CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

School administrators and corporate executives have been securing partnerships with each other for well over one hundred years. Most of the literature that deals with the history of school-corporate partnerships is based on how business involvement in education contributes to social efficiency, which argues that economic well-being depends on the ability to prepare young people in the workforce to carry out useful economic roles with competence (Labaree, 1997).

As business involvement becomes more prevalent in schools, additional aspects of school-corporate partnerships warrant investigation. While most studies of school-corporate partnerships are descriptive in nature, few studies have focused directly on the critical consciousness of school administrators with regard to school-corporate partnerships. Critical consciousness on the part of school administrators involves not only taking into account the financial aspects of the partnership, but taking into account the educational, social, political and ethical aspects as well.

This study examined the critical consciousness of school administrators with regard to school-corporate partnerships involving technology. The study focused on how school administrators think about school-corporate partnerships, employing political economy dimensions regarding what criteria or guidelines they considered when entering into technology partnerships, and what they perceive as the costs and benefits of their partnerships. Even though the

literature generally is lacking in the area of critical consciousness, one area of concern that has been noted in the literature is the increasing presence of commercialism in America's schools. This presence of commercialism lends particular relevance to the focus of this study.

This review of the literature is organized into three sections. The chapter begins with an overview of business influence in education, and includes descriptions of the contextual background of school-corporate partnerships, types of partnerships, and studies of school-corporate partnerships, with particular emphasis on technology and technology partnerships. This section of the chapter outlines the reasons for business involvement in education, including the benefits of partnerships to both schools and corporations. The second section acknowledges a major concern of business influence in education: the emergence of commercialism in the classroom, and describes laws, policies and other regulation of commercial activities in schools.

BUSINESS INFLUENCE IN EDUCATION

The business-education link has a very well-documented history, with numerous articles, books, and reports attesting to considerable activity, especially in the 1980s, when increasing concern was beginning to build about public education (Grobe, et. al., 1993). This section outlines the history of school-corporate partnerships, dating back to the 1700s, discusses types of partnerships, and offers examples of several school-corporate partnerships which portray different scenarios and outcomes of school-business relationships.

History of School-Corporate Partnerships

The business influence in education in America dates back about two-hundred-and-fifty years. In 1751, Benjamin Franklin described his curriculum and the entire process of education for the Philadelphia youth academy in his publication, *Idea of the English School,* as one in which “youth will come out of this school fitted for learning any business, calling, or profession” (Tyack, 1967, p. 51). Franklin believed that everything students studied had to be justified on its own merits and carefully sequenced so that it would make sense to students and prepare them for active lives (Tyack, 1967).

Relationships between schools and businesses accelerated during the 1800s when the industrial revolution necessitated the creation of education programs that could answer the changing needs of America’s work force. The need for these relationships were initiated and entered into primarily by businesses and corporations to improve the academic and technical skills of the future work force (Lankard, 1995).

At the end of the 19th century, businessmen and professional educators organized themselves to take control of school boards in cities and began running schools according to modern business practices (Carnoy & Levin, 1985). By 1916, although businessmen and professionals accounted for less than 11 percent of the nonagricultural labor force, they accounted for almost 80 percent of the school board members in 104 cities (Carnoy & Levin, 1985).

In the early 1900s social reforms made it obvious that public schools served a fundamentally economic purpose. According to Cuban (2001), “Public schools and universities were expected to Americanize newcomers and produce

vocationally skilled graduates who could fill administrative posts and technically demanding manufacturing jobs in the ever-expanding industrial workforce" (p. 9). In this era, vocational education and business-minded efficiency were seen as critical to preparing students for the industrial economy that was then competing with Great Britain and Germany.

Partnerships for Economic Development

In 1959, the Committee for Economic Development (CED) published its first major policy statement on education. The report, called *Paying for Better Public Schools*, clearly stated that "business has a responsibility, as citizens, to participate in the local, state, and national effort to improve the schools" (Committee for Economic Development, 1985). This report looked at the importance of the relationship between economic development and the quality of public school education in the United States (Levine & Trachtman, 1988).

Twenty-three years later, The Committee for Economic Development, chaired by Owen B. Butler, Chairman of the Board of Procter & Gamble, undertook a broad study to assess the overall quality of the American educational system as well as to pinpoint the problems impeding its success and suggesting solutions to improve the public schools (Levine & Trachtman, 1988). Butler and the committee saw their goal as the identification of new ways to "provide *all* our children with the opportunity to learn, to grow, and to become informed and productive adults" (Committee for Economic Development, p. xii). With this goal in mind, the committee urged the business world to take an active role in their quest. Their 1985 report, *Investing in our Children: Business and the*

Public Schools, outlined some of the main issues in public school improvement, including financing, curriculum, organization, management and work force of the schools, based on the perspectives, expertise and experience of business. This report also provided a rationale for corporate involvement in public and private school collaboration (Levine & Trachtman, 1988).

One of the four strategies for educational reform outlined by the CED was business/school collaborations and the committee examined how schools and businesses could forge effective partnerships. The committee felt that businesses were an important contribution to educational reform and that they could work with the schools both nationally and locally to develop workable reforms which they would be able to implement in a coherent and consistent manner (Committee for Economic Development, 1985).

Their case for business involvement in education focused on how human resources determine how the other resources of the nation will be developed and managed (Committee for Economic Development, 1985). According to the committee, “without a skilled, adaptable, and knowledgeable work force, neither industry nor government can work efficiently or productively” (p. 5). The committee saw the classroom as the means by which students would develop the skills and attitudes toward work that will “help determine the performance of our businesses and the course of our society in the twenty-first century” (p. 5).

The committee looked at the benefits derived from the contribution of not only the schools but businesses as well. They felt that school management and organization could be strengthened through application of modern management

strategies. Business techniques and strategies could also help schools more effectively prepare for the future of the dramatic change in demographics in the population of students and teachers (Committee for Economic Development, 1985).

CED looked at appropriate roles for business in the public schools. It felt that businesses have a responsibility for helping support and maintain quality in the public schools and to play a role in supporting adequate funding for schools (Committee for Economic Development, 1985). It saw three alternatives for corporate involvement: “supporting the existing system where schools are generally healthy; fostering innovative, incremental change; and working for major structural reforms in the system” (Committee for Economic Development, 1985, p. 12)

The committee urged businesses to examine the potential for improving education by becoming involved in skills and curriculum development and sharing management expertise with public schools. It also saw the need for business to participate in the local policy-making process through participation on local school boards (Committee for Economic Development, 1985).

The CED found a legitimate role for the business community in the public schools. It maintained that business benefits from improvements in the quality of the schools, and that it has a responsibility for helping to support and maintain that quality. It also determined that business has a role to play in supporting adequate public funding for the schools.

The Era of Education Reform

Business-school relationships evolved into formal partnerships in the 1970s and, by the 1980s, the perceived crisis in public education accelerated the development of these partnerships (Lankard, 1995). *A Nation At Risk*, published in 1983 by the National Commission on Excellence in Education, called for organizations to heed their recommendations for educational reform after the commission found that business leaders were required to spend millions of dollars on remedial education and training programs in such basic skills as reading, writing, and computation (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983). Businesses felt they were faced with the threat of an inadequately prepared work force that could jeopardize their competition with international commerce (Lankard, 1995). *A Nation at Risk* called for school-business collaboration as a way to improve schools. The business influence was so great following this publication that then President Ronald Reagan signed a proclamation on October 13, 1983 naming the 1983-1984 school year as the National Year of Partnerships in Education (Del Pizzo, 1990). In this same year, Ernest Boyer's 1983 high school study found that "excellence in education is possible only when connections are made with higher education and with the corporate world" (Boyer, 1983, p. 7).

In 1983 President Reagan also established the Private Sector Initiatives Program which provided federal funding to support school-business partnerships (Hopkins & Wendel, 1997). The Bush Administration followed with a goal of doubling the amount of participation in education by business and industry under first lady Barbara Bush's role as national chair of the school-community-business

partnership movement (Hopkins & Wendel, 1997). In 1988 a new organization called the National Partners in Education Symposium was created to represent the schools and educators, businesses, community groups and individual volunteers who worked together to enhance student education (Hopkins & Wendel, 1997).

Corporations throughout the United States continued to enter into partnerships with schools. For example, Adopt-a-School program became widespread in Chicago, Tenneco Oil in Houston implemented a new citywide program called Volunteers in Public Schools, and Pittsburgh's Partnerships in Education with The Allegheny Conference program was developed. One of the first initiatives of the Allegheny Conference was a public information campaign in support of the city's new magnet schools. Private enterprises assisted the schools by funding television and radio advertisements, billboards, bus placards, and general information material (Levine & Trachtman, 1988). Two other examples of partnerships that were created include Los Angeles-based Atlantic Richfield, which partnered with the public schools to create the program known as Atlantic Richfield's Educational Project, and the Boston Compact, a school-industry project aimed at the school desegregation crisis in the mid 1970's (Boyer, 1983). The Boston Compact was an agreement between the Boston School Department, members of the business community, area colleges and universities and trade unions. By signing the Compact, the business community agreed to hire 400 June 1983 graduates for permanent jobs and then increase that number to 1000 within two years if the graduates met entry-level

requirements. The School Department agreed to reduce the drop-out rate and school absenteeism by 5 percent each year and to implement increased academic standards, requiring that all graduates meet the minimum standards in reading and mathematics by 1986 (Levine, 1985). The Boston Schools exceeded nearly all of its goals, such as increased attendance and tests scores, by the end of the first year (Northeast-Midwest Institute, 1988).

