

Introduction

BACKGROUND TO CHANNEL ONE

When war in the Persian Gulf started, Jason was a senior and an average student at a large high school in the Southwest. His best friends, Ron and Mike, attended school in another part of the city. Because Ron and Mike were eighteen, they were able to and did enlist in the army after the start of the war. They had only two weeks of school left in late February 1990 before they had to report for military training, so they invited Jason to spend the day with them at school. Jason's mother, Sarah, had to drive him across town that day to be with Ron and Mike.

On the return ride, Jason said, "Hey Ma, they had Channel One in that school, and I watched it today."

Jason knew that Sarah, an instructional technology professor, was studying the effects of Channel One. "What was it like," she asked.

"Oh, I don't know," he replied.

"Come on, Jason," she prodded. "What do you remember?"

He hesitated and tried to recall. "Mom," he said finally, "did you know that Snickers has a new peanut-butter bar?"

"Jason." She was exasperated. "What else do you remember?"

He took his time and thought. He said tentatively, "There was an ad for Nikes."

"Is that all you remember?" Sarah was disappointed.

"Yup," he said defensively and then was quiet.

Jason's best friends were in danger of being shipped to the Persian Gulf. His mother was studying Channel One and spoke of it frequently at the dinner table. Whatever learning theory one selects to describe Jason's preparation to view and recall Channel One, he was

ready. He was rehearsed and cued. He had advanced organizers and a "mind set" to view, not only the news program itself, but segments on the War in the Gulf which were prominent that Wednesday. Yet, he could not recall seeing any news.

Channel One is a twelve-minute video news program which by mid 1992 was beamed daily to 11,900 high-school classrooms in the United States. Produced by Whittle Communications, the program attempts to combat a perceived teenage ignorance and apathy about current events. The contract between schools and Whittle Communications offers a free satellite dish and cable wiring for the building, plus videotape recorders and televisions in exchange for the promise that students will view the twelve-minute news program every day. (Schools who break the contract within the first three years must pay for all the electronic gifts.)

The controversy surrounding the program stems primarily from the fact that two minutes of advertising are embedded in each twelve-minute program. Whittle Communications charges advertisers \$150,000 for a thirty-second spot on Channel One. The New York Times estimates potential revenue from these ads to be approximately \$100 million a year. The venture has been so successful that Chris Whittle is raising his rates to \$200,000 for a thirty-second spot on the news program (Becker 1992). Some legislators argue that student time in tax-supported buildings is being sold to advertisers who will profit handsomely from addressing a captive audience. Questions have arisen about the legality of selling student time in exchange for free television equipment. Consequently, New York and Rhode Island have banned the program from public schools, while California reduces state support for those schools that adopt the program. While it is important to question sanctioned ads in public classrooms and to ask what students learn from viewing Channel One, this book will consider broader issues in an attempt to describe this cultural event. Some key concerns are the incursion of a private-sector entrepreneur in public school curriculum; the implications of private-sector wiring of public school buildings; the production and reception of Channel One commercial and noncommercial messages; and the attitudes of all the Channel One participants, including students, teachers, administrators, school boards, and parents.

It would be foolhardy for educators to underestimate the importance of this enterprise because it provides a window on the world of Chris Whittle, owner and president of Whittle Communications. The form and structure of his video news magazine, the terms of his Channel One contracts with schools, and the manner in which his

staff interacts with school administrators divulge his intentions for U.S. education. Further intentions are revealed in his plans for the opening of proprietary schools. Because these plans are closely linked to buildings wired for Channel One (Whittle speaks of an existing eight million electronic seat system), I will turn for a moment to the Edison Project.

THE EDISON PROJECT

The Edison Project is Whittle's plan to create hundreds of private schools for profit which rely on a technology infrastructure. In 1992, Chris Whittle hired a seven-person team to design new and better schools that could earn a profit.

The group includes Chester E. Finn, Jr., professor of education and public policy at Vanderbilt University, who was a top aide to education Secretary, William J. Bennett in the Reagan Administration; John E. Chubb, a senior fellow with the governmental studies program at Brookings Institute, and an advocate of parental choice in determining where to send children to school; Benno Schmidt, former president of Yale University; and Sylvia Peters, principal of Alexandre Dumas Elementary School in Chicago, the only team member directly connected with schooling for children.

