

THE PUPIL IN THE TEXT

**Rhetorical Devices in
Classroom Teaching Films
of the 1940s, 1950s and Early 1960s**

Eef Masson

© Eef Masson, 2010

Cover image: still from the film *Een wens verhoord binnen 24 uur: de post* (Stichting Nederlandse Onderwijs Film, 1953), reproduced by courtesy of Nederlands Instituut voor Beeld en Geluid, Hilversum

Cover design and typesetting by Claudy Op den Kamp

Printed by All Print, Utrecht

ISBN 978-94-6103-001-6

THE PUPIL IN THE TEXT

**Rhetorical Devices in
Classroom Teaching Films
of the 1940s, 1950s and Early 1960s**

De leerling in de tekst

**Retorische middelen in onderwijsfilms
uit de jaren veertig, vijftig en de vroege jaren zestig**
(met een samenvatting in het Nederlands)

Proefschrift

ter verkrijging van de graad van doctor aan de Universiteit Utrecht op gezag van de rector magnificus, prof. dr. J. C. Stoof, ingevolge het besluit van het college voor promoties in het openbaar te verdedigen op vrijdag 22 januari 2010 des middags te 2.30 uur

door

Eef Lieve Masson

geboren op 30 september 1976
te Gent, België

Promotor: Prof. dr. F. E. Kessler

Co-promotor: Dr. N. Verhoeff

CONTENTS

| | |
|--------------------|---|
| INTRODUCTION | 1 |
|--------------------|---|

PART I

1 • FILM FOR EDUCATION: DEBATES, IDEA(L)S AND PRACTICES

| | |
|---|----|
| Introduction | 19 |
| 1.1 Film as an Educational Tool | 22 |
| 1.1.1 Possibilities | 23 |
| 1.1.2 Limitations | 42 |
| 1.2 The Teaching Film: Institutionalisation | 52 |
| 1.2.1 NOF: Organisation and Procedures | 54 |
| 1.2.2 NOF: Rules and Regulations | 59 |
| Conclusions | 75 |

2 • TEACHING FILM USE AND THE PEDAGOGICAL *DISPOSITIF*

| | |
|--|-----|
| Introduction | 79 |
| 2.1 The Reception and Use of Teaching Films | 81 |
| 2.1.1 Scepticism and Resistance | 81 |
| 2.1.2 Some Hypotheses on Film Usage | 88 |
| 2.2 Teaching Films and the Pedagogical <i>Dispositif</i> | 95 |
| Conclusions | 102 |

PART II

3 • RHETORIC: TEXT & FRAME

| | |
|--|-----|
| Introduction | 105 |
| 3.1 Rhetoric: Conceptual Exploration | 108 |
| 3.2 Framing Rhetoric | 112 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| 3.3 Textual Rhetoric | 117 |
| Conclusions | 121 |
| 4 • TEXTUAL RHETORIC I: MOTIVATIONAL DEVICES | |
| Introduction | 123 |
| 4.1 Textual Motivation: Foci and Strategies | 127 |
| 4.1.1 Matter Made Appealing | 128 |
| 4.1.2 Viewing Made Appealing | 148 |
| 4.2 Strategies of Motivation: Blurred Boundaries | 166 |
| 4.3 Textual Motivation Reconsidered: Degrees of Roundaboutness | 170 |
| Conclusions | 175 |
| 5 • TEXTUAL RHETORIC II: REFERENCING THE PEDAGOGICAL <i>DISPOSITIF</i> | |
| Introduction | 177 |
| 5.1 Referencing the <i>Dispositif</i> : Discursive Variety | 180 |
| 5.2 References to the <i>Dispositif</i> : A Historical Perspective | 192 |
| 5.3 Textual References: Issues of Authority | 196 |
| Conclusions | 203 |
| CONCLUSIONS | 205 |
| NOTES | 217 |
| APPENDIX: DVD CONTENTS AND CREDITS | 287 |
| FILMOGRAPHY | 291 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY | 299 |
| SAMENVATTING | 321 |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS | 325 |
| CURRICULUM VITAE | 329 |

INTRODUCTION

If a film deals with a subject in its entirety, and from life, e.g. a business, a region, the life or fortunes of people, animals, plants etc., then it belongs, since feature films are not being considered here, to the category of the Teaching films, Propaganda (Educational) films or Cultural films. [...]

Teaching films, however, need [...] to fulfil the following conditions [...], by which they strongly distinguish themselves from Educational and Cultural films.

1. They provide a piece of reality, whereby subjects are addressed that fit into the curricula of all primary schools. [...]
2. Life should be represented in such a way, that the suggestion is made to the pupils, as if they experienced [sic] the events in reality. [...]
3. A minimum of visuality needs to be provided [...]. Redundant details need to be left out or kept in the background [...]. [...]
4. The events should be recorded and arranged in such a way, that the connection between them does not give insurmountable problems. ¹

Tidings of any 'new' audio-visual medium entering the domain of public consumption invariably seem to cause commentators to speculate on its potential educational use. In recent decades, it was the advent of 'innovative' digital applications that provoked such thought; earlier on, the promise of analogue media such as still and moving photographic images. Pronouncements on the subject tend to be made in rather grandiloquent terms: authors claim that the particular technologies they advocate might in some way 'revolutionise' current educational practice. The media they deal with are considered to hold the potential of radically changing didactic methodologies, and by the same token, solve century-old problems, both on the teachers' part (often practical difficulties) and on the pupils' or students' (for instance, motivational problems).²

In practice, of course, the objects of such speculation do not always find access very easily in (regular, formal) education. One obvious reason for this is the cost of those 'new' media. As a rule, compulsory schooling is financed at least in part out of public funds; therefore, the institutions that provide it can rarely keep abreast of the most up-to-date audio-visual developments. But in addition to this, optimistic predictions are often also countered with objections, originating among others in the teaching field itself.³ If any consensus between proponents and adversaries is eventually reached – more often than not, at a time when the technology concerned has not been 'new' for quite a while – one of the conclusions is that while it may indeed have certain didactic benefits, its educational use ultimately depends on the production of media *texts* that are sufficiently adapted to the specific purposes they

should serve in schools. The immediate implication is that such texts necessarily *differ* from the kinds of material that are already available, and that are used in other, non-educational environments. This last point is made quite explicitly in the document quoted from above.

‘Teaching Films’: What’s In a Name?

The passage cited is excerpted from a memo, drawn up in the early 1940s, which contains a number of guidelines for the establishment of a new, official body: an agency with the task of coordinating the supply of films for use in ‘regular’ (compulsory) education. It is part of a larger corpus of texts which, collectively, make a plea for the conception of such an organisation with money provided by the Dutch government. The documents’ main goal is to justify the body’s foundation: they explain why its establishment is necessary. In doing so, they emphasise the fundamental differences between the (prospective) institute’s activities, and those of other (existing) distributors of so-called ‘educational’ films.

One of the strategies of the texts’ writer is to query the validity of the motives of such entrepreneurs. The author argues that their purposes are often purely commercial, and that therefore, the films they provide cannot possibly be geared towards the educational needs of the children they target.⁴ At times, however, he also uses more positive arguments. Sometimes, he directs his readers’ attention to the qualities of the material which the new institute is meant to supply. In the fragment cited above, for instance, he focuses on the subjects it deals with, and on aspects of representational selection and filmic structure. In doing so, he basically specifies how these films, as texts, distinguish themselves from other (broadly ‘educational’) shorts – items which, therefore, he does *not* designate as *onderwijsfilms* (‘classroom’ or ‘teaching films’).⁵

Considered retrospectively, this approach is not so self-evident. In the same texts, after all, the author also emphasises that the sort of material he promotes *does not yet exist*. The requirements he formulates form part of a programme for *intended* production: the writer stipulates, even before the establishment of the body he advocates, the standards to which its films will be held. In the same movement, he basically creates, or gives substance to, a supposedly non-existent ‘genre’. He personally underlines this fact by making use of a newly-forged label; or in any case, one that was not yet common in sources at the time.⁶

Given this fact, it is remarkable that the chosen term found access quite readily in subsequent months and years. As soon as the proposed organisation, which immediately integrated the label into its company name, became operational, commentators benevolently adopted it – both to refer to the collection of that specific institute, and as a more generic denominator for the type of films it distributed.⁷ In most cases, the term’s users also employed it without questioning its semantic scope. From the moment it was introduced, then, authors seemed to know intuitively *what sort of* material it covered.

Once again, this is striking, especially if one considers the fact that the label itself does not foreground the films’ presumed ‘characteristic’ features, but rather the purpose they were meant to serve – or more accurately, the institution within which they were supposed to function.⁸ Apparently, then, the term *onderwijsfilm*, much like its German and French counterparts (*Unterrichtsfilm* and *film d’enseignement/film scolaire*), did not owe its semantic transparency

to the fact that it concerned a textually well-delineated category of films, but rather to its relation to a very specific screening location, a set of institutionalised practices, and/or a given audience.⁹ As such, it may have derived extra resonance from the fact that the first half of the compound highlights what is 'exceptional' about this type of film; classrooms, after all, were not the sort of settings with which the medium was most commonly associated (at least, if one goes by the pronouncements of critics at the time). At the same time, it evoked a number of connotations: it called up memories of a series of then-recent discussions on the role which film might play in the teaching of children, and of experiments with moving images projected in schools.¹⁰

Of course, the decision of the Dutch author to emphasise instead the textual singularity of the type of film he refers to should be seen as part of his endeavours at that point in time. As I said, the documents he produced were primarily a means to get something out of his intended sponsors, the national government. In the longer run, they possibly also served as preparation for his future attempts to win over the proposed agency's users.¹¹ In addition to this, and partly also because of it, the pronouncements he makes have a purely normative character: they describe a situation that *should* be, rather than constituting a record of what the man in question perceived as a textual reality. Yet in spite of this, the author's views show a remarkable similarity to the sorts of claims that have been made about these films in more recent years.

Recent and Current Debates

Within the field of media studies, academic interest in what is sometimes referred to as 'utility films' (a term which, like *onderwijsfilms*, foregrounds the material's utilitarian aspects) has increased considerably in the last decade or so.¹² Recent attention for such material is part of a more general inquisitiveness among researchers with respect to so-called 'ephemeral' genres: bodies of film which, despite the fact that they formed part of the cultural experience of several generations of people, have figured less prominently in (national) media histories.¹³ Inquiry of this type, some argue, has in turn been encouraged by people working in archives and repositories, and in particular, keepers of so-called 'orphan films' (yet another label that has recently gained more widespread use).¹⁴

So far, the relevant research has focused to a considerable extent on aspects of technological development and mechanisms of the market – resulting, among others, in histories of production and/or distribution.¹⁵ In work on films deployed specifically for classroom purposes, authors sometimes also address issues concerning the medium's educational 'success' or effectiveness. Studies of this type tend to be carried out by historians of pedagogy, sociologists or psychologists, whose research goals are often of a more instrumental nature, in the sense that they are geared towards the improvement of the audio-visual teaching aids that are presently available.¹⁶

In my own contribution to the utility film debate, I shall shift the emphasis away from aspects of production, distribution and effectiveness to *textual*, rhetorical matters. Despite the general interest in ephemeral material in recent years, few scholars so far have dealt specifically with such films as texts, or even made suggestions as to how this might be done. Some questions,

mostly methodological, have already been formulated, but the majority of them have yet to be answered.¹⁷ Doing so, I believe, is pre-eminently a task for media scholars – or perhaps, practitioners of ‘cultural analysis’ more in general.¹⁸

(The Problem of) Textual Specificity

One of the few people who *have* ventured into a thorough analysis of a body of such work is the French author Geneviève Jacquinot. *Image et pédagogie: Analyse sémiologique du film à intention didactique* (1977) is a study of films which specifically address an audience of schoolchildren, with the proclaimed goal of helping them acquire insights specified by the formal curricula. The book marks the beginning of the author’s long career as a theorist of audio-visual media for didactic purposes.¹⁹ Written well before the interest in utility films began to gain its present momentum, it positions itself within a semiotic tradition, and sets out to uncover how the films under scrutiny make use of the so-called ‘cinematographic language’ (*langage cinématographique*). Jacquinot describes the process of coding and decoding teaching films, with the ultimate purpose of crafting the means by which, eventually, the potential effects of a cinematic mode of expression on the learning process can be explored. Borrowing Christian Metz’ descriptive terminology, she works towards a taxonomy of didactic films and television programmes which centres around the question of ‘cinematic specificity’. Her final conclusion is that in general, AV media for teaching merely reproduce a traditional model of pedagogical communication – and therefore, have more in common with other tools used in classrooms than with films shown elsewhere.²⁰

Despite the fact that Jacquinot’s work came about within a scientific framework that has now been abandoned (but in which her premise of media specificity, and by the same token, the textual specificity of various ‘genres’, was the standard one) her views are still very much alive. In the absence of relevant research in the intervening years, the stock image of teaching films as extremely ‘formulaic’ seems to endure – even in academic circles.²¹ Apparently, most observers continue to think of such material in terms of deviations from a particular filmic norm. However, whereas Jacquinot explicitly identified this standard as that of narrative fiction film (in her words: the ‘centre of the cinematographic universe’) most of her colleagues do not, and simply neglect to specify a reference point.²²

In Jacquinot’s case, but by extension in all of the instances referred to above, one of the factors that contribute to an overly generalising assessment of the films’ textual appearance seems to be the way in which these writers demarcate their corpus.²³ In a recent article, I dealt with the French author’s criteria for selection in some detail; here, I shall merely repeat my conclusion that she seems to reason in a circular manner, in the sense that the same traits that she considers to constitute the genre’s divergence from the cinematic ‘norm’ also function as a yardstick for her choice of sample texts. The picture that results from such a *modus operandi* is not only highly selective, but also insufficiently specific, if only because a good deal of the textual features of so-called ‘didactic’ films are also common in other texts, including items that do *not* fit the more pragmatic criteria which the use of that term *also* indicates.²⁴

Research Objectives

The main purpose of my research, then, is to find an alternative for the aforementioned

approaches to the analysis of (teaching) films. The method which I am looking for, it follows from the above, needs to fulfil two basic conditions. On the one hand, it has to allow me to sketch a more varied, and therefore, more complete picture of the range of films that were once available for use in formal education (a category I shall further refine in the pages and chapters that follow). On the other hand, it has to enable me to determine more accurately what distinguishes films within this category from those that do *not* qualify for membership. By implication, then, it also has to allow me to take into consideration the elements that mutually *connect* them.

The first condition stems from my own experience that so-called ‘teaching films’ cannot be described in terms of sets of typical features; i.e. textual elements characteristic of, and determinate for, the ‘genre’ as such. First, because the titles I have viewed seem to deploy an extremely wide array of filmic resources – so wide even that ‘family resemblances’ (to use Ludwig Wittgenstein’s phrase) between sample texts are sometimes hard to find.²⁵ Second, because those resources (a term I use here to refer not only to technical procedures, such as recording or editing techniques, but also to the more encompassing rhetorical strategies of which they form part) are in no way unique to the material under scrutiny.²⁶ As it turns out, they show up in films that were available for exhibition in different settings, often also non-educational ones. In my experience, they inevitably encourage an observer to notice the connections with cinematic conventions and traditions that exceed the corpus’ boundaries – even conventions that some of the above authors might consider to belong strictly to the domain of narrative fiction film.²⁷ Therefore, it is imperative that I also leave room in what follows for those *non*-specific features.

However, while it is my ambition to discuss a body of films in all its variety, and in this process, undermine ideas concerning textual specificity, I depart from a collection of films which, right from the outset, have been attributed a very specific (genre) label. The consequence of this is that sooner or later, I shall have to explain what exactly justifies the selected titles’ membership of this corpus – and by implication, what distinguishes them from the items which I exclude from it. To do so will be one of my purposes in chapter 2.

A crucial step in the process of finding a method that fulfils both the aforementioned conditions, of course, is to ask the most productive research question. One of the dangers of the analytical approaches discussed above is that of immanentism: the consideration of films without reference to the historical conditions – material, ideological, institutional – in which they acquired meaning.²⁸ In what follows, however, I shall discuss issues which, strictly speaking, exceed the boundaries of the text itself. More specifically, I shall deal with matters of what I refer to as ‘rhetorical address’: I shall try to answer the question of *how teaching films ‘speak to’ the audience they target*. This entails that in the course of analysis, I shall consider, or ‘implicate’, the material’s consumers – not so much as *actual* beings, but in terms of their ‘presence’ (in absence) in the text itself.²⁹ In order for this to be possible, I shall need to shift my attention away from a given set of titles to the relation between those films and the functional frameworks within which they operated.

The Teaching Film as an Analytical Case

In my attempt to fathom the logic of ‘rhetorical address’, I shall focus, very specifically, on items

that targeted an audience of schoolchildren. I would like to stress however that in this work, I shall consider my teaching film corpus as a mere analytical 'case'. The ultimate purpose of my endeavour, after all, is to subvert some of the clichés that govern thinking about a much *wider* range of texts – a range that basically covers all titles that are not normally considered to qualify as 'entertainment' films.

An endeavour of this type seems long overdue, especially if one considers that 'audio-visual media' (a term which, incidentally, caught on in the period in which my corpus emerged) have by now been applied to an almost incalculable number of more 'prosaic' purposes.³⁰ In this study, I shall look back upon a period in which practices of this type had literally multiplied, and continued to proliferate: the decades immediately after the Second World War.³¹ While thus exploiting the advantages of retrospective research (among others, a sufficient amount of 'distance', in the diachronic sense, from my object of study) I do hope to reach some conclusions that can in turn provide a starting point for a consideration of comparable phenomena in a more contemporary media landscape.

Meanwhile, I still have not answered the question why I choose to focus specifically on classroom films. My main reason is that among what I have designated above, with a somewhat problematic term, as the more 'utilitarian' genres, classroom films have received comparatively little attention – even in the last few years. If the recent revival in the study of cinema's 'peripheries' has clearly led to more academic interest in, for example, amateur and family films, or films produced/screened in a corporate context (with an equally dubious denominator: 'industrial films'), teaching films have not raised the same level of curiosity – especially those that were made in the period that I shall later characterise as one of (limited) institutionalisation.³² In other words, in pursuing my more general research goals, I want to take the opportunity to call attention to a hitherto somewhat neglected corpus.

An added benefit of focusing on a corpus of teaching films is its exceptionally close connection with the social institution within which it was once exhibited. Let me illustrate this point by making the comparison with another body of 'utility' titles: the 'industrial' films of the Heineken corporation (a Dutch collection, like the one I shall concentrate on).

On the face of it, the filiation between such a corpus and a given 'institution' – a term referring here not only to the specific company with which it is associated, but also to business, or industry, as such – is quite self-evident.³³ However, this changes if one tries to make the relation between the two more concrete; for instance, by considering the collection in terms of the audiences to which the films it contains were shown. Among the Heineken titles, one can distinguish between items that were screened for spectators employed by the firm (for example, workers who had to be trained in operating, or cleaning, tools and machines) and for *outside* audiences (for instance, an ensemble of entertainment film viewers, the people targeted by the company's many commercials and promotional shorts).³⁴ Subsequently, one can further diversify within each of those categories; for instance, in terms of the various professional, and therefore, institutional, echelons of each audience group.³⁵ In the case of the collection that I shall use in what follows, none of this applies. The reason is that the material contained in it, according to the distributing agency's bylaws, could only be shown to schoolchildren, and on the premises of subscribing institutions.³⁶

I believe that focusing on a corpus with such tight links with a receiving institution is an advantage, because it makes for a very firm guideline in the process of devising the most appropriate method for analysis. In my methodology section, I shall elaborate this point. First, however, I want to share a few more thoughts on the logic I follow in demarcating my corpus.

Corpus

In what precedes, I have stressed the importance of corpus selection in preparation for any kind of textual analysis. One of the difficulties I encounter in this process is that the boundaries of the category which I set out to study are extremely blurry. Of course, this blurriness is a problem for anyone who deals with any sort of class, textual or otherwise. However, when focusing on an under-researched genre (if that noun is at all appropriate here) the difficulty is even greater, because nobody has yet uncovered the discursive conventions that form the basis for the ways in which we think and speak about that particular category. In the case of teaching films, the class' indeterminacy is underscored by the fact that there is no generally accepted term to refer to it. In literature dealing with corpora comparable to my own, such items are alternately designated as 'educational', 'didactic', 'pedagogical', 'classroom' or 'teaching' films, and sometimes even 'instructional' films (or any of their foreign-language equivalents).³⁷ Each of these phrases, however, highlights a different feature in its respective group of referents – even if the distinctions between them are sometimes quite subtle.³⁸

The easiest solution to this problem, of course, is to choose a method of selection based on textual characteristics, as this leads to a 'neat', easily surveyable corpus. The downside of such an approach is that it may provoke rather predictable conclusions. Therefore, I give preference to a delimitation on the basis of purely *pragmatic* grounds. The one feature which connects all the adjectives mentioned above is the fact that each focuses the user's attention on the relation between the films as texts and some sort of framework – whether in the physical sense, or a more metaphorical one – *within which a process of teaching takes place*. The link between those two, in turn, is what I shall call in what follows the material's 'deployment'. The most significant connection between the films I shall study, in other words, is the fact that they were all used, or made to serve a purpose, within institutions of formal education – a given which necessarily had far-reaching implications as to the ways in which they acquired meaning. Considering the importance which I attach to the relation between texts and their functional frameworks in the process of interpretation, this fact is also the most logical basis for the selection of my corpus.

Collection and Provenance

The ensemble of texts which I choose to concentrate on fully complies with the above criterion. The corpus is composed of materials that originate from the collection of a *médiathèque* which catered to the user group most relevant to the institutions mentioned: one consisting exclusively of classroom personnel.³⁹ After the film medium became obsolete as a didactic aid, the collection was deposited with a research institute (the former Stichting Film en Wetenschap, which translates as 'Foundation for Film and Science') and, later on, with an audio-visual archive (Nederlands Instituut voor Beeld en Geluid, Netherlands Institute for Sound and Vision).⁴⁰ Although I shall not consider *all* the films that have been distributed in the

period I focus on – if only because there are too many – I shall not make a further preliminary selection within this corpus on the basis of additional, for instance textual, criteria.⁴¹

All the films I include in my analysis were once part of the collection of Stichting Nederlandse Onderwijs Film (Netherlands Foundation for Educational Film, more widely known as 'NOF'; the organisation referred to in the epigraph text). NOF was a national, semi-official body for the production and distribution (rental) of audio-visual media for education, set up in the early years of the Second World War.⁴² With its activities, the foundation primarily targeted what was known in the Netherlands as 'primary education' (*lager onderwijs*, comprising those schools which catered for children of the compulsory school age, from six to twelve) and 'extended primary education' (*voortgezet of uitgebreid lager onderwijs* – umbrella terms for a wide variety of short-term, advanced training courses, often vocational, and usually aimed at pupils who did not consider academic study). Most of the films it distributed dealt with subjects which, according to the institute, tied in with the curriculum of the aforementioned types of education. In addition to this, NOF also administered a smaller number of titles which addressed specialist topics, either intended for children in vocational schools (*nijverheidsonderwijs*, focusing most often on a trade, industry or domestic activities) or what was known as 'secondary education' (*middelbaar onderwijs*, the kind which prepared for further studies, either specialised professional or academic).⁴³

In its first few years, the foundation concentrated on the age group from nine to fourteen. Later on, it also targeted older children (until sixteen/eighteen years of age) and younger ones (those in the first few years of lower school).⁴⁴ For the latter two categories, however, the selection was more limited – a circumstance which also made for fewer rentals among users involved with those categories of pupils. In the mid-1950s (NOF's peak years for the period under consideration, which runs until 1963 – a time frame that I shall justify further on) the foundation serviced around 4,000 schools, attended by about one third of the then Dutch school population.⁴⁵ However, the sources also show that the institute was known primarily as a provider of teaching tools for *primary* education; in practice, then, most of its users were teachers of children up to fourteen.⁴⁶

In the first decade of its existence, NOF distributed only mute 16mm films.⁴⁷ Later, from 1954 onwards, it also provided titles with sound. In the first half of the 1950s, it added filmstrips to its collection: short stretches of 35mm celluloid, used for stationary projection.⁴⁸ In subsequent decades – those *following* the period I deal with here – the institute's media repertoire was extended once more with video (various formats) and software for computers (several generations) – an evolution that was finally accompanied by a change in name (in 1970, 'NOF' became 'NIAM', Nederlands Instituut voor Audio-Visuele Media, or Netherlands Institute for Audio-Visual Media).⁴⁹

Object Status

Above, I have indicated that I shall consider the texts under scrutiny here primarily as objects of usage. Therefore, I shall pay only limited attention to the circumstances of the films' *production*. In the course of analysis, for instance, I shall not, as a rule, distinguish between materials made by NOF itself (in the early years, the only kind that were available; later on, constituting a much smaller part of the collection) and titles acquired elsewhere (either from

commercial enterprises or official bodies, from specialist or non-educational suppliers, in Holland or abroad). Distinctions of this type, I believe, can contribute very little in the process of answering the questions I ask. Therefore, I shall only mention them if it is necessary for the historical and/or theoretical positioning of my research object – the purpose of the entire first half of this work. For interested readers, however, some basic data on the films' production and acquisition will be mentioned in a separate filmography.

As a final remark on the subject of corpus selection, I would like to make explicit that like the teaching film 'genre' itself, the material which I study should be seen as a mere analytical case. The observations I shall make in the following pages and chapters are based on my viewing of a national, Dutch collection. Therefore, the research recorded here shall inevitably contribute to the film historiography of this country – at least, if the latter is conceived of, again, in broader terms than mere productional ones. In my first chapter, for instance, I shall occasionally point out that a given production criterion or certain features of the films which NOF supplied were exceptional from an international point of view, in the sense that they were absent in writings from, or items released by, foreign providers. However, the writing of a specifically *Dutch* film history is not my primary purpose here.

Research Scope

In what precedes, I have repeatedly drawn attention to the problematic nature of the concept of 'teaching film' which I deploy, and which results from the fact that whereas the phrase itself seems to indicate a clearly delineated category, there is no generally accepted criterion on the basis of which it can be defined. On those occasions, however, I have immediately added that this is true for any sort of classifier – genre or otherwise. Which referent such a denominator is taken to apply to, therefore, depends entirely on the user's purpose: on what he or she wants with a specific cluster of texts.⁵⁰ Above I mentioned that my main research questions concern matters of 'rhetorical address'. This fact has in turn provided the basis for the choices I make in the selection of source materials – choices which, again, have their own implications for the interpretation of the term with which I refer to them. What exactly these implications are, I have not yet made explicit. Doing so, however, is a highly important stage in the research process; therefore, it will take up the entire first half (the first two chapters) of this text.

My main criterion for corpus selection, I pointed out, can be associated with a pragmatics framework. I am choosing to consider the NOF collection on the basis of the fact that the films that constitute it were once deployed in formal educational institutions; i.e., by teachers in primary and (early) secondary schools.⁵¹ However, within the context of an inquiry into aspects of rhetorical address, this given still provides insufficient guidance. For even if those films, by virtue of the distribution principles their suppliers adhered to, could only be put to use in those particular types of institution, this still leaves room for a whole range of possibilities in terms of the material's actual deployment, and therefore, in terms of the ways in which those texts could acquire meaning. Chapter 2, therefore, will be devoted to an exploration of the conditions for the corpus' use, and subsequently, an explication of the conceptual choices that I shall make before embarking upon analysis.

First, however, I shall position my object in another way: as a *historical* construct. A circumstance which makes the notion of ‘teaching film’ (*onderwijsfilm*) particularly problematic is its close connection with a series of past ideas, ideals and practices. At the beginning of this introduction, I pointed out that this denominator cannot be pried loose from the entrepreneurial activities of the people who first deployed it in a more or less systematic fashion. It originated within, or more precisely, caught on as the result of, a very specific endeavour; a venture which, I shall argue, had ideological, but also economical and political roots and implications. As such, then, the term is all but neutral; it cannot be used as an ‘empty’ container, easily ‘filled up’. The purpose of chapter 1 shall be to investigate the many historical connotations that stick to it – and by the same token, to the films that I shall analyse.

Confines

As it turns out, determining the boundaries of my object, and by implication, the scope of my research *as such*, is not something I can do at the outset. It is a crucial part of my endeavour, and therefore needs to be given ample space in the pages of this text. However, there are a few restrictions which I can decide on right away. In what follows, I shall briefly discuss two. First, I shall specify which limits I set myself in terms of the historical period which my corpus, and therefore, my analysis, covers, and quote my main arguments for doing so. Next, I shall identify some areas of focus which I shall exclude from my inquiry.

Time Frame

In this work, I shall deal exclusively with films made and released between 1941 and 1963. The first is the year in which NOF began production. The starting point of the period which my inquiry covers, in other words, is very simply the moment of establishment of the collection which I study. However, there is also a more fundamental reason why I let my research commence here. The early 1940s, I shall argue, is actually the era in which the supply of films for teaching slowly began to reach a degree of what one might call ‘institutionalisation’ – not only in Holland, but also in other parts of the Western world. In those years, distribution activities were carried out more and more often by specialised bodies who occupied themselves primarily, or even exclusively, with that particular task. At the same time, and because of it, the use of the medium in schools could take on a more systematic form – a level of organisation that was also a condition for its deployment as an actual didactic *tool*. The latter circumstance is of considerable importance here, because it touches upon the core of my definition (in subsequent chapters) of the concept of ‘teaching film’. 1963, in turn, is the year in which school television was introduced in the Netherlands. Justification of my choice for the latter date requires a little more elaboration.

Even the roughest preliminary survey shows that the extent of the NOF collection is such that my analytical endeavour requires a further reduction of its scope. According to archive sources, the total number of titles in the lot is around 2,000 (a figure that covers moving image programmes on all formats).⁵² As I plan on sketching a picture of the material’s textual variety along the whole *breadth* of the corpus – a project that involves a comparison of as many texts as possible – this entails that I need to set myself a *temporal* limitation.

One period that is immediately up for exclusion is that which begins with the introduction

of video (1974). The reason for this is not so much the different material characteristics of the format as such, but rather the fact that it allows for much more flexibility than film in terms of deployment. For instance, video offers a good deal more possibilities when it comes to the selection of what is shown – a circumstance which, in extreme cases, can even lead to alterations with respect to what one might designate as the ‘text’ (i.e., that which one takes as one’s starting point for textual analysis). In addition to this, VCR use also provides more options in terms of a screening’s insertion into a lesson or lesson sequence.⁵³ Historically, both of these factors must have had their bearing on the ways in which the programmes shown acquired meaning. Clearly, then, the juxtaposition of texts on film/tape makes for an interesting comparative analysis.⁵⁴ Unfortunately, however, I cannot carry it out here, simply because it would require more time than I have available.

A next step I can take in delimiting my research period is to decide that it must, at the very least, extend to the point in time when the use of film in schools had reached a (first) level of saturation: a stage when all teachers who *wished* to employ the medium were in a position to do so.⁵⁵ In the first years after the Second World War, the use of film in education was gradually winning ground, but the process was still hampered by shortage in terms of the availability of both suitable titles and operational projection equipment. By the mid- to later 1950s, however, supply and demand matched each other more closely; at the same time, a stagnation seems to have occurred in the intensity of teaching film use.⁵⁶ Considering that it is my aim here to focus on *systematic* deployment – also in the conceptual/methodological sense – I should definitely include items that were available at that point in time. The most obvious choice, therefore, is to set a time frame that covers the period between 1941 and the end of the 1960s, or shortly thereafter. This way, my research can cover the entire process of teaching film institutionalisation up until the point where the medium had reached its peak in popularity.

That I ultimately choose 1963 relates to the fact that at that time, Dutch school television was launched (under the name of Nederlandse Onderwijs Televisie, NOT).⁵⁷ My decision to take this year as the cut-off date is inspired, once again, by a wish to exclude a potential object of comparison from my analysis. As in the case of video, television’s particular deployment options must have entailed that the programmes shown acquired meaning in different ways than 16mm films – albeit this time as a result of the medium’s *lesser* flexibility (for instance, in terms of the timing of presentations). As opposed to magnetic tape, which was first used about ten years later, (school) television was not introduced with the express purpose of eventually replacing a less ‘up-to-date’ format, and also in practice, both media were long used alongside one another.⁵⁸ A study which covers the period until *after* the time of TV’s classroom ‘debut’, I believe, should take into account the abovementioned distinctions. In addition to this, it should also consider the possibility of intermedial interaction or exchange between film and television *as such* (as the latter medium had by then secured itself a place in most middle-class households).⁵⁹ Again, however, I have to exclude such research directions from my project here, once more for purely practical reasons.⁶⁰

Areas of Focus

A second set of confines that I would like to briefly mention concern the focus of my research:

I want to name some possible areas of interest that I shall exclude from inquiry. I do not aim for exhaustiveness here; my purpose is merely to ensure that I do not raise unwarranted expectations. More specifically, I would like to avert any misconceptions as to the potential implications of the emphasis which I have placed on matters of film 'deployment'. Research questions or directions which my own study might in turn lead to shall not be mentioned here, and be dealt with in the conclusions.

A first topic that I shall exclude from my research is that of the films' appreciation: their evaluation by primary users (teachers) and/or the intended audience (one of pupils). Even regardless of the methodological difficulties which a search for the experience of historical publics might entail, I do not consider it very useful in the context of what I am trying to do here.⁶¹ If one sets oneself the goal of interpreting film texts, after all, the perception of individual 'readers', or a sum thereof, is not all that relevant. Of greater importance, in view of the interpretation's validity, is an understanding of what Robert C. Allen has called the "cultural repertoires" which the contemporary audiences of the films under scrutiny might have drawn on.⁶² Obtaining such a sense of their foreknowledge does not necessarily require empirical research. Instead, one can thoroughly explore the (written) discourse pertaining to those texts (my objective in chapter 1) and their day-to-day use (one of my goals in chapter 2).

Another series of issues that I shall not consider here are those which pertain to what one might call the films' educational 'effectiveness'. Such matters are, still, subject to a good deal of speculation, even among authors who approach their objects from a media historical and/or theoretical perspective.⁶³ Yet aside from the methodological problems which, again, are associated with these questions (for instance, the difficulty that there are no generally accepted criteria for measuring effectivity – if only because of the great variety of pedagogical standards, both historically and in the present), I also think that trying to answer them would not get me very far, since my objective is a purely interpretive one. In most cases, concerns of this type are proof of an observer's (implicit or explicit) *normative* agenda: a wish to contribute to, or stimulate, the improvement of (contemporary) texts and/or practices.⁶⁴ Influencing film production or deployment, however, is not my objective here. For similar reasons, I shall also exclude matters of *rhetorical* effectiveness.⁶⁵

Methodology

This work consists of two main parts, each of which fulfils a very specific function in the text as a whole; both therefore also require their own, separate methods. In what follows, I shall briefly consider them. Briefly, because the methodological choices that I make for the purpose of analysis (choices that are relevant, in other words, to the second, most important half of this text) will largely be based on observations that are made at the end of part I. I shall therefore elucidate them at the beginning of part II (chapter 3).

The purpose of the first half of this work is to position my research object. In what precedes, I emphasised the close connection between the term (and concept) 'teaching film' and a series of historical practices, but also ideas, pertaining to the use of film as an educational tool. These ideas (and ideals) shall be explored mostly through a discursive analysis of primary texts. Apart from conceptions relevant to the film corpus which I analyse later on, I shall also look

at notions that were entertained in earlier decades – a time when, incidentally, the medium was used in ways that affronted the authors of later years. In addition to this, I shall consider how the supply of film for education (in the widest sense of that phrase) was organised at the time. For the latter purpose, I shall draw to a large extent on the research of others.

A second goal of part I, in addition to historically ‘locating’ the concept which I work with, is to delineate, or construct, my own object of analysis. I mentioned that my interest in the NOF collection is due primarily to its status as an object of *usage*: the fact that the films it contains, collectively, were subject to a series of very specific practices. Obviously, this given shall also have its bearing on the choices I make in the process of delimiting my research object – and by the same token, my concept of ‘teaching film’ as such. In order to be able to make those choices, I first need to learn more about the aforementioned practices. Since primary sources on the subject are hard to come by, my observations here shall be largely of a hypothetical nature. In most cases, my statements shall be based on a combination of retrospective accounts and the results of a re-evaluation of the same sources that I rely on in the first half of part I.

However, as I already announced, the primary purpose of this study is to find an answer to the question of how the films under scrutiny address their spectators. The main portion of the text, therefore, shall be devoted to a rhetorical analysis. The word ‘rhetorical’, here, should be interpreted in its widest possible sense: I shall be looking not so much for the means by which the films discussed *persuade* their audiences – i.e. convince them that what they show or say is reliable or true – but rather for the ways in which they can help establish, or keep up, a communication with the people they target. My focus on what I shall call in what follows the films’ ‘mode(s) of address’ necessarily implies that I conceive of textual meaning not as something that is fixed, or ‘enclosed’, within the text itself, but as something that needs to be activated within a very specific (performative) situation.⁶⁶ The configuration of elements which I consider to be characteristic of this situation inevitably constitutes an abstraction, a simplification of a more diverse reality; its main features, however, shall be derived from my findings on *historical* practice, as obtained in part I.

Another point I should explicate here is that the purpose of my analysis is not so much to interpret a number of (individual) films, but rather to figure out how the wide variety of rhetorical means which they deploy can be explained with reference to the specific (educational) environments in which they had to function. In order to be able to do this, I view a large number of sample texts and compare them to one another. In my analytical chapters, however, I shall only refer to them in as far as they can help me illustrate the more general points which I try to make.⁶⁷

In order to structure my discussion, I shall take my departure from two preliminary observations. The first is that teaching films – like rhetorical constructs of *any* kind – are primarily oriented towards encouraging, or motivating, their addressees to read (watch) and/or to continue reading (watching). In this process, they make use of a wide array of strategies, which differ considerably from one another in terms of what sort of assumptions they make about what appeals to their audience. What connects these strategies is their basic *modus operandi*: one way or another, they all seek to motivate by ‘implicating’ (i.e., integrating, somehow, into the

text itself) the readers they target. It is a search for the mechanisms behind this principle of 'implication' that shall lead me inventorying the strategies which teaching films use – or more precisely, the various motivational possibilities which they exploit.⁶⁸

My second preliminary observation is that in this process of implication, many of the films discussed – although by no means *all* – seem to direct, or *redirect*, their audience's attention towards the specific (institutional, pedagogical) set-ups in which viewing takes place, and in which textual meaning comes about. In doing so, I believe, they contribute to the 'positioning' of their readers: they steer them towards the most desirable viewing attitude for that particular (type of) film. Again, they do so by means of textual elements – some very inconspicuous, and restricted in time to a single shot or sequence; some more prominent, and possibly, repeated, or stretched out, along the entire span of the film. The ultimate purpose of my analysis is to also identify those 'ingredients', and subsequently, to classify them according to the discursive levels on which they manifest themselves. In this process, I shall make use primarily of concepts borrowed from narratology.

Structure

This text, I repeat, consists of two parts. In the first, I position my research object: I explore the concept of 'teaching film', question it, and subsequently (re)delimit it, in view of the textual interpretation that follows. The second part is devoted to a rhetorical analysis of the NOF corpus.

Part I, in turn, consists of two chapters. In the first, I consider discourse pertaining to film as an educational means and practices aimed at making the medium available for didactic use. I shall concentrate here, first, on the years and decades leading up to the Second World War, and then, on the period after that, in which the aforementioned practices had reached a certain level of institutionalisation. In the second (post-war) section of the chapter, I shall rely primarily on the (often highly normative) writings produced by NOF. In chapter 2, I shall formulate, partly on the basis of those same sources, some hypotheses on the deployment of teaching films in the schools which the institute catered to. I shall concentrate here on two of the most common usage patterns. The conclusions I draw will in turn inform the conceptual choices which I make in the second half of the chapter. Here, I shall also expound my notion of a 'pedagogical *dispositif*'.

