|
| | | 6.00 | 25.7692 | 4.0856 |
| | | Total | 28.7447 | 4.7856 |
| Boy | Lower | 3.00 | 28.0000 | 2.8284 |
| | | 4.00 | 28.3333 | 3.5119 |
| | | 5.00 | 28.9091 | 4.3693 |
| | | 6.00 | 25.5385 | 6.1592 |
| | | Total | 27.2759 | 5.1817 |
| | Middle | 3.00 | 27.0000 | 4.1633 |
| | | 4.00 | 31.1429 | 4.2201 |
| | | 5.00 | 29.6667 | 3.4448 |
| | | 6.00 | 28.0000 | 2.8284 |
| | | Total | 29.4737 | 3.9068 |
| | Higher | 3.00 | 30.1333 | 4.1381 |
| | | 4.00 | 27.6429 | 3.2011 |
| | | 5.00 | 27.7778 | 4.9694 |
| | | 6.00 | 26.8889 | 5.6667 |
| | | Total | 28.3191 | 4.4336 |
| | Total | 3.00 | 29.3333 | 4.0906 |
| | | 4.00 | 28.7500 | 3.7446 |
| | | 5.00 | 28.6923 | 4.2967 |
| | | 6.00 | 26.2500 | 5.6588 |
| | | Total | 28.2316 | 4.5975 |
| Total | Lower | 3.00 | 27.0000 | 3.6056 |
| | | 4.00 | 29.0769 | 3.1744 |
| | | 5.00 | 29.5000 | 4.9929 |
| | | 6.00 | 25.2941 | 5.4745 |
| | | Total | 27.9298 | 4.9456 |
| | Middle | 3.00 | 27.0000 | 3.7417 |
| | | 4.00 | 27.7895 | 5.8839 |
| | | 5.00 | 30.1600 | 4.5614 |
| | | 6.00 | 26.0000 | 4.1748 |
| | | Total | 28.4828 | 5.0549 |
| | Higher | 3.00 | 29.4444 | 3.6934 |
| | | 4.00 | 28.8182 | 3.4865 |
| | | 5.00 | 29.5385 | 5.0434 |
| | | 6.00 | 27.2500 | 5.3108 |
| | | Total | 28.9189 | 4.1735 |
| | Total | 3.00 | 28.7368 | 3.7610 |
| | | 4.00 | 28.5185 | 4.3772 |
| | | 5.00 | 29.7833 | 4.7553 |
| | | 6.00 | 26.0811 | 5.1065 |
| | | Total | 28.4868 | 4.6866 |

Table 10. “Involvement” Related to the Variables of Father’s Education, Child’s Age and Gender

| | Sum of squares | Df | Mean Square | F | P |
|-----------------------|----------------|----|-------------|-------|--------|
| Fat.Edu(D) | 0.194 | 1 | 0.194 | 0.009 | - |
| Child Age(E) | 230.11 | 3 | 76.704 | 3.725 | *0.013 |
| Gender(C) | 63.03 | 2 | 31.51 | 1.53 | - |
| F.E(D)Xgender(C) | 78.65 | 3 | 26.22 | 1.27 | - |
| F.Exage.(D)X(E) | 90.99 | 2 | 45.49 | 2.21 | - |
| Agex Gen.(E)X(C) | 25.53 | 6 | 4.25 | 0.21 | - |
| F.Exagexg.(D)X(E)X(C) | 98.43 | 6 | 16.40 | 0.8 | - |

*significant with $p < 0.013$

As it is seen on Table 10; the age of children was significant at the criterion of “involvement”. However, father’s education level and gender are not significant at the criterion of “involvement”. ($F=3.725$; $p < 0.013$)

Moreover; at the criterion of involvement; the parents who have “3” years-old children found TV programmes less involving than the parents who have 6 years-old children. Also parents who have 5 years-old children found TV programmes more involving than the parents who have 6 years-old children.

Another question of the study was if there were any significant differences in the criterion of “entertainment” related to father’s education level, child’s age and gender of the child. A three-ways ANOVA was carried out in analyzing related data. The analysis related to “entertainment” criterion depending on father’s education, child age and gender was given on Table 11-12.

