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ABSTRACT

Media education has spoken of critical pedagogy from the time it came into existence. Critical is the operative word that brought it into the lime light. However, there was nothing critical about media education. It has failed miserably in bringing the students towards a critical awareness concerning the media. Students thoroughly know the history of television and have learned to "deconstruct" entire TV programs, but still think the people who watch it are stupid. The dissertation suggests that it is imperative that an analogous situation in the lives of the students be made problematic, for them to grasp the ideological relation between "text" and "reader".

This dissertation sets out to contribute to media education, specifically toward an altered media education pedagogy, by giving the learner voice in the media education curriculum. By drawing insights from observations of current media education practice, this dissertation addresses the two major gaps that a new critical pedagogy for media education confronts: first, little empirical research has been done on how learners evaluate their media experiences and, as a result, empirical grounds for understanding how media education might be altered does not exist other than as a general call for change towards dialogic learning; second, methodology for involving the learner in media education practice has not been developed. This study focuses
on conceptualizing the learner in media education through Freirean and feminist critical pedagogies. A methodology for integrating the learner and the learner’s life experience in the curriculum development and pedagogical practices of media education was developed and tested using Sense-Making interviewing. Participant observation, Sense-Making interviewing and text analysis have been used to assess current media education practice in two high schools and in one university. In addition, a field experiment involving the use of Sense-Making as a formalized means for giving voice to learners was implemented in a media education classroom.

In current media education practice, although, there is awareness about the need for integrating student experience in the curriculum. No concrete methods have been developed. Some of the present innovative methods have the potential towards a new student centered critical pedagogy. The field test proved that even in its most rudimentary format, Sense-Making can provide a method for integrating student voice in media education practice today.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Overview

The media have come to occupy a central position in the social, cultural and political life of the people today. Virtually all that we know or think we know about the world, beyond our immediate experience, comes from the media. This is true especially of the Western world. But in spite of its ubiquitous presence and influence the media have remained outside the purview of the curricula, class rooms and schools for a very long time. It was not until the late 1950s that media education (i.e. education about media institutions, functions, procedures and meanings) was introduced into schools and colleges as part of English and social science courses. Thus, in the beginning, media education, was shaped by the methods and principles of the parent subjects and therefore, its position was rather ambiguous. In the ensuing years media education has gained a permanent foothold in the curriculum in many

---

1The early predicament that persisted in this field as late as a decade ago is well described by David Lusted at the Media Education Conference in 1981. "(Other) subjects are more easily recognized as 'art subjects', with all the cultural status implied, whereas 'media education' assumes the appearance of a hybrid--neither art nor industry, neither academically respectable nor with an obviously vocational objective. It doesn't seem to 'fit' prevailing curriculum definitions" (Lusted 1981).
schools and colleges, specially in England, Scotland, Canada, Norway and Australia. Today media education has a special place in the curriculum labeled as media literacy, media education, media studies or as audio-visual education.

Among the English speaking countries, however, the United States ranks the lowest in media education despite its leadership in the development of modern mass media. In the 1970s and 1980s, both government and private funding backed a number of media education programs in schools. But when the major funding withered away, media education programs were also abandoned (Brown, 1991). Today no systematic media education programs exist in schools in the United States. Besides lack of funding, there are other reasons for this state of affairs. As Kathleen Tyner (1991) suggests, one of the main reasons is the lack of a common understanding about what media education is and how it should be developed in the schools. Concern about media and children continues but it only develops either into empirical studies without pedagogical application or into productions like "Sesame Street" that are used for educational purposes. Media education itself is neglected. Many of the media studies programs in the United States have become technical instructions on how to use the media equipments (Edward Palmer, 1988; Tyner 1992). As we enter the end of the 1990s, a renewed urgency about media education is evident in international conferences (Guelph, Spring 1990; Madison, Spring 1994; Madison, Summer 1994), and many hope a common effort towards a structured media curriculum development will emerge.

Central to the resurgence of interest in media education is a call to alter radically
media education's pedagogy, from the normative authoritative, top-down practice to a more dialogic practice involving the learner and the learner's experience as central to the process.

Curiously, this call for a new pedagogy for media education faces two major gaps. First, little empirical research has been done on how learners see and evaluate their media education experiences; as a result, empirical grounds for understanding how media education might be altered do not exist other than this general call for change toward dialogic learning. Second, a methodology for involving the learner in media education practice has not been developed.

This dissertation sets out to contribute to the general call for a resurgence in media education and a specific call for an altered media education pedagogy by developing and testing an approach giving the learner a voice in the media education curriculum. By drawing insights from observations of current media education practice, this dissertation addresses both gaps identified above by drawing on the following:

1. relevant literatures on media education, children and television, and pedagogy;
2. interviews with instructors and students and participant observation in current media education classes;
3. analysis of selected media education syllabi;

bringing these together to gain an understanding of how media education now conceptualizes media education, the learner, and the pedagogical situation. Based on
these insights, an approach to incorporating the learner's voice was developed and tested. The remainder of this dissertation does the following:

CHAPTER 1: A review of the media education literature—goals, definitions, descriptions; origins and history; models of media education; criticisms; conclusion. The purpose of this chapter is to anchor the study in context of this literature, describing the gaps and contests within and setting the stage for specific contribution of this dissertation.

CHAPTER 2: A review of the literature on children and television -- the two main thrusts: violence and learning; criticisms. The purpose here is to show how the main body of literature which gives the impetus to media education itself constitutes the flaws identified in media education.

CHAPTER 3: A review of the literature on pedagogy as it relates to media education and the learner in the media education setting. This chapter positions itself primarily from the stance of two critical pedagogy literatures, both of which form a basis for the critique of the top-down, transmission oriented pedagogy which dominates media education. These two critical pedagogies include the Freirean critique of pedagogy and the feminist critique of pedagogy. The purpose in this chapter is to show how the critical pedagogies challenge media education to reconceptualize its learner. It is this challenge which forms the basis for the proposed work of this dissertation.

CHAPTER 4: An explanation of the research design, and a description of Sense-Making methodology used in this dissertation. It's theoretic and philosophic
foundations and how it relates to the Freirean and feminist pedagogies. The purpose of this chapter is to explicate the research design in terms of methodology: site selection, interview questionnaire, interview protocols and analysis.

CHAPTER 5: An analysis of interviews with the teachers from the 'class room study'. The purpose of this chapter is to derive from the interviews the concept of the learner, the challenges and the highlights in the class room media education practices of the selected teachers.

CHAPTER 6: An analysis of student interviews in the 'class room study'. The student interviews are analyzed towards an understanding of class room practice from the point of view of the students. The purpose of this chapter is to identify the gaps that students face in the class room, their struggles to bridge them and the strategies they build in the process. The concept of the learner that emerges through the interviews.

CHAPTER 7: An analysis of reaction papers and the class teachers comments on the reaction papers. The reaction papers are analyzed in terms of the students resistance, confirmation and rejection of the curriculum in relation to their life experiences. The concept of the learner that evolves through the intervention of the reaction papers.

CHAPTER 8: Findings about the difficulties and struggles within media education practice; hopes and frustrations towards a new pedagogy; evaluation of the 'field test study' and proposals towards new pedagogy in media education
class room practice form this chapter.

Media Education

Goals, Definitions and Descriptions

What is media education? It is not always very clear what is meant by media education. In this section I have offered different views from leading media education scholars and practitioners defining the subject and describing its goals and purposes. Media education is often confused with educational technology and media training. But it differs from both of them. Educational technology is marked by the passive use of the media technology as "aids to learning" not necessarily in or about the media but simply with it. Media training concerns the acquisition of skills in media usage for very specific vocational purposes. But the main purpose of media education according to David Lusted (1981) is understanding of the media as producers of meanings—that is as language, or, better, signification. However, as Bob Ferguson suggests, there is no reason why education about the media should be excluded from educational technologies and media training. On the contrary, educational technologists have a wonderful opportunity to introduce notions of the mediating properties of the media, so that media technologies and media products, like films or TV programs are treated as producers of meaning, offering points of view about geographic or scientific subjects and not just as simple relay systems for acts of communication that exist outside them. For Bob Ferguson (1990, p.20), "...Media Education is an endless inquiry into the way we make sense of the world and the way
others make sense of the world for us. Above all it must be genuinely and openly
critical." An oft-quoted, recent definition of media education put forward by British
Film Institute Education Department gives a complete description of the subject
emphasizing the importance of developing the critical, and the creative and analytical
understanding and skills:

*Media education is a general term describing any progressive development of a
critical understanding which seeks to extend pupils' knowledge of the media and
to develop their analytic and creative skills through critical and practical work.
Such work should increase their capacity to understand both the contents of the
media and the processes involved in their production and reception. Media
education includes teaching about the forms, conventions and technologies
through which the media are manufactured, their institutional arrangements and
contexts, and their social, political and cultural roles. It aims to create more
active and critical media users who will demand, and could contribute to a
greater range and diversity of media products.* (p. 21)

According to Masterman (1981), a veteran media educationist, the purpose of
Media Education is to increase students’ understanding of how the media work, how
they produce meaning, how they are organized, and how they go about the business
of constructing reality. This activity does not seek to foster discrimination either for
or against the media—or even within the media.

The National Media Education Conference held in London in 1985 speaks about
media education as qualifying media literacy. "Media literacy" is considered not just
as a skill like the ability to see (observe), a neutral competence, but is taken as the
ability to read (understand) and media education would transform "literacy" by
introducing questions of *power and ideology*. It would aim for an understanding of
the processes of media construction: *who says what? to whom? in whose interests?*
The conference further goes on to explain how "media literacy" is often used to imply
a simple level of "understanding how it works", often termed "demystification" or 'deconstruction' and how this omits any critical engagement with the pleasures of the media. The conference recommends that media education should include this aspect viz. pleasure.

Barry McMohan and Robyn Quin (1990), two media education scholars actively involved in media education practices in Australia, have suggested that the focus of media studies should be shifted away from the details of who owns what onto the examination of the social origins and consequences of technological development and questions about the "naturality" of technology. "...the prime function of media education is to question the communication instruments of the institutional power in our society and...shift a little of the power into the hands of the students" (McMahon & Quinn, 1990). To achieve this shift, they propose a cultural studies approach to media education. In this approach to media education, three broad areas are examined:

1. organizational processes (conventions and routines of production, technical skills, professional ideologies and practices, assumptions about the audience, and definitions of what constitutes a "good program" which frame the text in the production phase);

2. institutional processes (concerned with the nature of the relationship between the media producers and the other institutions of power and control in the society. Some of these institutions will be formal ones such as governments.);
3. audience (processes by which audience come to accept as "natural" the view of society projected by the media).

One of the more common teaching strategies in media education today is the "deconstruction" of texts. According to Masterman (1980), critical understanding of media involves a reversal of the process through which a medium selects and edits material into a polished, continuous and seamless flow. This demands deconstruction of texts by breaking through their surface to reveal the techniques through which meanings are produced. According to David Buckingham (1991) who critiques the over-simplified deconstruction practice in media education, the aim of media education is not merely to enable children to "read" or make sense of media or to enable them to "write" their own. He insists that media education must also enable the children to reflect systematically on the processes of reading and writing themselves, to analyze their own experience as readers and writers.

From the above definitions and goals of media education we can produce the following table of media education goals.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GOALS OF MEDIA EDUCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Appreciate and enjoy the media (appreciation)*.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Analyze and critique the media (analysis).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Understand the role and influence of the media in society (media and society).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Discriminate between good and bad in media (discrimination).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Understand how media messages are created (media messages).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Understand the process of media production and develop production skills (production skills).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Explore their own reactions to the media (personal reactions).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Understand questions of power and ideology in media (power and ideology).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Know how meaning is constructed (meaning).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Understand media institutions and structures (institutions).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.1: Goals of media education as derived from the literature

* The goals are represented by words within parentheses to make it easier to use them in tables 4 and 5.
Origins and History

The origin of media education clearly lay in a profound distrust of the media (Masterman, 1983; Buckingham, 1991). Media education programs were instigated by the panic that was created by some of the effects studies. In the 1950s a series of studies were produced by the National Association of Broadcasters on the large number of crime and murder shows on television and the growing problem of juvenile delinquency. In 1954 and 1961 there followed Senate hearings, and in 1964 a Senate report was published that concluded that the violence in television had a significant link to the problem of delinquency (Liebert and Sprafkin 1988). Consequently, much research was done on the effects of television on children. This research is reviewed in the next chapter. Though the findings were not conclusive, fear for the safety of children left the policy makers and parents to initiate media education programs.

The first programs in the United States, intended to develop "critical viewing skills" in students, were launched in the late 1960s and early 1970s. They were the first ones to be organized and distributed for wider use in school districts. (Anderson and Ploghofoft 1977, 1980). James Brown (1991), in his detailed study of different "critical viewing skills" projects notes that the funds for these media education programs came from both public and private sources. They flourished in the US in 1970s and early 1980s but have almost died this last decade. However, media education has grown strong in other countries such as England, Scotland, Australia

Here, I describe the origin and development of media education in the United States. However it is not very much different in other countries.
and Canada. Media education is quite well established in the curriculum in the public and private school systems in these countries and its importance is generally accepted (Bazalgetti, Bevort, & Savino, 1992).

Masterman (1983) reminds us that it is important to recognize and remember that the origins of media education were steeped in distrust of the media because this distrust explains much of the media education practice today. Suspicion of the media has guided much of the development of media education and stunted the effectiveness of media teaching in schools and colleges. Media education was called upon to protect not only the young but also civilized and civilizing cultural values from what F.R. Leavis and Denys Thompson called "the competing exploitation of the cheapest emotional responses" and satisfaction offered at the lowest level by the media (Masterman 1983).

As lofty as such goals may appear on the surface, a number of criticisms have been and still are being launched against what is usually called the elitist thrust of media education. The arguments charge, in essence, that media education in both its origin and implementations has been paternalistic and middle class. The arguments emphasize that the common approach to media education:

1. implicitly presume that students are passive and uncritical viewers who need to be protected from bad influences of the media.

Poetry and novel were once denounced as frivolous and corrupting. These same charges were later, leveled against English theater. In just such terms the new art forms of the twentieth century—cinema, jazz, radio and television—have been attacked. (Ed Buscomb, IBA Fellowship Research, 1974)
2. assumes that students have acquired "false" beliefs through their uncritical experience and have to be taught to be critical and be given the analytical tools necessary to liberate themselves from false beliefs. (Buckingham, 1989).

3. focus on classroom practice in media education that consists of ideological analysis that seems to ignore the broader social relations implied in the classroom, thus betraying a lack of pedagogy. (Williamson 1981, McKiernan 1988, Buckingham 1990)

**Models of Media Education**

Above, I have traced the origins of media education in broad strokes. In this chapter, I will trace chronologically the four major approaches to media education that have been developed. All of these can be criticized as elitist and paternalistic.

**Inoculation Model**

The Inoculation Model is the very first media education model, begun as early as the 1950s. Born out of a moral panic, the inoculative model is derived from the literary criticism tradition of F.R.Leavis (Halloran 1984). The influence of literary criticism is very clear in this model of media education. The goal of this model, like that of English literary criticism, was to teach students to discriminate between the good and bad in media.

Discrimination in its negative sense of exclusion was originally called upon to be exercised against the popular mass media like film and television. In the 1960s the
"popular arts" movement advocated discrimination as a fine judgment between media products. For example, European films were preferred over popular cinema, serious newspapers over tabloid, and in television, documentaries over game-shows, etc. In classroom practice, discrimination meant that the elitist media tastes of the teachers were preferred over the popular media tastes of the students (Masterman 1983).

Discrimination, as Masterman points out, clearly works in elitist ways. It is not only unworthy and undesirable but it is an impossible aim, because it assumes that there is a clear criteria to evaluate media products, whereas serious attempts to erect and defend agreed on criteria of judgment of media products have miserably failed (D. Thompson 1964, Masterman 1983).

This model assumed that the media are harmful to the young and that young people who have to be protected (i.e. inoculated) against their bad influences. The pedagogy that followed focused on discrimination, implying that an education to discriminate would protect children from the harmful effects of the media. In this model children were assumed to be provided with a shield of protection against the media through the concept of discrimination. The goal was to teach the students to discriminate and choose the good in media.

The inoculation model lacked a pedagogy that took into consideration the students and their experiences, tastes and preferences for media products. Instead its approach has been authoritarian excluding the students' experience and taste as cheap and vulgar, needing refinement. Thus the media products that receive any attention in curricula were determined by the choice and taste of the teachers and administrators.
rather than the students.

Critical Viewer Model

A second model of media education that was popular, especially in the United states, is the "critical viewer model". This model is built on the previous inoculation model and took it one step further from discrimination to critical viewing.

Its goal was to teach the students the necessary skills to become critical viewers. In this model it was assumed that the student, after acquiring the appropriate skills, could see through attempts at manipulation by the media. Here, again, the assumption about the students was that they were passive and easily manipulated by the media. Therefore, the pedagogy that followed is paternalistic and elitist.

This model came as a result of the conference on "Film, Television and the Child" held in London in 1958. The recommendation from this meeting was further expanded in a report from the UNESCO sponsored international meeting in 1962. The report set down the following aims of the "critical viewing skills" media education:

1. To help viewers to increase their understanding of what they see on the screen.
2. To encourage viewers to become more selective in their choice of programs.
3. To help viewers to become more aware and discriminating in their responses and to develop their power of judgment so that they may benefit.

"Critical Viewer Skills" (CVS) media projects flourished between 1970 and 1982. In his study of all the CVS projects, James Brown suggests that the critical viewer
model has much to offer for educators who realize the significant link between television viewing and social, aesthetic, and economic reality as well as specific learning skills (Brown 1991).

In this model of media education the viewers were to become selective and discriminating consumers of television programming by developing receivership skills which would enable them to understand subtle and hidden meanings of messages by analyzing language and visual and aural images. "Receivership skills" as identified by James Anderson and Milton Ploghoft are at the core of this model of education.

Anderson identifies four different constructs that inform the critical viewer model of media education. The first, the intervention construct, is based on the assumption that television does things to the viewer and thus the purpose of education is to intervene to change the consequences (Doolittle, 1977). The second, a more popular construct, is based on uses and gratifications research and theory. Here the assumption is that television does not "do things" to people but people "do things" with television. Media education, therefore, consists in directing students towards identifying their motives in television viewing and helping them develop standards by which television use can be evaluated as a gratification for those motives. Here the emphasis is not on content but on students’ interaction with television. A third construct is cultural understanding. Television is viewed not as an adversary but as one of the many elements of culture; therefore, media education is directed towards understanding it through exegesis and criticism (Deming, 1979). According to Newcomb, this construct "forces us to look at television as used by people in history."
More specifically the students will have to understand the role of entertainment in culture and society.." (Newcomb, 1979, p.4). The visual literacy construct, a fourth way in which the critical viewer model has been developed, encourages sophisticated knowledge about techniques, for greater understanding of the messages and controlling their consequences (Zettl, 1973; Shor, 1978). Under this perspective, instruction emphasizes production of news and entertainment programs.

**Demystification Model**

A third model of media education is one of demystification. Greatly influenced by the work of Roland Barthes and semiotic studies, this approach is directed towards demystifying the media. Of recent development, this model (Masterman, 1980), has become quite popular with media teachers.

The structuring principle of this approach to media education is ideology. The main assumption is that media are ideological, they are not mere reflection of the society or "window on the world" but the end-product of social processes (Halloran, 1984). Donald argues that both education and media are ideological. They provide selective and fragmented knowledge and make particular social relations appear natural and normal, thus inhibiting any movement towards radical change in these relations (Donald, 1977, p.3). Classroom practice in this model consists in helping students examine underlying ideologies in media products through semiotic and structuralist analysis by deconstructing media texts. The goal is to make the student competent in analyzing and demythologizing media messages. In its pedagogical practice, it holds the same basic assumptions about students as the other two models.
and ignores the knowledge and experience that students have of the media.

This approach has had many criticisms launched against it. First of all, there is a danger that one might simply replace a dominant ideology with an opposing one, without pupils having a clear grasp of the problem (Halloran, 1984, p.136). Buckingham (1989), points out that the kind of analysis attempted in this model, being highly rationalistic, seems to imply that breaking a text down into its component parts will somehow give the student rational control of it and perhaps free him from its influence. This kind of analysis seeks to intellectualize and thereby to regulate pleasure that students find in the media. Besides, a good deal of this analysis is derived from elementary semiotics, an approach that could easily lapse into a view of language as a set of abstract codes and conventions which could be taught and learned in a structured sequence. This model implicitly presumes that meanings somehow reside in texts rather than being produced by readers. In terms of teaching, this model presumes that analysis will result in a single conclusion about the meaning of a text thus ignoring the inevitable diversity of readings of any given text. This practice, therefore, far from being an open ended procedure, becomes, through close ended questions, an exercise requiring students to identify aspects of the text which teachers themselves have previously defined as important (Buckingham, 1989, p.15; 1990, pp.35, 54). Finally, if we apply the acid test for any media education, as prescribed by Masterman, that is, if we inquire, to what extent the pupils are critical in their own use and understanding of media when the teacher is not there (Masterman, 1985, p.24), we find a disappointing answer. As Williamson points out,
in spite of all the analysis in the classroom, the students still do not grasp the meaning of ideology in their life situations (Williamson, 1981).

**Community Media Model**

A fourth model of media education is based on class analysis. Mass media, in this model, are considered as products of the capitalist system that serve the interests of the dominant class, legitimizing and reinforcing the capitalist system. The goal therefore is to enable students to recognize the power of the mass media and increase their social class awareness through community oriented media productions (Halloran, 1984). This model is very much encouraged in Finland and in Italy. However, Littunen who is the main proponent of this approach has not translated this adequately into classroom practice. Very little of this model is in evidence in actual media education practice especially in the schools.

**Criticisms**

Even though media education has developed into a respectable subject in many countries, the original promises of the movement have not been realized. Media education has been proposed by its advocates as a movement that could bring about radical political changes in the consciousness of students and in the educational system itself. Much was spoken about the ability of media education to subvert dominant ideologies, to empower the oppressed, and to revolutionize the school curriculum. Yet there is very little evidence that these claims have been borne out in practice. Instead media education practice has been accused of being caught up in abstract theorizing. The very development of media education itself has been overshadowed
by academic media theory (Buckingham, 1990, 1991).

In recent years the main criticism of media education practice has focussed on pedagogy. This brief look at the history of media education’s development and practice reveals the absence of the learner as the central deficiency in the pedagogy, and, in many views, the cause for the ineffectiveness of media education. Repeated calls for a critical pedagogy in recent media education literature echoes as the only hope for revitalization and a new beginning for media education.

Conclusion

The criticisms of the models described above confirm the research findings of Murdock and Phelp (1973) that there is a sizable gap between the life experiences of teachers and their students. More importantly there is a serious absence of the learner in the pedagogy that arises from this experiential gap. Normatively teachers presume their knowledge about the media experience of the students and discard the students’ experience and knowledge of the media as inadequate and fragmentary (Alvarado 1981; Williamson 1981).

The first discussions on pedagogy in media education began with Manuel Alvarado’s (1981) critique of the pedagogy implied in Len Masterman’s widely influential book, Teaching about Television (1980). According to Alvarado, Masterman implies that modes of transmitting "knowledge" are transparent, and questions of methodology thereby simply become the problem of how to select the best teaching strategy. Alvarado goes on to suggest that it is necessary to construct a
pedagogy that does not depend on experience which is "fragmentary and inadequate".

...personal experience does not necessarily teach one very much about matters ideological...Thus it is necessary to construct a pedagogy that precisely does not depend upon personal experience and, in certain ways, critiques it. (Alvarado 1981, p.63).

The need for pedagogy in media education was acknowledged by many (Alvarado, 1981; Williamson, 1981; Lusted, 1986; McKiernan, 1988). However it was Judith Williamson's (1981) contribution to this debate which Lusted aptly calls the founding moment of "modern" media education that established the importance of the study of media as a stage for connecting issues of personal identity with cultural activity and, even more importantly, skillfully demonstrated the crying need for attention to an effective critical pedagogy (Lusted, 1986, p.9). Williamson (1981) argues against Alvarado, showing convincingly, from her classroom experience the need for a pedagogy that is based on the experiences of the students:

_I can't say too often, it is not enough just to analyze the media. Students can know the history of TV backwards and "deconstruct" an entire TV program but still think the people who watch it are stupid. Unless you find any analogous situation in their own experience, and make it problematic for them--they will never really grasp the ideological relation between "text" and "reader"._ (p.84)

This call to construct a pedagogy grounded on the experience and knowledge of the students is repeated by Buckingham (Buckingham, 1990, 1991). The urgency to incorporate the learner into the curriculum and pedagogy in media education should be taken seriously if media education is to shift from academic discourses to practical benefits for the students.
INTRODUCTION

Media education has developed in close relationship to research into children and television. Research on the relationship between children and television and children and other media has had an important place in media education. Much of the fear and anxiety that encouraged research into children and television has also been the principal driving force in media education. The results and reports from the research have guided media education throughout its development. An overview of the research into children and television, consequently, brings into focus significant insights about media education practice today.

At the outset what becomes apparent about the research on children and television is its sheer quantity of the production. From the beginning of television there have been many research projects, studies and reports dealing with children and television. Since Senator John Pastore's letter to the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare in 1969, calling for more study and research regarding the relationship between

---

4 In this 'overview' of the research I shall limit citations to few main representative studies. The overview of the research here is not comprehensive but I feel adequate to understand the influence on media education.
children and television, many research projects have been lavishly funded. The Surgeon General's report alone, perhaps the most significant of all, took three years of research and study, cost 1.8 million dollars and consisted of twenty-three independent research projects and more than forty technical papers (Cater and Strickland, 1972).

I have reviewed the vast quantity of research on children and television under the following two major themes:

1. Relationship between television violence and aggressive behavior,
2. Learning from television.

The greater number of studies has been undertaken to determine the effects of television violence. This undue attention to violence is indicative of the negative approach that has plagued this area of studies and, consequently, media education.

Television Violence

Even before the advent of television, concern about the effects of violence in media on children was recorded. In fact concern about the influence of new media on young people, as some writers have indicated, has a very long history (Pearson, 1984; Lusted, 1985). Two thousand years ago Plato, the Greek philosopher, proposed to ban the dramatic poets from his ideal Republic, for fear that their stories about the immoral antics of the gods would adversely influence young people. Today, public anxiety about children and television appears to be the continuation of the age-old concern about the effects of popular arts and media on children.
In 1933, Blumer and Houser conducted research to study the impact of violence in cinema on criminal behavior. They emphasized the role of "intervening variables" that seem to mediate the possible effects. Early research into children and television came to the same tentative conclusion, that the effects of television violence will depend on the social and personal background of the viewers and on the way in which violence is portrayed on television (Himmelweit, Oppenheim and Vince, 1958; Schramm, Lyle and Parker, 1961). The later research, however, based on behaviorist models, sought to identify "direct effects" of television violence. Different hypotheses were offered to explain the relationship between aggressive behavior and the psychological mechanisms through which "effects" were produced. The following are the major hypotheses:

**Imitation or Modeling**

According to the theory of Imitation and Modeling, the characters in television serve as models from whom the viewers learn the aggressive behavior they are likely to put into practice when they encounter in their real lives situations similar to the ones in television. This approach, sometimes called "observational" or "social learning theory", is associated with the psychologist Albert Bandura (Bandura, Ross & Ross, 1963).

**Identification**

The hypothesis, termed "Identification" argues that viewers will tend to adopt the aggressive behavior of only the characters with whom they "identify" and whose aggressive behavior is shown as being justified (Schramm, Lyle & Parker, 1961).
**Triggering**

"Triggering" is very similar to the 'social learning theory' only it is more behaviorist in its emphasis on stimulus-response bonding. It argues that viewers build up a series of links or bonds between particular behavioral stimuli and particular responses from watching television. These bonds and links, transferred to real life situations, make some "unstable" viewers produce television responses when real life stimuli resemble the television stimuli (Berkowitz & Green, 1966).

**Instigation**

"Instigation" explains aggressive behavior as the consequence of exposure to "exciting" television content regardless of whether the content is violent or not (Tannenbaum & Zillmann, 1975).

**Catharsis**

"Catharsis" suggests that viewing fantasy violence on television can reduce children's aggressive energies and tendencies. This catharsis effect may vary according to whether or not the violence is portrayed as justified and the extent to which the consequences of violence are depicted (Feshbach & Singer, 1971).

**Disinhibition**

"Disinhibition" rests on the concept that viewers, especially young boys, are naturally prone to violence and that this tendency is kept under control under normal circumstances. Violent television programs weaken this control and let lose the inherent violent tendencies (Belson, 1978).
Desensitization

"Desensitization" argues that exposure to television violence desensitizes the viewers to violence in real life (Eysenck & Nias, 1978).

Reinforcement

"Reinforcement" claims that television violence has little influence and merely reinforces in the viewers their existing attitudes and behavior patterns. Here the significance of "intervening variables", which lead viewers to interpret television in different ways, is emphasized (Klapper, 1960).

Cultivation Theory

According to the "Cultivation Theory" the symbolic environment of television shapes the peoples' perception of the real world and those who are most exposed to television, "heavy viewers", develop feelings of anxiety, alienation and fear which lead them to support authoritarian policies on "law and order". Here the emphasis is on wider ideological effects of television violence rather than its short term influence on behavior (Gerbner, Gross, Morgan & Signorielli, 1980).

The above hypotheses have been studied through different methodologies using laboratory experiments, surveys and field research. Each method has its own advantages and limitations reflected in the outcome of the research. The laboratory experiments gave maximum control over the subject studied but had other serious limitations. The main problem with laboratory experiments is that the laboratory situation is an artificial one and therefore unable to help us understand children's behavior in real life situations. Another important limitation is that, though the
laboratory experiments may indicate many factors which can influence the behavior of children, they are unable to identify with any certainty those factors that actually do. Consequently their predictive power is very limited. Survey researches, on the other hand, are less artificial and therefore more reliable in the study of human behavior. However, they are more costly to undertake and, more importantly, they are rarely able to provide evidence which proves a causal relationship. The survey researches tended to report null-effects and the laboratory experiments tended to affirm positive effects. The field research, which combined the advantages of both laboratory experiments and survey research, however, were very rare because of the difficulties involved in conducting them.

There is no definite word on the findings of the research on children and television violence. Some reviews of the research suggest that television could be a significant cause of violent behavior (Liebert, Sprafkin & Davidson, 1982; Eysenck & Nias, 1978; Rubenstein, 1980), while others argue that there is no proof from the research to establish a causal relation between television violence and violent behavior (Kaplan & Singer, 1976; Howitt & Cumberbatch, 1975).

Learning from Television

While the violence theme was studied through behaviorist psychology based on direct effect hypothesis, the theme about children's learning from television was studied mainly, based on cognitive psychology. The three aspects of the research in this area concern, first of all "specifically educational television", secondly, "social
learning" from television programs, and finally, the process itself of learning from television.

Learning from Educational Television

"Educational television" refers to the television productions that were specifically designed to teach. Children's Television Workshop (CTW) has been the dominant force behind educational television programming. The president of CTW, Joan Ganz Cooney, described it as a "forced marriage of educational advisors and professional researchers with experienced television producers" (Lesser, 1974).

During the late 1960s and 1970s many innovative educational television programs were produced. The focus of these productions was on effectiveness. The best example among these is "Sesame Street", considered to be the most popular and successful program. The limitations and problems in these productions, as we shall explain later, are very clear from the many studies about "Sesame Street" production.

"Sesame Street" was the first mass audience educational program. It pioneered ideas like "learning can be fun" and "education by entertainment". It is the product of a rare combination of art and science to make education entertaining for children. Its child oriented format with special production techniques like animation, muppets, and word balloons is admitted, even by its critics, as "revolutionary" (Moody, 1980).

In spite of successful programs like "Sesame Street" there still remained several problems. First of all the educational programs did nothing to bridge the gap between "advantaged" and "disadvantaged" children. Secondly the production of programs like "Sesame Street" was very expensive and the diminishing government funds for
production of educational television is of great concern. However the accounts of educational programs like "Sesame Street" have dispelled any doubts that may linger about the possibilities of using television towards education.

Social Learning from Television

The "effectiveness" approach of educational television has ignored the broader questions about how television teaches attitudes, beliefs, and values, in other words the "social learning" from television. The research on "social learning from television" covers studies on political socialization (Atkin, 1977; Conway, Stevens and Smith, 1974; Chaffee, Jackson-Beeck, Durral and Wilson, 1977; Roberts, Hawkins and Pingree, 1975; Atkin and Gantz, 1978; Alper and Leidy, 1970), sex-role attitudes (Beuf, 1974; McGhee, 1975; Morgan, 1980; Tan, 1979; Durkin, 1985), racial and ethnic attitudes (Greenberg, 1972; Gorn, Goldberg & Kanungo, 1976; Bogatz and Ball, 1971; Graves, 1980; Leifer, Graves & Phelps, 1976), and many others that do not fall into easy categories like occupation and career related attitudes, effects of TV advertising on children, etc. In brief, "social learning" from television covers the role of television in children's attitude formation.

Social learning from television has been studied more extensively within the "critical" paradigm. Most of the studies consisted of statistical content analysis that explore the biases and imbalance in the representation of the social world. Lalor (1980) for example reports a systematic imbalance in the number of men and women and the range of their occupations represented on children's television programs. She argues that the producers act as a conservative force in reinforcing middle class
values.

The problem with this approach is that it assumes that the meanings extracted through such content analysis is identical with those which will be produced by viewers. In fact underlying such studies is the view of the influence of television from a behaviorist perspective.

Christenson and Roberts (1983) suggest that it is more practical to study the possibilities of improving children’s information processing skills rather than studying the content of children’s television programs in an effort to improve what is offered on television. However, our limited understanding of children’s social learning from television could be improved only by paying more attention to mediating factors. As Withey (1980) has pointed out there is no such thing as a “television message”. Children make sense of the same programs in very different ways.

The Process of Learning from Television

A considerable amount of research into the complex process of how children learn and make sense of television has been done. Some of the significant areas of research in this regard are “visual attention and comprehension”, “understanding of narrative”, “symbol system and cognitive skills”, “developmental studies” and “television literacy”. The cognitive approach which regards children as active viewers rather than passive receivers of television messages has been used in the researches that study the process of how children learn from television.

Visual attention and comprehension: Anderson argues that attention is not a kind of conditioned reflex which is produced automatically by certain stimuli. Rather,
children choose to pay attention to television. The choices they make depend upon their efforts to understand the television program and on other activities and choices available to them in a given environment. Neither does comprehension automatically follow attention. On the contrary, it is comprehension that partially determines attention (Anderson, & Lorch 1983; Salomon, 1983).

Children's understanding of narrative: Some researchers have studied children's understanding of television narratives. Collins has looked at the ways in which children understand television narrative and how that understanding varies according to the knowledge and experience they bring to it. (Collins, Wellman, Keniston & Wetsby, 1978). Anderson (Anderson, 1991), in his critique of cognitive research, suggests that there is need to go beyond identifying the inadequacies of children's understanding, and investigate why the children understand or don't understand as they do.

Symbol systems and cognitive 'skills': Another area of research has been about the different kinds of learning processes the different media offered in order to identify the best medium for a given teaching function. It concerned the relationship between specific "symbol systems" of a given medium and the cognitive "skills" which these may require (Schramm, 1977; Greenfield, 1984). Gavriel Salomon (Salomon, 1980, 1981) has conducted some sophisticated research into this area, studying specific aspects of television's symbol system and investigating the ways in which the symbol systems may "stand in" for internal mental processes, or "model" skills which children do not possess (Clark, 1983).
**Development Studies:** Much of the research in this area has been influenced by the work of Piaget. Grant Noble, for example, gives an account of children's television viewing pattern for each of Piaget's developmental stages (Noble, 1975). Aimee Dorr's studies in this area suggest that children's judgments of the "reality" of television content depends not only on the level of their cognitive development but also on the knowledge which they bring to the viewing experience. She argues that 'judging reality' is a multi-faceted process in which children employ a wide range of different and often conflicting criteria (Dorr, 1980, 1983; Streicher & Bonney, 1974).

**Television literacy:** Much of the work within the cognitive research is concerned with 'television literacy', which is the knowledge and skills involved in reading and making sense of television. Media education in the United States has been, for the most part, influenced by this research, and was directed towards teaching children "critical viewing skills" (Corder-Bolz, 1982; Brown, 1991).

**Criticisms**

Research on children and the media ought to be a very important help for media education. Unless we learn how children make sense of the media and then apply that learning to practice, media education will remain at the level of abstract academic discussions. It is not enough to have good research on the relationship between children and the media. The finding of that research must be applied to media education practice. Anderson argues that media education did not make the best use of the available research findings, because it was guided by a desire to protect...
children from television (Anderson, 1983). However the examination of the literature above suggests that in fact research on children and television has been almost compulsively concerned with detrimental effects of media on children.

The "effects model" under which most of the studies on television violence fall is actually an umbrella term describing a variety of approaches that study the influence of media. One conception of effects is the so-called "hyperdermic" model, according to which the media inject into the audience a dose of persuasive communication or message. A closely related model is the "stimulus response" (SR) model. This comes from the early behaviorist psychologists. According to this model the organism is exposed to a stimulus as a means of encouraging or extinguishing some response. Another "effects approach" is described by Williams (1981) as the "linear effects" assumption. According to this model the greater the viewer's exposure to the stimulus, the greater the effect. There are some serious problems with the effects model. First of all, its conception of the audience is very limited, and, secondly, disentangling the effects of a single medium on the audience from effects from other sources is considerably difficult (Howitt, Cumberbatch, 1975). The first problem is reflected in media education where the limited conception of the student has been a major hurdle.

The major limitation, however, of "effects" research, according to Buckingham comes from the basic question it has sought to investigate. In attempting to uncover a causal relation between television violence and children's violent behavior, it has marginalized other elements in children's lives that affect this relationship.
(Buckingham, 1993). In some effects research, these elements were included only to be identified and screened out so that the effects of television might be isolated, studied and measured. There is need, therefore, to situate research on children and the media in the broader context of other social relationships.

