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From the Editors…

SIFTING AND WINNOWING
IN THE 21ST CENTURY

Pulling together this issue on media literacy and school reform was about as easy as the old Indian legend of six blind men describing an elephant. When Marty suggested putting a picture of Ken Burns on the cover, Marieli and Karen asked what that had to do with an issue titled “School 2.0.” This led to a round-about debate that caused each of us to push our thinking a little further. We asked him to write his ideas into a cover story article that accompanies this editorial letter. His comparison of Ken Burns to Michael Moore immediately made a connection for us to the education debate between textbooks and Wikipedia. Ken Burns is considered to be an “institution” in documentary filmmaking. After all, he has an iMovie special effect tool named after him. When Ken Burns produces, people watch. They accept his work in the same way many teachers and students accept information from a textbook, as a credible resource. When Michael Moore produces a documentary, people scream. They claim he is biased and is breaking all the rules. Much like Wikipedia, Moore is wild and untamed, something that people aren’t supposed to trust. In truth, people must have the same critical eye in watching Ken Burns as in watching Michael Moore. They must also have the same critical mind in the reading of a textbook as in the reading of a Wikipedia entry. The media are simply there. It is what people do with them that matters.

The need for a much more sophisticated approach to media literacy is exemplified by the all-consuming role media play in our lives. Today, there is hardly a faction of society that is not impacted by the Web 2.0 environment. Everyone—young and old, around the globe—has the potential to be a Ken Burns or a Michael Moore, a producer, a participant, a purveyor of ideas. To understand the power of that role, to acquire and use the tools, to realize the absolute need for critical thought, must be the goal for the educated, literate citizen of this age. This is the challenge for school reform.

In the pages that follow, we have gathered the thoughts of a variety of authors to begin the process. There are many more voices to be heard. The sifting and winnowing begins.

—K. Ambrosh & M. Rowe

KEN BURNS, MICHAEL MOORE, AND MEDIA LITERACY IN THE 21ST CENTURY

People today see more images than in any time in history. The internet, YouTube, television, and DVDs are part of the visual revolution that is doing for visual communication in the 21st century what the Gutenberg press did for the written word in the 15th century.

For the first time, millions of people are watching documentary films in movie theatres and on TV. Ken Burns has become a household name because of his numerous documentary films on PBS television and Michael Moore has become the first movie marquee attraction produced by documentary film.

The way media executives gauge success, no documentary filmmaker has been more successful than Michael Moore. His films have been box-office successes and he has won many of filmmaking’s highest honors. He is also one of the most controversial and divisive filmmakers.
Ken Burns, on the other hand, has made documentaries about some of the most contentious episodes in American history without saying anything that will offend anyone. His PBS films have taken on potentially divisive topics like the Civil War, feminism, World War II and racism in America.

His latest, six-part PBS series, *The National Parks: America’s Best Idea*, seems to be no exception. But, coming out about the same time as Michael Moore’s “Capitalism: A Love Story”, Burns’ has made what may be his most political film yet. At the same time America is arguing over the role of government in saving banks and expanding health coverage, *The National Parks* seems to subtly support the idea that we need government to do things that can’t or won’t be done by the private sector.

*The National Parks: America’s Best Idea* is at the same time a story of people who were devoted to saving the land they loved, and in doing so, somehow exemplified the meaning of democracy. The film highlights the argument between those who would exploit the parks for private and commercial use and gain versus those who fought to preserve public places where all Americans could go to experience nature. For some that is a political agenda.

Burns says “If there were no national parks, then the Grand Canyon would be lined with mansions, and you and I and, more importantly, our children would never get to see that view. If there were no national parks, then the Everglades would be drained and it would be filled with tract housing developments and golf courses — and the world’s most exquisite, diverse habitat would be lost forever.”

Michael Moore uses interviews differently than Ken Burns but both make their presence known. Moore challenges his subjects and manipulates them into saying things that support his agenda, whereas Burns presents his films in the form of a monologue, Moore is usually personally present on camera to create a dialogue with his subjects and Burns shapes his message behind the camera and in the editing room.

Current technology is providing everyday people opportunities to produce and distribute their own films. YouTube, 12-Second TV, and a variety of other resources make it easy for people to become their own Ken Burns or Michael Moore. Students will need more media literacy education in schools to help them negotiate the increased exposure to films on television, DVDs, online and on their cell phones as well as their increased access to creating and distributing their own films.

The same effort that has taken place to teach people to read and write over the past 500 years will now need to be applied to learning to navigate visual literacy. The 21st century communication mode will be increasingly visual in the next 500 years.

—M. Rayala
Web 2.0 refers to the second generation of web development and web design that facilitates information sharing, interoperability, user-centered design and collaboration on the World Wide Web. The advent of Web 2.0 led to the development and evolution of web-based communities, hosted services, and web applications. Examples include social-networking sites, video-sharing sites, wikis, blogs, mashups and folksonomies.

As a result we have more and more people making their own videos and distributing them on the Internet through sites like YouTube. The international network of Computer Clubhouses in over 100 locations in 21 countries has low-income teenagers creating their own video games using a program called Scratch developed for them by MIT and available as a free download.

Education has not experienced a similar rebirth so schools have not kept pace with the extraordinary explosion of technologies such as iPods, iPhones, Wikipedia, Facebook, Google, IM, Skype and on and on. While communication has changed drastically in the outside world there has been little comparable change inside schools.

There are some notable exceptions, like the Science Leadership Academy in Philadelphia, where the evolution of web-based communities, such as social-networking sites, video-sharing sites, wikis, and blogs have been seamlessly incorporated into classrooms by teachers and students, but schools in general do not facilitate communication among students, information sharing, and wide-scale collaboration such as we see on the World Wide Web.

This issue of The Journal of Media Literacy looks at what School 2.0 will need to look like to catch up to Web 2.0. Like Web 2.0, the transformation is not necessarily about technology. Tim Berners-Lee, inventor of the World Wide Web, points out that many of the technological components of Web 2.0 have existed since the early days of the Web. The change is how we have come to use these technologies.
Keeping up with changing media

Here’s an image that’s helpful to have in mind to locate different stakeholders and ideas concerning education, media literacy and technology:

Schools traditionally fall on the left side of the timeline (between historic and contemporary) while the students’ interests typically fall somewhere along the right side (between contemporary and emerging). Classroom technology, in this timeline, might look something like (historic) blackboards, (traditional) white boards, (contemporary) smartboards, (new) 1-to-1 laptops, and (emerging) smart phones. In five years we could expect today’s “new” to become tomorrow’s “traditional”.

Curriculum is heavy on the historic and traditional side of knowledge. Schools traditionally viewed their responsibility as filling in what students had missed before they were born but students are increasingly more concerned with being prepared for a rapidly changing future. Some teachers purposely avoid addressing popular culture, new media and today’s technologies because they say “students already get enough of that in their lives. Our job is to give them the basics and a grounding in the proven past.”

With increasingly rapid advances in science and technology much of what students read in textbooks is no longer felt to be true or relevant so good teachers find it necessary to augment traditional materials with more contemporary and newly developed information and ideas.

California Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger announced that some schools in California will be using electronic textbooks for science and math in the Fall of 2009. This will save California money and allow for more rapid updating of the material to keep up with the pace of change. Electronic books like Amazon’s Kindle make traditionalists nervous and, in their struggle to pinpoint what they would miss about traditional printed books, they say silly things such as “I like the smell of books.”

Schools in general do not facilitate communication among students, information sharing, and wide-scale collaboration such as we see on the World Wide Web.
Among the other worries of traditional educators is that students are developing shorter attention spans and are becoming less reflective. There is also much hand wringing over negative aspects of media multi-tasking, social isolation, Internet safety, privacy, distractions, plagiarism, illegal downloading, appropriation of media, and on and on. Schools have spent so much energy, money and time “protecting” students from new media that they have fallen behind in providing them the benefits of the new media that many students are already enjoying outside of school.

One of the traditional concerns of media literacy has been to monitor the means of distribution for media. Media conglomerates are companies that own large numbers of companies in various mass media such as television, radio, publishing, movies, and the Internet.

As of 2008, The Walt Disney Company is the world’s largest media conglomerate with News Corporation, Viacom and Time Warner ranking second, third and fourth respectively. Sony is also a media conglomerate whose revenue is actually more than Disney’s, but this includes several other non-media businesses.

Thanks to Web 2.0, today there is an upheaval of media distribution with many individuals finding they can produce and distribute their own media products via the Internet. There has been a blurring of mainstream media boundaries. Many bloggers are engaged in participatory journalism and differentiate themselves from the mainstream media while most newspapers in the country are on the brink of becoming extinct. Members of the media are beginning to work through different channels. Some see blogging as a means of pushing messages directly to the public.

Some bloggers have moved to other media like radio and television. Some established authors have started using blogs to not only update fans on their current works but also to expand into new areas of writing. There are many examples of bloggers who have published books based on their blogs. Some books are being published only on electronic readers.

Mobility is the key feature of media technology today. The portable laptop computer is giving way to the even more portable smart phones like the Blackberry and the Apple iPhone. Kevin Kelley, former editor of Wired magazine, calls the collected content of the Web “the bubble”. More and more content is being stored in “the bubble” rather than on personal devices and is accessed with small handheld portals. We no longer purchase a set of encyclopedias but simply go online to look up any topic on Wikipedia. We often sidestep purchasing albums, movies or books by simply downloading music to our iPods, movies from NetFlix, and books from Amazon.com onto our Kindles.

What this means for teachers is that many find themselves increasingly defending traditional attitudes about new and emerging media and feel that the students often know more than they do about much of the technology. So, for example, teachers spend a good deal of time talking about how to restrict, control, or limit student access to media and technology. They worry that students are using media and technology too much or in inappropriate ways. As a result, many teachers sound like opponents to the new and emerging technologies that students find so exciting and are often seen by students as irrelevant or an impediment to their real learning.
Many adults bemoan a perceived decline in reading and a growing use of visual images in today’s culture. The idea that the book is always better than the movie is still popular among many educators. The movie industry is creating an ongoing list of new ways to attract viewers such as Imax theatres, digital video, high-definition images, and now 3-D movies. It is startling to see the high quality of the latest version of digital, hi-def, Imax, 3-D movies. The World Wide Web and the computer have done for reproduction and mass distribution of visual images in the 1990s what the Gutenberg Press did for the printed word in the 1430s. Both changed the world forever.

EDUCATING THE WHOLE BEING

Today, adjusting to changes in our culture, schools are having to expand the range of responsibilities to include areas that previously were not considered within the domain of schooling. There are four major goals in life we seek for ourselves and our children—doing well, doing good, being well and well-being. (See figure above.)

We want to DO WELL in life. We want ourselves and our children to have good educations, well-paying jobs, nice houses and stable and loving relationships. Schools have long accepted that their major responsibility is to prepare students to be able to secure good college educations, good jobs and attractive spouses.

Secondly, in addition to doing well in life we want people to DO GOOD as well. This has traditionally been seen as the domain of the family and the church but schools have also historically included a good dose of civics, citizenship, and behavioral admonishments.

With recent high profile examples like Bernard Madoff, the financier who was sentenced to 150 years in prison for defrauding thousands of investors of billions of dollars, there is a growing expectation that people who are “doing well” in life cannot do so at the expense of “doing good”.

Despite recent movies like Public Enemies that glorify gangsters like John Dillinger, the public is no longer as accepting of the idea that one must necessarily tread on the side of illegality and immorality to be successful. We are less accepting of philandering senators, crooked congressmen, and god-father-like CEOs. Behavior that we often turned a blind eye to in the past is increasingly being used to re-
move people from office and put them in jail. The rules are changing and society is expecting students to learn how to do good while learning to do well.

The futurist, philosopher, and inventor, Buckminster Fuller exemplifies a person who sought to do good over any desire to do well. He asked himself how an ordinary person with little money, average intelligence, and no special status, could improve the world for 100% of humanity. Never holding public office or heading a major corporation, he managed to make a difference on what he famously termed “Spaceship Earth” which he circled over 50 times in his life.

A third area we want for ourselves and our students is to **BE WELL**. We are much more health conscious and knowledgeable than past generations. The perils of smoking are now well documented despite the criminal actions of the cigarette industry to confuse people through advertising and media campaigns. People like scientist, inventor and futurist Ray Kurzweil are suggesting that our lives can be extended indefinitely by applying the knowledge of nutrition and medical technologies currently available.

Schools, while not shouldering this responsibility on their own, have traditionally included recess, athletic programs and health classes to meet the desire of people to be well while learning to do well and to do good.

The fourth area goes beyond being well to include **WELL-BEING**. We are finding more and more people who are ostensibly doing well in life, are good citizens, and in apparent good health but are none-the-less unhappy and dissatisfied with their lives. We have affluent, intelligent students committing suicide or engaging in risky behaviors. We live in fear of violence on our streets and in anxiety over everything from our job security to our personal appearance. We would like to be happier and more fulfilled in our lives.

Whole industries are supported by our need for well-being. Self-help gurus like Wayne Dyer and Eckhart Tolle, Landmark Education programs, the Dalai Lama and other Buddhist teachings, etc. are all devoted to helping us be more happy, more fulfilled, less anxious, and less fearful of life. They provide guidance on how to feel better about oneself (well-being) in contrast to most Western religions that focus on enforcing rules for moral behavior (doing good).

**CHALLENGING EDUCATIONAL REFORM**

Educators have been struggling to put structure into this vision. There were three major approaches to the reform of education as we entered the 21st century. One focused on content and knowledge, another focused on skill development, and the third focused on developing the basic tools of learning. A group of influential educators called “Common Core” recently criticized the recommendations of another set of education experts called the “Partnership for 21st Century Skills”.

The dispute is over how much emphasis to place on content and how much to place on skills. The organization Common Core calls for giving students strong content grounding across academic disciplines.

The Partnership for 21st Century Skills promotes the cultivation of a broad range of critical-thinking, creative, and analytical skills among students, including technological know-how, as well as skills in areas such as communication. The organization argues that those skills are vital to succeeding on the job and in life and schools should nurture them.

In its open letter, titled “A Challenge to the Partnership for 21st Century Skills,” Common Core says the approach of the Partnership, or P21, “marginalizes knowledge and therefore will deny students the liberal education they need.” They add that “skills can neither be taught nor applied effectively
without prior knowledge of a wide array of subjects.” Attempting to teach skills apart from knowledge undermines the quality of education in America.

There are at least three ways to slice the educational agenda: Common Core is approaching it from the direction of subject areas: history, science, literature, geography, civics, mathematics, the arts, technology, and foreign languages. Partnership for 21st Century Skills emphasizes skills such as critical thinking, creativity, and problem-solving. And the federal legislation that created No Child Left Behind advocated for developing the basic learning tools – reading, writing and math.

The problems with each of the approaches are that they co-mingle content, skills and tools in confusing and indiscriminate ways and they each leave out major components in their frameworks.

**Common Core: CONTENT**

To be appropriately comprehensive the Common Core philosophy of focusing on academic content learning should include seven major areas of content.

Place the subject areas in historic evolutionary perspective starting 13.8 billions years ago.

(A) the universe (Physics),
(B) our solar system and Earth (Geography, Geology),
(C) life (Chemistry, Biology),
(D) consciousness (Neuro-Science, Psychology, Philosophy),
(E) civilization (Civics, History, Religion, the Arts),
(F) technology (the Industrial Revolution, technology), and
(G) Information (computer science, information technology, Web).

