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Abstract

In this thesis I show how the child television audience is imagined and acted upon within an administrative regime of power/knowledge. However, the imagining of this audience is not unified. Its history is marked with both discontinuities and continuities, just as the object of its disciplining is non-unitary and dispersed. Nevertheless, a definite genealogy can be traced. Particular sites emerge as distinct areas of problematisation (the family, domestic space/time, the public) and particular knowledges and institutions make specific claims for governing the audience within these areas.

A central theme within the thesis is concerned with the way in which media technologies (radio and television) become embedded within the spaces of the familial and the domestic and with how the government of the use of these technologies has been, and still is, aligned with the government of the social and the public. For example, the child radio audience in the 1920s and 1930s was conceived and acted upon within a Reithian ethos of public service. However, instead of analysing this in terms of the paternalism of the early BBC, I show how Reith's conception of the ether (as providing a space in which government and governed, city and village, public and private could communicate with each other) lay the ground for the disciplining of proper listeners and good citizens and the regulated well-being of the communities of locality and nation. I show how these earlier discourses were, in part, surpassed with the emergence of a social scientific (primarily psychological) knowledge of the child audience and I look at how the reception of television in the home in the 1940s and 1950s was connected to a wider set of discourses about modernity, the visibilisation of the home and the formation of 'responsible' modes of parenting. This then sets the scene for an analysis of contemporary imaginings and management of the child audience within which we see an alignment of child-centred and neo-liberal modes of government.
Childhood is the most intensely governed sector of personal existence. In different ways, at different times, and by many different routes varying from one section of society to another, the health, wealth, and rearing of children have been linked in thought and practice to the destiny of the nation and the responsibilities of the state... Throughout the nineteenth century and our own, anxieties concerning children have occasioned a panoply of programmes that have tried to conserve and shape children by moulding the petty details of the domestic, conjugal, and sexual lives of their parents. (Rose, 1989, 121)

For Lorraine and I, television was a new invention which arrived in our childhoods and was regarded initially as something rather magical and unconnected with everyday life. For Ben and Anna, the television has always sat there somewhere in the house, ready to be turned on as and when they wanted - rather like their access to the refrigerator for eats and drinks, and to money to buy their own choice of clothes and personal belongings and other "privileges" of their own generation, which were certainly not available to us when we were growing up. In our childhoods, domestic routines, rules and regulations were ordered from above. Now everything is negotiated. In one generation our family has moved, as far as domestic matters are concerned, from the realm of necessity to the realm of freedom. (Worpole, 1987, 89)
Introduction
In this thesis I want to consider what we might call the child television audience. I hesitate in my naming of this audience because this is the central problem of my thesis. In what sense is the child audience an audience (i.e. through what terms and concepts is it defined and through what practices is it constituted)? It is an audience which invokes both intense discussion and also, paradoxically, almost complete silence. There is an immediate difficulty in talking about the child television audience. This difficulty takes the form both of a seriousness about children's television viewing and also of a lack of seriousness about the programmes which are designed specifically for this audience. This difficulty is in evidence both in academic and in popular writing. For example, both the press and the academy write prolifically about the problems of children watching television (whether this be terrestrial, satellite, cable or video) and yet there is little sustained criticism of children's television programmes.

There seems to be, on the one hand, a concern which touches those 'adult' institutions: a concern which is intimately connected to the questions and experience of adult viewing. And, on the other hand, there is a lack of concern, a space even, which has been demarcated as unproblematic and which is quite foreign and distinct from those other concerns.

These two problems rest upon a single conceptualisation of the child: a notion that the child is innocent. Children's television is seen as a protected space, whereas the very conception of the child viewer brings with it the possibility of the violation of that space of innocence: the problem, in part, with children's television viewing is that they can view 'adult' programmes and films. Philippe Aries has traced some of the aspects of this modern conception of childhood back to the 17th century (Aries, 1962). Others, such as Jacqueline Rose, have traced the emergence of a 'children's literature', from Rousseau and Locke, to the way this innocence of the child is constituted as a peculiarly adult fantasy, which disavows the complexities and contradictions of the unconscious and sexuality (Rose, 1984). And others have placed this conception at the heart of a political segregation.
and subjection of children (Hoyles, 1989). In the contemporary practices concerning the relationship between children and television there is a struggle between those who conceive of this innocence as real and hence something which needs to be protected and those who understand this conception as a myth which conceals an underlying set of power relations, whether between adult and child or State and people.

In relation to the problem of children's television viewing, this critical revelation of the myth of innocence is often articulated with a secondary revelation of the myth of past and present conceptions of the power of television over the child audience. For example, in a recent review of the literature in this area, Barry Gunter and Jill McAleer argue that:

Back in the nineteenth century and earlier in this one, concerns were expressed about the dreadful effects that the growing avalanche of 'pulp literature' such as 'penny dreadfuls', cheap novelettes and comics would have, both on the young and the less well-educated. Nowadays, although some concern is still expressed about the content and quality of children's literature, notably comics and the ubiquitous Enid Blyton, it is a mere 'drop in the ocean' when compared with the amount of criticism levelled at television. But how much of this criticism is based on 'myth' and therefore unjustified and how much is reality? (Gunter and McAleer, 1990, preface)

This critique, of what Martin Barker and many writers before him have called the 'magical power' of television to seduce and violate the protected space of childhood, results in a bifurcation of the problem. The exposure of the myth, or ideology, leads to the question of the function of the myth and the truth of the child: why is this myth deployed and what truth does it conceal? In this set of critical practices the ideologies of childhood are uncovered to reveal the truth and reality of children and the underlying proprietorial rights to power. It is predicated upon the question: in whose name is this myth (and its associated tropes of seduction, protection, violation and so on) really perpetuated? Barker and others argue that this myth is disseminated as a means of legitimating State censorship of television (cf. Barker, 1993).

In a similar theoretical manoeuvre, in relation to 'the significantly undertheorised domain of children's television', Simon Watney argues that we should consider how the 'gaze of childhood', which he refers to as a
'perceptualist bias in modern aesthetics', is 'underpinned by the notion of some originally innocent childhood vision'. He then goes on to state that:

The extreme conservatism which characterises both areas [the generic distinction in children's television between fantasy and realism], especially in matters of editing techniques, must also be understood beyond any transparent function of 'preparing' children for adult media literacy. (Watney, 1985, 89)

Even though we might contest his reading of the 'conservatism' of children's television, especially in matters of editing techniques, Watney's critique raises the important question of the relation between the language of children's television programmes and the training in television literacy. In this argument both are predicated upon a notion of the transparency of language and the fixity of identity. Watney's argument appears in a review of Jacqueline Rose's book *The Case of Peter Pan or the Impossibility of Children's Fiction* (1984) and he draws upon her thesis in order to raise certain questions about the media of film and television. He argues that we need to consider the way in which childhood figures as a fantasy of adult desires and as a form of regulation of our relationship to language. He argues that the 'projections and displacements of adult desires organise and construct a curriculum of specific genres, in which fantasy... interacts without any apparent discontinuity effect with realism' (Watney, 1985, 89).

Although the State figures, in part, within this argument, the focus is primarily upon the way in which the myth of childhood does not conceal a true child beneath, but rather figures the child as a mechanism 'to hold off a panic, a threat to our assumption that language is something which can simply be organised and cohered, and that sexuality, while it cannot be removed, will eventually take on the forms in which we prefer to recognise and acknowledge each other' (Rose, 1984, 10). While this analysis reproduces some of the tropes of deception and revelation, it nevertheless figures a *fiction for the child* (whether this be children's literature or children's television), not simply as 'the passive reflection of changing values and conceptions of the child (images of childhood)', but as an institution in its own right and one intimately connected to the construction of adult subjectivity (ibid, 138). However, even though Rose uses the term 'repetition' rather than 'oppression' to describe the process of formation of this subjectivity because the former term implies a sense of 'uncertainty' (ibid, 141), the effect of this theoretical move is to collapse children's fiction onto the question of adult subjectivity (i.e. that children's...
fiction is merely a question of the unconscious desires and fantasies of the adult).

The critiques and deconstructions of childhood innocence have been strategically useful in focussing attention on the gaps and silences in our questioning of adult/child relations within the field of television and more generally. Nevertheless they exemplify what Foucault has called the 'repressive hypothesis', namely that power works by saying 'No' (Foucault, 1979). Its primary mechanism, irrespective of its success or failure, is prohibition or repression, whether this is analysed at the level of State mechanisms or subjective mechanisms of regulation. Similarly, knowledge of reality (Truth) is displayed as the corollary of both resistance and progress. The true child audience or the true dynamics of its conception are revealed which can, then, take on an emblematic significance. Instead, I argue in this thesis that the child television audience is produced as an audience. I am not concerned with investigating 'actual' children watching television, rather I want to consider how this audience is constructed within a specific set of discursive relations. Whereas traditionally research in the social sciences has sought to 'discover' the child audience through observing children in research laboratories, conducting large scale surveys or using small scale interviews, I want to look at how this audience has been imagined and acted upon as an audience. Likewise, I argue that the production of knowledge about this audience is intimately connected to the establishment of power relations which cannot simply be defined in terms of the relations between adult and child. The truth of this audience, far from resisting the oppressive apparatuses of power, is constitutive of new realities, which define new domains of intervention and regulation. Power is not repressive and negative, but productive and positive. The task, then, is not to expose the truths, hidden deep beneath the lies, but to rethink those truths which shape our lives.

In this sense I am concerned with the specific relations of power and knowledge, or what we might also call the forms of government, which constitute what we now call the child television audience. This raises the initial and most fundamental question as to what constitutes the limits of this knowledge of the child audience: what constitutes its singularity? Psychologists, doctors, broadcasters, regulators, educationalists, journalists, Government committees, pressure groups and various others talk about children's television viewing and about children's television. However, the
analysis of such a wealth of material, from those early years in the 1950s to the present, would be overwhelming. This thesis is not, then, an attempt to offer a massive survey of all that has been said and written concerning the relationship between children and television, rather it is an attempt to form a picture, from a diverse array of sources, of the constituent and constitutive elements which form the child television audience. And I limit my research to what Dreyfus and Rabinow call 'serious speech acts', or what Foucault simply calls 'statements', that is those speech acts which take on a certain seriousness by way of the community of experts and the complex procedures of validation (Dreyfus and Rabinow, 1982, 48; Foucault, 1972). In doing so, the domain of statements concerned with children's television viewing and children's television programmes takes on a certain seriousness by virtue of the construction of this community of experts and procedures of validation. In fact, my thesis is centrally concerned with making intelligible these two seemingly distinct areas of concern as unitary. Nevertheless, I am still faced with the question as to whether the diverse array of things said and done by an equally diverse array of individuals and organisations concerning the child television audience constitute a unity? Can the statements of the psychologists be placed alongside the policy documents of the children's broadcaster? Is there something which ties them together? And if there is a unity, does it cohere through time and, if so, how? Is the child audience the same in the 1950s as it was in the 1930s and as it is today?

We can, however, unequivocally say that this domain of statements is, and has been, framed around a set of questions about the family, family viewing (as a collective or individual activity) and the home. John Ellis has referred to the way in which television functions according to an image of the normal family. This image of the family is deployed, it is argued, despite the fact that a large percentage of the population in Britain do not accord with this image of the normal family (Ellis, 1982, 113-5). In the opening pages of their book *Behind and In Front of the Screen: Television's Involvement with Family Life*, Barrie Gunter and Michael Svennevig state that:

The fact is that in Britain today, there is a variety of different household structures. Of all homes, 23 percent are one-person households, a further 46 percent contain two or more people but no child under school leaving age; which leaves less than one in three homes as family households in the traditional sense. In all, 31 percent of
households contain children aged up to 15 years, while 69 percent do not (BARB, 1986). In the past two decades the percentage of people living alone in particular has increased. (Gunter and Svennevig, 1987, 3)

Children watch television within families and yet, as we can see, these families, whether 'normal' or otherwise, constitute a minority of the households in Britain. Some writers have argued that the discrepancy between the image of the family presented on television (evident in scheduling, programmes genres, within the programmes themselves and also in the popular discussions and 'gossip' about the programmes) leads to a denial of the reality of ordinary domestic existence (cf. Ellis, 1982). Others have argued that the family is the 'fundamental unit within which people in most societies are brought up' and that it is 'the root of most individuals' socialisation into normative modes of conduct which are approved and accepted by society' (Gunter and Svennevig, 1987, 1). In my analysis of the child television audience, I, however, want to put forward the argument that the family is neither an image which bears little relation to reality nor a unit of socialisation which founds our social existence, but rather that the community of experts concerned with the child television audience and the discourses which circulate within this problematic constitute a particular regime of administration through which individuals are governed. I argue that the child television audience is formed within what Foucault has called 'dividing practices'.¹ The problem of children's television viewing and the setting up of children's television programmes for this audience is formed within a set of practices (i.e. not simply statements, but also administrative techniques) which divide this audience from adult audiences and divide this audience within itself (e.g. primarily according to age or, more accurately, developmental stage).

In this sense the child audience is important, not because the child watches within a familial and domestic context nor because the child is socialised principally within the family, but because these discursive practices are central to the administration of the arrangements of domestic and familial

¹ Foucault defines these practices in the following way:

The subject is either divided inside himself or divided from others. This process objectivizes him. Examples are the mad and the sane, the sick and the healthy, the criminal and the 'good boys'.
(Foucault, 1982, 208)
space and time. The concerns about the child television audience implicitly figure the problem of these domestic and familial arrangements, not because they are external conditions or constraints (i.e. its context), but because these administrative concerns are internal to its existence as a discursive formation.

Moreover this discursive formation does not rest upon a single image, or reality, of the normal family. I argue that the child television audience is formed in relation to two interdependent sets of relations. On the one hand, there is a set of relations between broadcasters and those families which are constructed as pathological (disadvantaged families, problem families) and which are primarily, although not exclusively, conceived as working class. In this formation the broadcasters are made responsible as a result of the perceived irresponsibilities of the parents within these types of families. In these families the children are conceived as being improperly supervised. In this sense the ethical duties of the broadcaster, vis-a-vis its audience, are conceived in relation to a specific type, or specific types, of audience. On the other hand, there is a set of relations between parent, child and television within families which are constructed as normal. In these families it is the parent, primarily the mother, who is conceived as being responsible for their children's television viewing. In this set of relations, it is the parent who takes on certain ethical duties in relation to the supervision of their children's viewing, for the formation of discriminate child viewers and for the facilitation of their development (vis-a-vis their viewing).

The invocation of responsibility for the child television audience is thus not only constructed differently in relation to these different configurations, but also constructed differently at different historical moments. The responsibility of both broadcaster and parent is formed upon a wider set of discursive relations concerning the administration of domestic and familial life. In order to uncover these discursive relations, I argue that we need to look at how these relations have been constructed historically, namely we need to consider their conditions of emergence. I invoke 'history' here not as a means of reifying this audience as an historical object, but as a means of establishing the cost of continuing with our present thinking. What are the costs of participating in the maintenance of this system? What is the cost of telling the truth about the child audience? Foucault, drawing on the work of Frederick Nietzsche, used
the term *genealogy* to describe this form of historical investigation. The task of the genealogist is to use history to reveal not the truth, but what is intolerable in our present forms of reason. History, in this sense, provides a technique for answering the question: how much does it cost Reason to tell the truth?²

I begin this investigation, in Chapter One, by looking at what has been to all intents and purposes two traditions of thinking about media audiences. On the one hand, there is a well-established tradition of research into children's television viewing in the social sciences, primarily drawing upon the discipline of psychology. Although its theoretical and methodological roots are secured within a longer history of social scientific research, this research goes back to the 1950s, with work by psychologists such as Eleanor Maccoby (1951) in the United States and Hilde Himmelweit (1958) in Britain. In its current form it would include work by psychologists such as Kevin Durkin (1985) in Britain and Aimee Dorr (1986) in the United States. This research continues an empiricist tradition. On the other hand, there is a history of research which we might call the 'radical tradition' or the 'critical paradigm' of media and cultural studies.³ Although framed, in part, within the social sciences, it also owes its origins to the discipline of literary studies. This tradition came out of a set of political concerns about the media and central to its thinking in the 1970s was a set of questions about the State and ideology which drew upon the thinking of Louis Althusser and Antonio Gramsci. At that time, these questions, along with those raised by psychoanalysis, structural semiotics and Brechtian aesthetics, formed one of the focal points within the influential journal *Screen* for thinking about the relationship between the text and the subject. It was not until the 1980s, with work by academics such as David Morley, that the question of audiences as an empirical question began seriously to be raised within this tradition. Morley, although firmly within the field of critical media and cultural studies, formed his arguments in response not only to earlier work within the journal *Screen* but also in response to the earlier social scientific tradition I refer to above. Much of Morley's work has focussed explicitly on the familial and domestic uses of television and yet he has said little about children's viewing. Whereas the social scientific tradition has been prolific in its research on the child

² I am grateful to John Rajchman (1991) for the formulation of this question.
³ James Curran uses the term 'the radical tradition' and Shaun Moores uses the terms 'critical paradigm' (Curran, 1990; Moores, 1993).
television audience, the critical tradition has said very little either about the texts of children's television or about children's television viewing.

In this chapter I take up Morley's work as my starting point and raise a number of questions about the text, the subject, power and resistance. However, rather than pursuing an ethnographic analysis of children's television viewing, I argue that we need to understand how the child television audience has been constituted as a discursive formation within a specific regime of power/knowledge. This line of analysis requires looking at the institutional and discursive practices within which the audience is always embedded.

In Chapter Two I look at radio broadcasting for children in the interwar years. Initially I was expecting to find either some continuity between the discursive practices which shaped children's listening in the 1920s and 1930s and the current practices which shape children's television viewing or, perhaps, a marked discontinuity predicated on the different technologies of radio and television. However, it soon became clear that I would find neither of these patterns. Instead I discovered that the child audience in the earlier period was conceived only inasmuch as it listened to children's radio and inasmuch as it listened in the presence of the family. This audience was located in both the public and the domestic spheres. These discourses firmly set in place a conception of the public space of broadcasting, such that broadcasting made possible a public space of the home. The practices of listening to the radio were to become intimately connected to the public concerns of liberal democracy and the State. And, through a series of cultural and moral discourses, the British Broadcasting Company (later Corporation) attempted to align the art of children's broadcasting with the art of children's listening in order to cultivate future citizens. It was only in the 1930s, primarily with the emergence of a series of social surveys of the radio audience, that this earlier formation is reshaped.

In Chapter Three I show how the child television audience emerged within a set of concerns about the administration of domestic space and time. In this chapter I look at the construction of this audience in relation to the policy practices of the BBC, the concerns about television within the architecture and design of the home and the emergence of a psychological knowledge of this audience. Across these different sites of discursive
production, it is clear that the child audience was formed out of the specific techniques used to divide children from adults within the home and to divide children within themselves. In this sense, the provision of regular children's television programmes became intimately linked to wider questions about children's television viewing. I argue that the child audience does not exist prior to or outside of these practices. Nevertheless, although this audience is formed as a distinct and separate entity, it is also intimately connected to a set of concerns about the emotional economy of the family. The child audience is constructed within a twin strategy directed at the pathologisation and normalisation of certain types of families and familial environments.

This then sets the scene for my analysis of more contemporary formations of the child audience in the 1970s, 1980s and 1990s. In Chapter Four I look initially at the series Watch with Mother and at the surrounding discussions in the 1950s. I then look at the contemporary pre-school programme Playdays. This analysis shows how the invention of the pre-school child audience was framed within a set of concerns about making the relationship between mother, child and television a site of care, love and learning. We can also see how, from the 1970s onwards, the pre-school audience was, and is, conceived within a child-centred discourse.

In Chapter Five I argue that many of the existing academic debates about the child television audience have been framed within what I call a 'protectionist hypothesis'. I argue that the development of the concept of the 'moral panic' within critical media studies (and in relation to the study of children and television) has failed to provide a historically specific analysis of the administration of the child television audience and as a result has tended to lead to an overemphasis on press reporting of children's television viewing. In pursuing my argument, I consider how the critical child viewer and the responsible parent have been constituted within child-centred forms of supervision.
Chapter One

Theoretical and Methodological Frameworks
In this chapter I initially consider how the child television audience has been constructed within traditional social scientific research. This research has been primarily dependent on the discipline of psychology and has constructed the child viewer in terms of a set of concerns about the mind of the child and the psychological effects and cognitive processes involved in watching television. This research has consistently been directed at the child viewer as an individual and has, to a large extent, ignored wider questions about the location of children's viewing within specific social and power relations. There is, however, a large body of research which has been concerned with analysing the subjective processes involved in watching television, and other media forms, in relation to these questions about power. This work comes out of what Shaun Moores calls the 'critical paradigm' of media and cultural studies (Moores, 1993). In the latter section of this chapter, I initially look at the theoretical approach which has been typified as *Screen* theory, following the writings stemming from that influential journal, and then, in more detail, consider David Morley's critique of *Screen* theory and the argument he, and others, make for an ethnographic analysis of media consumption within the context of the family. Particularly important for my analysis is his discussion, following the work of Paddy Scannell and others, of the temporal and spatial arrangements of domestic viewing. Finally, I raise some problems about this ethnographic research and argue that it is important to analyse the discursive construction of the child television audience and the way in which this construction is embedded within a set of institutional practices. In making this argument, the question of the historical conditions of emergence of this audience comes to the fore.

**Theoretical and Methodological Framework I**

The traditional research on the relationship between children and television has primarily focussed around three questions: how is the child *socialised* by television; why does the child *use* television; and how does the child *understand*
television? In this review of the literature, I follow what is now a conventional history of the research (cf. Buckingham, 1987; Dorr, 1986; Durkin, 1985).

The question of socialisation has been traditionally embedded within a number of questions about the 'effects' of televised violence on the child viewer. This particular question has more recently been deployed in relation to a set of questions about advertising, race and gender (cf. Durkin, 1985; Gunter and McAleer, 1990). The pivotal voice within this particular approach has been that of the behaviourist social psychologist Albert Bandura whose work in the 1960s has been influential, not only in providing a model through which we might understand the effects of television, but also in providing subsequent media researchers with an emblematic figure. Bandura's use of the laboratory-experimental methodology and his particular work on primary school age children, who are observed either bashing a 'Bobo doll' or not, has become particularly potent (as a set of images of this tradition) in defining the contours of subsequent debates about children and television. This image of Bandura's is used to exemplify a particular research tradition and is employed, usually in the opening pages of most reviews of literature, to define research into media effects (cf. Buckingham, 1987; Dorr, 1986).

Bandura's particular concern about television (although he was also concerned with other visual media, such as film) was that 'parents are in danger of becoming relatively less influential as role models, and often are greatly concerned with the problem of regulating their children's television viewing'. He argued that the 'performance' of information on television was able to provide a better method of learning for children than that presented through the parent's verbal descriptions, that is 'unless the parents exhibit modeling behaviour that is consonant with the instructions they issue' (Bandura and Walters, 1969, 49-50).

Central to Bandura's analysis was that television acted as a powerful mechanism of social learning through the presentation of social roles with which individual children could identify and which they could imitate. However, Bandura also argued that the effectiveness of this learning was dependent on the system of

1 Bandura's work comes out of a specific debate in the 1960s and 1970s with other psychologists such as Berkowitz, Feshbach, Singer, and others, concerning the specific nature of the effects (catharsis, stimulation, reinforcement, disinhibition or desensitisation) (cf. Buckingham, 1987).

2 Dorr refers to Bandura's research as '[t]he granddaddy studies of televised aggression' (Dorr, 1986, 72).
rewards and punishments which accompanied, and which could reinforce, those visual stimuli and behavioural responses. The question for Bandura was that of how to observe the linear causal relationship between visual stimulus and behavioural response. Bandura turned to the laboratory as a 'scientific' invention, which provided a specific architecture of observation and which could be used in order to isolate the determining factors of the child's behaviour. He states that '[t]he laboratory-experimental approach has the advantage that, if experiments are well executed, it generates relatively precise statements of cause and effect which are remarkably unambiguous' (Bandura and Walters, 1969, 40). The laboratory, which Bandura and his colleagues use in the experiments on nursery schoolchildren and televised violence, is constructed as if it were homely. For example, Bandura et al, in their description of the methodology, state:

The experimenter met the child in the nursery school and invited him to play in her toy room. On the way to the room the experimenter informed the child that she had to complete some paper work in another office during which time the child could watch a televised program. (Bandura et al, 1963, 602)

Having seen the televised programme the child was then taken to another 'experimental test room' which contained 'a baton, two 5-foot Bobo dolls, three balls, a hoola hoop, and a lasso, dart guns, cars, and plastic farm animals'. It also contained 'a blackboard, a doll house equipped with furniture and a doll family, three cotton-stuffed dolls, and a set of building blocks'. These toys were carefully arranged in a fixed order (ibid, 603). Criticisms of this laboratory-experimental approach have focussed on the 'unnatural' surroundings of the laboratory and on the irony that a social learning theory should test individual behaviour which 'was experimentally miscontextualised and interpretatively decontextualised (cf. Luke, 1990, 163; and also Buckingham, 1987; Noble, 1975).3 However, what we see clearly here is that far from being an unnatural context for research, the

3 Noble, for example, states that:

A psychologist will show you his laboratory with great pride. You will be encouraged to play with the many extensive toys with which it is equipped. Strange as it might seem, people, including themselves, watch television in their own homes. Television affects people as they sit at home and view. There is no need to stimulate this activity in a laboratory as though the laboratory were consecrated ground... Of course the social scientist can, and must, leave the laboratory. When he does so he will investigate the effects of televised aggression at first hand... (Noble, 1975, 29 and 31)

However, Noble's analysis of children's television viewing merely duplicates this architecture of laboratory observation within 'real' homes.
laboratory is designed in order to simulate an ideal domesticated space: a
domesticated observatory. The laboratory setting provided the social scientist with
a controlled environment which was structured in order to provide optimum
visibility of the child while also providing optimum invisibility for the
researcher. It both provides a relationship between observer and observed
(scientist/child) and between before and after (power of television/effect on

In response to social learning theory, Katz and Foulkes (1962), Klapper (1963) and
a number of other writers, put forward an argument that suggested that different
media and different media content were actively and intentionally selected by
individuals.4 Uses and gratifications research focussed on media use as a function
of individual social circumstances and psychological dispositions (cf. Luke, 1990,
161).5 Instead of conceiving of television as doing something to the viewer, this
model conceived of the viewer as doing something to television (Halloran, 1970).
Katz et al break down the process of media use into '1) the social and
psychological origins of (2) needs, which generate (3) expectations of (4) the
mass media or other sources, which lead to (5) differential patterns of media
exposure (or engagement in other activities), resulting in (6) need gratifications
and (7) other consequences, perhaps mostly unintended ones' (Katz et al, 1974,

---

4 This particular approach, although it did not gain 'formal textual recognition and
prominence' until the late 1950s and early 1960s (cf. Luke, 1990, 162), recast its history to
include earlier work by Herzog on responses to radio soap opera (1944), Suchman on the
motives for listening to classical music on radio (1942) and Berelson on newspaper reading
(1949) (cf. McQuail, 1969; McQuail and Windahl, 1981; Blumler and Katz, 1974). It is also
evident that Hilde Himmelweit et al in Britain (1958) and Wilbur Schramm et al in the United
States (1961), in their social surveys, were concerned, not only with 'content effects' of
specific types of programmes and the effects of television on school work and family life, but
also with identifying children's uses of television in terms of the 'functional equivalence'
between different media and the identification of 'displacement effects' (i.e. what do children
give up to watch television and does television fulfill the equivalent function or need). For
example Himmelweit et al state that:

... television like any other influence, is likely to have differing effects on
children of differing ages, intelligence levels, personality, home
background, and so on. Moreover, not only do children vary in what they
choose to watch on television, they also perceive and react to the same
programmes differently, according to their idiosyncratic needs.
(Himmelweit et al, 1958, 2)

5 In the United States the research tended to be focussed on the way in which the media was
used to satisfy certain psychological needs, whereas in Britain the concern was mainly about
the social uses of television (e.g. Dembo and McCron, 1976).
20). For example, films at the cinema might be watched, as opposed, say, to reading newspapers, in order to satisfy certain psychological needs for escape. Likewise, different types of television programmes might be watched in order to satisfy a number of different needs (cf. Katz et al, 1973). Some critics have argued that this approach fails to take account of the ideological role of the media in constructing these needs and that it fails to consider how 'non-purposive' and unconscious choices structure media use (cf. Elliot, 1974; Morley, 1980; Buckingham, 1993b). The methodology itself constructed the individual as self-conscious of his or her media use and of the reasons for those choices. Through the use of structured interviews it was hoped that the researcher would discover both children's different uses of the media and the underlying needs which they fulfilled. The task of the researcher was not to impose their assumptions and opinions onto the data, but to provide a methodological setting in which 'value judgements about the cultural significance of mass communication should be suspended while audience orientations are explored on their own terms' (Katz et al, 1974, 22). The method of analysis was intended to provide researchers with a knowledge of the relationship between child and television 'by simply asking them' (ibid, 21). The child is conceived as being, not only conscious of their media use and choice of media, but also able to articulate those decisions to the inquiring researcher. In terms of the procedures of analysis, whereas social learning theory attempted to prescribe the best conditions for observation, uses and gratifications theory attempted to devise a suitable method in which to allow children to speak truthfully about their viewing. In this sense the methodology deployed is a constitutive element in the way in which the child is presented, for example as a rational subject within uses and gratifications research, and in the results which might be gained. 6

Both social learning theory and uses and gratifications research were used to analyse media use and effects in relation to different types of media and audiences. In the 1970s and 1980s, a number of cognitive and developmental psychologists began to adopt an approach which focussed quite specifically on the child audience. This research was aimed at identifying, not what the media does to the child or what children do with the media, but how children understand the meanings presented on television. It was concerned with the way in which children, as cognitive subjects, processed information and with the way

6 Although I would agree with Morley when he states that 'the choice of method, in itself, can neither guarantee nor damn a given study', I would also argue that particular methods within specific discursive frameworks do constitute quite specific subjectivities (Morley, 1992, 13).
in which the child's development affected their cognition. This approach typically identified three levels of meaning construction: information-processing, interpretation and evaluation (cf. Dorr, 1986; Salomon, 1979; Greenfield, 1984; Sheppard, 1990). Although this distinction is seen as an abstraction and that children are not conscious of the different processes when watching television, this division is seen to mark out distinct cognitive processes (Dorr, 1986, 28).

The basic level of meaning construction is the processing of information. The television message is to be composed of basic information, such as visual codes, print, music, camera angle, editing techniques and so on, which is decoded at a literal level. In the face of a mass of information, children might only be able to decode a limited amount of data from any one text. The amount of data processed by the child, it is argued, increases as the child gets older. Likewise data may be decoded correctly or incorrectly and this again is largely dependent on developmental factors. It is argued that information is processed according to cognitive maps or knowledge structures which are called 'scripts' or 'schemas'. These schemas or scripts provide the framework for decoding information and they might be dependent on a number of factors such as 'viewer's needs and interests, their abilities and training, their innate information-processing patterns, their interpretations and evaluations of content, and the characteristics of the content itself' (Dorr, 1986, 31-2). The second level of the constructive process is that of interpretation. Interpretive activities, while dependent on the basic level of decoding, suggest meanings 'not actually depicted, to feelings and motives, and to string together pieces of content to form a larger whole' (Dorr, 1986, 28). Interpretation, it is argued, is more than merely receiving, understanding and remembering the 'momentary signals of television' (Dorr, 1986, 28). The act of interpretation is itself subdivided into three activities: integration, inference and attribution. Attributions are imputed motivations, ascriptions, or internal states, which are attributed to characters in a programme or to the programme itself. Inference describes the process whereby we understand the implications of a scene when not everything has been shown. Integration is essential to the other two activities in that it joins together the various bits of textual information. Interpretation, like the basic level of decoding, is dependent on scripts or schemas. The third level of processing is that of evaluation. Evaluative activities attach feelings and reactions to the denotative and connotative meanings. This level of processing describes the way we like or

7 In the following outline of this approach I draw upon Dorr's description (1986).
dislike characters or programmes. It describes the way we make judgements about the meaning decoded and interpreted. These different processes, of information-processing, interpretation and evaluation, are taken to describe the way in which the child organises complex information from the outside world according to the internal cognitive capacities of the child's mind.

More recent research has attempted to analyse the way in which children process information within the context of the wider social world. For example, Kevin Durkin, in _Television, Sex Roles and Children_ (1985), argues that the scripts which provide the cognitive maps for children to process information are both social, inasmuch as they 'form part of a given society's culture', and internal to the workings of the child's mind (ibid, 126). Children's understanding of television is dependent, he argues, on the familial and social context in which information is processed. Likewise Bob Hodge and David Tripp, in _Children and Television: A Semiotic Approach_ (1986), use this cognitive and developmental model in order to provide an analysis of the way children understand television within a social context. For Hodge and Tripp, social meanings are 'refracted' through the mind of the child. While not denying the ideological impact of television on children, Hodge and Tripp argue that these ideological meanings cannot be understood without an understanding of the way in which children process this information. Ultimately though for Hodge and Tripp 'meanings are constructed by minds, minds which bring other systems to bear on these physical systems [light and sound]. The systems, and the meanings they produce, are located inside brains' (ibid, 14). Although this research makes the question of meaning production central to the analysis of children's television viewing, it nevertheless locates meaning within the mind of the individual child. There is little understanding,

---

8 Durkin states that the 'social psychology of scripts has considerable value to researchers at the intersection of mass media and psychological processes' (Durkin, 1985, 126).

9 Although Hodge and Tripp provide a welcome departure from much of the research in this area, inasmuch as they do raise the question of language as a political question and in terms of their use of small scale loosely structured interviews, I want to argue that their research, nevertheless, can be seen within the context of earlier research of cognitive and developmental psychology and within the wider set of questions about the socialisation of the child. For example, Hodge and Tripp argue that:

Children watching television are not zombies. They are learning important and complex structures of meaning, and developing capacities for thinking and judgement that are a necessary part of the process of socialization.
(Hodge and Tripp, 1986, 10)

In this sense I hesitate in celebrating their presentation of the child as an active and literate viewer.
for example, of the way in which television is consumed within the home and within the context of the family.\textsuperscript{10}

Although the three different focusses on socialisation, use and understanding deploy different theoretical and methodological approaches, they nevertheless constitute the relationship between children and television as an unchanging and unitary object of study within a specific set of questions about the mind of the child. Each new piece of research is seen to contest or reaffirm previous research and is constituted within a linear progression toward the 'Truth'. The history of this research is told as if it were both a chronological and a logical progression toward a more complete knowledge of the audience. For example, social learning theory is often written-off as 'effects research', which is superceded by uses and gratifications research, which is in turn superceded by cognitive and developmental approaches. For example, Buckingham, in a discussion on television's effects, states that:

\begin{quote}
Statistical content analysis of television 'messages' - for example, counting the numbers of men and women in different occupational roles - is often seen here as adequate evidence of their effects. Yet again, the ways in which children make sense of television, and the social processes through which this occurs, tend to be oversimplified. (Buckingham, 1993a, 8)\textsuperscript{11}
\end{quote}

The production of research is seen as a juridical game in which 'evidence' is sought to 'prove' or 'disprove' the case. Likewise, new research, which presents new evidence about the child audience (e.g. on the pro-social effects of television on children, on children's understanding of television advertising, on parent and child co-viewing, etc), is seen to add to the 'sophistication' of the analysis in terms of its ability to properly discover the truth of this audience as a unitary object.

\textsuperscript{10} Buckingham's recent work (1993a and 1993b) represents a significant departure from his earlier work and begins to open up the field to new methodological approaches. Drawing upon work within cultural studies, he looks at how 'young people themselves conduct the meanings of those differences [race, class and gender] and how they are defined and mobilised in different social contexts' (Buckingham, 1993a, 15).

\textsuperscript{11} However, in the following paragraph, Buckingham also states that:

\begin{quote}
The history of media research is far from linear or straightforward. Particularly in the case of young people, there is a sense in which the same issues have recurred again and again as each new medium has arrived on the scene. (Buckingham, 1993a, 8)
\end{quote}

Although he suggests that the research does not follow a linear progression, he nevertheless constitutes this history as one of a repetition of 'the same' (i.e. that each new medium produces a panic which is legitimated by research into the 'effects' of that medium).
Moreover, children’s television viewing is conceived as a specifically psychological phenomenon and, as David Buckingham has argued, '[t]o all intents and purposes, children appear to be regarded as not fully social - or indeed 'pre-social' - beings' (Buckingham, 1993b, 11). Social learning theory presents a notion of the individual child as pre-existing the social. It is through television, as a social mechanism, that children are socialised. Uses and gratifications research likewise presents the needs and the satisfaction to be gained from television as pre-existing the uses of that medium. It is only through the use of television that those psychological needs can be gratified and in presenting television use in this way there is, as Carmen Luke has argued, a conflation of the social with the psychological (a 'psychologising of the social'). The social becomes intelligible within a set of questions about the psychology of the child (Luke, 1990, 161). Likewise cognitive and developmental psychological approaches to children's understanding of television present the 'outside world' in terms of the cognitive capacities of the child. Television programmes and the watching of television within the home are reduced to a set of mental techniques through which information is processed and internalised. And despite Durkin's and Hodge and Tripp's attempt to provide a model which accounts for children's understanding of television within a social context, they too provide a psychologised account of the social.

My point here is not that this research fails to overcome the dualism between the social and the individual (which, of course, it does), but rather that it constitutes, in its own terms, the social in a peculiarly limited way. Luke's critique of uses and gratifications research, that it psychologises the social, is apposite and can equally be conferred upon the totality of this research.\textsuperscript{12} My argument, though, is not that psychology is an 'anti-social' science 'focussing on the properties of individuals abstracted from social relations, reducing social issues to interpersonal ones, servicing an unequal society', but that it is profoundly social. It is not simply that 'childhood', and 'children' even, are socially produced categories or that the truth of the child television audience is constituted socially ('the outcome of a complex process of construction and persuasion undertaken within a social arena'), but rather, as Nikolas Rose argues, that 'the birth of psychology as a distinct discipline, its vocation and destiny, is inextricably bound to the emergence of the 'social' as a territory of our thought and our reality'\textsuperscript{12}

\textsuperscript{12} Henriques et al provide a particularly pertinent analysis of the individual/social dualism within the domain of psychology (Henriques et al, 1984).
Rose, drawing upon the work of Jacques Donzelot (1979), argues that the 'social' is 'an historical achievement, a shifting and uncertain terrain that began to consolidate in western societies in the nineteenth century'. For Rose, as for Donzelot, the 'social' is a discursively constructed domain which refers to institutional and practical arrangements, including the emergence of social security, social welfare, social workers and social services (cf. Hirst, 1981). He argues that:

The social is a matrix of deliberation and action, the object of certain types of knowledge, the location of certain types of predicaments, the realm traced out by certain types of apparatus and the target of certain types of programmes and ambition. Psychology as a discipline - a heterogeneous assemblage of problems, methods, approaches and objects - was born in this social domain in the nineteenth century and its subsequent vicissitudes are inseparable from it. And psychology, as a way of knowing, speaking, calculating, has played a constitutive part in the formation of the social. (Rose, 1990, 103-4)

Although there is a vast amount of research conducted on children's television viewing, there is little research which reflects upon its own practice as knowledge, in the way in which Rose suggests above, and which locates that knowledge within specific conditions of emergence. In order to conduct this type of research we would have to consider the way in which the child television audience is produced as an audience and to ask how and why, within quite specific conditions, were certain questions asked about children's television viewing. This type of research would be predicated on a notion that knowledge is itself contingent and that researchers, at different moments and within different contexts, might be talking about very different objects of study. This is, in part, what I want to do in this thesis. However, in order to do this I also want to consider the question of power.

Theoretical and Methodological Framework II

Buckingham has recently argued that research within media and cultural studies 'has often been caught in an uneasy tension between perspectives that proclaim 'the power of the reader' and those that insist on 'the power of the text'' (Buckingham, 1993a, 14). In the 1970s, British intellectuals, drawing upon a mixture of marxism, semiotics and psychoanalysis, focussed on the problematic of ideology in culture and the media. They were concerned with 'the ways in which
meaning and power intersect...ways in which meaning may serve, in specific social-historical contexts, to sustain relations of domination' (Thompson, 1988, 370, quoted in Moores, 1993, 11). The film journal *Screen* was seminal in the dissemination of these ideas and their theory of ideology and power was provided by the French marxist Louis Althusser. Although Althusser said very little about the ideological function of the media, he nevertheless provided a framework in which the media could be analysed as an instance of the Ideological State Apparatus. Power, in this model, was theorised as being not purely a matter of the force of the State (i.e. the Repressive State Apparatus, which includes the army, the police, the security services, etc), but more importantly in terms of the way in which individuals are 'interpellated' into the dominant ideology. Althusser was used not merely to theorise the class relations of capitalism, but also the relations of gender and, to a lesser extent, race (cf. Hall, 1977 and 1981; McCabe, 1974; Mulvey, 1977). This theoretical configuration was focussed around a particular reading of a Brechtian aesthetic. The interpellation of subjects within film and television was seen to rest upon the political operations of the 'realist text'. Realist aesthetic practices functioned within the dominant ideology as 'irredeemably bourgeois' (Moores, 1993, 13). These texts were seen to conceal their ideological operations and in doing so 'sutured', or stitched, the viewer into the ideological position of the text and hence also the dominant ideology. Only an anti-realist Brechtian aesthetic, which revealed the text's mode of production, could escape such a determination.

Other writers such as Stuart Hall, working in the wider field of cultural studies, used this Althusserian model alongside the conception of ideology proposed by the Italian marxist Antonio Gramsci. While the use of Gramsci allowed critics to analyse the more complex workings of ideology within modern societies, through the deployment of notions of 'articulation', 'negotiation' and 'resistance', it was still posed within the problematic of reading texts as either 'progressive' or 'reactionary' (cf. Morley, 1980; Hall, 1981; Bennett, 1991). The critical task, in this mesh of theories, was to understand the way the text constructed subjects within the dominant ideology or the way in which subjects could resist this cultural and social power.

However, in the early 1980s, a group of intellectuals, initially associated with the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies at Birmingham, began to raise certain

---

13 Shaun Moores states that "the rediscovery of ideology" was central to the formation of a critical paradigm in modern media studies' (Moores, 1993, 11).
criticisms of *Screen* theory and began to theorise the possibility of audience re-reading and re-using the media and the possibility of resistance (cf. Moores, 1993). This formed a two-pronged attack. On the one hand, they argued that media and cultural texts do not simply position subjects within the dominant ideology, as if texts determined subjects. On the other hand, they argued that interpretation and use of the media could not simply be analysed in terms of the individual reader. David Morley, whose work has been central to the use of ethnographic research into television viewing, argues in *Family Viewing* (1986) that if we look, not just at the way individuals interpret television, but also at the way television is used within the familial and domestic context, we can see how individuals are not simply determined by television texts and positioned through televisual techniques within the dominant ideologies of class, race and gender.14 According to Morley ethnographic analysis provides a suitable methodology for such an investigation. Although strictly speaking ethnography, which comes from anthropology, implies that the researcher records the daily practices of the group observed (i.e. participant observation), Morley's in-depth interviews with his family groups uncover a new set of dynamics ignored by earlier media research and mark a distinct shift towards qualitative small-scale empirical audience research within media studies.

Morley focuses on the uses of the media in order to foreground the negotiation and the tactics of possible resistance to the strategies of power (i.e. the media as an ISA).15 Morley argues that the everyday practices of domestic and familial media consumption provide the context for the uses, negotiation and resistance to the strategies of power. However, in doing so, even though Morley does not isolate the individual viewer from these social relations, he hypostasises this familial and domestic context. In research while at Brunel University, Morley and his co-author Roger Silverstone state that 'television meanings, that is the meanings of both texts and technologies, have to be understood as emergent properties of contextualized audience practices' (Morley and Silverstone, 1990, 33). Morley and

---

14 Although Morley talks about the 'use' of television within the home, he marks a significant departure from the earlier uses and gratifications model, inasmuch as he is not concerned with a psychological account of media use.

15 In his later work with Roger Silverstone, he borrows from Michel de Certeau's work on resistance and everyday life (de Certeau, 1984). Morley's use of de Certeau, however, is unlike that of John Fiske's, who rather romantically overplays the resistance to strategies of power (cf. Fiske, 1987). Morley states that 'the power of viewers to reinterpret meanings is hardly equivalent to the discursive power of centralised media institutions to construct the texts which the viewer then interprets; to imagine otherwise is simply foolish' (Morley 1992, 31; cf. also Morley and Silverstone, 1990; Silverstone, 1989).
Silverstone draw upon 'family systems theory' and family therapy theory to analyse the dynamics of familial media use (cf. Brodie and Stoneman, 1983; Goodman, 1983). Although this model provides an understanding of the rule-governed nature of television viewing, it nevertheless locates those rules as internal to the family. Family systems theory defines the family context as having certain 'normal' internal dynamics within which television is used and interpreted.

Morley, in his later work, attempts to articulate this analysis of the systematic nature of family viewing with a narrative of the historical and social formation of the family as an object of power. He states that:

... the family is neither totally separate from, nor opposed to, the state; rather the 'private' itself is a (legally, juridically) constructed space, into which the state and other agencies intervene. Among these agencies are, of course, communications and information organisations. (Morley and Robins, 1989, 30)

However, in arguing for the need to develop a 'double focus' on television viewing (Morley, 1992, 276), Morley foregoes any systematicity in his overall approach and appears increasingly duplicitous. Although Morley's project to analyse the specific locus of power and resistance of domestic and familial television viewing is admirable, his writing relies on a misreading of Foucault's analysis of power. Morley misreads Foucault as simply providing an analysis of power, whereas Foucault's argument is that power can only be analysed inasmuch as it is supported by resistance (i.e. power is a relational concept - not something which is held, but which is exercised). In this sense, a Foucauldian analysis does not allow the separation between a history of the construction of the family and the real practices of its existence (such that resistance is located on the side of the

16 For example, referring to the work of Brodie and Stoneman, Morley says:

These author's findings seem to support the thesis that in family interactions mothers will often assume a 'managerial' or 'overseer' role, while fathers will assume the 'playmate' role in relation to their children - that is, fathers will tend to join their children in activities while mothers sit and monitor the situation. (Morley, 1986, 29)

In this sense the role of the mother is understood only inasmuch as it functions within the intra-familial dynamics. In his earlier work, Morley makes no attempt to analyse how this role has been historically formed.

17 Morley's analysis grows and changes. His arguments become more complex as he engages on all sides with various critiques. In this way we can imagine Morley, like Foucault, saying, 'I am here, not where you think I am!'
real). Whereas Morley sees Donzelot's Foucauldian analysis of the family merely as a 'corrective of any analysis of domestic processes which remains blind to the history and social construction of that space' (Morley, 1992, 226), this is only because he is unable to see the far-reaching effects of understanding the actual television audience itself as constituted discursively: not as a unitary object, but as a dispersed and regulated field of invention and intervention. I will pick up on these points in a moment, but before doing so I want to look more closely at the question of the temporal and spatial arrangements of domestic viewing.

Paddy Scannell has provocatively argued that media analysis should move away from the question of representation and ideology to the question of 'the communicative ethos of broadcasting', which he characterises 'as a series of structuring temporal arrangements and as a communicative style, an orientation towards relaxed, natural and spontaneous modes of address and forms of talk' (Scannell, 1989, 152). He argues that it is through these processes that '[t]he world, in broadcasting, appears as ordinary, mundane, accessible, knowable, familiar, recognizable, intelligible, shareable and communicable for whole populations' (ibid). This world is not, he continues, 'a reflection, a mirror, of a reality outside and beyond': '[i]t is one fundamental, seen but unnoticed, constitutive component of contemporary reality for all' (ibid). Scannell's argument, in turning away from a concern with the 'politics of representation', focusses the problem as a question of organisation or administration. In an earlier argument, he refers to the way in which broadcasting has been a central figure within the organisation of modern time. Broadcasting helps shape calendrical time (through the broadcasting of national events and ceremonies), clock time (through the scheduling of programmes according to the normal family) and life time (through the way in which programmes, such as soap operas, are continuous with our own lives and through which we mark out points in our own life history) (Scannell, 1988). This concern with broadcasting and the temporal arrangements of modern living is matched by Shaun Moores who, in a fascinating analysis of the domestic consumption of information and communication technologies, discusses the way in which the home and family are organised spatially (Moores, 1993). He shows how individual family members are constituted within specific communities of taste (e.g. between the father's liking of the 'traditional' and the son's pleasure in the 'modern') which, in turn, map specific spatial contours within the home and outside of the home with national and global communities (e.g. the son watching MTV connects him to a global community of 'youth' culture) (cf. also Morley and Robins, 1989). In an earlier article, Moores refers to this using Foucault's phrase 'the little tactics of the habitat' (Moores, 1988).
However, whereas Moores stresses the agency of individual use within the structuring of these consumption spaces, I want to look at the way in which specific domestic viewing spaces have been formed historically within regimes of power. Morley takes a similar stance in his analysis of the arrangements of domestic space and time. However, although sympathetic to Scannell's argument, he warns against displacing questions of ideology by questions of ontology and he states that 'it would be quite possible to derive from Scannell's analysis a perspective which assumed that 'broadcasting times' simply imposed themselves on their audiences' (Morley, 1992, 261). For Morley, there is a clear distinction between broadcasting practices and the reality of actual audiences (which can only be discovered through ethnographic analysis). In an article on the 'politics of audience research', he draws upon Ien Ang's analysis of what she calls the institutional knowledge of the audience (Morley, 1990; Ang, 1991). According to this argument, broadcasting institutions deploy a 'ratings' discourse, which converts 'an elusive occurrence (people watching television) into calculable units on which economic transactions can be based, for audience measurement provides the economic foundations of the broadcasting industry' (Morley, 1990, 6). Although I would agree with Ang and Morley's concerns about this form of institutional knowledge, they hold onto a notion of the audience as ontologically prior, which can be known in its actual domestic context through ethnographic analysis. Both Ang and Morley draw upon a Foucauldian analysis, but stop short of asking how this form of critique might ask how ethnographic analysis itself might be caught up in a regime of power/knowledge which makes the audience observable, calculable, divisible and regulated.