Educational Partnership Programs

Congress enacted the Educational Partnership Act in 1988 in an effort to encourage the creation of additional partnerships between educational institutions and private and nonprofit sectors of the community. The United States Department of Education's Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI) funded the first cycle of four-year projects under its Educational Partnerships Program in September of 1990, authorized under the Educational Partnerships Act of 1988 (Grobe, et. al., 1993). These partnerships were part of the Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act of 1988 and were intended to foster joint projects between educational institutions and the community. The goals of these projects were to: 1) raise career awareness of secondary and post-secondary school students; 2) expand learning and experiential opportunities for gifted and economically disadvantaged students; and 3) work on school improvement (Bodinger-deUriarte, 1994). This legislation also required documentation from the partnerships that received assistance, assessing their impact on educational institutions, evaluating the extent to which

they improved their communities' support for education and identifying promising activities (Bodinger-deUriarte, 1995).

The Reagan administration's consolidation of federal education funding put pressure on states to increase general school funding. Such increases were not financially possible for many states. As a result, these states turned to business partnerships for financial support (Hoff, 2002). During this same time period, businesses experienced a decline in the labor market due to a decline in the number of available workers between the ages of 14 and 24 years old. Exacerbating the problem was the fact that many of the workers in this age range were entry-level applicants, many of whom had dropped out of high school (Hoff, 2002). The combination of less funding, a declining workforce and ill-prepared workers led to the belief that education was everyone's concern (Hoff, 2002). Business leaders began to ask for more accountability in student outcomes and began to question whether or not school partnerships were contributing to educational reform (Hoff, 2002).

Goals 2000

President George Bush's Goals 2000 plan for schools was highly touted by businesses and corporations, particularly, goals number three, number four and number five (Boyles, 1998). Goal 3 stated that by the year 2000, American students will leave grades four, eight and twelve having demonstrated competency in challenging subject matter in English, mathematics, science, history and geography, and every school in American will ensure that all students learn to use their minds well, so they may be prepared for responsible

citizenship, further learning, and productive employment in our modern economy. Goal 4 stated that “by the year 2000, United States students will be first in the world in mathematics and science achievement,” and Goal 5 said that “by the year 2000, every adult in America will be literate and will possess the knowledge and skill necessary to compete in global economy and exercise the rights and responsibilities of citizenship” (Boyles, 1998, p. 62).

Schools in the 21st century face a growing gap between the cost of educating students and the money available to do so (Wohl, 2001). According to Lankard (1995), “when businesses engage in collaborative partnerships, they look for benefits that affect their operation, productivity, and profit line – elements that enable them to be competitive in a changing society” (p. 3). By collaborating with schools that are in need of their materials and funding, corporations are finding additional means by which to increase their bottom line.

Spring (1982) asserted that public educational institutions have played a leading role in campaigns to end urban poverty and crime, assimilate immigrants, improve race relations, and rejuvenate an often-sagging democratic spirit. While Levine (1985) noted that “business/school collaboration has become a trendy piece of the educational reform movement,” she also maintained that there has been a real fundamental change in the level of business involvement with schools. While earlier in the twentieth century business focused on vocational education and narrow skill development, Levine saw that business efforts had now turned their attention to the need for more broad, liberally educated employees (Levine & Trachtman, 1988). Employers were now advocating for

more participatory management and leadership that empowers employees rather than the techniques that produced schools modeled after factories (Levine & Trachtman, 1988).

The Partnership for 21st Century Skills

One of the most recent major developments related to business-school partnerships is the Partnership for 21st Century Skills, a public-private organization of leaders and educators in business and education. This partnership was formed in 2002 to work toward the goal of closing the gap between the knowledge and skills that students learn in school and the knowledge and skills that they need in a typical twenty-first century workplace (Department of Education, 2002).

The Partnership for 21st Century Skills released its first report, Learning for the 21st Century: A Report and MILE (Milestones for Improving Learning and Education) Guide for 21st Century Skills in 2002. This report was designed to articulate a unified, collective vision for education and a framework for action (Department of Education, 2002). The report recognized that “while current budget constraints eventually will subside, the long-term need for 21st century learning will not: Accelerating technological change, rapidly accumulating knowledge, increasing global competition and rising workforce capabilities around the world make 21st century skills essential” (Department of Education, 2002, p.5). In the report it was stated that the Partnership contributes to improving education by a) synthesizing research, insight, and best practices about 21st century knowledge and skills into a powerful, shared vision, b)

defining a framework and creating a common language for understanding and promoting 21st century skills, c) providing education leaders with tools, examples and a strategy for action, and d) building consensus in the public and private sectors about the nature and need for 21st century skills (Department of Education, 2002).

The report outlined six key elements of 21st century learning which the authors maintain complement the No Child Left Behind Act. Those key elements include:

1. Emphasizing core subjects, identified as English, reading, or language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics, government, economics, arts, history and geography.
2. Emphasizing learning skills, including information and communication skills, thinking and problem-solving skills, and interpersonal and self-directional skills.
3. Using 21st century tools to develop learning skills to become proficient in information and communication technologies.
4. Teaching and learning in a 21st century context through real-world examples, applications and experiences both inside and outside of school.
5. Teaching and learning 21st century content identified as global awareness, financial, economic and business literacy and civic literacy.

6. Using 21st century assessments that measure 21st century skills, which means balancing high-quality standardized testing with classroom assessments for improved teaching and learning.

The partnership's work emphasized not only what students were learning, but also how they are learning as well. The partnership maintained that educators could begin implementing the 21st century skills by utilizing their nine steps outlined in this report to build momentum. Those steps include 1) embracing a powerful vision of public education that includes 21st century skills, 2) aligning leadership, management and resources with educational goals, 3) using their tools to assess where schools are presently, 4) developing priorities for 21st century skills, 5) developing a professional development plan for 21st century skills, 6) ensuring that students have equitable access to a 21st century education, 7) developing assessments to measure progress in 21st century skills, 8) collaborating with outside partners and, 9) planning collectively and strategically for the future (Department of Education, 2002).

Early Studies of School-Corporate Partnerships

Dale Mann was one of the first to research business participation in public schools. In 1983 he conducted his initial study of urban partnership programs, in 23 large cities, including Atlanta, Boston, Cleveland, Dallas, Los Angeles, Miami, New Orleans, New York, Phoenix, Seattle and Washington, DC (Mann, 1987). In 1985 Mann studied an additional 85 American public school districts in smaller cities. In all of these sites he and his colleague, RobertaTrachtman, collected information from primary documents and telephone interview data from

superintendents, members of teacher organizations and board members. Trachtman collected and analyzed the responses from teachers in the 85 smaller city districts and Mann advised and evaluated a large number of business groups, community agencies and school districts regarding their interactions with one another.

Mann's goal was to document the knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors of school personnel with regard to what he refers to as "this new generation of business involvement" (Mann, 1987, p.124). He maintained that the success or failure of a particular project often depends on school efforts - what school personnel think is directly related to the prospects for business involvement. The questions he asked were 1) "What does business want? 2) How are the bargains between business and the schools being struck? 3) What have been the results? 4) Are there limits to this new business presence? and 5) What is the relation between business and the future of school reform (Mann, 1987)?

Mann found that only one-in-twenty big-city superintendents seemed confident of the involvement of business leaders in their schools and that business is also interested in schools for altruistic reasons. From the business perspective, Mann found that the business interest in schools did not focus on specific subject matter or skills. Instead businesses want graduates who wanted to learn; have appropriate attitudes and work habits; and were willing to accept supervision. He also found that more amorphous goals seem to count the most and that the involvement of business in the schools had to do with the importance of projects, activities, events, persons, and students. According to

Mann, “So far, most business involvement seems to have been built on fuzzy altruism, wrapped around particular projects” (Mann, 1987, p. 125). Businesses want to help in practical ways that meet a need expressed by the school.

In 1984 the Committee for Economic Development conducted a survey of 500 large businesses and 6,000 smaller ones concerning their attributes for employability and their involvement in the public schools. They found that company size was an important factor in business/education collaboration. Over half of the large companies responding to the survey had some type of collaboration with schools, while fewer than 20 percent of the smaller companies had any type of business-school program. Large companies were more concerned with generic skills and abilities while small companies were more concerned with job-specific skills, commenting that schools do not equip students with these skills (Levine & Trachtman, 1988).

Survey findings also indicated that there was no statistical relationship between regions of the country and school-business partnerships, although they did find more evidence of partnerships in the East and the Midwest. They found that the type of companies that are most involved in partnerships are utility companies, electronic and high technology companies, and banking, insurance, and financial companies. The most prevalent type of involvement identified was programmatic involvement that focused on student development of employability skills and/or specific job skills for experience, including cooperative education, internships, and work-study (Levine & Trachtman, 1988).

In a follow-up survey in 1986, the Committee asked the respondents of the initial survey to update their information regarding their involvement with education. Levine (1988) cited 92 corporate responses, including funding of projects, internships, grants, training for students, teachers and parents, work-study, volunteerism, cooperative education, participation on advisory boards, dropout prevention programs, equipment donation, scholarships and awards, enrichment programs, fundraising efforts, mentoring programs, and career exploration (Levine & Trachtman, 1988).

A study done in the early 1990s by Northwestern National Life Insurance Company validated the belief that many high school students do not have the skills they need to succeed in the workplace after graduation (Romano, 1995). Northwestern surveyed 200 human resource and customer service managers in the Minneapolis area and found that “only 44 percent of human resources managers and 23 percent of customer service managers believe that most high school graduates have the skills and abilities to adequately perform entry-level jobs” (Romano, 1995, p. 7). The human resources managers cited math, reading, computer, keyboarding, and telephone skills as most important for people seeking entry-level positions. The Minneapolis school system paid attention to the study results and set up a partnership with Northwestern to improve students’ skills. The 12-week partnership program was offered to high school juniors and seniors for two hours a day, five days a week, and was taught by employee volunteers (Romano, 1995).

In his 1991 dissertation, D. L. Rowland examined the effect of corporate contributions made through school-business partnerships upon school achievement. He surveyed 84 elementary, middle, and high schools, looking for gains in the areas of student test scores, attendance, retention, and graduation rates. He concluded that no type of contribution, including money, materials, equipment, manpower, or any combination thereof, had a significant effect in any area of desired improvement (Hoff, 2002).