**No Child Left Behind: TOOLS**

No Child Left Behind (NCLB) made the mistake of focusing on only two of the tools used by our brains to process information. The full list includes eight tools comparable to what Harvard cognitive scientist, Howard Gardner, called multiple intelligences. Place the tools for learning in a separate list without confusingly co-mingling them with content:

(1) words (English, foreign languages),
(2) numbers (mathematics),
(3) sounds (speech, music, acoustics),
(4) movement (physical education, sports, dance, robotics),
(5) images (drawing, painting, photography, mapmaking, video),
(6) objects (manipulatives, museums, sculpture, products, artifacts),
(7) environments (architecture, urban planning, landscape, environmentalism), and
(8) experiences (theatre, children’s museums, theme parks, field trips, video games, toys, experiments, virtual reality).

**Partnership for 21st Century Skills: SKILLS**

The Partnership for 21st Century Skills suggests skills like problem-solving, creativity and analytical thinking. Their complete list should look something like this:

(1) ideation - goal-setting, brainstorming, problem-identification, creative thinking,
(2) research - inquiry, investigation, experimentation,
(3) developing criteria - analysis of needs, assessment rubrics, critical thinking,
(4) visualizing - more brainstorming, generating many possible solutions, sketching, planning, diagramming,
(5) **prototyping** - model making, testing, more hands-on experimenting, craftsmanship, problem-solving.

(6) **development/production** - selecting the most promising possibility, creating the solution, completing the process, fabricating.

(7) **implementation** - distribution, putting the idea into action, making something happen, trying it out, and

(8) **evaluation** - testing, assessment, evaluating, observing results, looking for room for improvement.

**CONCLUDING THOUGHTS: OPENING UP EDUCATION**

The mistake we are making in education is not in choice of **content** or development of **skills** but in not providing the learners brains the full range of **tools** they need to take in information, process it, and output results. The brain is physically structured to process words, numbers, sounds, movement, images, objects, spaces and experiences. Cutting learners off from any one of these (no matter the differences in learning styles) is like cutting out key elements of the food pyramid. All brains work better using the full range of **tools** they are built to use in solving problems (skills) in a variety of contexts (content). Media literacy offers guidance in dealing with contemporary messages that are rich with stories, sounds, images, movement, and interactive experiences.

Much can be learned by looking at the recent book, *Opening Up Education: The Collective Advancement of Education through Open Technology, Open Content, and Open Knowledge* edited by Toru Iiyoshi and M. S. Vijay Kumar. While the book is mainly about college level education, the authors argue for a broader vision of bringing schooling into the era of Web 2.0:

"...given the abundance of open education initiatives that aim to make educational assets freely available online, the time seems ripe to explore the potential of open education to transform the economics and ecology of education. ...we have yet to take full advantage of shared knowledge about how these are being used, what local innovations are emerging, and how to learn from and build on the experiences of others. *Opening Up Education* argues that we must develop not only the technical capability but also the intellectual capacity for transforming tacit pedagogical knowledge into commonly usable and visible knowledge..."

School 2.0 has to **embrace** the new media and technologies that are making the world a better place for 100% of humanity. We have to be as open to the tremendous benefits brought by the new media technologies as we are wary of their downsides. Rather than closing down, restricting, and censoring information and technology, our instincts should lean toward joyfully opening up access to all learning, anywhere, any time, by everyone.

**REFERENCES**


Remixing Media Literacy Education

STUDENTS ‘WRITING’ WITH NEW MEDIA TECHNOLOGIES

BY MICHAEL DEZUANNI

The reconceptualization of media literacy education should be one of the most important goals for ‘DIY’ schools because schools need to recognize the active and productive ways in which young people participate in media cultures. New media technologies have resulted in fundamental shifts in the relationship between young people and media and media literacy educators should ‘remix’ media education to effectively respond to the Web 2.0 world. This ‘remixing’ does not require a complete break with past approaches in the field. As the term ‘remix’ suggests, the best attributes of existing versions of media education should be retained and built upon. In particular, there should be more emphasis on media production—students ‘writing with’ media.

The best attributes of existing theorizations of media literacy education are those that emphasize the development of young people’s critically reflective participation in media cultures and that recognize that young people are not deficient in their relationships with media, but are active and proficient participants. These attributes have been identified by scholars internationally including Alvermann (2008), Burn (Burn and Durran 2005), Jenkins (1992; 2006), Hoechsmann (Hoechsmann and Low 2008) and Luke (2001). However, despite this theoretical move from deficiency to proficiency, classroom practice continues to over-emphasize critical approaches such as decoding (reading) at the expense of potentially more meaningful and productive encoding (making).

MEDIA LITERACY EDUCATORS SHOULD ‘REMIX’ MEDIA EDUCATION TO EFFECTIVELY RESPOND TO THE WEB 2.0 WORLD... IN PARTICULAR, THERE SHOULD BE MORE EMPHASIS ON MEDIA PRODUCTION—STUDENTS ‘WRITING WITH’ MEDIA.

The focus on decoding rather than encoding in classrooms is problematic because it tends to be inauthentic to young people’s daily media experiences. It aims to formalize knowledge about media and align this knowledge to processes of ‘schooling’. These processes include accepted bodies of knowl-
edge and ‘expertise’ that is likely to be held by the
teachers, ‘transferred’ to students and subsequently
tested and assessed. Young people’s actual use of
media has entirely different sets of hierarchies, ‘ex-
pertise’ and teaching and learning processes that
are likely to be more meaningful to students. In this
context, there is significant potential for school-
bascd media learning to be quite irrelevant to young
people’s actual media experiences.

‘Encoding’ or ‘writing’ media offers the potential for
making connections between young people’s daily
media experiences and their classroom experiences.
Writing with media provides young people with op-
portunities to explore their relationships with media
in ways that are potentially more creative and less de-
fined than media ‘theory’ work offered through tra-
ditional schooling processes. However, the version
of classroom media ‘writing’ that has relevance to
young people’s daily media experiences is not nec-
essarily the replication of industrial or even serious
amateur models of production, although these have
their place. The real potential for media ‘writing’ in
classrooms relates to the concept of ‘remixing’.

In the Web2.0 world, remixing is often defined in
quite specific terms to refer to reworking existing
digital artefacts. However, youth ‘remixing’ prac-
tices pre-date the Web. The British Cultural Studies
youth culture theorists recognized this in the 1970s.
These theorists focused on young people’s use of
found objects as fashion items, the recycling of
fashions in new contexts and the cut and paste cul-
ture associated with magazines, posters and bed-
room ‘wonder walls’. Paul Willis (1990) identified
young people’s symbolic creative work as an inte-
gral part of the formation of youth identities in his
also discusses these processes as forms of cultural
‘poaching’ and argues that they are crucial to partic-
ipatory culture. From this perspective, remixing in
digital environments might be read as an extension
of well established practices within youth culture.

An example of this type of remixing work by young
people recently took place as part of an Australian
Teachers of Media, Queensland initiative that
brought six young people from across Queensland
to Brisbane to workshop aspects of the relationship
between young people and media. However, rather
than over-emphasizing talk and analysis, the work-
shops focused on the students making short videos
about these issues. After an initial period of discus-
sion about youth representations and issues (ini-
tiated by the students), the students planned and
produced brief ‘One Minute Wonder’ videos that
aimed to make a comment about young people and
the media. These videos were shot in about an hour
and edited in about two hours. The videos were
then screened to an audience of media teachers and
followed up by discussion in the form of a ques-
tion and answer session. This process was a form
of ‘remixing’ in the sense that the students took
what they believed were dominant representations
of young people and reworked them to put forward
new representations. The videos can be viewed at
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IxwJw7CIgB8
and http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fbSE1rAU5Dc.
Remix culture has a crucial role to play in media literacy education because it allows young people to gain insights into media literacy concepts like 'representation', 'audience', and 'language' in more authentic ways than through 'decoding' practices. This is not to suggest that critical and conceptual understandings of media are unimportant. Rather, it suggests that students are most likely engage with these understandings through creative, decentralized and open processes of remixing rather than through more formal and 'closed' schooling processes. For remix culture to become a significant part of media literacy education, the media education curriculum itself needs to be remixed. Media literacy education, for so long an innovator in curriculum reform, needs to once again lead the way and embrace the DIY school philosophy.\(^1\)
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Power Dynamics in Classroom 2.0

BY NEIL ANDERSEN

The opportunities of Classroom 2.0 cannot be considered without regard for the shift in power dynamics that inevitably accompany them. Teachers must consider these, anticipate the opportunities and proactively meet the challenges.

Wikipedia is often touted as a prime example of Web 2.0. This is because it is predominantly comprised of user-generated content. It is invitational, participatory and interactive, and there is a measure of democracy about it. Its goal is not to glorify any particular contributor, but to further the collective knowledge that it represents. I.e., Wikipedia authors are not stars, but anonymously subordinate themselves to the greater benefit of the community.

If this model is transposed to the classroom environment, it implicates some significant changes and adjustments to protocols and decision-making. Some teachers might be threatened by these changes, seeing it as chaotic, maybe even anarchic. It needn’t be. In fact, the shift in the power dynamic can effect a profound benefit: students taking ownership of their learning.

Classroom 2.0 can also be a wonderful way of implementing multiple intelligences and differentiated instruction. The model might require teachers to be more transparent with their teaching and curriculum design, more open-ended and flexible with their assessment and evaluations. But it also requires students to step up and be more accountable for their demonstrations.

Rather than a teacher noting the learning goals mandated for a particular unit or lesson, then designing instruction and student tasks that deliver and evaluate them, the teacher might present the learning goals and instructional parameters to the students, then negotiate ways in which the students will learn and demonstrate. Transparency would occur when the teacher discloses the timelines, technical supports, etc. that support and limit the scope of the activities. In some cases, students might offer to peer-teach and assume technical responsibilities to see a project through. I.e., if the teacher is unsure of which blog host is best for a particular assignment, students might research and recommend one, even showing others how to create accounts and upload files, then trouble-shooting problems.

To be successful, Classroom 2.0 requires the kind of sharing of power that has made Web 2.0 successful. That does not mean that the teacher is powerless, but that the teacher might re-frame the course goals and the students’ roles.
goals and the students’ roles. Specifically, the prime directives are the curricular learning objectives, as mandated by an external curriculum document. These, and the standards that must be met for the grade, are non-negotiable. And because they are public documents and articulate, they can be shared freely among teachers and students.

A POSSIBLE CLASSROOM 2.0 MODEL

Once the fixed (non-negotiable) learning goals and standards are shared, students and teacher can research and negotiate the best way to demonstrate them. Note the power shift that this entails: the learning goals are dictated not by the teacher, but by the state/province. The discussion is not, “Because I say so,” but “Because the state/province mandates it.” This is freeing for the teacher because she/he is now working on the students’ behalf to support, rather than police, their learning.

Starting with due dates, the class might consider what kinds of appropriate demonstrations can be accomplished within the time frames and technical supports. Some of the questions that could guide these negotiations include:

- What kinds of and how much hardware and software are available?
- What kinds of projects are they capable of producing?
- For how much time can they be accessed?
- What student-owned equipment might be available?
- What portion of the research/production time might be class time and what portion must become homework/after school time?
- What do we collectively know and not know, both on the content and the form sides?
- Where might we look or whom might we ask to acquire the information we need?
- How are the copyright rules for what we might create?
- How do we honor those rules?
- How do we ensure privacy?
- Which students, or groups of students, will take responsibility for specific supports, e.g., learning and teaching others how to use equipment/programs, moderating a blog, logging and moderating a group’s progress according to a rubric?

Note that assessment is ongoing, and the teacher and students are in constant assessment mode as the projects progress. Mini-lessons can be delivered as needed. When it comes time for evaluation, the onus is on the students to explain how their products demonstrate the learning goals. As the power has shifted, so has the responsibility. The student owns the learning, and must take responsibility for what has been, or not been, demonstrated.

Classroom 2.0 redefines the meanings of ‘teacher,’ ‘student’ and ‘responsibility.’ It also means a shift in the relationships to curriculum and technologies. Moving to a Classroom 2.0 model can be challenging for both students and teachers, and the shifts in power and responsibility must be anticipated, acknowledged and negotiated carefully and transparently.

Neil Andersen has taught film and/or media studies for over 30 years. He has been a computer resource teacher, a literacy consultant, and has given educational keynotes and workshops across Canada, in the US, Asia, Australia and Europe. Andersen has taught at the University of Toronto, York University and at Mount Saint Vincent University. He is an executive member of the Association for Media Literacy (aml.ca) and on the Education Committee of the Media-Awareness Network (media-awareness.ca).
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Exploring the Media with Dora

A PRE-SCHOOL INTRODUCTION TO MEDIA LITERACY

BY CARLOS E. CORTÉS, MARIANA DIAZ-WIONCZEK, & VALERIA O. LOVELACE

“We did it!”

With those now iconic words, millions of young viewers each day join Dora the Explorer to celebrate the collaborative completion of a problem-solving television adventure. And they do it through media—actively and interactively.

Dora the Explorer made its Nickelodeon television debut on August 14, 2000. One of the most-watched pre-school television shows in the United States, it quickly developed into a social phenomenon (Diaz-Wionczek, Lovelace, & Cortés, 2009).

Children throughout the United States now proudly proclaim, “I’m learning Spanish from Dora.” And they applaud Dora’s fearless female activism. But, as a pre-school educator, Dora goes much further. Among its many achievements, Dora the Explorer has drawn young viewers into the world of the new media literacy using two main strategies: multiple intelligence-based interactivity and computer-based iconography.

Dora’s teaching effectiveness did not occur by accident. Here’s part of the story as viewed by the three of us, all part of the Dora team (Diaz-Wionczek, Director of Research and Development; Lovelace, Research and Curriculum Development Consultant; and Cortés, Creative and Cultural Advisor).

Dora is based on a carefully-constructed program format with a clear linear structure. At the beginning of each episode, the Map (Figure 1) lays out a sequence of challenges that Dora, her friends, and viewers must deal with in order to reach their ultimate goal. In the process, they engage in activities that contribute to their sense of media-related empowerment.
INTERACTIVITY

Interactivity fosters young viewer interest and facilitates learning (Linebarger & Walker, 2005). To capture and hold viewer attention, each Dora episode features a linear narrative shaped around a high-stakes adventure with serious consequences. It calls upon viewers to interact with the television to help Dora overcome a series of structured challenges. Mused co-creator and co-executive producer Chris Gifford, “It’s amazing to see the satisfaction it gives kids to help Dora solve a series of high-stakes problems. They’re like proud partners who believe Dora couldn’t have done it without them! (Gifford, 2008)”

After considering various program concepts, the creative and research teams developed an interactive pre-school curriculum based on seven of Howard Gardner’s multiple intelligences: logical/mathematical; musical/auditory; bodily/kinesthetic; interpersonal; intrapersonal; spatial; and linguistic (Gardner, 1993). Media literacy in Dora involves drawing upon young viewers’ personal capacities in each of those seven areas to interact with the media.

Viewers use linguistic intelligence (in Spanish and English) to solve problems, while The Map encourages viewers to use spatial intelligence. One parent wrote about her daughter (nearly 3) that “her speech has come on leaps and bounds with the repetition, and also her counting has improved” (Nick Jr., 2003).

Children use their bodily/kinesthetic intelligence as they physically model actions in which Dora and other characters are engaged. According to co-creator and co-executive producer Valerie Walsh, “One of the things I love most about the show, and something that makes it unique, is that viewers are asked to be active participants, not only by asking questions, but by getting off the couch and moving their bodies” (Nick Jr., 2000).

Interactivity, then, an essential feature of learning with the new media, is a core element of Dora. And, by drawing upon Gardner’s multiple intelligences, Dora stretches the traditional boundaries of media interactivity and, inevitably, media literacy.

DORA’S COMPUTER WORLD

Along with featuring interactivity, Dora the Explorer also fosters media technological literacy. This process begins with the very world in which Dora lives, a computer/fantasy world teeming with icons of computer technology and replete with computer conventions.

Cursor arrows (Figure 2) aid in problem solving. They function as cognitive organizers, helping young viewers focus and, in that way, become more effective in overcoming the challenges that are presented. Arrows draw attention to critical elements of the problems being addressed. They click, highlight, and drag objects as part of the problem-solving process.