As I stated above, Morley misreads Foucault's genealogical analysis of power/knowledge. In the following pages, I want to argue how a reading of Foucault's later work can provide a different focus for the study of audiences and the child audience in particular. Morely, in his criticism of Scannell, which I quoted above, poses an 'audience' upon which broadcasting time is 'imposed'. For Morley, there is a clear separation between the audience and the regimes of power/knowledge. But what happens if one poses the audience as being an audience only inasmuch as it is constituted within that discursive space? What happens if one gives those features of the audience, which ethnography (re)discovers (familial relations, television viewing as an activity, positions of supervision and so on), a history? If one gives television itself (as opposed to an imagined audience) a history? Michel Foucault, although he has never written about television (let alone television audiences), provides an analysis of what he calls discursive formations, which I want to argue can be particularly fruitful for
the analysis of the child audience. Foucault's work is of importance to my thesis because it allows me to hold on to the considerable insights of ethnographic analysis (concerning time, space and domestic use), while at the same time hanging onto the importance of a historical analysis of the institutional and discursive construction of the child television audience. It also suggests that any politics of the television audience needs to consider that the voices and practices of viewers only become serious within a given discursive arrangement and cannot be predicated upon a condensation of the questions of ontology and resistance. Foucault's conception of discourse allows us to think about the child audience neither as an empirical given nor as a priori.

In *The Archaeology of Knowledge* (1972), Foucault considers the question of the formation of systems of knowledge. His analysis is motivated by an attempt to find a unity, or what he calls a 'positivity', which is not that of the traditional unities of author or oeuvre. Nor is its unity defined by a reality external to the discursive formation (e.g. the economy or biological difference). However, while it is important to forego these traditional unities, it is clear that existing knowledge is not simply chaotic and accidental. Even though its logic may not be evident,

---

18 John Hartley makes a similar argument when he states that:

> In no case is the audience 'real', or external to its discursive construction. There is no 'actual' audience that lies beyond its production as a category, which is merely to say that audiences are only ever encountered per se as representations. (Hartley, 1987)

Len Ang also makes a slightly different argument. Although she looks at the discursive production of the television audience within television institutional practices, she nevertheless still hold onto a notion of 'actual' audiences, which are constituted not only as outside this apparatus, but also as having a specific ontology (Ang, 1991).

19 This becomes particularly important when thinking about questions of 'accountability'.

20 Foucault states:

> ... I shall take as my starting-point whatever unities are already given...; but I shall not place myself inside these dubious unities in order to study their internal configurations... I shall accept the groupings that history suggests only to subject them at once to interrogation. (Foucault, 1972, 26)

Does this suggest that 'history' has an agency which is external to, and determining of, discursive formations? Foucault often lapses into a phenomenology of knowledge. For example, he suggests that:

> One is led... to the project of a pure description of discursive events as the horizon for the search for the unities that form within it. (ibid 27)
certain logics can be uncovered. Foucault argues that knowledge is constituted within discursive formations, which he defines as a system of statements which are dispersed and yet have a regularity.21 This does not mean, then, that the task is simply to catalogue all that has been said about the child television audience, but rather to map, as Carmen Luke argues, 'effective statements' (Luke, 1990, 7). The problem though is not simply to catalogue those statements which are authoritative, have a regularity and reference to an object of study, but to show: how certain statements become authoritative; how different statements form a regularity; and how they constitute an object of study. In my thesis I consider how a specific discursive formation of the child television emerged as a unity. I aim to show how academic statements concerned with children's television viewing are themselves interrelated with other sites of discursive production.22 I look not only at academic discourses, but also at broadcasting memos and documents, television programmes, government reports on broadcasting and education, women's magazines, newspaper articles, the reports and newsletters of

21 He states that:

Whenever one can describe, between a number of statements, such a system of dispersion, whenever, between objects, types of statement, concepts, or thematic choices, one can define a regularity (an order, correlations, positions and functionings, transformations), we will say, for the sake of convenience, that we are dealing with a discursive formation... The conditions to which the elements of this division (objects, mode of statement, concepts, thematic choices) are subjected we shall call the rules of formation. The rules of formation are conditions of existence (but also of coexistence, maintenance, modification, and disappearance) in a given discursive division. (ibid, 38)

22 Luke, in her research, defines the task as cataloguing published academic work on children and television (i.e. academic books and articles which focus explicitly on children and television) and identifying their rules of formation, which, according to her, include citation networks and rules of authorship and authority. However, this is problematic on two counts. Firstly, it confuses a 'style' of discourse with a discursive formation. Academic texts constitute a particular style of writing; they do not constitute a discursive formation. Secondly, Luke states that she will only look at discourses which are explicitly on children and television. In this thesis I show how the discourse of the child television audience is formed not only out of those statements which explicitly refer to children and television. Archaeology would simply be a history of ideas if it merely left the traditional history intact and if it merely reviewed the existing literature. Instead Foucault's methodology, in inviting us to look for the conditions of existence of a discursive formation, allows us to rechart that history and to destabilise its traditional certainties. The discursive formation of the child television audience is not formed within a hermetically sealed discipline of academic study. The persistency of this discourse in fields other than academic knowledge suggests that its conditions of existence are much more widely dispersed.
pressure groups and the reports and injunctions of regulatory bodies. This type of analysis is, however, problematic for methodological reasons. Whereas it is relatively easy and straightforward for an academic to gain access to academic research, analysis of institutional discourses, such as the television industry discourses, faces problems of secrecy, incompetence, and the commercialisation of knowledge which academics find difficult to afford. Nevertheless I have attempted to piece together enough fragments from the different institutional sites for me to begin to define the discursive formation of the child television audience.

In my thesis I pursue these questions in relation to a range of primary sources. In conducting this primary research, I initially went through various files containing policy statements, departmental memos, personal memos, letters of complaint and praise, audience research, programme notes, press cuttings and various other documents at the BBC Written Archives in Caversham, Reading. I looked at documents from the earliest days of Children's Hour radio in the 1920s to those concerning children's television programmes in the 1960s. However, due to the BBC's adoption of the civil service thirty-year ruling, I was unable to look at documents beyond the mid-1960s. Likewise at the time of my research the Independent Broadcasting Authority was in the process of becoming the Independent Television Commission and, concerned about non-official researchers, they refused me access to their policy files. Nevertheless I was able to use to the full extent their in-house library, which contained much useful material. I was also able to get access to public policy documents from both the BBC and ITV. Other policy considerations concerning ITV and BBC in relation to children's programming, I gained from newspaper cuttings and from recording talks and papers at broadcasting conferences and seminars.

In addition to this I looked at the surviving children's programmes, which the BBC had recorded and not destroyed, from the National Film and Television

23 In this sense I take my lead not only from Foucault but also from John Hartley's analysis of the construction of the television audience as an 'imagined community' (Hartley, 1987). Hartley argues that the television audience is constructed primarily by three sets of institutions: the television industry (television companies, the networks, public service organisations, etc); political/legal institutions (regulatory bodies, government committees and reports, laws of obscenity, etc); and critical institutions (academic research, pressure groups, etc). Although Hartley's distinction between the different types of institutions and the primacy of these institutions in the process of discursive production is problematic, it nevertheless provides a useful framework for initially considering the sites through which the child television audience is constructed.
Archive and was able to take full advantage of the release on video of many of the recorded pre-school programmes from the 1950s to the present. This archive of programmes enabled me to provide an analysis of the relationship between programme material and the wider policy debates. I also recorded and viewed three years of the pre-school BBC programme *Playdays*, between 1990 and 1993, and I watched a range of other pre-school programmes across both ITV and BBC in order to make sure that the focus of my analysis could in part be used in relation to the general range of pre-school programme output.

Although I did not intend to carry out the kind of massive literature survey that Luke (1990) conducts in her archaeology of the child audience, for the reasons already given; I did cover a range of the significant research material both within and outside the broadcasting institutions from the earliest research in the 1950s to the present. I likewise analysed all the Government reports of the broadcasting and educational committees from the 1920s to the present in order to locate the relationship between the State and the emergence of this discursive formation.

I also conducted a review of the newspapers, journals and magazines held at the British Library Newspaper Division at Colindale, North London. Of this review, the analysis of women's magazines was the most systematic. I looked at the weekly magazine *Woman* from 1937 to 1939 in its entirety. I then looked at the monthly magazines - *Ideal Home, Home and Garden, Woman and Home* and *Everywoman* - and the weekly magazines - *Woman* and *Woman's Own* - between 1946 to 1965 in their entirety. My thinking here was that the most significant statements about television and children's television viewing would be found in the early years when the discourse was in its infancy. However, I also looked at *Woman* and *Woman's Own*, the most popular of the women's magazines, in the months of January, February, March, July and September until 1985. I assumed that if anything important was to be reported it would be reported in those magazines. My reason for looking at those magazines was that if the child television audience was connected to a set of concerns about domestic and familial space and time then it would figure in those popular magazines. Although there was much attention to television in the early years, there was little said after 1965. I also looked at a number of Government Reports concerning domestic architecture and design, again in order to get a sense of the interrelationship between television viewing and those wider temporal and spatial arrangements.
I sought to analyse this material in order to see whether there was, across the diverse set of statements, a system of dispersion and regularity; whether certain objects were formed through what Foucault calls authorities of delimitation, surfaces of emergence and grids of specification; whether there were certain subject positions which were constituted as authoritative and which were formed in relation to certain institutional supports; whether there was a set of relations which allowed certain concepts to emerge; and whether there was within this system, and in relation to a wider 'discursive constellation', a certain strategic motility which allowed certain choices to be made rather than others (Foucault, 1972). However, the price paid for adopting this type of methodology is that, while it enables me to analyse the interrelationship between different sites of discursive production, it foregoes close analysis of any one particular site of discursive production. Research which solely focused on how the BBC constructed its child television audience would undoubtedly come up with slightly different conclusions. For example, it might look closely at the relationship between organisational structures within the BBC and its programme output. My methodology is necessarily fragmentary. The 'archaeology', as Foucault puts it, of discursive formations is not concerned with 'total history'. The task of the archaeologist is not to represent the past as it 'really was'. Rather the task is to reconstruct the conditions of what was said: how at certain moments are certain things said about the child audience which are not said at other moments?

However, it would be a mistake to conflate Foucault's notion of discourse with verbal or written statements. He is at pains to show how his notion of discourse is not at all the same notion as language. A discourse can be both linguistic and non-linguistic. Laclau and Mouffe demonstrate this well using an example of a bricklayer asking their workmate for a brick and then laying the brick on a wall. The asking for the brick is a linguistic act. The laying of the brick is extra-linguistic. Laclau and Mouffe argue that while these both constitute two different types of act, they nevertheless consist of two partial moments within the wider totality of building a brick wall. This wider totality, they argue, is constituted discursively. The point of using the term discourse, they argue, is that it emphasises 'the fact that every social configuration is meaningful' (Laclau and Mouffe, 1987, 82). But whereas Laclau and Mouffe stress 'meaningfulness', Foucault stresses 'regularity'. Discourse refers to the organisation of signifying practices. Not all signifying practices are discursive.

This theoretical move allows us to understand the non-discursive, not as a unified domain of objects and events external to discourse, but rather as those social
activities which do not 'systematically form the objects of which they speak' (Foucault, 1972, 49; cf. Minson, 1985, 123). Thus if, as Morley states, the question is one of 'how different pre-existing cultural formulations of temporality determine how audiences relate to broadcast schedules' (Morley, 1992, 261), it is important not to equate this with a necessary form of resistance or any ontological priority or to seal it within a notion of 'the micro-level of analysis'.

Central to this set of problems is the notion of 'context' as that which frames the meanings of the text and as that which is a container for the uses of television. In the thesis I argue that the notion of familial and social context needs to be thought not in terms of how it fixes meaning, but in terms of how it identifies specific 'collateral fields' or 'associated domains' (Minson, 1985, 132-3). In this sense, the 'familial' and the 'social' need to be seen both as particular fields which are invented and adjacent to the realm of 'statements' within the discourse of the child television audience and also as internal to this discursive formation. These adjacent fields do not refer to material or psychological motivations but to 'the bounded group of relations which enable borrowings, exchanges, cross-references, substitutions and complementarities' (ibid, 133). Minson states that:

Contextuality is thus pluralised and made conditional on a heterogeneous and shifting set of interdependencies. 'Collateral field' poses the problem of the conditions of contextuality. Why can one set of considerations rather than another be adduced to make an issue intelligible? (ibid, 133)

Likewise, in conceptualising the uses of television or the 'techniques of viewing' in relation to their conditions of contextuality, we are invited to ask a different set of questions. The familial and the domestic are only external to the discursive

---

24 Brown and Cousins make a similar point:

What falls outside a particular discursive formation merely falls outside it. It does not thereby join the ranks of a general form of being, the Non-Discursive... no general relation may exist between 'external events' and discourse. This makes it possible to investigate what in particular external events (which may include other discourses) can be given as an object of particular discourses, of what the connection between a discourse and those events can consist. (Brown and Cousins, 1980, 254)

The equation of discourse with imaginary and ideal schemas and the non-discursive with a unified domain of 'reality' results in, as Foucault suggests, 'a very impoverished notion of the real' (Foucault, 1991, 81).

25 Mercer defines 'techniques of viewing' in the following manner:

An emphasis on 'technique' in cultural analysis shifts attention from what a cultural form - a film, an advertisement, a cartoon, a TV series - means,
formation of the child audience **prior** to their constitution within that discourse. If these viewing practices, to which Morley refers, are organised in any sense, then how are they organised and what discursive formation forms the rules of their organisation?

The questions of power, the real and resistance come to the fore in Foucault's later writings in which he discusses the way in which the production of knowledge is formed in relation to the practices of power. His arguments concerning the
to what people actually do with those forms, how they use them to shape kinds of identity, the sense of a body, a lifestyle and a community - the forms of *habitus* as both Mauss and Bourdieu have used the term... The 'meaning' of a television programme being watched in the family home (as distinct from, say, a schoolroom) would need to be assessed not as a one-off text but, rather, through a complex network of family roles, responsibilities, obligations and customary practices in the home: in brief, through the grid of specific techniques and occasions of watching. (Mercer, 1991, 71)

Although Mercer, like Morley, talks about the 'use' of television, this use is formed within specific techniques, which even though they are deployed within the home are formed within a wider arrangement of power.

26 His argument, however, is not that power is external to discourse. In the *History of Sexuality Vol.1*, he argues that it is 'in discourse that power and knowledge are joined together' (Foucault, 1979, 100) and, although his notion of strategy is wider than merely 'theoretical choices', it appears that his conception of discourse is similar to that employed in the *Archaeology*.

And for this very reason, we must conceive of discourse as a series of discontinuous segments whose tactical function is neither uniform or stable. To be more precise, we must not imagine a world of discourse divided between the dominant discourse and the dominated one; but as a multiplicity of discursive elements that can come into play in various strategies. It is this distribution that we must reconstruct, with the things said and those concealed, the enunciations required and those forbidden, that it comprises; with the variants and different effects - according to who is speaking, his position of power, the institutional context in which he happens to be situated - that it implies; and with the shifts and reutilizations of identical formulas for contrary objectives that it also includes. (ibid, 100)

From this it might seem that Foucault conceives of strategy as being a constituent feature in the unity of a particular discursive formation. However, he then goes on to talk about discourse as if it were constituted within the field of strategic forces.

Discourses are tactical elements or blocks operating in the field of force relations; there can exist different and even contradictory discourses within the same strategy; they can, on the contrary, circulate without changing their form from one strategy to another, opposing strategy. (ibid, 101-2)
discursive conditions of knowledge and power relations, though, are not merely theoretical, rather they document the historical emergence of modern forms of power. Foucault calls this mode of analysis, following Nietzsche, 'genealogy'. This later work continues his earlier interests but focuses more explicitly on the relations between power and knowledge and on the task of making intelligible the present. Archaeology becomes subsumed within this genealogical method, inasmuch as it is still concerned with analysing the singularity of 'events' (of treating knowledge not as universal, but as historically specific) and of understanding these events in terms of their diverse and plural conditions of emergence and intelligibility (Foucault, 1986, 11-2 and 1991, 76-7). In this sense he is not concerned with history in terms of the 'weight of causality' (Foucault, 1991, 77) or with the need for an 'exhaustive' interpretation (cf. Cousins and Hussain, 1984, 3). He is not concerned with the 'objectivity' of a particular historical period. Primary sources, for example, are not gathered in order to provide 'evidence' of the truth of objective historical reality. Rather sources are used in order to make intelligible the present regime under consideration.

However, while in Foucault's earlier archaeological works the analysis of power was obviously present it was never explicitly addressed. Genealogy names that mode of investigation in which power and knowledge are to be understood as intimately interwoven. Whereas in his earlier analysis the conditions of emergence were always considered in terms of the specific rules of formation of a discourse, in his later work he understands 'emergence' as 'always produced through a particular stage of forces' and 'the hazardous play of dominations' (Foucault, 1977a, 148-9). However, power is not repressive, but rather is in a constant relation with its resistance. In this sense power is relational, rather than totalising and fixed in its mechanisms. Likewise, no hailing of 'reality'

The field of strategies and tactics is both internal and external to the unity of a discursive formation.

27 In fact Foucault argues that he is not inventing a 'theory' as such, but rather investigating an 'analytics of power', in the sense that his 'interpretive grid' (as Dreyfus and Rabinow call it) is intimately linked with his historical investigation (Foucault, 1979; Dreyfus and Rabinow, 1982).

28 Foucault states that:

For, if it is true that at the heart of power relations and as a permanent condition of their existence there is an insubordination and a certain essential obstinacy on the part of the principles of freedom, then there is no relationship of power without the means of escape or possible flight. Every power relationship implies, at least in potentia, a strategy of struggle, in which the two forces are not superimposed, do not lose their specific nature, or do not finally become confused. Each constitutes for the
(whether as 'context' or 'actual audiences') can be used to declare a point of resistance. On the contrary, Foucault presents his work on sexuality as precisely a question of an analysis of 'the problematizations through which being offers itself to be, necessarily, thought' (Foucault, 1986, 11). He is concerned with the analysis, not of ideas or behaviours, but of the real itself, or rather with the real of sexual identity. Foucault argues that 'sex' (i.e. that which has been invested in bodies) is not somehow real and 'sexuality' merely a configuration of ideas.

So we must not refer a history of sexuality to the agency of sex; but rather show how 'sex' is historically subordinate to sexuality. We must not place sex on the side of reality, and sexuality on that of confused ideas and illusions; sexuality is a very real historical formation; it is what gave rise to the notion of sex, as a speculative element necessary to its operation. (Foucault, 1979, 157)

In this thesis I want to make a similar theoretical move and show how the concern with actual children watching television is historically subordinate to the discursive formation of the child television audience. I want to show how the truth of this audience is precisely what is at stake and in this sense my analysis is genealogical inasmuch as it is a 'historical ontology' of this audience and our relation to it (Foucault, 1986a, 45).

Foucault in his later genealogical writings frames the question of power/knowledge in relation to a concern with 'governmentality' (a neologism comprising governmental rationality and the mentality of government). The term refers not to contemporary definitions of government, which define government as a form of State power, but to its usage in the 16th century.

Power, then, is always caught up in a strategic game, such that winning results in the end of the game.

29 For example, Foucault, in his The History of Sexuality, Vol. 1, provocatively states:

... I do not envisage a 'history of mentalities' that would take account of bodies only through the manner in which they have been perceived and given meaning and value; but a 'history of bodies' and the manner in which what is most material and most vital in them has been invested. (ibid, 1979, 152)

30 In many ways it might be more appropriate to talk about Foucault's later work on government as archaeological rather than genealogical. The greek arche refers both to the question of origins and rule.
'Government' did not refer only to political structures or to the management of states; rather it designated the way in which the conduct of individuals or of groups might be directed; the government of children, of souls, of communities, of families, of the sick. (Foucault, 1982, 221)

In its 16th century usage, then, government referred to the way in which social life itself became an object of political concern. Power is defined not in terms of the 'confrontation between two adversaries' but in terms of structuring the field of possible actions of others or to the 'conduct of conduct' (ibid, 220-1). Foucault locates his argument not in terms of the way the State has power over individuals, but in terms of the way in which the the emergence of governmentality forms the State as the modern matrix of individualisation and totalisation: individuals are formed in relation to this totalisation, not against it. Foucault does not claim that this totalising and individualising power has 'taken hold of everything' or that it is 'ineluctable' (Rabinow, 1986, 22). The

31 In Foucault's writings on governmentality, the question of discursive practices becomes even more problematised. He talks about governmentality as 'the ensemble formed by the institutions, procedures, analyses and reflections, the calculations and tactics, that allow the exercise of this very specific albeit complex form of power' (Foucault, 1991, 102). Likewise governmentality is analysed in terms of the apparatus (dispositif) which is composed of rationalities, programmes and technologies:

... none of these is an 'ideal type'. I try to study the play and development of a set of diverse realities articulated on to each other; a programme, the connection which explains it, the law which gives it its coercive power, etc., are all just as much realities - albeit in a different mode - as the institutions that embody them or the behaviours that more or less faithfully conform to them. (Foucault, 1991, 81)

It is difficult to locate the discursive within this definition of governmentality: is the discursive to be understood at the level of rationalities; or does it define the unity of a programme; or is it somehow equivalent to the notion of 'apparatus'? Colin Gordon (1980) talks about three forms of rationality pertinent to the study of power/knowledge: strategies, technologies, and programmes. He states that these forms need to be understood in terms of three orders of events: discourses, practices and effects. Although this schematisation of Foucault's work is useful in that it points to the non-correspondence between these orders of events as a result of the forms of rationality and to an examination of the failure of such correspondences and the 'positive significance that can attach to such discrepancies' (ibid, 247), it is nevertheless an attempt to 'tidy-up' these concepts rather than allow them to rub against each other within the specific empirical analysis.

32 Rabinow states that '[t]he power of the state to produce an increasingly totalizing web of control is intertwined with and dependent on its ability to produce an increasing specification of individuality' (Rabinow, 1986, 22). This is a corrective to the critique of Foucault which suggest that he is only concerned with a 'micro-physics of power' (cf. Hall, 1988).
dissemination of this form of modern power needs to considered as an empirical question.

Foucault's analysis of power/knowledge is, I want to argue, particularly pertinent to my study of the government of the child television audience. It allows us to re-focus Scannell's analysis of the temporal (and spatial) arrangements of the home within a set of questions about the deployment of techniques of power, such that the consumption of television within the home is constituted within a set of techniques which form specific segregated times and spaces. Foucault refers to the way in which the school, the barracks and the prison were in the 18th century divided up using specific disciplinary techniques. The separation of, for example, the mad from the sane, the criminal from the good was accompanied by more specific and detailed techniques which organised, for example, the school according to regimented schedules in relation to specific spaces. Discipline, according to Foucault, provides a generalised technology of power/knowledge. It divides, distributes and arranges bodies; it provides a detailed prescription of activities; it divides up time and establishes a connection between the various times according to the logic of development or genesis; and it constructs a network between bodies and their respective activities (Foucault, 1977; Cousins and Hussain, 1984). Discipline functions through the arrangement of bodies in spaces. It coordinates the conduct of individuals, but it also constructs a relationship between the conduct of the observed and the surveillance of the observer. As Rabinow states: '[i]t locates individuals in space, in a hierarchical and efficient visible organisation' (Rabinow, 1986b, 19). The apogee of this technology of power is the panopticon. A whole arrangement of hierarchical observation, normalising judgement and examination is figured within the efficiency of an ideal architecture. As Foucault makes clear the question of architecture is central to this technology:

A whole problematic then develops: that of an architecture that is no longer built simply to be seen (as with the ostentation of palaces), or to observe the external space (cf. the geometry of fortresses), but to permit an internal, articulated and detailed control - to render visible those who are inside it; in more general terms, an architecture that would operate to transform individuals: to act on those it shelters, to provide a hold on their conduct, to carry the effects of power right to them, to make it possible to know them, to alter them. Stones can make people docile and knowable. The old simple schema of confinement and enclosure - thick walls, a heavy gate that prevents entering or leaving - began to be replaced by the calculation of openings, of

33 Moores actually makes a similar point (1988).
Foucault argues that this regime of power/knowledge has been, and is, directed at the production of regimented and self-policing subjects. Discipline produces docile bodies. In my thesis I show how the discursive formation of the child television audience is figured within this wider apparatus of power. This Foucauldian analysis allows me to raise the question, then, not simply of the temporal and spatial arrangements of broadcasting, but the disciplining of individuals and the 'coercion' of certain forms of conduct. This at first might seem bizarre: that the child audience is a disciplined audience. And in a sense there is something incongruous about using this Foucauldian analysis in a discussion about children’s television viewing. Foucault, himself, in later interviews was at pains to protest that his analysis was not about the formation of a 'disciplined society' (Foucault, 1991). In my thesis I want to argue that, although the government of the child audience is formed within this regime of power/knowledge, the child is not simply produced as a coerced and docile body. Rather, I argue that the techniques of power/knowledge which form the child audience, although they rest upon this disciplinary formation, nevertheless work to produce the child as free and critical, but only inasmuch as it is supervised. It produces the child as a citizen within a supervised freedom (cf. Walkerdine, 1984). Foucault was also to dispense with the overarching theme of discipline and to reframe its techniques within what he was to call 'pastoral power'. This is a power which is concerned with the well-being of the population. Pastoral power, which emerges from the modes of conduct of Christian pastorship, operates by caring for both the individual and the community (for both lamb and flock). Foucault argues that the State has been formed in relation to this much earlier form of power (Foucault, 1982 and 1988). This form of power, which we might also refer to as 'welfare', or which Foucault sometimes refers to as 'bio-power', is one which takes life as its objective. This form of power brings life into the realm of calculation and makes it an object of the art of government.

This, in many ways, brings us back to Scannell's description of public service broadcasting as a service for the public good and as a 'seen but unnoticed constitutive component of contemporary reality for all' (Scannell, 1989, 152): a form of broadcasting, which we can now suggest, is written into a less benign 'history of modernity (a pervasive history of the administration, or the policing, of individuals and the population). In this sense, it is not so much that broadcasting alone structures the temporal and spatial arrangements of modern living, but that
its mode of operation and the techniques it deploys are congruent with the modern forms of power/knowledge which Foucault describes. In a similar fashion, the concern with the life and well-being of individuals and the population, helps to locate my earlier comments about the place of psychology as a social science. The emergence of the 'social' as an administrative space, the policing of families and the invention of psychology as a technology of government form an interconnected network within this pastoral regime of power (cf. Donzelot, 1979; Rose, 1989 and 1990). I want to argue that we can also add the government of the child television audience to this list.

Having circumnavigated Morley, Foucault and others, we can return, nearly full circle, to the question of the text and the subject, not in the form of 'textual analysis' (i.e. not text-centred nor 'textual determinism') nor in the form of universalising hermeneutics of psychoanalysis, but in terms of the way in which certain techniques of viewing are deployed within specific strategies of power/knowledge directed at specific sectors of the population in order to produce specific capacities and dispositions. The endowment of these capacities (in many ways similar to Gramsci's sense of 'strategic deposits', cf. Hall, 1988) is specific to those techniques and cannot be generalised at a theoretical level (only defined at an empirical level). Ian Hunter uses Wittgenstein's analysis of language games to elaborate this point:

34 Both Michel Foucault and Jacques Donzelot have written on the family in relation to the problem of modern forms of government. Foucault talks about how in the mid-18th century the family turns from being a model to being an instrument of government. The family becomes 'the privileged instrument for the government of the population and not the chimera model of good government' (Foucault, 1991a, 100). And Donzelot argues that the government of the modern family, or rather through the family, is central to the emergence of the liberal-democratic state in the 19th century (with its redefinitions of 'public' and 'private'). The question that I address in my thesis is: to what extent do Foucault's and Donzelot's arguments about the family and governmentality make intelligible the governance of the child audience in the late 20th century? We might also add here that a Foucauldian analysis of the cultural has begun to be employed at the Institute for Cultural Policy Studies at Griffith University in Australia. In this analysis, most notably by Tony Bennett and Ian Hunter, the domain of culture does not define a realm of 'lived existence' or of 'signifying practices', but rather a domain of government. They argue that the cultural emerged historically in the 18th and 19th centuries as a specific object and instrument of government and hence needs to be analysed, not in terms of the progressiveness or reactionariness of particular cultural products or processes, but in terms of the way in which these products or processes fit into what they call 'cultural technologies' (i.e. those forms of power/knowledge which invent, and intervene within, the cultural) (cf. Bennett, 1991 and 1992; Hunter, 1988).
From Wittgenstein's examples... we can form a picture of human beings, as bearers of a dispersed array of practical capacities. These are built up through piecemeal mastery of a patchwork of social technologies ('language games'). They possess no general form or conditions of possibility, save those found in actual forms of social organisation ('forms of living'). (Hunter, 1984, 601)

In a critique of this post-Foucauldian analysis, James Donald offers a more sophisticated 'theory of the subject', which, although far removed from the 'textual determinism' of early Screen theory, still deploys the analytical framework of post-Lacanian psychoanalytic theory (Donald, 1992). He wonders how, within this post-Foucauldian analysis, do apparatuses of power/knowledge gain a purchase on subjective experiences. In response to Rose's analysis of the techniques of familisation, in which Rose describes how those desires which are constituted as 'out of bounds' are utilised precisely as the object of further incitements to 'normality', Donald asks: 'If there is no self preceding the operations of the social machinery, however, where do these transgressive desires come from?' Although Donald misreads the nature of these Foucauldian genealogies, which are directed not at understanding the realisation of these techniques of power/knowledge, but at assessing their programmatic existence (assessing what they can do, not what everyone is), he raises the question of how to understand, not the gap, but the 'splitting' between normality and actuality. And drawing upon Jacques Lacan's and Jacques-Alain Miller's notion of 'extimite' (namely the outside which is inside the subject), Donald posits the psychoanalytic notion of fantasy. 

These forms of activity do not just 'surface' as individual desires and self-directed agency. Rather, they have to return transformed as representations. They pass through a third space that is neither outside nor inside, but that psychic reality which Lacan located as 'the between perception and consciousness'. This is the scene of negotiation, of enunciation, of that active fantasy life which supports reality by giving it the appearance of consistency. (Donald, 1992, 95)

For Donald, as for others before him (cf. Cowie, 1984; Burgin et al, 1986), the notion of fantasy offers a way of talking, not about the escape from reality, but about an analysis of 'the staging and imaging of the subject and its desire in

35 Slavoj Zizek makes a similar move, drawing upon the notion of extimite and the notion of fantasy, to reposit a theory of the subject against the Foucauldian pluralisation of subjectivities (Zizek, 1989).
36 We might ask what this 'reality' is to which Donald refers. It is not consistent and yet it clearly constitutes a unified domain.
relation to complex social-symbolic scenarios' (Donald, 1992, 95). While it is undoubtedly the case that the analytical framework of psychoanalysis offers more sophisticated readings of the relationship between the subjective experiences of individuals and the processes of social existence, than, say, the language of psychology, which I described earlier, and while it presents the problem of the subject centre-stage, at what cost is this theory of the subject posited?37 This is felt most keenly when we consider the question of history. This psychoanalytic theory of the subject is left in a most acute dilemma: what it gains from providing a hermeneutics of the subject, it loses in its inability to historicise, not simply subjectivity, but subjectivities. It repeats the same hermeneutic formula of the Real, Imaginary and Symbolic and the tripartite familial structure. Foucault, in his last writings on sexuality and ethics before his death, provides a genealogy of what he calls 'practices of the self or 'techniques of the self'. These writings continue his earlier critique of psychoanalysis (Foucault, 1979). And in an interview in 1984, he states that:

... it is not enough to say that the subject is constituted in a symbolic system. It is not just in the play of symbols that the subject is constituted. It is constituted in real practices - historically analyzable practices. There is technology of the constitution of the self which cuts across symbolic systems while using them. (Foucault, 1986b, 369)

In this thesis, especially in Chapter Four, I want to begin to consider how this form of analysis might inform an understanding of the way both mother and pre-school child are constituted, not in the representation of the text, but in the material practices which constitute historically specific techniques of viewing.

However, in this regime of power/knowledge which constitutes the child television audience, the self is constituted, not merely at the 'butt-end' of this regime (as the objects to be administered), but also in terms of the self who governs others. This is most clear in my analysis of the arts of children's broadcasting in the 1920s, 1930s and 1940s. Moreover, the question of subjectivity, in relation to the construction of the child audience, appears most pressingly, and yet also sometimes most covertly, in terms of our (adults, experts and parents) investments: what is my relation to expertise, what is the nature of my authority and how might we begin to think it otherwise? In presenting subjectivity neither

37 Hunter phrases this question in a review of Donald (1992). He identifies the singularity of psychoanalysis and hence sets limits on its ability to provide a universal theory of the subject (Hunter, 1993).
as 'individuality' nor as a 'common nature', Foucault poses the question of subjectivity, not in terms of its construction, but in terms of our reflection upon the limits of our present:

I shall thus characterize the philosophical ethos appropriate to the critical ontology of ourselves as a historico-practical test of the limits that we may go beyond, and thus as work carried out by ourselves upon ourselves as free beings. (Foucault, 1986a, 47)

For me in this thesis the question of subjectivity is not simply that of how children are subjected to the regimes of power (in that sense we can identify how they are precisely the objects of this regime of power knowledge), but how much does it cost Reason to tell the truth? And how much does it cost me? What are the limits of reason within this regime of the child television audience, inasmuch as they bear upon myself, and how might we begin to undo them?38

In this chapter I have shown how traditional research into the child audience has been unable to pose this self-reflective question and hence unable to recognise how, as a field of knowledge, it produces the child audience as an audience. I then looked at the question of the production of the audience in relation to debates within media and cultural studies regarding family viewing and the temporal and spatial arrangements of viewing. I located these arguments within a Foucauldian framework concerning modern forms of government. I finally raised the tentative and inconclusive question of subjectivity within my research.

38 This is, in many ways, Walkerdine's question in her analysis of her own surveillance and voyeurism as a researcher researching family viewing. However, Walkerdine uses psychoanalytic theory to elucidate her investments and desires (Walkerdine, 1986).
The Art of Children's Broadcasting in the Interwar Years

Chapter Two
In this chapter I want to look at how the child television audience was formed as both a domestic and public audience. In order to do this I want to consider how the child audience was imagined and acted upon in the 1920s, 1930s and 1940s in relation to radio broadcasting. I want to consider the role of children's broadcasting in relation to the familialisation of radio broadcasting at this time. My discussion of this earlier period is important because it allows me to establish the specificity or the singularity of the discursive formation of the child television audience through mapping its continuities and discontinuities. In my discussion, I consider how the British Broadcasting Company Ltd, which later became the British Broadcasting Corporation, addressed this child audience and how it conceived of a specific art of children's broadcasting, which was connected to a set of questions about the conduct of children's listening and to the formation of a public space of broadcasting within the home.

In 1923 Marconi, Metropolitan Vickers, General Electric, Radio Communications, Hotpoint, Western Electric, Burnddept, and Siemens were amalgamated into the British Broadcasting Company Ltd. John C.W. Reith, its first Managing Director, envisaged its role in terms of its 'combination of public service motive, sense of moral obligation, assured finance, and the brute force of monopoly' (Reith, 1949, 99). On the 23rd December 1922, eight days after the British Broadcasting Company Ltd was formally registered, *Children's Hour* was first broadcast. 1 This space in the day's programmes, between 5pm and 6pm, took its name from a poem by Henry Wadsworth Longfellow:

```
Between the dusk and the daylight,
When the Night is beginning to lower,
Comes a pause in the day's occupations,
That is known as the Children's Hour.
```

---

1 *Children's Hour* was usually only 45 minutes long and sometimes only 30 minutes.
Reith referred to it as one of the two 'forms of art' (the other being radio drama) which broadcasting was developing 'as specifically its own', which was 'wholly novel' and which 'leaped at once into its permanent place in the scheme of popular life' (Reith, 1928, 34). This liminal space between day and night (a twilight zone of magic and fantasy), from its inception, had become conceived as being intimately caught up in the practices of everyday life.

We should be hesitant though about taking Reith's declaration at face value. Shaun Moores in his pioneering work on the reception of radio in the 1920s and 1930s argues, on the basis of oral histories of elderly men and women from a northern English town, that radio use was very much dependent on the limited technology of transmission and of the radio sets themselves (Moores, 1988 and 1993). The sets, which were often bought piecemeal, sometimes over months and years, were not conducive to collective familial listening. On the contrary, the use of radio in the home was specifically gendered, such that the sets became the object of playful experimentation: a 'miraculous toy' played with by husbands, fathers, brothers and uncles. The use of earphones, rather than a loudspeaker, prohibited other members of the family from listening. It was not, Moores argues, until the 1930s that radio listeners were constructed as a family audience. He isolates three interrelated shifts which occurred in this period. Firstly, the manufacture and design of radio sets were increasingly addressed not to individuals partaking in a masculine hobby, but to those concerned with the place of radio in the home as a fashionable piece of living room furniture. Manufacturers, such as Pye, Murphy and Ecko, began to transform radio, through the aesthetics of set design, from a novelty to a day-to-day routine. Secondly, Moores argues, radio consumption was formed within a set of discourses which constructed the audience as familial and which 'sought to interpellate mothers as monitors of domestic life' (Moores, 1993, 80). For example there were Doctors' talks in which advice was given to mothers about 'mothercraft' and there were talks about household management. Thirdly, he argues that programmes were increasingly organised into 'routinised' schedules that were formed in relation to the imagined daily activities of housewives and, also, other family members, such as children.2 Other broadcast historians have noted

---

2 It is not clear why Moores only refers to the daily activities of the housewife and not other family members (Moores, 1993, 80).
this shift, in the 1930s, towards the address to, and the scheduling for, the family audience and towards greater routinisation. Scannell and Cardiff, for example, describe how these changes were also accompanied by a change in the style of broadcast talk, the use of audience research, concern about growing competition from commercial stations on the continent (e.g. Radio Luxembourg) and the resignation of Reith in 1938 (Scannell and Cardiff, 1982 and 1991).

These shifts are evident in the changes that occurred within the realm of children's broadcasting. However, we can also see that the process of 'rationalisation' occurred much earlier in the 1920s (cf. Briggs, 1961, 260). *Children's Hour* was originally assembled within the local stations. There was no specific department responsible for the Hour and various 'Uncles' and 'Aunts' put together a magazine of different material in their spare time. By December 1923 it was decided that, due to the pressure of work placed upon these members of staff, the *Children's Hour* should be more centrally organised. Each local station was to appoint a woman to arrange a programme for the *Women's* and *Children's Hour*. These local members of staff were responsible not only to their local Station Director but also to a Central Committee in London and to Mrs Ella Fitzgerald, who had been appointed as Central Organiser of Children's Hour programmes, and to Miss E. Elliott, her assistant. Hence although the local stations still maintained a high degree of autonomy, they were nevertheless more centrally controlled by policy directives from London. This administrative framework allowed local stations to pool their material and to draw upon the resources from London. In February 1925 there were further attempts at rationalisation. C.E. Hodges (Uncle Peter) was appointed on a part-time

---

3 For example, Scannell and Cardiff state that:

Wireless reception, from its earliest days, had been naturalised as part of private, not public life. The radio in the living-room was part of the furniture of domestic everyday existence. It was in this context that the BBC recognised and addressed its audience, not as an aggregated totality (a mass audience) but a constellation of individuals positioned in families. The home was an enclave, a retreat burrowed deeply away from the pressures of work and urban living, with radio as part of that cosy, domestic warmth. The social level of the ordinary English family, as typified in many instances, was within the lower and middle reaches of the middle class: Acacia Avenue or Laburnum Grove, the tree-lined suburbs of Greater London and the Home counties. (Scannell and Cardiff, 1982, 168)
basis to run the programme and Fitzgerald was moved exclusively to run Women's Hour. In January 1926 Hodges was appointed on a full-time basis and was directly under the control of J.C. Stobart, a former Board of Education Inspector who was made Director of Education at the BBC. There were directives ordering 'back-chat' to be eliminated and by November 1926 the terms 'Uncle' and 'Aunt' were to follow suit. And later, under the cover of the war, Derek McCulloch, Director of Children's Hour, tried to further centralise Children's Hour by moving key members of staff from the regions to Bristol (which was the wartime centre of the organisation).

Many contemporary critics refer to Children's Hour in order to exemplify a shift toward the family audience, or what we might call the familisation of radio broadcasting (cf. Moores, 1988 and 1993; Frith, 1983; Donald, 1992). They refer to the use of the terms 'Uncle' and 'Aunt' as examples of this making radio familial and familiar. And yet, as I go on to argue, these terms were emblematic within a set of discourses which constructed radio broadcasting within the spaces of the domestic and the public. As Simon Frith states:

The radio made public events accessible, brought them into the home... This was the basis for Reith's claim for radio's contribution to democracy... Domestic listening is a very peculiar form of public participation and the key role was played by the commentator, the BBC talker whose job was, in practice, to teach the audience how to join in a radio event, how to organise their experience. Access was available, then, through an authority. 'Active' listening was a matter of knowing one's place. What was on offer was access to a community, a language, a set of radio manners. To become a BBC listener was to join a club (children could do so literally) which clearly excluded people with bad radio manners - the tap listeners, the passive consumers. The 'I/we/you' of the BBC announcer was, therefore, subtly arranged. (Frith, 1983, 121-2)

In the following discussion, I want to look at how Children's Hour and what I call the art of children's broadcasting was formed within this wider set of considerations. These wider considerations, I argue, form the conditions of existence, or the rules of formation, of the discourse of the child audience in this period. Although Children's Hour was undoubtedly instrumental in helping make radio a domestic and familial medium, my purpose, in this

4 Briggs notes that, due to opposition to the changes from children and parents, the ruling was relaxed (Briggs, 1961, 261).
chapter, is to see how the child audience emerged as an audience and to consider how the domestic and the familial, did not so much form the 'context' for the reception of these programmes, but were rather constituent elements within its formation. In making this analysis, we can see how the discursive formation of the child audience in the 1920s, 1930s and 1940s, although providing certain conditions for the discursive formation of the child television audience, was, in many ways, quite different.

**The Art of Children's Broadcasting**

The child audience was addressed as a miniature version of the 'general public' (the diversity of publics which were seen to reflect the different tastes, needs and interests of the population and which were addressed through the policy of 'mixed programming'). McCulloch referred to *Children's Hour* as:

... a miniature of broadcasting as a whole, covering a wide field representing drama, music, talks, stories and dialogue stories, outside broadcasts, variety features, topicalities, competitions, quiz features, religious services and regular prayers, and programmes by young artists. We produce a miniature, or microcosm of broadcasting because we cover almost every type of broadcast material under those headings. (McCulloch, 1946, 229)

The child audience was thus both a distinct audience, a distinct public even, with its own tastes, needs and interests, and yet within this audience, it was recognised, there were differences. The notion of the general public provided the BBC with a mechanism for imagining the diversity of the public sphere at the same time as ordering, evaluating and integrating these different publics. *Children's Hour* was organised in a similar

---

5 Reith envisaged the role of the BBC as ordering and evaluating this new public sphere.

Even in 1930 it seemed that broadcasting might be the integrating element; that, rightly understood and applied, a national broadcasting service might apply the integrator for democracy. No part of its service was wholly distinct from the rest. This singular unity might lead some hasty thinkers to regard it as no more than the technical engine for collecting and distributing the output of many fields of culture, themselves separate. It was more than that. Integration is a process not of gross summation but of ordering and
fashion. It allowed different voices to be heard and integrated those voices.6 For Reith, this understanding of broadcasting was crucial to its role in realising democracy: to its formation of the 'city-state of old'.7 And, as with Reith, McCulloch conceived of the role of children's broadcasting and the formation of citizenship as constitutive of a form of pastoral care. He formulated the duties of the children's broadcaster in the following manner:

Our wish is to stimulate their imagination, direct their reading, encourage their various interests, widen their outlook, and inculcate the Christian principles of love of God and their neighbour. It is our desire to try to help to mould the listening tastes of future citizens. There is no

valuation. Broadcasting was not only the collector but the selector of material. Therein lay - and always will lie - its supreme responsibility. (Reith, 1949, 136)

The general public was a way of conceiving that 'no part of its service was wholly distinct from the rest'.

6 Paddy Scannell, in a recent article, echoes Reith and talks about the way in which public service broadcasting has created 'new communicative entitlements for excluded social groups' (Scannell, 1989, 142). The question, though, is through what terms and conditions are these 'communicative entitlements' established? What is the cost of being a citizen within this new public space? James Donald rightly points out the problem with Scannell's argument:

Whereas for him this democratization constitutes partial emancipation, to me it sounds like broadcasting's contribution to the definition and articulation of social relations and its ascription of dispositions and competencies to the members of the 'public' it brings into being. (Donald, 1992, 138)

7 Reith conceived of the public space of broadcasting as providing the conditions for democracy as a 'living force'.

Democracy had for years been a ruling formula in this country and elsewhere. A philosopher's word, its actual usage as distinct from its theoretical content varied greatly. Further analysis of the theory was not of much avail; what was required was some mode of linking it to real life around; to the world as known to men and women as they were. Now broadcasting had emerged; was it the tempering factor that would give democracy for the first time under modern conditions a real chance of operating as a living force throughout the extended community as long ago it operated in the city-state? (Reith, 1949, 135)

In this sense broadcasting was not seen so much as a particular mass medium which would distribute information to its citizens, but rather as a way of realising democracy within modern society, that is, as a particular way of constituting individuals as citizens.
smugness in our attitude towards this vital task - only a feeling of great responsibility. (McCulloch, 1946, 229)

This responsibility was not simply to the child's radio listening, but to the whole social and cultural life of the child or rather to the cultivation of children as good citizens. The 'art of broadcasting' for children involved caring for both the soul of the individual child listener and for the morals and manners of the child population as a whole. This particular art of broadcasting was constituted in relation to a specific set of interrelated problems concerning the nature of this audience, the proper mode of conduct within the home and community and the address to this audience. These problems and the reflections upon the art of broadcasting, which were the central concerns of Children's Hour broadcasters in the 1920s, 1930s and 1940s, constituted a specific relationship between the broadcaster and the child.

The Nature of the Child Audience

The BBC Handbook in 1929 stated that 'first and foremost' the question is 'what is the child from the Broadcasting point of view'. It stated that the audience consisted of children 'of every age, size, shape and sex' (BBC Handbook, 1929, 253). It was clear to 'anyone who has had expertise of children that there is a wide gulf between a boy or girl of eight and one of twelve and the adolescent of sixteen'. J.C. Stobart stated that Children's Hour aimed to address 'the widest range of children having regard to sex, age and social class' (Stobart, 'Children's Hour, Instructions', 1927, 2, R11/27/2).

Some local stations divided up their programme into different categories of ages. Birmingham, Leeds and Stoke-on-Trent, for example, allotted a quarter of an hour each for 'Tinies', 'Middies' and 'Teens'. Others were very definite that Children's Hour was not intended to address the 'very young listener'. In the 1940s the audience was increasingly thought of in

8 Elsewhere, McCulloch stated that the aim of Children's Hour was to 'help train children to become good citizens and loyal subjects of the Empire' (McCulloch, 1942, 2, R11/51/2).
9 By the 1950s distinct categories of age groups provided the main way of conceptualising and organising this audience. However, conceptualising the audience in this way led eventually to the discarding of the title Children's Hour.
10 Roger Eckersley, Director of Programmes from September 1925, thought it pointless to make programmes for children under eight. He thought that young children were not
terms of the categories 'Home', 'Light' and 'Third'. The broadcasters also knew that there were 'hosts of other people listening too, thousands of adults among them.' And so it conceived of its audience as 'young in years or in mind' (BBC Handbook, 1929). What is clear from these various statements is that there was no generalised conception of how to define (in practical and policy terms) the child audience. Although specific programmes seemed to be addressed to specific audiences (e.g. Toytown for a younger audience), there were no clear lines of demarcation.

The Art of Children's Listening

The audience of Children's Hour was imagined as including both children and adults within a familial and domestic context. McCulloch stated that: '[t]he Children's Hour audience is inevitably a family one by virtue of the content matter of the programme, the design in presentation and the hour of radiation which in general coincides with the time-honoured family institution of five o'clock tea'. The child audience was constituted not as a distinct audience of children but as a family audience. Likewise, McCulloch argued that: '[i]t is our contention that where family listening exists it can only have good results because parents and children both have common ground for listening and for discussion' (McCulloch, 1946, 229-30). This notion of broadcasting, creating a common ground for listening and attentive enough. In a memo to C.E. Hodges (Uncle Peter), who had been in charge of Children's Hour from April 1925, Eckersley asked curtly 'how much of the fairytale stuff are you actually doing now?' (February 1927 cited in Hartley, 1983, 24). Likewise Derek McCulloch stated that:

It is our experience that within our limits of time, expense and general resources we cannot cater regularly for the very young listener, the three to five year old. At this age the attention wanders too quickly, as parents know, though many unmarried well-wishers often argue that we should provide a regular programme for the tiny tots. The very young listener is not completely neglected, however, reasonable provision being made with suitable short stories, fairy tales and fairy plays, nursery rhymes and so on. (McCulloch, 1946, 230)

11 These terms refer not only to the division of different services but to types of programme and audience. It is a way of conceptualising and organising difference.
12 In 1960 adult listeners outnumbered children listening to Children's Hour. More children listened to adult programmes on the Light service than listened to Children's Hour.
discussion, was formed in relation to the notion that broadcasting constituted a particularly democratic space. Reith had talked about the ethos of giving 'voices to the voiceless'.

One might still have pattered about the benefits to invalids and aged folk; to those whose lot was cast in the loneliness of insularity in space or isolation of spirit. About the amenities of town being carried to the country; about the myriad of voices of nature (nightingale included) being borne to the city street. About the voice of leaders of thought and action coming to the fireside; the news of the world at the ear of the rustic. About the Prime Minister speaking direct to the nation from his room in Downing Street; the King heard by his farthest and most solitary subject; the facts of great issues, hitherto distorted by partisan interpretation, now put directly and clearly before them; a return to the city-state of old. All that and more. (Reith, 1949, 100)

This was the common ground to which McCulloch referred. It was in relation to these public issues and within the 'city-state of old' that parent and child could listen and talk. It was not just the listening, but also the talk, which radio cultivated that formed its 'peculiar form of public participation' (Frith, 1983, 121). Reith stated that:

> It must cover more and more of the field of social and cultural life; become more and more valuable as an index to the community's outlook and personality which the statesman was supposed to read. The microphone could achieve where print and the philosophic formulation of doctrine had failed; could familiarise the public with the central organisation that conducted its business and regulated its inner and outer relations. Not the printable scheme of government but its living and doing, the bringing of personalities of leading figures to the fireside, which could unite government and governed in democracy as in dictatorship. There was already need to watch developments abroad. (Reith, 1949, 135)

Instead of analysing broadcasting in terms of the way this discourse articulated the public and the private, as if they were two self-evident and pre-given domains, the quote from Reith suggests that broadcasting

---

13 This ethos and concern about broadcasting and social/cultural life is a repeated concern of Children's Hour broadcasters. McCulloch in a 1942 policy document argued that the objective of Children's Hour was partly to 'interest children in contemporary life', 'interest them in their own part of the country' and 'contribute towards their moral and religious education' (McCulloch, 1942, 2, R11/51/2).
actually constitutes the home within this public forum. The commensurability of broadcasting and social and cultural life was formed in relation to home and family. Radio not only opened up what could be talked about in the public domain, but also provided the basis for public talk within the home. It provided a way, not only of constructing the public within the domestic, but also of imagining the familial as public. In this sense, the familial and the domestic are both the main sites of consumption and a key constituency of the social and cultural life which the public space of broadcasting makes visible. Broadcasting, as Sir Ernest Barker stated in the *BBC Quarterly* in 1946, 'enriches the citizen's power of choice' to the extent that 'it already means 'Democracy made easy".14 However, despite Barker's image of broadcasting as extending democracy into the home, such that the citizen 'in his own armchair' could listen to the 'authentic statements of competing ideas' (Barker, 1946, 33), there were others who conceived of this domestic space in less than cheery terms. Janet Adam Smith, former literary editor of *The Listener*, writing a year later pictured, in her article 'Children and Wireless' in the *BBC Quarterly*, a very different scenario: 't]he machine turned on full blast, and the baby screaming; the nursery squabbling because two want to hear News from the Zoo and the third can't bear it; banshee wailing as the juvenile experimenter gets to work on the knobs; dinner turned into an anxious misery of scufflings and whisperings because Father wants to hear the one o'clock news' (Adam Smith, 1947, 162).