Other team members have had no professional experience in education. They include Lee Eisenberg, former editor-in-chief of *Esquire* magazine, which Chris Whittle used to own; Nancy Hechinger, manager of Hands-On Media, a company that produces computerized reference material; Daniel Bierderman, president of the Grand Central and 34th Street Partnerships, organizations that assist property owners and tenants in Manhattan; and Dominique Browning, a former assistant managing editor of education, the family, television, and psychology for *Newsweek* magazine.

At a February news conference announcing the Edison Project team, Ms. Browning

... adopted a tone of amused wonderment [and said] "I think some of us feel as though we've thrown ourselves out of the window or into a black hole, . . . some of us don't know anything about anything and we need to catch up." (New York Times, 141:48, 890, Friday, February 28, 1992; Sec. A, 14)

When the former *Esquire* editor asked Chris Whittle why he, Eisenberg, had been chosen for the Edison Project team, Whittle re-

plied, "Think of this as eight to ten hours of programming to a young audience . . . Think of generating ideas that inform and entertain in several media" (Becker 1992, 173).

(The necessary expertise of two team members from the world of magazines would not surprise the classroom teacher who views Channel One each day.)

INSTRUCTIONAL TELEVISION IN THE 1950s

This is not the first time the private sector has mobilized to rescue an educational system defined as failing. Dissatisfaction with U.S. schools was rampant in the mid-1950s. Even before the capstone event of the Soviet Sputnik launch, the public was asked *Why Johnny Can't Read* (Flesch 1955) and was told that schools were *American Wastelands*, (Bestor 1953). Hirsch (1987) and Bloom (1987) were the 1980s counterparts of Arthur Bestor, and a similar movement for education reform was launched in the 1980s, partially on the basis of their critiques. The 1950s and 1980s reform movements have some interesting similarities—not the least of which is a reliance on technology.

Video technology was introduced to the classroom in the late 1950s in response to the postwar crowding of classrooms, dissatisfaction with the U.S. public school system, and the launching of the Soviet missile. The Ford Foundation—and private-sector representatives who sat on Ford foundation boards—dispensed money for the development of instructional television programs, thus deciding on subjects to be addressed and formats for delivery. Instructional video software was sponsored and approved by private sector businessmen while educators were bypassed. (It should be pointed out, however, that these men did not stand to profit by development of curriculum. They simply thought it was their civic duty to improve public education.) Ford Foundation agencies supplied 90 percent of the television-program dollars spent on every elementary and secondary student in the United States between 1953 and 1963 (DeVaney 1990). The 1950s video hardware—much of which eventually collected dust on library shelves—was purchased through National Defense Education Act grants. This expensive effort (\$100 million from Ford in 1950s currency) failed to achieve its goals, but was the start of instructional television in the schools.

That private sector businessmen—then or now—should turn to technology—especially television—is paradoxical. It may be said

that reliance on TV to educate is an articulation of the American love affair with technology, but commercial television is cast as a major culprit in the critiques mounted against public schools. Periodically—and especially when school budgets are constrained—studies are cited in which the number of hours in which students view television is correlated with their grade-point averages. Whether the ploy is deliberate or not, it usually stirs enough indignation at the electronic monster to deflect attention away from educational budget cuts (Felter 1982).

WHITTLE AND TECHNOLOGY

Unlike their counterparts in the 1950s, private sector educational innovators of the 1990s do not rely solely on television, but also on electronic learning stations. Chris Whittle envisions, not only Channel One but additional technology at the heart of Edison Project proprietary schools.

Technology will play a heavy role. Each student will probably have his own learning “partner” both at school and at home, consisting of a monitor, a computer, a printer and a VCR, a fax machine, a paintboard, a stereo and a telephone. Through this setup, there will be unlimited access to an electronic library of books, films, lectures, speeches and thousands of learning games. Mr. Whittle sees this library as “America’s new textbook industry.” (Chira 1992, A12)

Technological innovations—such as film, television, and main-frame computers—have, over the years, been touted as the panacea to many educational ills but have failed to fulfill their promise. The personal computer was introduced in classrooms and homes through a top-down, bottom-up process which makes its presence more stable and enduring than other innovations. This perceived stability has tempted both educators and noneducators to embrace desktop computers as an answer to many educational concerns. Because a decade of classroom computer use has uncovered its shortcomings, proponents with an undying belief in technology are not abandoning PCs, but they are suggesting the connection of additional hardware—such as video and telephone—to the desktop computer. The new panacea will be a multimedia learning station, and Whittle plans to plug the student into such a station, both in school and at home. There would

be less need for teachers or parents to interfere in the learning process, a fact that Whittle has noted.