In many respects, Dora episodes take on the characteristics of a computer game itself, something children might play in an arcade or on their home computers. Participating in a Dora show, in other
words, with its computer features and conventions, helps young viewers become more familiar and comfortable with the new media, preparing them for a future of computer-based learning.

**DORA THE EMPOWERER**

Research has shown that children feel more empowered if they can interact successfully with televised challenges (Anderson, Bryant, Wilder, Crawley, Santomero, & Williams, 2000). In that respect, *Dora* helps empower young viewers. This empowerment includes introducing them to and involving them in elements of the new interactive media literacy.

It is impossible to predict with certainty the exact course that schools will follow in the decades ahead. History is littered with the mistaken projections of past prognosticators. However, it is quite likely that more of future school learning will involve literacy and competency with the new media. If so, then the *Dora* experience may well prove to be a significant, if maybe unsung, contributor.

**REFERENCES**


*FIGURE 2*

Computer Iconography: the cursor arrow. Computer-based iconography—“click on the arrow”—draws young viewers into the world of new media literacy.

*FIGURE 3*

*Dora* and Boots are demonstrating their musical (teaching a song) and kinesthetic (winding the music box handle) intelligence.
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I am the Director of a Charter School Association. However, I am not mostly interested in schools. I am more interested in education.

It used to be that people were more concerned about education than schooling. Now, for the last I don’t know how many years, this has been turned around—most of the discussion is about schools. Worse, it is about schools as job training.

Education and schooling are different things. They are like sex and love. Sometimes they go together and sometimes they get in the way of each other. Most people in their lives experience sex, less love. Most people go to school, less get an education.

To get educated a person has to get lost and schools are more about making sure students don’t go astray. In school, teachers lead students out of the forest along well paved roads. Education requires a student to find his own way out through a less traveled or even a new path.

Throughout most of Western history the best education—a Classical and Liberal Arts education—did not prepare a person for any job. It just prepared a person to live a life well lived.

I think when we equate schools with job training we are saying there are many people who cannot be educated, should not be educated or who do not want to be educated. Having a schooled but
uneducated workforce makes it easy to market things to people. It makes it easy to get people to vote against their self interests. And, it is destroying our democracy.

Education is more like a dog park than a classroom. Sometimes I think teachers believe that if little kids run around making noise they will eventually explode like overfilled balloons. All young things—like dogs at a dog park—run around making noise. Like dogs, humans are neotenous, we are childlike (hopefully not childish) our whole lives. I think most little kids have a hell-raiser inside them. I think it is sad that most adults have lost touch with that hell raiser. School has something to do with that.

Dr. Robert M. Franklin, President of Morehouse College summed up an educated person in eight words: “Renaissance Men with social conscience and global perspective.” He went on to say that “one of the critical ingredients… is a fundamental sense of discontent with mediocrity and nonsense.”

Education, in the end, is about behavior—how one acts in and on the world—experiences the world and interacts with people and other living things in it. The sole purpose of education is to allow an individual to live a thoughtful life, to make contributions during that life, and to experience joy.

I find it interesting that most of the people I have met in my life that I thought were well educated also usually griped strenuously about their early schooling. I think schooling turns into education when students fight their schooling. I think the best schools design this into their pedagogy.

I griped about my schooling which was mostly in a small Catholic School taught by nuns who today could not get a teachers’ license from any State Department of Education. But, these nuns were really dedicated and passionate—they were on a mission. Not a proselytizing one about Catholicism. It was not even about knowledge. These nuns probably could not have passed any standardized test themselves on most subjects. What they did know how to do was point us in the right direction. They had unerring compasses. They were all about learning to learn and a lot of that had to do with how to behave. They had what I find now, looking back, to be the almost unique idea that learning is directly related to how you behave.

This had to do with the nuns’ desire to force us across the treacherous bridge from being humane to human; from intellectual detachment to engagement; from sympathy to empathy. It meant asking well framed questions. Yes, to my nuns, there was such a thing as a stupid question! It meant critiquing things, but always being civil. It meant respecting people—from the janitor to the principal and everyone else in between. At that time there was a respect for work and workers that does not exist now. The issue for the nuns was doing something well—not the status of it or how much it paid.

Finally, though, they taught me you really never become the fully educated person you wanted to be. That was the lesson here—they made you "want" it. They set you on the journey but failed to mention that the journey has no final destination. It is simply an endless adventure.

The idea is to simply keep visiting the dog park—sniff around, have some fun, explore a bit, happily greet people and other creatures, particularly be nice to children. Keep track of your pack—but don’t be afraid to run out ahead when the scent calls you. On occasion, growl if you must but don’t bite. When you get home, sit on your favorite sofa and mull the whole thing over. After all, as one old man once said, "An unexamined life is not worth living."

A schooled person knows who said it; an educated one knows what it means.
The 21st century media teacher is at a crossroads: as her students have become natural producers of media through forms such as YouTube and social networking, the inclination might be to consider production over deconstruction as a strategy for teaching key concepts. Some leading educators are now suggesting that this shift is necessary. David Buckingham (Media Education, 2003) says that we need to “displace the text as the privileged focus of classroom study” through production of the personal media text. Julian McDougall (The Media Teacher’s Book, 2006) suggests, “We should be looking to theorize the practical and energize the theoretical so that all media students are ‘learning by doing’”. McDougall references his videogame marketing project, in which students research the ways Nintendo has chosen to distinguish itself from Sony’s Playstation and Microsoft’s X-Box Live. The initially traditional research project shifts rapidly to a production extension in which students draft ideas for a new computer game called ‘Console Launch’. The game’s narrative is the marketing of a new console against competitors. Here, students must effectively apply ideas gathered in initial research, to a simulated production. Reflection and rationalization are included, so students can articulate applied ideas.

Ten years ago, such an assignment might have terminated at the research stage, but the complex and rapidly shifting nature of today’s media technology virtually necessitates production extensions – it seems poor pedagogy not to do so. If, as psychologist Lev Vygotsky believed, play is key to authentic learning, then playing with technology should be key to developing insights into its social meanings. Indeed, if we have until now cautioned to teach “about, as well as through” media, then perhaps effective teaching about media today necessarily involves teaching through it, more directly than ever.

As idealistic as I am, this shift to “theory through production” gives me pause, however. Ideal curriculum is never so promising as when on pristine paper, but the true test of its value is its ease of transformation to a real classroom.

I tend to agree with British innovator Sir Ken Robinson that “[the] present [education] system was designed for 19th century industrialism and it’s overheating in a dangerous way.” So here are the thorny questions: To what degree can today’s classroom yield authentic media learning within its 19th century infrastructures? In “Doing Cultural Studies”, Henry Giroux writes that “power is inscribed on every facet of the schooling process”, so how can we effectively draw on students’ lived media experiences within the hegemonic environment of institutionalized learning? And how does Vygotsky’s notion of learning through play change when that learning is structured in a space that often disempowers the student?
Arcus posits that learning media deconstruction via media construction may be a way of engaging the Net Generation in authentic learning tasks. Unequivocally, this generation, unlike any preceding generation, is attuned to media production technologies that enable them to conduct tasks and reach audiences never before imagined. From podcasts to Photoshop, teachers often relinquish their roles as omnipotent arbiters of knowledge in favour of student-led inquiry. Indeed, Arcus is correct in delineating many of the concerns and challenges associated with this “theory through production.” However, it would be unfortunate if pedagogues shirked the challenge of engaging their classes in authentic production projects due to their perceived complexity. Rich Performance Tasks involving media production need not be burdensome sojourns for the technologically gifted. Rather, media production invites the possibility of bridging the “digital divide” (Trotter, 2006), especially for those students living in school districts with low socio-economic status. As Tom Friedman articulates (The World is Flat, 2005), technology is the great leveller allowing people to participate and compete in ways they never could before. For my media students at least, in a school where one in four students lives below the poverty line, production, with all its hegemonic underpinnings, will be wholly embraced.

A RESPONSE...

BY JULIE CORRIGAN  [Teacher at Bishop Smith Catholic High School in Pembroke, Ontario, Canada]

Can all-consuming passion be transformed into structured study and, furthermore, be evaluated? Julian McDougall admits that “[t]here is clearly a tension between the ‘spirit of the subject’ . . . and the reality of its outdated assessment modes”. Buckingham hints at the difficult issues of post-production self-evaluation and metacognitive reflection: students will still perform and appear to be reflective, all the while being conscious of the need to ‘get through’ or please the teacher. In other words, “impression management.”

These are the obstacles to be negotiated by astute media teachers. They know there are at least two modes of awareness in learners: purposeful engagement focused on end assessment, and passionate, purposeful engagement with little interest in assessment. Good teachers pursue the latter. Probably the only strategies likely to yield authentic engagement are productions with meaningful personal and social themes – often community-linked, with real outcomes. Ideally, hegemony dissipates in the student’s passionate and personal focus, and assessment is perceived as an opportunity for personal reflection. As a caveat, my own chequered experience with student PSA’s reminds me that no matter how noble the cause, we can’t fool students into mistaking a simulation for the real thing, and we can’t fool them into caring for a cause that will never go beyond the boundaries of the classroom. Nothing is as demoralizing as the tired anti-smoking poster, hastily constructed to meet the due date. (I am not sure McDougall’s Console Launch project engendered much passion, however its complexity goes far beyond the familiar “design your own logo” assignment.) To summarize, in order to effectively teach about media, production projects must spring from authentic impulses, be challenging, and most importantly, liberally peppered with opportunities for both oral and written metacognitive reflection to retrieve learned concepts.

Although this approach can be enormously challenging and frequently disheartening, given the disparity between intransigent institutionalized education and students’ deep, natural engagement with media, the alternative (deconstructing texts without production) risks alienating a whole generation of students. They already come to us as enthusiastic media producers, and so have raised the bar in the classroom. Contemporary media teachers, therefore, have a daunting challenge but equally tremendous potential to dissolve the barrier between classroom and community, between school and self – to develop what Julian McDougall calls “[an] autonomous, reflective model of learning”.

Let’s acknowledge at the outset the controversy over new media: the paradigm shift to digital, multisensory modes of communications has us in a tizzy. As Canadian media guru Marshall McLuhan provocatively suggested, we “shape our tools, and thereafter our tools shape us.” Converging technologies are re-shaping traditional definitions of reading and literacy that originated in a linear print world. As with the advent of the printed word, traditionalists are alarmed. Now, like Mark Bauerlein (The Dumbest Generation), they fear that “the digital age stupefies young Americans and jeopardizes our future” by turning out hypernetworked kids who can track each other’s every move with ease, but are largely ignorant of history, economics, and traditional culture. In his article “School and the Reading Brain,” (Education Forum, Fall 2008), Jon Cowans worries that kids are losing their ability to read the printed word with comprehension and attention.

The 21st century child can be a thorn in the side of the 20th century educator. Nevertheless, visionaries such as Marc Prensky (Don’t Bother Me Mom, I’m Learning) are bold enough to recognize them as “Digital Natives”:

They have been adjusting or programming their brains to the speed, interactivity, and other factors in the [video] games…. Children raised with the computer—think differently from the rest of us. They develop hypertext minds. They leap around. It’s as though their cognitive structures were parallel, not sequential. (Digital Natives, Digital Immigrants)

This child of the iPhone, iPod, Blackberry, MSN, Facebook, Twitter, and YouTube is a voracious reader and prolific communicator, but in ways monumentally different than ever before. And what is she reading (and producing)? Websites, emails, text messages, online fan fiction, videogame cheats, news online, MSN chat, social networking websites. Not to mention Twilight. And
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the *Harry Potter* books, which Professor Francesca Coppa remarks, “...is no longer simply a series of books by one author but an entire creative universe within which millions of people are writing, reading, discussing, reporting, analyzing, criticizing, celebrating, marketing, filming, translating, teaching, theorizing, and playacting” (*Writing Bodies in Space*). In 2005, the Pew Internet & American Life report “Teen Content Creators and Consumers” indicated that more than one-half of all teens have created media content, and roughly one third of teens who use the Internet have shared content they produced.

**IT IS UP TO VISIONARY EDUCATORS WHO HAVE THOUGHT DEEPLY ABOUT 21ST CENTURY CITIZENS TO DESIGN A 21ST CENTURY CURRICULUM TO MEET THEIR NEEDS.**

The complex, active and dynamic nature of our students’ digital experiences, therefore, interrogate traditional notions of reading and literacy, prompting researchers such as Kate Pahl and Jennifer Rowsell to link this multi-sensory, multimodal, multi-literate experience to new notions of literacy and identity:

The new literacy studies...[make] us aware of our learners in relation to their identities. Literacy learners produce texts—bits of writing and other expressions of meaning, like drawing and talking. They become makers of texts and, as such, infuse their texts with their sense of identity and the everyday life things that happen to people. These include shopping and cooking and watching television and a myriad of other practices, all interwoven into the act of being literate. (*Literacy and Education*)

Henry Jenkins, until recently at MIT, calls this multimodal culture a participatory culture, [one] with “relatively low barriers to artistic expression and civic engagement, strong support for creating and sharing one’s creations, and...one in which members believe their contributions matter, and feel some degree of social connection with one another” (*Confronting the Challenges of Participatory Culture: Media Education for the 21st Century*). Don Tapscott, author of *Paradigm Shift*, has concluded that in fact Net Geners are smarter, quicker and more tolerant of diversity than their predecessors. They are more politically savvy, socially engaged and family-centred than society gives them credit for.

New cultural paradigms call for new proficiencies, which Jenkins says, ”build on the foundation of traditional literacy, research skills, technical skills, and critical analysis skills taught in the classroom.”

But we must be cognizant of the unique challenges that face the 21st century child: in sustained, comprehensive, critical reading skills; in organizational skills; and most importantly in the critical, reflective use of technology. This generation may surf the Net, but that does not mean they think about how, why and what they are doing. Jenkins reinforces this:

To say that children are not victims of media is not to say that they...have fully mastered what are...complex and still emerging social practices...[The] laissez faire approach...does not address the fundamental inequalities in young people’s access to new media technologies. [It] assumes that children are actively reflecting on their media experiences and can thus articulate what they learn...

Marc Prensky agrees:

One of the most interesting challenges and opportunities in teaching Digital Natives is to figure out and invent ways to include reflection and critical thinking in the learning (either built into the instruction or through a process of instructor-led debriefing) but still do it in the Digital Native language.
It is here that the thoughtful teacher must enter the process. Traditionally minded educators have clung to notions of linear, book-based decoding skills, when the obvious and urgent challenge is to teach students to both decode AND cogently navigate the highly complex systems of new media. It is up to visionary educators who have thought deeply about 21st century citizens to design a 21st century curriculum to meet their needs.

But as leading media education researcher David Buckingham has noted in the introduction to his UNESCO Policy Paper, “regrettably most formal and non-formal educational systems do little to promote media education or education for communication. Too often the gap between the educational experience they offer and the real world in which people live is disturbingly wide.” Welcome to the global village.

Often when media education is adopted, it is wasted through misapplied pedagogy: teaching through the media, rather than about it. This approach ignores the complex contextual relationship between content and form. It is the equivalent of reading a haiku without making reference to its physical structure. Or showing the film version of *Hamlet* without asking how and why this different medium changes the meaning for its audience. Recognizing the difference is one thing; asking why it is different illuminates the distinction between mere identification and critical thinking.

However, when used astutely, media education can be a model of differentiated curriculum. Teachers from many disciplines can exploit the teachable moments which surface so readily from the immense territory generated by the convergence of popular culture and the new digital media—whether it is discussing 9/11, Katrina, Britney Spears’ meltdowns, debating the pros and cons of Angelina Jolie and Brad Pitt engaging in celebrity diplomacy in Africa, or their newest YouTube and Facebook posts.