This was a space in which choice led, not to 'democracy made easy', nor to talk between parent and child, but to familial disharmony. It was not that this latter image was somehow real and the former image of public participation ideal or ideological, but rather that the image of familial

---

14 Sir Ernest Barker described broadcasting not as an 'organ' of democracy, but as its 'means'.

If democracy be regarded as 'a system of government by discussion' - or again (which comes to much the same thing) as 'a system of government based on the citizen's power of choice between competing ideas' - it is obvious that broadcasting will have something to do with the working of democracy... It enriches the citizen's power of choice, presenting him with authentic statements of competing ideas, made to him viva voce, as he sits in his armchair, either by the protagonists of the ideas or by their accredited deputies. We might thus say of broadcasting that it already means 'Democracy made easy'... (Barker, 1946, 33)
disharmony presented a specific object of concern and an object of governance. len Ang makes a similar argument. But she typifies this normalising knowledge as 'speculative' and 'theoretical', as opposed to 'empirical' (Ang, 1991, 110). However, it was only through constructing this concern about the misuse of radio as a real problem that it was targeted as such. For example, 'radio noise' inside and outside the home was conceived as a problem. John May, in an article in Woman (1937), advised housewives to arrange their rooms so that loud speakers were away from the walls dividing one's own home and one's neighbours as 'radio vibrations travel very clearly through even thick brick walls, especially the thumping low notes which can be so disturbing'. Likewise he called for listeners not to listen passively and continuously. Ilonor Croome, in an article entitled 'The Family Listens' in BBC Quarterly, talked about the problem of children being addicted to 'noise'. He coined the term 'noise addicts' and suggested that children were particularly susceptible to this form of addiction (Croome, 1949).

Such problems, and others, were presented within this discourse as the object of specific forms of intervention which were concerned with the production of 'proper listening'. Culture itself, as an ideal, was deployed as a technique. Stobert, in his policy document 'Suggestions for the Conduct of Children's Hour', argued that 'we grow more fastidious the more good music and good literature we hear and read' (Stobert, 1927, 2, R11/27/2). Likewise, Corbett Smith, in his policy document 'The Children's Corner', stated that:

> Teaching 'how to listen', 'how to appreciate', is of paramount importance. This is, in fact, the keynote of the Hour. It is to send the children to read, listen, or see for themselves and their ever-increasing pleasures and happiness. A child who early learns the loveliness and purity of a Mozart minuet will not in later years be content with 'We have no bananas'. He has learnt the difference between gold and tarnished tinsel. He has won an abiding joy. He will seek to share that joy. His character is a-building. (Corbett Smith, 1924, 5, R11/27/1)

It was through 'good example' that children could listen properly which implied in turn that they engaged in other worthwhile activities. However, although 'culture in itself' provided one of the conditions for proper listening, competency needed to be developed through other techniques of choosing which programmes to listen to and when to turn the radio on and
off. The technique of proper listening was not simply directed at the child audience. Filson Young made a more general appeal to listeners:

I would urge listeners to cultivate the art of using their wireless receivers intelligently and artistically, so that the immense care and trouble that are taken in compiling and presenting the programmers' skill achieve their true direction and effect. (quoted in Frith, 1983, 106)

In the early years of the BBC, there was no fixed schedule so that listeners had to consciously choose which programme to turn on. However, during the late 1930s, scheduling began to be introduced and by 1937 there were forty fixed points in the schedule between 6pm and 10.30pm (Scannell and Cardiff, 1982, 181). By 1940, after the resignation of Reith, the objections to scheduling were seen as evidence of the BBC's aloofness. The BBC Handbook stated:

... rightly or wrongly, it was being urged a year or two ago that the BBC was aloof from its listening millions, offering programmes with a complacent air of 'Take it or leave it'. These various experiments in 'Listener participation' with many others are evidence that the ice, if it ever existed, has rapidly melted. New and friendlier contacts have been established on the air. (BBC Handbook, 1940, 83)

However, while scheduling was employed more generally across BBC programme policy, there was still the exhortion to all listeners to look at the Radio Times or the daily paper every morning to see what to listen to, when to turn on the radio and when to turn it off. Choosing to turn on the radio was not a random activity but an act of 'discrimination'. Children's

15 Although the BBC did not 'schedule' programmes, in the contemporary sense of the fixed weekly schedule, until the late 1930s, they did engage in 'programme planning'. Whereas the latter implied that conscious decision-making was involved in where programmes were placed, the former carries the implication that systematic research into audience practices figures in the final decision of where a programme is placed and the introduction of some regularity in the flow and repetition of programmes. The conditions of scheduling can, in part, be found in the introduction of a Listener Research Department at the BBC in 1936, which I discuss at length in the following chapter.

16 John May, in Woman magazine, argued that listening to the radio was like going to the theatre. It was an 'appointment with the BBC'. He encouraged listeners to:

Train yourself and your family (especially the family!) to switch off directly the item that you are listening to is finished. Don't let interest die a lingering death! (May, 1937)
Hour, although it often had no scheduling within the 'hour', was from its inception regularly broadcast between 5pm and 6pm during the week. This routinisation, which would later be deployed more generally in programme policy, allowed Children's Hour to be inserted into the daily activities of children and encouraged their discriminative listening. Derek McCulloch, London Children's Hour Organiser and later Director of Children's Hour, wrote in the Children's Hour Annual in 1937:

> We welcome both criticism and appreciation alike, but, it is not fair to criticise unless you have been prompted to do so as the result of selective listening...which means taking the weekly edition of Radio Times and making notes about the programmes you really do want to hear. It may be, for example, that on Wednesday you find there is a play you particularly want to hear, but that you have a friend coming to tea - not a quiet friend, but one you must talk the hind leg off a donkey. Have him -or her - to tea, by all means, but cancel your proposed date with the loudspeaker, or of course, cancel the invitation to your friend and arrange another day. (McCulloch, 1937 cited in Briggs, 1981, 103)

Not only did listening to the radio properly require that one consciously chose whether to listen to a programme, but also the discourse of discriminate and conscious choice allowed radio listening to become inserted within the fabric of children's everyday lives and to be attributed with the importance of everyday decisions. Broadcasting could become intimately connected to the everyday. The act of switching on the radio set was in itself an act of participation. It was a conscious decision to meet the broadcaster some of the way and to 'collaborate' in the programmes.¹⁷

---

¹⁷ Gordon Stowell, in an article entitled 'The Listener Takes Part' published in the BBC Yearbook, stated that:

> In one sense the listener, by the simple act of switching on his set, always takes part and always has taken part in every broadcast he has ever listened to since broadcasting began. To switch on the set is the very least we can do. Many would assert that unless he is also prepared to bring to his listening, however slight the programme may be, some degree of intelligence and sympathetic imagination, to say nothing of the requisite congeniality of mood, he might as well switch off again. In other words, it has always been expected of the listener that he should meet the broadcaster at least a small fraction of the way. The idea behind the recent development of what the jargon of BBC officials and radio journalists call 'listener participation' is to turn that small fraction into a big one. The listener is now invited to show himself a collaborator in
However, as I stated above, this concern to make children active and participative listeners was tempered by a conception of the disharmony which radio could bring to the routines of the home and the imperatives of education. Janet Adam Smith stated that:

> Blackest of all is the threat to concentration. Its most obvious form is interference with homework. There are plenty of homes where preparation is regarded as even more a nuisance by the parents than by the children: schools are expected to relieve the mother of trouble, and not to add to her worries at home by awkward demands for silence and space. And so no effort is made to find a quiet room for a child (this indeed may be a physical impossibility, especially in winter with unheated bedrooms); or even to clear a table, or a corner of a table; and in such homes the wireless is likely to be kept, if not bawling, at least humming, while John tries to make sense of *je suis, tu es*. (Adam Smith, 1947, 163)

The aim of the broadcasters to encourage proper listening, as a facet of good citizenship, was caught up in a set of problems concerning the wider government of domestic and familial space and time. It is clear that the art of children's broadcasting rested upon the exclusion of certain types of listening in certain domestic situations which they knew existed. Reith intended *Children's Hour* to provide 'a happy alternative to the squalor of the streets and backyards' (quoted in Frith, 1983, 112) and in 1942 McCulloch stated that:

> Inevitably, I think, our programmes are aimed at children of elementary and secondary education. Undoubtedly there are many poorer class children living in such crowded conditions that they cannot really 'listen' in the proper sense of the word. I am thinking of the child who spends most of its time running errands, minding the baby or, most frequently, playing in the street. In these days of better schools and better education I think we confront ourselves in the belief that the Children's Hour net is spread wide and catches the better majority. (McCulloch, July 1942, 3, R11/51/2)

Programmes that are so designed as to demand from him more than the usual response, programmes that are indeed incomplete without him. (Stowell, 1940, 80)

Programmes, such as spelling-bees and quiz programmes, were indicative of this sort of participative programming.
Ien Ang describes such working-class practices, which McCulloch saw as conducive to improper listening and Reith conceived as 'obstacles', as 'difficulties which ultimately resided in resistances on the part of the object of that endeavour [to discipline, in Ang's terms, the audience] and she goes on to say that '[i]n fact, a history of European public service broadcasting could be written from this perspective: a narrative in which the resistance of the audience against its objectification in the name of highminded, national cultural ideals drives the story forward' (Ang, 1991, 101). However, instead of arguing that 'the audience' somehow pre-existed its formation and that, through its resistance, it somehow acted as the motor and agent of this particular history, I want to suggest that these particular 'obstacles' were formative in the construction of the audience as an object of power/knowledge. The 'happy alternative' of proper listening within the homes of the 'better majority' (the goal of those 'highminded ideals') and the obstacles of improper listening within the overcrowded working-class home and the squalor of the streets and backyards (in Ang's terms, the failure of, and resistance to, those ideals) are clearly presented within the discursive formation of the child audience (and within the BBC ethos of public service broadcasting). These images are articulated by Reith and McCulloch within a set of questions about the domestic and familial nature of broadcasting. My argument here is that the domestic and familial are only external to this discourse of the child audience prior to its constitution within this discursive formation. In approaching the problem in such a way the question becomes one of how the domestic and the familial figure in this discursive formation and what this discourse makes possible in figuring this 'context'. Just as Scannell's argument concerning broadcasting's ability to confer certain 'communicative entitlements' is, as Donald (1992) argues, problematic, so too is the implicit notion that the audience constitutes a liberating force. It is not that the audience is disciplined and resists, but that individuals within the population are formed as an audience bearing certain capacities and dispositions. Those individuals who listened 'improperly' were constituted within this discursive formation and as the object of it. It was only in relation to 'improper listening' that 'proper listening' was formed. They formed twin

---

18 Ang quotes Reith, who stated that the cultural mission of the BBC was the 'systematic and sustained endeavour to re-create, to build up knowledge, experience and character, perhaps even in the face of obstacles' (Ang, 1991, 101; Reith quoted in Briggs, 1985, 54).
poles within a single strategic intervention. Resistance was neither external to this regime of power nor did it possess an agency or definition outside of this formation.

As I stated at the beginning of this section, the child audience was addressed as a family audience and, moreover, the techniques deployed to form proper listening conditions drew upon the resources of the family. As Croome stated: '[t]he 'family' nature of wireless entertainment does not merely affect the nature of the programmes themselves; it affects the very nature of listening' (Croome, 1949, 32). For Croome, the responsibility for supervising listening conditions fell upon the parent. Parents needed to accept that children might make choices 'that we ourselves detest', and that, as a result, they, the parents, had some responsibility in providing the conditions for participative and selective listening. It was not until the 1940s that commentators began to talk in any detail about the responsibilities of the parent (primarily the mother) and then in relation

19 Janet Adam Smith stated:

How can we foster this active state of mind in the child listening to the wireless? We can begin by not wincing when he chooses what we ourselves detest. Far better that a ten-year-old should turn on 'William' because he really likes it than 'Camus' because he thinks that it is what you want him to like. The act of choice - which involves studying the programme and being conscious of alternatives - is a necessary and important exercise in keeping the appreciative faculties alert. (Adam Smith, 1947, 165)

Likewise she continued by stating that:

That habit of choice established, we can encourage experiment, and prevent too easy discouragement. And above all we can, in our own practice as well as in our explicit advice, insist that there is a two-way traffic in wireless: it brings us music, plays, ideas; it leads us to music, plays, ideas. Here the example of school broadcasts, which always point the way to further activity, is a great influence for good. The parent who encourages his child to listen to string quartets and Sunday evening talks, and never takes him to a concert or suggests a book for him to read, is threatening to make a lazy and passive man of him. For our attitude to listening, and to the arts that we meet through the medium of wireless, helps to determine whether we have an active or passive attitude to life itself. (ibid, 165-6)

It is clear from the article that it was the mother who was being addressed and it was her responsibility which was being invoked.
to the general conduct of the family rather than the child listener in particular. At the end of his article, Croome stated that:

In a sense, the advent of almost universal listening has added something to the responsibilities of parenthood. It is perfectly possible to forestall and check noise-addiction, and that without instituting a tyrannical censorship of listening proper; to establish, among other recognised family rules, the understanding that the wireless shall only be switched on when some freely chosen item is about to begin, and switched off when it ends. Far better an ecstatic concentration on Dick Barton or Much-Binding-in-the-Marsh than a nine-tenths automatic - or enforced - hearing of Bach. (ibid, 36)

Croome invokes the responsibility of the parent, primarily the mother, as relay between the ideals of the broadcasters and everyday life. He says:

From every aspect, indeed, family listening is what the family makes of it. It is an art, answering to the art of the broadcaster himself; an art by no means easy, comprising both a co-operative technique of programme-building and a skill in harmoniously weaving together this and other elements on family enjoyment. It is in fact part of the art of life in general, and a part capable of being practised in circumstances providing few other facilities; amid austerity, restrictions and overwork. And it is an art whose development, in any particular household, falls eminently within the sphere of the housewife, to whom it thus offers indirectly an opportunity far wider than any programme directed specifically to her individual enjoyment or instruction. (ibid, 36)

Broadcasting was used, not only to incite the responsibilities of the mother to care for children's health and for the home, but also to construct the care for her children's listening among those responsibilities (cf. Moores, 1988 and 1993). The techniques of broadcasting provided an instance of, what Donzelot has termed, 'government through the family' (i.e. that the techniques of power and knowledge construct the mother as the State's delegate, responsibilising her so as to form, through her care and attention, healthy citizens) (Donzelot, 1979). The constitution of the familial and the domestic as an element within this discursive formation made

---

20 This quote suggests that the concern about the responsibility of the parent implied a shift away from the 'tyrannical censorship of listening proper'.
21 The objectives of broadcasting were aligned with the objectives of those other welfare institutions and practices which were concerned with the health and well-being of the child (cf. Drotner, 1989, 192-201).
possible the responsibilisation of the housewife within circumstances of 'austerity, restrictions and overwork'. The art of children's broadcasting both constituted the familial and the domestic within its terms and conditions and also offered a solution to the perceived need for responsibilisation within these given conditions.

However, Adam Smith, at the end of her article in the *BBC Quarterly* asked: 'Do we want conscientious parents to give their children exercises for wireless appreciation, as they do for flat feet and round shoulders?' She went on to answer her question: 'No: for like all the best things in life, listening properly to the wireless will be an instinctive growth, as much the result of unconscious example and never-formulated assumptions as of any conscious plan.' She pictured the 'millions of families' with their individual characteristics unconsciously moving towards family harmony:

How, for instance, are we to harmonise good manners and considerateness in listening with the readiness to experiment that helps to create genuine taste? The answer is that there is no such thing as perfect listening in a perfect family. There are only millions of families, who all want something different in their listening. All family life is an attempt to harmonise varying interests, experiences and emotions: the wireless simply presents us with a new set of tensions that have somehow got to be reconciled to make a harmonious pattern. Each family must resolve them in its own characteristic way... (Adam Smith, 1947, 166)

Despite this disagreement between Adam Smith and Croome, there was an obvious agreement that radio broadcasting was specifically addressed to a family audience. And although Adam Smith began to forgo any notion of the conscious planning of proper listening, there was also clear agreement concerning the responsibilities of the parents. For Adam Smith these responsibilities were constructed as being resolvable by the families themselves. Moreover, although the broadcaster could not control the way in which radio was used within the home, there was agreement that the 'art of broadcasting' required the broadcaster to 'scan his matter with much of

---

22 This notion that 'family life is an attempt to harmonise varying interests, experiences and emotions' becomes particularly important in the postwar discourses which construct the child television audience. I look at this in the following chapter.
the selective vigilance exercised by a Victorian publisher with his eye on the family reading-aloud circle' (Croome, 1949, 32). 23

The mapping of the child audience in relation to these manners, habits, demands and responsibilities provided a way of thinking about the 'family circle'. Although the child audience was conceived as a familial and domestic audience and although radio was conceived as a mechanism for bringing children off the streets and into the home, this audience was also imagined in relation to a notion of the child as a citizen, doing 'good works' in the local community. In the early years of Children's Hour, this participation was encouraged through the forming of Radio Circle clubs.24 In 1923 Birmingham set up the first Radio Circle and soon afterwards other local stations set up similar clubs. There were nineteen altogether, linked to the various local stations. They were known variously as Radio Circles, Radio Sunbeams, Radio League, Fairy Leagues and the Fairy League of Animal and Flower Lovers. The membership ranged from 624 members in Hull to 45,000 members in Cardiff. Although Cardiff had no subscription, most stations charged 1 shilling subscription. In 1927 all stations were instructed to charge not more than this amount in order to cover the cost of a badge and postage. The members, through various activities, developed a special relationship with their local station. Aberdeen Radio Circle stated its aims as follows:

The Radio Circle has the motto 'Truth, Friendship, My Country', but the organisation is used mainly to promote a strong bond between the listening child and the station. Our general attitude is that while we are interested in all children, we are especially interested in members of the Radio Circle. Radio Circle members have the right to have birthday greetings broadcast, to take part in concerts at the studio, receive preferential treatment regarding visits to the studio, etc. (Radio Circle, 'Functions of Organisation', 1927, R11/58)

23 Colin Mercer, writing on the Victorian novel, argues that:

... far from being an extrinsic condition on the practice of reading, the location or occasion has specific effects on the way in which something is read and on its range of effects. Reading is the product of a specific cultural technology organising the work that these texts are doing in relation to the family, the hearth, the home, and the household. (Mercer, 1988, 63)

24 Children's Hour annuals also played an important part in this respect.
Initially *Children's Hour* broadcast birthday greetings of all children who wrote in. However, after a short while, there were too many requests and they were limited to Radio Circle members only. Likewise Radio Circle members were invited to visit the station to meet their favourite personalities and to see how radio broadcasting worked. In Bournemouth the condition of membership was that 'each member, loving animals and flowers, promises to cherish them and protect them from hurt and harm, earnestly to try to spread among children the principles of the Fairy League' (1927). These active citizens held parties and fundraising events and donated their takings to local charities and hospitals. And, although these clubs excluded certain types of listeners, they nevertheless connected broadcasting to the intricate texture and dense network of clubs, churches, hospitals, voluntary societies and other social institutions of everyday life. These practices helped to connect the child audience not only to the family but also to the community. Proper listening was constructed as an *exemplary* form of citizenship to be shaped within the home in order that its effects could be beneficial to, and performed within, the community.

It was not so much, as Moores argues, that 'the social and spatial arrangement of households served... to constrain and regulate the ways in which broadcasting could be utilized by its listeners' (Moores, 1993, 83), but

25 It is clear that by the 1950s this relationship had ended. David Davis, while Head of Children's Hour, stated that:

> In the beginning of Children's Hour, we adopted the hearty Uncle and Aunt technique. Those were the days of 'Hullo, Twins!', and Uncle This and Auntie That, and 'Birthdays', and general amiable improvisation. To-day, we try to approach our audience at least as individuals, worthy of the respect due from one grown-up person to another. (Davis, 1957, 2, R11/51/3)

26 Donald states that:

> However much Reith dreamed of 'a return of the city-state of old', the effect was to undermine the intermediate institutions and forums for debate that had classically made up the public sphere. As the wireless made the home more important as a centre for leisure, entertainment and the formation of opinions, the public spaces of street and neighbourhood became less a magnet. (Donald, 1992, 83)

It is clear, though, that children's broadcasting was dependent on its relation to these intermediary institutions.
that the social, spatial and temporal arrangements of the home and of the
local and national community formed specific conditions of existence for
the child audience. These temporal and spatial arrangements, which cut
across the divisions of both private and public, were formed within a set of
questions about how to make the audience intelligible and how to govern
its conduct in relation to the good of the local and national community. The
audience only becomes intelligible in relation to the grid of techniques of
listening (of proper listening, of responsible mothering, of programme
planning).

Addressing the Child Audience

As a result of such problems, the art of broadcasting was necessarily
contradictory and yet organised around a certain relationship between
broadcaster and child. The art of broadcasting to children required the
'careful training and wide experience' of the presenters, but also that they
have an 'innate sympathy with the child-heart'. This 'innate sympathy'
was aided by the fact that many children's broadcasters were parents or
genuine aunts and uncles. McCulloch stated that:

... I would stress the profound necessity for specialised
staff who have a real love for, and an understanding of,
children in the right sense. I would encourage the
appointments of married women where possible as
Directors or Organisers. Similarly, their staffs should have
youthful interests at heart, and here the employment of
single men and women can be satisfactorily visualised.
(McCulloch, 1944, 4, R34/298)27

Major A. Corbett Smith, the first station Director at Cardiff, who moved to
London in 1924 to become its Artistic Director and to develop 'features'
broadcasting, presented a policy document entitled 'The Children's Corner'
which stated that:

---

27 Likewise David Davis, Head of Children's Hour stated that:

It is desirable, if not absolutely essential, to maintain living
contact with children somehow; only in that way can one avoid the
academic theorising that so easily besets us. (Davis, 1957, 2,
R11/51/3)
A story should never be read, save in very exceptional cases. It should be told as a 'vivid reminiscence' of the teller. It must come spontaneously... All art is a projection of personality. The teller must so fuse his own personality with that of the author as to make a perfect art-work... Be natural. Do not pose nor 'talk down' to your audience... on no account suggest or close with a moral... Similarly there must be no suggestion of a hint of education. (Corbett Smith, 1924, 3-4, R11/27/1)

It was clear that 'any excess in the direction of childishness and sentimentality restricts the area of appeal' (Stobart, 1927, R11/27/2). The address to the child audience rested upon the ability of the broadcaster to spontaneously express his or her very being to the child listener. This expression was to be honest and profoundly sincere. The children's broadcaster was, not merely someone trained to make programmes, but someone who was formed, and who formed themselves, through a set of ethical practices. These practices required the broadcaster to search within themselves to recognise themselves within their very being: 'the man or woman who can entertain children is a very rare being' (Corbett Smith, 1927, 5). I want to look at this in more detail in relation to the problem of addressing a domestic and public audience and to the problem of children's broadcasting as 'educative in the best sense'.

Children's broadcasters needed to address their listeners intimately, as if they were speaking to them individually. Such a mode of address was not limited to Children's Hour broadcasters. Reith argued that '[t]here was an intimacy and individuality of appeal in a broadcast talk which made it radically different from those agencies which served for many generations - the oration, press comment, public meeting, club or public discussion' (Reith, 1949, 135). Talking to the domestic required a particular discipline. As Hilda Mattheson, who was Head of Talks (1927-31), stated:

Early experiments with broadcast talks showed that it was useless to address the microphone as if it were a public meeting, or even to read it essays or leading articles. The person sitting at the other end expected the speaker to

28 McCulloch stated that:

The realisation that 'you cannot - not you must not - cheat a child' should be foremost in the minds of all those who have regular contacts with the younger generation, in the sphere of entertainment as in that of education. (McCulloch, 1946, 230)
Radio talk was not simply an address to the audience at home, but also a way of addressing the microphone physically present before the speaker in the studio. The talk was neither read nor impromptu. It was personal, yet ordered. Manuscripts submitted to the BBC had to be 'translated' into a suitable personal spoken style. Radio talk, to both children and adults, was formed as a way of speaking within the public space of the home and a familiarised public space. For Reith, radio talk was a specific kind of practice which offered the possibility of bringing government and governed together through the ether. This was a relationship which had, according to Reith, vanished since the 'city-state of old' due to the nature of political rule in the West. 

The form of intimate and individual address to the child was caught up within the exigencies of the public space of broadcasting. The difficulties of such an address was borne out in debates about the construction of children's broadcasters as 'Aunts' and 'Uncles'. On the one hand, the intimacy of these personalities made possible an affection between the listeners and the radio service. Ella Fitzgerald stated that: '[f]rom all that I personally have gleaned and opinion I have collected from parents and children it does seem that permanent uncles are the feature of the children's hour that has really won children's affection: they get to know the sort of story a serious uncle reads; the sort of remark a humourous uncle will make; and they build up personalities which are alive and lasting as no casual uncle or aunt can ever become' (Fitzgerald, 'Suggestions for Children's Hour', 1924, 4, R11/27/1). The success of the embeddedness of these personalities within everyday popular discourse is

29 Reith states that:

The oration derived from the days when the city was the unit of the state and every citizen could attend to hear in person. It came westward in the train of the Renaissance, but in the west the political unit in general was the country, or at least the province; the forum had vanished. Statesmen discussed matters not directly with the people, too numerous or too scattered to hear them, but with intermediaries. Parliamentary transactions were twofold -oratory and committee work - but continuance of the formal discussions veiled the fact that the statesman was no longer talking directly to the community. (Reith, 1949, 135)
made clear through the use of the closing words of Uncle Mac ('Goodnight children everywhere') and Stephen King-Hall ('Be so good. But not so frightfully good that someone says to you, "Ah! and what mischief are you up to?" So if I were you I should be just fairly good') in Oxo's advertising campaign in women's magazines in 1945.

On the other hand, there were those within the BBC who thought that *Children's Hour* should be 'the most strenuous mental and physical work' and that such personalities led to 'relaxation'. Corbett Smith referred to this as 'the most damning evidence of inadequacy' (Corbett Smith, 1924, 6, R11/27/1). The notion that addressing a child audience was somehow easy and didn't require any expertise was vehemently opposed. Eckersley in a memo to Reith in 1926 stated that he wanted such personalities to be done away with and Stobart, in his *Children's Hour, Instructions*, stated that:

> There is no Headquarters Rule for or against the use of these terms, which are traditional in the Children's Hour. The purpose is to establish friendly relations and create a happy family atmosphere. Experience has shown, however, that the excessive use of nicknames and pet names is detrimental, especially when applied to senior officials whose work lies mainly outside the Hour. Station Directors should be careful to see that titles are not abused and that the proper informality of the Children's Hour is not allowed to prejudice the dignity of the Corporation's work. (Stobart, 1927, 2, R11/27/2)

Corbett Smith, as early as 1924, asked whether the success of *Children's Hour* 'is built upon a genuine, worthy, and permanent foundation', to what extent *Children's Hour* assisted in the 'formation of character' and to what extent it was conducted for the 'entertainment of the 'uncles' and 'aunts'' (Corbett Smith, 1924, 6, R11/27/1). In February 1925 Stobart argued at a Programmes Board that there should be a reduction in the 'backchat' of such personalities. By 1936 the Northern Ireland Regional Director had stated that he had dropped the use of 'uncles' and 'aunts' and that Children's Hour should have full-time permanent staff, with expertise and equal pay (Northern Ireland Director, 1936, R11/27/2). These debates and policy decisions show how the address to the child audience was constituted in relation to both the public and domestic space of broadcasting.

The intimate and yet respectful address to the audience was coupled with an address which was neither high- nor low-brow but middle-brow and which
was neither simply entertainment nor education but entertainment which is 'educative in the best sense' (cf. Frith, 1983). This had been a concern of the BBC as a whole and Reith was at pains to make it clear how the BBC should intervene in this area. In 1924 Reith referred to entertainment in the following way:

... entertainment, pure and simple, quickly grows tame; dissatisfaction and boredom result. If hours are to be occupied agreeably, it would be a sad reflection of human intelligence if it were contended that entertainment, in the accepted sense of the term was the only means of doing so. (Reith, 1924, quoted in Frith, 1983, 108)

However, by 1928, in the BBC Handbook of that year, Reith stated:

As to the remaining time given to music and entertainment, let there be no idea that this category is one given grudgingly and under pressure from public and press. It is not so. To provide relaxation is no less positive an element of policy than any other. Mitigation of the strain of a high-pressure life, such as the last generation scarcely knew, is a primary social necessity, and that necessity must be satisfied. (Reith, BBC Handbook, 1928, 34)

30 The BBC, as a public service broadcasting institution and as a particular form of cultural monopoly, emerged within a set of discursive oppositions between mass audience/public, commercialism/licence-fee funded monopoly and Americaness/Englishness. Unlike the mass audience which was seen in terms of its size, its populist taste (that determined by the 'lowest common denominator') and its passivity, the public was conceived in terms of its ability to be entertained and educated, its middlebrow taste and its selective and conscious listening. Whereas the mass audience got what it wanted, the public only received what it needed. Reith had argued that 'few knew what they wanted, fewer what they needed'. The task of the BBC was to lead the audience, rather than to follow their confused and misdirected pleasures. Not that it would have mattered to many, though: 'nobody would have protested'. But 'it was better to over-estimate than to under-estimate' and 'to carry into the greatest number of homes everything that was best in every department on human knowledge, endeavour and achievement; and to avoid whatever was or might be hurtful' (Reith, 1949, 101).

31 Scannell and Cardiff argue that Reith's defensive tone can be accounted for by the press criticism of the standard of broadcast entertainment in the late 1920s. Newspaper polls showed that audiences preferred vaudeville and variety, which were on short supply from the BBC (1991, 225). The transition from Company to Corporation seemed to many to alter 'the relaxed and friendly relations between broadcasters and listeners' (ibid). A listener from Devon wrote:

At one time you and l were good pals, thanks to your spontaneous naturalness (what larks we had!) but now all has changed and your
It might appear that there was a contradiction between the two statements and that Reith had changed his mind as to BBC policy on entertainment. Or it might appear that while the public wanted entertainment in the early 1920s, Reith in 1924 needed to declare his hostility to it in order to present the BBC as an institution worthy of becoming a public corporation and not one pandering to the desires of the masses.\(^{32}\) However, on closer analysis it would be incorrect to assume that Reith simply opposed entertainment and education.\(^{33}\) There is a distinction to be made between 'entertainment in the accepted sense' ('entertainment, pure and simple'), which was associated with the 'mass audience' and tainted with the connotations of 'Americanness', and 'entertainment which is educative in the best sense'.\(^{34}\)

---

voice has assumed a tutorial (and dictatorial) inflection, whilst I have become a small boy again in the Lower Fourth. (Radio Times, 20 July 1928, 4, quoted in Scannell and Cardiff, 1991, 224-5)

32 This may have been so given the fears of Americanisation voiced by critics such as F.R. Leavis, Q.D. Leavis and Denys Thompson. It was important that the BBC set itself apart from other 'mass media' (cf. Donald, 1992, 74-5).

33 Mercer argues that:

There was no contradiction here between the 'serious' qualities of citizenship (the public service ideal) and the 'frivolous' features of being amused (the 'light entertainment' ideal); they fuse through a series of techniques to form a particularly enduring relationship between the categories of individual, citizen, family and nation. (Mercer, 1986, 192)

He argues that the category of 'citizenship' allowed BBC radio to provide, what he calls, its 'socius function'. Mercer quotes Reith:

The problem was to fit entertainment as occasion into intimate routine... The solution lay in the development of a particular sort of voice - intimate and authoritative - and a particular sort of personality - relaxing and knowable. The radio star was public figure as private friend. (ibid)

While this is correct, I want to argue that the category of 'entertainment' itself undergoes transformation within this discourse. There is no simple opposition between 'education' and 'entertainment'.

34 The production of entertainment 'in the best sense' allowed broadcasters to address the developmental capacities of the listener. Reith stated that:

Recent times, however, had rid us of the notion that the humanised spirit could find no better means of actualising itself than through cramming and the cane. The cultural in education was seeking methods which would reach and develop the specific attitudes of every educable person, young and old. 'Development' did not mean
Those involved in making programmes for *Children's Hour* stressed that for them entertainment was in no way didactic or instructional. Stobart stated that all broadcasting contained the possibility of being 'educative' and that there was a distinction to be made between broadcasting as a 'series of thrills and stunts' and broadcasting as a 'steady supply of enjoyment, entertainment and interest' (cf. Briggs, 1985, 69). In June 1927, J.C. Stobart stated in his 'Suggestions for the Conduct of the Children's Hour' that:

> Sound notions on such subjects as fair play, pride of country, personal cleanliness, good manners, thrift, "safety first", sympathy with animals and birds, tidiness in public places, respect for the aged, self-restraint, etc. should be fostered in the Children's Hour through example in song and story rather than by formal exhortations. (Stobart, 1927, 1, R11/27/2)

This address, though, was not shaped simply by the concern to create a middle-brow culture between vulgar taste and high culture but also by a concern about the place of that address. Stobart stated that:

> If the organisers of the Children's Hour keep in mind the creation of the atmosphere of a good home and the presentation of real beauty in song, story, music and poetry on a plane attractive to the young, they will inevitably, without self-conscious efforts, raise the standard of culture in their young listeners and the result will be educative in the best sense. (Stobart, 1927, 1, R11/27/2)

The discourse of the child audience was not shaped by the way that radio was actually used by children within the home, but rather by the way in which broadcasters created 'the atmosphere of a good home' as a specific mode of conduct of the art of children's broadcasting. Stobart makes this point more clearly when he states in 'Children's Hour, Instructions' that:

> The Children's Hour is, as its name implies, 'a pause in the day's occupations'. Those in charge of it will bear in mind

inducing a hypertrophy of this or that specific quality in the individual; rather an ambience in which the special aptitude could flourish and be socially effective. (Reith, 1949, 145)

35 Stobart also talks about the distinction between broadcasting which 'civilises' and broadcasting which is 'crude' (Stobart, 1927, 1, R11/27/2)
that their listeners are for the most part children who have had a long day in school already, and very possibly have home lessons still before them. The purpose of the Children's Hour is therefore mainly recreation and not instruction or moral improvement. (Stobart, 1927, 1, R11/27/2)

The concerns about education and entertainment were framed within a set of considerations about the address to the domestic audience and the way in which radio listening was embedded within the everyday routines of children. There was a clear demarcation between the requirements of schools broadcasting, which addressed children as pupils and which was instructive, and Children's Hour broadcasting, which addressed child in the home. However, although Children's Hour broadcasters had to be entertaining in order to distinguish the programme from the institution of schooling and to gather an audience at all, they were caught up within a wider set of debates concerning pedagogy and culture. The BBC needed to distinguish itself from taint of 'pure entertainment' and to align itself with those critics of mass society. Whereas for the Leavisites mass society posed a fundamental problem for democracy, for Reith, and others at the BBC, radio had to be popular in some quantitative sense (or rather it had to make possible through its universality an address to one and all) in order to make radio the condition of possibility for a living democracy. Programmes for the child audience were constituted in relation to institutional supports, such as the school and the home, which provided what Minson refers to as the conditions of contextuality. The invention of the child audience was

36 McCulloch stated that:

We do not then aim primarily at educating our listeners, as is the case in Schools Broadcasting, but we do realise that, for example, good literature and good music are educative in the best sense. We have to remember that the majority of our audience listens to us after a long day in school with a session of homework ahead. (McCulloch, 1946, 229)

37 Donald states that:

Whereas for the Leavisites mass-ness was the fundamental flaw in democracy, however, for Reith the mass address of radio offered some sort of solution. (Donald, 1992, 75)

However, it should be clear that it was precisely Reith's aversion to the notion of the mass audience which provided one of the conditions for the conception of the general public and for the need to negotiate between entertainment and education.
intimately caught up in a network of concerns about the temporal and spatial location of the child (its routines, habits, activities) and a return to the city-state of old.

**Surveying Social and Cultural Life**

The practices which constitute the child audience in the 1920s, 1930s and 1940s made possible an area of private life which could become accessible to increasing governmental intervention.\(^{38}\) The cultural life of the home (its manners and mode of conduct) could become an object of government. However, this discursive formation which I have mapped out above was already being undermined by a series of changes which I referred to at the beginning of this chapter. During the 1930s and 1940s the BBC underwent significant organisational changes: the network of local stations was replaced by a more centralised system of London control of the Regional Stations in the 1930s; members of staff were increasingly professionalised; the programme schedule increasingly had more fixed points; the Listener Research Department was set up in 1936; and Reith resigned in 1938. This more centralised and professionalised BBC began to lose touch with its audience.\(^ {39}\) New ways of knowing the child audience needed to be

---

\(^{38}\) This intervention might be linked to the increasing governmental intervention which Stuart Hall and Bill Schwarz refer to. They state that:

> This new conception of the state was articulated through a range of doctrines: Social Imperialism, 'national efficiency', tariff reform, 'new' liberalism, Fabian socialism, Lloyd George coalitionism, Social Darwinism, ethical Christianity, and other philosophical schools and political tendencies which contributed to the formation of a new collectivism, based on the ideal of a universal, interventionist state. (Hall and Schwarz, 1985, 40)

\(^{39}\) Scannell and Cardiff state that:

> The regime of control was to replace informality by a studied formality; to replace local variety and differences by a standardised conception of culture and manners; to replace audience participation by a more distanced, authoritative and prescriptive approach to broadcasting; to replace ordinary people and amateur performers in the studios by 'authorities', 'experts' and 'professionals'. (Scannell and Cardiff, 1982, 166)
established.\textsuperscript{40} It was not so much that the 1930s saw the formation of a family audience but that the conception of the domestic nature of the audience began to shift at this time. Its full effects though would not be felt until the 1950s after the introduction of television at a popular scale. Central to this shift was the emergence of new knowledges of the audience and the development of new techniques of regulation.

Instead of understanding this transformation in terms of the internal dynamics of the organisational structure of the BBC, we can see how the exigencies internal to the BBC were constituted in relation to the increasing mapping of social and cultural life generally by social scientific knowledge and specifically by the use of the social survey. In 1947 Adam Smith asked: 'Is it a good effect? Has it enriched family life?' Her response was that personal and parental observation needed to be supplemented by 'generalisations' based on scientific experiment.

Every parent can give a personal answer, but to generalise is very difficult. There has been no formal enquiry into the subject: no Carlisle experiment, with one group of children docked of wireless and then observed to see if they are more polite, or more musical, or better at homework, than the group with the wireless compulsorily on all day. All is tentative, personal, and subject to the difficulty of disentangling the effect of wireless from the effects of half-a-dozen other modern phenomena, such as the cinema, the combustion engine, the popular press. One can only collect information as widely as possible, and on it try to build some generalisations that, the writer well knows, are open to challenge. (Adam Smith, 1947, 162)

The local stations were replaced by the National and Regional services. Those services were mapped out in terms of different conceptions of culture. Scannell and Cardiff state that:

London, in line with Arnoldian notions of sweetness and light, would provide the best that was available in music, talks, drama and entertainment. The standards and values of metropolitan culture were taken for granted... The national culture that the National Programme claimed to embody was of the educated, south-east English variety. If the Regional service rooted in provincial centres, could not match the quality that London could draw upon, its task was to give expression to the everyday life and variety of the areas served by the regional stations - culture 'as a way of life' in Raymond Williams' phrase. (op.cit., 16)

\textsuperscript{40} Ang makes this point in \textit{Desperately Seeking the Audience} (1991, 110).
However, eight years prior to this statement, the BBC had enlisted the help of two academics from Bristol University to conduct a survey into the social effects of broadcasting. Hilda Jennings and Winifred Gill undertook a survey specifically into the social effect of broadcasting on individuals and families in a working-class neighbourhood in Bristol. They looked at broadcasting in relation to, among other things: the enrichment of mental background, interest and knowledge of current events, newspaper reading, attitudes to party politics, musical production and appreciation, attendance and membership of religious and other organisations, domestic habits, and school education. The deployment of the social survey allowed radio broadcasting to be conceived within a specific political rationality which linked broadcasting with a whole host of social problems. In so doing broadcasting could provide a mechanism for the moral management of social space. Radio broadcasting was conceived as an apparatus for achieving the well-being of the population.

In conceiving of broadcasting in such a way the degenerative effects of unmanaged social existence were thrown into sharp relief. This was primarily articulated in the form of 'the mob' or 'the crowd'. Although itself an invention with a much longer genealogy, the mob provided a way of imagining both the nature of social life before the civilising effects of radio and also presented the dangers of an ungoverned populus. Jennings and Gill stated that:

> Until a comparatively recent period the street and the public-house offered the main scope for recreation outside the home. On Sunday afternoons and fine summer evenings the whole family would stand at the street door or sit on chairs on the pavement. When tension in a street ran high, quarrels easily arose and quickly spread. Witnesses told the survey worker that "There was a row every night in some streets." The rougher children "ran the streets." Rival street gangs raided each other or even pursued victims into their own homes. The drama of neighbourhood life was watched and discussed at length on

---

41 Val Gielgud, in 1930, called for 'some sort of systematic research into the social psychology of regular listening' (quoted in Briggs, 1965, 256). McCulloch and Robert Silvey, Head of Listener Research, had engaged in discussion about how to gain information about the child audience using survey techniques in 1947. Davis, in 1957, after discussing how to approach this audience asked 'how do we know what our audience wants' and referred to information gained from surveys conducted by the, now renamed, Audience Research Department (Davis, 1957, R11/51/3).
the door-steps and at the street-corner, as well as in the public house. (Jennings and Gill, 1939, 10)42

They also stated that, in comparison, broadcasting has civilised the pleasures of the subordinate classes and brought them within the confines of the home and family:43

It was also generally agreed that comparatively few people now spend a whole evening in a public-house, as they want to get home to the wireless. The children also play less in streets than formerly, partly of course owing to the new public provision of play CENTRES, but also partly because they like to listen to the wireless programmes. (Jennings and Gill, 1939, 21)44

The social survey not only made such social changes visible but also made visible the way in which radio broadcasting was imbricated within a wider set of social problems. The social survey enabled the BBC to understand its specific effect upon social and cultural life and to understand how it was

42 Moores also refers to B. Seebohm Rowntree's survey of York in 1941:

... a large proportion of young working people spent their evenings lounging about in the neighbourhood of their houses or promenading up and down certain streets in the city. The main street was so thronged with them that it was difficult to make one's way through it and a number of policemen were required to keep people moving and to prevent the horseplay between youths and girls from becoming too obstreperous. Youths used to boast how many girls they had 'got off with' during the evening... Drunken men and women were constantly to be seen in the streets. On Saturday nights special policemen were drafted into the poorer districts of the city in order to deal with fights and brawls. (Rowntree, 1941, 468 quoted in Moores, 1988, 25)

43 Moores draws upon Donzelot's work in The Policing of Families (1979) to argue that radio needs to be conceived in terms of a more general 'withdrawal to the interior' (Moores, 1988).

44 Jennings and Gill state that:

The analysis of the 841 forms filled in by children between the ages of eleven and fourteen showed that 90 per cent sometimes listened to the Children's Hour, while over 80 per cent said that they sometimes stayed at home to listen to the wireless. (Jennings and Gill, 1939, 21)
itself central to the formation of a new public space in relation to the increasing structural changes of social and cultural life.45

In the late 1940s the social scientific knowledge of broadcasting's relationship to the social and cultural life of the population began to be matched by an increasing focus on the psychology of the individual listener. Sir Cyril Burt, in 1949, went so far as to question the existence of 'the listener' (Burt, 1949). Instead of locating the problem within the 'human mind', as if all mental activity could be defined in terms of a universal and unified conception of 'mind', he referred to the individual mental differences within the population in terms of 'the cognitive side of the mind' ('perception, imagination, and thought') and the 'feelings and emotions' of individuals.46 In categorising radio listeners in terms of their 'intellectual ability' and in opening up the question of the emotional economy of radio listening he made possible a new way of thinking about and acting upon the child audience. In opening such a discursive space, Burt put into play the conditions for conceiving the concerns which were to arise with the popularisation of television in the 1950s. I discuss the deployment of the social survey and the psychological knowledge of the individual within the discourse of the child audience at greater length in the following chapter.

Broadcasting was seen to play an ever more important role in the government of liberal democracy. Through its technical apparatus communities of citizens could be formed and new connections could be established between government and governed. As structural changes dissolved and rearranged earlier forms of social and cultural life, broadcasting could participate in the creation of a new public space and new forms of citizenship.

The impact of these new techniques of government were not felt widely until the late 1940s and early 1950s. By that time, it was clear that the BBC

45 Jennings and Gill refer to the structural changes in terms of home life, working hours and leisure-time facilities and habits (Jennings and Gill, 1939, 9-11).
46 In an article in the BBC Quarterly on 'Psychology and the Listener', Professor T.H. Pear talked more specifically about the 'personality' of the listener in terms of individual differences (Pear, 1949). He drew upon Jung's analysis of 'introversion' and 'extroversion', which although not in a Jungian sense, became of particular importance in the 1950s and 1960s discourse on children's television viewing.
was failing to address a large proportion of the child population. The new procedures for knowing the audience threw into sharp relief the failure of its earlier enterprise: the BBC had been primarily addressing 'home service' children. Richard D'A. Marriott, Director of Sound Broadcasting, described Children's Hour in the following way:

They are the programmes of good children, of the attentive and serious minded, the children of homes where parents are careful in the influences which are brought to bear upon them, and this is no doubt a minority of the children and the homes in this country. (Marriott, February 1960, R11/51/3)

The melancholic realisation that Children's Hour had failed emerged with an understanding that the BBC 'should have found a means of seeking out and talking to children on their own terms'. Marritt declared: 'but I have a feeling that it may now be too late for this' (Marriott, February 1960, R11/51/3). He was right. On Good Friday, 27 March 1964 the last Children's Hour was broadcast. Its share of the radio audience was embarrassingly low.

47 Richard D'A. Marriott, Director of Sound Broadcasting, stated in 1960 that:

Children's Hour, as at present constituted, is for the children most carefully brought up, in the best homes, and for those of the highest educational potential. It is, one might say, a Home Service rather than a Light Programme audience, although children divide in the same way as adults do. (Marriott, 'Future of Children's Broadcasting', August, 1960, R11/51/3)

48 Children's Hour was restructured in February 1961. The title was dropped and programmes were made for different age groups across the Light and Home services.

49 Donald argues that changes in programme policy were a response to a 'stubbornly fragmented' population.

Yet the population the BBC was addressing remained too stubbornly fragmented to be satisfied by homogeneous programming, and in response new formats, more varied registers of speech and more targeted types of comedy and music began to emerge. (Donald, 1992, 84)

The problem with this formulation is that it implies that audience fragmentation pre-existed the knowledge of such changes. It is clear from my research that the BBC only recognised the nature of the audience and understood its failure to address certain audiences after it had developed the techniques deployed within the Listener Research Department and the social surveys.
In this chapter I have shown how the discourse of the child audience was formed in the 1920s, 1930s and 1940s in relation to the problems concerning the public space of broadcasting and the art of children's broadcasting. Although in this chapter I have focussed almost exclusively on those policy documents, memos, articles in internal journals, books and biographies, emanating from within the BBC and primarily in relation to the practices of the Children's Hour, in the following chapter I show how this discourse is formed across a number of institutions and practices, most notably across those of the psychological sciences, broadcasting institutions, educational practices and women's magazines. In the 1940s, 1950s and 1960s we see a shift in the way in which the family and culture are constituted as instruments and objects of government.

50 In focussing on these specific aspects of the formation of the public space of broadcasting, I have avoided any analysis of how the State guarantees its existence. Such an analysis has been completed elsewhere by many others and my purpose here has been merely to map out the contours of this space inasmuch as it supplies an integral element to the discourse of the child audience. Much work on radio in the period has focussed on the way the BBC has drawn its authority from its relationship to the State. While there are different interpretations as to whether the BBC was (and is) an autonomous or semi-autonomous institution, the debate has focussed around the common problematic of the relationship between radio, culture and political rule (cf. Briggs, 1985; Garnham, 1978; Hall, 1986; Hood, 1980; and Scannell and Cardiff, 1991). The lynchpin of this discussion has been the way in which the then General Manager of the British Broadcasting Company spoke to the country concerning the General Strike of 1926, negotiated governmental interventions from Winston Churchill (the then Chancellor of the Exchequer) and made possible the transition of the British Broadcasting Company to a public Corporation following the Crawford Committee Report of March 1926. It is this complex series of events which has been seen to mark both the BBC's emergence as a public service corporation and the emergence of its cultural authority.
The Emergence of the Child Television Audience

Chapter Three
In the previous chapter I showed how the child audience was formed as both a domestic and public audience in relation to questions about the nature of the audience, the conduct of proper listening and the specific form of address. The audience was cultivated as a population of future citizens. In the 1930s, with the introduction of a social scientific knowledge of the audience, the child audience began to be conceived in relation to a set of social problems and the earlier regime of government began to be reformed. However, the social concerns which Jennings and Gill raise in their survey and which Burt raises in his article in the *BBC Quarterly*, are not those which present themselves today. They are not, for example, the problems concerning the effect of violent representations on the child nor the problem of excessive daily consumption. How, then, did these new social problems emerge? How did the child audience become conceived in relation to the problem of delinquency and social decline? Likewise, the child audience was conceived in the earlier formation as a family audience. The audience of children's radio programmes were children within, and in the presence of, the family. The audience was not conceivable as listening to other programmes. How did the audience of children's programmes become conceived as distinct from the family and yet the object of surveillance by the mother within that domestic space? How did the child audience become conceived as caught up in the emotional dynamics of the family and as an object of the discipline of psychology? And how too did this audience become embedded within a whole spatial and temporal administration of individuals, a whole architectural management of domestic living?