Several criticisms of research on "learning from educational television" arise. First of all the programs are evaluated only in terms of their effectiveness in achieving the goals of the producers. This is the approach of "educational technology" which claims to be an "applied science" of instruction. But the science meant here is that of behavioral psychology which defines learning as "a relatively permanent change in behavior" (White, 1980). Limitations of this approach are evident in the studies on Sesame Street, the most successful educational television production (Bates, 1985; Howe, 1977).

Educational technology required that the objectives should be strictly measurable thus limiting and narrowing down the objectives of the productions. The effectiveness of the series was restricted to measuring a very limited performance skills (Lesser, 1974; Polsky, 1974; Mattelart, 1985; Ball & Bogatz, 1970; Bogatz & Ball, 1972). It did not bridge the gap between the "advantaged" and the "disadvantaged" children as predicted. The school culture it presented differed from the disadvantaged children's lived experience (Cook, 1975; Sprigle, 1971; Crane, 1980). It was criticized for using advertising techniques that tend to socialize children into commercial television and consumerism (Goldsen, 1976; Dunn, 1977; Barreto, 1979). Further it was criticized for its hidden agenda and for cultural imperialism (Ferguson, 1978;
Mattleart & Waksman 1978; Goldsen, 1976). These studies indicate that "educational television" is not just a neutral educational tool and that the educational technology ignores much of the use and effects of educational television.

In the 1970s the production of programs designed to teach pro-social behavior increased. Some research reported an increase in pro-social behavior in children through these productions (Coates, Pusser, & Goodman, 1976; Friedrich & Stein, 1975; Leifer, 1975; Paulson, 1974; Singer, Singer, Tower, & Biggs, 1977). These studies are in many ways similar to the effects studies on television violence. They measure "before and after" effects of exposure to pro-social stimuli. As Buckingham points out, these studies focus on short term changes, and accept the "pro-social" intentions of the productions at face value. They fail to study the programs in detail. They ignore the fact that messages are not simply contained within television content but have to be constructed by viewers (Buckingham, 1992).

Most of the studies on social learning from television use content analysis to expose specific biases within television's representation of the social world. The limitations of this approach are that they measure content as if it could be objectively identified and its meanings unproblematically defined; and they assume that the meanings extracted through such analysis are identical with those which will be produced by viewers and the effects of the text can be readily understood from an analysis of the content (Buckingham, 1993).

Underlying all these studies on children and television is the view that children are more at risk from television than adults. This view ignores the fact that children
make sense of television in very different ways from adults (Buckingham, 1992).

Durkin argues that the "direct effects" approach in these studies oversimplifies the process of learning from television and ignores the relationship between television and other factors which contribute to attitudinal changes.

In contrast to essentially unidirectional theories which assume that television does something to the viewer, I have argued that we need to develop theories which are both social, acknowledging that the viewer is located in an interpersonal and socio-cultural context within which he or she does something with television, and developmental, acknowledging that the viewer's capacities to interpret and respond to television information will vary as a function of other attainments in the course of developing as a social-cognitive being. (Durkin, 1985, p.129).

Thus Durkin suggests a holistic approach to research on television and children.

The earliest studies on the relationship between children's attitudes and their exposure to mass media are the series of reports known as Payne Fund Studies, a collection of experimental, quasi-experimental and survey research on the effects of motion pictures on children. Many of these studies reported attitudinal change through exposure to certain films (Peterson and Thurstone, 1933). As Howe notes, it is a sobering realization to know that the questions we are asking today are the same questions raised by the Payne Fund Studies, more than half a century ago (Howe, 1983).

The history of the development of research on media violence follows a pattern of "perpetual recurrence" (Reeves & Wartella, 1985). Throughout the literature on children and media there is a recurring interest in addressing the public concern. Every time the public concern is raised, research around that concern seems to be repeated. The questions about television violence that were investigated in the 1960s
were already surpassed by the studies on the effects of cinema that were carried out in the 1930s. As Buckingham points out, it's interesting that the 1972 Surgeon General's study on television violence was conducted under the auspices of the National Institute of Mental Health, thus reflecting the pathological conception of the problem\(^5\) (Buckingham, 1993). Almost an irrational fear and an overly protective, paternalistic concern for children has hindered the progress of research on children and the media, guiding it in circles. The irrational fear is also a recurrent theme in public debates about the media. This anxiety evidently has been carried into media education practice especially in the "inoculation model" that is centered around protecting the children from the bad influence of the media.

The recurring public debates about the media and children are often caused by anxieties over what are perceived as undesirable social or moral changes. On these occasions, blaming the media may have become a very easy way of averting attention from other possible causes of change or decline that the debates are not ready to face (Connell, 1985; Buckingham, 1991). This observation is not meant to deny the effects of television on children, but to invite a wider perspective to investigate the problems. The problem with much of the debate and with much of the research informed by it is that while the relationship between children and television is studied,

\(^5\)The Surgeon General's study is considered the most significant landmark in research on television violence. For a history of the debates surrounding the report, see Liebert, Sprafkin and Davidson, (1982) The Early Window: effects of Television on Children and Youth; for a summary of the findings, see Atkin, Murray and Nayman 'The Surgeon General's research program on television and social behavior: a review of empirical findings', *Journal of Broadcasting*, 16(1), 1971-72, pp. 21-35.
that relationship abstracted from social and cultural contexts within which it is formed.

Perhaps the most significant absence in the research on children and television are the children themselves. They are treated as objects of research whose behavior is observed and interpreted by adults. Children's own voices are almost entirely excluded from these studies, perhaps as "inadequate, fragmentary and immature". More recent research, however, show that what children have to say about their relationship to the media are more revealing and far more complex than they are typically assumed to be (Brown, 1976; Hodge & Tripp, 1986; Buckingham, 1991). In media education practice a need for the presence of the learner seems obvious as does the need for the child's presence in the research on children and television. This study attempts to incorporate the learner's voice in media education pedagogy.
CHAPTER 3

PEDAGOGY, MEDIA EDUCATION AND THE LEARNER

Introduction

This study is a response to the call for pedagogy in media education. The literature that informs this study comes from media education, radical theories of schooling, critical pedagogy and feminist studies. The concept that is investigated in all these areas is that of pedagogy. Pedagogy is an old concern in education. Much literature in education deals with pedagogy. However I do not intend to review all the literature on pedagogy in education. In this chapter I review only selected concepts relating to pedagogy, especially concepts emphasized by critical pedagogy. The view of pedagogy presented here, then, is a view from the perspective of those writers who have criticized normative pedagogy and attempted to develop alternative critical approaches. This proposal emphasizes critical pedagogy because the media education movement has been anchored on a rhetoric of critical pedagogy. However critical pedagogy is not present in media education practice. A number of aspects of critical pedagogy have been entirely ignored in media education. Of particular importance to this dissertation is the pedagogy of Paulo Freire with its feminist critique.
What is pedagogy? The word "pedagogy" comes from the Greek word paidagogia (paidos which means boy and agogos which means a guide). It means, therefore, a kind of guidance for the young. The need to institutionalize pedagogy gave birth to schooling. Schools arose out of the practical needs to cure ignorance and moral depravity, to reform, to discipline, and to educate the social body. Their origin is not very different from the formation of prisons. The school became the site of the practical expression of both repression and formation (Luke, 1989).

As Gore (1993) comments,

...the regulative aspects of pedagogy are overwhelmingly difficult to throw off, and so the possibilities for "emancipation" and "liberation" in the name of pedagogy (assuming we even know what these terms mean and who is to be liberated or emancipated from what), are restricted partly by their very location within pedagogy" (p.10).

The struggles of pedagogies in education, as will be shown below, illustrate what the main concerns were in schooling and the construction of pedagogies. The two main theories in the critique of schooling and pedagogy in education are theories of reproduction and theories of resistance.

Critical Pedagogy

Origins

As Felman (1982, p.24) points out, "Every pedagogy has historically emerged as a critique of pedagogy". The origins of critical pedagogy are the critique of schooling, the critique of traditional pedagogy.
Theories of Reproduction

The early critique of schooling is based on theories of reproduction. Radical theories of reproduction have played a significant role in exposing the ideological assumptions of both the conservative and the liberal understanding of schooling. Liberal and conservative theorists claimed that public education offered possibilities for individual development, social mobility, and political and economic power to the poor and the underprivileged. Contrary to this view, radical educators have argued that the schools reproduce the dominant ideology and perpetuate inequalities. As Paul Willis (1983) confirmed through his studies,

*Education was not about equality, but inequality... Education's main purpose of social integration of a class society could be achieved only by preparing most kids for an unequal future and by insuring their personal underdevelopment. (p. 110)*

Karl Marx’s concept of reproduction has been at the heart of all theories of reproduction. Marx (1969) states that,

*...every social process of production is, at the same time, a process of reproduction...Capitalist production, therefore...produces not only commodities, not only surplus-value, but it also produces and reproduces the capitalist relation, on the one side the capitalist, on the other the wage-laborer. (p. 531)*

There are two different approaches within the theories of reproduction: the theories of social reproduction have been proposed by the work of Althusser (1971) and Bowles and Gintis (1976); and theories of cultural reproduction mainly based on the work of Bourdieu and Passeron (1977), and Basil Bernstein (1977). I shall review briefly these theories which deal with some of the basic problems of critical pedagogy.
Althusser In his influential essay, "Ideological State Apparatus" Althusser (1971) argues that in capitalist social formations, labor is not reproduced inside social relations of production themselves but outside of them in the domain of superstructures, in institutions like family, church, media and school which are not directly linked with production. Schools, universities and research centers reproduce the technical competence of the labor needed in advanced systems of capitalist production. But this labor, to be useful for capital, has to be politically subordinate. Therefore, the more important task of schools and universities is to cultivate the kind of labor which is able and willing to be subordinated to the discipline, the logic, the culture and the priorities of the economic mode of production of capitalist system, a labor which can always be subjected to the dominant system. Schools, for Althusser, are the dominant institution in the ideological subjugation of the labor force: "...one ideological state apparatus certainly has the dominant role, although hardly anyone lends an ear to its music; it is so silent! This is the School." (p. 143)

Ideology is central to Althusser's conception of social reproduction. Ideology for Althusser is practice producing the subject. In his essay on ideological state apparatus, Althusser thinks of ideology in relation to other social practices in terms of the concept of reproduction. The function of ideology for Althusser is to reproduce the social relations of production. Through ideology the subjugation of the labor force is accomplished. Hall points out the limitations of this essay saying that ideology referred to in the essay seems to be that of the dominant class, and, if there is an ideology of the dominated classes, it seems to be perfectly adapted to the functions
and interests of the dominant class. Thus Althusser is open to charges of a creeping Marxist functionalism where ideology performs the function required of it without any opposition.

Hall (1985) sums up his critique this way:

But a notion of reproduction which is only functionally adjusted to capital and which has no countervailing tendencies encounters no contradictions, is not the site of class struggle, and is utterly foreign to Marxist conception of reproduction. (p. 99)

Further Hall points out that though Althusser was correct in insisting that ideology appears in social practices within specific "apparatuses" or social institutions his writing lends itself to the misunderstanding that ideologies are nothing but social practices.

According to Giroux (1983) the paradox underlying Althusser's account of social reproduction is the fact that although Althusser raises the most important question to understand the process of domination, namely how a particular form of subjectivity is constituted in schools and other ideological sites, he fails to answer the question for the lack of sustained analysis of day to day class room practices. According to Giroux (1981),

...Althusser's analysis is a notion of ideology that exists without the benefit of human agents. Domination appears so complete in this perspective that the 'constituted subject' appears helplessly reduced to the prison house of ideological state apparatus... (p. 5)

Althusser sacrifices the possibility of human struggle and resistance within a hegemony that is both pessimistic and conceptually limited (Sharp 1980; Thompson 1978; Erben & Gleeson 1977; Best and Connolly 1979; Arnowitz 1980).
Sharp (1980) sums up the contradictions and limitations in Althusser's theory of reproduction in this manner,

*It suggests a determinist reproduction of the relations of production by the educational system which tends to contradict Althusser's own thesis of the relative autonomy of the ideological and political levels and leads to a form of reductionism. It also provides no hope that subjects can ever escape from ideology.* (p. 163)

Bowles and Gintis Bowles and Gintis (1976) agree with Althusser in many aspects of their social reproduction theory with regard to schools. Schools serve two functions in the capitalist society, namely of reproducing the labor force necessary for capital, and the more essential one of reproducing those forms of consciousness, dispositions and values necessary for the maintenance of "institutions and social relationships which facilitate the translation of labor power into profit." However for Bowles and Gintis, it is not ideology that is central to the social reproduction but a "correspondence theory" that emphasizes a structural relationship between schools and the economic system.

The correspondent theory proposes that the hierarchically structured patterns of values, norms and skills of the work force are reflected in the dynamics of the daily class room encounters. Bowles and Gintis (1976) clearly explain this:

*The educational system helps integrate youth into the economic system, we believe, through a structural correspondence between its social relations and those of production. The structure of social relations in education not only inures the student to the discipline of the work place, but develops the types of personal demeanor, modes of self-presentation, self-image, and social class identfications which are the crucial ingredients of job adequacy.* (p.131)
Bowles and Gintis (1976) have been criticized for the reductionist and mechanistic nature of their argument. Their theory fails to deal with resistance, consciousness, or social change. They assume that the youth they are describing are all male, and social relationships learned refer only to class structure and waged work. They exhibit no recognition of patriarchal relationships or the production of gendered subjects either in terms of sexual relations or patriarchal work relations. (Arnot, 1982; Weiler, 1988; Giroux, 1981; Best & Connolly 1979).

Bourdieu One of the criticisms leveled against the work of Althusser and Bowles and Gintis is that they fail to consider actual processes by which the social reproduction is achieved. Pierre Bourdieu and Jean-Claude Passeron, in their work at the center for European Sociology in Paris, have tried to develop a sociology of curriculum that links culture, class and domination on the one hand, and schooling, knowledge, and biography on the other.

In the theory of cultural reproduction proposed by Bourdieu, the schools are not considered as reflecting social structures but as autonomous institutions that are only indirectly influenced by the political and economic structures. Schools are seen as part of a larger universe of symbolic institutions that reproduce existing power relations through such subtle means as production, distribution, and legitimation of the dominant culture, "...relative autonomy enables it to serve external demands under the guise of independence and neutrality, i.e. to conceal the social functions it performs and so to perform them more effectively." (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977a, p. 178)
The key concepts of Bourdieu’s theory are "cultural capital" and "habitus". Cultural capital refers to those different sets of linguistic and cultural competencies or knowledge and modes of thought that characterize different classes. Schools play a major role in legitimizing and reproducing the dominant culture. Consequently, those students who have little connection to forms of cultural capital that are highly valued by the dominant society are at a definite disadvantage. According to Bourdieu (1977), the educational system,

...offers information and training which can be received only by subjects endowed with the system of predispositions that is the condition for the success of the transmission and of the inculcation of the culture. By doing away with giving explicitly to everyone what it implicitly demands of everyone, the educational system demands of everyone alike that they have what they do not give. (p. 494)

"Habitus", for Bourdieu means those subjective dispositions that reflect a class-based social grammar of taste, knowledge and behavior, inscribed in the "body schema and the schemes of thought" of each developing person. Schooling is biased in favor of those who, by virtue of their class habitus have already acquired the appropriate dispositions and attitudes to language and other preconditions to succeed in education.

Bourdieu, in his theory, tries to find a synthesis between two traditions. The first, the idealist approach (e.g. Levi Strauss, 1958; Saussure, 1959), considers symbolic systems as "structured and structuring". They structure phenomenal reality through their own internal structuring. Bourdieu also tries to add a concept of symbolic system as performing the political function of maintaining class dominance in the tradition of Marx and Weber. In Bourdieu’s theory, symbolic power is the
focus of class struggle. Dominant and subordinate classes compete and struggle over how reality should be symbolically defined, either

...directly in the symbolic conflicts of everyday life or indirectly through the struggle waged by specialists in symbolic production in which the object at stake is the monopoly of legitimate symbolic violence—that is to say, the power to impose instruments of knowledge and expression of social reality which are arbitrary. (p.115)

Basil Bernstein For Bernstein (1977), who offers another version of cultural reproduction, the central focus is the "process of transmission" of knowledge. He expresses the problem at the center of his theory of cultural reproduction in this way:

How a society selects, classifies, distributes, transmits, and evaluates the educational knowledge it considers to be public, reflects both the distribution of power and the principles of social control. From this point of view, differences within, and change in the organization, transmission and evaluation of educational knowledge should be a major area of sociological interest. (p. 85)

Bernstein analyzes the transmission of knowledge in schools through categories of classification and framing relationships.

"Classification" refers "not to what is classified but to the relationship between contents" (p.88). i.e. to the strength or weakness in the construction and maintenance of the boundaries that exist between different categories. "Framing" refers to "the degree of control teacher and pupil possess over the selection, organization, pacing and timing of the knowledge transmitted and received in the pedagogical relationship" (p.89).

The classification and framing relationships control the transmission of knowledge, and "generate distinctive forms of social relationships and thus communication, and through the latter initially, but not necessarily finally, shape mental structures" (p.11). Bernstein argues that through the transmission of knowledge in what he calls "codes" certain knowledge is legitimated. This
legitimated school knowledge and language, according to Bernstein, is middle class and puts the working class children at a disadvantage in the schools.

For both Bourdieu and Bernstein, schools, by legitimating the language and culture of the dominant class, reproduce existing class structures and inequalities. Both fail to address the actual experience of schooling and teaching. The hegemony built up by the cultural and linguistic codes seems unbreakable and, therefore, there is no place for change and counter hegemonic struggle (Weiler 1988, Giroux 1981, Bredo and Feinberg 1979). As Macdonald (1977) puts it, "In both theories there is a sense in which socialization is nearly total, the gap between socially determined action and individual freedom of action is small if not insignificant" (p.44).

Theories of Resistance

Theories of social and cultural reproduction have failed to address the complexity of human experience and therefore have failed to recognize human agency, resistance, conflict, and struggle. Recent theories about schooling have tried to move beyond reproduction theories and have emphasized the importance of human agency (Apple 1982; Bates 1980; Connell, Ashenden, Kessler & Dowsett 1982; Whitty 1981; Giroux 1983).

These theories give central importance to notions of struggle, conflict and resistance. In the Birmingham Center for cultural studies, Willis (1977, 1978), Hall and Jefferson (1976) and others have focussed their studies on conflicts and tensions that mediate schooling and the sub-cultures, and have demonstrated that social and cultural reproduction are never complete and are always met by elements of partially
realized resistance.

The theory of resistance could be traced back to the earlier phenomenological critique of the "new sociologists of education". Young (1971) and Keddie (1971), among them, used the phenomenological sociology of Schutz (1943) and Berger to analyze the classroom knowledge and social relationships in order to reject the positivist sociology and demand a return to the lived experience of social actors themselves.

The key theme in their work was the need to make problematic what counts as educational knowledge. Against the claims of educators that the knowledge they teach is "objective", the new sociologists argued that all knowledge is "socially and historically constructed" relative to a particular time or social context.

These analyses of school knowledge emphasized the construction of meaning but ignored the ideological material forces of reproduction. As Whitty (1977) explains,

"the emphasis on the notion that reality is socially constructed seems to have led to a neglect of the considerations of how and why reality comes to be constructed in particular ways." (p. 43)

These earlier theorists, influenced by phenomenological sociology were interested in human agency, the production of meaning and culture, like the critical resistance theorists. However the critical theorists ground their work on a moral imperative, in Bates' terms, on "political commitment to human betterment" (Bates, 1980).

Though resistance in education is as old as education itself, the concept of resistance is relatively new in educational theory. This theoretical neglect by both conservative and radical educators can be traced to their different approaches to
The conservative educators explained the oppositional behavior primarily through psychological categories and defined the oppositional behavior of the students as a deviant, disruptive failure on the part of individuals. The radical educators like Freire, on the other hand, with their focus on domination and class conflict, failed to recognize the experiences of teachers and students, how they lived their daily lives in schools (Giroux, 1983).

Theories of resistance study the ways in which class and culture combine to offer the outlines for cultural politics. In this regard the work of Paul Willis at the Birmingham Center is a prime example. He sets out to explain why, in the context of a class society, some working class students choose to lock themselves into personally unrewarding and low status manual laboring jobs, despite the genuine concern and efforts of many of their teachers and youth employment officers to rescue them from their fate. Using ethnographic methods, he studied a group of working class students from an all male comprehensive school.

He raises important questions about the way in which the themes within their subculture decisively reflect and help to reproduce the lived experience of these students both within and outside the school. Willis' work provides an analysis of how the apparently oppositional and antagonistic attitudes of working class students towards schooling are vitally important components of the way in which the class structure is legitimatized and sustained.
Themes within the subculture, linked with broader aspects of working class experience outside the school, in reality work to sustain the existing patterns of domination and subordination within society and the framework of capitalist production. This detailed study explores some aspects of social and cultural reproduction and the nature and role of resistance in this process.

Michelle Fine's study (1982) of drop outs from alternative high schools in South Bronx, New York was similar to Willis, in which positive elements of resistance were recognized. As she reports, "Much to our collective surprise the drop outs were those students who were most likely to identify injustice in their social lives and at school, and most ready to correct injustice by criticizing or challenging a teacher." (p.6)

It is within this context that Giroux (1983, 1988), McLaren (1989), Freire (1970, 1987), Shore (1980, 1987) and others attempt to develop a theory of critical pedagogy. According to Giroux (1981), in constructing a critical pedagogy, the counter hegemonic traces have to be saved from being incorporated into the dominant culture so as to be stripped of their political possibility.

Willis (1978) writes:

*We must interrogate cultures, ask what are the missing questions they answer; probe the invisible grid of context, inquire what unsaid propositions are assumed in the invisible and surprising external forms of cultural life. If we can supply the premises, dynamics, logical relations of responses which look quite untheoretical and lived out "mere" as cultures, we will uncover a cultural politics.* (p.172)

**Hegemony**

In theories of education the concern is to accommodate adequately and to account
for both the human agency, expressed in culture and the production of knowledge, and the power of material and ideological structures that constrain and reproduce dominant ideologies. Giroux (1981) suggests that Gramsci's work is the richest source for developing a critical theory of education that can encompass both agency and structure.

Gramsci was both a theorist and a political activist. He looked for ways in which the oppressed can create alternative political and cultural structures through which they could understand, oppose and change the oppression they undergo. Through the concept of "hegemony" Gramsci addresses this his central concern.

As is evident from the review of the critique of schooling, at the heart of the construction of a critical pedagogy is the reconciliation of human agency and the educational structure that reproduces dominant ideologies. This concern is identical to concerns about restoring learner's voice within curriculum, class rooms and pedagogies.

The different strands of critical theories in education, therefore, are those concerned with pedagogical relation as power relation (Bernstein, 1975, 1986, 1990; Bourdieu and Passeron, 1977) and those focused on "pedagogy as possibility," and are concerned with developing a "critical pedagogy" (Freire, 1973; Giroux, 1988; McLaren, 1989; Shor, 1980; Simon, 1987). Still a third strand rooted in feminist movements is concerned with developing "feminist pedagogies" (Lewis, 1990; Maher, 1985; Morgan, 1987; Mumford, 1985; Schniedewind, 1985).
In the following sections I shall review the pedagogy of Paulo Freire which stands at the center of many other critical pedagogies. Among all the critical pedagogies Freire's has been the most successful as is evident in its application. The Freirean pedagogy has been used in English studies, specially in composition, in adult education and vocational training. He is cited very frequently in the major journals and his philosophy of education has informed the work of Ira Shor, Henry Giroux, Ann E. Berthoff, James A. Berlin, C. H. Knoblauch and Lil Brannon, among others.

Paulo Freire

The "pedagogy of the oppressed" as Freire calls his pedagogy arose as a critique of traditional education as a banking system in which students are regarded as passive receptacles where information was deposited. This critique echoes the early critique of Dewey in his metaphor "pouring in". "Why is it", he asked, "in spite of the fact that teaching by pouring in, learning by passive absorption, are universally condemned that they are still entrenched in practice?" (Dewey, 1966, p.38).

Freire, opposing an education for conformity, proposes instead a problem-posing method of education towards liberation. Freire developed his method from his literacy work with the peasants in Brazil and Chile. His method, therefore, has to be understood in the context of the political and economic situation of Brazil and Chile in those particular periods. He insists on the particularity of the historical situation of his method and strongly opposes transferring it to other settings without modifications to fit their particular historical situation (Freire, 1985).
He conceived education in terms of the working class revolutionary struggle. In his classic work, "Pedagogy of the Oppressed" (Freire, 1970) he discusses "conscientization", "dialogue", "praxis", "oppression", and "humanization", concepts that are at the heart of his pedagogy. What is of interest to this study in Freire’s pedagogy is the fact that it is firmly based on the experience of the oppressed. Entering through the experience of the student, Freire successfully strikes a balance between the structure and the human agency in education (a problem that has plagued education and created road blocks in the creation of a critical pedagogy). Freire, basing his pedagogy on the experience of the learner, recovers the lost voice of the student towards a praxis of freedom.

According to Freire, through reflection and action upon one's own experience, the oppressive structures are changed. The process of liberation or humanization occurs only through "reading the world and the word". This means understanding their experience of oppression as subjects. Underlying this process is the strong belief that all people are subjects capable of knowing the world through their experience of oppression, through conscientization. As Freire (1970) explains,

...the point of departure must always be with men in the "here and now," which constitutes the situation within which they are submerged, from which they emerge, and in which they intervene. Only by starting from this situation--which determines their perception of it--can they begin to move." (p. 72-73).

The practice of conscientization which is central to Freirean pedagogy is the coming to consciousness of oppression through the experience of oppression, the reading of the world. This attitude of awareness of oneself as the knower Freire calls conscientization. In this process of liberation or humanization the student-teacher
opposition is resolved through "dialogue".

This dialogue requires not only reflection upon the world but also action or "praxis" (Freire, 1970). It is only through the combination of reflection and action upon the world that the oppressed society can truly be transformed. According to Freire (1985),

*Only beings who can reflect upon the fact that they are determined are capable of freeing themselves. Their reflectiveness results not just in a vague and uncommitted awareness but in the exercise of a profoundly transforming action upon the determining reality (p. 68).*

Freirean pedagogy, though situated today within education in academic discourse, did not originate within the educational system but as an adult literacy program outside educational institutions and is based on his strong conviction that there cannot be a neutral pedagogy. Education will either lead out towards freedom or into slavery, depending on its pedagogy. Freire calls his pedagogy a pedagogy for freedom in contrast to the traditional pedagogy that is prevalent today which he calls the "banking system" of education. Freire proposes conscientization and dialogue as methods to correct the traditional transmission model of education.

In his essay on "extension or communication", Freire laid out the "associative fields" implied by the term "extension" which he saw as a banking perspective. His analysis can be applied equally to the term "transmission" and is presented in Table 3.1.
Table 3.1: Analysis of the associative fields for the term "transmission" as informed by Paolo Freire.

In his analysis of the associate terms of "extension", Freire emphasized how the terms all connote imposition on others:

*All these terms imply actions which transform people into "things" and negate their existence as beings who transform the world...they further negate the formation and development of real knowledge.* (Freire, 1973, p.95).
Feminist Pedagogies

Feminist pedagogy emerges with roots in feminist political movements arguing that schooling is patriarchal (Clarricoates, 1981; Grumet, 1988; Kelly and Nihlen, 1982). It has developed in two distinct departments having different emphasis. A feminist pedagogy that emphasizes the instructional aspects has emerged from Women's Studies, while another strand of feminist pedagogy emphasizing feminist social visions for education has developed from Schools of Education.

Scholars in the first strand of feminist pedagogy (Culley, Schniedewind, Shrewsbury, Morgan and others) tend to be located in Women's Studies departments while scholars in the second strand of feminist pedagogy (Maher, Grumet, Greenberg and others) are mostly located in Schools of Education (Gore, 1993).

Ellsworth (1989), in her critique of critical pedagogy calls these pedagogies "repressive myths" that accompany emancipatory rhetoric. She tells us that,

> when participants in our class attempted to put into practice prescriptions offered in the literature concerning empowerment, student voice, and dialogue, we produced results that were not only unhelpful, but actually exacerbate the very conditions we were trying to work against" (p.298).

There are, however, great many similarities between critical pedagogies and feminist pedagogies. They both emphasize student experience and voice (Berry and Black, 1987; Freire, 1970; Giroux, 1988; Lewis, 1988, 1990; McLaren, 1989; Shor, 1980), they both insist on self and social empowerment that will bring about social and structural changes (Culley and Portuges, 1985; Giroux, 1988, Mclaren, 1988; Shor and Freire, 1987; Shrewsbury, 1987), and they both speak of liberation and are linked to political movements that struggle against different forms of oppression.
Feminist pedagogy, most aligned to the pedagogy of Paulo Freire, builds upon a critique of Freire.

The critique of the Freirean pedagogy within feminist discourse offers the opportunity to expand Freire’s work to embrace emancipatory agendas not only within the third world context but also to other historic and economic contexts. Like Freirean pedagogy, feminist pedagogy is grounded in a vision of social change and liberation from oppression. Both pedagogies rest on truth claims of the primacy of experience and consciousness that are grounded in historically situated social change movements.

However, within Feminist pedagogy is a caution against a "Freirean idolatry". Feminist educators are urged to consider the broad perspectives of Freire’s work rather than accepting it uncritically.

The feminist critique of Freirean pedagogy suggests three areas of concern that could be enriched through feminist discourse. The first regards the role and authority of teacher. The second concerns experience and feelings as source of the claims for knowledge and truth. The third raises the question of difference (Weiler, 1991).

The role of the teacher in Freire’s pedagogy is to encourage dialogue based on the common ability of the student and the teacher to know the world and to act as subjects to transform it. According to the feminist critique, however, Freire fails to address the question of the power and the authority of the teacher’s position as raced, classed and gendered subject. The assumption is that the teacher is on the side of the oppressed student and that, in the process of dialogue, the teacher and student will
uncover the same reality, the same oppression and the same liberation.

In Pedagogy of the Oppressed, the teacher is presented as a generic man whose interests will be with the oppressed...The subjectivity of the Freirean teacher is, in this sense, what Gayathri Chakravorty Spivak refers to as "transparent." In fact, of course, teachers are not abstract; they are women or men of particular races, classes, ages, abilities, and so on (Weiler, 1991, p.454).

Freire in his later works tries to explain the authority and power of the teacher:
"without authority it is difficult for the liberties of the students to be shaped.
Freedom needs authority to become free. It is paradox but true" (Shor and Freire, 1987, p.91). Freire further explains that the teacher knows that his authority is based on the freedom of others and therefore cannot become "authoritarian".

The question of authority is a difficult one. Giroux and McLaren in their construction of critical pedagogy, call it an "emancipatory authority". They situate the understanding of authority within the context of emancipation, democracy, social justice and community. But they are aware of the danger of it becoming destructive and silencing the voice of the student in the interest of social justice and democracy.

On the one hand teacher voice represents a basis in authority that can provide knowledge and forms of self-understanding allowing students to develop the power of critical consciousness. At the same time, regardless of how politically or ideologically correct a teacher may be, his or her "voice" may be destructive for students if it is used to silence them (Giroux, 1988, p.144).

Ellsworth is critical of this "emancipatory authority" as it can easily become oppressive. She argues that the superior knowledge or commitment of the liberatory teacher is not a given (Ellsworth, 1989). Shor, in his construction of critical
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pedagogy, talks about the "withering away of the teacher" (Shor, 1980, p.100). He says,

*As I understand it, in a liberating class room, the teacher seeks to withdraw as director of learning, as the directive force...You can let go of authority too soon, just as you can let go too late. Making that calculation is precarious...when and how to pass on authority to the students*" (Shor and Freire, 1987, p.90).

As Gore points out, the danger of teacher authority and the inconsistencies of empowerment discourse threaten more the strand of critical pedagogy constructed by Giroux and McLaren than the one constructed by Freire and Shor. Giroux and McLaren pay little attention to specific pedagogical practices, and, in fact, the question of how to apply critical pedagogy in the class room does not appear important in their works. Freire and Shor, however, develop critical pedagogy in relation to their own pedagogical practice and thus avoid, what Ellsworth (1989) calls the "repressive myths", created by critical pedagogy (Gore, 1993).

The feminist pedagogy in its critique of Freire does not resolve the problem of teacher authority, but points to some valuable insights and directions for pedagogical practice. Morgan (1987), in her discussion of "the paradox of the bearded mother" contests the stereotypical thinking, that feminist teachers have to be "bearded", that is, they are expected to display the forms of rationality and critical lucidity that have been assigned as male characteristics. She also argues against the unconditional nurturing role assigned to feminist teachers. A feminist teacher is considered to be in a difficult position trying to reconcile her nurturing and teaching roles in a class room within the patriarchal construction of education, thus becoming "a strange creature - neither father nor mother" (Pagano, 1990, p.33).
Culley (1985) shows a new understanding of authority in feminist teaching when she says that "the authority the feminist teacher seeks is authority with, not authority over" (p.215). It is not, therefore, power over but power with (Miller, 1990). This authority is based on caring and reciprocal relationships and is not experienced as authoritarian. In this context feminist pedagogy suggests "cooperation", one of the essential tenets of feminism, as having implications for feminist education (Schneiderwind, 1989; Maher, 1985; Boxer, 1988). Schneiderwind (1989), explains cooperation as "a joint undertaking for mutual benefit...so as to make students collectively responsible for one another’s learning" (p.75).

Feminist concerns about teacher authority address the question of classroom practice and theory overlooked by Freire. The feminist teachers, therefore, are more conscious of their position as teachers and their power relations than the "transparent" liberatory teacher in the Freirean pedagogy. Acknowledgment of the conflicts and tensions in the subject position of the teacher based on contradictory political goals, as well as of the meaning of historically experienced oppression for both teachers and students, will lead to a pedagogy that respects difference as significant for both student and teacher (Weiler, 1991). Gore (1983) questions the specific feminist contribution in all these pedagogical practices. "The extent to which these 'pedagogies' are 'non-traditional,' let alone specifically 'feminist,' is questionable. That is, the pedagogy argued for ...is clearly traditional in progressive education" (Gore, 1993, p.80). Even though these practices could be found in progressive pedagogy, the context in which they are promoted and the problems they are
addressing are different and more evolved in feminist pedagogies.

The second critique concerns personal experience as a source of knowledge and truth. In Freirean pedagogy through questioning of their own personal experience the oppressed are conscientized and come to know the world and the word and realize their own power to transform it. Experience and feeling are also basic to the feminist movement. In early consciousness-raising groups, feminists have explored both experience and feeling as sources of knowledge. Feeling is looked upon as a more reliable guide to deeper truths than rationality (Fisher, 1987; Lorde, 1984). Feelings and emotions have been traditionally considered as a source of women's knowledge about the world and have provided a link between inner truth or inner self and the outer world, including ideology and culture (Hochschild, 1983). Thus, feminist pedagogies have developed with a continued emphasis on experience and feeling. As Maher explains, the goal of feminist "interactive pedagogies" is to relate the subject matter to aspects of the students' lives. This type of pedagogies uses student experiences and feelings defined by gender, race and other characteristics as concrete bases for building common meanings (Maher, 1985).

The emotional and feeling aspect of experience and knowledge is not exploited in the Freirean pedagogy. The feminist theory certainly can enrich the pedagogical practices in this regard. Feminist pedagogy does not, however, blindly accept all emotions as leading to inner truth. It recognizes that strong emotions sometimes can simply be cathartic and may make us feel good without contributing very much to our understanding of a situation. It admits that emotions are not outside the socio-
economic and political sphere and are manipulated and shaped by dominant discourses. Even though feelings are socially constructed they still serve as a very valuable source of knowledge. Fisher explains the contradiction between the constructed nature of emotions and the possibility of arriving at deeper truth through their guidance in the following manner:

*In theoretical terms, we cannot simultaneously claim that all feelings are socially conditioned and that some feelings are "true." We would be more consistent to acknowledge that society only partly shapes our emotions, leaving an opening where we can challenge and change the responses to which we have been socialized. That opening enables the consciousness-raising process to take place and gives us the space in which to reflect on the new emotional responses that our process evokes* (Fisher, 1987, p.48)

She further warns against romanticizing the emotional dimension of consciousness raising, but at the same time affirming that emotions clearly constitute a very powerful resource for liberatory pedagogy.

Sharing of experience, emotions and feelings have been the touchstone of early consciousness-raising women's groups and it continues to be the cornerstone in the building of a feminist pedagogy. Adrienne Rich (1979) speaks about a materiality of experience, "To think like a woman in a man's world means...remembering that every mind resides in a body; remaining accountable to the female bodies in which we live; constantly retesting given hypotheses against lived experience" (p.243).

Underlying all these early reflections on experience is the assumption that there is a common women experience. This came under revision when the lesbian and
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women of color argued against a common women experience that laid the foundation for an unproblematic knowledge or truth. As Diana Fuss (1989) suggests, "female experience is never unified, as knowable, as universal, and as stable as we presume it to be" (p.114). Experience, like emotions, is socially constructed. We need to use existing ideologies and language to be able to express it. But, this does not diminish its potential as an instrument to probe into ideologies and the cultures that shape us. However, ignoring its constructed nature can lead to simplistic and uncritical methods in our pedagogical practices.