Let's not be locked into the standard student-teacher ratios . . . The rigidity—twenty-to-one, thirty-to-one, with the teacher in front—is part of the problem. With technology in place, the idea of “teacher” will be expanded. Yes, we may have fewer paid teachers . . . (Becker 1992, 174)

A large body of literature about computers and television supports the notion that students learn better with human partners such as classmates, teachers, and parents who participate in the electronic lesson. But this research does not serve the political nor market goals of the Edison Project. At the heart of Whittle's educational policy is the publication, *Politics, Markets and America's Schools*, (1990) which John Chubb, an Edison Project member, and Terry Moe wrote. It has been cited as the blueprint for believers in parental choice, and as a justification of the voucher system. Another Edison Project team member, Chester Finn, translated Chubb and Moe's dissatisfaction with the current U.S. educational system into President Bush's voucher plan. This plan formed the basis for the “New American Schools,” a proposal by former Education Secretary Lamar Alexander to present parents with the freedom of choice through vouchers. He and others believe that successful private schools will force changes in public schools. Former Secretary Alexander, who is a former business colleague of Chris Whittle, has not publically commented on the Edison Project, but the similarity between the Edison Project design and “New American Schools” is marked.

Whittle's strength in the past has been in identifying and selling specifically targeted markets to single advertisers. (See chapter 5.) The Edison Project would sell students in proprietary schools to communications corporations who might own the network configurations and could conceivably produce educational software; to electronics corporations who might produce the educational hardware; to publishers who would produce educational software; to service corporations, such as McDonald's that would operate cafeterias; and to advertisers of products which teens consume. Whittle envisions his educational enterprise as big business and claims,

There is going to be a Silicon Valley of education and Knoxville [Whittle headquarters] could well be where it's based. . . With Channel One we've effectively built an eight-million-seat sys-

tem—and we may well double its size. That pipeline becomes a freeway to providers of educational software. I see a link between that pipeline and those providers. And Edison might be one of the big software providers. (Becker 1992, 174)

Understanding the profitability of such a venture, partners have already joined Whittle in the enterprise. They are the Time-Warner communications conglomerate, Phillips Electronics N.V., and Associated Newspapers of Britain.

Issues of diversity are not mentioned in reported Edison Project plans, and methods for teaching a multicultural student body are not discussed in “New American Schools.” When Chris Whittle was asked by news reporters about access to his schools for profit, he indicated that all students, regardless of race, who had the ability to pay would be accepted (Chira 1992). He hopes to be able to offer 20 percent of the students full scholarships. His intent is to charge approximately \$5,500, tuition which is the average cost per student in today’s public schools. However, he would actually have to operate the schools at a \$3,500-cost-per-pupil figure to accommodate building costs and scholarships. In his design, scholarships have been tied to the accomplishment of a fiscally ambitious—and perhaps impractical—plan. Charges of elitism—which have been levelled against former Secretary Alexander’s voucher plan—can certainly be levelled against the Edison Program plan. Although these proprietary schools are in the future, part of the electronic “freeway” for their implementation has been established and built with Channel One.

CHANNEL ONE

All the studies included here have been generated by the need to examine what the authors consider to be a groundbreaking innovation in public schools. These studies have been jointly designed and coordinated to address a common set of concerns, and they have theoretical and methodological coherence. They answer many questions about Channel One that simple comprehension and retention measures alone cannot answer. (These measures, however, have not been neglected. See chapter 2.)

The groundbreaking aspects of the innovation which generate a common set of concerns include the following:

1. This is the first time a precisely targeted captive audience—such as high school students—have been sold to television advertisers

with the sanction and permission of the schools. (Channel One is not similar to an ad on the wall of a school gym which students may elect to view.)