From the 1930s a new regime of governance began to be put into play. However, it was not until the 1950s and early 1960s that the regime was properly established. In the 1950s those involved in making and planning children's programmes sought to mark out the differences within this audience: by age and gender. The schedule began to be conceived as a way of dividing the audience and administering them as individuals. A whole utilisation of time and space became instrumental in the governance of this audience. Simultaneously, journalists and various experts in women's
magazines and newspapers began to invoke the responsibilities of the mother in the governance of her children's television viewing and in the governance of the modern home. Again a whole temporal and spatial logistics began to be employed, which had as its goal the increasing visibilisation of familial and domestic conduct.

By 1960 the child audience had become constituted within a specific body of knowledge. In the 1950s those involved with children's television programming at the BBC started to talk increasingly about 'the child audience' as an object which had its own habits, attitudes and behaviours. The child audience had become an object with its own specificities and increasingly the programme makers and programme planners referred to the emerging experts of this audience: the social scientists within the BBC's Audience Research Department and within the academic world. The new knowledge of the audience brought with it a range of categories which would map the conduct of this audience and would differentiate types of viewing in terms of the 'normal' and the 'pathological'.

In this chapter I consider such changes and show how they were predicated upon a twin strategy directed at the responsibilities of middle-class parents and at the responsibilities of the broadcasters. While the former was conceived in relation to the critical and discriminating child viewer, the latter was conceived in relation to the 'irresponsibilities' of working-class parents and the 'unsuitable' environment of working-class families. Instead of focussing on the spectacle of television within the home, I focus, then, on the way in which children's television viewing was made visible within specific techniques of government. In formulating the problem this way I initially look, not at the power of televisual representation, but at the way television programmes were utilised within a set of questions about the management of domestic living.

**Television Policy - Children's Programmes, 1946-1966**

Although children's television programmes had been shown before the war, there was no regular service until after 1946. Initially the driving force behind children's television at the BBC was Mary Adams, Head of
Television Talks. By 1947, under her control, the BBC had shown *Muffin the Mule* since the preceding year and one short play. She pushed for a weekly one hour slot, initially designed to be on Sunday afternoon. She wanted to include plays, 'how to' series (e.g. how to make puppets, kites and toy theatres), story-telling, 'collectors' corner' (e.g. stamp-collecting, butterfly-collecting and shell-collecting), programmes on pets, travel tales, 'nature parliament', *Muffin the Mule, James Pratt and Molly Blake*, outside broadcasts (e.g. children visiting museums and toy factories), films (e.g. 'Secrets of Nature', 'How the Telephone works' and 'Instruments of the Orchestra'), current affairs, participation programmes (e.g. general knowledge quizzes and spelling-bees) and 'children's encyclopaedia' programmes. However, the timing on Sunday was particularly sensitive. It would first have to be agreed by the BBC's Central Religious Advisory Committee and gain the consent of other religious authorities. In June 1947 the Director of Religious Broadcasting wrote to the Director of Television Services arguing that the new service for children should not clash with Sunday School and should also be after the religious broadcast at 3pm. In July, the Television Programme Director, Cecil McGivern, wrote to the Head of Television Service, Maurice Gorham and to his replacement in 1947 Norman Collins, saying that Sunday was not suitable for the children's programmes. He argued that 'children are fascinated by Television' and that 'the correspondence protesting against children being lured away from Sunday School by Television testifies to this' (T16/45/1). Despite these protestations, McGivern announced in November that children's programmes would begin every Sunday from January 1948 between 4pm and 5pm. The slot was to be called *For the Children* and Mary Adams was to organise it. In August 1948 there was talk of a daily service.

1 Mary Adams stated in a memo to Television Programmes Director that:

> At present, children's programmes are my responsibility, and I am very conscious that they have totally inadequate attention. I feel strongly, however, that our child audience is so important that these programmes should have really top priority for the future.  
> (Adams, 8 August 1947, T16/45/1)

2 The child audience was imagined primarily within the context of rural middle-class routines and habits. For example, Mary Adams imagined the child audience as one that went to Sunday School and went on 'outdoor walks and picnics' on Sunday afternoon (21 January 1949, T16/45/1).

3 Norman Collins, Television Controller, stated in a memo to Nicolls, Director of Home Broadcasting that:
wanted thirteen staff (organiser, secretary, a clerk to coordinate billings and continuity, six producers and four secretaries) to run one hour on Sunday and half an hour on weekdays. Two hundred and fifty pounds was the minimum per hour of transmission needed. The logistics of organising the new service was tricky considering there were only two studios for all television output. These were needed for transmission and rehearsal. Most material was broadcast live.

However, although children's programmes were still within the control of the Television Talks Department, there was no Head of Children's Television yet. It was not until 4 April 1950 that Peter Thompson, television producer, and Richmond Postgate, Head of Schools Broadcasting took joint control. Thompson was very much an idealist and even considered the possibility of children making their own programmes (T16/45/1). But he nevertheless recognised the organisational difficulties of such a scheme and fell prey to a more pragmatic approach. Postgate was the driving force behind the partnership and with his expertise from Schools Broadcasting, he began to shape children's television. In a policy document distributed on 20 January 1950 he stated his aims:

Television Children's Hour aims to enrich children's lives and to foster their development by the stimulus and enjoyment of what they see and hear. This aim seems to have several elements:

- to entertain and to be liked by the children;
- to satisfy the parents that the programme is fostering children's development in ways of which they approve;
- to satisfy instructed professional opinion that programmes are soundly conceived and well executed. This refers both to the entertainment value and aesthetic competence, and to the educational and psychological judgement which the programmes will reflect. So far, Television has to some extent not come under the vigilant gaze of psychologists and educationalists, but when it begins a daily service of the type proposed we must expect a great deal more comment and criticism to be generated. (Postgate, 20 January 1950, T16/45/1, 2)

D.G. [Director General] has already approved in principle that daily children's programmes should be the next development in BBC Television, and with the acquisition of Highbury Studios the whole thing becomes possible. (August, 1948, T16/45/1)
We can see how the problem of how to address the child audience, although both domestic and public (indicated by that assemblage of child, parent and expert), was no longer defined in terms of entertainment which is educative in the best sense, but in terms of the alignment of entertainment and educational and psychological judgement. We can see the emergence of a concern about the psychological development of the child. For Postgate, as for others, children's television required the expertise not only of broadcasters, but also of the psychologist and educationalist. The enunciative modalities of the broadcaster were, in that sense, not defined by the institution of broadcasting. The possibility of talking about and making programmes for this audience required a wider network of expertise and knowledge. Mary Adams called for research into the physiological, psychological and social problems concerning children's television viewing (Adams, 1950, 89). Naomi Capon, television producer, stated that decisions concerning children's programming 'must be moulded by the experience we gain in the daily production of programmes, and by our accumulating store of knowledge of what our young viewers need and like to see' (Capon, 1952, 31). In August 1950 Norman Collins sent a memo to Robert Silvey, Head of Audience Research, asking for information about the popularity of programmes for 'the very little ones', 'the mid-age group (7 to 10 years old) and 'the 10 to 14 year olds' (24 August 1950, T16/45/1). Likewise there were also calls for research into the possibility of having separate television programmes for girls and boys on different days of the week (4 September 1950 and 15 January 1951, T16/45/1). The tentative demands for outside expertise, which could provide a knowledge of this audience and which would facilitate the production of suitable programmes satisfying both parents and children, were embedded within a set of administrative practices which sought to divide the child audience from the adult audience and within itself.

The separation of children's programmes from adult programmes had been a feature of *Children's Hour*. However, whereas children's radio programmes were seen to address a family audience, children's television programmes spoke to a child audience free from the constraints of adult authority, whether from school or home. Freda Lingstrom, Head of Children's Programmes (Television) (1953-1956), imagined children's television as similar to the walk between school and home: a time and a space which was not supervised. It provided a space through which children could visit other worlds and peoples. She envisaged children's
television as fitting into the routines of children, who were all too conscious of this mapping of everyday life: '[a]t an early age children accept the fact that life divides itself into parts' (Lingstrom, 1953, 99). Television was inserted into this space, not as an intrusion, but as something which was welcomed by the child: '[t]he child is not forced to look at the screen, no one says he must. Of his own free will he stands in happy anticipation ready to receive and observe' (ibid, 100).

However, the problem was not simply to construct the child audience as distinct from the family audience, but also to govern the child audience itself: to provide forms of conduct within the space of children's television. The child audience was seen to comprise a vast array of differences. The division of the audience was a pragmatic response to this problem. But the question remained of how to divide it? Thompson had argued that programmes should be divided 'into two defined periods, the first for the younger children and the second for older ones' (30 June 1949, T16/45/1). Postgate played with the idea that different age-groups might be better served if they made 'certain days of the week specially suitable for particular age-ranges'. Postgate's suggestion, though, cut across the 'idea of a daily Children's Hour of which the essence seems to me that those that will can listen daily and can hope to find something suitable for them each day' (Postgate, 20 January 1950, 4 and 5, T16/45/1). Thompson's 'dream of children's programmes' was that television 'should be used only as a door to

4 Freda Lingstrom, Head of Children's Programmes (1953-6), referred to the problems of broadcasting to such an audience.

Waiting for the programmes which will eventually be transmitted are 1,000,000 children between the ages of five and fifteen. The under-fives, for whom a special provision is being made, must be discounted: their needs are simple in comparison with those of that vast concourse whose stages of physical growth and mental development are distributed over a span of ten years - a span of 'difference' never to be found at any other period of life. (Lingstrom, 1953, 97)

5 Mary Adams in 1949 agreed that it was a good idea to divide children's programmes into 15 minutes for the very young and 45 minutes for the older children (15 December 1949, T16/45/1). However, Spicer argued against this division:

The Children's Programme should be each afternoon an organic whole, not a string of items each with its age-group or interested minority. (10 May 1951, T16/45/1)
a child community through which by skillful manipulation the child can enter and join their fellows' (June 1949, T16/45/1). But the access to this community was seen to need careful policing and was seen to be intimately intertwined with the government domestic viewing practices. Mary Adams raised the issue in 1950:

Practical problems, however, set some limit to this massive objective [of addressing the diverse audience]. The age range, for example. At present, children from two years keep company with teenagers. How shall they be separated, and each provided with adequate satisfaction? (Adams, 1950, 86)

The solution lay in 'specialisation' which, in part, was made possible by the introduction of a regular daily programme in September 1950. The regularity of a daily service allowed broadcasters to think about how to divide up the daily and weekly programme times according to the differences within the child audience, rather than disavow those differences in an attempt to address all children. Specialisation allowed broadcasters to conceive of the different child audiences in terms of 'the needs of boys and girls, town and country children, solitary and gregarious viewers' (Adams, ibid). The problem, then, was not simply in terms of the question of representation (i.e. what representations were suitable for each specific audience), but more generally a question of administration or management. The production of specific programmes for specific types of children at specific and fixed times was accompanied by other techniques such as 'signposting in billing and announcements' such that 'children

6 To this end in the early period the BBC employed children to present programmes and to act as announcers. These included Jennifer Gay, Jannette Scott and Elizabeth Cruft. A typical announcement was:

Hallo everyone. We are doing Thursday's play again this afternoon - "Exercise Hush" which is an adventure thriller for boys - and girls, I think - but definitely not for the younger children. Before that there's the Newsreel and we start the programme with Muffin. Here's Annette with "We Want Muffin". (Gay, T2/214)

Due to excuses about legal injunctions against the use of child presenters (despite the Home Office stating the contrary), the BBC withdrew them at the beginning of 1952.

7 The call for separate programmes for girls and boys was always rejected on the grounds that while girls would watch programmes for boys, boys would never watch programmes made specifically for girls. The object then was to make 'unisexual' programmes and 'to use the strong narrative book of interest to both' (Spicer, 15 January 1957, T16/45/1)
will be urged to view what suits them best' (Adams, 1950, 86). The production of information about the programmes in the *Radio Times*, newspapers, magazines and importantly on television itself was deployed as a technique for regulating individuals into audiences. Nevertheless, there were some categories of the child audience which posed particular problems. Mary Adams referred both to the increasing homogeneity of the child and, as I have stated above, to the increasing gulf between the pre-school and the teenage audience. She argued that programmes for the pre-school audience should be 'hived-off' so as to avoid being 'a hindrance to the producer' and to avoid 'embarrassing' the older child audience. I discuss the pre-school audience at greater length in the following chapter. However, for the moment I want to focus briefly on the teenage audience, which in many respects presented a larger problem for BBC Children's Programmes (Television). The formation of this distinct audience not only led to a discussion of the types of programmes which might be produced, but more importantly led to a discussion about the redefinition of the child audience itself. Adams, although she argued for the distinct needs of this audience, made no suggestion that it should be catered for outside of children's programmes. Likewise, Freda Lngstrom in 1953 maintained

---

8 Owen Reed, Head of Children's Programmes (Television) from 1956 reaffirmed that position in a policy document to all involved in children's programmes. He stated that the 'age-target of each programme should be carefully considered and made as plain as possible in billing and presentation' (5 June 1959, T16/45/2).

9 Adams stated that:

One thing is certain, unless they are specially provided for these pre-school children will form an embarrassing part of the more mature audience and will be a hindrance to the producer. With the help of parents, it might be possible to hive off the under-fives from the Children's Hour programme, and by offering them special programmes at special times, give fuller range of interests to the older children. (Adams, 1950, 87)

10 As Adams stated:

It is probably more important to satisfy his needs [the adolescent viewer] than gratify the under-fives and their mothers. Anyone who has read *Eighty Thousand Adolescents*, a study of young people in Birmingham conducted by the Cadbury Trust, will feel inclined to support that view. (ibid, 87)

11 However, it was clear from Adams' discussion that the teenage audience could no longer be addressed as 'children'. She asked:
that this audience should still be addressed as 'children'.\textsuperscript{12} By December 1955, however, the discussion gained increasing importance with the impact of commercial television. Lingstrom called for the revival of 'teenage programmes'.\textsuperscript{13} Owen Reed, in a set of notes concerning the state

\begin{quote}
What shall the adolescent be offered? Plays of action or detection? Documentaries like 'London Town', or 'How to be a Doctor'? Travel films? Advice on collecting? Hobbies, such as carpentry or metal work? Coaching for sports and athletics? Dancing lessons? Crafts? Competitions which test his knowledge and abilities? Campanology?

(Adams, ibid, 87)
\end{quote}

She continued by saying that, although there are plenty of subjects to consider, the important question is that of 'scale'. This audience needed to be presented not with models and studio-based programmes but outside broadcasts presenting the 'real thing'. For example:

\begin{quote}
In the studio, let them plan and organise a voyage round Britain, round the world. Then charter a vessel and let them go, recording their journey by film, photograph and painting for the others to see on transmission. (Adams, ibid, 88)
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{12} Freda Lingstrom, in discussing the diversity of the child audience stated that:

\begin{quote}
At fifteen, however inarticulate they may be in expressing opinions to adults, they have formed them - indeed, by that time a large proportion will be wage-earners compelled to rely upon their own judgement. It will not be a very mature judgement and it can only be exercised against a set of values gradually built up during childhood. (Lingstrom, 1953, 101)
\end{quote}

She made no argument that adolescents should be treated as separate from the child audience.

\textsuperscript{13} As a result of the introduction of commercial television there was a concern that the 'toddlers truce', between 6pm and 7pm might disappear. The 'toddlers truce' had been a space in the day when no programmes were shown in order to aid mothers to get their children to bed. Lingstrom considered what to place in this slot:

\begin{quote}
I very much want to revive our teenage programmes and would like to think there might be space for two, one of a magazine character and the other a forum of some kind, each to last half an hour and occur in alternate weeks. (30 December 1955, T16/45/2)
\end{quote}

Although she resisted the idea that children's programmes should be shown between 6pm and 7pm, she stated:

\begin{quote}
It occurs to me that the period 6 to 7 might well be used for handicraft demonstrations or for a series on careers and trades likely to be of interest to teenagers. (ibid)
of children's programmes, put forward the cases for and against the splitting up of children's television and the provision of specific programmes for teenagers. In the argument for splitting up existing children's programmes he stated that:

The tastes of older children (i.e. the 12+ age group) are so different from those of younger children that there is nothing to be gained by trying to include them under the title of 'children' at all. Teen-agers are more likely to resent the appellation than to be drawn to it. (Reed, 2, T16/45/2)14

He also put forward the argument that these older children were more interested in watching adult programmes than they were children's programmes.15 In which case, it would seem more sensible, he argued, to provide programmes only for 'the true child-audience'. However, against the proposal to reformulate the category of children's television, he argued that the 'whole concept of age groups, while necessary for planning programmes, is fallacious'. He stated that:

By Saturday 16 February, after the ITV companies had petitioned Charles Hill, the Postmaster General, arguing that 'it was the responsibility of parents, not the State, to put their children to bed at the right time', the toddlers truce was formally ended and the Six-Five Special was started (cf. Hill, 1991, 90). It was pop music rather than handicrafts which finally won the day.
14 This document is undated but it was produced between 1955 and 1959 and it is likely that it was produced in about 1958.
15 Owen Reed stated that:

These children, whose needs occupy a good half of the Department's effort, are really more interested in adult programmes than in those we provide for them. Their main character as a group is their desire to respond as adults with adults.

He continued by saying that there are some programmes, such as Jane Eyre, which older children might be more 'emotionally attuned to' and yet which would be 'quite unsuitable for younger children'. It would be, he argued, 'dangerous to attempt to satisfy these contradictory needs in a single programme'.

As older children are already able and willing to view adult programmes, the illogicality rests in attempting to stretch CTV to include them. They can perfectly well be catered for jointly with adults in the pre-peak, early evening programme planning, and can find the diet they seek in the 'Tonights', 'Whackos' and 'Dixons'.
(Reed, 2, T16/45/2)
They are not cut-and-dried entities but interlock and overlap almost infinitely, and it is this very fact which gives the idea of a consolidated children's programme its inner strength and sense of purpose, and evokes that loyalty which is borne out by the audience figures. (Reed, ibid, 2)

The technique of scheduling children's programmes as distinct from adult programmes was deployed as a means of dividing the viewing habits of the population. Likewise the division within children's programmes both divided the viewing habits of the child population and provided a means through which children could progress from the programmes appropriate for one age-group to another. The broadcasters had an understanding of children's development as separate from their particular age and that programmes for older children were necessary in order to provide that 'undiscovered territory' as something to reach for (Reed, ibid, 2). However, it was also clear to the broadcasters that children of all ages watched different programmes for different age-groups: 'not only do different children cross the age-barriers at widely different ages, but they cross them at different ages for different programmes': 'Sooty fans from St. Paul's Girls School rub shoulders with 6 year old boys who write to demand repeats of Nicholas Nickelby' (Reed, ibid, 2).

The concern about the title of children's programmes (as there was similarly for children's radio programmes at this time) was symptomatic of the difficulty. Instead of seeing it as a result of the new competition from

16 In 1958 Owen Reed stated that he did 'not know whether the existence of the word 'children' in our daily title is a source of strength and pride or a damaging weakness in the eyes of the audience we are trying to attract' (2 June 1958, T16/45/2). However, by 1959 he stated that:

We must no longer plug 'children', which is a word to which most of our viewers are allergic, and which is a breeder of false attitudes, but think of them simply as unusually selective and appreciative human beings of limited and varying experience. This last point needs stressing. In aiming at this wide bracket we must never forget that many school-goers are just children. We must be the more careful about how we approach them, and not treat or greet any part of them in a way that lays them open to the jeers of older brothers and sisters. If we are to hold together the junior and senior halves of our audience we must continue to find an approach which will satisfy both without being offputting to either. That, and within each programme to be sure of our target, are the important things. (5 June 1959, T16/45/2)
commercial television, which undoubtedly had effects in intensifying concern and raising questions about the type of programmes shown, it is clear that children's broadcasters were preoccupied with a set of concerns about the administration of this audience. Children were both separated from adults and divided within themselves. The distribution of bodies was likewise arranged according to a specified logic of development. Programmes both addressed specific age-groups and also provided markers along a line of progression for those climbing up the 'rope-ladder', as Madden called it. The distribution of bodies within this temporal arrangement allowed the construction of specific audiences for television (e.g. the teenage audience and the pre-school audience). Foucault refers to the process in terms of individualisation. Such arrangements construct individuals. However, the problem attendant upon the construction of these new individualities was that they threatened the unity of the category of children's television (which addressed a unified child audience). 17

This configuration of practices was markedly different from those earlier practices concerning Children's Hour radio. Whereas the formation in the 1920s, 1930s and 1940s had conceived of the child audience as a family audience and as isomorphic with Children's Hour itself (inasmuch as children were not conceived as listening to programmes for adults), we now see the possibility of children being conceived as an audience in their own right (as distinct from the family audience) and as an audience who might possibly watch programmes other than those designed for them. In 1954 Freda Lingstrom had stated that children should only watch one hour of television a day (i.e. children's television). There was clearly an emerging concern that they might watch more than this. The distinction between the audience of children's television programmes and the child audience (who might watch any programme) made it possible for children's television viewing itself to become an object of government. In doing so it laid open the limits of scheduling as a technique of government.

In this document he also states that the overlap in viewing habits of older and younger children helps to bind this audience together as an audience. 17 I should also add here that the discursive construction of the teenage audience was obviously constituted both within and outside this specific set of problems. The concerns about the teenager more generally within the 1950s locate the problems I have outlined above within a particular discursive constellation, which has been analysed in terms of the question of youth subcultures (cf. Hall and Jefferson, 1976; Hebdige, 1979 and 1988).
Scheduling relied on an implied isomorphism between the address of a programme and the audience it delivers (i.e. a children's programme if addressed to a child audience will deliver that audience). The conception of children watching programmes other than those specifically designed for them required another form of intervention. These disciplinary techniques were much more extensive than simply the deployment of scheduling as a particular dividing practice. They reached out into the conduct of the family and into the home. Adams referred to the problem of how to 'restrain' children's television viewing and looked to the assistance of the parent:

Thus, restraint in viewing will be encouraged in the interests of programme quality, as well as in the interests of other pursuits and the demands of homework. It will take some time to make this policy effective; it will need the co-operation of parents, and consistency in planning over a period of time. (Adams, 1950, 86)

Likewise Lingstrom, in 1953, invoked the responsibilities of the parent:

This business of giving a salad to the 15-year-olds which is understandable by the five-year-olds is difficult. It is hard for older children to sit and watch a puppet, for example, put on for the very young. Parents should dissuade their children from looking at items which are too old for them. Children quickly tire of older programmes, and that is not good.

It would be a comfort to know that there is some selection at the other - parental - end. This is important because here in television we do not know what happens to a child when it sees a thing. We could only find that out by invading a man's home. (Lingstrom quoted in the Evening Standard, 9 October 1951)

Lingstrom makes clear in this quote that the limits of broadcasting as a disciplinary apparatus are set within the limits of liberalism. Although the broadcasters could invite the proper responses and responsibilities from parents, they could do nothing but ask. In the following section I look at the way children's television viewing is caught up within a set of concerns about the management of the home and then in the concluding section of the chapter I look at how a specific social scientific knowledge comes to play in this set of administrative practices.
The Art of Managing the Modern Home

Instead of looking at various statements concerning the art of managing the home and family as a separate discursive formation, I want to look at how they provide one of the conditions of existence of the child television audience. I want to consider the domestic and the familial, not as the context of the discourse of the child television audience, but as a set of adjacencies which help to make this audience intelligible. Such statements add a new texture to my discussion of television and the administration of domestic conduct.

In January 1945 an advertisement for Oxo beef stock appeared in Woman (see Appendix A). A family was pictured congregated around the hearth in the sitting room. The father was reading the daily newspaper from the light of a lamp above him. In another armchair opposite him and facing towards the fire was the mother and next to her, sitting on the arm, was the daughter. A clock over the mantlepiece marked the time as 20 minutes to 9 o'clock. A wireless set, probably bakerlite, sat on the sideboard. A tray of steaming hot Oxo drinks was placed on a small table. The room was dark and cold except for the light and heat of the fire. Outside of this visible clearing was darkness. We might presume that nobody ventured to the other rooms in the house, which were cold and dark through lack of central heating.

The picture was underlined by the copy:

"These simple things..." In the quiet of the evening, waiting perhaps for the nine o'clock news. All that is peaceful and restful is centred in the room, around the fireside. Such simple ordinary things - a thrilling book, a special chair, the favourite, homely nightcap - OXO. These are things that make up home. (Woman, 6 January 1945)

This advertisement is interesting, not because it depicts an image of the radio both forming and embedded within the routines of familial and domestic life, but also because it presents a nostalgic image of the past as a counterpoint to what came to be known as the reconstruction of the modern home (cf. Robertson, 1947).

Four years later, in 1949, in Woman magazine on the letters page, there appeared a hand-drawn picture of a woman turning on a wooden-encased upright television set and getting annoyed at seeing a blank screen.

Beneath the image were the words: 'If everything looks black, try writing
to us. A guinea-winning letter will brighten your outlook' (Woman, 12 November 1949). This configuration of images of television, woman (as mother and housewife) and visibility proliferated in women's magazines, newspapers and journals in the late 1940s and 1950s.

At that time there was an increasing number of images and statements concerning, or involving in some sense, television. Many of the early statements were concerned with the use of television as a way of sustaining friendships.18 Simultaneously there emerged a more popular discussion of television presenters and characters on television (both gossip and other information) and eventually in 1953 Woman had a television review section called 'On Your Home Screen'. In 1954 the television review column became more prominent. There were an increasing number of cartoons featuring a television set and of advertisements either for television sets or which used the television set as a selling point.19 There were also a

18 An article in Woman stated:

If you're lucky possessors of a television set, please don't be shy about inviting neighbours in this way. For those of us who haven't a set, an invitation to 'view' is a very special treat indeed. (Woman, 17 December 1949)

Likewise, in 1960 there was a letter on the 'Woman to Woman' letters page entitled 'Viewing Today' which stated that: 'one woman has a television set, and she allows the twenty-four children in the street to watch it. The editor responded by saying:

Many TV owners are as kind as your neighbour. We find it's up to the parents to guard against their children abusing the privilege. The card in the window is a good way of making sure the children don't call too often. Another 'system' is for the children's names to go on a rota so that they know in advance when their turn to view will come and they can look forward to their treat. (Woman, 31 January 1953)

During the Coronation in 1953 both Woman and Woman's Own contained special features on family and friends watching the event on television.

19 The first mention of television in Woman was in the form of an advertisement with a television set in it in 1949. There are a number of advertisements for polish referring to shine on the wooden-cased television set. One advertisement for Johnson's Pride wood polish has the caption: 'The TV is the one piece of furniture in a room you can't miss - because it's there for you to see' (Woman, 14 November 1953). There are also some for coffee. One advertisement for Nescafe shows a group of people sitting around a television set drinking coffee (Woman, 8 December 1951). One regular cartoon-strip entitled 'Wuff, Snuff and Tuff' in Woman (24 September 1949) told the story of the three small pups of the title being scared off a bone by a large ferocious dog. The three pups dash inside to take the magnifier off the television set (a frequent
significant number of articles (both features and regular columns), and responses in the letters page, which discussed the beneficial or harmful effects of television. Some referred to the possibility that the television set was, not simply a means of transmission, but also a means of surveillance. One set of articles were concerned with the parenting of children's television viewing and on the place of television within the administration of the home and family. The regular column 'Star Gossip' stated that the actor Van Heflin viewed television as a 'threat to children's health':

TV programmes are day-long in America, and he tells me that indiscriminate viewers let their children sit absorbed by the screen, when they should go out of doors enjoying fresh air and their own inventive games... Van talks as a father - his daughters Vara Gay, aged eight, and Kathleen Carol, aged five, looking-times rationed to two tea-sessions a week. And no viewing if punishment is necessary for naughtiness. (Woman, 19 April 1951)

This article, even though it presented Van Heflin as the 'good father', was addressed to a female readership and offered the readership an image of the 'good mother' who was aware of her responsibilities for her children's television viewing. Monica Dickens, a year earlier, in an article entitled 'Television - not for me!' in her regular column in Woman's Own, presented an image of the 'bad mother' and 'housewife'. She began by drawing a picture of Sweden as clean, well-ordered and without television. She then constructed a social geography within which television was located:

If you go into the most sordid slums of Chicago, seek out a tumbledown tenement building in a filthy alley, climb over the garbage pails to the top flat where poverty, drunkenness and squalor reign, you will find a frig. and a television set. (Dickens, 27 July 1950)

accompaniment of small screen sets). Standing behind the screen the pups look bigger and frighten away the larger dog, who drops his bone in the process.

She conjured up a nostalgic image of the past:

They have to make do with just the old-fashioned wireless or the cinema, or more antiquated still, they have to find their own amusements.

They have to play cards, or read, or knit, sew or talk, whereas we, who have magic screens in forty thousand of our homes, are outgrowing the need to amuse ourselves. (Dickens, 27 July 1950)

She started by saying:
The refrigerator and the television set were seen as symptomatic of urban deprivation and depravation. They were seen as signs of excessive ill-afforded spending and were viewed as being mistaken for 'the essentials of life'. She described television as being 'like an imperious queen' which 'claims your undivided attention' and whose effects would be all too apparent:

If they ever start having TV programmes all day long we might become a nation, not of housewives, but of sluts! I don't say we would, but we might.

Such an anxiety about the state of women's home was articulated with a concern about the state of their children:

And what might our children become? They might become a generation who couldn't read a book, or play games out of doors, or amuse themselves with carpentry or trains or butterflies, or the hundreds of hobbies with which a child can potter so happily. (Dickens, ibid)

And for Dickens, as for others, children's television viewing and the demise of earlier pastimes was articulated with a set of social concerns (ill health, intellectual development and learning, family life) and a set of experts (the doctor, the teacher and the sociologist). The image of woman as mother

Why don't I like it? Well, for one thing, I think it's a terrible extravagance to spend all that money on a glorified toy when you can't afford new shoes for the children, which is what does happen in a great many families. Especially in America. (Dickens, ibid)

22 She stated that:

To the family who struggles for existence there, they are the essentials of life. They are bought on the never-never, of course - apt nickname, because they're usually taken away in the end because the payments can't be kept up. (Dickens' ibid)

23 She particularly refers to romance and melodrama (what she calls 'second-rate and elderly film'):

You may turn on the set as you pass by sweeping the floor, just to see what's on. It's a film. He takes her in his arms. He's going to kiss her - no, she moves away. (Dickens' ibid)

24 Dickens stated that:
and housewife was underlined in a cartoon at the bottom of the page (see Appendix A). The woman was seated at the dining-room table with a meal laid out. The father, annoyed, stomped to the sitting room saying: 'If they can't eat when they're supposed to, we'll sell the television!' The second image was of the mother sat, head in hand, at the dining-room table alone. And the final image showed father and the two children watching a western. The mother was seated in the same room, head still in hand. The discussion of television in the women's magazines of the period rested upon a wider 'discursive constellation': the discourses of domestic architecture and design and the discourses of parenting and childcare. It is, I argue, only by connecting to this wider discursive constellation and to the wider configuration of governmental techniques that the discursive formation of the child audience was, and is, able to maintain its persistent grasp on everyday domestic and familial living.

At the end of 1947 only 34,000 television sets were in use. Only 0.2 per cent of families had sets in their homes. In 1948 the figure had risen to 134,000. In 1955 40 per cent of the population had a television and by 1963 89 per cent now had a television set. Unlike radio's troubled acceptance into the home, television's impact was more immediate. The television set was a signifier of modernity and its ownership signified, not just status among friends and relatives, but also the presence of the 'modern home' (cf. O'Sullivan, 1991). Although the design of the television set changed rapidly from the early bulky wooden and bakelite small-screened model of the 1940s and 1950s to the sleek streamlined metallic design of the late 1950s

---

25 John Comer states that in 1948 the number of licences had risen to 45,564 in a population of about 50 million. The price of a 'budget model' set was around £50. The average industrial wage was just under £7 a week (Corner, 1991, 3 and Briggs, 1979, 245).  
26 In 1955, however, only 5 per cent of the population with a set could receive two channels. In 1963 87 per cent could receive two channels (O'Sullivan, 1991, 161 and Briggs, 1979, 187 and 204).
and 1960s, its insertion into the home during that time signalled a wider set of changes. For example, its location within the home displaced the centrality of the hearth.\textsuperscript{27} An article on 'Fireplaces and Fireplacing' in \textit{Ideal Home} in 1949 declared:

\begin{displayquote}
To-day, when we introduce such benefits of scientific discovery as television into our sitting-rooms, we find ourselves faced with the problem of resolving a new duality of interest: the fireplace and the television set. (\textit{Ideal Home}, October 1949, 37)
\end{displayquote}

Instead of the warm glow of the flaming fire in the family's faces, there was now the steely grey flicker of the television's radiation.\textsuperscript{28} Its

\textsuperscript{27} The displacement in itself had deep resonances in terms of the connotations of the 'English home'. For example Davidoff et al state how the 'temple of the hearth' had become an evocative image in literature and house design and they quote \textit{Paved with Gold} (1858) by Augustus Mayhew:

\begin{quote}
Then as the dusk of evening sets in, and you can see in the squares and crescents the crimson flickering of the flames from the cosy sea-coal fires in the parlours, lighting up the windows like flashes of sheet lightening, the cold cheerless aspect of the streets without sets you thinking of the exquisite comfort of our English homes. (cited in Davidoff et al, 1976, 153)
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{28} The displacement of the hearth by the television set was, in part, dependent on the introduction, at a popular level, of central heating. Howard Robertson, in his short book \textit{Reconstruction and the Home}, stated that:

\begin{quote}
The fact is that houses designed without consideration of heat and light, natural and artificial, can never be proper homes; and that such consideration so properly affects the planning and structure from the outset that decisions thereon have a No. 1 priority. It is necessary to compare a modern open plan, based on the employment of central heating or air conditioning, with the cellular planning of the traditional home which depended on open fires, to realise that the technique of equipment influences design. The whole character of the lay-out is affected; and likewise the way of life within the dwelling. (Robertson, 1947, 18)
\end{quote}

An advertisement for central heating in \textit{Ideal Home} (February 1949) marks out this same transition from the old, dark and cold home with an open fire to the modern, light and warm home with central heating (see Appendix A). An image on the top right-hand side of the page portrayed a family doing different activities in different parts of the living room. Grandfather was reading in one corner; father in the other; mother and grandmother sat chatting; and the child played with his toys on the floor. The room was well-lit and everything was clearly visible. Underneath the image the copy read: 'No need to be left out in the cold where there is central heating. The entire room is
introduction into the home gave rise to a new set of domestic designs for television viewing.

Most of the day your set will sit lifeless in the room, so its looks are important. As the cabinet is bulky and creates special problems of accommodation, its position shouldn't be obtrusive. Your room must be re-arranged for its new function. (Home and Garden, Spring 1949)

Although the mass-market magazines, such as Woman and Woman's Own, did increasingly in the 1950s figure images of television sets in articles on design, the concern about television set design and the design of the living room for television viewing was mainly limited to magazines such as Ideal Home and Home and Garden, which had a predominantly middle- and upper-class readership. For example, in spring 1949 both Home and Garden and Ideal Home carried articles on the place of television within the home. 'Make Room for Television' (Home and Garden, Spring 1949) gave the prices for television sets, licence fee and fixed lenses (to enlarge the picture on small screens). It showed examples of different ways of placing the television set in different types of living room. 'Decision on Television' (Ideal Home, May 1949) was rather more technical and referred to cathode-ray tubes and aerials. However, both articles stressed that television need not be watched in a darkened room and even layed out the spatial arrangement of viewers in the room:

Low chairs are needed, four to twelve feet away. You need not sit in complete darkness when viewing. Many cabinets now on sale are pleasing in design, but if you can't find a set to harmonise with your room, you can build one into an existing piece of furniture, for some makers will sell the chassis without a cabinet. (Home and Garden, ibid)

warm and so are all the other rooms in the house.' On the left-hand side of the page was an image of a family huddled around the fire. The room was dark except for the glow of the fire. Grandfather and father were reading; mother and grandmother sat talking; but the child, not playing, was looking into the fire. The copy read: 'How different when you depend on a fire for warmth. Roasted toes perhaps - but shivers down your spine! And how you dread to leave the fireside to go to bed.'

30 The concern about watching in a darkened room was partly to do with the glare from the television screen.
In December 1950 *Home and Garden* published an article entitled 'Within Your Means' (subtitled 'An inexpensively furnished living room well designed to accommodate television') which presented a diagram of these spatial arrangements (see Appendix A).

The articulation of television and the modern home rested on a wider set of discourses concerned with domestic architecture and design. The postwar reconstruction of housing in Britain began in earnest with the publication of the Dudley Report in 1944. There were seen to be two main faults in pre-war council housing: lack of variety and lack of sufficient space for modern living. There was a shift away from the earlier design of popular housing: scullery, for washing dishes and clothes; living room/kitchen, in which meals were cooked and eaten; and the parlour/front room, in which the best furniture was kept and which was used only on special occasions (cf. Boys et al, 1984). Although the Dudley Report was 'working against the background of the 'thirties' (Ministry of Housing and Local Government, 1961, 1), architects and designers in the late 1940s were beginning to reconceptualise contemporary domestic living. Howard Robertson, in *Reconstruction and the Home*, declared that:

> The conception of living is in process of being closely scrutinized, and at times drastically revised. Introduction of improved mechanical services, obligatory stress on labour-saving, and an allround reduction in the size of dwellings have focussed attention on open planning and 'space-making' within a limited compass. More and more ingenuities go to compensate for less and less superfootage. (Robertson, 1947, 10)

31 1944 also saw the publication of the *Housing Manual*, which was one of a series of government design manuals. The manual incorporated a number of the recommendations of the Dudley Report. The Report was an element within the wider programme of postwar welfarism and reconstruction and there was tacit support from all parties on state-supported welfare, benefits, housing, education, national health service, full employment and a greater role of the State in economic and social management (cf. Hall, 1985). A major priority was housing and between 1945 and 1951 the Labour Government built approximately 900,000 houses, falling short of its target of 240,000 a year. The Conservative Government had promised 300,000 houses a year and in 1953 and 1954 they even exceeded their target (cf. Burnett, 1986, 286).

32 The Dudley Report did not prescribe a single plan but rather offered a choice of designs: a large living room/kitchen in which meals could be cooked and eaten; a large living room and a good sized kitchen; or a smaller living room and a large kitchen in which meals could be cooked and eaten.

33 The television can be seen, in this sense, as a 'space-making' solution to the problem of the 'small home' (cf. Spigel, 1992). Moores makes the claim that television...
The modern home was opened up to the outside world. It had larger windows. It was lighter. Bright colours were used in the decor. Furniture was made to look lighter in weight, thinner and lower to the ground. Different rooms were no longer distinct and separate from each other, but were made to merge into one another. The concept of 'open planning' was deployed in order to create, as *Ideal Home* referred to it, 'space through unity' (*Ideal Home*, April 1960).

and other technologies, such as satellite, display what Williams earlier referred to as 'mobile privatisation', namely the possibility of travelling to other places via television. Television is seen to be a space-making device through its construction of a virtual space which transcends the boundaries of the domestic and also of the national (Moores, 1992; Williams, 1974). However, whereas Moores draws upon Giddens (1990) for analysis of how this 'time-space convergence' is a feature of modernity, I locate the problem in terms of the disciplinary nature of the organisation of time and space within the home. Whereas Moores focusses on the ability to travel, I focus on the place from which we can imagine ourselves to be elsewhere, that is, on the conditions of possibility for this mobility, which lie in the positioning of the stationary individual at home.

34 Not everyone adhered to this new architecture of contemporary living. For example, Attfield cites the journal *Design* in 1957:

They fight shy of open-living... there is a strong tendency to shelter behind net curtains. Large windows are obscured by elaborate drapes and heavy pelmets, by dressing table mirrors and large settees. Corners are cut off by diagonally placed wardrobes and sideboards. By careful arranging and draping, the open plan houses are being closed up again, light rooms are darkened and a feeling of spaciousness is reduced to cosy clutter... in achieving cosiness they are completely at variance with the architect's achievements in giving them light and space. (Cited in Attfield, 1985, 219)

Attfield goes on to say that, in the pages of the *Harlow Citizen*, architects complained about 'windows heavily shrouded in net curtains' and tenants that 'privacy is one of the things held in low regard in the town from the planners' point of view' (Attfield, ibid). However, resistance to open planning took form within the oppositions of light/dark and space/clutter. The official discourse displayed a fear of the resistance to visibilisation and in many ways repeated the late 18th century fears to which Foucault refers:

... fears of darkened spaces, of the pall of gloom which prevents the full visibility of things, men and truths. It sought to break up the patches of darkness that blocked the light, eliminate the shadowy areas of society, demolish the unlit chambers where arbitrary political acts, monarchical caprice, religious superstitions, tyrannical and priestly plots, epidemics and the illusions of ignorance were fermented. (Foucault, 1980, 153)
The conceptualisation of the modern home broke away from the cellular
design which we might, to use Foucault, trace back to the 18th century:

The house remains until the eighteenth century an
undifferentiated space. There are rooms - one sleeps, eats
and receives visitors in them, it doesn't matter which.
Then gradually space becomes specified and functional...
The working class family is to be fixed; by assigning it a
living space with a room that serves as a kitchen and
dining room, a room for parents which is the place of
procreation, and a room for the children, one prescribes a
morality for the family... the little tactics of the habitat.
(Foucault, 1980, 148-9)

The increasing visibilisation of domestic space, although it shifted away
from the cellular ordering of rooms, in a sense, increased the intensity of
the mechanism of the cell. It focussed, now, on the individual and on
freedom within the home. For example, the Council of Industrial Design
journal Design stated in 1959:

Focus on space, a key word, space that gives freedom.
Destroy the distinction between rooms. The home is
subservient to life in the home. Banish the cold formality
of front parlours that attempt to impress callers - then
stand unused, to collect dust... Push back the wall, bring
the kitchen in, dissolve divisions that separate life into
compartments... Allow freedom to change and space to
move. (Cited in Attfield, 1985, 219)

Talk of freedom belied a greater intensification of these disciplinary
techniques, such that power worked through the freedom of individuals
rather than in opposition to them. For the Parker Morris Report of 1961,
the recent changes in contemporary life and the greater informality in
home life meant that the arrangement of domestic space needed to be
organised, not in terms of fixed cellular room divisions, but rather in terms
of the diverse functions and activities which might take place within the
home. This new domestic space, although it was more 'communal',
focussed on the different activities of individuals within the home.

35 See also Foucault, 1979.
36 The Report stated that:

At every stage in the life of the family the home has to provide for
an extremely wide range of activities; and even when bedrooms come
to be put to wider daytime and evening use, living areas in the
Family homes have to cater for a way of life that is much more complex than in smaller households. They have to accommodate individual and different group interests and activities involving any number, or all, of the family, with or without visitors; and the design must be such as to provide reasonable family life as part of a community of friends and relations. (Parker Morris, ibid, 8)

The problem, then, was to coordinate the spatial and temporal arrangements of the home. It was not simply a question of the separation of individuals through physically distinct cellular spaces, rather the physical design of the home needed to take account of the individual and collective use of different spaces at different times of the day. Space in the Home (Department of Environment, 1968) again intensified these mechanisms drawing up time/space diagrams, making the distinction between primary and secondary activities and conceptualising the development of family activities through a longer period of time (i.e. lifetime rather than simply daily time).38 This form of disciplinary arrangement (the breaking down of domestic activities into their temporal and spatial elements) was not a new technique and had been deployed as a form of domestic Taylorism in the earlier part of the century.39

37 The Parker Morris Report stated that 'family life is both more communal and individual' (ibid, 307).

38 The Report set out the space required for specific activities, such as housework, watching television, doing homework, washing in the morning and so on. These activities were then separated into primary activities, which involve several or all family members (such as watching television), and secondary activities (such as sewing or reading). Secondary activities could take place within the same space as primary activities, although some were more mutually exclusive (such as watching television and doing homework). The Report stated that:

No rigid demarcation line between the two can be drawn, and how the activities are fitted into available spaces, whether as primary or occasional, will depend very much on the way in which the total living space is divided up. But usually, certain activities take place mainly in a particular room or area where they can be treated as primary, and around them cluster a wide variety of activities which take place only occasionally. (Space in the Home, 1968, 3)

39 For example, Adrian Forty argues that:
Although architects, designers and journalists attempted to govern women's management of the home in terms of an increasing focus on the aesthetics of light and space, such that individuals could act freely within the family, there was a noticeable absence of expert opinion on children's television viewing in many of the women's magazines of the time. There was a significant amount of expert opinion from doctors, psychiatrists and psychologists regarding general parenting and childcare, but much of the discussion concerning television viewing in the late 1940s and 1950s focussed on the place of television within the family.  

It would be a mistake to conceive of this discursive formation as if it were somehow uniform, as if the readers simply repeated the arguments within the magazines. Monica Dickens' article 'Television - not for me!' 'brought a storm of protest from readers' and 'roughly, only one in every seven agreed with the views she expressed'. For example, Mrs Rostron from Mangotsfield argued that: '[t]elevision is no 'glorified toy', but an instrument of enormous possibilities for teaching young and old'. Mrs Boyes from Middlesex was adamant that '50,000 women have benefitted from the cookery demonstrations'. And F.J. Camm, Editor of *Practical Television*, strongly disagreed with Dickens stating that '[t]he arguments she adduces in support of these contentions are too specious to warrant special

... the breakdown of domestic tasks could lead to more efficient housework. Diagrams of movements in the kitchen, after the manner of F.W. Taylor's analyses of labour in the factory, indicated supposedly optimum kitchen layouts. The analogy between the home and the factory... was strengthened by frequent references to the kitchen as a workshop and to domestic appliances as tools. (Forty, 1986, 216-7)

40 For example, Monica Dickens, in an article entitled 'They're not fit to be mothers' argued that mental neglect was perhaps worse than physical neglect which may not always be the fault of the parents. The consequence of mental neglect was, according to Dickens, a society of 'lawlessness and a complete lack of moral discipline that grows rapidly into real vice'. She stated that:

Mental neglect is as bad as physical neglect, and there's a tragic lot of that, too, in Britain today, as shown in the increase in juvenile crime. (Dickens, 2 April 1948)

41 However, of the five letters which *Woman's Own* published, only three were in disagreement with Monica Dickens.
elaboration' and that television had contributed to the benefits of modern life. Nevertheless, there were those who supported Dickens' views. For example, Betty Dale from Leeds argued that:

Television is certainly a menace to family life. When friends come to see us, instead of a friendly chat or game of cards, we sit in silence in a darkened room. All companionship is lost. And Sunday tea-time, hitherto the pleasantest meal of the week, now has to be taken either impossibly early or late, and is, therefore, seldom enjoyed.

(Woman's Own, 7 September 1950)

These letters were, in many respects, typical of other responses in other magazines. Although there was much disagreement about the benefits or disadvantages of television, the various statements from readers and journalists circulated around a common set of concerns. The debates about television were embedded within concerns about the family in terms of its daily routines, habits, manners and intercommunication. In 1958 a letter from Mrs Lee in Everywoman stated:

Our three children, aged seven, ten and twelve, have developed such a passion for television that I can't get them either to do their school homework or to go to bed; and then, of course, it's one long struggle to get them up in the morning. (Everywoman, August 1958)

42 Camm stated that:

It is obvious that if Miss Dickens had her way the world would be without motor cars, trains, coaches, radio, aeroplanes, or any other of those links between the enlightened present and the abysmally ignorant past, which have made the world a pleasanter place in which to live... According to the Ministry of Health, we are a healthier and happier race, and radio and television have certainly contributed to that. On the score of education, radio and television have certainly contributed to that. On the score of education, radio and television have done more to enlighten the youth of this country than textbooks and homework. (Camm, 7 September 1950)

43 Some of these concerns were also found in relation to additional concerns about the changing nature of friendships. For example, W. Lewin from Liverpool, having visited a friend and watched television all evening, stated that '[i]t had been a pleasant evening, but oh! so unintelligent, so unstimulating and devastatingly passive'

(Woman's Own, 14 February 1952).
She then went on to describe the rows she had with her husband because he fails to be helpful. She refers to him as a 'TV fiend'.44 The insertion of television into the domestic conduct of the family and its potential to create or disrupt its internal harmony rested upon making mothers responsible: not simply in terms of banning television from the house, but in terms of forming their children into discriminate viewers. Jan Troke, in her regular column in *Everywoman*, stated that '[p]sychologists say that the right use of leisure turns on one thing, and one thing alone: discrimination' (*Everywoman*, September 1950).45 Likewise Monica Dickens, in an article entitled 'Every Parent's Dilemma', talked about television as one of the everyday responsibilities of parenting and specifically about the problem of letting children choose for themselves as part of their normal development. Reluctantly accepting the way in which '[f]or good or ill, it has become part of our national life' and accepting the fact that 'children are learning from it', she argued that '[i]t is up to the parents to decide whether what they learn from it shall be good or bad'.

It is their job to restrict viewing to reasonable hours and to insist that the set is left alone when there is something else to do, their job to prevent their children becoming glued to the screen. (Dickens, 9 January 1960)

She argued that, however much '[y]ou may hate Westerns and gangster plays as much as I do', 'to try to ban them only makes them more attractive'. Instead, she argued:

Teach them good taste. Teach them morals. Teach them to recognize the second-rate, and not to take seriously the cruder entertainment that is offered. (ibid)46

44 The Editor stated that she gets 'many letters from mothers with the same problem!' and that Mrs Lee should point out to her husband that 'the children are as much his responsibility as yours, and that sitting up in this way is bad both for their health and their progress at school' (*Everywoman*, August 1958).

45 Troke continued by saying that:

TV and the cinema have come to stay. How to use them to enrich young lives without letting them swamp young personalities is one of the problems of our changing world. (*Everywoman*, September 1950)

46 She continued by saying:

Let them watch television. Let them, as they reach each right age, cross the road, ride bicycles, travel alone in buses and trains, ride ponies, sail boats, dive off the high board.
Dickens argued that parents needed to train their children on how to avoid 'dangers', rather than overprotect them. As we shall see in the following section, the forming of the discriminate child was connected to a wider set of problems concerning the emotional and psychical economy of the family. In this section I have shown how the construction of the child television audience was embedded within a wider set of discourses concerning the management of home and family and secure those concerns of the broadcasters I described previously. However, the two sets of discourses, of broadcasting and of domestic and familial management, only become properly interdependent within the construction of the child audience within the discourse of psychology. In the following section I look at how the language of psychology provides a way of binding the art of broadcasting with the art of parenting.