Table 11. The mean scores and standard deviations for the criterion of “entertainment”

| Father’s education | Gender | Age | Mean | sd |
|--------------------|--------|-------|-------|------|
| lower | Girl | 3.00 | 16.00 | 3.46 |
| | | 4.00 | 19.00 | 2.94 |
| | | 5.00 | 18.81 | 3.02 |
| | | 6.00 | 13.75 | 5.05 |
| | | Total | 17.85 | 3.70 |
| | boy | 3.00 | 20.50 | 2.12 |
| | | 4.00 | 19.33 | 1.52 |
| | | 5.00 | 18.36 | 3.04 |
| | | 6.00 | 16.38 | 4.07 |
| | | Total | 17.72 | 3.54 |
| | Total | 3.00 | 17.80 | 3.63 |
| | | 4.00 | 19.07 | 2.62 |
| | | 5.00 | 18.59 | 2.97 |
| | | 6.00 | 15.76 | 4.30 |
| | | Total | 17.78 | 3.59 |
| | Middle | 3.00 | 20.50 | 3.53 |
| | | 4.00 | 17.25 | 3.22 |
| | | 5.00 | 19.26 | 2.76 |
| | | 6.00 | 17.00 | 2.96 |
| | | Total | 18.35 | 3.07 |
| | Boy | 3.00 | 18.00 | 1.41 |
| | | 4.00 | 20.14 | 3.02 |
| | | 5.00 | 18.50 | 2.81 |
| | | 6.00 | 18.00 | 1.41 |
| | | Total | 18.94 | 2.57 |
| | Total | 3.00 | 18.83 | 2.31 |
| | | 4.00 | 18.31 | 3.38 |
| | | 5.00 | 19.08 | 2.73 |
| | | 6.00 | 17.25 | 2.60 |
| | | Total | 18.55 | 2.90 |
| Higher | Girl | 3.00 | 17.00 | 2.41 |
| | | 4.00 | 18.50 | 2.87 |
| | | 5.00 | 20.25 | 2.21 |
| | | 6.00 | 17.00 | 1.00 |
| | | Total | 17.92 | 2.60 |
| | Boy | 3.00 | 17.53 | 1.99 |
| | | 4.00 | 16.07 | 2.67 |
| | | 5.00 | 18.44 | 3.84 |
| | | 6.00 | 16.88 | 3.91 |
| | | Total | 17.14 | 3.03 |
| Total | Total | 3.00 | 17.29 | 2.16 |
| | | 4.00 | 16.95 | 2.93 |
| | | 5.00 | 19.00 | 3.44 |
| | | 6.00 | 16.91 | 3.36 |
| | | Total | 17.43 | 2.89 |
| | Girl | 3.00 | 17.23 | 2.81 |

| | | | | |
|--|-------|-------|-------|------|
| | | 4.00 | 18.16 | 3.04 |
| | | 5.00 | 19.23 | 2.75 |
| | | 6.00 | 16.00 | 3.55 |
| | | Total | 18.08 | 3.13 |
| | Boy | 3.00 | 17.90 | 2.02 |
| | | 4.00 | 17.66 | 3.22 |
| | | 5.00 | 18.42 | 3.16 |
| | | 6.00 | 16.70 | 3.78 |
| | | Total | 17.68 | 3.15 |
| | Total | 3.00 | 17.60 | 2.39 |
| | | 4.00 | 17.94 | 3.10 |
| | | 5.00 | 18.88 | 2.94 |
| | | 6.00 | 16.45 | 3.67 |
| | | Total | 17.88 | 3.14 |

Table 12. “Entertainment” Related to the Variables of Father’s Education, Child’s Age and Gender

| | Sum of squares | Df | Mean Square | F | P |
|-----------------------|----------------|----|-------------|-------|--------|
| Fat.Edu(D) | 18.05 | 2 | 9.02 | 0.99 | - |
| Gender(C) | 3.06 | 1 | 3.06 | 0.33 | - |
| Child Age(E) | 99.33 | 3 | 33.11 | 3.62 | *0.014 |
| F.E(D)Xgender(C) | 40.04 | 2 | 20.02 | 2.19 | - |
| F.Exage.(D)X(E) | 63.37 | 6 | 10.56 | 1.154 | - |
| Agex Gen.(E)X(C) | 24.86 | 3 | 8.28 | 0.90 | - |
| F.Exagexg.(D)X(E)X(C) | 66.53 | 6 | 11.08 | 1.21 | - |

*significant at $p < 0.014$

The Table 12 indicates that; the age of children are found to be significant at the criterion of “entertainment”. However, father’s education level and gender are not statistically significant at the criterion of “entertainment” ($F=3.617$; $p < 0.014$). Besides; the parents who have 5 years-old children find TV programmes for children more entertaining than the parents who have “6” years-old children.