Part II will be introduced by a short methodological chapter, in which I make explicit some of my basic analytical assumptions. In this section, I shall discuss the concept of 'rhetoric', and explain how I deploy it in the chapters that follow. I shall argue that rhetoric should be conceived of as a textual 'potential': something that can come to activation within a given, functional framework (i.e. as part of a very specific *dispositif*). Next comes the first analytical chapter. Here, I shall discuss some of the strategies that teaching films use to motivate their readers to (keep) watch(ing). I shall classify them, first, according to the types of rhetorical potential which they exploit, and second, in terms of the level of directness with which the texts in which they turn up address pedagogically 'relevant' issues (or in other words, how they deal with so-called 'didactic' matter).⁶⁹ The fifth and final chapter shall concern the ways in which the films themselves seem to manoeuvre their readers into the most desirable

viewing role (i.e. that of *pupil-viewers*). I shall conceptualise the textual elements that serve this purpose as references to the pedagogical *dispositif*. At the end of this section, I shall also speculate on the significance of such elements for the relations of authority between all sorts of teacher figures ('filmic' and 'real') – an issue which seems to have strongly occupied the minds of the authors referenced in part I.

Finally, I also want to draw attention to the DVDs appended to this work. Both discs contain a sample from the NOF collection: the first only mute films, the second films with sound. In some cases, related paperwork has been digitised as well (for instance, instruction booklets or scripts). An overview of all titles that have been included, with a note on my criteria for selection, can be found in the back matter. Films that figure on the first DVD are marked in this text with an asterisk (*); those that are included on the second, with a music note (♫), denoting the fact that they have sound.

PART I

1

FILM FOR EDUCATION: DEBATES, IDEA(L)S AND PRACTICES

Introduction

On 6 May 1941, about a year into the occupation of the Netherlands by Nazi Germany, the Dutch Ministry of Education, Arts and Sciences ratified the establishment of a new public body: Stichting Nederlandse Onderwijs Film, or NOF.¹ The foundation's remit was to centrally organise the production, acquisition and distribution of films for primary and (early) secondary education in Holland. The establishment of the new institute was an ambitious enterprise; in previous decades, attempts had been made to facilitate the use of film for teaching, but never before on such a scale. After a mere four years of operation, NOF boasted sixty five employees and claimed that it had distributed films to about 1,000 schools. Supposedly, 4,000 teachers from all parts of the country, dealing on a daily basis with 100,000 pupils, had made use of the new didactic aid.² A more important cause for pride, however, was the fact that what the institute had on offer was purpose-produced. Its publications insisted that unlike previous initiatives in the field, it provided titles designed especially to match the official school curricula.³

Although NOF emphatically dissociated itself from all earlier forms of educational film use – and most notably, from the so-called 'school cinema' system of the 1920s and 1930s – the texts in which it praised its goods and services contain arguments derived from public debates that had emerged several decades earlier, and that involved not only film entrepreneurs and pedagogues, but representatives of a much wider array of social pressure groups.⁴ These discussions, dating back to the beginning of the century, are marked by a tension between two sets of convictions. On the one hand, primary sources attest to an awareness of, and in some cases, an almost unconditional belief in, the unprecedented didactic potential of film. On the other, they show apprehension of the dangers attached to what was taken to be a 'transfer' of the medium from an entertainment context to a traditional educational environment, especially if in unmodified form. The same opposition also manifests itself in the way in which NOF presented itself to its users, and in its day-to-day production and acquisition policies.

In what follows, I shall take a closer look at the abovementioned debates, and at the arguments with which both parties defended their positions. In addition to this, I shall discuss some actual film practices: some of the ways in which, in the period up to the classroom film's heyday, teachers, producers and distributors applied the medium to so-called 'educational' purposes, or encouraged others to do so. In this process, however, I shall focus very specifically on how

said debates, ideas and ideals helped shape those concrete praxes. My ultimate purpose, after all, is to situate my corpus within a set of historical discourses, and thus, to demonstrate the constructedness of my research object – a necessary preamble to a (more inferential) consideration of the collection as a *user corpus*, and, following on from this, a justification of my methodology for textual analysis in part II.

One of the tendencies that will manifest itself in the practice-oriented sections of this chapter is one towards specialisation. In what follows, I shall trace the shift from a series of unconnected, *ad hoc* initiatives for the application of film to various didactic purposes, towards more diversification, and at the same time, concentration, in terms of (intended) uses and (target) audiences. In doing so, however, I shall emphasise that in the period up to the Second World War, the *extent* of the educational film ‘business’ was extremely limited. While a desire, and even need, for more large-scale organisation was expressed quite early on, one cannot speak of any form of ‘institutionalisation’ until the mid-1940s, whether it be in terms of production or distribution, or the actual deployment of films in schools. This observation also constitutes the basis for the periodisation that I shall adhere to.

In paragraph 1.1, I shall give an overview of the main themes that run through debates on film and education in the period up to the late 1930s.⁵ In the first half of this section (1.1.1), I shall deal with ideas pertaining to the film medium’s potential benefits for teaching and learning, and their respective historical contexts; in the second (1.1.2), I shall discuss its perceived limitations. The distinction between two clusters of ideas which I make here, of course, is purely practical; historically, they also occurred in combination, and in some cases were even voiced by *the same* parties or speakers.

In paragraph 1.2, I shall concentrate on the period *after* that, using NOF – both the institute and its collection – as my case. After a short overview of the foundation’s organisation and procedures (1.2.1), I shall deal with issues of standardisation (1.2.2). A second trend that will be highlighted in the first half of the chapter (in addition to that towards specialisation) is in terms of regulation. Increasingly, organisations were set up and publications brought out with the explicit purpose of controlling, and homogenising, the relations between film and education. In paragraph 1.2, I shall deal with this topic in more detail. I shall discuss, successively, issues pertaining to the standardisation of the film material itself, and of its deployment in teaching. A secondary objective of this subsection (and in particular, of my “Benchmarks” segment) is to sketch a first picture of the textual variety within the NOF corpus – and by extension, within the classroom teaching film ‘genre’ *as such*.

Although both halves of the chapter do form an entity, in the sense that each deals with a combination of debates, idea(l)s and (ensuing) practices, there are also a few aspects in which they differ. Primarily, of course, a distinction can be made in terms of the historical periods covered. Whereas the first half of the chapter deals with the early decades of the twentieth century, the second concentrates on the period after that, when the use of film in schools had finally become possible on a more or less extensive scale. However, in the transition from 1.1 to 1.2, I also *narrow* my outlook. In the latter section, I shall concentrate on (sources relating to) a single, well-delineated corpus, and by the same token, on a nationally-specific expression of a geographically more widespread discourse. In addition to this, the second part

of the chapter will also focus more rigorously on that which I defined earlier as the 'teaching film' in the strict sense. In paragraph 1.1, I shall gradually restrict my view to that type of use; in 1.2, I shall deal with it *exclusively*.

1.1 Film as an Educational Tool

In his book *Teachers and Machines: The Classroom Use of Technology Since 1920* (1986), Larry Cuban quotes an extract from a 1925 publication, written in verse, in which California school teacher Virginia Church gives a somewhat sentimental account of her experience of classroom life. One of the topics she addresses is the introduction of audio-visual media, and more in particular, film. Her text reads as follows:

Mr. Edison says
 That the radio will supplant the teacher.
 Already one may learn languages by means of Victrola records.
 The moving picture will visualize
 What the radio fails to get across.
 Teachers will be relegated to the backwoods,
 With fire-horses,
 And long-haired women;
 Or, perhaps shown in museums.
 Education will become a matter
 Of pressing the button.
 Perhaps I can get a position at the switchboard.⁶

The above excerpt clearly demonstrates that the advent of film as an educational tool was greeted with varying degrees of enthusiasm. Two factions in particular voiced their thoughts on the matter with great passion. On the one hand, there were those who, like the 'Mr. Edison' referred to by Church, focused on the medium's advantages, and envisaged a future in which all (practical) problems that plagued formal education – oversized classes, a lack of good teachers, and the like – would cease to exist. On the other hand, there were those who harboured considerable suspicion. Like Miss Church herself, they feared that teaching would become 'mechanised' – a prospect which they dreaded not only for personal reasons (i.e. concerns about the nature and even necessity of their professional activities) but also because it might imply that the 'non-rational' aspects of classroom interaction would get neglected. Another reason for scepticism was the fact that the medium was too closely associated with the entertainment sector to function well in class.

In retrospect, however, early opponents had little to be afraid of, as it would take another couple of decades before an infrastructure was in place that allowed for the large-scale use of moving images in schools. As soon as the first types of roll-film were commercially available, scientists and pedagogues throughout the Western world began to experiment with the medium in their own teaching.⁷ However, these initiatives were very disparate, and did not yet take an organised form. Producers and distributors also took to playing the educational card early on, but once again, this fact cannot lead to far-reaching conclusions as to their films' day-to-day use. In many cases, titles earmarked as 'educational' served a variety of purposes – many of them bearing little or no relation to the objectives of formal teaching.⁸ Entrepreneurs of the 1910s and 1920s found the didactic market to be rather small, and most of them therefore concluded that further specialisation would not benefit them commercially. In order for the business to become viable, then, governments needed to get involved. In many countries, however, political leaders hesitated some time before taking actual, practical measures.

As my own case illustrates, those involved in more organised forms of teaching film production and distribution often conceived of their own business as distinct from, and in some cases, even as a reaction *against*, earlier attempts to make the medium available for education. In reality, however, their activities involved a good deal of ‘recycling’, both in terms of the rhetoric used (arguments in favour of the teaching film, and against) and in actual practice (the ways in which they adapted production and acquisition to established educational frameworks). Many of the ideas and ideals they put forth have their roots in debates that originate in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. If only because of this, it is necessary that I begin my exploration with a consideration of the issues that were at stake at the time.

1.1.1 Possibilities

In retrospect, I have observed, the early years of film, like those of any other ‘new’ medium, are marked by an experience of unlimited possibilities – both theoretical and real. On the one hand, scientists, engineers and commercial entrepreneurs imagined a wealth of applications, many of which held the promise of changing modern life drastically. On the other hand, the period was characterised by an *actual* variety of uses – a diversity that would thin out over time, due in part to forces of the market.

One of the promises which the medium was considered to hold was that of becoming an extremely powerful didactic tool. Well before the first (one-minute) films were produced, commentators foresaw their value as a means of ‘universal’ education.⁹ Also in later years, pronouncements on the topic often had highly utopian overtones.¹⁰

Grand Visions, High Expectations

One of the best-known early advocates of film as an educational tool was the American industrialist Thomas A. Edison, mentioned above. Among statements on the subject, his were – and still are – quoted the most often. Particularly famous is the pronouncement he made in 1913, when he predicted that in due course, books would no longer be the primary didactic means, and that scholars would “soon be instructed through the eye.” In 1922, he elaborated:

I believe that the motion picture is destined to revolutionize our educational system and that in a few years it will supplant largely, if not entirely, the use of textbooks. I should say that on the average we get only about two percent efficiency out of schoolbooks as they are written to-day. The education of the future, as I see it, will be conducted through the medium of the motion picture, a visualized education, where it should be possible to obtain a one hundred percent efficiency.¹¹

Although probably the most notorious, Edison was not the first to make known to the world his ideas on the educational use of film. In 1898, Polish cameraman Boleslas Matuszewski, author of one of the earliest pleas for the establishment of an official film repository, argued that the medium could become “a singularly effective teaching method”.¹² Charles Pathé and Frantz Dussaud, his personal advisor, proclaimed in the early 1910s: “The cinematograph will be the theatre, the newspaper and school of tomorrow”.¹³ Others, speaking around the same time as Edison, referred to the cinema as “the master of the future” or believed that “The royal road to learning lies along the film highway”.¹⁴

Arguments

In their statements on the topic, these and other commentators tended to conflate two sets of arguments. The first series was based on the premise that film held the potential of functioning as a *superior* teaching aid. The medium itself, it seems, was considered particularly fit to serve as a didactic tool – more so than others that already existed. Its greatest merit, supposedly, was the fact that it could help educational practice become more efficient.

The reasons quoted in turn varied widely. Some authors used arguments that must have been relevant in particular to the people involved in educational administration: those concerned primarily with the practical aspects (and cost) of school organisation.¹⁵ In the publication mentioned above, Cuban notes that one of the dreams that inspired early advocates of any (supposedly ‘innovative’) educational tool is that of increasing productivity – that is, “students acquiring more information with the same or even less teacher effort”.¹⁶ In 1935, D. Charles Ottley, author of the British manual *The Cinema in Education*, recapitulated their logic as follows: “In times such as ours speed is of paramount importance, speed in assimilating facts and in applying them.” Film in particular was seen to help fulfil this purpose, as it was the only medium that could, for instance, “present to a class in the space of ten minutes the successive stages of fertilization, germination and growth, recorded [...] over a period of from one to five years”. What mattered as well was the number of pupils that could be reached at any one time. The cinema, Ottley was convinced, “can illustrate simultaneously [...] to every scholar in a class small or large what the teacher would need to illustrate individually”.¹⁷ Similar opinions had been voiced by scientists and film-makers in previous decades, from the doctor Eugène-Louis Doyen (in the late 1890s) to the director Jean Painlevé (in 1931).¹⁸

Arguments like these still bear the marks of a late nineteenth century euphoria concerning the relation between modernity and progress – a conviction that machines would, in the end, help resolve all human problems and take away people’s practical constraints.¹⁹ The above pronouncements were made at a time of rationalism (in the epistemic sense: unchallenged positivism, and a strong belief in the idea that the world is knowable) and rationalisation (production processes being made more efficient with the help of science).²⁰ Such notions went hand in hand with a hope for a more prosperous future, and the expectation that the world would become a better place to live in. Education, in this context, had an important role to play: the assumption was that intellectual enlightenment would eventually also contribute to peace and democracy.²¹

Filmic representation not only allowed for the educational process to become more time and cost effective, it also made learning easier, and at the same time, more attractive, for the pupils involved. Easier, because the medium was supposed to make matter both more accessible (as American editor Jerome Lachenbruch put it in 1920, “subjects formerly taught in colleges are now being made understandable for children of ten”) and easier to remember (according to US child psychologist Lawrence Augustus Averill, writing in 1915, “the events which are portrayed in motion pictures remain indelibly in memory”).²² It made learning more attractive, because cinematography was considered to have an inherent appeal to those taught. A text by the Frenchman Hugues Besson (1920) reads: “The appeal of the spectacle solicits the pupils’ attention, even of those whose imagination is slow.” Fifteen years on, Ottley

rephrased it as follows: “The voice (both human and mechanical) may tire, but the voice of animation [...] still sounds sweet when brain is weary and nerve jaded.”²³

Last but not least, the medium’s potential in terms of educational efficiency was ascribed to the fact that the information conveyed was likely to be of superior quality to that passed on in traditional teaching situations. First, because film allowed for a wide dissemination of knowledge by the best of teachers.²⁴ And second, because filmic matter was considered to be devoid of value judgements. As Ottley summarises, “[t]he Cinematograph is free from bias; it neither condemns nor condones.” And who, the author wonders, would expect the same to be true for a *human* teacher?²⁵

Ottley’s remark directly ties in with the second set of claims that supported the utopian predictions quoted above. In his text, the author advances a number of arguments which, although presented as having a specifically educational relevance, duplicate prior statements on the cinema as an instrument for faithfully recording – and as such, storing and preserving – extratextual reality.

As Brian Winston points out, the idea of film as a recording (or ‘inscription’) device has been with the medium since its inception.²⁶ Particularly well-known are Matuszewski’s assertions that views captured on film constitute a more reliable historical source – and therefore, allow for greater insight into things past – than other documents. The reason is that they are basically fragments or ‘traces’ of history *itself*. Convictions such as his would inspire those responsible for the earliest collections of animated photographic images (such as, the “Archives de la Planète” of Albert Kahn and Jean Brunhes in 1909) and the first repositories of film (for instance, at the Musée Pédagogique or the Cinémathèque de la Ville de Paris, both in the 1920s).²⁷ Matuszewski’s notions were revived later on in debates between realists and formalists on the ontology and (social) function of the cinema. Theorists such as Walter Benjamin, representatives of what is sometimes called the ‘*photogénie* school’ (Jean Epstein, Germaine Dulac, Louis Delluc) and, later on, Siegfried Kracauer, maintained that film’s main asset was that it could capture and reveal aspects of reality – some of which hitherto unknown to us. This characteristic, which Metz would later designate as *cosmophanie*, was often related to the medium’s potential to manipulate time and scale (i.e. to speed up, slow down and enlarge aspects of referential reality).²⁸

In the early decades, also pedagogues argued that film had no equal in terms of fidelity to that which it represents. Because of this, it was endowed with characteristics such as ‘realness’ and ‘concreteness’, but also ‘truth’, and even ‘meaningfulness’.²⁹ In his plea for the use of film in schools, Besson advances the argument that “the cinematograph *is* life”.³⁰ Ottley states that film is “a record of life”, and therefore, “a record of truth, since neither lens nor microphone can invent”. In his view, the advantage in terms of education is that the medium forces teachers to confront their pupils with the actual *facts*, rather than renditions of those facts – or worse, mere opinions. Like the theorists just mentioned, he also attributes great value to the revelatory powers of film: the fact that it allows us to “behold what we should not, and indeed, *could* not behold with the human eye unaided”. Unlike the advocates of a *photogénie* idea, however, he does not see this in terms of nature’s ‘magical’ dimensions, or in relation to the human unconscious, but purely as an asset to the children’s learning.³¹

Pedagogical Framework

The arguments outlined above can be related to concurrent discourse on the film medium and its epistemic potential, but also to a number of specifically *pedagogical* ideas and ideals: notions of why and how people should be taught. Many of these are part of traditions which date back several centuries. In what follows, I shall single out two. First, I shall talk about the contemporary perception of a need for public education, which in turn coincides with a demand for the democratisation and popularisation of scientific knowledge. Next, I shall address the long-standing conviction that the most effective kinds of learning involve a variety of sensory experiences, and above all, confrontation with concrete, *real-life* objects or situations.

Public and Adult Education

The first organisations that advocated ‘the education and development of all’ were set up in the late 1700s, at the onset of the Industrial Revolution. Supporters argued that generalised instruction was in the interest of society as a whole: that it could help fight poverty and criminality and elevate the average standard of living.³² Initially, the movement was strongly inspired by bourgeois ideals, and based its activities on the premise that the ‘common’ people should be ‘edified’ or ‘civilised’ in order to advance socially. The sort of education it had in mind can be characterised as ‘personality training’: the passing on of values and standards held by those in charge. Later on, socialist activists made a plea for public education as well – this time however for the sake of social equality. The type of instruction they favoured was aimed at the acquisition of specialist knowledge rather than a more general intellectual an/or moral ‘enlightenment’. It was intended to open up better job prospects for the working classes.³³

At first, both branches of the movement dedicated themselves to the fight for a generalised (i.e. compulsory) primary education, but they continued to focus on the teaching of grown-ups later on. In the last quarter of the nineteenth century, initiatives in the field of adult education were booming; however, they still varied widely in terms of the organisations responsible, the didactic formats chosen and the sites where teaching took place.³⁴ In the Netherlands, for instance, lectures and courses were most often organised by clubs and associations (some with a party political or confessional slant). In the US, early forms of adult education took root in lyceums and commercial or proprietary schools, but also YMCA meeting rooms, town halls and community public libraries.³⁵ Centralisation occurred around the turn of the century, when official institutes of higher education for adults were set up. In Holland, the first such *volksuniversiteit* (in English usually called ‘university extension’, in French, *université populaire*) was established in 1913.³⁶

In his book *The Evolution of American Educational Technology* (1990) Paul Saettler points out that the adult education movement was very quick to recognise the potential of audio-visual teaching aids.³⁷ Most often, its activities took the shape of lectures held in public spaces (rather than in formal classrooms set up for drill and recitation); therefore, the projection of lantern slides was a particularly useful means of instruction. Later on, film began to fulfil a similar role. In France, the medium is reported to have been used for that purpose as early as 1912, by the labourers’ cinema (*cinéma ouvrier*) of the northern industrial town of Roubaix. A year later, and in the same spirit, a Société du Cinéma du Peuple (Society for People’s Cinema)

was set up.³⁸ In the early twenties, Dutch authors as well held pleas for the use of film in the context of what was commonly called *volksontwikkeling* ('development' of the people) and made mention of the first such initiatives. Also in Germany, film was deployed for purposes of *Volksaufklärung*.³⁹

Scientific Popularisation

Initiatives to educate, 'edify' or 'enlighten' the working classes went hand in hand with a call for the popularisation or 'democratisation' of science: a making more accessible of the outcomes of scientific inquiry by what was necessarily an intellectual elite. In the late nineteenth century, scientists increasingly travelled the world to promote inventions and discoveries, and filled the pages of newly established magazines.⁴⁰ At the same time, the number of museums rose spectacularly. According to Saettler, this numerical growth coincided with a change in policy. Museums stopped functioning as mere storage houses, and took on a manifest instructional role; new institutions were seen by their founders as "social instruments for the educational progress of the masses".⁴¹ A commercialised form of scientific popularisation took place at world fairs and exhibitions – events which, Tom Gunning argues, were often explicitly designed as "educational texts".⁴²

Like those involved in adult education, scientific popularisers sought for alternative methods of instruction and took a keen interest in devices and machines that might help further their cause.⁴³ They were looking in particular for means that would allow them to reach larger audiences. Film, in this context, was considered to have a definite advantage over other (visual) aids. In the early twentieth century, the medium's popular appeal, due in part to its status as an entertainment force, was seen as a powerful tool for making the acquisition of knowledge more attractive.

In a piece on the work of the French film-maker Jean Benoit-Lévy, Valérie Vignaux points out that the first initiatives to distribute film for educational purposes were meant to 'lighten' or 'ease' teaching through 'visualisation' (*par l'aspect*). This objective was relevant in particular to those who targeted adult audiences: people who had already finished their compulsory schooling, and had to be lured into attending lectures or seminars by the prospect of a non-formal, accessible presentation of the facts.⁴⁴ Cinematography seemed to fit this goal perfectly. At the time, it was seen as a 'universal language': one that could be understood by all, regardless of nationality or cultural background, and that allowed for communication between the high (the world of science and learning) and the low (that of the 'common' man).⁴⁵

Similar arguments were made with reference to the teaching of children. In a piece dating from 1912, the French journalist and novelist Lucien Descaves calls the cinema a 'theatre of the people' and argues that pedagogues should turn this fact to their own advantage. Eventually, he predicts, the use of film in education will be unavoidable, because modern pupils will no longer accept being taught with tools from the past. As a matter of fact, he is surprised that this time has not yet come:

When I consider that in schools – secondary as well as primary education – children still recite geography from manuals with lists of words followed by descriptions!

One probably finds a few more illustrations in them than one used to; however, with which indifference or mischievous spurn does the child who has just left the cinema

across the road approach those images from a different age, the era of stage-coaches and voyages around the world illustrated by copper engravings!⁴⁶

In some countries, the relation between the use of AV-media for the purpose of scientific popularisation and visual instruction in classrooms was a highly tangible one. In the US, for instance, the first facilities for the distribution of lantern slides, films, filmstrips and study prints to schools were exhibition centres. Examples are the American Museum of Natural History in New York City (founded in 1869, and renting out visual aids as of 1904) and the St. Louis Educational Museum (which in turn evolved from the 1904 world's fair, the Louisiana Purchase Exposition).⁴⁷ In France as well, such institutions played a central role in the supply of AV-material to schools. The Musée Pédagogique, one of the first moving image repositories in the country, established a slide library in 1895, adding film to its collection in 1920. Also the Cinémathèque de la Ville de Paris, founded a few years later, was set up as a combination of archival depot and educational distribution centre.⁴⁸

It is quite remarkable, therefore, that the films which, in those first few decades, were considered appropriate for use in schools were not always 'scientific' in the strictest sense of the word, but often served a much broader educational purpose. Since the late nineteenth century, and even more so during the interwar period, there was a growing body of opinion that formal education should focus less on the acquisition of factual knowledge and more on what was commonly called 'life adjustment', or, in the 1920s and 1930s in particular, 'spiritual and moral rearmament'.⁴⁹ Like the early advocates of public education, proponents of visual instruction argued that one of the main tasks of pedagogy was to instil into children a community spirit and sense of civic duty. Christophe Gauthier observes that also in practice, the ideology of (early) educational film was inextricably linked to a conception of the school as a site of moral righteousness for the entire nation.⁵⁰ A good deal of the titles that were distributed as fit for teaching reflected this philosophy.⁵¹

Learning through the Senses

The second pedagogical tradition that inspired early advocates of film for education is one that concerns the relation between learning and sensory perception. Since the beginning of the seventeenth century, progressive pedagogues have advanced the idea that teaching with words alone might be insufficient, and that in order for children to acquire *lasting* knowledge, other human capacities must be activated besides verbal understanding. In the early 1600s, the Italian philosopher Tomasso Campanella argued that all learning must take place through the senses. The influential pedagogue Johann Amos Comenius also supported this principle; his 1658 textbook *Orbis Sensualium Pictus* (*The Visible World in Pictures*) is generally considered one of the first aids to visual instruction.⁵² Among the champions of observation and other forms of sensory perception, the one whose fame has lasted the longest is the Swiss educational scientist Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi, active in the late 1700s and early 1800s. He argued that first-hand physical experience is crucial to the acquisition of knowledge, and more effective than most kinds of drill.⁵³

Although it never quite disappeared from liberal pedagogical agendas, the principle of learning through the senses received renewed attention – as well as a wider circulation – from the 1910s onwards, as the Western world was flooded by a wave of educational reform. In the decades

leading up to the Second World War, educators in Europe and the US were responsible for what has retrospectively been termed the 'New Education': a conglomerate of ideas on the practicalities of teaching which were based on then-recent insights into how children learn. The reformists' views derived from such 'new' sciences as child psychology and paedology, and were based on the premise that the specific characteristics of children's cognition should serve as a guide in the choice of classroom activities.⁵⁴ Enlightened pedagogues strongly objected to the principle of class teaching because in their view, it ignored the individuality of each child, encouraged passivity and required strict discipline enforced by an authoritarian teacher.⁵⁵ Instead, they preferred more active methods, which required children to carry out tasks of their own choosing, and at their own pace. Such procedures severely conflicted with the principles of abstract learning favoured by Herbartianism, the eighteenth-century educational theory and praxis which, at the time, still prevailed in most Western schools.⁵⁶

Even though some reformist ideas did penetrate the educational system as a whole, they were implemented most rigorously by a limited number of experimental project schools. These institutions based their *modi operandi* on the concepts of such pioneers as Maria Montessori (Italy), Helen Parkhurst and John Dewey (US), Ellen Key (Sweden), Georg Kerschensteiner (Germany) or Kees Boeke (The Netherlands), and taught their pupils by means of purpose-made educational tools.⁵⁷ Of all the values they shared, the one that found the most ready access in more traditional pedagogical circles was a rather fervent anti-verbalism: the idea that too many words, especially when coming from a teacher, are detrimental to a balanced educational 'diet'.⁵⁸

To those who promoted the use of film in classrooms, the above idea was an attractive one. Advocates collectively sold 'visual education' (in Dutch: *aanschouwelijk onderwijs*; in German: *Anschauungspädagogik*) as the solution to the 'problem' of verbalism – thus in fact narrowing down the reformist cause for sensory stimulation.⁵⁹ Opposition to this promotional strategy was simply brushed aside. For instance, in the early 1920s, the influential Dutch pedagogue Ph. A. Kohnstamm published a series of articles in which he argued that the use of teaching films was diametrically opposed to the requirement of activity advanced by recent psychological research and supported by most champions of the New Education.⁶⁰ Proponents of audio-visual media, however, were not intimidated, and continued to recycle only those scientific claims which suited them best.⁶¹

Abstract vs. Concrete

One ingredient of visual instruction rhetoric that was clearly borrowed from the educational reform movement was the argument that audio-visual media could help introduce concreteness into a learning environment that traditionally catered only to the transmission of dry, abstract ideas. Film, the slogan went, could "bring the [outside] world to the classroom".⁶² Proponents were convinced that concreteness made education more effective, because children, and *modern* pupils in particular, learnt faster through confrontation with actual, real-life situations. As Ottley summarised it in 1935: "It is of tremendous import, in all departments of teaching, that the film can picturize (materially) what the teacher can only visualize (mentally)".⁶³ In his book on educational technology, Saettler argues that this rationale inspired visual instruction activists over a period of half a century.⁶⁴ In the publications of manufacturers, it was even

adhered to until the early 1960s, when the battle for legitimacy of visual classroom aids had long been won.

The main advantage of film over other photographic media, in this context, was taken to be the fact that it could also reproduce movement. For this reason, it was considered a closer approximation of reality – and therefore, a better teaching tool. Saettler relates this view to the late nineteenth and early twentieth century practice of compiling so-called ‘concrete-abstract continuums’: listings of types of instructional tools, classified according to their respective levels of concreteness (and by the same token, suitability for classroom use). The top position in any such list was taken by ‘the real thing’: an actual specimen of the particular plant, animal or object that the lesson concerned. The importance of real-life samples as educational tools can in turn be related to the turn-of-the-century pedagogical fashion of so-called ‘object teaching’ (known in Dutch as *zaakonderwijs*, or in French, *leçons de choses*): a didactic method based on the scrutiny of actual, tangible substances rather than description by means of words. Next in the hierarchy came all manner of replicas of this ‘original’; for instance, models of the object in question, or diagrams focusing on some aspect of it. Verbal renditions, as a rule, came last.⁶⁵

Although all proponents of visual instruction made it clear, either implicitly or explicitly, that film belonged in the higher regions of this classification, its exact position varied according to the author. Some suggested that the medium, by virtue of its ability to represent movement, should be considered the next best thing to ‘the real thing’. Motion, according to the Dutch commentator H. Zanen, is what makes photography such a close ally of reality, and therefore, a means so easily accessible to the mind of a child.⁶⁶ Others were even more optimistic, and attributed to film the same didactic qualities as to material samples; a few therefore actually mentioned the possibility of a ‘cinematographic object lesson’.⁶⁷ Finally, there were those who decided that the medium’s potential to reproduce movement was a reason to classify it as a *superior* teaching aid. In comparing the act of watching a film in class to its (past) alternative, a curricular museum visit, Ottley argues:

Although an improvement upon the purely oral discourse, the cabinet (and its contents) had definite limitations. The record was still static and unless the teacher was uncommonly brilliant, the presentment suffered from the same limitation.

The record presented by the Cinematograph is animated... it lives and breathes and speaks. [...] [T]o the classroom may be brought a record of life, taken from life, which, to the boy and girl who eagerly await the magic image, *is life*.⁶⁸

In addition to the fact that it brought liveness and contextualisation, another distinct advantage of film was its potential to manipulate – speed up or slow down – the movement which it represented, and thus, make visible things that simply could not be observed in reality.⁶⁹ For the most optimistic group, this was yet another proof of the medium’s educational superiority.⁷⁰

One of the premises that underlie such pronouncements is that seeing something is basically the same as experiencing it *in real life*. In his article on visual spectacle at the 1904 St. Louis world’s fair, Gunning observes: “The object lesson with its direct and visual evidence, seemed to short circuit the act of signification and to bring the things themselves before the spectating public.”⁷¹ The same assumption, I believe, surfaces in statements of the most ardent supporters of visual instruction in the first decades of the twentieth century. As Jacques Wallet has pointed

out, the principle pedagogical objective of educational films at the time was to “open up a path to the real and to undercover the world”. The function which mediation fulfilled in this process, it seems, was not (yet) taken into consideration.⁷²

Another assumption that clearly manifests itself in such statements is the idea that visual perception of something equals knowledge of it. Besson, in his 1920 evaluation of the uses of the cinematograph for education, quotes a colleague’s claim that “seeing is almost the same as knowing”. Earlier on, the American George Brown Goode, employee of the Smithsonian Institute and responsible for exhibits at several world expositions, had argued even more confidently that ‘to see is to know’.⁷³ Interpretation on the part of the viewer, in other words, was not accounted for – at least, not explicitly.

As the above examples demonstrate, those in favour of film for education argued on the basis of a near-unshakeable belief in the merits of the visual, but rarely with reference to actual, ‘scientific’ facts. Proponents did claim to take into account the results of experimental research, both where it concerned the psychological and cognitive functioning of their intended audiences and in relation to the didactic efficiency of the medium as an educational tool. In spite of this, several authors have argued, both at the time and retrospectively, that the actual *merits* of the visual as a major ‘channel’ for learning have never been demonstrated.⁷⁴ One possible conclusion is that for visual instructionists, what happened in the scientific arena primarily served as a source of inspiration for marketing purposes. However, not all advocates of educational film use had commercial interests. Cuban therefore speculates that analysts, policy makers and ‘informed’ practitioners of the 1920s and 1930s in many cases actually “believed that the research demonstrated the motion picture’s superiority as a teaching tool”.⁷⁵

Commercial Exploitation

Meanwhile, of course, manufacturers and distributors did capitalise on the convictions of early visual instructionists. At the beginning of the century, Luke McKernan has pointed out, actualities, travelogues and scientific films were sometimes promoted as ‘self-evidently’ educational.⁷⁶ In the advertising process, informative content was equalled with instructional value. By deploying this strategy, entrepreneurs hoped to tap the widest possible market for their products.

One set of sources which demonstrate this are early distribution catalogues, some of the first types of advertising tools producers and renters of films had at their disposal.⁷⁷ By the end of the 1900s, prospectuses appeared that specifically targeted exhibitors with educational objectives. In many cases, however, such directories merely listed a selection of what was already available. George Kleine’s often mentioned *Catalogue of Educational Motion Pictures* (US, 1910), for instance, contains 1065 titles, distributed over some thirty (sub-)categories. Of course, not all of these films were purpose-made. The prospectus brings together actualities, ‘scenic’ and industrial shorts as well as some films based on literary classics and historical events. Many of these had previously been screened for general (entertainment) audiences.⁷⁸ The first edition of Charles Urban’s *Urbanora* catalogue (UK, technically predating Kleine’s guide) is most well-known for its “animated films depicting various manifestations, transformations, and phenomena of nature”. Although some of those were first presented as part of Urban’s own scientific and travel shows (such as, some of the microphotographic productions by F.

Martin Duncan), bringing them together in a specifically *educational* catalogue was primarily a commercial move: an attempt to add a user group to that which the films already appealed to.⁷⁹

Film exhibitors as well took their inspiration from public educators and visual instructionists. Building on a tradition of magic lantern lectures, they organised readings illustrated with scenic films and travelogues, actualities and popular science films: events that were advertised as having a distinct 'educational' value. In some cases, the production companies themselves coordinated such screenings, like Urban did with his *Urbanora* shows. Another format is that of the early projection service of the Maison de la Bonne Presse, a French (book) publishing company catering to the "informational and cultural needs" of its Catholic public.⁸⁰ In 1910s and 1920s Switzerland, travelling exhibitors showed industrial films in 'neutral' locations such as school buildings and community houses – allegedly, in an attempt to combine promotion with public education.⁸¹

The trend towards targeting various market sections at the same time even expanded as the distinction between theatrical and non-theatrical outlets grew more pronounced. In the early 1920s, natural history films shown in the supporting shorts programmes of entertainment venues were barely profitable, and therefore also got advertised, for instance, as classroom teaching aids.⁸² About a decade earlier, producers of popular science films such as Pathé-Frères and Éclair had followed a similar impulse when producing 'safety' (non-flammable) versions of existing titles for use at home and in school. This way, these companies claimed to fulfil the highly idealistic goal of so-called 'extended education'.⁸³

In practice, it seems, the words 'education' and 'educational' were used without much discrimination. Not only were they tagged onto films with a wide variety of subjects, they also covered a broad range in terms of target audiences and viewing occasions. In the introduction to his 1910 catalogue, Kleine already recognises this. He writes:

The word 'educational' is here used in a wide sense and does not indicate that these films are intended for school or college exclusively. They are intended rather for the education of the adult as well as the youth, for the exhibition before miscellaneous audiences, as well as for more restricted use.⁸⁴

Conversely, films that were considered to have educational value were labelled in different ways, depending on which seemed the most helpful from a promotional point of view.⁸⁵

As such, then, these tags provide little insight into how the films they were attached to were actually employed. In the first decades of the twentieth century, the medium's educational potential was a definite selling point for those involved in the film business; the question remains, however, to what extent their product was used as an instructional tool. Another topic that needs to be addressed is the relation between production/distribution and what the first generation of educational film enthusiasts – both policy makers and actual users – eventually aimed to achieve. In what follows, I shall take a closer look at early practices involving film that served an educational purpose (of some kind).

Early Film Practices

Roughly speaking, two broad tendencies can be distinguished. On the one hand, one can observe a strong disposition towards diversity. In the late nineteenth and early twentieth

centuries, film was used for a variety of purposes – both the medium as such, and the specific titles that were released. Productional intentions and actual deployment did not always correspond. On the other hand, one can also make mention of an inclination towards specialisation: a tendency to attune film supply (both the production of materials and their distribution) to the more specific needs of a given portion of the audience. At first, the latter propensity was largely a matter of wishful thinking – particularly in as far as so-called ‘educational’ material was concerned. In practice, then, it took several decades before some kind of a specialist teaching film business could take root.

Diversity

With respect to the film medium’s educational use, the words that best describe what went on in the early decades are ‘variety’ and ‘diversity’. Self-evident enough when it comes to the so-called ‘pioneer years’ (a time of try-out and experimentation, in all possible respects) this observation equally applies to the period *after* the consolidation of film as a primarily theatrical (entertainment) medium, which took place towards the end of the 1910s.

In order to give an idea of the extent of this diversity, I shall concentrate in what follows on an example. I shall focus on films that claimed to discuss ‘scientific’ subjects, such as topics belonging to the field of natural history (the genesis of plants, animals or humans) and (pseudo-)ethnography. In many cases, those titles did indeed serve an educational purpose – but hardly ever *exclusively* so.