The Social Survey and the Psychological Knowledge of the Child Audience

In the early 1950s the architecture of domestic television viewing was not simply conceived in terms of an aesthetics of the home, but also in terms of a medicalisation of that space. For example, doctors advised parents not to let their children sit too close ('sit about 6 to 10 feet away from the television screen') and to stare at the screen for too long ('glance round the room occasionally, as a change of focus rests the eyes'). They advised children to sit at eye level to the screen and never to view in darkness (due to the effect of the contrast between screen and room on eyesight). They also advised that the set be properly tuned-in ('otherwise the picture may be unsteady and distorted and this strains the eyes') (Vision, 1952). Likewise dentists complained about children watching while lying on the floor with head in hands as this was seen to cause 'malocclusion' or jaw displacement. 47

And if you are not prepared to teach them how to do these things wisely, safely and skilfully, then coddle them. Forbid them. Make sissies of them - and blame yourself when they get into real trouble later on because they can't stand on their own feet. (Dickens, 1960)

47 In 1950 George Barnes, Director of Television, stated in a document that he was worried about children's eyesight and suggested that children's television might be shortened to avoid this danger (27 November 1950, T16/68). Likewise an article in the
Although the medical discourses provided important coordinates for domestic viewing, they were soon superceded by a set of psychological discourses, formed primarily within the BBC and the academy, which mapped the temporal and spatial arrangements of domestic viewing in a more profound way. In 1936 the BBC set up the Listener Research Department and in 1939 it conducted a daily Survey of Listening. After Reith's resignation in 1938, Listener Research began to be taken more seriously under the new Director General, F.W. Ogilvie. However, as Briggs states, research was still 'experimental, lively but incomplete, and in places insecurely based' and the 'communication of research conclusions' was still a difficult process: 'policy-making still rested on many other criteria, and most people believed that it should continue to do so' (Briggs, 1965, 279).

Until this time the BBC had known its audience through Advisory Committees, programme correspondence and the personal knowledges and

*Journal of the American Medical Association* (1949), entitled 'TV and Eyestrain', stated that a large television was better than a small one, that the viewer should sit 10 feet or more away from the screen and should be perpendicular to the set. The *Birmingham Post* (1952) quoted Dr Wendell from the United States: 'half-an-hour a day of watching television is plenty for any growing children'. In 1957 Dr A.N. Griffith, Senior Medical Officer for Cardiff, produced a report on children's television viewing and eyestrain. He stated that children over the age of 10 and 11 were more likely to be prescribed glasses due to television viewing. Although he did not argue that there was a direct causal connection, he nevertheless recognised that there was a correlation and he recommended that parents become aware of the possible dangers and regulate their children's viewing accordingly (cf. VR/57/652). However, Himmelweit, in an article in the *British Medical Journal* (14 December 1957), argued that, while her findings did not exclude the possibility that children with defective eyesight may have eyestrain as a result of viewing, 'the number is not likely to be much larger than the number who do not view but who experience discomfort when exposed to other sources of eyestrain' (cf. VR/57/652). In September 1954 the BBC issued advice to children not to watch television with their head in their hands, following a warning from a dental association that this was liable to 'make their faces mishapen' (cf. The *Times*, 13 September 1954). Similar discourses were prevalent in the United States (cf. Spigel, 1992).

In 1935 Sir Stephen Tallents, who had previously been in charge of public relations at the Post Office, was appointed to the new BBC post of Controller of Public Relations. His Deputy was Patrick Ryan, who had worked with Tallents at the Empire Marketing Board. They both argued for systematic audience research and, although Reith disagreed, Robert Silvey, who had previously been at the London Press Exchange (one of the larger British advertising agents), was appointed to the Head of the new Listener Research Department.

The lower age limit of the Survey of Listening was 16. In 1951 it included television viewing.
contacts of the programme makers.\textsuperscript{49} The Ullswater Committee Report stressed the importance of Advisory Committees as a means of representing the 'views of the general public as well as of experts in each category of broadcast subject' (1936, 16).\textsuperscript{50} However, by 1951 the Beveridge Committee Report on Broadcasting stressed the importance of the 'systematic study of audiences' and identified it as one of the responsibilities of the broadcaster.\textsuperscript{51} Much of the research, in which the Listener Research Department (later renamed the Audience Research Department in 1950) was engaged, was concerned with providing 'measurements of the extent to

\textsuperscript{49} Silvey, however, stated that 'by the time I joined the BBC its senior officials at least were treating programme correspondence, as a reflection of listener opinion, with a long spoon' (Silvey, 1974, 31).

\textsuperscript{50} The Committee stated that:

\begin{quote}
We are confident that among public-spirited people ways and means will be found for securing a fully representative balance of opinion and for expressing it in helpful and constructive advice; and with this object in view we recommend that the membership of the Advisory Committees should be as comprehensive and varied as possible. (Ullswater Committee Report, 1936, 17)
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{51} The Beveridge Report stated that:

\begin{quote}
Systematic study of audiences is no less important where broadcasting is on a public service basis as in Britain. The object of broadcasting is to be heard. Those who organise broadcasting should be interested in knowing both by how many people any particular broadcast has been heard and how its has affected the hearers. Broadcasting authorities cannot serve the public without studying it; they must study deliberately if they have no market quotations as automatic indicators of public feeling. (Beveridge Committee Report, 1951, 56)
\end{quote}

The study of the audience was seen as a way of recasting the responsibilities of the broadcaster which had been established in the interwar period. The Report stated that:

\begin{quote}
We accept this whole-heartedly on its negative side: broadcasting should not be governed automatically by regard to what will please the listeners. But from this negative it is necessary to proceed to further questions. First, how shall programmes be governed positively? The Corporation speaks of a 'responsible decision'. To whom is the broadcaster responsible? If it is only to his own conscience, the decision might not better be described as irresponsible. Second, though the purpose of broadcasting is not to please as many listeners as possible, broadcasting without listeners has no purpose at all... If Audience Research is worth doing at all, it is worth doing well. And it must be done. For broadcasting without study of the audience is dull dictation; it is not responsible public service. (ibid, 59-60)
\end{quote}
which the public has listened to, (or viewed), the programmes which have
been broadcast, and the extent to which those broadcasts have pleased
them' (Silvey, 13th April 1950, 1, R9/20/4).52 Audience measurement and
appreciation indices were developed alongside other risk-reducing
strategies, including fixed formats and genres and weekly scheduling. They
were, as Ien Ang has aptly described them, 'aimed at the codification,
routinization and synchronization of the audiences' viewing practices, to
make them less capricious and more predictable' (Ang, 1991, 19). Although
this type of research took up the bulk of the activities of the Department,
other research was carried out in-house or commissioned by the BBC. For
example, G. Masterton, from the University of Nottingham, carried out
research into the effects of radio listening in 1951. Likewise, A.J. Laird,
from the Department of Psychology at the University of Aberdeen,
presented a report on the effects of radio broadcasting. Both were very
similar, using empirical data from listeners' letters, which were then
grouped into different types of effects. Much of the material was similar to
the earlier research by Jennings and Gill (1939) and surveyed the way in
which radio listening was bound up within a more complex set of domestic
and social activities.53

In the 1950s the Audience Research Department continued its investigation
into what Silvey called 'the social effects of broadcasting' as distinct from
'broadcasting-centred' research (Silvey, 1974, 173), and in 1949, with an
annual grant of £10,000, it set up a Projects and Development Section which
as Silvey stated would call upon the disciplines of statistics and psychology

52 In 1950 it was suggested that 'communication indices' be added to the bread and
butter of daily audience research, alongside audience measurement and appreciation
indices. The aim was to discover whether or not listeners and viewers actually
understood what they were listening to or watching. This idea was never taken up (cf.
Silvey, 1950, 2, R9/20/4).
53 For example, Laird stated that certain programmes such as *Mrs Dale's Diary*,
*Woman's Hour*, and *Listen with Mother* have a 'stop everything quality'.

In many families, meals apparently begin and end as programmes
begin and end; hitherto unpunctual husbands and children arrive
like clockwork on certain evenings to hear favourite programmes;
'at home' and 'not at home' evenings conveniently fall into line with
listening preferences, village shops 'empty regularly' at 4.10pm,
e tc. It would indeed seem that many listeners' lives are, to use a
phrase employed on more than one occasion, 'regulated by radio'.
(Laird, 1951, 4, R9/20/4)
(ibid, 137). Out of this new project emerged the Advisory Committee of Psychologists. With the assistance of Sir Cyril Burt, from University College, London, Silvey drew up a list of prominent psychologists to assist the Department. It included: Sir Cyril Burt, Professor D.W. Harding (Bedford College, London), Professor Rex Knight (University of Aberdeen), Dr R.H. Thouless (a private practitioner), Professor P.E. Vernon (Institute of Education, London), Professor W.J.H. Sprott (University of Nottingham) and its Chairman, Dr Alec Rodger (Secretary of the British Psychological Society).\(^54\) It also included BBC staff: Robert Silvey, W.A. Belson (a psychologist who later became Head of Survey Research at the London School of Economics), and B.P. Emmett (a statistician). Much of the work of the Advisory Committee of Psychologists was, as its title suggests, advisory. It advised the Audience Research Department primarily on methods of audience measurement and appreciation. It was not until 1953 that it first considered the question of children's television and it was not until 1960 that the daily Survey of Listening and Viewing lowered the adult age range down to 15 and was supplemented by 300 five to seven year olds, 400 eight to eleven year olds and 300 twelve to fourteen year olds.\(^55\)

In January 1953, at the request of Freda Lingstrom, the Advisory Committee of Psychologists was invited to discuss 'the fears of children up to the age of seven' and 'in view of public criticism, if Westerns are damaging to children's morals' (7, R9/20/4).\(^56\) The Committee discussed the 'standard fears of children'.\(^57\) Thouless argued that a child would not be harmed 'so

---

\(^54\) Professor Knight had worked in the War Office during the war to develop better methods of officer selection. Professor Vernon was an expert on intelligence tests, as, of course, was Burt.

\(^55\) Emmett had argued that interviewing children was in many ways easier than interviewing adults. However, he stated that parental help would be required with the youngest children and that a specially trained group of women interviewers, employing different techniques of sample selection, would also be needed (cf. Silvey, 1974, 151-2).

\(^56\) I discuss the concern over the Western at greater length in Chapter 5.

\(^57\) The minutes of the meeting stated that:

The following standard fears of children were suggested by members of the panel: (i) malevolent old women (Thouless); (ii) dangerous situations and enclosed spaces (Thouless); Burt suggested, in particular, 'unfinished' dangerous situations; (iii) inanimate objects becoming animate and hostile (Thouless); (iv) objects approaching the television camera, and thus increasing in apparent size (Thouless); close-ups of the human face, particularly teeth (H.A.R.). (5 January 1953, 7, R9/20/4)
long as he is only frightened on the conscious level, but where unconscious fears are aroused, nightmares are a likely result'. Vernon added that a situation is frightening if 'the child identifies himself with the person(s) involved'. And in relation to the Western, Thouless stated that they were 'so fantastic and unusual as to create 'distance' between such happenings and the experience of ordinary living' and as a result 'they did not create a code of morals for the child'.

Only where the broadcast situation was similar to the surrounding life of the child, was genuine fear likely to be aroused or identification with the actions and moral standards of the subject likely. (5 January 1953, 7, R9/20/4)

The views expressed were very much informed opinions not based on any specific research and, although the Committee noted the lack of existing research, it made no appeal for research to be carried out in this area.

Even though Silvey stated, in relation to the inclusion of children within the daily Survey of Listening and Viewing, that 'after the war, and even more after the revival of television, the exclusion of children came to be seen as not only illogical but increasingly intolerable' (Silvey, 1974, 151), it is noticeable how little concern there was about children's television viewing in the early 1950s. It is perhaps not surprising that the advice of the Advisory Committee of Psychologists was not sought when the Children's Programmes (Television) Department initiated its own survey into the child audience in 1952. The Commissioned Report on Children's Television emerged out of the recommendations of the Beveridge Report, which argued that there needed to be more outside expert opinion utilised in the making and planning of programmes. The commissioned report was based on the views of a panel who were required to watch children's television programmes from 18 May to the 30 June 1952.58 The panel of

58 The panel included: Mary Fields, Children's Film Foundation; Jean Irwin, Art Organiser, Department of Education, Glasgow University, who ran classes for children every Saturday; Mr A.J. Jenkinson, Principal of Bolton Technical College, who conducted an inquiry into what children read; Caryl Jenner, who ran a mobile theatre which visited schools; Miriam Langdon, Assistant Head of Department of Child Development at the Institute of Education, University of London; Boyd Neel, who appeared in a children's television music programme and who visited schools; Lady Pakenham, mother of eight children; and Evelyn Tillyard, 'a village housewife who lets all the children of the village come to see her television set'. The panel was suggested
eight individuals watched in their own homes, wrote individual reports and then met to discuss the issues and to write the final report.\textsuperscript{59} The report was written as a set of fragmentary comments. And as yet the psychologist and psychological knowledge of the child audience had not come to prevail as the primary authority in this discursive formation. For example, on the one hand the report reaffirmed earlier aesthetic and moral discourses on the child audience:

> While recognising that television is the youngest of the arts and still in its experimental stage, we feel that its aims should be wide and its sights set high; not merely to promote 'active' viewing but to widen the children's experience and appreciation of all forms of art and culture, and help them develop into civilised adults. It should introduce the child to good home conditions, good designs and decoration, beauty in every-day life. This is already being done to a certain extent, but we feel that it could be done even more effectively. (Jenkinson Report, 1952, 1)

On the other hand, the report employed a language of the psychology of the child:

> Programmes about the real world can also help to satisfy the child's growing need to differentiate clearly between the world of reality and of phantasy... From an educational angle the drawing of this distinction is also important. Children's awareness of truth, powers of verification, sense of security in their own experience are all closely bound up with their awareness of an inner and outer reality. It therefore seems important on all counts that adults should give them full support in this growing-point of their developing personalities. (ibid, 5-6)

It is possible to see, from the report itself and from the minutes of the meetings, how there were quite distinct 'authorities of limitation', which were negotiated and contested within the dynamics of the group. For example, Miriam Langdon, the developmental psychologist, although

---

\textsuperscript{59} The panel was chosen from those who had a knowledge of and contact with children, rather than an expertise in television or the child television audience. Some members even needed to be provided with television sets. I refer to the report as the Jenkinson Report after its chairman.

by Freda Lingstrom and originally contained two psychologists. However, Cecil McGivern, Controller of Television Programmes, stated that the original list demonstrated 'too much of a sociological and educational approach' (Lingstrom, T16/46).
profusive and authoritative in her writing was circumspect and almost absent from much of the discussion. When she did speak, her comments were often ignored or circumvented. In a discussion about children being frightened by television programmes, Langdon said, 'You get a strange emotional expression set up, and it is awfully difficult to make any general statement about how they react to these things. I think a lot depends on the adult's make-up - as was seen in the air raids'. Langdon's professional expertise was politely dismissed by Fields, who replied, 'This may be something for the psychologist - I don't know' and she continued, 'but I should think it was the more abnormal children who are more easily frightened. But there is no doubt that some groups enjoy that sort of thing to no end'. This marginalisation of the expertise of the psychologist was clearly expressed in the conclusion of the report, which stated that there was a need for the BBC Children's Programmes (Television) Department to form contacts, not with psychologists and educationalists, who were not even mentioned, but with those involved in children's radio, theatre, music, art, film and libraries (ibid, 22).

The psychological knowledge of the child television audience was uneven in its deployment within different sites of discursive production. However, over the next few years this was to change. In July 1953 the Advisory Committee of Psychologists proposed to initiate a detailed survey of the effect of television on children. In 1954 the Nuffield Foundation was approached to fund the survey and in 1958 Hilde Himmelweit and her fellow social psychologists from the London School of Economics published *Television and the Child*, subtitled *An empirical study into the effect of television on the young*.60 There had been research into the child audience in the United States in the early 1950s and research into the use of television by adolescents in Britain, but this was the first major piece of research into children's television viewing, not only within Britain but

---

60 The research was jointly authored by A.N. Oppenheim and Pamela Vince from the London School of Economics, in collaboration with D. Blumenthal, E.W. Croft-White, A.G. Maclaine, M. Newell, N.A. Standen and J. Wheldon. It was funded by The Nuffield Foundation and was under the 'guidance and support of a strong advisory committee' which included Sir Hector Hetherington (Chairman), Leslie Farrer-Brown (Vice-Chairman), J.G. Dent, Professor G.C. Drew, Professor M.G. Kendall, Professor A.R. Knight, Miss J.M. Morrell, Professor P.E. Vernon, Professor J.Z. Young, J.E. Morpurgo (Secretary 1954-5) and J.C. Beavan (Secretary 1955-8).
across the globe. It was closely followed by major studies in the United States (Schramm et al, 1961), Japan (Furu, 1962), and Australia (Campbell, 1962). As a form of social enquiry the research was not in itself interesting. It continued the protocols of the social survey into the realm of children's television viewing, but it did not offer any novel ways of researching this audience. However, taken as a particular social document, it provided an exemplary account of a new set of intermeshing knowledges of the child audience, recoding the responsibilities of the broadcaster and bringing to the fore the responsibilities of the parent. The fact that there had been a number of social surveys concerning radio listening, following Jennings and Gill (1939), and that similar results had been discovered indicates that the introduction of television cannot itself account for the shift. The Jennings and Gill study listed its contents as: social changes in the twentieth century, the effects of broadcasting on the individual (extension of field of interests, effects on critical faculties, effects on creative faculties, effects on social habits), effects on family life, effects on the coming generation and effects on attitude to special interests. The Himmelweit study listed its contents as: the child audience, reactions to conflict, crime and violence on television, effects on values and outlook, effects on knowledge and school performance, effects on leisure and interests and other effects (effects on eyesight and night rest, television and the family and the television addict). The similarities are obvious and yet the last item in the Himmelweit research, tucked away in a small corner, is an item which holds the key to understanding the introduction of a psychological knowledge of the child audience within the mapping of the population through the social survey. The complex of discourses which surrounded the figure of the television addict provided a way of making intelligible the discursive formation of the child television audience and the way this discourse was caught up in a web of disciplinary techniques.

For Himmelweit children's television viewing was not linked to any notion of passivity: 'there is no evidence whatsoever that makes television passive; viewers are as active, independent, and imaginative as controls' (ibid, 365). Instead of the opposition between active and passive viewers, an opposition

61 For example, in the United States Eleanor Maccoby had carried out small scale surveys into school children's viewing (Maccoby, 1951 and 1954) and in Britain M. Gordon had published a Report on a Survey by the Coventry University Tutorial Class on the Adolescent and Television (1951).
which is readily banded around in contemporary discourses, Himmelweit's analysis rested upon an opposition between discriminate viewing and excessive consumption. I have already referred to the pedagogic imperative to produce discriminate child viewers as a way of mediating freedom and choice in my discussion of the practices of parenting in the previous section. However, this concern was also prevalent in educational discourses. For example, both the Crowther Report (1959) and the Newsom Report (1963) referred to the need for teachers to teach children how to be discriminate and critical consumers of the mass media. Again the imperative was predicated upon a need to regulate the relationship between freedom and choice in an age where it was perceived that the old authorities of 'home town, county, church and father's political party' had given way to the influence of 'public opinion' (Crowther, 1959, 43). The problem was that children and teenagers were not 'thinking for themselves' and the task of the teacher, and others, was to form within these individuals the capacity to make critical judgements: to help children govern themselves. Although the specific mechanisms deployed within

62 In Chapter 4 of the Crowther Report, entitled 'Changing Social Needs' there was a discussion of what it saw as the two main forces which were 'especially important for their impact on teen-agers and for the way in which they define some of the objectives of educational policy'. These forces were: firstly, the 'emancipation or isolation of the individual' and the 'rejection of traditional authority'; and secondly, 'the conquest of the field of communications by the mass production techniques which were first applied to the manufacture of goods' (ibid, 36). The Report stated that:

Young people enjoy a much greater freedom to live their own lives without adult supervision, and to meet and spend their time together as they like without censure and without restraints other than those which their own individual taste or conviction imposes. (Crowther Report, 1959, 37)

The Report noted that there had been a shift away from 'discipline by order' to 'self-discipline'.

63 The Crowther Report stated that:

Of all age-groups, the teenagers are the most exposed to the impact of the mass media of communication. At school, they had the help of educational adults to enable them to distinguish and to criticise; to master the suggestive and imaginative material put before them in a never-ending stream, and not to be mastered by it. As adults, they can hope to acquire a sufficient knowledge of life, a certain mastery in the art of running a home and earning a living, which will give them a touchstone for the vicarious experiences they get from screen or printed page. Most teenagers have neither the one safeguard nor the other. (ibid, 43)
the educational apparatus are beyond the boundaries of this thesis, inasmuch as they function within a quite separate governmental formation, it is nevertheless clear that educational practices provide one of the conditions of existence of the discursive formation of the child audience, inasmuch as educational authorities legitimate a particular forming of the child viewer within the home.

The 'television addict' was formed as a particular pathology constituted within the wider axis of discriminative/indiscriminative viewing. The Nuffield Report initially identified the television addict as a 'heavy viewer', a product of a specific set of statistical techniques. In so doing it aligned the discourse of the child audience with a longer history of statistics as a particular technique of government. The deployment of statistics as a form of science of state dated back to the middle of the eighteenth century and

The Report recognised the importance of the media in enlarging 'the imagination' and 'the horizons of millions'. But it also recognised that they needed to be 'treated with the discrimination that only education can give'. The Report urged 'those who wield such great power to use it responsibly' and it rallied those within education to offer 'some counter-balancing assistance' (ibid, 44). Likewise the Newsom Report talked about the need to offer 'some counter-balancing assistance'.

We need to train children to look critically and discriminate between what is good and bad in what they see. They must learn to realise that many makers of films and of television programmes present false or distorted views of people, relationships, and experience in general, besides producing much trivial and worthless stuff made according to stock patterns. (Newsom, 1963, 156)

The Newsom Report identified the problem, not simply with television and the mass media, but with 'a very large field of popular culture' (ibid, 74).

64 The group designated as addicts were 'the one-third of each age group who spent the longest time viewing' (ibid, 385). This was a purely arbitrary designation. Himmelweit stated that:

The point beyond which behaviour is considered excessive is generally fixed arbitrarily (for example, the amount of drink someone must consume to be described as a heavy drinker) and is selected as a compromise between conflicting considerations: the contrast between this group and the rest must be sharpened, which means fixing the point as far away from the average as possible; yet the group must contain sufficient numbers to permit statistical analysis. (ibid, 385)
more recently to Galton's invention of the 'normal curve' as a statistical technique for measuring normality in the late nineteenth century. This technique rendered the child viewing population calculable and governable. This particular form of government produced the television addict alongside other social problems within a specific moral topography of psychological instability, family disharmony, delinquency and crime.

The addict was classified in terms of the biological factors of age, sex and intelligence, and the sociological factors of education and class. Of these, intelligence and class were centrally important. The survey stated that among ten to eleven year olds 36 percent of heavy viewers had IQs of below 100. Among thirteen to fourteen year olds the number was 50 percent. And while class was not seen to play an important role in the older age group, it was seen as significant in the younger age group. The differential importance of class in the figures is seen as being due to the way in which 'the closer control exercised by middle-class parents diminishes when children reach early adolescence' (ibid, 386). These different factors of analysis take on their strategic importance when they are connected to the specification of the television addict as a type of personality. Himmelweit defined the television addict in the following way:

65 Firstly, statistics enabled what Rose refers to as 'the unblocking of the new art of government', that is a shift away from government as oeconomy, which conceived of the mechanisms of government in terms of acts of a sovereign-like statesman and its object of government in terms of the model of the family (Rose, 1985, 42). It allowed a shift towards a notion of government of the population through the family. As Foucault states: 'statistics, in that it makes it possible to quantify the phenomena specific to population, also shows that this specificity is irreducible to the dimension of the family' (Foucault, 1991, 99). Policing of the population was concerned with the health, longevity and wealth of the population. But it was also conceived in relation to the problem of pauperism and provided 'a systematic mode of conceptualisation of the social problem' in terms of 'the danger of urban degeneracy, the key role of casual labour, the rate of reproduction of unemployables and its consequences' (Rose, op. cit., 47). The discursive formation of the child audience was to add children's domestic television viewing to this list. Secondly, although Galton's invention of the 'normal curve' was framed within the field of eugenics, its invention, which allowed the formulation of a systematic relationship between the terms population, norm, individual and deviation (Rose, ibid, 69), was deployed, as we can clearly see, more widely across the field of the social. It was the deployment of statistical knowledge that, Rose argues, made possible the psychology of the individual.

66 In the older age group 36 percent of middle-class and 31 percent of working-class children were identified as addicts. In the younger age group the figure was 25 percent of middle-class children and 37 percent of working-class children (Himmelweit, 1958, 386).
... an addict type emerged who is not exclusive to television; his emotional insecurity and maladjustment seem to impel him towards excessive consumption of any available mass medium. If television is available to such a child, he will view excessively; if not, he will go very often to the cinema, listen a great deal to the radio, or become a heavy reader of comics (but not books). Such children were characterised by lack of security, by being ill at ease with other children. Their teachers often described them as shy and retiring. (Himmelweit, 1958, 29)

The addict was constituted in relation to a set of discourses concerning the emotional economy of the family. These discourses, as Rose argues, were formed in the 1920s and 1930s with the emergence of 'new psychology' and were, in turn, constituted within a longer genealogy of the invention of psychology as a particular governmental technology. The 'socially adjusted' child was 'the natural outcome of the child's development and the normal outcome of family life'. The 'normal family', as Rose puts it, 'could now be specified in psychological terms' (Rose, 1989, 155). Likewise, Rose states that:

But if the family produced conflicts in wishes or emotions, denied them expression, associated them with unpleasant feelings, or reacted in terms of their own fears, hopes, desires, or disappointments to the child's feelings, what would be produced would be maladjustment. And maladjustment, from bed-wetting to delinquency, had become a sign of something wrong in the emotional economy of the family. (ibid, 155)

In the Nuffield Report children's television viewing was clearly added to this list of pathologies. Whereas children's listening was framed in terms of training and good moral influences, children's domestic television viewing was conceived as a element within the dynamics of intra-familial emotions, wishes and expressions. The television addict 'turns to viewing because of the kind of person he is, and viewing in turn reduces his feeling of isolation and insecurity by giving him imaginary companionship and satisfying his need for vicarious excitement' (Himmelweie, 1958, 395). The types of programmes an addict liked were seen to be the same as those within his/her age group 'except that he enjoyed plays especially family serials, adventure, and mystery - plays which permit identification with the type of active person he would like to be, or with the happy family of
which he would like to be a member' (ibid, 29, 390 and 395).\textsuperscript{67} The child was seen to develop an emotional investment with television in response to the lack of emotional support and security provided within the 'real life' of the family. In place of the image of television as providing children with a 'window on the world' and an extension of citizenship, which, as we have seen, was presented across a number of institutional sites, this discourse presented an image of the child viewer as an 'introvert' who turns to television to escape from 'reality' and the duties of public life. Such an image, as we can see from an article in \textit{The New Statesman and Nation} by Richard Strout in 1949, had been in circulation prior to the publication of the Report. Strout pictured television as bringing the world into the home. He presented an image of television viewing as passifying and breaking down communality. Strout stated that:

\begin{quote}
The effect of this illusion is spectacular, and upon children it acts like a drug. I have seen a gang of noisy unmanageable boys huddle before a set for hours, hardly speaking. Is this a good or a natural thing? (Strout, 1949, 553)
\end{quote}

Instead of locating the image of television-as-a-drug as discursively distinct from Himmelweit's concern with the uses of television, it is clear that the image is produced within the same discursive formation. And, whereas other discourses of the popular were concerned about the production of new forms of youth \textit{community} (for example, in relation to the concern about youth subcultures, cf. Hall and Jefferson, 1979 and Hebdige, 1976 and 1988), the discourse of the child television audience pathologised the child's \textit{retreat} from public life. Unlike the discursive formation of the child audience in the 1920s, which presented the overcrowding and rowdiness of working-class families as a problem, this discourse focussed on the problem of the withdrawal to, what we might call, the interior space of the mind.

The introduction of the expertise and language of the psychologist reformed the relationship between the public space of broadcasting and its affinity to the democratic life of the population and constituted the relationship in terms of the social problems of delinquency, familial

\textsuperscript{67} Similar findings were made in the United States (cf. Schramm et al, 1961).
disharmony, crime and social decline. The postwar period saw a continuation of the visibilisation of social and cultural life, and in the late 1940s and 1950s, the process was intensified in relation to domestic and familial conduct. The proliferation of images of light, spacious, and yet small, homes were now reconstrued within a discourse of the psychology of children's television viewing and the (dis)harmony of the family. The aesthetics of domestic space and the medical discourse of viewing posture and position were rearticulated within an architecture of the psychology of children's viewing. The addict not only shied away from other children and public life, but also watched within a womb of darkness. Richard Strout, in his article 'Every Cellar a Cinema', declared of his own family that:

68 It should be noted at this point that the concern with the domesticity of television viewing was the result of other concerns about the cultural monopoly of the BBC. For example, the concern to produce a public space of broadcasting in the late 1940s led to the argument that television should be shown in cinema theatres (cf. Buscombe, 1991). The Beveridge Report on broadcasting details the arguments between the cinema industry and the BBC over the nature of television as a 'public' medium. The Director General of the BBC, Sir William Haley, in the BBC Quarterly, asserted that television broadcasting was in many ways similar to radio broadcasting:

When it is possible every evening for every citizen in this country not only to hear but to see what has been happening in the world that day; when the great events of nations and in the international field can be remotely 'attended' by the inhabitants of almost every town and village; when the colour, the excitement, the variety, and the worthwhileness of everyday life can be communicated to the richest, the poorest, the loneliest and the most gregarious; when harmony, design and grace can be visually as well as audibly taken into every home; then there must surely be something added which, working with all the other beneficial influences within the community, will have the capacity to make for a broader vision and a fuller life. (Haley, 1949 quoted in Beveridge, 1951, 85)

The Beveridge Report agreed with this formulation and, although it noted the differences between listening and viewing, such that the dangers of 'passive' television viewing were seen to feed into the fears of 'totalitarian' misrule in the Cold War climate (Beveridge, 1951, 75 and 86-7), stated that '[b]roadcasting - communication to the public in their homes - is basically the same kind of service and should have similar aims whether it uses the medium of sound only or combines vision with sound' (ibid, 86). In these arguments the earlier formation of the public space of broadcasting within the terms of the aesthetic and moral language of citizenship was deployed by the BBC as a result of certain strategic institutional interests (i.e. it wanted to maintain its cultural monopoly). However, there were, as I have described above, more strategic shifts in terms of the government of the domestic and the familial which account for the argument of television being located within the home.
The children dash in every evening for permission to see "Howdy-Doody" at a neighbour's before dinner. Squatting there in the darkness will be a dozen watching a television marionette show. Other shows follow. The children are dragged away by brute strength. A recent *New Yorker* cartoon puts the point: "Remember the good old days," a wife says to her husband with a gesture at the crowd round the television set, "when we didn't know where they were?" (Strout, 1949, 552)

There is an obvious play here between the darkness of the viewing space and the increased visibility of children for the parent. Himmelweit argued that 'more addicts than others watched (and would like to watch) in the dark, duplicating at home the setting of the cinema in which familiar surroundings are obscured. (Himmelweit, 1958, 391). The isolated child, the insecure child, the delinquent child, the maladjusted child and the 'dull' child were seen to congregate silently around the television set in darkness.

However, it was not that television produced delinquent children (for example, through the effects of violent television images), or any other of these 'pathologies', rather the psychologisation of children's viewing made possible a whole infrastructure of problems and concerns through which familial and domestic conduct could be managed. This was a more insidious manoeuvre. As Himmelweit stated '[t]he solution of the problem is not primarily to restrict children's viewing, but to attack the various underlying causes' (Himmelweit, 1958, 396). Television viewing acted as a 'barometer', to use Himmelweit's term, of the insecurity of the child.

A reduction in the amount a child addict views is likely to be a sign that his personal relations have improved; an increase may well reflect tension and anxiety. Viewing, it would appear, might well serve as a barometer to indicate the extent to which the child's life is satisfactory, provided it is considered in relation to the child's age, intellectual calibre, and background. (ibid, 396)

Whereas the concern with the causal connection between television content and children's attitudes and behaviour was strategic in the government of television content, the discourse which I have outlined above was able to shape familial and domestic conduct as a particular area of intervention. This manoeuvre was much more insidious because it connected concerns about television viewing to a wider set of social
problems and forms of intervention. If television itself was simply to blame for some social problems, then the solution would simply be to regulate television and not the conduct of individuals.

The Nuffield Report had a major impact upon the broadcasting institutions and the press at the time. It was reported in the late 1950s alongside various other reports and pieces of research concerning children and television. An analysis of these discussions allows me to display more clearly how the discourse of the child television audience was formed in relation to two strategic objectives of making middle-class parents conscious of their responsibilities and of making broadcasters assume responsibility for the irresponsibilities of working-class parents. The Nuffield Report was keen to stress that it found no evidence to support the view that supervision of children's viewing was greater in middle-class than in working-class homes (Himmelweit, 1958, 44). However, despite protestations, class was clearly central to the formulation of its knowledge of children's television viewing. The Report stated that:

Parent viewers have a vested interest in presenting television as something of a benefactor, and as a result, especially in working-class families, it tends to be regarded in an uncritical manner. (ibid, 379)

The Report then included an example of a working family in which television provided a common point of interest and conversation and in the same paragraph provided another example of a mother who kept 'her baby quiet by holding it up to look at television' (ibid, 380). However, only two pages later it talked about how middle-class parents 'pay more attention than working-class parents to [the] potential uses of television'. These uses included young boys making things by hand with their fathers and girls

69 Of these the most significant and widely reported in Britain were: Mark Abrahms' research on the child television audience for the BBC Audience Research Department (R9/10/2, 1955); the ITA Report on Parents, Children and Television, 1958; the ITA/BBC O'Connor Committee Report, 1960; the Knight Committee Report on television and the family, 1960; and the Pilkington Report on broadcasting, 1962. There was also a report conducted for the Council for Children's Welfare, 1958 (cf. Blishen, 1958 and Birk, 1957).

70 In traditional histories of research on children and television Himmelweit is never discussed in terms of class. Likewise Carmen Luke, in her recent archaeology of children and television, simply takes Himmelweit's initial word on the matter (Luke, 1990, 102). This oversight is one of the problems with the kind of massive literature survey which Luke undertakes.
sharing interests with their mothers sewing (ibid, 381-2). The Report then went on to state that 'no rules for avoiding conflict can be a substitute for unstrained relationships, for perceptive parental handling of the child, and for a home atmosphere which is conducive to the development of many alternative interests to viewing' and it provided an example from a middle-class mother of four children (aged six to eighteen) whose 'family has rules for viewing, flexibly adhered to, and the children have many other interests' (ibid, 383). The positioning of working-class and middle-class families within this discursive formation was picked up in the press, institutional reports and government committees primarily in relation to the problem of when and in what space children watched television, whose responsibility it was to regulate the situation and how it could be regulated.

The recognition that children constituted a distinct audience in their own right and did not simply watch programmes designed for them was clearly established, as I have argued above, in the early 1950s. Broadcasters attempted to separate the child audience from the adult audience through various techniques, including the 'toddlers truce' which supposedly intermeshed with the routines of normal family life (e.g. washing the children and putting them to bed) and provided a distinct separation between children's programmes and adult programmes. However, the Nuffield Report repeatedly stated that the problem was not how much time children spent watching television but the 'nature of the programmes' they watched (ibid, 44). Thus, as The Times Educational Supplement put it, the report would not flatten the carping minority of critics, but would be like a 'drink with a kick in it' and would 'jolt the thoughtful adult into new anxieties just when he is feeling secure' (12 December 1958, 1785). The paper also referred to the way in which children 'trespass determinedly and extensively into the programmes that are meant for adults' and the inability of the broadcasters to 'parcel out the day between the young and their elders'. As The New Statesman commented in the same month:

One particularly useful corrective is the report's insistence on the impact on children of 'adult' TV programmes, up to 9 p.m. or later; in future, no one discussing this subject will be able to do so in terms of 'children's television' alone. (Driburg, 20 December 1958, 880)

71 The Times Educational Supplement stressed the scientific nature of the research.
Himmelweit had shown how a large number of children stayed up watching television until 9pm and that significantly large numbers stayed up later.72

The BBC had, from the late 1930s, when television was first regularly broadcast, issued warnings about certain programmes.73 It had also been suggested that 'a carefully-written synopsis of the programmes should be printed in the Radio Times' (Adams, 20 April 1949, T16/166). Another consideration was the use of a continuous warning symbol in the corner of the screen (11 January 1966, T16/166)74 However, although these mechanisms of certification were regarded as insufficient, there was seen to be, nevertheless, a pressing need to regulate domestic viewing.75

The problems concerning children watching unsuitable programmes were, as I have already argued, framed within a discourse of the emotional

---

72 *The New Statesman* had reported on a survey in 1958 on school children in Widness which had discovered that 65 percent of children aged seven and eight were watching television between 9pm and 10pm (Blishen, 4 November 1958, 446).
73 The BBC had issued warnings as early as 1938. A standard announcement took the form of:

> We think it our duty to inform viewers that the play which follows may be considered unsuitable for children or for those of a particularly nervous or sensitive disposition. We trust you will note this announcement and use your own judgement in the matter. (28 December 1938, T16/166)

74 The O'Connor Report thought that warnings were, in themselves, insufficient. However, although it dismissed the use of a continuous warning symbol, it agreed that information should be recorded in the *Radio Times* and *TV Times* and other television guides (O'Connor, 1960).
75 Comparison was made between the regulatory mechanisms within the cinema industry and the failure of those same certificatory mechanisms in relation to television. For example, Alma Birk, writing in *The New Statesman*, stated that:

> Both parents and the law prevent children visiting the cinema to see 'X' features, but there is no law which stops them seeing similar things in their own homes - and a lot of children watch adult programmes for more hours than they watch those designed for children. Indeed, it is doubtful whether the majority of parents do any serious selection of programmes for themselves, let alone for their children. They may not know what to choose, they may be out, they may be too lazy or they may be unable to control their children's choices. (Birk, 14 December 1957, 810)
economy of the family. A consequence of constructing children as watching programmes other than those designed for them was that the audience for programmes after children's television was now seen to include children, adolescents and adults. Likewise the inclusion of children into the imagining of the temporal arrangements of television viewing, other than between 5pm and 6pm and after school during school term-time, was interconnected to the particular spatial arrangements of television viewing in the home. Himmelweit had stressed that television viewing was 'after all a family affair', that it took place 'in the only room available in a home containing children of very different ages' and that 'effectively they [young children] cannot be sent out of the room' (Himmelweit, 1958, 53). It was not that the imagining of broadcasting as a 'family affair' was a novel idea, but that such an imagining in the 1950s was embedded within a wider deployment of techniques directed at the government of domestic and familial conduct. Television viewing was conceived as a particular familial activity, which because of its very nature, was (to use an architectural term) a 'primary activity'. However, whereas the formation of the child radio audience included the family audience within the space and time of Children's Hour, the formation of the child television audience located the configuration of child, family and television set in relation to programmes other than those designed for children. Likewise, it created children's television viewing as an effect of the discursive formation of the child television audience and as a specific object of government.

This viewing scenario was the main concern of the joint ITA/BBC O'Connor Committee Report (1960) which stated that:

The television-set is generally kept in a single living-room used by all the family. No-one in the room can avoid giving it at least some of his or her attention. The television audience ought, therefore, to be considered as having no analogy with any other. Not even radio offers a satisfactory parallel. It is possible to turn the mind away from mere sounds issuing from a box, but much harder to ignore the pictures moving in the corner of the room. At least up to 9pm, then, the television audience is largely a family audience, concentrating their attention upon the screen. (O'Connor Report, 1960, 3)

76 The O'Connor Committee started its work in May 1959 and presented its report in April 1960. It included: Mary O'Connor, the Chairman, a member of the ITA's Children's Advisory Committee and Chairman of the Isle of Wight Education Committee; Mrs Swanzy, a member of the ITA's Children's Advisory Committee and a
Although the BBC, through its programme policy, could deploy dividing practices in order to separate and individualise the child audience, the construction of television viewing as a familial activity led to calls for greater regulation of both the broadcasters and parents. These calls were also tied to a wider set of concerns arising from the introduction of commercial television in 1955, after the Television Act of 1954, and a concern about the attack on the moral framework of society from the Western and other 'American' programming.77 However, instead of seeing these concerns in terms of a set of 'moral panics' and analysing regulatory measures in terms of their limiting the freedom of the viewer, my point is that the measures were productive and that they were directed at inciting certain responsibilities within broadcasters and parents.

The O'Connor Committee Report called for the introduction of three different temporal-spatial arrangements: programmes suitable for children, programmes not unsuitable for children and programmes unsuitable for children. These categories in turn refer to children's programmes, family viewing time and adult programmes. In this sense, television programming had become regulated in relation to the figure of the child viewer.78 The ITCA was resistant to such a conceptualisation and

'prominent figure in the Women's Institute; Hywel Roberts, a member of the ITA's Children's Advisory Committee and a lecturer in education at a Teachers Training College in Cardiff; Lady Banwell, a member of the ITA's Children's Advisory Committee and active in the National Council of Women; Lady James, Chairman of the BBC's North Regional Advisory Council and a JP; Lesley Farrer-Brown, Director of the Nuffield Foundation; Mr G.C. Diamond, a member of the Schools Broadcasting Council and Headmaster of Cardiff High School for Boys; and Mr A. Shimeld, a member of the Schools Broadcasting Council and Headmaster of a Secondary Modern School in Wellington, Shropshire. The Committee accepted evidence from: the BBC Television Service Study Group; the Independent Television Companies Association; Jan Choyce, Assistant to the ITA's Children's Advisory Committee; Mary Field, from the Children's Film Foundation and consultant on children's programmes for ABC-TV and ATV; Mr A. Graham, Advertising Administration Officer, ITA; Hilde Himmelweit; Enid Love, Head of Schools Programme, ARTV; Victor Peers, Chairman, Children's Programmes Committee, ITCA; Owen Reed, Head of Children's Programmes, BBC Television Service; Mr J. Scupham, Head of Educational Broadcasting, BBC; R.J.E. Silvey, Head of Audience Research, BBC; Mrs J. Spicer, Head of Programme Planning, BBC Television Service; Mr R. Steele, Secretary, School Broadcasting Council of Great Britain; and Mr J. Trenaman, Granada Research Fellow, Leeds University. The Secretary was Colin Shaw.

77 I discuss this at length in Chapter 5 in relation to the question of 'moral panics'.
argued that an adult had a 'right to expect that entertainment at the peak viewing hours of the evening will be designed for him rather than for children, whose needs have already been catered for in schools and children's programmes earlier in the day': 'Is Television for children or adults?' (O'Connor Report, Appendix C, 1960, 2). They argued that the logic of the argument for a family viewing time between 6pm and 9pm could extend 'in the interests of children over the whole viewing period, and would preclude any attempts at more sophisticated programmes and stultify much creative talent' due to the fact that large numbers of children viewed until 10pm and even until 11pm (ibid, 3). As a result they declared that '[p]arents must surely accept the main responsibility for what their children are allowed to see during the hours intended for adult entertainment, and the responsibility cannot be transferred' (ibid, 3). In 1962 the Pilkington Report received a number of submissions from individuals and organisations concerned with television violence and children and as a result of the evidence reaffirmed many of the recommendations of the O'Connor Committee. 79 There were also a number

79 The Pilkington Committee received submissions concerning children's television viewing from: the Church of Scotland Committee on Church and Nation, the Council for Children's Welfare, the National Federation of Women's Institutes, Professor H.J. Eysenck and Hilde Himmelweit. The Council for Children's Welfare presented its research on television programmes between 1959 and 1960 and stated that '[v]iolence for its own sake rarely exists in reality, being normally the expression of other aspects of personality and environment' (Pilkington, 1962, 1200). Himmelweit reiterated the results of her research stating that 'the onus of proof rests with the television companies, not the viewer' (ibid, 1126). And Eysenck talked about the 'threat to the moral fibre of Western civilization by the display of aggressiveness, cruelty and sex on television screens, in films and elsewhere'. He referred to the rise in violent crime, illegitimacy and various other indicators of lack of 'public morality'. He criticised the existing social surveys of children's viewing and called for laboratory experimentation. As with Himmelweit, he laid the onus firmly with the broadcasters:

It seems to me that in a matter of such great importance to the moral well-being of the nation neither the BBC nor the commercial television companies should be allowed to sit back in whatever comfort they may derive from a verdict of "not proven", but should be called upon to endow the only kind of research which is likely to throw some light on the public consequences of their actions, to wit, a careful laboratory investigation of well-documented psychological theories regarding the effects of their programmes. Manufacturers of food, and companies producing drugs, are required to satisfy responsible authority that what they sell is fit for human consumption and not poisonous; it is difficult to see why television
of calls for the institution of an advisory council to supervise the relationship between the television broadcasters and children. 80

Framing these discussions was a sense that children needed to be able to watch television in a secure and stable familial environment which would facilitate their mental and emotional development. Family viewing time was invented as a means of providing such an environment. However, such regulatory measures were not introduced to 'dilute' or 'emasculate' television programming.

Indeed, the protection and security offered by the family to its younger members should provide the right circumstances in which children can be introduced to many problems of adult life. What matters, as the Committee sets out later, is that these problems should be properly introduced. (O'Connor, 1960, 3)

In this sense family viewing time was imagined as providing the context for 'normal' viewing as well as excluding programme material, such as horror, space fiction and even Jane Eyre, which might be harmful to

companies should be exempt from a similar self-denying ordinance. (ibid, 1119-20)

The Pilkington Committee agreed with much of this evidence:

Though the damage was said to be to all age groups, submissions criticizing violence in television were almost without exception especially concerned about its effects on children. It was not enough to produce between the hours of 5 and 6 p.m. programmes suitable for children. Until 9 p.m. audiences, we are told, included a great many children. We are reminded that, for this reason, the O'Connor Committee had in 1960 recommended that programmes up to 9 p.m. should be not unsuitable for children. (ibid, 30)

80 The O'Connor Committee called for a joint ITA/BBC advisory council which would contain 'people who have a special knowledge of the mental and emotional development of children as well as the medium of television' (O'Connor, 1960, 13). The Pilkington Committee considered the idea of a viewers' council, but rejected the idea and even relieved the ITA of its statutory obligation to appoint a Children's Advisory Committee (cf. Sendall, 1983, 164). Demands for such a council had been made consistently throughout the mid- to late-1950s from the Council for Children's Welfare and other organisations. For example, Alma Birk in 1958 in The New Statesman argued that it 'should include doctors, social psychologists, teachers and parents, and its function should include the preparation (and supervision) of a production code, the right to propose changes in programmes and the publication of an annual report both on children's programmes and on their impact (Birk, 14 December 1958, 810).
children at risk. As I have argued above in relation to the Nuffield Report, this discourse was not simply predicated on a notion of the defencelessness of the young child, but rather on a notion that certain parents were seen to be too irresponsible to supervise properly their children's television viewing. The O'Connor Report stated that:

The Committee does not consider that broadcasters can discharge their responsibility simply by leaving to parents the question of what their children see. Parents are not always present when children are viewing, nor can they always tell from published information the nature of the programmes about to be televised. There are other parents too irresponsible to care what their children see. The broadcaster must accordingly recognise that he has the responsibility for providing programmes not unsuitable for children at those times when it is known that large numbers of children are viewing. (O'Connor, 1960, 10)

Whereas some parents were deemed responsible for supervising their children's discriminative viewing, other parents were not. The Economist, in an article on the O'Connor Committee Report, made it clear who those parents were:

... there is a grain of common sense in the BBC and ITV contention that parents have a responsibility to send children up to bed when anything unsuitable comes on; but there has always been a clear class distinction in Britain between the parents who drive young people to bed reasonably early and those who do not. Until middle class standards are commoner in this matter of child welfare, the BBC and ITV can at least voluntarily remind their programme makers that, when in doubt about how far to go during family listening time, they should adopt the

---

81 Himmelweit stated that '[t]elevision in so far as it is more of a family activity than radio listening is likely to arouse less fear, but television's visual impact in darkened rooms could well make up for this (Himmelweit, 1958, 19; see also O'Connor Report, Appendix B, 1960, 7).

82 The Pilkington Report stated that:

The need for this awareness [of the nature of the family audience] sprang from the conviction that children, particularly very young children, were especially defenceless. Self-evidently, they lacked experience and discrimination; for them the distinction between reality and make-believe was often obscured. When violence, through television with all its power of dramatic presentation, invaded the security of the home, and did so in a form which was not to the watching child a game being played, then the child suffered. (Pilkington, 1962, 30)
maxim of Victorian Grundyism 'Not before the children.'
(The Economist, 30 July 1960, 464)

Although broadcasters could rely upon the responsible supervision of children's viewing in middle-class homes, programme makers and planners, regulators and others concerned with children's television viewing could not rid themselves of a vision of the pathologies of working-class families. The working-class home was deemed to be an environment which was potentially harmful to the development of the child.

In this chapter I have begun to map out the emerging techniques of power/knowledge through which the child television audience was formed as an audience. By 1960 although various individuals and institutions spoke about children's television viewing and despite the fact that different authorities delimited the object under discussion, there was nevertheless some agreement in their disagreement in respect of the recognition of psychological authority in establishing the child television audience.

I have shown how the emergence of the discursive formation of the child audience was predicated upon the temporal and spatial administration of children and adults within the home. These arrangements had a disciplining and individualising effect, such that the child audience could be spatially and temporally separated from adult audiences and divided within itself in terms of age. I also showed how the construction of the child audience as a distinct psychological entity with its own attitudes, habits and behaviours made possible the responsibilisation of broadcasters and parents with respect to that audience. Central to this discursive formation was the construction of the child viewer within the emotional economy of the family and the construction of the television addict as a particular pathology of the dysfunctional family.

This discourse took the form, not simply of written or verbal statements as such, but of architectural spaces, diagrams, graphs, visual images and so on. I argued that this discursive formation was constituted across a number of different discursive sites of production (the broadcasting institution, the regulatory body, the government committee, the educational apparatus, the women's magazine, the press, the academy). However, although produced across different sites, it is clear that authority within the formation was limited to a few and although journalists might repeat statements
concerning children's television viewing, the authority of those statements was deferred to the expertise of the social scientist (primarily the psychologist), the educationalist and the doctor. These are what Foucault calls 'authorities of delimitation'. Similarly this discursive formation constituted 'grids of specification', that is a series of terms and conditions through which children's television viewing could be understood. Finally, I showed how the domestic and the familial could not be seen as institutional contexts external to this discourse of the child television audience, rather they are central to its definition. The architecture and design of the home and the practices of the family had a discursive existence outside that of the child audience but they bore upon the shaping of that discourse. They were both inside and outside, providing what Minson calls its conditions of contextuality.

