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Abstract

Historically, there has been a lack of educational studies measuring student trust and commercial messaging; therefore, this study presents and encourages further research into this problem. Today's American student is educated within a realm of brands, logos, and other corporate identifiers that may facilitate an educational environment that reinforces consumerism, rather than promotes critical thinking.

As we progress into the technological, information-based, 21st Century, teachers may be eager to utilize new methods involving technology. In response to this instructional need, new products are being marketed towards teachers and students, many with advertising attached. Instructors that choose to incorporate current events, or popular culture into their curriculum may also wish to use materials from other commercial sources, such as ABC, NBC, or MTV. While commercially broadcast materials may present very relevant topics, is there a cost associated with presenting corporately sponsored media in the classroom?

The literature review of this study demonstrates ways in which schools enter into partnerships with external funding sources with the desire of mutual gain. Through small donations and large contracts, corporations are able to get their messages to millions of students each day on textbook covers, satellite television, websites, and DVDs. To some, schools are seen as a powerful market to be privatized.

Trust is seen as a necessary component of education. As a necessary component of education, this study identifies the historical and contemporary understandings of trust and creates and validates a survey instrument capable of measuring trust in an educational setting. The results of this quantitative study show that student trust and comprehension are affected by the endorsement of the educational material.
Preface

As we entered into the 21st Century, educators and educational scholars alike, took notice of the external control of American schooling and research (Bartlett, 2007; Pachter et al., 2007; Spring, 2003). While advertising in public schools isn’t new, it is now taking on a unique form, creating new questions about the purpose and form of public education in America (Boyles, 2005; Molnar, 2005). This dissertation’s exploration is centered around commercialism’s impact on the efficacy of American education through the lens of trust because trust has been acknowledged as the foundation of educational relationships (Bryk & Schneider, 2003; Curzon-Hobson, 2002; Raider-Roth, 2005; Willie, 2000). In this study, I combined these two areas to create the research question to be explored: “How will student trust be affected by the external endorsement of the educational message?”

In Chapter One, I begin this exploration by focusing on the history and dimensions that inform trust as a measurable construct. Throughout this exploration I acknowledges that students are a type of “captive” audience, participating in trusting relationships with their teachers and texts, while attempting to achieve a certain standard – perhaps external to their own control. As I will demonstrate in this dissertation, this means that while students trust the content curriculum, they are also learning within a structural curriculum, which may include the ever-present use of creative advertising (Klein, 1999). Teachers are participants in this process as they often serve as gatekeepers to the development of the student. By omitting certain types of information, teachers also participate by enforcing a “null” curriculum.
But why do schools allow advertising in schools in the first place? Today, schools strive to keep up with mandates to ensure operating funding for the next year (Provenzo, 2002). While this may mean securing federal money through standardized test scores (No Child Left Behind [NCLB], Public Law 107-110), it could also mean partnerships with external entities, such as corporations, non-profits, other schools, or governmental agencies (Boutwell, 1997). Reduction in funding may also result in a change to the structure of education, such as “on-line” high schools, e-texts, and shorter weeks (Noble, 2001). Schools perform a funding balancing act. While curricular materials are essential, they are often very expensive. As tax-supported funding becomes less stable, schools must decide if a partnership would benefit them. At what cost does this decision come?

Although curricular material have been influenced by manufacturing and commercial interests for nearly 100 years (Spring, 2003), the level to which product endorsements reach students today is unprecedented (Boyles, 2005). A good description of the reach of corporate interests into schools can be found in Molnar’s (2005) School Commercialism, in which it is demonstrated that students, from the moment they wake up, to the moment they go to sleep, are surrounded by the messages of product endorsement. Schools must acknowledge the meaning of partnerships that meld advertising to student learning.

The media processes of production, distribution, and exhibition have created an absence of alternatives to messages of violence and competition (Miller, 1990). What does this mean for our students, who may be striving for critical thinking? While Channel One is used as the litmus test for consumerism, and ultimately, hegemonic control in the classroom, many other
corporations are specifically endorsed by the federal government, including Time Inc., Fisher-Price, Barnes and Noble, Verizon, and Target (NCLB Summer Reading Achievers Program).

While some of these simply provide funding, others such as USA Football, provide bookmarks, decals, visors and other materials to students, in addition to incentives to principles to participate. Advertising, or brand recognition, is expected to build life-long student trust in the donor. In Chapter Three, I discuss the context and structure of privatized information, specifically curricular materials such as Channel One. These materials often offer financial incentives, but what effect do they have on the students who are subjected to the advertising? Are they more trusting of corporate messages? Finally, who is more likely to engage in these partnerships?

In the first chapter, I present research that suggests that trust is one of the most important foundations of success. While student trust is widely ignored in the broad educational literature, this is not due to a lack of importance. The literature presented in this dissertation strongly suggests that trust is necessary for learning to occur; therefore, I have chosen to measure student trust as an indicator of learning. The creation and validation of this study’s measurement tools are discussed at length in Chapter Four. Chapter Five reveals the findings of the study, including each tested hypothesis. In the final chapter, I make recommendations to educators and researchers.

I can not stress the urgency of this study as today’s students, both inside the classroom and at home, are being “manufactured” into response-driven, yet passive, consumers. They have been raised with advertising-based television as a third educational institution, along with the
family and the school (Spring, 1993). Students expect commercials on television, but do they expect them at school?
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CHAPTER ONE: THE EVOLUTION AND EVALUATION OF TRUST

As a young college instructor, I have had my fair share of skeptical students, especially in courses about human diversity and social inequalities. Students have expressed their doubt regarding certain topics, such as the on-going civil rights struggle in Cincinnati. As I tried to explain the details of the civil unrest in the city, students questioned what I said. Typically, they will say “how do you know” as if to say we don’t trust you. This immediately brought the issue of trust to the forefront of my teaching — if my students didn’t trust what I was telling them, how effective a teacher would I be?

When probed deeper, students told me that because they had not heard about it from the media, that “it must not be true”. Still interested in the topic, students challenged me to find sources to back up what I had said. I then compiled both traditional and non-traditional sources, including videos and audio recordings from local for-profit news organizations. These corporate sources assuaged the students, seemingly restoring trust in me as the instructor. As I began to question this scenario more deeply, I was led to my thesis that university students, mired in the culture of corporate media, will not demonstrate different levels of trust for corporately endorsed information or information with no endorsement at all, in an educational setting.

In order to investigate this issue, I created a reliable scale intended to measure student trust. To do this, I examined the literature on trust in multiple disciplines. This chapter presents the literature and helps to pull out the main concepts I used to measure trust in this study. In the following chapters, I turn the lens of trust on corporate encroachment on schools and the media in general. Because trust is such an important topic for education, all instructors need to consider the power of the relationship they have with their students.
In this chapter, I present research in several fields to unveil a common set of factors used to measure trust. Although trust is a very important element of the educational experience, it has been neglected in research about Educational Studies, especially regarding student trust of teachers. This lack of attention to student trust in the literature has led to arbitrary assumptions about trust. By exploring trust in great detail, I ultimately make the argument for authentic, rather than hierarchical, trust. I will summarize the leading literature in each of these areas, discussing assumptions about cooperation, risk, reciprocity, familiarity, and mistrust. I will go into considerable detail about early studies because they are often cited by contemporary researchers. Finally, a summary of the contemporary views will be presented, culminating in a discussion of distinct aspects related to measuring trust.

The importance of school trust has been examined by researchers, including Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2000), Bryk and Schneider (2003), Curzon-Hobson (2002), Stancato (2001), and Willie (2000). The most comprehensive review of the literature on trust and its implications for schools is Tschannen-Moran and Hoy’s (2000) “A Multidisciplinary Analysis of the Nature, Meaning, and Measurement of Trust”. They write that “Trust is fundamental to functioning in our complex and interdependent society” (p. 549). All of the research on trust points to the fact that it is both desired and needed for the proper functioning of relationships, schooling, and society as a whole. The research is consistent with my experiences as a college instructor, that had I not regained my students’ trust, I would not be able to effectively teach.

Educational Implications of Student Trust

In educational settings, the thesis of this dissertation assumes trust as one of the most important conditions for learning and teaching; as we will learn later, trust itself educates. In education, building a school’s ethos, or school culture, is a collaborative effort between students,
administrators, teachers, and staff. While the essence of “trust” within education is hard to quantify, this research demonstrates that there are common concepts students use to measure teacher ability. These concepts include a demonstration of professionalism, competence, knowledge, logic, and to a lesser extent benevolence and integrity. These concepts will be explored throughout this chapter.

Trust is important facet of any school’s ethos. From the literature, it is clear that there are many benefits to trust in schools, including the professionalism of teachers. Trust between teachers can create openness where “teachers are pleased to share professional secrets, successful teaching strategies, materials, and equipment in the interest of helping students learn” (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2000, p. 572). Tschannen-Moran & Hoy (2000) write on trust:

Not only has trust been linked to effectiveness and quality theoretically, in the past decade, empirical evidence has demonstrated the significant role of trust in school effectiveness and student achievement. (p. 584)

Bryk & Schneider (2003) discuss the findings of a longitudinal analysis of successfully restructuring schools which concludes that trust has received too little attention. In regards to the importance of trust in all aspects of schooling, Tschannen-Moran & Hoy (2000) conclude:

Trust makes a difference in student achievement, teachers’ collective sense of efficacy, and overall school effectiveness. If schools are to function well, they need trust. (p. 584)

Trust between teachers is essential for enhanced learning; however, trust is required for other relationships to exist within the school ethos. Stancato (2001) claims schools, who develop trusting relationships, will be more successful in preventing school violence, than those who use punitive measures. Even with the assertions above, much of the educational research fails to reflect the position that student trust in teachers is explicitly valued.
As education may be described as an act of exploration, teachers must nurture the trust of their students in order to allow the student to have freedom to make mistakes, learn, and develop. Instructors in higher education must create dialogic learning environments that allow students to view instructors as authentic human beings, rather than simply as authority figures. Curzon-Hobson (2002) writes that “in order for students to feel that trust, they must sense that the teacher is also imbued by the will to potentiality, and that he or she exists as a learner, and needs this particular learning environment to further realize and test out his or her understanding” (p. 269). Curzon-Hobson (2002) also demonstrate that students must trust the instructor to “direct the learning process… create depth, direction, and rigor” (p. 270) and if the instructor does not gain student trust in these areas, students will disengage. Curzon-Hobson (2002) concludes that “trust is not something that can be stimulated or realized through prescriptive policy, but rather developed through a freedom that generates teacher’s energy and imagination” (p. 274).

Finally, the need for trust within the school is underscored by Willie (2000):

This is the essence of trust, depending on others without fear that they will take advantage of one’s weakness. Because opening up oneself to learning is to experience vulnerability, a person needs reassurance that he or she will not be harmed. (p. 3)

In sum, this research accurately portrays my students’ reluctance to accept what I had learned from my experience in the on-going civil rights movement. They were struggling with trusting me because they were unsure if I was being benevolent, and providing them with accurate information that would suit their needs. At some level, these students were also calling into question the integrity of the information I was presenting. Students need to have the opportunity to see me as a learner myself to begin to trust the perspective I present. Therefore, by
bringing in the corporate media references, the students we able to sense the respect and acceptance I had for them.

School Trust – Developing School Ethos

Although Curzon-Hobson (2002) acknowledges the role of trust in higher education, much of the research on trust in schools focuses around teachers and administrators. In Curzon-Hobson’s recent article in Teaching in Higher Education it is asserted that “trust is a fundamental element in the pursuit of higher learning for it is only through a sense of trust that students will embrace an empowering experience of freedom, and the exercise of this freedom requires a risk on behalf of students and their teacher” (p. 266). It became clear to me that this freedom may be applicable to all learning situations. And furthermore, “This sense of freedom and the experience of risk is that which underpins students’ projections to realize their unique potentiality” (p. 266). To highlight this necessary freedom, Curzon-Hobson (2002) goes on to explain the dynamic of professionalism within teacher-student relations:

This is a trust, therefore, not simply to provide and create, but also restrain and control… It is a student’s trust that the teacher is not only ‘present’, but also challenging and demanding. (p. 271)

Stancato (2001), writing in response to egregious violations of trust, school shootings, noted that trust is an important part of ensuring the general welfare of a school. After explicating the role of trust in the school and the possible avenues of distrust, he concludes “schools characterized by low trust relationships run the risk of causing individuals to feel unworthy and possibly rejected by peers and teachers” (p. 3). Without trust among all school members, whether student, teacher, administrator, or staff, schools may become unstable, and dangerously unsafe.
Willie (2000) writes on the reciprocal nature of trust in his article “Confidence, Trust and Respect: The Preeminent Goals of Educational Reform” in the Journal of Negro Education. He states “We trust people who believe in us and belief is a property of confidence. It is because teachers evidence confidence in their students that students risk trusting their teachers” (p. 3). Willie (2000) concludes with, “Thus, I classify confidence, trust and respect as the three operative and most important concepts in education and school reform. It is through the relationships of respect, confidence and trust that we transform a learning environment into a genuine learning community” (p. 3).

Bryk & Schneider (2003) insist that trust is essential in school improvement and claim that “social trust among teachers, parents, and school leaders improves much of the routine work of schools and is a key resource for reform” (p. 41). They cite several studies to embolden their claim that “a growing body of case studies and clinical narratives directs our attention to the engaging but elusive idea of social trust as essential for meaningful school improvement” (p. 41).

This literature stresses the importance of the awareness of trust to ensure learning opportunities, yet the study of student trust has been widely neglected. As I continued my search for a deeper understanding of trust between students and teachers, I began to see the cyclical nature of the study of trust across disciplines. Up to this point, most of the literature presented has focused on benevolence, integrity, and professionalism. I use the rest of this chapter to present a multi-discipline review, ultimately laying the foundation for the study of trust in the classroom that builds on these concepts (benevolence, integrity, and professionalism), while constructing the case for the inclusion of more aspects of trust.
An Ethical Approach

In general, the literature that I present in this chapter agrees that there has been a dearth of research on the heuristic nature of trust. Hosmer (1995) examined the Encyclopedia of Ethics I (1992) and found that it “devotes less than 2 of its 600 pages to a discussion of the topic, and then cites only minor passages from Aristotle and Locke” (p. 394). Hosmer (1995) continues, “Trust, consequently, was pushed to the background of normative ethics; it remained a result of proper actions, not a part of proper actions” (pp. 394-395).