With large budget deficits currently at both the federal and state levels, schools are increasingly looking for non-traditional sources of revenue, such as school-business partnerships, to supplement the sources of revenue that have traditionally funded education. As Larson (2001) states, evidence suggests that school-business partnerships are becoming a standard fixture in America's schools. Such evidence is that as of the year 2000, there were over 200,000 school-business partnerships (Hoff, 2002).

The history of business involvement in education described relationships between schools and corporations over the past two-hundred-and-fifty years. These relationships range from minimal involvement to multidimensional, systemic involvement. The following section details the types of partnerships that exist between schools and corporations.

Types of Partnerships

Grobe, et. al. (1993) interviewed Fordham University professor Roberta Trachtman and found that what she determined differentiates partnerships from other types of institutional relationships is a matter of "who benefits?" Trachtman

maintained that if all parties do not benefit then the relationship is not a true partnership. Trachtman outlined various ways that partners benefit:

- Business – improved public relations, better-prepared employees, decreased training costs, increased productivity and greater potential for local economic development;
- Education – increased public confidence in support for education, increased access to new technology, enhanced opportunities for professional growth, increased resources, increased staff morale and student success (in the areas of student behavior and truancy);
- Higher Education – increased college admission and retention, better prepared students, decreased remediation costs;
- Parents and Students – greater voice in education affairs, empowerment, enhanced higher education and career opportunities; and
- Community – improved quality of life, strong education system that can attract newcomers to the city (Grobe, et. at., 1993, p. 7).

The United States Department of Education's Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI) commissioned four reports in order to assess what was already known about partnerships and to review potential evaluation design options. One of the OERI-commissioned reports (Grobe, et. al.,1993) outlined and discussed the context and types of educational partnerships. Grobe described partnerships in terms of typologies including level of involvement, partnership structure and level of impact.

Grobe's (1993) first typology categorized three levels of involvement: support, cooperation, and collaboration. The support stage is typically the beginning stage of a partnership that focuses on acquiring new resources for a specific project or program. In the support stage, a member of the school community engages a business partner to provide resources in the form of classroom volunteers, funding, computers, or a specific school project. The cooperation stage is characterized by a greater degree of communication and participation in the school, such as mentorship programs or school-to-work programs. The third stage is the collaboration stage in which the partnership is in full swing. Partners have established long-range goals that address the specific needs of the school and major resources are allocated (Grobe, et. al., 1993).

Grobe's second typology described the partnership structure. In a simple partnership, one partner manages the initiative and the other partner supplies the resources. An example of a simple partnership is the Adopt-a-School program. The Adopt-a-School program is one in which a business or industry sponsors a particular school. The business helps students by providing staff who serve as role models, tutors, and counselors. The company may also provide summer employment, field trips, and cultural experiences (Los Angeles Unified School District, 1984)

A moderately complex partnership is one in which the school is not just a recipient of the resources, but an active partner. It can take the form of shared management between two or more partners, multiple partners who have different responsibilities or more than one partner within each sector of the program.

Summer job partnerships in which school personnel and business employees teach courses, provide readiness skills and engage in job placement are examples of moderately complex partnerships (Grobe, et. al., 1993).

A complex partnership is essentially a moderately complex partnership with additional levels of partnership in the project, a new organization formed for the purposes of the project, or multiple partners from two or more sectors (Grobe, et. al., 1993). An example of a complex partnership is a city which established a youth commission to address major issues coordinate funding programs, and address service gaps or programmatic improvements (Grobe, et. al., 1993).

Grobe's third typology indicated levels of impact upon the education system. These levels of impact are characterized by partners in special services, the classroom, teacher training and development, management, systemic educational improvement, and policy (Grobe, et. al., 1993). Said Grobe, "multidimensional partnerships can be found at any level; however, in general, "the higher the level of involvement and investment in education, the greater the opportunity to bring about lasting improvements in education, and the greater the likelihood of significantly improving the work force readiness of our nations's youth" (p. 10).

Partners in special services, the lowest form of involvement, provide short-term project or student-specific activities or resources to help with a specific project. Partners in the classroom generally are volunteers from the business community who "improve the learning environment by bringing their business or occupational expertise directly into the classroom for students and teachers, or

bringing the classroom to the business"' (Grobe, et. al., 1993, p.12). Partners in teacher training and development provide opportunities for upgrading or maintaining skills and learning more about the labor market. Partners in management provide school officials with management support and expertise in areas such as labor relations, purchasing, management information systems, and strategic planning. The highest level of involvement, that of systemic educational improvement, is one in which business officials and other community leaders identify the need for educational reform or improvements and work long term to make the changes happen (Grobe, et. at., 1993).

While business influence in education has been documented since the 1700s, only in the past 30 years have there been significant studies conducted to research its impact on the public and private sectors. Partnerships between schools and businesses have grown steadily over the past 30 years. The percentage of school districts involved in partnerships grew to about 51 percent in 1990 and was up to approximately 69 percent, over 200,000 partnerships, by 2000 (Hoff, 2002).

The types of partnerships outlined in this section will be contextualized in the following section. This section will highlight several examples of school-corporate partnerships that involve technology, ranging from state-wide corporate partnerships to single-school corporate partnerships.

Examples of School-Corporate Partnerships Involving Technology

School-corporate partnerships that involve computer technology have become prevalent across the United States. Some partnerships involve entire

school districts, some involve creating technology schools within specific school districts, and others involve specific schools. Examples of partnerships of each scope are cited in this section.

The New York State Education Department and Apple Computer forged a partnership in 1990 to explore the contribution that technology can make to schools. This partnership was based on Apple's Learning Society program and the Education Department's Long-Range Plan for Technology in Elementary and Secondary Schools in the state of New York. Apple's vision of a Learning Society complemented the strategic direction for the use of technology in New York schools. Phase I of this partnership provided hardware, software, and enhanced support for the teaching and learning process to five schools selected by Apple Computer, Inc. (Stoll, 1991). The five schools each received 20 Macintosh computers, one laser printer, one Macintosh administrative workstation, the services of an Apple systems engineer to help with installation and networking, training of teachers and administrators, Apple's Visual Almanac (an interactive laser disc resource), and hardware maintenance for up to a year (Stoll 1991). According to Jack Murphy, Vice President for Eastern Operations at Apple, their mutual objective was to explore the role of technology in one or more dimensions of the educational system, including the student, teacher, administrator, and classroom dimensions. Said Murphy, "We expect that as a result of our collaboration, selected school districts will provide information and direction to other school districts that are working to implement the vision of the future" (Stoll, 1991, p. 2).

The second phase of the partnership involved six school districts selected by Apple from over 140 applicants. Phase 2 schools received teacher and student computer workstations, cabling, software products, training and technical assistance for installation and networking (Stoll, 1991).

Stoll concluded that the partnership exemplified the benefits that result when public and private sectors collaborate to enhance the quality of education and introduce new learning opportunities for students and teachers. However, he did not elaborate on the benefits besides the $1.5 million Apple invested in the New York schools. A March 1991 report from the Public Policy Institute of New York State, underscored the educational benefits of public-private sector partnerships such as the New York State Department of Education/Apple collaboration. According to Stoll, “the SED/Apple Computer, Inc. Partnership Program illustrates the opportunities that result when education and industry collaborate to plan effectively for the future use of technology for enhancing learning and restructuring schools” (Stoll,1991, p. 12).

The Los Angeles County Office of Education made steady progress in reaching the goals of its Technology for Learning (TFL) initiative through a collaborative effort between public and private organizations designed to improve educational technology access and use throughout the county. The Los Angeles County schools implemented the first phase of the initiative with a $1 million donation of software licenses from Davidson & Associates in Torrance, California and a $500,000 software donation from the Microsoft Corporation (THE Journal, 1997). In addition to these California-based resources, other key private sector

donations included an $800,000 assessment of technology needs from ETC, a regional communications hub from Pacific Bell to allow the Los Angeles County schools to concentrate local network activity in a centralized location, and a grant from AT&T to organize 25 regional technology centers throughout the county (THE Journal, 1997).

As a result of these contributions, the ratio of students to computers in schools improved, Los Angeles schools forged ahead of both national and statewide averages regarding student access to multimedia, more schools were connected to the Internet, and more teachers were trained to use technology effectively in the classroom. The Los Angeles County schools credited the private sector for the improvements. The director of the Technology for Learning Initiative credited the private sector for driving the Initiative's success. He reported that "During the past year, TFL's corporate partners have worked closely with educators in the region to ensure that new technologies truly contribute to student achievement" (THE Journal, 1997).

In 1985, Apple and the Houston Independent School District began a "School of the Future" project to create a model school at F.M. Black Middle School in Houston, Texas. The project was created to demonstrate how microcomputers and related technology could make the instructional process more efficient and effective (Otterbourg & Adams, 1989). Based on the evaluations of the School of the Future program and the researcher's observations, it was concluded that the program did influence the instructional

climate of the entire school through the enhancement of staff and student morale and instructional organization. According to Otterbourg and Adams (1989),

> even though the appropriate student achievement data was not available to show that the program had a positive impact on student performance, it was the perception of the instructional staff (74 percent) that student learning received a reasonable degree or a great deal of improvement during the 1986-87 school year (Otterbourg & Adams, 1989, p. 9).

Another example of creating a technology-rich school was the Saturn School of Tomorrow, a Saint Paul, Minnesota public school for students in grades four through eight, which began operation in September of 1989. The school was named for the challenge offered by Al Shanker, president of the American Federation of Teachers in the late 1980s (Preskill, King, & Hopkins, 1994) “to change the way children are taught in the same manner that Saturn automobile manufacturers changed the way cars were made”(Preskill, King & Hopkins, 1994, p. 43). The vision of the Saturn School was to personalize learning, professionalize teaching and take advantage of cutting-edge technologies available. The school was created in conjunction with three partners, the University of Saint Thomas in Saint Paul, Minnesota Educational Computing Company (MECC), and Apple. The school also received $90,000 from The Bush Foundation to fund a comprehensive evaluation, one that would examine process, product and cost-effectiveness factors over a three-year period (Preskill et al., 1994).