The challenge to the unitary notion of women's experience comes not only from lesbian and women of color but is also raised by feminist theorists influenced by postmodernism. Postmodern feminists point out the unstable nature of self and argue that socially given identities such as "woman" are "precarious, contradictory, and in process, constantly being reconstituted in discourse each time we speak" (Weedon, 1987, p.33). Therefore turning to experience does not lead to universal and common women's essence but rather it shows deep divisions within the experiences and the knowledge they generate. The sharing of experiences in class rooms does not build solidarity but raises conflicts and tensions that are challenging and require articulation of difference. Freire in his pedagogy does not address this difference, the multiple forms of oppression that emerge in "reading the world" through experience. Unlike the feminists who are influenced by postmodernism, Freire writes from within the tradition of western modernism, and his theory is based on transcendental and universal truths. The Freirean pedagogy, therefore, will be benefited by feminist
Maher (1987) articulates two distinct models of feminist pedagogical practice, pointing out the strengths and weaknesses of both these models, and argues towards an integrated model of feminist pedagogy that will have the strengths of both the models. One is the "liberation model" of pedagogy that is derived mainly from the work of Paulo Freire. This seeks to empower women students who are viewed as an oppressed and silenced group (Barret, 1980; Hartman, 1976). A second approach, a "gender model", is derived from women studies that emphasize the nurturing roles and the private sphere as fundamentally different from men's (Blenky, Clinchy, Goldberger & Tarule, 1986; Chodorow, 1978; Gilligan, 1982; Martin, 1985, Miller 1976).

The Feminist critique of Freirean pedagogy is a real contribution towards critical pedagogy. Although many accounts of teaching practice exist, no systematic, proven methodology applies feminist pedagogy to the classroom to include the learner and empower the student.

The Learner

The critical pedagogies, when they critique traditional pedagogy, critique, above all, the concept of the learner implied in that pedagogy. Thus they reconceptualize the learner in their critique. Critical pedagogy, specially in the works of Paulo Freire, emphasizes the fact that the learner is a subject just like the teacher.

*Teachers and students (leadership and people), co-intent on reality, are both Subjects, not only in the task of unveiling that reality, and thereby coming to know it critically, but in the task of re-creating that knowledge. As they attain this knowledge of reality through common reflection and action, they discover*
themselves as its permanent re-creators (Freire, 1970, p.56).

This view of the learner is opposite to the understanding of learner in traditional pedagogy. Freire criticizes the traditional education as the "banking system of education". In traditional pedagogy the teacher-student relationship is a subject-object relationship. The teacher speaks and the students listen. The teacher, knows and the students are ignorant. The task of the teacher therefore, was to fill the students with the information that the teacher considers valuable. The teacher deposits knowledge and the students receive that knowledge.

The learner is viewed as passive and knowledge is considered a gift from the teacher, who knows, to the student, who is ignorant. Education therefore becomes the process of transferring knowledge. The role of the student is a passive one. Contrary to this, in critical pedagogy, the learner is active and learns by acts of cognition. The teacher-student contradiction is resolved through dialogue. Through dialogue teacher and student learn together. In Freire's approach this dialogue centers upon codified representation of the learners' existential situations which leads to acquisition of literacy skills and more importantly leads the learners to a critical awareness of their life situations and conditions.

In traditional pedagogy the teacher-student contradiction is resolved in favor of the teacher. The teacher is privileged and becomes the subject, while the student is silenced, and becomes an object. The teacher is active and the student becomes passive. The student-teacher contradiction reflects the problem of structure and agency that was mentioned earlier. This problem is not peculiar to education; it is
pervasive as well in communication and social studies generally. The way this problem is resolved in the different areas of education reflects the way the learner is conceptualized.

In media education, as is practiced today, the learner is conceptualized very much like s/he is in traditional pedagogy. In spite of media education's claims to becoming student centered, its pedagogy still remains rooted in traditional pedagogy. As much as the pedagogy lacks a methodology to access and integrate the knowledge and experience of the students, all attempts in media education to become student centered remain illusory.

As in traditional pedagogy so also in media education pedagogy, the student is considered to be an empty receptacle to be filled with knowledge and information. What is taught in media education does not relate to the existential experience of the students because the curricula do not originate from an understanding of the students' experiences and existential situations and, therefore, do not become effective knowledge for transformation. At the most, the curriculum is inspired by what the teachers think and assume to be the experiences of the students.

The student-teacher opposition is resolved in Media Education by silencing the student in favor of the teacher. The criticisms of the different models of media education as reviewed above illustrate that the problem of structure and agency is resolved not by accommodating both but by eliminating agency or the student voice and activity. The student in media education practice is considered to be passive.

Media education is protective in its approach. It considers the students in
paternalistic ways, as helpless victims of the media needing education to protect themselves. Undertaking media education to teach the students critical skills fails to acknowledge and understand the natural critical stance of the students. The efforts in media education practice to free the students from ignorance by teaching media theories fail to understand the students’ struggles to become free subjects and participate in the transformation of their reality. Further, very little attention is paid to the emotional aspects of learning in media education. Feminist pedagogies have criticized Freirean pedagogy for this lack and have developed to a greater degree this aspect of learning.

The research on children and television which supports much of the media education practice views the student in similar manner. The major gaps in the research on children and television, as mentioned earlier, are the absence of the children’s voice, the fact that children are considered objects of study, and the need for new holistic paradigms. These criticisms of the research indicate that children are conceptualized as passive, helpless victims. Though in some of the research on children and television, attempts were made to study the child in a wider context (Durkin, 1985; Hodge & Tripp, 1986), the results of these researches were not translated into media education practice. As James Anderson (1983) suggests, first the desire to save the children should be abandoned so that a better informed media education curriculum that integrates the new research findings could be developed.

This study focuses on reconceptualizing the learner in media education through Freirean and Feminist critical pedagogies. The purpose of this dissertation is to
develop and test a methodology for integrating the learner and the learner's life experience into the curriculum development and pedagogical practices of media education so that both the structure and agency—learner and the curriculum are privileged. From the above ideas about the learner, two opposite tables could be drawn. The oppositions in the two tables is also a reflection of the structure-agency contest that is present in media education. Table 3.1 presents the concept of the learner deduced from the present media education practice and Table 3.2 presents the new conceptualization of the learner in media education revised through the pedagogies of Freire and the Feminists.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>The Concept of the learner in media education.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>The learners are considered more as objects of study and education than as subjects who are capable of knowing (object).*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>The learners are considered as passive receptacles ready to receive knowledge as a gift from the teacher (passive).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>The learners are considered incapable of transforming their world without the intervention of education (incapable).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>The learners are considered to be victims of the bad influences of the media in need of help from outside intervention (victim).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>The learners are considered as empty and ignorant, and their experience and knowledge are marginalized (empty).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>The learners are considered to be without critical understanding of the media (not critical).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>In the conceptualization of the learners, the emotional dimension of their learning and understanding is excluded (not emotional).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Learners' personal experiences in the context of their own social, familial, cultural, and political milieu is marginalized primarily through omission (one dimensional).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The words in parenthesis will be used in Tables 4 and 5 to represent the corresponding concepts.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LEARNER 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>The learners are considered as subjects capable of acts of cognition (subject).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>The learners are considered as actively involved in the production of knowledge (active).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>The learners are considered as capable of transforming their world through praxis—reflective action (capable).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>The learners are considered not as helpless victims of the bad influence of the media but as capable of critically understanding the media (not victim).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>The learners are considered not as empty and ignorant but as possessing experience and knowledge (not empty).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>The learners are considered as capable of critical understanding of their existential reality (critical).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>The learners are considered in their full emotional capacity to know (emotional).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>The learners are conceptualized in the context of their social, cultural and political experience (socio-cultural)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.3: Concept of the Learner in Critical Pedagogy.
CHAPTER 4

METHODOLOGY AND METHOD

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study, as indicated in the introduction, is to contribute to the debate in media education regarding pedagogy and specifically to:

1) Document in actual practice the difficulties faced in media education because of the absence of a methodological approach for including the learner, by

   a) interviewing teachers and students, using these interviews as primary data sources
   b) observing classes and analyzing current syllabi and other classroom documents, using these as secondary and contextualizing data sources

2) Illustrate a methodological approach to incorporate the learners' voice in media education practice -- in the classroom, curriculum, and pedagogy -- building the strengths and weaknesses of students' critical understanding of the media by introducing a reaction paper in the form of a Sense-Making interview into the syllabus of a media education class.

These two major purposes of this study dictated two separate but related studies -- one
of these is entitled for purposes of this dissertation the Class Room Study; the second, the Field Test Study.

The Class Room Study involved an in-depth examination of media education practice at two sites in Canada. Site and sample selection is discussed below. At each site, the intent was to:

a. Conduct interviews with teachers to learn of their philosophy and approach to the practice of media education, including what they see as strengths and weaknesses, and their concept of the student/learner.

b. Conduct interviews with students to learn of their assessment of their media education experience, its strengths and weaknesses and, in particular, how it relates to their life-experiences, problems, and their own understandings of the media.

c. Participant observation in classes to provide context for interpreting the interviews.

d. Analyze selected syllabi and other class room documents, hand-outs, media etc. again to provide context.

The second study -- the Field Test Study -- was a specific attempt to learn from a group of students in the US how student voice could be systematically integrated into the media education curriculum and practice through a Sense-Making intervention in the curriculum.
Sense-Making Methodology and Freirean and Feminist Pedagogies

In this section I shall explain the Sense-Making approach, its philosophical foundation and processes, and suggest the similarities between the Sense-Making approach and the Freirean and the Feminist pedagogies. I'll further explain the reason for choosing the Sense-Making methodology and how the Sense-Making approach applies to this study. Sense-Making was the chosen methodology for this study, used in three different ways. One application involved using it as a theory of the interviewing, guiding the construction of the interviews with teachers and students. The second application involved using it as a deductive analysis or framework for examining the results of qualitative interviews. The third application involved using it as a pedagogic intervention in the media education classroom.

Sense-Making, then, provided the over-arching methodological framework for the study as well as guidance for the development of specific methods. It was incorporated in these ways because it is seen as offering a methodology that is compatible with Freirean and Feminist theories of teaching and at the same time providing specific guidance for pedagogical practice.

Thus, as the literature review in Chapter 3 emphasized, both Freirian and Feminist theories of pedagogy point to the development of student-centered pedagogies. Freire did this primarily by mandating education for conscientization, a process by which learners are aided and encouraged to their natural capacities for critical analysis of and transformative action in their social worlds. Feminist pedagogy added to Freire's critical pedagogy through specific attention to issues of
power dynamics between student and teacher and to the ways in which even critical pedagogies ignored the specificities of human struggles and the variety of ways of knowing through feelings and emotions. Thus, in this dissertation, Sense-Making is seen as forging a bridge between Freirean and Feminist pedagogies because it offers a theoretically guided set of methods for examining; acting, knowing, and feeling in the world in specific conditions. Further, it is seen as pointing more directly to classroom practice because it is conceptualized directly as a theory for communicating practice.

"Sense-Making", developed by Brenda Dervin, has been used successfully as a theory and research tool or methodology. According to Dervin (1989),

Some people call it a theory, others a set of methods, others a methodology, others a body of findings. In the most general sense, it is all of these. It is, first and foremost, a set of meta-theoretic assumptions and propositions about the nature of information, the nature of human use of information, and the nature of human communication. (p. 2)

The philosophical foundations of the Sense-Making theory rests on the gap idea, a fundamental assumption about the nature of the human condition which is derived from Carter's (1980, 1989) discontinuity assumption. Discontinuity, as Dervin uses it, is assumed to be a fundamental aspect of human experience that mandates humans to take steps to construct sense in changing life situations. The gap condition is assumed to exist in the whole of reality, between reality and human sensors, between human sensors and mind, between mind and tongue, between tongue and message created, between message created and channel, between a human at time one and a human at time two, between humans and institutions, between institution
and institution, and so on. Following this assumption is the idea that communicating behavior is best studied by focusing on these gaps or discontinuities. If communicating is usefully construed as gap bridging behaviors, then the gap perspective is a powerful organizing perspective to study communication phenomenon (Dervin, 1991, p.62).

Part of the Sense-Making metaphor is conceptualizing the actor as step taking through time and space by bridging the gap. It is not always easy to define the gaps or the bridges. Neither are to be construed as merely some kind of linearly-arranged problem-solving because the gap in Sense-Making is a meta-theorized assumed constant of the human condition, always there, constantly changing, bridged in myriad ways ranging all the way from purposive action to inattention. The linearity assumed applies only to the passage of time-space as the structural framework within which the Sense-Making metaphor is constructed. The sense-making involved may or may not be conscious, linear, and/or purposive.

Using this framework, it is assumed that gaps are ever-present and thus many, perhaps most, are so very common that they go unnoticed. "Gap is not some earth-shattering event, rather an everyday occurrence" (Dervin, 1991, p.62). So also are the bridges. Everyone bridges gaps in their lives in unique ways, some mixture of new bridgings in a new situation and repeated bridges, perhaps habitual, informed by past experiences and acculturations.

Often enough people are not aware of their gaps or of the bridges they construct. But in the Sense-Making guided interview, the intent is to structure a
dialogic interface which encourages and assists the interviewee in attending to, recalling, and describing gaps and bridges. Sense-Making interviews mandate a repeated reiteration of the Sense-Making metaphor -- a triangle of situation-gap/bridge-uses which conceptualizes the sense-making as facing a gap in a situation anchored in material and historical conditions, building a bridge (cognitive, behavioral, emotional) across the gap, and then making sense of the outcome in terms of its connections (e.g. uses, helps, impacts, effects, consequences) on his/her life. Sense-Making through this metaphor frames the life stories of the interviewees and thus awakens the interviewee and also the interviewer, if s/he is willing and ready, to the awareness of the gaps and the bridges in their particular life situations.

Sense-Making's emphasis on a structured interviewing dig is not very different from the concept of conscientization that Paulo Freire uses in his pedagogy. What differs is that while Freire provides only the most general guidance for implementing conscientization, Sense-Making provides a theoretically guided set of methods. The Sense-Making step taking metaphor can be applied to understand how the students react to media and how they make sense of it, how it relates to their lives and to consequences for their lives. Through Sense-Making, the students' knowledge and experience and their own behavior with regards to the media can be studied. As Buckingham (1991) points out,

*The aim of media education, then, is not merely to enable children to ‘read’ or make sense of media texts, or to enable them to ‘write’ their own. It must also enable them to reflect systematically on the processes of reading and writing themselves, to understand to analyze their own experience as readers and writers.* (p. 8)
In Chapter 3, it was noted that one of Freire’s primary criticisms of the "banking" or transmission model of education is that it pays attention to "inputs" and "outputs" but ignores the intermediary phase of the constructing dynamics, i.e. the making of sense, the connectings people make between messages and their material and situated lives and their efforts and struggles. Sense-Making as a methodological approach focuses specifically on the making of these connections, on gap-bridging, and on the step-takings involved in making sense and thus offers an alternative to the transmission model. An outcome of the transmission model is also an outcome of privileging the teacher over student, knowledge over knowing, in other words structure over agency.

The transmission model conceptualizes structures, including cultures, societies, systems and institutions, in static terms. It fails to recognize that procedures or 'step-takings' are what energize structures. A structure that is not energized through procedures, "step-takings", "gap-bridgings", necessarily dies. It is the procedures or "step-taking", both individual and collective, that maintain and transform structures (Dervin, 1991, p.63). Thus focusing on procedural dynamics of students and how they make sense of media in their lives and in the class rooms, Sense-Making is used to understand both the structures and the individuals. It accommodates both the agents (students and teachers) and the structures (socio-cultural and economic). The learner within this context remains a subject instead of becoming an object of study or of educational projects. Further, Sense-Making, as a methodological approach, specifically mandates attention to the unmaking of bridges as well as the making,
being confused and muddled as well as making answers, knowing emotionally and physically as well as knowing cognitively. In this sense, then, Sense-Making is both compatible with Freire’s approach to pedagogy, while at the same time incorporating the important elements of the criticism of Freire offered by feminists.

Thus, in this dissertation, Sense-Making is chosen both for its theoretical affinity to Freirean and Feminist pedagogies and for its methodologically-guided methods which provide not only a compatible way of hearing students and teachers as informants but also a compatible communicative intervention in the classroom.

**Sense-Making and This Study**

The Sense-Making approach attends to the theoretic of the gap by focussing attention on the key points of the Sense-Making metaphor as illustrated in Figure 1\(^8\), namely the situation one finds oneself in, the gap one encounters in the given situation, the bridge one constructs to overcome the gap, and the helps/hinderences that resulted from the bridge. The gap is the incompleteness of the situation that mandates the bridge. It is problems and difficulties encountered. The bridge comprises thoughts, ideas, feelings, solutions. Helps/hinderences are the outcome of the bridge. How the subject perceives the bridge as facilitating or hindering the life step taking or journeying.

In the construction of the interviews with the teachers and the students the Sense-Making metaphor is interpreted as seeking information in the classroom practice of media education. Sense-Making builds on a core "time-line" interview

---

\(^8\)Figure adapted from Dervin and Clark (1987a, 27)
format which is the method seen as most isomorphic to the theoretic assumptions of Sense-Making. The time-line interview is a structured interview that allows the informant to construct a perspective of information seeking and information use relative to a self-constructed view of time and space. The teacher or student is asked to describe in detail a particular situation or practice. With the teachers' interviews it is the construction of the syllabus, strengths, weaknesses. With the students it's the class that they like or dislike. The responses are then triangulated according to the metaphor, focussing on gaps, bridges, helps and hinderences. The core of the interviews is the dynamics of moving through situation, gap, help and hinderences.

Figure 1: The Sense-Making Metaphor
Research Design

The Learner in Media Education: A Framework

There are two deductive analytic frameworks brought to bear in this dissertation. One of these is the Sense-Making methodology seen as an apt implementation of the central premises of Freirean and Feminist pedagogies, as described above. The second is the conceptualization of Learner I versus Learner II as presented in Chapter 3. This conceptualization requires re-emphasis here because it provides the substantive analytic framework for the dissertation. The central question being asked is the extent to which media education practices exhibit an emphasis on Learner I versus Learner II conceptualizations of the student and, thus, the Learner I versus Learner II conceptualization is used repeatedly in analysis.

Tables 4.1 (presented on page 81) repeats the explication of Learner I versus Learner II concepts as presented in chapter 3 but revises the presentation to the form that is used as the primary substantive template applied to the data sources for this dissertation.

Thus, Table 4.1 provides a framework for designing and analyzing both the Class Room Study and the Field Test Study in this dissertation. As noted above, the purpose for the classroom study was to document current approaches to conceptualizing the learner in the media education class. Based on the review of the literature presented in Chapters 1, 2, and 3, it was expected that the Class Room Study would confirm the well-documented emphasis on Learner I concepts documented in
the assumption that an explicit critical practice must be combined with intentions to move media education from Learner I to Learner II approaches, the purpose for the Field Test Study was to illustrate an alternative approach for incorporating the learner. In essence, then, this dissertation offers a study of actual practice of media education both conventional and modified. The intent was to see to what extent the eight criticisms of how the learner is conceptualized in traditional media education play out in actual practice in a given site and to determine to what extent this practice reaches towards revised concepts of the learner and how it might do so in the future.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Learner I</th>
<th>Learner II</th>
<th>BASIS FOR COMPARISON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>object</td>
<td>subject</td>
<td>Are learners considered as objects of study and education, or as knowing subjects?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>passive</td>
<td>active</td>
<td>Are learners considered as passive receptacles ready to receive knowledge, or as actively involved in the production of knowledge?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>incapable</td>
<td>capable</td>
<td>Are learners considered incapable of transforming their worlds without the intervention of education, or are they considered capable of transforming their worlds through praxis-reflective action?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>victim</td>
<td>not victim</td>
<td>Are learners considered to be victims of the bad influences of the media in need of help from outside intervention, or are they considered as capable of critically understanding the media?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>empty</td>
<td>full</td>
<td>Are learners considered as empty and ignorant with their experiences and knowledge marginalized, or as possessing relevant experience and knowledge?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>not critical</td>
<td>critical</td>
<td>Are learners considered to be without critical understanding, or as capable of critical understanding of their existential realities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>not emotional</td>
<td>emotional</td>
<td>Is the emotional dimension of learning and understanding excluded from the conceptualization of learners, or is it included?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>one dimensional</td>
<td>socio-cultural</td>
<td>Are learner's personal experiences in the context of their own social, familial, cultural, and political milieus marginalized or omitted, or are learners conceptualized in the socio-cultural context?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1: Comparison of Learner I versus Learner II conceptualizations used for analysis of qualitative data sources.
Review of Study Purposes and Components

As stated above, this dissertation is composed of two intersecting studies. The first--called "Class Room Study"-- focuses on the current practices of media education as it is currently exemplified in two sites (described below). This study consists of two major components: 1) interview of teachers and students, used as primary data; and, 2) participant observation and analysis of class syllabi and documents, used as secondary contextualizing data.

The second study--called "Field Test Study"-- illustrates a methodological approach to incorporating the learners' voices in media education practice, building on an understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of students' critical understanding of the media. It consists of written reaction papers in the form of Sense-Making self-interviews incorporated into the class syllabus as a required assignment.

Site Selection

The class room study was done at two school sites in Toronto, Canada where media education is firmly rooted in the educational system. From 1987 media education has been mandated as part of the regular English curriculum. According to Ontario's Ministry of Education guidelines, at least one third of a course in both intermediate and senior division English is required to be devoted to media education (Pungente, 1993). Compared to the United States, media education programs in Canada are well developed. The choice of the two schools was done under the guidance of Barry Duncan and John Pungente. Duncan is the Head of English and
Media Arts at the School of Experiential Education, Ontario, Canada, and co-founder and president of the Association for Media Literacy (AML), and author of *Mass Media and Popular Culture*, a high school text book. John Pungente is the founder and director of the Jesuit Communication Project in Toronto.

The field test study was done in the United States with students in a communication class in a major midwestern university. This site was chosen for practical reasons. The flexibility to introduce a reaction paper into the syllabus was not readily available in Canada because of established approaches to media education. In addition, a media education instructor at the midwest University was herself convinced of the need to implement the kind of intervention proposed by this dissertation and was, thus, a willing collaborator. Finally, I felt it fitting to choose a US site in order to focus attention on media education practice in the United States where there is so much need for this discipline given the presence of such a prolific media production sector and the comparative absence (in contrast with Canada, Great Britain, Australia, and New Zealand) of emphasis on media education.

**Class Room Study: Purpose, Sampling, and Interviews**

*Overall purpose.* Given, that the general purpose of the class room study was to document in actual practice the difficulties faced in media education because of an absence of a methodological approach to the learner, the implementation needed to attend specifically to the strengths and weaknesses attributed specifically to how the student is conceptualized in the learning situation. Table 4.1 provided a deductive template for this analysis -- elements of both conceptualizations of learners were
The study components and respondents. As indicated above, two primary components constitute the classroom study but when broken down into separate activities, they comprised four segments: interviews with students, participant observation, and analysis of syllabi and analysis of related classroom documents. Each of these components is described below.

Two classes were selected, one at each high school in Toronto. For each of these classes, the teacher was interviewed and a selected set of students. One additional teacher was interviewed and it was planned to interview students from this teacher’s class but access was not possible because of school system constraints. Thus, the final teacher sample was a judgmental pick of three teachers and the final student sample was a selected set from each of the classes of two of these teachers.

Five students from each of the two classes were interviewed. I asked the teachers to choose the students to be interviewed, choosing one of the best students, one of the worst students and three average students, judging them from their grade point averages.

A more complete portrait of the obtained judgmental samples of teachers and students is presented in chapters 5 and 6 as part of the presentation of findings for the classroom study.

Interviews with teachers. Each of the three teachers was interviewed in depth in a series of interviews that accumulated to a total of three hours each. The Sense-Making approach to interview construction was used, designed to allow the
teacher to describe how he/she made sense of the constructing and conduct of the
class and how he/she conceptualized students in the process. A sample interview
format is given in appendix A.

In overview the interview did the following: using the Sense-Making
approach, it asked the teachers to indicate how they constructed their syllabi and what
the goals, strengths, weaknesses or difficulties were in their teaching practice. For
each goal, strength, weakness or difficulty mentioned, they were asked "what led
them to consider it the goal, strength or weakness and what helped or hindered
them?" The other aspects teachers were asked to focus on included their pictures of
the best and the worst student in their classrooms, the important issues in media
education today and the question of structure and agency as played out in the
classroom. In all cases, answers were "triangulated" as is mandated in using the
Sense-Making methodology. The specific sections of the interview were structured as
follows:

a) Construction of the syllabus: The teachers were asked to describe how they
constructed the syllabi for their media education class. In particular they were
asked to described the goals envisaged in the construction their syllabi. Every
goal mentioned was triangulated with the Sense-Making approach. They were
asked what led them to consider this as a goal, whether they achieved this goal
completely, partially or not at all. They were further asked how the
accomplishment of this goal would help the students and how this goal
addressed issues of power in society and in media, whether this goal was
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accomplished for all the student, most of the students, about half the students
or only for a few students and what led them to make this judgment. For each
goal accomplished for all of the students, they were asked what enabled them
to accomplish their goals. For goals that were accomplished for less than all
the students, they were asked what enabled them to reach some students and
what prevented them from reaching others.

b) Major strengths: The teachers were asked to describe what they considered
to be the strengths in their syllabi and in their teaching practices. For each
strength they mentioned, they were asked what led them to consider these as
strengths, what were the major benefits from this strength and whether it
benefitted all the students, about half or only a few students and what leads
them to make that judgment. For each strength that benefitted less than all the
students, they were further asked what helped some students to benefit and
what prevented some from benefitting from this strength.

c) Major weaknesses: In the third part of the interview the teachers were asked
to identify what they considered to be major weaknesses, difficulties and
barriers in their syllabi and media education practice. Each weakness
mentioned was triangulated in a similar Sense-Making fashion. They were
asked what lead them to consider this as a weakness, whether this impacted the
whole class, half the class or only a few students. For each weakness that
impacted less than all the students, they were further asked why it impacted
some and did not impact others.
d) Portrait of the best student: Here the teachers were asked to give a picture of one or several students they considered as the best in their classroom and what lead them to make that assessment. For each reason mentioned they were asked to illustrate with an actual example or examples.

e) Portrait of the worst student: A similar line of inquiry was followed for the ones the teachers considered the worst students in their class. These questions were designed to elucidate the teachers ideas and ideals for the students.

f) Major issues in media education: In this section of the interview the teachers were asked to express their ideas about media education and what they considered to be the major issues in the field today. Again, their answers were triangulated in the Sense-Making fashion: what lead them to these conclusions and how they worked out their conclusions in the classroom.

g) Issues of structure and agency: In this section the teachers were asked to comment on the structure versus agency issue which pervades the media education literature, asking their views on whether media education should focus on teaching students to protect themselves from powerful/destructive media forces, or to develop their own creative capacities to enjoy media as consumers. Again, the Sense-Making triangulation was used, asking what lead to these conclusions and how the teachers worked out this issue in the classroom.

Interviews with students. As noted above, the purpose of the interviews with students in each of two media education classes was to learn from their perspectives
how they saw the teacher as conceptualizing them as learners and how they evaluated the class experience in terms of its relevance and sensitivity to their experiences and their strengths/weaknesses in understanding media. The sampling procedures were described above, yielding five interviews with students in each of the two classes. A total of 10 students.

The interviews with students were conducted during class hours with the permission of the teacher. They were recorded on audio tapes and transcribed verbatim. A copy of the interview instrument is included in Appendix B followed by a sample interview. The interviews were constrained by time as the time available for each interview was only 45 minutes, the length of the class period.

In the interviews, the Sense-Making approach was used in a series of seven modules, examining in turn student views on the ways the class fit and did not fit their understandings and experiences; what they saw as major goals of the class, major strengths and major weaknesses; how they would change the class if they had a magic wand; and, their opinions on whether the class should emphasize protection against media or the enjoyment of consumption.

As is mandated by the Sense-Making methodology, each of these modules was triangulated by asking students to explain what lead them to their conclusions/ideas and how actual events or hypothetical events did (or would) help and/or hinder them. For the last module, they were asked how they would make changes in the media education classroom that would reflect their own ideas.

Participant observation. The design of the classroom study called for
participant observation at the two class sites. The plan was to observe at least five to ten classes at each site. Observing was to continue until it became clear that additional observations were unlikely to produce any new understandings. As is participant observation practice, detailed field notes were taken of both teacher and student behaviors in class. In all, observations were made for 10 class sessions.

Because observation not only disturbs and shapes but is shaped by what is observed (Zukav, 1979; Lincoln & Guba, 1985), an awareness of this mutual interaction called for a journal by the observer. For this reason, I kept a reflective journals of my thoughts and ideas on the observations and interviews. Qualitative research can not be conducted without carefully reflecting on each stage. One needs to reflect upon each observation and interview before taking the next step (Glesne & Peshkin, 1992).

The primary purpose of the participant observation was to provide context and extension of the interview data. Participant observation also accomplished another purpose, that of establishing rapport with the students and teachers to make the interviews easier and more yielding.

Analysis of class syllabi and documents. The final element of the classroom study was an analysis of the class syllabi, handouts, and other documents/aids used in each class at each study site. The primary purpose of this analysis was to glean from the materials both overt and covert assumptions regarding the conceptualizations of learners in terms of the frameworks developed in chapter 3.

Closing in of the data on itself. As emphasized by Lincoln and Guba (1985),
in qualitative research the criterion used for judging when to stop sampling and observing is "information redundancy" (p. 202). The four observational activities for the classroom study included interviews with teachers, interviews with students, participant observation with reflective journal, and analysis of class syllabi and documents. The redundancy test was used to judge if the observations were sufficient.

**The Field Test Study: Purpose, Sampling, and Interviews**

**General purpose.** The purpose of the Field Test Study was to explore and illustrate how the learner’s voice can be made integral to the media education project. In the context of the discussions above, the intent was to address explicitly the eight criticisms of how the learner is typically conceptualized in media education practices despite the critical pedagogy ideals set forth.

The purpose in the field test study was not to do an audience reception analysis of student media behavior but rather to look explicitly for how the use of a minimal intervention tool based on Sense-Making’s theory of communicative practice would bridge the gap between student experience and classroom practice. In essence, then, the field test study was designed to address a major gap in the media education literature -- the gap between the wish of media education to be student centered and the actuality which is documented as teacher centered.

The minimal intervention introduced was the use of a reaction paper assignment which asked students to explicitly attend to the ideas they brought to the class, the connections of these ideas to their lives, how the ideas had been changed or
affirmed, and potential impacts of these changes. The reaction paper assignment, structured using the Sense-Making approach, was seen as implementing each of the Learner II concepts laid out in Table 4.1. The assignment, it was assumed, positioned each student so s/he could attend and react to class in ways it is assumed learners can and will, given the implementation of Learner II conceptualizations in media education practice.

The intent of introducing the reaction papers then, is to invite students to build the bridges between the class, their life experiences, and their understandings of the society in which they find themselves. The reaction paper assignment was introduced even though in a very small way as a systematic methodological component to the media classroom that will enable a greater understanding of the interaction of students' life experiences and the media education experience, and allow students themselves; as well as the teacher, to live out this understanding and its implications.

Selection of respondents. As indicated earlier, the class selected for the field test study was a university level media education class at a large midwestern US university. The large class population -- 92 students enrolled -- was taught by a doctoral teaching associate and two assistants. The class consisted of three lectures a week for 10 weeks. This class was selected primarily because of the teacher's willingness to launch this experimental intervention and because such an intervention was not possible at the Canadian site.

The intervention involved building an assignment into the class syllabus. As
given in the course description, the reaction paper assignment was designed

...to encourage you (students) to think about course materials in the ways they do (or
do not) intersect with the substance of your own life, and to stimulate you to articulate
the main points of the various lectures, readings, and audiovisual programs.

The students were told to choose a topic, issue, or theme that was covered in a
given week's lectures and to give it a title that indicated where they would be
focusing their reflections in writing the reaction papers. In all, each student was
asked to write five reaction papers during a 10-week term with each paper focusing
on a part or all of a different week's lectures. The reaction paper consisted of three
parts. In the first part the students were asked to write down any thoughts, opinions,
feelings or conclusions that they may have had on the subject they had chosen to write
about before entering the class. Each thought, opinion, feeling or conclusion was
then triangulated, as is mandated in the Sense-Making methodology, by the following
questions: "What in your life led you to this thought, opinion, feeling or
conclusion?", "Did having this thought/feeling impact your life in any way? And how
so?", "Now that you have been in this class, has the thought/feeling been confirmed,
strengthened, changed, or eliminated? If yes, how? What impact do you think this
will have on you?".

In the second part of the reaction paper, the students were asked to write down
any new thoughts, opinions, feelings or conclusions on the subject after being in the
class. Again each thought, opinion, feeling or conclusion was triangulated by the
following questions: "How does this new thought/feeling connect to your life?",
"What in the class led you to this new thought/feeling?", "What impact or effect do
you think this new thought/feeling is going to have on you?"

In the final section of the reaction paper the students were given an opportunity to communicate any difficulty they might be having with material framed by a question, "Do you have any questions, concerns, or confusions about the lecture, reading, or video on this topic? If yes, list or describe at least one."

Each student was asked to submit five reaction papers. The five one-page reaction papers carried two points each. There were all together 331 reaction papers submitted by the students. The questionnaire which formed the structure for the reaction papers is included in Appendix C, followed by a selection of examples of reaction papers.

**Sampling the data.** In all, the 92 students handed in 331 reaction papers. An examination of the data suggested that it worked best to take the reaction papers in sets with each set applying to a particular focal topic in the class. The most talked about focal topics included ritual (how media connects to life rituals and how these differ between cultural groups), feminism (the feminist critiques of media and media roles in society), and advertising (the role of advertising in society and its connections with the everyday). In all, 121 reaction papers were turned in on these three topics, written by 69 or 75.0% of the 92 students. An examination of the reaction papers not represented in this selection clearly showed that their removal did not change the conclusions to be drawn for purposes of this dissertation while their inclusion did not provide the kind of comparative focus which attention to the top three focal topics provided. The final sample for data analysis then consisted of the 121 reaction
papers on the top three focal topics.

Analysis of data

Data analysis, as pointed out by Lincoln and Guba (1985) "...is not a phase marked out as occurring at some singular time during the inquiry. Data analysis must begin with the very first data collection..." (p. 242). In the analysis of the data obtained for the two component studies -- the Class Room Study and the Field test Study -- and across the four data sources (interviews with teachers and students; and participant observation and analysis of syllabi and documents (Class Room Study only), the process was one which evolved in a series of iterative circles from the beginning of the field work phase in Canada in November 1994, through the two intensive months of field work, to the collection of the reaction paper data in Spring 1995, and then through two years of interpretation and re-interpretation of the mass of qualitative data obtained.

All data resulting from interviews was transcribed and entered in a qualitative analysis program resulting in some 400 pages of transcription.

The data was interpreted using both inductive and deductive qualitative analysis as recommended by Strauss (1990) and Patton (1990). Inductive analysis is the inverse of deductive data analysis. In deductive analysis the data was defined by apriori categories. For this dissertation, these were supplied by the Freirean and Feminist theories of pedagogy and their implications for media education. In particular, the Learner I versus Learner II comparison of conceptualizations of learners as presented in Table 4.1 was the primary substantive deductive template
used. In addition, the Sense-Making metaphor as described earlier in this chapter became a deductive analytic tool that aided the search for inductive patterns by directing attention to gap-facings and bridge-makings. The purpose in the inductive analysis was to allow the interviews to both inform and to challenge a priori assumptions.

For this dissertation, the interviews formed the primary data source. The reflective journal, the field notes, and the analyses of tests and documents were also analyzed in the same manner as described above, but were used as background to contextualize and extend the interviews.
CHAPTER 5
TEACHERS AND MEDIA EDUCATION PRACTICE

Chapter Focus and Approach

This dissertation consists of two studies -- a classroom study of current media education practice in two Canadian high schools; and a field test study focusing on a pedagogical intervention in a US university’s media education class. The classroom study consisted of two parts -- interviews with teachers and interviews with students.

This chapter focuses on the first part of the classroom study -- the in-depth interviews with the three Canadian media education teachers. The fourth teacher interviewed for this dissertation -- the teacher from the US based field test study -- is incorporated into this chapter as well, in essence as one of four teachers in the teacher sample. The reason for this is that other than her use of an experimental intervention and the fact that she taught at the university level in the US, there was no reason to consider the results of the interview with her separately. Thus, those portions of her interview that provide fodder for this chapter are included here; those portions that pertain specifically to the experimental intervention in the field test study are incorporated in chapter 7.
The sample of teachers used for the interview and the analytic procedures used for this sub-study are described in chapter 4. They are reviewed briefly here.

Table 5.1 presents the teacher's self-descriptions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Background and Teaching Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANNE</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>I'm a high school teacher of media and drama very interested in serving students' needs. I have a Masters in drama and I worked on media literacy by going through different countries—Australia, England, Los Angeles in the States and working on the media literacy guide for the Province...we changed a number of things in the education system here. So lots of different things. With media I started in the eighties...when it became quite popular. We started to make it so. With drama it was back in the seventies but it was a life long interest. I am teaching mostly high school students. I've taught grade school and I taught in Engineering at the university. That was one of my first teaching experiences, teaching English to engineering students but now it's mostly high school, a real mix of high school students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAN</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>I got involved in media education actually in teachers college in 1984 when I took part in a workshop. I went to a couple of other workshops offered over the years and I started teaching in my first school in 1985, an all girls school. Then by 1990 I went into the media education program offered from the faculty of education so I took part I, II and III from 1990 to 1992. Those were the courses I took from the faculty towards my media specialist. It's a certification from the Ministry. In 1990 I moved to another school and I have been teaching there till 1995. From 1995-96 I did media curriculum for the board for media education and now I'm back at the school. I'm teaching completely high school students...age 14 to 19 years old. I'm teaching...English this semester. I have been involved in the AML (Association for Media Literacy). I have written curriculum for them; done a couple of workshops for them and for my own board and I have written a few articles on media education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>I have a Bachelors degree in English but I have no formal education in media. I taught for about 10 years as an English teacher and then I was transferred to a new school where there was an existing media course that I was asked to teach. This was my first experience in teaching media. The next year instead of one class I had three and the year after that there were five. The more I taught the more I came to know its importance. All my teaching has been in high schools. Most of my learning about media education came partly from the job and partly through contact with Barry Duncan and the Association for Media Literacy. After several years teaching media in the class room I was made a kind of a relief teacher to go from school to school helping other teachers get media program started. I did that for seven years. And now I'm back in the classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARIE</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>My first degree was in Journalism. And after that I worked in public radio and television, very very small market. I have an MS in mass communication and now I have been teaching at this university for four years. While teaching I have also been involved in public television.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1: Statements by the four teachers in the teacher sample for the classroom study regarding backgrounds and teaching experiences.