Until recently, popular culture was always contrasted with “high” culture. Opera, Beethoven, Shakespeare and Michelangelo vs. Beyoncé, Harlequin romances, blockbuster films and reality television. Academically, we need to recognize that in the last 20 years cultural studies departments have gained a strong foothold on North American campuses, offering rich, academic opportunities for students. Courses focus on the dynamics of gender, race and class and on the social, economic and political issues surrounding the media, including the importance of ownership and control of the media industries. This is reason enough to embed it solidly into secondary curriculum.

**EXPLAINING THE TEACHABLE MOMENT**

**RECOGNIZING THE DIFFERENCE IS ONE THING; ASKING WHY IT IS DIFFERENT ILLUMINATES THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN MERE IDENTIFICATION AND CRITICAL THINKING.**

Teachers who lack the means or time for formal training in media studies can take heart in knowing that there are fundamentals they can apply easily to any text or topic. Media education is concept driven and there is international consensus on the areas that need to be covered. These key concepts become the organizing elements that give this work the required intellectual coherence and academic rigour. Imagine discussing a Dove commercial, or the Obama campaign, or Facebook, with a class and applying the following key concepts:

- **MEDIA CODES AND CONVENTION** are technical codes such as camera angles, visual design and how they shape the message.
VALUES AND IDEOLOGY concern a set of beliefs about the world. Typical questions: Who has power? Who does not and why? How are stereotypes used in this text?

MEDIA AND INDUSTRY recognize the commercial implications of media and that most of the world’s information and entertainment industries are owned and controlled by a handful of media conglomerates.

MEDIA AND AUDIENCE are considered in two different ways: How we as consumers become target audiences, and how we as active participants make sense of the media.

Ontario has made important inroads into media curriculum: initially a “movement” of enthusiastic teachers in the 1980’s, Canadian media education began to be taken seriously by education policy makers. In 1986, Ontario became the first jurisdiction in North America to make media literacy mandatory, from K–12. Following that decision, the widely acclaimed Media Literacy Resource Guide was produced by the Ontario-based Association for Media Literacy (AML) and published in 1989. By 1997, the rest of Canada followed suit and media literacy was embedded in provincial policy guidelines for all English/Language Arts programs. The documents encourage a wide range of media activity, from the social significance of tabloids to the study of media conglomerates. It is also important to note that the expectations for Media Studies in Ontario are very different from those of Media Arts; the former soundly embraces critical thinking skills, the latter emphasizes hands-on creative expertise.

Regrettably, few teachers are adequately trained to teach media literacy, but as more teachers receive in-service training through Additional Qualification (AQ) courses, more schools will feel comfortable including it as an essential part of the curriculum. Media Studies AQ courses are offered at Canada’s York University and the University of Toronto. Teachers should lobby for their availability at their faculties of education. Alternatively, and as a stopgap measure, teachers accessing AML resources could conduct their own research. While only English teachers in Ontario are required to include media literacy in the curriculum, there are some marvelous opportunities to infuse it into subjects such as history, geography, health, sociology, and gender studies.

Ultimately, perhaps we are only tinkering with the old curriculum, for as Marshall McLuhan suggested, “we see the world through a rear-view mirror, marching backwards into the future.” The institution of education has never been known for its vision in anticipating the needs of the next generation. Nevertheless, changes wrought by technology are changes we, as educators, must address.

Rather than condemn or endorse the undoubted power of the media, we need to accept their significant impact and penetration throughout the world as an established fact, and also appreciate their importance as an element of culture in today’s world. The role of communication and media in the process of development should not be underestimated, nor the function of media as instruments for the citizen’s active participation in society. (Grünwald Declaration on Media Education, UNESCO.)

The naysayers who decry the loss of one kind of reading, while abandoning the many kinds of reading skills that youth need in a complex multi-modal world, are failing those students utterly.
In the last few years, Web 2.0 developments have encouraged me to explore new pedagogical means to transform traditional classrooms into what I call "Class 2.0." One of the most significant Class 2.0 changes I have adopted is social networking as a means to push the temporal and spatial boundaries of classroom learning. In order to meet the needs of a web-savvy student population, I now have a personal web site, blog, and a Facebook page, all of which feature my professional ambitions as well as interesting trivia about myself, such as my favorite movies, TV shows, books, songs, food, travels, hobbies, family photos, podcasts, and even my birthday (year excluded). I’ll admit that my impetus for creating these web-based social networks was partially motivated by a need to enhance my sense of cyber-caché with my students, particularly since I teach about the Internet and new communication technologies. But my primary aim has been to make myself more accessible to a new generation of students whose understanding of self and social space has changed radically with the proliferation of new digital technologies. Making my personal and professional interests, goals, and critical commentary available to my students through new digital means has enabled me to secure powerful relationships with students to stimulate learning.

With educators often arriving on the web scene later than students, it can be daunting to cross the digital line. However, allowing students to express themselves using communication tools that are native to them and their generation can enrich the learning experience. Often times, new technologies stimulate learning in powerful ways because students begin to see themselves as authentic producers of knowledge who can secure legitimate cultural space to represent their world view and the fruitions of their education. Students who might be disadvantaged in traditional school settings because of their inability to communicate through speech, level of confidence, or other socio-cultural dynamics often thrive online as new tools for
expression are harnessed. With clear parameters in place for acceptable social collaboration and shared learning, students can motivate themselves and their peers to learn as a community.

Currently, in all of my classes, I require students to create personal and course-related content using Web 2.0 applications to foster collaboration and shared learning. Since students can creatively express themselves through a rich panoply of multimodal communication and media on their Facebook pages, as well as self-designed blogs related to course objectives, students are provided with rich opportunities to express themselves intellectually and socially, thereby fostering a unique sense of community. For example, during the U.S. presidential election campaign of 2008, students taking a media criticism course had to create a class Facebook account and individual blogs for an intense research project. The online sites served as the means through which students contrasted mainstream media coverage of the Democrat and Republican candidate with factual evidence of each candidate’s platform, voting record, accomplishments, weaknesses and the like. Using a ‘multi-literacies’ model of information literacy, digital literacy and media literacy, students worked in collaborative groups online and in class to define the socio-political issues most important to them, and to report how each candidate addressed these issues. By creating blogs with integrated links to scholarly online sources, credible links, web portals, polling data, podcasts, and YouTube clips, students became politically engaged with issues facing their generation. As media producers and activists, they used their blogs and Facebook account to create a respectful dialogue between and among themselves, and mobilized their peers to read their sites and come to the campus to listen to their speeches about the candidates and issues. Combined with traditional media, students used their blog links to create press releases to visit the campus to listen to their speeches about the candidates and pertinent election issues. They also conducted radio interviews with the local community radio station to generate “buzz” about their project and the importance of voting in the election. The result was a tangible learning product and cultural artifact that could be integrated into their digital social networks and personal lives.

When I speak to my colleagues about using new social media, many educators fear that crossing the digital divide weakens their claims to authority and traditional means of power. For me, social networking provides a means of connecting with...
students through multimodal interconnectivity in new and exciting ways. Whereas traditional pedagogies reinforce individualized learning within classroom walls during school time, social media encourages continuous collaboration and shared knowledge beyond the classroom walls through global and local hyperlinks, blogs, and web-based content. To keep students engaged in Class 2.0, educators must learn to harness the power of the integrated web to stimulate enhanced global interconnectivity in the digital age.

The new millennium may be the right time to reexamine our philosophical hesitancies to cross the digital line and engage in new Class 2.0 pedagogical experimentation. Online social networking, blogging and web interfaces between faculty and students may help K–12 schools and higher education foster a stronger sense of community in the class, regardless of the physical limitations imposed by class size, or the interpersonal limitations contingent upon traditional markers of experience and identity through race, class, gender, etc. With the right supervision, online networking can also provide a way for students to share their knowledge and inquiry within the larger local, regional, national or global web environment. While educators and students need to do more than adjust their Facebook profiles to make learning inroads, embracing new technological means of expressing oneself and communicating online may be a means to fostering creative and imaginative identities and social discourses that reflect a more diverse set of values, characteristics, principles, and goals.

Like the adage goes, learning should not take place in an academic vacuum; rather it should be shared with the outside world. Online social media and communication may be useful tools to accomplish this task. To be clear, online social networking and blogging must adhere to the same moral–ethical standards that come with all shared interactions between educators, students and the public at large. Trust, integrity and privacy are among the most essential covenants between students and teachers, and both groups have a responsibility to represent themselves with integrity and accuracy, regardless of the medium or space in which they do so.

As with other technological developments, educators will need to reinvent traditional pedagogical paradigms for effective learning in the digital age. Profound socio-cultural changes, many of which have undoubtedly been promulgated by new technologies and a new generation of learners, will continue to shape school reform in the coming years. By creating new sites of web-based learning through teacher- and student-generated social media, blogs, websites, discussions boards, virtual chats, learning resource portals and the like, the scope and purpose of Class 2.0 education can continue to enhance our face-to-face classroom dialogue and collaboration in profound and meaningful ways. 
Web 2.0 and the Socialization of Learning Working Together

BY BELINHA DE ABREU, Ph.D.

“In large measure, we’ve got a situation when kids are walking in the front door of the school, they’re being asked to power down. School doesn’t look at all like the reality in which we live, and while it is easy for people to ban, block, or filter all these new technologies, what they are doing is not embracing the tools of this generation.”

—ANN FLYNN, DIRECTOR, NATIONAL SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION

At the end of every school year, teachers look back to see what things have changed, what they learned, and what they implemented in class that would be worth using again in the forthcoming academic year. This past year in schools has seen the onslaught of Web 2.0 technologies as well as a shift in the technology movement. It actually got faster.

Perhaps it started in January when Twitter became known nationally after the Hudson River plane landing. News agencies were not there to report the events; instead cell phones captured the brilliant landing with their cameras and people nearby twittered the news to their friends, to their families, to strangers, and yes to the news stations. It almost seems as if the world shifted a bit on its axis. The speed with which people were communicating! In schools, where change is much slower, the shift was happening as well. Teachers were beginning to hear words like Google apps, wikis, animoto, glogster, nings, and much more. Many teachers just ignored the words and kept teaching in the same way, but others began to delve into these new platforms to see what would engage their students in learning. Students, in turn, began engaging with their teachers on the various platforms and discussing what they liked and did not like.

While visiting some schools, it became apparent that classrooms which used some of these programs had a more active and interested group of students. After asking a 7th grade social studies teacher what the students liked about the particular Web 2.0 feature they used in the classroom, “Animoto” they stated. “In a nutshell, it is the simple creativity pieces that enable us to interact with information more readily. From being able to produce the videos on Animoto to readily sharing with students who can then comment on it so that a greater understanding can be had.” What was described by this teacher and others is that Web 2.0 enables students to be more active with the cur-

“...YOU GET TO EXPRESS YOURSELF IN LOTS OF WAYS AND CREATE: AND THERE ARE NO LIMITATIONS TO WHAT YOU CAN DO.”

—FROM A SEVENTH-GRADE MIDDLE SCHOOL STUDENT
riculum. Therefore, what they read might have more meaning if they associate it with their own creations. The catch with all of these technologies is that it requires us to be more media and information literate savvy—Kids and teachers.

For teachers it requires a rethinking of the kinds of things we use in the classroom. Reshaping of instruction can be likened to calculators...teachers had to reshape the idea of using them within the math curriculum. Part of that change includes looking at the social networking sites and tools that teenagers are using. Teenagers are in the middle of the most social time in our history, and they are active partners in this movement that is shaping their identity and their connection to the world. These young adults in restaurants, walking to classes, or even with their families, can usually be seen either chatting on their cell phones or more likely texting each other. While most teens are already social beings, social networking has added another dimension to their scope of thinking, learning, and their global relationship to the world.

Students have always been noted for learning new technology at a more rapid pace than most adults, but it is significantly apparent now (Warlick, 2008). Adding to the allure of the technology is their uncanny ability to handle more than one of these forms of technology at once. Researchers call much of what these young adults are doing, multi-tasking (Kaiser Family Foundation, 2007). If they aren’t using their cell phones, then they are IM-ing or finding other forms of communicating. The inside key to many of these kids’ modes of learning has to do with the process of socialization presented by the various technological platforms and by these social networking sites.

K–12 teachers who participate in the new technologies are using blogging, EduSpaces, Flickr, iGoogle, Second Life, SchoolTube, TeacherTube, and Wikis predominately as their means of communicating or working. Most of these sites are used by middle and high school level teachers (Willard, 2006). The use of the mainstream social sites such as MySpace and Facebook are not acknowledged as much by educators. At the elementary level, Flickr, SchoolTube and TeacherTube have seen usage, but even that is limited by internet access, and teacher knowledge.

Adding to barriers of usage of these various platforms are teacher technophobia and inexperience. However of more concern to teachers who are willing to put these Web 2.0 tools into use are the school internet policies, educators discounting the value of using social networking classroom, educators not finding it to be an effective communications tool, and just plain being unknowledgeable. School internet policies have been a source of contention especially for high school teachers who really do like to incorporate cutting-edge online media into the classroom curriculum (Cook, 2007). Teachers who would like to use YouTube for instructional purposes have found the sites blocked on many occasions. They have resorted to finding other means of downloading the content they would like to show, or making copies, at home and bringing them into the classroom. Sites such as MySpace and Facebook
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have been blocked because of the threat of harm that is most commonly what parents have found to be so problematic (Goodstein, 2007). There is little understanding of the potential of these sites as a means of educational growth when there is so much fear surrounding its security.

The best way to find out how Web 2.0 is faring in schools is to put the question to the student user. In this case middle school students who, when asked what they liked most about learning and putting into practice these tools, indicated, “you get to express yourself in lots of ways and create, and there are no limitations for what you can do.” At the end of the day, is that not what educators would want most for students? To feel empowered about learning and to foster their creative abilities so that their learning is most meaningful—which is what Web 2.0 ultimately has to offer the students, the teacher, and the classroom.
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We were talking, about the space between us all. And the people who hide themselves, behind a wall of illusion.

—GEORGE HARRISON, FROM THE SONG Within You, Without You

1. REMEMBER, “THE MEDIUM IS THE MESSAGE”

For the past four years I have worked at a small high school in one of the poorest congressional districts in the country. Located in the South Bronx, our school serves over four hundred students; 87% of them live below the poverty line. While many students manage to buy MP3 players and cell phones, Internet access is rarely guaranteed in students’ homes. Unfortunately, Internet access is also not guaranteed at school.

Last year, for the first time in our school’s ten-year history, we received extra space and funds to create a desktop computer lab. Prior to that, students shared two class sets of 2004 MacBooks connected to our shaky wireless network. The school purchased the same MacBooks for teachers, but now entering year five, they border on obsolescence.

In many cases we “hide [our]selves behind a wall of illusion” when we assume that technology alone can be a catalyst for school reform. This assertion assumes that a majority of teachers have access to technologies and the training to use them. To me, a better question might be, what can teachers with minimal technology training or those working in low-tech environments learn from new media and technology that might improve teaching and learning?
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Many discourses around media and technology in schools over the last forty years have emphasized issues of content and psychological effects. These are essential variables for the study of media and technology, but they often overlook Marshall McLuhan’s famous adage that “the medium is the message.” McLuhan defined a medium as any technology that acts as an extension of the human mind or body. In McLuhan’s eyes a lightbulb, car, or computer are all considered media. To those ends, the message of a medium is how it “shapes and controls the scale and form of human association and action” (McLuhan 2003, p. 20).

McLuhan’s “message of a medium” seems in many ways analogous to culture. Anthropologist Margaret Mead believed that “culture is the learned behavior of a society or a subgroup” (Mead + Metraux, 2002, p.22). Raymond Williams, one of the founders of Cultural Studies, believed that “culture includes the organization of production, the structure of the family, the structure of institutions which express or govern social relationships, the characteristic forms through which members of the society communicate” (Sardar + Van Loon, p.5). These conceptualizations of culture stand side by side with the messages of McLuhan’s mediums. For that reason one can say that the “the message” of new technologies is embodied by the cultures they create.