Foltz and Foltz (2005) also present a wide review of the literature on trust. Writing on the Social Capital School they quote Fukuyama (as cited in Foltz & Foltz, 1993, p. 122) who builds upon the notion of professionalism in normative ethics:

Trust is the expectation that arises within a community of regular, honest, and cooperative behavior, based on commonly shared norms on the part of the other members of that community. Those norms can be about deep value questions such as the nature of God or justice; however, they can also encompass secular norms such as professional standards and codes of behavior. (Fukuyama, 1995, p. 26)

Foltz and Foltz (2005) describe this type of trust as “traditional” and what others may see as “familiarity” (p. 122). Their work sheds light on how theories, such as those presented by the the Social Capital School, assert “high-trust societies are also prosperous ones (p. 122)” and that trust may be understood in terms of class. “In this vein, they present information from “The World Values Survey (Inglehart et al., 1998) [that] reported that people with higher education and higher incomes are significantly higher trusters than those with lower ones” (Foltz & Foltz, 2005, p. 122). The Social Capital School is a generalized belief that humans carry with them an ability to create and sustain wealth.
Hosmer (1995) presents a summary of the classical ethicists’ benevolence-based position on trust, which, in general, “focus[es] on what is ‘good’ for the society rather than on what is ‘good’ for the individual” (p. 399):

Each of the first principles or decision rules or alternative perspectives from the classical ethicists asserts that a “good” man or woman should act not for his or her short-term self gain only, but for a mixture of that gain together with his or her vision of the future (Protagoras), his or her sense of self-worth (Aristotle), his or her goal of community (St. Augustine), his or her fear of retribution (Hobbes), his or her calculation of social benefit (Mill), his or her understanding of universal duty (Kant), or his or her recognition of individual rights (Jefferson). (p. 395)

Hosmer (1995) declares that “cooperation was the major theme of moral philosophy, and that trust was essential to gain cooperation” (p. 398). From an ethical view, trust is an on-going negotiation of societal and personal norms. Trust could be exchanged for cooperation, or sold as form of capital. In the past, cooperation was a necessary component of survival. In the following section, I explore a creative study designed to help understand how cooperation, individualism, and competition affect the dynamics of trust.

**Deutsch’s Landmark Prisoner Dilemma Study**

Early studies in psychology have contributed greatly to the body of knowledge surrounding trust. Morton Deutsch (1958) is often credited with the first studies interested in measured trust among study participants. To better understand the need for study in this area, Deutsch (1958) wrote:

> Discussions of such problems as the armaments race, mental illness, the “hidden persuaders,” and juvenile delinquency employ such terms as “trust,” “suspicion,”
“betrayal,” “faith.” Past preoccupations and current concerns make it apparent that the concept of “trust” and its related concepts are vital to the understanding both of social life and of personality development. (p. 265)

About Deutsch’s basic assumption, Hosmer (1995) wrote, “Deutsch (1958) believed that trust was the non-rational choice of a person faced with an uncertain event in which the expected loss was greater than the expected gain” (p. 381). The assumption that risk is a part of trust comes from this model. Before Deutsch, the study of trust had been seriously overlooked in the research fields. Tschannen-Moran & Hoy (2000) claim “Deutsch’s work set off an avalanche of experiments involving mixed-motive games” (p. 565).

The study of trust in the United States can be traced back to Morton Deutsch (1958), a researcher at Bell Labs who published in the Journal of Conflict Resolution. His article entitled “Trust and Suspicion” became the basis of years of research during the Cold War in which it was hoped that understanding trust would become a way of de-escalating a possible arms war (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2000). It was believed that if we knew the conditions that would enable the enemy to trust us, we could either exploit that trust or enter into a cease-fire agreement. Deutsch (1958) understood that “Risk-taking and trusting behavior are … really different sides of the same coin” and then began to use games in order to study ways in which communication affected trust (p. 266).

Deutsch (1958) was concerned with understanding if different types of “orientations” — co-operative, individualistic, competitive, or reciprocal — would have an impact on the level of trust the subjects would demonstrate. He concluded “that expectations of co-operation from the other person were very likely to be confirmed for subjects with a co-operative orientation but were very likely to be disconfirmed for those with an individualistic or competitive orientation”
(p. 272). Furthermore, “the behavior resulting from an individualistic orientation is very much
influenced by situational determinants” (p. 273). Deutsch (1958) described four elements that are
required for co-operative relationships: “(1) expectation, (2) intention, (3) retaliation, and (4)
absolution” (p. 273). Here retaliation could be thought about as an acknowledgement, response,
or recourse, rather than a measurable penalty. Ultimately, Deutsch struggled to create a
comprehensive definition of trust. He asserted that “‘trust’ involves the notion of motivational
relevance as well as the notion of predictability” (Deutsch, p. 265), which led to the use of
mixed-motive games for his study.

Deutsch (1958) centered his study around mixed-motive Prisoner Dilemma Games (PD
Games) in which one participant’s response is dependent on how much he or she trusts the other
participant. The premise for PD Games surrounds two people who are arrested for committing a
crime. At first neither of the accused will confess, but they are told that if they tell on the other
person they will receive a lesser sentence for aiding the police in their investigation. Each of the
accused is forced to question their trust for the other. If the trust between the two is very strong,
and neither one will tell on the other, then they will both be let free — the maximum benefit.
However, if prisoner A confesses and accuses prisoner B, then prisoner A will receive a lesser
sentence, and prisoner B will receive the harshest penalty. This is the basic premise for PD
Games.

Initially, Deutsch was unsure if trust could even be measured. His hypotheses asserted:
(1) as the individual’s confidence that his trust will be fulfilled is increased, the
probability of his engaging in trusting behavior will be increased; and (2) as the ratio of
anticipated positive to anticipated negative motivational consequences increases, the
probability of his engaging in trusting behavior will be increased. (Deutsch, p. 268)
He wanted to look more deeply into the factors that make up trust by focusing on “the nature of the intentions that the individual perceives his potential object of trust to have; the perceived power of the object of trust to cause the desired events; the power relationship between the individual and his object of trust; [and] the influence of communication upon the development of trust…” (p. 269). It is the final factor, based upon communication, that Deutsch’s study most reflects.

Deutsch defined three types of motivational orientations:

(a) *co-operative* — each subject was led to feel that the welfare of the other person as well as his own welfare was of concern to him and that the other person felt the same way; (b) *individualistic* — each subject was led to feel that his *only* interest was in doing as well for himself as he could without regard to how well the other person did and that the other person felt the same way; (c) *competitive* — each subject was led to feel that he wanted to do as well as he could for himself and he also wanted to do better that the other person and that the other person felt the same way. (p. 270)

While focusing on these three motivations, Deutsch (1958) demonstrated that “a co-operative orientation primarily leads the individual to make a co-operative choice and results in mutual gain, while a competitive orientation primarily leads the individual to make a non-co-operative choice and results in mutual loss” (p. 271). He also found that individualistic orientations are influenced by the experimental conditions, meaning “trust in co-operative behavior from another can reside in the situational determinants of his behavior rather than in his character” (p. 273).

Deutsch (1958) was also interested in understanding the role communication plays in trust and proceeded to do subsequent studies in this area. In these studies he allowed communication to occur between the participants and found that “when the subject has some
power, rather than none, to influence the outcome of his partner, he is more likely to expect trustworthy behavior and is also more likely to make a trusting choice” (p. 276). Deutsch (1958) also found that “an individual is more likely to trust another (a) if he believes the other person has nothing to gain from untrustworthy behavior and (b) if he perceives that he is able to exert some control over the other person’s outcome” (p. 277). Finally, Deutsch’s (1958) study demonstrated that “the introduction of a third party, that is mutually disliked by the participants, can increase the tendency to make trusting (and trustworthy) choices” (p. 278).

Deutsch (1958) did more than just help define the types of orientations that one may take in any given situation — he also opened the door for research into trust. For the expansion of the ability to measure trust in a study setting, Deutsch (1958) expressed the most important finding of his work as follows:

It is possible to capture in the laboratory the phenomenon of “trust” and to study experimentally some of the variables which influence the tendency to engage in “trusting” and “responsible” behavior. (p. 278)

Organizational and Social Implications

Although trust is often thought of as interpersonal, it can also be part of groups and complex social systems. A useful understanding of social trust may be seen as “institution-based trust” as summarized by Tschannen-Moran & Hoy (2000):

Institution-based trust is supported by formal social structures that confer trust, such as having a license or certification to practice a profession, or mechanisms such as guarantees, insurance, or contracts (Creed & Miles, 1996). Informal social structures also contribute to trust. (p. 562)
Hosmer (1995) writes that “Weber was the first to observe that formal social mechanisms, such as the legal system, were designed to ‘guarantee or secure trustworthy conduct.’ The process of economic development tended, he believed, to shift the focus of trust from a personal relationship to a social mechanism” (p. 388). Hosmer (1995) continues: “This shift, if true, would help to explain the varying definitions of trust; the concept would differ depending upon the stage of economic development reached by a given society” (p. 388).

The scholarly view of trust has changed slightly over the years within a framework of psychological orientations and sociological institutions. Foltz (2005) writes on this shift in our understanding of trust by sociologists Luhmann (2000) and Giddens (1990) when he claims “they examine the move from the familiarity of traditional bodily-present communities where trust had to do primarily with interpersonal relationships to the remoteness of the modern world where it has to do with abstract systems” (p. 116). Foltz continues that other scholars “define trust in terms of social capital” (p. 118) while Tschannen-Moran & Hoy recognize that “early measures of trust were experimental and conceived of trust as observable behaviors. These measures looked at trust reactions in interactions with strangers” (p. 564).

Zand (1972) provides useful tools for the analysis of trust in managerial situations. In the Administrative Science Quarterly, Zand (1972) elucidates the importance of trust in business:

One who does not trust others will conceal or distort relevant information, and avoid stating or will disguise facts, ideas, conclusions and feelings that he believes will increase his exposure to others, so that that information he provides will be low in accuracy, comprehensiveness, and timeliness; and therefore will have low congruence with reality. (p. 230)
Zand (1972) concludes that his “results indicate that it is useful to conceptualize trust as behavior that conveys appropriate information, permits mutuality of influence, encourages self-control, and avoids abuse of the vulnerability of others” (p. 238). Essentially, the argument for competence as a precursor to trust is being made by Zand (1972), which will be incorporated into the research study.

Luhmann (1979) expanded the issue of trust to the modern world by asserting trust as an effective form of complexity reduction and possibility enhancement. From the perspective of a sociologist, Luhmann (1979) writes “Trust occurs within a framework of interaction which is influenced by both personality and social system, and cannot be exclusively associated with either” (p. 6). Similar to Deutsch (1958) he also claimed that for one to “show trust is to anticipate the future” (p. 10) and that there exists a “critical alternative, in which the harm resulting from a breach of trust may be greater than the benefit to be gained from the trust proving warranted” (p. 24).

As Luhmann (1979) was interested in understanding trust as a complexity reducer, he also saw trust as a combination of knowledge and ignorance that is “learned, just like any other kind of generalization” (p. 27). Luhmann (1979) makes the case that even with modernity, trust is still needed. Luhmann (1979) writes:

Trusting other people no longer automatically comprehends, as a matter of course, treating their view of the world as authoritative. One has to learn to put up with different ways of looking at the world, linking one’s own behavior nevertheless to the selections of others. (p. 49)

One of the most important aspects of Luhmann’s (1979) work is the transfer of personal trust into system trust — essentially mechanisms designed to keep risk under control. In writing
about boundaries that are maintained by systems in order to control trust Luhmann (1979) writes, “It is a basic thesis of systems theory that systems constitute themselves by means of the distinction between inner and outer and maintain themselves by stabilizing this boundary” (p. 90). In system trust, this boundary is the zone between trust and distrust that is maintained by systematic regulations that enhance or degrade trust. Luhmann (1979) hypothesizes about systems-theory:

a social system which requires, or cannot avoid, trusting behavior among its members for certain functions, needs at the same time mechanisms which prevent distrust from gaining the upper hand, and, from being reciprocated by a process of reciprocal escalation, turned into a destructive force. (p. 75)

Luhmann (1979) writes “neither trust nor distrust is feasible as a universal attitude. That would either be too risky or too great a burden” (p. 72). He continues:

Consequently distrust also achieves simplification, often drastic simplification. A person who distrust[s]… becomes more dependent on less information. …strategies of distrust become correspondingly more difficult and more burdensome. They often absorb the strength of the person who distrusts to an extent which leaves him little energy to explore and adapt to his environment in an objective and unprejudiced manner, and hence allow him fewer opportunities for learning. Relatively, trust is the easier option, and for this reason there is a strong incentive to begin a relationship with trust. (p. 72)

As Luhmann (1979) demonstrated, students who are distrustful in general, may become more dependent on less information; therefore less willing to further their knowledge base. In education, trust becomes an issue of importance, as students are encouraged to question and keep and open mind, while simultaneously asked to accept standardized curricula.
Contemporary Viewpoints

Organizational Management

In regard to the advancements of the study of trust in organizational management, there has been some consensus on the factors related to trust. Mayer and Davis (1995) write that “even though a number of factors have been proposed, three characteristics of a trustee appear often in the literature: ability, benevolence, and integrity” (p. 717); however, there is also some variation in strength of these factors that is dependant on situational determinants. Hosmer (1995) demonstrates that “inequality of position” (p. 384) can cause differences in trust levels while five factors — integrity, competence, consistency, loyalty, and openness — were factors in other studies. Butler (1991, p. 647, as quoted in Hosmer, 1995, p. 385) reached the conclusion:

The literature on trust has converged on the beliefs that (a) trust is an important aspect of interpersonal relationships, (b) trust is essential to the development of managerial careers, and (c) trust in a specific person is more relevant in terms of predicting outcomes than is the global attitude of trust in generalized others.

Hosmer (1995) makes several conclusions regarding the organizational theory literature:

1. Trust is generally expressed as an optimistic expectation on the part of an individual about the outcome of an event or the behavior of a person.

2. Trust generally occurs under conditions of vulnerability to the interests of the individual and dependence upon the behavior of the other people.

3. Trust is generally associated with willing, not forced, cooperation and with the benefits resulting from that cooperation.

4. Trust is generally difficult to enforce.
5. Trust is generally accompanied by an assumption of an acknowledged or accepted duty to protect the rights and interests of others. Hosmer’s (1995) conclusions demonstrate the incredible difficulty in maintaining trust on an organizational level. To this regard, Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2000) state:

Superiors can promote trust by demonstrating benevolence: showing consideration and sensitivity for employees’ needs and interests, acting in a way that protects employees’ rights, and refraining from exploiting others for the benefit of personal interests. Trust is also enhanced by a willingness to apologize for unpleasant consequences. (p. 571)

Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2000) claim that “employees see managers as trustworthy when their communication is accurate and forthcoming” (p. 571) and that “research has shown that subordinates perceive greater trustworthiness on the part of superiors who share control, including participation in decision making and delegating control” (p. 572). However, they continue, “both policy and norms are important in development of organizational trust” (p. 574) and “policies must be in place that demonstrate an expectation of trustworthy behavior on the part of organizational participants, but means must also be available to respond to breaches of trust” (p. 574). This adds another aspect to trust, logicality, or that the information that is being shared makes sense, and is easy incorporated into one’s point of view.

There is a special relationship between trust and distrust; Foltz and Foltz (2005) write “increased contact and interaction can build distrust as well as trust” (p. 122). Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2000) show how betrayal is also a part of distrust:

Betrayal involves a behavior (an actual violation) rather than simply the thought of betraying. And even if the violation of expectations is not detected by the trustor, it still constitutes a betrayal. Betrayal is voluntary, in that trustees either lack the motivation to
conform to the expectations of the trustor or become motivated to violate these expectations. (p. 576)

Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2000) also make the claim that “although relationships necessarily involve two parties, it takes only one of these parties to change the quality of the relationship” (p. 579). And, finally, to repair trust Lewicki and Bunker (1996, as cited in Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2000, p. 580) cite four courses for trust repair:

1. The victim refuses to accept any actions, terms, or conditions for reestablishing the relationship.
2. The victim acknowledges forgiveness but specifies “unreasonable” acts of reparation.
3. The victim acknowledges forgiveness but specifies “reasonable” acts of reparation.
4. The victim simply acknowledges forgiveness and indicates that no further acts of reparation are necessary.