The four teachers for the focus of this sub-study were George Shepherd.
Alan, Anne, and Marie. The above names are alternative names chosen by the teachers themselves to protect their identity. George, Alan, and Anne are high school teachers in Canada and Marie is a doctoral level teaching associate at a university. George teaches in public school, we shall call it school 1 while Anne and Alan teach at two Catholic schools, that we shall call schools 2 and 3 respectively.

Table 5.2 (presented below) repeats the description of the four teachers who were interviewed as presented in the methods chapter 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEACHERS</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>SYLLABUS</th>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>George</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Not Written</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Not Written</td>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>U.S.A.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.2: Overview of the judgmental sample of the four media education teachers in the classroom study teacher sample.

As explained in detail in chapter 4, the interviews focused on each teacher’s philosophy and approach to the practice of media education attending especially to perceived strengths and weaknesses and the difficulties involved in actual classroom practice, to the construction of the syllabi and to particular teaching styles. A sample interview, as noted in chapter 4, is in appendix A. The interviews were conducted after class hours and at times convenient to the teachers. They were recorded on audio tapes and later transcribed verbatim. Each interview took an average of one and a half hours.
It is these interviews which form the primary focus of this chapter. Using the interview data as my source, I have explored the concept of the learner as expressed in the interviews and as understood in the context of the two templates of Learner I and Learner II that were introduced in chapter 4. Relevant quotes from the ‘field notes’ and the ‘reflective journal’ described in chapter 4 are included to illustrate or emphasize concepts and ideas that emerged from the interviews. Both the field notes and the reflective journal are sparse intended primarily to provide contextual background and I use them here only as secondary data.

In overview the interview did the following: using the Sense-Making approach, it asked the teachers to indicate how they constructed their syllabi and what their goals, strengths, weaknesses or difficulties were in their teaching practice. For each goal, strength, weakness or difficulty mentioned they were asked ‘what led them to consider it the goal, strength or weakness and what helped or hindered them’. The other aspects teachers were asked to focus on included their pictures of the best and the worst student in their classrooms, the important issues in media education today, and the question of structure and agency as played out in the classroom. In all cases, answers were "triangulated" as is mandated in using the Sense-Making methodology, as explained in chapter 4.

In analyzing these four in-depth interviews, I focused on themes of agreement and disagreement between the four teachers and in particular located themes in terms of the bridges that they attempted to construct in the process of developing the syllabi and in conducting their teaching practice, bridges between the teacher and the
students, the students and their lives and the curriculum and between the curriculum and the popular media. I looked into how these bridges that the teachers were struggling to construct and maintain related to their situation and conditions.

In my analysis, the Sense-Making metaphorical framework focusing on time and space (e.g. history, experiences, society), movement (e.g. ideas, practices) and gaps (e.g. struggles) became a deductive template by which I located points of interest for the inductive analysis. The analysis below results from the inductive substantive search for themes or agreement and disagreement.

In all there emerged eight themes: (1) Relevance of the syllabus in the teaching practice; (2) Student centered media education practice; (3) The balance between the critical and the creative processes; (4) Marginalization of media education; (5) Ideals and goals in media education; (6) Styles of teaching; (7) Issues in media education; (8) The concept of the learner in media education practice.

Inductively Derived Themes from the Classroom Study

(1) Relevance of the Syllabus in the Teaching of Media

One thing that emerges as a difference between the four teachers is that two of them explicitly chose not to use a written syllabus and two chose to use the syllabus. This difference manifested their differing philosophies regarding the syllabus as a process versus the syllabus as a contract.

(a) Syllabus as a Process: George and Anne who chose not to use a syllabus agreed in their reasons. They wanted an openness in their teaching that could be
responsive to the students' needs. For George the syllabus was part of the process of teaching, trying out some activities to see what works and what does not.

*I do not like to develop a curriculum in the absence of the student.* So when I came to the school though I had some idea, some rough idea of what the student body here was like but I wouldn't say I knew what I was dealing with. So I was very hesitant to write a curriculum in advance. I think that's generally a good way to proceed....

...I had certain principles and ideas, kind of framework that I'm looking for and what I'm hoping to achieve. The framework I want to use and certain kinds of outcomes that I want to be working towards. But where the kids are in terms of their ability to grasp and what their particular needs are in terms of the curriculum. So it's a feeling about, in a way, trying some activities, see what works and what kinds of things work and what kinds of things do not work.

He was quite convinced that the syllabus has to be the responsibility of the teacher which he has to work out through his class with his students.

*It requires a lot from teacher too.* Because as I have outlined it I said what I outlined was a model and not a syllabus. It means that you've got to be making a curriculum all the time in a way, and I happen to think, some consider it as a joke, real teachers make their own curriculum. When I see teachers taking package of curriculum, we Don't see much in Canada but I understand it's quite common in the United States, where teachers are given a curriculum to teach complete with worked out lessons and everything, you know, I find it inconceivable. I Don't know how anybody could think of themselves as a teacher and not be involved in shaping their own curriculum.

Anne who used drama in media education preferred to keep her class very flexible so she could remain relevant to the students' day to day media experiences.

*I have an open syllabus in terms of the media depending on what's happening in the world.* I keep it extremely current....

...At the beginning of the year we start going through the basic key concepts of media literacy, the understanding of constructions and how the world of media operates, and it's a wonderful thing, you know, because after about the first week, the students start saying, "Oh, my goodness, I can't watch TV the same way any more, I'll never see the commercial the same way" and that's a wonderful thing."
(b) Syllabus as Contract: The two teachers who used a written syllabus did so for different reasons. Marie who had a detailed syllabus with course objectives, course requirements, course policies, course schedule and even a plagiarism statement used the syllabus as a contract between the student and the teacher. She explained the way she constructed her syllabus and the reason why she wrote her syllabus in detail.

*Because of everything I've studied on the mass media I'm sort of making it into a sort of media studies class. And what I tried to do is break the syllabus up into coherent units, themes that we were going to cover. The way I designed it was to start with economic structure for a few weeks and then go into text analysis, and that's another kind of structure and the third unit is audiences which you might call agents or individuals. So, we spent a lot of time on structures and a lot of time on what I thought was the cannon, you know, of critical cultural. And then at the end we have a nod towards real people and the audiences. That was my basic idea......the strength of my syllabus is that I explained all the course assignments on paper and had a plagiarism statement and it's all on the syllabus and it's not separate handouts that I gave out sporadically during the term where there will be a risk of some people not picking it up, getting it, that they were absent.*

Thus, Marie left no place for any ambiguities and misunderstandings and expected the same honesty and responsibility from the students. While Marie was guided by a pedagogical philosophy that essentially said that the syllabus would allow certain outcomes to be achieved, Alan followed a particular syllabus for different reasons. He followed a syllabus because it is co-written by the department head.

*The syllabus is co-written by the head of the department and myself and what it's based on is the idea of critical thinking. And what we base on as key principles of media literacy and how they play themselves in different forms of media. So we look at popular culture, we look at television, we look at film, we look at advertising at the tail end. Those are what I usually focus on and the students will apply those principles and they'll look at other things with research eye....they'll do things some specific aspects for instance of television or film that really interest them but they can explore variety of different things.*
He followed the syllabus also because it fit his own particular teaching style. He explained the need for a syllabus to fit his personal style. He expected the spontaneity of the students to fill the gap that this pre arranged syllabus created.

_If I have a structure behind me then I tend to flounder. I could never go and kind of do it by the seat of my pants. It just doesn’t happen for me that way very well unless the kids kind of take it you know from there and they bring up things._

(2) A Student Centered Media Education Practice

The second theme that arose out of this analysis was the attempt by the teachers to move toward a student centered pedagogy. All the four teachers recognized the importance of reaching the students where they were at and understanding their media experiences. Anne expressed this very clearly when she said, “I think starting where they (students) are at is extremely important”.

Alan observed how the students showed resistance when you talk about things that touch their lives.

_It’s really interesting when you’re talking of popular culture, I found the greatest resistance because you begin to talk about things that are at your heart, you know, that are really important to you. And when you do that you like to think about them critically. To think about them critically, for instance, a really good example is clothing. I look at the significance of clothes, you know, what they could represent for people, fashion and hair length and all that type of thing and when you come to music the kids become very guarded about their music, you know. Some of the guys there are big rock and rollers and some other kids are rappers. And one of the exercise was if you design an album an album without using any language what symbols would represent your type of music. If you are rock fan what would you have there? And I switched to rappers and the kids were very uneasy with it. I think that’s a real problem too, the inability to see things critically because they take it real personally. You know sometimes that could really be hard. It’s much easier doing where they have no stake in it but when there is stake in it you really have to be careful how you go at it. They are not willing to be open in their discussions and with each other they can be brutal._
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In his classroom Alan approached this subject carefully because it was a touchy subject for students and yet he admitted that it is the only way that he could do real teaching.

*I think it's the only real way that it's going to make sense is by touching something that hits home. I'm not sure how much it helps but at the beginning I really do make a point that we are going to talk about things that are quite personal to them.*

Though the teachers were very much aware of the importance of reaching the student, there was no evidence that this importance is reflected in their syllabus or in the construction of it. Rather it was left to the ingenuity of the teacher and primarily to moments of hoped-for spontaneity in the classroom.

(a) *Strategies for Reaching the Student/Bridging the Gap:* Anne and George used the concept of 'teachable moment' in their classrooms. 'Teachable moment' is a concept promoted by Barry Duncan, the president of the Canadian Association for Media Literacy. Though Duncan himself has not written anything explicitly on the subject of 'teachable moment', many of the media teachers in Canada have understood it's significance and have integrated into their teaching. In a recent article Barry Duncan gives us an idea of what he means by the 'teachable moment'.

*Using the investigative processes of audience research encourages teachers to become classroom researchers and ethnographers of our every day social practices who can move beyond simple deconstruction of texts to a rich variety of sources for meaning making....Let us begin discussion about audiences by using a recent teachable moment or in other words, an excuse to look at the incredible resurrection of who else. Well, Michael Jackson; the packaging of new and old music in 'HIStory', and some mind boggling interviews and publicity students beginning in June 1994.*

One of my teachers -- George -- explained the 'teachable moment' as a
spontaneous moment when the student is interested in an event or media moment or news that concerns or attracts him/her and therefore is receptive to it.

*I think media literacy is somewhat different from other subjects because important things come out spontaneously, the spur of the moment, what Barry Duncan calls "the teachable moment" and you have to seize it. It can happen with news, or it could happen about the covering of the news, particularly when kids come and talk about it. You have to be prepared to deal with it at that time.*

Anne considered one of the strengths in her curriculum that she was open to the experiences of the students and ready to prioritize it in her curriculum. This aspect of her teaching comes very close to Freire's own method of using 'generative themes' and 'generative words' in order to develop the content of the literacy programs as explained in chapter 3.

*The strong point is being open enough to use what is most powerful right at that given month or week or year with the students. Because, I think starting where they are at is extremely important. I may even start, 'what's in your lockers? what do you have up in your locker?' And when you start with something that familiar it's amazing how they catch on, and I just have them to start to speak. I Don't get into analysis or anything for the first little while. It's creating a chance for them to feel very comfortable in speaking about what it is that affects them, what it is that is near and dear to their hearts,*

Anne talked about a particular class where she used the news that was top most in the minds of the students to teach them about media and how it is constructed. The news was about the Montreal massacre where fourteen women were killed. It was in all the papers that day and the students were all talking about it. She took the different news paper reports and helped the students to understand the different ways the story was reported by the different news papers.

*I'll never forget that. And if I wasn't ready with that, to teach that course to that class at that time, one week later, I Don't think I could have. I would
have lost it. So this is it, 'the teachable moment'. You really have to grab those...if the teacher has some sort of a media literacy frame work in his/her head they are able to react to the situation and will be able to help the kids to make sense of their experience of the media. Whereas if you are tied to a rigid curriculum you are not in a position to take advantage of those moments.

Close to the idea of 'teachable moment' is the use of the 'media log' in the classroom. Many of the teachers introduced the 'media log' into their curriculum. It had been officially structured into the syllabi in many of the Canadian Secondary media education programs. However evidence from my classroom study suggests that the media log was treated more as an assignment than as an integral part of the structure of the syllabi. George explained his use of the media log in the following way:

The media log? Students are required to write two entries a week on the log in which they comment either upon the class and what's going on in the class and what they have learnt in the class or on their own media experiences. If they watch a television program they could write about that television program. We have a discussion in class in which they get involved or Don't get involved, they can discuss that. It's a channel of communication. Every week I sit down and read about what they have been thinking about or involved in.

In contrast, Anne used the media log as a structural element in her curriculum. For her it is no more than a mere assignment. She examined it and expanded it to teach media concepts. In a lengthy explanation she described her approach:

...the media log? OK. What it is, is that they are asked to first bring in any one image in the media that they feel had an impact on them and half the time it's an add or a billboard or once in a blue moon it'll be a slogan from a radio or a TV program. So, what they'll do is they'll bring that in and we start with something simple like that and we analyze the add, we deconstruct it. they try to get the idea of that hands on working with an add. And so then their project is to look the areas of television, magazines, radio, songs, you know,
rock video as well as TV shows and any programs on the air that they would, you know, come across and news. Many look at..... and they asked to get 10 to 15 examples of adds and then approximately 2 examples from each of all the other medium and in the mediums of songs and TV shows and in those medium what I ask them to do is to pick one very positive image that they get, from say a song and then to pick an other song that they feel is not such a positive image or not such positive message. So, it's wonderful. They could see now how these particular forms can change their moods, have an effect on their own responses and so they'll put that together in a scrap book. And the scrap book is the media log. And they start usually with all of the adds and they just write a little note below each add, what images are used, how it was constructed, what audience is the intended audience and what the point of view is, and so, it's really a, very powerful. The next thing, what happens is, we'll have the sections at the back with the radio, the tv programs, the soap operas, all sort of things. And then they come into class when it's finally Done. And it's just wonderful. They pick the one thing in their media log that they are most proud of and they share that with the rest of the class. And then what we'll do is we'll create scenes on those adds. So, the students will reenact the commercial or say, do a tableau image of the magazine add and then I ask them to adjust or just switch the message around to something that they feel tells the truth about the product or tells more of a reality as opposed to an image, you know, a statement about whatever the product or point that is being shared. You know, so, it really is great. Because, we then, talk about what is true about this and what is fantasy.

Anne combined the use of the media log with the use of the drama. She felt that through drama she somehow directs the student to get under the skin of the media. She used drama in her class to teach media in much the same way that other teachers use media equipments in production.

Other strong points? I would say the using of drama. It's absolutely fabulous. Because what ends up happening is you have students really and truly sharing ah, in a doing format. Their having to live through this commercial also makes them feel what that model feels like. They can love watching that and looking through the magazine and flipping through pages. All of a sudden when they have to get into the position of the model on that page and feel it, you know, you get the reaction that this is not natural. This is so difficult to do or this is stupid, you know. And it's only when they do, I find that they really learn it, the ultimate end of learning, like I think, that old quote that they had about, you know, learning is in the different stages, if you talk about it you are catching at one level, and it's when you really do it, you know, you
get it inside of you.

(b) Disempowerment and Discontinuity: Disempowering teaching practice is not difficult to find in media education. It is the natural outcome of the gaps between the teacher and the student, the student and the curriculum, the curriculum and the media experiences of the student. It is the absence of explicitly constructed connections. Among the difficulties that Marie encountered in her classroom, the most serious one was in making the students believe that she really wanted the students' participation, their ideas and input in the classroom. She found it difficult to counteract the cynicism and distrust in the students. She believed it was because students were so very used to disempowering teaching practices that it was hard to break them out of that mindset. Marie told about the presence of disempowering teaching practice through her own experiences in the class rooms.

They are not used to being privileged in that way in the classroom. And I've heard this from students that they are used to being either anonymous students in a huge lecture or even in a small room are simply talked at and not required to participate. I imagine there is a lot of disempowering educational practices out there. In fact I know there are....I suspect students probably get cynical about it and they Don't really believe me when I tell them that I want them to be critical and independent and they probably think that just means that my course material is radical or alternative and they are supposed to still buy it hook line and sinker.

Disempowering education essentially is the denial of students' experience and knowledge. It could take so many different forms. It need not necessarily be rude.

Marie continued:

That the students' statement about what they've seen and felt about the world are perhaps discounted either verbally in front of every one, not necessarily in a rude way but discounted or students statements about their experiences and feelings are discounted when they put them down on paper in some essay or
other assignments so they get marks off.

She further explained disempowering practice as the lack of methodologies to accommodate the student's voice.

*I think that is one way that students are disempowered in the classroom by not having good procedures for class discussions where students are aware ahead of time that we won't all agree but that doesn't mean that parts of their inputs are not valid. That is one disempowering thing. And another disempowering thing is not to solicit any of that material from the students in the first place.*

This gap in the pedagogies was also one of the reasons, if not the main reason, that Marie concluded the students often find it difficult to grasp what is being taught.

Other reasons offered by Marie included:

*There are always those whose attendance is poor and Don't do the readings and they Don't get it.....But there are some people who come to class every day and do the readings and they still Don't get it. Some of them I'm teaching over their head and they are normal students and for some students they are unprepared to be in the university and I assess that they Don't get my vocabulary that's one thing.*

There are of course other difficulties that are tied to background of the students and problems of multiculturalism that were common to all three schools. Anne pointed out these difficulties:

*Well one of our difficulties here is we have a lot of students who are ESL students. They Don't understand the language. I mean they all understand the images so you get through there. We have many students who are learning disabled. So they would be sometimes limited in their ability to understand imagery, symbolisms. Those things become difficult sometimes. Ah, we have behavioral cases where students are involved in very difficult situations outside the school life. Sometimes they are just not capable of even being around a group. Those are things that, you know, are challenges to any teacher.*

George expressed the gravity of this problem as needing the support of the whole school.

*On the other side there is a multi cultural department in the school. They give*
a great deal of support to kids in their identity or lot of understanding offered to in the pressures of learning in another language, basically trading in their language. It's a traumatic experience lasting a generation and a half really. Family trades its language. That's a very hard thing. So there are ESL classes. But so also support for being who you are is part of the watch word of the school. There's also a separate literacy department that deals with kids who have specific problems. Some of the kids coming here haven't learnt to read in their first language. Learning is not just learning another language but learning to read and write in a foreign language while you never learnt to read or write in your own has a lot of difficulty.

(3) The Balance between the Critical and the Creative Processes

All of the teachers agreed on their goal to teach the students to become critical and creative with regard to the media. The critical they equated with skills in analysis, and the creative, with the skills in production. In their teaching, they tried to find a balance between these two.

(a) Critical Autonomy: That the students become critical thinkers aware of the influence of the media in their lives was a priority for all the teachers. They argued that the students could be deceived easily by the media because of the way it is presented as a seamless whole. Alan wanted his students to

...become critical thinkers, much more aware of the influence of the media in their lives, much more able to interpret and make sense of media; I guess to watch more critically or think more critically are key goals... I think the goal of the critical studies, or the critical analysis or being able to think critically is to be able to get that distance, to be able to analyze what's in front of them, to be able to make sense of it to be able to see that in fact it's put together. Because it's so seamless.

George wanted the students to see the seams of the media and recognize that they are constructed, put together:

I want them to be able to look critically at the media to see how it works, the role it plays in their own lives and in the larger society...because the media tend to, particularly the visual media, tend to be experienced by the kids
almost as a seamless extension of reality. I want to show them the seams. Because it is not an extension of reality but a construction of reality.

He called for the critical autonomy that he saw as necessary to live as free human beings.

Dealing critically is critical autonomy. The roles in our lives is to recognize the power the media has to shape things...I want to see autonomous people in the society. I think that's how we are going to be useful in society. And if you are not able to deal critically with the media I Don't think you can be an autonomous individual. I guess it's about people being free, and it's about people being in a better position to have their say in the society to see that the decision making power in the society is more equitably distributed.

For Anne teaching the students to become critical was to help them in their understanding of themselves, others and the society. She suggested that this be achieved through the use of drama.

Open the eyes of the students and help them to understand themselves better, how they relate to their society, how they relate to one another, and to help them with their real relationships, their real mom and dad as opposed to the sitcom mom and dad, you know, I mean the real friend. And their feelings as opposed to the dating relationships that they see on the tv set.

She used drama to achieve this goal. She felt that she is able to involve the students in a real way in the whole process of critical analysis.

But the wonderful thing about drama, all of a sudden the main resource becomes the student, the student's body, the student's brain, and things like desk and chairs are removed and you all of a sudden are dealing with the raw material of the emotions. And we get a lot closer to that. Of course, the media is playing with our emotions all the time...So, I just think the fact that I'm able to really be working with emotions and reactions and problem solving, right on site, right at the moment, not just simply an analytical approach like where we write about it or read an essay about it. I really find it very wonderful what you get. And then, we decide to get into sharing what's been, you know, rehearsed we may video tape and then we get into that last bit of technical aspect of involvement. But because something really belong to the student or the scene that belongs to the student, once they see it on video they see it all of a sudden distance them and then they can speak about that in a
very personal way.

The way drama was used by Anne presented a substantive contribution to media pedagogy. Thus, she was reaching for using drama not only to involve students in her chosen agendas but to empower students to open their own agendas. In actual practice, however, as the literature reviews presented in earlier chapters suggest, most teaching regarding critical autonomy translates into teaching some skills in decoding and deconstructing of text with little impact beyond the text. Even today, after many years of media education, the concerns raised by Judith Williamson and others regarding pedagogy, as noted in chapter I, remain very real. It is this concern that is voiced by Anne when she said:

...that person who intellectually talk about oh, yes, I know all about stereotypes, I know all about these things and they go out and they repeat the stereotypes or whatever. Once they've lived through it in a drama class, just I just found it much more powerful mode.

(b) Production: Production has always been a part of media education. Three of the four teachers used the creative use of the media as an integral part of their media education curriculum. Marie was the exception because she did not have the production side of media education available to her because at the university level, media production is a separate course of study. In the Canadian high schools, on the other hand, the production side of the media is often represented by an SP or the independent study project.

Despite this common mandate, the teachers used production for different reasons in their class rooms. Alan felt that the production end of the class was an important element to help the student grasp media construction and appreciate media.
In fact he considered the critical without the creative aspect as boring.

...the creative use of the media. Yeah, I think that's important. Then only they'll have the opportunity to look critically at things. I think that it can become sterile after a while. It has to be I think they should take some of the insights or some of the critical things and turn around and do it themselves. I mean I think that's what will help them appreciate on the one hand what media does day in and day out basis.

For George the production aspect of media education provided a different mode of learning for the students. He considered as a strength in his curriculum a balance between analysis and production.

One strength is the back and forth between production and analysis. I think that's very important because it let kids learn in different modes. Some kids will learn best from the analytic mode and some kids will learn best from production mode.

Alan, too, considered the balance between production and analysis as a strength in his media education curriculum:

...flexibility in the curriculum...The combination of the critical thinking as well as the creative is a strength. We try to do both...When it's under the technical department it's not media literacy it's media production...Another school will do straight media literacy. But what it often turns out to be is like the history of television, that type of thing. We try to balance it. And I think those are the strengths.

Well, I think what it does is it doesn't allow the course to just be one kind of stream that alright we're going to examine things we're going to look at these things. It really draws on different talents of the students.

Alan mentioned some of the good things that happen through production, especially through ISP (Independent Study Project). Students not only learned to work together, but also began to respect each other.

I just find it amazing when they watch each others' video, you know. Sometimes the quality is not terrific but they are genuinely respectful of the process the people have got through.....Because it's a struggle they are all going through right now. They are all in that silly booth trying to put this
together, you know, and there is a real sense that we’re all in this kind of mess together. And when they see something, you know, they genuinely do appreciate it. They watch it and they want to see it again. I think that’s a really good thing, healthy thing.

For George production was more than an exercise in creativity, it was an opportunity to allow the different talents of the students to shine. As he suggested, students who could not grasp media through analysis, found it easier to understand it through production.

My experience leads me to believe this: that the kids who can’t get abstractions can get it from production side....And often their early production work besides being technically bad tends to replicate existing media. We want to teach kids about stereotypes, and media uses stereotypes to communicate and often they fall into some of the same problems that main stream media exhibits. It used to bother me more than it does. I realized that it’s asking a lot from the kids to master the media, the technology and to transcend the main stream media. It’s really asking a lot.

Alan explained how the students abilities showed in the production classes specially through the ISPs where they were encouraged to choose their own topics and stories. Production, Alan said, was important not only for the appreciation of the media but also for student self esteem.

I think it’s really important. It brings out a whole other aspect, I mean, these guys will slave, the group that had ISP (Independent Study Project), the first group, spent hours on it. We’ve never seen them writing essays in their lives but they’ll story board and they’ll really put energy in and I think there is a real level of satisfaction...They are on a par with kids because they can think visually in ways perhaps the other kids just can’t, you know, and it’s marvelous. It’s really a wonderful thing to see some of these kids grow. Jeff Smith who is never looked to as a kind of resource by any one, you know, in an English course but here, you know, and Willie and Chuck, Ricardo, I mean, Robert over there, you know they become people that bring out a new aspect of themselves. And I think that is really valuable. And the whole production is really important for the appreciation of the media as well as for self esteem.

George agreed with this assessment and noted that the order of excellence in
students was reversed in the production classes.

One of the striking things about media literacy programs is that they often kind of reverse the normal pecking order in the class. Kids who are good at reading and writing, kids who are top kids in the class in reading and writing activities are not necessarily the top kids in a media class. Kids who often don’t do too well in a class focused on reading and writing do extremely well. Those kids have skills and intelligence that we should be honoring, that are valuable and we don’t in most of education. I'm really glad to see that there is a place here for that.

Thus these remarks reaffirm the common observation of other media teachers that hard to motivate students often excel in their media classes.

(4) Marginalization of Media Education

Another theme that emerged from the four interviews is the marginalization of media education. This concern was expressed by all the teachers in different ways. Consequences of marginalization of media education were seen as many. They manifested themselves primarily as the struggles the teachers faced in dealing with the educational system; and as problems of discipline in the class room.

(a) Struggles within the Educational System: Marginalization of media education may not be obvious in the university system. But the interview with Marie suggested that the program did suffer through cut backs in financial support especially on the production side of media education. The tendency was to leave the production classes to professional training schools outside the university system where they tend to become just technical training. In the high schools, however, the interviews with the three high school teachers suggested that the problem is very real and very painful for the teachers involved in it. The subject of media education is judged as a 'sloppy second' to the English course, according to Alan:
The weakness I think is that the course is perceived as a course for students who perhaps cannot do an academic English course, for those advanced level students who can't. So, you know, sometimes you tend to very often pick up kids who see the course as the sloppy second.

One consequence of this attitude is the poor teacher preparation in the system.

George reported that, in his judgment, many of the English teachers who have been called on to teach media education have very little commitment to it.

Other issues, I think in Ontario we have to break out of that kind of curriculum ghetto. Right now as you know it's one third of two courses plus an optional, fifth English credit, that's full credit media course and my belief is that probably no more than third of the teachers in the province are really doing that one third. English teachers are not committed to it.

George had his own suggestion for this situation, but did not believe that it could happen.

There has been a really terrible failure on the part of the ministry of education in teachers' training to train new English teachers in teaching the media. I would like the ministry to start reviewing the implementation and making sure that it happens or to maybe be taken out of there and say OK it's not part of English course any more but there is one full credit course that's compulsory at grade 10 level so that we could be assured that every student in Ontario is getting some media literacy. I have my doubts whether that will happen.

Anne, too, expressed her concern about the lack of qualified teachers in media education.

...what scares me, too, is sometimes I'll see people teaching media and they'll spend a whole class showing a film, you know. But there isn't a process of stop and questioning and asking students to look at what they are seeing.

One of the difficulties mentioned by her was working in an education system that does not recognize the validity of teaching media. Here she referred specifically to drama that she used in her media education.

The difficulty is perhaps working in the education system. Because still our
education system is very much set up on structures that ah, you know, are still not thinking about this technique as the number one way of teaching. Things are a lot better than they were. But even your room, OK, for instance getting a space that has a carpet on the floor or has space for those chairs, has space that really can be used for drama area that'll allow this interacting thing. That's one thing. Waking up other teachers and other parents and educators to see that this isn't just playing even though the kids are having fun sometimes, they have a great time. But the learning aspect is very strong and it's very vital.

From these interviews, then, one is left with the impression that these committed media education teachers are doing enormous service against many odds.

(b) Discipline: Since the system considers media education as an unnecessary subject, it is not surprising that these interviews suggested that the students perceive it as an easy substitute for English. This created a problem of discipline in the class room, since the students who were attracted to the class were often not highly motivated. Alan explained how he dealt with this problem:

...kids will come into the course thinking 'well there's no text book. It's great. There are no long essays. But they got a calendar at the start of each month different thing laid out on them. It's like, oh! what's going on? So they really learn organization very quickly or you get mobbed. Because I didn't want this course to be perceived as a bird course. Either you learn organization or. I mean, the kids who aren't here very often, well, if you're not going to be here then you certainly better organize your time very well. And they flounder badly.

Given the present position of media education in the school system, according to Alan there were two kinds of students, the ones who came because they think it's an easy way to get necessary credit, and the others who came because they enjoy the subject and are fascinated by it.

And if you're along for the ride I'm not going to make a personal demand. I'm not going to make a personal sacrifice on my part. No, I'm not. I'll learn whatever formula you want me to learn from media but don't ask me to make
that kind of, I Don't have to do that. And, so the whole element of risk taking, that's kind of hard to ask him to do that. If they perceive the course as something that they have to go through in order to get a credit, which you are doing there anyway. But it's quite amazing when you get kids in there who are really doing it because they enjoy it. They are very willing to do that, to take those risks.

(5) Ideals and Goals in Media Education

The fifth theme from the interviews concerns the ideals and goals of media education. The goals expressed by the teachers in the interviews reflected the goals of media education as enunciated in the introduction to this dissertation (pp.8-9). All agreed, as already suggested above, that the goal was to have students become critical thinkers aware of the influence of the media in their lives. George summarized the important goals of his media education class in this manner

*I want them to be able to look critically at the media, to see how it works, the role it plays in their own lives and in the larger society, to have some ability to use the media to express themselves. I wanted them to be able to do a certain amount of decoding or deconstructing when dealing with text and so on. I want them to have some understanding of the audience, the role that the audience plays in constructing meaning, the various factors that operate within that—the culture, ethnicity, education, race, gender...I want to get kids to the point to be active viewers, where they— I won't say passively, because I don't think kids deal passively with media, I think that's a mistake to describe kids as passive in relationship to the media, because the brain is quite active in making sense of the media--But they are unconscious, or unaware of them. The meanings that they are making are not the meanings that they are examining consciously...I think all media texts have value messages. I just want kids to be conscious of this in dealing with them.*

Alan considered it part of his responsibility to help the students to identify values in the media and to value their own opinions:

...you don't want them to be victims, you know, I mean, this isn't the kind of rehashing of almost a conspiracy theory about media but a genuine direction of media is economic force. The different areas of media are there to create audiences to create economic growth. So, they want purchasing. And you
want them to be able to say, well, what are the values that they're wanting me to buy into. I think part of my job is to help them identify those values and help them say, well, am I in agreement with them or am I in disagreement with them.

Marie’s goals were slightly different in that they do not have the production aspect of media education. But she agreed with the others on the important goal of teaching critical autonomy or independent thinking.

The first objective is to provide a broad survey of issues, theories and concepts in cultural studies as they pertain to mass media and mass media studies. My second objective is to engage the student in critical and independent thinking in terms of analyzing media experience and the third objective is to just sort of expand their notions of what we consider reality or expand their notions of how we are supposed to be in the world, how we are supposed to see and think...I want them to not take everything hook, line, and sinker. By that I mean I want them to be a little skeptical about material that's presented, skeptical about things they hear outside the classroom about the world, about people.

The teachers in these interviews were very articulate about the goals in their media education teaching, but they said very little about how these goals were achieved, and, with the exception of Marie, did not mention the need for explicit procedures for reaching these goals.

(6) Styles of Teaching

From the interviews it's clear that each teacher had his/her particular style of teaching. The literature clearly suggests that media education very often depends on the personal style and ingenuity of the teacher to achieve the goals of media education. This may be an indication of a pedagogy that is not well developed.

George talked about his personal style of teaching that depends on an open communication between the students and him. Here he explained why some of the students get what he is teaching:
Another possibility is that communication just don't click with me, personality clash or whatever. It's not very common but because my teaching style is kind of personal kind of style when it does go bad lot is lost because the personal communication channel is what I depend on a lot. Without it I'm kind of crippled.

The personal styles of the teachers that emerged from these interviews were of great value to teacher training in media education. It was clear that the teachers had an investment in their styles and saw them as taking a long time to develop, achieving them through years of teaching. George further explained his ways of teaching as one of listening and responding,

_I want to be real to them and I do that by really listening to them, encouraging them to talk about themselves and responding to that and also by talking about myself to them when it seems appropriate._

Alan, though he followed an already written syllabus, felt that the students had great freedom within his syllabus. At the same time he challenged the students to reach the goals set for them by the syllabus.

_I have a curriculum that I work through but the kids on the other hand are, have got a tremendous amount of freedom within that, you know. They have choices they can make. When they are working on projects I give them time. I set out the goal. They've got to reach that goal by this date, you know. And So, it's a different type of structure. Some teachers are very uncomfortable with it. Some kids flounder in it, because it really demands a lot out of them. The purpose of putting it is if it's not done it's not done. But you've been given this time and you have to make your decision._

He explained his personal style of dealing with his students in the class as one of respect and control.

_as much as I fool around with them you have to be respectful and so allowing for free exchange and at the same time keeping a muscle on some of them when you know that they are going to get to the point of being disrespectful, that you go back and forth._
Another important theme of agreement among the teachers was their current concerns regarding media education. The teachers talked about what they thought were the important issues in media education today. All three high school teachers from Canada, showed concern about the present position of media education in the school system. The concern was about media education being part of English. It was about the lack of qualified teachers. This issue was elaborated on above.

Besides the problem of the place of Media Education in the Canadian systems. George spoke of how students still couldn't identify ideology in the media in spite of all the skills in deconstruction emphasized in the class:

..students have learnt all kinds of skills in dealing with the media but they haven’t come to the point where they could identify ideology in a text. They have all kinds of deconstruction skills but they couldn’t get to this point. I’m struggling with that...Well, we are not as a culture very adept at identifying ideological issues. I think that the main stream ideology of the culture tends to be invisible to the members of the culture. Is it not the Jesuit Father John Culkins who said "I don’t know who discovered water but it certainly is not the fish”. I think it’s the kind of thing. We tend to be surrounded by the culture’s ideology and for that reason find it rather difficult to identify. I think also, it’s a kind of a side issue and sort of a personal theory of mine, that one of the striking thing about the development in media education is that it happens outside the United States. Lot of it happens in Canada, lot in Australia. I think perhaps in Britain as well as in Australia perhaps because of higher level of class consciousness.

It is the same concern that was expressed by Anne when she talked about how the students repeated in their lives the same stereotypes that they analyzed and critiqued in their class rooms. Marie warned against uncritical celebration of popular culture.

I don’t think media education should be uncritical celebration of pop culture. I fear that will happen if we lean so much towards let’s pull examples from students’ programming....So there is the fear of celebrating pop culture to the
point of it seeming harmless and of no consequence socially or politically and students fall in love with mass media so much that they want to work in it and they accept its conventions and norms as natural and real or whatever. That's one major issue of media education.

While George and Anne found the recognition of ideologies a problem for the students, Alan felt the problem of pornography was an important issue that had to be dealt with in media education. However, he found it a very difficult subject to bring into the class room.

I think we need to look at the whole issue of pornography. I think it is a vital area. But I don't know how to do it. I mean I truly don't know how to do it. How do you do it without ending up pandering you know.

He felt it was an important issue because it was important to the students:

Well, it's obviously important for the kids. I find that they have very strong opinions about it. They want to talk but it's tied into violence. The whole idea of restriction it has to do with the idea of being able to be a critical thinker I think.