The formative evaluation, completed in August 1994, found that students in the technology-rich school were falling behind other students in their test scores, especially in the areas of math and science. Without textbooks or district curriculum, staff were confused as to what should be taught and by whom (Preskill et al., 1994). As of 1996, the Saturn School ceased to exist.

A working relationship between Honeywell and the Horace Mann School for the Deaf and Hearing Impaired in Brighton, Massachusetts illustrates a partnership between a large corporation and a single school. The partnership started in 1976 when instructors from Horace Mann asked employees at Honeywell to participate on its Business and Advisory Commission. Honeywell agreed and its involvement expanded from advising the school on job training needs to providing both training and jobs. Honeywell donated a full-time training center which provided instruction for students in electromechanical assembly. Honeywell then established a work-study program and hired students after graduation. After having successfully helped numerous deaf people find entry-level jobs, Honeywell employees initiated other collaborative programs with the school to establish new job training programs and work opportunities for disabled adults (Levine & Trachtman, 1988).

The programs described are just a few examples of school-corporate partnerships involving educational technology. They illustrate the range of complexity and levels of involvement of both schools and corporations. As Molnar (2004) noted in *The Seventh Annual Report on Schoolhouse Commercialism Trends* in September 2004, “The trend persists despite growing

criticism of – and to some degree, attempts to resist – practices that create tighter bonds between public and private, for-profit corporations" (p. 1). He believed the trend is driven in large part by continued financial struggles of public school systems to meet the demands of educating children in the face of tighter resources.

EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY

This study focuses on partnerships that involve educational technology, the definition of which can be very broad. According to Saettler, "the meaning of educational technology is intertwined with certain historical conceptions and practices or bound to specific philosophical and psychological theory as well as with particular scientific orientations" (p. 5). The term 'educational technology' can mean very different things to different people. In 1977, the Association for Educational Communications and Technology (AECT) in the United States put forth the following definition: "Educational technology is a complex, integrated process involving people, procedures, ideas, devices, and organization, for analyzing problems and devising, implementing, evaluating, and managing solutions to those problems, involved in all aspects of learning" (Thomas & Kobayashi, 1987, p. 1). This definition was actually 16-pages of text included in AECT's 1977 publication *The Definition of Educational Technology*. This 169-page publication intended to do two things: 1) systematically analyze the complex ideas and concepts used in the field of educational technology; and 2) show how these concepts and ideas related to one another. (Januszewski, 2001). However, according to Saettler (1990), "because of the current changes in

the field, the publication is seriously outmoded and in need of revision" (p. 7). As this definition is very broad in context, this study limited its focus to devises, specifically, computer software and hardware.

Technology in the Schools

Engel (2000) summed up the current trend of educational technology maintaining that "in its interactions with the impersonal workings of the free market, computer technology is creating an information society that will shape our daily work, restructure our leisure time, and thus change our lives. The schools and their students can either choose to go with the flow or be left in the backwash" (p. 93).

Computers are now an integral part of education, with technology advancing at a rapid pace. According to the United States Department of Education's Office of Educational Technology, there was one instructional computer for every 20 students in 1990. In 1998, there was more than one instructional computer for every six students. Between the years 1993 and 1999, the percentage of schools with Internet access increased from 35 percent to 65 percent. The proportion of teachers using the Internet in teaching continues to grow along with school connectivity – from 65 percent in 1998 to 85 percent in 2000 (United States Department of Education 2000). A 2001 study by Cattagni and Westat concluded that by the fall of 2001, 98 percent of all schools were connected to the Internet (Ross, 2001). Technology in the schools continues to grow, spurred in part by legislative acts, grants, and partnerships.

Computer Contribution Act

In 1983, Congress passed the Computer Contribution Act, which was designed to encourage contributions of computers and computer equipment to elementary and secondary schools by providing an enhanced charitable contribution to the donor (Congress of the U. S., 1983). Chairman Stark of the Subcommittee on Select Revenue Measures of the Committee on Ways and Means of the United States House of Representatives emphasized during the legislation hearing that the law was not designed to benefit any one company or industry, but instead, it was designed to help the children and the schools by providing them with up-to-date equipment which many schools couldn't afford to purchase themselves (Congress of the U. S., 1983).

National Education Summit Meeting

In 1996, a National Education Summit Meeting was held at the corporate headquarters of IBM. State governors, corporate leaders, federal officials, and a few educators listened to President Clinton address the group on the importance of academic standards, tests, and technology. The conclusion of the Summit meeting was wrapped up into one sentence, stating that they are convinced that technology, if applied thoughtfully and well-integrated into the curriculum, could be utilized as a helpful tool to assist student learning, provide access to valuable information, and ensure a competitive edge in the workforce (Cuban, 2001). President Clinton then appropriated $2 billion for five-year grants from the Technology Literacy Challenge Fund for building the necessary technological infrastructure in the schools. Clinton also laid out four "pillars" which he challenged the nation to achieve. Those four pillars were: 1) modern computers

and learning devices will be accessible to every student; 2) classrooms will be connected to one another and to the outside world; 3) educational software will be an integral part of the curriculum – and as engaging as the best video game; and 4) teachers will be ready to use and teach with technology (Cuban, 2001, p. 16).

In his 1997 State of the Union address, President Clinton outlined a 10-point plan for improving education that included wiring every school in the United States to the Internet by the year 2000 (Kent & McNergney, 1999). As the Internet was growing, inequality of access and understanding of technology across racial and socio-economic lines led to the concern of the new phenomenon called the digital divide. Policymakers became concerned about the digital divide and argued that public schools were the natural place to teach underserved students about computers.

The E-Rate

In order to succeed at the task of wiring all schools, especially those with low access to the Internet, President Clinton and Vice-President Al Gore proposed, and Congress authorized, creation of the “E-rate,” a universal phone service subsidy which discounted the cost of wiring classrooms to the Internet in schools with high percentages of low-income students (Cuban, 2001). As part of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, the E-Rate program allowed the government to actively subsidize between 20 and 90 percent of Internet and telecommunications access in the U. S. classrooms and libraries through a tax on long-distance services. The Schools and Libraries Division (SLD) of the

Universal Service Administrative Company (USAC) was appointed to by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) to be responsible for carrying out the E-Rate program's day-to-day operations (General Accounting Office, 2001).

The E-Rate, which began in 1998, provided up to $2.25 billion per year of subsidies to schools in Internet and communications technology (Goolsbee & Guryan, 2002). E-Rate wiring initiatives in the schools were very successful: the ratio of computers to schools dropped from 125:1 in 1981, to 18:1 in 1991, to 5:1 in 2000 (Cuban, 2001).

In a May 2001 update on E-Rate funding, the Government Accountability Office found that requests for E-Rate support rose steadily each year since the program began in 1998. For the third and fourth years of the program, total requests greatly exceeded the program's annual funding cap of $2.25 billion (General Accounting Office, 2001). For the third year the requests exceeded $4.2 billion and SLD could not support all the requests, leaving nearly $2 billion of the $3.2 billion requested for internal connections unfunded. In the fourth year, the year the report was written, the SLD estimated that of the $5.2 billion in applicant requests, a large proportion of the nearly $3.5 billion in internal connection requests would go unfunded (General Accounting Office, 2001). The FCC and SLD took steps to reduce the amount of committed funds that went unspent by canceling the funding commitments of second-year applicants that had not confirmed they had begun receiving services associated with these funds (General Accounting Office, 2001).

Wiring schools is just one aspect of technology costs for schools. In addition to start-up costs for hard infrastructure, there are the costs associated with soft infrastructure such as technical support and professional development. Hard and soft infrastructure costs together add up to a multi-billion dollar investment. In 1995, it was estimated that approximately $3.3 billion was spent on hardware, software, networking and other related costs, which was about 1.3 percent of the average annual per-pupil expenditure, or $75 per student (Cuban, 2001). By 1999, spending had increased to $5.5 billion for K-12 education, equivalent to $119 per student (Cuban, 2001).

CEO Forum on Education and Technology

In 1997, the CEO Forum on Education and Technology, which includes members from corporations such as America Online, Apple Computer, Classroom Connect, Dell Computer, Hewlett Packard, IBM and Lucent Technologies, issued its first report on technology and education, *From Pillars to Progress*. This report urged schools to purchase hardware and connectivity as a means to achieve educational objects and improve student achievement (CEO, p. 4). According to Ross, et. al (2001), “Market Data Retrieval (2001) reported that 66.7 percent of schools’ technology spending goes to purchase hardware” (p. 21).

By investing money in technology, technology promoters assumed that increasing the availability of computers in the classroom would lead to increased use, which was then further assumed to lead to efficient teaching, greater achievement, and yield graduates who could compete in the workplace.

President Clinton made these assumptions explicit when he stated that, “frankly, all the computers and software and Internet connections in the world won’t do much good if young people don’t understand that access to new technology means…access to the new economy” (Cuban 2001, p. 18). These assumptions dominated policymaking about educational technology in the United States during the first years of the 21st century.

Technology Standards

With additional investments in technology leading to the presence of more computers in the classroom, concerns about how they were used in the schools and how they were integrated into the curriculum spurred the International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE) to publish its first edition of foundational technology standards for students in 1998. This document synthesized responses to proposed educational technology standards for students from many different groups and individuals across the country who participated in conference sessions, technology forum meetings, Internet dialogue, and surveys (International Society for Technology in Education, 2002).

Following this first document, ISTE developed the National Educational Technology Standards (NETS) project to enable stakeholders in Pre-K-12 education to develop national standards for utilizing technology in education as a way of facilitating school improvement throughout the United States. The International Society for Technology in Education introduced the National Educational Technology Standards for Administrators (NETS-A), Teachers (NETS-T) and Students (NETS-S). The NETS project is the result of a

collaborative participation of curriculum associations and partnering education organizations. Along with ISTE, the NETS project partners included educational organizations such as the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD), the American Federation of Teachers (AFT), National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP) and the National Association of Secondary School (NASSP). Other collaborators included the Public Broadcasting Service (PBS) and the Software & Information Industry Association (SIIA). The ISTE NETS co-sponsors included corporations such as Apple Computer and the Intel Corporation, as well as the United States Department of Education. ISTE (2002) reported that "this participation helped ensure that the standards were developed in consultation with a wide range of audiences" (p. xii). This partnership effort illustrates the stake that both education and corporations have in technology in the schools.