2. This is the first time that a private-sector entrepreneur who develops instructional television has exercised such control over the design, delivery, and reception practices of his product. The Whittle contract is restrictive. For example, students must view 90 percent of Channel One programs per year. They may not do any other work while the program is being shown and cannot be excused from the room to study elsewhere. School personnel have no input to the program, nor any choice of delivery time. If any aspect of the contract is broken, Whittle Communications will cease delivery of the program and charge the school for the electronic wiring and hardware which it supplied free. No instructional nor educational television innovation to date has exercised such control over classroom practices.
3. This is the first time that a private sector entrepreneur has electronically wired 11,900 high schools in the United States. These high schools are prepared to receive additional Whittle channels that are being tested.

In addition to similar concerns about this innovation, the authors of this book share common ideas about television which shaped the manner in which their studies were conducted. Some common assumptions about the medium of television—whether commercial or educational—are important to an understanding of the significance of Channel One.

THE STUDY OF TELEVISION

Commercial television is a major transmitter of culture today. Practices of production, transmission, and reception shape our lives in a substantial way. Patterns of speech, dress, fashion, family rituals, group behaviors, and other social roles are simultaneously reflected and exaggerated on the TV screen. Broadcast and cablecast television help shape children's actions, beliefs and empirical knowledge. Educators often neglect to assign enough influence to television. Whether at home or in the school, television is a powerful teacher who competes daily with classroom teachers from preschool through college.

Traditional educational studies of television have endeavored to ascertain what children learn by applying behavioral or cognitive the-

ories of learning. Some researchers even considered the medium to be neutral in shaping information. Many current researchers understand that learning is a social as well as a psychological construct.

Humans learn because of their membership in groups which provide access to the construction and production of communications. Long ago, the signs and symbols of these communications were negotiated in and by practice, and are renegotiated daily by their users. Thus, analysis of communicative systems becomes central to researchers attempting to access the social construction of knowledge.

Analysis of language is the obvious avenue of address to social knowledge, but the human environment consists of many additional communicative systems, not the least of which is television. Just as linguists and literary critics analyze texts, so can the communicative system of television be analyzed.

A television program such as Channel One has all the elements of a text and may be considered to be a social text that has been constructed with intent by a producer. It may also be considered to be encoded in socially constructed signs and symbols that are interpreted by members of a community who have access to those signs and symbols. As other texts do, Channel One draws its visual and verbal language from larger, more amorphous texts or discourses. While the authors of this book ask important questions—such as what and how many facts are retained by students watching Channel One (chapter 2), these questions concern only one narrow aspect of a cognitive discourse and do not address the context of Channel One. (The authors do realize that this narrow aspect influences political funding decisions.) The transmission and reception of Channel One is an event which incorporates signs, symbols, codes, and the rhetoric of discourses from broadcast and cablecast TV; from the marketplace; and from instructional television. The advent of Channel One breaks through the curricular rhetoric of U.S. high-school classrooms and includes decisions of administrators, school boards, and parents. Not only does it alter the student's classroom experience, but electronic wiring alters the function of the school building. Whether the alterations improve education or not, the event is major in its proportions and deserves close scrutiny. As scholars, the authors of this book address the event of Channel One.

In these chapters, larger texts than television are identified. For example, high-school teachers and administrators participate in marketplace discourses as well as educational discourses. They may discuss and agree with former Vice President Quayle's pronouncement

about Murphy Brown, depending upon the discourse of which they are subjects. Also, they may support the notion of private-sector incursion in public schools depending upon which educational discourse they have adopted as their own. Discourses or systems of thought are textual, because they have been also constructed by producers, contain encoded messages, and are interpreted by receivers. The discourses identified in this book are not discrete. They overlap, and one person may have membership in several groups which produce different discourses. However, the discourses themselves may be verified by the manner in which they incorporate their own assumptions and values, by the language that they call their own, and by the prestige that they ascribe to certain concepts and, ultimately, to certain knowledge. Channel One is a small text which has been thrown like a pebble into a pond in which it activates and participates in widening circles of discourses. It is the television text, as well as these widening discourses, which these chapters address. This approach, however, breaks with traditional methods of researching television in the classroom.