DISCUSSION

Discussion on the Results Related to the Effects of Mother’s Education Level (MEL), Income Level of Family (ILF) and Gender of the Child(GOC) on the Quality Criteria

According to the analysis of the combined effect of MEL and GOC variables, mother’s who have male children and medium level of education mostly think that children’s TV programmes are less thought provocative, when compared to other mother’s.

Among the families who have male children, the one’s in which mother’s have high education level think that children’s programmes are thought provocative than the one’s in which mothers are in medium educational level. According to the analysis of the combined effect of MEL and GOC variables, mother’s who have male children and medium level of education mostly think that children’s TV programmes are less thought provocative, when compared to other mother’s.

Neither of the variable were not significantly related to the criteria of “innocuousness”; “presence of role models”; “restfulness”; “credibility”; “involvement”; “entertainment”; “comprehensibility”.

Discussion on the Findings about the Effects of Father’s Education Level (FEL), Age of the Child (AOF) and Gender of the Child (GOC) Variables on the Quality Criteria

FEL, AOC, GOC variables were not found to be statistically significant for “innocuousness” quality criterion. Besides, the main and interactions effects of the above mentioned variables were not found to be significant either. According to the analysis of the main effect of AOC variable, parent’s who have “5” years-old children mostly think that children’s TV programmes are more innocuous than the parents who have “3” and “4” years-old children.

A research carried out by Angela Teresa Clarke and Beth Kurtz-Costes (1997) supports our results. That research revealed that television viewing time was negatively related to school readiness for children at 6 years. In this occasion, parent's who had "6" years-old children might think that their children could do beneficial activities rather than viewing TV. Also, a research carried out by Williams and Hanford (1986); indicated that the communities in which there were no television viewing, doing sports activities was more popular among children (Cohen, 1993).

As a conclusion it may be said that parents from different cultures perceive TV watching as being not for beneficial for their children at 5-6 year-olds. FEL, AOF, GOC variables were not found to be statistically significant for "involvement" quality criterion. Besides, the combined effects of the above mentioned variables were not found to be significant either. However; the main effects and interaction of AOC variable was found to be statistically significant.

According to the analysis of the main effect of AOC variable, parent's who have "3" years-old children mostly think that children's TV programmes are less involving than the parents who have "6" years-old children. In addition, parent's who have "5" years-old children mostly think that children's TV programmes are less involving than the parents who have "6" years-old children. On the basis of those results it may be said that when the child gets older, the parents may think that the children's TV programmes are more involved. In a study which were carried out in Turkey; the results indicated that only 17 percent of the Turkish parents of 3-6 year-olds expected that TV programmes for children should be entertaining (Başal,1999).

On this occasion; "3" years-old children's parents may think that their children are so young to understand the children's TV programmes. And the parent's who have "6" years-old children may think that their children have to study for academic development because of their age. Also they may be though that the TV programmes for children are not suitable for all ages. The cognitive abilities of the older children might be related to their higher TV interest than the younger children. Evra (1998) shares similar opinions in this topic such as older children's having longer attention span.

FEL, AOF, GOC variables were not found to be statistically significant for "entertainment" quality criterion. Besides, the combined effects of the above mentioned variables were not found to be significant either. However; the separate effect of AOC variable was found to be statistically significant. These results also revealed that the main effect of AOC variable, parent's who have "5" years-old children mostly think that children's TV programmes are more entertaining than the parents who have "6" years-old children. Thus; children's TV programmes which are produced for fun might be perceived as being more childish by parents who have "6" years-old children.

On the other hand, there are some other researches, which are focused on the parents concerns about entertainment media. Parents are deeply concerned about children's exposure to "inappropriate" content in entertainment media, especially on TV (Rideout, 2004). Two out of three parents (63%) say they are "very" concerned that children are being exposed to too much inappropriate content in entertainment media, and another one in four (26%) say they are "somewhat" concerned. When asked which type of media content concerns them the most, a third (34%) say TV, 20% say all media concern them equally, 16% say the Internet is of greatest concern, 10% say movies, 7% music, and 5% say video games (Rideout, 2004).