COMMERCIAL ACTIVITY IN SCHOOLS

According to Addonizio (2000), public school districts across the United States have long attempted to identify and tap into non-traditional sources of revenue to fund educational programs and materials. Schools often rely on business partnerships to share expenses related to operation, instruction and program costs. The literature reveals that one of the major concerns related to business involvement in education is the marketing and commercial efforts of corporations targeted toward school children. Larson (2001) explains that, "The concerns critics are raising over corporate involvement in schools are directed less at the businesses that have opened their doors than at the marketers who

aim to open their doors of schools to businesses" (p. 14). These concerns have been documented by several researchers including Deron Boyles, Larry Cuban, Alex Molnar and Alexander Wohl, and by organizations such as the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD), the National Parent Teacher Association (PTA) and Commercial Alert. Consumer activists and politicians such as Ralph Nader, California Assemblywoman Kerry Mazzoni, United States Senator Christopher Dodd and United States Representative George Miller also have expressed their concerns regarding commercialism in schools.

History of Commercialism in School-Corporate Partnership

The push toward consumer materialism in education can be traced back to arguments for the common schools given in the 19th century by Horace Mann (Boyles, 1998). Mann maintained the "wealth position," meaning that individual wealth depends on the general wealth of the community and that schools are where the traits that make productive workers can best be instilled. In this regard, Mann argued in favor of common schools and that those who pay for the schooling should not only be those who have children attending the schools. It was in everyone's best interest to see to it that the schools succeeded in producing productive members for society (Boyles, 1998). Although Mann was not actually advocating consumer materialism in education, his ideas supported the idea that consumer materialism was one outcome of the debate and placated the tension by appearing to satisfy all parties, while primarily benefiting business in the long run (Boyles, 1998).

Sponsored Materials

While Mann might not have been advocating consumer materialism from the business perspective, many companies were. In response to consumer materialism, in 1929 the National Education Association's Committee on Propaganda in the Schools surveyed school officials to determine what sponsored materials had been received and what policies were in place to deal with them (Molnar, 2000). The committee consisted of ten members, most of whom were state superintendents. Other committee members included principals, deans of education and college presidents. The committee sought to answer certain questions, including:

1. What is the extent and nature of the outside forces which are attempting to use the schools for propaganda purposes?
2. What steps have been taken by school boards, executives, and teachers to meet the situation?
3. What further action is deemed desirable? and
4. What principles guide the schools in their selection or rejection of privately supplied materials (Harty, 1979, p. 99).

The committee's report consisted of a comprehensive review of the commercial materials found in schools, their type and the source of the materials. The committee found that "we have hundreds of outside agencies each striving to exploit the school in the interest of its particular commodity or idea. Their resources are large and their method of penetration ingenious" (Harty, 1979, p. 99). In their conclusions the committee decided that regulation of outside

influences on schools was to be one of local determination. They did not suggest legislation, although state departments of education were advised to set up guidelines for evaluation and to encourage teacher training in the area of propaganda. The committee also recognized that “the difficulty of this problem will be lessened when all schools are supplied with adequate funds so that no school will be compelled to rely on gifts and donations from the outside” (Harty, 1979, p. 99).

Sponsored materials continued to gain momentum in the schools. In 1965 and 1970, Charles Du Vall of the University of Indiana found that over 90% of the school districts in cities with populations of 100,000 or more allowed the use of free, industry-sponsored materials, while less than 3 percent specifically prohibited it (Harty, 1979). Du Vall noted that the change in terminology over the years in reference to sponsored materials is proof that their acceptability is increasing. He added, “Initially referred to as ‘propaganda’ some fifty years ago, the terminology changed from ‘print advertising’ to ‘industry aids’ to ‘public service information’ and finally to ‘educational materials” (Harty, 1979).

To further help teachers become aware of the use of sponsored materials in their schools and classrooms, the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development published a guide in 1953 called *Using Free Materials in the Classroom*. Two years later, the American Association of School Administrators followed suit with a similar publication, *Choosing Free Materials for Use in the Classroom* (Molnar, 2000). Both of these guides were written to assist teachers in the use of sponsored materials in their classrooms. The guides also warned

teachers against uncritical acceptance of sponsored materials but did not go so far as to recommend that they reject free offerings all together (Molnar, 2000).

The Right to Advertise

In 1976 The U. S. Supreme Court determined that “commercial speech,” such as advertising, is a type of speech worthy of limited Constitutional protection, which means that since 1976 there has been a Constitutional right to advertise (Davis, 1991). “Commercial speech” is any kind of expression that, in part, proposes a commercial transaction, either expressly or implicitly (Davis, 1991). The 1976 case, *Virginia State Board of Pharmacy v. Virginia Consumer Council, Inc*., was a challenge against a governmentally-imposed advertising ban brought about by consumers and citizens because the state of Virginia had made it illegal for pharmacists to advertise and promote the prices of prescription drugs, which made it impossible to comparison-shop. By striking down the advertising ban on prescription drugs, the Supreme Court shifted the power over the information flow from the paternalistic state to consumers of prescription drugs (Davis, 1991). According to Davis (1991), this decision demonstrated that consumers “have more legal power to insist on seeing “The Marlboro Man” than the multi-billion dollar giant Philip Morris has in making and placing the Marlboro advertising. He added, “if you, as a citizen and a consumer, can show that an advertising ban hurts you or your exercise of rights as a citizen, you stand a better chance than a big advertiser that your interests will prevail constitutionally over the government’s interest to ban speech” (p. 202).

These two cases illustrate two points. The first point is that there is a constitutional right for companies to advertise. The second point is that consumers have the right to view advertisements. What is not as clear cut is when and to whom companies ethically should not advertise, especially when the advertising is directed at school children. Cuban (2001), in the first decade of the 21st century, acknowledged these concerns about market competition and advertising when he posed such questions as “Is everything for sale?,” Is being a good citizen about nothing more than being a good consumer?,” and “What about the ‘common good’ the founders of public schools and universities so fervently sought to foster?” (p. 11). Rather than searching for answers to these ethical questions, what dominates media attentions and policymakers’ discussion of education is that schools should strive to achieve success on business-style assessments such as standardized tests through business-like technical means. As Cuban (2001) maintained, “no tool is better suited for those economic ends than computers” (p. 11). He believed that by securing more and better computer technologies for schools, they could operate more efficiently and faster and support better teaching and learning. This, he said, has been touted by corporate leaders and public officials as a splendid way to reform schools according to the market-driven agenda of the past two decades.

Commercialism in the Classroom

Commercialism in the classroom is nothing new. Back in the 19th century a paint company produced a hand-out on primary and secondary colors for art teachers to distribute to students, bake sales have funded many field trips and

projects, and advertisements in yearbooks have funded athletic teams (Wohl, 2001). Commercialism in the classroom has become a huge business and corporations are reeling the profits of Internet spending by children. According to Fabos (2004), a Jupiter Communications study found that “Online shopping by teenagers 13-18 years old reportedly totaled $300 million by the end of 2000 and seemed to be accelerating twice as fast as the rate of adults who shopped online” (p. 59). The study also predicted that teenagers would be spending upwards of $2 billion annually on internet-based merchandise and that by 2005 the amount spent by teens would be close to $4.9 billion (Fabos 2004).

Another Internet study conducted in 2002 surveyed approximately 2,000 middle school and high school students from across the United States about teen Internet use. The researchers found that 94 percent of 12 to 17-year-olds turn to the Internet for their school research and that 71 percent rely on the Internet as their major, and sometimes only, resource (Fabos, 2004). A second study conducted by the Pew Internet and American Life Project later the same year found that college students rarely go inside their college library. When they do most of their time is spent on e-mail, instant-messaging and surfing the web rather than conducting academic research (Fabos, 2004). As Alexander Wohl (2001) claimed, “We have allowed businesses access to a school audience, confident that selling a few advertisements or batches of brownies would not compromise a school’s basic mission or its financial structure” (p. 16).

Types of School-Related Commercial Activity

Wohl (2001) cited three types of school-related commercial activity: direct advertising, product sales and incentive programs, and indirect or sponsored advertising. While direct advertising may be the most visible in schools, product sales and sponsored advertising are prevalent in schools as well.

Direct Advertising

The most obvious type of commercial activity is direct advertising, which can be found in some form or another throughout most secondary schools. One of the more well-known examples of direct advertising is that of Channel One. In 1989, Chris Whittle founded Channel One, the commercial television venture that pioneered electronic marketing (Wohl, 2001). Channel One is a twelve-minute satellite-fed program consisting of ten minutes of news and two minutes of commercials. School administrators who sign up to participate in the Channel One program agree that they will show the programming 90 percent of all school days in 80 percent of all classrooms (Wohl, 2001). In exchange for their viewing, Channel One provides a free satellite dish and internal wiring, two videocassette recorders and a nineteen-inch TV set for each classroom, all of which are owned, operated and maintained by Channel One. According to Wohl (2001), the basic criticism of Channel One is that students should not be watching any amount of advertising during the time meant for learning during the school day. Also cited is criticism about the new program itself as well as the fact that teachers have no control over the content.

A 1998 study by the Economic Policy Institute and the Center for Analysis of Commercialism in Education looked at the loss of teaching time in fiscal terms,

concluding that Channel One programming costs taxpayers $1.8 billion a year in time taken out of the school day for viewing. The two minutes of commercials alone cost $300 million (Molnar & Reaves, 2002). In addition, at $200,000 for each thirty-second commercial aired, Channel One made $346 million in 1999. As Molnar & Reaves (2001) note, if those calculations are correct, taxpayers spent $1.8 billion so a company could make $346 million (Molnar & Reaves, 2002).