INSTRUCTIONAL TELEVISION RESEARCH

Since the late 1950s, educators considering the purchase of video hardware and software have been plagued by a basic question of "What and how much do students learn while viewing television in the classroom?" Early instructional television research, like other instructional technology studies, pitted television against live lecture with the hope of discovering how much students learned when exposed to the medium (Williams, Paul, and Ogilvie 1957; Pflieger and Kelly 1961; Schramm and Chu, 1967; and Sykes 1964). These studies—informed early on by behaviorism and later by cognitivism—assumed that the medium was neutral. Not only was that assumption false, but the research design and statistics employed in these studies were rigorous. True and quasi-experimental designs and the application of T tests or ANOVAs called for a comparison of slightly different—not widely different—treatments such as television and live lectures. Unfortunately, most of that early research must be jettisoned. (It is interesting to note that some of these same designs are being employed today in educational computer studies. This is because political agendas, not appropriate research agendas, often determine research designs. Agencies which offer computer research grants demand that the grantee supply numbers which verify the efficiency and effectiveness of this instructional technology.)

In the early 1970s, there were isolated researchers who noted the unique nature of television, in and out of the classroom. They attempted to describe the impact of TV structure on viewers. Anderson (1972) explored the visual rhetoric of instructional TV, and Morrow (1975) attempted to map a grammar of media. *Sesame Street* studies (Lesser 1974) added information about the effects of pacing, linearity, and sequencing upon viewing. Baggaley and Duck (1975) explored the structure of commercial television. The largest contribution to research on the structure of educational television and learning was made by Salomon (1979, 1981, 1982, 1984) with his early investigation of aptitude treatment interaction and his later exploration of television as a symbol system. However, it is the nature of instructional technology researchers—as with some other educational researchers—to conduct studies in isolation. Also, the findings already mentioned, have never formed any cumulative body of knowledge about instructional television nor have the designers of educational television consulted this body of research.

The assumptions of psychological learning theories and their concomitant research designs unduly strain any investigation of a cultural artifact such as television. Any analysis of individual brain function does not have the power to account for the assemblage and origin of various communicative codes found in any television program. Such theories do not have the power to address the manner in which students participate in a community to master and read these codes.

TELEVISION AND CULTURAL CRITICS

Several cultural critics, however, have explored forms of commercial television and established the tenor for inquiry about that medium which pervades our personal lives and institutions of schooling. (Ellis 1982, Fiske 1988, Fiske and Hartley 1978, Gitlin 1980, Hall 1980, Heath and Skirrow 1977, Tuchman 1978, Williams 1975). Although these authors produce diverse analyses, they perceive television as a cultural form around which unique aesthetic practice, institutional organization, and social roles coalesce. They see the practice of television embodying powerful change and inherent contradictions. Their work forms a body of knowledge to which scholars in media studies refer, and some continuity can be said to exist in this arena. It is this body of knowledge which informs the common beliefs about television that the authors of this book share.

ETV AND ITV

There is a distinction between instructional television (ITV) and educational television (ETV). The former originally consisted of telecourses designed for credit, and the later consisted of informational and aesthetic programs for general viewing. Recently, the distinction has become blurred for several reasons.

The financially beleaguered Public Broadcasting System, which is the largest producer of educational television, has been bolstered by Annenberg Foundation money since the mid 1980s. Annenberg Foundation board members provided the fiscal and political impetus to deliver junior-college telecourses for credit to homes across the country. With Annenberg grants, PBS entered the instructional television market, but additional distinctions are fading.

The production and delivery of ETV and ITV originally generated separate video grammars, with ETV borrowing most of its visual codes from commercial television, and ITV incorporating visual codes from classroom lectures, World War II demonstration films, and documentary films. However, with the continued success of *Sesame Street* and the popularity of MTV, instructional television grammar is changing drastically.

Fast-paced, mixed-format codes—some of which are unique to television—are borrowed frequently by ITV producers. However, neither visual grammar, whether it is classroom or commercial grammar, has produced outstanding curricular materials. Indeed, an ongoing tension between designers of ETV and ITV has spawned a sometimes acrimonious debate about production styles. ETV producers, many of whom started in commercial television, often rejected designs of ITV producers who were usually educators. The elements of instruction, that is, advanced organizer, repetition, and summary, were often too boring for ETV producers. They argued that boring ITV programs would not maintain the attention of students. ITV producers, on the other hand, argued that the fast pace and superficial treatment of commercial television would hinder viewer learning. Such arguments were largely responsible for the failure of many well-funded joint efforts in instructional television.