(8) Concept of the Learner

This section looks at the interview corpus as a whole for each of these teachers in terms of what the interview said about each teacher's conceptualization of the learner. Here I am referring back to chapter 3 and the contrast between the Learner I and Learner II. Using my own judgments and a careful reading of each interview. I looked for statements that each teacher made regarding their assumptions about the learner as the learner entered the class. Table 5.3 below indicates the results of my judgments for teachers across all the categories. In assessing each teacher's narrative in terms of whether it represented Learner I versus Learner II concepts, I introduced a mixed judgment where I found a reasonably balanced mixture of both Learner I.
and Learner II qualities. My judgments (e.g. active and passive) are not to be interpreted rigidly. In practice, most of the teachers exhibited in their narratives a mixture and a clear indication of struggling to move from Learner I to Learner II concepts. When I categorized a teacher’s conception of the Learner as active, for example, it indicated that in my judgment there were more active than passive conceptualizations present in the practice as represented in the interview materials and the supporting syllabi and field notes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>George</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Incapable</td>
<td>Victim</td>
<td>Empty</td>
<td>Not Critical</td>
<td>Not emotional</td>
<td>Socio-cultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Incapable</td>
<td>Victim</td>
<td>Empty</td>
<td>Not Critical</td>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>Socio-cultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Incapable</td>
<td>Victim</td>
<td>Empty</td>
<td>Not Critical</td>
<td>Not emotional</td>
<td>Socio-cultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Capable</td>
<td>Victim</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>Not Critical</td>
<td>Not emotional</td>
<td>Socio-cultural</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.3: Coding of each teachers’ interview in terms of whether the narrative representations of their media education practices reflected Learner I versus Learner II concepts.
Tables 5.4 through Table 5.7 provide individual analyses for each of the four teachers in terms of what material from their interviews I used to arrive at my judgments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>mixed</td>
<td>George considers his students some times as subjects and some times as objects. He considers them as subjects in the way he develops his syllabus. I do not like to develop a curriculum in the absence of the student he tells us. However, in actual practice, there is very little input from the students in the curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>active</td>
<td>He tells us that the students are never passive with regard to the media: I don't think kids deal passively with media, I think that's a mistake to describe kids as passive in relationship to the media. Besides he has many group activities and independent study projects where the students are expected to be responsible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>incapable</td>
<td>Media education is considered as a necessary intervention for the students to be able to transform their world and their lives. He considers the students to be &quot;unconscious or unaware&quot; with regard to the media.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>victim</td>
<td>Like many other media teachers George considers his students victims of the media. They are unconscious of the meaning they are making of the media and therefore victims of the influence of the media.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>empty</td>
<td>Though it is not expressed in so many words the practice indicates that the students are considered empty receptacles. There is very little contribution from the students towards the syllabus. There is nothing mentioned about what the student brings to the class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>not critical</td>
<td>The goal of the teacher is to make the student become critical. This assumes that the student is not critical. The student is unable to identify ideology and needs the help of the teacher in this task.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>not emotional</td>
<td>There is hardly any mention of the emotional aspect of the student. It is the absence of attention to this aspect of students learning that leads me to this conclusion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>socio-cultural</td>
<td>There is evidence in the interview of the concern for the students' socio-cultural background even though in a negative way. This attention is given especially to problem students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.4: Analysis of George's user of Learner I versus Learner II qualities in his teaching practices as they emerged in his interviews.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>mixed</th>
<th>Anne considers her students as subjects in the way she develops her syllabus. However, there is not enough recognition of the students' critical awareness. Open the eyes of the students and help them to understand themselves better, how they relate to their society, how they relate to one another, and to help them with their real relationships, their real mom and dad as opposed to the sitcom mom and dad, you know, I mean the real friend.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>active</td>
<td>There's an active involvement of the students in her curriculum specially in her use of media log.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>incapable</td>
<td>It is through the intervention of media education that the student is capable of understanding his/her media environment or relationships. It is the teacher who could open the eyes of the student.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>victim</td>
<td>It is only after the class that the students “start to make their choices a lot more from the critical point of view from a little more of a thought out process opposed to just reacting and becoming sort of pawns of what they’ve seen”. There is an underlying notion that the students are pawns in the mercy of media.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>empty</td>
<td>There is not enough integration of students' media experiences in the curriculum. “Because as teacher there is no way you can know every single images. But you do have an incredible amount of understanding to share with them”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>not critical</td>
<td>Without the help of the teacher and the class the students are not critical. “The goals are to open up the eyes of my students to becoming a little bit more in charge of choices in their daily lives and in their relationships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>emotional</td>
<td>The emotional content of the student is integrated through the use of drama. I just think the fact that I’m able to really be working with emotions and reactions and problem solving, right on site, right at the moment, not just simply an analytical approach like where we write about it or read an essay about it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>socio-cultural</td>
<td>As she explains, her goal is to help student establish true relationship with themselves and others through media education.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.5: Analysis of Anne’s use of Learner I versus Learner II qualities in her teaching practices as they emerged in her interviews
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Alan considers his students some time as subjects and sometime as objects. In his syllabus they have very little voice and are more like objects. In his teaching style however they are very much subjects who deserve respect. &quot;as much as I fool around with them you have to be respectful and so allowing for free exchange and at the same time keeping a muscle on some of them when you know that they are going to get to the point of being disrespectful, that you go back and forth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>incapable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>victim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>empty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>not critical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>not emotional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>socio-cultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The students are actively involved in the process of knowledge production. The ISP and other assignments leaves the responsibility of learning on the student. &quot;I have a curriculum that I work through but the kids on the other hand are, have got a tremendous amount of freedom within that, you know. They have choices they can make.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The intervention of media education is considered necessary for changes in the students attitudes and ideas. To become critical thinkers, much more aware of the influence of the media in their lives, much more able to interpret and make sense of media; I guess to watch more critically or think more critically are key goals.&quot; Not enough credit given to the students' critical awareness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The students are victims of media manipulations. &quot;One is that, you Don't want them to be victims, you know, I mean, this isn't the kind of rehashing of almost a conspiracy theory about media but a genuine direction of media is economic force. The different areas of media are there to create audiences to create economic growth. So, they want purchasing. And you want them to be able to say, well, what are the values that they're wanting me to buy into&quot; There is still some of the protectionist ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>It is not that students are considered empty headed when they come to class but there in no attempt to find out what they have to contribute and very little of their experiences are privileged or integrated into the class. The syllabus is co-written by the head of the department and myself and what it's based on is the idea of critical thinking. And what we base on as key principles of media literacy and how they play themselves in different forms of media.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Students' critical awareness is not acknowledged enough. &quot;I think part of my job is to help them identify those values and help them say, well, am I in agreement with them or am I in disagreement with them.&quot; It implies that the students need the help of the teachers to identify values and to have a critical distance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Emotions are hardly every mentioned in the syllabus or anywhere in the interview. It does not play a part in the media education practice in this class room.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Alan depends on group activities and interaction between the students in his class room. The social context is acknowledged at least within the class room. &quot;I just find it amazing when they watch each others' video, you know. Sometimes the quality is not terrific but they are genuinely respectful of the process the people have gone through.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.6: Analysis of Alan's user of Learner I versus Learner II qualities in his teaching practices as they emerged in his interviews.
Marie considers her students as subjects fully capable of acts of cognition. Her attitude is reflected very much in her syllabus—in her contract with the students. "I explained all the course assignments on paper and had a plagiarism statement and it's all on the syllabus..." "In terms of independent thinking I Don't want them to just spit back anything that I say. I'm not presenting God's truth out there. I want them to draw on their own experiences, their own knowledge, whatever they have from within."

The students in Marie's class were actively involved in the production of knowledge. "I tried to counter it by doing several active learning exercises, what I would call active learning exercises and the reaction papers again make them feel they had a voice and I was listening to them. They could communicate privately to me and ask questions in their reaction papers also and I would actually write on them and answer their questions."

The students in the class were considered capable of transforming their world through reflective action—praxis. In her new assignment called the reaction paper she invites the student to reflect upon the intersection of the media with their lives.

There is still traces of the old protectionism. "...celebrating pop culture to the point of it seeming harmless and of no consequence socially or politically and students fall in love with mass media so much that they want to work in it and they accept its conventions and norms as natural and real or whatever."

Marie presumes that the student comes to class not empty but full of their own experiences ideas. It is evident in the reaction papers "I think they get it because I instituted a new assignment called reaction papers. So that's partly why they get it.

The reaction papers in the class assumes that the students are critical and the Sense-Making approach in the assignment presupposes that students make sense of their life experiences.

There is hardly any mention of emotions in the syllabus. It is mentioned in the reaction papers as questions to the students but was not followed up.

The students are considered in their social context and there were many group discussions and group learning.

| 1 subject | Marie considers her students as subjects fully capable of acts of cognition. Her attitude is reflected very much in her syllabus—in her contract with the students. "I explained all the course assignments on paper and had a plagiarism statement and it's all on the syllabus..." "In terms of independent thinking I Don't want them to just spit back anything that I say. I'm not presenting God's truth out there. I want them to draw on their own experiences, their own knowledge, whatever they have from within." |
| 2 active | The students in Marie's class were actively involved in the production of knowledge. "I tried to counter it by doing several active learning exercises, what I would call active learning exercises and the reaction papers again make them feel they had a voice and I was listening to them. They could communicate privately to me and ask questions in their reaction papers also and I would actually write on them and answer their questions." |
| 3 capable | The students in the class were considered capable of transforming their world through reflective action—praxis. In her new assignment called the reaction paper she invites the student to reflect upon the intersection of the media with their lives. |
| 4 victim | There is still traces of the old protectionism. "...celebrating pop culture to the point of it seeming harmless and of no consequence socially or politically and students fall in love with mass media so much that they want to work in it and they accept its conventions and norms as natural and real or whatever." |
| 5 full | Marie presumes that the student comes to class not empty but full of their own experiences ideas. It is evident in the reaction papers "I think they get it because I instituted a new assignment called reaction papers. So that's partly why they get it. |
| 6 critical | The reaction papers in the class assumes that the students are critical and the Sense-Making approach in the assignment presupposes that students make sense of their life experiences. |
| 7 not emotional | There is hardly any mention of emotions in the syllabus. It is mentioned in the reaction papers as questions to the students but was not followed up. |
| 8 socio-cultural | The students are considered in their social context and there were many group discussions and group learning. |

Table 5.7: Analysis of Marie's use of Learner I versus Learner II qualities in his teaching practices as they emerged in her interviews.
Thematic Summary

This chapter constituted a careful study of the interviews I conducted with four media education teachers. Results were organized in terms of eight major themes but are reconceptualized here in terms of how they illuminate the major focus of this dissertation — the search for pedagogical practices that move media education from an emphasis on Learner I to an emphasis on Learner II concepts. The major findings of this chapter showed:

1. Without exception these teachers showed an exemplary level of commitment to media education, often in the face of major obstacles, including disinterest in their school systems, downsizing of their resources, and disrespect from both students and fellow teachers.

2. Without exception these teachers were committed to the idea of student-centered education. This was true regardless of whether they utilized structured syllabi or open-ended syllabi and regardless of which of a number of different involvement strategies they employed. Each of these teachers indicated a deep caring about their students, a wish to reach them, and to have a profound impact for the better on their lives.

3. Without exception these teachers were committed to a critical orientation toward pedagogy, toward wanting their students to be able to unravel the ideologies hidden in media practices and messages and apply them to their lives.

4. Among the specific involvement strategies employed by all the teachers
were the use of the teachable moment (capitalizing on what’s in the news); use of the media log (where students record their media activities), and use of drama (where students roleplay, e.g., the narrative of an advertisement). Evidence showed that teachers saw all of these as useful. There was, however, little discussion of whether these tools actually achieved the critical orientation toward media, which was the teachers’ goal for their students.

5. And, despite the use of these involvement devises, all of the teachers reported difficulties with getting beyond surfaces in media education -- i.e. in encouraging students to go beyond the personal, beyond stereotypes and beyond acceptance of media practice and its relationship to society as given.

6. The only involvement strategy which was explicitly linked to societal attentions was the use of production exercises in the high schools. The teachers recognized that often these exercises reversed the usual socio-economic strata -- the usually low achievers often did better. There was no indication, however, that this was explicitly talked about, as such, in the classroom.

7. Only one teacher made explicit reference to an approach for asking students to bring to bear their understandings of connections between their lives, the media, and society. This teacher was Marie, the one whose class is the subject of the field test study used in this dissertation.

In sum, then, results of this chapter showed major discontinuities between the ideals and struggles of these teachers and their practices vis-a-vis Learner I versus
Learner II concepts. Most of the teachers wanted to involve students in a critical conscientizing, as idealized in the media education literature, but most had no developed theory of practice for doing so.
CHAPTER 6
HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS AND THE MEDIA EDUCATION PRACTICE

This chapter, the second part of the classroom study, deals with the in-depth interviews with the students at two high schools in Canada. The interviews are analyzed, and relevant emerging themes are detailed in this chapter. The sample of the interview and the analytic procedures used are described in chapter 4. Here they are briefly reviewed.

As explained in chapter 4, two media classes, one from a public school and the other from a Catholic school in Canada, were selected for this study. The students from these classes were interviewed to find out about the actual classroom media education practice from the students' point of view, and to identify areas of strength and weakness. Five students from each class were interviewed. I had asked the teachers to choose the students to be interviewed, choosing one of the best students, one of the worst students and three average students, judging them from their grade point averages. The interviews were conducted during class hours with the permission of the teacher. They were recorded on audio tapes and transcribed verbatim. A sample interview is attached in appendix 1. The interviews were constrained by time as the time available for each interview was only 45 minutes, the length of the class period.
In this chapter once again I have tried to explore the concept of the learner as used by the two teachers. In the last chapter the explorations focused on how the teachers described themselves. In this chapter, the focus is on how the students described their teachers and their own involvements in the media education classroom. As in the last chapter, the substantive deductive analytic focus is the templates of Learner I and Learner II that were introduced in chapter 4. Relevant quotes from the ‘field notes’ and the ‘reflective journal’ described in chapter 4 are included to illustrate or to emphasize concepts and ideas that emerged in the analysis. Both the field notes and the reflective journal are sparse intended primarily to provide contextual background and I have used them only as secondary data.

The interviews focused on the student’s understanding of the media education classes. Using the Sense-Making approach, I asked each student to talk about a media class that she or he liked. They were asked to identify good and bad points in that class and to articulate what changes they would like to see in their class. Each good or bad point and each change mentioned was triangulated in the Sense-Making fashion with questions like “What led you to make this judgment?”. “Did this help or hinder you?” and “How does this connect to your life?” At the end there were two questions regarding censorship and media education, the answers to which, in turn, were triangulated in similar ways.

I have used alternate names for the students in order to protect their privacy. The two schools I shall call school 1 and school 3 as I had already designated in the previous chapter. School 2 is a Catholic school where Anne taught but no interviews
were conducted with the students in that school. Table 6.1 presented below provides an overview of the 10 students interviewed in the two classes in the Canadian high schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDENT</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>MANAGEMENT</th>
<th>TEACHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Penny</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>Alan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danny</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>Alan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anton</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>Alan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willy</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>Alan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>Alan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>George</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>George</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>George</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsie</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>George</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aziz</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>George</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.1: Overview of the judgmental sample of the ten students interviewed from two schools in Canada.

In analyzing these ten in-depth interviews, I focused on themes that concern the problems posed in this dissertation regarding media education pedagogy: i.e. what were the gaps in the media education in actual classroom practice, whether the students were making connections between the curriculum and their life experience, and whether students are moving toward the ideal of media education practice — critical self-reflection and conscientizing.

In my analyses, I looked for themes of agreement and disagreement among the students, and in particular connections and discontinuities that were evident in the
media education class room practice. In particular I looked for connections between the teacher and the students, the students and the curriculum, and between the curriculum and the students' media and life experiences. I looked into how these bridges were made and where there were discontinuities within media education practice. I used Sense-Making as a methodological template by which I tried to identify points of interest for the inductive analysis. The analysis below results from the inductive substantive search for themes of agreement and disagreement, for connections and discontinuities.

The following four meta-themes emerged from the analysis of the student interviews: 1) student centered or teacher centered media education which focused on the students' experience of the class room specifically in their relationship to the teacher; 2) ways of learning which focused on the students' experience of the class room specifically in their relationship to media education activities and assignments and their experiences of learning; 3) discontinuities and discipline which focused on students experience of the class room with regard to the problems they encounter and the changes that they would like to see; 4) the concept of the learner. The chapter therefore is comprised of five parts; ie. the four major themes and a thematic summary.

The Four Major Themes Emerging from the Student Interviews

(1) Media Education Practice: Student Centered or Teacher Centered?

The first group of patterns which emerged from the student interviews
concerns at an abstract level whether the student or the teacher is the focus of the class. Students spoke very often of their teachers and their teaching, about what they like about them and their teaching, and about what they disliked. They spoke as well at length about what they learned and what they liked about what they learned. Results group in three major categories: a) teacher qualities where the students talk about what they most like in their teachers; b) student learning that focuses on the learning that students described as happening in the classroom; c) missing bridges which indicate the shortcomings in this classroom practice.

a) Teacher Qualities: The two teachers described are George and Alan. George teaches in the public high school and Alan teaches at a Catholic high school in Canada. Both are very talented teachers, very much admired by their students. Speaking of George, Tom, one of his students, described his teaching style as interesting and entertaining:

I like his teaching. He is kind of playing with us and is teaching at the same time. Some teachers are kind of serious. It's better to have a teacher you like and with whom you can get along than a teacher that you hate. Then the attitude you are in won't allow you to discuss things.

He explained how the teacher first let them watch a sitcom and enjoy the show, and then told them to look carefully for hidden meanings and messages in the show and pointed out to the students how the hidden meaning were not always very funny.

It might have been one of those TV shows, a black sitcom or something like that and what was underneath them, the values, meanings of things, how we see them...He wanted us to look at the show and then he turned around and said that we should look at what is really there. Asked us to see if we could find anything else. He sort of tricked us into laughing and make us realize that we can't feel too good about watching it for its hidden meaning.
Paul, another of his students, described George as being a very powerful speaker, able to hold the attention of the students.

These then are the strengths: First of all he is a good teacher. Secondly he is a very domineering speaker and he pushes you to do the best. He told exactly what he expected from his students.

Paul again spoke of him as a caring teacher who was always ready to help the students in whatever way he could.

I mean if we need any material to do our project he’ll say you go to this teacher and say that I sent you and he’ll give you what you need. He assists you in any way he can.... It showed me that he cared about his students. You know some teachers are just there. They explain what they have to explain and that’s it and they say go to work. He takes his time. He makes sure that you understand and you know what you are doing before he stops talking.

The students pointed out what they liked about their teacher. They liked him because he cared for them, told them exactly what he expected from them, pushed them to do their best and his teaching was interesting and entertaining. While pointing out the things they admired about their teacher, they also pointed out his shortcomings. Robert suggested that he could be a little more open and honest about his own feelings.

Well, I think he would be a more effective teacher if everybody knew how he felt about a certain subject instead of asking us what we thought. Because we are talking to someone who is not giving any feedback which is like talking to a wall. Stating our opinions but not hearing how he feels about the subject or what he thinks about our opinions.

The students of the second teacher, Alan described him in similar ways.

Student Willy, for example described him as being very clear in his teaching:

Mr. Walker himself tries to give the best explanation of it. He gets so deep into it. If there’s something you don’t understand, he’d explain it to you. Like one on one. He breaks it down to find your answer quicker than if you’re
Another student, Anton, described him as energetic, interesting and funny in his teaching, making everyone feel at ease, capable of getting the students involved and willing to accept the students ideas and opinions.

He's very energetic and gets the class involved easily like there are some teachers that are I don't know very conservative and very plain and people are afraid to put up their hands because they don't know how that teacher might react. With the teacher he is very cheerful and full of energy willing to accept ideas and opinions. When we discuss he is funny and he makes every one comfortable. It helps the students a lot.

The students could not find any fault with him or with his teaching. All that Danny, another of his students, could say was this:

I can't think of anything from top of my head. Overall to me the assignments are lengthy and big but they all turn out to be kind of fun, you know. They are not a burden on the rest of my school work, you know. It's a class, I always look forward to come into the class at the end of the day. I never skipped it and don't plan to, you know. It's because of Mr. Walker. Personally, I think he is a great teacher.

Danny talked about the class and how Alan gave importance to the subject rather than all the other trivial matters of discipline that upset students, and how he treated the students like friends, giving them their space.

He jokes in class and how everybody is kind of it's an easy going class. He doesn't focus the class on little trivial things like whether you are in complete uniform or you are saying something that is not you know is not right in the principal's eyes or anything like that. It's more about the topic on hand which is I think teaching media, the English Media course. And he doesn't worry about all those things that upset students. I think, you know, talking to my friends and how I feel I have much more respect to that kind of teachers who give you a space and treat you more as a friend than a student type thing, you know. I guess that's why I enjoy the class.

It is for this reason that he felt obliged to respect the teacher and stay committed to
his class and his studies.

*It's not an easy course. It's a difficult course. We do a lot of assignments. I feel I owe it to the teacher and to myself that I should do the assignments because he has given me the freedom of coming to class the way I choose to; in return I don't give him any problems, any hassles.*

The students spoke highly also of their class. Danny went on to describe his class as very interesting.

*They were fun. That's why I took the course. In the beginning it was because I liked filming and I like the whole movie and television aspects...Because I learn something and not just a class where I obtain a credit. It's a class where you walk away with something, you know, you can pass on to other people. Something of that nature.*

Apparently the students' experience of the media class was very positive and they wished they could change others' ideas and attitude towards the media education classes.

*I like the class. I like how it goes. The only thing that I would like to see is more students in that class. Lots of students say media-English, what the heck is that. I don't need no media-English. If all the people know what we learn in media-English, I think lot of things could be different, like things that are on TV. People wouldn't want their children to watch certain things because they know what is really being said. Like how they show the Indians as savages and things like that. People may not want their children to see them because they would want their children to have the same opinion of the Indian. I would like more students to know what's going on with TV. TV tends to put down minority groups I guess.*

b) **Student Learning:** According to these students' reports, there was also much learning going on in these classes. Students spoke about what they learned in their class rooms. Penny, one of the students from Alan's class room, found the class interesting because she was able to learn interesting information about the television shows and how the shows are mixed with commercials.
I liked when I found out about how the TV shows were like set up and like how they mix the commercials and the particular type of show. I just found it really interesting. I didn't think that how long the shows would be and how many commercials. Because the commercials seem to take for ever but it is only eight minutes. ...It helped me to understand like why they put different shows with different commercials and stuff like that.

Anton, another student from Alan's class, explained what he learned from his class both from making media and from analyzing media.

For example when we use the editing machine, we'll have segments of video that we order, that in itself is helpful. Other classes would be the analyzing media, because lot of times television stations, newspapers they go out for stories that are sensational and add false facts to make the story, to spice it up a bit, and by analyzing these different sources we learnt how to decipher what's really going on or happening.

He felt confident that he has learned to analyze the media and is able to discern facts from fiction and opinion in a news cast.

Well, we learnt all about the different kinds of media, how they perceive the world, the ways that the media is given to us and the effects it has on our lives...Well, when I'm at home watching the news or reading the newspaper, I can now say to myself OK these are the facts and this is the writer's opinion or the reporters opinion and throwing it in might seem like a fact but really is his opinion. Some of the reporters write like that.

Paul, a student from George's class, talked about the things he learned in class. He learned about the relationship between advertisements and shows. He also leaned how to use the camera and about the different types of shots one can take with a camera.

Yes. It was helpful to me because I found out that media uses certain shows to advertize certain products and how it focuses on certain audiences through different programs....It was helpful because I learned different shots and then I got to practice them before we actually went to shoot. And what he said, like everything he explained, he explained it good so that I understand.

Elsie was vague and very general about what she leaned in her class room:
Yes it was. It widened my horizon. It taught me how to think clearly. It taught me how to do things right. How to read the newspaper, things like that. When you look at a newspaper, you underline a few things or take notes, things like that were very helpful.

Tom thought that he had learned to look at the hidden meanings in the television programs.

Normally you look at a program and see the funny side of it. Instead of watching what's there, I look at what's there and also what is behind it. One thing may mean two things. So I look at both of the meanings.

Even though it is very difficult to judge how much the students learned about media in their class rooms it is very clear from their interviews that they learned something, even something that is useful for them.

c) Missing Bridges: There is no doubt that these teachers made real connections with the students and earned their respect. They helped the students to connect with the curricula. It is evident in the fact that the students found the classes very interesting and enjoyable. They learned new information about the media and acquired new skills in understanding the media, no small achievement for any teacher. Still, there are real connections missing in their pedagogy. The students did not find the syllabus connected to their own personal experiences of the media and their lives.

One of the students, Danny, answered the question about connection between the curriculum and the students life:

Not really. You know, I come into the class with whatever and then whatever I learn there and I leave there. I lead my own life. Sometimes you hear a very good joke and you pass it on and that's about it. And again with the presentations you learn something new and you pass it on to your friends or whatever.

All of the students were asked this question about the connection between the
curriculum and their lives. Most of them said that there were no connections while some, through the Sense-Making questioning, were directed to find connections.

Anton said that his desire to study different media is connected to his life from the fact that he was exposed to different media at home.

\[\text{I'm sort of surrounded by media and different styles in media in my life. Like my parent will read the paper on Saturday early morning and Sunday, as well; and at dinner time the television will be turned on to City TV and in the morning the radio is on. So I was exposed to all these styles of media.}\]

In these classrooms, then, the evidence suggests the students saw the relevance of the class as primarily limited to the class, and when they reached for further connections, they could only make them in the most general terms despite the mandate from the Sense-Making methodology to draw material connections to their own life experiences. Thus, despite the fact that students liked their teachers and enjoyed their class room and they enjoyed part of the teaching a great deal, this data suggests that there is no visible evidence of real connections being made between the syllabi, the teaching experience, the class room experience and the students own media experiences, life, and place in society.

(2) Ways of Learning

This section deals with the pedagogical strategies that the teachers used in their class rooms and the students own response to them. The students spoke much about their likes and dislikes of these strategies and how they learned through them. This section is divided into two sub-sections: 1) production as media education and 2) class discussions. The first sub-section centers around the students' comments about production activities in the class room, and the second focuses on students' comments
on class room discussions.

a) Production as Media Education: The students appreciated very much the
time they spent in their class room making media. All the students had very positive
comments on their production experiences. Of special interest to the students was
‘Video ISP’ which stands for Video Independent Study Project. Wayne, one of the
students, described the assignment as follows:

Video ISP, we had to make sort of like a sitcom. In a way something with a
serious point to it just like a documentary. It could be all serious or it could be
half serious in a comical way. Like how to arrange editing. The whole group
worked together. I would have had a certain part. It’s not like a drama but
how you arrange everything, how organized. I think what he is trying to show
with video ISP how organized and how well put together the group is. How
you work together with different people. That’s how I look at it.

The students found working on these projects a very good learning experience.
They learned about the media and also about each other. Wayne went on to explain
his experience in the following manner:

The project itself, we work strongly. We need time for it. It’s not because of
the market. But in my point of view we worked hard for something which we
enjoyed. I’m not saying that you know we are still doing work but we were
enjoying it. It was new for me. I never had in the past something like that,
editing and knowing learning about it. This is my first English media class.
In all the other English we never did sort of such a thing like that… I worked
with different people with whom I never worked. People who I really didn’t
enjoy probably working with because some kids I do not really like in the
class. I’m getting to know them better.

Anton, explained how the production aspect was a necessary part of media
education because he learned best from his experience.

Basically before I just liked to know about the media. But now that I’ve gone
into this course I’ve learned that we are doing both things at once. As we
learn a little bit of this we do a little of our own. As we go on and learn more
we are allowed to do more. It just feels necessary to have both through the
personal experience of the course.

George let the students in his class room present a proposal for a production that they would like to do. Aziz described the assignment

Basically what we had to do was we had to create our own sitcom. Basically do a rough idea of what it was going to be about. Have a name for our company. Have a name of the show. We had to create characters and what kind situation they'll be in. What kind of class, middle class or working class or whatever or upper class. Basically had to sketch some ideas about the show. What kind of value messages we are trying to put across, things like that. It was not very easy.

b) Discussions: Next to production what was most popular with students was class discussions. During discussion they were able to express their own opinions freely and listen to the opinions of fellow students. The discussions came alive when the topic of the discussion was of interest to the students. I have this entry from my field notes:

The teacher started talking about violence and specifically about a violent incident that took place that morning in the school yard. He described the incidence to the students. That morning a couple of oriental kids who didn't belong to the school had come into the school yard and beat up a black kid from this school. The police had come and there was much commotion. As the teacher invited the students to talk about violence in general and about this incident, the black students started accusing the Chinese of the violence. The teacher tries to intervene and tell the students not to generalize. There was much heated arguments.

For Aziz from George’s class, the best classes were that centered around discussions and class presentations.

Basically all the good classes we ever had were when we had discussions about certain topics that really bothered us. Otherwise nothing really much. On the other hand there were some other good things like the presentations that gave us lot of responsibilities and really helped us get the feel of what it’s like to make your own sitcom and what you got to do to make it work. Oh, couple of things, you really get some experience. I like that part. Now I know what it's
like to get a show on the air, really good. I like that part.

Paul, a student from George's class, explained the way the teacher conducted these discussions to allow everyone to express their opinions and ideas.

He brought out the topic and then he just asked peoples' opinions. What do you think? And everybody had an opinion. It was a good way. If he did all the talking, no body could have voiced their opinion and it wouldn't have been a good class. But he just sat there and listened to what everybody else had to say and he included some of his own stuff. It brought out opinions which people wanted to express.

Anton, a student from Alan's class, seems convinced that learning includes learning from each other and not just from the teacher and the books.

Well, the school is not just learning from the teacher, it's also learning from each other. Teacher is like just one person, one opinion there. People being involved, we learn from each other's opinions and find out about each other--find different angles to situations or certain questions. When every one is involved it speeds up the course a lot faster, and when every one is involved, the work just gets done faster and it makes things a lot easier.

Class discussions certainly offered an opportunity for students to exchange ideas, to assert their knowledge and perhaps to build upon it. Thus, in their class activities and exercises, students preferred the ones that gave them an opportunity to bridge the gaps that the curriculum and their life experiences presented.

(3) Discontinuities and Discipline

The third major theme that emerged from the student interviews is encapsulated here under the title "discontinuities and discipline." The students were very much aware of the discontinuities they faced in the class room -- in particular of their own struggles to understand syllabi that did not connect to their experiences and schooling that did not seem to connect to their lives. These discontinuities often
translated into problems of discipline, of which students were well aware.

For example, Willy talked about difficulties in understanding the teacher and
the subject. He suggested that media should be taught not only in the senior class but
also in grade 8, 9 and 10, thus giving the subject a continuity. Besides, he suggested
that teachers should use words that are familiar to the students.

*I guess, (media education) should be taught in grades 8, 9 and 10. That
would give a better understanding. Also let teachers teach and student
understand. The students are always talking about how teachers will say
things and the students some will understand but others find it hard. Therefore
put things on students' understanding. How now we are talking about the
sitcoms, lot of the TV shows now are relating to certain ages. Kids of all ages
can pick up on it. That could actually happen here so that they relate to the
students….If you use big words, explain what the words mean. Teachers are
older and they went to the universities, so those are the words they learn in
there. But technically they teach us university words. Teach us the words that
we grew up with. Teach us words that we want to know.*

Mike talked about the disruption from students who did not respect the teacher and
disturbed the class.

*In class sometimes it upsets me when I see other students in the class talking
when he is talking. I think we should give him the same respect that he has
given us. It's kind of open. Nobody has to raise their hands. It's not anarchy
either. It's controlled anarchy, I suppose.*

Anton, too, made the same complaint about some of the students who continually
interrupted the class.

*Some times when the people are presenting or the teacher is presenting they
make comments or they start fidgeting or they disrupt a discussion and they
are disrespectful to the teacher or presenter. Also it slows things down
because the presenter has to stop and wait for those people to stop and start up
again, and they probably start up again.*

Robert, another student from Alan's class, wished that only students who were really
interested in the subject would come to the class.
Well, if it's going to be a media class, you want to have the students who are really interested in it. This makes the course interesting and more fun. If you have students in the class who are joking around and not caring, you can't concentrate on what you are doing and can't take the class seriously.

Elsie from George's class talked about even more serious problems of discipline like students bringing weapons to school and not respecting their teachers.

They shouldn't take any weapons to school with them. They do take weapons to school here without the principal or teacher knowing. The students should be more disciplined. They should, for example, respect their teacher.

(4) Concept of the Learner

In this section I have examined carefully the entire corpus of student interviews in the two schools in Canada in terms of what the interviews said about each of the two teachers' concept of the learner. Here I'm referring back to chapter 3 and the contrast between Learner I and Learner II. Through a careful reading of each interview, I looked for statements that the students made that indicated the operation of the teacher's assumptions about the students. Table 6.2 below indicates my judgments based on what the students said about the two teachers across all the Learner I versus Learner II categories as explicated in earlier chapters. As I did in the last chapter, in making my judgment I included a "mixed" judgment where I felt the evidence suggested a reasonably balanced use of both Learner I and Learner II concepts. The other categories (e.g. active and passive) are not to be interpreted rigidly. The students' descriptions of their teachers and their media education experiences included the same mixture of Learner I and Learner II concepts as was exhibited in teacher descriptions of themselves. When I've categorized as 'active' for example it indicates that there is more of 'active' than 'passive' learner qualities
present in student descriptions of the practice.

The following Table 6.2 presents a summary of the two teachers' concept of the learner as derived from the student interviews:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEACHER</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE</td>
<td>MIXED</td>
<td>ACTIVE</td>
<td>INCAPABLE</td>
<td>VICTIM</td>
<td>EMPTY</td>
<td>NOT CRITICAL</td>
<td>NOT EMOTIONAL</td>
<td>SOCIO CULTURAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAN</td>
<td>SUBJECT</td>
<td>ACTIVE</td>
<td>INCAPABLE</td>
<td>VICTIM</td>
<td>EMPTY</td>
<td>NOT CRITICAL</td>
<td>NOT EMOTIONAL</td>
<td>SOCIO CULTURAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.2: Use of Learner I versus Learner II assumptions regarding students as presented in the student interviews for a sample of students for each of two media education teachers.
Table 6.3 below shows the material I attended to in arriving at my judgments of George, as drawn from interviews with his students.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>George considers his students some times as subjects and some times as objects. &quot;It showed me that he cared about his students. You know some teachers are just there. They explain what they have to explain and that's it and they say go to work. He takes his time. He makes sure that you understand and you know what you are doing before he stops talking.&quot; (PAUL) &quot;He didn't express his opinion whether he thought it was good or bad.&quot; (ROBERT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>He expects students participation. &quot;These then are the strengths: First of all he is a good teacher. Secondly he is a very domineering speaker and he pushes you to do the best. He told exactly what he expected from his students.&quot; (PAUL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>incapable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is no evidence in the interviews to make a judgment contrary to the earlier one as to whether George considers media education as a necessary intervention or not for the students to be able to transform their world and their lives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>victim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is no evidence to make a judgment contrary to the earlier one about George if he considered his students victims of the media or not.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>empty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>His teaching style may indicate that he considers them to be full &quot;He brought out the topic and then he just asked peoples' opinions. What do you think? And everybody had an opinion. It was a good way. If he did all the talking no body could have voiced their opinion and it wouldn't have been a good class. But he just sat there and listened to what everybody else had to say and he included some of his own stuff. It brought out opinions which people wanted to express.&quot; (PAUL) But there is no mention of any serious acceptance or integration of students' opinions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>not critical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is no evidence to make a judgment contrary to the earlier one about George if he considered his students capable of critical understanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>not emotional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The absence of emotional aspect of learning in these interviews may indicate that his teaching did not take into consideration the emotional aspect of the students' learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>socio-cultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is no specific evidence to make a judgment contrary to the earlier one regarding George's conceptualization of the learner if it was unidimensional or of socio-cultural context.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.3: Analysis of George's use of Learner I versus II qualities in his teaching practices as they emerged in interviews with his students.
Table 6.4 presents the same evidence for my judgments of Alan's teaching based on interviews with his students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>mixed</th>
<th>Alan considers his students some time as subjects and sometime as objects. In his teaching style they are very much subjects who deserve respect. He doesn’t focus the class on little trivial things like whether you are in complete uniform or you are saying something that is not you know is not right in the principal’s eyes or anything like that. It’s more about the topic on hand which is I think teaching media, the English Media course. And he doesn’t worry about all those things that upset students. I think, you know, talking to my friends and how I feel I have much more respect to that kind of teachers who give you a space and treat you more as a friend than a student type thing, you know. I guess that’s why I enjoy the class. (DANNY)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>active</td>
<td>The students are actively involved in the process of knowledge production. &quot;It's not an easy course. It's a difficult course. We do lot of assignments. I feel I owe it to the teacher and to myself that I should do the assignments because he has given me the freedom of coming to class the way I choose in return I don’t give him any problems, any hassles. (DANNY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>incapable</td>
<td>Students' interviews do not refer to Alan's teaching with regard to his concept of the learner as capable versus incapable. In the absence of evidence I retain the earlier judgment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>victim</td>
<td>Students' interviews do not refer to Alan's teaching with regard to his concept of the learner as victim versus not victim. In the absence of evidence I retain the earlier judgment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>empty</td>
<td>Students' interviews do not refer to Alan's teaching with regard to his concept of the learner as empty versus full. In the absence of evidence I retain the earlier judgment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>not critical</td>
<td>Students' interviews do not refer to Alan's teaching with regard to his concept of the learner as critical versus not critical. In the absence of evidence I retain the earlier judgment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>not emotional</td>
<td>Students' interviews do not refer to Alan's teaching with regard to his concept of the learner as emotional versus not emotional. In the absence of evidence I retain the earlier judgment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>socio-cultural</td>
<td>Students' interviews do not refer to Alan's teaching with regard to his concept of the learner as unidimensional versus socio-cultural. In the absence of evidence I retain the earlier judgment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.4: Analysis of Alan's use of Learner I versus II qualities in his teaching practices as they emerged in interviews with his students.
In these judgment processes, it is important to note that when students did not make mention of the teacher's use of a Learner I versus Learner II category, I coded the judgment as Learner I on the assumption that a Learner II guided pedagogy must be explicit and readily observable.

Thematic Summary

This chapter is made up of an analysis of the students interviews conducted in the two schools in Canada. Out of this analysis emerged four themes relevant to this dissertation's themes, i.e. the search for classroom practices and a critical pedagogy for media education that emphasizes Learner II rather than Learner I concepts. The student interviews spoke of the current media education practice in the classroom from the students' points of view and revealed some of the good and bad qualities of current pedagogical practices. Results showed that:

1. In general, students were enthusiastic about and liked their teachers because they cared and because they were seen as competent.

2. However, despite the popularity of the teachers and the enthusiasm students held for how they thought, there was little evidence of real connections being made between the curriculum and student life experiences. There was virtually no evidence of students moving toward the media education ideal of conscientized reflection regarding self-media-society.