In the following chapter I pursue this analysis but I look specifically at the emergence of the 'very young viewer' and at how it was formed in relation to the set of concerns I have discussed above. In doing so I show how, initially, the invention of that audience, and of programmes for that audience, provided a specific mechanism through which the mother could love and care for her child in relation to her or his television viewing.
The Creation of the Pre-School Audience

Chapter Four
In this chapter I look at how the pre-school child television audience emerged as a specific object of government. This particular case study allows me to pursue the analysis of the child television audience that I had begun to map out in the preceding chapter. Surrounding that audience is a concentration of available written and, importantly, broadcast archival material. As a consequence of the availability of such data I have been able to begin to uncover the particular relations between the textual form of programmes for the pre-school audience and the wider discursive formation of the child television audience. In so doing I have been able to raise more explicitly certain questions about how techniques of power/knowledge form new subjectivities. How do the techniques of power/knowledge, which I have begun to outline in the previous chapter, instil certain capacities and dispositions for subjects?

In the first part of this chapter I look at the invention of the audience in relation to the programming of *Watch with Mother* in the 1950s and at how it was specifically designed to facilitate a caring relationship between child, mother and television set. Then in the second part I consider how the government of that audience began to undergo significant changes in the 1970s. Although the object of government remained unchanged, the techniques deployed constituted the child as a cognitive and developmental subject and stressed particularly the linguistic development of the child in relation to the problem of disadvantaged families and their ability to function as capable citizens.

**The Government of the Pre-School Child Audience I: Watching with Mother**

Although the title *Watch with Mother* did not come into existence until 1952, *Andy Pandy*, the mainstay of the series, was first broadcast in July 1950.² Two years

---

² The BBC dropped the title in 1980. Anna Home, current Head of Children’s Programmes, says that the main reason for dropping the title ‘was that large numbers of children at that time
later it was joined by *The Flowerpot Men* and later in the 1950s the two programmes were scheduled alongside *Rag, Tag and Bobtail*, *Picture Book* and *The Woodentops*. Similarly in 1950 BBC radio first broadcast *Listen with Mother*. It is surprising that, even though the BBC had been making children's programmes for nearly thirty years, it had not demarcated a specific time slot for children under five. This audience had not been 'completely neglected', but it could not, as Derek McCulloch stated in 1942, be 'catered for deliberately'. He imagined that this audience could only enjoy a 'twinkly tune or Certain sound effects, particularly domestic animals and everyday noises normally associated with the home'. The problem, though, was not merely a question of the capacity of this audience to enjoy radio, but rather that for McCulloch, and much of the *Children Hour* staff at the time, this audience was seen to come 'into no real category at all'. The reason why the BBC had not made regular programmes for pre-school children was because it did not know how to imagine such an audience.

Both *Listen with Mother* and *Watch with Mother* did not address an audience which already existed. The emergence of those programmes signifies the invention of a new audience for broadcasters within the discursive formation of the child audience. This is not to say that children under five did not listen to radio or watch television before 1950, but that the distinctiveness and separateness of this audience *qua* audience was a historical invention and that its invention was caught up in a set of practices aimed at governing domestic and familial conduct. Central to my argument is that the emergence of this audience is symptomatic of a concern about the mental and emotional well-being of the child in relation to the social and familial environment and disciplinary techniques concerned with the spatial and temporal administration of domestic living. This audience is symptomatic of the wider shifts within the discursive formation of the child.

---

2 *Rag, Tag and Bobtail* first started in 1953 and *Picture Book* and *The Woodentops* started in 1955. In 1955 they were scheduled within *Watch with Mother: Picture Book* on Monday, *Andy Pandy* on Tuesday, *The Flowerpot Men* on Wednesday, *Rag, Tag and Bobtail* on Thursday and *The Woodentops* on Friday. The series finally finished in 1980 when it was replaced by *See-Saw*.

3 See also McCulloch, 1946, 230.

4 McCulloch, in a document on *Children's Hour* policy, distinguished between the 'individual listener' ('quite a common category for the modern child'), the 'group listener' ('who listens to most things') and the 'younger listener' ('who is able to glean a certain amount from most of our programmes'). He stated that very young listeners, the three to five year olds, 'are much in the minority and cannot, I think, be catered for deliberately in the limited time at our disposal' (McCulloch, July 1942, R11/51/2).
television audience.

In saying this I am not stating that the emergence of the 'very young viewer', as the BBC referred to this audience, is a direct result of the influence, for example, of the research of the developmental psychologist John Bowlby. Nevertheless, the writings of Bowlby are significant in that they constructed the care for the child in terms of, not only physical, but also mental and emotional neglect and that the burden of this care fell upon the mother. Bowlby's work was both popularised in the ideological climate of the postwar period, fitting in with assumptions about women's labour, and also incorporated into social welfare practices directed at mothers and mothering. As a result the concept of 'maternal deprivation' was central to the discourse of mothering. This discursive formation constituted 'love' no longer as 'a moral duty or romantic ideal', but as an element in the production of 'normal and abnormal children'. As Nikolas Rose states:

Normality was now to be promoted not through coercion after the event - the removal of a pathological child and the disablement of the family - but by inciting the family itself to take on board the business of production of normal subjects. A new relation between subjectivity and the social order was being formed within the matrix of the family. Expertise was to enable the social obligation on the family to regulate the subjectivities of its children to be translated into the personal desire for normal children, and to a set of emotional and intersubjective techniques for securing this goal. (Rose, 1989, 156)

It is possible to see the formation of the pre-school television audience within a strategy aimed at responsibilising families in the production of normal citizens. We can see, in the following pages, how Watch with Mother, and the practices which surrounded it, were formed as one specific element in a wider web of

5 For example Bowlby stated in Child Care and the Growth of Love, originally published in 1953 and the result of research for the World Health Organisation, published as Maternal Care and Mental Health in 1951, that:

At least two forms of neglect can therefore be recognized - physical neglect and emotional neglect - and, though they may coexist, it is of prime importance to distinguish them, since they need very different remedies. Broadly speaking, it will be found that, while physical neglect is most often due to economic factors, the ill-health of the mother, and ignorance, emotional neglect is the result of emotional instability and mental illness in the parents. (Bowlby, 1965, 90)

The distinction between mental and physical realities in relation to the psychology of the child had emerged in the 1920s in the 'new psychology' (cf. Rose, 1985 and 1989).

programmes and how they specifically incited, through a number of devices, certain competencies and dispositions within the viewing population. In this sense, television viewing is construed, not as symbolic of all the evils of popular culture to be feared and regulated as a consequence, but as a central component in the production of normal families. The consumption of broadcasting, which had been constructed within a set of questions about children's radio and democracy, was now, in relation to television viewing, articulated with a discourse of postwar familialism.

In the planning stages of Andy Pandy there was clearly some hesitancy about the introduction of television programmes for very young children and a concern about their affect on the proper mode of conduct within the home. An internal BBC memo stated in 1950:

> We had a special panel to advise us consisting of representatives of the Ministry of Education, the Institute of Child Development, the Nursery Schools' Association, and some educational child psychologists, and I think they would be pretty sure to squeak if you were to publicise any Television programme for very young children as something that would set Mother free to get about her other business, even though that might in fact be what happened. (6 March 1950, T2/7/1)

7 It provided an example of what Rose calls 'therapeutic familialism'. He states that:

> This therapeutic familialism was one element in a web of programmes and arguments that enmeshed conjugal, domestic, and parental arrangements in the post-war period. The objectives of these programmes were varied, but each entailed the revalorization of the child-centred family as a site for the emotional investment and self-realization of citizens. (Rose, 1989, 157)

8 This particular configuration was at odds with the set of arguments which Monica Dickens and others made about television and family life. Nevertheless, they were both responses to the same problematic concerned with the mental well-being of the child within the emotional economy of the family.

9 The memo, from the Acting Controller of Talks to the Head of Television Talks, about Listen with Mother, lays out the 'reasons for bringing Mothers in on this programme'. It stated that:

Previous suggestions for programmes for Under Fives were strongly discouraged by the S.B.C. [Schools Broadcasting Council] and other advisers and it was only when I came back from Australia with the idea that Under Fives should listen with Mothers that they viewed the idea of a special programme with tolerance. (6 March 1950, T2/7/1)

It also stated that there should be cooperation between radio and television broadcasting in relation to this audience and that it would be worthwhile for those involved with the making of television programmes for the very young viewer to draw upon the expertise in Schools broadcasting.
The memo indicates a concern about the pre-school audience and the domestic conduct of mothers and it also displays the authorities which it calls upon. The memo clearly presents a concern that mothers should watch with their children and yet it also presents a reluctant acknowledgement that mothers might actually just put their children in front of the screen and do something else. Although it was a far cry from the concern that Monica Dickens voiced about women becoming 'sluts' if they watched television instead of doing the housework, it does show how television viewing for women was normalised within the regulatory practices of mothering and the management of the home.

The techniques deployed in relation to the programming of Watch with Mother were symptomatic of the need to bring mother and child together in front of the television screen and the realisation that mothers might not be present with the child. Watch with Mother attempted to make television a medium through which the mother could love and care for her children. And yet at the same time it also placed the 'mother' centrally within the text as a substitute for those absent mothers (i.e. television needed to be seen as motherly). Through such specific techniques children's television viewing could become aligned with the practices of 'good mothering'. This discursive strategy made visible the pre-school audience as an object of concern and instrumentalised television as a means of governing domestic activities and routines.

In this chapter I want to consider specifically how this discursive grid of practices attempted to produce certain capacities and dispositions in the viewing population. In order to conduct my analysis I need to consider, as a result of employing a Foucauldian set of tools, whether the conceptual categories of 'the text' and 'the subject' are sufficient or insufficient in their ability to explain the specificity of this discursive set of relations.

The BBC Mother

Four years before the showing of Andy Pandy the BBC introduced Muffin the Mule. It is clear, from the lack of concern about the earlier programme among the authorities I have mentioned above and among the journalists in the press, that Muffin the Mule was not specifically addressed to children under five. Although it has all the hallmarks of a maternalist, infantilising address to this young
audience, it was nevertheless addressed to and watched by a large age group. Muffin, the star character, performed alongside other puppets, such as Peregrine the Penguin, Oswald the Ostrich, and Louise the Lamb, on top of a piano played by Annette Mills. The programmes were fifteen minutes long and they centred on daily domestic situations such as Muffin having a bath or Peregrine having squeaking shoes. Although difficult to imagine now, *Muffin the Mule* was a great success and stayed on screen until 1957, with a brief spell on ITV between 1955 and 1956. W.E. Williams stated in *The Observer* that 'when a puppet like Muffin the Mule is on view I realise that television is one of the pictorial arts as well as a medium of instantaneous communication' (*The Observer*, 16 February 1949). The *Daily Express* described Muffin as the 'biggest personality in TV' (*Daily Express*, 3 May 1949).

Muffin's success was not limited to the small screen. The Muffin Syndicate Ltd, jointly owned by Ann Hogart and Annette Mills, licensed puppets, toys, books, dresses, drinks, soap, puzzles, wallpaper, calendars, china ornaments and various other character merchandise. The company was reported to have had a three-quarters of a million pound turnover in 1953 (*Evening Standard*, 6 October 1952; *Sunday Dispatch*, 16 November 1952; *Illustrated*, 19 December 1953). There was a *Muffin the Mule* strip cartoon in the *News of the World TV Comic* and in 1952 it was to be distributed globally by PA Reuter Features Ltd (*World's Press News*, 13 June 1952). *Muffin the Mule* had become securely embedded within popular everyday life. Peter Flemming in the *Sunday Times* worried about the 'extent to which television is standardising one particular kind of experience for small

---

10 Indications of this address can be seen even in the announcement for the programme. For example in 1949 the BBC announcer stated:

Now if you listen very carefully I think you will hear some most extraordinary noises coming from Annette Mills' piano, and I wonder who's making them. Can you guess? Let's see if you're right. (26 June 1949, T2/104/1)

An indication of the audience comes from the *Daily Herald*, which stated that Muffin was an 'overnight sensation causing parents to fight their children for places in the parlour for TV children's hour' (*Daily Herald*, 10 November 1951). The *Daily Express* stated that *Muffin the Mule* had an audience of 'more than a million' (*Daily Express*, 3 May 1949).

11 The *Daily Herald* stated in 1951 that:

The big stores, the multiple manufacturers are joining in; shops are stocking up with Muffins and the rest for the Christmas stockings. It's a million-pound trade now, and there seems to be no limit. (*Daily Herald*, 10 November 1951)
children' and that 'all entry into the world of illusion and entertainment' would be 'through the same narrow gate and under the same impeccable guidance'. He was particularly concerned about its effect on our 'earliest memories' and he stated that '[e]ndearing though Muffin the Mule may be, I doubt if he has a right to a place (which he will certainly get) in the first chapter of virtually every autobiography published in this country at the beginning of the twenty-first century' (Sunday Times, 30 December 1951). Nevertheless Muffin the Mule had managed to constitute television viewing as a particular space of love and care between mother and child. In an advertisement for Chilprufe woollen children's clothes, in Woman and Home, three small children were pictured sitting in front of the television set watching Muffin the Mule (see Appendix A). The children are happy and contented and the copy beneath the image read, in bold letters, 'Mothers Vision' and below it 'seeing the children grow bonnier and sturdier every week, mother blesses her early foresight' (Woman and Home, January 1952). Instead of television being presented as the destroyer of childhood, it was aligned, through the imaging of Muffin, with the practices of 'proper mothering' and healthy child development.

The construction of Muffin the Mule as safe for children was dependent, in part, upon the presence of the 'mother' within the text itself. Annette Mills is figured in the text as motherly. Through her shrill BBC voice she keeps Muffin and his friends in order and she carefully directs their play. She not only speaks to the characters in the text, but also directly addresses the audience (both mothers and children) at home. Muffin and the other characters who signify early childhood through their various gestures and activities are silent and yet give the impression that they could speak through whispering inaudibly to Annette Mills, who then relays what they had said to the audience. W.E Williams in The Observer stated that 'Miss Mills has no truck with such vulgar devices as ventriloquism, but by repeating to us what Muffin the Mule has inaudibly whispered into her ear she convinces us that thus and thus did really speak' (Williams, ibid). Mills argued that '[i]n this way we have found that the imaginations of the children are more stimulated and the characters of the creatures are more free to develop. This has been, apparently, a more successful experiment after the spoon-fed entertainment of the cartoon films and comic strips' ('Writing for Puppets on Television', The Writer, May 1952). The motherly voice of Annette Mills carefully directs the

---

12 For example, when Peter the Puppy gets out of the bath and shakes the water off, Annette Mills says, 'They always shake water all over you, don't they!' She was both referring to the actions of a dog and also to the exuberance of a small child.
puppets' play and gives meaning to their activities. Her voice always emanates from the visible space of the screen in which she is present and yet within that space there is a clear division between the space of Annette Mills on the piano stool, the theatrical space on the piano itself and the space of the diegesis, which is audible and implied, but not visibly present on the screen. The camera is always fixed and never ventures outside of the space of Annette Mills and her piano. Although we get a sense of the space of the diegesis outside the screen, inasmuch as we hear sounds off-screen and Annette Mills looks beyond the visible space of the screen beyond the piano and out of the window and recounts to the audience what she has seen, this space is always static. In this sense the space off-screen is always represented to the audience in the past (we only have second-hand knowledge of it). It is a world which is always mediated by the mother. Likewise the space on the piano is constituted by the voice and gaze of the motherly narrator. All the activities take place on top of the piano. Their play is carefully located on top of the piano and in sight of Mills. This particular technique of dividing visible and audible spaces constituted the relations between mother and child (Muffin and characters and Annette Mills) within specific relations of power. The voice of the mother is somewhere between the authority of the voice-over and the diegetic voices of the characters.

13 Annette Mills stated that 'it seemed a pity such a good stage as the top of the piano should always be empty' (Sunday Dispatch, 16 November 1952). The Sketch elaborated on this particular diegetic space:

Cameras and arcs and cables and microphones are apparently as invisible to her as they are to us; she has the rare gift... of seeming to talk casually and intimately to one very welcome dropper-in, and of never having heard of the existence of such things as scripts and rehearsals. (The Sketch, 16 February 1949)

14 The construction of the off-screen diegetic space was seen as a particular difficulty. Annette Mills stated that:

For the first few programmes the dialogue was merely a linking up of one song with another or an introduction to a new character. It was Ann Hogarth who first suggested a slight plot, a complete adventure which began and ended in fifteen minutes on my grand piano top. This was not easy at first because only one puppet (except on rare occasions) can be seen with me at a time, and so the script had to be full of descriptions of what was happening off-stage (or outside the window in the garden which is always seen on the television screen). (The Writer, May 1952)

In only having one of the puppets on the screen at one time and having them not able to speak to each other, we can see how the child-like characters are constituted as a community only inasmuch as they are voiced and seen by the motherly narrator.
And yet *Muffin the Mule*, despite such features, was not intended to address, and clearly was not simply seen by, a pre-school child audience. This in itself suggests that in order to understand how the text *functioned* we need to look beyond the text/subject relationship and focus more generally upon the techniques through which the pre-school audience is constructed. Ian Hunter turns toward a more pragmatic analysis. He argues that human beings act 'as bearers of a dispersed array of practical capacities' which are 'built up through piecemeal mastery of a patchwork of social technologies ('language games')' and which 'possess no general form or conditions of possibility, save those found in the actual forms of social organisation ('forms of living')'(Hunter, 1984, 421). He uses the language of 'capacities' and 'dispositions' and he turns to Wittgenstein as a way of shifting away from a general theory of 'the subject' or 'representation' and of providing 'a variety of strategies for breaking up and resolving a number of quite different problems grouped under these headings'. He states that '[n]othing governs the formation of a capacity except the social organisation of 'special methods' which varies from case to case and to which we are tied by practical acquaintance'. He argues that we need to analyse, for example, 'the deployment of a character notation, of techniques for self-scrutiny, of instrumentalities tying the behaviour of family members to particular norms of conduct' in relation to specific cultural technologies (ibid, 426). This form of analysis suggests, not only a shift away from a universalising theory of text/subject relations, but also a shift toward the question of government.15 In a recent article Colin Mercer argues that we need to look at the relationship between individuals and government, not in terms of 'semiotics', but in terms of 'human resource management'. He traces the emergence of this *use* of culture to the French Revolution, which, Mercer argues, is 'the beginning of a political economy of the sign' based upon the question of government (Mercer, 1991, 64).16 That would suggest dethroning the concept of

15 Tony Bennett, in an article on cultural policy, makes a similar argument:

> My principal concern here, then, is to suggest that viewing 'the policy debate' through the prism of such oppositions runs the risk of distorting the issues that are at stake in that debate. These, I want to argue, do not take the form of a generalized choice between theory on the one hand and policy on the other, or between textual analysis and pragmatically oriented research. Rather, they take the form of a choice between *different* bodies and styles of theory, between *different* ways of construing the relations between theoretical and pragmatic concerns, and between *different* kinds of textual analysis and their associated estimations of the issues at stake in the conduct of such analysis. (Bennett, 1992, 395)

16 Mercer states that '[s]pecific practices and capacities of reading were then required to form citizens as they now are to form the citizen-consumer confronted by the 'texts' of advertising'
the 'text' and making it pertinent only to a discussion of the 'programme', which as a category only gets deployed within certain discourses (e.g. the discourse of scheduling). The notion of the 'text' would then lose its universalising theoretical and methodological baggage and become defined as a particular discursive technique.

This can best be exemplified if we look at the discussions concerning Andy Pandy. It was initially a short experimental series of four programmes shown on Tuesday and Thursday between 11 July and 20 July 1950. After its initial success the series was shown regularly from 19 September 1950 and scheduled every Tuesday at 3.45pm. It was created by Freda Lingstrom and her long standing friend, Maria Bird, as a programme specifically directed at the pre-school audience. Lingstrom, while Assistant Head of BBC School’s Broadcasting, had been responsible for Listen with Mother and was asked to make a 'television equivalent on music and movement lines'. Andy Pandy was intended to provide a friend for the very young viewer and 'a three-year-old actor was out of the question, so a puppet was the obvious answer'. Like Muffin the Mule, Andy Pandy had no linear narrative structure. Instead it presented a series of tableaux with no apparent overarching theme. In one programme Andy starts by playing on a swing, accompanied by Maria Bird singing 'Swinging high, swinging low...'. He is joined by Teddy. The camera then focusses on Teddy who enacts the movements to the nursery rhyme 'Round and round the garden...'. Finally, after a scene with

(Mercer, 1991).

17 There was much concern in 1965 when viewers thought that Camberwick Green was to replace Andy Pandy and Bill and Ben. Doreen Stephens, Head of Family Programmes, reassured the audience stating that they would be shown, although less frequently until 1970 (Daily Mirror, 1 October 1965).

18 Lingstrom, though, shifted away from the notion that this audience was constituted by the regime of schooling and began to refer to it in terms of the notion of 'the very young viewer'. In a memo she stated:

Notice that I said "for the very young" and not as has been billed for so long "for those not yet old enough to go to school". I have been reminded that some children go to school at two or three years of age, and one proud (but angry) owner of a cap and blazer commanded his father to express his indignation in written form.

I suppose soon we shall have be asked to remove the word "very" from the present sub-titles! (Lingstrom, 1951, T2/184)

19 The production of the programme was very much a local affair. Both Lingstrom and Bird lived together in Westerham, Kent, and the puppet was made by an old man in the village, supposedly according to the exact proportions of a three year old boy (Good Housekeeping, January 1963).
Andy and Teddy playing in their cart and a scene with Looby Loo singing her song, 'Here we go Looby Loo...'; the two male characters return to their basket and wave goodbye and Maria Bird sings 'Time to go home...'. Lingstrom stated that '[t]he tempo is slow and there is no "story": the action moves from one situation to another in a way totally acceptable to the very young child' (Lingstrom, February 1953, 3, T2/7/4).

The programme was designed to bring three year olds 'into a close relationship with what is seen on the screen, and through the medium of a character called "Andy Pandy" to provide a programme which young children may enjoy, taking part in simple movement, games, stories, nursery rhymes and songs, some of which will be traditional and some new' (Bird, 31 August 1950, T2/7/1). The use of nursery rhymes was seen as particularly important as it worked both to establish a relationship between the mother and the development of the child and also to connect the child to a tradition and community of pre-school childhood. *Good Housekeeping*, in an article on Andy Pandy stated that:

> Andy Pandy has also helped to revive the nursery rhyme in this country. During the war, with so many mothers and children separated, these old songs and verses were neglected. Miss Bird felt that nursery rhymes could enrich the life of a child to an unbelievable extent. They often provide him with his first experience of melody, and they teach him about numbers, time and space, the seasons and festivals, youth and age. So in each programme Maria Bird gives Andy Pandy a different nursery rhyme to sing, which he repeats several times. The words are always the traditional ones, and so is the music, harmonized very simply so that it can easily be remembered. *(Good Housekeeping, January 1963)*

The children were invited, not only to listen and to 'watch the movements of a simple puppet, naturalistic in form and expression', but also to 'respond to his invitations to join in by clapping, stamping, sitting down, standing up and so forth' (Adams, 1950). The programme provided a space in which children could 'build for themselves a heritage of traditional and other stories' and through

---

20 Dr D.B. Bradshaw, Leeds School Medical Officer, in his annual report, argued that television had resulted in a decline in nursery rhymes and jingles. 'Many young viewers', he said 'are missing the valuable experience in speech training which the learning and recitation of nursery rhymes used to provide as a normal part of family life'. He argued that children's speech was 'less mature than it used to be'. The *Yorkshire Evening Post* defended *Watch with Mother* by saying that '[a] child's activity being "endless imitation" we should have thought TV would encourage children to recite rather than otherwise' *(Yorkshire Evening Post, 27 April 1961).*
which pre-school children could be constructed as a community for television. The repetition of these different elements and the characterisation of Andy Pandy were formed as a specific technique through which children could act out and identify with the forms of pre-school childhood: 'there is much repetition and plenty of opportunity for children to become so familiar with the puppets' actions that they regard them as "real"' (Lingstrom, 3 February 1953, T2/7/4).

**Andy Pandy** drew upon the language of play in order to make itself, and hence also television, homely: '[t]he puppet comes to the child in the security of its own home, and brings nothing alarming or contradictory to the safe routines of the family' (Adams, 1950). In **Andy Pandy**, and also in **The Flowerpot Men**, the fictional world of pre-school childhood was presented within the confines of the domestic. Andy, Teddy and Looby Loo were always presented within the garden or the living room. Likewise in **The Flowerpot Men**, the characters were presented within the garden and in close proximity to the little house which was pictured at the beginning of each programme opening its doors to the diegetic space. In **Andy Pandy** we hear nothing of the outside world. And in **The Flowerpot Men** the only off-screen characters we hear about is the gardener, whose character, never seen or heard, signifies the limits of the imaginary world.

As with **Muffin the Mule** the characters are voiceless. Maria Bird not only speaks to the characters, she also speaks for them. Andy, Teddy and Looby Loo play, dance and do childish things, but they are unable to articulate their own thoughts, desires or troubles. In **Muffin the Mule** the world of children's play was

---

21 Bird in a document on the objectives of the programme stated that '[i]t is hoped that at some point in each programme they will be ready to join in, responding to Andy Pandy, and either following his movements or reacting freely to his stimulus' (Bird, 31 August 1950, T2/7/1). These reactions were clearly seen as natural and universal by some commentors. Although Monica Clare, Children's programmes Organiser at the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, was concerned that 'shrill female voices' makes them 'very, very English' and hence not suitable for export, she stated that 'children of that very young age, after all react in the same way all over the world' (13 May 1955, T2/7/4).

22 Lingstrom stated that the Flowerpot Men and Weed exist in a world secret from adults and only the child watching can know that secret (T2/51).

23 In **The Flowerpot Men** although the characters have voices, they speak gobbledygook. This was particularly worrying for some broadcasters and parents who wrote to the BBC. Derek McCulloch stated that:

I am not so sure about "The Flowerpot Men". They are said to have a considerable following, but they indulge in a comic, higgledy-piggledy kind of language which some parents boast is adopted into their children's everyday talk. Grown-ups who embarked upon "ickle-doggy-wog" babyhood
carefully watched over by the 'mother' on screen. However, in Andy Pandy the mother is not physically presented. Instead, the mother is signified as outside of, and constitutive of, the diegetic space. Her voice is constituted as an authoritative voice and it is able to speak to both the characters within the diegetic space and to the viewers at home. In a scene in which Andy is playing on the swing, Maria Bird addresses the viewer directly saying, 'Andy likes swinging, don't you?' She then asks, 'Have you got a swing in your garden?' and then exclaims, 'I expect some of you have!' The voice establishes a complicity between itself and the viewer and in doing so bypasses the characters. The voice places the image and makes it intelligible to the viewer. However, in being able to cross between the diegetic space and the space of the viewer at home, this authoritative voice establishes an equivalence between the two spaces. And yet this voice is not a disembodied voice. The voice, authoritative because Other, is embodied as the Mother.

The omniscient and omnipotent, authoritative voice, which constitutes the thoughts and actions of the characters, is formed in relation to the gaze of the camera, always at a fixed medium to medium-close length, which follows the voice. For example, in one scene Andy and Teddy after playing in the pram go off to look for a blanket. The camera, accompanied by the voice, follows them so far and then the voice says 'Let's go back to the pram and see Looby Loo again'. The camera returns with the voice to Looby Loo and the pram. Just as the voice is embodied as motherly, so too is the gaze of the camera embodied as the Mother's vision. It is at this moment that the diegetic space is constructed as distinct from the screen space. The attention of the mother's voice and gaze focusses on Looby Loo, who 'remains inanimate while Andy and Teddy are there, but who comes to life and

vocabularies, are now faced with the additional complexities of "flowerpot" talk, may well wish they had stuck to English from the beginning. (The Daily Telegraph, 25 August 1954)

The Daily Sketch reported that:

People are saying that the gibberish Bill and Ben, the flowerpot men, use is rearing Britain's babies in the wrong way...It seems the young viewers are imitating the double-talk and so, it is claimed, the children's education is being retarded. Miss Freda Lingstrom, Head of Children's Television Programmes, has called for an investigation into reports that children are conducting long conversations in the new language. (Daily Sketch, 2 March 1953)

Lingstrom argued that they had 'decided on a new language - on the grounds that pure English would spoil the "other world" atmosphere of the puppets' (News Chronicle, 16 March 1953). She related it to the nonsense language of Lewis Carroll and stated that the 'small child has enough sense to realise that one is fun and the other is reality' (ibid).
plays with the children when they are not looking' (Lingstrom, 3 February 1953, T2/7/4). At this moment we have two diegetic spaces and two forms of complicity between narrator, characters and viewer. This sequence was formed within a set of hierarchical and secret relationships between: narrator and Andy Pandy and Teddy; narrator and Looby Loo; narrator and child viewer; Andy, Teddy and Looby Loo; and the child's mediated relationship to the different characters. The relationship between Looby Loo and the child poses a certain anxiety: where are Andy and Teddy (inasmuch as they are not seen or heard) and what position do they occupy (child or adult)? The anxiety that might be produced by Andy and Teddy walking off-screen is compensated by the insularity of the diegetic space itself: they can wander off only because we know they cannot go far.

It is clear from my analysis that the techniques of the motherly voice and gaze, the imaging of the insularity of the domestic space, the presentation of a pre-school world of play and nursery rhymes and the silencing of the characters were constituted within a discourse concerned with the production of the mother as supervisor. These techniques, although pleasurable to the child audience, were framed within a particular set of power relations which constructed television as safe, maternal and homely.

By 1953, partly as a result of the televising of the Coronation, television had become more firmly embedded in everyday British popular life. In the same year Rag, Tag and Bobtail was scheduled within Watch with Mother. Unlike Andy Pandy or The Flowerpot Men, the new programme had a masculine narrator, the characters were given voices and were structured within a narrative. The characters, Rag the hedgehog, Tag the mouse and Bobtail the rabbit, were placed within the classic fairytale tradition and each story started with 'Once upon a time...'. The narration used the third person to frame the voices of the characters and the narrator used direct address to the viewer at home. The narrator impersonated the characters, giving the impression that they had an identity distinct from that of the narrator at the same time as constituting their identity within his voice. The first instalment of the programme, which was shown to parents in the evening beforehand (presumably to gain their consent), was described as presenting three 'normal animals in their natural surroundings - they will not wear clothes and will not talk direct' (The Star, 31 August 1953).

Although the programme escaped from the confines of the domestic, the rural was nevertheless domesticated and tamed. Similarly, in 1955, The Woodentops
presented an image of rural domesticity and happy family life. Although the narrator is motherly the characters are given a voice of their own and even the dog has a bark.

These programmes, alongside Picture Book, were presented within a regular schedule and were intended each to 'reflect a different aspect of a small child's life'. Lingstrom stated that:

Andy Pandy had satisfied their wish for a friend of their own age; The Flowerpot Men were to cater for their need for fantasy; the little glove puppets, Rag, Tag and Bobtail, were to bring soft, cuddly toys to life; the Woodentops were to illustrate a small child's enjoyment of playing families, and "Picture Book" was to encourage the creative impulse by giving children things to do. (Good Housekeeping, January 1963)

In scheduling the programmes in this way the BBC were able to address and constitute the different needs of the audience at the same time as constituting those differences within a single pre-school child audience. The series form allowed the pre-school audience to become visible as an audience for television and in so doing constituted a relationship between mother, child and television. The techniques deployed owed more to the formation of that particular set of relations than it did to any logic of 'representation' or the politics of 'realism'. The series was constituted within specific techniques and occasions of viewing within which the domestic and the familial were its constituent elements.

Rituals of Viewing

The broadcasting of different programmes within a series provided a means of dividing the pre-school audience from other child, and adult, audiences and, paradoxically, of providing some form of continuity between the different age-groups of viewers. Watch with Mother was 'hived-off in the early afternoon' so that the young audience 'need not fear the scorn of impatient elders'. But the 'hiving-off' was also conceived in terms of what Owen Reed called 'the rope-ladder concept', such that children's television was like 'a rope-ladder which children ascend by standing on one rung and instinctively reaching up for the next'.

24 The characters included 'Mummy Woodentop and baby, daddy Woodentop, the two twins, Willy and Jenny, Mrs Scrubbit, who comes to help Mummy Woodentop, Sam, who helps Daddy Woodentop and Spottydog' and they all live in 'a little house in the country'.

25 Reed was conscious of the problems with his concept. He stated that 'it is really a very
showed in the previous chapter, the arrangement of children's programmes both separated children from each other and constituted each division within a hierarchy of the child's development. Such practices did not merely reflect the 'nature' of the child nor did they simply borrow from the discourses of education and developmental psychology. Rather, in producing divisions and continuity, children's television aligned itself in relation to the authorities of education and psychological expertise.

Moreover, even though *Watch with Mother* emerged within a set of disciplinary techniques, it also sought to produce an affective relationship between the very young viewer and the mother. *Watch with Mother* was never scheduled within the main bulk of children's programmes between 5pm and 6pm. When, in September 1950 the Controller of Television sent a memo to Cecil Madden arguing that *Andy Pandy* should be shown with the rest of children's programmes, Richmond Postgate firmly responded stating that at 5pm three year olds should be thinking of bed (13 September 1950, T2/7/1). Initially *Andy Pandy* was shown in the afternoon between 3.45pm and 4pm at the end of the women's programme *For Women* and announcements for the programme were intended to address 'mothers at home'. Maria Bird, in a policy document concerning the objectives of the programme, stated in August 1950 that:

complicated ladder where certain tastes and enthusiasms run far ahead of others, so that a Prudence Kittenite may become a Sketch Club fan though not yet ready for Paul of Tarsus'. Nevertheless, Reed held that it was a technique for making intelligible the very young audience and he stated that '[t]he rope-ladder concept expresses itself in a basic programme pattern' (Reed, 1961). Reed also used the notion of the 'climbing-frame' to describe this pattern and referred to the way that 'this unconscious spurring-on produces results'. Reed, however, recognised, as did Lingstrom before him, that the effectiveness of the strategy relied on the responsibilities of the parent:

The safety of such a policy depends on parents realizing that children need adults with them at the deep end until they have learnt to swim. The Crucifixion scene in *Jesus of Nazareth* and the terror of the hysterical boy in *The Secret Garden* have a meaning of infinite value for children to unravel but they are not for little children to see unaccompanied. (Reed, 20 November 1961)

26 For example, Sylvia Peters, in an announcement on Tuesday 18 July 1950 after *Shop at Home*, stated:

And now, may I remind those of you who have been looking at "Shop at Home" that at a quarter to 4 we are putting on the third programme in our short series for very young children - for three-year-olds. Andy Pandy will be shown again at that time. You will know that he is the friendly little puppet who comes to play with the very young children. (T2/7/1)
It appears to be in the interest of the child that the series should be attached to a women's programme and separate from the Children's Hour. The performance should be seen at a time when older children are at school, so that the very young can look without the disturbance of the reactions of older children. If this can be achieved both the pre-school child and his mother may come to feel that this programme is especially theirs. (31 August 1950, T2/7/1)

The programme was designed to fit into the routines of both mothers and small children and changes to its scheduling caused minor revolts widely reported in the press. When in 1963 the BBC planned to show Watch with Mother at 10.45am, the Daily Sketch declared that 'for most small children 10.45 is a time to "Watch Without Mother". And there's not much joy in that.' However, although the timing of the programme was intended to provide a space 'especially' for mother and small child, it is clear that some viewers saw it as a means to do other things. A letter in the Evening Standard from Mrs Olive Attwater stated:

The critics have a lot to say about every programme except Watch with Mother. Yet how many mothers, I wonder, are deeply grateful for this simple programme, which gives them at least one moment's relief during the day. (Evening Standard, 23 June 1956)

Whether or not mothers actually did watch with their children, what emerges from my investigation of the material is that the BBC had been successful at creating a 'loving' and 'caring' relationship between mother, child and television as a specifically discursive space. The techniques of scheduling, programme announcements, the construction of the motherly voice and gaze, the silencing of...
the child, the imaging of a rural domesticity and the presentation of specific activities (e.g. nursery rhymes, playing, 'movement', etc) were formed in relation to specific knowledges which made intelligible the relationship between mother, child and television. Andy Pandy can perhaps be seen as the first programme in Britain to be 'pre-tested'. The initial series of four experimental programmes were coupled with audience research into the habits of young viewers and their mothers.28

The programme makers welcomed viewers' letters and invited further response.29 Research into the audience was conducted by the Audience Research Department for the four experimental programmes and in November 1950 Maria Bird addressed the audience of mothers at home informing them about the type of programme Andy Pandy was and inviting further criticisms and comments.30 The 'talk' referred to the fact that 'some people think there ought not to be a programme for very young children at all', but continued by saying that 'we know that children of this age do look at television, so we have tried to make a suitable programme for them, as different as possible from those for the older children' (14 November 1950, T2/7/1). She also, importantly, stated that:

I hope very much that you will be able to look at the programmes with the children. I know that in some cases it is not possible, but we do want to know the children's reactions, and you are really the only people who can tell us if we are on the right lines. (ibid)

The incitement of the responsibilities of mothers in watching with their children fed into a spiral of power and knowledge. The mother acted as a relay not only of the means of supervising the child but also of gathering knowledge of this small audience. The Audience Research Department, likewise, invited mothers to respond to their questionnaires.31 They wanted to know whether children between two

28 Listen with Mother received similar attention from the Audience Research Department. It is significant that the 'twinkly noises' and so on that McCulloch had been so disparaging about were conceived by both the respondants of the Audience Research Departments questionnaires and the programme makers themselves as a central component within the programme and as accounting, in part, for its popularity.

29 The BBC announced, after Shop at Home and Women of Today, that some of the suggestions would be 'incorporated' and would help in deciding the future of the programme (see 18 July, 20 July, 1 August and 19 September 1950, T2/7/1).

30 The research conducted by the Audience Research Department was initiated by the children's television producer, Naomi Capon (19 June 1950, T2/7/1).

31 The survey employed two methods: firstly, 600 questionnaires were sent out to viewers with at least one child under seven years, of which 290 were completed; and secondly, questionnaires and the routine weekly logs were completed by the London Viewing Panel (18
years and five years old watched television 'fairly regularly', whether
programmes for this audience were 'a good idea', whether the children watched
alone, with an adult or with older children, whether they were sitting down,
standing up or moving about, whether their attention was held throughout,
whether they joined in the movements or singing, whether they remembered and
used any of the sayings or songs and what would be the most convenient time for
the programme to be shown. Most children of this age group, it was discovered,
watched television regularly. Ninety percent of the respondents thought that a
programme for this age group was a good idea. Some stated that it was good
training 'in sitting still and concentrating' and that it would allow them to 'focus
their interest in television on to suitable subjects and thus make them less apt to
demand a share of 'grown-up' programmes'. Two-thirds of the children watched
with an adult and others who did not actually sit with their child 'spied unnoticed
on their child's reactions'. Most children sat to watch the programme and about a
third always responded to the songs and movements. And while most children, it
was stated, believed Andy to be 'real', some children were 'more sophisticated'. The
respondants also pointed out that 'great care' needed to be taken 'to prevent Andy
doing anything that it would be unwise for a child to imitate' and that when
invited to imitate Andy's actions they became 'embarrassed and worried' (due, it
was said, to 'children's shyness of strangers'). The research not only indicated to
the BBC what was liked or disliked about the programme, but also showed how this
type of programming could become embedded within the daily domestic routines of
mothers and children. The audience needed to be made intelligible as an audience
and the place of television in the lives of mothers and very young viewers needed
to be made visible as an object of intervention. In this sense, Watch with Mother
both acted as a specific element in making the audience an object of government
and in forming specific techniques of intervention. In the following section I
consider how those techniques of power/knowledge were re-formed in the 1970s
and I look at the contemporary pre-school children's programme Playdays.

The Government of the Pre-School Child Audience II: Learning, Life and
Television

Playdays, which was originally entitled Playbus, began on 17 October 1988. It is

August 1950, VR/50/279).

32 Muffin the Mule was cited as the most popular programme.
shown regularly on weekdays at 10.05am on BBC1 and lasts 25 minutes. It was intended to replace the long running *Play School* which had begun on 21 April 1964. It was, and is, produced by Felgate Productions Ltd, which was formerly headed by Cynthia Felgate until her death in 1991. Felgate had worked with Anna Home, now Head of Children's Programmes at the BBC, on *Play School*. She helped set up *Playaway* in 1971 and *Think of a Number* in 1977. She also helped to develop *Postman Pat* and was editor of a number of programmes shown in the series *Watch with Mother*. Felgate Productions Ltd was set up in 1987 with a number of her old BBC colleagues, including Anne Gobey, who was executive producer of the children's programme *Corners*, and Michael Cole, who had worked with Felgate on *Play School*. Michael Cole said of her:

She brought to programme making a truly democratic belief in the equal opportunities that television could offer to all children. "Offer" was the crucial word.
As television developed and became more and more obsessed with winning the ratings battle, her attitude was always that writers, directors, actors, designers or musicians were there to "offer" the child information and entertainment. This was the philosophy of *Play School* and its successor, *Playdays*. (*The Guardian*, 8 November 1991)

The setting up of *Playdays* in the late 1980s was caught up in an increasing concern about deregulation and the rationalisation of television production according to market supply and demand principles rather than any notion of public service. Children's programmes were perceived to be under threat and pre-school children's programmes were seen to be under greater threat. It was difficult to conceive of that audience in terms of its ability either to gather a mass audience or to gain advertising revenue. In March 1988 Michael Grade announced that Channel Four was to stop commissioning children's programmes and to deploy 'precious resources' to the teenage audience, which, according to Grade, was 'sorely neglected'. Dan Madicott, Head of Children's Channel, which produced, and still produces, about four hours of pre-school television, was

---

33 Like other children's programmes it has associated character merchandise, including a weekly magazine.

34 Question about the deregulation, or perhaps more accurately the 'neo-liberalisation', of television broadcasting had clearly been placed on the political agenda since the Peacock Report in 1986. Nevertheless, the publication of the White Paper on Broadcasting (1988), which led to the Broadcasting Act of 1990, intensified these concerns.

35 Greg Dyke, of London Weekend Television, stated at the Edinburgh Television Festival 1988 that children's programmes were too costly and 'produced little effect' (cf. Messenger Davies,*The Guardian*, 17 October 1988).
bemused by Grade's action: 'you don't need a lot of money to make good programmes, certainly not for under-fives. That's a completely spurious argument'. The developmental psychologist and journalist Maire Messenger Davis stated that:

Grade's stance also shows no appreciation of what both Anna Home and Cynthia Felgate recognise: that today's audience of young children is tomorrow's teenage and adult audience. They see "diversity and choice" as essential in developing discrimination in children and in creating a discriminating "adult audience of the future". (The Guardian, 28 March 1988)36

These different statements, I want to argue, are formed within a 'child-centred' discourse concerning children's television viewing. The language of 'offering' children 'diversity and choice' and of making 'discriminate' viewers, although here deployed in opposition to neo-liberal changes within the structure and economics of television broadcasting, bears an uncanny resemblance to the discourse of economic liberalism. I am not suggesting that the child-centred discourse was invented as a particular strategy of the neo-liberal rationality, but rather that it provided one of the conditions for thinking about the child television audience as 'consumers'. Sue Elliott, then Television Programme Officer for the Independent Broadcasting Authority (IBA) and a representative on the ITV children's sub-committee, echoed a slightly different note when she stated:

Young kids are not part of the market - but children's programmes are an important part of the schedule that need protecting... We've always taken the view that ITV should cater for the less educationally-advantaged children who don't enjoy a lot of parental interest and rely on the television. Good pre-school television provides them with experiences of the world outside the home and knowledge of relationships they wouldn't otherwise have. (The Guardian, 28 March 1988)

Nevertheless, a concern to 'cater for' 'disadvantaged' children was equally central in the formation of a child-centred discourse. In the remainder of this chapter I want to look at that discourse in relation to the pre-school programme Playdays and in the following chapter I look more specifically at neo-liberalism and a child-centred discourse.

Playdays is organised around the notion of a 'playbus' making different stops on

36 Messenger Davis was a founder member of British Action for Children's Television, which was set up in March 1989, primarily as a response to the Conservative government's White Paper on Broadcasting (1988).
each day of the week: Monday is the 'Why Bird Stop'; Tuesday is the 'Playground Stop'; Wednesday is the 'Dot Stop'; Thursday is the 'Patch Stop'; and Friday is the 'Tent Stop'. In dividing up the week into different 'stops' with different programme forms and different presenters, the series format was able to provide, Felgate argued, 'maximum opportunity for inventiveness, new content and changing styles of production' (The Guardian, 17 October 1988). Although the series format was talked about in terms of 'offering' 'diversity and choice', rather than a notion of 'reflecting', as Lingstrom had stated, the 'real lives' of the under-fives, it was, nevertheless, formed upon earlier techniques of constituting a distinct pre-school child television audience which had emerged in the early 1950s. The different experiences and pleasures of this audience were able to be constructed through the different programmes but within the unity of the series. The title sequence provided a master narrative through which the series and audience could be held together.37 The programme opens with the title 'Playdays', written in primary colours in the middle of the screen, which then turns into a bus carrying the main characters of the series. The bus, which has a face on it, smiling through headlights, bumper and grill, proceeds on a journey from countryside into town and back into countryside, whereupon it finally stops at a bus stop. The bus stop sign spins around and then stops to reveal the day's location. The bus journey is accompanied by off-screen children's regional voices saying: 'It's a playbus'; 'But where does it go?'; 'Where does it stop?'; 'What's the sign on the lollipop?'; 'Stop, it's the Why Bird Stop!' The series is framed within a set of children's statements and questions. It is encoded through the questioning, examination and experience of the pre-school audience and positions the viewer as one who asks questions and seeks answers.

The title sequence figures the different stops within images of 'everyday life'. Although there are no overt signs for the different stops, we see a playground (the Playground Stop), a billboard poster (the Dot Stop), a 'Whytech' machine (the Why Bird Stop) and a play tent (the Play Tent Stop). Through covertly embedding the different stops in the practices of everyday life, the ordinary is made into an act of discovery: a veritable feast of signifiers which await the viewer's discovery and recognition of itself within the community of the pre-school audience and within a world which is refracted through the codes of that community. The everyday is

37 The title sequence is more than, to use John Ellis's term, a 'narrative image'. It does more than say what the series is about and incite our desire to see more (Ellis, 1982, 120). It is embedded within a set of discursive practices concerned with the routines and management of domestic life and the nature, and unity, of this audience.
encoded within the terms of early childhood. The bus journey passes rabbits, ducks and other animals. It passes a city pond, shops and houses. Road signs mark the journey. The dashboard of the bus is shown with its dials and meters. When the bus travels through a small tunnel, it emerges with a shower of light, balloons and streamers. The everyday is like a party and the division between country and town merges into a continuous landscape, painted in primary water colours, in which there is no fundamental difference.\textsuperscript{38} The viewer is positioned both as an observer, looking at the bus journey and into this childhood world, and also as a participant in the bus, as a driver looking out.

A range of techniques are deployed in the series of which I will identify four, concerning: a) the facilitation of the child's development and the delineation of a space of play and learning; b) adult/child relations in terms of relations of authority (i.e. questions about the authority of the narrator); c) the address to and construction of a pre-school child community within urban, rural and domestic settings. These techniques are not unified and are sometimes contradictory. They are dispersed throughout the programmes and are not connected with particular characters, stories, themes or settings. In this sense they form a structure for different narrative and textual features. Likewise they are dispersed across a range of pre-school programmes, to such an extent that we might say that they constitute the diversity of programmes as specifically \textit{for} the pre-school child audience.

\textbf{The Facilitation of Child Development and the Delineation of a Space of Learning and Play}

The child-centred discourse of offering choice and diversity can be exemplified by looking at a short sequence from the Why Bird Stop in which Why, the woodpecker puppet, and the Bus Driver, played by Stuart Bradley, play a choosing game.\textsuperscript{39} Both Stuart and Why each have a box of household objects and they take it in turn to pick out an object. The other then looks in their box to see if they can find an object which rhymes with the object initially chosen. It is a game of examination and name-identification and of the relationship between different sound-images. But it also displays a certain relationship between adult and child and constitutes

\textsuperscript{38} The shift away from the images of rural domesticity occurs primarily with the production of \textit{Mary, Mungo and Midge} in the late 1960s.

\textsuperscript{39} This particular programme was originally screened on 11 November 1991.
the child within a particular pedagogic space. For example:

Stuart [S] (bringing in the two trays): All these things here are for a game. You have to find things that rhyme.

Why Bird [WB]: Ah, ah. But what are all these bits and bobs for Stuart.

S: I was just saying Why, it's a rhyming game. Now the idea is that you pick one thing from one tray and then choose something from the other tray that rhymes with the first thing.


S: OK I'll go first. I'll choose this. Here's a piece of lace. Why, see if you can find something to rhyme with lace.

WB: Now have we got a case?

S: I don't think there's a suitcase on there Why.

WB: Well it rhymes doesn't it!

S: It does rhyme.

WB: Do you know, I can't see anything. What, what's this thing here? What is it?

S (laughing): Well done Why. It's a face.

WB: Oh a face. Can I choose one now.

S: Face and lace. Right, your go.

WB: Right. Oooh, I want this nice green toad.

S: I think that green toad is a frog.

WB: Oh is it.

S: Ribbit. Ribbit.

Children's play is a central figure, not only in *Playdays*, but in all pre-school children's television. In the above example Why continually asks questions about how to play the game and about what objects are visible. In playing the game and in asking questions, play is articulated with learning. Yet at the same time, the freedom of the child/Why Bird is secured precisely through that play. Stuart, in failing to explain the game sufficiently for Why Bird to understand, does not then persist with his instruction, rather he suggests that the bird will learn through playing the game itself. Valerie Walkerdine has argued that this pedagogic technique emerged in the 1930s and was popularised in the 1960s and 1970s with, for example, the Plowden Report on *Children and their Primary Schools* (1967). Play, she argues, although it has a much longer genealogy, was aligned with the freedom of the child within the work of developmental psychologists, such as Jean Piaget and Susan Isaacs. In this child-centred discourse, learning is able to take place both in the school and in the home, such that everyday life can be construed

40 It is noticeable that, unlike Muffin, Andy Pandy or Bill and Ben, the characters in *Playdays* all have a voice. As I stated earlier in this chapter, the shift, in terms of giving the child an autonomous voice, begins to occur in the mid-1950s with *The Woodentops*. 
as a pedagogic encounter. The product of such techniques, it was argued, was the child as a democratic citizen: '[c]hildren were free to play, and this was part of ensuring the free citizen' (Walkerdine and Lucey, 1989, 82). However, play itself is not enough. The child's learning within this pedagogic space needs to be 'facilitated' through the guiding hand of the caring adult. Instead of correcting Why Bird's mistakes, Stuart uses phrases like 'I think that' or 'I don't think that'.