‘Vernacular’ vs. ‘Specialist’ Use

Looking at examples taken from distribution catalogues published in the first decades of the century (some of which I have mentioned above), I would argue that a good deal of these items can be associated with the category of what has retrospectively been termed ‘vernacular’ or ‘popularising’ science films. In one sense, this phrase is used to refer to the output of a number of (mostly French) production companies that were active between the late 1900s and the early 1910s, which specifically targeted a youthful audience and were meant to both ‘educate’ and ‘entertain’. In most cases, they dealt with natural subjects, such as plant and animal life. Their purpose was scientific ‘vernacularisation’, or, as Thierry Lefebvre puts it, “the social dissemination of knowledge”. According to the same author, they should be distinguished from science films in the strict sense, which addressed a different audience (one of specialists) and were accompanied in a different way (by speakers who used scholarly language). Lefebvre directly relates their existence to the late nineteenth and early twentieth century tendency towards scientific democratisation.⁸⁶

In a broader definition, which I shall adhere to for the sake of my current argument, the term ‘vernacular’ is used to refer to a temporally more extensive range of films with roughly the same objectives, varying from the work of the so-called *cinéastes scientifiques* of the thirties, forties, and on (for instance, Painlevé or Pierre Thévenard) to wildlife television series such as those written and presented by David Attenborough in the 1980s and 1990s, or broadcast by the National Geographic channel to this day.⁸⁷ In his book on the latter, Bienvenido León argues that what such films do is mediate between two types of knowledge: that of specialists (systematic, and logically structured) and that of layman-viewers (non-systematic, and much

less organised). Their purpose, he believes, is primarily to establish a *rapport*: a bond with the audience that will encourage it to take an interest in, and subsequently learn about, the scientific facts discussed. According to León, this typically involves the use of some very specific cinematic techniques.⁸⁸

Yet the question is whether the opposition between ‘popular’ and specialist science films which Lefebvre proposes is not too rigid. In any case, it cannot serve as a basis for a distinction between educational and non-educational types of use. In my view, the suggestion that this might be the case is based on too narrow a conception of the purposes which the latter category of titles served, and of the audiences for whom they were screened.⁸⁹ Films with highly specialist subjects, after all, were not necessarily viewed by established scientists only, but also by people who still had to be trained. Items originating in a medical context, for instance, often simultaneously served as archival documents (records of a given phenomenon, illness or operation, available for presentations among peers and/or self-study) and that of instructional tools (i.e., instruments to train prospective doctors and paramedic personnel).⁹⁰ In addition to this, they were sometimes used for the improvement of public relations, either by an individual, or by an entire institute.⁹¹

In some cases, furthermore, such films were seen by a much larger audience – not only people who took a professional interest in what was shown. A good deal of evidence exists of the recycling of footage, with shifts in usage conditions as a result (for instance, in terms of the composition of the public, the material’s function within a larger programme, and/or its presentation format). Items that originated in a laboratory context, for instance, were taken on by commercial distributors and shown to popular audiences later on.⁹² Particularly well-known is the example of the French Dr. Doyen, whose surgical films were shown to non-specialist audiences – very much against his own will.⁹³ Alternatively, the films’ re-use in different circles was initiated by the makers themselves. Painlevé, a producer with both a scientific background and surrealist sympathies, is known to have shown his work in ciné-clubs and *avant garde* theatres once the other screening options had been used up.⁹⁴

Distributors who marketed the work of others tended to claim in the process that they had educational objectives, but the films they circulated often also served the purpose of sensationalist attractions.⁹⁵ For instance, José van Dijck has argued that medical films frequently functioned as a means to amuse audiences of lay people. A telling example in this context is Doyen’s registration of an intervention to separate a couple of Siamese twins. According to the author, public screenings of such images can be traced back to a nineteenth-century tradition of freak shows in circuses and fairs, aimed at satisfying the viewers’ tendency towards voyeurism.⁹⁶ Paula Amad, for her part, mentions the ‘geographical explorations’ produced for Kahn’s “Archives de la Planète”, which were meant to be shown exclusively to an intellectual elite (for instance, members of the select Société Autour du Monde, or those attending lectures given by Brunhes at the Sorbonne or the Collège de France). However, recent study shows that the films have also been appreciated by less ‘cultured’ viewers, this time as “entertaining spectacles”.⁹⁷

Retrospective Accounts: Matters of Origin

Another, somewhat unrelated point I would like to address here is the fact that authors who

write about either of the above categories (vernacular, or specialist science films) are often also tempted to make inferences about the medium's supposedly 'scientific', or even 'educational', beginnings. For instance, Anne Raynal, in her contribution to a French collection on the topic, argues that "the cinema is scientific by birth". Some make even more lofty statements, for instance to the effect that 'the scientific film' came first. André Drevon, in his article for the same volume, writes: "in the beginning there was scientific and educational 'cinema'".⁹⁸

Such pronouncements, of course, are based on very broad generalisations. In both of the above cases, the speakers are insufficiently clear about what exactly the term 'scientific', in those particular contexts, is meant to refer to. The first quote, which follows an enumeration of techniques used in the study of phenomena which cannot be observed with the naked eye (for instance, rapid movement) seemingly relates it to film's potential as a research instrument (a use of the medium which I have not touched upon so far). The second, in contrast, is taken from a section which considers it as a means to educate, and more specifically, to influence or change human behaviour. Assessing Georges Demeny's use of chronophotography to teach the deaf-mute how to speak, Drevon literally refers to his subject as "a pioneer of film for school".⁹⁹

Furthermore, statements such as these make abstraction of the great range of factors which helped facilitate the initial survival of, and later developments in, the film medium. For instance, some historians argue that 'the cinema' (presumably, institutionalised entertainment film) is really no more than a by-product of methods for the study of locomotion which were developed in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, and which many, including at least one of the above authors, consider to be at its origin.¹⁰⁰ However, researchers such as Étienne-Jules Marey, canonised as one of *the* pioneers of film, were interested in the analysis of movement rather than its reproduction or synthesis – to all accounts a most crucial step in the evolution towards film as we know it today. Meanwhile, it required more commercial minds (for example, those of Edison and the brothers Lumière) to develop, and subsequently market, the potential which these scientists did *not* exploit. In addition to this, also the researchers themselves were dependent on developments made for economic reasons; for instance, the invention of roll-films with sufficiently speedy photographic emulsions.¹⁰¹

For all those reasons, it seems inappropriate to suggest that in retrospect, scientific and/or educational film can be considered a historical 'point of departure', and that all other applications of the medium can be seen as developments of, or even deviations from, this 'original' form. Another argument, perhaps even more important in the context of this work, is the fact that it obscures the distinction between the scientifico-technological origins of the apparatus on the one hand, and the first more or less organised forms of film supply for educational use, on the other. Marey himself used to say that one of the two human defects which photographic images can help overcome is "the limitations of our language to express properly and communicate what it is that has been acquired".¹⁰² Yet even if he did use the medium accordingly, this does not yet make him 'the' father of 'the' teaching film.

As McKernan has pointed out, the systematic use of film for education – which, he argues, did not really take off until after the First World War – should be considered "a new enterprise, not an extension of that which already existed".¹⁰³ Before it could become successful as a

didactic tool, two conditions had to be fulfilled. First, the teaching world had to be sufficiently prepared for the reception of the new medium – one that clearly required its own (but as yet largely experimental) pedagogical approach. Second, a reasonable amount of material had to be available: schools had to have access to enough films and playback equipment that met their educational demands.¹⁰⁴

On the face of it, the first condition may seem to have been by far the most difficult to fulfil, considering that it required the breeding of a positive disposition among an entirely new, and as I shall demonstrate further on, at times very hostile, user base. In reality, however, also the second, more practical problem took a good deal of time to solve. The main reason for this appears to have been that if the teaching film business was to become more or less viable, relying purely on the workings of the market was not an option. Yet although governments in the twenties and thirties did recognise this, few of the authorised officials were in a financial position to prioritise the supply of visual aids to schools.¹⁰⁵

(Some Steps towards) Specialisation

In her recent monograph on the work of Benoit-Lévy, Vignaux quotes from a “Rapport sur la création d’un office national du cinématographe” (Report on the creation of a national cinematographic agency) which came out in 1928. The text reads:

The need to organise at last the cinematograph for educational and teaching purposes seems more and more urgent. [...] The present lack of coordination and cohesion between the relevant ministerial departments, between the various regional bureaux, between the programmes of social education, has the inevitable consequence both of a mutual ignorance of the obtained results, and a fragmentation of efforts and a regrettable duplication of investments.¹⁰⁶

Although commenting very specifically on the situation in France, the above quote reflects the views of visual education proponents throughout Europe and the US. Like this one, analyses made elsewhere indicate that by the end of the 1920s, within government circles, a good deal of support existed for the use of film in teaching. In many cases, moreover, this approval was more than purely theoretical. In several countries, the state organised some form of educational film supply; occasionally even via multiple (i.e. regional as well as national) distribution points. At the same time, however, such pronouncements also show that the large-scale use of film for teaching was still an unrealised ideal. One of the factors which commentators attributed this to was a lack of coordination between the multitude of initiatives that co-existed.

Commissions and Reports

At first sight, the limited scale of the educational film ‘business’ may seem a little surprising. Interest in the issue, after all, long predates the above-mentioned report, also among people involved in policy making. Throughout the Western world, the first disparate attempts by teachers and professors to deploy film as a classroom aid were immediately followed by a variety of (semi-)official initiatives. From the 1910s onwards, all sorts of commissions gathered with the intent purpose of collecting information about, and subsequently, taking a stance on, the medium’s suitability as a didactic tool – both in a general sense, and with reference specifically to young children. In France, for instance, the results of an early inquiry on the

use of film for agricultural education were presented to both houses of parliament as early as 1912. In Holland, the city council of The Hague created a Bioscoop-Commissie (Cinema Commission) to study the matter; the group reported back in 1913, after a delegation had returned from a work visit to the first Belgian 'school cinema'.¹⁰⁷

In most cases, the tone of the committees' deliberations can be characterised as 'cautiously optimistic'. The Dutch report, for instance, assesses the future of education with film (*bioscopisch onderwijs*) as very promising. At the same time, however, it stipulates a number of conditions for the medium's further use. On the one hand, it says, film should be deployed only if it can be expected to *add* something to the teacher's argument, and if it is likely to help clarify something which cannot be illustrated with other means. On the other hand, teachers should use films that are made especially for that purpose.¹⁰⁸ Neither of these requirements, the document implies, were fulfilled at the time.

During the First World War, for obvious reasons, the teaching film was not high on the political agenda.¹⁰⁹ Immediately after, however, issues pertaining to its use were addressed with renewed enthusiasm. In France, for instance, an extra-parliamentary commission under the auspices of the Ministry of Public Instruction and Arts delivered its long-awaited report (the so-called 'rapport Bessou'). This in turn gave impetus to the creation of a film service at the Musée Pédagogique (previously distributing only slides) and, a few years later, the set-up of a *cinémathèque* at the Ministry of Agriculture.¹¹⁰ In Holland, the so-called 'Onderwijsraad' (Education Council) was asked to advise on the use of film as a teaching tool; its conclusions were made public in 1922.¹¹¹ In Britain, meanwhile, a Cinema Commission of Inquiry, appointed by the National Council of Public Morals, had started debates on the issue; its report came out in 1925. Seven years later, a Committee on Educational and Cultural Films produced the landmark paper "The Film in National Life", containing a plea for the establishment of a more permanent advisory body that would also implement the recommendations made.¹¹²

The accumulation of government initiatives, it seems, bears a direct relation to the activities of various interest groups. In the course of the 1920s, the latter not only increased in number, but also began to organise themselves more professionally. The most telling example here is the US, where five national associations were established in as many years' time (1919 to 1923). Although some of these organisations merged later on, they represented an ever expanding base of lobbyists for the teaching film cause.¹¹³ Like their colleagues elsewhere, American visual instructionists proclaimed their views on the issue at conferences, in journals (first *Moving Picture Age*, then *Visual Education* and *The Educational Screen*) and through practical courses for teachers in all subject fields.¹¹⁴

In the 1920s, the movement also began to internationalise. The first step in this direction was taken in 1921, when the League of Nations installed a Committee for Intellectual Cooperation, whose sub-commission on cinematography deliberated on the relation between film and intellectual life. In 1926, the French branch of this organisation coordinated an international cinematographic congress; one of the topics discussed was 'teaching through cinema' (*l'enseignement par le cinéma*).¹¹⁵ In subsequent years, specialist classroom film conferences were held. From 1928 to 1934, these took place under the auspices of the newly established International Institute of Educational Cinematography, a League of Nations division with

offices in Rome. Two of the goals they achieved were the standardisation of 16mm as an educational format, and an agreement on the exchange of films among member states.¹¹⁶

When compared to those that came out in the first half of the 1910s, the minutes, reports and conventions of committees that met after the First World War tend to have a somewhat different emphasis. In most cases, the purpose of advisory boards at the time was no longer to decide whether or not the film medium was suitable as a didactic aid. Rather, taking this fact as a premise, compilers of such documents aimed to demonstrate how the various subject fields could benefit from its use. In order to prove their point, they conducted tests and experiments, or referred to results obtained by colleagues.¹¹⁷ In addition to this, members also made more concrete recommendations, for instance with regard to the practical organisation of production and distribution. The general assessment was that in order for film to become a viable teaching tool, more government involvement was required.¹¹⁸ Most of the reports envisaged a combination of two things. On the one hand, they demanded a more proactive approach to the logistics of teaching film supply (for example, through the coordination of national and/or regional distribution networks – as in the French report quoted above). On the other hand, they asked for more initiative in terms of production, both regulatory (i.e. the setting of standards) and financial (sponsorship by the state).

At the time, indeed, the availability of suitable films was still a major problem – despite ten, twenty, even twenty-five years of deliberation. The reason seems to have been that private enterprise was in some kind of a deadlock. Because of the fact that most schools did not yet have the resources for teaching film use (often for infrastructural reasons, such as a lack of projection equipment, or simply because they could not afford to buy or rent films) investment in specialist production was still too risky. As a result, companies chose to produce material that served several purposes at once; films, in other words, that were ‘educational’ in the broadest possible sense of the term. Such titles, however, did not meet the much more stringent demands of the people who had to put them to use.

Specialist Production

Even in the first two decades of the century, there were some commercial enterprises that catered specifically to those in formal education. In many cases, however, the long-term existence of such companies depended not on the production of teaching films, but on other, more lucrative activities. One example that illustrates this point is the Dutch firm Polygoon, which officially opened in 1920. Right from the start, its founder had the ambition to operate on the educational market. With the 1922 release of a film about the course of the river Rhine, the company earned the pedagogical recognition it required. Four years later, the firm also set up its own projection service, which presented specially compiled programmes to a public of schoolchildren – supposedly in an effort to circumvent the country’s lack of infrastructure for (educational) film viewing. Meanwhile, and in spite of claims that it was established with the intent purpose of providing ‘good teaching films’, Polygoon also marketed titles which targeted non-school audiences.¹¹⁹ Eventually, historian Bert Hogenkamp argues, it was the production of newsreels which ensured the survival of the company.¹²⁰

In other countries as well, diversification turned out to be the solution for those who wished to engage in the production business. In the UK, Gaumont-British Instructional (G-BI),

subsidiary of the Gaumont-British Picture Corporation, was established in 1933 to provide for the educational market. While other branches of the concern concentrated on feature films and newsreels, G-BI specialised in titles for classroom use. The most well-known of its products was the so-called *Secrets of Life* series (initiated in 1934). Unlike *Secrets of Nature*, which had made the fame of the earlier British Instructional Films, *Secrets of Life* was geared specifically towards use in biology lessons.¹²¹ Without the profits made from the sale of other genres, however, G-B's Instructional branch might not have been sustainable.¹²²

For completeness' sake, I should point out here that the above situation is most characteristic of Europe. In the US, it seems, specialist production has always been a little more successful. Not only did entrepreneurs venture onto the educational market sooner (i.e., from the very beginning of the century), some of them actually managed to focus exclusively on the provision of material for classroom use. One possible explanation is that several of these early companies took on the entire cycle of production and distribution, including also the selling or renting out of equipment for film screening.¹²³ This way, they attempted to break through the infrastructural deadlock which their European colleagues were still dealing with.

In addition to this, American producers also operated on a much larger scale – especially in the twenties and thirties. The reason for this, I believe, is twofold. First, many of the bigger firms maintained close relations with institutes of higher education which stimulated the use of audio-visual media in schools. Such cooperation, it seems, not only relieved the companies financially, it also increased the acceptability of film as a classroom tool – and thus, the teachers' willingness to put it to use. Particularly well-known in this context are the various partnerships with the University of Chicago. Through all manner of collaboration, this institution contributed to the success of, in that order, the Society for Visual Education (a production company founded in 1919, known also for its enormous filmstrip library), Eastman Teaching Films (incorporated in 1928 as the outcome of an elaborate research-demonstration project headed by the university), ERPI (erected in 1929, and endorsed by the school's staff) and, later on, its successor Encyclopaedia Britannica Films (future market leader in the field, and established with the financial support of the university's vice-president).¹²⁴

The second reason that can be inferred is that companies such as the above also benefited from America's long-standing tradition of collaboration between public institutions on town, state and federal levels. Like many countries in Europe, the US harboured a wide range of facilities for the rental and exchange of classroom films and equipment. Yet in spite of complaints about a lack of harmony between the various agencies that coexisted, distribution here seems to have functioned much more efficiently than in France, Holland or the UK.¹²⁵ At least to some degree, this may have been the result of a much more powerful central back-up system for communal initiatives. Authorities and organisations that were particularly helpful in this respect were the Motion Picture Department of the US Bureau of Education and the Association of School Film Libraries.¹²⁶

Reuse and Resemblance

In many parts of Europe, in contrast, purpose-production was still an unattainable ideal, even in the 1930s. In practice, a good deal of the films which companies advertised as fit for 'curricular' use had been recycled from other viewing contexts (entertainment settings, but

sometimes also more specialist scientific ones).¹²⁷ In some cases, of course, they had been adapted so as to fit their new purpose. British Instructional Films, for instance, re-edited episodes from its *Secrets of Nature* series after they had been brought out commercially, and refitted them with captions appropriate to a youthful audience. In Switzerland, distributors of teaching films re-cut documentaries in order to make them suitable as teaching tools, replacing intertitles and, later on, voice-over commentaries. In France, Benoît-Lévy's work was sometimes reused to make 'specialist' classroom films. Essentially, however, these titles were mere reorganisations of images that had been assembled before.¹²⁸

In addition to this, films that were meant to function as teaching aids are often highly reminiscent of what was available for non-school audiences, even if they were in fact purpose-produced. The latter observation not only applies to their stylistic features – a fact which seems logical, considering that such titles often only constituted part of a firm's output – but also to the thematic choices made. An example may help me illustrate this point.

In the year 1926, Polygoon director B. D. Ochse published the brochure *De Film ten dienste van Onderwijs en Volksonwikkeling* (Film at the service of teaching and public education), in order to spread the word about the company's newly established projection service. The last few pages of the booklet contain a selection of titles that were available for this goal; at least some of those – although by no means all – were made with pupils in mind.¹²⁹ Speaking in 'curricular' terms, most of the films listed deal with subjects belonging to the domain of geography (either of the economical strand, or more or less 'ethnographic'); a single one (*De bijenwereld*, 1927, The world of bees) covers a biology topic.¹³⁰ Considered a little more closely, and in relation to the user comments that follow, each of these titles conjures up images of films that were shown for more broadly educational purposes; for instance, as part of the supporting shorts sections of cinema programmes, or otherwise, during more *ad hoc* screenings.¹³¹ They evoke associations with the types of material which, at the time, were variously catalogued as 'travelogues', 'scenics', or 'manners and customs' (such as, a film reported to feature "Eastern types" of people, animals and plants). Alternatively, they remind one of the kind of shorts which, retrospectively, have been called 'process films', and which show a product's manufacturing from raw material to consumable good. The title of the biology film, in turn, leads one to suspect an ethologic-observational content, in line with that of popular science films made since the late 1900s.¹³²

Similar observations are made by authors who base their conclusions on the composition of educational catalogues released elsewhere. In his article on French geography teaching films, Wallet even goes so far as to state that "[n]othing distinguishes a documentary for school use from one intended for the general public". Pierre-Emmanuel Jaques in turn draws attention to the 'stereotypical' outlook of films dealing with the specificities of a location – both in terms of their topical focus and their common 'didactic' approach. In an article on the subject, he attributes this to the relative 'closedness' or 'impenetrability' of the documentary utility film.¹³³ Whether or not the latter generalisation is a legitimate one, it is definitely safe to conclude that in those days, it was rarely the very specific *textual* characteristics of 'teaching' films that made them seem fit for their specialist (i.e. institutionally restricted) use.

Official Intervention

As the American example already demonstrates, a sustainable system of teaching film supply ultimately could not be achieved without at least some form of material back-up from the state. As far as 'official' intervention is concerned, a favourable attitude towards educational film use simply was not enough. The schools themselves, oftentimes short on cash (especially during the interwar years) could not be expected to carry the financial burden of the entire enterprise. In order for it to succeed, then, monetary incentives from the government were necessary as well. These could either take the form of direct subsidies to producers, or a more active engagement in the organisation of film distribution and/or technical support. The best way to illustrate this point is by using a 'negative' example: the instance of a country where lack of official intervention eventually led to the failure of a whole chain of initiatives.¹³⁴

In France, the introduction of classroom films to schools at first seemed to progress rather well. After the publication of the abovementioned 'rapport Bessou' (1920), the government actively supported the development of educational film use – not only in word (by openly proclaiming its favourable position) but also in deed. In subsequent years, several ministries set up or financed specialised libraries, often also providing the means to commission new, purpose-produced titles. In the second half of the decade, however, the state's interest in the matter gradually began to wane. A major blow to visual instructionists was the failure to materialise of a so-called Office national du cinématographe (an institute that would, among others, coordinate the government's disparate efforts to have films screened in schools).¹³⁵ The result was that until the eve of the Second World War, the availability of AV-materials depended to a considerable extent on regional initiatives (for instance, those of the various Offices régionaux du cinéma éducateur). Although these were oftentimes highly active, a lack of national support minimised the impact of their activities. Since local providers as well had to draw on what was held by state-funded repositories, the latter institutions ended up getting paralysed by their own success.¹³⁶

Like France, most (Western) countries that did develop a well-coordinated, central support system for classroom film use tended to do so *after* the Second World War. The reason for this timing was primarily infrastructural. Much more so than had been the case twenty years earlier, governments in the early forties relied on the non-theatrical film circuit for purposes of information, education and propaganda.¹³⁷ In a mere four years' time, the market for small-gauge film grew spectacularly; the number of libraries that rented out such materials literally multiplied. As far as 'mobile' projection was concerned, 16mm effectively became the standard.¹³⁸ In the peace time that followed, the results of this evolution could immediately be redeemed. Post-war administrators benefited not only from what was left materially – equipment or films available for recycling, AV-departments requiring new assignments – but also in terms of know-how. In several countries, such assets were turned to the advantage of formal education.¹³⁹ This in turn gave an incentive to private enterprise.

Although valid for many countries in Europe, there is one distinct exception to the above observations. In Germany, direct government involvement in the production and supply of classroom films – which, incidentally, took an extremely centralised form – began well before the Second World War. The first official teaching film institute, known by the name of RfDU

(Reichsanstalt für den Unterrichtsfilm) was erected in 1933.¹⁴⁰ The agency simultaneously acted as a commissioner of AV-material and as an administrator of the entire distribution chain.¹⁴¹ Through a vast network of regional offices (*Landes-, Kreis- and Stadtbildstellen*) RfdU monitored the schools' needs and coordinated the transport of equipment and films. Although answering directly to the Ministry of Education, Science and Public Development, it functioned more or less independently. Funding was obtained directly from the pupils' parents (in the form of a compulsory contribution per school-going child); because of this, it was unaffected by the outcome of governmental negotiations on the distribution of tax proceeds. In addition to this, the institute had complete authority over what was shown in schools. Without its explicit permission, teachers were not allowed to screen titles from outside RfdU, *even* if they had been approved as official propaganda tools.¹⁴²

In spite of the fact that the institute emerged within a system of governance that favoured centrally managed public services of this kind, it should not be considered a mere product of national socialism. According to Malte Ewert, who wrote a history of RfdU up to 1945, the body would have materialised in any case – even if the political constellation had been radically different.¹⁴³ The reason for this is that in the years and decades before, the Reichsanstalt's *modus operandi* had been thoroughly prepared. In Germany, the production of films, especially those with (supposedly) 'edifying' qualities, had long been considered an activity that needed official support. Pressured to do so by a very active cinema reform movement, municipal councils (organised in a so-called *Bilderbühnenbund*) committed themselves to the screening of *Kultur-* and *Lehrfilme* (the former targeting a general audience; the latter aiming specifically at schoolchildren and college students).¹⁴⁴ The federal government in turn sponsored the making of such films, both directly (for instance, via the *Kulturabteilung* of Ufa, an institute which also received public funds) and indirectly (among others, through tax reliefs for the makers of films rated as 'educationally fit' by the *Zentralinstitut für Erziehung und Unterricht*, the Central Institute for Education and Teaching).¹⁴⁵ Even more significant in terms of what RfdU achieved was the vast network of communal AV-libraries (*Bildstellen*) set up in the course of the 1920s, which operated on the level of towns and states. After 1933, they were converted into teaching film archives, and served as a basis for the institute's centralised system of storage and distribution.¹⁴⁶

Despite its association with a hostile political regime, Germany's production and distribution system caused envy among foreign proponents of the teaching film. In Holland, for instance, RfdU statistics were quoted whenever the necessity of government intervention had to be affirmed. The institute's success was attributed not only to its tight central organisation, but also to the way in which it was funded. From a pedagogical point of view, the Reichsanstalt was praised for providing films that were entirely suited to their goal.¹⁴⁷ Yet in spite of such arguments, it would take another while before foreign governments would begin to follow the Germans' lead.

1.1.2 Limitations

Despite what I may have suggested above, the tardiness with which, in most Western countries, specialist production of teaching films took root was not *purely* an effect of a logic of the market. Ultimately, it had at least as much to do with the prospective users' preparedness to

deploy film as a classroom tool. If pedagogues and educators had been collectively convinced of the medium's usefulness as a didactic aid, the visual instruction movement would have received their active support; as a result, it might have been able to enforce the necessary government measures. In the twenties and thirties, however, the number of undivided enthusiasts among schoolteachers was less than overwhelming.¹⁴⁸

Reservations

Much like the praise of early advocates, concerns about the pedagogical limitations and even dangers of film were voiced as soon as the medium emerged.¹⁴⁹ On the face of it, objections to its use in school – often expressed by authors who spoke from personal experience – tended to be quite concrete. Roughly speaking, they can be divided into two groups. On the one hand, teachers had fundamental, methodological preoccupations, which in turn gave expression to their concern with the psychological and pedagogical needs of the audience addressed. According to reports, educators were not convinced that the use of the medium could help young children learn; some even suggested that it might slow down their development. On the other hand, they were worried about the potential practical difficulties. The latter type of objections in particular indicate that according to prospective users, neither the pedagogical world nor the market were (logistically) prepared for the large-scale deployment of teaching films.

In addition to this, the same sources attest to a kind of fear that seems at least equally profound, but much harder to pin down. The teachers' apprehensiveness, it seems, not only resulted from the assumption that film might not yet be adapted to its function as a teaching tool, but also from suspicions regarding the medium *as such*. Implicitly or explicitly, those who complained about the increasing presence of moving images in schools blamed their inherent corruptive potential – a danger primarily for the children watching, but to some degree even for the adults who put them to use. In what follows, I shall also address those types of fear. First, however, I shall take a closer look at the more concrete, 'visible' objections to the use of film in schools.

Psychosocial Concerns

Of all the concerns that were mentioned in questionnaires and reports, psychosocial ones were given by far the greatest weight. Regardless of whether they actually constituted what worried teachers the most, suspicions about the relation between film viewing and the (development of) children's perceptive, cognitive and/or interpersonal capacities often took centre stage. A possible reason for the prominence of such arguments is that their relevance to the discussion was beyond any doubt: if there was one issue educators were *supposed* to be concerned about, it was whether or not the intended audience could pedagogically benefit from the medium's use. In addition to this, teachers were confirmed in their intuitions by educational scientists who held similar views, and who argued in their books and articles that the effects of the medium on the way children learnt had not yet been sufficiently researched.¹⁵⁰

In her contribution to a volume on French scientific and educational film, Annie Renonciat points out that in the course of the past centuries, pedagogues have not only stressed the advantages of sensory education, but also underlined young children's perceptual constraints.

In the late 1900s, visual representations were considered educationally fit *only* if they lived up to certain standards; for instance, in terms of clarity and readability, informational hierarchy and logical construction. For detractors of the didactic use of film, those were precisely the areas where the medium failed as an educational tool.¹⁵¹ On the one hand, because it presented an inordinately fast succession of ‘views’, ill-adapted to the cognitive processes of young pupils. The film image’s inherent speed and fleetingness were considered to stand in the way of careful observation and to encourage viewers to forget what they had seen. On the other hand, because moving image technology, unlike graphics for instance, was considered to conflict with the pedagogical ideals of selection and simplification. Opponents argued that a camera pointed at a phenomenon or object worth knowing was likely to record a host of irrelevant details as well. The children watching, meanwhile, could not be expected to differentiate between the two, and as a result, were bound to end up more confused.¹⁵²

A more direct consequence of the transient quality of film which commentators quoted was the fact that it did not involve the viewers’ mind in an active way. According to the medium’s adversaries, moving images incited children to passivity and mental laziness. Rather than encouraging pupils to think about what they saw, motion pictures subjected them to an uninterrupted stream of visual stimuli, leaving them only a number of unrelated, inconsequential impressions.¹⁵³ This circumstance, of course, was a thorn in the side of educational reformists. I have mentioned earlier that according to the Dutch professor Kohnstamm, film viewing was diametrically opposed to the principle of activity advanced by the New Education. In his view, even the use of words – otherwise a condition for priming thought – could not remedy this. Watching film, he believed, required such a degree of submission that listening to verbal clarifications at the same time was sure to interfere with the workings of the mind.¹⁵⁴

Another, equally fundamental danger of film was what Renonciat characterises as “the almost hallucinatory power of the cinematographic image”. For educators, the following problem posed itself:

the film spectator, little by little, no longer sees before him moving images, but real beings; the obscurity in which he is immersed reinforces his illusion. Rationalist teachers of the most uncompromising kind hate to let the cognitive processes of their pupils rest on the virtues of a simulacrum of which the buoyancy derives from *make-belief* rather than a process of *making* [pupils] *think*.¹⁵⁵

In other words, the very *same* characteristic that proponents of the medium considered a major advantage – its life-likeness – constituted a problem for its opponents. In their view, watching film made the children enter some sort of ‘dream state’, thus paralyzing their critical functions. The emotional condition it caused was taken to be the result of a purely physical process: the fast succession of single pictures (and more precisely, the flicker which this was supposed to entail).¹⁵⁶

Last but not least, sceptical teachers also feared that use of the new medium might cause a disregard for the non-rational aspects of classroom education. As Cuban points out, pedagogues throughout the decades have tended to believe that interpersonal relations are essential in student learning; as a result, “the use of technologies that either displace, disrupt, or minimize that relationship between teacher and child [have been] viewed in a negative light”.¹⁵⁷ In the 1910s and 1920s, such arguments gained additional weight, supported as they

were by the findings of educational scientists who studied the workings of children's minds. In the interwar period, they were further reinforced due to the contemporary attention to 'personality training': the preparation of pupils for full membership of a peaceful society. Teachers who were already suspicious of the film medium argued that this task conflicted with the use of (too many) technical aids.¹⁵⁸

Practical Considerations

At least as important to users, although often less heavily emphasised in contemporary writings, were a series of more tangible problems: practical difficulties that prevented the large-scale deployment of moving images in schools.¹⁵⁹ In the book mentioned earlier, Cuban writes:

Invariably, the following reasons turned up on lists of obstacles blocking increased film use in classrooms:

- Teachers' lack of skills in using equipment and film
- Cost of films, equipment, and upkeep
- Inaccessibility of equipment when it is needed
- Finding and fitting the right film to the class.¹⁶⁰

In what follows, I shall take a closer look at each of those concerns.

The first hurdle which Cuban mentions, I believe, is part of a more extensive, and above all, a more diversified set of (perceived) practical constraints. Although many teachers may indeed have suffered from a fear of incompetence with respect to the mechanical aspects of film screening, the reasons for this apprehensiveness were not necessarily technical in themselves. In his book on American educational technology, Saettler quotes from a 1930s report investigating the causes of slow development in the field of classroom film use. One of the explanations given here is that heads of schools tended to devote little or no time or energy to the implementation of visual education. Teachers, in other words, were not given sufficient guidance, and therefore approached the new challenge with excessive trepidation. Another reason quoted by the same report is the lack of standards in terms of both film production and application. If the great variety of available tools and methods already confused school boards and executives, of course, it was quite inevitable that it should also intimidate those who had to put them to use.¹⁶¹

The third and fourth items on Cuban's list indicate difficulties in terms of how the new technology could be made to fit into both the school curriculum and established teaching routines. On the one hand, many commentators complained that although the medium might be useful *in principle*, insufficient amounts of suitable films were available (as yet). In order for teachers to welcome the tool into their classrooms, titles had to be provided that dealt with subjects relevant to formal education, and in ways that could appeal to the age groups concerned.¹⁶² On the other hand, the material had to be usable at the times and place which the lesson programme ordained. Teachers of the 1920s and 1930s disapproved of the fact that they should adapt their schedules to those of the film distributors. They believed that the medium could only be effective didactically if this logic was radically turned around.¹⁶³

Another practical concern that is not mentioned explicitly by Cuban but is often referred to in Dutch primary sources is the time-consuming nature of the entire enterprise. Many teachers seem to have been bothered by the fact that the use of any (short) film required several hours

of lesson time. Teaching with audio-visual means, after all, was not only a matter of screening the chosen title; an equally important part of the process was verification of the acquired knowledge or skills. This excess time, however, had to be skimmed off the school hours that were available – hours that could be spent more ‘safely’ on faster methods, that were well-tried.¹⁶⁴ Another, related consideration was that showing film required extra preparation. Even if a title did deal with subjects that were part of the school programme, teachers still had to preview it and adapt any relevant lesson plans. In this sense as well, film was felt to consume too much of their time.¹⁶⁵

Remarkable about this last argument is that it often appears in texts which characterise the use of AV media in general as a ‘hassle’ or ‘rigmarole’.¹⁶⁶ Pronouncements of this kind tend to confirm Cuban’s observation that resistance to the introduction of new teaching tools in part also derives from a fear of anything that might make the teacher’s task more complicated to perform (an assertion I shall address much more thoroughly in chapter 2, paragraph 2.1.1). In my view, then, it is quite likely that some of the more down-to-earth reservations about classroom film use (for instance, the last of Cuban’s obstacles: that of maintenance and cost) should be seen as attempts to give a more concrete or tangible expression to an otherwise rather elusive concern.¹⁶⁷

Underlying Fears

Although both the above clusters of considerations may indeed have mattered to some of the teachers involved, I would like to point out that they probably also constituted a front for a series of other fears. The types of anxiety that I am thinking of here are very different in nature to the ones I already mentioned. At the same time, they seem to have been at least equally heartfelt. The problem for an outside observer is that although they are sometimes named in primary sources, it is not always clear how exactly they would have affected the professional group concerned. In what follows, I shall try to clarify this. I shall deal successively with two types of fear.

Cinema and Moral Decline

The first series of concerns dealt with above (those which derive from a sense of maladjustment of the new teaching tool to the children’s minds) often occur in combination with a set of objections that I have not yet touched upon. More specifically, they coincide with reservations relating to educators’ aversion from entertainment theatres, by then constituting the most important viewing environment for film. In the 1920s and 1930s, the gloomiest of cultural commentators systematically associated cinemas with moral decline. Affected by such tidings, teachers balked at the prospect of welcoming into their schools the medium with which these venues were affiliated.¹⁶⁸ However, few of them seem to have been able to pinpoint the danger’s precise nature or extent.

As a matter of fact, the issue not only confused pedagogues, but cinema opponents more in general. In articles written by objectors, the emphasis wavers from aspects pertaining to the films’ content to the circumstances in which they were shown. On the one hand, authors opposed to the type of productions screened – unserious at the very least, but often also provocative or sexually titillating. The objections they raised were largely the same ones that

had been directed earlier at the more popular genres of literature, music and art. On the other hand, commentators struck out at the sort of activities that cinema visits presumably entailed: drinking, inappropriate physical contact, and even criminal behaviour. Such conditions, it was argued, were inconducive to the ethical upbringing of the young.¹⁶⁹ The general permissiveness which opponents associated with the cinema was in turn related to the fact that the entertainment sector was run by men with purely commercial interests, who tolerated whatever guaranteed them the highest profits.¹⁷⁰ Defenders of religious values in particular (but not exclusively) mercilessly denounced them for their negative moral influence on society at large.¹⁷¹

Amongst those who came up with remedies against this perceived 'moral decline', two main groups can be distinguished. On the one hand, there were commentators who targeted the act of film viewing itself, and saw regulation as the only solution. Again, the rules they proposed either pertained to the type of films that were shown (censorship) or to the circumstances in which viewing took place (supervision of exploitation, sometimes combined with attendance restrictions).¹⁷² On the other hand, there were those who believed that the so-called 'cinema problem' was not inherent to either film making or film viewing, but a result of the way in which moving images had been 'abused' in the course of time. They strongly believed in the uplifting potential of film and thought that 'positive' action was needed: the provision of an alternative to that which commercial entrepreneurs put on screen. The cause of the second group was defended by a variety of (semi-)official associations whose members tended to believe that the promotion of 'superior' productions would help restore the film medium to its 'original' mission or state.¹⁷³

Extreme opponents of the use of film in class had no sympathy whatsoever for the latter's arguments. According to them, the only way in which teachers could help minimise the effects of the so-called 'cinema threat' was by protecting pupils from all exposure to the medium – among others, by banning it from school grounds. The results of studies and questionnaires, which were plentiful at the time, showed that children had no problems whatsoever finding their way to entertainment theatres.¹⁷⁴ Making use of the latest 'fad' in didactic tools, adversaries thought, would only give off a sign of approval. In their opinion, it would encourage youngsters to go to cinemas, instead of bringing attendance figures down.¹⁷⁵

The official reason for this exceptionally repressive attitude was that children were particularly vulnerable to the perils of cinema-going. The frequenting of film theatres was dangerous for everyone, but grown-ups at least were *supposed* to know the difference between right and wrong. Whether or not they acted accordingly, then, was primarily a matter of will-power. Children, in contrast, could not be expected to make moral judgements, because they had not yet reached the age of discretion.¹⁷⁶ Their minds were much more impressionable, and therefore required extra protection from the potentially negative influences of such environments.¹⁷⁷

In my view, however, it is just as likely that pronouncements like these can be related to an unspoken fear of the unknown. Like the so-called 'new media' of every age – but according to some, visual technologies in particular – film terrified teachers, because its (semantic) potential seemed to have no bounds. Educators were aware that the methods for 'decoding' moving images deviated from those that could be applied to other didactic texts. How

exactly the reading process was executed, however, was not known. As a result, teachers had no clue as to how to supervise a film viewing, and above all, as to how to 'steer' the pupils' interpretation of what was seen.¹⁷⁸

As I shall argue later on, a driving force behind this fear was the suspicion that the above situation might lead to a loss of classroom control. Cuban and Saettler both suggest that resistance among teachers towards the introduction of film might be due to a conviction that the use of 'popular' media would have a negative effect on the image of seriousness which they had established over time.¹⁷⁹ I suspect that educators probably also experienced a much more direct threat, which concerned their day-to-day functioning in class. This threat was all the more pertinent to those who understood that the children they taught were much more familiar with the new medium than they were themselves – not only as a technological given, but also as a source of signification.¹⁸⁰ I shall further elaborate on this subject in paragraph 2.1.1.

The Threat of Mechanisation

In my section on psychosocial concerns, I touched upon the argument that the deployment of too many 'machineries' might entail negligence of the so-called 'non-rational' aspects of education: those insights or abilities that can only be passed on through interaction with real, living people. The official explanation, then, was that the mechanical, automatic side of film (or film usage) was harmful primarily for the intended audience, the recipients of schooling. At the same time, however, primary sources also contain evidence of the teachers' own fear of the (as yet) unknown, and therefore, uncontrollable 'robotic' potential of the new classroom tool. A fear, in other words, which seems much more profound than a mere insecurity about their technical (in)competencies.¹⁸¹

In the essay version of a lecture held in 1967, at the dawn of what would later become known as 'computerised instruction', Philip W. Jackson gives an overview of the various manifestations of this anxiety – from the classroom introduction of what he calls 'the humble crystal set' (the earlier versions of wireless technique) to the incorporation of information technologies that were state-of-the-art at the time. His conclusion is that in the instances he quotes, the teachers' fear did not so much concern the possibilities of the machine itself, but rather the so-called 'mechanistic ideology' that advocates of new media supposedly upheld.¹⁸² A crucial ingredient of this ideology was the vision or hope that the use of such automatons might eventually make real teachers obsolete (a prospect that is also hinted at in the poem quoted from at the beginning of this chapter).