What cultures do new technologies create? One of the best places to look for this answer is in the recent deluge of articulations around future skills and literacies. Representative texts like Project New Media Literacies white paper, “New Media Literacies” (Jenkins, et al, 2006), the Partnership for 21st Century Skills Framework (2009), Daniel H. Pink’s book A Whole New Mind: Why Right-Brainers Will Rule the Future (2005) and Howard Gardner’s 5 Minds for the Future (2008) all have different foci, but clearly illuminate the messages of new media and the cultures they are creating.

These “frameworks for the future” contain common themes around things like: decentralization, performance, role-play, empathy, storytelling, collaboration, synthesis, pattern-recognition, play, and interdisciplinarity. Among this list, the clearest meta-theme of these frameworks is the importance of making connections between people, things, ideas, and data. These newly emphasized values mirror the potentially positive messages and cultures surrounding new technologies.1

While the technologies sending these messages have “newness” to them, it is important to remember McLuhan’s point that every new medium merely contains old media. Speech contains thought, writing contains speech, and books contain writing. The Internet contains books, their related print media, and a wide range of media related to sound and image. Since none of the media contained by the Internet are “new” it is safe to infer that people are actually reacting to a newly emphasized set of cultural values.

We know from neuroscience that connecting ideas, thoughts and experience is essential for learning and memory. Psychologists who study creativity point out that connecting ideas is essential to innovation. These facts coupled with the culture of connectivity created by new media mean that the ability to connect people, ideas, and information is one of the most important skills for students to understand if they are going to be creative, caring and productive global citizens in a hyper connected world.

Because I rarely work in “wired” classrooms I developed a low-tech practice that is a mash-up of the game Twister™, Mind Maps (made famous by Tony Buzan and Inspiration™ software), connect-the-dots and the experience we have surfing the web. I call the learning experience Connect the Minds.

---

1 I mention these as “potentially positive messages” because our greatest strengths can also be our greatest weaknesses. New technologies are a double-edged sword as the seemingly positive messages of new media also allow for negative outcomes. Worst case scenarios illustrate the downsides of our increased connectivity—the increased connectivity of global finances exacerbated the economic crisis of 2008-2009. It is now easier for predators to connect with minors online and hate groups can collect followers across the globe through online social networks.
Connect the Minds (CTM) is designed to mirror the messages of new technology in a low-tech setting while creating a fun, differentiated, and meaningful way to assess, reinforce, and learn about student understandings. This activity has been used by teachers in my graduate courses and by students and teachers in the South Bronx.

I usually use CTM as a review at the end of a unit, course, or at the end of the year. It could just as easily be used as an interactive KWL activity at the beginning of a unit of study.

I. MATERIALS

To do this practice you need:

1. Butcher paper – enough to cover the floor of your classroom
2. Sticky notes
3. Markers
4. Floor Space
5. Moderator (usually, but not always the teacher)
6. Students

II. PREPARATION

To prepare for this activity:

1. Move the desks and tables in your room out of the way so there is a large open space on the floor.
2. Lay at least two 8-10 ft. sheets of butcher paper side by side on the floor space in the middle of your room. Then tape the sheets together and secure them to the ground.
3. Surround that space with a circle of chairs for seating.

III. PROMPTS

Before students come to class it is important to create a series of prompts (aligned to your learning objectives) that you want students to explore. The students will answer each prompt on an individual sticky note. Below, is a list of questions I created for a 10th grade biology teacher I was collaborating with on a genetics unit.

Before you read the questions there are two things to note:

- The entire unit was framed around the The 6th Day - an Arnold Schwarzenegger film about cloning.
- Students answered these questions by referencing the work they had completed during the unit collected in their notebooks and binders.

Genetics Review Questions

1. What is a vocabulary word you still don’t know? Using your notes, write the word and its definition
2. What is the most interesting thing you learned in the genetics unit? Explain why it was interesting.
3. What is one question you still have about genetics?
4. What activity/reading or viewing did you learn the most from?
5. List something you thought was fiction (made-up) that you now know is fact.
6. What is something from the film The 6th Day that you know is fiction (totally made up)?
7. What is a positive or negative outcome of stem cell research?
8. What moral challenges does cloning pose for society? Explain why this is a challenge.
9. What is one cool/interesting thing you learned from the short film and radio clips you watched/listened to?
10. List two scientific challenges posed by cloning? Explain why these things are challenges.

Here are prompts I used with our staff for an end of the year reflection.

1. What was the funniest thing that happened in your class this year? Please describe the experience.
2. Choose one student you learned something from this year. Explain when and what you learned from that student.

3. What was the best lesson you created this year, and why do you think it was successful?

4. What is something you wish you had done differently this year? Why?

5. Please list two things you learned about teaching this year.

6. What is something that surprised you this year?

7. What was a memorable quote you came across this year (from a text, peer, or student) that you want to remember for next year?

8. Please list two questions you would like to have answered by the end of the year.

9. Please list your two saddest memories this year. Is there anything you can do to improve these situations?

10. What was something extraordinary another adult in the school did to help you this year? Please acknowledge what they did and thank them on the sticky note.
IV. WHEN THE STUDENTS/PARTICIPANTS ENTER THE ROOM...

Have participants sit in the chairs surrounding the butcher paper. Give each person an appropriate number of sticky notes and a marker. Explain that you are going to spend about 30 minutes answering some review questions on sticky notes. In order to differentiate the activity and allow additional processing time for those who need it, explain to participants that they only have to answer 6 out of the 10 prompts. Read each prompt slowly and allow ample time for participants to answer each question. You might also consider printing out a list of prompts that you hand out at the beginning of the Connect The Minds session.

V. SHARING & CONNECTIONS

There are no hard and fast rules for how to share out and make connections. In fact, I would argue that there is an almost infinite series of permutations on the script below. Here I will articulate a sequence of events as it might play out when I’m working with adolescents.

1. Ask everyone to read over his or her sticky notes. Ask them to pull out the one they think is the most interesting for the first round.
2. Go around the circle and have each participant share his/her sticky notes out loud. Also, remind them it is important that they listen carefully to their peers.
3. Ask people to adhere their sticky notes somewhere on the butcher but away from other sticky notes.
4. Ask them to get down on the floor/paper (this is where Twister™ comes in) and use their marker to draw a line connecting their sticky note to another sticky note in any way they see fit. Ask them to write the reason for their connection on the line.
5. Ask everyone to return to his or her seat and ask about five students to share their connections with the whole group.
6. Repeat as often as you like.

After this initial round you can craft many variations on this process. Some examples:

You can skip step 1 and 2 and just ask students to connect one of their unused sticky notes to someone else’s sticky notes and share out those connections.

You can modify step #2 to have students pair share or group share rather than doing whole group share outs.

You can specify different types of connections on step 4. For example, with the genetics review we did seven rounds of connections such as:

- Make any connection.
- Connect two of their own sticky notes and write the link between them.
- Create a scientific link between two sticky notes.
- Connect something positive with something negative.
- Make a cause and effect connection between sticky notes.
- Make a question and answer connection between sticky notes.
- Make two connections between something from The 6th Day and two other ideas or concepts.

When you are working with adults it is easier to have them make a series of connections they think are interesting. Younger participants generally benefit from the additional scaffolding on step #4 for parts of the activity.
Learning experiences like Connect the Minds create a very different culture of learning than fill in the blank worksheets, multiple-choice questions, and traditional review guides. Those traditional assessments are designed to engage students with facts they do not always know. Connect the Minds is about making connections between things students do know and can learn with help from their peers.

This activity is a form of active learning because students are allowed to revisit and interact with content using higher level thinking skills in a way that enriches learning. Students are able to consolidate classroom experiences and think about how the ideas discussed in class connect to other people, ideas, and information. This process allows students to get better at remembering what they’ve learned; psychologists call this phenomenon elaborative encoding.

The task is differentiated as it utilizes multimodal “ways of doing.” It engages visual, auditory, kinesthetic, verbal, intrapersonal, and interpersonal learning styles. Additionally, since there is an infinite series of “right answers” it facilitates abstract thinking. Every participant is given space for creativity as he or she makes multiple new connections between information and ideas across subjects of study and domains of experience.

As you can see, this type of instruction is related to the type of experience we have using new technologies that place a high value on connections between people, ideas, and data. This activity uses the potentially positive messages of new technologies to create a dramatically different classroom culture around teaching and learning.

Few teachers work in completely “wired” classrooms and many schools do not have access to new technologies. For that reason it is important to remember that schools can be “connected” without spending millions of dollars on hardware and software. Technologies and teaching practices that create common cultures connecting people, ideas, and data can be powerful models of educational best practice.

Connect the Minds is just one low-tech example of how we can embrace the messages and cultures created by new media. Many hi-tech innovations are merely a reflection of humanity’s low-tech desire to communicate in a collaborative and connected world filled with people who long to “close the spaces between us all.”

### Connect the Minds

**3. CONNECTED SCHOOLS**


The Future of the News Media and How It Will Affect Education

BY MIKE FANCHER

“I believe in the profession of journalism. I believe that the public journal is a public trust; that all connected with it are, to the full measure of their responsibility, trustees for the public; that acceptance of a lesser service than the public service is betrayal of this trust.”

Those words guided my career for more than 40 years, from the time I first heard them in a high school newspaper class until I recently retired from The Seattle Times, where I spent 20 years as executive editor. The words begin “The Journalist’s Creed,” written by Walter Williams, who founded the world’s first journalism school at the University of Missouri 100 years ago.

Some of the creed’s language is antiquated, but its core principles have endured: clarity, accuracy, fairness, truth and independence. It has served as a declaration of values and standards for generations of journalists, publishers and others associated with journalism. It also has served as a guide that the public could use to understand the role of the press and to evaluate its performance.

As I’ve watched the accelerating deterioration of the business model that supported journalism through the past century, I’ve wondered whether the spirit of public-service journalism can be sustained. Is Williams’ belief that “the supreme test of good journalism is the measure of its public service” still viable, or even relevant?

The creed was written at a time when information was scarce and access to it was limited. Communications technologies through most of the past century favored those who could afford the infrastructure to gather, process and distribute the news. The prevailing busi-
ness model became the “media triangle,” which used content to attract audiences and advertisers.

Without saying it directly, the Creed put journalists on a plateau above the public they served. They were called upon to be trustworthy because they were the trustees who decided what served the public best. From Walter Williams’ day forward, journalism was mostly a one-way relationship. News producers reported, edited and presented the news, while news consumers read, watched, listened to or ignored what came their way. The journalists were the gatekeepers and, as a practical reality, news was whatever they decided to publish or broadcast.

Digital technology is transforming the relationship between people and information, with profound effects on journalism and democracy. The Internet and search technology have flung open the gates, producing a shift in creative control from news producers to news consumers.

“The trigger is technological, but the impact is behavioral. As individuals respond to the infinite range of choices available to them, this will reshape the media landscape and, over time, society itself.”

Whether journalism will remain relevant and accountable in this new landscape depends on two factors: whether citizens will recognize, support and demand true journalism, and whether journalists can embrace the shift of content control away from themselves. The two are connected, and journalism education can be the critical lynchpin connecting them.

I have seen the future of journalism education and it isn’t only for journalists. The model is at the Stony Brook University, on the north shore of Long Island, a 2-hour train ride from Penn Station in Manhattan.

The program is the creation of Howard Schneider, at the behest of Shirley Strumm Kenny, president of Stony Brook. She called Schneider late in 2004, shortly after he abruptly quit as editor of Newsday, asking if he would start a journalism program at the university. He said no.

Schneider explained in a piece for the Nieman Reports fall 2007 issue that he was drained of ambition, wanting nothing more than to burn off some emotional energy by cleaning out his home basement. His newspaper career and tenure as Newsday editor had been successful by any measure, but he was tired from fighting the relentless erosion of support and resources that have become the norm in the newspaper industry.

Strumm Kenny asked him to think about it, they talked more and Schneider ultimately decided to take it on, starting with teaching a class called, “The Ethics and Values of the American Press.” Schneider, whom everyone calls “Howie,” positively lights up when he talks about how the spirited discussions with his students caused him to think in new directions.

As fast as this has been happening, we haven’t seen anything yet. Consider this observation from the “Newspaper Next” report of the American Press Institute in 2006:

“This is change on the grand scale, driven by a fundamental transformation in the connection between humans and information. The social impact is likely to rival the advent of movable type and mass literacy...”
"A journalism school of the future would need two missions, not one," he concluded. "Our first mission was daunting enough: to train the next generation of reporters and editors in a period of media transformation. But the second mission was of equal—perhaps greater—importance: to educate the next generation of news consumers."

The vehicle would be a class called News Literacy, which would aim to help any student be a better, more knowledgeable consumer of news. Schneider reasoned:

"The ultimate check against an inaccurate or irresponsible press never would be just better-trained journalists, or more press critics and ethical codes. It would be a generation of news consumers who would learn how to distinguish for themselves between news and propaganda, verification and mere assertion, evidence and inference, bias and fairness, and between media bias and audience bias—consumers who could differentiate between raw, unmediated information coursing through the Internet and independent, verified journalism."

Yet most journalism programs largely ignored the issue, choosing to focus almost exclusively on the supply side of the journalism equation. We would focus on the demand side, as well, and build a future audience that would recognize and appreciate quality journalism."

On the supply side, Schneider and his colleagues designed their program around what they call the Newsroom of the Future, a state-of-the-art facility used to both teach and create journalism. The emphasis is on learning to report stories on multiple platforms.

Schneider wants to produce not just journalists who can compete wherever the future takes them, but the next generation of media leaders. He stresses that technology is simply the means to the end of getting to the truth. "Never, in my opinion, has there been a greater need in this country for smart, well-trained journalists who can get to the bottom of stories."

On the demand side, the Stony Brook program has already put about a thousand non-journalism students through a 3-credit course in news literacy. Another 2,000 are expected to take the class next year*.

I telephoned Schneider when I read his Nieman Reports article, because his news literacy concept so perfectly captured my ruminations as my own newspaper career was winding down. I had written a weekly column called "Inside The Times" for 15 years, trying to accomplish some of what Schneider was proposing with news literacy, helping readers understand the motives and methods of the press. In recent years I had done extensive speaking on emerging risks to public-service journalism and to the profession of journalism.

It had been my good fortune to spend my career of almost 40 years at just two newspapers, the Kansas City Star and The Seattle Times, both of which were fully committed to the public-service journalism envisioned by the Journalist’s Creed. But newspapers and all media that rely on advertising revenue are going through devastating structural changes brought on by the rise of Internet competition and shifting demographics.
Financial pressures are making it harder for the press to do its job, especially as the watchdog of government. Hard-hitting, independent, investigative journalism is expensive and is being squeezed. In the name of reinvention and transformation, community-service journalism in many news organizations is giving way to emphasis on infotainment.

In 2004 the Project for Excellence in Journalism (PEJ) released the first of what would become annual reports on the State of the Media. It described a vicious cycle in public attitudes toward the press, saying disinvestment in news was reinforcing the public’s suspicions that news organizations are motivated more by economics than public service. One consequence was deeply troubling: "Those who manipulate the press and public appear to be gaining leverage over the journalists who cover them."

Each succeeding year, the PEJ assessment has identified trends that are hostile to true journalism. The emerging models of journalism are "faster, looser and cheaper." There is less original reporting being done, despite increasing numbers of news outlets. At many news organizations, profits trump principles. The "media triangle" economic model is collapsing. There is no clear model for doing journalism online. Journalistic ambitions are shrinking. The bottom line dictates doing less with less.