*Measuring Consumer Trust*

A more recent application of the study of trust in psychology has been on the use of e-commerce sites to facilitate purchases from online vendors. McKnight, Choudhury, and Kacmar (2004) examined behavioral intentions of consumers by measuring “three specific behaviors: a. follow the advice of the web vendor; b. share personal information with the vendor; and c. purchase goods or services from the vendor” (p. 301). In their quest to define trust and trust factors they noticed a similar pattern as stated throughout this literature review:

Over time, researchers have migrated towards three or four such beliefs — integrity (trustee honesty and promise keeping), benevolence (trustee caring and motivation to act in the trustor’s interests), competence (ability of the trustee to do what the trustor needs), and predictability (consistency of trustee behavior). (p. 303)
Ultimately, the study found that “trust has a strong influence on [the] three consumer intentions” (p. 313) and “consumers cared more about integrity and benevolence than about competence when it came to purchasing” (p. 315). They made this suggestion to the e-commerce world:

Vendors should take careful steps to communicate their integrity/honesty and benevolence to prospective consumers in order to entice them to share personal information and make purchases. (p. 315)

Important Considerations of Trust

Five major aspects about trust have emerged from this literature review: cooperation, risk, reciprocity, familiarity, and potential mistrust. Each aspect discussed in this section has major implications for any study related to trust. Hosmer (1995), Foltz (2005), and Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2000), all write about the need for societies to be cooperative in order to succeed. They further purport that in order for business, education, and all sectors of social life to flourish, trust must be the backbone of cooperation. The assumption that trust underpins all aspects of behavior is part of this study – meaning, that all situations are trust measurable.

Risk is perhaps the most considered aspect of trust. Deutsch (1958) wrote that “risk-taking and trusting behavior are thus really different sides of the same coin” (p. 266). His understanding of risk revolved around the act of parents letting strangers watch over their small children. As was stated earlier, there is an assumed possible loss when trust is involved that may be much larger than the gain received from the trusting action. Studies of trust must examine the possible risks being simulated.

Bok’s (1978) assertion about the reciprocal nature of trust (as cited in Foltz, 2000, p. 118) demonstrates the complexity of the assumption of reciprocity of trust:
The function of the principle of veracity is evident when we think of trust: that you will treat me fairly, that you will have my interests at heart, that you will do me no harm. But if I do not trust your work, can I have genuine trust in the first three? If there is no confidence in the truthfulness of others, is there any way to assess their fairness, their intention to help or to harm? How, the, can they be trusted? Whatever matters to human beings, trust is the atmosphere in which it happens. (p. 31)

Foltz (2000) further writes that “Trust gives the other the benefit of the doubt, a leap of faith beyond pure prediction” (p. 122). This lens helps to demonstrate that there is an assumption of reciprocity, creating trusting relationships among two or more parties.

The next consideration of trust is contained within the concept of familiarity, which basically means that trusting relationships grow with time, through interaction, unless trust is broken. This assumption takes into account psychological perspectives and sociological mechanisms that further trust.

Finally, once trust has been broken, a state of mistrust ensues. In an educational environment, distrust spells disaster, as students may be unable to learn if they do not trust the information or processes within education. When my students question what I am telling them, are they questioning me, or the information? Do they distrust me generally, or is it the way I present the information to them? Is it possible that students have the ability to trust information, but not the source of the information? As these questions have been informed by the presented literature, I will attempt to create a set of terms that will enable me to study trust in the classroom. The following section summarizes definitions of trust, and ends with a set of terms that will aid in the measurement of trust.
Definitions

In order to design a measurement instrument to test student trust of teachers, I needed to explore, and now summarize, the historical constructions and definitions of trust. While most definitions include integrity, benevolence, competence and predictability, other considerations have been made in defining trust. As discussed earlier, the work of Morton Deutsch (1958) is regarded as the most important early development in the study of trust. Many researchers have intertwined their definition with Deutsch’s (1958) definition that included risk.

Zand (1979) builds upon the work of Deutsch (1958) by including “vulnerability” as an aspect of trusting behavior (p. 230). He continues to diverge from Deutsch’s (1958) work by renaming penalty as “disutility” and benefit as “utility” in regards to the risk one takes in engaging in trusting behavior (p. 230).

Tshannen-Moran and Hoy’s (2000) comprehensive work brings together several definitions of trust through a multidisciplinary lens:

From a philosophical perspective, trust has to do with ethically and morally justifiable behavior (Baier, 1986; Hosmer, 1995); in economic terms, however, trust is a rational calculation of costs and benefits (Coleman, 1990; Williamson, 1993). In individual terms, trust is conceived as the extent to which people are willing to rely upon others and make themselves vulnerable (Frost, Stimpson, & Maughan, 1978; Rotter, 1967). From an organizational perspective, trust is often a collective judgment that another group will not act opportunistically, is honest in negotiations, and makes a good faith effort to behave in accordance with commitments (Bradach & Eccles, 1989; Cummings & Bromily, 1996).
This literature provided a foundational lens to study student trust. Based heavily on the literature presented in this chapter, I have concluded that the measurement of trust should include the following components: (a) benevolence, (b) integrity, (c) competence, (d) knowledge, (e) logicality, and (f) professionalism. The combination of these aspects make up the lens used throughout the data collection procedure. The conceptual definition that I will use throughout this study is as follows: Trust encompasses many perceived aspects, including benevolence, integrity, competence, knowledge-base, logicality, and professionalism. In a later chapter, I describe the method I used to create a reliable instrument capable of measuring multiple aspects of student trust.

Teachers searching for a deeper level of trust from their students should focus on each of the components included in my definition. The observations of multiple researchers described in this chapter galvanize the argument that trust is needed for learning; therefore, it can be assumed that the more trust a student has in a teacher, the more the student will ultimately learn. This assumption will augment the research study discussed later in great detail. Teachers should not rely on hierarchical methods of classroom management that enforces rules rather than values. Teachers must recognize themselves as life-long learners, who are adaptable, just as students are. By focusing on these components teachers will be able to create authentic relationships with their students.

In the following chapter, I apply the lens of trust to the media in order to view the relationship of the media to students. I also use the media as an avenue of exploration of the messages students receive outside of the classroom. As was the case with my students in my courses on social inequalities, students often believe that all Americans are given the same opportunities to succeed — in essence, students trust the privilege mythology within the
American Dream. The following chapter examines the power and influence of the media to demonstrate the media’s grasp on students.
CHAPTER TWO: SCHOOL CURRICULA: GOOD ‘TIL THE LAST DROP

Students are actively negotiating trust with their environment, both inside and outside of school. They learn to (dis)trust their peers, teachers and schools through a variety of curricula, most of which are beyond student control. In this chapter, I discuss three specific forms of curricula involved in student trust: (a) hidden, (b) null, and (c) popular. I do not discuss the formal curriculum, as in the standardized curriculum, although it interacts with all of the other curricula in various ways. I end this chapter with a discussion on liminality, or being between. Students may lack the ability to be critical trustors, as they mediate their activity in each curriculum.

In the information age, students exist within a liminal space, between the curricula described in this chapter. Each curricula has implications for a school’s ethos, and more importantly, each curricula impacts student trust. The first curriculum is the hidden curriculum, or what is taught to students informally, often unrecognized by students themselves. Trust enables the hidden curriculum to mediate traditions, manners, customs, and roles within a school.

The second curriculum discussed in this chapter is the null curriculum. Essentially, the null curriculum is what isn’t being taught to students. The dialogue surrounding the null curriculum demonstrates that certain topics may be considered taboo in schools, and left out all together, in order to fulfill a particular cultural or ideological end. The null curriculum may contribute to ideological beliefs that distort historical facts, and ultimately, misplace trust. What we think of as propaganda fits conceptually into the null curriculum and is discussed in this chapter as well.
Outside of school, students are engaged in a popular curriculum, one that can be found on media outlets, clothing, and now, the Internet. This final popular curriculum is a controlled process of consumer culture highly dependent upon participant trust. Without participant trust, the structure of the media may be completely altered, or rendered altogether ineffective. The media has evolved rapidly in the past century. As it evolved, it formed a specific commercial structure, laying trust as its foundation. Commercialism represents the current popular curriculum and is discussed in this chapter.

Finally, I end this chapter with the problem of student trust; how do students negotiate trust when the lines between the curricula become less clear, or merge? As I demonstrated in the previous chapter, trust is essential in the process of teaching and learning. This chapter is designed as an overview of key curricular areas in which student trust is active.

The Hidden Curriculum

Teachers and schools are agents of trust, and should carefully consider the unintended messages they may pass to students because no part of American life has remained free from the grasp of corporate interests (Apple, 1985). As students participate in traditions, they are learning to trust their school and learn how to behave properly. They learn to trust the role of the teacher, and trust the customs associated with school. The hidden curriculum may be thought of as proper etiquette, but it also includes a wide worldview, one that negotiates trust in the production of school, and in the production of advertising.

In addition to the forms of curricula that affect trust, two main locations of trust exist, internal and external. Internal trust is the regard students have for peers and teachers. External
trust is garnished through exposure to texts, promotions, and other curricular materials. Educational institutions, motivated by the need to update curricular materials and technology, incorporate external commercial messaging through product placement, direct advertising, and even through the choice of textbooks (Spring, 2003). Student trust for commercial messaging may vary; however, as incidence of advertising in schools increase, the likelihood that trust increases for external sources may be rising.

Another pervasive way advertising reaches American classrooms is through Channel One (McChesney, 1993), which will be discussed in depth in the next chapter. Many advertising-based school partnerships, such as Channel One, have “strings attached” such as distribution regulations, time requirements, and exclusivity contracts. These restrictions give corporations direct access to students, effectively monitoring each student as a consumer. Acts of surveillance are becoming more necessary to fulfill the requirements of the federal No Child Left Behind Act (Public Law 107-110), commonly known as NCLB. NCLB focuses upon high-stakes tests, in that, schools that fail to reach certain measures may lose federal funding. NCLB also mandates that all students are accessible by military recruiters (Public Law 107-110, SEC. 9528). Opting out of this maze of corporate and military control has become increasingly difficult — perhaps impossible for students in America's schools.

This hidden curriculum makes it nearly impossible for students to opt out of advertising from one source or another. Students are not taught to deconstruct advertising to uncover hidden messages. Rather, students are led into putting trust into commercial messaging by their schools. Teachers and administrators could mediate this hidden curriculum readily; however, the current
trend in education is to increase technology-based learning, effectively relocating student trust. If advertisers had their way, no message of consumerism will be left behind.

The Null Curriculum

Schools are expected to present a curriculum that will benefit the student and society. Through curriculum, schools demonstrate their benevolence, integrity, and knowledge-base. Although curriculum is often understood as a collection of materials, there is another form of curriculum that is equally as powerful – the null curriculum. Eugene Provenzo, Jr. (2005) writes in Critical Literacy: What Every American Ought to Know that the power of omission is great:

By choosing certain content, we make clear cultural and political statements about what is of significance to us as a society. Traditional mores and values are sustained and stabilized via the null curriculum [emphasis added]. (p. 42)

The power of omission, or the effect of the null curriculum, is very strong, and obviously so. A old saying goes something like “To the Victor Goes the Spoils” which demonstrates that those who are successful in the past are offered immortality through placement in the curriculum — those who lose, end up in the null curriculum, or the stories that are left out because they do not further certain ideological ends. Therefore, student trust is placed in one set curriculum.

Recently Berlowitz, Long, and Jackson (2006) made the case that African Americans and their perspectives have been excluded from the curriculums of Peace Education to the detriment of a real sound national peace education curriculum. Textbooks and other educational materials are very politicized and offer insights into the success or failures of history. The null curriculum forces us to question who the Victor of history really is, and what happens when many other
“voices” are left out of both curriculum and popular culture. How do students learn to trust what is there, as well as what is missing?

Propaganda

With any message, there is some form of agenda, or intended effect. The expression of this agenda may be considered propaganda. Usually, I think of propaganda in dealing with news accounts, but it may be thought of as part of the null curriculum. Propaganda takes on three forms: white, gray, and black (Jowett & O’Donnell, 1999). White propaganda builds credibility, and the information is accurate. Gray propaganda builds credibility, but the accuracy of the information may be in question. Black propaganda includes all forms of creative deceit, and is meant to spread lies, fabrications, and deceptions. I think it’s important for me to note that propaganda is not always a bad thing, rather propaganda is often a by-product of meaning-laden messages, conveyed through various forms of technology in the production of power.

Students must make trust decisions regarding the messages they receive in schools and in the media. They are asked to trust, rather than question information sources, especially texts. In addition, according to Jowell & O’Donnell (1999), disinformation means “false, incomplete, or misleading information that is passed, fed, or confirmed to a targeted individual, group, or country” (p. 11). In Lies My Teacher Told Me, educator Jim Loewen (1995) demonstrates the existence of disinformation in schools. To accept that schools do not have an ideological ends would be naïve, and would end essential discussion within the social foundations of education.

Ultimately, it is these forms of communication – propaganda, disinformation, and omission – that combine to create a system of student trust that may be entrenched in the
structures and values of capitalistic culture. Students are faced with important questions of trust both inside, and outside of the classroom, but the issue is widely ignored. In popular culture, trust is an active part of the process. In the next section, I explicate certain considerations related to the popular culture curriculum.

Popular Curriculum

The popular curriculum surrounds students when they are outside of their classrooms. Students are exposed to countless commercials, brands, and other corporate identifiers on a daily basis. They see simulated acts of violence in commercials, cartoons, and movies. These notions of popular culture in America are important to examine because it is possible for students to be unknowingly influenced by societal norms. The popular curriculum may prevent students from participating in a critical conversation about branding and school-based endorsements. Therefore, this section builds a framework of the popular curriculum. This section on popular culture relies on Spring (2003) and Fisk (1989). Other authors who are important to this analysis include Buckingham (1998), Farber, Provenzo, and Holm (1994), and Klein (2000).

Creative marketers attempt to maximize profits by seamlessly melding products into the student’s life. This process relies on trust, and intends to motivate students to purchase and consume. Because trust is such a big focus of brand advertising, students become susceptible to the message of consumerism. This process requires trust on the part of the consumer because without trust, there could be no consumer transaction. Often, students are unable to opt of these messages, solidifying consumerism and commercialism into the popular curriculum.

Spring (2003) ominously warns us that commercialism creates a culture where
consumption equals equality, merit equals product consumption, and the mindset that we should all “be united in efforts to maximize the production and consumption of goods” (p. 6).

Commercialism, Spring (2003) argues, creates a culture where people believe that “advertising is good because it motivates people to work harder to consume products” and that people feel that “the consumption of products will transform one’s life.” Each of these conditions of commercialism is present in, and perhaps perpetuated by, popular culture as well as schools. In essence, the presence of advertising insists that Americans be consumers only, and leave their class and civil standing behind. As we will find out in the next chapter, students are not marketed to in a way commensurate with their social and class standing.