On the basis of the results of this research, the quality criteria for the children's TV programs should be studied in relation to the education of children. Thus it could be possible to make television programs more sophisticated in relation to reach educational targets. A suitable way of accomplishing this could be that the teachers and educators in relation to attaining educational goals can evaluate those criteria. Since the television offers a capable and an effective technology for instruction (Zechowski, 2006), more quality criteria should have been defined and studied in this respect for making this technology more influential to educate children and people.

The purpose of this article was to help to increase the quality of policymaking process and decision-making within the media industry, by offering some insights into what parents mostly thought about children's television programmes, the influences they saw on their own children's lives. So the children's television programmes could be more educative and entertaining if the children's programmes would be evaluated by parents, teachers, educators and program makers according to the quality criteria.

REFERENCES

Anderson, D. R., Huston, A. C., Schmitt, K. L., Linebarger, D. L., & Wright, J. C. (2001). *Early Childhood Television Viewing and Adolescent Behavior: The recontact study*. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development. USA. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx>

- Başal, Asude Handan.(1999). “3-6 Yaş Çocukların Günlük yaşamlarında Televizyon ve Televizyon ile ilgili Anababa görüşleri” (Television in 3 to 6 years old children’s daily life and parent’s views about television).İletişim ortamlarında Çocuk birey Sempozyumu Bildiriler Kitabı. Eskişehir: T.C. Anadolu Üniversitesi İletişim Fakültesi Yayınları
- Bayram, Servet. (1991). “ *An Instructional Design Analysis of Susame Street for Social Learning*”. İstanbul: Institute of Social Sciences, Boğaziçi University.
- Batur, Yüksel. (1998). “*Bilim Kurgu Sinemasında Şiddet ve İdeoloji.*” (Violance and ideology in science fiction cinema).İstanbul: Kitle Yayıncılık
- Buckingham, David. (1993). “*Children talking television*”. The television literacy. London:The Free Press.
- Clarke, Teresa Angela; Kurtz-Costes Beth.(1997). “Television viewing, Educational Quality of the Home Environment, and School Readiness”.*Journal of Educational Research*. 90,279-285.
- Cohen, Stewart. (winter 1993/94) “Television in the lives of children and their families”. *Childhood education*.
- Evra, Judith Von. (1998). *Television and Child Development*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum associates.
- Koutsouvanov, Eugenia. (1993). “Television and child language development.” *International Journal of Early Childhood*.
- Nikken, Peter&Van Der Voort,(1997), “Children’s Views on Quality Standards for Children’s Television Programs”. *Journal of Educational Media*. 23,169-185.
- Steiner, Deborah.(1999). “*6 Yaşında*” (6 years old) (Çev. Füsun Doruker). İstanbul: Altın Kitaplar.
- Özdiker, Cengiz. (2002). *Çocuk Ve Televizyon* (Child and television). Çoluk Çocuk.s:16
- Özgen; Özgün. (1985) “*Radyo ve Televizyonda Okul Öncesi Eğitim ve Öğretmen Yetiştirme*”. (Preschool education and teacher training in television and radio)Okul Öncesi Eğitimi ve Yaygınlaştırılması Semineri. Ya-Pa Yayınları. İstanbul.
- Rideout, Victoria & Hamel Elizabeth. (2006). “*The Media Family: Electronic Media in the Lives of Infants, Toddlers, Preschoolers and Their Parents*”. California: Kaiser Family Foundation. www.kff.org
- Rideout, Victoria. (2004). “*Parents, Media and Public Policy: A Kaiser Family Foundation*” Washington: Kaiser Family Foundation. www.kff.org
- Yeşiltuna, Dilek. (1999). *Kitle İletişim Sürecinde Çocuk*.(Child in the telecommunication process). İletişim Ortamlarında Çocuk Birey Sempozyumu Bildiriler Kitabı. (140-148). Eskişehir: T.C. Anadolu Üniversitesi Yayınları, İletişim Fakültesi Yayınları.
- Zechowski, Sharon.(2006).*Educational Television*.
<http://www.museum.tv/archives/etv/E/htmlE/educationalt/educationalt.htm>