The 2008 report says "the biggest problem facing traditional media has less to do with where people get information than how to pay for it—the emerging reality is that advertising isn’t migrating online with the consumer. The crisis in journalism, in other words, may not strictly be loss of audience. It may, more fundamentally, be the decoupling of news and advertising."

This current report says news people somehow "must reinvent their profession and their business model at the same time they are cutting back on their reporting and resources."

Howard Weaver, chief news executive of the McClatchy Company, told PEJ, "It’s like changing the oil in your car while you’re driving down the freeway."

As the newspaper industry has responded by cutting newsroom investment through these years, the concept of the public journal as a public trust is at risk. Indeed, the profession of journalism as articulated in the Journalist’s Creed is at risk. As I contemplated retirement from The Seattle Times, I decided I wanted to explore what could be done to preserve both.

Visiting Stony Brook seemed like a great place to start, and it was immediately obvious that the News Literacy effort has become a source of pride on campus. There is a clear sense the program is doing something important and that it could become a model for other colleges, high schools and communities.

"Everybody we’ve talked to has said we’ve really hit on something," says Jim Klurfeld, interim director of the Stony Brook Center for News Literacy. "It’s really exciting to see the student go from one level of understanding to another."

One science student told him that after taking the class she can’t read or watch a news story without deconstructing it. The catchphrase for that deconstruction has become "Open The Freezer," referring to an article in the American Journalism Review by Brian Thevenot, a reporter for the New Orleans’ Times-Picayune. In his piece, Thevenot bluntly explained how he got wrong some critical facts in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina. He had quoted two soldiers by name who said a freezer in the New Orleans Convention Center contained 30 or 40 bodies, including a 7-year-old with her throat cut. One of them said he didn’t have the stomach to look inside the freezer.

My expectation is that these and future investments in the critical thinking of news consumers will help journalism remain relevant and accountable.
"I didn’t push it," Thevenot wrote in AJR. "Now I wish I had, as gruesome as that may seem...Neither the mass of bodies nor the allegedly expired child would ever be found." It turned out that the soldiers themselves had never looked in the freezer and were repeating what they had heard from others.

Thevenot’s admission became a metaphor for questioning whether a news story explains to readers how a journalist knows what is being reported. Students in the news literacy class began saying things like, "I don’t see where this reporter looked into the freezer."

The News Literacy Center at Stony Brook was made possible by a $1.8-million grant from the John S. and James L. Knight Foundation. Part of the funding involves testing to determine what impact the classes are having. A pre-test has been undertaken this year*, and next year* a full study will compare students who have taken the class to a control group to determine whether they are more engaged with the news media, whether they are more critical in their news consumption and whether they are more engaged with civic affairs in general.

Another $200,000 grant from the Ford Foundation is enabling the program to be extended to high-school students, teachers and citizens. This summer Stony Brook is offering a 5-week intensive course for high school teachers, part of which will be devoted to designing a course to take back to their schools.

Schneider and Klurfeld, who had worked together at Newsday, are eager to share their curriculum and hope it will be adopted widely. They are in discussions with the Poynter Institute to offer the course as part of the institute’s online News University, Newsu.org, also funded by the Knight Foundation. Additionally, the American Society of Newspaper Editors (ASNE) this year* announced a news literacy initiative for young people.

My expectation is that these and future investments in the critical thinking of news consumers will help journalism remain relevant and accountable. Greater news literacy could also help journalists embrace the shift in content control.

The two greatest fears I hear from younger journalists is whether anyone will want true journalism in the future and whether there will be a business structure to support it. They are shaken at what is happening to their profession. The nearer they are to the middle of their careers, with young families and mortgages, the more paralyzed they are. They wonder how long it will take for new business models for journalism to develop and whether they can sustain themselves across that horizon.

No one knows what the viable business structure will be; there could be several different ones. I believe they will develop in response to the demand for journalism that will be driven by these forces:

- The desire of people to have credible information for self-governance.
- The inherent public distrust of power, and the demand for accountability.
- The need for help in navigating in a world of information overload.
- The desire of people to have connection and community.

Each of these forces could be amplified by the push for news literacy. Each, in turn, will enhance the appreciation of true journalism. Consumers will control their use of media more than they did in the past, but that simply means journalists must compete more effectively for their time, attention, respect and trust. People will not only have greater control over the media they consume, they will create some of it. Rather than fear this democratization of media, journalists should facilitate it.

I believe that for all of its criticism of the press, the public holds an underlying respect for its role. In the end, I think most people know that they and the press are on the same side. The role of journalism in this emerging world is to be an honest broker.
The key is for journalists to be true servants of the public, driven by clear values and ethics.

In striving to live up to all of this, journalists must accept that a discerning and skeptical public will be as distrustful of the press as it is of government, politicians, businesses and any other institution of society. Journalists must articulate the standards that set their craft apart and create methods to assist the public in determining whether those standards are being met. Knowing their best efforts will always fall short, journalists must commit to introspection and transparency.

Until new business models for journalism are clear, and even after they are evident, journalists must recognize they can’t rely on any organizational structure for their motivation or security. In the end, journalism is a personal calling. Its continuation depends on the commitment of those who would become or would remain journalists to pledge themselves to that calling, which raises a pivotal question:

What is the Journalist’s Creed for the 21st Century?

Here, again, education can play a defining role. The journalists of the future must have a new skill set that enables them to tell compelling stories in many ways, but they also must have a new mindset. They must be both pragmatic and idealist. They must be skeptical and optimistic. They can’t just be passionate about telling a story, they must care deeply that the story connects with people and matters to them. They must be more entrepreneurial in terms of creating value in the information marketplace, without compromising clarity, accuracy, fairness, truth and independence.

They must hone their curiosity and critical thinking in ways that stir those qualities in the public, while also being ever attentive to the public’s questions and criticisms. Loyalty to the public shouldn’t be an abstraction, but should be an abiding desire to connect on a human level.

They must be independent of those they cover without being indifferent or hostile. Independence achieves its greatest impact when tempered with a sense of goodwill.

They must be willing to collaborate effectively to take full advantage of all the story-telling power in emerging communications technologies, mindful that technology isn’t a substitute for craft, skill and ability. The must gain comfort with technology as an enabler of great journalism, rather than a threat to it. They must strive for perfection, while being open to admitting and learning from mistakes.

Relevance, optimism, inter-personal connection, self-promotion, organizational savvy, curiosity, creativity, problem solving and leadership all are concepts and traits that can be nurtured, and not just by the personal examples of dedicated faculty. They can be designed into the professional curriculum of journalism programs and job training.

Howard Schneider makes the point that the news media provide the biggest form of continuing education in citizens’ lives. I agree and would add that journalists of the future must see their own careers as the continuing education of their lives. This is the surest way they always will be able to say, “I believe in the profession of journalism.”

* Article originally written in August 2008.
Media Literacy and Political Communication

BY GLENN W. RICHARDSON JR.

Political communicators have recognized the importance of sight and sound at least since Protagoras and his Sophist brethren tangled with Socrates over the nature of persuasion and the teaching of virtue. Western thought has generally followed Aristotle in seeing the rhetorically gifted Sophists as debased practitioners of the dark arts of persuasion (unto manipulation), finding the path to enlightenment in the textual substance of argument rather than in stylistic flourishes of lyric and aesthetic. While the Sophists’ modern descendants have prospered, including the much maligned political consultants, contemporary thought still tends to see the skillful use of audiovisual communication as benighted.

The dawn of the 21st century has seen the emergence of a host of new communications venues from the world wide web and social networking to YouTube and Twitter, which have been quickly adapted to politics. As the tide of political communication becomes a tsunami, citizens are in greater need than ever of the analytical and intellectual tools by which they can draw meaning from the maelstrom. There is, in short, a greater need than ever for media literacy in political communication.

Perhaps the most despised of all audiovisual political communications are campaign ads. Widely ridiculed as vapid, mean-spirited concoctions of mistruths, half-truths and outright falsehoods, campaign spots nevertheless flood the airwaves (and now the internet) each election season. Yet even as citizens claim to be unaffected by what they see as 30-second stink-bombs, they respond to surveys by drawing upon information that could only have come from the ads.

There is... a greater need than ever for media literacy in political communication.

The perceived ability of political advertising to move voters has naturally drawn the attention of scholars and journalists. When the 1988 presidential campaign in particular seemed to turn on the tale of "Willie" Horton, questionable claims about Democratic nominee Michael Dukakis’s record, and Vice president Bush’s frequenting of flag factories, it spawned a major reform movement among academic and media watchdogs designed to police the content and veracity of campaign ads.

Perhaps the most consequential of these efforts were those of Kathleen Hall Jamieson (and her team of graduate student researchers based out of the Annenberg School of Communication at the University of Pennsylvania). They came to the realization that merely countering the questionable claims in a campaign commercial by providing a voice-over critique while simultaneously showing the original offending ad did little to enlighten audiences who unsurprisingly focused on the ad’s audiovisual message, even confusing it with the news content in which it was embedded.

The Jamieson project developed a “visual grammar” for “ad watch” journalism that was widely adopted by the media during the 1992 campaign. Rather than merely showing a full screen image of an ad while a narrator pointed out the ad’s falsehoods and inconsistencies (what I have called “Ad Watch 1.0”), Jamieson recommended placing the ad inside a graphic representation of a TV, canting it to one side to further signal its representational nature, labeling it clearly as a campaign ad, and forcefully superimposing the key terms of criticism (for example, “FALSE” or “MISLEADING”) directly on top of the canted representation of a TV screen. “Ad Watch 2.0,” as I have called it, was credited with deterring some of the more flagrant violations of campaign etiquette in the 1992 campaign (see Richardson 2002, 2008).

Unfortunately, ad watch journalism soon fell into disrepair, perhaps in part due to the arrival of a new generation of reporters who had not been part of the call-and-response that had produced the genre in the first place. The number of stories critiquing the claims of political spots dropped, and reporters reverted to pre-Ad Watch 2.0 praxis. Some scholars described the death of the ad watch (West 2005; Weaver Lariscy and Tinkham 1999). Perhaps more significantly, however, even Jamieson’s effort to devise a “visual” grammar to critique campaign ads was actually a visual approach to textual communication. Left uninvestigated were the audiovisual elements of the ads themselves.

Those elements are not inconsequential. Researchers have begun to show how campaign ads draw upon the existing networks of audiovisual and narrative associations in the minds of viewers to communicate on both a cognitive and emotional level (Richardson 1995, 1998; Nelson and Boynton 1997). In short, by creating campaign spots with the look and feel
of a "slasher" film or horror story, political communicators can literally evoke the "Nightmare on Elm Street" that will be America if the opposing candidate is elected. Film theorists refer to recognizable packages of audiovisuals and narratives as genres. Political ads mimic generic forms like horror stories, heroic biographies, action-thrillers, family melodrama and so on precisely because viewers already know the details and can (and do) fill them in when presented with the generic form. Ads designed to look like local news add credibility to the charge that an opponent is "mobbed up." The dimly-lit, shaky, hand-held videostyle of "Cops" conveyed the urgent threat of illegal immigration in an ad for GOP presidential hopeful Pat Buchanan in 2000. In 2004, Bush-Cheney spots drew upon the audiovisual conventions of the FOX suspense-thriller "24" (evoked in part by ticking clocks and surveillance-style video screens) to cast the president as Agent Jack Bauer, unafraid to defend the nation, "whatever it takes."

Such embedded meaning has frequently eluded scholars and analysts more schooled in Aristotelian logic than the work of film theorists. Yet recent advances in our understanding of how our brains work points to the vital role generic forms and their emotional evocations play in how we process political communication. Cognitive scientist John Anderson has described a process of "spreading activation" to explain how our brains draw links between concepts. Unlike the more rigid construct of schema (which posits fixed webs of association), spreading activation allows for different patterns of association depending on how various stimuli are processed. Metaphorically, familiar forms like genres facilitate "top-down" processing, where meaning is derived from the form and details are "reconstructed" rather than recalled.

Psychologist Drew Westen has pointed out how one of the most talked about campaign spots of 2006, an attack on U.S. Senate candidate Harold Ford Jr. produced by the Republican National Committee, juxtaposes audio and visual cues to invite viewers to "hear" the ad’s closing tag line, "he’s just not right," as "he’s just not white." Our brains tend to link similar sounding words, especially when "primed" to do so by additional cues.

An ad produced by a political operative employed by a firm that had done work for the Obama campaign became the first "viral video" of the 2008 race when it "mashed" the 1984 Apple Computer ad, itself drawing upon Orwell’s dystopian 1984, to vividly depict the upstart Obama campaign’s challenge to the "big brother" Clinton machine. In this case, the medium itself was part of the message: a rogue mash-up video using wildly democratic YouTube to end-run the money-rich established machine candidate.

After "Vote Different" became a viral sensation on the internet and began to receive extensive attention from the mainstream media, the Clinton campaign itself turned to popular culture to frame a response ad. The ad essentially reproduced the final scene of the final episode to the HBO series "The Sopranos," with Bill and Hillary taking the roles...
of Tony and Carmela Soprano, the first couple of an organized crime outfit in New Jersey. The ad simultaneously suggested the couple was culturally hip while playfully poking fun at the charge that the Clinton campaign was a machine.

While the newspapers of the past may be fading, the multimedia world wide web is growing, and it offers the natural forum for an advanced approach to media literacy.

One of the shortcomings of extant approaches to policing the content of campaign advertising is the penchant for balance in the mainstream media. This proclivity has led journalists to produce reporting that finds fault with both sides, regardless of whether both sides have in fact been equal transgressors of campaign decorum. In fact, while both candidates may take occasional liberties with the facts, it is unusual for each to adopt the same strategic posture. For example, candidates with comfortable leads are considerably less likely to “go negative” than their opponents.

The demise of the independent newspapers that once formed the backbone of the American media also portends fewer opportunities for mainstream ad watches and the like. Coupled with a political process increasingly polarized along partisan lines, the contemporary media environment promises ever more aggressive attack politics of the audiovisual variety. Who or what will defend the public interest in such trying times?

It is here that an informed and vigorous media literacy movement can have great impact. The very technologies that have empowered political communicators may also empower those who seek enlightenment rather than obfuscation in campaign communication. Organizationally, the efforts of a group of journalism and law students at Northwestern University who worked to free four men wrongly convicted of murder may prove inspirational (see Protess and Warden 1998). Cadres of students and researchers in the fields of journalism, communication, design, brain and behavioral science and politics may be able to coalesce and form the multidisciplinary teams necessary to fully inform a media literacy movement devoted to political communication.

Such media literacy efforts applied to campaign communication would be importantly audiovisual in nature. It would ground analysis in our knowledge of cognition and brain science. It would recognize the role of emotion, not merely in short-circuiting reason, but in promoting thought and action. It would likely need to learn effective audiovisual communication techniques from the very admakers it seeks to counter. Last and not least, it would be a communal and cooperative endeavor, capable of drawing upon the talents and insight of a diverse community of researchers. While the newspapers of the past may be fading, the multimedia world wide web is growing, and it offers the natural forum for an advanced approach to media literacy.
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INTRODUCTION: PREPARING TOMORROWS COURSE DEVELOPERS AND TEACHERS

The field of instructional design and technology is "concerned with understanding, improving, and applying methods of instruction. As a professional activity done by teachers and instructional developers, it is the process of deciding what methods of instruction are best for bringing about desired changes in student knowledge and skills for a specific course content and a specific student population."1

To apply the best method of instruction, students of the field must be literate in new media formats so the right instruction can be delivered to the right learner within the right timeframe. This concept—coupled with the growing recognition of the educational value of projects in which learners design artifacts that they share and discuss with others—points to the need for instructional design students to understand, participate in and create new media.2,3,4

Unfortunately, many courses covering topics in the field of instructional design are bound by the confines of traditional course design and delivery. Even courses placed online are trapped by the narrow parameters of Learning Managements Systems (LMS). These systems require a university approved student login, students working in an environment shared only by their immediate classmates, and limited access to the course materials created by the students after the course has ended.