Consumerism is essential in the creation of popular culture because it exists as a conversation between the producers and the consumers. Fiske (1989) purports that this conversation allows for culture industries to target the consumers, who will be making new meaning out of a repertoire of cultural texts. In the popular curriculum, ideology is created through the consumption of cultural texts. Fiske (1989) gives parameters for this conversation:

The producers and distributors of [products] do not intend to promote capitalist ideology with their product: they are not deliberate propagandists. Rather, the economic system, which determines mass production and mass consumption, reproduces itself ideologically in its commodities. Every commodity reproduces the ideology of the system that produced it: a commodity is ideology made material. This ideology works to produce in the subordinate a false consciousness of their position in society, false for two reasons: first because it blinds them to the conflict of interest between the bourgeoisie and
proletariat, ... and second because it blinds them to their common interests with their fellow workers — it prevents the development of a sense of class solidarity or class consciousness. Ideology works in the sphere of culture as economics does in its own sphere, to naturalize the capitalist system so that it appears to be the only one possible. (p. 14)

Students, as participants in the popular culture, are unable to obtain a culture separate from the products of the capitalist system. Fiske (1989) claims “excorporation” (p. 15) limits the notion of a pure, or “authentic” folk culture one may obtain; in essence, the subordinate need the products of the dominant system to create popular culture, while, at the same time, the dominate system needs the popular culture of the subordinate to mimic and market. This tension leads to an ongoing struggle between the dominant and subordinate culture, known as popular culture.

Ultimately, Fiske (1989) makes the argument for the case of liminality:

The 'art of being in between' is the art of popular culture. Using their products for our purposes is the art of being in between production and consumption, speaking is the art of being in between their language system and our material experience, cooking is the art of being in between their supermarket and our unique meal. (p. 36)

Using a parallel form, trust is the art of being in between their message and our ideology.

Students are vulnerable and incomplete; therefore, they are easy targets for the producers of cultural texts.
Framing the Media

Building brand recognition builds brand trust. Students are targeted because they are seen as a new market, as education rises, so does income. This interaction has broad implications for educators as we grapple with the influx of media types that our students use on a daily basis. Governmental media regulation allows for hundreds of commercials to reach our students daily. Monopolistic behavior (Klein, 1999) of commercial media has nearly decimated public broadcasting (Herman, 1995) and left us with only four media corporations in America: Disney, Warner, GE, and News Corporation. These four media corporations control all types of media from newspapers and magazines to television and textbooks. Corporate media gain trust by influencing the meaning of culturally significant objects and by omitting voices and structures counter to the gain of capital.

When broadcast technology first became available last century, the United States governmental regulatory commission delegated strong bandwidths to “commercial ventures … to serve in the public interest, convenience, or necessity” while granting only a handful of weak frequencies to community, educational, or religious broadcasts (McChesney, p. 225, 1993). This was done because the corporate interests made the argument that they would be able to further technology better than anyone else. The content of America’s airwaves was given to corporations because it was thought that they would advance the structure of media through competition.

Today, media corporations integrate all forms of media vertically and horizontally. Vertical integration occurs when a single company controls all steps, from production to exhibition. This means that a corporation creates, distributes and controls the cultural texts.
Horizontal integration is when one company controls many different kinds of media (i.e. newspapers, magazines, television, radio, cable, internet, etc.). Total integration allows for a small elite to frame the conversation and regulate content while creating a sophisticated network of information and capital sharing.

This synergy, or concentration of power through ownership and control of today’s media, is without precedent (Herman & Swiss, 2000) and has a great effect on student trust. Media has kept up with neoliberal policies and practices by allowing itself to be subject to the logic of the market (Marcel & Strong, 2001). This has left America vulnerable to exclusively hegemonic control. While the number of perspectives continues to decrease, news information is presented that has not been cross-referenced. Americans suffer from an “issue-attention cycle” during which issues are only “on the radar” for a short time and left unresolved before falling out of public view (Paehlke, 2003). This perpetuates hegemony by changing the subject before resolution, and by placing popular trust in a small number of corporations.

Ideally, America would have a Democratic Socialist Media in which everyone has the right and ability to utilize media regardless of class or social status. Currently, American broadcast media operate within the model of Libertarian Media in which the rich are favored (Picard, 1985). The more media corporations control the public means of information dissemination, the more democracy is contained by the elite. An example of this fallout would be the omission of certain voices in media, such as the labor interests that have completely fallen out of the scope of the media (Aronowitz, 2001). Omission of important issues, such as global warming and poverty, is one form of control that is used to control the cultural texts.
In essence, the unique history of American media can be seen as a propaganda testing ground for neoliberalism and hegemony because the content and structure are both consistent with the ideologies of neoliberalism (“free market”) and commercialism (“consumption driven”). Students today are enveloped by popular culture, largely through mass media, yet without acknowledgement, schools may fail to respond to the messages and forms of influence that popular culture has on students, including trust.

Student Liminality

Teachers are powerful actors in the negotiation of culture as we use “their products for our purposes” when developing and implementing curriculum. While the American power struggle surges through popular culture it also surges through our schools and imbues them with certain “truths” — that consumerism is the normal way of living, that success is about the individual and not the society, and that the victor is the only one worthy of infamy. Students find themselves in the middle.

American teachers may have had concern about the impact of commercial media on their students, just as the American Psychological Association has concerns regarding corporate funding of university research (Patcher, et. al, 2007). As a peace educator, it may be impossible to reach students without explicitly acknowledging the content, form, and purpose of corporate messages that inundate the lives of our students (Burns & Aspeslagh, 1996). All students who set foot into our classrooms have seen thousands of simulated murders on screen — is this what they trust? Perhaps because of this, they come into our classrooms with an undeveloped understanding of positive peace, justice, or even democracy. Issues of structural violence are
masked under the hyper-individualism of American Dream “survival of the fittest” — perhaps successful at keeping the American public under corporate control.

Students are unable to address the monolithic corporate control of media, but it has become more common among scholars and artists alike (cf. Spring 2003, McChesney 1993, Miller 1990); however, any conversation about the effect of consumerism messages are either banned from commercial airwaves or are ignored by corporate media in the interest of the bottom line, profit. Counter examples to corporate control of American popular culture are virtually non-existent (Chomsky, 2004) because positions that counter the system of control are perceived as unhealthy for corporate America (cf. AdBuster's, 2005). Direct attacks on commercialism outside of American popular culture may be less effective than the messages within the corporate structure that question the validity of the power structure (Klein, 1999). As the popular curriculum encroaches further into schools, corporate messages are normalized while trust is put indirectly into corporate America.

Educators act as cultural mediators that coping with both sides of this tension: a. commercialism’s effect on students, and b. funding mandates. As I will demonstrate in the following chapter, students are asked to be open to learning, and to trust their schools, but schools exploit student trust. Ideally, if the teacher is successful, students will take what they have learned from the educational experience and use it to benefit themselves and the society. However, if both perception and funding structures have removed the societal contribution aspect, how will the teacher know she is being effective in her efforts to promote a cooperative and sustainable future?
CHAPTER THREE: COMMERCIALISM AND CHANNEL ONE

If you were to look around your school, what signs of trust and commercialism would be revealed? Would you see soda and vending machines with giant glowing brand names on them? If your school is fortunate enough to have a playing field, are there local company billboards adorning the scoreboard? Do your students wear clothing with brand logos splashed all over them? Have you ever participated in Book It! or given out coupons for fast food as incentives for achievement? Did you use a curricular “tie-in” provided by Disney, or other media company attempting to promote an upcoming film or children’s toy? While these actions seem small, and often beneficial, it is the collection of these actions in schools that allow for advertising to become normalized and validated by educators themselves.

Have you ever seen or made your students watch Channel One? Channel One is one of the most, if not the most, pervasive encroachments of commercial advertising into American schools. Due to the stringent policies of the broadcast, it can be seen as pinnacle of the technological exploitation of the captive student audience. In this chapter, I review the literature on Channel One and present the argument that it is a powerful tool to encourage a consumerist mentality that is ultimately unhealthy for America. I will also use exposure to Channel One as a covariate in the study presented in later chapters.

I begin this chapter with a look at the theoretical structures at play, including power and legitimacy, and their possible ramifications, including the commodification of American students. Major contributors to the literature in this area include Michael Apple and Mark Crispin Miller. In this chapter, I build a more specific picture of the hidden, null, and popular curricula within Channel One. In addition to this theory, I also present several studies that sought
to measure the relationship of Channel One to students and schools. Finally, I elaborate on the urgency of examining this problem in education.

Aiken (2000) gives a precise definition of the problem: “commercialism in schools is the practice of promoting products and services to students in a school setting” (p. 12). On first glance it does not necessarily seem like a big problem; however, when the role of teacher trust is combined with commercial interests, there is a lot at stake. Schools risk their status as being benevolent, professional, and logical when they open themselves up to corporate messaging and influence. Teachers themselves may pervert their knowledge-base with curricular tie-ins provided by external corporations. Ultimately, students are putting their trust into schools and teachers on a daily basis.

The shift from schooling as “a set of democratic political commitments” to “the idea of a competitive marketplace” (Apple, 1993, p. 115-116) has altered our meaning of freedom. Apple (1993) warned that students and schooling were becoming a “retail product,” that is now “integrated into the mechanisms of an unfettered commercial market” (p. 116). It is clear that the purpose of education has dramatically changed from its initial conception; "in effect, schools were being used as a product to be packaged and sold” (Aiken, 2000, p. 15). Student trust was being used as a mechanism of commercialism.

In this context it’s easy to see why an entrepreneur, such as Chris Whittle, founder of Channel One, would wish to capitalize on America’s public schools. Mark Crispin Miller’s (1997) study of Channel One led him to question the authority and effect of commercialism in the schools:

…these are devices — the fake “authority,”” the vaguely scientific-sounding mumbo-jumbo — that advertising has been using on the public since the 19th century. Their
patent falseness makes them grossly inappropriate for use inside our schools — where children ought to learn to think, not to be taken in. (pp. 5-6)

The issue becomes even more serious as other studies have shown that students exposed to Channel One “expressed more materialistic attitudes in general” (Morgan, 1993, p. 2) in addition to being more likely to “buy a product [advertised on Channel One] because they knew ‘it was good’” (Tozzo-Lyles & Walsh-Childers, 1995, pp. 19-20).

It is true that our students are inundated with commercial messages outside of the classroom, but rather than teaching how to deconstruct these messages, teachers (and school systems) are guilty of promoting them. Later in this chapter I will present research that demonstrates the connection between funding for texts and the presence of Channel One that leads administrators to adapt Channel One; however, before I get to those research studies, I want to make it clear Channel One is no accident, nor is it as innocuous as some people might make it out to be. Encased within neoliberalism Apple (1993) discusses the political culture that led rise to Channel One:

The threat to egalitarian ideas that this represents is never made explicit since it is always couched in the discourse of improving standards and quality in an educational system that is seen as in decline if not in crisis. This is especially the case with Whittle Communication’s entire package of ‘reforms,’ from Channel One to Whittle’s recent proposal to establish a national chain of private schools. (Apple, 1993, p. 95)

Whittle’s vision for a national chain of private schools has come to fruition with Edison charter schools (http://www.edisonschools.com/edison-schools/faqs), pushing further the ideology of “what is public is bad and what is private is good” (Apple, 1993, p. 95). This is not a study of the Edison charter schools, but rather a look at its predecessor, Channel One, which
according to Tiene (1993, p. 51), as quoted in Aiken (2000), “positions a school to exploit the video revolution. If there are trade-offs to allowing commercialism in the public schools, perhaps public discussion should shift to how to take advantage of opportunities provided” (p. 22). Until this specific dialogue occurs, it is important to evaluate and assess the presence of commercialism in our schools, and it’s ramifications for student trust.

Channel One provides corporations with a captive audience of millions of American school children, five days a week, according to their corporate website (http://www.channelone.com/static/faq/). According to Channel One, this figure represents roughly 1/3 of all school children in this country. Advertisers were sure to jump on this opportunity. McNeal (1998), as referenced in Aiken (2000), found that “about 90 percent of product requests made by children to their parent were by brand name [and] children have indirect influence over … $300 billion in purchases, ranging from restaurant suggestion to which automobile to buy” (pp. 15-16). The existence of commercials on Channel One was no accident and the exploitation of students occurred through marketing the demographic.

The use of power as a narrative to describe the problem of commercialism in our schools is useful to the extent that (dis)power surrounds all the relationships involved in the problem. Advertisers clearly focused their work on making the powerless (the adolescent audience) feel empowered through consumption. Miller (1997) dissects the dialectical relationship of the product and the consumer in Channel One commercials:

Such fantasies appear to answer — and, of course, also exacerbate — the ferocious longing of their captive audience for freedom, independence, confidence and strength, which adolescents generally lack, and know they lack. (p.2)

Miller (1997) further explains:
Admakers use every visual and aural means available to make the everyday experience of tasting this or wearing that seem like a sort of psychedelic wet-dream, in which you feel like you’ve never felt before: ecstatic and all-powerful. (pp. 8-9)

Miller (1997) shows that with the use of “high technology” and “fantasy” combined with elements of commercialism (“That point is: “Buy the power,” p. 3) students are left to see the products as “drugs: you swallow them, and go delightfully insane” (p. 9). Miller (1997) speculates that the combination of these elements will “lead to a widespread sense of disappointment,” and possible “emotional disorders among teenagers” (p. 9). Miller (1997) firmly concludes:

To recognize the falseness of that propaganda, to learn to read its images, and also to read widely and discerningly enough to start to understand the all-important differences between a good life and a bad one: such are the proper aims of school — which is why Channel One should not be there. (p.9)

Example: Book Covers

To show that Channel One is not an isolated incident of the problem of commercialism in our schools, I will discuss Deron Boyles’ (2005) article in Educational Studies entitled “Uncovering the Coverings: The Use of Corporate-Sponsored Textbook Covers in Furthering Uncritical Consumerism.” Boyles (2005) asserts that “ultimately, this article questions the role teachers play in promoting, wittingly or not, commercialism in schools” (p. 256). Boyles believes that there should be more consideration for the health of the students, both physically and intellectually, when business interests enter the school.

Boyles (2005) posits that “the book cover has become a minibillboard students carry around with them” and that “schools should not be places where teachers allow the uncritical
acceptance of any narrative, much less the lopsided narrative put forward by corporate advertising campaigns qua book covers” (p. 262). By examining the content of a large sample of book covers, Boyles (2005) was able to parse out the covert messages found within corporately sponsored book covers. Boyles (2005) argues that the book covers promote anti-intellectualism, competition, gender-bias, anti-critical thinking, and neoliberalism.

Boyles (2005) found that admakers, such as Froot Loops Cereal purport to provide “factual” information while presenting fallacious information such as the spelling of Froot, a bird with a “nose” rather than a “beek,” and non-proportionate illustrations of fruit. To Boyles (2005) “the book cover represents what is so problematic about market logic masquerading as philanthropy in schools — misinformation, images as reality, and commercialism” (p. 257). He sees these “free” book covers as coming at a higher cost.