Attempts to deliver credit courses to adults at home have been particularly plagued by this debate, including that of the Open University of America, the University of Mid-America, and many Annenberg projects. Actually, both visual grammars are constrained; ITV by its excessive use of the talking head and omniscient voice-over narrator, and ETV by its blind incorporation of the shifting visual

styles of commercial television. The current trend on both sides is to imitate commercial television. (See the Children's Television Workshop production of *Square One TV*.)

Chris Whittle bypassed this debate, when he hired his own producers from commercial television. The Channel One format is borrowed intact from MTV and includes visual or "sight bites" as well as "sound bites" of the news. Young DJs, similar to those on MTV, introduce and segue the bites. Gavriel Salomon (1984) found that children were predisposed to be entertained when watching television at home, and that this predisposition had to be confronted before a video program was screened in the classroom. In other words, students must be carefully prepared to attend to televised instruction in a manner that will heighten recall. Such is the drawback of trying to teach with television. If a program incorporates the codes of MTV, it most likely encourages a predisposition for entertainment in the classroom.

CHANNEL ONE STUDIES AND ANALYSES

Most of the chapters in this book report studies which were designed, coordinated, and conducted by the authors to describe the cultural event of Channel One. The authors are primarily educational technology professors and were selected for their common research interest and varied methodological approaches. To achieve a rich and articulated description of this event, all studies were designed to explore separate issues, but also to complement each other.

The event of Channel One is articulated on many planes. As I have indicated earlier, it is the first time that thousands of public schools have been wired by an entrepreneur in the private sector. It is also the first time that so restrictive a contract has been written for students viewing television in classrooms, and it is the first time that television ads have been aired daily to millions of students. Discourses of public schooling, pedagogy, the marketplace, media communications, law, and other factors construct the Channel One event and the knowledge which it generates. When exploring this cultural event, the authors apply a range of methods such as narratology, structural, and poststructural techniques for reading the news program, rhetorical analysis, political and ideological approaches, and quasi-experimental design.

Because all communications are some form of narration, Rob-inson opens this book with a vivid description of daily life in a Mid-

west suburban junior high school. She makes the sights, sounds, and smells of this building available to the reader as she considers what, if any, important contribution Channel One makes to this school. Students speak frankly if tersely, about their reaction to the current events program. Teachers are more detailed in their responses. All staff members are worried, not about Channel One, but about finances during this recession and, additionally, about control over the curriculum. The principal notes that the "real driving force behind the school is the three B's—buses, bread, and basketball."

While educational scholars sometimes write about structural and post-structural theories, they seldom apply methods suggested by these theories to discourses, and rarely do they apply these methods to specific media texts. This book breaks ground in this area by providing specific models in chapters 4, 6, and 7 for the analysis of educational television programs. Structural techniques are borrowed from the formal film model developed by the cinema scholar, David Bordwell (chapter 7). His exploration of aesthetic style and production techniques are used by Barbara Erdman to examine the emergence of a new educational genre, the school news television program. Although informed by the dictates of structure, Erdman's work incorporates a consideration of popular culture and the environment of the classroom in which lessons are produced. As with the more sophisticated semiotic models, her analysis explores the paradigmatic origin of the structures encountered in the school news program. She conducts a formal analysis of both Channel One and CNN's *Newsroom*, another current-events program produced for public schools. The form, style, and lesson of each program selected for analysis are described. The stylistic slickness and attractive format of this new genre are weighed against the content of the lesson offered.

While structural theories of meaning construction offer a unique opportunity to explore the codes, design, production techniques, and other formal aspects of television, they do not address the reader nor the viewer. Poststructural theories reinstate the reader in the communicative troika of author, text, and reader. In fact, they valorize readers and locate the construction of meaning in the reading process, rather than in the text itself. Some reader theories, such as reception theory, provide the opportunity to explore the relationships between and among reader, text, and the author or producer. Poststructural theories have been more widely discussed by educational scholars and more frequently applied by language arts researchers than were structural theories in the field of education. Nonetheless, they are seldom applied to the analysis of educational media.