Continually, intellectual capital in the form of new media creations built during the course of a semester is lost. Often student created content from a previous semester is deleted to make room for the work of next semester students in a seemingly endless cycle of destruction.

LEARNING IN 3D

In an effort to preserve student creations, immerse them in a 3D learning environment and teach about new media, two summers ago I developed a course called "Learning in 3D." The goal of the online course is to provide knowledge in designing the most effective 3D environments for different types of learning but also to encourage and require students to explore new media as a way of communication and instruction. The course is delivered completely online in a six week session.

KARL M. KAPP, Ed.D., CFPIM, CIrM is Assistant Director of the Institute for Interactive Technologies and Professor of Instructional Technology at Bloomsburg University, Bloomsburg, PA. Kapp is the co-author of Learning in 3D: Adding a New Dimension to Enterprise Learning and Collaboration and author of Gadgets, Games and Gizmos for Learning: Tools for Transferring Know-How from the Boomers to the Gamers.
The primary software for the course are two 3D software platforms. One is Second Life, a commercial metaverse that allows free access to a virtual world, and the other is a virtual world that is available primarily to corporations and schools behind a firewall known as ProtoSphere. This product was created by a company called Protonmedia located in Lansdale, PA.

Since the course was designed to immerse students in new media, a decision was made to avoid the use of the university supplied Learning Management System, Blackboard. Instead of managing student assignments, course content and course communications within a closed system, the entire course was managed through a wiki. The syllabus was posted on the wiki along with course readings and instructions on how to log into ProtoSphere and Second Life. It was also requested that students input their avatar name, an image of their avatar and their real name on a wiki page so I was able to match students and avatars. (See Figure 1)

The course requires students to post assignments to the wiki, comment on the instructor’s blog about the class and to post to their primary assignment to a video sharing web site. The primary assignment of the course is for the students to create a Machinima project which teaches one aspect of Second Life such as how to navigate, build an object or modify the look of an avatar. Machinima is created by having the students build an environment or "set" within Second Life and then using their avatars as "actors." The avatar actors act out a lesson plan and record it in a manner similar to an educational video. The animated activities of the avatars are edited and manipulated until a complete ten minute instructional video is created. The completed video or Machinima is posted on a video sharing web site to be viewed by the entire web community.

**RESEARCH BASIS FOR MACHINIMA ASSIGNMENT**

The research basis for the development of the machinima project is twofold. One is that researchers and psychologists who have studied student interaction with learning tools have demonstrated that designing, building, and interacting with models is an effective vehicle for teaching and learning subject matter content. Requiring students to manipulate objects and items in a 3D world provides this level of interaction. They must interact with the tools, build "sets" and observe activities based on the lesson they scripted and then act out the "scene" as virtual actors through their avatars.

The second research foundation is that proponents of "situated cognition" have shown that learning is far more meaningful when students draw on real-world situations, especially those in which they are personally invested. This was accomplished by having the students immersed in the 3D learning environment and building realistic sets and activities.

The combination of the research foundations for the course and the use of new media by the students combined to provide an online environment in which students interacted with each other, the course material and with other individuals within the blogosphere.
LEARNING IN 3D: AN INNOVATIVE COURSE

Week One

For the first week of class, I presented basic concepts using Adobe Connect, a synchronous tool that uses PowerPoint and allows for Voice Over Internet Protocol. We then went into Second Life as a class. When the students first arrived in Second Life, the scene was a bit chaotic. We encountered the usual difficulties of trying to make sure everyone was logged in and able to teleport to the proper location and determine who was who within the class. After the class, I blogged about the experience on my blog, Kapp Notes, and asked my students to respond with comments. I wrote:

Total Chaos: First Second Life ID Class...Total Fun. Tonight was the first “Learning in 3D Class” it was totally fun and totally chaotic. It reminded me a lot of the first e-learning classes that I taught, no one was really sure what to do, the software would crash from time-to-time and students and instructors where figuring out what needed to be done...

I then listed a series of “lessons learned” from conducting the first class. Students responded to my comment and wrote about their experience in the class. Some representative comments:

I haven’t been in this kind class before. Therefore, there were lots of times I was lost and tried to figure out what we were doing. Haha, but it was still a fun class. I think I just need more time to explore and play with it and get use to it...

I believe learning in Second Life truly eliminates the idea of “distance” learning. It felt like I was actually there interacting with other students, which was great. In a “traditional” online course you feel detached from everyone and you never get to know who they are or what kind of personalities they have. Personalities were coming through people’s avatars...

While the majority of comments were from students in my class, I did receive one unexpected comment from an alumnus of our program. He provided some “lessons learned” from his work in Second Life. He added to the collective knowledge of the class.

Seems like everyone had a good experience, so you’re off to a great start. A couple hints:
• Avatars can’t teleport off orientation island until they ‘graduate’, but other people CAN offer them teleports off the orientation space. We often have people create avatars and immediately offer them teleports to Istania.
• We often use SLurls on a class-related webpage for navigation purposes (until people get comfortable using the landmark feature). Students can run SL in a window and keep the class page with the SLurls open in another window. Good method to do ‘field trips’...Hope the semester continues to go well! —Bart

The comments were so helpful from Bart that I asked him to come to Second Life and speak to the class the following week which he agreed to do.

Week Two

The second week of class was a little less chaotic than the first and Bart did an excellent job. Unfortunately, Second Life was plagued with technical difficulties that session. In spite of the difficulty, the class proceeded.

After the class, Bart posted his thoughts and ideas about the class on his own blog, Virtual Learning Worlds.com as well as commenting on the class blog, Kapp Notes. What Bart did without consciously trying was to further expand the class. The openness of the class moved from just the readers of Kapp Notes to the readers of Virtual Learning Worlds.com as well. Bart unwittingly tore down even more walls by expanding the discussion of the class further into the blogosphere.

The talk last night went very well. We utilized a combination of Adobe Connect (formerly Breeze) and Second Life for the course session. I’d like to thank Karl and his students for coming up with some great questions and bearing with me as several of us struggled with the technology. Some things to ponder based on the experience:
• Being on the “bleeding-edge” can be painful...for both the learners and the facilitator. Several students couldn’t login to Second Life due to lab computers, several people got disconnected on occasion (including me), and it was difficult for
some folks to quickly navigate between Second Life, Breeze, and this blog with all the SLurls (the post below).

- Utilize the Buddy System. Some students had trouble getting from place to place. I suggested that students pair up, and once a student finds the correct location, offer a portal to the other student. Mass-teleports could also be utilized, but I haven’t explored this option enough to figure out the logistics.

Additionally, that week the class blog received a comment from a person not affiliated with the class or program at all. KP suggested that we expand the class machinima assignment from only posting the finished project on YouTube to also posting it on TeacherTube. He even provided rationale for expanding the assignment.

Karl,

We’re following the Second Life class with anticipation. Please don’t allow the students to give up. The possibilities are SO HUGE once the wrinkles are ironed out.

I would like to request that the videos be cross-posted on TeacherTube as well as YouTube. Many of your education track students will STILL find that YouTube is filtered out at school.

Thanks for keeping the blogsphere posted on your progress.

KP – ’99

TECHRUMINATIONS

The assignment was altered based on input from the community at large. If they were to gain value from the new media developed by the students, the students would need to post the media in locations accessible to everyone within the larger community.

Week Three

In the third week of class, we had another guest speaker. This was a female alumna who spent some time in Second Life as a male. She related her experience mixing genders and exploring the virtual world from a different perspective. The class also briefly logged into a corporate version of Second Life called ProtoSphere. The goal of that presentation was to provide students with an understanding of how corporations are beginning to seriously consider virtual worlds as a viable tool to increase productivity.

The third class was very interesting. I found Suzi Mazzenga’s presentation on switching genders in Second Life very interesting. In the book Second Life: The Official Guide, the topic of switching avatar genders was touched upon. I liked hearing someone who has experienced this personally expand on the information I had read in the book.

I found Protosphere to be more professional overall than Second Life, but also very limiting... I can see how corporations would feel much more comfortable with a world like Protosphere because it allows for interaction without as many (often inappropriate for the workplace) distractions.

Week Four

This week involved a guided tour of ProtoSphere and a discussion of the design aspects of working in a virtual world. However, the most interesting thing about that week was that one of my students had completed his machinima project early. He posted the project on YouTube and TeacherTube and provided instructions on how he did his project on the classroom wiki to help other students. (See Figure 2)

Interesting, his video was noticed by the SL Newspaper and he received the following email:

I’m from the SL Newspaper and I just want to let you know that I came across your movie on YouTube.com (about LSL) and that we put it in our paper... Great tutorial by the way. Are you planning on making more of these tutorials? Thanks ...

Again, the class expanded. A student’s work broke out of the confines of the class and the narrow sphere of the classroom blog and was distributed to a larger audience. To this day, the video has been viewed over 3,000 times.
Week Five

In week five, I was out of state and encountered technical difficulties just as class was starting. Luckily, I had cell phone communications with one of the students and she conveyed my classroom instructions to the students. I had the students go to a virtual store and role-play an interaction between a sales person and a customer and then switch and reflect upon how conducting such a role play was enhanced, or not, because of the 3D environment.

Again, after the class was over, comments were posted on a blog and students were given the opportunity to comment on the role play activity.

My group sold a t-shirt from one person to another. It helped us learn to use the inventory items in Second Life and also helped us to become creative in our role-playing...

I must admit before attending the first class, I never realized the possibilities of 3D worlds. I definitely see all of the advantages and benefits a person that works in a retail setting would receive by taking part in a similar activity. It would allow them to practice interacting with potential customers, sales pitches, demonstrating knowledge of the products, correct mistakes before they interact with “real” customers, and so much more.

Week Six

The final class involved a tour of Virtual Morocco led by Hilary Mason, a professor of New Media/Computer Science at Johnson & Wales University. She and a group of her students created Virtual Morocco for the Moroccan tourist agency. Hilary (known as Ann Enigma in Second Life) described how Virtual Morocco was built, the group’s trip to the real Morocco and the issues they have run into while creating the space within Second Life.

Students commented on the overall class:

Nice end to a wonderful six weeks. Things that I could not even imagine two months ago started to become real and take shape in these 3D worlds. The Morocco tour was very cool; it made you feel like you were actually there.

The students sent me links to their machinima project; I graded them and provided the appropriate feedback and grade to all the students. At that point, I was glad I has survived the six weeks of class and imagined that the class was finished.
KEY INSIGHTS

The class wasn’t finished, the work of the students and the comments in the blogosphere continued. At the time of the initial machinima assignment I gave little thought to who else would be viewing the material and the potential value it would have to others, I just wanted them to be familiar with the tools. I believe a professional going into the field of instructional technology should have experience with new media and have some level of understanding about the leading edge of instructional design and technology.

One of the most amazing things to me in retrospect is the reach of the students’ work through the new media tools. The original reason I wanted students to put content into new media tools was to give them experience working with those tools. I hadn’t considered the reach and impact their work would have on the educational blogosphere.

Within a short period of time, the excellent videos the students created were viewed hundreds of times and student progress in the course was tracked by a small segment of the blogosphere which allowed individuals outside of the class to give feedback and input to the students and the course. One student video titled Educational Uses of Second Life has been viewed over 100,000 times, has a four star rating on YouTube, has been commented on 154 times and is still viewed today. In fact, the students were contacted by a company that works in Second Life requesting permission to link to the video. Additionally, six different edubloggers commented on the student work and/or posted examples of the work for their own corner of the blogosphere. Posting materials on the Internet and making them freely available provided life to the student projects way beyond the four walls of a classroom or the confines of a Learning Management System. (See Figure 3)

PRIVACY ISSUES

When I present the concept of this course in a presentation or to fellow faculty members in a discussion, one question always arises, “What about privacy issues?” At the time of the class, I had no questions from the graduate students regarding concerns about privacy. The students were told in advance that they would be posting to a public blog, posting to a public wiki and inputting a project to YouTube (and later TeacherTube) that could be viewed by anyone on the Internet. After the class was over, I did have one student ask that her name be removed from the wiki and that her blog comments be removed. Her information was removed but she was the only person who ever made such a request.

When faculty consider that this generation of learner has contributed to social networking spaces like MySpace, Facebook and others, the fact that they are being requested to place work on a public site as part of a class turns out not to be an issue for the vast majority of the students. However, because it may be an issue for some, I allow them to use an alias to post blog comments (of course they need to tell me their alias.) Students can also use their Second Life Avatar name if they want to protect...
privacy. Faculty must respect the privacy issues of students but often students have little privacy concerns about posting an assignment to a video distribution site or to a blog.

SUMMARY

The educational implications are staggering. The four walls of a classroom and the virtual four walls of educational learning management systems (where only those with a password can get in and view the intellectual contributions of the students) were shattered. Students were able to break out of the confinement of a contained course.

The students’ work created and distributed with new media tools will live well past the class, their work will be shared by hundreds if not thousands a people—well beyond the 34 who are officially registered for the class. The value of the material will be judged not only by the instructor but by people who need and want the information. The machinima created by the students will be rated, postings viewed, value obtained or not depending on the quality of the student work. The instructor is not longer the ultimate judge, it is the eventual patrons of the media that will assign its ultimate value.

The difference in using new media tools for class administration and coordination is so dramatically different than an academic LMS in the reach of the content. This class was shared and influenced by a community. The students did not work in isolation; they worked under the watchful eye of a larger community. I am convinced that it altered (for the better) the quality of the work and the focus of the instructional design students.

This "open course" concept using new media tools not only has an impact on academic classes but has a huge potential for the sharing of user created content in a corporation. If academic institutions are not looking at new media tools to expand the educational reach of their students and to share outside of the walls of the classroom or Learning Management System, they are missing out on a huge opportunity and unfairly leaving their students and institutions behind.
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The growth of human communication through the increasing use of electronic and digital media, has increased the need for analysis, and debate, of the concept of literacy. This has been a challenge for many researchers and educators throughout the world, and also, for many social and political organizations, including UNESCO, the European Council and the European Union (EU).

The concept of media literacy will only be understood once it has been conscientiously accepted, and then fully developed and implemented by media education programs. This implies the enhancement of new competencies in all. In particular, it applies to the younger generation. Those involved in media literacy education, ideally all people to some degree, would become much more aware and interested in the use of all new media and much more sensitive to the consequences of inappropriate use of these technologies. Media literacy also requires the participation of all agents, from politicians to industry content producers and especially from educational agents, since it concerns all individuals and affects the way we relate to each other and understand information.

The use of mobile phones, as well as IM—Instant Messaging, has become ubiquitous throughout the world. Communication industry regulators (OFCOM in Great Britain, for example, or ANACOM, in Portugal), non-profit organizations and marketing studies enterprises (Kaiser Family Foundation and Pew Internet & American Life Project in the USA), as well as investigational projects led by universities or other institutions, like the European Union (2007, Study on Media Literacy: Current trends and approaches to media literacy in Europe or 2006, Mediappro) and the UNESCO or the Göteborg University and its International Clearinghouse on Children, Youth and Media (Nordicom), just to cite a few, are evidence of this new media saturation, especially among young people. Despite their ubiquity, some technologies have not yet been fully explored as they could be, through explicit skills training, to create a truly functional literate society. One untapped area is the use of “txting” (the abbreviated writing form used mainly by young people to communicate through mobile phones and IM services) as a valid pedagogical strategy to teach/learn, especially with regard to language content.
**Cortes**

Texting is a code; not a completely original one, in the sense that it has characteristics common both to the dominant codes used by its writers (their native languages), as well as characteristics of iconic and signifying codes. It’s not possible, either, to establish a grammar for it, since a grammar is a very long and thorough list of rules, but it’s possible to identify some basic grammar rules and to understand, as Noam Chomsky said (Szabó, 2004), that their users have to develop a set of accepted group language conventions leading to an acceptable performance, whether the group’s primary mode of communication be Chat, SMS, MSN (or other IM services), to name just a few possibilities. Texting is a hybrid code, mixing characteristics of native languages with others specific from **computer mediated communication** (CMC), and there is a clear possibility of classifying it as a new textual genre, with specific lexical or other linguistic features, just as Marcuschi (2002) and Santos (2003) defend, more than considering it a dialect (geographical variation of languages). Pierre Lévy (2002), in a conference about the “The Collective Intelligences/Internet and Human Development,” held in one of the universities of S. Paolo, Brazil (SESC), said alphabets would resist the birth of a new language of animated images/drawings, motivated and resulting as a direct consequence of media use (computer games or graphic softwares, such as Power Point, for example), which potentiates the integration of visual and multimedia tools and features in language codes; but in Lévy’s opinion, it was perfectly possible to see such a development in the near future. Texting already does some of this, by integrating visual/iconic elements, such as emoticons and smileys (graphic symbols or combinations of symbols used to convey emotional content).