> Commercial Alert, an organization whose mission is to keep the commercial culture within its proper sphere and to prevent it from exploiting children, found that Channel One delivers its two minutes of advertising, as well as the ten minutes of what Commercial Alert called "banter and fluff," to about eight million students in 12,000 schools across the country (http://www.commercialalert.org/ issues/education/channel-one, 2004). In light of all of these statistics, several politicians have put forth legislation protecting schools from corporate involvement that requires or pressures students to observe, listen to or read commercials during the school day. This legislation, called the Public Education Act of 1999, also sought to protect education from taxpayers who subsidize the delivery of commercial advertising to schoolchildren.

The noted consumer activist, Ralph Nader, has been outspoken about the agenda of Channel One. He believed that

> Channel One doesn't belong in schools because it conveys materialism and harmful messages to children, corrupts the integrity of schools and

> degrades the moral authority of schools and teachers, exploits schools and compulsory attendance laws to coerce schoolchildren to watch ads, and wastes school time and tax money. The reality is that Channel One is a way for commercial advertisers to bypass parents and to promote products to a captive audience of schoolchildren. Its primary function is not to educate but to get children to spend money. The "news" programming is merely the backdrop (http://www.commercialalert.org/issues/education/channel-one, 2004).

When Republican Senator Richard Selby of Alabama, a Channel One opponent, initiated Senate hearings in 1999, Channel One spent almost $1 million in lobbying efforts to thwart further action or hearings. Meanwhile, Chris Whittle sold Channel One to K-III Communications, presently called Primedia, which merged with the Internet Company About.com (Baker, 2001).

The ZapMe! program has taken a similar approach to advertising but instead of using television, its medium is the Internet. ZapMe!, the company, agrees to install up to fifteen multimedia computers and monitors, Internet connections, and a printer in the computer lab of a middle or high school. In exchange for the equipment, the schools agree to have students use the computers an average of four hours per day. During those four hours the students are a captive audience for advertisements sold by the company (Molnar & Reaves, 2002). Schools that participated in the ZapMe! program were required to hand over students' personal data so that the company could better target its commercial advertisements to individual students (Fabos, 2004). The company

placed banner ads on the top and the bottom of its interface and placed a constantly-moving, interactive ad called a dynamic billboard in the bottom left hand corner. According to Fabos (2004), “every activity a student performed on the lab’s computer was framed by these advertisements, even word processing” (p. 63). Students could also earn ZapPoints, which were points earned for every moment they searched the web, which in turn could be redeemed for merchandise at the ZapMall.

By the fall of 1999, 2000 schools had already signed up for the ZapMe! program and 15,000 more were on a waiting list. At this time, ZapMe!’s stock was worth half a billion dollars and the company was hoping to reach a student audience of 10 million by 2002 (Fabos 2004). The Commercial Alert organization maintained that ZapMe! “tried to turn the schools and the compulsory schooling laws into a means of gaining access to a captive audience of children in order to extract market research from them and to advertise to them” (http://www.commercialalert.org/issues/education/ zapme.2004). The Commercial Alert organization sent a letter to all fifty governors to bring ZapMe!’s marketing practices to the public’s attention. Articles about ZapMe! began to appear in the *New York Times, Newsweek, The Wall Street Journal, U.S. News and World Report. Mother Jones, The Nation, Education Week* and the *School Library Journal* (Fabos, 2004).

ZapMe! responded to the concerns by getting rid of the ZapPoints and some of the advertising on its interface. However, all the negative publicity took its toll on the company and advertisers no longer wanted to be associated with

ZapMe! The company's stock plummeted and, by November of 2000, ZapMe! had collapsed as an educational service and had changed its business venture to selling satellite internet services to businesses (Fabos, 2004).

Product Sales and Incentive Programs

The second type of school-related commercial activity that Wohl cited is in the form of product sales and incentive programs. This type of commercial activity includes cash or credit rebate programs such as General Mills' Box Tops for Education and Campbells' Soup Labels program, whereby tops from cereal boxes and labels from soup are purchased in the private sector and returned to school in exchange for cash, fundraising activities such as Innisbrook wrapping paper and World's Finest candy, and exclusive contracts with companies such as with Nike, Adidas, Coke or Pepsi. Exclusive soft drink contracts are the most common form of product sales. Coke and Pepsi vie for exclusive rights to the vending machines in schools. For example, an exclusive Coca-Cola contract forced the executive director of school leadership for Colorado Springs School District 11 to send a memo to principals pointing out that District 11 students needed to consume 70,000 cases of Coke products if the district was to receive the full benefit of its exclusive sales agreement with Coca-Cola. The director offered school principal tips on how to better promote the consumption of Coke products such as telling them to allow students to purchase and consume vended products throughout the day and to locate vending machines where they are accessible to students all day (Molnar, 2003). He also offered to provide

schools with additional electrical outlets and enclosed a list of Coke products and a calendar of promotional events to help principals advertise the products.

Molnar (2003) concluded that it is unlikely that the trend toward exclusive agreements with soft drink bottlers will subside anytime soon. As G. David Van Houten, Jr., Coca-Cola senior vice present said,

> Schools – the education channel, youthful consumers – are important to everyone, and it has recently become a high-stakes game for that very reason. How much is that [school] business worth? I doubt we'll be able to answer that question fully. But we're going to continue to be very aggressive and proactive in getting our share of the school business (p. 5).

However, beginning in about late 1999, school districts across the nation began to question the value of exclusive "pouring rights agreements" with soft drink companies. For example, the school district serving Crested Butte and Gunnison, Colorado rejected an offer in 1999 from Coca-Cola and removed all of its soft drink vending machines as well. In February 2000, Philadelphia school officials turned down a potential $43 million deal with Coca-Cola after parents vehemently opposed it. Later in 2000 administrators in Santa Fe, New Mexico and Sacramento, California also rejected deals from separate soft drink companies that potentially could have brought in at least $2 million to each school district (Molnar & Reaves, 2002).

Indirect Advertising

The third type of commercial activity in the schools is known as indirect advertising; that which is carried out through grants, sponsored educational materials such as videos and lesson plans, and corporate-sponsored teacher training or contests. For example, Apple Computer's Apples for Students Program encourages students and their families to purchase produce from a local grocery store which then, in a deal with Apple Computer, provides the school with free or reduced-price computers once a certain threshold of purchases has been reached (Stark, 2001).

Another example of indirect advertising is Pizza Hut's Book It! program. When students meet their reading goals set by their teachers each month, they receive a coupon for a free personal pan pizza. While Pizza Hut may be encouraging reading, it also is encouraging families to patronize the restaurant. While the student eats his free personal pan pizza, the restaurant is profiting from the meals the rest of the family orders. According to Molnar (1986), "Book It! unethically uses schools to get Pizza Hut inside students' homes. Because the Book It! program can create a classroom atmosphere in which a child who doesn't join in feels odd, it is very hard for a parent to demand that a son or daughter not participate. Parents who may want nothing to do with Pizza Hut are forced to either go along with the program or face struggles with their children. Moreover, children who do participate and meet their reading goals feel cheated if they are not then taken to Pizza Hut for the promised award" (p. 45).

Molnar (2005) added two additional types of commercial activity. One of those is the allocation of school space for corporate logos or advertising messages, such as scoreboards, rooftops, bulletin boards, walls, textbooks, and even school. Another example is that of “weekly folders” which students bring home once a week containing homework and notices. The covers of these folders feature logos of companies and corporations, which are seen by students, school staff and parents continuously throughout the school year.

The second type of commercial activity that Molnar added is privatization of schools. Molnar (2005) explained that the principal manifestation of privatization is the use of for-profit corporations to manage public charter schools, and to a lesser extent, conventional public schools.

Guidelines for Business Involvement in Education

The growth of business involvement in schools has spurred debates regarding the ethical and legal concerns on the part of educators, administrators, parents, and policymakers. In response to the increased corporate involvement, several agencies and educational organizations have been assessing and attempting to control commercialism in the schools. Agencies and organizations such as the National Parent Teacher Association (PTA), the US General Accounting Office (GAO), The Council for Corporate and School Partnerships, the Center for the Analysis of Commercialism in Education (CACE), the Association for School Curriculum and Development (ASCD), and the British Columbia Teachers’ Federation BCTF) have created guidelines, resolutions, and legislative initiatives regarding business involvement in education (Larson, 2001).

Alex Molnar, an expert in the area of school commercialism, created and directed the Center for the Analysis of Commercialism in Education (CACE) when he was a professor at the University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee. In 1990, Molnar hosted a meeting at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee at which he and other members developed the Milwaukee Principles for Corporate Involvement in Schools. These principles have been adopted by the Action for Children's Television, National Education Association, National Association of State Boards of Education, National PTA, American Association of School Administrators, and the National Council of Social Studies. They have also been endorsed by state superintendents in ten states: California, Georgia, Iowa, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Nevada, Pennsylvania, and South Carolina. According to Molnar:

> School-business relationships based on sound principles can contribute to high quality education. However, compulsory attendance confers on educators an obligation to protect the welfare of their students and the integrity of the learning environment. Therefore, when working together, schools and businesses must ensure that educational values are not distorted in the process. Positive school-business relationships should be ethical and structured in accordance with all eight of the following principles:
>
> 1. Corporate involvement shall not require students to observe, listen to, or read commercial advertising.

2. Selling or providing access to a captive audience in the classroom for commercial purposes is exploitation and a violation of the public trust.
3. Since school property and time are publicly funded, selling or providing free access to advertising on school property outside the classroom involves ethical and legal issues that must be addressed.
4. Corporate involvement must support the goals and objectives of the schools. Curriculum and instruction are within the purview of educators.
5. Programs of corporate involvement must be structured to meet an identified education need, not a commercial motive, and must be evaluated for educational effectiveness by the school/district on an ongoing basis.
6. Schools and educators should hold sponsored and donated materials to the same standards used for the selection and purchase of curriculum materials.
7. Corporate involvement programs should not limit the discretion of schools and teachers in the use of sponsored materials.
8. Sponsor recognition and corporate logos should be for identification rather than commercial purposes (http://www.asu.edu/educ/epsl/ CERU/Guidelines/ milwaukeeprinciples.html).