Boyles (2005) found that the advertisements championed “market logics” and capitalist expectations such as “competition, ferocity, and winning” (p. 259), and gender inequality (p. 260). He claims:

Schools are seen by businesses, business advocates, and consumer materialists as the place for children to “get” an education in order to “get” a job. Further, businesses use schools as captive markets where they can test new merchandise, advance their public relations, and appear philanthropic by “donating” materials to schools. This is part of the problem with the book covers. They are “free,” so they are either eagerly sought after or merely accepted, since the hegemonic message so deeply reinforced in the United States is that schools are now and forever will be under funded, so anything free must be accepted (and because it is accepted is good?). Teachers are often grateful, even for book covers. (p. 263)
Boyles (2005) is quick to point out that the interests of teachers and the interests of corporations are different and that “two points seem clear: (1) teachers may be committing a form of educational malpractice or intellectual negligence, and (2) teachers may be hegemonically reinforcing the very stereotypes and power structures that cause them to struggle in their daily lives as teachers” (pp. 262-263). Boyles (2005) isn’t sure if there’s much difference between teachers and telemarketers, other than the fact that students are a captive audience without the option of hanging up.

Boyles (2005) feels that the book covers themselves may be covering an already corporate curriculum that needs to be questioned. He understands the illusion of choice sustaining neoliberalism when he paraphrases Kozol:

Current schooling may answer the charge of promoting anti-intellectual and anti-democratic values by pointing to the aforementioned ‘choices’ [texts such as Channel One and booklets from Time Inc.] as well as to their learning centers, baby rabbits, and three-thousand-dollar vouchers. (p. 264)

Boyles (2005) demands that teachers and students take a more critical look at commercialism in the schools by using book covers as “object lessons” (p. 264) and “deconstructing and reconstructing the economic, corporate, and capitalist assumptions surrounding and infiltrating schools” (p. 265).

Back to Channel One

Apple (2004) writes of the relationship between hegemony, neoliberalism, and the schools:

The world is seen as a vast supermarket. Schools, and even our students in the case of Channel One in the United States where children are sold as a captive audience for
commercial advertisers who market their products in schools, become commodities that are bought and sold in the same way everything else is bought and sold. (p. 186)

If this is true, have we have sold out our students in the interests of “cooperation” with corporations and the privatization of school texts and covers?

As the cost of instructional material continues to increase (Aiken, 2000, p. 15) marketers, specifically Channel One, are able to exploit schools, administrators, teachers, and students more readily. Morgan (1993) sought to find and study the demographics of schools that employed Channel One:

Overall, the most glaring discrepancies revolve around clusters of attributes reflecting class, income, and race. Channel One is disproportionately found in schools located in high poverty areas. These schools spend the least amount of money per student on instructional or other materials by far. Also, Channel One is more often found in schools with larger proportions of African-American students, while the more Asian students there are in the school, the less likely that school is to feature Channel One. (p. 4)

At this point you are probably wondering where you can sign up for Channel One. So, before I go further into the implications of this, and other recent studies, I will outline the history, structure, and content of Channel One.

The Emergence of Channel One

By 1993, Michael Apple understood Channel One to be a new form of a school text that accompanied the “growth of plans for privatization, for corporate control and funding for schools, for industry/school ‘cooperation’” (p. 94). Apple (1993) continues:

Channel One need to be seen in the context of this conservative reaction. Its status as a ‘reform’ and its acceptance in many schools can only be fully understood as a partial
embodiment of a larger conservative movement that has had a considerable effect not only on education but all aspects of the society. One of the effects has been to transform our collective sense of the roles schools play in this society. This has meant that equalizing the opportunities and outcomes of schooling has been seen increasingly not as a public right but as a tax drain. (p. 95)

What Apple has demonstrated is that the relationship between corporations and schools is very much connected, and that the corporations, through tax breaks and other forms of corporate welfare, have caused a situation where the schools are under funded, needing to reach out to corporate monies, and therefore, interests. Whittle communications arose at a time that many perceived education in America to be failing (c.f. America At Risk, 1983) and schools were strapped with enormous costs compared to their operating costs. Chris Whittle saw this vulnerability and proffered Channel One as a solution.

Essentially, Whittle Communication offered schools a satellite link for the school and televisions for each of the classroom in exchange for 90% of the students watching 90% of the daily programming. The daily programming is Channel One, which contains eight minutes of “news” and two minutes of “commercials” each day. If a school does not meet the criteria of the agreement, all equipment will be removed from the school, or the school will be forced to pay for all of the equipment.

According to Aiken (2000) early studies “found students did not like the programming and were not paying much attention when it was broadcast” (p. 19). Soon after its introduction, Whittle Communications moved Channel One’s production facilities “from New York to Hollywood and David Neuman, a Hollywood producer, was put in charge” (p. 19). Early studies
also showed that at the time this switch was made, “there was a general erosion of teacher’s views of quality” of Channel One programming (Ehman, 1993, pp. 22-23).

Apple (1993) rightfully claims:

It is more than a little romantic to assume that teachers will always be able to spend already scarce time on deconstructing the news or ‘playing’ with the commercials. Thus, as teacher’ work becomes increasingly intensified, there may be almost no time to counteract the way the news is portrayed. (p.114)

What has become even more evident is the “news” on Channel One is clearly a lead-up to the commercial. Aiken (2000, p. 20) writes about the high price corporations pay to get their ad to run on Channel One, estimated to be more than $185,000 per spot. Once production moved from New York to Los Angeles the journalistic integrity decreased dramatically, and the number of non-news pieces increased. Miller (1997) clearly explains the significance of the relationship between the “news” and the “commercials:”

Its real function is not journalistic but commercial, for it is meant primarily to get us ready for the ads. What this means is that the news must, on the one hand, keep us sitting there and watching, as an m.c. has to keep his audience mildly entertained between the acts; but it must also constantly efface itself, must keep itself from saying anything too powerful or even interesting, must never cut too deep or raise any really troubling questions, because it cannot ever be permitted to detract in any way from the commercials. Its aim must be… to keep our eyes wide open and our minds asleep, so that the commercial will look good to us, sound true to us, and thereby work on us. (p. 1)

According to Aiken (2000):
Whittle Communications realized their unique responsibility to the teenage audience early in their marketing strategy to school board officials. The issued standards for their advertisers to follow:

A. Include a balanced representation of individuals for a variety of social, racial, ethnic, or gender groups.

B. Provide positive role models for all members of the viewing audience.

C. Include and portray individuals with physical and mental impairments.

D. Place an emphasis on the importance of education and remaining in school.

E. Communicate strong messages against all forms of antisocial behavior, including drug use, violence, and prejudice. (Devaney, 1994, p. 151). (p. 20)

*Channel One’s “News” and Commercial Messages*

Apple (2004) writes that we must grapple with ways of understanding how the kinds of cultural resources and symbols schools select and organize are dialectically related to the kinds of normative and conceptual consciousness “required” by a stratified society. (p. 2)

Miller’s (1997) content analysis provides us with the most comprehensive review of Channel One’s programming. Miller (1997) demonstrates the lack of substance in the “news” reports, which are

all loud, speedy filler, which — with minimal background, and no context — leaves the mind with nothing…all of it dressed up with the usual brilliant, zippy graphics, but none of it made clear or relevant enough to bear in mind. (p. 1)

As far as the commercials go, Miller (1997) shows the relationship between power, real or inauthentic, is capitalized on with the messages and structure of Channel One:
It therefore must be sort of a relief when Channel One takes over, so you can lose yourself in its really cool graphics and its tantalizing burst of rock music — and in the advertisers’ mind-blowing little fantasies of power: power through Pepsi, Taco Bell, McDonald’s, Fruit-A-Burst and/or Gatorade (“Life Is a Sport. Drink It Up!”), power through Head ‘n Shoulders, Oxy 10 and/or Pantene Pro-V Mousse (“…a stronger sense of style!”), power through Donkey Kong and/or Killer Instinct (“PLAY IT LOUD!”), and/or power through Reebok (“This is my planet!”). (p. 2)

Miller (1997) claims that the advertisers prey on the deficiencies of the viewer — adolescent boys are exploited for their rebelliousness, and other viewers are told that they can become empowered, even rescued, by the product (p. 4). Miller (1997) sees the commercials as an avenue to anti-intellectualism as they idealize ignorance:

Over and over, the ads idealize ignorance: like the kid who wonders about nothing but how ‘they’ make that cereal so sugary, and like the famous athlete, the ads’ countless momentary heroes each know only what the advertisers want their audience to know. (p. 4)

Miller (1997) continues:

The ads on Channel One also promote stupidity by representing all of life as nothing but a series of extremely simple problems, each soluble through the immediate application of some very smart commodity or other. (p. 5)

Miller (1997) also shows that viewers are led to believe that “there is no worthwhile knowledge other than the knowledge of elite technicians (who are, of course, all working for Nintendo, Reebok, Mars, AT&T and other major corporate advertisers” (p. 5) and that “while you need almost nothing in your head, you must put this — and lots of this — into your mouth” (p. 6).
Concluding on the tie between technological advancements and Channel One, Miller (1997) writes:

Channel One’s commercials are all, finally, celebrations of technology: not only are the ads themselves mind-bending feats of digital f/x, but they all tout the video games and pimple creams and running shoes as masterworks of technical design… (p. 5)

Research Studies on the Effect of Channel One

There have been a substantial number of research studies on the effects of Channel One, including ones sponsored by Whittle Communication. It’s interesting that those sponsored by Whittle Communication set out to prove that Channel One has had a positive effect of viewers and only found that it has had little to no effect — this is a claim that hides the real effects of Channel One. I have split the research results into several different areas, including Channel One in the Social Studies Classroom, Channel One and Text Funding, and, finally, Advertising and Channel One. Many of the findings overlap from one section to another, but it is clear from the research that Channel One is having some effect on America’s students.

First of all, however, it’s clear that Channel One has a different effect on female students than it does on male students. Tozzo-Lyles & Walsh-Childers (1995) found that “females, regardless of degree of impulsiveness, are less likely to have enough money to spend and less likely to have money in savings, than their male peers” (p. 20). They also site studies that suggest females are more compulsive by nature, but females who watch Channel One, versus those who do not view Channel One daily, are “more likely to have a favorable attitude towards products advertised on the network” (p. 20). The results of these studies should bring up red flags, regarding the existence of commercialism in the schools in general — how can we advertise to
the poorest of American communities in good faith? I will cover this further in the section on text funding and Channel One.

Channel One, for the sake of its survival, must control the way it is perceived within the educational community. One way Channel One does this is with claims that their viewers have a better grasp on “current events” because they are covered in the “news” section of the broadcast. Aiken (2000) found that there is “a significant statistical difference in the current events knowledge of those students who viewed and discussed the Channel One news program and those who did not view and discuss the program” (p. 36). Students exposed to Channel One showed a higher comprehension on current issues. Unfortunately this study was flawed because the “current events” knowledge came directly from the Channel One broadcasting; for example, stories about certain celebrities that were included in Channel One “news” were measured in the research. Here is an example of a “news” agency creating a narrative devoid of issues of climate change and poverty and getting away with it through research.

Channel One must hide “glaring contradictions in each broadcast” (Miller, 1997, p. 6-7) to ensure that students “readily half-believe that all of this is ‘educational’ — that this relentless daily come-on has some ‘higher purpose’” (Miller, 1997, p. 8). It is logical to believe that Channel One could play a specific purpose in Social Studies classrooms because current events are relevant material. Ehman (1993) studied the attitudes of Social Studies teachers and students, regarding Channel One, during two years, 1991 and 1993. Ehman (1993) found two patterns:

(1) in both years teachers were more positive about depth of coverage on Channel One than were students, and disparity was very large; and (2) while students’ attitudes were very stable across the two years, the teachers showed some erosion from 1991 to 1993 in their assessment of depth. (Abstract)
Ehman (1993) speculates as to the causes of the erosion of the teacher attitudes toward Channel One without considering the “news” department’s move from New York to Los Angeles. Ehman (1993) also shows that the existence of Channel One in the schools comes with a responsibility of the teachers to help the students look critically at the content of Channel One “news.” Reluctantly, Ehman (1993) shows that “there was as sharp diminution of students’ judgment about Channel One’s overall ‘worthwhileness,’ dropping from 79% in 1991 to a 52% agreement level in 1993” (p. 23). From both teacher and student responses it’s clear, from even the earliest studies, that Channel One’s use in the Social Studies curriculum was wearing thin.

Other research showed that Channel One “does not appear to be effective in increasing students’ knowledge about current events” (Robinson, 1994, p. 58) and that “the decision to adopt Channel One was based on opportunism rather than on curricular content or specific curricular need” (Knupfer, 1994, p. 84). Knupfer (1994) discusses the acceptance of Channel One:

Although teachers’ organizations at the national level have opposed Channel One, teachers at the local level support continuation of the broadcast. Because this local-level support does not seem to emerge from any evidence about curricular gains, one must ask whether teachers are taking the time to think critically about the educational value of the programs. (p. 84)

Bachen (1998) presented results from a study (Hoynes, 1997) of Channel One that “gives the program low marks for dealing with race and ethnicity as issues (beyond the presentation of a multicultural news staff), economic inequality, and teen issues presented in a larger social context, not just as individual moral choices” (p. 145). Morgan’s (1993) study of Channel One’s audience provides us with a better view of what Channel One is doing to America’s students.
Morgan (1993) attempts to locate and examine the schools that have adopted Whittle's Communication’s Channel One. Using Market Data Retrieval, a subsidiary of the Dun & Bradstreet Corporation, Morgan (1993) found that 36,000 public schools in America have students in the 7th grade and above (p. 3). From the sample of 47.7 percent of these public schools, Morgan concluded that “Channel One can be found in 26.4 percent of the” sample (p. 4), leading us to believe, as Channel One’s website claims, that it can be found in nearly 1/3 of American schools. This number will be important in the research study discussed in the following chapters.

As I mentioned earlier, text costs continue to rise in American schools causing a vulnerability to predator corporations like Whittle Communications. Morgan (1993) shows the inverse relationship between text funding and the adoption of Channel One; simply put, “...the more money schools spend on instructional materials per student, the less likely they are to receive the program” (p. 5). Morgan (1993) found “the schools with the greatest concentrations of low-income students are more than twice as likely (37.7% vs. 16.6%) as the school with the wealthiest students to have Channel One” (p. 5) and “schools that spend the least amount of money overall, aggregate educational enterprises are about six times as likely to have Channel One as are the schools that spend the most” (p. 6). The type of predator / prey relationship that Whittle Communications thrives upon is certainly unconscionable and inappropriate.

Keeping in mind that “low income students and youth of color attend schools most in need of a substantial infusion of resources” (Morgan, 1993, p. 10), Morgan (1993) suggests:

The Channel One program — and its commercials — take the place of more proven educational resources in the country’s most impoverished schools. Whittle is thus apparently used not to complement, but in the place of, texts and other instructional
materials when these resources are most lacking. The schools with the fewest resources to offer are those in which students are most likely to be exposed to Whittle Communications’ programs and advertisements in the classroom. (p. 6)

These results become increasingly disturbing as students may remember more advertisements than “news” stories per week. Morgan (1993) sees an inevitability of Channel One to “further entrench and legitimize the power of massive private commercial interests in those public arenas where a diversity of voices is most badly needed,” especially while “Channel One is more often shown to the students who are probably least able to afford to buy all the products they see advertised. It requires no stretch of the imagination to suggest that this in turn may enhance their alienation and frustration” (p. 10).