Primary sources attest that the threat which film technology posed to the teaching profession as such was strongly felt. In an article in a 1938 issue of the journal *Lichtbeeld en cultuur* (Projected Image and Culture, the periodical of one of Holland's main action groups for the reevaluation of the film medium, bringing together proponents of so-called 'positive action'), Zanen uses some rather revealing imagery:

Often the fear has been expressed that film, once allowed into the school, will show the behaviour of a cuckoo in the nest; and even if it may not succeed in throwing the teacher overboard, it will try to corner him with Hollywood-esque dexterity. We know the power of film and dread its domination. All too often, we see it sit enthroned as a second queen of the earth.¹⁸³

Of course, reactions of this kind were (involuntarily) provoked. The efficiency-crazed enthusiasts of the early decades, after all, had actively promoted a mechanist ideal. Since that time, it had been adopted by the first specialised production and distribution companies, who had turned it into a publicity tool.¹⁸⁴ Because of this, the users' anxiety was extremely hard to expunge (a fact which, it seems, also contributed to the teaching profession's general image of conservatism).¹⁸⁵

Once again, analysts agree that what put teachers off the most was the prospect of losing classroom control. As Cuban points out, advocates of automation projected a shift in the learning process from a communication between educators and pupils to one between students and machines.¹⁸⁶ Further on in this work, I shall argue that the latter situation posed two types of threats to the instructors' authority: first, that of a weakening of their functional classroom power, and second, that of a certain degree of intellectual 'impotence'.¹⁸⁷

Conditions

In as far as it was considered acceptable at all, then, the deployment of film in school was subject to some very strict conditions. Even those who were optimistic about the medium's educational potential rarely expressed their enthusiasm without adding at least some 'buts' and 'ifs'. Pieces that presented arguments in favour of its use most often contained a series of specifications. The reasoning was that if readers took these into account, the risks outlined above could be considerably reduced.

Generally speaking, two types of conditions were laid down. The first variety were textual specifications; stipulations, in other words, that concerned the appearance of the films themselves. One of the sceptics' strongest convictions was that schoolchildren should not be shown the same titles as grown-ups – even if those too could be of a highly informative kind. Youngsters were considered to have a different sort of mind, and the teachers' choice of screening materials should reflect this.¹⁸⁸ Authors therefore took to enumerating rules and standards, which aspiring producers and distributors were encouraged to take into account. In due course, these developed into actual 'benchmarks': criteria for what constituted a good teaching film, and by implication, what did *not*.¹⁸⁹ The second set of conditions concerned aspects of usage: how classroom films should (ideally) be deployed. From a retrospective point of view, the latter kind seem more prominent: publications that refrain from dealing with formal requirements often do mention the medium's 'appropriate' use. In these writings, the impression is given that a film's effectiveness as an educational tool depends primarily on how it is handled.¹⁹⁰

Ultimately, the above recommendations can all be traced back to the same concern: that the use of the medium be made to fit into the established structures of formal education. Of primary importance here was that film should be given the role it was due: that of a tool, a (mere) *means* in the hands of a pedagogue. This purely instrumental function was stressed in the great majority of publications, and considered an absolute condition for the medium's didactic use.¹⁹¹ For those who were opposed to (commercially-organised) off-site projections, it also functioned as an argument in favour of its deployment in schools.¹⁹²

What is remarkable about these conditions is that they show a good deal of continuity – both

geographically and historically. Not only did variations on the same requirements turn up all over the Western world, they were also repeated for decades on end. Even so, variation is noticeable over time. Texts from the 1920s and 1930s (often appearing in pedagogical and film-related journals and magazines) tend to have highly restrictive overtones. Rather than spelling out how things can best be done, they focus on what should above all be *avoided*. In the specialist brochures and monographs from later on, prohibitive rules figure as well, but they gradually become less prominent. Recommendations increasingly take the form of affirmative guidelines, constituting proverbial ‘recipes’ for the medium’s successful use. At the same time, the tone of the advice is more reassuring. The unspoken message here seems to be that if readers do follow the rules, a positive teaching result is likely to ensue.

In my view, the above development can be related to a shift in the authorship of the documents concerned. If the job of formulating the conditions for film production and use was in the hands of (moderate) enthusiasts at first, it was taken over increasingly by parties which depended for their existence on a more than sporadic deployment of the medium; for instance, producers and distributors. Companies that took their educational activities at all seriously advised prospective users in every way they could.¹⁹³ As a rule, however, they did so in more encouraging ways than their predecessors.

In chapter 1.2, I shall explore in more detail the recommendations that were made in publications of this kind. Using examples relating to the Dutch NOF, I shall consider the specific production conditions and user advice that were laid down. First, however, I need to say some more about the nature of these writings, and their difference in status from the articles and leaflets that were brought out in earlier decades.

Formalisation and Appropriation

The two most popular types of post-war publications were classroom film manuals and so-called ‘teachers’ notes’. The first, which appeared in book-form, provided general advice; presumably, their purpose was to bring together the recommendations which up until then had been distributed in a more unorganised form. Most of these manuals contained overviews of the different kinds of film available, provided pedagogical guidelines for its use, and gave practical tips as to the choice, purchase and operation of projection equipment. Sometimes, they also contained a brief history of the medium and its didactic application. Although their number increased as the educational use of film got institutionalised, they had by then been in existence for quite a while.¹⁹⁴ Producers and distributors in the 1940s therefore had to compete for the audience’s attention with the authors of independent guides.¹⁹⁵

Teachers’ notes (in Dutch, *instructieboekjes*; in German, *Beihefte*; in French, often simply called *notices explicatives*) were either small booklets or leaflets, which were distributed with the films themselves.¹⁹⁶ Each brochure or sheet documented a specific title, although most of them reiterated some of the more general user guidelines as well. For the films which they accompanied, they provided details pertaining to length, subject area and intended audience. In addition to this, they gave overviews of content and structure, contained some factual background information (often highlighting relevant vocabulary), and specified related tasks and/or added a short bibliography. In the case of sound films, they sometimes also contained a transcript of the voice-over commentary. Apart from serving as a concrete

starting point for the preparation of a lesson, they were meant to help teachers in their search for appropriate films.¹⁹⁷

The second type of publications in particular need to be interpreted as a token of, perhaps even as a step towards, the institutionalisation of film as an educational tool. By systematising the provision of user advice in the form of teachers' notes, the parties responsible subscribed to an age-old tradition of assisting users in the deployment of didactic aids. The editors' choice for a recognisable format – for after all, a similar sort of instructions were also provided with *other* teaching tools – helped create an impression of solidity and reliability, and thus, bestowed (didactic) legitimacy onto the film medium itself.¹⁹⁸

What seems to have taken place here, in other words, is some kind of formalisation: the moulding into a definite shape of a practice – in this case, one of advising and regulating – that had been in existence for a considerable period of time. The benefit to users was that it could give them a sense of security. The promise of a practical didactic guide accompanying each new item gave them the reassurance that they would never have to face the challenge of using films unassisted.¹⁹⁹ Meanwhile, those responsible for the booklets' contents set some sort of standard, thus making the implicit promise that they would produce *at least* the same quality in every issue they subsequently released.

At the same time, however, the publication of such books and leaflets should also be seen as a form of appropriation. After all, the taking over of an advisory/regulatory task by a party that could gain by it materially necessarily coincided with a shift in the function of the practice as such. The same rules that first served as a means of reducing the dangers which the deployment of film supposedly entailed subsequently did precisely the opposite: they helped demonstrate the tool's efficiency – and therefore, once again, the legitimacy of its use. So even if those sources, by taking over the advice that was given previously by (moderate) sceptics, seem to have fundamentally supported the latter's view, they ultimately also served the purpose of *subverting* the reservations on which those very recommendations were based.

As a last remark on this subject, I should add that the difference between the two 'generations' of publications distinguished here – and more specifically, their respective conditions of authorship – are not always as well-delineated as I may have implied. For instance, of the three main sources that I shall rely on in paragraph 1.2, only one can be considered an actual 'mouthpiece' for the distributor whose activities it promoted; the others' statuses are much more unclear. One of these books was written by an ardent teaching film enthusiast, who also supported the initiatives of NOF. Yet although the manual did get an official endorsement, its author was not (materially) linked to the institute – at least, not at the time of its writing. The second publication in turn was conceived by a member of staff, but sources attest that the ideas it expressed were not accepted by all his fellow employees.²⁰⁰ Even so, both handbooks strongly encourage more intensive teaching film use. Therefore, it can be assumed that the responsible authors had at least something to gain by the continued existence of the agency.²⁰¹

1.2 The Teaching Film: Institutionalisation

In the first half of this chapter, I have argued that the information and propaganda policies of governments in the early forties greatly contributed to the expansion of the non-theatrical film circuit, and that this in turn affected the supply of material for educational use. Both in Europe and the United States, war-time events helped lay the (infrastructural) basis for much more professionally organised networks for the provision of audio-visual aids to schools. For the first time in history, political leaders with an interest in the matter were actually in a position to facilitate the deployment of film for teaching. By repurposing already existing structures and institutions, the authorities of towns, states and countries could fulfil the practical conditions for the medium's educational use, in turn encouraging commercial entrepreneurs to engage in the production of specialist films.

Despite the fact that not all governments made this choice, I think it is reasonable to conclude that the immediate post-war period is marked by a general tendency towards institutionalisation. Throughout the Western world, agencies were set up to coordinate (and in a few places monopolise) the production and supply of film for education.²⁰² In most cases, these bodies received some form of support from the state, financial and/or logistical. Their success in bringing films to schools depended on a range of factors: not only the diligence or practical insight of the responsible administrators but also the extent to which their services were publicised, and at least as important, the enthusiasm of the users themselves. Even without precise usage rates to rely on, it is safe to say that from that time onwards, an increasing number of teachers in an ever expanding geographical area were at least given the *opportunity* to deploy the medium in class.

Although the Second World War was an important turning point in this respect, the institutionalisation of film as a teaching tool did not happen overnight. As far as infrastructure for distribution and screening is concerned, some crucial conditions had indeed been fulfilled – in terms of know-how if not in actual fact. In many locations, however, few suitable films were as yet available, because purpose-production still had not taken root.²⁰³ From the second half of the 1940s, this situation gradually got remedied. As the quantities of useable titles increased, so did the numbers of distribution channels and their respective subdivisions. With some delay, a rise also took place in the amount of play-back equipment in schools.²⁰⁴ This trend continued until the later 1950s, when stagnation occurred, most likely because of a combination of market saturation and the (anticipated) ascent of newer audio-visual aids.²⁰⁵

When considered in an international context, the Dutch NOF stands out as a textbook example of the above tendency. Making their first moves during the Second World War, the institute's founders immediately capitalised on the recent proliferation of film as an instrument of information and persuasion. In those years, of course, resources for education were limited; Holland's head start in terms of the medium's actual use in schools therefore was minimal. In the longer run, however, the country's teachers definitely benefited from the timing of NOF's establishment. In his article on the institute's early years, Hogenkamp points out that the German occupation provided an ideal opportunity for the forging of a centrally organised, government-funded body handling the production and distribution of classroom films. After the war, the foundation managed to maintain a connection with the state, and

thus, to further expand its services within the relative security of a (semi-)official enterprise.²⁰⁶

Due to the conditions of its emergence, NOF constitutes a particularly useful, because exemplary, historical 'case'. Not only does it stand out for the almost symbolical timing of its establishment – a timing which, I suggested, underscores the relation between the institutionalisation of teaching films and developments in the non-theatrical film sector in those days – but also for its double organisational structure. Like many of its foreign counterparts, NOF was supported by the government only up to a certain degree. While the Ministry of Education fully endorsed the institute's activities, the financial implications of this arrangement were rather limited. After the war, the foundation's funding was scaled down, and had to be supplemented with contributions from subscribing schools. Therefore, also NOF's existence depended on the enthusiasm of its users in a very direct way (not just in terms of how it justified the investment of tax revenues).²⁰⁷

In the next few paragraphs, I shall explore the process of teaching film institutionalisation through practices and ideas related to the Dutch institute. First, in chapter 1.2.1, I shall briefly outline the foundation's structure and day-to-day operation. After a short preamble on its organisation, I shall focus more closely on some of the procedures which it developed over time. The latter primarily concern the ways in which NOF communicated with (prospective) users, and thus, tried to influence their attitude towards both its activities and the products which it supplied. In my view, such practices may also be taken as evidence of the foundation's attempts to accelerate the educational institutionalisation of the film medium itself.

Next, I shall deal with matters of regulation. As I explained earlier, the formulation of conditions for the production and use of classroom film was an important part of the distributors' attempts to demonstrate its legitimacy as an educational tool, and thereby, of their own efforts in bringing it to schools. One purpose of the abovementioned procedures was to ensure an efficient communication of the institute's rules and standards; a consideration of NOF's routines therefore constitutes a first step towards uncovering how this justification process worked. At least as important, however, is an evaluation of the conditions themselves – my objective in chapter 1.2.2.

Fully in line with the tendencies I mentioned before, the rules which NOF laid down can be divided into two groups. On the one hand, books and brochures edited by the institute contain prescripts as to the content and form of the film material itself; specifications that are conceived of as 'benchmarks' for the production and identification of (good) audio-visual tools. On the other hand, NOF's publications spell out how the medium should be used. Ultimately, however, both types of rules can be considered to serve the same basic purpose: to control the users' conception of teaching films as such. In fact, the conditions made all highlight their inherent specificity. The first do so by stressing the distinction with other (*non-educational*) audio-visual texts; the second by insisting on their (functional) relatedness to a given pedagogical exchange.

In addition, paragraph 1.2.2 will also give a first impression of the sort of films which NOF supplied. In the course of time, the institute's collection expanded considerably, not only quantitatively, but also in the textual sense. Over the years, the films it distributed both addressed an increasingly wide range of subjects and integrated a greater variety of (audio-)

visual techniques. I shall trace this historical development, providing both NOF's justification and, where necessary, my own interpretation of its claims.

As a last preliminary remark, I want to stress that in what follows, I shall not discuss actual teaching film *use*. Although the sources I consider do contain instructions on how NOF's material had to be employed, they do not provide concrete evidence of compliance with those rules. In my view, the specifications which the institute laid down may well reveal something about the attitude of the people to whom they were addressed. A hypothesis on this matter, however, will be given in chapter 2.

1.2.1 NOF: Organisation and Procedures

In early 1940s Holland, the idea of establishing a more or less permanent structure for the screening of films for schoolchildren was not unprecedented. About two decades before, a number of Dutch towns had introduced so-called 'school cinemas' (*schoolbioscopen*): municipal film theatres where local pupils gathered to watch specially compiled programmes. Some of those venues had purely educational purposes; others were regular cinemas, used during off-peak hours.²⁰⁸ Whichever was the case, screenings always took place on a central location in town, which required that pupils left their familiar classrooms. In the eyes of many teachers, this was a reason for concern. First, because relocation necessarily caused undue loss of time. And second, because children were likely to get restless – a mindset inconducive to learning from what was shown. In addition to this, such trips supposedly cleared the way for visits to cinemas of a non-educational kind, and consequently, the unspeakable conducts they were thought to induce.²⁰⁹

Another objection which educators raised concerned the nature and composition of the programmes shown. In most cases, school cinemas screened compilations: about 90 minutes' worth of shorts, usually of a broadly informational kind. Because of this, viewings could never be made to fit with the teachers' own lessons, or the logic and structure of the wider curriculum.²¹⁰ The films themselves, moreover, were often condemned as unfit for the purposes they served. Produced for a general audience, they were judged to be too long and too detail-ridden for 'underdeveloped' minds. In addition to this, the bulk of the information they conveyed was considered irrelevant to young children, and above all, unrelated to what they learnt in school. This made for a didactically unacceptable situation, which the designated film lecturers – well-intentioned, but pedagogically inexperienced – could not remedy.²¹¹

For most parties, the only solution to the above problems was a system which involved *purpose-produced* films that were shown *on school grounds*. In the 1920s, this set-up was still unattainable, because it posed practical problems that could not yet be overcome. With 35mm as the standard gauge, the fire hazard, rental cost and lack of technical expertise were insurmountable obstacles.²¹² By the early 1940s, however, this situation had changed. In those years, what was needed above all was a feasible, practicable plan and a benevolent government. Incidentally (and ironically), the occupation provided both of these things.²¹³

Organisation

The Dutch NOF was modelled directly after its German counterpart, the Reichsanstalt für Film

und Bild in Wissenschaft und Unterricht (RWU, previously known as RfdU). In the first half of this chapter, I pointed out that the latter body was a shining example for visual instructionists elsewhere. For most admirers, RWU's main asset was its tight, professional organisation: the structure of national, regional and local offices through which supply and demand were attuned. Most of its proponents recognised that such a system was sustainable only with back-up from the state. One of them was A. A. Schoevers, NOF's founding director.²¹⁴ Yet unlike his fellow enthusiasts abroad, the Dutchman actually managed to establish a similar institution at home. Taking advantage of the circumstances of the war, he got in touch with administrators of RWU, making them lobby for support with representatives of the occupying force.²¹⁵

During the war years, NOF operated as a dependency of the Ministry of Education, Arts and Science. Until the mid-1940s, it was entirely government-funded. In addition to this, it had a *de facto* monopoly: it was the only body schools were allowed to rent films from.²¹⁶ Later on, the market was liberated, which meant that other providers could enter the business as well. Even so, the institute still had a considerable advantage. First, because it continued to receive (some) money from the state. However little this was, it entailed that the foundation could operate on a larger scale than its rivals. And second, because its (semi-)official status seems to have endowed it with a certain amount of credibility. If the sale of lantern slides and filmstrips for education was a more or less competitive business at the time, film rental was not, because most relevant publications referred their readers to one and the same address.²¹⁷

Structure

As far as distribution is concerned, NOF can be seen as a perfect scale model of its German counterpart. Like RWU, the institute was a layered organisation. At the top of its hierarchy stood a head office, which collected data on the types of film and amounts of copies and equipment required. Next, there were a number of so-called 'Provincial Offices' (*Provinciale Centrales*). Each of those administered the transport of materials for a given district (a section of the Dutch territory) and passed on its needs to the NOF headquarters.²¹⁸ The actual dispatch of films was done by Local Offices (*Locale Centrales*) which were manned by unpaid volunteers, usually teachers.²¹⁹ Each of these local branches in turn catered to up to six schools, which were located in each other's vicinity. This way, institutions that did not yet own projectors could also share hardware provided by NOF.²²⁰

With respect to production and acquisition, the institute was actually *more* self-sufficient than its German example. In an effort to distance itself from the practices of the school cinemas of previous decades, NOF proclaimed that the making of teaching films should never be left to commercial enterprise. If the objective of production was profit-making, it argued, the interests at stake could not be purely didactic. The institute therefore decreed that all films, whichever educational level they were intended for, should be made in-house.²²¹ It held this position until the early 1950s, when it first began to openly acquire items that had been produced elsewhere (in the early years, titles released by foreign educational providers; later also materials from non-specialised companies). On the rare occasions that it *did* act as an intermediary for the rental of titles from third parties, it warned its users accordingly, and explicitly asked them to make up for the didactic 'shortcomings' of the material concerned.²²²

The actual production of teaching films was handled by two different departments. In the first decade of NOF, the head office had a three-part structure, consisting of a Distribution Section (*Dienst Organisatie*, later called *Distributieafdeling*), an Educational Section (*Onderwijsafdeling*) and a Technical Service (*Technische Dienst*, later also known as *Opnamedienst*, Recording Section).²²³ The tasks of those working in the Distribution Section were primarily logistical: closely cooperating with the Provincial Offices, they kept track of the (material) needs of the various districts, solved practical problems relating to transport and circulation and set strategies for the films' introduction into schools. The making of the films themselves was the shared duty of the Educational Section and the Technical Service. In the early years in particular, each had its own, well-delineated responsibilities. While staff in the first department determined the films' topics and wrote scripts, those in the second did everything practical: shooting and editing, but also producing the prints that were sent out. The Educational Section, in other words, was the site of all decisions pertaining to the films' content and form; the task of the Technical Service was to realise the former's ideas.²²⁴

Employees

The above divide in NOF's production activities had a direct consequence for its choice of employees. The Educational Section, on the one hand, was staffed with people with pedagogical backgrounds: teachers and various 'contacts' of the inspectors of schools. The Recording Section, on the other, was populated with technicians: men with experience in film making, or if not, a strong interest in the matter.²²⁵ The heads of department as well were recruited from these seemingly unrelated fields. The manager of the Educational Section (sometimes also called 'pedagogical leader') was required to have good knowledge of, and experience with, the organisation of the Dutch teaching world; the first man appointed to the job had been recommended by the then Secretary General of the Ministry.²²⁶ The head of the Technical Service, on the contrary, was expected primarily to be "fully informed [...] of film making and everything that relates to it". The first person who took on this function was a well-known small gauge amateur.²²⁷

By entrusting different tasks to people with different backgrounds, NOF implicitly attached value judgements to the respective activities which they carried out. The institute's official viewpoint was that classroom films were intended above all to teach children something; the successfulness of its productions therefore depended primarily on their suitability as didactic tools. How polished or artistic they looked was a matter of lesser significance (an argument that was sometimes also used to justify the films' slightly 'boring' mien). The pedagogues' contribution to the production process, therefore, was given a greater weight than that of the technical staff.²²⁸ In my opinion, NOF's attitude in the matter, which it also communicated to the outside world, should be seen as an attempt to assure teachers of the didactic fitness of the material it rented out. Apparently, the institute tried to please its users by placing the main responsibility for the making of classroom films in the hands of those who were, theoretically at least, in the best position to know their concerns.²²⁹

In the early 1950s, NOF also became subject to a different type of divide, this time of a confessional nature. In the period the institute was set up, socio-cultural life in the Netherlands was organised along denominational lines (as a result of the so-called *verzuiling*; literally: 'pillarisation'). In

practice, this meant that Protestants, Catholics and 'others' all had their own institutions – not only political parties and trade unions, but also schools and universities, newspapers and radio stations.²³⁰ Although NOF was a neutral institution at first (i.e. one supervised only by the state), this situation simply could not last. In the late 1940s, the foundation's board of governors was remodelled so as to include representatives of the three lobbies; in 1952, it was split up altogether.²³¹ For the users, the changes were minimal; internally, however, processes became more complex. From that time onwards, all the institute's activities were subject to the consent of three parties. Whenever a representative of one of those disapproved of a production plan, a compromise had to be found.²³²

Procedures

Schools that subscribed to NOF's services (mostly institutes of primary education, catering to children between six and twelve) were required to pay a fixed sum, based on the number of pupils attending.²³³ Subsequently, they could borrow films on a weekly basis. Institutions that also made use of the foundation's projectors had to adapt to the rotation schedules that applied. Upon subscription, member schools received publications that informed them on the contents of the collection: issues of NOF's newsletter (*Mededelingen van de Nederlandse Onderwijs Film*) which discussed recent and forthcoming titles, and later also more extensive catalogues. In addition to this, they were sent copies of teachers' notes for new or soon to be released films. In combination, these writings could help them choose the items that were most suited to their specific (didactic) needs.²³⁴

Permits and Courses

Although payment of the subscription dues entitled member schools to make use of NOF's services, the actual hiring of material was conditional upon proof of their staffs' familiarity with the institute's basic principles. Teachers who wished to show films needed a user permit (*Gebruiksvergunning*). This document served as evidence of both their projection skills and their knowledge of, and compliance with, the foundation's didactic rules. It could only be obtained upon successful completion of a number of test lessons. The latter in turn were considered to demonstrate a candidate's acquaintance with NOF's principle guidelines and his ability to put those into practice. The amount of prints a school could hire per week stood in direct relation to the number of 'competent' teachers it employed.²³⁵

One way in which educators could prepare for the necessary qualifications was by following a course. Over the years, NOF organised a variety of those – some for experienced teachers, others for trainees in colleges. At first, following one was compulsory: a necessity for those who wished to obtain a user permit. Later on, as the number of subscription increased, attendance could no longer be enforced. In addition to this, the content of the courses changed. From the 1950s onwards, they dealt more and more often with aspects of moving image production and signification – the sorts of topics that collectively became known at the time as 'film education'.²³⁶

Dissemination of Information

If the institute required such dedication from its subscribers, it had to make sure that they were thoroughly informed of the ideas which it upheld. Dissemination was the task of the institute's

consultants, who visited schools to give user advice.²³⁷ In addition to this, NOF also edited books and brochures. In the early years, when the resources were still scarce, the foundation's newsletters constituted the main channel of information. In addition to descriptions of the latest productions, they featured more lengthy articles, often concerning the 'appropriate use' of teaching films. In 1943, the first official manual was published: *Het paedagogisch en didactisch gebruik van de film bij het lager onderwijs: Leidraad voor kwekelingen* (The pedagogical and didactic use of film in primary education: Guidelines for trainee teachers). In this book, deputy director C. Schreuder gives an overview of the classroom film's most characteristic features, and spells out how it should be used. A very succinct version of these guidelines can also be found in the instruction booklets that came with the prints.²³⁸ Later on, another handbook was brought out; this time by primary school headmaster J. J. van der Meulen, a more distant relation of the institute.

These newsletters, instruction booklets and manuals often have a highly patronising tone. Although their authors (in most cases, employees of NOF's Educational Section) do seem to value the readers' pedagogical experience *in principle*, this does not prevent them from stating what are clearly didactic self-evidences.²³⁹ Above all, they show very little faith in the teachers' ability to apply and adapt what they already know. In addition to this, the advice they give is often phrased in a rather commanding way. The second tendency in particular suggests that NOF hoped that the publications it edited might help control the classroom conduct of its users, just like the permits and courses were supposed to do. A hypothesis on the rationale behind this strategy will be formulated in chapter 2.1.1.²⁴⁰

Acquisition of Information

However, NOF's writings are not unequivocally imperative. From time to time, the institute also inquired into the teachers' own wishes and demands; for instance, by means of surveys. In most cases, the questions asked concerned the respondents' user habits (for example, to which age groups they showed the films), the merits of the medium (its perceived educational value, especially in comparison with other tools) and potential areas of criticism (such as, how the contents of instruction booklets might be improved). In addition to this, the institute also conducted tests. In most cases, these were classroom experiments, designed to optimise the quality of the products which it supplied.²⁴¹

At first sight, both forms of information gathering seem to indicate a genuine and selfless curiosity about the reception of the institute's teaching films by the professionals it addressed. On a more profound level, however, the situation is more complex. In my view, NOF's inquiries were inspired also by its own interests. After all, the foundation's activities were made possible in part by the contributions of subscribers; therefore, it was imperative that the latter were at least given the *impression* that their voices were heard. However, it is not always clear in retrospect which lessons the institute learnt from the data it collected, or how it implemented its findings. As time went by, NOF's representatives even began to admit that the results of the research they carried out were limited, and that many decisions were actually taken on a trial-and-error basis.²⁴² In addition to this, the information they obtained tended to be of a highly instrumental nature: it was aimed primarily at providing a more successful product, and thus, boosting the foundation's membership.

A second remark that should be made is that NOF had a rather conservative take on what constituted (a film's) didactic effectiveness. This attitude contrasts sharply with the image of pedagogical progressivism which it cultivated as well. Like producers elsewhere, the institute insisted that the use of teaching films tied in seamlessly with the most up-to-date insights of educational science – and more in particular, (reformist) ideas on the functions of the senses and the different kinds of knowledge which they can help obtain.²⁴³ However, while the foundation clearly exploited the film medium's reputation as a 'modern' teaching tool, its own programme of data collection was a rather traditionalist one. For instance, when testing a class' reponse to a new title, surveyors tended to concentrate on the amounts of factual information children had memorised. By the same token, NOF was only satisfied with the outcomes of its research if they indicated that pupils were able to reproduce sufficiently large numbers of verifiable facts.²⁴⁴ Again, the inference can be made that in doing so, it aimed to win over the teachers it addressed – people who presumably were less sensitive to progressivist ideals than the authors or instigators of educational policies.²⁴⁵

1.2.2 NOF: Rules and Regulations

In what precedes, I have explained that the school cinema system of the twenties and thirties was heavily criticised by teachers and educational scientists. From its inception, NOF capitalised on this controversy, and insisted that its own product provided solutions to the problems that had risen at the time. One of the institute's main selling points was that the films it distributed were made to fit 'naturally' into the course of everyday classroom proceedings. Produced with an audience of pupils in mind, they contained only relevant information, and used formats that were adapted to the children's (limited) cognitive abilities. In order to convey this message to its users, NOF drew up lists of 'benchmarks': criteria that helped readers make the distinction between 'good' teaching films and items that were considered unfit for use in schools.

At the same time, the institute emphasised that the quality of the material it provided could not be dissociated from the conditions of its use. Like film proponents elsewhere, NOF argued that a title's didactic effectiveness depended to a considerable extent on how it was deployed. No matter how well a film was made, a teacher's mistakes could easily annihilate its dormant value. In order to avoid this, users had to be given plenty of advice. In the forties in particular, the recommendations made were highly specific: guidelines concerned not only the basic principles of teaching with film, but also the precise place, timing and frequency of screenings and accompanying activities. Like the textual properties mentioned above, they were normally communicated via the pages of instruction booklets and user guides.

In what follows, I shall deal with both types of rules successively: first the benchmarks, then the user advice. Earlier on, I explained that the sources I scrutinise here always served a double purpose: they were meant not only to inform readers, but also to legitimise NOF's activities. Therefore, the statements they make should be seen as a record of the self image the institute wished to promote – not as a reliable source on what it actually *did*. More specifically, there seems to be a discrepancy between the production ideals the foundation advocated and the sorts of films it brought out. Whenever this divergence is particularly acute, I shall point it out in my overview. Doing so shall also help me sketch a (rough) first picture of the textual

range of the material which the institute supplied.²⁴⁶

Benchmarks

As a rule, NOF publications discriminate between rules pertaining to the choice of film topics, and the way in which content is presented (formal requirements). In what follows, I shall use this distinction as an organisational guide. In addition to this, I shall structure my account chronologically. NOF's policies, but also its output, evolved considerably during the two decades which my overview covers. Throughout this paragraph, I shall highlight the changes that took place.

Film Topics

In what precedes, I explained that in the early decades of last century, film's main asset to education was considered to be its capacity to 'liven up' the teacher's argument: the fact that it gave pupils the chance to catch a glimpse of the (real) world that lay *beyond* the words he said. Several decades later, NOF still held this view. A 1955 issue of its newsletter claims "that there is no better means [than film] to broaden the pupils' fields of vision and to open up the windows of the classroom, figuratively speaking, to the diverse richness of life that unfolds outside the school walls".²⁴⁷

Like colleagues elsewhere, the institute's representatives argued that the medium should serve above all as an instrument of visualisation. More specifically, it had to help children see things they did not know from their own experience; for instance, faraway sights, or phenomena invisible to the naked eye. Films, in other words, should act as aids to the children's imagination. This way, lesson topics that would otherwise remain abstract could be brought to life.²⁴⁸

Facts and Figures

An immediate consequence of this view was that the medium was associated with a rather specific range of lesson topics. In previous decades, visual instructionists had argued that film was particularly useful as an aid to the teaching of the so-called *zaakvakken*: subjects which involved the study of facts and figures (for instance, geography, economy or biology) rather than the acquisition of practical or logical skills (such as, language or mathematics). *Leidraad voor kwekelingen*, NOF's official manual, endorses this standpoint. Classroom films, it says, should devote themselves to describing 'the various parts of the earth' in relation to their respective 'natural and artistic products'.²⁴⁹ The titles of films that came out in the institute's first few years – for example, *Giethoorn **, *Veluwe I* and *De Kieviet* (The lapwing) in 1942; *Bloembollenteelt* (Bulb cultivation), *Kaas ** (Cheese) and *Glas* (Glass) in or around 1943 – suggest that this principle also functioned as a guideline for production.²⁵⁰

However, NOF was not quite as strict in its subject policy as some of the film proponents of earlier years. For instance, the institute thought that moving images could also serve the purpose of language education. While not a suitable means for the teaching of rules (the principles of spelling, grammar or style) film could help stimulate verbal expression, written as well as spoken. *Leidraad voor kwekelingen* argues that the medium's main value for language instruction lies in the fact that it encourages pupils to formulate thoughts and ideas. Because they are confronted with purely visual representations, children are forced to relate actions

and events in their own words – rather than to simply repeat what they have already heard.²⁵¹ The first such films, often relating purely fictional events, were released in 1947.

In spite of this, NOF as well maintained that some topics could not benefit from cinematic treatment at all. Arithmetic, for instance, did not make good subject matter for teaching films. Nor did physics – unless perhaps to demonstrate how science could help solve real-life problems.²⁵² In the first decade of the institute, then, few such titles were released. Other curriculum areas did provide filmable ingredients, but the production of relevant titles was not (yet) considered feasible. History teaching, for example, definitely required the activation of the children's imagination, and therefore was a good subject field in theory. However, the making of pictures set in the past, involving large quantities of actors, locations and props, was deemed too expensive for quite some time.²⁵³

'Civics'

By the early 1950s, however, NOF's topical range had extended considerably. Although biology and geography titles still formed the bulk of what was brought out, catalogues show that apart from mathematics, nearly all curriculum subjects were dealt with in the films that were released.²⁵⁴ Around that time, the institute's own pronouncements on the matter also became less restrictive. Newsletter articles and specialised monographs now focused on the medium's potential with respect to the various subject areas – much rather than on what could or should *not* be done. Overall, the foundation's production policy became more liberal.

One cluster of subjects that were introduced at the time were those which the institute collectively designated (in Dutch) as *civics*. Films within this category were meant to provide "a formative insight [...] into the social, economic and cultural structure of society".²⁵⁵ Their topics ranged from national and international political organisation (*Verkiezingen voor de Tweede Kamer*, 1957, Elections for the Lower House) to safety and personal hygiene (*Veilig fietsen*, [ca. 1955], Safe cycling; *Onze tanden*, [ca. 1956], Our teeth). The films showed scenes of responsible (social) conduct, and aimed to influence the audience's behaviour accordingly.²⁵⁶

When compared to similar institutions elsewhere, NOF was rather slow in releasing titles of this kind. Prior to 1950, the social and ethical aspects of education were dealt with on film, but usually as part of texts that were meant to function as aids to the teaching of more 'established' lesson subjects, such as Dutch language. Items intended for speaking or writing practice (for instance, *Helpers in nood*, [ca. 1948], Helpers in times of emergency) or economic geography classes (*Vuilnis van een grote stad*, 1943, Waste of a big city) often carry a moral lesson.²⁵⁷ However, none of these films openly lecture children on how they should behave, or which role they should fulfil within society at large. At the time, titles that did were already quite common abroad. In the US, for instance, 'social guidance' (or 'mental hygiene') films had become hugely popular immediately after the Second World War. Dutch schools, in contrast, did not yet have access to audio-visual aids of this kind.²⁵⁸

In my view, this fact is a result of the way in which Dutch society was organised, rather than of a lack of interest in such topics in pedagogical circles. In the decades prior to the establishment of the institute, I have pointed out, the role of schools in the teaching of social values had become widely recognised. In the Netherlands, however, this task was considered to belong

strictly to the domain of the so-called 'pillars' – the three denominational factions into which society had effectively been split up. By the same token, the only organisations that were entrusted with the treatment of value-laden subjects were those with a clear (confessional) slant.²⁵⁹ NOF, at first, positioned itself *outside* of this divide – as opposed to the schools it catered to. Because of this, it had less authority when it came to moral issues. Taking this fact into account, it probably thought it safer to steer away from matters concerning the children's upbringing. Later on, when the institute had been 'pillarised', the production of *civics* titles was still subject to much internal debate; in the end, however, a compromise between the parties' representatives could always be found.²⁶⁰

'Ambitious' subjects

Around the same time, NOF had also become a lot more open to the possibility of distributing films that were made elsewhere. In the early years, the institute's staff had judged material from foreign producers rather harshly, usually for the (supposedly) 'inferior' educational principles on which they were based.²⁶¹ In accordance with this verdict, it had barely distributed such films at all. By the first half of the 1950s, this changed, and NOF began to acquire at least as many films as it made itself. In addition to this, the institute also became an active affiliate of the International Council for Educational Film (ICEF), a European-funded organisation which encouraged cooperation and exchange between (15 to 20) member states. In the institute's publications, objections to non-home-made materials were no longer raised.²⁶²

An immediate consequence of this development was that from then on, NOF could also distribute materials which it was unable to produce – whether for financial reasons, or through lack of expertise. This was relevant for instance in the case of astronomy films. Very often, such titles contained a good deal of animated sequences, which were both expensive and cumbersome to make. If the institute could manage the simple effects of its own regional and economic geography films, it could not yet handle those necessary for the representation of (inter)planetary movements.²⁶³ Therefore, titles like *Sterren en Sterrensystemen* (1962, *Stars and Stellar Systems*) had to be purchased abroad (in this particular case, from the German FWU, RWU's successor for Western Germany).²⁶⁴ Another category of films that were acquired rather than produced were those intended for foreign language teaching. Items of this type entered the collection from the late 1950s onwards – a few years after the institute had released its first films with sound. An early example of this is the British-made series *La famille Martin* (The Martin family, produced by Basic Films for the Educational Foundation for Visual Aids).²⁶⁵

International collaboration not only encouraged the exchange of prints, it also allowed AV institutes worldwide to make more 'high-profile' films. ICEF set up joint production programmes, which usually resulted in the release of series on specific themes. For NOF, this created an opportunity for the production of titles with a historical slant. Films such as *Antoni van Leeuwenhoek*² (1959, part of the series *History of Science*) or *Erasmus, stem van de rede* (1961, Erasmus, the voice of reason, a contribution to a sequence on *Great Europeans*) could not have been made without the Council's support.²⁶⁶

Film Education

In the first decade of its existence, NOF placed great emphasis on the necessity of a close

connection between film subjects and the teaching programme. Like the school cinema opponents of previous decades, the institute insisted that what pupils were shown should seamlessly tie in with what they normally learnt in class.²⁶⁷ This position first came under serious review in the early 1950s, when Jan Marie L. Peters took charge of the institute.