ASCD also believed that it was important for schools to develop clear guidelines to govern their relationships with business. An ASCD task force, chaired by Molnar in 1989, was created to propose guidelines for business

involvement with schools. ASCD maintained that “In structuring relationships with business, educators

> should remember that the state requires students to attend school. This gives educators the responsibility of ensuring that the welfare of their students, rather than the special interest of any particular group, is promoted by school programs” (ASCD Task Force on Business Involvement in the Schools, 1989-1990, p. 84). The ground rules that the ASCD established for any proposed business involvement with schools include ensuring that the proposed involvement:
>
> - Is consistent with the values, goals and objectives of the educational program;
> - Responds to a clearly understood educational need;
> - Supports and does not undermine either implicitly or explicitly an existing curriculum and instructional message;
> - Has been considered and assessed by groups with different views; and
> - The process should provide for an ongoing review of all school-business relationships (ASCD Task Force on Business Involvement in the Schools, 1989-1990, p. 84).

The Council for Corporate and School Partnerships, founded by the Coca-Cola Company in 2001, set out to better understand the dynamics of successful partnerships by interviewing nearly 300 school board members, superintendents and other school administrators, along with more than 50 executives from large,

medium and small businesses. Their goal in conducting these interviews was to create a series of Guiding Principles for Business and School Partnerships that would serve as a resource for educators community members and business leaders nationwide (Council for Corporate & School Partnerships, 2004). The participants in the survey were asked a number of factors relating to how successful partnerships were structured, implemented and evaluated. Based on their findings, the Council for Corporate and School Partnerships developed principles that help illustrate the characteristics of effective partnerships for schools, communities, and businesses that were interested in developing new partnerships or enhancing existing ones (Council for Corporate & School Partnerships, 2004).

The foundation of the principles involves developing the partnership's core values, including the beliefs that 1) school-business partnerships be built on shared values and philosophies and 2) partnerships should be defined by mutually beneficial goals and objectives. The implementation of the principles involves translating the values into action, stating that 1) partnership activities should integrated into the school and business cultures, 2) partnerships should be driven by a clear management process and structure, and 3) partnerships should define specific, measurable outcomes. The principles also state that the partnership should be sustained over time, including the beliefs that partnerships should have support at the highest level within the business and school, and the partnerships should include detailed internal and external communications plans, which clearly illustrate expectations of all parties. Finally, the principles outline

evaluation of partnerships, including determining strengths, weaknesses and future directions, with clear definitions of success for all partners (Council for Corporate & School Partnerships, 2004).

The British Columbia Teachers' Federation wanted to ensure that business partnerships did not violate the integrity of public schooling or take advantage of students as a captive market, which is why the Federation adopted specific guidelines for school-business partnerships. The guidelines begin with an assertive statement that "Education/business partnerships should not be established to compensate for inadequate funding of education" (http://www.bctf.ca/parents/IssuesInEducation/Support/guidelines.html). The nine guidelines are accompanied by 13 statements of ethical standards for education/business partnerships. Many of the guidelines are similar to those set by Molnar's group at the University of Wisconsin, however, some address more specific concerns related to financial equity. The guidelines they set forth are:

- Programs of corporate involvement meet an identified educational purpose, not a commercial motive.
- Ethical standards (developed by the BCTF) that protect the welfare of students and the integrity of the learning environment are agreed to followed by all parties.
- Sponsored teaching resources and materials are evaluated for bias before they are used, and teachers retain discretion in the use of the materials; sponsored and donated materials are held to the same standards used for the selection and purchase of curricular materials.

- Corporate involvement does not require students to observe, listen to, or read advertising. Sponsor recognition and corporate logos, for identification rather than commercial purposes, are kept to a minimum.
- Corporate involvement does not increase inequality in the education system. Money and other donations are made to school districts, to be administered centrally, not to individual schools.
- Partnership agreements are reached after full discussion among participating school staff, parent representatives, and the prospective partner, and any agreements are open as public information.
- Partnership agreements are for a limited time.
- All partnership agreements are systematically evaluated.
- Teacher and student participation in partnerships is voluntary (http://www.bctf.ca/parents/IssuesInEducation/Support/guidelines.html).

In March 1990, Alberta, Canada's Education Minister established teams to help implement Alberta's 3-year education plan. Two of the teams were the Implementation Team on Business Involvement and Technology Integration (I-Team) and the Business Involvement Advisory Group (BIAG). These two teams worked to develop plans and recommendations regarding expanding business involvement in education through workplace learning opportunities for students and to increase the effective use of technology in the delivery of education (Alberta Dept. of Education, 1996). These teams found evidence that indicated that some educators were unsure of the motives or the educational agenda of business/employers, and felt that this agenda could unduly narrow the goals of

education. They also found concern among educators that some forms of business sponsorships might exploit students to sell products or services. In addition, they found that educators were also concerned that some representatives of businesses advocated instructional policies that would move the educational system backward rather than forward (Alberta Dept. of Education, 1996).

In response to the educators' concerns, the teams recommended specific actions take place including that each school system adopt and implement a policy of respecting the involvement of local businesses in education and that the policy should affirm the Conference Board of Canada Ethical Guidelines for Business-Education Partnerships. These ethical guidelines state that Canadian employers and educators support business-education partnerships that:

- Enhance the quality and relevance of education for learners
- Mutually benefit all learners
- Treat fairly and equitably all those served by the partnership
- Provide opportunities for all partners to meet their shared social responsibilities toward education
- Acknowledge and celebrate each partner's contributions though appropriate forms of recognition
- Are consistent with the ethics and core values of all partners
- Are based on the clearly defined expectations of all partners
- Are based on shared or aligned objectives that support the goals of the partner organizations

- Allocate resources to complement and not replace public funding for education
- Measure and evaluate partnership performance to make informed decisions that ensure continuous improvement
- Are developed and structured in consultation with all partners
- Recognize and respect each partner's expertise
- Identify clearly defined roles and responsibilities for all partners
- Involve individual participants on a voluntary basis.

Willard (2000) Director of the Center for Advanced Technology in Oregon offered guidelines for partnerships with businesses that offer technology resources to students, specifically in regard to Internet use. She recommended that students should never provide personal information over the Internet. In many instances, she said, dot.com companies are asking children to disclose personal information which they use for the purpose of influencing consumer behavior. Many dot.com companies are working with child psychologists to gain insight into how children think in order to improve their ability to manipulate the children for commercial purposes. According to Willard (2000),

> "dot.com companies have an advantage reaching children. The emergence of an understanding of the appropriate boundaries of personal privacy is clearly a developmental process, tied to the child's emerging cognitive development. Technically proficient children are using the Internet before they have the ability to appreciate the possible consequences of disclosure of personal information" (Willard, 2000, p. 6).

She maintained that it is not possible for schools to teach children about the importance of protecting their personal privacy on the Internet if they schools are entering into partnerships with companies that require students to agree to the collection of personal information as a condition for use of the technology resources. She proposed that in order for schools to meet their ethical obligations to students, administrators should make every effort to identify the potential benefits and consequences associated with the partnership and then determine the proper course of action that preserves students' right to privacy while also providing positive educational experiences (Willard, 2000).

Two other organizations that are dedicated to disseminating information about commercialism and business influence in schools are Commercial Alert and the Commercialism in Education Research Unit (CERU). Commercial Alert's mission is to "keep the commercial culture within its proper sphere and to prevent it from exploiting children and subverting the higher values of family, community environmental integrity and democracy" (www.commercialalert.org, 2004). In August 2001, the CACE was renamed the Commercialism in Education Research Unit (CERU) and became part of the Education Policy Studies Laboratory in the College of Education at Arizona State University. Still directed by Professor Molnar, the CERU continues to conduct research, disseminate information, and helps facilitate dialogue between the education community, policymakers and the public about commercial activities in schools.

Laws, Policies and Regulation of Commercial Activities in Schools

While numerous organizations have developed guidelines to foster ethical relationships between schools and businesses, the federal government has provided policies to protect students from commercial activity in schools. Several laws have been enacted to protect children from invasion of privacy. One such law is the Federal Policy on the Protection of Human Subjects. Federal law for the protection of human subjects in research provides schools with guidance on standards that are considered necessary to the protect the welfare of research participants. These rules, that are especially necessary for children who are research subjects, require that: 1) academic researchers seeking to gather data from students must demonstrate that their research will have a social benefit; 2) researchers must provide a detailed human subjects protocol that addresses issues of privacy and confidentiality and the human subjects protocol must be approved by the research institution's Institutional Review Board and by the individual school district prior to any collection of data from students; and 3) researchers must prepare an informed consent document for parents and older children which outlines the socially beneficial purpose of the research and the provisions for the protection of the child. Both the parent and the child must sign the informed consent document (Larson, 2001).

Bills related to commercialism in the schools have been introduced and signed into law at both the state level and the national level. In January 1999, California Assemblywoman Kerry Mazzoni introduced two bills on commercialism in schools. Assembly Bill 116, signed into law in September 1999, added to the state board's guidelines for curriculum and textbook adoption, "a determination

by the state board that these instructional materials do not contain materials, including illustrations, that provide unnecessary exposure to a commercial brand name, product or corporate or company logo" (A.B. 116, 1999-2000 session, (CA 1999)). The bill also provided that instructional materials that contain a commercial brand name, product, or corporate or company logo may not be used unless the board makes a specific funding that the use of the brand name, product or logo is appropriate (A.B. 116, 1999-2000 session, (CA 1999)).