While reader theories form a fully articulated paradigm which includes psychological, phenomenological, and social models, those forms popular in the United States are the social models, especially that of deconstruction. The challenge to all authority which is inherent in deconstructive thought has captured the imagination of U.S. literary scholars both on the left and the right. This amethodological theory appeals to those who wish to challenge the status quo in radical or reactionary, progressive or regressive ways. With the exception of language-arts scholars, most educational researchers use post-structural theories only for discourse analysis, not for textual analysis.

Chapter 6 in this book applies an adapted reader theory to explore the manner in which Channel One advertisements construct their audience or subjects. Cues within the visual and audio channels of the ads are examined to answer the question of "Just whom do these ads think their viewers are?"

Advertising is also the topic of chapter 5 which traces the inception of Channel One in public-school classrooms, and describes the nature of pilot programs and early testing of the current events program. As an advertising professor, Barry's primary focus is a consideration of the ethics of advertising in the classroom. This factual chapter provides vital background information on Chris Whittle and other Whittle Communication enterprises. An early version of this chapter provided the impetus for several studies in this collection.

If structural and poststructural theories disclose the constructed nature of that which is considered to be true, one might believe—as does Ellen Rooney (1989) in *Seductive Reasoning* and Steven Mailloux (1989) in *Rhetorical Power*—that all construction of meaning and, consequently, all knowledge, is rhetorical in nature.

Chapter 4 returns to rhetoric as a device for the analysis of media. To investigate what students view, Belland conducts a visual and verbal discourse analyses of a week of Channel One programming.

While most readers are familiar with discourse analyses of written and spoken words, Belland's work emphasizes the rhetorical nature of visual communications. In addition to content, he considers framing, transitions, pacing, duration of sequences, and other elements which create the televised message. The construction of these elements are traced to discourses from the domain of public-school pedagogy, journalism, commercial television, the marketplace, and pop culture. His analysis also explores the ethics of this event.

A separate and more traditional incorporation of rhetorical analysis can be seen in chapter 10. Here St. Maurice delineates the

rhetoric of the debate surrounding Channel One and the rhetoric of the pedagogy evinced in the program itself. Although he cites John Dewey's call for the protection of the U.S. curriculum from the "money motif," St. Maurice speaks practically about schooling in the 1990s. Because Channel One offers synthetic ways of seeing the natural world and the other, he believes that an opportunity exists for teachers to employ critical analysis in the classroom. Teachers have a chance to uncover "artificial modes of experience" which are offered on electronic media. By doing so, they continue a time-honored pedagogical tradition in U.S. public schools—namely, critical rationality.

As I have noted, the dominant educational reform discourse in the United States has been constructed by a few authors, and politicians such as Hirsch, Bloom, Chubb and Moe, Finn, Alexander, and others. Informing the work of most of these reformers is the seminal book *Free to Choose; A Personal Statement* by the Nobel Laureate economist, Milton Friedman (1980) and his wife, Rose. Although Friedman's work and the writings of these reformers have officially and inextricably entwined the marketplace, privatization, vouchers, and public schools, a separate reform discourse runs as a subtext to this dominant one. One of the proponents of democratic, not capitalistic, public education examines the politics and ideology of Channel One in chapter 8. Apple explores the program as part of Whittle's broader efforts to help reform the "failing" U.S. public educational system. His analysis is situated within the debate over the control of school structure as well as school knowledge. The adoption of Channel One is, for him, part of a larger conservative move in this country to recapture the curriculum for the purpose of transmitting ideas of a "common culture," which would ultimately work against the goals of equity and diversity. Channel One participates in this transmission.

Politics and ideology are also the topics of chapter 9 which follows the event of Channel One as it worked its way through the educational systems in California and North Carolina. Muffoletto attempts to describe the political patterns which emerged in these two specific deployments of the news program. The ethics, economics and symbolic function of the event are delineated within an institutional and historical context.

A cognitive paradigm is invoked for the case reported in chapter 2 in which Knupfer and Hayes offer findings from a large ($n = 2,267$) quasi-experimental study in which they determined the ability of students to recall news items and advertisements. They also assess the effectiveness of Channel One to teach overall knowledge of

current events. In addition to ascertaining what place, if any, this news program had in the cognitive life of students, their anecdotal recollections are an important part of this book. Their presence in fifteen schools over a period of several weeks gave them access to information about how Whittle Communications staff interacted with administrators and provided wiring and hardware.