In Peters' view, the films' relation to the curriculum did matter, but should not be the makers' primary concern. In his 1954 publication *Visueel onderwijs: over de grondslagen van het gebruik van de film en de filmstrip in het onderwijs* (1954, *Visual education: On the foundations of the use of film and filmstrip in teaching*), he writes:

In our opinion, it is [...] more important to consider the way in which a child takes in and digests subject matter, than to make sure that the films and strips on offer are in keeping with what the curriculum prescribes. One of the main requirements for a systematic application of visual aids is to familiarise the pupils with the tools themselves.²⁶⁸

Unlike his predecessors, Peters was not primarily a pedagogue, but a media scholar. A few years prior to his appointment as director of the institute, he had obtained a doctoral degree in film studies – the first in this field in the Netherlands.²⁶⁹ In his dissertation, Peters takes a semiotic stance: he argues that visual images should be conceived of as signs, which, just like words, are part of a language (in the linguistic/psychological sense of the term). Films, therefore, make use of conventions: rules that help viewers figure out what is meant. Although these rules may be easier to understand than those of verbal language, no one is able to decipher them at first sight. Film viewing, in other words, is a skill that should be taught – to the public in general, but to young viewers in particular.²⁷⁰

Like many cultural critics at the time, the NOF director was convinced that moving images appeal to the senses more directly than verbal discourse, and that they therefore involve the danger of bypassing the intellect. Unlike some of his contemporaries, however, Peters denied that watching film is necessarily a passive process.²⁷¹ Kohnstamm, the influential pedagogue who was also one of Peters' predecessors at the institute, had argued earlier that an overload of sensory stimulation could fixate young viewers in what he called a 'primitive' cognitive stage. Films that targeted an audience of children therefore had to be short, have a logical structure, and contain a single strand of thought. Only in this way, he thought, those viewers could be expected to move on from mere perception to thorough, analytical thinking.²⁷² For Peters, in contrast, such arguments no longer made sense. In his opinion, modern man had simply been overtaken by the new medium, and never learnt properly how films should be 'read'. The task of (visual) education was to put this situation right.²⁷³

According to the author, there were two ways in which this could be done. On the one hand, spectators had to be taught the meanings and functions of moving images through the study of sample films. In this process, complexity should not be shunned – although working in 'stages' was definitely advisable. On the other hand, education had to instil into the public the virtue of discernment: a readiness to judge (moving) images in a critical way. Eventually, the NOF-director argued, the development of a sound judgement in the audience would help advance the state of film culture itself.²⁷⁴

Peters, in other words, was the first person at the institute who openly declared himself in favour of so-called 'film education'. While earlier spokesmen had argued that in a school

context, the medium could be no more than a *tool* (i.e., a means to pass on predetermined lesson content), he was convinced that it should be a *subject* of teaching as well. In a wider cultural circle, Peters' ideas had quite some supporters. Since the second half of the 1930s, organisations had been set up that disseminated the same message – first Catholic associations (for instance, Katholieke Film Actie, KFA, and Instituut Film en Jeugd, which translates as 'Institute for Film and Youth'); later also Protestant ones (Christelijke Film Actie, CEFA).²⁷⁵ The idea behind such initiatives was that the over-consumption of entertainment films, and by the same token, the moral decline this was considered to cause, could only be counteracted if people were directed towards 'better' alternatives. Since films of this kind generally required more mental exertion, the appetite for them had to be stimulated in an active way. One channel for doing this was formal education.²⁷⁶

Of course, if teachers were expected to instruct children on how film should be viewed, they first had to possess the relevant skills themselves. In many cases, however, adults did not have contact with the medium quite as often as the pupils whom they cared for; as a result, they still approached it with a good deal of scepticism. In order to make up for this, the various organisations that promoted film education also organised conferences, trainings, and workshops for teaching personnel.²⁷⁷ In the later 1950s, NOF joined their ranks. In its newsletter, it published a series of articles on moving image analysis and reviews of books on film history and art. Around that time, it also set up its first course on film education in schools.²⁷⁸

Although his policy was not supported by all NOF's employees, Peters did set in motion an evolution that could not be reversed. After his resignation in 1956, film education remained an important area of focus.²⁷⁹ One symptom of this development was that the collection was supplemented with relevant titles. In the later 1950s, the institute made a start with the distribution of items that documented the film production process (*Hoe ontstaat een filmscene*, [1956], The genesis of a film scene; *Filmmontage*, 1959, Film editing) or dealt with aspects of cinematic style (*Variaties op een filmthema*, 1959, Variations on a film theme).²⁸⁰ In addition to this, it increasingly began to acquire well-known Dutch documentaries. Titles such as Theo van Haren Noman's *Een leger van gehouwen steen* (*An army of Hewn Stone*), Bert Haanstra's *En de zee was niet meer* (*And there was no more sea*) and *Rembrandt, schilder van de mens* (*Rembrandt, Painter of Man*, all re-released by NOF in 1958) were meant to serve a double didactic purpose. On the one hand, teachers were expected to use them as part of the regular lesson programme (in the above cases: history, geography and art history classes respectively). On the other hand, they were encouraged to draw the pupils' attention to the films' formal characteristics, in order to familiarise them with the medium as a means of 'creative expression'.²⁸¹

Formal Requirements

Above, I pointed out that in the years prior to Peters' directorship, NOF demonstrated a strong preoccupation with its target audience's mental capacities, and in particular, the pupils' limitations with respect to the processing of visual stimuli. One of the main objections to the school cinemas had been that the films they screened were ill-adapted to the children's levels of cognitive development. According to the system's opponents, the titles programmed far

exceeded the audience's understanding.²⁸² In its early publications, NOF blamed this, among others, on the fact that the material shown ignored a fundamental didactic principle: that of structural logic and transparency.

Film Structure

Like visual instructionists elsewhere, the institute's representatives took the position that films could only serve educational purposes if they were built up in sufficiently logical ways. In *Leidraad voor kwekelingen*, Schreuder explains: "The teaching film should provide a unified entity, a series of actions, conducts or movements which lead to a particular aim or result; everything should be designed so as to make the connection between the parts and the whole as clear as possible." The reason he gives is that young children are not yet capable of relating visually disconnected bits of information: "As a rule, indeed, primary school children are not able to mold events, of which the connections do not follow from the images, into logical entities – even if they are helped along [...] by commentaries."²⁸³ In the institute's view, this fact was due to the pupils' lack of cognitive maturity. Possibly, ellipses in time or place could be used in films for *older* children; however, experimental research first had to determine the precise age at which such effects could be understood.²⁸⁴

In order to help viewers comprehend how facts and events related to one another, then, films had to be constructed as clear causal chains. In addition to this, they had to be stripped of all 'unnecessary' particulars. Producers, in other words, had to be selective: instead of representing reality in its entirety, they had to concentrate on its most important components. The rationale behind this was that an abundance of details would only confuse the spectators, and turn the film into an instrument of distraction rather than a means of direction.²⁸⁵ Making a good teaching film, *Leidraad voor kwekelingen* argues, entails that

everything is aimed at strongly focusing the pupil's attention on a specific subject and at keeping all inessentials in the background or even cutting them off. Only in this way [...] it is possible to force the pupils' mental activity entirely in the desired direction and to arouse a healthy interest [...].²⁸⁶

NOF's requirement that films should always focus the pupils' attention on essential objects and processes also applied to the composition of individual shots. In his 1951 manual *Film en lichtbeeld bij het onderwijs: Een praktisch-didactische handleiding* (Films and slides in education: A practical-didactic guide) author Van der Meulen elaborates on Schreuder's rules. In the benchmark section of his book, he warns that the frame of a teaching film should never contain unnecessary movement. The camera should approach its subject as closely as possible and exclude anything that is not strictly relevant to an understanding of how it functions.²⁸⁷

Another point which makers had to bear in mind when determining a film's construction was the pupils' (limited) powers of concentration. NOF insisted that items should never last too long – ten to fifteen minutes maximum. In addition to this, the events shown should proceed at a sufficiently quiet pace. In the institute's view, it was imperative that shots and sequences did not follow each other too quickly – otherwise, spectators might get tired or be unable to let the argument sink in. For the same reason, events or processes that were central to the film's development had to be repeated visually. Van der Meulen's creed that revision is the best teacher ("herhaling is de moeder van het geleerde") thus also applied to

the organisation of the films themselves.²⁸⁸

'Global' Films

Despite the fact that it strongly emphasised such organisational characteristics as focus and selectivity, NOF insisted that the phenomena dealt with should never be shown in isolation. Teaching films had to leave out anything that was not strictly relevant to their central arguments; at the same time, the events they pictured could not be disconnected from the situations and physical environments of which they formed part.²⁸⁹ In justifying its attitude, the institute drew on the ideas of the Belgian pedagogue Ovide Decroly.

Popular among educational progressivists of the 1930s and 1940s, Decroly was known primarily for his views on human perception. According to his writings, people perceive reality in three consecutive steps. First, they enter a so-called 'global' phase, in which they take situations in as entities; then they pass through a stage of 'de-globalisation', when they perceive things more analytically; finally, they reach a level of synthesis, at which they recombine separate elements into a single conceptual whole. In Decroly's view, these phases not only characterise the perception process as such, but also mark successive steps in the development of the human intellect. Young children, in other words, can easily perceive things globally, but have a hard time analysing them in their constitutive parts. Therefore, teaching matter has to be presented to them in larger wholes – not as divided into separate units.²⁹⁰ NOF reasoned that the same also applied to the means with which school subjects were taught. Referring to Decroly's educational premise, the institute claimed to produce only so-called 'global' films (*globale films*): titles that did not present phenomena and processes in isolation, but only as part of, and in relation to, the larger structures of which they were part.²⁹¹

Another argument in favour of presenting reality 'globally' was that children were considered to acquire knowledge only if it somehow related to what they already knew. All of the institute's writings stress the importance of so-called *uitgangservaring*: the (life) experience a child builds up on a day-to-day basis. This knowledge was considered to constitute a pupil's so-called 'apperceptive structures' (*apperceptieve structuren*): the cognitive foundations on which novel insights are based. One way in which films could make use of these structures, NOF's proponents argued, was by highlighting the relevance of the matter dealt with to the spectators' own lives.²⁹²

In bringing this principle into practice, the institute drew once again on a concept devised by Decroly. Aside from his ideas on sensory perception, the pedagogue was also known for the teaching method based on his notion of 'spheres of interest' (*Centres d'Intérêt*). Taking his departure from the premise that lesson topics should not be taught as unrelated units, Decroly proposed to organise subject matter around the children's primary needs – for instance, nourishment, protection, or solidarity.²⁹³ In the first few years of its existence, NOF based its production programme on this idea. Titles were brought out in series, all linked to a specific geographical area. Each sequence consisted of a so-called 'foundation film' (*basisfilm*) and a number of related items. While the foundation film documented the physical characteristics of the chosen region, the other parts of the series focused on activities, 'characteristic' of the area under scrutiny, which were considered to fulfil one or more of the viewers' basic needs (for example, the production of a particular food or tool). Although the institute abandoned

this procedure quite early on, it continued to emphasise the relevance of the scenes depicted to the lives of pupils (and of humans more in general) in later years.²⁹⁴

Film as Experience

While the concept of globality itself remained an important inspiration for NOF, it soon ceased to function as the *only* valid principle for production. Peters' manual endorses the standpoint that the film medium is particularly suited to the task of establishing links between distinct areas of knowledge. At the same time, it opposes the idea that all classroom films should be made with this purpose in mind. In the author's view, there is room in NOF's output for other materials than the so-called 'global' films. The latter, he argues, are useful in particular as introductory tools. In some cases, however, they are not what a teacher needs. At times, a user prefers to first explain a point, and subsequently show a film, either for the purpose of illustration, or in summary of what has already been said. Alternatively, he may want to use the medium as a means of instruction, to teach his pupils a number of very specific skills. In all of these cases, items that concentrate on a given process or action seem more useful to the author than those which represent a situation in its entirety.²⁹⁵

In addition to this, NOF representatives of the 1950s and 1960s valued the principle of globality for different reasons than the spokespeople of earlier years. Right from the start, the institute's writings had stressed that teaching films should provide their audiences with 'second-hand' or 'vicarious' experiences. In NOF's view, the titles that were screened had to allow their viewers to mentally relive what was shown. In order for this to happen, the processes dealt with had to be depicted in sufficiently verisimilar ways.²⁹⁶ From the 1950s onwards, this argument gained in prominence. For Peters, it was even the main argument for exploiting the film medium's aptness for representing things in relation to the larger world of which they formed a part.²⁹⁷

Earlier on I explained that the NOF director was less inclined than his predecessors to justify production benchmarks on the basis of biological arguments. In his view, what children could learn from watching films depended not so much on their respective stages of cognitive development or the life experience they had built up, but rather on whether or not they had learnt to accurately decipher various cinematic codes. The institute's claim that films should always be tailored to the children's 'apperceptive structures' therefore did not appeal to him at all. In fact, Peters reasoned the other way round: for him, the purpose of treating reality globally was not to tie in with what children were already familiar with, but rather to *widen* their horizons by providing experiences they had never had before.²⁹⁸ His colleagues and successors continued to pursue this policy line.

Practical Considerations

No matter how ardently the institute defended them, NOF's representational principles did not always correspond to the reality of film production. In practice, it seems, the standards which the Educational Section set were not all that easy to match.²⁹⁹ A telling example is the requirement of structural logic and simplicity. In the institute's view, the order of shots and sequences should never detract from the objects or processes under scrutiny, and be aimed entirely at revealing the connections between their constitutive parts. On the surface, NOF-films often seem simple enough, especially early ones. They are made up of long takes, shot

from a restricted number of angles, and edited in strictly chronological ways. However, this does not always result in transparency in terms of content. For instance, films that depict production processes (such as, the aforementioned *Glas*) often do not unveil the connections between operations or manipulations – even if the order of shots and sequences is determined by their real-life temporal succession. Likewise, items documenting the life cycles of species, which do tend to follow a chronological order (*De kieviet*), rarely clarify what motivates their subjects in the behaviours shown.

In addition to this, producers sometimes had to choose between conflicting sets of rules. NOF's requirement of structural transparency, I explained, coincided with a demand for selectivity: the elimination of all unnecessary details. Even regardless of the practical difficulties this entailed – for after all, there are limits to how selective a photographic representation can be – it must have confronted film-makers with a dilemma. If they prioritised visual logic and simplicity, they threatened to lose contextual information; however, if they lived up to the condition of globality, they ran the risk of confusing or distracting the minds of their addressees. A similar problem may also have posed itself in relation to the requirement of motion. NOF user manuals throughout the decades insist that the great advantage of film over still images (wall charts, glass slides or filmstrips) is that it can reproduce movement. A consequence of this is that the medium can only reach its maximum (didactic) potential if this characteristic is fully exploited.³⁰⁰ In practice, however, it may often have been difficult to represent motion in an orderly and logical way.

Consequently, films produced by NOF's own staff often look like the result of a compromise – especially in the early years.³⁰¹ For instance, titles that concentrate on the actions or behaviours of a single species (*De kapmeeuw*, 1947, The black-headed gull) tend to combine (lengthy) sequences of close shots of the creatures under scrutiny with fewer distance shots representing 'the world of which they form part' (their physical surroundings and habitat). In most cases, however, there is little or no visual integration between the two. Also, in order to overcome the difficulties associated with the depiction of movement, makers often took their recourse to some form of manipulation (for instance, the speeding up or slowing down of live-action images) or graphic re-representation. The latter, however, were options which the institute fundamentally opposed (for reasons that I shall explain later). Therefore, they may be taken as signs of the producers' incapacity to live up to, or reconcile, what the rules prescribed.³⁰²

Film Sound

If producers seem to have had a hard time complying with NOF's requirements in terms of structure, this problem posed itself far less with respect to film sound. Incidentally, the institute's position on the issue was also less ambiguous. In the first decade of its existence, official publications were unanimous that films for schoolchildren should preferably be mute. The reproduction of background noise was considered permissible *in theory* (at least, if it was 'inherent' to the action depicted); spoken commentaries, in contrast, were downright taboo.³⁰³ In practice, however, NOF did not make *any* films with sound – nor did it acquire them.

Although financial considerations definitely played a part as well, the reasons given were of a different nature entirely.³⁰⁴ In the majority of cases, they related (once again) to the intended audience's level of cognitive development. *Leidraad voor kwekelingen* claims that primary

school children cannot yet deal with combinations of image and speech. Contemporary educational research had revealed that commentaries required the pupils' full attention; the manual therefore concludes that listening to them could hamper the children's perception of the visuals. In addition to this, it argues that pupils must not be pampered. Teaching films should not provide answers to all the questions that spectators might have, but encourage reflection instead. In *Film en lichtbeeld bij het onderwijs*, Van der Meulen agrees that children should be motivated to clarify problems for themselves. One of the great risks of visual education is that of 'mental laziness' (*geestelijke luiheid*). Therefore, teaching films must be designed so as to stimulate thought rather than to confirm viewers in their passiveness.³⁰⁵

In defending its position, however, NOF did not focus exclusively on the interests of the audience. In some cases, it also addressed the concerns of the users: the teachers who had to put the films on screen. One of the arguments quoted was that pedagogues should not be forced into giving up too many educational decisions. As a rule, the institute's publications point out, teachers know best which information their children need, and at which time it has to be passed on. Films with spoken commentaries, they suggest, ignore this fact, and therefore deprive educators of the responsibilities they are due. In addition to this, articles insist that classroom interaction should always take place in an atmosphere of quiet diligence. The use of sound, they imply, is fundamentally at odds with this requirement.³⁰⁶ In my view, both of these points can be read as a direct response to a (perceived) fear among teachers that the use of film might result in a loss of educational authority (an argument which I shall develop in paragraph 2.1).

Despite the fact that sound projection was already the norm in 'regular' (entertainment) theatres, NOF's demand for mute films is not as curious as it may seem at first sight. In the year of the institute's establishment, the so-called Nederlandse Vereniging voor Culturele films (Dutch Association for Cultural Films, one of the country's oldest champions of 'high quality' moving images and editor of the periodical *Lichtbeeld en Cultuur*) had drafted a report on the medium's educational use. Its conclusion was that films with recorded commentaries were entirely inappropriate for deployment in schools – regardless of what cinema audiences were accustomed to.³⁰⁷ Visual instructionists elsewhere supported this view. In Germany, the war-time RWU only distributed mute films; the reason quoted, again, was purely pedagogical. Its decision, it seems, met with the approval of colleagues worldwide.³⁰⁸

In spite of this, NOF's attitude in matters of sound can be characterised as rather conservative. First, because the institute stuck to its position for a disproportionately long period of time. It defended the production of mute films until well into the 1950s, when the issue had long ceased to exercise the minds of proponents abroad. Second, because it was just as radical in practice as it was in theory. In other countries, the ideal of muteness was often valued *in principle*, but considered unattainable from a practical point of view. Children had grown used to a reality of sound films – a fact which commercial producers chose to take into account. Since distributors in most cases were dependent to a large extent on private initiative, continued opposition to this practice seemed pointless.³⁰⁹ NOF, however, had a *de facto* monopoly, and could therefore afford to take a more conservative stand.

As time passed, it turns out, this situation changed. The first sign of a policy shift occurred

in 1954, when the institute released six films with sound. In his manual, Peters makes a first attempt at explaining this move. In a short paragraph, the author wipes the floor with his predecessors' psychological arguments. He argues that there is no scientific evidence to support the claim that children cannot simultaneously process images and sound; therefore, it cannot serve as a basis for NOF's muteness stance.³¹⁰ A few years after the book came out, the institute's newsletter featured a series of articles which elaborated on the issue. At the time, the reasons given were much more down-to-earth. According to the authors, mute films basically constituted an anachronism. Regardless of the fact that this might detract from the medium's status as a motivational tool, it also entailed that such items could serve little purpose as means to acquaint children with the codes of film language, and in the process, teach them to be critical about what was shown in cinemas. At the end of the decade, moreover, every school teacher was thought to know 'in his heart' that sound films were bound to 'take over' eventually.³¹¹ Clearly, NOF had realised by then that it would miss out on profits if it did not provide them itself.³¹²

From the mid-1950s onwards, then, the institute steadily acquired more films with sound; by the end of the decade, about a hundred of them were available. According to the reports, the foundation never quite managed to keep up with the demand: in the early 1960s, schools even gave up their membership because not enough sound prints were available. Meanwhile, however, some institutions still requested mute titles. NOF applauded this fact, arguing that primary school children, who were considered less 'spoilt' by cinema visits than their seniors, could still benefit from watching moving images in silence.³¹³ For the schools themselves, the main argument was probably a practical one: they did not yet own the equipment to project films with sound. And as long as the users still required mute titles, the institute continued to produce them.³¹⁴

In terms of policy, NOF took a more or less isolationist attitude. Much like in its earlier years, the institute set itself the target of improving on what the entertainment industry did. In teaching films, it proclaimed, soundtracks should have a very clear purpose: they should never be gratuitous, but always *add* something to the information which the image conveyed (for instance, emotional depth or contrapuntal value). Voice-over commentaries were only permissible if they unveiled connections which the visuals could not make clear, or which the teachers themselves could not disclose.³¹⁵ In reality, however, producers did not always live up to this ideal. In order to boost the supply of sound films, NOF's staff took their recourse to dubbing mute titles that had been released before. In this process, commentaries were added that merely summarised factual information from the instruction booklets that had accompanied the originals – a practice which, in previous years, the institute had squarely rejected.³¹⁶

Titles and 'Tricks'

Surprisingly enough, early publications which still opposed the use of spoken commentaries did not recommend that the lack of oral clarification be compensated for through the use of printed texts. In practice, also, intertitles were used very sparingly. Once again, the official motivation was psychological. Treating written and spoken language as equal, the institute's spokespeople argued that it was too difficult for young children to switch from one kind of

perception (the processing of film images) to another (the digestion of verbal information). The interruption of a visual flow supposedly entailed that the ‘illusion of reality’ which was aimed at was annulled. This in turn was considered to cause children to lose interest, and to take away their desire to talk about what they had seen in the remainder of the lesson. In addition to this, publications also warned users of a potential loss of educational control. Apparently, NOF’s didactic staff thought that the more a film directed the children in their interpretation of what they saw, the less likely it was that a teacher felt in command of the pedagogical exchange.³¹⁷

The same line of reasoning also applied in the case of so-called ‘tricks’ (*trucs*) or schematic representations. In practice, however, the latter seem to have been much harder to avoid. From quite early on, NOF’s films occasionally featured maps, charts, diagrams or profile drawings. Employees testify that this was often done out of necessity – for instance, when simultaneous production processes had to be visualised. In such cases, sketches or animated models were given preference above explanatory texts.³¹⁸ As time went by, schematic representations became more numerous. By the later 1950s, films were distributed that hardly contained any live-action footage at all. For instance, the Defa-produced natural history film *Het paard* ² (The horse, released in Holland around 1959) was made up entirely of animated drawings. Publications from that time no longer seem to object to their use at all.³¹⁹

Although NOF took a much firmer stand where it concerned intertitles, producers, again, did not always live up to the institute’s rules. In the first few years in particular, makers often ‘sneaked in’ verbal elements – usually as part of the *mise en scène*. For instance, in items documenting production processes, written captions were fastened onto containers (in *Kaas* *, to identify the raw materials inside) or machines (in *Van koren tot brood*, 1942, Corn to bread, to explain what an appliance does). Films dealing with a particular region or locally relevant activity sometimes contain shots of inscriptions, either naming a town (*Elf-stedentocht*, 1942) or a service (*Vuilnis van een grote stad*). In the course of time, words and phrases were also integrated into charts and diagrams (*Steenkool vervoer*, [ca. 1951], Coal transportation).³²⁰

User Advice

Like the producers and distributors of earlier years, NOF also took on the task of directing its users in the application of the materials it supplied. Teachers’ manuals, instruction booklets and catalogues describe how, when, and how often titles should be shown, and which activities are suitable as preparation or follow-up. They also spell out how teachers should act during screenings: which roles they should take on, and above all, which types of behaviour they should avoid.

Didactic Embedding

One of the concerns that NOF-related publications focus on is how moving images can be made to fit ‘naturally’ into the course of everyday classroom proceedings. Time and again, the documents stress the importance of a smooth transition between a film and the rest of the lesson in which it is embedded. The requirement that nothing should disrupt the natural flow of teaching was precisely the point where, according to critics, the school cinema system had failed; NOF therefore insisted that teachers should do anything in their power to avoid

the mistakes their predecessors had made. In order to succeed, they had to respect some very specific rules.

First of all, users had to make sure that the physical circumstances of the screening were as close as possible to those of a 'standard' teaching situation. Ideally, film sessions had to be held in the children's familiar classrooms (rather than school attics or large assembly halls). Of course, this was not always possible: sometimes, such spaces were hard to darken, or could not accommodate the projection equipment needed. Even so, those using the films had to ensure that the chosen locations always foregrounded the educational nature of the event. Only in this way, the reasoning was, pupils could be expected to enter the right state of mind to learn from what was shown. As Van der Meulen's manual puts it:

Films and slide images for education belong in the regular, daily classroom. [...] They do not require us to take a trip. [...] Definitely not outside of the school building, but preferably not outside of the classroom either. A projection lesson may be something pleasant, but it is not something exceptional, sensational.³²¹

Second, screenings had to take place in the presence of the children's own class teachers. In previous decades, film lessons had been led by special school cinema lecturers, who might have known a thing or two about film, but were pedagogically inexperienced. Not only had this prevented them from making a well-informed choice in terms of what was shown, it had also meant that they could not relate the items projected to what their audiences learnt in school. Teachers in contrast did know how to tie in with what was taught. The closer they were involved with the viewers' education, the better they could take up on what the children already knew.³²²

However, the importance of the teacher's role was not just a matter of his pedagogical expertise. It also derived from the fact that he – and he *only* – could endow the film with the status it was due: that of a mere educational tool. Like the publications of teaching film proponents elsewhere, NOF's manuals and newsletters place great emphasis on the instrumental nature of the material it supplied. Just like school books, wall charts or model globes, the texts argue, films can be used for instructional purposes; they cannot, however, teach by themselves.³²³ Van der Meulen writes:

One should beware [...] of treating slide and film as the stones of didactic wisdom! Both can relieve, but never take over, the task of the teacher, who remains *the man* in all circumstances. [...] Film and slide are merely *aids* – although very attractive and effective ones.³²⁴

In order to have any didactic value at all, then, films had to be employed by an instructor: a person who, by grace of his position within the classroom, could determine which part of the film's content got the status of lesson subject, and who could focus the children's attention accordingly.

Prohibitive Rules

One implication of the fact that viewers constantly had to be aware of film's instrumental nature was that it could not be used excessively. The authors of manuals and brochures advised to employ it by way of exception, and only if no other tool was more suited to the lesson's purpose. As I explained earlier, the medium's main asset was considered to be the fact that it could help lay a child's so-called 'apperceptive structures': the (life) experience he required

to understand what was taught. In this respect, film was no more than a *surrogate*: a means for experiencing things that could not be witnessed 'live'. If pupils were at all in a position to see objects or phenomena in person, teachers had to make sure that they did. In addition to this, educators had to provide sufficient technological variety. Films should not be used by themselves, but always in combination with other tools. The various types of representation (still and moving) were taken to have their specific possibilities and limitations, and therefore, their designated functions in the course of an educational exchange.³²⁵

Compared to the instructional texts of earlier decades, NOF's publications generally took a more encouraging attitude towards teaching film use. Yet even so, the institute still formulated quite a few rules as to what users should *not* do. For instance, it insisted that teachers should never pause a film during projection, but always let it run its full course. In addition to this, educators were asked to reduce verbal interventions to the absolute minimum – especially if an item was shown for the first time. If the former principle could be justified on the basis of practical concerns (for instance, the fact that stopping a film might cause physical damage), the latter was defended once more with purely psychological arguments. For Schreuder, clarification by a teacher was just as useless to an audience of young viewers as a recorded commentary, because the children's understanding depended entirely on the organisation of the visuals. Therefore, it was best to let their perception of the film go undisturbed. Even Peters, who was open to the use of moving images with sound, held on to this argument.³²⁶

'Global' Viewing

In addition to being still quite restrictive, NOF's user advice was often also highly specific – especially in the first decade or so. Teachers' notes in particular went into great detail as to how titles could best be used. In most cases, they began with a short section on a film's connection with the curriculum: they specified which levels and age groups it was intended for, and which part of the lesson programme it was supposed to reinforce. Next, they spelt out the order of viewings and accompanying activities. They stipulated how many times a film should be shown, and what should be done before, in between and during consecutive screenings. The last page of each booklet normally also contained suggestions for follow-up: examples of exercises, assignments and projects, to be done either individually or in groups.

The order of screenings and related activities was justified once again on the basis of insights formulated by Decroly. Above I explained that the pedagogue had argued in his works that human perception took place in stages; the consequence was that children should be given the opportunity to process their impressions accordingly. First, they should be allowed to (merely) observe, then to associate (i.e., relate their observations to earlier ones) and finally to express their findings, ideally in a creative way.³²⁷ NOF incorporated Decroly's ideas into its specifications for the viewing of films.

In *Leidraad voor kwekelingen*, for instance, Schreuder explains that the purpose of a film's first screening is to bring about a so-called 'foundational experience' (*grondleggende ervaring*). It is meant to give the children a rudimentary, global impression of the situations or phenomena under scrutiny, and to rouse their interest and curiosity. At this stage, the teacher must refrain from speaking, and let the pupils take in the visuals by themselves. Next comes the crucial phase of 'deglobalisation', in which viewers acquire a deeper understanding of what they have

seen. The teacher now takes on his familiar role as mentor, and makes explicit the “spatial, temporal and mental structure of reality”. The purpose of his efforts is to let pupils move away from a generalist experience of their surroundings to a deeper insight into its constitutive parts. In order to allow the children to fixate their findings, they must then be set all sorts of tasks – preferably assignments involving the use of language. Finally, the master can project the film again. At this stage, children should be able to make the connection between facts, events, and actions, and the larger world of which they form part.³²⁸

In the first half of the 1950s, NOF’s publications gradually became more relaxed about the role of teachers and the precise order of the actions that they should perform. At the same time, they also became less explicit about the relation between rules and regulations and the children’s stages of cognitive development. Yet in spite of this, manuals and brochures were always concerned that the viewing of films should primarily have an experiential function. Therefore, it was considered crucial that pupils could undergo the screening itself with as little distraction as humanly possible, and without the interference of an overactive ‘coach’.³²⁹

Conclusions

Looking back on the developments dealt with in this chapter, one can observe that the process of teaching film institutionalisation was primarily a matter of adapting the medium to the existing structures of formal education. On the one hand, film, in the 1940s, was considered to have definite benefits for teaching: it could help visualise, and thereby, make more concrete, subject matter that was thought to be too abstract for young children (whose cognitive abilities, according to contemporary paedological insights, still had to mature). On the other hand, parties with an interest in the matter immediately felt the need to formulate all sorts of conditions – even if they were in favour of the medium’s didactic use *in principle*. Like the ‘new media’ proponents of later years, they reasoned that in order for film to reach its full potential, it had to be adjusted as much as possible to the educational framework within which it was to function.³³⁰

In practice, regulation often came down to the imposition of constraints: restrictions in terms of what was theoretically possible. With respect to film content, for instance, authors pressed for the exclusion of anything that was not strictly relevant to the educational curriculum.³³¹ Also in the formal sense, the enforcement of rules and regulations meant that the medium’s possibilities could not be exploited to the full. For instance, NOF’s pursuit of structural simplicity and transparency entailed that organisational procedures that had been tried out in previous years or decades, or that had even become productional standards, could not be continued – a fact which also accounts for the accusations of boringness, outmodedness, or even ‘primitiveness’ that have been directed at the institute (both at the time, and retrospectively).³³² Also the foundation’s position in matters of film sound (or verbal language in any form) contributed to the stylistic gap between the material it provided and the films that were shown outside of schools.

A same tendency also manifests itself in the domain of user advice. Like the authors of instructional texts from earlier decades, NOF’s writers seem to have been quite preoccupied with what teachers might do *wrong* – even if they tried to phrase their recommendations in more encouraging ways. Therefore, manuals and brochures often also impose certain constraints. Of course, guidelines that pertained to classroom conduct were not as easy to enforce as rules of a textual nature (which, in the Dutch case at least, were applicable only to fellow workers within the same institute). Yet even so, teaching film distributors would often go to great lengths to ensure that educators deployed the medium as prescribed. Consultants, trainings and user permits were instructed or devised with this purpose in mind.

As time went by, however, rules and regulations became more flexible. Production standards and user conditions were toned down, or ceased to be mentioned altogether. The timing of this development varied from country to country, and depended to a considerable extent on the amount of competition producers encountered. In Holland, it came extremely late (a fact which also explains why the standpoints formulated by Peters seem so revolutionary in retrospect). If such policy changes were at all motivated, it was often with the argument that the didactic principles which the standards of earlier years were based on were no longer considered valid.³³³ In my view, however, a more important reason may have been that the rules had become untenable from a productional point of view. In NOF’s case in particular,

I pointed out, benchmarks sometimes ran counter to the course which (commercial) film making was taking at the time. The consequence was that what had once been promoted as a modern didactic instrument was rapidly turning into a symbol of a foregone era. Meanwhile, competitors played off precisely those features which the official teaching film institute eschewed, and which were actually favoured by many of the designated users.³³⁴

Another explanation for the gradual relaxation of rules and conditions (textual ones in particular) is the fact that the views of visual instructionists on the educational role of the medium changed over time. As the years went by, film was no longer seen primarily as a weapon against verbalism but also as a form of cultural expression, worth studying in itself. This in turn implied that the titles shown not only had to meet the standards of didacticism, but also those of 'good' film making. Moreover, if the objective was to direct the pupils in their viewing habits, producers had to live up to (and even surpass) children's qualitative expectations of cinematic texts – expectations which, to all accounts, could hardly be overestimated.³³⁵ For NOF's employees, this meant in practice that they were encouraged more and more often to give rein to their artistic aspirations. In exchange for this, makers increasingly were credited for what they did.³³⁶

Growing appreciation for the medium-specific potential of film coincided with a weakening of AV proponents' efforts to dissociate their own activities from those which took place in an entertainment context. As time went by, also subsidised teaching film producers and distributors began to openly recognise that children enjoyed watching films, and argued that this fact should be reckoned with in the production and selection of material. In the first few decades of the century, pupils' 'natural' interest in the medium had actually been considered one of the main arguments in favour of its use as an educational tool. In practice, however, this idea turned out to conflict with the didactic requirement that classroom activities should take place in an atmosphere of seriousness and diligence – circumstances incompatible with (the expression of) enjoyment or enthusiasm.³³⁷ For NOF, the consequence seems to have been that the material shown should always look as frugal as possible. This situation lasted until the early 1950s, when Peters observed that films could only serve their intended purpose if they managed to arrest the audience's attention. In order to do so, he believed, they had to (formally) appeal to the pupils addressed.³³⁸

As final remark, I would like to emphasise that in the NOF collection itself, the abovementioned shifts in attitude towards the medium do not manifest themselves very clearly until the later 1950s. In its first decade or so, the institute adhered quite strictly to its most prohibitive rules (for instance, specifications with respect to film length and pace, and the use of sound). In the years that followed, it began to demonstrate more openness to change, but its various products still attested to a fundamental indecisiveness. Formal options that were discussed in articles and handbooks were not yet tried out by those making or acquiring the films; conversely, techniques that were experimented with in practice were not justified in the institute's texts. Towards the end of the decade, NOF finally began to present the more consistent image of a body concerned with the didactic use of film in its most up-to-date form, and to balance its collection out accordingly. At that point in time, however, it had long been outrun by its more progressive users, who had been asking for more 'modern'-looking material for years. In the chapter that follows, I shall try to uncover some of the more hidden motives behind

this apparent conservatism.

TEACHING FILM USE AND THE PEDAGOGICAL *DISPOSITIF*

Introduction

In what precedes, I discussed how NOF, like similar bodies elsewhere, tried to influence its users' conception of what constituted a 'good' teaching film, both in the textual sense, and in terms of its deployment as a didactic tool. In the course of the first chapter, I suggested that the institute's efforts in this area should not be seen as the result of a philanthropic impulse, but as an act of self-preservation: an attempt to ensure the continuation of the activities it had developed over time. By teaching potential subscribers the difference between what was appropriate for classroom viewing and what was not, it basically gave them the reassurance that the film medium was indeed suitable for educational use – and therefore, that the services it provided warranted the schools' membership.

Earlier on, in the introduction, I also stressed that my choice of corpus, and by implication, of my case as such, is inspired mainly by pragmatic considerations. My interest in the collection, I said, is due primarily to its status as an object of *usage*: the fact that it was subject to a number of very specific practices. Yet as it turns out, the day-to-day use of NOF's films is a domain which the institute's normative writings seem to block from view. If the texts of handbooks and brochures can tell how the titles concerned were *meant* to be shown, they do not provide evidence of compliance with those rules. Topical specifications and formal benchmarks can be checked against the material which the institute distributed; user advice, in contrast, cannot be matched with anything 'real'. In addition to this, first-hand reports on the actual circumstances of the films' viewing are remarkably scarce.

Even so, I believe that it is possible to make some statements on the way(s) in which teaching films were used – if not on the basis of direct evidence, then by means of deduction. In the first half of this chapter, I shall pursue this goal. My main purpose in paragraph 2.1 is to supplement earlier pronouncements on NOF's policy with some thoughts on how its collection was most probably employed.

Before I do so, however, I shall briefly address the question of how the institute's product was received by the people it targeted: the teachers who had to put the films to use. In doing so, I shall rely once again on the texts discussed in chapter 1. In my view, NOF's publications not only constitute a record of the foundation's marketing strategy, they can also serve as a (more indirect) source of information about the medium's reception by the audience they addressed. In order to win users for their cause, after all, authors had to make sure that

they gave advice that was perceived as relevant; i.e., tips that could be read as answers or solutions to questions or problems that were actually *felt*. Therefore, it is fair to assume that the recommendations made can often be interpreted as a response to – or at the very least, an anticipation of – (perceived) interests, worries, or prejudice among the teachers themselves. In paragraph 2.1.1, I shall discuss the nature of, and backgrounds to, the tendency towards scepticism which the texts reveal.

Subsequently, the same findings will be used to reinforce some of the hypotheses which I develop in 2.1.2. In this section of my chapter, I shall sketch a rough picture of the ways in which Dutch teachers used films in schools. In doing so, I shall rely in part on retrospective accounts: the recollections of (former) NOF employees, classroom personnel, and some of the pupils they taught. On the basis of their stories, I shall make some conjectures about which usage patterns were most common at the time. To corroborate the hypotheses I formulate here, I shall make use again of the conclusions drawn in paragraph 2.1.1.

My second purpose in this chapter is to make some methodological choices, based on my observations about teaching film use, that will serve as a basis for the rhetorical analysis that follows in part II. As I shall elaborate later, I intend to base my interpretation of sample texts on the ways in which the films under scrutiny operated within the very specific (pedagogical) set-ups in which they were commonly deployed. However, one of the points that will be made here is that there was a whole *range* of uses, none of which can rightfully be characterised as ‘dominant’. For the purpose of analysis, then, I shall need to reduce this variety to a single, workable abstraction. One of my aims in paragraph 2.2 will be to determine which of the abovementioned screening practices is most relevant to my project, and can therefore function as a model. In this process, I shall also expound some of the conceptual choices which I make.

2.1 The Reception and Use of Teaching Films

Earlier on I have demonstrated that in defending its rules, and especially those formulated in the first, 'strictest' ten years, NOF tended to focus on the interests of pupils. In its publications, the institute systematically rationalised benchmarks and user advice on the basis of what the intended audience could or could not do. This is striking, because in earlier years, visual instructionists had oftentimes found legitimacy for what they proposed in matters that were of relevance mainly to the *teachers*: the primary users of the medium concerned. Although the foundation's authors occasionally addressed such issues as well, they did not do so quite as often. In addition to this, they tended to discuss them in more guarded terms.¹

Of course, none of the above implies that such concerns were not actually on the teachers' minds. In my view, the benchmarks and rules which the institute formulated, and in some cases, also the characteristics of the films themselves, actually provide evidence to the contrary. In what follows, I shall start from the assumption that the recommendations which NOF made can often be read as a reaction to the teachers' own perceptions and concerns – perhaps even of a resistance toward the use of the medium as such. My argument will be that they show proof of a certain scepticism, which in turn sprang from a suspicion that the deployment of the film medium (or that of audio-visual aids more in general) might overthrow, or at the very least destabilise, established classroom relations and/or teaching routines. In the first half of this paragraph, I shall show how this anxiety can be understood from an educational point of view.

Subsequently, I shall shift my focus from ideas on the topic to actual practices of teaching film use. Despite the generally reticent attitude that speaks from the sources discussed, NOF did have a more or less loyal (and until the mid-1950s, steadily growing) user base.² In paragraph 2.1.2, I shall address the question of how those people put its product to use. My hypothesis here will be that two usage types were particularly common. I shall argue that both these (clusters of) practices can be conceived of as attempts to deal with – and indeed, overcome – the professional anxieties referred to above.

2.1.1 Scepticism and Resistance

In chapter 1, I pointed out that NOF's publications (and those of its *aficionados*) often place great emphasis on the purely instrumental status of the material it supplied. Films, they insist, are mere educational *tools*, and should be used accordingly. By the same token, such writings also attach a great deal of value to the role of the instructor. *Leidraad voor kwekelingen*, for instance, argues that the quality of a film lesson ultimately always depends on the person who puts a title to use. Pronouncements like these, moreover, are often accompanied by expressions of confidence in the teacher's didactic abilities. As Van der Meulen points out, trained pedagogues know full well what good education entails. By implication, they are also the best judges of how audio-visual aids should be employed.³

However, I also argued that the same publications are characterised by an extremely patronising attitude towards the professional group they address. Subscribers are told down to the last detail how to choose and utilise films, and which choices or behaviours to avoid at all cost. Recommendations like these hardly attest to the authors' faith in the users' capabilities or

didactic expertise. Teachers may be commended for their practical educational experience; they do not seem to be given much credit when it comes to applying or adapting the skills they possess to the integration of 'newfangled' tools.