Channel One’s Educational Objective

All of this information presents some interesting questions: Why hasn’t the percentage of schools with Channel One risen dramatically in the past 15 years? What relationships exist between impoverished areas and consumerism? To what extent does the captive audience of our students affect their values?

Miller (1997) has demonstrated that “Addiction is what they sell on Channel One” (Abstract). Miller (1997) further writes:

And yet the contradiction here is total: for the only moral difference between the individual drug-dealers and the corporate advertisers in our nation’s schools is one of scale — the advertisers are immeasurably richer, and have done a lot more harm. Both work full-time to lure the children into absolute and permanent dependency, and both do so exclusively for profit’s sake. Both, therefore, would prefer that their young targets be ill-educated on the subject of addiction. (p. 4)
Essentially, advertisers on Channel One want to ensure that the American public will be paying for their product forever, no matter how detrimental it may be to our health. Channel One is a good example of how technology allows advertisers to utilize school markets. With entrée’ into a steady market of school children, producers ensure their trusted place in the market of the future.

It is true, as Maurice (1994) writes, that “Channel One is a challenge to educators to rethink their moral deliberations” (p. 226); however, because Channel One is an outgrowth of neoliberalism and commercialism, its very existence controls the parameters of the challenge. Apple (1993) acknowledges that we participate in these relations and “we have the responsibility to say ‘no’ to as many of them that are antidemocratic as we can and to act to affirm what is less dominative and more caring” (p. 14). Erdman (1994) calls for “more work to be done concerning the effects of the broader use of media in the culture, and how that use relates to viewer expectations in regard to educational media experiences” (165).

Channel One is couched within a broader social/political movement where students are sold like commodities. Apple (1993) writes that this is a movement:

toward reductive, mechanistic, and industrialized accountability systems, tighter control over the curriculum and pedagogy, the complex dynamics of deskilling and reskilling of teachers, an increasingly close relationship between economic rationality and educational means and ends… (p. 93)

Examples of commercialism, like book covers and Channel One, have allowed “business to slowly transform the educational system into one more site for the generation of profit” (Apple, 1993, 117) while gaining student trust. If the structure and content of both book covers and Channel One are any indication of the level of commercialism that is allowed in the schools, there is no corporation that would want to neglect such a large population. With funding a
constant issue for schools throughout the country, no school is impervious to the reach of corporate America’s anti-democratic values.

Channel One purports that it is acting benevolently by providing important equipment and news to America’s school children; however, the research presented above shows that students are more in tune with the commercials, and teachers are unable to adapt the equipment for their own needs. The research above also demonstrated that the content on Channel One was banal, and didn’t contribute to the knowledge-base of students. As Channel One continues to sell addiction, the logic of continuing the relationship with schools comes into question, as does the professionalism of teachers and administrators who are eager to adopt Channel One.

In the following Chapters, I describe the research I conducted to more fully understand the relationship between trust, media, and schooling. The study drew heavily on the literature on trust while incorporating video-based education. As will be discussed in the following chapters, I used participant exposure to Channel One as a covariate to determine the relationship between trust and media endorsement. From the material presented in this chapter, I hypothesized that participants who had been exposed to Channel One in their schooling experience would present a higher level of trust for corporately-endorsed material, as compared to those who did not experience Channel One.

The hypotheses for the study included:

1. The University endorsed group will have a significantly higher level of trust and comprehension, as compared to a group exposed to a Corporate endorsement, and a group with no endorsement at all (Control).

2. The Corporate endorsed group will have a significantly higher level of trust and comprehension, as compared to the Control Group.
3. Participants who experienced Channel One will exhibit a higher level of trust and a lower level of comprehension, as compared to participants who were not exposed to Channel One.
CHAPTER FOUR: RESEARCH METHODS

The purpose of this study was to determine how participant trust was affected by the endorsement of the instructional video. The participant consent form can be found in Appendix A. Appendix B is the survey; Appendix C is the survey by variable. The differences in the script of the video introduction can be found in Appendix D. The logos used in the study can be found in Appendix E. These fictional logos served as the treatment, thus allowing for the examination of participant trust by endorsement. Would participants who were shown a University logo indicate more trust in the video, compared to participants who were shown a Corporate logo? How would the trust of these participants compare to the trust of participants who watched the instructional video without any endorsement?

In addition to the endorsement groups, this study also examines levels of trust by comparing participants who had experienced Channel One in school to those who had not. Finally, as a researcher, I was also interested in how much participants paid attention to the video. I used a multiple-choice question set to gauge participant comprehension. In this chapter, I will discuss the instrument and procedure used to obtain the results presented in the next chapter.

Because this study took place at a large, Midwestern, urban university, I hypothesized that participants in the University logo group would exhibit the highest levels of trust and comprehension, while participants exposed to the Corporate logo would exhibit trust levels higher than only the control group. Based upon the literature review, I hypothesized that higher levels of trust would result in higher comprehension scores; therefore, trust and comprehension would exist in a directly proportional relationship, where when one is increased, the other would increase as well. In this study, I have developed a survey instrument to measure both trust and comprehension, with the hope of capturing this relationship.
I hypothesized that there may be one exception to the direct relationship of trust and comprehension: Channel One exposure. In Chapter Two I demonstrated that advertising, specifically the use of logos, was normalized into the school curriculum. From the student perspective, schools were endorsing corporations via instructional materials. As Morgan (1993) demonstrated, schools who participate in advertising-driven partnerships, such as Channel One, are more likely to be unable to fund an adequate set of curricular materials. Therefore, my final hypothesis was that a participant who had been exposed to Channel One in high school would exhibit higher levels of trust, but score lower on the comprehension, as compared to the non-Channel One viewer. I believe that participants with Channel One experience will exhibit a higher level of trust because this type of education, with commercialism, has been normalized in the school ethos. Conversely, Channel One students will have lower comprehension scores because their high schools were more likely to be under funded.

I have chosen to pursue a quantitative research methodology to develop and validate a trust scale. I then compared the groups on the trust scale. As I outline below, the initial stage involved creating and implementing the survey. In the next stage, data was entered and cleaned. Then, factors were identified and tested for reliability. In the final stage, test groups were compared to the control group, and each other, to see if there was a significant difference in participant trust or comprehension due to the endorsement of the message, or by Channel One exposure.

Participants

The research sample consisted of student participants born after 1974 to ensure that participants *could* have been exposed to Channel One in high school. I obtained at least 65 participants per group, 211 total, in order to ensure the proper level of statistical power for the
analyses discussed later. Of the entire sample, 33 were uncertain as to whether they had Channel One in their high school. Of the remaining 178 participants, 83 had experienced Channel One and 95 had not. See Table 1 for more detailed information regarding the sample size by group and Channel One exposure.

*Table 1: Sample Size With Channel One Viewing, By Group.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Corporate</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Entire Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Channel One</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Channel One</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A demographic profile of the 211 participants is presented in Table 2. The participants ranged in age from 18 to 34 (mean age = 21 years). There was a greater than 2:1 ratio of female (148) to male (63) participants. Approximately 89% of the participants were White, 6% Black, 4% Other. The gender and racial makeup closely reflects the demographics of the educational institution where the study took place. The vast majority were undergraduate Education students.

Procedure

Each participant was enrolled in a course administered through the College of Education at a large, urban Midwestern University. To obtain my sample, I directly contacted several instructors, requesting 30 minutes of a class period. I drew my sample from roughly 15 classes, during the same term. Instructors were not told of the level of participation of their students, and per Internal Review Board (IRB) standards, each instructor was instructed to leave the room during the study. Each session was randomly assigned to one of the three groups, whose treatments differed only by the content of the endorsement.
Table 2: Demographic Characteristics Of The Sample (N = 211)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-20</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-23</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-34</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unreported</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White / Caucasian</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Major</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Non-Education Major)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure to Channel One</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the 30-minute survey, all participants were briefed about the purpose of the study and received the consent form found in Appendix A. All participants watched the same lecture video “Deborah Tannen: That’s Not What I Meant!”; however, the endorsement with a logo was different between groups. See Appendix D for the video-taped introductory script, logos, and a
single slide of the actress. The complete video was presented in the following order: (a) logo, (b)
introduction video, (c) lecture video, and (d) logo.

In the University and Corporate endorsement groups the logo remained on the screen
while participants completed the 40-item survey (see Appendix B). The survey was designed to
measure participant trust in both the lecturer and the video. In the same survey, participants
answered questions related to the content of the lecture. This survey also asked questions
regarding media habits and general disposition to trust, among other demographic information
required by the IRB standards. Participants received the survey questions as they appear in
Appendix B. Participants returned the survey to the researcher after completing it and ended their
participation by leaving the room.

During the study, I attempted to minimize coercion by making it clear that participation is
optional, and participants may leave at any time. I was careful to follow the same script during
each survey session, and even wore the same clothes during each session. This was done to help
limit any unintentional influence that I, as the principle investigator, might inadvertently
introduce. Participants were told that they were free to leave the study location, with no penalty,
at any time. Approximately 15 participants chose to leave during the study.

Survey Design

The survey, found in Appendix B, has been designed to reflect the literature discussed in
the earlier chapter on trust. The literature review of trust in psychology, sociology, education,
and economics created a conceptual definition of trust, defined mainly in terms of benevolence,
integrity, competence, and predictability. Based on the literature review presented in Chapter
One, I used the conceptual definition to create a measure of trust. On the survey itself, a common
definition of each of the four main concepts above was provided.
The work of Converse and Presser (1986) was used to create a useable questionnaire. I used ideas from Converse and Presser (1986) to develop several features of the survey, including: (a) careful language in the instructions and questions, to reduce confusion among participants; (b) non-forced Likert scale items, to reduce the feeling of coercion among participants; and (c) a relatively short survey, to keep participant attention. Although the survey contains many short parts, the two sections I focused on for this study were the sections intended to measure trust and comprehension. Before I could ensure that the survey response items measured a single dimension as expected, I needed to clean and analyze the data.

Data Cleaning

The initial sample size was 243. Immediately, I scanned the descriptive statistics for extreme values and found no invalid values. I cleaned the data to make sure there were no data entry errors, and I corrected them or omitted them, if necessary. Data that were incomprehensible or incomplete were omitted; sixteen surveys were removed because they were incomplete or incomprehensible. Two surveys of participants who indicated they had seen the video or lecturer before (Questions #1 & #7) were removed from the study. Fourteen surveys of participants over the age of 34 were also removed from the study because they were outside the target sample. I rechecked all of my scales to make sure they were all coded in the correct direction. The final sample size was 211.

Factor Analysis

I followed the procedures outlined in Pett et al. (2003) to perform an exploratory factor analysis on the data obtained in this study. It is always necessary to validate the survey construction before conducting an analysis of variance. Essentially, this means first determining which items in the survey are most effective at measuring the desired construct. In my case, this
means determining which items on the survey adequately measure trust, and which items
measure comprehension. When I had constructed the survey, I had certain items in mind as the
ones that would logically measure trust and comprehension; however, a factor analysis would
create a tighter measurement. After determining the items that worked best, I then tested them
for reliability. The final step of this stage involved a linear combination of items to create the
trust variable (TRUSTTOTAL), as well as, comprehension variable (TOTALCOMP).

**Trust Variable (TRUSTTOTAL)**

Once the data set was ready for analysis, I set out to determine if the survey’s trust items
would load into two separate factors; one factor to measure the subjects’ trust in the video, while
the second factor would indicate the subjects’ trust in the lecturer, Deborah Tannen. Initially,
four factors (one strong, three weak) were found using the Principle Axis Factor (PAF) method
on all the trust items (see Table 3).

**Table 3: Factor Loadings For Sample On All Likert-scale Trust Items, With Mean and Standard
Deviation (PAF, oblimin rotation converged in 13 rotations, pattern matrix is reported in table.)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>F1</th>
<th>F2</th>
<th>F3</th>
<th>F4</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Lower-Level College Appropriate</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Upper-Level College Appropriate</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I learned from this video</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I would recommend this video</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Lecturer showed benevolence</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Lecturer showed integrity</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Lecturer seems competent</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Lecturer seems knowledgeable</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Lecturer is logical</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Lecturer acted professionally</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Lecturer showed interest</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I trust this lecturer</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I trust this video</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I also ran it as a Principle Components Analysis (PCA) to compare the factors (see Appendix F). These factor analyses did not fit with my initial conceptualization that students would view the video and lecturer separately.

The factor loadings, item means, and standard deviations of all trust items are presented in Table 3. The correlation matrix can be found in Appendix G. On a 5-point scale, where 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree, the means ranged from 2.93 (6. I would recommend this video to others) to 4.3 (13. the lecturer acted professionally). Before I could accept the factors, I determined that several items (3 – 6) would need to be deleted. I removed items (3 – 5) because they had several low factor loadings that were uninterpretable. Item Six (I would recommend this video to others) was removed because it had relatively strong loadings on more than one factor. Another reason why I removed these items was because the percent of extracted variance for factors 2 through 4 were ≤ 6% (see Table 4). This meant that I had one strong factor with multiple items, and three weak factors with one or two items. This gave me reassurance that I could remove the items without weakening my single factor. The remaining eight items were analyzed using PAF in the Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS). These items can be found in Table 5.

Table 4: Total Variance Explained By The Four Extracted Factors Of All Trust Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Initial Eigenvalues</th>
<th>Extracted Sums of Squares Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>34.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>10.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>8.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 shows two distinct factors with low shared loadings. I used a direct oblique rotation because I had suspected the factors would be correlated. To ensure accurate results, I verified that the means and standard deviations were correct and the correlations were what I had expected. I examined the output to determine the direction, structure, and magnitude of the relationships among the items. To accomplish this, I examined the KMO statistic (.82) to evaluate the strength of the linear association among the items. I examined the significance level for Bartlett’s test of sphericity, and the alpha level of .00 ensured that the correlation matrix was not an identity matrix. I finally determined that the items were related and that the pattern matrix was logical by checking the direction and the magnitude of the items. Items 8 and 9 loaded on F2 in Table 5 and were removed before the next step when reliability of the trust variable was determined.

Table 5: Factor Loadings For Sample On Remaining Trust Items (PAF, oblimin rotation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>F1</th>
<th>F2</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. The lecturer showed benevolence</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The lecturer showed integrity</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The lecturer seems competent</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The lecturer seem knowledgeable</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The lecturer is logical</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. The lecturer acted professionally</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I trust this lecturer</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I trust this video</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reliability

I computed the reliability of the remaining six items (10-14, 2). It seemed prudent to remove the Items 8 and 9 because they theoretically differ from the other items. Items 8 and 9 may be thought of as interpersonal, whereas the others are professional. The result of this
analysis produced a Cronbach’s Alpha of .82, indicating that the composite measure has an acceptably low-level of measurement error. Once I determined that these six items were loading on the same factor and reliable, I combined them into a single variable in SPSS. This process determined the average of all six trust items in F1 (Table 5) and computed a new variable TRUSTTOTAL for each case. I used this variable in all further analyses of variance in this study.