More than a “fashion item,” texting will have a tendency to establish itself as a characteristically CMC form of expression, with developmental characteristics similar to those of cinema or television language, which were initially the object of so many doubts, suspicions and fears but are now an integral part of everyday life. Even handwriting, when originally seen as a new technology, once had the disapproval of many, as Umberto Eco often refers in papers and conferences. Writing, as a means of transmitting ideas using a code and a physical support (paper), took the role of a social distinguisher, since it was reserved for a select few, such as priests, nobles and scholars, for many centuries; in fact, it still is a barometer of social and economical development in societies. Likewise, now many, even in the press, accuse texting of being the cause of dramatic language changes, of being the cause of poor learning and native language use, largely because of the fact that young people are the main users.

Some critics go so far as to say texting is destroying languages as we know them. Nevertheless, we, as well as many others (Benedito, 2002, 2003 and, Segerstad, 2002; 262, Thurlow, 2003 and 2006 and Tagliamonte and Denis, 2006), believe languages will not be structurally affected by the use of
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these new forms of communication, even though we find the communication of young people showing signs of them, such as abbreviations, shorter sentences, acronyms, among others. Such slight variation and development is natural in living languages, which progress and modify themselves constantly, as living organisms do (Lavoisier and Darwin demonstrated clearly this principle), without being destroyed in the process. This possibility is even more evident in languages, which are products of conventions, accepted and transformed at the same rhythm as societies and mentalities change themselves.

Interestingly, a case study in a secondary school in Silves, Portugal (a small city in Algarve, the southern region of the country), shows that students understand this flexibility of languages and compare it with examples from the Portuguese spoken language itself, such as the spelling of the word “Farmácia” (pharmacy/chemistry), which was written “Pharmácia” in the 19th century. Students in the study, between the ages of 15 and 21 years old, with difficulties in learning their native language, had a greater tendency to integrate components of texting in their communication, especially in contexts that reveal inappropriate timing, mainly formal settings (exams, reports, etc.). They also reveal fewer skills in its use, that is, a poor mastery of the aesthetic and grammatical features of the Portuguese idiom, as well as a lack of creativity in the use of texting. Rat (the MSN nickname of one 17 year-old student) had such significant expressive difficulties in the Portuguese language that when he used texting, he could not decode the basic sentences or signs of it. The poor use of both codes, of course, shows an increased likelihood for language acquisition problems.

Having established this, why not take advantage of the situation, using these technologies to do exactly the opposite, that is improving the knowledge of one’s native language and motivating the problematic students to learn it?

Using prior knowledge in the teaching/learning process has been promoted by many researchers, mainly constructivists. Jean Piaget, the well known Swiss psychologist, talked about a continuous process of assimilation and accommodation that leads children to developmental stages, until they reach a complex knowledge about a particular situation/theme or gestalt. Vygotsky talked about the influence of social interaction in the learning process, and Bruner believed that a stronger grasp of new concepts was built on present and past understanding of facts, resulting from two main stages. First, the process of knowledge transmission, which is concerned with the experiences and contexts that contribute to build the student’s will to learn. Second, the learning process has to be structured in such way that the concepts can easily be learned through the creation of “spiral curricula” (repetitions of themes with increasing, interrelated complexity that build on the learner’s developing knowledge). Bruner proposes that teaching must be considered as facilitating the students’ search for solutions, driving them to explore subjects beyond those given or presented by the teachers and valuing ideas such as intuition and analysis. Therefore, situated learning (developed by authors like Lave, Wenger, Schuman and Clancey), and more specifically, the Situated Action Theory (proposed by Artman and Wærn), give a relevant theoretical frame from which to justify the use of texting in classes, and in the teaching/learning of native language idioms; since this use implicates the clear perception that the world, relationships and, consequently, identities are permanently changing. Such an acknowledgement of ongoing change implicates each one of us, since learning is the result of belonging to a certain place (Duncan and Leander, 1998–2003), as well as the result of interaction and communication (Artman and Wærn, 1995: 12). The idea of using, valuing, and bringing to the classroom, students’ personal experiences, their daily practices and their personal “libraries of knowledge” relevant to this theoretical frame, could foster additional motivation and interest, a constant need in the teaching/learning process. Moreover, it would promote a better adap-
tation of teaching methodologies to each student’s learning style.

A program of exercises was developed and tested at the aforementioned school, which served as a pilot study site, to implement these principles. The program is still being improved for use in other schools, through the collaboration of Portuguese language teachers and students. It has a clear focus: to use the students’ experience as texting users, referencing examples of this code, to teach them some of the basic grammar concepts of the Portuguese language. At the pilot school, the application of the program has improved the relationship between teachers and students, since they had to share a non-conventional knowledge, which is seen by some as being "softer." Many of the teachers never tried using texting before and by engaging in this experience, they became closer to the students; the transmission of "harder" subjects became much easier after that. But it also improved the critical thinking and analysis skills of students, making it possible for students to build individual tools and strategies for coping with different situations, regardless of their relation to texting. This type of connection made it possible to deliver what Paulo Freire referred to as a “Dialogical Education”:

“I defend a critical-dialogical pedagogy (...) the critical apprehension of significant knowledge through a dialogical relationship (...) where one proposes the building of a collective wisdom articulating both the popular knowledge and the critical knowledge, the scientific knowledge, mediated through the experiences of the world.”

And the Brazilian pedagogue concludes:

"Only dialog, that implies a critical thought, is capable of generating that same critical thought. Without it there’s no communication and without communication, there is no true education*” (1995: 83 and 1987: 83).

As a result of this study, a small book of exercises is being written, which incorporates the national guidelines defined by the Ministry of Education Board, as well as the goals and timeline of the participating teachers. Examples of prior media literacy curriculum development efforts were also analyzed (CLEMI, France and Instituto de Inovação Educacional, Portugal, for example). Based on these guiding factors, each exercise specifies its objectives, intended audience, needed materials, suggestions on appropriate teaching methodology (group/individual work, for example), key words and concepts, related topics for further investigation, articles/web sites to consult (with references), the activities themselves, and notes. The graphics of the book are intended to be appealing and easy to use (See examples on next page).

The participating teachers were consulted throughout the process of creating and implementing the lessons. The teachers used the lessons in their classes, which consisted of students in the 10th, 11th and 12th grades (as previously mentioned, between 15 and 21 years old). Several focus groups are still being created to evaluate the program, including teacher groups, to analyze the exercises and reactions of students, as well as student groups, both for those in the Portuguese classes and a sub-group of those with poor marks in their Portuguese classes.

This experience has been one of great collaboration and success, since all the people involved have shown sincere appreciation and given valuable suggestions and contributions. Their goal has been to improve the first edition of the book and to go on with the investigation, preparing a second stage, in which different countries and other schools will be involved.

* This is a free translation of the original portuguese text, by Paulo Freire, that says: “Defendo uma pedagogia crítico-dialógica (...) apreensão crítica do conhecimento significativo através da relação dialógica (...) onde se propõe a construção do conhecimento coletivo articulando o saber popular e o saber crítico, científico, mediado pelas experiências do mundo; Somente o diálogo, que implica um pensar crítico, é capaz, também, de gerá-lo. Sem ele não há comunicação e sem esta não há verdadeira educação.”
Mainly, though, the study has created a needed space for debate around literacy issues related to the new communication technologies (CMC, Chatting, and SMS, in particular). At the moment, there is a clear perception that the introduction of texting in the language classes has made it possible to prepare both teachers and students to maintain a constant awareness of literacy issues. Additionally, in terms of the teaching/learning process, we can surely affirm that this experience enhances students’ comprehension of language structures, thereby improving their use of lexicon, semantics and grammar. This improvement, in turn, has led students to much more accurate identification and correction of their own mistakes (and the mistakes of others), gaining better expressive skills and demonstrating improved native language skills as well.

In terms of literacy, there are two major benefits. **First**, knowing how to use the language, students can better understand the meaning of words and texts. This ensures a better comprehension of messages, which is the necessary basis to be a media literate person. **Second**, analyzing the specific characteristics of texting and thinking about CMC provides students and teachers with the tools to make better use of those new technologies and promotes in all of them, better “abilities of identifying, accessing and analyzing, as well as to interpret, evaluate and communicate/select competently” the media.
Therefore, they will become media literate, which is to say, people “able to exercise informed choices; understand the nature of content and services; be able to take advantage of the full range of opportunities offered by new communications technologies; and be better able to protect themselves and their families from harmful or offensive materials”. They will be engaged and competent citizens in a society already demanding them to be media literate “as a result of the media convergence – that is the merging of electronic media (mass communication) and digital media (multimedia communication) which occurs in the advanced stages of development of an information society. This media literacy includes the command of previous forms of literacy: reading and writing (from understanding to creative skills), audiovisual, digital and the new skills required in a climate of media convergence” (Pérez-Tornero/Barcelona University, 2007: 8). And, now and in the future, students and teachers will all be able to carry on the message of media education proposed by UNESCO (1982, 1999; 2002), the Council of Europe and the European Commission.
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MEETING THE CHALLENGE FOR SCHOOL REFORM

An example of School 2.0 in the Digital Age is the learning environment of the Globaloria Project (previously featured in JML, vol 54, numbers 2 & 3).

Deeply grounded in sound pedagogy applied to 21st century knowledge, with technology-based methods, and a 5-year Statewide Pilot Project currently underway, Globaloria and its unique contributions will be examined in our upcoming issue of JML.
Do you have these media literacy resources?

If you missed these *Journal of Media Literacy* and *Telemedium* issues, they and many others are still available. Each issue of the indispensable archive of media literacy contains useful information, usually targeting a pertinent topic.

Select from the choices below and fill out the order form on the opposite page.

- **NEW MEDIA, LEARNING & CIVIC ENGAGEMENT**
  - *Journal of Media Literacy* [v55, n3, 2008/09, 52 pgs]
  - Edited by Karen Ambrosh; this issue grew out of a virtual Media Cafe between college and high school students, discussing the role of new media in education reform and civic engagement. Key authors include Nick Pemisco, Michael Wesch, Henry Jenkins, Mimi Ito, and Lance Bennett.

- **CULTURAL DIVERSITY:**
  - *Journal of Media Literacy* [v55, n1&2, 2008, 80 pgs]
  - Guest edited by David Considine, this double-issue features articles regarding diversity in media education in light of the landmark election year in the U.S. Key authors include: Carlos Cortes, Cornell West, Cam Macpherson and others.

- **THE NEW LITERACY RENAISSANCE:**
  - *Journal of Media Literacy* [v54, n2&3, 2007, 80 pgs]
  - Edited by Martin Rayala. This issue features some of today's most advanced thinkers in the frontiers of new media literacy and the virtual world. Among the major authors are: Henry Jenkins, Alice Robison, Eric Zimmerman, Julie Frechette, and Renée Hobbs.

- **BROWSING THROUGH THE YEARS:**
  - *Journal of Media Literacy* [v54, n1, 2006, 28 pgs]
  - Continues the retrospective from Part 1:50 years of Media literacy as seen through the chronicles of the American Council for Better Broadcasts/National Telemedia Council; From early ACBB newsletters to the development of Telenetemedia and the *Journal of Media Literacy* (1983–2003).

- **CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES:**
  - *Journal of Media Literacy* [v53, n2, 2006, 88 pgs]
  - Integrating Media Literacy into the English Classroom
  - Karen Ambrosh & Marieli Rowe, Editors. Featured authors include Donna Alvermann, Neil Andersen, David Considine, Barry Duncan, John Golden, Renée Hobbs, Jeff Share, Allen Webb, and others.

- **VISIONS/REVISIONS:**
  - *Journal of Media Literacy* [v53, n1, 2006, 28 pgs]
  - A retrospective of the first thirty years years of Media Literacy as seen through the chronicles of the American Council for Better Broadcasts/National Telemedia Council; From early ACBB newsletters to the development of Telemedium and the *Journal of Media Literacy* (1953–1983).

- **EMBRACING DIVERSITY IN THINKING:**
  - *Journal of Media Literacy* [v52, n3, 2005, 24 pgs]

- **VIDEO GAME CULTURE:**
  - *Journal of Media Literacy* [v52, n1&2, 2005, 104 pgs]
  - Edited by Martin Rayala. Opens the new educational connection between game culture and Media literacy. Ten major authors in the field include James Paul Gee, Henry Jenkins, Ildt Caperton, and Kurt Squire. Also includes Part III (of three) of *Emerging Authors: New Voices in Media Literacy*.

- **THE NEXT GENERATION IN MEDIA LITERACY:**
  - *Journal of Media Literacy* [v51, n1, 2004, 52 pgs]
  - Edited by Martin Rayala and Marieli Rowe. Addresses key media literacy issues from the 2003 International Video Conference: New Media & Digital Culture; Testing the Limits of Democracy: Global Media Education; and Media Literacy in Theory & Practice.

- **TUNING INTO DEMOCRACY:**
  - *Journal of Media Literacy* [v51, n2, 2004, 52 pgs]
  - Guest edited by David Considine and Frank Baker. With feature articles by Barry Duncan, David Buckingham, Robert McChesney. Also includes Part II (of three) of *Emerging Authors: New Voices in Media Literacy*.

- **VISIONS/REVISIONS:**
  - Moving Forward with Media Education
  - Special 50th Anniversary publication, anthology of top authors from around the world, a virtual textbook of the key issues and ideas shaping media literacy education for the 21st Century.

- **MEDIA LITERACY AND THE ARTS:**
  - *Journal of Media Literacy* [v49/50, n1, 2003, 98 pgs]
  - Edited by Dr. Martin Rayala. A visionary, 100-page issue, building the innovative bridge between Media Literacy and the Arts. Five parts, with twenty-three authors.
ADDITIONAL COPIES OF TELEMEDIUM (NOW THE JOURNAL OF MEDIA LITERACY) ARE AVAILABLE FOR PURCHASE INDIVIDUALLY OR IN SETS. CONTACT NTELEMEDIA@AOL.COM FOR MORE INFORMATION. ADDITIONAL AVAILABLE ISSUES INCLUDE:

- Celebrating 100 Years of Film
- Telemedium: Dedicated to Jessie McCanse
- Understanding Television: A Healthy Balance of Media Literacy and Health
- Children, Youth and the Media: Beyond the Millennium, Toronto Summit 2000 Conference
- Toronto Summit 2000 Conference: Children, Youth and the Media
- National Media Education Conference, June 23-26, 2001
- Global Studies and Media Literacy
- Pride and Joy: Media Literacy and the Early Years
- Media and Youth: Wonder Years or Risky Business: How the Media Construct Teens
- Book Anthology: Visions/Revisions: Moving Forward with Media Education (7x9", 194 pgs)

The future of education lies in media literacy!