Although these two tendencies may seem irreconcilable at first sight, I think they can be interpreted as means to the same end. In my view, the peremptory nature of the institute's advice is directly related to the value it attached to educational expertise. In emphasising the importance of the instructor's role, after all, the authors of manuals and brochures also burdened their readers with a heavy responsibility. If the films' correct application was paramount to their effectiveness as didactic tools, it was the users who were to blame if the lessons in which they were shown did not meet the targets set. The advice given balanced this situation out: it provided reassurance, because it also guaranteed that success could be achieved. The more specific the recommendations were, the more grip they gave, and consequently, the more manageable they made seem the task at hand.

In addition to this, I also believe that the prominence of such instructions in NOF's early publications is proof of the fact that a need for them was felt. Presumably, the institute's representatives met with a great deal of apprehension: scepticism among teachers as to the (unforeseen) effects of film's didactic use. Of course, feelings of this type resurface whenever a classroom technology is introduced, and do not necessarily result from a rejection of the medium as such.⁴ Instead, they should be associated with an urge among pedagogues to protect and preserve established routines. More specifically, they can be linked to a profound reluctance to adopt measures or tools that might change or affect their relations with the pupils they teach.⁵

In the following pages, I shall briefly address the backgrounds to what NOF perceived as a resistance among users to the product it supplied. More in particular, I shall discuss what motivated the teachers in choosing for, or otherwise, in positioning themselves against, the introduction of specific methods and tools. In doing so, I shall rely on insights obtained by educational historians. My purpose will be to find out why so many instructors seem to have considered teaching film use a potential threat rather than a new didactic opportunity.

Classrooms as Typical Work Settings

According to sources on the topic, teaching styles in the West have changed very little in the course of last century. Historical accounts seem to fundamentally agree that the efforts of educational reformists have not led to profound alterations in terms of classroom conventions. Despite the attempts of progressive pedagogues to make pupils the focus of instruction, pedagogical interaction in the second half of the century remained largely teacher-centred. In most institutions of compulsory education, instructors continued to function as the possessors of knowledge, transmitting information to an audience that was seen as both passive and ignorant.⁶ In this process, they relied primarily on tools that accommodated the same (conservative) epistemology: methods, books and aids that facilitated a process of transmission rather than one of exchange.⁷

In *How Teachers Taught: Constancy and Change in American Classrooms 1880-1990* (1993), Cuban attempts to find out how the above tendencies can be logically explained. The author

considers which factors have prevented the occurrence of major innovations, both technical and methodological, in formal teaching over the years. His conclusion is that education's apparent immunity to all kinds of change can be largely attributed to the demands which schools make on the people they employ. More specifically, it can be related to the various restrictions which are imposed upon teachers, both in and through the settings in which they work.⁸

All pedagogues, Cuban explains, are subject to two kinds of constraints. First, there are external pressures, which emanate from society at large: long-term cultural beliefs about the nature of knowledge and the purpose of education. As a rule, these ideas are inspired by the norms and practices of the socio-economic systems of which they form part. Teachers are expected to pass on those facts and skills which pupils require to (minimally) participate in the social, bureaucratic and industrial organisations of the communities to which they belong. The content considered most suited to this purpose is recorded in official curricula. Second, there are restrictions which derive from the ways in which schools and classrooms are typically organised: the (physical) settings in which teaching takes place. In most cases, educators need to deal with large numbers of pupils in small spaces for extended periods of time. Within this framework, they are expected to meet very strict targets, and produce tangible evidence that prescribed content is satisfactorily acquired.⁹

In spite of this, teachers do have a certain amount of autonomy. In most cases, they can determine the ways in which knowledge is passed on: which tasks are set, how skills are practiced, and how pupils are supposed to participate. In addition to this, they can decide on material issues, such as the arrangement of space and furniture or the selection of tools and aids. Yet as Cuban observes, the instructors' options are also highly "situationally constrained". In the end, pedagogues will always be judged on the basis of whether or not (quantifiable) targets are met. Therefore, they have to be pragmatic: they must choose those methods or tools that do not involve the risk of making more arduous an already heavy task.¹⁰

Teacher Authority

A major consideration here is what technical or procedural choices entail in terms of a teacher's authority. As Cuban points out, classroom control is a necessary precondition for instruction. Without a minimum of order, a teaching process simply cannot occur. Moreover, if it is true, as the author suggests, that the kind of education our Western society demands takes the form of a transfer, then the conditions in which learning can take place are necessarily very restrictive. Within the established system, teachers and pupils both have a predetermined range of intellectual activities: the former must spout, the latter merely absorb. For the children concerned, functioning well within such a context requires a great deal of discipline. Because of this, the power relations between both parties are bound to be highly asymmetrical.¹¹

In Cuban's view, the centrality of the instructor's authority to the educational process is one of the main reasons why teachers' appetites for fundamental classroom changes are generally low. Whether faced with decisions pertaining to the physical arrangement of desks and chairs, the nature of classroom activities, the amount of student participation, or the various types of instructional tools, educators tend to avoid altering routines that can help maintain classroom control. The dominance of teacher-centred instructional practices in schools of the

past decades and centuries, he argues, is a major consequence of this attitude.¹²

Assuming that NOF's advice can indeed be read as a direct response to the concerns of the people it addressed, it is highly likely that fear for loss of classroom control was a major factor in the educators' attitude towards teaching film use. Specifications on the location, length, and accompaniment of screenings can all be interpreted as attempts to counter the assumption that the medium's deployment would necessarily foster a 'recreational' atmosphere – and therefore, a disorderly or rowdy conduct on the pupils' part. Apparently, teachers were worried that the activity of viewing might cause excitement, and by the same token, disrupt the power balance on which they had come to rely. The recommendations made were meant to reassure them that their status of authority need not be jeopardised – as long as they did as the institute prescribed.¹³

Of course, it is doubtful whether such advice was at all convincing. Clearly, the teachers' unease with the 'new' medium derived from a lack of confidence in their own abilities at least as much as the unpredictability of the pupils' behaviour. The use of classroom films required a very different set of skills than they otherwise needed – both technically and in the didactic sense. In addition to this, not all educators had a great deal of experience with the medium as such, even as viewers. In many cases, their pupils had been exposed to it more intensively than they had been themselves. For all of those reasons, using it demanded a good deal of self-confidence. Only those teachers who were (already) convinced that they could control their pupils could take the risk of showing films in class.¹⁴

Flexible Tools

For those who felt less certain about the authority they could command, it was of crucial importance that the tools they had on hand were sufficiently flexible: that they could easily be adapted to the methods or procedures which suited them best. In his 1967 essay on technology in schools, Jackson argues that this also explains why 'traditional' tools, such as blackboards and books, have a greater appeal than more 'modern' (audio-visual) implements. While the former are extremely versatile, and can easily be adjusted to the established procedures which teachers favour, mechanised devices tend to offer more limited options in terms of deployment. According to Jackson's logic, this restriction derives primarily from the fact that the latter present their users with an uncontrollable succession of mediated content. Unlike more 'conventional' classroom aids, films, television broadcasts and computer programmes do not give educators much control over the pace or sequence of the matter addressed, or even the direction of the arguments made. In the case of such implements, in other words, the technological conditions for the use of didactic texts can be experienced as (overly) restrictive.¹⁵

In Jackson's view, the lack of correspondence between teachers' requirements and the available tools is at least partly due to a conflict of interest between the parties involved. Cuban confirms that there is a major cultural difference between the devisers of such aids and the promoters of their use, and the people by whom they are normally employed. More specifically, a discrepancy is noticeable in their respective conceptions of what constitutes educational 'efficiency'. Engineers and policy makers (some of which I quoted in chapter 1) tend to assess a device's value on the basis of the productivity it generates: the ratio between

the knowledge pupils acquire and the time or cost which this entails. For teachers, in contrast, the usefulness of any new tool depends primarily on whether it allows them to achieve the same goals (as established ones) without making the educational process more difficult.¹⁶

According to Cuban, the users' reluctance to integrate new aids is strongly reinforced by this difference in outlook, and the lack of communication between the parties concerned. Teachers' resistance towards any kind of change, he argues, can partly be attributed to the fact that such measures are usually imposed from 'above' or 'outside'. As a rule, ideas on how educational reform can help solve problems of a social, economic or cultural nature originate with, and are turned into policy by, academics or officials. In many cases, the author claims, those people do not consider how the decisions made will be implemented in practice, and neglect to communicate the motives behind them towards the teachers concerned. As a result, the latter feel compelled to stick to their old habits (thus, again, reinforcing the image of conservatism which is commonly attributed to classroom personnel).¹⁷

Ownership Issues

In my view, however, the fact that educators are not involved in the development of classroom tools may actually bother them in more profound ways than the abovementioned authors seem to suggest. Although primary sources do confirm that the teachers' reluctance to put into practice new methods or aids can often be ascribed to inadequate knowledge of its objectives and practicalities, I would argue that the picture they sketch is too restrictive. In my view, they represent the users as too passive, and do not allow for more fundamental objections concerning the ownership of such tools – and by extension, of the lessons they teach.¹⁸

As I explained, Jackson claims that the limited appeal of audio-visual tools is largely due to the fact that they take away from a teacher his control over the ways in which content is treated. In making this point, the author foregrounds the mechanical nature of the reproduction process: the fact that these 'modern' devices force their users to follow a fixed (argumentative) route, at a predetermined speed. What he suggests here (but does not make explicit) is that with such aids, it is always someone *other* than the teacher who decides on the tenet of the didactic message that is passed on. When using books, for instance, instructors can pick and choose: they can skip pages, add to the information given, or even ignore certain content altogether. Films or television broadcasts, in contrast, cannot be selected from quite so easily: they cannot simply be interrupted, or temporarily put aside. In addition to this, it seems much harder for users to distance themselves from what is 'said' – even if this is done in purely visual ways. Disclaiming the contents of (moving) images, after all, requires an emphatic denial of the truth value with which they are commonly endowed.¹⁹

Of course, teachers do have the possibility of choice: they are free to select the particular film (or broadcast, or computer programme) which is most in keeping with what they want to convey. Yet in this process, they always have to rely on what is made available by others: the people who produce, or market, didactic tools. By implication, they are also dependent on the ways in which a chosen subject is dealt with: which aspects of an issue are covered, in how much detail this is done, and which is the general direction of the argument made. Considering the already heavy restrictions which educators normally encounter, the above

considerations may well contribute to their reluctance to put AV media to use.

Intellectual Authority

However, a question that may preoccupy the users even more is what matters pertaining to the provenance of film content – and by extension, of the teaching matter as such – might do to their status of *intellectual* authority. In what precedes, I interpreted the term ‘ownership’ in the most literal sense: in my account, the (figurative) ‘possessor’ of a didactic text was the person, or collectivity, with the privilege of determining the direction of its argument. Likewise, the grounds for resistance which I identified were of a very tangible kind: I basically inferred that because of this fact, users of audio-visual classroom tools may feel that too many (actual) educational decisions are taken out of their hands. Yet there is also another way of reading the term, which makes the issue far less palpable. In order to clarify what I mean, I shall briefly return to an issue which I discussed before: the concern among educators that their profession might get ‘mechanised’.

In chapter 1, I argued that one of the more hidden anxieties of the early opponents of visual instruction was that films might end up replacing them. Contemporary writings suggest that the people concerned often interpreted this quite literally: commentators voiced the expectation that audio-visual media would eventually develop into teacher ‘surrogates’: automatons substituting for educators of flesh and blood. As time passed, scenarios like these gradually lost credibility, but a residue of the apprehensions behind them remained in place. Also in later decades, teachers seemed worried that the use of mechanised tools might force them into a classroom position that was far less prominent than what they were accustomed to. Again, I would like to argue, such concerns can be attributed to a fear for loss of power: a diminishment of the authority which educators consider to be at the basis of their teachership. This time, however, I am not thinking of a (purely) functional kind of supremacy, but of an intellectual one. I am referring here to the prerogative which educators derive from the possession of a certain body of knowledge.

In what precedes, I pointed out that educational historians tend to agree that even in recent decades, the most common form of pedagogical communication has been one of transmission: a transfer of wisdom from someone who has it, to people who do not. In *How Teachers Taught*, Cuban argues that in our Western society, educators are commonly seen as specialists in the subjects they teach, and by the same token, as the sources of all relevant knowledge on the topics with which they are concerned. Within a classroom environment, in other words, teachers take on authority not only because they are actually – legally – ‘in charge’, but also because they are the ones ‘in the know’. In fact, it is arguable that the instructors’ functional power derives at least in part from their (presumed) intellectual advantage over the pupils they teach.

An important implication of this observation is that loss of intellectual power necessarily results in a diminution of a teacher’s functional authority – the ‘mastery’ he requires to set in motion didactic processes of any kind.²⁰ This link, I believe, is of crucial importance, not only for a better understanding of the nature of classroom interaction as such, but also for an accurate evaluation of the educators’ reluctance to put teaching films to use. I suspect that instructors who had not yet deployed automated devices foresaw that they would endanger

their own status of intellectual superiority, and as a result, their (functional) authority over the children they taught.

One concrete example that bears out this view is NOF's policy in matters of sound. As I have already explained, the institute, in the first decades of its existence, fundamentally opposed to the use of spoken commentaries. In defending this position, it argued (among other things) that voice-over narration might jeopardise the classroom status of the teachers it targeted. Quoting representatives of the profession itself, authors expressed the concern that the integration of recorded speech might entail that the medium took on a role which in fact belonged to the people by whom it was deployed. In doing so, they recycled the pronouncements of earlier commentators, who had literally branded the device as 'too authoritarian' for educational purposes.²¹ In my analysis, such pronouncements suggest that in the speakers' perception, the use of sound might involve that the historically most firmly established channel of knowledge transfer – the voice – was no longer reserved to the (human) teacher. More important even than how this might affect his privilege to select the information conveyed was the possibility that for those watching, the 'man in front' would cease to function as its undisputed source.²²

A potentially aggravating circumstance was that the films' spectators were likely to be more familiar with the medium which produced this effect – and more specifically, its powers of signification – than the users themselves. In other words, not only was there a danger that in deploying such texts, real-life teachers might no longer be held responsible for the (lesson) content conveyed, there was an added risk that the pupils would infer meanings which their instructors had no notion of. As a result, teachers may have been afraid that they would appear to have less ownership over the arguments made than the children they taught – a situation which the latter, in the worst case scenario, could actively exploit.²³

With respect to the example quoted here, NOF's reasoning seems to have been that avoiding the 'dreaded' technique altogether was the best way to alleviate the educators' fears. By providing mute films only, the institute gave its users the reassurance that they would never be deprived of their 'master's voice', and continue to be the prime mediators of the knowledge that was to be passed on.²⁴ The fact that, in this matter, NOF took the teachers' wishes into account should be seen as part of its strategy to convince them that the films it had on offer were adapted to the needs of the classroom, and did not form a threat to the habits and power relations which their predecessors had built up over time.²⁵

As I explained earlier, imposing restrictions on the production of material was a strategy which the institute relied on most heavily in the early decades of its existence. In later years, the benchmarks it imposed were less radical, and adherence to them was no longer enforced quite as strictly. However, none of this implies that the concerns described above were no longer felt. Over the years, further habituation to the medium may have softened the teachers' judgement, but not necessarily taken away their most profound anxieties. In my view, the most sensible conclusion is that as of the later 1950s, the films' distributors agreed in principle that the users' scepticism should be fought not by imposing textual restrictions, and thus, limiting the medium's supposedly uncontrollable semantic potential, but by educating teachers, and offering them the tools to actively direct their pupils' interpretation of what they saw.

2.1.2 Some Hypotheses on Film Usage

At the beginning of this chapter, I announced that one of my purposes here is to formulate some hypotheses on the ways in which NOF's films were commonly deployed. By way of lead-in, I elaborated on the reception of the medium by its prospective users – and more specifically, on the reasons behind their reluctance to try it out in class. In doing so, I relied on sources of a highly prescriptive kind: texts that were meant to direct the performance of the readers addressed. As much as these writings can reveal about the latter's motives, so little they seem to disclose on the subject I shall focus on next: the actual, day-to-day use of the material discussed. Yet even so, their role is not yet fully played out. In the following pages, NOF's publications – or rather, the conclusions which I have drawn from what they say – shall be used again, this time in support of hypotheses which I formulate in the absence of more concrete information on the issue at hand.

As I have explained, primary reports on what we might call classroom film 'practice' are extremely scarce, both in Holland and abroad. In most cases, data are available on the number of schools that subscribed to a distribution service and the (average) rates at which films were taken out. Figures like these can of course help to reconstruct the extent of the medium's educational use. As a rule, they indicate that while there definitely was a demand for such material, its deployment in class was not at all generalised. Data provided by NOF, for instance, show that in the period I deal with, the institute, despite its near-monopoly on so-called 'purpose-produced' titles, never serviced more than one third of Dutch schools – and the majority of those not even on a regular basis.²⁶ What these sources cannot do, however, is to enlighten one on the ways in which teaching films were deployed. One cannot derive from them in which conditions they were commonly shown, or whether – and if so, how – they were made to fit into the course of a didactic exchange.

In Holland in particular, information of this type is hard to come by. Not only did NOF rarely give the floor to its users, especially the more critical ones, also independent magazines are remarkably silent on the practicalities of classroom film use. The only alternative are retrospective accounts: reports based on the recollections of teachers, pupils, and (the most user-oriented) members of the institute's personnel. Such memories, however, have not been recorded systematically; in addition to this, they are often very partial. As a result, I cannot treat them here as 'hard evidence'. While they do permit me to make some tentative observations, the conclusions they allow for are necessarily of a hypothetical nature. Yet in some cases, they can in turn be reinforced, and in the best case scenario, explained, on the basis of what I have argued before.²⁷

Basic Usage Patterns

In the epilogue to his 1951 manual, Van der Meulen specifies which readers he targets. He writes:

For whom was this booklet written? Not for those who are convinced that whatever is new is no good, simply because it is new; nor for those who ask for slides because 'they have already seen all NOF's films'! (Attested!) It is intended for those who want to integrate projection into their teaching, but get confused by its great variety and many possibilities.²⁸

In fact, the author here criticises two types of moving image users. On the one hand, those who refuse to try out new classroom tools, either out of prejudice, out of fear, or out of sheer

laziness. On the other hand, those who use film not for the pupils' benefit, but for their own divertissement. Although Van der Meulen clearly shares the latter's enthusiasm for the medium as such, the author disapproves of their reasons for deploying it in school. Consistent with NOF's policy, he argues that films should be used in support of everyday classroom activities, and *not* to provide some kind of relief (whether for the pupils, or for the teachers themselves).

In my opinion, the above quote sketches a much more accurate picture of the ways in which teaching films were commonly used than might be expected on the basis of the author's rather uncritical dedication to the foundation which he endorses. Van der Meulen's remark confirms my impression that those teachers who were prepared to take advantage of the institute's services in many cases did *not* embed projections into the flow of standard classroom proceedings. As I shall argue in the following pages, users of film very often seem to have conceived of the medium as an instrument of diversion, and of its screening as a happening in and of itself. The showings they organised had the status of exceptional events, and tended to take place at times that were (already) reserved for activities which did not form part of the formal curriculum.

Another type of usage which Van der Meulen refers to is the kind which he approves of, and which was practiced by the teachers whom he claims to address. According to reports by first-hand witnesses, a fair deal of the screenings that were held in schools *were* indeed geared towards the educational needs of the audiences they targeted. As opposed to the instructors mentioned above, the people who conducted them did deploy films as classroom tools. While fewer in number, they were more dedicated users, who rented out titles on a more regular basis. As such, they may actually have been responsible for a relatively *higher* percentage of the screenings that took place.²⁹

Of course, there were other types of use beside those two. In the course of time, teachers and instructors must have developed their own habits and preferences, and practiced more 'hybrid' deployment styles. The usage patterns which Van der Meulen mentions should therefore be conceived of as extremes on a scale, with variations and combinations in the space that lies between. Yet in spite of this, the reports that are available do seem to suggest that NOF's subscribers were most often inclined towards either one of these poles. For this reason, I shall concentrate in what follows on the characteristics of those two.

'Occasional' Use

In the first of a series of articles for the 1960 volume of the trade union magazine *Het Schoolblad*, trainee-teacher (and future documentary maker) Roelof Kiers complains that film projections in schools often serve a purely recreational purpose. In his piece, the author compares such screenings to the travelling shows of the cinema's early days: performances that take place purely for the diversion of an audience. Like Van der Meulen, he argues that while it is not inconceivable that children do indeed learn something from attending them, they rarely fulfil a clear educational function.³⁰

As it turns out, the great majority of testimonies from first-hand witnesses correspond to Kiers' observations. Apparently, a good portion of the screenings held in schools did not take place in the 'studious' classroom conditions which NOF and its supporters insisted on.

As a matter of fact, the films' projections often did not even occur in class at all. Those with memories of the forties, fifties and early sixties mention such screening locations as school attics, cellars and assembly halls. In most cases, these were larger spaces, where children from several forms or age groups gathered.³¹ Reports indicate that this usually brought about an atmosphere of excitement: joyful anticipation of what was still to come. Film viewings, then, often had the character of 'events': happenings disconnected from the routines of a 'regular' educational day.³²

In many cases, the exceptional nature of a screening was further reinforced by the fact that it coincided with a particular occasion; for instance, a children's festival (*Sinterklaas*, Saint-Nicholas' Day) or the birthday of a headmaster or school director. Other times of the year when lots of screenings took place were the ends of terms and the weeks before breaks or holidays.³³ In addition to this, the films that were shown rarely matched the lesson programmes of the pupils attending (as NOF decreed). Given the diversity of the audiences gathered, of course, this was hardly possible – also if the titles chosen *did* deal with subjects that were considered educationally 'relevant'. Yet according to the sources, even that was not always the case.³⁴

As a matter of fact, evidence exists that a good deal of the items that were shown in schools were *not* classroom films in the 'strict' sense (that is, if we go by the standards set in the aforementioned brochures and manuals). In many cases, the titles that were screened did not address matter covered by the official curriculum. Ed van Berkel, who has conducted an informal questionnaire on the subject, points out that the top-four of NOF's most popular items belonged to a category which the institute itself sometimes qualified as 'seasonal films'. Usually, it concerned here fictional narratives, of the kind that were officially listed as intended for language teaching. In practice, however, they were rarely used as such.³⁵ In addition to this, schools occasionally made use of the services of the institute's competitors: companies such as Nederlandse Schoolbioscoop, Filmbureau Niestadt and Benelux Films. Apart from topical and broadly informational shorts, these firms also supplied dramatic children's films, which were especially popular during the holiday season.³⁶ Catholic schools sometimes also programmed mission films.³⁷

The type of screenings described above, I would like to argue, can best be conceived of as examples of 'occasional' use. First, because they often had the character of a celebration – if not of an actual event or festival, then of the fact that the year, week, or school day was drawing to a close (an attractive prospect, for both teachers and pupils). Second, because in many cases, they constituted 'happenings' in and of themselves. As the matter films dealt with rarely formed part of the (entire) audience's lesson programme, these sessions basically constituted a suspension of formal educational activity. And third, because they were organised only occasionally: a few times a year at the very best.³⁸ Again, this fact constitutes a deviation from NOF's recommendations. According to the institute, only the regular use of its films could help them gain their 'proper' educational status: that of (mere) instructional tools. In the situations described to here, they clearly could not fulfil this role.³⁹

Embedded use

Despite the fact that a majority of witnesses had personal experience of the type of screenings characterised above, a considerable number also attest to an entirely different kind of use.

They relate that in the schools they attended or taught in, film showings did indeed tie in with the educational curriculum. As a rule, the titles they saw were projected one at a time, rather than in (unrelated) series, as was often the case with viewings of the more 'occasional' type. In addition to this, they were discussed thoroughly, either before a screening, afterwards, or at several points in time. Barring practical impediments, they were projected in the children's own classrooms, and in the presence of a teacher who was knowledgeable about the subject at hand.⁴⁰

Also contemporary reports testify to a more 'embedded' kind of use. Without exception, those teachers who did indeed take the effort of relating their experience in the pages of journals and magazines seem to have shown films on a regular basis, and in ways that suggest a sincere dedication to NOF's educational objectives. Although such users did not necessarily follow all the institute's specifications – many for instance deviated from its rules on the number of times films should be shown, or occasionally admitted a colleague's class to a screening; others were also open to renting films that did not specifically target an audience of pupils – they did live up to its ideals *in principle*. As opposed to the teachers referred to above, they deployed the medium as a didactic tool: as a means to contribute to the process of knowledge transfer which, as educators, they were supposed to stimulate. They held screenings not to (temporarily) free the children from their educational obligations, but rather to fuel their desire to acquire those facts and skills which the programme prescribed. In this process, they took it upon themselves to guide the pupils in their interpretation of what they saw, and to make them distinguish between what was educationally relevant, and what was not.⁴¹

Whether or not pupils got to attend projections of this type seems to have depended to a considerable extent on the personal initiative of the teachers in whose classes they ended up. A witness from Zeist recalls that in his primary school, sixth-formers would have a screening every month, while the rest of the pupils only viewed films once a year (on *Koninginnedag*, Queen's Day). Whereas the latter were gathered together in large groups, and saw titles that somehow fit the occasion (for instance, newsreels featuring members of the royal family, or fictional shorts), the former got to see 'actual' classroom films, in the presence of, and accompanied by, their own class teacher.⁴² An ex-schoolmaster from Oisterwijk in turn relates that he organised screenings every week. As a rule, they were attended by pupils from the fourth grade (the age group he was responsible for); more exceptionally, some of his colleagues' children could join in too.⁴³

Although evidence on the subject is scarce, it seems pretty safe to assume that teachers who organised film viewings regularly often did so out of a personal interest in the medium. Presumably, they were convinced that screenings might contribute to the educational process, but they also found them enjoyable themselves. Written sources suggest that at least some instructors may have been small-gauge amateurs; others probably had more extensive experience of the medium as viewers.⁴⁴ Following Cuban's example, I would like to refer to them as 'media-philés' or '(teaching) film buffs'.⁴⁵ Considering their 'extra-curricular' interests and activities, it is quite remarkable that these people most often organised projections *within* the established boundaries of formal education – and by implication, of their own teachership. In what follows, I shall hypothesise a little further on the logic behind this choice.

Teaching Film Use as Didactic Pragmatism

On the face of it, the relatively more widespread occurrence of what I have called 'occasional' film use seems a perfect illustration of Cuban's observations on the limited integration of new technological tools in the classrooms of primary and secondary schools. As a rule, the author states, audio-visual teaching aids have been – and in fact, continue to be – accessories to, rather than the primary vehicles for, basic instruction. A number of film scholars therefore conclude that the medium has never functioned as an instrument of educational reform – in spite of what NOF (and similar institutions abroad) might have led their readers to believe.⁴⁶

Cuban, I have pointed out, explains this state of affairs as a consequence of a fundamental suspiciousness among teachers towards modern teaching tools. Their mistrust, he argues, results in turn from a 'natural' impulse towards pragmatism: a tendency to choose only those educational solutions which can be made to fit into existing didactic structures (both procedural and relational) and which do not hold the risk of making their jobs more difficult to perform.

As it happens, the use of teaching films did indeed require a very specific set of skills. On the one hand, it called for a certain practical adroitness, for as witnesses testify, things *did* go wrong, whether because of the state of the prints, or the imperfections of the projection machines deployed.⁴⁷ In addition to this, teachers had to be able to plan lessons with sufficient flexibility in order to allow for unforeseen events (both material, and in terms of the pupils' behaviour). On the other hand, they needed skills of a didactic nature. Users of the medium had to consider how they could frame what a film said or showed, in which ways they could direct the children in what they learnt from it, and above all, how they could maintain their authority in class while lesson content was clearly passed on through some sort of 'surrogate'. The easiest way to dodge the above difficulties, many teachers seem to have thought, was simply not to use films in class at all.⁴⁸

Another option was to deploy the medium, but in such a way that the threat it posed to established didactic structures was minimal. One way of doing this was to ban screenings to the margins of formal education. In the examples of 'occasional' use which I described, the films' viewing did not form part of a lesson sequence, and in fact, not even of the educational 'enterprise' as such. Within these circumstances, the rules which normally applied in class were no longer valid. Retrospective accounts of such screenings attest to merriment and rowdiness – conditions which, according to both NOF itself and educational scientists, were entirely inconducive to the successful execution of a teaching/learning process of any kind.⁴⁹ Within the framework of the 'happenings' which these viewings were, however, this was entirely irrelevant. First, because knowledge transfer simply was not their primary objective. And second, because the loss of teacher authority which these circumstances entailed was likely to be temporary. All participants to the screening were aware that once the occasion was past (and/or the holidays were over) school life would return to 'business as usual', and 'improper' behaviour would once more provoke the standard repercussions. They knew that if teachers, during such screenings, seemed to (partially) let go of their power prerogatives, this was in fact a highly exceptional kind of leniency, entirely bound up with the occasion (undeniably, a very special one).

In my view, however, the practices which I designated above as 'occasional' are not the only

kind that can be interpreted as manifestations of the teachers' tendency towards didactic pragmatism. As opposed to Cuban, I believe that this also holds true for what I have termed 'embedded' use. In my opinion, also the characteristics and conditions of the latter type of usage can be explained with reference to the instructors' anxieties about the potentially destabilising effects of the medium's educational deployment. Again, they can be seen as attempts to avert or counteract any profound changes to their daily routines – but more importantly, to the teacher-pupil relations on which, over the years, they had come to count.

To substantiate this, I need to return once more to the reasoning which I followed earlier on this chapter. In my section on teaching film reception, I started from the assumption that NOF's user advice should be conceived of as a response to a perceived need among its users. (And I might even specify: among its most *dedicated* users, since *they* were the ones who bothered to make their wishes known.⁵⁰) The fact that the institute, in its writings, steered its readers in the direction of a highly embedded type of use suggests that it saw this as a solution for some of the problems which teachers experienced or foresaw. More specifically, NOF's representatives seem to have thought that the more its users tied in with existing procedures for the deployment of (other, more established) educational media, the greater was the chance that their experience of film would be a positive one, which they would therefore be inclined to repeat.

In this context, the connection which the institute saw with current procedures should not be interpreted too narrowly. Technologically, after all, film was quite different from any of the tools that teachers commonly used, such as books, wall charts, or various kinds of slides (if only because, as Jackson emphasises so strongly, the information stream it produced could not be interrupted quite as easily). As a result, instructors simply had to deal with it in different ways. However, what mattered to the institute was that its usage paralleled that of other classroom media *in principle*. In practice, this entailed that the films screened above all had to be given the status of educational tools. For teachers, 'degrading' the medium to the rank of an aid – by deploying it for a purpose that matched their professional duties: the transmission of a given, predetermined set of knowledge or skills – could mean that in the eyes of their pupils, they acquired at least some ownership of the arguments made.

It is my suspicion that instructors who opted for what I have termed 'embedded' practices trusted NOF's judgement that the best way to achieve this was to use film as intensively as possible. Like the institute, they were convinced that the only way to free the medium of the 'entertainment hue' that stuck to it (and which, supposedly, increased the risk of all sorts of 'un-classroom-like' behaviour) was to actively accustom pupils to the idea that it did indeed belong in schools.⁵¹ Also, they seem to have thought that instilling this in their children could best be done through frequent exposure.⁵² For the teachers themselves, the repeated use of film would then become part of a self-rewarding cycle: the more often they deployed it, the more likely it was that it would help them meet their educational targets, and subsequently, give them the satisfaction of a job well done.

Embedded use, in other words, should be seen as an alternative way of dealing with the professional anxieties which Cuban considers to be so 'natural' for teachers confronted with new educational technologies. One option which educators had was not to give in to their

fears, but to try to overcome it by 'mastering' the medium (in all possible senses of that word). By following standardised procedures (whether long-established ones, or new ones inspired by pre-existing routines) they could let classroom interaction run its most 'regular' course. Doing so, after all, constituted the smallest possible threat to their own authority – or if not, allowed them to re-establish it in the shortest possible time. As such, it was the most likely road to a successful execution of their educational duties.⁵³

As a last remark, I need to add here that even if the above is true, the option of embedded, and therefore, intensive use was probably only attractive to those teachers who already had a certain amount of confidence in their own didactic abilities. More specifically, it required that they were convinced that they had some 'credit' in terms of authority: some kind of a 'power stash' to rely on in the early stages (the habituation phase, for the pupils in particular) of teaching film use. A factor that could help reinforce this self-assurance was a lack of fear of the technology itself. As I pointed out earlier, intensive users were often amateurs of film: people familiar with the medium, either as a technical given, or as a generator of meanings. Knowing that they derived from this at least a certain level of skill may have armed them some more against the many 'risks' of its educational use.

People who were *highly* confident of their capacities as teachers, viewers or operators, for their part, could allow themselves more liberties with respect to the recommendations which distributors made. Van der Meulen, himself an experienced user of film, leaves room for this in his writings. Although the author emphatically condemns those teachers who deploy the medium *purely* for purposes of entertainment, he does not at all object to film lessons in which the participants also have some fun. For this reason, he is also less strict than NOF's own authors with respect to the practicalities of the medium's use.⁵⁴ For most teachers, however, the institute's instructions constituted something to hold on to. For them, deviating from those rules probably did not become attractive until they had already built up sufficiently firm routines.

2.2 Teaching Films and the Pedagogical *Dispositif*

In what precedes, I have discussed some of the ways in which (teaching) films were commonly deployed in Dutch primary and secondary schools. My motivation for doing so, I explained, was that my interest in the NOF collection is due primarily to its status as an object of usage; a status which in turn derives from the fact that it constitutes the holdings of what was once an active *médiathèque*. In order to accurately position my research object, then, I also had to consider some of the practices which, in the course of time, it has been subject to. For want of more concrete evidence, I resorted in this process to formulating conclusions of a largely hypothetical kind.

In the picture I sketched so far, teachers occupy a rather central position. Within the context of what I was trying to do, this is quite logical, for in most cases, it was the instructors who took decisions on the basic conditions for the films' screening. They were the ones who determined in which location and physical conditions a projection would be held, and whether or not a connection would be established with the lesson programme. In doing so, they defined to a considerable extent the framework within which practices of classroom film viewing (in both meanings of that phrase) could take place.

However, it would be reductive thinking to conclude therefore that teachers were exclusively responsible for the ways in which films were, or could be, 'read'. Clearly, other factors as well contributed to the manner in which these texts were understood – not only the viewing instructions which, implicitly or explicitly, were formulated by the people who put them to use. So, as an interpretation of the films will be my main goal in the second half of this work, it is imperative that I now round out the picture I sketched above: that I am more precise about the interaction between the various circumstances or agents that may have had a bearing on the reading of the texts under scrutiny here. For this purpose, I shall make use of the concept of a 'pedagogical *dispositif*'.

In what follows, I shall first expound this idea. I shall briefly discuss the notion of the 'cinematic *dispositif*', of which my own term is a derivation. Subsequently, I shall demonstrate how I have adapted it – specified, but also narrowed down – for my own purpose. Next, I shall explain why this version of the concept is the most useful one, in view of the analysis that follows in part II. As I announced earlier, the determination of a framework for textual interpretation (my objective in this paragraph) will require that I reduce the variety of classroom film practices which I sketched previously to a single, workable abstraction. In doing so, I shall take my inspiration from the cluster which I characterised earlier as 'embedded'. In the last few pages of this chapter, I shall justify this choice.

Dispositifs of Viewing

In his introduction to an unpublished seminar paper, Frank Kessler traces the evolution of the *dispositif* concept in media studies from the time it was first mentioned (the early 1970s) to the present day. At first, the overview suggests, the term had a rather static meaning. In the work of Jean-Louis Baudry, arguably the first in the field to adopt it, it is used to explain the impression of 'reality' that is experienced in watching a fiction film. Baudry's phrase 'cinematic *dispositif*', then, refers to a very specific spectator positioning, which is conceived

of as a trans-historical phenomenon. In recent years, however, the word has been endowed with meanings that allow for more flexibility. It has been used to account for variety instead of constancy, both synchronically (in which case various cinematic *dispositifs* are considered to exist one alongside the other) and diachronically (the *dispositif* concept then functioning as a historiographic tool).⁵⁵

Kessler himself opts for a pragmatic interpretation of the term, thus creating the possibility to (re)historicise the interrelationship between a technology, a specific filmic form and a viewing position. Within a pragmatic approach, he points out, the notion of *dispositif* can help take into account different uses of the same (or similar) texts within various exhibition contexts and/or institutional framings. As such, it allows one to conceive of media history in terms of evolving configurations of 'hardware', text and spectatorship rather than as a series of forms or formats following each other in time – each with its own 'identity' or 'specificity'.⁵⁶

One of the authors Kessler references in establishing his point is Roger Odin, who has made some valuable observations on the ways in which institutional framings can affect the interpretation of filmic texts.⁵⁷ The tenet of Odin's argument is that the (reading) role which spectators adopt is linked to a considerable extent to so-called 'bundles of determination', issuing from the 'social space' in which viewing takes place. Within this social space, several 'institutions' are at work: normative powers that manifest themselves both materially (in the physical characteristics of cinemas, museums, etc.) and as the set of interpretations which they 'programme' or stimulate (and which he calls 'institutional constraints', *contraintes institutionnelles*). While spectators are often in a position to 'dissent' from imposed readings, Odin suggests, some of these forces are near-inescapable; especially, those which emanate from the 'dominant' cinematographic institution, that of fictional (entertainment) film.⁵⁸

While the author thus points out that there are other factors beside texts and their readers which contribute to the production of meaning, his primary focus is necessarily on the audience. Odin's approach requires that one concentrates on how *spectators* are directed in their reading of specific films, both by the viewing situations in which they end up, and the 'institutional' conventions and traditions which govern them. In my view, the main advantage of using the theoretical concept of *dispositif*, rather than a conception of readers as subject to various bundles of determination, is that it does not privilege either one of the players that contribute to the process of meaning construction, and that it does not subject them to any kind of conceptual hierarchy. The reason why I choose to use the notion, in other words, is that it allows for an understanding of the interaction between its constituents (technology, text, and viewer/viewing position) as an entirely reciprocal and simultaneous process.⁵⁹

The Pedagogical Dispositif

As a theoretical concept, the *dispositif* notion not only has a tradition in media studies, but also in the field of educational science (among many others). Within a pedagogical context, however, the term often has a somewhat normative connotation.⁶⁰ In her contribution to a collection of essays mapping current uses of the term (in the French-speaking world), Anne-Marie Chartier writes:

In the field of pedagogy, the term *dispositif* is often used in a banal way to designate the organised, well-defined, stable means that form the framework for repeatable actions.

Among the *dispositifs* of education, the alternation is [with] a *dispositif* which differs from the 'classical' one organised around theoretical courses.⁶¹

As such, she demonstrates, it often functions as a synonym of method (*méthode*): a standard for teaching and learning, usually as prescribed by manuals and sample texts or tests. *Dispositif* thus excludes everything that can be referred to as 'practice' (*pratique*), or those aspects of the teaching process that take shape in daily classroom interaction. This use of the concept, she points out, is entirely compatible with what she describes as "the technocratic idea that it concerns institutionalised, finalised machineries, conceived by decision-makers seeking to be efficient".⁶² What is left out here, in other words, is precisely the aspect of interdependency which I singled out above as the *dispositif* notion's chief merit.