3. There was also little evidence of students attending to the involvement tools offered by the instructors as more than exercises to involve the student in teacher-established agendas. In effect, these media education classes remained
more teacher centered than student centered despite the best intentions and efforts of the teacher.

4. The involvement exercises that the students did emphasize were media production and class discussions. Students found these to be interesting experiences. In these classes there is evidence that the students tried in their own fashion to make the bridges to their lives. They found a positive learning experience in their working together with other students in the production classes and listening to each other in their discussion classes. There is little evidence that the teachers capitalized on these moments as times to make connections, for example, between issues of multi-culturalism and the role of media in society.

5. If anything, the evidence suggests that students attended to multi-cultural issues when they critiqued who was allowed to attend the media education classes and in their concerns for lack of disciplined behavior by some other students. No connection was made between this, however, and the multi-cultural issues as portrayed in the media.

6. In general, despite the very positive feelings students had for their teachers and the positive feelings student had for some things that happened in the classroom, the evidence from the interviews suggests that there was a general lack of connection between what happened in the class and student lives.

Based on the student interview data, thus, we must conclude that there was some evidence of Learner II qualities exhibited in very general terms, but when we
focus on the ideal of the Learner II as exhibited in the media education literature. Very little evidence of Learner II qualities emerged.
CHAPTER 7
THE FIELD TEST STUDY

The field test study was an attempt at introducing a modest intervention into a Media Education curriculum with the intent of taking steps towards the creation of a new pedagogy for media education classes. This chapter deals with this part of the research. The methods for the field test study are described in chapter 4. Briefly, a reaction paper was designed, following a Sense-Making format, and added to the syllabus as part of the curriculum of a communication course, “Communication in Culture and Society” in one of the public universities in the midwest USA. The course, taught by Marie, a doctoral level teaching associate, was a large population class with about 92 students enrolled. Class consisted of three lectures a week for 10 weeks. Marie was assisted in grading and student tutoring by two other graduate student assistants. As given in the course description, the reaction papers assignment was designed

...to encourage you (students) to think about course materials in the ways they do (or do not) intersect with the substance of your own life, and to stimulate you to articulate the main points of the various lectures, readings, and audiovisual programs.

The students were told to choose a topic, issue, or theme that was covered in given week’s lectures to give it a title that indicated where they would be focusing
their reflections in writing the reaction papers. In all, each student was asked to write 5 reaction papers during a 10 week term with each paper focusing on a part or all of different week’s lectures. The reaction paper consisted of three parts. In the first part the students were asked to write down any thoughts, opinions, feelings or conclusions that they may have had on the subject they had chosen to write about before entering the class. Each thought, opinion, feeling or conclusion was then triangulated, as is mandated in the Sense-Making methodology, by the following questions: ‘What in your life led you to this thought, opinion, feeling or conclusion?’ ‘Did having this thought/feeling impact your life in any way? And how so?’. ‘Now that you have been in this class, has the thought/feeling been confirmed, strengthened, changed, or eliminated? If yes, how? What impact do you think this will have on you?’.

In the second part of the reaction paper the students were asked to write down any new thoughts, opinions, feelings or conclusions on the subject after being in the class. Again each thought, opinion, feeling or conclusion was triangulated by the following questions: ‘How does this new thought/feeling connect to your life?’. ‘What in the class led you to this new thought/feeling?’ ‘What impact or effect do you think this new thought/feeling is going to have on you?’

In the final section of the reaction paper the students were given an opportunity to communicate any difficulty they might be having with material framed by a question, ‘Do you have any questions, concerns, or confusions about the lecture, reading, or video on this topic? If yes, list or describe at least one.’
Each student was asked to submit five reaction papers. The five one-page reaction papers carried 2 points each. There were all together 331 reaction papers submitted by the students. Examples of reaction papers are included in Appendix 3.

This chapter contains the analysis of the relevant parts of the in-depth interview with the teacher of this class and the analysis of the reaction papers of the students. The reaction papers were analyzed in sets focusing on the following three substantive topics that were most frequently touched upon by the students: "ritual", "feminism" and "advertising". Under each one of these topics, the reaction papers were read and reread using a similar approach as described in chapter 4 in which the Sense-Making analytic was used as a deductive framework to facilitate teasing out the moments of gap facing and gap bridging which pointed to material examined for generating inductively derived patterns. As in the prior chapter, the focus in the inductive search was placed on student struggles in bridging the gap between their daily life experiences and the school and the media education curriculum. Again, primary focus was placed on whether the data suggested that Marie's class and her use of the reaction papers exemplified Learner I or Learner II pedagogy. In particular this chapter is concerned with whether the use of the reaction papers moved the pedagogical approach from the traditional Learner I assumptions to Learner II where the learner is positioned as a subject actively involved in the production of knowledge, capable of transforming their worlds through praxis --reflective action-- full of experience and knowledge capable of critically understanding the world in the emotional and social context of their lives. Results are presented below, first.
organized within the three topics about which students spoke the most, namely, feminism, ritual and advertising. Again the names of students and teacher as used here are alternate names to protect privacy.

Patterns of Learning in ‘Feminism’

The feminism lectures covered the effects of feminist philosophy, feminist theories and feminism and culture. Two lectures were spent on the topic of feminism. The teacher tried to present a wide selection of feminist thought from literature and encouraged the students to reflect on their own personal views and opinions on the subject. Interesting video presentations accompanied the lectures. Feminism was one of the more popular topics among the students. Altogether 39 reaction papers were written on feminism and 38 students chose to write on the topic. Almost all had definite opinions and ideas on the subject.

I searched the data looking for evidence of resistance to new learning or change, confirmation of previous learning, of reflection and self-reflection as a precursor to conscientizing, and of conscientization when it occurred. For each, I focussed, as the Sense-Making methodology mandates, on the bridges students constructed between their learnings and their life experiences. What is striking is the stereotypical preconception of the students both male and female. The following are some of the striking comments of male students as they came to the class:

*I thought that all feminists were just women who hated all men and wanted to see all of the rights changed for them....I always thought that the word "feminism" meant that women were superior to men.* (JAMES ANDREW)
Yes, I thought that feminism was just male bashing disguised as a movement for equality...I thought that feminists were just a bunch of whining, liberal women. (RYAN HUFFORD)

It always seemed like every man is an enemy to the feminists....My thoughts remain unchanged after the lecture. It sounds like some women want a man-free society. Good luck reproducing! (ANDY GABRIEL)

My definition for feminism, before this class, was someone talking bad about men, and how they always do this, and I am God's gift to the world. You know what I mean? I am sure I'm sure that is an ignorant statement but that is how I thought it to be. (JOE MUNI)

Aaron reflected upon his automatic reactions on the feeling level to the subject of feminism thus initiating a self-reflection that could have lead him towards a clearer understanding of his prejudices.

The word "feminism" has always created a negative feeling in me. Having this feeling has made impact because whenever feminism comes up, I automatically begin to think 'male-bashing' which is harmful to my egalitarian perspective. (AARON MURO)

I thought it was women that hated and blamed men for every thing in the world that isn't in the best interest of women. I also thought that all feminist were lesbians because they hated men and loved being with and around women. (DAVID OTIS)

The women were not exempt from such biases. The following are some of the preconceived ideas that female students carried into the class room:

Before entering class I considered feminism to be a man-hating, masculine type movement. I thought this way because I had conjured up my own stereotypes based on the radical feminists that I had heard. (MARGARET BRADY)

When I think of feminism I picture women who basically think they are superior to men. These are women who feel that they should have not only equal rights but more powerful rights than men. When I think of a feminist I think a woman who comes across to most as a "bitch" (MELINDA MONROW)

I always thought that the word feminism meant that women were superior to men. (MICHELLE BETTER)
Thus, it is obvious that students did not come to the classroom empty headed, ready for the teacher to fill with knowledge and understanding as the Learner I conception suggests. In the reaction papers the students were given an opportunity to express opinions and ideas that they brought to the classroom. This knowledge that students brought to the classroom was based on past experiences both negative and positive. As mandated by Sense-Making methodology, the reaction papers brought forth these experiences that were the root of the knowledge that students brought to the classroom. For example, it was a strong negative experience that was at the root of Andy’s bias against feminists. It was also obvious why it was hard for Andy to accept new ideas from the class. The resistance that Andy showed was deeply rooted in his life experience and he was yet not ready to accept change. The rejection of that experience on Andy’s part necessarily demanded the rejection of feminism as he struggles to justify his feelings.

Yes, I am quite leery of any die-hard feminist rhetoric. My thoughts remain unchanged after lecture. It sounds like some women want a man-free society. Good luck reproducing!..... Sadly enough, I think that the changes women have seen as a result of their persistence, have destroyed the family. Because my mother went to work, our family drifted apart. I think that was one of the reasons my father left us. (ANDY GABRIEL)

Similarly, it was association with a radical feminist, as he called the woman he dated, and the negative experiences he had that were the root of Richard’s prejudices as he sometimes equated feminism with a superiority complex.

I once dated a radical feminist, and she blamed all the negativity that exists in this world on men. I agree that I think woman should have more equality in the workplace, and everywhere else that women may be slighted the chance for opportunity. However, it’s this “women are superior” attitude that I have a problem with. (RICHARD HAHN)
Tricia arrived at her judgment on the feminists through her experiences in the Women's Studies Department where she felt that the people she thought were radical feminists were interested in male bashing and feminism was equated with lesbianism.

In dealing with the Women's Studies Department, I encountered a lot of "radical" feminists who were mainly interested in male-bashing, and they centered the term "feminism" around lesbianism. (TRICIA HIERING)

Michelle, another of the students in the class did not like the attitude of friends who called themselves feminists

I have a lot of friends that call themselves feminists and all that they do is talk about how women are better than men. One of my friends is so against men that she is very reluctant to go out with them because they will open the door for her and she feels that she can do that herself. (MICHELLE BETTER)

But the ideas and opinions students brought into the class were not always negative. Eric talked about his positive ideas from his experience of the women that he knew, and explained how these ideas and opinions were confirmed in the class room.

My views on feminism are positive. I believe women are equal to men and they should be treated as so. However, I also believe that women are different and so they should be recognized for their individuality and difference. I came to this belief with watching my close female friends attempt and achieve their personal goals. I also have seen what they cherish, their side of issues on gender and their emotions on maternal talk. I know women look at relationships differently than men, and place great emotional values on certain things while men place theirs on others. I am not saying that one's importance is more significant than another, I am solely bringing to light their difference. Obviously, these are generalizations on gender, yet I think the individuality of gender between men and women should be taken into consideration when explaining their equality. These thoughts have impacted my life to the extent that I appreciate women and respect their gender and sex. Personally, I think women on the whole, are more intuitive and in touch with their feelings than men. My thoughts of equality have been confirmed in class yet I question to what extent active feminists will go to get their views across, for themselves and for society. I believe that feminism is good as I explained before, yet I
feel that it has become a little too trendy and absurd when certain radical feminists try to ignore or humble their gender individuality and solely focus on their material and social obstacles. I feel that by doing this and consciously ignoring their maternal spirituality, they are cutting themselves short of the beauty they possess to procreate, by focusing so much on their social obstacles. (ERIC BLAKE)

Many of the students' commentaries indicated students changed their ideas of feminism through the class. But this was not always true as some of the students became more convinced of the positions they had brought to class. Here is a sample of both. James's idea of feminist was changed when he learned about the different types of feminists.

Watching T.V. and seeing how the media made them out to look like, and how I heard what everybody else would say about them. Yes, because every time that I heard the word feminist I had this picture in my mind of what one was and it was not a good picture, so I would place them in a group of people not to like. Yes, it sort of changed how I see all feminist because there are many different levels and not just the extreme view. (ANDREW JAMES)

Margaret said that her life was impacted by her negative opinions of the feminists.

This thought impacted my life in that I never really read any feminist articles, etc. seriously because I thought it would consist of men bashing, reject your feminine side stories.

But she felt that her ideas were changed through what she learned in class and specially through the discussion in the class all about feminism.

After being in class I learned that feminism is the radical notion that women are people. In other words, that women are just as important as men. This new thought has made me more open to the idea of feminism and what it really stands for. I think the way we talked about feminism in class and how it was presented to us brought me to this new feeling. (MARGARET BRADY)

Andy's thoughts and ideas were not changed by the class or the readings. On
the contrary they were strengthened.

It always seemed like every man is an enemy to the feminists... Yes I am quite leery of any diehard feminist rhetoric. My thoughts remain unchanged after lecture. It sounds like some women want a man free society. Good luck reproducing! (ANDY GABRIEL)

Eric on the other hand reflected on his process of learning and on what he has learned from the class. He understood what it was about feminism that he found difficult to accept. These qualities certainly belong to the Learner II model where the learner is a subject who is active in the production of knowledge and critical in the process.

I really haven't reached any new conclusions after last weeks discussion, yet I did learn which group crawls up my skin with their feminist ideals. I learned the difference between liberal, radical, essentialism and Marxist feminists. These groups have made me realize how serious and distinct each one is to the movement. I can relate to the feminist movement and support it, however when it comes to male bashing, lesbian interest based on male hate and superiority based on nothing of rational substance, I begin to question the seriousness and intellect of certain groups. (ERIC BLAKE)

There were also moments that could be called moments of conscientization when the students arrived at new understanding of the subject and were able to identify their place within this new knowledge. This phenomena was most typical of the female students. For example, Melissa, who found her opinions confirmed in the class, reflects on her own actions in the light of this confirmation.

This class has again confirmed my knowledge. I wish myself and more women would voice out and clarify the generalizations of feminists to society. For instance, like last Tuesday, if a teacher asked for a raise of hands of those who considered themselves feminists, I wish more would have admitted, including myself. Although, society has portrayed feminists like lesbians and bitches which many people in the class do not consider themselves. (MELISSA MARININK)
Stacy, similarly found her place in the new definitions of feminism.

I learned that each wing of feminism has their own specific definitions and each can produce their own respective results. As I mentioned before, that now I know where I actually fit in into the scheme of things with the feminist issue. The specific definitions that were given in class led me to the realization of what type of feminism I fit into. (STACY IVERS)

Jennifer affirmed her identity as a feminist when she learned about the different types of feminists.

I learned that there are different types of feminism. All feminists are not looking for change through radical means. I can say I am a feminist. (JENNIFER JONES)

Renee realized that it was her personal experience that had hindered her from understanding the feminist movement, its importance and need.

Since this class I think my feelings have changed somewhat. I mean, I always felt equal because I was treated as one -I never took the time to really analyze how women are treated as a group. I guess I just thought everyone was treated as I was. But after my Women's Studies class last quarter, and this class, my attitude is pretty different. (RENEE SAUER)

A new realization or understanding, though not so strong as in the female students is found also among male students. The following are some of the comments by the male students who claimed that their thoughts were changed.

Once I heard you give the definition I saw that feminism was not just ladies hating men that they wanted equal rights for themselves. (ANDREW JAMES)

I never realized that different types of feminism existed (ie. liberal, radical, socialist, lesbian). It made me aware that feminism is a lot more than male bashing and that it consist of various types and degrees. All groups challenge the structure of society but each goes about its attack differently. (RYAN HUFFORD)

It has been weakened because now I can see that there are differing types of feminists. The type that I tend to always end up in fights with are the really
radical feminists. I got a new perspective on how other people feel about feminism. (PHILIP MARTIN)

This makes me realize that not all feminists have the same thoughts. Their primary focus is not male-bashing, a subject that seems to be associated with being a feminist. (CHRIS MERCER)

Feminism is a struggle for women's equality. (JOE PUKANSKY)

Changed, I know what feminism is and I know that not only females, but males can be feminists too. (BRIAN THOMAS)

Yes, It made me have a different outlook at females and their attitudes. Changed, In class I learned that there are many feminist groups that are very different and that there all types of feminists. (BRIAN THOMAS)

It has brought me to realize these issues, before they hardly ever crossed my mind. (BRAD WERTENBERGER)

Now I feel that it is an individual choice whether or not a feminist wants to wear cosmetics. It really has no affect on me. (JOE WINCHELL)

It will cause me to look at feminists more openly. I remember the first time I saw Gloria Steinem on TV. I was expecting a plain looking women with long untamed hair in an army jacket. I was shocked to find out she was an extremely handsome feminine woman in a dress. (JOE WINCHELL)

Though these claims for change are difficult to evaluate, it is clear that through the reaction papers, the students were encouraged to articulate the connections between their lives and the curriculum, thus revealing for themselves and for the teacher important moments of learning. The important elements that emerged from this analysis were evidences of self-reflection on their process of knowledge both new and old, changes in their thoughts, opinions and feelings, and even some instances of conscientization, of critical reflection about self-media-society.

Patterns of Learning in ‘Ritual’

A total of two lectures were delivered on ritual. The focus of the lectures was
the theory of ritual. The lectures explained how cultures are permeated by rituals both in modern and tribal context. The students were fascinated by the tribal rituals. The teacher invited the students to explore the role of ritual in their own worlds and in their lives. There was lot of confusion in the minds of the students between ritual and habit, as they tried to identify rituals in their lives and in today’s culture.

Ritual is another topic that attracted the attention of the students and more than half the class, about 54 students chose to write one of their reaction papers on ‘ritual’. The analysis of these reaction papers revealed patterns similar to the feminist section in the students’ commentary. They were reviewed again in terms of resistance, confirmation or rejection, reflection and conscientizing and how they related to experiential conditions.

Robert and Michael admitted to their biases against rituals from other cultures, with some self-reflection on their own attitudes:

*Rituals of other countries are full of goofy sayings and strange acts which have little or no relevance. I’ve seen movies with scenes of rituals, and they are always depicted as mysterious events with unexplainable traditions. I suppose I didn’t respect or believe in the rituals of other cultures. (ROBERT BOVANIZER)*

Robert blamed the movies and television shows for his misunderstanding, but in tracing the root of his thought, he admitted to his own prejudice towards other countries and cultures.

*I do not understand why they go to such lengths to glorify simple events in life. I have seen these huge rituals that supposedly celebrate different occasions that seem very insignificant to me…. I always thought these people were non-educated and would perform these rituals because they did not understand certain things and why they were in existence. I have changed my feelings somewhat, but I still believe they don’t realize why things have a certain*
purpose in life, so they celebrate it as something holy or religious. (MICHAEL PACE)

Michael likewise admitted to his ignorance, but showed resistance to change his ideas about other cultures and people, as he believed them to be ignorant.

Another major discovery in the reaction papers on "rituals" was the way in which students attended to life connections and their connections with the media education curriculum. This attention was, of course, explicitly mandated by the Sense-Making based assignment. But results showed that the students relished this attention. Melissa, for example, talked about her experiences of rituals and how she found it difficult to communicate their significance to others.

*I found rituals to play a big role in my Catholic Church. It was with rituals I grew in my faith. It greatly impacted my life because family and friends gathered at these events in my life. This symbolized their love for me which I feel I have truly benefited from. My feeling has now been reconfirmed and I realize how special rituals, family, and friends are to me. It's often easy to take advantage and forget. I hate how when I tell those outside my Church about my experiences, they often do not realize the significance in rituals. I remember telling people about my First Communion and Confirmation and them not understanding the meaning behind it. This would drive me nuts because it was impossible to put what went on in words. Now I realize there are ways to better my situation by using the method of "Mapping Rituals" to better explain occurrences in ways for outsiders to interpret. (MELISSA MARINIK)*

Douglas explained how his notion of ritual as a big part of religion, especially in under-developed countries, is tied to his early childhood and early school days.

*I used to think of ritual as being a big part of religion. I always tied the thought of smaller underdeveloped countries or tribes to thoughts of ritual. Most of my views go back to my childhood. From Sunday School or even courses in Greek Mythology I took at private school. When you are young, you are very impressionable and do not question authority. I vaguely remember what was being taught. (DOUGLAS LUPER)*
Lucinda connected her understanding of ritual to her enthusiasm for horror movies and felt that the class experience had eliminated this idea.

*Whenever I heard the word "ritual" I thought of a group of people like witches having some kind of a gathering. I think I watched too many horror films when I was a kid. Every Saturday night I'd watch Bob Wilkins double feature horror films. I don't think it really effected my life very much. This thought has been eliminated from my way of thinking since taking this class. I have learned that a ritual can be just about anything that is a routine or a habit like baptism or a rival football game. (LUCINDA DOYLE)*

There were also moments of conscientization when the students changed their opinions and ideas through self-reflection. Thus, for example, Michael's reflection on ritual lead him to realize how something could be sacred to one person and junk to another. He felt that he could understand this and respect the difference.

*I learned how precious something might be to someone that worships it. It makes me aware of how powerful something might be in other people's eyes. The idea that a simple wooden sculpture might be looked upon as junk by one person, but viewed as ritual item to another. I believe I can understand and realize the real impact of religion, and the power it possesses in some people's minds. (MICHAEL PACE)*

He also reflected on his difficulties in understanding rituals and attributed this to his non-religious background. In connecting his opinion to his personal background he moved from prejudice to awareness or critical understanding of his opinions.

*I learned about new cultures and the ideas they held sacred. It gives me a new and more educated understanding of cultures that I do not know very much about. Through readings of ancient tribes and cultures that tell of ritual practices and space, that I had never had an understanding of in the past. I can be less ignorant of other people's society and not pass judgment so quickly in the future...The whole idea of ritual practices is still a little foreign to me, mostly because of my own non-religious background, but the information that has been available has been beneficial in the understanding of why certain cultures think and perceive ritual ideas. (MICHAEL PACE)*

Andy believed that a new understanding of cultures helped him to understand...
more his own personal habits and rituals.

*I also realize that many cultures depend heavily upon their ritualistic nature. I can see the patterns of my ritualistic behavior, in retrospect. Reading the article about the Nedembu rituals. Like I said, I am now more aware of my own rituals. I never realized how many I participate in without even knowing it.* (ANDY GABRIEL)

Anthony felt strongly against the tradition of marriage and its rituals, and said his feelings were not changed but strengthened through the class. However he failed to elaborate a connection to his life, so we are left with a sense of an unanchored resistance. Again, however, the brevity of the intervention assignment constrained the possibility of more fully developed reflections.

*I believed that marriage was a custom that was outdated and unwarranted in modern society. I looked around me and saw couples committing to each other, without this ceremony, who loved each other just as much as those who had been married. This impacted my life in that I couldn't understand what the big deal about this simple, ancient, ritual was and I could not understand why there was a controversy with people living together out of wedlock. Since I've been in class, my feelings have not changed considerably, but I know now how culture, economics, and even the media play an important role in illustrating the seeming importance in this ritual. The impact of this realization though, has sharpened my awareness to things that I normally just took for granted or ignored...my feelings on this matter definitely have not changed, and if anything have been strengthened. I think it is time that society should resist the dictations of an old culture, and adopt a ceremony, or include these around us into the present ceremony.* (ANTHONY BOLDMAN)

Michael reflected on his process of writing as a ritual, and how it helped him.

*Paper Writing is a Ritual for me, especially reaction type papers. First, I dwell on possible ideas to write on. Then I probe a few sources to narrow the idea's down and possibly come up with a new one. I pick one and write out a short outline by hand. Then, I sit down and begin typing, letting my thoughts and feelings flow naturally. Next, I read it over once and check for grammatical errors, run the spell check this may take a few minutes. Finally, I print out the paper and turn it in. Occasionally I'll get a few hours sleep during the last stage....This ritual allows me to communicate my thoughts and ideas well on*
the subject matter I'm writing about. The class has strengthened this thought. I like my method of writing, and it works for me. The reaction papers in this class disrupt my writing ritual, and I don't feel my papers are as good. Changing my ritual writing format results in my thoughts not flowing as well, my ideas don't seem to come across as clear, and the assignment tends to take longer. English 110 forced me to write multiple rough drafts, and I thought that always screwed up the flow of my papers. In an attempt to make them more suave, I messed them up. I believe the quality of my writing suffers when I am forced to change my ritual writing format. (MICHAEL KRIMPENFORT)

David reflected on his ritual when he begins a lacrosse game and concluded that it might be some kind of a superstition with him.

Some rituals I do before every lacrosse game. I always put everything on my left side on first. For example, I put my left leg through my shorts first, then my right leg, left shoe then right shoe, etc.... I pray in the locker room before we go out on the field and then pray while we stretch and also when I walk on the field to start the game. Me and our goalie always bump chests before the game, every time we score, and every time we come on the field after a quarter or timeout. (DAVID OTIS)

Patterns of Learning in "Advertising"

The third topic selected was advertising. There was no separate lecture on advertising, but lectures on semiotics and feminism touched this subject. The teacher tried to help the students see every day advertising through these theories on semiotics and feminism. There were 26 reaction papers written on this subject by 24 students.

Here again, I searched the data looking for evidence of resistance to new learning or change, confirmation of previous learning or opinion, of reflection and self-reflection as a precursor to conscientizing, and of conscientization when it occurred. For each, I focused, as the Sense-Making methodology mandates, on the
bridges students constructed between their learnings and their life experiences, thus moving the concept of the learner from Learner I to Learner II.

While results parallel those for the feminism and ritual topics presented above, the specifics are interesting in their own right. Some students used the classroom content to affirm and rationalize their current perspectives and experiences. As an example, Michelle found connection when she reflected on her experiences participating in the Miss Teen USA 199- contest, in this case a connection that was a memory.

\[
I \text{ had a fabulous experience and vacation in Mississippi when I represented Ohio in the Miss Teen USA 1991. In my experience with pageants, I feel, that I did not exploit myself nor teen girls, nor conform to any "fluffy" stereotype. My pageant history has given me, among other things, public experience, confidence and successful opportunities for scholarships. I used a talent of my own to accomplish these successes. The media did not use me. (MICHELLE MOUSER)}
\]

In contrast, Nicole based her anger against advertizing in her experience of young people who are duped into obsessions about looks. Lori, like Nicole expressed frustration with ads representing women with no body fat.

\[
I \text{ still fear that advertising sexually explicit material produces many negative aspects. Sexy classification of women is unfair to those especially who try to break the mold and move their way up the corporate ladder. I have known many young people who have become obsessed with looking like a beautiful model or famous star. This enrages me, that the advertising industry has so much power on so many impressionable young individuals. (NICOLE RASHEED)}
\]

Ads that show people with "perfect" bodies really bothers me. I feel that this is the image that everyone enjoys looking at or these models would not be so popular and in such high demand. I feel like so many people are judged by the standards set by the advertisers. I get frustrated when I see these ads that constantly show women with no body fat. I get really down on myself because I look nothing like the women in these ads. These feeling have been confirmed
especially reading the "Sex, Sin and Suggestion" article. These women's thin sexy bodies are used to sell all kinds of products. This says to me that as long as you are skinny you can buy anything or eat or wear anything and still look perfect. (LORI DARDINGER)

Matt expressed a stereotypical male view of advertisement and female representation, but gave no clue as to what experiences produced this opinion.

I believe that the way women are portrayed in advertisements is positive. It can be used as motivation for women who do not particularly like how they look and feel. If a woman is content with her appearance, then she does not have to look at the ads as any more than a photograph. Women who complain about how it places pressure on them to look good and raise competitiveness are not looking at it logically. A woman who is beautiful and feels great and confident will succeed in whatever she wants to do in life. No one should criticize beauty, beauty is a good thing. I believe that the way women are portrayed in advertisements is positive. It can be used as motivation for women who do not particularly like how they look and feel. (MATT HAMMOND)

Many of the students admitted to the impact of the class. Karlene admitted to a change in her understanding.

Yes, it impacted my life, once pornography enters advertisement in order to sell a product it has made me realize how hung up America is on sex. (KARLENE TUREK)

Tricia admitted to her feeling of anger, a reflection on an emotional level that affirmed her and her thoughts.

It impacted me a little. I would occasionally become angry because I felt that the portrayal of women was usually very demeaning. (TRICIA HIERING)

Stacie reflected on the impact on her life.

This has in a way effected my life, in that I sometimes feel the pressure to look a certain way because the group of people around me are doing it. (STACIE IVERS)

Patrick through the class discussion and the movie reflected on advertisers and
Yes, because after having a discussion in this class and watching the movie it showed that advertisers thrive on women and sex. This will have a positive impact because I will watch commercials more closely. (PATRICK MORGAN)

Denise admitted to no change, at least on an emotional level.

I know it impacts my life in some way, but it does not make me angry. I think the ads have made sex more socially acceptable. This may be a problem. (DENISE SEMICEK)

From the In-depth Interview with the Teacher

Finally, to evaluate this field test study, I’ve taken relevant parts from the interview with Marie who taught this class. When asked whether the students understood what she was teaching, Marie compared this class to the one she taught previously and considered this class to be better. Reaction papers were among the elements that contributed towards students’ understanding.

This quarter I think they get it. I think they get it because I instituted a new assignment called reaction papers. So that’s partly why they get it. The second reason why they get it this quarter is that I’ve tried to explicitly mention those kind of things in lecture. Several time I’ve said, “look, you have to pretend to be social scientists now for this term” and what are sociological kind of questions they try to unmask the facades of social structures that we never thought about before until I did try to be more explicit on several occasions in lecture about unmasking things we usually take for granted or things we take as natural or real in some sense. So, I’d say at least 50% of the class gets it because of my reaction paper assignments that finally strike them what’s going on with those assignments and number two because I try to talk about it in the lecture more often than I ever did before.

The reaction papers were not only helping the student to understand and get involved in the class more, they also gave them a voice in the curriculum. When asked if the reaction papers were also the students’ contribution to the class, Marie said ‘yes’.
said 'yes'.

Yes, and some class participation but mostly when they raise their hands they are asking clarification questions. So I assess the accomplishment of this particular goal by what I read in their reaction papers. That’s how I assess it. Otherwise I’ll have no idea if they are getting it. But I see lot of good thinking going on in the reaction papers. In the fall I wasn’t too good at the empowerment disempowerment thing but in the spring I tried to counter it by doing several active learning exercises, what I would call active learning exercises and the reaction papers again make them feel they had a voice and I was listening to them. They could communicate privately to me and ask questions in their reaction papers also and I would actually write on them and answer their questions.

Evaluating her empowering practices in the class room, Marie mentioned active learning exercises, the reaction papers and the final paper. But she mentioned also the difficulties with the reaction papers in that the students considered it home work even though it is very easy to do.

I like to think that it’s all three. Probably a tie between the reaction paper and the final paper. Well the final paper lot of them don’t even really tackle it until may be the 10th and the 11th week or maybe 9th if we are lucky. So, perhaps it comes too late in the course process for me to say that’s really what has helped me to empower them. On the other hand if I favor the reaction papers as the really empowering part of the class, I have to admit to you that lot of them don’t want to do it because it’s home work. Even though it’s real easy home work there is still mere resistance to even having to complete one and it’s a real easy assignment with few right or wrong answers, you know. Most people get the full credit. So, I still think it’s a tie between the final paper and the reaction papers. The active learning works, some times they are little exercises, but I wouldn’t say that’s the biggest contributor to empowering students in the class room. It helps but not number one.

Marie saw reaction papers as giving her an assessment tool and a communication channel with the students.

Well I’m able to assess better how well the videos and films were because people often comment on them in their reaction papers. And there aren’t that many people commenting in their reaction papers on what they got out of their readings. But they often would say ‘the video showed me that ..’
For Marie, reaction papers were not a strong intervention in the curriculum. They didn’t carry many grade points and they were not fully used. Yet, as I shall elaborate later in judging from her evaluation and the students’ use of the reaction papers, they proved to be the strongest link in the students’ learning chain, despite the fact in many ways they were a minimal intervention.

Thematic Summary

This chapter dealt with the field test study in which a minimal intervention was used in a media education classroom -- an intervention which it was expected would aid the movement from Learner I to Learner II concepts. The intervention involved students in writing reaction papers structured using the Sense-Making methodology as described in chapter 4. The intervention was considered minimal because each paper counted for only two points with a total of ten maximum; and because the teacher only scanned them and did not use them in any formal way. However the intervention did mandate that students be asked to address the learnings with which they came to class, the learnings they developed out of the class, and the connections of these to their lives and experiences.

A total of 92 students wrote 331 reaction papers. In all I used 121 papers selecting the three most talked about topics (feminism, ritual, and advertising) in order to fully anchor my findings in context. The reaction papers were carefully analyzed to evaluate the impacts of the use of the intervention tool on student involvements in the class and on teacher practices. Results showed that the patterns
of impacts which emerged were virtually identical across the three focal topics, so this thematizing summary collapses the three topics.

Looking across the focal topics, the patterns which emerged were as follows:

1. Overwhelmingly, the reaction papers indicated that the students arrived in class with fully articulated and experientially anchored opinions, ideas, and feelings regarding topics of attention in the media education classroom.

2. Overwhelmingly, too, the evidence indicated that the mandate of the reaction paper assignment involved students in an engagement with, and sometimes clear evidence of a struggle with, the self-media-society intersection.

3. In some cases there was outright rejection of the teachers' lessons, but even in these cases the students usually articulated quite fully what led to that rejection and how it connected with their lives.

4. There was clear evidence, as well, that in some cases the classroom experience affirmed and gave strength to students emotionally and to their struggles with media and society. This, too, was often anchored in their life experiences.

5. In some cases, although it is impossible to give a full account based on the brevity of the exercise, there was evidence of conscientizing reflection and even conscientization.

6. Even though the reaction paper was a minimal intervention, it was very clear that the intervention led the students to involved Learner II activities.
with the material in ways that connected to their lives and attended to issues of the connection between media, their lives, and societal structures.

7. While these kinds of substantive attention to the ideal of critical conscientizing as mandated for media education practice were almost non-existence in the teacher and student interviews of the classroom study, they dominated the reaction papers of this field test study.

8. The reaction papers, therefore, exemplified for the test study teacher — Marie — the very kind of explicit procedural activity which she believes is necessary if a Learner II pedagogy is to be implemented.

In conclusion, then, it is fair to indicate that the minimal intervention which was the focus of the field test study in fact proved to be a major intervention in the movement from Learner I to Learner II concepts. This issue will be discussed in more detail in the concluding chapter 8.
CHAPTER 8
DISCOVERIES, DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

This study has focused on pedagogy in media education. Observing current media education practice in two high schools in Canada and a university in the USA through in-depth interviews and participant observation, this dissertation addressed two major gaps in media education pedagogy, namely the lack of research on classroom practice, and the need for an alternate pedagogy that bridges the gap between the students' life experiences and the curriculum. The research was comprised of two parts: one, the classroom study, and the other, a field test study. The classroom study consisted of in-depth interviews of three teachers and ten students from the two schools in Canada. The field test study constituted the introduction of a reaction paper in a Sense-Making format as part of the syllabus in a media studies class at a university in the US.

Class Room Study

The classroom study, i.e. the study of current media education practice, revealed not only its achievements and contribution to the educational system, but also the setbacks and difficulties within the system today. I have assembled the difficulties
under the heading 'challenges’ and the achievement and contribution under the heading, ‘highlights’.

Challenges

The interviews with both media education teachers and their students in the Canadian-based classroom study both confirmed and illuminated the challenges to media education which were reviewed in the beginning chapters of this dissertation. The findings regarding challenges can be summarized in terms of two themes: 1) the need for an experientially-based critical pedagogy; and 2) the need for legitimizing media education as part of the curriculum.

1) The need for an experientially-based critical pedagogy. Still the greatest challenge to media education is to find an alternate pedagogy where the students will have a voice in the curriculum and where the syllabus will have some relevance to their life experiences; in essence, to develop a pedagogy where there will be more of Learner II qualities than Learner I qualities in the concept of the learner which undergirds the educational experience.

The interviews in this study revealed that the predominant pedagogy used in these classes was still traditional and more teacher centered than student centered. This was true despite the fact that the teachers were extraordinarily committed to media education, to their students, and to the idea of student centered practice. But, although the teachers were fully aware of the importance of reaching the students where they are at, there was little evidence in the teaching practice that this was achieved nor was there evidence of any reliable pedagogical strategies towards this
Two of the teachers did use an involvement strategy by opening their syllabi to the students in that they did not have a fixed, already prepared syllabi but preferred to construct their syllabi in the process of teaching. Yet, this open approach to the syllabus still did not allow the student voice to have an explicit and active role within the syllabus. Apparently it is not enough to merely open the syllabus to the students, but there is a need to involve the students through concrete pedagogical designs and strategies.

In contrast, this study also showed that leaving the syllabus open as a means of inviting student voice was not a necessary strategy for doing so. In fact, the field test study, to be discussed later in this chapter, was an explicitly closed syllabus but invited the student voice in with an explicit procedure contracting student attention to substantive issues and the relationships between these issues and their life experiences. The evidence of this dissertation suggests that this more structured approach was more successful in moving from Learner I to Learner II concepts than the less structured open-ended syllabus strategy exhibited in the classroom study.

From the students' interviews, it is clear that students found far more ways to introduce themselves into the curriculum in the classroom study because of production assignments and because of classroom discussions. These were the classes they liked most. In a way, in the Canadian classrooms studied, it was the students themselves who changed the concept of the learner imposed on them by their teachers through production assignments and discussions. This suggests that these two involvement
approaches—production and discussions—can play a major role in the development of a new critical pedagogy.

Unfortunately, however, the production aspect of media education has too often been neglected or relegated to technical schools. As Buckingham (1995) points out, "the establishment of Media Studies as a legitimate academic subject in schools has involved a troubled, almost schizophrenic, stance towards practical production." (p.6) He further notes that Len Masterman in his most influential book Teaching About Television published in 1980 has the shortest chapter on practical work, and in his book Teaching the Media published in 1985 gives a little more than a page to practical work. Masterman's concern was with what he calls "the technicist trap" i.e. the fear that media education will be reduced to technical training. Bob Ferguson, writing in Screen Education (1981), likewise criticizes practical work in media education,

Many groups ended up just clowning around with the equipment...the camera was often 'squirted' at its subject and the dizzy, boring and incoherent results thus obtained could be justified as experimentation. When plots were attempted they were puerile and in further education often incorporated obligatory punch-ups in pubs and discotheques. (p.44-45)

These criticisms were partly motivated by an enthusiasm to obtain legitimacy for Media Education as a serious academic subject within the curriculum. Through the 70s and 80s, media education has achieved the much desired respectability and the class room research in the nineties has challenged us to re-evaluate practical production in media education. But as Buckingham suggests, the suspicions about practical work and the unwillingness of teachers to cede control to the students
still linger.