Knupfer also reports survey results in chapter 3 which provides information about how students, teachers, and parents in three school districts reacted to the adoption and daily broadcast of Channel One. Important habits about the consumption of news are also described.

Stories have been told here about the cultural event of Channel One from a multivoiced platform of various, but coherent, education theories. These stories have been articulated through numerous and divergent research methods to provide the reader with a rich description of a significant juncture of public-and private-sector interests in the U.S. educational enterprise. The authors of this collection invite you, the reader, to evaluate this event.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, C. M. 1972. In search of a visual rhetoric for instructional television. *AVCR* 19. 43-63.
- Baggaley, J., and S. Duck. 1975. Experiments in ET: Effects of adding background. Research notes. *Educational Broadcasting International*. 7:208-209.
- Becker, J. 1992. Chris and Benno's excellent adventure. *Vanity Fair*, August. 142-147, 172-176.
- Bestor, A. 1953. *Educational Wastelands: The Retreat from Learning in Our Public Schools*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press. (Reissued 1985).
- Bloom, A. D. 1987. *The Closing of the American Mind*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Chubb, J. and Moe, T. (1990). *Politics, markets, and America's schools*. Washington, D.C., Brookings Institute.
- Chira, S. 1992. Yale president quitting for private teaching venture. *New York Times*, May 26, A1, A12.
- DeVaney, A. 1990. Instructional television without educators. In *The Ideology of Images in Educational Media*, eds. E. Ellsworth and M. Whatley. New York: Teachers College Press.

- Ellis, J. 1982. *Visible Fictions*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Felner, M. 1982. Television viewing and school achievement. California Assessment Program. Sacramento: California State Department of Education.
- Fiske, J. 1988. *Television Culture*. London: Routledge.
- Fiske, J., and J. Hartley. 1978 *Reading Television*. London: Methuen.
- Flesch, R. 1955. *Why Johnny Can't Read*, New York: Harper.
- Friedman, M. and Friedman, R. 1980. *Free to Choose*. New York; Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich.
- Gitlin, T. 1980. *The Whole World Is Watching*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Hall, S. 1980. Encoding/decoding. In *Culture, Media, Language*, eds. S. Hall, D. Hobson, A. Lowe, and P. Willis. London: Hutchinson & Company. 128–138.
- Heath, S., and G. Skirrow. 1977. Television: A world in action. *Screen* 18:2. 7–59.
- Hirsch, E. D. 1987. *Cultural Literacy: What Every American Needs to Know*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Lesser, Gerald S. 1974. *Children and Television* New York: Random House.
- Mailloux, S. 1989 *Rhetorical Power*. Ithaca, N.Y.; Cornell Univ. Press.
- Morrow, J. 1975. Toward a Grammar of Media. *Media and Methods*, October, 78–80.
- Pflieger, E. F., and F. C. Kelly. 1961. *The National Program in the Use of Television in the Public Schools*. New York: The Ford Foundation and the Fund for Advancement of Education.
- Rooney, E. 1989 *Seductive Reasoning*. Ithaca, N.Y.; Cornell Univ. Press.
- Salomon, G. 1979. *Interaction of Media Cognition and Learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- . 1981. *Communication and Education: Social and Psychological Interactions*. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage.
- . 1982. Television literacy and television vs. literacy. *Journal of Visual and Verbal Language* 2:2. 7–16.
- . 1984. Predisposition about learning from print and television. *Journal of Communication* 34:2. 119–135.

- Schramm, W. and Chu, G. 1967 *Learning from Television; what the research says*. Washington, D.C.; National Association of Educational Broadcasters.
- Sykes, R. E. 1964. The effectiveness of closed circuit television observation and of direct observation of children's art classes for implementing elementary teacher's training in art education. *Dissertation Abstracts*, 25. 2387.
- Tuchman, G. 1978. *Making News*. New York: The Free Press.
- Williams, D.C., J. Paul, and J. C. Ogilvie. 1957. Mass media, learning and retention. *Canadian Journal of Psychology* 11. 157-163.
- Williams, R. 1975. *Television: Technology and Cultural Form*. New York: Schocken Books.