The second problem with earlier uses of a concept of 'pedagogical *dispositif*' is that those who deploy it usually lend too much weight to the texts which their analyses revolve around. Daniel Peraya, author of a piece on the mediatisation of education published in the same volume, argues that the genre characteristics of classroom films "provoke" corresponding cognitive positionings in their spectators. Fabienne Thomas, in turn, sets herself the task of determining how structural changes to film texts can help create a more desirable audience attitude. In this context, she speaks of the "effectuation" of the film's *dispositif*, thus suggesting that the latter is very much a function of the text itself.⁶³ Both authors, I would argue, fail to acknowledge the highly interactive nature of audience positioning, and in particular, the role which, in this process, can be attributed to (institutionalised aspects of) the relationship between pupils and teachers.

Jacquinet, author of *Image et pédagogie*, the book which I mentioned in my introduction, makes a terminological distinction which seems useful here. Borrowing her concepts from the American theorist Rudy Bretz, she differentiates between two types of (media) communication: the kind which takes place within a 'system of information' (*système d'information*) and that which is characteristic of a 'system of instruction', or 'tuition' (*système d'instruction*). Both types of communication are vehicles for messages with an informative content; the difference between them lies in the purposes they serve. Whereas the first aims merely at informing users, the second also offers them the opportunity to learn. Another crucial distinction between the two systems is that instructing, as opposed to informing, involves an element of control: it implies that someone (an instructor) takes charge of, or "masters", the conditions in which meaning production can take place.⁶⁴

The latter remark in particular interests me, as it underlines the relational aspect of the *dispositif* which I focused on earlier. In the first half of this chapter, I pointed out that teaching situations are usually characterised by an element of constraint, which derives from the fact that instructors and learners do not have the same level of authority. Although those who teach on a daily basis will confirm that in practice, an appropriate power (im)balance is not always easy to achieve, I would like to argue that a certain amount of coerciveness is inherent to the educational 'institution' itself. The hierarchical relation between teachers and pupils may have to be reconfirmed upon every encounter between them; it does not, however, need to be *reinvented*. As partners in a so-called *système d'instruction*, both parties are familiar with the standard procedures for interaction – whether they choose to abide by them, or not. The particular nature of their relation, in other words, is a constitutive part of

what could be called a 'pedagogical *dispositif*'.

One advantage of the *dispositif* concept which I use here is that it does not reduce the figure of the teacher to a mere institutional 'factor', a part of a more general 'context' which influences the spectators' reading of a film. In what precedes, I emphasised the role of the medium's deployers in determining the conditions in which viewing takes place. While the effect of the decisions they take on the pupils' interpretation of the material shown should not be seen too deterministically, I do think that one should foreground their relation to the children they teach – not only for the purpose of appropriately valuing the more 'contingent' aspects of the pedagogical *dispositif*, but also for an accurate understanding of a text's functioning as part of it.

Within a classroom setting, after all, the relation between instructors and spectators, but also that between instructors and texts, is a rather direct one. In the previous paragraph, I argued that an educator's (functional) authority over the class he teaches is closely bound up with his presumed intellectual superiority: the fact that he already possesses the knowledge which his pupils still need to acquire. This authority, I would like to point out, also extends to the tools he chooses to use. By showing a film to a group of children, a teacher inevitably demonstrates that he considers it a 'worthy' instrument for the transfer of those facts or skills which he is supposed to pass on – a condition which in turn presupposes that he can vouch for the accuracy of the information it conveys. The approval which he thus (tacitly) gives to what is said or shown, I believe, is a crucial constituent of the *dispositif* within which that specific title acquires meaning.⁶⁵

The Pedagogical *Dispositif* as a *Dispositif* of 'Embedding'

In what precedes, I have occasionally referred to the configuration of technology, text and viewing position that is relevant in my case as 'the' pedagogical *dispositif*. One can wonder, however, if the indefinite article might not be more appropriate. After all, the set-up which I describe is not the *only* one imaginable – even if one chooses to focus on the ways in which the films under scrutiny functioned within the context of formal educational institutions. In determining the constituents of 'my' pedagogical *dispositif*, I very specifically infer a screening/viewing situation in which the conditions that apply to 'regular' classroom interaction stay in place – or if not, eventually do get recreated. In other words, I presuppose a configuration that can only take shape in the event of what I have previously called 'embedded' use. This inevitably entails that there is a whole series of alternative possibilities which I leave aside.

The reason why I do this is that in what follows, I shall use the *dispositif* concept not as a mere idea, but as an interpretational tool – or perhaps more accurately: as an interpretive 'frame'. In her book *Travelling Concepts in the Humanities* (2002), Mieke Bal uses this term (and its derivative verb form, 'framing') to describe what one does in the course of analysing texts (or images, or cultural objects of any kind). The notion foregrounds the fact that in interpreting, one basically 'produces' an 'event': one makes choices in terms of what one brings to bear on that which is scrutinised. By definition, then, the act of 'framing' is always provisional: which frame one chooses does not merely depend on the object of analysis, but also on the goals one sets oneself at a given point in time.⁶⁶

Necessarily, this act of framing one's object is also reductive. Making interpretational choices entails that one privileges certain angles over others, or even ignores possible points of view. In addition to this, one also reverts to abstractions. In what precedes, for instance, I have amalgamated a multitude of real-life configurations into a single, theoretical model. In a way, then, the set-up I work with constitutes an 'ideal type' in the sense of Max Weber: although it is *derived* from a series of actual examples, it is obtained through an act of synthesis and simplification. In other words: it is a unified construct, corresponding to a much more diverse reality.⁶⁷

However, I should also stress that the decisions that underlie this reductive act are not random, but informed by some of the conclusions which I drew earlier. More specifically, my choice for a *dispositif* of 'embedding' is based on the observation that in the case of so-called 'occasional' use, films did not really function as didactic aids. For me, the ultimate implication of this viewpoint is that in the case of practices of this type, one should not be using the term 'teaching film' at all – even if the texts deployed, at times, *did* deal with subjects that were commonly considered relevant to the objectives of formal education.

My reasoning here is pretty straight-forward. In order to convey it accurately, let me return briefly to the work of Odin. Within the framework of his so-called 'semio-pragmatic' approach, the author claims that various institutions guide spectators in their interpretation of the film texts they are confronted with. These institutions, he specifies, direct them either towards a 'fictionalising', or towards a 'documentarising' reading. On a more specific level, they can also steer them towards an interpretation in terms of a specific sub-'genre' (or as he calls it himself: *ensemble*, an 'aggregate' or 'entity'). For instance, it is largely due to certain institutional constraints that a film will be taken to qualify as a *reportage* film, a 'pedagogical' film (*film pédagogique*), or any other type of non-fiction film.⁶⁸

Proposing a somewhat more 'interactive' variation on this analysis, I would argue that it is the specific *dispositif* which comes into being during a given text's screening/viewing that determines whether or not it takes on the status of a teaching film (for that specific group of viewers, on that particular occasion). If what comes about is the type of configuration that I have designated above as 'pedagogical', then use of the term is indeed appropriate; if not, I would choose to employ a different label altogether. Re-applying the metaphor I used earlier, then, I claim that the tag 'teaching film' is suitable only in the case of texts that are 'framed' as *didactic instruments*. The *dispositif* that this usage type generates, in turn, constitutes the framework for my analysis of their operation as rhetorical constructs.⁶⁹

Reading vs. effectiveness

Those familiar with Odin's work will probably notice that some of the interpretive assumptions which I make here fundamentally conflict with the author's views on the activation of reader roles in a formal educational context. In a short paragraph on the subject, Odin argues that in practice, teaching films (or their more up-to-date equivalents: school television broadcasts) rarely function as 'aids' to pedagogical interaction; in fact, he says, they nearly always *undermine* the sort of communication that normally takes place in class.⁷⁰ The immediate implication of this assessment is that in practice, the *dispositif* which I described above cannot take shape. In what follows, I shall briefly explain why I do not take over the author's viewpoint here.

As I said, Odin postulates that film viewers are directed in their interpretation by so-called 'institutional constraints'. However, the coercive potential of these forces is not absolute: spectators always have the freedom to deviate from a proposed reading, and choose an alternative one. Within a pedagogical setting, he adds, this is particularly common. In fact, pupils who are made to watch films in class rarely accept the interpretation that is imposed. While it is very difficult for them to decode the texts they are dished up *differently* than the educational institution requires, simply because the reading order given is too powerful to oppose, they do have the option of refusing to interpret altogether. The result of this, Odin continues, is that the exchange comes to a halt: there is no filmic communication, but no (proper) *pedagogical* communication either. The author explains this failure to converse as a result of the fact that the viewers are given two conflicting reading 'directives' (*consignes*). On the one hand, they are encouraged to fictionalise (by the dominant cinematographic institution, which defines this as the 'standard' interpretational mode); on the other hand, they are stimulated to documentarise (by the teacher, or the educational institution which this person represents).⁷¹

My first objection to this analysis is that it constitutes an (unjustified) generalisation. Although the situation which Odin sketches is definitely conceivable, I dismiss his conclusion that classroom viewers are inevitably placed in a so-called 'double bind'.⁷² His assessment, I believe, is based on the presupposition that films, by definition, will never be recognised as ('proper') didactic tools, *even* if they are shown in a markedly pedagogical context. In my view, however, this is not necessarily so. How pupils perceive of the medium is largely a matter of what they are accustomed to: the more experience they have with teachers who develop routines of embedded use, the less likely Odin's scenario is going to be.⁷³

A second, more important point I wish make is that pronouncements to this effect often form part of a discourse centring around the potential successfulness, or effectiveness, of teaching films/didactic broadcasts. In Odin's view, the (near-)impossibility for a so-called 'documentarising pact' to emerge within an educational institution seems to hinge primarily on the teachers' failure to 'frame' adequately the films which they deploy. Other authors, however, blame it on the qualities of the texts that are chosen for this purpose; for instance, the fact that they are often stylistically 'backward' (either due to productional restrictions, or because they tend to be used 'beyond their time').⁷⁴

In my opinion, such considerations are of lesser importance, especially if one's primary objective is the rhetorical analysis of a given corpus of texts. For the purpose I set myself here, it does not matter all that much whether pupils, in concrete viewing situations, did or did not adopt the readings that I shall infer – or with Odin's terms: whether or not they accepted the communicative 'pact' that these interpretations presuppose. For me, it is much more relevant that within the functional set-up that I have identified above, viewers were necessarily aware which readings were the most 'appropriate' ones; or in other words: which interpretations that given *dispositif demandé*. In the case of embedded use, I believe, the situation's pedagogical nature would have been so obvious that children could not simply *ignore* the readings that were associated with it, but only actively *oppose* them. By implication, then, they had to know full well what these 'correct' interpretations were.⁷⁵

Taking the above reasoning just a little further, I would like argue that the pupils' consciousness of what they were *supposed* to make of a film is actually the *only* given of which one can safely assume that it was shared by a majority – if not all – of the people present. Therefore, I shall use it as a guideline for analysis.

Conclusions

In this chapter, I have set myself two goals. The first was to sketch a picture of how (classroom) films were deployed in Dutch primary and secondary schools in the period I deal with. In the absence of concrete data on this subject, I have thought it useful to first consider what NOF's (normative) writings reveal about the attitude which teachers took to the possibility of the medium's classroom use. The insights I obtained in this process, combined with a few first-hand, mostly retrospective reports, have allowed me to formulate some basic hypotheses on the topic.

My second purpose was to figure out what these observations on classroom film use might in turn contribute to the analysis that follows in part II. In the second half of this chapter, I have argued that, while I have no reason to qualify either of the two usage patterns which I singled out as dominant, the cluster which I designated as 'embedded' would probably be the most productive model for a rhetorical analysis. Therefore, I have chosen to take it as my inspiration in determining the characteristics of the pedagogical *dispositif* that will serve as my interpretational frame.

In chapter 3, which will function as an introduction to part II, I shall further develop the links between the *dispositif* notion that I have established here, and my reading of sample films from the collection under scrutiny. In the next few paragraphs, I shall elucidate my conception of rhetoric as something that is not confined to a given (audio-visual) text, but that needs to get activated, or 'performed', within a specific functional framework. In addition to this, I shall expound my analytical method, and identify the two sets of textual elements that I shall focus on next.

PART II

RHETORIC: TEXT & FRAME

Introduction

In his introduction to the National Film Preservation Foundation's recently compiled *The Field Guide to Sponsored Films*, Rick Prelinger ponders some of the challenges of what he calls 'ephemeral film scholarship'. He writes:

As historically neglected film types gain attention, archivists and scholars face challenges quite unlike those confronted in collecting the better-documented fiction feature. In a universe of hundreds of thousands of poorly known and largely undocumented works, where do we begin? [...] How can practitioners compare similar titles and characterize their specificities [...]?

The methodological difficulties which the author here associates primarily with research on 'sponsored' films (a term with which he refers to a rather broad category of items financed and/or produced by companies, associations or institutions, often for purposes of advertising or education) equally apply to the study of titles intended more specifically for classroom teaching. As in Prelinger's case, my problem is that there is no ready-made method to describe the films I investigate; that is, no (approved) analytical procedure that takes into account both what distinguishes them from *non*-teaching films, and any textual variation that might occur within the corpus itself.

Attempts to distinguish between various kinds of 'educational films', of course, have been made ever since the first such titles were rented out – both by the material's distributors, and by academic authors (often pedagogues). Staff at NOF, for instance, based their classifications on the subject categories instated by the curricula which the films were meant to support. Others categorised titles according to their didactic methods or learning objectives. Some combined one or more of the above principles with more traditional organising criteria, such as the films' various generic features.² However, none of these classification systems provides a useful starting point for the (much more encompassing) analysis that I want to conduct here.

Considering educational and classroom films retrospectively, more recent academic studies have tried to develop terminologies that allow for distinctions on a higher analytical level – a vocabulary, I mean, that is used not so much to differentiate within the corpus itself, but to distinguish educational films from titles intended for other purposes and/or audiences. The most notable example, again, is Jacquinet's *Image et pédagogie*. As I explained in my introduction, the book's objective is to determine how common cinematographic codes are adapted so as to serve a specifically didactic purpose. Jacquinet, in other words, tries to find out what is textually 'characteristic' of such titles. One of her main conclusions is that teaching

films, as a rule, are rather 'authoritarian': they do not leave much room for the reader's own (interpretive) initiative. She attributes this, in large measure, to the films' so-called 'verbosity': the fact that they primarily use *words* to pass their messages on, and in this process, severely restrict the signifying potential of the images.³

As I pointed out earlier, I do not support Jacquinot's view. I disagree with her, on the one hand, because her conclusion constitutes an unwarranted generalisation. What she says most certainly applies to some, but by no means to *all* films that were deployed for didactic purposes (at least, if one judges by the titles that I have studied – a corpus, of course, selected on the basis of a very different set of criteria than hers).⁴ On the other hand, because I think that in formulating her observations, she posits the uniqueness of features that are not at all exclusive to that particular category of material. For instance, the relations between verbal and visual elements which she considers to be typical of this type of film can equally be found in all sorts of shorts (many of which informational) that did not specifically target an audience of schoolchildren.⁵

Remarkable in this context – although by no means surprising, given her choice to refer to her object as 'films with didactic *intent*' – is that the author here takes her inspiration from the circumstances of the films' production. According to Jacquinot, teaching films look the way they do because of a division of tasks between pedagogues and directors in the process of making them (the former determining content; the latter merely 'translating' it into images and sounds). Although I do not wish to deny here that the educational background of the films' writers, and more in particular, their first-hand experience of other types of didactic 'texts', may have affected the appearance of those shorts to a certain degree (also in the Dutch case), I do not consider it a very productive starting point for analysis.⁶ Background knowledge of this kind definitely has some clarifying potential, in the sense that it can help determine why, in individual films, certain textual choices were made. However, it does not provide any further clues as to how that specific body of material should be *read*.

In what precedes, I explained that for me, the most important 'common denominator' of these films is the fact that they were once deployed within the framework of, and more specifically, as an aid to, regular education. Obviously, then, this fact should also inspire me in the process of interpretation. In my analysis, I shall focus, like Jacquinot, on textual features: I shall take my departure from the (sound and/or) image configurations that I come across. However, as opposed to the French author, I shall not relate those to the conditions of the films' production. Instead, I shall try to answer the question of what sort of meanings these textual elements take on, or might have taken on, within their very specific *functional* environments.

Before I do so, however, I shall elucidate my main principles for analysis. My aim in this chapter is to clarify how, in my discussion of concrete films, I shall try to achieve an analytical balance between the texts under scrutiny, and the (pedagogical) frameworks within which they had to operate. More specifically, I shall explain how a rhetorical perspective can help me integrate the various factors that contribute to the process of signification. I shall do this in three steps.

First, I shall state my position in the (expanding) field of rhetorical theory by making explicit my understanding of the notion which I work with here. I shall argue that rhetoric should be seen not as a finite series of compositional techniques, but as a basic textual function that

gets 'activated' under a given set of circumstances. Next, I shall elaborate on the rhetorical function of the latter: the *non*-textual conditions that I collectively refer to as the text's 'frame'. Finally, I shall specify which types of textual rhetoric I intend to focus on: which kinds of elements I shall look for in the course of my analysis.

3.1 Rhetoric: Conceptual Exploration

Over the past twenty years, authors of (theoretical) studies of non-fiction film have increasingly been using the concept of 'rhetoric' in attempts to characterise, and in some cases delimit, their objects of research. Bill Nichols, in several publications on documentary, has defined non-fiction films as 'arguments' or 'claims' about the historical world, which "characteristically depend on [...] rhetoric" rather than plot. Carl Plantinga has argued that non-fiction is a "genre of rhetoric" (rather than imitation, or reproduction). About a decade earlier, Willem Hesling had already proposed to adapt instruments commonly used to describe verbal structures of argumentation to the study of film in general, and of documentary in particular.⁷

One obvious reason for the concept's popularity in this context is the fact that non-fiction is often closely associated with notions of 'reality' (or 'real-ness') and 'truth'. The title of Winston's book on the subject, *Claiming the Real*, builds on the widespread assumption that the task of documentary film is to persuade an audience that what is represented corresponds to extratextual reality (and by implication, that this is a measure for its successfulness). Noël Carroll, for his part, points out that the objectivity that is commonly required from non-fiction is often taken to be an equivalent of truth. For Plantinga, in turn, "nonfiction films are those that assert that the states of affairs they present occur(red) in the actual world" – something they can do with varying degrees of (narrational) convincingness.⁸

Commanding epistemic authority, however, is only one aspect of the rhetorical process: a means to a much more encompassing discursive end. Modern conceptions of rhetoric, in any case, no longer associate the notion exclusively with the art of persuasion (or the study thereof) and the instruments or procedures involved. In its broadest possible definition the term now stands for "the use of symbols by humans"; as such, it functions as a synonym of 'communication'. Also authors who define the concept somewhat more narrowly emphasise that 'rhetoric' can be related to *any* aspect of textual construction.⁹ In writing on film, however, it is still used in most cases to describe isolated mechanisms (for instance, the functioning of visual imagery) in explicitly persuasive or propagandistic genres.¹⁰

Even if their interpretations of the concept are not quite that limiting, the non-fiction film theorists mentioned above deal with matters of rhetoric in a rather restrictive manner as well. The reason is not so much the fact that they consider a fixed range of textual procedures, but rather the ideas which they entertain on what constitutes the object of what Seymour Chatman, with a more neutral term, has called a text's 'suasion'.¹¹ Nichols, Winston and Plantinga all seem to take for granted that the primary purpose of the rhetorical process is to make an audience accept the reality or truth of the proposition made by a film. This assumption comes very close to classical conceptions of rhetoric as aimed at convincing hearers that they should agree with the speaker on the thesis he defends – a definition which, indeed, automatically confines the use of the term to a non-fiction context.

Rhetoric as a Textual Function

My own position, in contrast, is more in line with present-day conceptions of rhetoric, which shift the attention away from the purport of the proposition (and its relation to the world it references) towards its *status as a proposition*.¹² By substituting 'persuade' with 'suade'

Chatman emphasises that the area of study he deals with “concerns the urgings of the text, the ‘available means’” rather than any kind of ‘message’ or the text’s failure or success in conveying it. Rhetoric, in this sense, refers to argumentation in the most general sense of the word: the use of textual resources to ensure the acceptability of a particular statement, *as a statement*. In as far as the notion has anything to do with persuasion at all, then, it is not in terms of the plausibility of certain pronouncements, but rather their validity, their “right to be taken seriously”.¹³

From this perspective, every utterance, whether verbal or audio-visual, can be considered to have some sort of a rhetorical function. In his article on the analysis of documentary film, Hesling argues that some strategies of argumentation are used specifically to augment a work’s persuasive force. Preceding this moment of persuasion, however, “there is a moment of compulsion which has much more to do with the *interpretation of the meaning of a text*”. The author thus widens the scope of the term ‘rhetoric’ to include all procedures that contribute to a film’s coherence and, consequently, its intelligibility. The fact that meaning production depends on rhetorical mechanisms, he concludes, entails that the latter necessarily also fulfil a *text-internal* function.¹⁴

Moving on from Hesling’s position I would like to argue that rhetoric not only plays a part in the public’s understanding of a work, but also has some kind of a motivational function. Whatever is ‘rhetorical’ about a text is what can help convince an (implied) reader/viewer that what is said or shown is worth his attention, and therefore, that he better read/watch (or continue to do so). Yet in order for such a plea to even *register* with an audience, a work first of all needs to be able to draw attention to itself. Ultimately, therefore, rhetoric contributes not only to a text’s intelligibility, but also to its *visibility*. The concept, in other words, concerns the entire complex of features with which an utterance ‘requests’ to be ‘heard’.¹⁵

If this is the case, of course, the term ‘rhetoric’ can refer to procedures common to *all* kinds of texts – not only non-fictional ones. In an article from the late 1970s (expressing ideas that were rather ‘modern’ for that time), Laurence Behrens states that “[f]ilms don’t have to be overtly didactic [...] to be arguments” and that any “presentation of a character, a situation, a sequence of events, a resolution, a milieu” counts as a rhetorical device, since each of those must be convincing if the argument is to be considered successful.¹⁶ Rhetorical effectiveness, in other words, is in essence a matter of the audience’s willingness to consider what is said or shown – not its preparedness to accept it as either ‘real’ or ‘true’, or to agree with a narrator’s point of view.

‘Rhetoric’ as such, in turn, should be seen as a basic function, or dimension, of any text – whether spoken, written, or constructed out of photographic images and/or recorded sounds. Considered from a methodological point of view, it also constitutes a possible ‘perspective’: an aspect of the text that one can focus on during analysis – as I shall do in the following two chapters. First, however, I need to make explicit a few more theoretical assumptions.

Rhetorical ‘Performance’

One consideration that is dealt with by the above authors, but only in passing, is the fact that if the objective of rhetoric is to make a communication acceptable, then the concept’s

referential scope cannot be limited to features of the text itself. Chatman does quote Wayne Booth's pronouncement that certain 'problems' that one might encounter while reading fiction can be handled "by rhetoric provided outside the work"; however, he does not elaborate on how exactly the latter should be understood, or how its relation to the text in question might be conceived of. Jacques Derrida, for his part, is a little more specific. In an interview on the subject, he argues that the effects of rhetoric in part also depend on text-external factors, such as political, economical, or 'libidinal' situations (which he collectively designates as 'pragmatic' ones). However, he does not specify how precisely textual and non-textual elements interact.¹⁷

In my own view, the role of text-external factors can best be conceived of as that of 'setting off', or 'activating', the rhetorical potential of the (literary/cinematic) work itself. In other words, I take my departure from the assumption that textual rhetoric gets 'actualised', as Umberto Eco once put it, within, and to some extent also *by*, the particular situation in which a piece is 'consumed'.¹⁸ Inevitably, this also implies that a text cannot achieve its maximum argumentative effect unless it is presented to its readers/viewers within its most 'relevant' (institutional) framework. For teaching films, the type of works I am dealing with here, this means in practice that they are most likely to compel their audience's willingness to consider what they argue – *as teaching films* – if they are part of what I have designated earlier as a 'pedagogical *dispositif*'.

In order to develop the above ideas a little further, I would like to pick up on a reference made, again, by Derrida. In the article which I mentioned earlier, the interviewee associates rhetoric with 'performativity', thus establishing the relation with speech act theory, as developed by J. L. Austin and John Searle.¹⁹ Linguistic utterances, according to this theory, function in concrete user situations as speech acts, which should be conceived of as a combination of propositional content (their 'locutionary' aspect) and performative (or 'illocutionary') force. Performativity here concerns a statement's potential as an act that can generate a certain effect ('perlocution'). In their performative aspect, speech acts are subject to sets of semantic and pragmatic rules (or 'validity claims', as Habermas calls them) which form the criteria on the basis of which utterances can be evaluated.²⁰ The latter characteristic in particular links the speech act to textual rhetoric as a conceptual tool: in a similar way, rhetorical activity cannot be pried loose of the expectations that are embodied by the pragmatic situation in which it comes about. It is precisely those conventions by which rhetoric can, quite literally, 'take effect'.

Following on from the above, I would like to argue that what I have referred to earlier as the process of rhetorical 'activation' might also be characterised as one of 'performance'. In a book chapter on the subject, Mieke Bal has pointed out that the latter term, although the most 'natural' choice of noun to indicate the occurrence of performativity, has developed into a concept as part of a different theoretical tradition (aesthetics, instead of the philosophy of language). As a rule, moreover, both terms are employed to highlight different properties of the objects dealt with. For instance, while 'performance' is often used to foreground the one-off, non-recurring aspects of a happening/presentation, 'performativity' precisely draws attention to a given (linguistic) *potential*, and therefore, the referent's being subject to, or part of, a long series of repetition.²¹ Yet even so, Bal insists, there are striking analogies between

the two notions. One relation that is of particular significance to me here is the importance, in either case, of the role of memory.²²

In what precedes, I already stressed the significance of conventions, expectations, in the process of activating the performative aspects of an utterance. Of course, a similar type of (historical) understandings also play a role in the execution of that which is traditionally designated as a 'performance': an enactment of a rehearsed text, scene, or play. Here, it concerns more specifically those associations which occur to the viewer/visitor in the process of watching.²³ Like the rules which speech acts are subject to, these (memories of) cultural conventions constitute a stock of necessary (fore)knowledge: without them, the rhetorical potential of the work simply cannot be activated. This property, I would like to argue, connects texts that are enacted live (i.e., performances in the 'strict' sense) to recorded/filmic ones. For in such works as well, it depends on which stored notions readers or viewers rely on, which meanings get actualised in that which 'unfolds', or occurs, before their eyes.²⁴

Precisely because it is so inextricably bound up with the here-and-now of some sort of 'performance', then, the activation of a text's rhetorical potential is also contingent upon the conditions in which the reading act takes place. Film spectators, for instance, will take their recourse to different cultural conventions in different viewing situations. Which memories they draw on, in other words, depends in turn on how the work itself is framed.

3.2 Framing Rhetoric

A work's 'framing', in what follows, shall be taken to refer to those aspects of the rhetorical process that can be situated *outside* the 'text' itself. In my previous chapter, I used the term – or rather its nominal form, 'frame' – to draw attention to the choices, or assumptions, which I make in the process of interpreting films. Here, in contrast, I shall take it to refer to something more concrete. I shall use it to identify those elements of a work's 'surroundings', both material and non-material, that have a role to play in activating, or performing, its rhetorical potential. In doing so, however, I shall *also* carry out a more abstract act of framing: I shall draw attention to, or foreground, the ways in which text-external factors can help set off a film's various (latent) rhetorical effects.²⁵

While the terminology used above may suggest that I consider these 'extratextual' elements to be distinct from the work itself, I would like to emphasise that in concrete analytical situations, they cannot be seen as separate. In what follows, therefore, I shall consider the frame not as something that literally 'borders' the text (and thus, sets it apart from that which surrounds it, like the woodwork of a painting) but as part of a larger whole, and more specifically, of a complex of mutually connected, and complementary, elements.²⁶ In other words, I shall think of it as an inextricable part of a wider *dispositif* – a set-up which then encompasses both the text *and* the various elements, or relations, that contribute to its framing.

Earlier in this chapter I characterised the function of rhetoric as that of ensuring the acceptability, or visibility, of a particular statement, *as a statement*. Which aspect of the utterance exactly this acceptability concerns, however, varies according to the type of statement under scrutiny, and by the same token, according to the particular *dispositif* of which it forms part. For instance, a film that is framed as 'educational' and is allowed to function as part of a distinctly pedagogical *dispositif* shall be acceptable for other reasons, and on other conditions, than one that is screened within a different set-up. Let me illustrate this with an example.

The NOF-distributed shorts *Een natte broek in Waterland* (1956, Wet trousers in Waterland) and *Een vrolijke kadotter in huis* (1959, A jolly starling in the house) both tell the story of a few young protagonists who enjoy an 'unusual' adventure before returning to the routines of their everyday lives.²⁷ Within most institutional frameworks, they would probably have been read as fictions, providing either suspense or comic relief. On those occasions, the films' rhetorical potential would have concerned their acceptability as narratives; the measure for their success, then, would have been the audience's preparedness to immerse itself in the (imaginary) universe represented. When seen in a school classroom, however, other aspects of the films' discourse might have stood out. In addition to telling the story of a couple of young children, the films also document, respectively, some of the physical features of the Dutch polder land, and the behaviour of a bird in freedom and captivity.²⁸ Within a teaching situation, therefore, their rhetorical effect might also have depended on their intelligibility, and acceptability, as geographical/biological claims – at least, if the facts presented would have been considered relevant in the context of the day's lesson. In such a case, the films' status of educational tools would have decisively affected their functioning as rhetorical constructs.²⁹

Classroom Rhetoric

In the seminar paper which I quoted from earlier, Kessler summarises the purport of current usages of the term *dispositif* as: a material and conceptual configuration “making it possible for a given type of phenomena to occur”. The phenomena he refers to here are not confined to what happens inside a film, but consist of everything that results from the encounter between that text and the set-up of which it forms part.³⁰ In view of what precedes, it is possible to exchange the last few words in this definition for the terms ‘rhetoric’ and ‘to get performed’. After all, Kessler’s view of how those textual ‘phenomena’ come about is fully in line with my own conception of rhetoric as performance, and of a film as providing a variety of rhetorical potential that may (or may not) be activated in a concrete viewing situation.

Although the above applies to each type of text and within every single viewing context, I think it is useful to point out that among the various possible frameworks for the viewing of films, the pedagogical one has particular rhetorical qualities. A classroom, after all, is an environment in which the rhetorical dimension of the exchange that takes place always (already) takes centre stage. In the previous chapter I established that the ultimate purpose of classroom interaction is to make pupils acquire the knowledge and skills that are commonly considered to belong to the field of formal education (within a given society). The success of this process, I added, depends to a considerable extent on whether or not what is said can be made acceptable as ‘relevant’ to the institution in which the communication takes place – precisely that which I have defined in the first part of this chapter as the ‘activation’, or ‘performance’, of rhetoric itself.³¹

An immediate consequence of this fact is that if teaching aids are used, pupils must understand that they function as tools in a process of pedagogical exchange. In some cases, indications of this status can be found on a textual or paratextual level. Classroom films, for instance, often have leaders carrying a distributor’s logo or contain simple credits which identify the type of activities they are meant to support. Additionally, instruction booklets and sheets contain clues as to their intended purpose. However, quite apart from the fact that such signs of ‘indexing’ are often targeted mainly at those who put the films to use (rather than the pupils-spectators themselves) they are also, strictly speaking, unnecessary.³² The fact that an aid is employed by a teacher as part of a lesson already calls the viewers’ attention to its current status as a didactic tool – regardless of how it has been deployed elsewhere. If, for instance, a physics instructor chooses to cook something as a way of illustrating his point, the pots and pans he uses, for that particular audience, can no longer function as mere ‘household gear’. The same also applies to films. Items that are not in any obvious way labelled as teaching aids, or even contain textual evidence of a prior relation with a *different* viewing context, *become* such tools as soon as they are put to the service of communicating didactic matter.³³

The prominence of the rhetorical dimension of an educational screening, then, is inextricably bound up with the role of the teacher, whose task it is to make content acceptable to the audience addressed. His ability to do this, I pointed out earlier, derives to a large extent from his (institutionalised) position of authority: the fact that inside the walls of a classroom, he is the one ‘in charge’. Drawing again on terminology developed by Austin and Searle, I would argue that it is largely due to his status of instructor that he can ensure the ‘felicitousness’

(appropriateness, validity) of the performative act that the presentation of a classroom film constitutes.³⁴ In his capacity of teacher, in other words, he can accomplish something that no other user of such material could. For the pupils, in turn, the presence of an educator during the viewing entails that they are subject to an extreme form of (interpretive) pressure: they are given a very limited choice in terms of how they should understand the text that is screened, and therefore, of which rhetorical potentials should get performed.

The ultimate consequence of this view, I believe, is that within this particular set-up, issues of authority – which, I have pointed out, are traditionally considered to be at the core of the rhetorical process – can largely be referred to what happens *outside* the text. As opposed to Jacquinot, who claims that teaching films establish rhetorical (and more specifically, epistemic) ‘force’ by textual means, I maintain that this is largely a matter of how such titles are framed.³⁵ In other words, it depends on whether teachers can (or want to) command the power they are due – a necessary precondition for making films acceptable as didactic tools.³⁶

The ‘Unfinished’ Teaching Film

Considering the overriding importance of what happens in the process of its framing, I would like to argue, the teaching film can be seen as a highly ‘unfinished’ type of text. More so even than seems to be the case with many other genres, the production of meaning in such items is dependent on the way in which textual rhetoric is complemented by what takes place in the classroom setting in which it gets performed.³⁷ The rhetorical effectiveness of a children’s entertainment film, for instance, is not likely to depend on the specifics of its viewing to quite the same degree. The chance that it is read as such is generally high – whether it is seen in a cinema, a school gym, or at home. As a rule, far less ‘framing effort’ is required to convince an audience that it should accept the recreational status of the communication in the case of an entertainment screening, than of its didactic status in the event of a projection with an educational purpose.³⁸ Also, in the former case, the nature of the relationship between those present (and in particular, between the adults and the children attending) does not normally have the same impact on the reading of the text.³⁹

Of course, the kind of textual ‘incompleteness’ which I posit here, although highly noticeable in the corpus I study, is not *unique* to material of this type. In their closing paper for an international workshop on industrial films held in 2004, Vinzenz Hediger and Patrick Vonderau characterised the genre they dealt with as a ‘weak format’: one that lacks textual ‘dominance’ and extracts meaning from a specific audience and use.⁴⁰ In an article on the same topic, Yvonne Zimmermann refers to her corpus as one of *Halbfabrikate* (semi-manufactures): rhetorically ‘underdetermined’ texts that become ‘end products’ when embedded in given discursive/performative practices. Similar arguments have also been made about other types of text, such as amateur films.⁴¹

In my view, however, the interpretational ‘closure’ which can come about in the interaction between a text and its rhetorical frame takes a different form in each of these cases. In order to demonstrate this, I shall contrast what I observe in my own corpus with what Odin has written about this issue in one of his pieces on home movies (or ‘family films’, as in the original French). I shall argue that in either case, the relation between the various players within the *dispositif* is specific to that given category of texts. Amateur and classroom films, in other

words, are 'unfinished' in slightly different ways.

Classroom vs. Family (Films)

In his article "Rhétorique du film de famille", the author argues that in films meant for screening in a family circle, the diegesis is not produced by the work itself, but constructed entirely by the audience. Family films, Odin states, merely function as *souvenirs*: as aids to the memories of those present. Construction of the diegesis is part of a process of remembrance: during the projection, viewers mentally relive the events that are shown. A screening of family films, it follows, very much invites the spectators' participation; in practice, audiences often vocalise their memories in a collective creative effort. The ultimate effect of seeing such films, Odin continues, is that of remodelling the past: while watching them, viewers privilege certain events above others and transform the lived past into a mythical one. Yet even so, he concludes, spectators do not experience a so-called 'fiction effect' (*effet fiction*): they always remain aware of the historical relation between their own lives and what is represented in the text.⁴²

The process sketched by Odin, I believe, is one that can only take place in a very specific setting: it can only materialise as part of what I would like to call, with a phrase that incorporates the terminology I use here, a 'domestic' *dispositif*.⁴³ When I compare it to what happens during the screening of a teaching film within a corresponding *pedagogical dispositif*, I immediately notice a number of differences.

First of all, textual signification, in the case of teaching films, is not *purely* the result of a remodelling of what the audience already knows. Of course, pupils are aware, due to the setting in which they view such films, that what they see (and/or hear) can only be relevant in as far as it bears a connection to something they have learnt before, either in the same context, or in a similar one. Even so, that which they remember – i.e. the curricular knowledge which spectators have, due to their prior experience as schoolchildren – does not have the same weight. In the case of a classroom screening, such recollections merely help them distinguish between what is relevant to the educational process of which the screening forms part, and what is not.⁴⁴

An immediate consequence of this observation is that the viewers' role as active participants is limited compared to the situation Odin describes. In addition to this, the precise extent of the pupils' involvement – or more precisely, how *vocal* they can be about what they see – depends on the concrete viewing situation. Above all, it hinges on the attitude of the teacher, that other participant in classroom communication. For after all, it is he who allows for pupil interaction, either by exercising his authority (in which case he can either prevent, encourage, or enforce it) or by refraining from doing so.⁴⁵ In the latter case, however, he lets go of his institutionalised role as the person in charge of the educational process, and therefore, of the film's status as a teaching tool.

From what precedes it follows logically that my thoughts on how classroom films are read must differ from Odin's views on family film. When talking about the 'resolution' or 'closure' of the interpretational 'openness' that characterises such films, I think, it is not all that useful to consider meaning production entirely in terms of the construction of a diegesis.⁴⁶ One of the most striking features of the communication that takes place within a pedagogical

set-up, after all, is that it is oriented towards what goes on *outside* of it, in the world at large. Something similar also applies to the films (or books, maps, models) that function as didactic aids: they are only relevant in as far as they can contribute to the acquisition of knowledge about the external – i.e. *extratextual* – world. The role of rhetorical framing, in this process, is precisely to focus the pupils' attention on the relation between a text and the outside reality that is, in fact, the *true* object of learning. Put in Odin's words, this implies that although the construction of a diegesis (even a fictional one) may be possible, the reader always remains aware that this is not what the viewing is, ultimately, about.⁴⁷

3.3 Textual Rhetoric

In what precedes, I have been trying to answer the question of how rhetorical processes are affected by the ways in which films, and those used for classroom purposes in particular, are framed. In the course of analysis, however, I shall focus on texts: the conglomerates of words and/or images that contain the rhetorical potential that is activated within a specific *dispositif*. In other words, I shall deal with (various types of) *textual* rhetoric. In what follows, I shall introduce the sorts of filmic ‘ingredients’ that I shall discuss. Before I do so, however, I would like to say a few more words about my analytical method. A notion that will help me in this process is that of ‘mode(s) of address’; therefore, I shall introduce it first.

In the seminar paper referred to above, Kessler argues that “[an] investigation of historical and present *dispositifs* would [...] have to take into account the different viewing situations, institutional framings, the modes of address they imply, as well as the technological basis on which they rest”.⁴⁸ Kessler’s use of the phrase here has two distinct advantages. On one hand, it allows for a conceptualisation of textual features as directed towards an audience. Earlier on in this chapter, I drew attention to the reader-orientedness of any notion of rhetoric. Whether used in a traditional sense (as a term referring to a well-delineated set of rules and/or skills) or in its more up-to-date, inclusive meaning, ‘rhetoric’ always concerns a plea to the listener, reader or viewer: an appeal to his willingness to consider what is said. The phrase ‘mode of address’, in other words, renders quite accurately what I am looking for here.⁴⁹

On the other hand, Kessler conceives of the concept as something that is ‘implied’ by an (institutional) framework, rather than being a finite, text-immanent given. In what precedes I have emphasised repeatedly that textual meaning can never be isolated from the conditions in which it comes about. The same also applies to the ways in which a film addresses its reader. Even when considered on a more abstract level, the audience can never be seen as generic: its particular composition, and the reasons for its constituents’ membership, should always inform the interpretation of a work. The rhetorical analysis of a text, in other words, requires that an observer draws inspiration from the specific spectatorship which a film, by grace of the particular *dispositif* of which it forms part, is considered to serve.