Comprehension Variable (TOTALCOMP)

Participants answered 7 multiple choice questions pertaining to the content of the instructional video. For every correct answer, the participant received one point. Zero points were assigned for each incorrect answer. If the participant correctly answered all of the questions, the participant would have 7 points. The participants’ correct answers were summed and divided by 7, to compute the TOTALCOMP variable used in the MANCOVA described below.

The means and standard deviations for the comprehension questions can be found in Table 6, with the lowest mean at .32 (19. Conversational Device), and the highest at .90 (16. Roommate Conflict). The overall percentage of correct responses for all participants was 65%.

Table 6. Sample Means And Standard Deviations On All Multiple-Choice Comprehension Questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean*</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. “Roommate Conflict”</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. “Conversational Style”</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. “Conversational Device”</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. “Proper Response to Greeting”</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. “Frames the Message”</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. “Complimentary Schismogenesis”</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. “Power and Hierarchy Grid”</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The mean represents the percentage of participants who responded correctly to each item.
I made the decision to take the percentage correct on all items as the measure of comprehension. I felt that this would be an adequate measure because there were no multiple strong loadings on a single factor. While the practice of using multiple-choice questions tests is often a debate in education, they can be helpful for assessing some aspect of performance.

Channel One Exposure

Finally, I combined participants who had indicated that they did not have Channel One in their high school with those who were not sure whether or not they had Channel One in their schooling experience (see Table 7). This was done because an unsure position may mean that participants did not have Channel One, or that if they did have it, but could not remember, it can be assumed that Channel One did not produce any change of student attitude. I also checked the mean values, and found that the unsure participants presented a pattern consistent with the participants who did not have Channel One in both the trust and comprehension variables. The new identifier variable ChannelOne1 was created and used in subsequent tests.

Table 7: Sample Size With Channel One Viewing And Total, In Each Group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Channel</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Corporate</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Entire Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Channel One</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Channel One</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MANCOVA

In the final stage of this research study, I compared each of the groups on the dependent variables of trust and comprehension. Special considerations were made to ensure the viability of
the data collected in this experiment. Initially, the sample size was considered in order to ensure proper power of analysis. Because this was an exploratory test, I used the traditional nominal \( \alpha \) (alpha) level of .05. The following section discusses the multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA) used in this study, as well as its assumptions.

According to Stevens (2002) the use of MANCOVA to analyze data will take into account the intercorrelations among the dependent variables while keeping the overall \( \alpha \) (alpha) level under control and remaining sensitive for detecting differences. Stevens (2002) also claims that the traditional measure of significance for MANCOVA is Wilk’s \( \lambda \) (lambda). Using the Table E in Appendix A provided by Stevens (2002) I am assured that a sample size of 211 will detect all effects, from large to small, at the .05 alpha level with power of .90 in multivariate statistics. SPSS can determine significance in a MANCOVA by modifying the General Linear Model (GLM) or by utilizing discriminant control lines:

```plaintext
GLM TotalComp TrustTOTAL BY Group ChannelOne1 Race WITH Age Gender /METHOD = SSTYPE(3) /INTERCEPT = INCLUDE /PLOT = PROFILE( Group Group*ChannelOne1 ) /EMMEANS = TABLES(Group) WITH(Age=MEAN Gender=MEAN) COMPARE ADJ(LSD) /PRINT = DESCRIPTIVE ETASQ OPOWER PARAMETER HOMOGENEITY /CRITERIA = ALPHA(.05) /DESIGN = Group ChannelOne1 Race Age Gender .
```

The output included the \( p \) values and indicated whether the three groups were significantly different on the set of two variables.

I customized the model to control for Channel One viewing, age, gender, and race. The dependent variables were represented by TOTALCOMP and TRUSTTOTAL. The independent variable was represented by the SPSS variable Group (1 = University, 2 = Corporate, 3 = Control). An alpha level of .05 was used for all statistical tests. To determine whether the groups
were significantly different on the two dependent variables, I examined the output, including Wilk’s lambda.

Assumptions

According to Stevens (2000) the first assumption of MANCOVA is independence. While it is nearly impossible to obtain a truly independent sample, certain considerations were made to ensure that the data was collected uniformly without coercion, and with random group assignment. During data collection, I wore the same clothes, and was very careful to follow the same script, and made sure the participants did not interact with each other.

Another consideration of independence is whether individuals are being influenced during the treatment by other individuals, especially other participants. Although I “modeled good behavior” by watching the video intently, I was able to make mental notes of participants who did anything other than watch the video, such as using the bathroom, talking with other participants, or working on their computer. I removed the surveys of participants who did not watch the full video; this occurred in approximately 15 cases.

Another assumption of MANCOVA is that the covariance matrices are homogenous. According to Stevens (2000), this was done by examining Box’s Test. Because Box’s test did not produce significant results ($p > .05$), it was concluded that the covariance matrix was homogenous, thus fulfilling this MANCOVA assumption. A final assumption is normality of the dependent variables, which will be discussed in the limitations section. In the following chapter, I present the results of the MANCOVA tests used to test the hypothesis of this study.
CHAPTER FIVE: FINDINGS

In the previous chapter, I discussed the methods I used to obtain and analyze the data, resulting in two dependent variables (TRUSTTOTAL and TOTALCOMP). In this chapter, I will describe the study sample in more detail by presenting the means and standard deviations of the trust and comprehension scores in each group. I will then outline the results of the MANCOVA procedures aimed at testing the following hypotheses, repeated from earlier chapters:

1. The University endorsed group will have a significantly higher level of trust and comprehension, as compared to a group exposed to a Corporate endorsement, and a group with no endorsement at all (Control).

2. The Corporate endorsed group will have a significantly higher level of trust and comprehension, as compared to the Control Group.

3. Participants who experienced Channel One will exhibit a higher level of trust and a lower level of comprehension, as compared to participants who were not exposed to Channel One.

Descriptive Statistics

As I described in the last chapter, the sample was derived from the student population at a large, Midwestern, urban university. While this sample is severely limited by the student body population, it does offer several insights into the relationship of commercialism and schooling. Due to the relatively small proportion of non-white students, I will not be able to do statistically reliable comparisons of minority and majority race students; however, I will control for these demographics in my analysis. Therefore, I will focus on overall differences between the experimental groups, as well as, the difference between participants with Channel One viewing experience.
Table 8 displays the descriptive statistics of the sample, such as the sample size, means and standard deviations, on TRUSTTOTAL for Channel One viewers, non-Channel One viewers. Notice that none of the groups were consistent, in terms of the level of trust. Channel One viewers only exhibited a higher level of trust in the Corporate group (4.08).

Table 8: Sample Size, Means And Standard Deviations On TRUSTTOTAL, By Channel One Viewing And Total, In Each Group (maximum score = 5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Corporate</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>mean sd</td>
<td># mean sd</td>
<td># mean sd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channel One</td>
<td>25 4.10 .58</td>
<td>32 4.08 .39</td>
<td>26 3.88 .49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Channel One</td>
<td>49 4.12 .42</td>
<td>40 3.93 .53</td>
<td>39 4.06 .42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>74 4.14 .48</td>
<td>72 4.00 .44</td>
<td>65 3.99 .46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 displays, the sample size, means and standard deviations on TOTALCOMP for Channel One viewers, non-Channel One viewers. Notice that none of the groups were consistent, in terms of comprehension levels and Channel One experience. Channel One viewers only exhibited a higher level of comprehension in the Corporate group (4.34).

Table 9: Sample Size, Means And Standard Deviations On TOTALCOMP, By Channel One Viewing And Total, In Each Group (maximum score = 5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Corporate</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>mean sd</td>
<td># mean sd</td>
<td># mean sd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channel One</td>
<td>25 4.20 1.29</td>
<td>32 4.34 1.49</td>
<td>26 4.52 1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Channel One</td>
<td>49 4.98 1.35</td>
<td>40 4.23 1.40</td>
<td>39 4.77 1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>74 4.72 1.37</td>
<td>72 4.28 1.44</td>
<td>66 4.67 1.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10 displays, the sample size, means and standard deviations on both dependent variables in each experimental group. Notice that none of the groups were equal, in terms of the level of trust or comprehension. The University endorsement group consistently demonstrated higher levels of both trust and comprehension.

Table 10: Means And Standard Deviations On TRUSTTOTAL & TOTALCOMP, By Total, In Each Group. Sample Size Given In Parenthesis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>University (74)</th>
<th>Corporate (72)</th>
<th>Control (65)</th>
<th>Entire Sample (211)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mean sd</td>
<td>mean sd</td>
<td>mean sd</td>
<td>mean sd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRUSTTOTAL</td>
<td>4.14 .48</td>
<td>4.00 .44</td>
<td>3.99 .46</td>
<td>4.05 .47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALCOMP</td>
<td>4.72 1.37</td>
<td>4.28 1.44</td>
<td>4.67 1.29</td>
<td>4.55 1.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the procedure of examining means by themselves does not produce statistically significant results, it can be beneficial to look at the means of Questions 32 (How valuable was Channel One to your educational experience?) and 34 (How effective do you think multimedia is for learning complex concepts?), which are Likert-scale questions, ranging from one to five points. Based upon the means on Question 34, I can conclude that, in general, students do believe that Multimedia has the potential to aid teaching complex concepts ($M = 3.89, SD = .48$); however, the students who did have Channel One broadcast in their high school, were generally neutral to the statement “Channel One was valuable to my educational experience” ($M = 2.58, SD = 1.19$).

Hypothesis Testing — MANCOVA

This study was designed to capitalize on a MANCOVA procedure, where the independent variable was the differences in the scripted video before each lecture, and the
dependent variables were participant trust and comprehension. The objective of the analysis was to determine whether any of the groups differ, on average, on the set of dependent variables. MANCOVA compared the groups while controlling for demographic factors such as race, age, and gender. Because the literature shows that students who are exposed to Channel One may possess a different attitude, as compared to students not exposed to Channel One, I first determined if the existence of Channel One interacted significantly with the experimental groups.

First, I customized the model to include the interaction between the groups and Channel One viewership. The resulting Wilk’s Λ determined that there was only a marginal significant interaction between the groups and Channel One viewing ($p = .065$). Thus, I was able to remove this expected interaction from the model, and proceed with the MANCOVA with main effects only.

The second MANCOVA, which controlled for the demographic conditions, including Channel One viewership, resulted in a Wilk's Lambda of $p = .029$, meaning that the groups were significantly different from one another. In the between-subjects effects tests (see Table 10), the comprehension score was marginally significantly different ($p = .06$) and the trust was significantly different ($p = .05$). More specifically, the University endorsement group was significantly different from the other groups based upon trust ($p = .034$), while the Corporate endorsement group was marginally significantly different on the comprehension ($p = .059$). Race, Gender, Age, and Channel One Viewing did not produce significant results (see Table 11); however Channel One viewers consistently scored lower on the comprehension and displayed lower trust.
Table 11: Result Of Multivariate Tests: Dependent Variables TOTALCOMP, TRUSTTOTAL, By Group, Channel One, And Race, With Age And Gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$df$</th>
<th>Error $df$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>.488</td>
<td>105.83</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>.948</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChannelOne</td>
<td>.988</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>.298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>.977</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>.316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.994</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>.562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.989</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>.319</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis 1: The University endorsed group will have a significantly higher level of trust and comprehension, as compared to a group exposed to a Corporate endorsement, and a group with no endorsement at all (Control).

The University endorsement group yielded higher trust versus other groups. This hypothesis was confirmed, and shown to be statistically significant. This may be due to the fact that all of the participants were currently enrolled at a university, even though the endorsement was for a fictional university, not the university where participants were enrolled. Students may have also made the assumption that because the video was endorsed by a university, it was tested and proven to be effective at teaching the concepts. This will be discussed in more depth in the following chapter.

The other part of this hypothesis was not confirmed – although University endorsement participants displayed higher trust, they did not score statistically higher on the comprehension section, as compared to the control group. This means that a video with a University endorsement will result in the same comprehension score as a video with no endorsement. Therefore, this part of the hypothesis cannot be confirmed.
Hypothesis 2: The Corporate endorsed group will have a significantly higher level of trust and comprehension, as compared to the Control Group.

The Corporate endorsement group scored significantly lower on the comprehension section, as compared to the other groups. This may be due to participant ambivalence about the material, or because participants were unclear as to why a corporation would be sponsoring this video. A corporate endorsement may also make participants feel uneasy about the research itself. However, the Corporate endorsement group did display a lower level of trust as compared to the University group, but a higher level of trust as compared to the Control group. Therefore, it cannot be determined that trust was adversely affected by the Corporate endorsement. This will be further discussed in the following chapter.

Hypothesis 3: Participants who experienced Channel One will exhibit a higher level of trust and a lower level of comprehension, as compared to participants who were not exposed to Channel One

The final hypothesis compared participants who had experienced Channel One with those who did not. The hypothesis that Channel One Viewers have higher trust, yet lower comprehension than non-Channel One Viewers was rejected. Channel One viewers displayed lower trust and comprehension scores; thus, confirming the directly proportional nature of trust and comprehension. There are several reasons why a Channel One effect may not have been discovered in this study; this may include the homogeneity of the studies, or that all students may view advertisements equally. The content of the video, being educational, may have reduced the effect, as students may expect recreational videos from commercial sources. Students may also see universities as “pseudo-corporations”, resulting in a smaller effect.
CHAPTER SIX: DISCUSSION

Media certainly have a place in the schools; administrators, students and teachers alike acknowledge the enhancing possibilities of media supplements. Instructional material has a direct purpose and benefit in schools; however, media sources need to be understood within their specific context. As discussed in earlier chapters, American students are currently seeing a corporation of educational texts, spaces, and supplemental materials — some students even fulfill their high school diploma online with the help of corporate models of online learning. At the same time, consumerism is being normalized in the schools, mainly through saturation, and corporations know that their message is limited by the level of overall school trust of the product. No Child Left Behind (NCLB) has also driven a new imperative to corporations to provide materials to schools, (including texts, multimedia, and tests), wherein schools are targeted with messages to consume.

These messages, whether overt or hidden, must be taken seriously, as the context of the relationship of the corporate sector to the schools may give unnecessary power to the corporations. This power appears, at large, to be ubiquitous. It has been normalized into texts, and has been very clearly demonstrated by those who perceive Channel One as a benefit. Channel One, with its 10 minutes of news and two minutes of commercial messaging, wraps important world affairs into a commercial message package. Students are not protected, and are encouraged to consume, while blocking out specific wide-ranging issues. The context of the messages that students are receiving may render the populace complacent to corporate messaging.

Certainly school-business partnerships have benefits and limitations. Media entrepreneur Christopher Wittle (2005) shows how his model had become successful. The success came
through adequate funding and standardization. This meant that the curricular materials were current, the style of education was under-girded by technology, and instructional flexibility was allowed. Within instructional flexibility, Whittle’s (2005) model gave students latitude to instruct their peers – thereby reducing the faculty teaching load.

Students may trust their schools to be places of learning, enrichment, and safety. Students may see schools as places of cooperation, with social networks of trust, wherein gains and losses are all possible. Schools may take an ethical approach to model trust as a result of proper actions, not a part of proper actions. Schools serve as social mechanisms that encourage risk, and accept loss; the cooperative nature of schools balances trust with distrust. Anyone who has lost trust knows that trust is a contract that can be broken by any party, at any time, for any arbitrary reason. Students may lose trust in their schools, or their teachers, or their peers at any given moment. From this study we can see clear and direct benefits of trust.