Compared with safety of critical analysis, practical work is bound to be much less controllable. It is here that teachers have to hand over the ‘means of production’ to their students, and live with the consequences. As we have indicated, the media educators’ reluctance to cede this control has led to a widespread suspicion of practical work, and to prescriptions for classroom practice that are often highly reductive. In the process, a series of fundamental theoretical oppositions have been invoked which are profoundly problematic—oppositions between theory and practice, between rationality and emotion, between objectivity and subjectivity, between the cognitive and the experiential. Here again the problem is not simply that these oppositions are theoretically questionable, nor indeed that the central terms are so ill-defined; it is also that they fail to provide an adequate account of what is actually taking place in students’ uses of dominant media forms. (P.201)

Yet, the evidence presented in this dissertation suggests a need to fully integrate practical work into media education, because this research has clearly indicated that the students grasped the media most fully through practical productions. Not only did students seem to favor production assignments, but it was clear that the mandate to create through production provided the students with an avenue for active rather than passive attention to the media education curriculum.

Equally important were the class discussions. The students emphasized in the interviews that they preferred them and that they learned much from them. Evidence also suggested, in student evaluations of their reactions to their teachers, that a critical issue for them was the extent to which teachers respected and genuinely listened to their opinions.

Despite the fact that both these involvement approaches -- production exercises and class discussions -- were favored by the students and clearly provided the primary vehicles for student interest and attention in the Canadian classes, their use was not
driven by anything that might be seen as a theory of practice. The use of these approaches was primarily dependent on the ingenuity and predilections of the teacher. Even the fact that media production exercises tended to reverse the usual privileging hierarchies for academic excellence was not remarked on by the teachers as an element of pedagogical practice or a step toward achieving the kind of critical pedagogy which is the ideal of media education.

In general, an examination of the evidence showed that students were not actively connecting the classroom experiences, even the production and discussion experiences, to their lives and to an increased understanding of the relationships between their lives, their social context, and the role of media in society. Since these are the stated aims of a Learner II driven media education [as informed by perspectives on critical and feminist pedagogies and reviewed in Chapter 2], it is important to emphasize that the kind of involvement exhibited in the Canadian classrooms fell short of this mark.

One striking example of this is the fact that student talk about the classroom experience emphasized primarily their own comfort levels (e.g. how much they liked the teacher, the class, an exercise, how much fun it was) and/or the teacher's personality (e.g. he was nice). What was missing was evidence of the kind of conscientizing talk which is the stated goal of a critical pedagogy.

In contrast, the results from the field test study, to be presented below, suggests that it is possible to explicitly design involvement exercises that invite conscientizing.
The need for legitimizing media education as part of the curriculum.

Media education today has gained much recognition as an academic subject in schools, especially in countries like Canada, England, Scotland and Australia. But the way media education entered academic circles, namely on the back of the teaching of English, has brought many difficulties to its position in school systems today.

In the interviews, the teachers wished that the subject could stand alone. Presently, Media Education in Canada is mandated, according to one of the teachers interviewed, to be covered in one-third of two courses and probably no more than a third of the teachers are really doing that one-third. The teachers interviewed suggested that the ministry review the implementation of Media Education as part of English and make sure that it happens or take it out of English and make it a full credit course that will be compulsory at grade 10 level so that every student is assured of some Media Education.

The bad consequences of Media Education being part of English are many. First of all, the teachers who are called to teach Media Education are often English teachers with little or no training in Media Education. As a result, many of them are not committed to teaching the subject. Secondly, Media Education is considered by the English teachers and often by the school as a low status subject for low status students. Therefore teachers who are called to teach Media Education are not properly trained to do so. The students who are attracted to the class are also those who are problem students who are not serious about their studies, who are looking for an easy class where they don’t have to work too hard to get a credit. Finally, the
traditional English teacher has molded Media Education into a text oriented subject.

Robert Morgan writing in *Continuum* (v.9,n.2) explains the place of media education in the English department.

*Why, we might ask, has English been so hospitable to Media Education if it is not precisely because it has turned everything into texts? Bennett has made the suggestion that such initiatives risk providing "a new set of objects" for English "to latch on to" (Bennett, 1993:227), a reinvigoration of 'formalist analysis with critique" over wider moral "terrain which [now] encompasses a popular end—restoring English to itself and its true vocation" (228)*

This emphasis on the text also explains the present practice of media education and the use of pedagogies that are current. The text oriented pedagogy that is prevalent today, rooted as it is in traditional approaches to teaching English literature as canon, still has to find ways to deal with student involvement, including opportunities for student interpretations to play a role, and opportunities for students to be engaged creatively through practical production activities. Morgan goes on to suggest a less text-centric media education in the following passage.

*The core of a less text-centric education for MacCabe are questions that matter to students, projects that 'focus on the production of value' in local contexts and make a difference to their community. Ironically, this suggestion was made almost a quarter century ago by Murdoch and Phelps, two researchers who examined early versions of Media Education in English secondary schools. What they found was that far too much time was spent by educators on 'deleting, criticizing and inhibiting' media use, while they ignored the fact that most students actively 'make[ing] judgments and discriminations' about popular culture, 'select[ing]...and reject[ing] the media they encounter (Murdoch and Phelps, 1973: 141). Starting from students' life experiences of media meant for these authors that media pedagogy was not simply a 'school subject'; addressing quotidiem experience means unavoidably becoming entangled in public issues. (p.28)*

The evidence presented here suggests that it will not be easy for Media Education to avoid all the negative influences of being situated in English departments.
in Canada and that it will take a very long time for Media Education to find its own ways in pedagogy, curriculum and approach. Given the realities of political situations, it is probably most reasonable to call for better training of teachers to face the challenges of Media Education and the development of the kinds of tools for student involvement which are the focus of this dissertation to assist these teachers.

**Highlights**

The use of production exercises and classroom discussions was reviewed above. Clearly, these were avenues for student involvement. In addition to these, however, evidence from the Canadian study showed that the teachers were clearly struggling to find ways to involve students and to employ explicit strategies to engender student involvement. As has been suggested above, evidence showed that these attempts missed the mark and were not guided by any developed theory of how to facilitate student conscientizing. Thus, evidence showed that the approaches rarely elicited student attention to the relationships between their lives, society, and media. However, despite this, the use of involvement strategies in these classrooms must be viewed as highlights, as hopeful signs pointing toward the development of more explicit strategies for moving from Learner I to Learner II pedagogies.

The primary involvement strategies used by the teachers interviewed in this study included (1) seizing the teachable moment, (2) using media logs, (3) using drama, and (4) using open-ended syllabi. These are the set of strategies explicitly selected by the teachers as involvement approaches in contrast to production exercises and classroom discussions reviewed above which were, in effect, student constructed
involvements.

(1) **Seizing of the teachable moment:** The teachable moment is a concept that was used by some of the teachers to attract the attention of students by capitalizing on media events that students were experiencing or ideas, opinions and feelings that they were involved in. The positive side of this was that it indicated that the teachers interviewed in the classroom study had an interest in reaching students and involving students. Thus, the strategy of using the teachable moment achieved this goal at least in the sense of touching upon subjects that were fresh in the thoughts of the students and of connecting these subjects to the curriculum.

However, the evidence in this study showed that these teachable moments did not go the distance—they did not reach and touch the students’ ordinary experiences, but rather were restricted in their impacts to the selective experiences that related to the curriculum. In essence, then, the seizing of the teachable moment ended up being a method to capture the attention of the students. Once the students attention was gained, the teaching went on in the traditional way of filling the student with the knowledge of the teacher and the knowledge prescribed by the curriculum and the school.

Again, we find evidence of intentions to move from Learner I to Learner II concepts but failure in execution, indicating again a need for the development of explicit strategies for carrying through Learner II pedagogical approaches.

(2) **The use of media logs:** The media log was another strategy that the teachers used in their Media Education practice as exhibited in the classroom study.
This consisted in the students keeping a diary where they were asked to write down their experiences of the media or of the Media Education class. This, again, was a useful strategy for entering the media experiences of the students as they perceived and understood them. Since it was entirely the choice of the students, it allowed the students to perceive and select media experiences that were relevant and meaningful to them, experiences that they valued and were related to their lives.

The media log, however, was often understood as a class assignment by both students and teachers. The media log was graded and given back to students. The media log was not fully utilized substantively in the content of teaching by the teachers as it was regarded only as an assignment. Evidence did suggest, however, that the media log would have been a very useful way to enter the lives of students and connect these lives to the curriculum. Evidence presented in chapter 5, for example, showed the students did indeed talk about their lives in the media logs and indeed, upon occasions, they reflected upon their position in social order.

Media logs, therefore, have potential both for making the connection between life experiences and the curriculum and the social order, but also in evaluating students' skills in writing about media experiences and in developing syllabi that are closely relevant to the students. In order to use media logs more fully as a tool for moving from Learner I to Learner II concept of teaching, the media log needs to become more procedurally explicit, i.e. to become part of a fully developed praxis by instructing students on how to keep the log. Perhaps it would mean using Sense-Making as a methodological frame for developing media logs. Dervin (1983) presents
an example of media logs collected within a Sense-Making framework where every media experience of the students' report is connected in terms of what led them to that media experience, how that media experience connected with their past lives and what impact that media experience had on their lives.

(3) Drama: Only one of the teachers, Anne, used this method to teach media. She was very enthusiastic about this method of teaching and from the interview it appeared to be an effective teaching tool. As she put it, the students really learn through this method when they are called to act out what they see,

_They can love watching that and looking through the magazine and flipping through pages. All of a sudden when they have to get into the position of the model on that page and feel it, you know, you get the reaction that this is not natural. This is so difficult to do or this is stupid, you know. And it's only when they do, I find that they really learn it._

In Anne's class the students were asked to act out in class some of the ads that they had collected in their media log so that they could come to a greater awareness of the advertisements and their messages.

In drama, the media is no more a mere written text but becomes a multi-dimensional reality where the physical and emotional aspects of the students come into play in the act of learning. As Anne put it:

_But the wonderful thing about drama, all of a sudden the main resource becomes the student, the student's body, the students brain, and things like desk and chairs are removed and you all of a sudden are dealing with the raw material of the emotions. And we get a lot closer to that. Of course, the media is playing with our emotions all the time...So, I just think the fact that I'm able to really be working with emotions and reactions and problem solving, right on site, right at the moment, not just simply an analytical approach like where we write about it or read an essay about it. I really find it very wonderful what you get._
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Anne's position would suggest, then, that drama has as a teaching strategy great potential for assisting movement from a Learner I to Learner II pedagogy. Evidence from this dissertation is limited both because only one teacher sued the approach but also because in essence this teacher used the approach primarily as a Learner I device in order to teach something that she had decided in advance. Few of the students mentioned the role playing experiences as being involving and there was no evidence that it helped to build the bridge to Learner II concepts. However, it is important to know that the very fact that one teacher was using the role playing exercises is a step forward, given the relative lack of involvement exercises in Media Education curriculum as evidenced by this study.

(4) Open Syllabus: Two of the teachers preferred to have an open syllabus in their Media Education practice. It meant that they did not follow any ready made syllabus but constructed their syllabi in the course of their teaching. This did not mean that they had no idea what they were going to teach in the class room but simply meant that they opened their own ideas of what the student should learn to be corrected and to be enhanced by the students' participation in the class room.

Though a very valuable idea towards a critical pedagogy and movement from Learner I to Learner II, evidence from this study suggested that the open syllabus strategy was not well used. Part of the difficulty was students' unwillingness to participate but the more apparent difficulty was the lack of explicit procedures inviting participation. Thus what the teachers did was to leave things open ended hoping students would give direction. But without explicit procedures for student
participation, students regressed to the normative behavior they have learned regarding classroom participation. Thus, evidence in this dissertation showed that students paid a great deal of attention to teacher personalities and to whether they liked the class and the teacher. In essence, then, and with some irony, evidence in this dissertation suggested that these media education classrooms ended up with the same emphasis on personality that is well-documented as characterizing the dominant approach of the media to even hard news coverage.

To fully move toward Learner II concepts of media education, the open-syllabus strategy would need to be driven by explicit attention to Learner II concepts and, in particular, by procedures that explicitly invite consciousness of ones' social position and the role of media in creating that social position. Since such conscientized attentions are not normative in either classroom or society, we do not see them happening spontaneously in these data.

Field Test Study

The field test study was the second empirical part of this dissertation. A communication class in a major US midwestern university was studied through the introduction of reaction papers designed in a Sense-Making format. Each student was asked to write five one-page reaction papers on topics of their choice from the class material. The maximum grade points for each paper was two. There were 92 students in the class and the total number of reaction papers received was 331. Obviously not everyone wrote all the five reaction papers. On the average, the 92
students completed 3.6 of the five assigned.

The reaction papers were reviewed by the class teacher and her assistants and returned to the students. They were marked satisfactory or unsatisfactory. The satisfactory meant two points and unsatisfactory meant one point. Sometimes comments were written on the reaction papers by way of clarification or direction. The papers didn’t take much of students’ time, didn’t form a major procedural component of the class, and in fact the teacher paid minimal attention to the papers other than scanning them and using them as general background information on the students.

Yet, even though these reaction papers were designed as minimal intervention, the data collected in this study—both the interview with the teacher and an analysis of the reaction papers themselves—showed that the reaction papers, as an involvement tool directing movement from Learner I to Learner II concepts, were a major benefit both to the teacher and the students.

The teacher herself acknowledged it was a valuable tool for assessing students’ progress and understanding of the subject. It also gave voice to the student in the knowledge production process.

But I see lot of good thinking going on in the reaction papers. In the fall I wasn’t too good at the empowerment disempowerment thing but in the spring I tried to counter it by doing several active learning exercises, what I would call active learning exercises and the reaction papers again make them feel they had a voice and I was listening to them.

The reaction papers showed how Learner II concepts can come to play in a Media Education class room relatively easily. It was clear that students did not come
to class empty headed without their own opinions. On the contrary, many of them had very strong opinions that were very much tied to their life experiences and therefore difficult to change. Thus, for this teacher, the reaction papers served as a constant interruption of any tendencies toward using the traditional teaching practices Freire called 'the banking system' of teaching.

The reaction paper structure was driven by the Sense-Making methodology as described in Chapter 4. The students were, thus, not only asked their thoughts, opinions, and reactions to class but were also mandated to search for the connections between these and their lives. Evidence showed that in the process, students yielded a wide variety of connections: sometimes affirming their acceptance of societal arrangements; sometimes struggling with them and resisting them; sometimes exhibiting marked re-evaluations and change. In all cases, it was clear that the students, even those who clearly were merely executing the assignment because it was required, had to construct some minimal level connection to their own lives. At a minimum, then, the reaction papers began an explicit movement to Learner II concepts of involvement—i.e. explicit attention to the relationship between self and media. In some instances, explicit signs of what critical pedagogical approaches would term conscientizing were apparent—i.e. growing awareness of one's place in the social order and how the social order constrains and/or enables.

According to the teacher, even these minimal intervention/reaction papers provided a channel of communication with the students. The students used the reaction papers to express their feelings, thoughts and opinions and to ask for
clarifications. The reaction papers provided the teacher an insight into the students prejudices, difficulties and confusions.

The results of the field test study, thus, showed that Sense-Making may provide one viable approach to implementing explicit procedures aimed toward engendering not merely student involvement but student involvement that moves toward concepts of Learner II as guided by critical and feminist pedagogies. What is encouraging about this is that prior work in the use of Sense-Making in teaching settings (Dervin 1983) suggests that the approach can be relatively easily learned by professionals, those without prior experience with and/or successes in using discussion involvement approaches.

Thematic Summary

The focal goal of this dissertation is the need to move toward a pedagogy for media education that lives up to its ideals as informed by critical and feminist pedagogies.

Results in this dissertation showed that from the classroom study we find good intentions on the part of teachers who wish to involve students. We even find some degree of student involvement. However, despite the many efforts to involve the students, we find very little effort at any kind of praxis; or any kind of explicit attempt to intercept life, social situation and media education, and we find almost no evidence of it happening spontaneously.

In contrast, in the field test study we see the potentials for an explicit and
derived practice in moving from Learner I to Learner II pedagogy. The Sense-Making intervention guided by the theory of Sense-Making as explicated in chapter 4 was a minimal intervention. It didn’t occupy much of either student or teacher time. However it had a profound impact on the process of knowledge production. There was clear evidence of students readily describing connections to life, and clear evidence of attention to social conditions. Throughout, there was clear evidence of high student involvement. In most cases, students attended to their place in the social order. Sometimes this attention was supportive of the social order (e.g. a female student describing how beauty pageants have taught her a lot); sometimes the attention was critical (e.g. a female expounding on how she hates women’s bodies being a subject of compulsive daily attention); and sometimes it was transformative (e.g. a female student explaining how she is beginning to see that her self-hatred is linked to media displays for female bodies and society’s attitudes toward women). The field test study in this dissertation suggested, then, the potentials for explicit procedural attention to Learner II concepts. Despite a minimal intervention, results showed that these media education students were beginning to attend to the hidden power dynamics of how society is working and how media coverages relate to these.

In sum, then, results of this dissertation suggest that most media education practice, while well-intentioned and struggling with ways to involve students, still ends up implementing Learner I concepts. Further, the dissertation suggests that there are ways to explicitly invite Learner II concepts, and that merely using involvement exercises will not be sufficient. The involvement strategies must
incorporate procedures which invite student attention to substantive class contents regarding media and to the relationships between these and their lives and their places in society.

The literature review which guided this dissertation showed, in sum, a call for student involvement of the Learner II kind but virtually no evidence of the development of a theoretically-guided repertoire of strategies for implementing the goal. This dissertation points to potentials; it also mandates an agenda for pedagogical development.
APPENDIX A

SAMPLE QUESTIONNAIRE AND INTERVIEW FOR TEACHERS
a) How syllabus and class design was constructed:

a1. Looking at this syllabus, what would you say were your major goals in its construction—what did you want to accomplish? What did you hope students would go away from the class with?

[FOR EACH GOAL NAMED]

a1.1. What was it that led you to seeing this goal as important?

a1.2. Would you say that you accomplished this goal completely, partially, not at all?

a1.3. How do you see the accomplishment of this goal as helping the students?

a1.4. How would you say this goal addresses the issues of power and structure in society as manifested in the media?

[FOR GOALS ACCOMPLISHED COMPLETELY OR PARTIALLY]

a1.5. Looking back at the situation would you say that this goal was accomplished for all, most, about half, or only a few
students? What leads you to say this?

[FOR EACH GOAL RATED AS ACCOMPLISHED FOR LESS THAN ALL STUDENTS]

a1.6. What was it that enabled you to reach these students?
What was it that prevented you from reaching more students?

b) Major strengths of his/her approach to class.

b1. Looking back over the most recent time you taught this class, what would you say were the major strengths of teaching and class design?

[FOR EACH STRENGTH NAMED]

b1.1. What was it about this that leads you to call is a strength?

b1.2. What were the major benefits gained from this?

b1.3. Would you say this strength benefitted all, most, about half, or only a few students? What leads you to say this?

[FOR EACH STRENGTH RATED AS BENEFITTING LESS THAN ALL STUDENTS]

b1.4. What was it that enabled this to help these students?
What was it that prevented it from helping more?
c) Major weaknesses of his/her approach to class.

cl. Looking back over the most recent time you taught this class, what would you say were the major weaknesses in your teaching or class design--major difficulties or barriers you faced?

[FOR EACH BARRIER, DIFFICULTY, WEAKNESS NAMED]

cl.1. What is it that leads you to call this a barrier/weakness/difficulty?

cl.2. What in particular made it difficult?

cl.3. What consequences did it have?

cl.4. Would you say this weakness/difficulty/barrier impacted all, most, about half, or only a few students? What leads you to say this?

[FOR EACH WEAKNESS RATED AS IMPACTING LESS THAN ALL STUDENTS]

cl.5. Why was it that it didn’t impact all students?

d) Picture of the best student.

d1. Thinking back over the most recent time you taught this class, think about the one student or several students whom you thought got the most from the class. What do you think made it possible for them to gain in this way?

[FOR EACH REASON GIVEN]
e) Picture of the worst student.

e1. Thinking back over the most recent time you taught this class, think
about the one student or several students whom you thought got the least
from the class. What do you think accounts for this?

[FOR EACH REASON GIVEN]

e1.1. Illustrate this with an actual example.

f) Ideas about major issues in media education.

f1. As one looks at issues in media education, what would you say the
big issues are?

[FOR EACH ISSUE NAMED]

f1.1. What leads you to say this?
f1.2. What is your position on this issue?
f1.3. What leads you to conclude that?
f1.4. How do you work this issue out in the classroom--what
do you do?

g) Ideas about structure vs. agency.

g1. One concern that seems to run through the media education
literature is whether we should be teaching students to protect
themselves from all powerful/ destructive media forces...or whether we should be teaching students to develop their own creative capacities to enjoy media as consumers. What is your opinion on this issue? Any other thoughts?

[FOR EACH THOUGHT OFFERED]

g1.1. What leads you to say this?

g1.2. How do you work this issue out in the classroom? What do you do?
School:

Name: George

Age: 52

Male

Teacher

Q. You told me that you don't have a fixed syllabus but keep building it as you go along. Could you tell me more about it?

A. Sure. I've been out of class rooms for several years. This is my first year back in. I have been working as a consultant to media literacy. I do not like to develop a curriculum in the absence of the student. So when I came to the school though I had some idea, some rough idea what the student body here was like but I wouldn't say I knew what I was dealing with. So I was very hesitant to write a curriculum in advance. I think that's generally a good way to proceed. I think the real teachers make their own curriculum. This is just one more situation where it is more desirable. You want me to go on?

Q. Yes.

A. I had certain principles and ideas, kind of frame work that I'm looking for and what I'm hoping to achieve. The framework I want to use and certain kinds of
outcomes that I want to be working towards. But where the kids are in terms of their ability to grasp and what their particular needs are in terms of the curriculum. So it's a feeling about, in a way, trying some activities, see what works and what kinds of things work and what kinds of things do not work; what elements are specific to the population that's here, in terms of cultural factors, in terms of skills levels, in terms of previous experiences.

Q. So you have a frame-work?
A. Yes. I have a frame-work of what I think media literacy is. From there I would work out. I think media literacy is somewhat different from other subjects because important things come out spontaneously, the spur of the moment, what Barry Duncan calls "the teachable moment" and you have to seize it. It can happen with news, or it could happen about the covering of the news, particularly when kids come and talk about it. You have to be prepared to deal with it at that time. If the kids walk in and talk about Simpson or wearing a Bart Simpson T-shirt, if the teacher has some sort of a media literacy frame work in his/her head they are able to react to the situation and will be able to help the kids to make sense of their experience of the media. Whereas if you are tied to a rigid curriculum you are not in a position to take advantage of those moments.

Q. Looking back to your approach to the media what would you call the major goals of this approach?
A. Well, I guess I want to see students who have an understanding of the media as constructors of reality. It's a core concept in a way. I want them to be able to look critically at the media to see how it works, the role it plays in their own lives and in the larger society, to have some ability to use the media to express themselves. I wanted them to be able to do a certain amount of decoding or deconstructing when dealing with text and so on. I want them to have some understanding of the audience. the role that the audience plays in constructing meaning, the various factors that operate within that—the culture, ethnicity, education, race, gender...I want to get kids to the point to be active viewers, where they—I won't say passively, because I don't think kids deal passively with media, I think that's a mistake to describe kids as passive in relationship to the media, because the brain is quite active in making sense of the media—But they are unconscious, or unaware of them. The meanings that they are making are not the meanings that they are examining consciously. Lastly, I would also like them to have some understanding of what kind of context the media are produced, the economic ones, some times political, or cultural, so that they understand why programs are made, how they are made, what circumstances and under what constraints they are made. I want kids in particular to identify the value messages that are embedded in media texts. And I don't want that to happen in a...? I think all media texts have value messages. I just want kids to be conscious of this in dealing with them. The values they themselves adopt.

I want kids to understand how production is carried out from a technical point of view but I also want them to understand some of the constraints involved, some time
they are economic and some times they are political or cultural. I guess one of the phrases used in the past is, we want kids to be "critically autonomous".

Q. First of all taking what you said about media constructing reality..
A. Media as constructed, some times the phrase is used, "the construction of reality". Not that reality doesn’t exist, but every time we try to describe it we are constructing it.

Q. What makes you think that this is an important goal?
A. Well I guess, partly because the media tend to, particularly the visual media, tend to be experienced by the kids almost as a seamless extension of reality. I want to show them the seams. Because it is not an extension of reality but a construction of reality. And if they want to be autonomous they may have to understand this.

Q. Would you say that you accomplished this goal completely, partially or not at all?
A. Well, I don’t think that I ever accomplished it completely. May be partially. With the two classes that I have currently, I think that I’m doing far better with the advanced level class than the general class. The general level class has some pretty low functioning kids, who are not comfortable dealing with abstractions and in fact though they describe it as a general level class, this would be a basic level class. There are even in fact four kids who are ranked below basic which really means mildly retarded. With those kids I stopped at the current time trying to do much
analytic work with media and I switched into doing production much more. It's a slower approach. I don't do production for the sake of doing production. That for kids who can't get the ideas through discussion of abstraction or even through analysis of media texts there is some hope that it's possible through production. My experience leads me to believe this that the kids who can't get abstractions can get it from the production side. When they start to see the choices that they have to make in production and the way that they are in fact constructing situations, when they record them, then they begin to apply that understanding that they get in a visual way. They can then begin to look at the media in a new way. They know that it's something made. With all classes, I do, like with the advanced level class, production with them as well. I'm starting production with them next week. With the advanced level class you can start with the abstractions or at least with the analysis and build up some momentum that'll lead to production. With the general kids you have to start with production first.

Q. How do you see this goal as helping the students?

A. Well actually it is the last one that I said, the "critical autonomy". I think that helps the students certainly. I guess it's my own particular bias as well. I want to see autonomous people in the society. I think that's how we are going to be useful in society. And if you are not able to deal critically with the media I don't think you can be an autonomous individual. I guess it's about people being free, and it's about people being in a better position to have their say in the society to see that the
decision making power in the society is more equitably distributed.

Q. Could you elaborate on what leads you to hold this opinion?
A. Why do I think that it is important that people be critically autonomous? What led me to that? I guess my belief that freedom is a good thing, that equity is a good thing. It's not as if we live in a totally just society. We live in a world where there are great inequities between different groups of peoples. Having the same opportunity to understand the culture is tremendously important in breaking that down. Not just like I guess from a kind of a levelling of the scales thing, but whoever you are in the society to understand it. I think media literacy is cultural understanding. And you know, we are not robots. We are not animals. We are humans. We need to understand our world and this is a big chunk of media literacy.

I think regardless of students this has been a priority for me. If I were teaching in the wealthiest part of town, I think I would be teaching much the same curriculum. It's cultural understanding and everybody has to have it. Often those in power, I think I've talked about this in terms of equity, maybe that's not correct. Often those who are privileged in society don't necessarily have better understanding vis-a-vis those who are less privileged. It does seem to take on a keener edge here where most of my students are poor and disadvantaged.

Q. How does this goal address the question of structure and agency?
A. I've been in this school only a few months. I'm not in a good position to answer
that question. I’m not sure I fully understand the question. I think you are saying how does the school see it’s own student body. This is a very disparate population. As you walk the halls here you’ll see people from many different countries. It’s rather difficult to I guess to try to give voice to all of those different voices. What the school sees itself doing is providing a very supportive environment for kids who are attempting to learn under difficult circumstances. The circumstances in school are particularly difficult. The lives that they are leading often does not make it easy for them to attend school or many disadvantages they face. I think the school is extremely flexible here in dealing with the kids who are having trouble. I don’t think I’ve ever seen any school that goes this far and gives so many extra chances and as much extra help when they are having trouble. There is a whole department in the school called the intervention department. And so many of these kids are angry as well. It’s not surprising the lives that they have to live could make them angry. Sometimes that anger is misdirected and at some times it’s directed at each other and some times it’s directed at the authority they find within the school. I’m not saying that authority is always right either. But often teachers attempt to go about their daily work teaching most of the students who are there and coming into contact with students who are filled with anger over something else in their lives and they can’t deal with the situation there. So they stop attending. There is group of staff members in the school who are set up to deal with kids who are at the point of losing their credits or being kicked out of class. I had one student for example who is having trouble with his family. He left home last year and got in trouble with the
law. Got arrested and finally came back and continues to have trouble with his family. There was a drinking problem at home and some time he has a drinking problem himself as well. He is on the verge of moving out or has moved out of his home. I learnt of his problems and immediately I took him to the people in the department who have time to deal with such problems. I have a class to go out to. I can’t deal with kid’s problem on my own. There is somebody ready to deal with their problems. Social workers who come into school and they put him contact with the social workers and they give assistance for housing and see that his teachers understand his situation. Support is given. Other times, there are some kids in grade nine who are going off the rails as they skip classes and so on. The school is set up to try to pick up such kids and give them a higher degree of support and supervision in an attempt to get things moving. On the other side there is a multi cultural department in the school. They give a great deal of support to kids in their identity or lot of understanding offered to in the pressures of learning in another language, basically trading in their language. It’s a traumatic experience lasting a generation and a half really. Family trades its language. That’s a very hard thing. So there are ESL classes. But so also support for being who you are is part of the watch word of the school. There’s also a separate literacy department which deals with kids who have specific problems. Some of the kids coming here haven’t learnt to read in their first language. Learning is not just learning another language but learning to read and write in a foreign language while you never learnt to read or write in your own has a lot of difficulty. So there are those kinds of support. Is that the kind of thing you
are asking?

Q. Yes. But my question is also to see how this goal addresses the question of structure and agency with regard to media.

A. I think that's the talk about the critical autonomy that I was saying. The media has this power to construct reality for us and there is the necessity for the kids to first of all see that it's a construction and not necessarily the reality and not necessarily their reality and we also give them the opportunity, we put the tools in their hands and begin to teach them to construct themselves and make their own stories. The advance level class presenting the sitcoms, it was quite striking that one of the common themes that ran through is their attempt to bring a higher degree of realism to the programs, racial issues. And we had to switch the discussion to why TV doesn't do that and whether the audience will tolerate or not. There are some interesting questions on the structure and agency in media. Running on a little with that when kids do production for the first time it's extremely difficult for them for they are mastering a new medium. And often their early production work besides being technically bad tends to replicate existing media. We want to teach kids about stereotypes, and media uses stereotypes to communicate and often they fall into the some of the same problems that main stream media exhibits. It used to bother me more than it does. I realize that it's asking a lot from the kids to master the media, the technology and to transcend the main stream media. It's really asking a lot. And specially on a one semester course it's not really till the end of the course that the
kids are beginning to do work that you can look at as reasonably competent and
originals as well. If I stay in this school for a length of time I would lobby to get a
second follow up course put in place. Kids who have got some mastery of the
technology and some ideas in critical thinking can have an opportunity to really begin
to use the media to express reality and to take power.

Q. If you accomplished partially could you speak about what made it possible for
you to reach some students and why you failed to reach the others?

A. Well, it's different for different students. For some students you can talk to
what's on the screen and they'll get it and that's where their heads were. And for
other kids either you'll have to have some class and some of those kids won't get it
till they see it in the editing consul while putting images together to make meaning,
and then they'll go, "Oh that's what it's all about". Often the lights go on in that
room there, and they say "Uh, I understand what you mean". So it comes at different
points for different people. I think it's very important that you have an open class
room, relatively democratic class room where you're approaching media as
exploration to some extent rather than as you know this is good media and this is bad
media. It depends on skills of kids and the kinds of discourse that shakes up the
class. The reason why you don't get everybody? I'm not a perfect teacher. I can't
teach every kid everything. Some kids are just not there in their heads. Things may
be going on in their lives to make it difficult for them to deal with whatever it is we
do. It varies from subject to subject too. If we are to do a critical study of race.
some kids are going to be very involved and some kids are going to drop back. If we are going to do a critical study of fashion, some kids might get involved and some kids might get quite threatened. Kids who invested a great deal in their appearance for example, can feel quite threatened, you know, if you start to deal critically in that. I think you have to have a wide variety of approaches and texts and so forth to draw in as many kids as possible. That’s why I do try for lot of variety. But it’s not always possible.

Q. Let’s take the second goal, to become critical, to understand how it works, to develop the ability to use the media to express, to deconstruct...We could take them one by one or all together.

A. Well, they are all connected, you know. Dealing critically is critical autonomy. The roles in our lives is to recognize the power the media has to shape things. But there are limitation and there are lots of debate on that in the media literacy circles. Some people say that the people subvert the text and others say, well, not so much. I think that it’s important to talk with kids about the role it plays in their lives. I just come and say what you’re watching, what you’re listening, why, and what sense you’re making. So why do you like this and why this person like that. Then you get into audience. You’re talking about audience as well. How do we make sense of this? Blacks kids may not be interested in the show as white kids.

These are all parts of the larger goal of critical autonomy. What we have there is one or two goals and mostly strategies. Well looking at text is one of the routs to
critical autonomy. Looking at audience is another route to critical autonomy.

Examining the institutions is another route. And we have to be using all of those tools if we're going to be critical autonomists.

Q. What are the strengths of the syllabus that you have described?
A. One strength is the back and forth between production and analysis. I think that's very important because it let kids learn in different modes. Some kids will learn best from the analytic mode and some kids will learn best from production mode. All of them will have to put it together with the other side...What I most like to see is production that is informed by analysis and analysis that is informed by production. I wish that were true of the industry as well. We get a lot of people making television who are very good at making television but they don't have any critical sense of television themselves. Another strength is I guess is the syllabus which is a conceptual model and I think it's a fairly strong model itself and it covers all or most of the issues that we would want covered in a media literacy program.

Q. The second strength then is that it is a strong conceptual model that covers all the aspects of media.
A. Yes. I think so. If I can go back to the first as well, to the production and analysis, it lets kids with different learning styles and kids bringing different sets of skills have an opportunity to use those skills. So many English classes, you know, it's really a narrow band of student skills or student intelligence that we are replying
to. If you get into a media class you get, there's always in a class, some kids are technologically inclined, kind of techies we class them, and certainly those skills in English class are valuable and people are looking for them. You get other kids with artistic skills. Suddenly in an English class those skills are valuable. You get other kids who just have a very good sense of visual things, they might not be particularly artistic but they are good at discussing and processing visual images. Often these kids are special-ed kids. One of the striking things about media literacy programs is that they are often kind of reverse the normal pecking order in the class. Kids who are good at reading and writing, kids who are top kids in the class in reading and writing activities are not necessarily the top kids in a media class. Kids who often don't do too well in a class focussed on reading and writing do extremely well. Those kids have skills and intelligence that we should be honoring, that are valuable and we don't in most of education. I'm really glad to see that there is a place here for that. I guess I'm attracted to it myself because I tend to be something of a generalist. I'm not particularly good at any one thing but I as a teacher media really engages more of my skill sets as a teacher of media than more of my skill sets engaged as a teacher of English. So that's why I'm so attracted to this room.

Q. What would be the benefits to the students from this strength in the syllabus?
A. Well, actually I've answered that already. The fact that it accesses, you know, skills and intelligence that isn't normally accessed in our school system except in peripheral areas like music.
Q. Does this strength benefit all the students or some of the students?
A. As I said the kids who are normally do well in reading and writing don’t necessarily do well in this stuff. So, in that sense it doesn’t benefit them as much. But in that it’s a balancing, I think it benefits students as a whole and also it’s not a bad thing for those students who are, you know, top of the class in reading and writing to learn that those aren’t the only valuable skills. I should go back a little bit though. Another strength of the syllabus I think is the fact that it aims to produce the critical autonomous student which is what I was talking of before.

Q. The second strength you mentioned was the conceptual model that covers all aspects of media. What leads you to call this a strength?
A. Well, I guess because it is integrated. It’s an attempt at integrating and connecting up a lot of different aspects of critical thinking on media.

Q. Does it connect only the media aspects or also connecting other subjects?
A. Well, I guess I do. Certainly the teachers that I worked with in the past almost uniformly reported that the quality and quantity of students’ writing goes up. I think because it’s a subject area that they feel is more relevant than perhaps the 19th century fiction or a 17th century drama. There is a greater sense of commitment in their writing and consequently there is more quality and quantity. And also, I think the kind of critical skills that we are teaching in media connect up with what kids are doing in history or environmental studies and also in literature as well.
Q. Could you say little more on how it connects to these subjects?

A. Well, I think modern approaches to history deal a lot with dealing critically with sources. Most of what I've seen of history courses though tends to deal quite well with the print sources but rather poorly with visual sources. I think we teach kids critical skills for dealing with visual sources as well. And more and more use is being presented, use of current affairs are being presented visually and if you want kids to deal with them critically in those areas then there have to be critical skills that help with visuals. The same thing with environmental issues as well.

Q. Third strength you mentioned deals with critical autonomy of students.

A. I talked at length about it last time. It's only logical and I think that's the strength of the syllabus. At least it's one of the objectives.

Q. What would you consider as weaknesses in this syllabus?

A. It can be difficult to manage. When you got kids going back and forth between production activities and analytic activities it's easy for the class or the groups within the class to get out of sync and you have to constantly finding something for the groups to do when something else is not available for them to do. It happens often when a piece of equipment is broken down or battery is dead or some one in the group is absent. It's also something that is not necessarily every English teachers' cup of tea though, here, the media literacy is taught through English departments. Some English teachers are quite comfortable with technology, and with media studies
but others are not. And others when they do they prefer to take up purely analytical approach and not through production, because they are intimidated by the technology and the production activities and they are also are not terribly comfortable dealing with visual material either.