Two points emerge from the above. Firstly, the freedom of Why Bird is predicated upon the disavowal of the authority of the adult. Unlike the authoritative motherly voice of Maria Bird in Andy Pandy, Stuart both feigns partial ignorance and supports Why Bird's initial understanding of the game. In this sense, although Playdays is still located within a discourse of 'caring for the child', it shifts the terms of caring away from direct supervision towards caring 'at a distance'. It provides the child with the space of a 'supervised freedom'. However, the positioning of looks within the sequence (the play of shot-reverse-shot) allows a form of identification with both Why Bird and Stuart (child and adult). Although such a technique establishes relations of authority and the terms of its instrumentation, it cannot determine who will occupy those positions. However, instead of providing a space of resistance to this form of subjectification, the possibility of taking up either position works to intensify the binding of the subject. The voice of authority is, by definition, a voice of knowledge and also its ideal. It forms a double-bind. In order for the child to know and to have authority, it must become like the one who knows. It must take up this voice. At one level, this procedure is very different from Foucault's description of 'the organisation of geneses', but it does construct developmental divisions, such that there is a path of evolution from the elementary to the advanced (Foucault, 1977, 156-62).

Secondly, the adult characters within Playdays are neither motherly nor even

41 Walkerdine argues that play takes on connotations of freedom in the 1930s within the context of the rise of fascism. Educational discourse within Britain needed to distance itself from the regimented training of the German school system, which was seen as an important factor in the production of fascist characteristics (Walkerdine, 1984, 180-1).

42 Walkerdine and Lucey state that:

Play and learning become inseparable. The learning environment becomes the entire home, every possible permutation of events, actions and conversations becomes a 'not to be missed' opportunity for a valuable lesson. But the lesson cannot be discovered by the child alone. It must be directed carefully and sensitively taught, directed, by the mother, to ensure that the right lesson is learned. The good mother must always be there. (Walkerdine and Lucey, 1989, 82)
parental. Neither do we see the 'mother' constructed within the text nor do we 'see' the mother outside. Nevertheless, the concentration of techniques within this child-centred discourse provides a master position from which the different characters can speak. It is a position which is both motherly and teacherly. As Walkerdine, Urwin and others have argued, this child-centred discourse constitutes a bridge between home and school (Walkerdine, 1984; Walkerdine and Lucey, 1989; Urwin, 1985). The home (including television viewing and other activities) has become a pedagogic site constituted within a discourse of developmental psychology. But this discourse, within a televisual space, constitutes a world in which ordinary people help facilitate a development and learning from life. This discursive formation constructs a community of caring people. Although Playdays escapes from the confines of both home and rural tranquility, it is still located within a world which has become domesticated. And, as I shall argue shortly, this domestication is also untroubled and harmonious.

The Establishment of Positions of Authority

The establishment of positions of authority are not constituted specifically as relations of power. They can be taken up by both child and adult and it is only through such flexibility that power can be exercised. For example, in all the programmes, except the Tent Stop (which is itself a complete narrative), a story is told within one section of the programme. In the Patch Stop, Pam Eyres tells the story of 'Piggo' the piglet who lives on a farm. The Playground Stop typically chooses a well known story, such as Mr and Mrs Hay the Horse by the Ahlbergs. In these stories the narrator is an adult and the story is framed within their voice. However, in the Why Bird Stop, Why often tells the story. In a programme 11 November 1991, Why tells the story of Penelope the Penguin, about a penguin who could not fly and who finally realises that she can fly under the water. The narration is accompanied by still hand-drawn pictures on screen. The meaning of what we see is enframed within the voice of the narrator. Even though Why tells the story it could equally have been told by Stuart. There are no signs which

43 For example, we might note here the developmental psychologist, Barbara Tizard's work on children's cognitive and linguistic development in the context of home and school (cf. the discussion of pre-school children's television viewing in Tizard and Hughes, 1984). Tizard also was one of the founder members of the children's television pressure group, British Action for Children's Television (BACTV).

44 Walkerdine and Lucey make it clear that 'harmony' is formed along lines of class and gender. The imagining of the child as a free, autonomous and reasonable citizen is at a cost (Walkerdine and Lucey, 1989, 101-17).
distinguish Why as a narrator. The authority of the narrator is contained within the position itself. The narrator is a position that, although it signifies a position of adult authority, can nevertheless be taken up by the child-figure of Why.

'Fingerprint Farm', which is a regular story in the Dot Stop, presents another and quite different example of such positioning. It is set in an imaginary world in which the animals and the environment are constructed around painted fingerprints ('a fingerprint world at Fingerprint Farm'). The farmer, Farmer Hand, is a real hand which constructs the world around itself. It makes fingerprint animal friends and fingerprint scenes and yet it does not usually act within this environment. The hand is also the narrator of the story. In a story about a butterfly which has got caught in a spider's web, a hen, a duck and a cow all attempt to free the butterfly but all get caught in the web themselves. At one point the voice-over says, 'I'll make a wind to blow the web away from the butterfly.' The hand does so. But once the attempt has failed, the farmer makes a frost and the leaves on the trees fall along with the web and the animals are freed. The hand is constituted as a constructed and constructing machine. It is both inside and outside the diegetic space. In one instance though (30 January 1992) the animals on the farm are bored and Farmer Hand gets them to play a game of looking at the clouds and trying to identify what animal they can see. The animals can recognise other animals but they cannot recognise themselves. Then when it is Farmer Hand's turn a fingerprint hand is presented on screen, as if a cloud. The Farmer is unable to recognise himself. The other animals laugh and repeat the refrain, 'Funny how you know all the other animals, but don't know yourself'. At this point in the narrative, the narrative changes from first person to third person. Although the other animals are given voices and although Farmer Hand is able to be present within this diegetic space, it is only Farmer Hand who is able to take up the position of the narrator.

This technique is deployed, not only across a number of the programmes, but also in relation to other scenarios. For example, the Dot Stop provides the clearest example of the omnipotent masculine narrator being positioned as an authoritative voice. The voice, as with the motherly voice of Andy Pandy, establishes a complicity between the viewer and itself and an equivalence between the diegetic space and the space of viewing at home. In one programme (13 November 1991) the narrator asks, 'Where's Dot?'. Dot appears playing a violin. Dot, as with other characters in the programmes, does not speak. The narrator narrates her actions and also the environment around her (e.g. wind blows in the studio when the narrator refers to the wind). At one point the narrator asks, when Dot
looks at a thin piece of cut-out card on mobile, 'What's that? It's too thin to see'. It then goes on, 'Something yellow something round'. Dot then turns the shape around so that it is clearly visible to the camera. 'It's the sun with a face that smiles.' The act of discovery is constituted within specific relations of authority. However, this voice, unlike in Andy Pandy, is not embodied. It is absolutely other and absolutely indeterminant (cf. Bonitzer, 1986, and Doane, 1986). In the programme, in contrast again to Andy Pandy, the voiceless Dot is able to act out meanings through mime. We are not dependent on the voice to make intelligible the events on screen. The space of the studio, which is both the space of the diegesis and the space of the screen, contains virtually nothing and yet from the scraps of paper and other household items it is formed into an imaginary world, created, invented and re-invented through the actions of the characters and not purely through the voice of the narration. For example, Dot makes a drum from a piece of card and some tissue paper. She makes a kazoo from a comb and some tissue paper. The comb is then brushed against her clothes to create static and pick up pieces of tissue paper on the floor. A balloon is likewise rubbed against her clothes to pick up the paper. Meaning is clearly constituted through showing and doing rather than simply from doing and saying. This in itself does not contest the authority of the position of the narrator, but presents a space in which the narrator has not chosen to speak.

The Address to and Construction of the Pre-School Child Community

This technique is deployed in the title sequence, which I have already described above, but it is also deployed across the series in different forms. For example, in the Playground Stop (28 January 1992) there is an outside broadcast of a family (mum, dad and three girls of about four and five years). The family is presented as having a 'dressing up party' in which they search around the house for old clothes, boxes, pieces of tin foil, and so on to create costumes for themselves. We see them hunting in garages, cupboards and cluttered rooms. We see them making the costumes and then at the end of the sequence they present themselves: a clown, a mermaid, a robot, a scarecrow and a pixie. The scene is completely narrated by the children themselves.

Likewise, in the Patch Stop (30 January 1992), there is an outside broadcast of Scott and Jamie, aged about five years, who tell us about their home and their community. The scene is constructed in the form of a video-telephone communication between Patch, the rag doll, and the two boys. Patch phones them
up and speaks to them directly, and their narration operates as if they were speaking to Patch ('Time to talk to some friends Peggy' says the adult who accompanies Peggy Patch). This form establishes a complicity between pre-school children at home (Scott and Jamie are presented as if they were ordinary pre-school children) and the space of the programme. In showing different types of children it presents an image of the diversity of environments, lifestyles and types of children and families that exist within the category of 'pre-school children'. This particular form offers, as Felgate might say, a space in which such children can speak for themselves and from their perspective. And yet it is framed within the questions that Patch asks ('What's it like where you live?', 'What's the weather like today?' and so on). When the questions are asked we have a shot of Paggy Patch on the phone. For example, when Patch asks 'What colours do you see on your way to the village?', the children respond as they walk on their way to the village shop: they see red berries, the green of the road signs and the trees and so on. This technique, then, both addresses the child within the diegetic space of the programme as a particular community and in doing so it constitutes the diversity of children presented as a community. The differences between the urban, rural, domestic and public life are framed as a series of differences within the life of this community. These techniques, which form a specific pedagogic space, certain relations of authority and a particular community of pre-school children, emerge within a set of concerns about 'disadvantaged families' and children's learning. Those concerns are visible in the earlier debates about Play School in the late 1960s and 1970s.

When, in 1988, Playdays replaced Play School, there was a commotion in the British press. Anna Home, in her history of children's television, lists a number of headlines: 'Please Don't Dump Humpty' (Daily Mirror), 'A Great Fall, Victoria Coren Weeps For Play School' (Daily Telegraph), 'Last Turn of the Lock' (The Guardian) and 'Humpty Dumpty Dumped, Beeb Faces Backlash On Play School Chop' (Daily Star). Both programmes, though, were in many ways very similar: they were constituted within a child-centred discourse. Statements concerning Play School made by the BBC display explicitly the problem which Sue Elliott mentions in relation to Playdays, namely that of 'disadvantaged children'. For Elliott, good pre-

45 The Daily Star reported that 'the move is certain to infuriate millions of mums and dads who have trusted Play School not to scare, indoctrinate or confuse their children' (cited in Home, 1993, 49). The announcement that Play School was to stop production came in March, although programmes ran until October 1988. This was a timely event as it coincided with a meeting between the BBC and parents and teachers in Birmingham to discuss the future of under-fives television.
school television provided 'less educationally-advantaged children' with the care and attention which was absent from some families (Elliott, 1988).

Play School was the opening programme of the new BBC2 service on 21 April 1964. It was shown regularly on weekdays at 11am on BBC2, lasted 25 minutes and was repeated in the early afternoon (at about 4pm) on BBC1 for children returning home from school. It was created by Joy Whitby, who had worked on Listen with Mother, and was later produced by Felgate from 1967 to 1987. It was seen by the BBC's General Advisory Council, in a publication entitled Children as Viewers and Listeners, as an 'innovation and an important one in the realm of pre-school experience' (1974, 5). Introducing mime, music, poetry, stories, films and experiments to children, it was intended to 'extend interest and suggest ideas for creative play' (ibid, 5). Through its mainstay of dolls and teddys (Humpty, Jemima, Big Ted and Little Ted), pets, and familiar routines, such as the telling of the time on the clock before the reading of the story, the looking through the windows and filmed sequences of the outside world, it was directed at a particular audience.47

The Advisory Council stated that 'in many homes no adult is available to bring the child to the programme regularly and so he is spoken to directly and encouraged to want to watch and participate' (ibid, 5). As with other pre-school children's programming, there was an emphasis on 'encouragement' rather than 'instruction'.48 This 'encouragement' was particularly directed at 'disadvantaged

46 The programme was originally staffed by: Felgate, production assistant; Molly Cox, production assistant; Daphne Jones, research assistant; Anna Home, research assistant; and Dorothea Brooking, producer.
47 The title sequence had the image of a house, drawn in simple medium thick black lines, accompanied by the verse:

Here is a house,
Here is a door,
Windows one, two, three, four,
Ready to knock, turn the lock,
It's Play School.

The title of the programme and the image of the house, rather than a school, neatly display the articulation of school with home.
48 The Advisory Council stated that:

There is no directive to learn, but a constant encouragement to play with rhymes, songs, movement, sounds, painting and dressing up. Nursery rhymes, clapping rhymes, and tongue twisters encourage the child to experiment with words and, from time to time, new and sometimes difficult words are introduced and explained to widen the child's vocabulary. (BBC General Advisory Council, 1974, 5)
children'.

It is sometimes suggested that there is a need to make programmes directed specifically at pre-school children who come from homes where there are seldom or never adults available and willing to talk to them and where reading and writing are virtually unknown. Such children will continue to suffer throughout their schooldays because words and numbers are unfamiliar to them and it will be then too late for them to catch up. They are caught in a cycle of deprivation in which their parents may well have been caught before them and from which their own children, in their turn, may also find it difficult to escape. But television reaches inside their homes. Could it not do something positive to help? (ibid, 10)

However, the programme makers were faced with the problem that if the programme was overtly addressed to such an audience, they would not watch it.

The experience of the BBC Children's Programmes Department is that children do not like to be singled out and treated as a special audience. They are sensitive to their differences and want to conceal them, so they try to merge with everybody else. For this reason Play School, for example, is offered to all children of varying backgrounds, who have only one thing in common - their particular age range. (ibid, 10).

The quote exemplifies two points. Firstly, there was a conception of 'disadvantaged children' as a deceptive audience: an audience that masquerades as something it is not and disavows its difference. In this sense, the programme was seen itself as complicit in a reluctance to expose difference. And secondly, the BBC, in order to address a diversity of backgrounds and particularly the fundamental difference between advantaged and disadvantaged children, must likewise disavow any difference and constitute the pre-school child audience as a unity in terms of age alone. It is strikingly evident that, in disavowing social difference, the criterion of age alone was not capable of constituting the audience as unified. Although Play School was addressed to all children, it was for disadvantaged children.49

While there was a stress on the playfulness of language (as against the concern about the language of Bill and Ben), there was a more intense concern about the linguistic development of pre-school children. The Advisory Council continued by stating that:

Since many children live in homes where adults seldom hold a conversation with them this aspect of pre-school programmes is regarded as more important than attempting actually to teach reading or arithmatic to children who are not yet five. The aim is not to fill children with even (even useful) information, but to awaken in them a desire to find out and learn for themselves. (ibid, 5)

49 Reading against the grain, we can also see how Sesame Street was invented to tackle similar
The discourse of the child television audience that I have begun to map here was contemporaneous with a wider set of documents, discussions and debates concerning urban decay, deprivation and lawlessness. Pre-school education, in school, home and elsewhere, was seen as a particular mechanism through which order and harmony could be established. In a speech to the Pre-School Playgroups Association in 1972, Sir Keith Joseph talked about the problems of deprivation and maladjustment in terms of what he called the 'cycle of deprivation' in which sectors of the population were seen to be trapped. Intervention into the pre-school years by various social agencies was formed as a particular response and television was demarcated as one of the means through which that sector of the population could be reached. But the attempt to reach it was not so much through the programmes themselves, but through the viewing practices which could be incited. For example, the Bullock Report on education, *A Language for Life* (1975) argued that television, far from causing the decline of standards of reading, could actually be deployed as a technique to facilitate literacy and children's linguistic development. It argued that television made the 'vocabulary of the moment eminently available to children. The vocabulary of politics, popular music, space travel, and industry is acquired by children not through the adult programmes of news and comment, but through cartoons, children's serials and tea-time entertainment programmes' (ibid, 61). And it stated that television 'exposes children to a range of accents, idioms, and registers which they would not otherwise hear' (ibid). However, it was not to the socialising problems. It was specifically directed at the children of *black* urban ghettos in the United States. *Sesame Street* emerged out of the Head Start project which hoped to address the problems of disadvantage, not through economic measures, but through facilitating children's learning and development. As we would expect there was a wealth of research into the 'teaching' capabilities of the programme (cf. Ball and Bogatz, 1970 and Bogatz and Ball, 1972). I should state that, in reading *Sesame Street* in this way, I am not saying that the text is bound to those conditions of existence. It can be read otherwise.

50 In the 1960s a playgroup movement emerged which formed the Pre-School Playgroups Association. Playgroups were funded by the State in order to counter the problems of disadvantage (cf. Rose, 1989).

51 The issue concerning the adequacy of nursery school provision was a crucial debate at this time. In 1971 there was no public and universal nursery school provision. Only 55 per cent of three year olds and 35 per cent of four year olds went to nursery school (cf. Dunn, 1977).

52 In 1972 the National Foundation for Educational Research declared that reading standards had declined in the late 1960s. The then Minister for Education, Margaret Thatcher, called upon Sir Allan Bullock to chair an enquiry (cf. Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies education Group, 1981). The Report drew upon the research by Himmelweit with regards to the question of whether television leads to a decline in reading (Bullock Report, 1975, 13, 14 and 61).
capabilities of television that the Bullock Committee turned, but rather to its ability
to incite an exchange of dialogue and experience between mother and child. Television viewing was to be imagined as one of the sites through which the child could be 'bathed in language' and in order to do so pre-school children's programmes needed to address both child and parent. The programmes needed to engage with 'the experience', the pleasures and points of identification, of the mother.

The most effective will be the programme that makes this a certain outcome; it is not likely to happen if the mother's experience cannot so engage with what she is seeing as to draw her to elaborate upon it. This in itself is an argument for a tone and content with which she can find a good measure of identification. (ibid, p.61)

In concert with this tactic, the Committee also suggested, although it was never carried out, that 'schools and social agencies [should begin] to promote active participation'. It advocated showing the programmes, via video tape, in ante-natal clinics, as it was 'convinced that the dividends would be out of all proportion to the cost and effort' (ibid, p.326). Although the Report seems to echo some of the concerns that I mapped out in relation to *Watch with Mother* in the early 1950s,

53 Although the Report particularly praised programmes such as *Rainbow, Mr Trimble, Playtime* and *You and Me*, it was not due to the 'content' of the programmes, but to their ability to provide 'a common experience' and 'opportunities to talk' (ibid, 61). *You and Me* was invented in 1974 by the Schools Broadcasting Department. The General Advisory Council stated that it 'pays particular attention to the needs of children aged 4-5 whose language may be restricted' and it was intended to explore 'everyday experiences outside the home, going to the supermarket, looking at traffic lights, looking at animals and so on'. It would also have an activity and story based at home. The Advisory Council stated that those parents who most needed this programme were the ones most unlikely to watch and as a result the programme was aimed at attracting the attention of the child alone. It stated that:

It is, of course, recognised that the children whose need is greatest usually comes from homes where the adults are unlikely to show much interest in such a programme. Yet it is believed that in many such homes, the television set is often left permanently switched on. What is needed is some way of drawing the attention of children to the screen at the time the programme begins. (General Advisory Council, 1974, 10)

Although the Bullock Committee agreed with much of this, it nevertheless considered the possibility that 'the children's programmes themselves could be structured in such a way as to focus the parent's attention on these language needs in the process of fulfilling them' (Bullock, 1975, 61). However, the educationalists, psychologists and broadcasters grouped around the Head Start project and *Sesame Street* argued that there should be separate programmes directed at making parents responsible for their children's development (cf. Ball and Bogatz, 1970 and Bogatz and Ball, 1972).
the Bullock Committee was no longer merely concerned with inciting the capacities of the mother as a supervisor.54

However, there were some experts who doubted the effectiveness of television in facilitating children's learning. Gwen Dunn, who was a primary school head teacher, argued, having carried out some research on television and the under-fives for the IBA, that because television is uni-directional (i.e. it speaks and shows, but does not listen or see) it could not facilitate children's development. The conditions for learning from television needed to be provided by the parents themselves: 'they must provide a climate in which education happens' (Dunn, 1977, 39). Despite such reservations and qualifications, Dunn was to be a key figure in this debate. In 1980 she spoke at a conference organised by the UK Association for the International Year of the Child and entitled 'Television and the Family'. She argued that for television to become a useful pedagogic tool it needed to be watched 'selectively' ('by content and not simply by a limitation of the time which can be spent by children in front of the set'). In a similar fashion to Himmelweit she identified the problem with what she called 'wobbly families' (namely, '[a]dults, alcohol and food downstairs, children and television set upstairs'), rather than with television itself (Dunn, 1980, 60-1). The conference brought together a number of educationalists, broadcasters, psychologists and parents. Its speakers included: Lady Plowden, Chairman of the IBA and President of the Pre-School Playgroups Association; Biddy Baxter, editor of Blue Peter; Brian Goombridge, formerly Head of Educational Programmes Services at the IBA and now Professor at the Institute of Education; Eurfron Gwynne Jones, former editor of the BBC series Parents and Children and pioneer of a course, at the University of London Extra-Mural Department, for parents on children growing up with television; Christopher Jones, Deputy Head of Educational Programme Services at the IBA; John Kershaw, scriptwriter for Rainbow; Maureen Lalor, lecturer at Rolle College, Exmouth; Penelope Leach, Vice-President of the Pre-School Playgroups Association and developmental psychologist; and Cynthia Felgate. Even though there were disagreements between these various experts, each drawing upon their own field of knowledge, they exemplified a formation of individuals and organisations which constituted the authorities of delimitation of the discourse of the child

54 The Report stated that:

The habit of passive viewing needs to be broken and the parents made aware of their role in using television constructively, not merely as a means of keeping children out of mischief. (Bullock Report, 1975, 326)
television audience. Although the developmental psychologist was but one of the experts within this discursive formation, developmental psychology was instrumental in the discourse: it was able to bridge the gap between learning, life and children's television viewing.55 Lady Plowden, who had herself taken up the positions of educationalist and broadcaster, in her address to the conference stated that:

If teachers ignore the message in home viewing they will rapidly become out of touch with the cultural environment of the children, and perhaps miss some of the important opportunities. Similarly if parents ignore the learning opportunities in their children's home viewing, which could complement what happens in school, they surrender their own rights (and responsibilities) as educators within the family. (Plowden, 1980, 34)

These constituent elements comprised the discursive formation of the child television audience in the 1970s and 1980s and, when in 1977, the Annan Committee on broadcasting reported that 'children are the most diligent television viewers (Annan report, 1977, 349) and that 'parents are responsible' for their children's viewing, it was within this formation that such statements had any intelligibility.56 The techniques, which I described above in relation to Playdays

55 Penelope Leach, for example, articulated such concerns at a popular level through her childcare manuals, such as Baby and Child.

In our anxiety lest children lose playing or reading time for television, we tend to lose sight of its benefits. Selective viewing can increase your child's knowledge of the world and available fuel for thought enormously... Until your child can read the programme guide for himself, television should cause no problems. You can tell him what is on; when it is over you turn the set off... You can encourage now a selective and critical attitude to viewing which should stand you in good stead later. Don't ever yield to the temptation of using a soap opera as a baby sitter and don't turn the set on casually 'just to see what's on'. You want him to feel that watching television is a positive activity rather than something to do when there is nothing to do. You can make it even clearer that it is an activity with a purpose if you watch with him as often as you can and talk with him about what he has seen. (Leach, 1977, 433)

Leach echoes Himmelweit's concern about parenting and television. However, the discursive formation of the child television audience was, in the 1970s, now able to draw upon a range of pedagogic techniques of power/knowledge and upon their wide institutional infrastructure. 56 The Annan Report stated that:

... many teachers and others concerned with the welfare of children have wrung their hands at this state of affairs [the amount and the time at which children were watching television]. But the broadcasters are not to blame. The parents are responsible. (ibid, 249)
(the creation of a pedagogic space, of relations of authority and of a community of pre-school children), emerge within concerns about 'disadvantaged families' and children's learning. They are aimed at facilitating the cognitive development of the child. In this viewing space the responsibility of the parent is not simply to supervise the child, but to provide a space within which the child can learn and develop. Programmes such as *Playdays*, but also *You and Me, Rainbow* and others, are inserted into the routines and daily existence of parent and child. And although certain expertise is directed to the responsibilities of the parent, other expertise is directed to those irresponsible parents whose children television broadcasters must address directly. This set of practices, although dependent on the earlier concerns about children's television viewing and the responsibilities of parents and broadcasters, is now rooted in the life and experiences of the child as a developmental subject, whose freedom is closely bound to their cognitive growth. However, the freedom of the pre-school child audience is a facilitated freedom, marked out within clear lines of authority and pedagogic objectives. It is government at a distance (cf. Rose, 1990).

In this chapter I have begun to map the shifting contours of the discourse of the child television audience in relation to the invention of the pre-school child audience in the early 1950s and to its re-formation in the 1970s. Again we can see how this discursive formation rested upon a set of questions about the government of domestic and familial conduct and how there has been a proliferation and intensification of the prominent sites of expertise, namely within the apparatuses of broadcasting, education and developmental psychology. In my analysis of both *Watch with Mother* and *Playdays* I have asked, not what these texts represent, but how they function. How do these programmes and these techniques, which I described above, work? How are these things good to think and act with?57 Such programmes and the discourses surrounding them make visible pre-school children as an audience and provide specific forms of intervention.

---

57 I draw upon Mercer's analysis of entertainment here (Mercer, 1988).
Beyond the Protectionist Hypothesis

Chapter Five
In the previous chapters I have considered how the child television audience emerged within a set of administrative techniques concerned with the well-being of the population. In creating the child audience as distinct from the family audience and as a distinct entity in itself, children's television viewing could become the focus of a number of social concerns from literacy to delinquency. Likewise a psychological knowledge was brought to bear upon this audience inasmuch as it too was embedded within these administrative practices. The truth of this audience was manifest as a series of inventions. The expertise, sought by broadcasters and others about the child audience, did not so much discover the reality of this audience as create this audience and provide the terms of intervention.

The genealogy of this audience which I have outlined in the earlier chapters of the thesis uncovers a very different history of power/knowledge to that which is presented in, what we might call, the protectionist hypothesis. It has been suggested in a number of writings in the 1980s (e.g. Barker, 1984b; Buckingham, 1993a and 1993b; Gunter and McAlere, 1990; Messenger Davies, 1989) that our knowledge of the child audience has been hindered by those who insist on conceptualising the child as passive and innocent and television as all-powerful. This insistence, it is argued, is produced within a wider set of alliances, which are 'fed by a combination of consensus journalism, behavioural research and religious/moralist lobbies' (Lusted, 1985, 13), and leads to forms of censorship or protectionism in the name of the endangered child. In response to such protectionism, a number of writers, in different ways, argue that concerns about children and television are manufactured 'moral panics' and that the child is not passive and innocent but has a capacity for critical and discriminative viewing. Implicit in this hypothesis is the

1 The naming here is intentionally drawing upon Foucault's work on the 'repressive hypothesis' (Foucault, 1979).
notion that there is a historical rupture between an age of repression and a critical analysis of this protectionism (whether in the form of a critique of moral panics or in the form of new child-centred knowledges of children's television viewing). The date of the historical break is often not explicitly stated but Buckingham marks a shift emerging in the early 1960s with uses and gratifications research outlining a model of media use, rather than direct media effects (Buckingham, 1993a, 8). Nevertheless, we can identify the emergence of a more specifically child-centred approach in the 1970s and 1980s and the title of Maire Messenger Davies's book, *Television is Good for your Kids* (1989), stands as a popularised hallmark of this current orthodoxy. The distinction can be seen as an instance of what Minson calls a bipolar retrospective logic: namely those histories which mark a break between an earlier reviled (or mourned) past and a glorious (or reviled) present and which construct the past from the vantage point of the present. At the same time though, there is a sense, David Buckingham argues, that 'the same issues [vis-a-vis what I am calling protectionism] have recurred again and again' (Buckingham 1993a, 8). In the press, stories about the harmful effects of the media are regularly repeated and are seen to sure-up existing regulatory practices and bodies and to put into effect new ones. The critique of protectionism, then, not only marks a distinction between earlier, now discredited models of media power, but is also constantly vigilant in warning against the further curtailment of individual liberties or interests.

In this chapter I want to unpack this set of arguments concerning what I have termed the protectionist hypothesis and to argue that the critique of protectionism, instead of unveiling the myths of moral panics, fails, as a result of a bipolar retrospective logic, to recognise how the new child-centred discourse of children's television viewing is made possible by earlier discourses and how they establish new forms of supervision. In Chapter 3 I have already shown that the research of the 1950s and 1960s cannot be simply typified as 'effects research', concerned with the powerful media and the passive child, and that the Nuffield Foundation research into the 'effects' of television, although it was a 'caution against the more alarmist views which were already circulating in public debate' (Buckingham, 1993b, 11), constructed a relationship between the arts of broadcasting, the arts of parenting, an expert language of psychology and the arrangement of domestic space and time. In this sense, we need to be cautious of such retrospective histories of media effects research as a
unified and homogenous body of knowledge. In this chapter I initially consider how the recent concerns about the Bulger murder, Childs Play 3 and Elizabeth Newson's highly publicised response have been conceived as symptomatic of a longer recurrent history of moral panics about the media. Although the historical narrative, voiced by such writers as Martin Barker, David Buckingham and Geoffrey Pearson, identifies a 'history of suspicion' of the media (cf. Lusted, 1985), it glosses over certain discontinuities. This is, in part, due to the lack of historical detail within the narrative (e.g. the lack of historical research into children and television in the 1950s and 1960s) and to the overemphasis on contemporary press reporting of children's television viewing. A closer inspection of press reporting of children's television viewing in the 1950s, for example, reveals that there was no moral panic as such and that orchestrated campaigns only emerged in the 1960s as a result of more significant shifts within the management of children's domestic television viewing and the emergence of the child television audience as a distinct audience. I then argue that underlying recent discussions of children's television viewing are a set of concerns about the responsibilities of the parent. Although these concerns mark a continuation with the governmental concerns of the 1950s, there has been a significant shift. Even though the responsibilities of the broadcaster are formed in relation to the image of a pathologised viewing space, they are also seen, now, to be constituted as an effect of the actions of the responsibilities of the parent, namely to be active in informing public opinion.

*Child's Play 3, Newson and Moral Panics*

There has been, in response to the murder of James Bulger in February 1993 and Justice Morland's summation of the trial which referred to the possible influence of the 'video nasty' Childs Play 3, an intensification of concern about video and television violence and children. Two distinct and opposing arguments have circulated: on the one side, an argument that children are harmed by, and need protecting from, certain types of television (whether this be terrestrial broadcasting, satellite, cable or video), and on the other, an argument that children have the capacity for critical and discriminatory viewing and that concern about televised violence conceals a more disturbing political agenda of censorship. The former argument can be found, for example, in a recent paper by Elizabeth
Newson, Professor of Developmental Psychology at the Child Development Research Unit, University of Nottingham. The paper was an attempt to name the 'different factor' which has entered the lives of children and adolescents in recent years, causing violent behaviour exemplified in the Bulger murder. Although the paper is ostensibly concerned with video violence, it draws upon Michael Medved's populist assault against screen violence and moral decline entitled *Hollywood Versus America* (1993), refers to research by two professors of psychiatry and paediatrics, Andrew Sims and Peter Gray, on 'media violence' (1993) and to a recent review of the literature on 'the impact of television violence' by George Comstock (1991). In this sense her concern is focussed more generally on the problem of 'children's viewing' within the home (i.e. not specifically with video viewing). Newson argues that the media corporations responsible for this media violence will not curtail their own practices: 'it seems unlikely that those who feel responsibility for protecting children will be able to wait for such corporate self-denial' (Newson, March 1994, 7). Likewise, she has little faith in the responsibility of parents: 'Most of us would prefer to rely on the discretion and responsibility of parents, both in controlling their children's viewing and in giving children clear models of their distress in witnessing sadistic brutality; however it is unhappily evident that many children cannot rely on their parents in this respect' (ibid).

And, as a consequence, she argues that 'society', by which she means the State, must take that responsibility: 'By restricting such material from home viewing, society must take on a necessary responsibility in protecting children from this and other forms of child abuse' (ibid).

The report, ostensibly addressed to Members of Parliament in both Houses, was a carefully worded exercise in public relations. The first three pages of the seven page report are taken up with an emotive description of the murder of James Bulger, a description of other murders and attempted murders by children.2 The evidence she cites in the next three pages is

2 Newson stated that 'Now that the immediate shock of the trial has a little receded, perhaps this is the time to evaluate more carefully the situation which this murder of a child by children has forced us to examine' (Newson, 1994, 1). She referred to 'Jamie', 'Robert' and 'Jon' and, for example, she stated that:

We now know that the final scene beside the railway line was long-drawn-out and merciless; that paint was thrown, and blows were struck not once but enough to cause 42 separate injuries; that there were sexual elements to the torture and Jamie's mouth was damaged
primarily anecdotal. However, the material is presented in the form of an
academic paper (title page, references and bibliography) and the
reference to Medved's highly publicised book is revealing inasmuch as it
indicates what we might call its domain of legibility. The paper is legible in
terms of the way its argument is embedded, not only within a set of
scientific debates, but more importantly within a set of popular debates and
widely reported events in television, radio and the tabloid and broadsheet
press. It is able to translate the terms of scientific discourse into the idioms

The relationship between truth, freedom and regulation are clearly at stake
in her argument. In her closing paragraph she states that: 'Many of us
hold our liberal ideals of freedom of expression dear, but now begin to feel
that we were naive in our failure to predict the extent of the damaging
material and its all too free availability to children' (Newson, 1994, 7). This
statement was widely reported in the press. The Evening Standard paraded
the headline: 'U-Turn Over Video Nasties'. It referred to the naivety of the
experts who had 'allowed themselves to "put liberal ideas [sic] of freedom"
ahead of the available evidence' and it talked about the report as a
'confession' (Evening Standard, 31 April 1994).3 The experts, whose
atonement Newson declared, referred to psychologists, psychiatrists,
criminologists, doctors and other 'professionally concerned with children'
(ibid, 3) and particularly to the 25 'professionals' who signed and endorsed
the report.4

---

on the inside; and that the children got blood on the soles of their
shoes. (ibid, 2)

The tension in her writing between a graphic explicitness and a lack of explicitness is
resonant of the horror genre itself. It has to show enough to scare, but not so much that
we understand how the scene is done.

3 Other newspapers picked up on this same sentence. For example The Guardian
carried the headline 'Video-crime link stronger than thought, say child experts' and the Daily Telegraph carried "Naive" experts admit threat of violent videos' (1 April 1994).

4 The signatories included the following psychologists: Professor Derek Blackman,
University of Wales; Phil Christie, Director of Child and Educational Services for
NoRSACA; Dr John Coleman, Director, Trust for the Study of Adolescence; Gill Green,
Principal Clinical Psychologist; Dr John Harris, Chief Executive, British Institute of
Learning Difficulties; Rosemarie Irvine, Principal Clinical Psychologist; Dr Richard
Lansdown, Consultant Psychologist, Great Ormand Street; Professor Ruth Lesser,
University of Newcastle; Professor Paul Light, University of Southampton; Dr Susanna
Millar, Universities of Oxford and Birmingham; Professor Peter Mittler, University of
In response to Newson's paper, another group of 23 academics presented 'The 'Video Violence' debate: Media Researchers Respond'. These experts were primarily from the fields of cultural and media studies and, unlike the earlier paper, this response was poorly reported in the press. The statement was primarily formed around two lines of argument: one concerning the complexity of children's discriminative responses to the media and the other concerning the history of moral panics about the media. On the one hand, it states that research in this area must ask the following questions: 'what prior knowledges and expectations do viewers
bring to the programmes they watch? How do they know how to make sense of them? What are their reasons for watching, and how do those reasons for watching in turn affect how they incorporate meanings from the films into other parts of their lives?' (Barker et al, 1994). On the other hand, it states: 'For more than a hundred years, each time our society has found itself in confusion or crisis, there have been attempts to shift the blame for societal breakdown onto the media' (ibid). The concept of the 'moral panic', which frames this statement, enables its authors to begin to question the status of truth and science to which Newson is so closely allied. However, in doing so, it merely categorises such knowledge as false and mythical ('"Blaming the media for violence' is our society's equivalent of blaming illness and the death of pigs on witchcraft") and reveals the truth of the complexity of children's critical viewing. Although the two lines of argument arise from different traditions of research, they are presented in the press release as two central components of a strategic intervention in the debates concerning children domestic viewing.

As evidence of the way in which the Newson report helped to construct the present moral panic, we can cite the way in which the paper was presented to the press on the 31 March 1994 as part of a wider campaign orchestrated around Liberal Democrat MP David Alton's proposed amendment to the Criminal Justice Bill, which was due to be debated on the 12 April 1994. Alton had gained cross-party support of around 220 MPs, including former Labour leader Neil Kinnock, Liberal Democrat Sir David Steel and Conservative MP Sir Ivan Lawrence (of the Home Affairs Select Committee), to restrict the availability of 'violent' videos in the home. There were numerous proposals for regulatory controls, such as: making it illegal for parents, or other adults, to show adult videos to children or to leave these videos in the home where children might find them; improve local government's ability to enforce existing legislation; the introduction of identity cards for young people to prove their age when buying or renting videos; and to revive the 'Restricted 18' category, which would limit some videos to registered sex shops where children are forbidden (cf. The Independent, 12 April 1994). The Daily Express argued that there should be more legislation to tackle the selling of 'pirate' videos at market stalls and

---

6 Julian Petley has argued that a version of the amendment to the Criminal Justice Bill was drawn up months before. He has argued that the campaign was, in part, focussed around a journal called the Christian Democrat (Petley, 1994).
car boot sales (13 April 1994). Lynda Lee-Potter appealed to Daily Mail readers to take upon themselves 'responsibilities towards the most vulnerable members of our society' and she suggested that 'bad parents' should be fined or 'if necessary' given a custodial sentence (Daily Mail, 13 April 1994). And the Evening Standard returned the debate to the responsibility of the parent: '[t]he onus will always be on parents to consider the psychological health of their children. A symptom is treated, but the disease remains' (Evening Standard, 13 April 1994). Michael Howard, Home Secretary, as a move to head off a growing backbench revolt, announced on the 12 April that he would table a new clause in the Criminal Justice Bill in the Lords which would accommodate David Alton's demands. It would include the British Board of Film Classification (BBFC) taking account of videos which are likely to cause 'psychological harm to a child' or which present 'an inappropriate model for children', the tightening of the BBFC's own classifications and a tightening of existing penalties for video store owners who rent inappropriate films to children.

This particular moral panic soon became connected to other concerns, such as the regulation of film, video and television in other European countries, and other panics concerning the regulation of children. For example, on the 13 April Newson stated that the new measures 'may be too little too late' and that the Government had not addressed the problem of video and computer games and the effect of violent videos on adults (The Guardian, 13 April 1994). Likewise, on the 16 April The Guardian ran an article about the Internet which stated '[f]orget the video nasty: the latest moral panic is computer porn'. We could argue that the spiralling of panics and regulatory proposals were, and are, constituted within what Beatrix

7 She stated that:

There are thousands of children in this country with fathers they never see and mothers who are lazy sluts. They are allowed to do what they want, when they want. They sniff glue on building sites, scavenge for food and until now, they were free to watch increasingly horrific videos. By 16, they are disturbed and dangerous... It's no longer enough to look after our own sons and daughters. The time has come when we need to feel a commitment towards the sad, disturbed, neglected and abused youngsters around us. It's too simplistic and destructive to opt out of involvement. (ibid)

8 For example, see The Daily Telegraph, 9 April 1994 and The Sunday Telegraph, 10 April 1994.
Campbell has called 'the great moral crusade against children' (*The Independent*, 13 April 1994).9

The concept of the 'moral panic', upon which the critique of Newson is partly based, emerged in the early 1970s in the work of Stanley Cohen (1972) and later in the work of Stuart Hall et al (1978) as a way of describing the construction of and reaction to certain popular cultural forms: Cohen looks at concern about the 'Mods' and 'Rockers' in the 1960s; and Hall et al look at the fabrication of the 'mugger' in the 1970s and its effectivity in establishing a consensus which made possible the Conservative Party victory in 1979. In both accounts the media, particularly the press, are of considerable importance in terms of their ability to mobilise a consensus and constitute certain figures as scapegoats or 'folk devils'. For Hall the concept of the 'moral panic' provides a theoretical tool for analysing the historical formation of a 'law and order society' in the 1970s. The disintegration of the social democratic consensus under the Labour Prime Minister, James Callaghan, and the rise of the radical right, under Margaret Thatcher and the intellectual leadership of right-wing think tanks (such as the Centre for Policy Studies and the Institute of Economic Affairs) and intellectuals (such as Sir Keith Joseph and Alfred Sherman), led to the balance in the relations of force moving towards an 'authoritarian pole'. At the same time, though, according to Hall, the sequence of moral panics in the 1970s allowed the authoritarian move to take on 'the gloss of populist consent'. In this sense, the moral panics take on their significance only within a discussion of the wider conjunctural crisis in the period and of the ideological struggle for hegemony (Hall, 1985, 116).

---

9 Beatrix Campbell and Judith Dawson write in a later article: 'The decade of the discovery of the dangers of childhood [of child sexual, and other, abuse] has become the decade of dangerous children' (Campbell and Dawson, September 1994). The construction of children as both in danger and dangerous has, though, a longer genealogy which we can trace back to the 19th century (cf. Rose, 1985). Nevertheless, such discourses constitute lines of consent and mark out new boundaries between 'us' and 'them'. They constitute a particular example of the politics of representation. The othering of children is, we might argue, constituted within an ambivalence which leads both to the desire to expel dangerous children from the realms of decent society (to exclude them from the boundaries of citizenship) and also to the desire to protect them from further harm (to lead them out of the wilderness back into the fold).
Martin Barker, in his discussions of the campaign against horror comics in Britain in the 1950s, of the campaign against 'video nasties' in Britain in the early 1980s and, more recently, of the concern about children's television and video viewing in the 1980s and 1990s, has used the notion of the 'moral panic' as a way of understanding orchestrated reactions to popular media and attendant calls for censorship (Barker, 1984a, 1984b and 1993; see also Barker and Petley, 1994). However, instead of analysing such campaigns as specific instances of a wider hegemonic struggle, Barker analyses them in terms of their effectivity in establishing a specific goal: censorship. The tabloid front-pages and editorials concerning children's television and video viewing are significant only inasmuch as they represent the public face of a hidden and organised political agenda. Likewise David Buckingham draws upon a similar argument in his discussion of children and television (Buckingham, 1993a and 1993b). Buckingham links this argument to one about a consensus of opinion which talks consistently about the 'negative effects' of the media. A concern with the negative effects of the media is, he argues, connected to a form of behavioural psychology or 'effects research', such as that practised by Bandura, which views the child as a passive victim of a powerful medium. Buckingham argues that: '[t]o define young people as merely vulnerable and credulous thus represents a forceful legitimation of adult power and control' (1993a, 4). Both Barker and Buckingham in their accounts of moral panics refer, not to specific figures or constructed personalities, but rather, to the way in which the medium of television or 'the media' in general are constructed as powerful and to the way in which

10 In Barker's earlier writings the concept of the 'moral panic' is, even though it frames his arguments, rarely used and never adequately theorised. The lack of theorisation is partly due to the more popular readership which Barker is addressing in these books. In a quick-witted strategic response to the Video Recordings Bill, Barker collected a group of academics and journalists to write a critique of what they saw as the ideological production of a panic around children's viewing of certain horror videos. In Barker's opening essay he attacked the social scientists, psychiatrists, paediatricians and others who, as the Parliamentary Group Video Enquiry, had been constructed in certain sections of the press as 'folk heroes'. Steven Barnett refers to this type of formation in terms of 'the language of political pressure groups and tabloid editorials' (The Independent, 5 April 1994). It would be incorrect, though, to argue that all moral panics are predicated upon conservative political interests. Barker's fascinating work on the campaign against the 'horror comics' in the 1950s uncovers an unholy alliance between conservative political interests and the Communist Party of Great Britain (Barker, 1984a).
the child is constructed, not as a folk devil, but as an innocent, manipulable individual needing protection.

We could cite other examples, but it is clear that both Newson and Barker, Buckingham and others put forward opposing arguments vis-a-vis regulation (the one side wants to see legislation and regulatory controls imposed, the other wants them revoked). And yet they both understand and agree upon the meaning of the term itself: regulation is seen as regulation by the State or the parent. It exemplifies what Foucault calls a juridico-discursive conception of power (i.e. power is always from above directed at those below). And Barker and Buckingham, in their analysis, locate calls for regulation (whether they were realised or not) within a history of panics about the media. In an article entitled 'Sex, Violence and Videotape', Barker argues that 'history never simply repeats itself, and the circumstances of each panic about the media have been importantly different' (Barker, May 1993). He then goes on to recount the different historical circumstances of the campaigns against the penny dreadfuls in the 1860s to 1880s, music hall in the same period, cinema in the 1910s and 1920s, horror comics in the 1950s and television in the 1970s. However, Barker also argues that 'the continuities such a history reveals is the willing of magical powers on the media' (ibid) and he argues, drawing upon Geoffrey Pearson's work on 'hooliganism' (Pearson, 1983), that panics repeat themselves in a 25 year cycle (each adult of each period remembers their past with nostalgia and looks at the present with horror). Similarly, Buckingham provides a review of some of the newspaper headlines and press stories which form the current panic and he traces a history of such panics about the media back to Plato's Republic, in which Plato voices concern about the relationship between the 'poetry' of Homer, Aeschylus and others, and the moral training of the young (Buckingham, 1993a and 1993b).

This account of moral panics concerning the media re-presents a history which, although it notices certain historical differences, nevertheless

11 For some reason Barker, in relation to panic over television in the 1970s, states that 'it is no coincidence that the Festival of Light, the anti-abortion movements and the campaign to clean up television occurred simultaneously' (Barker, May 1993). And yet the Clean-up TV campaign started in 1963, the Society for the Protection of the Unborn Child (SPUC) began in 1966 and the Festival of Light was launched in September 1971.
repeats the mechanism of censorship as an instrument of State power in relation to the recurring 'magical power' of the media. It is difficult to see, then, how such a model can be attentive to the contingencies and specificities of history. Not only does it conceive of power as juridico-discursive, but it also falls into what Foucault calls the 'repressive hypothesis': namely that the effectivity of power is its ability to say 'No'. This is a conception of power as negative and repressive, rather than positive and productive (Foucault, 1979, 82). Power, in this sense, is always dogged by the same limitations, uninventiveness and monotonous repetition.12

In the following section I argue that, although the concept of the 'moral panic' effectively establishes an analysis of the relationship between concerns about, and knowledges of, children's television viewing, parental authority and State power, it fails to provide an analysis of the historical specificity of power and to offer an account of other forms of regulation or government. Also, in the deployment of this concept, there tends to be a preoccupation (especially in recent accounts of moral panics) with how the press constructs stories about children and the media. For example, Tim Newburn, in an account of Thatcherism and morality, which draws upon Barker's analysis, states that '[d]uring 1983 the British tabloid press - and the *Daily Mail* in particular - spearheaded a campaign against what became known as 'video nasties". He continues by saying that:

The campaign had all the classic ingredients of a moral panic: a stereotyped threat to societal values (the stereotype constructed by the mass media); the manning of the barricades by moral guardians or 'right-thinking' people; and the construction of a legislative 'solution' which allowed the panic to subside. (Newburn, 1992, 183)

12 We might cite Foucault here, who says in relation to the 'repressive hypothesis' of sexuality:

Underlying both the general theme that power represses sex and the idea that the law constitutes desire, one encounters the same putative mechanics of power. It is defined in a strangely restrictive way, in that, to begin with, this power is poor in resources, sparing of its methods, monotonous in the tactics it utilizes, incapable of invention, and seemingly doomed always to repeat itself. Further, it is a power that only has the force of a negative on its side, a power to say no... (Foucault, 1979, 85)
Or, for example, Buckingham, in an account of the debates in 1988, draws upon reports in the *Daily Mail* and the *Daily Mirror* concerning Prince Charles' statements about violence on television. These reports are then linked by Buckingham to a wider consensus of opinion: to the arguments of Mary Whitehouse (in Britain) and Marie Winn (in the United States) about the harmful influences of television (cf. Tracey and Morrison, 1979; Winn, 1985). The press, in turn, is seen to set the agenda for academic research into the child audience (Buckingham, 1993a, 3-12). In order to unpack this I return to press reports about children and television in the 1950s and 1960s. I argue that, while the press has been to a certain extent influential in setting an agenda concerning legislation, it has played little part in the forms of government which I have analysed in the previous chapters. A problem here is that Buckingham and others have tended, not only to think about power as the property of the State or of the parent, but also to conceive of regulation as a form of unchanging and inflexible prohibition. In this sense, legislation offers only a partial solution, and by no means the most important, to the problem of children's domestic viewing.

**Press Reports of Children's Television Viewing in the 1950s and 1960s**

The following discussion of press reporting of children and television in the 1950s and 1960s is instructive because it shows: that children's television viewing was not always the site of moral panic; that the concerns which were visible were specific to the changing administration of the child audience, which I have discussed in the preceding chapters; and that it was not until the late 1950s and early 1960s that concerns about the child audience were incorporated within wider campaigns calling for legislative solutions.

In the early 1950s there were concerns about the use of close-ups, teeth, ghosts and witches. In a speech to the Society of Film Teachers, which was widely reported by the press, Freda Lingstrom stated that if she were to include witches and dragons in children's programmes, 'they must on no account have teeth, for children are terrified by teeth' (*The Times*, 9 October 1953). It was particularly close-ups of teeth which were seen to be
most frightening. Likewise, Ursula Eason, television producer, stated that 'ghosts, witches, and figures with ghoulish faces are strictly censored for children' (Daily Mail, 11 December 1954).

Although it could in no way be constituted as a fear, there was also a concern about the acceptance of gifts of programmes from the USSR. In reaction to a programme entitled Children of the U.S.S.R., the Daily Mail alarmingly declared that 'the film was a massive propaganda job for Russia' (Daily Mail, 9 October 1954). And while on the whole 'Britain's new TV

13 The speech was delivered on the 4 October 1953 (cf. Birmingham Mail, 5 October 1953; Manchester Guardian, 5 October 1953). The concern about teeth is raised in the Commissioned Report on Children's Television. In a section on programmes which were thought to be frightening, the Report stated:

The directors and producers of television programmes are to be warmly commended for the care they have taken in reducing frightening situations to a minimum. We feel they have taken the sting out of those things which most obviously produce fear - things which appear to be common denominators in children of varying ages and environments - for example, sudden loud noises, close-ups of intense feeling portrayed on adult faces, emotions which seem out of control, eerie music, wailing of wind in the dark, close-up shots of animal's teeth etc.