This study demonstrated that there is a link between the context and efficacy of instructional materials. The data presented in this dissertation suggests that students, presented with a documentary segment endorsed by a corporate entity, trust and comprehend the video to a lesser extent than students who viewed the same documentary with no endorsement, or with a university endorsement. While these findings do say something about the sample, they do not necessarily mean that all students are critical of corporate messages within the context of education; however, it strongly suggests that corporations, who are able to directly bring their message to student consumers, need student (and teacher) trust.

Limitations

The first limitation identified regarded the construction of the survey instrument itself. Multiple items and sections that I thought would be useful in the data analysis had to be
discarded; for instance, Question 18 (In the following space, please list as many conversational styles, mentioned by the lecturer, as possible.) was written poorly because it contained a fragmented clause, and no reference participants. The media consumption section had an issue because I did not provide an option for 0 hours. After I began to put the data into SPSS, I realized that I should have had a 0 hours option in the media consumption category. The way the survey was written, 0-5 hours was the same as no hours, leaving me with a poor estimation of the consumption habits of the participants. Because of this, I chose to discard the media consumption aspect of the study, which was unfortunate, but the only avenue that I felt I could justifiably follow.

Another process consideration was made about the survey questions themselves. After running the factor analysis on the lecture trust questions, benevolence and integrity were found to load more heavily on a second component. Why is this? The literature clearly showed that there is a relationship between these concepts and the trust construct. It is possible that these two concepts cannot be immediately recognized through impersonal contact, or it may be that these questions were worded slightly differently than the others (a definition of each of the concepts was given on the survey). In either case, the questions were not used in the data analysis.

Finally, the survey was given in a university classroom setting, lending to internal, but detracting from external validity. The assumption that I am making here as the researcher, is that I am studying the effects of commercialism in the classroom. While I may not be able to extend the findings to non-collegiate populations, I am confident that I can apply these findings to other college students. Also, since participants were training to be teachers themselves an interesting aspect was added to the study, as those students may be more critical and less trusting of supplemental educational materials. While these are all major considerations, I can’t find any
reasons to abandon the findings altogether. Participants in the University endorsement group may have trusted their experience in the study more because they themselves are in a university setting.

Internal validity is relatively strong, as students were selected from the same pool of approximately 16 classes, there are no known confounding variables and the observations were independent. Threats to the external validity of the findings may be that because all of the participants were currently enrolled in an education course, the findings can only be generalized to the population of people at the university level, and more specifically, within the halls of colleges of Education. Also, situational specifics, such as the lighting in the room, the focus of the students, and the type of display (television vs. projection screen) may affect the external validity of the findings. I am confident, however, that as a researcher I did everything I could to minimize these differences to obtain usable data.

The assumption of normality was not confirmed for this study. It may be the case that the data collected was skewed, or had a form of kurtosis, which may render the findings obsolete. In any further examination of this data, normality must be explored and, if needed, corrected. Finally, I missed an opportunity to get socio-economic data from my participants, which may have enhanced the study and its results.

Suggestions for Further Research

Further research needs to address three issues: (a) survey construction and measurement of trust and comprehension, (b) more broad study of trust in teachers, and (c) the relationship between under funding schools and consumerism.

The first area in need of research regards the use of benevolence and integrity in the construction of trust. Benevolence and integrity were most important in the e-vendor study.
(McKnight et al., 2002), but did not load very heavily in this study’s model. Structural equation modeling may be useful to uncover the dimensions of trust even further. The question to be examined would be what limits are there to the use of benevolence and integrity in the measurement of trust. In addition, what is the difference in measuring trust in on-screen presenters versus real-life teachers? Ultimately, this would prove useful in future research on trust and the move to a more internet-based educational system. For this reason, research needs to be done on the effectiveness of the form and content of educational multimedia.

It would be desirable to replicate this study with a younger generation of students, comparing students in a Channel One setting, versus those whose schools do not enter into such partnerships. A shorter, more active video would be needed for a younger audience. Multiple ways to measure trust and comprehension need to be developed in a study of this nature. The results of this study need to be compared to the studies completed on different age populations. Studies that add to the literature on trust in the schools are essential for sustaining successful schools and combating the presence of consumerism.

Effectively, educational research studies must take seriously the effect of consumerism on students. Students give the schools, and their teachers, a lot of trust out of necessity. This trust can be easily exploited and lost. Further research needs to address how a breach of trust is dealt with by the individual and the school community. Finally, teachers need to weigh in on this issue to help identify the effect and symptoms of consumerism that need to be further studied so that schools may equip themselves with relevant tools to combat the issues created by consumerism.

Suggestions for Schools

In order to better mediate the relationship of external funding to schools in this new century, we must evaluate the partnerships on a per-school basis. Schools should create a media
representative, separate from the library staff, who is responsible for examining the partnership materials. This would mean that each curricular “tie-in”, or text book cover, or Channel One broadcast would be evaluated. Criteria for evaluation would focus on several areas, including: the proportion of advertising to curricular material; the content of the advertising; and finally, the size, type and location of the external partnership organization. The media representative would be responsible for summarizing all of this information and presenting it to the school community on a consistent basis. I propose that this report be required as part of NCLB requirements; therefore all schools would report external support to be included in yearly report cards.

The media representative would also be responsible for assessing the student, in terms of commercialism and trust. This would require pre-testing all students before, and after, the use of curriculum containing advertising. If student trust or level of commercialism was greatly affected by the material, then an intervention would be necessary. A standard for this interaction needs to be set as part of the media representative’s duties.

The final role of the media representative would be to make suggestions for future partnerships. After evaluating current partnerships, media representatives would research additional partnerships resources that would promote the purpose of the school. This duty alone will make the media representative’s position worthwhile to financially struggling schools. Since the media representative will know the types of partnerships that are most beneficial for the school, he or she will be able to better evaluate the terms and conditions of each new partnership. Ideally, administrators would accept the partnership suggestions from the media representative.

Curricular changes are also needed to combat this problem. Students must develop a new skill set that adapts to new technologies. Students should participate in a media literacy course that examines advertising and media messaging in detail. In algebra, budgeting programs, such
as Quicken, need to be taught. In geometry, electronic maps need to be used to help students develop spatial orientations useful in dealing with global warming. Finally, database creation and research skills must be stressed as these are skills that are needed in the new information age.

In addition to a media representative and skill development, schools need to increase the interest in all students to become teachers themselves. A rise in teacher prestige may be accomplished in three ways: a. creating and distributing media recruiting high-talent individuals into teacher education; b. lobbying for higher wages; and c. shaping the role of the school in a way that promotes a healthy community. While schools are mainly concerned with what happens within their doors, they need to be aware of how the public’s perception shapes student trust.

Suggestions to Educators

As trust agents in every community in America, educators must take control of the power of their message. Deutsch (1958) observed a half of a century ago that communication is simply power, and that trust plays an integral part of this process. He stressed that situational conditions determined the ways in which individuals behaved, whether cooperatively or competitively. He also made the observation that competitive orientations always resulted in mutual loss. I believe it is for this reason, the tradition in educational studies is to advocate for the outcome of cooperative orientations (McCarthy, 2006), for the mutual gain of society; however, from the literature and findings presented in this study, it is reasonable to believe that school partnerships have led to the opposite outcome. In order to mediate this discrepancy, I use the following section to suggest several actions educators may use to encourage cooperative, inquiry-based forms of instruction.

The first group of suggestions has arisen from the factor analyses performed on the collected survey trust data. In the case of this study, competence, professionalism, and
predictability, all loaded on the same variable as the direct trust questions. Educators are constantly interpreting each of these items meaning to shape the ethos of educational community. My first suggestion deals with competence and professionalism. Certainly educators enroll in continuing education courses and consider themselves “life-long learners”; however educators also must adapt a different way of thinking, one that is contextually appropriate for the new century. This can be most effectively accomplished through an interdisciplinary approach.

The seminal text regarding this approach is Newell & Green’s (1982) Defining and Teaching Interdisciplinary Studies, in Improving College and University Teaching. I suggest that educators become more comfortable with inquiry-based learning as the outcomes are concurrent with the traditional ideals of cooperation. Newell & Green (1982) present three specific outcomes of interdisciplinary courses: a. deductive reasoning; b. reasoning by analogy; and c. synthetic thinking, which “enhances creativity” (p. 32). Not only will an interdisciplinary approach increase the critical thinking skills of the students, it will also raise the competence of educators as they will be encouraged to go beyond their own skill set, thus further developing the professionalism of the educator.

The next suggestion stemming from the factor analysis is that educators need to be conscious of their student’s expectations. In general, students may expect their teachers to be predictable. While predictability in instruction may produce negative outcomes such as boredom, (drawing from my own experience), it may be more beneficial to think of predictability in terms of classroom management and student-to-teacher relations. I suggest that all educators, regardless of setting, cooperatively determine a set of classroom “values” with their students during their first meeting. Ideally, this is an open conversation, where all student ideas are placed into a set that is agreed upon by the whole class and the instructor. Generally, I propose the
creation of a list of values, or standards that students should model for each other. Students usually use this opportunity to address classroom management issues (tardiness, homework policies, participation expectations) while developing a trusting relationship with the teacher.

The next set of suggestions I have for educators deals with the relationship between external funding sources and the teacher. Simple measures that may be relevant include: a. distributing textbook covers but allowing students to cover them with the blank side on the outside; b. discussing with students the funding source of all external curricular “tie-ins”; c. create assignments that encourage critical thinking about advertising and marketing in general. Each of these suggestions should be incorporated into an age-appropriate interdisciplinary approach, yet to the specifications and ability of the teacher. Finally, teachers should be allowed to use their own discretion to opt-out of partnerships without penalty. While this final suggestion may not be realistic, schools should be fully compensated for any endorsements they make.

Suggestions for Teacher Education

Teacher education programs must adapt to include a strand of media literacy and school partnerships. As schools are becoming more interdependent on support outside of the tax base, corporations are competing for endorsement. Deutsch (1958) showed us how the competitive orientation led to mutual loss. Recently in education, “choice” has become conflated with “success”. At the same time teachers are being told to comply with accountability systems in order to maintain their position, they are also under fire if their students do not perform. Teachers are often left without a choice – they must reskill into mechanisms of technological surveillance.

Teacher education must address the deskilling and reskilling of America’s teachers. Teachers are expected to follow a set of curriculum, often finding it impossible to supplement it with enriching materials, due to time restraints. When Michael Apple (1993) called for schools to
become “more caring” he clearly did not mean that schools should measures to make the school environment less personal. Teachers struggle to connect with their students and build trusting relationships. Teacher education must enable teachers to work with media representatives to ensure the best practice.

Suggestions for Potential School Partners and Advertisers

Organizations wishing to enter into a partnership with a school need to focus on the long-term effects of the partnership. To do this, organizations must ask if they are communicating an ethical message, and compensating the school ethically and appropriately. If commercialism is going to be part of the partnership, it needs to be clear to what extent it will affect the student. They must ask if they are helping to pave the way of the avenue of anti-intellectualism by promoting items such as “froot” loops, or by promoting violence as a problem-solving solution. Students are a protected class, and ought to protected from the depravity of commercialism.

While the intended purpose of advertising is to build brand recognition and trust, there is also an expectation that partners have for the future – that students will use their influence to increase sales. This measurable outcome is not the same as the school, and therefore schools shouldn’t be treated like a billboard. Partners must accept limitations to their exposure to students, and must allow for schools to end the partnership without penalty.
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Appendix A

Informed Consent Form

Information about Participating in a Research Study
University of Cincinnati
College of Education, Criminal Justice, and Human Services

**Educational Multimedia Study**

Investigator
Mark Mussman, M.Ed., Principal Investigator
University of Cincinnati
(513)556-3624
mussmamp@email.uc.edu

I am inviting you to complete an anonymous survey. The survey is part of a research study that I am doing for my doctoral degree program. The questions ask about your feelings and comprehension of a short documentary film. You will not receive any credit for participating in this study. You will not be penalized for not participating.

Watching the documentary and completing the survey will take about 30 minutes. When you are finished, please hand the survey back to me. **Do not write your name on the survey form.**

There are no expected risks or benefits to you from completing the survey. Because the survey is anonymous, your identity and your answers can not be connected. Your participation may, however, help teachers decide on using documentaries in the classroom. There are no other activities planned if you do not want to complete the survey.

**Offer to Answer Questions:**
If you have any questions about study-related activities, you may call me at 556-3624 or Dr. Marvin Berlowitz, my faculty advisor, at 556-3608. If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant, you may call the Chair of the Institutional Review Board – Social and Behavioral Sciences at 558-5784. If you have a concern about the study you may also call the UC Research Compliance Hotline at (800) 889-1547.

You do NOT have to participate in this study. You may choose not to participate or you may quit participating AT ANY TIME. Please indicate that you do not wish to participate by turning in a blank survey, or by writing “I do not wish to participate” on the final page of the survey. Please remain quiet for the duration of the study.

**BY TURNING IN YOUR COMPLETED SURVEY YOU INDICATE YOUR CONSENT FOR YOUR ANSWERS TO BE USED IN THIS RESEARCH PROJECT.**

**PLEASE KEEP THIS INFORMATION SHEET FOR YOUR REFERENCE.**
Appendix B

Survey

Contact author for survey.
Appendix C

Survey by Dependent or Experimental Variable

Contact author for survey.
Appendix D

Table D1: Endorsement Scripts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPERIMENTAL GROUP 1</th>
<th>EXPERIMENTAL GROUP 2</th>
<th>CONTROL GROUP 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hello, <em>Western University</em> is happy that you have the opportunity to view Deborah Tannen's video.</td>
<td>Hello, <em>the Corporation for Educational Media</em> is happy that you have the opportunity to view Deborah Tannen's video.</td>
<td>Hello, <em>I'm</em> happy that you have the opportunity to view Deborah Tannen's video.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*differences in boldface*
Appendix E

Logos and Video Frame

Figure E1: Fictional Corporate Logo.

Figure E2: Fictional University Logo.

Figure E3: Endorsement Video Still Frame.
Appendix F

Table F1: Factor Loadings For Sample On Trust Items (PCA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F1</th>
<th>F2</th>
<th>F3</th>
<th>F4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower-Level College Appropriate</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td><strong>-.84</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper-Level College Appropriate</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td><strong>.79</strong></td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I learned from this video</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td><strong>.71</strong></td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would recommend this video</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td><strong>.52</strong></td>
<td>-.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The lecturer showed benevolence</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td><strong>.80</strong></td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The lecturer showed integrity</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td><strong>.79</strong></td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The lecturer seems competent</td>
<td><strong>.73</strong></td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The lecturer seem knowledgable</td>
<td><strong>.81</strong></td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The lecturer is logical</td>
<td><strong>.47</strong></td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The lecturer acted professionally</td>
<td><strong>.77</strong></td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I trust this lecturer</td>
<td><strong>.66</strong></td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I trust this video</td>
<td><strong>.51</strong></td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The lecturer showed interest</td>
<td><strong>.50</strong></td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix G

Table G1: Correlation Matrix For All Trust Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>