Q. What is it that helps you to cope with this?
A. Flexibility and a sense of humor.

Q. Any other practical help in this regard?
A. You have to have a back up work to do all the time. You want to have what I might call bail out assignments. I don't always like using a text book but it's useful to have a text book around because if you have a group of people who haven't got anything to do at that moment you can say, OK, turn to page in the text book and answer these questions. I don't think highly of that kind of approach to education but it's not a bad one for some kids. It's justifiable.

Q. What are the consequences of this difficulty on the students?
A. Some of them tend to lose focus and get confused about what they should be doing at any particular time, particularly kids who need a lot of structure and sometime kids who are lower functioning. Some of these kids have more trouble with the kind of free-flow, open-ended quality of class. It's easy for a student who tends to waste time to waste time.
Q. Any other weakness in this type of syllabus?

A. It requires a lot from teacher too. Because as I have outlined it I said what I outlined was a model and not a syllabus. It means that you’ve got to be making a curriculum all the time in a way, and I happen to think, some consider it as a joke, real teachers make their own curriculum. When I see teachers taking package of curriculum, we don’t see much in Canada but I understand it’s quite common in the United States, where teachers are given a curriculum to teach complete with worked out lessons and everything, you know, I find it inconceivable. I don’t know how anybody could think of themselves as a teacher and not be involved in shaping their own curriculum.

Q. What makes you think this is a weakness?

A. Well it’s hard work, and harder work than dealing with something that is prestructured. I guess what I’m saying is that it is not really unique for it’s what real teachers do but it is a little more demanding than most because the curriculum can almost change from day to day. You know if a significant event happen in the media, you have to be able to walk into a class and deal with it that day. Start from scratch without necessarily having a lot of preparation.

Q. Are there any more weaknesses?

A. I can’t think of any other off hand. Tomorrow I might think of something else.
Q. Could you picture the best student in your class, someone who has got most of what you were trying to get across tell what is it that made it possible for that student to grasp what you were teaching?

A. Well, two things: I think that what I have to say to kids or what I had to teach them is both new and powerful, in a sense that it seems to make sense of their world in ways that they couldn't before and also I think that I'm a fairly effective communicator and I'm able to establish a certain kind of rapport with many of my students that helps them to listen to me.

Q. Could you give an example?

A. I can't think of one off hand.

Q. Picturing a student with whom you had difficulty getting across what do you think accounts for this difficulty?

A. In general the students I strike out with completely are generally kids who have got significant problems also in their lives and they are missing a lot of classes or their life is messed up somehow, and school and what goes on here including my class just isn't happening. Another possibility is that communication just don't click with me, personality clash or whatever. It's not very common but because my teaching style is kind of personal kind of style when it does go bad lot is lost because the personal communication channel is what I depend on a lot. Without it I'm kind of crippled.
Q. Could explain a little on what you mean by a personal style?

A. I guess I really struggle to establish a relationship with my students that goes somewhat beyond, you know, kind of a standard teacher student relationship. I want to know my students, I want to care about my students. I want them to know me and care about me as well to some extent. Does not mean that I share everything about myself nor they everything about themselves but I want to be real to them and I do that by really listening to them, encouraging them to talk about themselves and responding to that and also by talking about myself to them when it seems appropriate. Not going on and on about my life but satisfying their curiosity about myself, you know. I know some teachers who won’t tell students their first name or their age and stuff like that. I think that’s silly. I think it’s really important for teachers to be really human, be real to the students in anything that can help.

Q. How do you think this helps the students?

A. They take me seriously and they are more likely to take you seriously and take what you say seriously. Creates an atmosphere in the class in which they feel not afraid to express their opinions. It seems to democratize the class.

Q. What according to you are the main issues in media education in your own practice and in general?

A. Few things: One is that one of the research that was carried out a couple of years ago showed that the students have learnt all kinds of skills in dealing with the
media but they haven’t come to the point where they could identify ideology in a text. They have all kinds of deconstruction skills but they couldn’t get to this point. I’m struggling with that. My approach to that is by really trying to assure that my students can identify the value messages in text. I think it’s a kind of an important step in that. Other issues, I think in Ontario we have to break out of that kind of curriculum ghetto. Right now as you know it’s one third of two courses plus an optional, fifth English credit, that’s full credit media course and my belief is that probably no more than one third of the teachers in the province are really doing that one third. English teachers are not committed to it. There has been a really terrible failure on the part of the ministry of education in teachers training to train new English teachers in teaching the media. I would like the ministry to start reviewing the implementation and making sure that it happens or to say OK it’s not part of English course any more but there is one full credit course that’s compulsory at grade 10 level so that we could be assured that every student in Ontario is getting some media literacy. I have my doubts whether that will happen. Another major area facing media literacy is regarding the elementary curriculum. There is some progress here in terms of getting media literacy into the common curriculum in the language arts standards. But what will actually happen in practice is anybody’s guess, and I fear that it will be implemented without lot of expertise and that there won’t be much decent professional help for teachers and what might happen may not be terribly good. If you put into the curriculum and don’t give teachers proper support I think you create negative kind of impression. This is what I could
Q. Regarding what you said as the major problem of students being unable to identify ideology what leads you to say this?

A. Well, we are not as a culture very adept at identifying ideological issues. I think that the mainstream ideology of the culture tends to be invisible to the members of the culture. Is it not the Jesuit Father John Culkins who said "I don't know who discovered water but it certainly not the fish". I think it's the kind of thing. We tend to be surrounded by the culture's ideology and for that reason find it rather difficult to identify. I think also, it's a kind of a side issue and sort of a personal theory of mine, that one of the striking things about the development in media education is that it happens outside the United States. Lot of it happens in Canada, lot in Australia. I think perhaps in Britain as well as in Australia perhaps because of higher level of class consciousness, it might also be that tremendous amount of American media is exported and American media of course has, you know, has embedded within the American ideology. It's significantly and subtly different from Canadian ideology. It may be that being exposed to foreign media in our own language makes us more sensitive somehow, and the importance and significance of the media leads us to the study of it. You know what I mean. The Americans do not recognize the ideology of their own media because it is their ideology. Because it's somewhat different from our ideology we tend to notice it. We start looking at the impact of this media on our culture, bla..bla...bla. And that's in a way a beginning point for media literacy.
media education.

Q. How do you work this issue in your own classroom?
A. As I said I try to get them looking at values. I haven’t done specific comparisons with American media because the subtle difference between American and Canadian media are less meaningful to them than to a class of mainstream Canadians. Such simple things as looking at how television stations in Canada and United States sign off at the end of their broadcast they play the national anthem and show pictures. Most American stations have pictures entirely of the armed forces, their jet-fighters and tanks and soldiers and war ships and so forth whereas in Canada it’s mostly of geography and people. We show the prairies, the mountains, we show the people in the big cities, bla, bla...sort of thing.

Q. What are your ideas about structure and agency in media?
A. I think there is a kind of a dialectic in structure and agency. For example this morning I said to my advance level class, we have roughly six weeks left in this course and what are some of the things that you would like have us study here. I put them into groups and ask them to discuss it. I didn’t get a lot of useful response but the door is open. Sometimes on the other hand I will say that we are going to study this. I don’t give all of the decision making over to them. It sort of goes back and forth. Also in the production assignments there is some individuality and creativity. In their media logs, they are good openers too.
Q. Could you tell a little more about the media log?

A. Students are required to write two entries a week on the log in which they comment either upon the class and what's going on in the class and what they have learnt in the class or on their own media experiences. If they watch a television program they could write about that television program. We have a discussion in class in which they get involved or don't get involved, they can discuss that. It's a channel of communication. Every week I sit down and read about what they have been thinking about or involved in. Also in the second semester they all do what is called an independent learning project in which they research an issue on their own. The independent learning projects are generally done on topics suggested by me, but they are not limited to those topics. If someone come to me and says that they want to do on a topic which is not on my list. I encourage them to come up with other topics. I have to balance a degree of democracy, openness, respect for everybody in the class room with sufficient discipline and control that those who are not interested in being there don't take over the space and make it a space where very little happen because they are not interested in learning much. I try to be flexible. I want them to treat me with respect and I always want to treat them with respect. We don't always manage.
APPENDIX B

SAMPLE QUESTIONNAIRE AND INTERVIEW FOR STUDENTS
CLASSROOM STUDY
QUESTIONNAIRE USED FOR INTERVIEWS WITH STUDENTS
FOLLOWED BY EXAMPLE TRANSCRIPTION

a) Ways the class fit your understandings and experiences.

a1. Thinking back over the class, in what ways do you think the class fit with or agreed with your understandings and experiences?

[FOR EACH WAY NAMED]

a1.1. How in particular did this fit with your understandings/experiences?

a1.2. Was this agreement helpful to you? How?

a1.3. Was this agreement in any way hindering to you? How?

b) Ways the class did not fit/disagreed with your understandings and experiences.

b1. Thinking back over the class, in what ways do you think the class did not fit with or disagreed with your understandings and experiences?

[FOR EACH WAY NAMED]

b1.1. How in particular did this disagree with or not fit your understandings/experiences?
b1.2. Was this disagreement hindering to you in any way? How?

b1.3. Was this disagreement helpful to your in any way? How?

c) The major goals of the class.

c1. Thinking back to the class what would you say were the major goals or purposes of the class from the instructor's point of view?

[FOR EACH GOAL/PURPOSE NAMED]

c1.1. What leads you to conclude this was a class purpose?

c1.2. Was this goal helpful to you in any way? How?

c1.3. Was this goal hindering to you in any way? How?

d) The major strengths of the class.

d1. Thinking back over the class, what would you say were the major strengths or the best parts of the class from your point of view?

[FOR EACH STRENGTH NAMED]

d1.1. What leads your to say this was a strength?

d1.2. Was this strength helpful to you in any way? How?

d1.3. Was this strength hindering to you in any way? How?

e) The major weaknesses of the class.

e1. Thinking back over the class, what would you say were the major weaknesses or the worst parts of the class from your point of view?
[FOR EACH WEAKNESS NAMED]

e1.1. What leads you to say this was a weakness?

e1.2. Was this weakness hindering to you in any way? How?

e1.3. Was this weakness helpful to you in any way? How?

f) Magic wand.

f1. If you had a magic wand and could change the media education class in any way you wanted to, in what ways would you change it?

[FOR EVERY CHANGE NAMED]

f1.1. What leads you to want change the class in this way?

f1.2. How would this change help?

g) The structure versus agency issue.

g1. There's an argument among media education teachers about what to emphasize in class. One group thinks it's important to emphasize the ways in which media have power in society to control and manipulate messages, information, and discourse. This group wants to see students become capable of protecting themselves. The other group, in contrast, wants to assist students in learning how to creatively consume and get the most enjoyment and use from media. What thoughts do you have about this disagreement?

[FOR EACH THOUGHT NAMED]
g1.1. What leads you to conclude this way?

g1.2. What do you think needs to happen in class in order for this idea to be implemented?
INTERVIEW 3

School:
Name:
Age: 18
Male
Grade: 11

Q. Think back to one media class, one that you liked.
A. Yes. To one where he was discussing about the violence that was going on in the school, where six guys beat upon one guy. He was discussing what people should have done and stuff like that.

Q. Did you like that class?
A. Yes. He was discussing different solutions to prevent other incidents like this.

Q. What makes you like that class?
A. He brought out everybody’s point of view, what they thought of the incidence. What should have happened and what happened. Some people said what they saw.

Q. Any other reason that made that class good?
A. No. Just this that everybody got to say what was on their minds, their own point
Q. The fact that they discussed different solutions, did this help you in any way?
A. Yes. I thought of my point of view. Say that six guys are beating upon on a student. By the time you get the teacher more damage is going to be done. But if you helped the guy on the spot less damage will be done. The guy could have been killed. Trying to get the teacher you leave the guy unattended, doing nothing. Fortunately the teacher was close by and the guys stopped.

Q. In what way did this help you?
A. Many of the peoples' points of view is to go get a teacher. They didn't want to have nothing to do with the incident. But if you are there and know what's going on at least what you can do is help. Stand up for your self. Stand up for what you believe. If you believe that you should help. If a guy is in trouble you should go ahead and do it instead of running to a teacher.

Q. Was this discussion hurtful to you?
A. Well, sometimes it was hurtful because some people don't want to do anything and want to stay out of it. What kind of people are we if we are not going to help other people who are in trouble. That was hurtful. How could they be like that! If somebody is in trouble you should help them no matter what situation that is.
Q. The fact that everyone expressed their opinion, was this helpful to you?
A. Yes. Because some students were saying, you know, the guys shouldn’t have been allowed into the school, others were saying people should have helped, others were saying to get a teacher. Other people were saying to ignore it altogether, it’s not your fight why should you have to get involved. It brought up a lot of different topics like doing good for some body or forgetting the whole incident. What each person felt about the situation and what they would do.

Q. Did this in any way help you personally?
A. Well, it changed my point of view a lot on what I thought about other people. I think that other people would sure help and I expect other people to help everyone else. But I found out that there are people who don’t want to get involved. They don’t want to help anybody fight their own battle. It make me understand peoples’ reaction to the situation.

Q. What do you think were the major goals or purpose of this class?
A. I think the major purpose of that class was to bring out the importance of violence and how it’s affecting us, our attitude toward other people, how we live and how we think.

Q. What makes you think that this was the purpose of that class?
A. Well, the teacher said that many people act out violence because they see it on TV. When the young see violent movie, when they watch Kung-Fu movie they act as if they know Kung-Fu, kicking and punching. The more violence they show more people want to mimic the violence they see. They tend to become violent and they end up hurting somebody. It's all because they saw it on the movie which is not right to begin with. The purpose of the class was to talk about violence and how it affects our society.

Q. Was this helpful to you?
A. Well, I watch violent movies myself. When that movie came out "Natural Born Killers" I watched it because there is action. Most people like movies wit some action in it. As we were discussing the topic we found that lot of people act out what they see on movies. The stuff they see on the movies aren't real.

Q. Was this hurtful to you?
A. I'd say it was hurtful, because it made me realize how people reacted to movies and what bad can be accomplished when certain movies are shown to younger audiences, because it's mostly between young children to adolescents to young adults who watch mostly violent movies. And what they act out are what they see on TV. They end up hurting other people and the society and paying for it.

Q. What do you think were the major strengths of the class?
A. I'd say the strengthful aspects were that the teacher was pointing out the uselessness of violence, how we don't need it in our society, that everything should be peaceful, normal, not going around shooting people just because they've seen it on the movie or somebody did something wrong and the other person's looking for revenge or something like that.

Q. Any other strengths?

A. Another strength was that it brought out how other people felt which is good because most people don't express how they feel about certain things like tolerance and stuff like that. But it brought it out which is good because then when another situation arises they could say this is what happened and this is what I could do to change it so that such things do not happen again.

Q. What makes you call the discussion about the uselessness of violence a strengths?

A. Because from my point of view I agree. We shouldn't have violence. I mean because we've been around long time and we should have better sense to know that fighting is only leading to deaths of loved ones and people are hurt by violence. I don't think it's good. All these wars over money and power and stuff like that. It's nothing we shouldn't even have it, I mean we should live and be happy with what we've got.

Q. Did this help you?

A. Well it helped me because it gave me a sense of comfort knowing that there are
other people that have the same point of view on violence as you. It's not good and it shouldn't be going on. Instead of everybody being against it you hear some people saying violence is good, it's enjoyable and stuff like that. There are more people who think like and may be it'll bring other people to have the same opinion. May be doing something about it.

Q. Did this hurt you?
A. Well, it hurt me in a way because back home where I come from, in Newfoundland there's not much violence no one carries guns and everybody is open with their feeling. But up here people always saying violence is good and there is lot of violence in Toronto. It hurts me to see that it's not a long distance away, just across the water and you have all this violence compared to East of Canada where there hardly any violence at all.

Q. What makes you call bringing out others' feelings about violence a strength?
A. Well, some people if you ask them what you think of violence or something like that they'll say, oh, nothing much or something like that. They won't give you a specific answer but in the class they said I don't like it or I like it because it's terrible and what examples to use. They said more in detail about what they thought.

Q. Did this help you?
A. Yes, it helped me because I always hoped that if I'm going to talk to somebody
about a certain topic they should be outright and open. They’ll express what they think and they are not going to be afraid to admit something on talking about violence or guns some thing like that and if I ask them what you think of guns one might say I don’t like guns because such and such. It’s better than saying I don’t like guns because they kill. They are just saying that. Instead they could say I don’t like guns because it’s violence towards society, many young kids could get killed. It’s expressive. You get new information about what other people think.

Q. Did this hurt or hinder you?
A. I don’t think it hurt me because it gave me an idea of how everybody feels and they can’t judge anybody because what they look like may be different from what they think. Intellectually. They might have great ideas but they are afraid to express them. When they expressed them in class you came to know, hey, he is pretty smart. he has good ideas about what’s right and what’s wrong and good ideas like how to bring change. It was good. It gave me a great understanding of people and to see what each person has.

Q. What would be the weakness in this class?
A. I’d way the weakness is just those who had negative opinion about violence. Those who like violence on TV. I thought that was a weakness. To me who watch lot of violence end up being violent themselves, some sort of way either they go out and kill somebody or beat up, rob or steal. I think that was the only thing that was
weak. Rest of the opinions were strong about what should be done about violence and what was wrong about it.

Q. Was there any other weaknesses, may be about the class, how it was conducted?
A. No. He brought out the topic and then he just asked peoples’ opinions. What do you think? And everybody had an opinion. It was a good way. If he did all the talking no body could have voiced their opinion and it wouldn’t have been a good class. But he just sat there and listened to what everybody else had to say and he included some of his own stuff. It brought out opinions which people wanted to express.

Q. Was this weakness helpful to you?
A. Well it was kind of helpful and it was kind of confusing. When they have a negative opinion about one thing they have positive opinion about another which others might find negative. People might like violence but hate abortion or lot of people might hate violence and like abortion. This is two different topics but he might think abortion is violence because you mustn’t kill but violence is good on TV.

Q. Was it hurtful?
A. It was hurtful because these people have to realize that violence is not a good thing, violence can kill people and we don’t need it. I don’t need it back home and
we don’t need it up here.

Q. Think back to a class that you consider the worst class.

A. I’d say the worst class was when he showed about the military, about US submarines. I thought that it was pretty bad because he asked people what they thought about the military but nobody expressed their opinions. They just said I don’t like the military because if I’m in it I’ll get shot or something like that. He didn’t express much of opinion. He wanted us to say what the recruits liked about it and what they disliked about it.

Q. What were the weaknesses?

A. He didn’t express his opinion whether he thought it was good or bad.

Q. Any other reasons?

A. Well, there were a couple of students who liked the military. I’m joining in the militia in February. It was weak because only couple of us stated why we like the military, good education, good training, physical fitness, self-reliance, capability.

Q. About the first weakness...

A. Well, he didn’t state whether he liked it or disliked it or why he liked it. He just wanted to know whether everybody else does which I thought was not good. He is the teacher. He should have an opinion on what he likes and what he doesn’t like. But in that class he didn’t state it. In the other class he stated that violence is not
good it’s bad.

Q. Did this weakness help you?
A. I don’t think that helped me much. Only thing that I realized that many people don’t have an opinion on what’s going on.

Q. Did this hurt you?
A. I’d say it hurt me because for living in Canada we should know about our military, we should know how our government is working and why the military does such things and why the training is necessary and why the demands are on physical fitness in creating good solid soldiers.

Q. The second weakness that only a few were interested...did this help you?
A. It did help me to know that at least a couple of people were interested. Myself I like the military. I’ll be fighting for peace and not for power and they had similar feelings. They’d fight wars to end wars. They wouldn’t fight wars to create new wars.

Q. Did this hurt you?
A. I don’t think it hurt me, because they expressed what they believed and they believed in peace.
Q. What in your opinion was the purpose of this class?
A. I'd say the purpose was to show how the military works and some of the demands that were necessary to make good armies. One of the students had an opinion that he liked the self defence part because he had a small frame a small structure and this way he could defend himself more. In an attack if somebody comes and want to beat his head he could defend himself. If he didn't have that knowledge they could come up to him, bully him and push him around and take what they wanted.

Q. What leads you to say this?
A. Well he started out with a movie. So for me it's like he is going to show something on how the military works, why the military was important, what do you gain from the military, ways of knowledge, fitness and other things like that. He showed the film first and then he stopped every now and then and asked what we think of a particular section. For instance why did that officer yell at a soldier because he quit and he wouldn't continue on. Military doesn't tolerate quitters. If you want to be in the military you stick with it. You are determined to stay with the military.

Q. What were the weaknesses in this class?
A. It didn't work because nobody voiced their opinion.

Q. What in your opinion lead to this silence on the part of many?
A. I think they were probably afraid of what other people might think. If some one says that he doesn’t like the military because he’s afraid that he might get shot others might think that he is a coward. It’s not true. It’s self preservation. No one wants to get shot. Common logic. But if they have a reputation that they are strong or something like that then they might say some thing that says that they have some feelings which others might think him as weak.

Q. What changes would you make if you had a magic wand?

A. I’d say he is asking for our opinions and he wants us to write it down on the paper most of the time. Write out what you think of this and this and this. We may not have any experience with what he is asking us to do. We are just like guessing. If he tells us to do something like, write an essay on war. I have experience about war and I could write about it. But if he says to write about such and such a movie and if you haven’t sen the movie and you can’t write about it. So I’d say if he gives us an assignment and there is a certain movie he wants us to criticize I’ll say bring in the movie and show us the movie so that everyone can see it. Those who have seen it can refresh their memory. The we get to see the movie and we write what we liked and disliked about the movie and how it plays a role in our society.

Q. Any other changes?

A. I’d kind of change teacher’s attitude towards media. Because some times he has a neutral attitude. It’s not good, it’s not bad, but somewhere in between. I don’t think
it’s right. You are for it or against it. You can’t be between. It’s like the abortion is good if the woman has already a kid or if she is under the age of 18 or something like that. That’s not good. Abortion for me is not good. There is no two ways about it.

Q. Any other changes?
A. I’ll probably change what other people thought of the class. because some people in the class are not doing anything. They are just sitting there laughing, fooling around, not doing any work. Me myself I fool around a bit but I still do the work that is assigned to me. I have an opinion and I state those opinions. Many people just sit there, joke around and don’t do any work at all. It’s just a place to hang out which is not good.

Q. What leads you to make the first change?
A. Because it refreshes everyone’s opinion and then we can say what we thought about the movie whether it’s good or bad and then we can express what effect it will have on the society. It’ll have much more realistic effect. If you take “Natural Born Killers” somebody might say it’s a good movie because it has lots of action. But they may not be right because they haven’t seen the movie. But if you have seen the movie you might say it’s a bad movie because the way it was set out and the amount of violence that was shown, the intensity of that violence.
Q. What leads you to the second change about the change of teacher’s attitude.

A. Well, I think he would be a more effective teacher if everybody knew how he felt about a certain subject instead of asking us what we thought. Because we are talking to someone who is not giving any feedback which is like talking to a wall. Stating our opinions but not hearing how he feels about the subject or what he thinks about our opinions.

Q. How would this change help?

A. Well if he changes we’ll be able to have a conversation instead of being one sided. Instead of asking us he’ll be able to say well I don’t like violence for such and such reasons but your point is good because it expresses what you feel about it. It’s not that somebody like violence totally altogether.

Q. What leads you to change the attitudes of students?

A. Well, if it’s going to be a media class you want to have the students who are really interested it. This makes the course interesting and more fun. If you have students in the class who are joking around and not caring you can’t concentrate on what you are doing and can’t take the class seriously.

Q. How would this change help?

A. We’ll get a better sense of the violence in the media and how it affects peoples’ lives. And we’ll actually learn something instead of just sitting there.
Q. What is useful in media education, to protect the student from the media or help students to use media creatively?

A. I'll probably endorse both of them. The first one gives everyone a chance to see how violence is in TV, how it is depicted, the intensity of violence in our society. It'll show all of the violence. Some TV stations are all news stations. They give you pieces of what happened. They look one sided. They don't give the whole picture. If they are just going to use the media just to show bits and pieces but to use it creatively like for example a 6 o'clock news that shows fighting going on in Peru or something like that telling this side is doing this to the other side and the other side has to retaliate and then they say you know more information will broadcast as it comes in. They don't seem one sided but they are waiting to get all the facts before they continue on. So that it doesn't seem one sided so that you don't know the rest of the fact.

Q. Would approve of censorship in the effort to protect the student from the media?

A. Yes. Things like 'Power Rangers' on tv, I have a little cousin who watches 'Power Rangers', and every time it comes on he is acting like one of the Rangers punching and kicking. He acts out what he sees on tv. He could be watching a 'Star Trek' show which has violence in it but deals a lot with science and still goes around acting like one of the lieutenants in the show. It's good to limit what children watch. If they are going to show really violent shows the children won't be watching it but only the parents. This way the younger children won't grow up saying violence is cool and go beat up somebody.
FIELD TEST STUDY

QUESTIONNAIRE WHICH STRUCTURED THE STUDENT REACTION PAPERS, FOLLOWED BY A SELECTION OF EXAMPLES

Explanation:

Students were asked to select a topic or presentation that was a focal point of the class during at least one class session. For that focal point, they were asked to write their answers to these questions.

**Before: Things I brought to the class**

Before entering this class, did you have any thoughts, opinions, feelings, or conclusions about [X]? If yes, what were they?

For each thought, opinion, feelings, conclusion:

a. What in your life led you to this thought/feeling?

b. Did having this thought/feeling impact your life in any way? And how so?

c. Now that you have been in this class, has the thought/feeling been confirmed, strengthened, changed, or eliminated? If yes, how?

What impact do you think this will have on you?
After: Things I got from the class

After being in this class, have you arrived at any new thoughts, opinions, feelings, or conclusions about [X]? If yes, what are they?

For each thought, opinion, feeling, or conclusion:

a. How does this new thought/feeling connect to your life?

b. What in the class led you to this new thought/feeling?

c. What impact or effect do you think this new thought/feeling is going to have on you?

The last section is your opportunity to communicate any difficulties you are having with the material. Do you have any questions, concerns, or confusions about the lecture, reading, or video on this topic? If yes, list or describe at least one.
BEFORE: THOUGHTS, OPINIONS, FEELINGS, CONCLUSIONS

1) I have noticed sex in advertising since about the age of fourteen.
   a) The first example I noticed was the sexual symbolism on packs of Camel cigarettes.
   b) First is the phallic looking nose of the Joe Camel character. His features in his facial area resemble the male genitalia.
   c) Also the camel on the front of the box, if you look very closely, you will notice two people engaging in oral sex. A rather graphic form of sexual symbolism.

2) The impact of sexual arousing advertising has an extremely negative effect on the younger audiences.
   a) Sexual appealing advertising encourages kids that their product will make them more sexually appealing, and all young teenagers want that.
   b) By making these children more sexually appealing, supposedly, kids are
more apt to have sex, and thus more pregnancies, and sexually transmitted diseases.

AFTER: THOUGHTS, OPINIONS, FEELINGS, CONCLUSIONS

1) After reading "Sex Sin and Suggestion", by Carol Moog, I have started to notice that there is some sort of sexual display in almost all advertising today.
   a) For example, the Newport ad on page twenty seven of her essay. This looks like an ad showing people having show much fun and implying that it is because of smoking. But in reality it is showcasing a classical sexual position.
   b) This type of advertising is very effective, due to the fact that it plays on our subliminal thoughts of sexual activity.

2) Whether this sort of sexual display is intentional, which I believe it is, or not it is very effective in our society.
   a) I recently saw a Coca-Cola commercial on T.V., It was showing an empty glass of ice and coke pouring into it. Then when the coke was done being poured into the glass the straw, that was in the glass, began to sigh in enjoyment and rise up, until completely standing straight in the air. This commercial is playing totally on our sexual senses. Whether its the act of the straw rising or the joy in the narration.
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RITUALS AND ROUTINES

BEFORE: THOUGHTS, OPINIONS, FEELINGS, CONCLUSIONS

1) I always thought of rituals as something special, even if it was a daily thing.
   a) I guess I would have to say that either my parents or school led me to
      this feeling.
   b) Yes. If something that I did, fell under my definition of a "ritual".
      then I would always hold that "ritual" in high regard.
   c) I wouldn't say that the thought has been confirmed, strengthened,
      changed, or eliminated. I think that it will make me re-evaluate what
      the word "ritual" means to me as opposed to the rest of the world.

2) I always thought that routines were something habitual or almost automatic.
   a) Again, I would have to say that either my parents or my schooling led
      me to this belief.
   b) Yes. It helped me differentiate between what was a ritual and what
      was a routine.
   c) Again, I wouldn't say that the thought has been confirmed.
strengthened, changed, or eliminated. Yet, this thought has been questioned since I have been in this class. I don’t think this will have any impact on me.

AFTER: THOUGHTS, OPINIONS, FEELINGS, CONCLUSIONS

1) I learned that some people think that things I would always see as a routine, see it as a ritual.
   a) It makes me feel that some people don’t feel as strongly as I, about rituals.
   b) The fact that someone could actually feel that brushing your teeth is a ritual.
   c) It will make me think twice when someone refers to something as being a "ritual" or a "routine", and make me think "what is this persons definition of ritual and routine?".

QUESTIONS, CONCERNS, CONFUSIONS

I am really confused as to where the line falls between rituals and routines. For me it seems to be black and white, but for others the words seem to be almost interchangeable.
SOPHOMORE
FEMALE
RANK: 2
WEEK: 9
VIEWS ON FEMINISM

BEFORE: THOUGHTS, OPINIONS, FEELINGS, CONCLUSIONS

1) I always thought that the word feminism meant that women were superior to men.
   a) I have a lot of friends that call themselves feminists and all that they do is talk about how women are better than men.
   b) One of my friends is so against men that she is very reluctant to go out with them because they will open the door for her and she feels that she can do that herself.

2) I've always believed in the equality of men and women.
   a) I believe that if a man can get a certain job or position, a woman can have the same opportunity to get that job. She should be judged for the position and not for her sex.
   b) But, if the woman doesn't get the job I don't think that she should get an authority figure to fight in court for rights.
AFTER: NEW THOUGHTS, OPINIONS, FEELINGS, CONCLUSIONS

1) I agree with the thought that one's gender is a relevant factor in how one sees the world.
   a) Like I said before I've always thought that women should be equal to men, and their role in society is an important factor in getting whatever they want.
   b) But, I never thought about how the human experience is not generic. Everything has some type of label to it.
   c) For example, one person mentioned in class that feminism is somehow linked to lesbianism. So is every feminist a lesbian? I don't agree because my view of a feminist is not as extreme as that idea. I value all of the human race no matter what the gender.
BEFORE: THOUGHTS, OPINIONS, FEELINGS, CONCLUSIONS

1) My views on feminism are positive. I believe women are equal to men and they should be treated as so. However, I also believe that women are different and so they should be recognized for their individuality and difference.

a) I came to this belief with watching my close female friends attempt and achieve their personal goals. I also have seen what they cherish, their side of issues on gender and their emotions on maternal talk. I know women look at relationships differently than men, and place great emotional values on certain things while men place theirs on others. I am not saying that one’s importance is more significant than another’s. I am solely bringing to light their difference. Obviously, these are generalizations on gender, yet I think the individuality of gender between men and women should be taken into consideration when explaining their equality.

b) These thoughts have impacted my life to the extent that I appreciate
women and respect their gender and sex. Personally, I think women on the whole, are more intuitive and in touch with their feelings than men.

c) My thoughts of equality have been confirmed in class yet I question to what extent active feminists will go to get their views across, for themselves and for society. I believe that feminism is good as I explained before, yet I feel that it has become a little too trendy and absurd when certain radical feminists try to ignore or humble their gender individuality and solely focus on their material and social obstacles. I feel that by doing this and consciously ignoring their maternal spirituality, they are cutting themselves short of the beauty they possess to procreate, by focusing so much on their social obstacles.

AFTER: NEW THOUGHTS, OPINIONS, FEELINGS, CONCLUSIONS

1) I really haven’t reached any new conclusions after last weeks discussion, yet I did learn which group crawls up my skin with their feminist ideals. I learned the difference between liberal, radical, essentialism and Marxist feminists.

a) These groups have made me realize how serious and distinct each one is to the movement. I can relate to the feminist movement and support it, however when it comes to male bashing, lesbian interest based on male hate and superiority based on nothing of rational substance, I begin to question the seriousness and intellect of certain groups.
b) there are always mixed views on preferences, significance of beliefs and interpretations of intentions. I have come out of last weeks discussions with the same views as I went in fact I have been confirmed.
BEFORE, THOUGHTS, OPINIONS, FEELINGS, CONCLUSIONS

1) I believed that marriage was a custom that was outdated and unwarranted in modern society.
   a) I looked around me and saw couples committing to each other, without this ceremony, who loved each other just as much as those who had been married.
   b) This impacted my life in that I couldn’t understand what the big deal about this simple, ancient, ritual was and I could not understand why there was a controversy with people living together out of wedlock.
   c) Since I’ve been in class, my feelings have not changed considerably, but I know now how culture, ecorsm~iotics, an even the media play an important role in illustrating the seeming importance in this ritual. The impact of this realization though, has sharpened my awareness to things that I normally just took for granted or ignored.

2) I wondered why and how marriage could serve in a society that consists of so many diverse groups that can not take part in what is considers
a) Everyday, you hear how marriage is discriminatory to gays and lesbians who want to make a lifelong commitment to each other. I tend to agree that it is wrong that the law, as well as society, does not see it fit that these couples cannot be joined in a ceremony and not recognized as a married couple.

b) This particular issue did not directly affect me, but I did see it happen to several of my friends. The pain and humiliation that this thinking caused them was almost unbearable. This same mentality also affected me in that society did not see that living with my girlfriend (now ex) was a legitimate commitment are socially acceptable to some.

c) Since I've been in Communication 260, my feelings on this matter definitely have not changed, and if anything have been strengthened. I think it is time that society should resist the dictations of an old culture, and adopt a ceremony, or include these arounds into the present ceremony.

AFTER: NEW THOUGHTS, OPINIONS, FEELINGS, CONCLUSIONS

a) I think I expressed in the previous text how this present ritual has connected to my life. I have seen its effects on my friends, and the belief on living together out of wedlock in my own experiences.

b) What lead me to see this ritual for what it is, was the lectures and
readings in Communication 260. I saw how the economy feeds this belief in that a man and a women need to be married to be complete and to function properly financially in society’s eyes. I also see how our customs and media influence this ritual of marriage.

c) I think that I will not be so quick to judge today’s world. I also will respect any commitment made by a couple and honor it, regardless of whether a ritual says it is justified or not!
APPENDIX D

MEDIA LOG SAMPLES
The commercial about "shoes that don't creak" is one commercial that was constructed very well so that you would remember it. The commercial was about a woman who goes to a hotel and sneaks into a room where she finds her husband or boyfriend having dinner with another woman. This is connected to the product, because the way she was able to sneak into the room without anyone knowing was because her shoes didn't creak. The commercial had a fairly fast pace. The shots were approximately the same length, only at the end the shots were a little longer when she was getting her revenge.
on her man and the girl he was with
in the hotel room. I think they used
a fast pace in this commercial to keep
the audience hooked to the screen, because
if it was slow people would get bored
and flip the channel. In this commercial
they only use cuts to keep the pace up.
The shots were mostly taken from level
angles, like they would only show the
front half of the body or only the
hands, this keeps the viewers who
are watching in suspense. Mostly all the
shots were close-ups, then longshots, and there
was a few medium shots. There was
dark and dramatic lighting, also some
shadows. The colours scheme was dark
(black), and this relates to the product.

There was a shooting, a 17 year old student shot two counsellors, they are now round in critical condition. The debate is to installing metal detectors at schools like “in New York”, are things getting that bad here in Canada.

This incident has opened up the eyes of people besides installing metal detectors, there also thinking of cutting down on violence on television and movies. It could be that by installing H.D and cutting down on violent films people will take this gun business more seriously, and stop using them like toys.

It may also give the secure resting, so they could get back to there teaching. I mean teachers are more afraid of students, then students are of teachers.
As for cutting down on violence on TV, I think it'll make a big difference because our future are the children, and if children keep on watching violence they'll get used to violence and be violent. I think it's the same as living in a violent home.
MEDIA LOG  Nov. 14, 94

I watch T.V. and lots of it. There are shows I like and there are shows that I will never like. There is one show and it's called Barney. Man when I was a kid, shows for kids were better made, shows like Sesame Street and other shows of the late 70's and early 80's. This show is a piece of crap. It's not very well made, the value messages are that life is always going to be good, caring and sharing and other crap. I'm not saying that kid shows need to be realistic, they just need to be more educational. On Sesame Street there was plenty of education and that show had a good purpose, and kids learned a lot from that. On Barney, all he does is tough for a half-an-hour, and sing and dance. And the acting is so fake, I know these kids aren't
Like that in real life. But anyways I just think kids T.V. should be upgraded and do something better for it.
Body Image or Body Damage?

In today’s fashion world the beauty of a woman has taken a complete change of what is considered beautiful. A beautiful woman is completely thin to an extreme, flat on both sides, and tall. The media and society is portraying the ideal woman to look like she has just come from Anaïs, half starved.

How women especially teenagers, throw out the world tenat models and actresses, to new method of what is beauty is. Some women would do anything to look like models. Thats where women begin to grow a low self-esteem which occurs, eating disorders young woman have dieting or eating disorders differ from wanting to look like a model or actress. Sometimes, thin can be a bad thing if its not done properly. Everyone’s body is different, one must eat according to ones height, weight and size. Models and actresses must have tiny, men, fame and money, but they are more to life and that’s ones health.

What people realize is that what makes these models and actresses beautiful on the outside, is killing them on the inside. Most models have been tested and proven of having eating disorders all most nutriend. They aren’t old enough road to make there body function properly, some even become permanently sterile. All this just for a few years of luxury and fame because, by the time they reach there 40’s most likely they’ll either died or have major health problems.
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