The Report went on to state that:

... without the help of psychologists, or perhaps even with it, we believe it would be impossible to make every programme fear-proof for every child. Children's fears are often quite unpredictable and are highly correlated with temperament, individual experience, the adults in the child's environment, etc. (Jenkinson Report, 1952, T16/46)

The Report also mentions children being frightened by the sight of animals or other children being hurt. However, it neither catalogues the lists of contemporary concerns nor considers 'frightening' programmes with the present intensity of investment.

14 Eason went on to become Assistant Head of Children's Programmes at the BBC from 1955 to 1970. The Manchester Guardian, which reported Eason's speech at the Institute of Education, stated that '[t]he list of proscriptions [carried out by the BBC Children's Programmes Department] merely covers obvious things such as close-ups of the grotesque and, of course, ghosts' (Manchester Guardian, 11 December 1954).

15 The Daily Mail's concern about the programme was matched by its concern about the representation of the United States.

"Children of the U.S.S.R." was followed by a new American Western film series. Thud went the hooves and bang went the rifle. "He didn't have a chance," said the range rider examining the first body. (Daily Mail, 9 October 1954)
family', as the *Daily Mirror* called it, was welcomed by the press, some did voice their criticisms of *The Appleyards*. Councillor F.V. Scopes, of Derbyshire Education Committee, was particularly worried about 'young people' being 'shown betting on horse racing' and 'teenagers' 'shown smoking (*Derbyshire Advertiser*, 28 November 1952).\(^{16}\)

Likewise, even though certain individuals voiced concern about the Western, the press, in the early 1950s, continued to present the genre in a benign manner.\(^{17}\) The *Evening Standard* enthusiastically quoted Freda Lingstrom, after her recent appointment as Head of Children's Programmes at the BBC:

> So long as we have nothing frightening, nothing cruel and nothing 'vulgar', nothing is barred. I am fully in sympathy with the children's desire for a good healthy Western or having clowns - or whatever it is. (*Evening Standard*, 9 October 1951)

In 1953 the *Liverpool Echo*, in an interview with Lingstrom, stated that 'Western films cause no alarm in children' and, that because the genre is so 'remote' from the children's lives, they 'count Westerns good entertainment and aren't a bit worried by flying arrows and bullets' (*Liverpool Echo*, 28 September 1953). There were, though, parents who were worried about Westerns. Lingstrom was reported in the *Manchester Guardian* as saying that, while the children made no complaints, there was a 'large group of parents who had a strong reaction to "Western" shows'. But she went on to say that these parents always referred to them as

---

16 This was at odds with most of the reporting, which stated that, even though it was shown within children's programmes, *The Appleyards* would appeal to 'thousands of women with TV sets who devotedly follow Mrs. Dale and the Archers on radio'. The Appleyard family were described as 'ordinary, workaday folk' (*Daily Mirror*, 2 October 1952).

17 An example of this particular concern is presented in the *Birmingham Post*, which reported that George L. Reakes, Chairman of Wallasey Juvenile Court, had criticised the showing of *Murder on the Yukon*. He stated that it was 'not fit even for adults'. This criticism was presented within a speech about a 'wave of brutal crime' in which he attacked the 'dangerous and senseless sentimentalism which inspires opposition to restoration of corporal punishment' (*Birmingham Post*, 5 November 1952). The *Wallasey News* added that the programme provided 'a demonstration for murder, theft with violence, fighting and battery on a full scale' and that 'such television stories could do nothing but harm to children and prepare the groundwork for more juvenile delinquency' (*Wallasey News*, 8 November 1952).
'gangster films' (*Manchester Guardian*, 5 October 1953). Even when Mr M. Gordon, psychology tutor at the Extra-Mural Department of Birmingham University, who had published research into adolescent viewing (Gordon, 1951), addressed the Coventry Rotary Club in 1953 concerning the way in which television could affect the moral development of children, the *Coventry Standard* reported that a 'large section of responsible psychiatrists said that violence on television provided a harmless outlet for the normal and natural aggressiveness of all children' (*Coventry Standard*, 28 August 1953). These concerns were raised exclusively by individuals and only rarely were they taken up at a party political level or within orchestrated campaigns. For example, David Llewellyn, Conservative MP for Cardiff, attacked *Billy Bunter of Greyfriars School* and *Desert Adventure* and called children's television a 'national scandal'. This outburst, though, was a specific attack on the BBC and contained within an argument for the introduction of commercial television (*The Western Mail*, 3 September 1953). In January 1954 it was reported that Llewellyn had drawn the attention of Sir Ian Jacob, the Director General, to a girl who had gone 'into hysterics on seeing the film *Wallaby Jim of the Islands*, which depicted a man being hit on the head with a bottle, a man being whipped for theft, and fights with guns and knives'. As a result the BBC announced that 'a closer check is being kept on western and other adventure films shown on Children's TV' (*The Times*, 15 January 1954). In 1957 concern about

---

18 The 'misrecognition' of westerns as 'gangster films' obviously owed much to the concerns in the 1920s and 1930s about American crime thriller films. The use of the term allowed a condensation of images of crime, Americanisation, and unruly youth to be deployed in relation to the concern about the western (cf. Pearson, 1983). Lingstrom was also reported as saying that '[d]uring the controversy over the Craig and Bentley case, I was directly accused by some people who said that Bentley was looking at the children's television programme when Craig came to call for him to go on that terrible mission' (*Manchester Guardian*, 5 October 1953). Of more concern to Lingstrom and the press was the problem of children watching too much television, which Lingstrom associated with children's television viewing in the United States (*Birmingham Mail*, 5 October 1953).

19 Llewellyn stated that he wanted to 'break down the B.B.C. monopoly, especially of children's TV' and that '[f]reedom of the air would give parents a wider choice' (*The Western Mail*, 3 September 1953).

20 The *Yorkshire Evening News* also commented on 'how children's eyes can be kept away from unsuitable TV programmes' and on the problem of children 'peeping over the shoulders of their elders at the television set'. The paper also wondered whether
certain types of programming began to intensify. The Council for Children's Welfare conducted a survey of parental attitudes to children's viewing.\(^{21}\) The *Evening Chronicle* argued that parents could no longer trust the BBC to 'supervise the youngsters viewing at that hour' (*Evening Chronicle*, 24 February 1960). In 1961 there was widespread concern about a children's programme called *Paradise Walk*, which according to Owen Reed, then Head of Children's Programmes, was about 'the twin evils of hooliganism and race-hatred' (Reed, 1960).\(^{22}\) Reed unwittingly stated in the same article that 'had we been doing *Oliver Twist*, which is far more violent and harrowing, this would have passed without comment' (ibid). In March 1961 Reginald Bevins, Postmaster General, joined MPs' protests in the House of Commons against the violent killing of Nancy in the BBC Children's Programmes Department's production of *Oliver Twist*: he thought it 'brutal and quite inexcusable'. Victor Yates, Labour MP, called upon the Postmaster General to use his powers to require the BBC and ITA to refrain from showing scenes of brutality and violence when children were viewing. Dame Irene Ward, Conservative MP, asked the minister 'who advised as to what time children went to bed?'. Mr Yates also raised the issue of 'four cases of boys who had been found dead from hanging after watching television programmes about crime, including hanging scenes' (*The Daily Telegraph*, 28 March 1962). Despite these protests, Owen Reed insisted that children did not share their parent's view: 'the Department had received many letters from children saying how much they enjoyed it!' (*Luton News*, 7 June 1962). Reed had argued that children's television should not shy away from violence, but that it should be presented within a moral framework:

> Of course, there are things that can damage, and against which we keep constant vigil: bad habits in a hero, sudden reversal, for shock dramatic effect, of a "good" character

\(^{21}\) The survey was widely reported in the press. The *Daily Mirror* laid out the arguments of the Council for Children's Welfare side by side with a response by Sir Robert Fraser, Director General of the Independent Television Authority (*Daily Mail*, 27 November 1957). The chairman was Dr Phyllis Dobbs and one of its vice-presidents was Sir Frederick Messer MP. Barker gives an account of the role of the Council for Children's Welfare in relation to the panic over 'horror comics' (Barker, 1984a).

into a "bad", anything that really strikes deeply at a child's trust and sense of security, experiments inviting dangerous imitation, or bad taste. Shall I add violence?... It is violation rather than violence which is the enemy. (Reed, 1960)

This argument, about the dramatisation of violence within a manichean world of good and bad characters, found its exemplary text in the Western. Reed had argued that 'Westerns are basically a good thing for children because they present a tremendous panoramic sweep and basic healthiness with a knight errant there for a good purpose' (Southport Visiter, 27 February 1960). His views echoed Sir Robert Fraser's defence of the Western and of commercial television in 1957:

> What is the moral fabric out of which television films [this was a euphemism for the Western] for children are constructed? If someone would point out to me in what way they do not in general embody the salient moral values of Western civilisation, I should be obliged. (The Times, 7 December 1957)

Those concerns were, in the late 1950s and early 1960s, articulated with specific campaigning organisations. The Council for Children's Welfare in its submission to the Pilkington Committee specifically focussed on the Western and the crime series which, even though they might deploy a moral framework, were seen to automatically lead to an 'accumulation of violence' (Pilkington, 1962, 1202). Later, in the mid 1960s, the National Viewers and Listeners Association (NVLA), which had been formed, in part, as a consequence of this emerging configuration of interests and concerns, drew specific attention to the spate of hangings and other scenes of violence. In an essay entitled 'A Power in the land', its founder, Mary Whitehouse referred to the 're-enactment' of a hanging in a western by a 12 year old boy from Dudley in 1964 and to the dangers of children playing cowboys (Whitehouse, 1967). Whitehouse argued that it was not a

---

23 There has been much work on Mary Whitehouse and the NVLA (cf. Tracey and Morrison, 1979; Weeks, 1981; Watney, 1987; and Newburn, 1992).

24 Whitehouse referred to an article by Rosemary Ross Skinner in the Weekend Telegraph which discussed the 'disruptive effect [of television] on some children'. Skinner stated that:

> Where there are a lot of small children television appears to be a godsend to a mother - her little ones are presumably warm, quiet and safe. The fact that they are being exposed to a dangerous and
question of whether or not television violence was presented within a moral framework, but rather a question of the way violence was presented as normal: '[i]f violence is shown as normal on the television screen it will help to create a violent society' (ibid).

Although there was widespread concern about certain types of programming on television, this concern, as we have seen, was not organised around a specific theme: at different moments the concern refers to quite different features, such as the close-up, and to different types of programmes, such as the Western. We can also see that these concerns, in the early 1950s, were neither widespread nor organised within a general campaign. They were also primarily located within debates about children watching children's television. Lingstrom asked in 1953: '[w]ill this powerful, intrusive invention undermine the authority of family life or enrich it; will the speed with which 'pictures' can be understood sharpen perceptions or dull them; will television become a despot, encroaching on the liberties of the mind?' (Lingstrom, 1953, 101). She was referring to her responsibilities as a children's broadcaster and not to the responsibilities of broadcasters for children viewing children's and adult television. It was not until after the introduction of commercial television, the Nuffield Report, the O'Connor Committee Report and the Pilkington Committee Report, that a more orchestrated opposition to certain types of programming began to emerge and the problem was conceived as a problem of children's television viewing generally, and not specifically about children's television. It is essentially in relation to this administrative complex that the current 'moral panics' about children's television viewing are displayed. And, although the motif of the 'innocent

insidious influence is not immediately apparent. (Skinner Weekend Telegraph, 15 July 1965 quoted in Whitehouse, 1967, 71)

She then went on to say that even though responsible parents might raise 'good, intelligent, independent children', they cannot account for children whose parents are not responsible. These children play, for example, with airguns as if they were cowboys:

'Shoot you dead,' he says. 'Cor, wouldn't dare! I'd tell your dad.' 'So what? Bang, bang, you're dead.' Well, not dead, just blind. And don't think this is far-fetched; it happened near here last week. (ibid)

The strength of such stories lay in their being anecdotal and common sensical and yet drawing upon scientific authority.
child', which has a genealogy dating back much further, is still deployed today, its precise deployment is dependent upon calculations at an administrative level, regarding the isolation of the child audience (as different from the adult audience) and its separation from, and its positioning within, the family at different spatial and temporal moments. In this sense, the repeated insistence that the image of the 'innocent child' is false and the continued over-reliance on the press as an index of contemporary concerns about children and television fail to grasp more significant shifts in the government of the child audience.

**Moral Entrepreneurs and Enterprising Selves**

Although a critique of the repressive hypothesis could lead to a neglect of State power and to a celebration of the micro-political, it would be foolish not to recognise the role of orchestrated campaigns in establishing certain legislative effects. For example, the campaign against the 'video nasties' in 1983 and 1984 not only formed around the Bright Bill but also undoubtedly set the tenor for the encoding, at a statutory level, of 'family values' and 'taste and decency' within the remit of the Broadcasting Standards Council and, in the 1990 Broadcasting Act, the extension of the 1959 Obscenity Act to cover television.25 However, to consider these legislative effects as the primary object of critique is to fall into an argument which sees power as purely proprietorial and prohibitory, which fails to account for the micro techniques of government and which ignores the articulation of localised networks of power/knowledge with the macro-political regulation of statutory controls.26 For example, Nikolas Rose has argued that:

25 In a recent article Angela McRobbie has argued that the recent 'moral panics' surrounding the Bulger case and other events have failed to deliver a conservative consensus, specifically around Prime Minister John Major's short-lived campaign for 'Back to Basics', because of the 'withholding of consent' mobilised by the voluntary sector and small-scale organisations and pressure groups (McRobbie, 1994).

26 As I argued in the preceding chapters, the discipline of psychology plays an important role in making possible this assemblage. Nikolas Rose makes this point:
... despite the vociferous demands of the 'moral majority' in the United States and Britain, and the occasional symbolic foray into censorship of explicit sexuality, legal measures and statutory enforcement of moral codes have taken second place to the utilization of other techniques to generate the commitment of selves to values and forms of life supported by authorities. (Rose, 1989a, 225)

Rose's argument here allows us to shift away from a conception of 'moral panics' as created to reinforce State power over individual and collective interests and freedoms, to the ethical question of how individuals construct their freedom. Rose suggests that we consider the way in which power works through the freedom of individuals. He discusses this notion of self-government (i.e. those competencies and dispositions of individuals) in relation to what he calls neo-liberal rationalities of government and the constitution of the enterprising self (Rose, 1989a and 1989b). He argues that commentators from all sides of the political spectrum have launched a wide ranging critique of 'the welfare state', inasmuch as its bureaucratic machinery has denied individual rights and freedoms and policed personal and family life. Rose looks at the phenomenon of neo-liberalism as 'the most explicit statement of these forms of political rationality' (Rose, 1989a, 226). However, instead of merely equating this rationality with economic liberalism and strictly confining it to the domain of the economic, Rose argues that 'enterprise also provides a rationale for the structuring of the lives of individual citizens' and that within this rationality '[i]ndividuals are to become, as it were, entrepreneurs of themselves shaping their own lives through the choices they make among the forms of life available to them' (Rose, 1989a, 226). The construction of the 'enterprising self', as a relation of self to self, results in the fabrication of social life in terms of the underlying rationality of economic liberalism and consumer sovereignty.27 This rationality construes the freedom, autonomy and

27 Rose states that:

The self is not merely enabled to choose, but obliged to construe a life in terms of its choices, its powers, and its values. Individuals are expected to construe the course of their life as the outcome of such choices, and to account for their lives in terms of the reasons for those choices. Each of the attributes of the person is to be realized through decisions, justified in terms of motives, needs and aspirations, made intelligible to the self and others in terms of the unique but universal search to find meaning and satisfaction through the construction of a life for oneself. (Rose, 1989a, 227)
responsibility of the self, not in opposition to the State, but working in concert with the expertise of authorities which determine the specific formation of that style of government. In this sense, the freedom of the individual is not posed against the power of the State nor is it presented as an ideological ploy through which we assent to our oppression unknowingly, rather, according to Rose's Foucauldian argument, regulation works *through* our freedom, autonomy and responsibility. For example, he states, in relation to questions about familial autonomy:

> Parental conduct, motherhood and child-rearing can thus be regulated through familial autonomy, through wishes and aspirations, through the activation of individual guilt, personal anxiety and private disappointment. And the almost inevitable misalignment between expectation and realization, fantasy and actuality, fuels the search for help and guidance in the difficult task of producing normality, and powers the constant familial demand for the assistance of expertise. It has become the will of the mother to govern her own children according to psychological norms and in partnership with psychological experts. The mother-child relationship is to be governed through the wishes, hopes and fears of the responsible, autonomous family. (Rose, 1989b, 23)

This formulation relies not upon a notion of the imposition of public collective order upon private individual freedoms, but, firstly, upon the notion that specific 'private' acts can be construed as both private and public and, secondly, that individual freedom can be construed in accordance with a concern for the public good. As we have seen from the preceding chapters, children's television viewing has been constructed within what I call the public space of the home and has been governed in order that children might develop into rational and responsible citizens. I have also detailed the way in which the expertise of psychologists, educationalists and broadcasters has governed the temporal and spatial arrangements of children's domestic television viewing and has established the mother as a relay of power, free to govern her children according to the 'normal' and the 'pathological'. However, if we accept Rose's argument concerning the implementation of neo-liberal technologies of government, then we should be able to ascertain some significant shifts within the discourse of the child television audience.

In order to discuss this further I need to mark out some significant recent changes within the discourses of British broadcasting. On 13 April 1994,
after the Home Secretary had announced new legislative measures to tackle 'violent video' viewing by children, the *Dail Mail* editorial declared: 'Oh, what a wonderful day for democracy.' This statement was couched within an argument which stated that the proposals constituted 'perhaps the most significant reversal yet seen to the permissive trend which had its genesis back in the Swinging Sixties' and that they were 'nothing less than a return to responsible censorship by popular demand'. Mark Lawson, though, argued a few days earlier in *The Independent* that the Conservative Government's acceptance of the Newson Report represented a 'right-wing back-flip', given that '[i]n the Conservative free market ideology of the Eighties, the video shop and satellite dish had vast symbolic power' (*The Independent*, 5 April 1994). He went on to say:

> They represent the empowerment of the consumer; the provision of data and entertainment by the market rather than by the imposition of (as the Conservatives represented them) a left wing elite in charge of British broadcasting. Hence the present political talk about "regulation" and "control" of visual entertainment is perhaps rather more of a U-turn than that by the authors of *Video Violence and the Protection of Children*. (ibid)

Lawson, though, fails to recognise that Conservative Party policy in the 1980s and early 1990s has been in a permanent 'U-turn'. The oxymoronic logic, some critics argue, has been at the heart of conservative ideology in this period. The Conservative Government pursued a neo-liberal policy of 'deregulation' and attacked the 'cosy duopoly' of the BBC and ITV as a paternalist institution alongside other 'establishment' institutions, such as the Church and the Universities, which nurtured an anti-enterprise culture (cf. Gamble, 1988). Within this discourse there was an equivalence between anti-enterprise and socialism. During 1986 and 1987, Norman Tebbit, as the Chairman of the Conservative Party, engaged in a series of attacks on the political bias of the BBC. Likewise the Media Monitoring Unit, set up in 1985 by Lord Chalfont and Dr Julian Lewis, engaged in similar attacks, verifying its reports with content research on the BBC's and ITV's programme output. The strength of this neo-liberal argument lay, in part, in its ability to appeal to a widespread sense of grievance and anger among many segments of the population who felt that the BBC was a biased institution.

---

28 It is interesting to note that the editorial repeats the motif of the mother as supervisor. In its closing paragraph it states that 'Michael Howard has virtually had to concede that on the gut issue of violent videos, the Mother of Parliaments knows best' (*Daily Mail*, 13 April 1994).

29 See Collins, 1989 and Donald, 1992 for different interpretations of these contradictions.
in its alignment of enterprise with the freedom of the individual and of the duopoly with authoritarian antiquated paternalism. At the 1989 Edinburgh International Television Festival, Rupert Murdoch attacked British public service broadcasting as being obsessed with class, dominated by anti-commercial attitudes and tending to hark back to the past. He argued that '[m]uch of what passes for quality on British television is no more than a reflection of the values of the narrow elite which controls it and has always thought that its tastes are synonymous with quality' (Murdoch, 1989). The articulation of such views at an ideological level touched upon considerable discontent with the anti-populism of British broadcasting, and especially the BBC.

The nub of neo-liberal arguments about broadcasting in the 1980s rested on a notion that the development of the new television technologies of satellite, cable, video and microwave technology forged the way for more competition, consumer choice and democracy. Cento Veljanovski, the Research and Editorial Director of the Institute of Economic Affairs (which has provided much of the intellectual argument for deregulation), stated, in Freedom in Broadcasting (1989), that '[t]he development of cable and satellite technologies has generated a momentum for more competition and more choice which no government, including the Eastern bloc, can stem or control' (Veljanovski, 1989, vii). However, while technological innovations removed the problem of 'spectrum scarcity' and the problem of 'totalitarian government', these innovations only occurred in concordance with institutional and structural changes within broadcasting. The Peacock Report on the Financing of the BBC argued that the new age of broadcasting could only be brought about by dismantling the 'cosy duopoly' of ITV and the BBC (Peacock Report, 1986). The Report set firmly on the agenda the question of the financing of the BBC, and ITV's monopoly of television advertising. It also put firmly in place the argument that broadcasting should not be governed according to its ends, but according to the level of access it affords to individuals to choose the programmes which they want to watch (cf. Barnett and Docherty, 1986). The rationality for such changes has been provided by the discourse of economic liberalism which Peacock had argued 'virtually began in the UK with the studies generated by the methodology adopted by the Committee on Financing the BBC' (Home Office, 1986, xii). Consumers were now seen to be able to judge their own interests better than the guardians of public interest and public taste.
However, the language of enterprise was able to co-exist with the language of the neo-conservatism of pressure groups such as the NVLA and the Broadcasting Standards Council (BSC). The clearest display of such co-existence can be seen in the White Paper on Broadcasting, which opened with the statement 'that there need be no contradiction between the desire to increase competition and widen choice and concern that programme standards on good taste and decency should be maintained' (Home Office, 1988). In this discourse, standards of taste and decency are maintained only inasmuch as they are represented as public opinion. This faith, at a political level, in the conservatism of 'public opinion' made possible the imagining, at a technical level, of specific mechanisms through which the broadcasters could become accountable to viewers as both citizens and consumers. Although it was undoubtedly an act of faith for the Government to assume that increased competition in the production and distribution sector would lead to greater choice and variety (cf. Collins, 1989 and Keane, 1991), the White Paper and the subsequent Broadcasting Act of 1990 have provided political weight to those rationalities which seek to make the television viewer, not merely a consumer, but a consuming citizen able to make responsible and rational choices.

30 It is not easy to pigeon-hole the BSC, because of its alliances with liberal pressure groups, such as BACTV and the Voice of the Listener and Viewer (VLV), the odd mix of paternalism and 1970s feminism of its Chairman, Lord Rees Mogg, and the tactical thinking of its Director, Colin Shaw.

31 The White Paper stated that:

The Government places the viewer and the listener at the centre of broadcasting policy. Because of technological, international and other developments, change is inevitable. It is also desirable: only through change will the individual be able to exercise the much wider choice which will soon become possible. The Government's aim is to open the doors so that individuals can choose for themselves from a much wider range of programmes and types of broadcasting. In this as in other fields consumers will rightly insist on safeguards which will protect them and their families from shoddy wares and from exploitation. But the Government believes that, with the right enabling framework, a more open and competitive broadcasting market can be attained without the detriment to programme standards and quality. Its single biggest advantage will be to give the viewer and listener a greater choice and a greater say. (Home Office, 1988)

32 The argument that viewers cannot be made into consumers on the grounds that viewers cannot buy programmes misses the point. For example, subscription services and 'pay-TV' offer techniques for such consumption. The problem is not whether or not
The Peacock Report recommended that there should be no 'pre-publication' censorship in broadcasting. It was critical of the way that the BBC and the IBA were able to prohibit the transmission of certain programmes, although, at the same time, recommended that broadcasting be brought under the 1959 Obscene Publications Act. By 1990 the Government had included broadcasting within the Act and had set up the Broadcasting Standards Council in 1988 and given it statutory basis in 1990. The BSC was initially seen by the broadcasters and others as a sop to right-wing moralists, like Mary Whitehouse. However, to regard the Council as merely a censorship body is to ignore the way in which it is framed within a discourse of 'public opinion' and 'consumer choice'. The concern about taste, decency, sex and violence is identified as a public concern:

Recently there has been much public concern about the portrayal of violence and sex in broadcast programmes, especially on television. The Government recognizes that concern, as do the broadcasters. The Government has no wish to undermine the regulatory bodies carrying out the often difficult and delicate task of enforcing consumer protection obligations. It nevertheless believes that further steps are needed to meet public concern. (White Paper, 1989, 34)

The BSC, through its research, monitoring and consideration of complaints from the public, was set up to take on the role of enforcing consumer protection. It provides a particular intermediary institution through which individual consumers can have their complaints mediated and sometimes acted upon. And although it rarely matches up to what the NVLA would like it to be (cf. NVLA Newsletter, Autumn 1994), both pressure group and regulatory body speak a similar language of consumer freedom, consumer protection and public opinion. At the NVLA Annual Convention, Mary Whitehouse explicitly set the aims and objectives of the organisation in these terms:

What we are really talking about here goes to the very heart of a democratic society. In a dictatorship the answer

33 It would also be overly simplistic to target the BSC as neo-conservative for other reasons, not least because of those individuals who work for the Council and because of the network of experts who conduct research for and advise the Council.
would obviously be simple. Do as the Government tells you or get out - at best! Like the programmes we transmit or lump them!... Making democracy work is an infinitely more challenging and demanding exercise than paying lip service to a dictator. But that is the burden which is laid upon us. Tirelessly put pen to paper. Refuse to accept the brush off; involve our M.P.'s; work through our favourite organisations; take and make every opportunity in our local and national press... The Chairman [Lord Rees Mogg] intends that the B.S.C., which began its monitoring work on the first of January this year, should end the 'producer monopoly' of television. 'The programme-makers, for the first time, will have to bow to the public's views' he said. 'The consumer ought to be sovereign in television as in everything else. That is what democracy is all about.' Well, we certainly have a long way to go! (Whitehouse, 1991, 4-6)

Likewise, in a speech at the same conference, Kenneth Baker, the then Home Secretary, stated that broadcasters should be brought into line, not through Government censorship, but through the power of public opinion as voiced through the complaints of viewers and listeners to the BSC.34 However, the notion of consumer sovereignty, upon which Baker's notion of public opinion is predicated, is 'not simply a matter of individual taste': '[i]f it were we could perhaps leave the individual to make the choice' (Baker, 1991, 3). Baker states, in relation to the fact that a large percentage of the population have a video recorder and television sets in children's bedrooms, that '[w]e cannot be with our children, nor supervise their viewing at all times' and that '[w]e need to ensure that impressionable young minds are protected and the broadcasters, as well as the viewers, must share some responsibility for that' (ibid, 3). This discourse constitutes the consumer as autonomous inasmuch as he or she is adult, responsible and voices his or her opinions publicly to bodies such as the BSC. This mechanism, then, makes the responsibility of the broadcaster an effect of the responsibility of the parent. In doing so it rests upon those earlier administrative practices which constitute the audience within a series of psychological fears and desires, which constitute the child audience as a

34 He stated that:

Since 1 January this year the Council has been a statutory body, with power to consider complaints. We believe that adjudication on complaints from viewers and listeners will become one of the Council's most important functions. It is also likely to shape the development of standards in the years ahead. As we politicians know only too well, the force of public opinion cannot be ignored. (Baker, 1991, 5)
distinct and separate audience and which constructs 'responsibility' as an attribute of certain types of parents.

**Parental Responsibility, Children's Viewing and Child-Centred Discourse**

The main point I want to make here is not that the freedoms of the parent are curtailed by this form of protectionist discourse (constituted within the series of consumer sovereignty, public opinion and consumer protection), but that power works through the freedom of the responsible parent, such that responsibility is a point of deliberation within set terms and conditions. For example, David Morley, in his ethnographic research on the consumption of information and communication technologies [ICTs], uses an example of a family from south-west London to bring out one aspect of such deliberations:

... they are concerned by the prospect of deregulated satellite television broadcasting bringing pornographic or violent programming within their children's grasp: '[They] have sets in their rooms and [we] can't know what they are watching all the time'. Thus, deregulation is not only a concern at the level of the disruption of national boundaries by transnational broadcasters: for this family at least, it is also a question of fear of the family's boundaries being transgressed. (Morley, 1992, 241)

For those parents the neo-liberalisation of broadcasting raises certain critical questions and problems about their capacity to supervise and hence also about the constitution of their responsibilities as parents (i.e. how, as a parent, do I act responsibly within this new set of temporal and spatial arrangements?). Morley goes on to parade the bizarre response of those particular parents:

Their parents' concern to regulate their children's use of ICTs is powerfully symbolized by the 'umbilical' principle of the electricity supply in this house: the only power point upstairs is in the parents' bedroom, from which wires are run into the children's rooms - and the children's electricity supply can thus be controlled directly by the parents. This, naturally, is a source of some tension, because, certainly for the son, part of the attraction of watching television in his room is his sense of this as a relatively unpolic ed/unsupervised activity. (ibid)
Anxiety about the regulation of children's television viewing is felt, not only in relation to children watching adult programmes, but in relation to children's programmes themselves, inasmuch as they are supposed to offer a protected space. In 1989, in response to the Conservative Government's White Paper on broadcasting, the British Film Institute stated charitably that '[t]he White Paper's proposals about children and television are expressed in terms that suggest that it is not the government's intention to destroy the present pattern of programming for children' (BFI, 1989, 22). And yet even as late as 1993 Anna Home, Head of Children's Programmes at the BBC, stated that children's television might soon become 'an endangered species' and she envisaged a future of 'wall-to-wall cartoons and junior soaps' in an 'increasingly pressured broadcasting environment' (The Independent, 14 April 1993). 35 The language of this concern not only presented merchandising-led animation and soap operas as mutually exclusive to children's television, but also framed concern in terms of the specific set of spatial and temporal arrangements formed around children's television. The concern, then, was, and is, not merely about the commercialisation of children's television, but about the loss of a particular set of viewing arrangements. For the most part, now, as Home stated in the same article, children's television 'can be safely watched without mother' (The Independent, 14 April 1993). 36

---

35 The use of the phrase 'wall-to-wall' was originally deployed in relation to the US soap opera Dallas by Alisdair Milne, Director General of the BBC, 1982-1987 (cf. Collins, 1986). This concern was particularly evident in the mid 1980s after the introduction of the television animation series He-Man and the Masters of the Universe in spring 1984. The characters in the programme had been produced by the toy corporation Mattel in 1982 and had led to the invention of the programme. There was much concern about children's television becoming merchandising-dominated.

36 Even the NVLA reported in its Spring 1994 newsletter that '[t]he majority of children's programmes monitored during the week 20th-26th November 1993 were of good quality, well produced and of sound value to the children watching'. Nevertheless it did pick out Byker Grove (BBC TV) as one that 'deserves special comment'. It stated that:

In the episodes monitored there were scenes of house-breaking, referral to drug abuse, referral to adultery, a vivid street fight and a hit and run accident. All of this in only two programmes was considered by the monitor to be excessive. (The Viewer and Listener, Spring 1994)
However, Sue Cook stated in response to the Newson report that although she could 'trust the programme makers enough to enjoy a lie-in on a Saturday morning after a long working week while the children sit in front of the television set', she would 'never consider letting [her] son have a television set in his room to watch alone at night' (The Times, 13 April 1994). Likewise, Libby Purves argued, in relation to the 'libertarian chorus' which responded to Howard's legislative proposals, that the problem needed to be seen in relation to the capacities and dispositions of different age-groups of children:

Older children, over nine or ten, may be armed against damage by discussion, technical interest, and increasing understanding of the fact that some adults are a bit "sicko", as they put it. They can also appreciate camp and parody. But small children need protecting: and if parents are too idle or stupid to do it, the law will have to. If not, now, through Mr Alton's Bill, then through other measures, however much they inconvenience childless households. (The Times, 13 April 1994)37

In this sense, Cook and Purves present the problem as a question of what we might call the micro-politics of domestic viewing. They cite the problem in terms of the specific administrative arrangements of television viewing within the home. However, instead of posing this discussion in terms of individual private freedoms against a collective public good, the discussion itself, within the public space of the press, provides ground for thinking about children's domestic television viewing as an administrative problem, in which statutory measures are only one suggested technique of government. Although the reservoir of images of the irresponsible parent, the single mother and 'latch-key kid', the child slumped in front of the television set in a darkened room whose face is lit-up by its glare, and the disfunctional working class family abound in contemporary representations of children's television viewing and are deployed in a set

---

37 Similarly, Maureen Freely argued for greater regulation of the broadcasting institutions and of video retailers, not because she believes that this regulation is a proper response to the problem of irresponsible parents, but because it would allow her not to worry about the problem herself, as a parent.

If I'm happy to live with a video nasty ban, it's not because I think it's an easy way to get families back on track, but because it allows me some time off in fool's paradise. It allays my fears and so makes me a more competent parent. (The Guardian, 15 April 1994)
of prohibitory mechanisms of government (at the level of the State and the parent), another set of images are used to imagine the good parent's responsibilities towards her children's television viewing.

Marie Winn, journalist, parent and campaigner against television, presents, in her book *The Plug-In-Drug* (1985), a number of images of the turmoils of having television within the home. For example, she quotes one mother whose children wanted to watch a programme which was aired at dinnertime:

I'd tell the kids that if they insisted on watching *Jeannie* they'd have to turn it off when dinner was ready. They'd say, 'Yeah, sure, we'll turn it off.'... Of course they didn't turn it off. I'd always have to come in and turn it off and they'd be very angry about this. They'd say, 'I hate you,' and come in to dinner shoving and kicking each other, angry and pouty, very, very angry. (Winn, 1985, 200)

This confession, which Winn extracts from her interviewee, is presented as an instance of a wider catalogue of the dangers of television. Nevertheless, it is cited by Maire Messenger Davies, developmental psychologist, journalist, founding member of British Action for Children's Television (BACTV) and author of *Television is Good for your Kids* (1989), in order to display, not an image of the frustrated mother faced with children made unruly by television, but an image of 'bad parenting'. She presents a different image of domestic viewing:

The wise parent does not take a confrontational position: she takes her sons out for a walk after school, then sits down and watches the television with them while they all have a cup of tea or a drink together. She then gets on with making dinner while they do what they want to do, having made sure that there are plenty of alternative activities in the room with the TV set. (The wise parent therefore has a very untidy sitting room.) The wise parent serves dinner at 6.30, after *Jeannie* has finished. (Messenger Davies, 1989, 60)

Although both the quotes by Winn and Messenger Davies demonstrate how the space of domestic viewing has become a site upon which the problems of children can be observed and within which parenting can be performed, both writers clearly make visible a different set of relations between parent, child and television. Messenger Davies' description of the household of the 'wise parent' strikes a chord with Ken Worpole's
description of the shift in parental supervision of children's television viewing: '[i]n one generation our family has moved, as far as domestic matters are concerned, from the realm of necessity to the realm of freedom' (Worpole, 1987, 89). Messenger Davies' description of the household of the 'wise parent' is not a description of greater private freedoms, but one in which those freedoms are constituted within a set of concerns about the emotional and cognitive development of the child and the production of responsible and rational citizens. It is not that one household is freer than the other, but that in both homes the freedom of the child and the responsibilities of the mother are constituted as a problem of government. Nevertheless, the techniques of supervision at hand in the child-centred home are more generously displayed: the mother has an untidy sitting room; she provides alternative activities; she arranges the domestic timetable to include her children's activities; she constitutes viewing as a joint (parent and child) activity; and she allows the children to watch freely within this supervised space. The image of the child-centred home is presented by the pressure group British Action for Children's Television (BACTV). It was set-up in 1989 in response to the recent neo-liberalisation of British broadcasting and modelled on the United States pressure group Action for Children's Television (ACT) headed by Peggy Charren. It was keen to argue that television played an important role in children's development and that television programming and parental supervision should be directed towards this end (cf. BACTV, 1989).

The child-centred discourse of children's television viewing, as I have argued in Chapter Four in relation to pre-school children's programmes, emerged in the 1970s and rests upon the governmental techniques developed in the late 1950s and 1960s. Buckingham, though, presents a more sophisticated analysis, which, nevertheless, still remains within the terms and conditions of the child-centred discourse and presents a version of the protectionist hypothesis. In a recent paper, whose title 'Intruder in the House: The Regulation of Children's Viewing in the Home' is resonant of my own concerns, he looks at family viewing in terms of the 'operations of social power, both within and beyond the family itself' (Buckingham, 1991, 4). As one of his opening premisses he states that in the early 1980s '[v]ideo changed the site of regulation from the broadcasting institutions to the family itself' (ibid, 4). Although I would locate the responsibilisation of parents as a central element of the discursive formation of the child television audience which emerged in the 1950s, it is clear that the
broadcasting institutions are a central force in the regulation of television viewing.

In a fascinating account of the details of different regulatory manoeuvres between child and adult, Buckingham condenses these features within a fixed relationship of power between parents and child.

The relationship between parents, children and television is thus inevitably characterised by struggles for power and control. For a variety of reasons, parents may seek to restrict and regulate their children's access to television; and children themselves may well resist this. (ibid, 3)

For Buckingham power is something which parents possess and through which they regulate their children's viewing. Children on the other hand are only able to resist this control. Although Buckingham, here, shifts the question of regulation within the domain of the family, he nevertheless constitutes the family within a juridico-discursive model: regulation is equated with restriction. His critique of parental regulation, in his sense, rests upon the notion that parents are under the illusion that television is a powerful medium and that children are at its mercy and need rescuing. Even though Buckingham shifts the site of regulation, he still maintains the same model of regulation and power that Barker, for example, employs in relation to State censorship (i.e. a form of the protectionist hypothesis).

38 Despite these limitations, Buckingham's work is particularly important not only in terms of analysing what parents and children say about television viewing within a family context, but also because he also begins to unsettle some established notions about the role of television within those familial relations (most notably his emerging critique of the notion that it is the father who is in control of the television set) (Buckingham, 1993b, 113).

39 Buckingham argues that regulation takes the form of 'adults' attempts to impose their own tastes' or 'from broader, social or even political commitments'. These attempts to regulate children's viewing, Buckingham argues, are based on a wider set of discourses concerning the normal and healthy development of the child. He then goes on to state that:

... these discourses serve to position children as passive recipients of their own socialisation. Children are at the mercy of the 'powerful medium' and will simply absorb its moral and behavioural messages if their viewing is not regulated and controlled. Where it is not perceived as positively harmful, watching television is seen simply as a waste of time, and as a distraction from more beneficial activities which, unlike television, involve 'work'. (Buckingham, 1991, 31)
The objective of power is always the same and always repeated. For example, Buckingham argues that parental attempts to turn television into a pedagogic tool are resorted to only as a last means of control. He states that:

From this perspective, parents inevitably perceive themselves as powerless by comparison. If their child is 'mesmorised' by the screen, or simply too 'lazy' to do anything more constructive, it is up to the parents to intervene in the interests of healthy development. If the child cannot be weaned off television completely, it can perhaps be turned into a self-regulating viewer, whose pleasures are subject to rational control. (ibid, 32)

This model of power is intertwined with an implicit account of the relationship between the true and the false. Those who regulate television viewing do so according to a false and illusory knowledge of the power of the media and the innocence of the child. Buckingham offers a critique of the myth or ideology of childhood innocence. It is this image, within Buckingham's argument, that holds the key to power over the child. In pursuing his argument he contests the Victorian image of the child and he contests the notion that the media have led to the disappearance of childhood (cf. Postman, 1983).

In Buckingham's work the psychological discourse of critical and discriminative viewing easily slips into a political discourse of the autonomy and rights of the child. Buckingham, in his critique of Postman, states that:

... in describing parental authority as essentially 'humane', Postman effectively ignores the ways in which it is abused, and has been abused throughout history. In regarding children as passive victims of television, he ignores the diverse competencies that are involved in making sense of the medium. And in asserting the need to keep them ignorant, he denies them the right to develop their own critical perspectives. (ibid, 127, my italics)

For Buckingham, the corollary of making the child, as it were, a making-sense-machine is that the child has certain rights and autonomy. What Buckingham ignores, though, is that capacities for critical viewing (through which these 'rights' are articulated) are produced through the forms of supervision at a distance which Messenger Davies describes. Buckingham makes a familiar move in which ontology is made the
foundation of resistance. The critical capacities of the child's mind are the basis upon which certain rights accrue and upon which resistance can be asserted. In this sense the liberties of the child parallel a recognition of the interests of the child. And yet it is clear from my analysis that the child viewer is too much a product of governmental practices to stand outside the tainted domain of power.

In this chapter I have begun to unpack what I call the protectionist hypothesis. I have argued that the concept of the moral panic, as deployed by Buckingham and Barker, both fails to historicise the relationship between regulation and freedom and also mirrors, through replicating a juridico-discursive notion of power, those arguments it wants to critique. Likewise, I argue that, despite the obvious tension between neo-conservative and neo-liberal arguments about broadcasting, the responsibilities of the broadcaster, at least in relation to the child audience, are constituted as an effect of the responsibilities of the parent. Both broadcaster and parent are constructed as specific relay points within the discursive formation of the child television audience. Nevertheless, we need to be cautious not simply to understand power as proprietorial and as held by the parent. On the contrary, power is exercised through the parent in producing the supervised freedom of the child-centred viewing space. In this sense it is not that individuals delegate their power, as a possession, to the broadcasters and regulatory bodies (such that freedom is transposed from a public activity to an internal state of sovereignty), but rather that regulation works through our freedom (i.e. exercised through those techniques which construct individuals both as responsible parents and critical child viewers).
Conclusion
In this thesis I have shown how the child audience is an imagined audience. It is imagined and acted upon within an administrative regime of power/knowledge. However, the imagining of this audience is not unified. Its history is marked with both discontinuities and continuities, just as the object of its disciplining is non-unitary and dispersed. Nevertheless, a definite genealogy can be traced. Particular sites emerge as distinct areas of problematisation (the family, domestic space/time, the public) and particular knowledges and institutions make specific claims for governing the audience within these areas. In the following pages I want to review my argument and to summarise my findings.

The Child Audience

- The child audience in the 1920s and 1930s was conceived and acted upon as if it were a constituent element within a wider entity: the family audience. The audience of *Children's Hour* was imagined, not simply as children, but as including other family members. This familial audience allowed children's radio listening to become the object of both discussion and argument within the home.

- The child audience was not unified. It was divided primarily, although not exclusively, in terms of those children who could listen properly and those children who, predominantly from working-class families, were seen to be unable to listen properly. This division provided a rationale for acting upon the listening population (both adult and child), such that children could, through radio, become responsible citizens.

- In the 1950s and 1960s this division was re-articulated within a psychological discourse and provided the tools for a more intensive governance of the television audience. The emergence of a psychological discourse of the child audience meant that the mode of conduct of viewing could be conceived, not in terms of an aesthetico-moral discourse as it had been in relation to radio listening (a concern with morals and manners), but in terms of the normality...
or abnormality of the individual mind of the child viewer and of the conditions of viewing. This discourse made possible the systematic normalisation of predominantly middle-class children and families and the pathologisation of predominantly working-class children and families.

• Central to the emergence of this discourse was the imagining of the child audience as distinct and separate from adult and family viewers. This audience was conceived as having its own habits, behaviours, attitudes and its own stages of development. For the broadcasters, this meant that children's programmes could be conceived as a means of dividing the child audience from the wider family audience and as a means of dividing children within themselves. It is within these dividing practices that the pre-school child audience emerges in the 1940s and 1950s. These dividing practices, though, were implemented in order that children would be secure within the time/space of the programmes and would, through time, be led safely into adulthood.

• Although initially the child audience was conceived as only watching children's programmes, an effect of conceiving the child audience as watching television programmes on their own was that children were now seen to be watching programmes other than those designed for them. A new concern about the dangers of children watching 'unsuitable' programmes became visible. This set of administrative changes fuels the current concerns about violent television. In the late 1950s a new scheduling policy was implemented (family viewing time) as a response to such concerns.

Familial and Domestic Space/Time

• The dividing practices which constitute the child audience as an audience establish this audience within specific temporal and spatial relations.

• Although in the 1920s the BBC was initially resistant to any scheduling of programmes, by the mid-1930s many programmes had established times of the day and week and hence could be fully incorporated into the routines of their listeners. In the 1940s and 1950s scheduling and programme announcements were used as a means of establishing a relationship of care between mother, pre-school child and television. In the 1970s the relationship of care becomes increasingly child-centred.
Likewise the children's television programmes themselves were conceived as a special spatial environment at specific times of the day. As programmes for older children were designed to open up the home to an adventurous world outside, programmes for the pre-school child were designed to keep the audience within a domestic space under the watchful eye of mother.

The practices of listening and viewing were imagined within specific spatial relations. In the 1920s and 1930s radio listening was presented within the context of the family gathered around the warm glow of the fire. In the 1940s, 1950s and early 1960s television was increasingly represented as a corollary for the modern home. The television set was positioned within a home now light, spacious and with thin, light, streamlined furniture. And television itself was seen to open up the home to the public. At the same time, though, another image of the geography of viewing was pictured: the darkened room, the shiny glare of the television screen, the flickering glow on the young child lying on the floor face held in hands. Just as the former image of the bright side of television's modernity illuminated a normalised space of viewing, the dark side made evident its pathologisation. However, this pathologised space of children's viewing was not imagined as reproducing the horrors of the crowd (animalistic, impressed by the visual and out-of-control), rather this pathology was hidden within the mind of the child, an interior space which would, when damaged, produce delinquent children and unruly adults.

The Public Sphere

In the 1920s and 1930s children's radio listening was conceived as linking the private space of the home to the public world of government. It was conceived as a democratic forum, a city-state of old. This imagining of radio listening made possible a domestication of forms of public dialogue and also the formation of a public space of the home. Similarly, radio provided the basis for 'public talk' within the family. Access to this public forum of broadcasting necessitated the dispositions and competencies of proper listeners.

In the 1940s and 1950s this public space of the home was now scrutinized by a psychological gaze. The discourse of psychology produced an image of the pathological child as withdrawn, not only from him or herself, but also from the public sphere.
In the 1970s and 1980s the relation between public and private was reconceptualised. In a neo-liberal discourse the viewer is imagined as the sovereign consumer free to choose the programme (commodity). And in recourse to faulty products the viewer is protected by certain consumer rights. This economic discourse, though, assumes a similarity, identity even, between adult and child. Both are conceived as consumers with rights to choose. At the same time however, a neo-conservative discourse articulates a set of morals and manners within this framework. Conservative notions of family, taste and decency, blasphemy and bad language are constituted within a wider domain of 'public opinion' and the protection of the consumer. In this sense, the neo-conservative mobilisation of moral panics serves to instigate personal responsibilities as a corollary of consumer choice.

Although these new political discourses forge a privatisation of the public sphere, they nevertheless rely on the existing psychological discourses of the child audience in order to discuss and argue through concerns about the liberties of some viewers in relation to the protection of others. Likewise, the discourse of developmental psychology constitutes the mother as someone facilitating her children's cognitive development and their critical viewing skills. These dispositions and competencies provide the conditions for thinking about the viewer as consumer sovereign (i.e. understanding is a condition of free choice).

Institutions, Expertise and Responsibilities

In the early years of the BBC those with authority to speak about the child audience were the children's broadcasters, mothers, clerics and other moral guardians. In the 1940s and 1950s doctors and dentists also had their say, but it was the psychologist and the educationalist who, by the mid-1950s, took on the mantle of knowledge.

The emergence of a psychological knowledge of the child audience was constituted between the institutions of broadcasting and the academy. This knowledge was, from the very beginning, a practical knowledge. Its conceptual tools were derived from the existing discipline of psychology. Psychology, as Rose has argued (1990), is inextricably bound up with the emergence of the social and social agencies. Its deployment as a practical knowledge within broadcasting was dependent on a host of factors both internal and external to
the institutions of broadcasting. Its effect was to provide a language through
which the concerns of State, broadcasting institutions, psychologists,
educationalists, journalists, pressure groups and parents could be translated
and within which the responsibilities of both broadcaster and parent could be
clearly demarcated, if hotly contested. The shift towards a more child-centred
discourse constitutes new programme forms and new forms of supervision.

This genealogy of the child television audience brings together different areas of
concern not as a unified historical narrative of a unified social agent, but rather
as the troubled history of overlapping problems which constitute a dispersed but
regular field of intelligibility, namely a discursive formation. Although I suggest
that this history is linked to a longer history of modern technologies of
government, only a more lengthy investigation of earlier troubles could properly
do it justice. Nevertheless, we can be sure that the child audience is not simply an
object, ontologically prior to discourse, waiting to be discovered. Our knowledge of
it is quite clearly constituted in relation to the exercise of power.

We cannot take the child television audience as a self-standing source of ethical
and political resistance to government. It is too much a product of the technologies
and objectives of government to stand outside of the tainted domain of power (cf.
Hunter, 1993). Claims to know the child audience, to name its identity and even to
speak for it are assertions and justifications of a particular mode of authority (cf.
Donald, 1993, 120). We cannot merely assert the criticalness of the child viewer,
just as we cannot simply reproduce the old maxims of the manipulated and
impressionable child who needs protection. Both are constitutive elements within
the same discursive regime.

However, just as the cost of tolerating this regime is too great, so too is the cost of
completely abandoning the framework of this regime. Although in this thesis I
have problematised the identity of the child television audience and offered
instead a more self-reflexive analysis, I would argue that it is equally important to
think that audience's identity anew, at both a theoretical and practical level. How,
for example, to think through the responsibilities of broadcaster and parent
without repeating the residues of earlier normalisations and pathologisations? It is
not sufficient simply to criticise the pathologising construction of working-class
audiences as 'irresponsible'. The cost of this criticism is, perhaps, too great. It
merely vacates that moral space and fails properly to consider both the politics
and ethics of any engagement with the question of children's television viewing.
My research has been heavily influenced by the work of Michel Foucault and my use of his work has been deliberately myopic. It has failed to address questions about: the ideology of childhood and children's television; the economic forces at play in providing a condition of existence for certain practices over others; political factors regarding the regulation of television; and practices of resistance to this formation, which Buckingham begins to explore in his excellent research (1993a and 1993b). Notwithstanding these failings, my narrowmindedness has proved fruitful in bringing other questions about the child audience to light: questions predominantly about the government or management of the child audience. As a consequence it will, perhaps, be less easy to assert, in the same way, those existing questions about children's television viewing: questions about the effects of television or about the critical capacities of child viewers.
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