Mazzoni's second bill, Assembly Bill 117, aimed at prohibiting school districts from entering into "a contract that grants exclusive advertising rights within the district to a person, business, or corporation, a contract that prohibits a school district employee from disparaging the goods or services of the party contracting with the board, or a contract with an electronic product or service that requires the dissemination of advertising to pupils" (A.B. 117, 1999-2000 session, (CA 1999)). AB 117 met with a great deal of opposition and was ultimately modified to require that the contract be debated and entered into at a noticed public hearing. This rendition of the bill was passed in fall 1999 (Molnar, 2000).

At the federal level, two bills were introduced, but never passed. H.R. 2915 was introduced in the House of Representatives in September 1999 and S. 1908 was introduced to the Senate in November 1999. Both of the bills sought to accomplish two goals: 1) prohibit programs from using funds under the Elementary and Secondary School Act to allow a third party to monitor, receive or gather information intended for commercial purposes from any students under 18 years of age without parental consent; and 2) require schools, local

educational agencies, or state agencies to inquire if an individual or organization intends to gather or store information on students and to determine the nature of the information being gathered; how the information will be used; whether the information will be sold, distributed, or transferred to others; and how much class time, if any will be consumed by such activities before entering into a contract with the individual or organization (General Accounting Office, 2001). H.R. 2915 had been referred to the House Committee on Education and the Workforce, and S. 1908 had been read twice and referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions, where both have since died.

Under these bills there also was to be a study conducted by the United States General Accounting Office (GAO) regarding the prevalence and effect of commercialism in elementary and secondary education. The intent of the study was to:

1) document the nature, extent, demographics and trends of commercialism (commercial advertising, sponsorships of programs and activities, exclusive agreements, incentive programs, appropriation of space, sponsored educational materials, electronic marketing, market research, and privatization of management) in elementary and secondary schools receiving funds under the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965;
2) consider the range of benefits and costs, educational, public health, financial and social, of such commercial arrangements in the classrooms; and

3) consider which commercial arrangements in schools affect student privacy, particularly in regards to new technologies such as the Internet, including the type of information that is collected on students, how it is used, and the manner in which schools inform parents before information is collected ("Student Privacy Protection Act," 1999b).

The GAO found that while commercial activities continue to increase in public elementary and secondary schools throughout the United States, very little is known about the laws and policies that govern commercial activities and the nature of the activities in the schools (General Accounting Office, 2000). In the report to Congressional requesters in September 2000, the Health, Education and Human Services Division of the General Accounting Office (GAO) reviewed the laws, regulations and policies that regulate commercial activities in schools and described the nature and extent of these activities. The report, requested by Senator Christopher Dodd of Connecticut and Representative George Miller of California was the first-ever government study of commercialization in the schools (Baker, 2002). Representative Miller said he was prompted to request the report by concerns over data being collected about students through computers given to their schools by ZapMe! (Hays, 2002).

The General Accounting Office's Report

The GAO report, *Public Education: Commercial Activities in Schools*, outlined some of the states' laws and regulations. The report identified four areas of commercial activities. The first area was product sales, the most common and lucrative type of commercial activity, which are primarily the sale of soft drinks by

school or districts under exclusive contracts and short-term fundraising sales. The second type was direct advertising, the placing of corporate logos or brand names on school equipment, school buses, scoreboards, posters, and student assignment books. Indirect advertising, as opposed to direct advertising, pertained to corporate-sponsored educational materials such as Colgate's dental hygiene program that promotes oral hygiene while promoting Colgate products. Market research, including surveys, polls, internet panels, and Internet tracking is the fourth type of commercial activity found in schools.

Dodd and Miller reported that 1) nationwide, only general laws and regulations that apply to all businesses or that govern school finance usually cover school-based commercial activities, and 2) state and local laws and policies vary by school district and by state. Nationally, 19 states have statutes or regulations targeting commercial activities in schools, but they vary in their content and coverage. For example, Minnesota and Massachusetts allow advertising on and in school buses, while Virginia prohibits school bus advertising. As a result of the 2003 Massachusetts legislation that approved school bus advertising as a revenue mechanism, Boston Public Schools anticipated $640,000 in annual revenue in 2004 from selling ad space on school buses (Palumbo, 2004). California prohibits state and local school boards from adopting instructional materials that provide unnecessary exposure to brand names, products or company logos, while New York prohibits commercial activities on school premises, but permits commercial sponsorships of school activities (General Accounting Office, 2000).

The GAO report noted that while local school officials, parents, and others, including the United States Department of Education, applaud businesses that support schools by donating free or low-cost goods and services, many individuals have become concerned about the potential effects of lost instructional time and biased materials on students when companies provide these goods and services to schools in return for access to students for sales, advertising or market research. The report indicated that

> Many of the displays of corporate logos and brand names in school – such as those emblazoned on students' clothing, sports uniforms, crayons, and milk cartons – yield no tangible commercial benefit to the schools, although they do yield benefit to the advertiser. Advertisements are also pervasive on the Internet. Not only are ads a part of many products, but they are often seen as status symbols, decorations, and even art (p. 9).

Protecting Children

As schools were becoming potential gold mines to Internet advertisers, Congress began introducing and passing laws to protect children's online privacy. Congress' first attempt to protect children, the Communications Decency Act (CDA) of 1996, was intended to protect children from exposure to pornographic material on the Internet. The CDA prohibited the knowing transmission of obscene or indecent messages over the Internet to any recipient under 18 years of age (Ashcroft v. American Civil Liberties Union, et. al., 2001). The CDA ultimately fell to the First Amendment in *Reno v. American Civil Liberties Union*, 521 United States 844. The conclusion by the Supreme Court of

the United States that the CDA violated the First Amendment was based, in part, on the “crucial consideration that the CDA’s breadth was wholly unprecedented” (Ashcroft v. American Civil Liberties Union, et. al., 2001).

Congress’ second attempt to address this issue was the Children’s Online Protection Act (COPA). COPA became effective in April 2000, but was concerned only with web sites trying to collect online information from children 13 years and younger (Fabos, 2004). Unlike CDA, COPA covered only communication made “’for commercial purposes’” (Ashcroft v. American Civil Liberties Union, et. al., 2001). The United States Supreme Court held that COPA’s reliance on “community standards” to identify what material is “harmful to minors” did not by itself render the statue substantially overbroad for the First Amendment and was therefore overturned (Ashcroft v. American Civil Liberties Union, et. al., 2001).

A third attempt of Congress to address online privacy was The Children’s Internet Protection Act (CIPA), PL 106-554, which required libraries and schools to install filters on the Internet-connected computers in order to retain funding and discounts for computers and computer access. The legality of CIPA was first argued in May 2002 in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania. In this case, the American Library Association sued the United States to stop the enactment of CIPA, which required libraries to be equipped with Internet filters (Ashcroft v. American Civil Liberties Union, et. al., 2001). The filters were a requirement to receive federal funding grants under the Library and Services Technology Act and E-rate discounts for Internet access (Ashcroft v.

American Civil Liberties Union, et. al., 2001). CIPA was ultimately struck down 5-4 in June 2004 by the United States Supreme Court, suggesting that “the law is likely unconstitutional, and it suggested that perhaps parents, rather than the courts should take the lead in screening kids’ Web access” (Biskupic, 2004). These cases also demonstrate the need for promoting ethical practices on the part of companies that produce material and advertisements whose audience can potentially include children.

Legislation, which in some cases is necessary to protect children from certain aspects of technology, is sometimes necessary to ensure children’s access to technology. In September 2004, members of The Consortium for School Neworking (CoSN), International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE), and Software & Information Industry Association (SIIA) joined forces with education and industry to urge Congress to restore the education technology program funding and oppose pending cuts to the Enhancing Education Through Technology (E2T2) program (www.iste.org). The E2T2 is a program that targets funds to the most disadvantaged communities because they often have the highest telecommunications costs and the lowest Internet and computer penetration rates (www.iste.org). According to Keith Krueger, CEO of CoSN, ‘"the proposed cuts send the wrong message at a time when the nation is calling on our schools to leverage technology to elevate school performance and student achievement. A $91 million cut would have grave implications for the ability of states and communities to implement effective technology programs”’ (www.iste.org).

The laws, policies, regulations, and guidelines address some of the aspects of school-corporate partnerships that school administrators might consider when assessing the viability of such partnerships. These laws, policies, regulations, and guidelines also address other aspects of partnerships discussed in this chapter such as commercialism and funding.

CONCLUSION

Certainly there are benefits to business involvement in education. The pure economics of it alone allow schools to acquire resources they would not have otherwise. The economics of money drives self-interest, and benefits, profits and gains in market share all are fundamentals of economics. However, when the targets of the benefits, profits and market share are schoolchildren partnerships become more controversial. With schools strapped for money and school children having more purchasing power than ever, schools and corporations continue to find it beneficial and in their self-interest to forge partnerships with each other. Molnar (1998) echoed these sentiments as he maintained that one of the justifications used by educators in explaining the trend toward corporate sponsorship of school activities is the need for money. Corporations also are driven by the desire of and the need for money. This desire and need, along with the increase in students' purchasing power, has led to an increase in marketing aimed directly at them (Molnar, 1998).

The objective of this literature review was to gain a better understanding of the past and current trends of school-corporate partnerships, and to identify aspects of school-corporate partnerships that have not been well researched.

The next chapter addresses the issue of critical consciousness, specifically addressing the criteria or guidelines principals considered when entering into a school-corporate technology partnership and what administrators perceived as the costs and benefits of their school-corporate partnerships. Through in-depth interviews, school administrators were asked to articulate: 1) the criteria they considered when entering into the existing partnership with the corporation; 2) the policies and/or guidelines they consulted prior to entering into the partnership; 3) the benefits they perceive to derive through the partnership; and 4) the costs they perceive to incur from their school-corporate partnership. When analyzed, this data revealed the degree of critical consciousness of school administrators with regard to school-corporate partnerships. The data also helped determine whether or not the need exists for more global awareness of guidelines and decision-making criteria for school administrators as well as what criteria should be considered by school administrators when entering into a school-corporate partnership that involves technology.