Implied Reader

In the analysis that follows, then, I shall be using the interpretive concept of an ‘implied reader’ (or its audio-visual variant: ‘implied viewer’). The term was introduced in (literary) narratology in the early 1960s; since that time, however, it has been deployed in a variety of ways, to sometimes contradictory purposes. Although it is most often associated with the study of reception in the narrow sense – the phenomenological approach of Wolfgang Iser and Roman Ingarden, among others – it was coined by Booth, a theorist with an interest in rhetorical analysis. Booth’s interpretation of the concept, however, is based on a model of literary communication that is too normative to suit my purpose.⁵⁰

In her introduction to a collection of essays on the subject, Susan R. Suleiman points out that rhetorical varieties of audience-oriented criticism tend to conceive of interpretation as a process of “decoding what has by various means been encoded in the text”. Booth, for instance, argues that while the implied reader is a textual function, the ‘successful’ reading

of a work is fully dependent on an *actual* reader's identification of (and with) his values and beliefs. The implied reader, for him, serves as a guide to the 'ideal' interpretation of the text.⁵¹

One reason for Booth's tendency towards normativity can probably be found in his conception of the implied reader as the counterpart of an implied *author*, a textual agency which he defines as an 'official version' of the real writer (his so-called 'second self').⁵² Such a definition seems to confuse the issue of intentionalism that the early advocates of an audience-oriented approach precisely wished to circumvent. In a chapter entitled "In Defense of the Implied Author", Chatman points out that although Booth disallows the intention of a real author in the interpretation of his work, constructing a textual alter ego also prevents him from conceiving of a piece of writing as a 'self-existing thing'. The link between the implied author and the text, for Booth, is still one of production: the former is seen as a "choosing, evaluating person", the 'inventor' of what is said.⁵³

A similar propensity towards collapsing implied and real authors can also be found in the work of other theorists who claim to privilege the reader's point of view. Narratologist Peter J. Rabinowitz, for instance, replaces the term 'implied' with 'authorial' audience, thus emphasising the role of an actual, creative person who invites his addressees to read in a particular (albeit socially constituted) way.⁵⁴ Scholars in the field of rhetorical theory as well tend to slip into statements about reading instructions as given by *real* authors. In a critical discussion of the concept of 'intention', Bal attacks this practice – and by extension, the notion of an implied author as such – by arguing that it opens the door for authorising interpretations that are really those of the interpreters themselves.⁵⁵

The implied reader I choose to construct differs from that of Booth and other reader-oriented critics in that I do not explicitly pair it with an implied author. Discussing rhetorical 'strategies', as I do in the following chapter, does of course presuppose a certain degree of intentionality on the part of a more or less purposeful agent, who somehow manifests himself in the film. This textual function, however, is not what I am interested in here. With Bal, I am convinced that the notion of (authorial) intention does not necessarily bring one closer to understanding a work.⁵⁶ This is definitely the case when the processes under scrutiny are of a rhetorical nature. As I already stressed in my definition of the concept, rhetoric concerns the ways in which the object of an exchange – or even, the exchange *itself* – can be made visible or acceptable to those watching. By implication, it is its aspect of *reader*-orientedness that I should investigate.

Furthermore, not inferring an (implied) author allows me to draw attention to my own interpretive activity. In what follows, I shall use the concept of an implied reader as a purely artificial construct: a tool that gives me the opportunity to bring something out in a given corpus of texts. This use of the notion, in fact, is closer to the one favoured by what Suleiman calls the 'structuralist and semiotic variety' of audience-oriented criticism – the kind practiced, for instance, by Gérard Genette and Gerald Prince. As opposed to authors who take a 'rhetorical' approach, these theorists and critics do not consider it their task to devise ways of capturing a text's (one and only) meaning, but rather to analyse the codes and conventions that allow for its readability. Their implied reader (often also called 'inscribed' or 'encoded') does not correspond to the ideal interpreter of the text, but is merely one in a much wider range of meaning-producing elements.⁵⁷

A last preliminary remark on this subject concerns the status of the implied reader which I construct as a member of a collective. A characteristic property of the experience of watching a classroom film, of course, is that it is done in a group. A pupil-spectator, by definition, is never alone: viewing a teaching film always takes place in the company of classmates, whose presence also affects the way in which it is seen. By analogy with the actual viewer, the reader that is embedded in the text should be considered part of such a collectivity.

In this context, it might be useful to introduce Carolyn R. Miller's concept of 'rhetorical community', a notion which she defines as the entity "invoked, represented, presupposed, or developed in rhetorical discourse". She contrasts this entity with that of a 'relational' collective, which is distinguished by actual ties among its members, and a 'taxonomic' one, which exists only in the minds of classifiers, sociologists. A rhetorical community, it seems, is somewhere in between. Although definitely a virtual (i.e. imaginary) collectivity, it is also a functional one: in order to communicate effectively, users of language need to draw on the communal baggage of its constituents.⁵⁸ Conceptualising the implied reader as a representative of a rhetorical community should keep me aware of the need to specify *which* textual audience is addressed.

Types of Textual Rhetoric

In my general introduction, I briefly made the point that the corpus I deal with is characterised above all by its textual variety: the extremely wide range of filmic resources – and conventions, or traditions – which it draws on. In what precedes, I have tried to demonstrate that this does not necessarily lead to excessive semantic/referential ambiguity. The interpretational 'openness' that is caused by a teaching film's apparent textual indeterminacy, after all, is easily removed in the interplay between such a title and its more encompassing *dispositif*.⁵⁹ For me, however, this inevitably entails that in order to fully understand what a classroom film 'says' to its viewer (in his capacity of pupil), one needs to consider this configuration *in its entirety*.

As I said, I shall focus in the analysis that follows on the textual aspects of the rhetorical process. In doing so, however, I shall let myself be inspired by the characteristics of the pedagogical *dispositif*: the set-up within which the teaching films under scrutiny function (or used to function) *as didactic tools*. In other words, I shall be concentrating here on a very specific textual dimension: the signs, or marks, of the shorts' orientation – their 'addressivity' – towards a given audience (one of schoolchildren) watching within a clear educational framework (i.e. in the context of a lesson).⁶⁰ In this process, I shall construct an implied reader that is inextricably linked to this specific *dispositif*, and that is addressed as a collective of what one might call 'pedagogical subjects'. I shall deploy it in my discussion of two distinct types of rhetoric.⁶¹

Motivational Devices

First, in chapter 4, I shall discuss textual elements of which the rhetorical potential must be situated on the level of the communication itself. The type of features I shall deal with here neatly fit the definition of 'rhetoric' that I gave earlier: their function is to draw the audience's attention towards the film (as a statement) rather than to ensure the validity of the position which it defends.

Above I argued that in the case of teaching films, whether or not the exchange, and by

extension, its object (the film's content), can be made acceptable as didactic depends to a large extent on the way in which it is framed. The type of rhetorical activity I focus on here, however, somehow *precedes* this phase – not in the temporal sense, but as a condition that needs to be fulfilled. My assumption is that before viewers can accept the communication's status as 'educational', they first need to simply *consider* what is shown. The rhetorical elements I have in mind, then, primarily have a *motivational* function: they invite the audience to take part in a communicative exchange. Their rhetorical quality lies in the fact that they support a (non-explicit) argumentation of which the purport is that paying attention might somehow be in the spectators' own interest.⁶²

The clusters of techniques that I shall discuss in this chapter are in no way specific to the teaching film. They are principles for visualising and organising content that are common to a wide range of genres, and in fact belong to the cinematic repertoire *as such*. However, when placed within the *dispositif* in which these texts were supposed to function, the features under scrutiny can all be read as part of motivational strategies targeted at an audience with a very specific composition and purpose. In what follows, I shall group these 'tactics', among others, according to the various rhetorical potential(s) which they seem to exploit (and thus, foreground).

References to the Dispositif

The second type of rhetoric that I shall deal with *does* concern the acceptability, or the validity, of the filmic communication as a didactic exchange – albeit, still, in a rather indirect way. The textual elements I am referring to here act as 'reminders' of the texts' functional framework. They are visual and/or auditory representations of tools or roles that are commonly considered characteristic of formal didactic environments. As such, they function as textual references to the pedagogical *dispositif* within which the films under scrutiny were meant to operate.

Unlike the features that I shall discuss in chapter 4, elements which reference the *dispositif* do have some kind of a distinguishing value, in the sense that they alert their viewers to the fact that they are *teaching* films. However, they do so, again, in a very roundabout way. In my view, their function is merely to *confirm* the allocation of the films' status as classroom tools – a status which ultimately needs to be established not by the text itself, but in the process of its framing. Textual allusions to the shorts' institutional context, in other words, can never have the same rhetorical impact as the extratextual framework which they (also) reference. In addition to this, 'echoes' of this type cannot in any way be considered characteristic of the genre as such – if only because not *all* teaching films feature them. Over time, however, they tended to do so more and more often. In my fifth chapter, I shall also consider this development, and how it relates to an ever more pronounced reflection in the films themselves on their status as didactic tools.

Conclusions

In this chapter, I have explained how I interpret the concept of rhetoric, and how I intend to deploy it in the analysis that follows. I have argued that it should be conceived of not as a (finite) series of compositional techniques, but as a textual potential that comes to activation within a given functional framework, i.e. as part of a very specific *dispositif*. In this context, I have also used the term ‘performance’: a notion that underscores the connectedness of the rhetorical process to the here-and-now of a concrete user situation, and by implication, to the particular conventions that govern it.

Next, I have taken a closer look at the properties of this process as it is executed within a classroom setting. I have identified those text-external factors which, in my view, are of particular significance to the activation of the rhetorical potential of teaching films, within their most ‘relevant’ *dispositif*. Here, I have drawn the conclusion that such items can be characterised as highly ‘unfinished’: as a kind of texts which, in the process of acquiring meaning, depend to a particularly large degree on what happens in the space, both physical and conceptual, that *surrounds* them.

Finally, I have elucidated how, in my discussion of the corpus under scrutiny, I shall try to account for what these external factors contribute to the rhetorical process. I explained that I shall do so by focusing in my analysis on marks, or markers, of the films’ addressivity: their orientedness towards a specific audience, as operating within a particular *dispositif*. For this purpose, I shall make use of the concept of an ‘implied reader’ (or ‘viewer’). This notion, or construct, will function as a tool in my search for two types of rhetorical elements: motivational devices (discussed in the following chapter) and references to the pedagogical *dispositif* (the subject of chapter 5).

As a concluding remark, I would like to point out that the above kinds of rhetoric are by no means the only ones that may be relevant to a discussion of the texts under scrutiny. The reason why I have opted for those two here is that both give me the space to discuss teaching films in all their structural and stylistic variety, while also allowing for a consideration of what they have in common. The second type in particular should also help me to account for those textual features that inevitably focus one’s attention on what those shots ‘were supposed to do’ – however without generalising, or reverting to explanations in terms of (productional) intentionality.

TEXTUAL RHETORIC I: MOTIVATIONAL DEVICES

Introduction

My basic theoretical assumption, I have explained, is that (film) texts contain a variety of rhetorical potential that either does or does not come to activation, depending on the *dispositif* within which they are embedded. On its most fundamental level, this potential is of a *motivational* nature: it concerns the ways in which the implied audience is encouraged to take into consideration the statements that are made. Its ultimate purpose, then, is to invite communication, or alternatively, to ensure the continuation of an already on-going exchange.

My purpose in the current chapter is to loosely classify filmic procedures – representational techniques, or combinations thereof – in terms of the various motivational possibilities which they seem to exploit. In this process, I shall identify a number of strategies, inferred on the basis of recurring textual patterns, which aim at stimulating the audience to consider what is shown and/or said. These strategies, in turn, are based on assumptions – once more, implied by the text – about what appeals to the viewers: notions as to which features make a text sufficiently interesting, engaging or agreeable to stimulate them to stay tuned.

Motivation of an (implied) audience, as I have insisted above, is a basic rhetorical function. As such, it is common to all texts, and all forms of communication.¹ *How* a work's motivational goals are pursued, however, depends to a considerable extent on the particular audience that is addressed. What appeals to one set of viewers, after all, does not necessarily appeal to another, and assumptions about what does/does not hold motivational potential are inevitably linked to *who* should be reached. Any attempt to unravel a text's or corpus' rhetorical structure should take this into account.

In what precedes, I have characterised my overall analytical endeavour as a search for filmic marks of addressivity: the texts' orientation towards a specific, institutionally 'situated' audience.² In the context of the current chapter, then, my pursuit can best be rephrased as an inquiry into what the films under scrutiny say about their viewers' textual 'seduceability': their proneness towards being 'won over' by certain features of the text. Since I am dealing here with teaching films, the implications I shall be looking for will concern, very specifically, the presumed motivational sensibilities of *pupils*: children (not adults), who are viewing in a markedly educational environment (not an entertainment setting) and in the presence of a teacher.

Many of the assumptions I identify will seem at first sight to be pretty 'universal' (i.e. not at all

specific for the type of text and audience which I have in mind). In the next few pages, I shall discuss the use of (narrative) devices that exceed the boundaries of my own corpus – and in some cases, even the scope of the film medium itself. In addition to this, readers of this work will notice that in other texts, they often also fulfil similar motivational functions. What *is* particular about them, however, is their ‘execution’: their concrete, textual manifestation in this type of shorts.

In order to explain what I mean, let me give a simple example. Consider for instance the strategy that I shall designate in what follows as ‘enabling recognition’. Some of the films under scrutiny here feature ‘familiar’ characters: human, or *humanised*, narrative agents who are likely to ‘strike a chord’ with the audience group addressed. In the context of this chapter, my reasoning will be that the introduction of such roles is based on the premise that they can make the viewing process more agreeable, and therefore, encourage viewers to stay tuned. This inference, however, can be made for a wide variety of texts – not only those that specifically target schoolchildren. Neither the representational principle, nor the rhetorical strategy behind it, in other words, is unique, or typical, for classroom films. Yet at the same time, the characters in these shorts do have some peculiarities that distinguish them from those in *non-teaching* films. One such feature is their age; in the titles I consider here, they are often very *young*.³

The above fact, however, is only significant if one takes into consideration the precise composition of the public targeted. The assumption that age is rhetorically relevant – in other words, that it is a contributing factor to this particular motivational strategy – is based on the presupposition of what I have referred to earlier as ‘audience implication’: the idea that texts, rhetorically speaking, always seek to imply, or even implicate (i.e. ‘pull in’, and thus make contribute, in the process of incorporating) the spectators they address. In the example quoted above, the marks of filmic addressivity are quite unmistakable. What is (re)presented here is some sort of a ‘viewer surrogate’: a textual equivalent of the pupil-spectator.⁴

In many cases, however, audience implication takes a somewhat more subtle form. I am thinking here of those textual procedures that derive their motivational potential – i.e., their *primary* rhetorical potential – from the fact that the films in which they turn up target a *school* public: a group of children who attend screenings within a specifically educational framework. This circumstance, I would contend, inevitably heightens the appeal of features that might not constitute much of an attraction when seen elsewhere, even by a public of roughly the same age. Consider for example the ways in which the films under scrutiny use (graphic) animation techniques. Remarkable about these shorts is that although they often contain sequences that deploy such methods, these rarely look very ‘sophisticated’ when held to the production standards that post-war children, as seasoned cinema visitors, must have been accustomed to.⁵ Yet however *unattractive* this may make the films seem in retrospect, I do believe that such elements must have had at least *some* motivational potential at the time. When seen in a classroom setting, after all, animated sequences (and especially those of the more playful, imaginative kind) inevitably must have stood out, precisely because they did not ‘belong’ in a school setting. Their appeal, in other words, was due to the association with another, ‘recreational’ type of film – or as I shall argue further on: with the particular *dispositif* of which it commonly formed part. In teaching films, then, the deployment of such

means can be interpreted as yet another way of implicating a socially, but also *historically* situated audience.⁶ It is this type of observation that shall serve as my guideline for analysis.

In what precedes, I have announced that my purpose in this chapter is to loosely classify motivational strategies that are commonly deployed in teaching films according to the various rhetorical possibilities on which they draw. In the paragraphs that follow, I shall conceptualise the latter as ‘foci’: the motivational ‘centres’, or (with a less spatial term) ‘cruxes’, around which these strategies revolve. The notion of ‘focus’, here, refers to the text’s tacit assumptions about the *nature* of a procedure’s spectatorial appeal. In other words, it concerns the answer – read: *my answer* – to the question which rhetorical potential a given representational technique exploits, and in this process, *foregrounds*. By adopting it as my main criterion for classification, I shall try to always keep in mind the (necessarily audience-specific) suppositions that underlie the strategies which I infer.

The first, most extensive section of this chapter, paragraph 4.1, will be devoted to a discussion of six motivational foci, in combination with some of the strategies with which they can be associated. The latter shall function here as examples: my aim is to illustrate how certain rhetorical potentials can be exploited, rather than to give an exhaustive overview of the various ‘tactics’ which teaching films employ. Yet inevitably, my exposition will also amount to some sort of classification. In paragraph 4.2, I shall immediately reconsider this categorisation, and argue that it is a taxonomy which, for practical reasons, is more rigid than the reality which it attempts to represent. Subsequently, I shall demonstrate that textual elements often serve various motivational purposes at the same time, and that the strategies of which they form part tend to occur simultaneously, and to overlap.

Further on in the chapter, I shall also advance an *alternative* classification. In paragraph 4.3, I shall discuss the films under scrutiny in terms of the level of ‘directness’ with which they represent pedagogically relevant matter. In this final section, I shall focus not so much on specific rhetorical strategies, but on what characterises entire *texts* in their motivational approach. The categorisation I propose in this paragraph will be less rigid than the previous one: it will be conceptualised not as a ‘grid’ with discrete sections, but as some sort of a gliding scale.

Before I embark upon analysis, then, I would like to make a few more side remarks. First, I want to (re)emphasise that in what follows, I shall be dealing with a variety of rhetorical *potential* – not with finite, text-inherent meanings. In order for the strategies which I identify to even become visible, first of all, they need to be considered as part of a very specific, pedagogical *dispositif*. For instance, a film which capitalises (or ‘focuses’) on the motivational potential of what I shall designate as ‘comprehensibility’ may be taken to do so *only* if it is understood that it is addressed towards a public of schoolchildren. For any other audience, the features which carry this potential might cause redundancy rather than clarification – hardly a textual point of appeal. In addition to this, the question of whether or not the identified strategies were actually *performed* (i.e., whether the assumptions which I infer are/were ‘correct’, and therefore, whether the films under scrutiny were rhetorically ‘successful’) is not a point of discussion here.⁷

As a second preliminary remark, I would like to emphasise that my focus on aspects of textual motivation, while giving me the opportunity to discuss an extremely wide variety

of features in the corpus under scrutiny, also constitutes a restriction. Motivational devices, I explained, are those textual ingredients that can be considered to help invite the viewer to communicative interaction, or otherwise, encourage him to continue the exchange. Yet of course, not all features of the shorts under scrutiny can be read in those terms. Consider for instance those points in a text where the audience's attention, as it were, is 'forced away' from a scene or representational procedure that is pleasant to observe but strictly speaking irrelevant to its didactic point, and subsequently (re)directed towards the facts that need to be passed on (for instance, through a camera movement, or a cut towards a sequence with a different content). Such textual ingredients, of course, are not in any way motivational. By ignoring them in what follows, I am not trying to imply that they do not *occur* – merely that they are irrelevant to what I am doing here.

My third and last remark, then, concerns my use of the term 'motivational' itself. In the first half of this text, I quoted primary sources: teachers' manuals and instruction booklets as well as early studies which reflect on classroom practice. All attest to the fact that the appeal of the film medium *itself* was often considered one of the main arguments in favour of its use. For instance, in *Film en lichtbeeld bij het onderwijs*, Van der Meulen argues that the chief merit of moving images is that they function as a means of catching the pupils' attention (thus helping to fulfil a basic condition for pedagogical interaction).⁸ By focusing on specific textual elements, of course, I do not wish to ignore the more fundamental, inherent motivational potential of classroom film use (or, for that matter, that of any other educational medium that is more commonly associated with a different *dispositif*). My premise here is merely that teaching films, in addition to this, *also* contain features that can be interpreted as part of strategies that aim at keeping their audiences tuned.

4.1 Textual Motivation: Foci and Strategies

One of my main goals in this chapter is to distinguish between different rhetorical foci: the centres, or cruxes, around which motivation in teaching films revolves. The focuses which I identify should not be conceived of as mutually exclusive. Strategies, in teaching films, often occur one alongside the other; therefore, the texts in which they turn up can be considered to exploit various motivational possibilities (or 'potentials') at the same time. For convenience's sake, however, I shall deal with them here successively. For a qualification of the taxonomy in which this results, I refer to paragraph 4.2.

In the discussion that follows, foci – and by extension, strategies – will be divided into two main groups. First, I shall consider those textual procedures whose motivational potential lies in the fact that they can help make the *matter* films deal with more attractive to pay attention to. In the texts I discuss here, in other words, content is presented in such a way, that it may encourage the audience to keep watching. Next, I shall deal with textual features (or clusters of them) that can be considered to make the *process of viewing* more alluring. The experience of watching is made more pleasurable, which in turn entails that audiences are more likely to want to stay tuned; this way, the spectatorial activity becomes a self-perpetuating one. Of course, this distinction should not be considered as absolute. If a film's matter is made more inviting to watch, audiences are likely to find the act of viewing itself more enjoyable as well. By discerning between two levels of motivation, I merely try to determine which mechanism is the dominant one. The question, so to speak, is which of the two comes first. If watching becomes agreeable, this can either be a primary effect, or merely a consequence of something else. The division I propose is based on which is the case in each of the instances I discuss.⁹

Either of these two categories, in turn, shall serve as an umbrella for three different foci: the rhetorical premises that inform the clusters of strategies which I infer. The focuses, then, form the connections between the texts' various motivational tactics. I use them to pinpoint the specific potentials that a given set of procedures exploit, and thereby, foreground. The strategies, however, are the *main* objects of my inquiry; in what follows, it is their operation that shall be illustrated by means of textual examples. But in this process, I repeat, I shall not attempt to be comprehensive.

In order to substantiate my point, I shall draw on a wide variety of filmic ingredients which cannot always be situated on the same level of a text. In one case, I shall consider principles of visualisation (the ways in which objects or processes are made to appear on screen); in another, I shall deal with what is perhaps more appropriately called 'aspects of textual organisation'. At one time, I shall be focusing on the use of very specific cinematic techniques (such as optical ones); the next, I shall discuss chains or clusters of them, concentrating instead on the more encompassing choices that inform their deployment (for instance, *how* a given set of procedures seek to foreground a certain rhetorical potential). Some of these elements, patterns and techniques, moreover, will be discussed on several occasions: first as part of strategy A; subsequently as a means to motivational purpose B. The relation between various rhetorical tactics and their textual 'residue', in other words, is never an *exclusive* one.

4.1.1 Matter Made Appealing

The first series of strategies that I shall consider can be read as part of an attempt to make the filmic matter itself more appealing. The premise I start from here is that the subjects teaching films deal with sometimes contain ingredients that already hold the potential of attracting their audience's attention; in order to do so, however, these elements or characteristics somehow need to be 'set off'. When highlighted, emphasised or strengthened, they can provoke in their viewers a number of reactions; each of those, in turn, can constitute an encouragement to stay tuned.

In what follows, I shall discuss, first, strategies that highlight the matter's unfamiliarity: the fact that the subjects films deal with, or certain aspects thereof, are fundamentally unknown to the audience addressed. The shorts in which they feature solicit their viewers' attention by showing them things – often, processes or phenomena that are very intricate, or highly organised – that normally remain hidden. Next, I shall give some examples of procedures that foreground the matter's comprehensibility. I shall deal here with films that give their spectators the impression that the topics they discuss are not quite as complicated as they might have thought. Some do so by representing content as either simplified or highly structured; others by making textual meanings (verbally) explicit – or rather, by *implying* that this is what they do. The third and last cluster of strategies motivate by focusing the readers' attention on a subject's inherent *doability*: the practical feasibility, or reproducibility, of a certain behaviour or skill.

The six strategies discussed here should be seen as possible alternatives – not as stages in some sort of hierarchy. By considering them in a specific order, I do not wish to make any statements on their relative frequency or the extent of their rhetorical potential. The overview I give is just one possible representation of the array of motivational options which teaching films exploit (their so-called 'foci') and of the ways in which they do this (the various 'strategies' they use).

Focus: Unfamiliarity

One way in which the texts under scrutiny fashion subject matter so that it can help convince an audience to be attentive is by foregrounding its most unfamiliar constituents or features. In most cases, it concerns here aspects that normally remain hidden: facets that are invisible, either for the schoolchildren addressed or for humankind as such. All the films that I shall discuss in the first half of this paragraph have in common that the manner in which they represent objects or processes lends those some sort of 'surplus value': without the help of film – the medium, but this specimen more in particular – viewers would not find them quite as interesting or intriguing. In the particular instance I deal with here, the reason is that the short allows the children to see something which they cannot ordinarily see (at least, not in the shape in which it is presented here).

In what follows, I shall distinguish between two strategies. Although I discuss them here as separate tactics, the distinction between them is quite subtle. First, I shall consider films, or sequences, that motivate their readers by giving them access to a world which they may previously have known to exist, but never saw with their own eyes. These shorts, in other

words, give their spectators the opportunity to observe something which they have not witnessed, and which they therefore do not yet know the particulars of. The second series of texts, in contrast, attract their audience's attention by spectacularising, and in the process, alienating viewers from, that which they *thought* they were familiar with. What the audience gets to see, in other words, estranges it from, and perhaps even contradicts, what it knew (in theory) before. In many cases, texts which rely on either of these strategies make use of the same sets of representational techniques. Whether I shall consider them here as examples of the first, or the second, depends on the particular spectatorial experience which they aim to induce.

Strategy: Providing Access

The first of those two, the motivational strategy which I shall designate hereafter as 'providing access', basically entails that the audience is given the opportunity of some sort of a visual privilege. Films that make use of it allow their viewers to observe something that they most likely have not seen before, and that other people (those who are not present during the screening, or at any similar occasion) may never even behold *at all*. The reason is that the things, or processes, such titles show cannot normally be witnessed in person, either because they happen too far away, or because they are too small to discern (or the opposite: too large to oversee). The only way of observing them – at least, for the particular audience addressed – is by means of film: a medium that can visualise things that are strictly speaking 'invisible', and that can penetrate locations that are physically inaccessible.

Optical Manipulation

One of the most obvious ways in which teaching films exploit the medium's potential to provide access to things unseen is by making use of all sorts of optical manipulation techniques: methods for shooting and post-production that serve to enlarge, speed up or slow down scenes or processes. Most of the titles in which such procedures are used deal with scientific subjects, such as biology or natural history.

The zoology films *De honingbij* ([ca. 1951], The honey bee) and *De kamsalamander* (1949, The crested newt), for instance, both deploy such techniques. The first film, which uses macrophotography, does so consistently, as it shows life inside a hive – or so the viewer is meant to believe. The second contains micrographs, but not all the way through. Here, the technique's use is restricted to a single sequence, which features successive images of the embryo of a newt in various stages of development. Also the films *In de bruine boon schuilt een plantenleven* * (1955, Plant life, hidden inside the brown bean) and *Antoni van Leeuwenhoek* †, items designated by NOF respectively as 'botany' and 'natural history', have microphotographic sections.¹⁰ In the former, the sequences concerned are accelerated so as to make visible to the viewer the process of a bean's growth. In the latter, they function as subjective shots, showing organisms as seen through the microscope of Antoni van Leeuwenhoek, the 17th-century scientist whose work the film deals with.

More sporadically, techniques like these are also used in films on other subjects, such as home economics (the first part of *Goed bewaren – geld besparen*, [ca. 1955], Preserve well – save money) and physical geography (the first instalment of the series *De kust van Nederland*,

1957, The coast of Holland).¹¹ In *Goed bewaren – geld besparen*, microscopic images of fungi are inserted between shots of contaminated foods to provide visual evidence of the fact that the risks of bad kitchen manners are considerable. Obviously, the assumption here is that what is shown is likely to surpass the viewers' imagination. In the geography film, accelerated images of a drying beach are used to sketch a more lively picture of the principle of changing tides.

The examples I am quoting here show very well how inextricably the rhetorical potential of the strategy discussed is bound up with the composition of the audience that is addressed. In chapter 1, I briefly mentioned the use of film by scientists, as a means to examine phenomena that would otherwise be difficult to research. In this case as well, the medium's main benefit lies in the fact that it can optically *transform*, and thus make visible, objects or processes that humans cannot normally perceive. However, for the group of spectators targeted here, the appeal of such images, and the motivational potential of the methods with which they are visualised, is necessarily different. After all, specialist audiences are less likely to experience the observation of nature's intricacies as a privilege. Quite possibly, they can behold optically manipulated images – for instance, microscopic ones – on a daily basis. For them, in other words, the attraction of such techniques must lie elsewhere.¹²

In fact, it is arguable that the experience of privilege which the above films incite derives at least in part from the fact that observation of what they show is normally restricted to particular circles or professional groups. By watching them, in other words, viewers get to metaphorically 'look over the shoulders' of the biologists, chemists, doctors or laboratory technicians that see them on a more regular basis. In doing so, they can have a brief 'vicarious' experience of the complex phenomena which those specialists witness more often. Presumably, something similar also happens in films that exploit the rhetorical potential of images shot in locations that are otherwise inaccessible.

Location and Access

In the examples mentioned above, viewers are presented with sights that they cannot normally see, because they are the result of some sort of *transformation*. Objects or processes are moulded into a form (shape, size, speed) which they do not have in the actual, referential world. However, there are other ways of showing viewers things unfamiliar, that involve far less artifice.

The geography film *Boerenarbeid in Tirol* (1951, Farmers' labour in the Tyrol) shows fragments of life and work in an agricultural community in the Tyrolean Alps. In this short, viewers are virtually taken along to a location which, in a time before mass tourism, pupils were not very likely to visit themselves.¹³ Through this film, the audience gets the opportunity to closely observe actions and events previously unwitnessed (and perhaps even unheard of). The short features images of men transporting logs over wild mountain rivers, making hay on very steep hill sides, and climbing rocks in traditional outfits; sights, in other words, that cannot normally be observed – except perhaps by seasoned travellers, or even ethnographers.

In my view, the above short provides access to things unfamiliar in at least two different ways. On the one hand, it brings into the classroom a world that is literally 'out of the spectators' reach'. By showing them recorded images of distant sites, it gives them the chance to

(mentally) travel to places they cannot go to in person. On the other hand, it presents them with views of events and activities that probably strike them as rather peculiar. By focusing on those aspects of the locals' daily lives that are *different* from the spectators' own, the short once again foregrounds the lesser known aspects of existence elsewhere. In this process, it also exploits the film medium's potential to virtually 'transport' the spectator. Consider for instance the sequence in which the Tyroleans make hay, or go climbing. Scenes like these cannot normally be seen by anyone other than the farmers themselves, simply because they are too dangerous for outsiders to come near. Again, the camera – or rather, its skilful operator – provides a (surrogate) solution here.¹⁴

Another category of films that transport their viewers to otherwise inaccessible locations are those which document the lives and habits of animals. In those titles as well, motivational potential is often due at least in part to the makers' physical dexterity. The shorts *De spreeuw* (1950, The starling) and *De kapmeeuw*, both categorised by NOF as 'zoology', show the behaviour of a specific type of bird. Unlike the biology films mentioned above, they do not feature enlargements or accelerated images of the species they deal with. Even so, they visually confront their spectators with aspects of animal conduct that they would not be able to witness, if it were not for these films. Both items contain large quantities of often very close shots of birds nesting, eggs hatching and young flying out. Viewers can tell that the birds have been filmed from vantage points that are difficult to get to. In some cases, it is obvious that recording equipment has been placed in spaces that humans cannot physically enter; for instance, inside a nesting-box (in *De spreeuw*). This way, the shorts allow their viewers to circumvent difficulties which they would encounter when trying to behold similar scenes in real life.

Yet another cluster of films that show nearby, but usually unobservable sights are the kind that depict industrial production processes (most often classified as 'geography', section 'industry' or 'the Netherlands').¹⁵ In such titles, the camera facilitates access to locations that ordinarily bear a 'No trespassing' sign, and that can be entered exclusively by 'authorised personnel'. As a rule, these films further accentuate the lesser known aspects of the procedures which they represent by exploiting the rhetorical possibilities of the spaces in which these take place. Some do so by playing with the distance between the camera and the objects or processes it shows: close shots to underscore the ingeniousness of modern machines, as in *Suikerfabriek* ([ca. 1944], Sugar factory) or *Auto's aan de lopende band* ([ca. 1952], Cars from the assembly line); extreme long shots in *Haven en handel* ([ca. 1955], Harbour and trade) to highlight the massiveness of its scale.¹⁶ Others are shot from highly 'subjective' vantage points; for instance, a small window in the frame of a machine or the open top of a container – often the same position as that of the factory worker in the preceding shot (as in *Suikerfabriek*; *Hoogovens*, [ca. 1951], Blast-furnaces; *Wasserij*, [ca. 1951], Laundry). Again, the viewer is allowed here to 'tag along' with someone who is familiar with life 'behind the scenes'.

Staging

The difference between films that make use of the medium's potential to penetrate locations that are difficult to get access to and the kind that use optical manipulation, I have pointed out, is that the latter show phenomena that do not really exist in that form, as the films depict

them as larger, faster, or slower than they are *in real life*.¹⁷ A more extreme version of this practice can be found in titles that deal with situations or events that occurred in the past.

A good deal of the films which NOF advertises as intended for the teaching of history, literature or religion are made up of enacted scenes from a bygone era. Often, they are scripted around facts relating to the lives and works of canonised figures: locally-famous people, as in *Vondel, het leven van een groot Nederlander* (1955, Vondel, the life of a great Dutchman), or personalities known internationally, as in *Maarten Luther* (1959) and *Johannes Keppeler* (1960).¹⁸ In the first two shorts, scenes of actors impersonating the films' subjects are alternated with shots of the manuscripts, drawings and models which they produced, and of contemporary portraits and paintings; the last (a two-reel, feature-length film) is made up entirely of enacted sequences.

An important difference with items such as *De kamsalamander* or *De honingbij*, which use optical manipulation techniques, is that the above no longer even seem to create the impression of a direct relation to an extratextual reality. In writings on early popularising science films, the viewer position implied by the text has been characterised as resembling that of an eye witness to the processes shown. In addition, such techniques have been attributed the role of veridiction: that of providing the audience with evidence (of otherwise 'bookish' knowledge) that is normally available to specialists only. In the case of history films, however, this analysis no longer applies. An illusion of 'realness', after all, is no longer pursued: viewers are fully expected to take what is seen as a mere imitation, and as the result of an *interpretation* by a (creative) intermediary.¹⁹

Verisimilitude and Authenticity

Yet none of the above implies that what is depicted therefore has an air of *untrustworthiness*. All of the films mentioned so far derive their motivational potential from the fact that they show sights that are rarely observed; however, they also suggest that what is seen is an *accurate* representation of the object, or process, concerned. As a matter of fact, this is quite crucial. Most of the shorts referred to seek to incite a certain measure of admiration: an appreciation of the intricacy, or tight organisation, of the phenomena or procedures which they show. This sentiment, however, can only be induced if viewers are made aware that the unfamiliar things they see really do (or did) happen – albeit always *beyond* their own visual (and thereby, mental) reach. In chapter 1, I explained that one of the chief merits of teaching with film was considered to be the medium's capacity to 'bring the world into the classroom'. NOF's rationale for the production of so-called 'global films' was that they allowed children a perception of reality comparable to that of someone present at the scene. Such an experience, however, is only possible if the rendering of procedures and events can be perceived as reliable.

As the history examples show, the requirement of factual accuracy does not automatically preclude a certain degree of artificiality. The same primary sources which emphasise the importance of a verisimilar representation also point out that one of the main didactic benefits of the film medium is that it can give a rendering of the facts which is even *better* than 'the real thing'; for instance, because it gives a condensed version of what takes place in the referential world. More often than not, this requires some kind of staging: an intervention by the makers into what happens before the camera lens.²⁰ In the most extreme cases, the result is an (almost) entirely enacted film, such as *Vondel*, or *Johannes Keppeler*. In situations like

these, I would contend, it is not the camera's presence at the time of the events, but rather the apparent well-researched nature of the facts chronicled that guarantees their reliability, and thus, the authenticity of what is depicted. Sometimes, props are relied on to enhance this effect. The films just mentioned, for instance, use historical documents to support an argument on the lives and works of the personalities dealt with; in doing so, they compensate on a diegetic level for what cannot be achieved on a 'higher' discursive plane.

Strategy: Spectacularisation

Despite its prominence in primary sources, the requirement that teaching films should give their audience a vicarious (i.e. life-like) experience of the events and processes shown is merely one clue to their rhetorical functioning. Some of the techniques that I have discussed above also feature in films or sequences where the creation of a verisimilar effect no longer seems to be the *primary* concern. In those shorts, what is aimed for is not so much an impression of authenticity, but rather an experience of estrangement or alienation from the phenomena that are shown.

The 1961 short *Het bos in de bergen* (The wood in the mountains) paints a poetic picture of life and work in the Swiss highlands. Like *Boerenarbeid in Tirol*, it focuses primarily on the interdependence between man and nature. The film's spoken commentary sings the praises of the region's inhabitants, who manage to hold up against their beautiful yet inhospitable surroundings. About five minutes into the short, however, the viewer is shown a brief succession of speeded up close shots of opening buds on various trees, plants and flowers growing out of the forest soil. Simultaneously, a light instrumental score can be heard, made up of flute and clarinet sounds. As opposed to the microphotographic sections in *In de bruine boon schuilt een plantenleven* *, these images do not seem to be part of a broader argument on the specific biological phenomenon represented. The narrator mentions botanical concepts such as fertilisation through pollen, but does not go into matters of growth. Pollination as such, meanwhile, is not made visible.

In this film, I believe, optical manipulation no longer (exclusively) serves the purpose of acquainting viewers with the hidden aspects of the natural life that surrounds them, and of compelling admiration for its many intricacies. In fact, the processes that are depicted here do not look very 'natural' at all. In the accelerated sequence – which, incidentally, is speeded up much *more* than the ones in *In de bruine boon* * – plants and flowers perform a somewhat uncanny 'dance', the purpose of which is not at all obvious. From what we see here, vegetal growth does not seem to have much of a point within the larger scheme of the universe.

Attractional Display

In *Het bos in de bergen*, I would argue, the manipulated sequence has acquired the status of what is known among (early) film scholars as a cinematic 'attraction'. The term, used initially to refer to a representational practice specific to the pre-1909 period, essentially denotes an 'exhibitionist' tendency in moving images which present "moments of spectacle rather than narrative". Tom Gunning, in a revised version of one of the founding texts on the subject, has defined the cinema of attractions as the kind which "directly solicits spectator attention, inciting visual curiosity, and supplying pleasure through an exciting spectacle – a unique

event, whether fictional or documentary, that is of interest in itself". In recent years, the concept has also been used in a non-historicising sense to refer to aspects of filmic 'display' that generate comparable effects.²¹

Particularly interesting in the context of what I am trying to pinpoint here is Gunning's own characterisation of cinematic attraction as a specific (non-standard) "configuration of spectatorial involvement". Acknowledgement of the viewer, the author argues, is one of the defining features of this type of filmic practice.²² In this respect, I would contend, the above fragment is as pure an example of 'attractiveness' as any of the early ones quoted in his text. Here, a natural process is turned into a visual spectacle that no longer makes any narrative – or in this particular case, *informative* – 'sense', but is there merely for the viewer's enjoyment. The budding plant sequence, in other words, is a sheer sign of 'reaching out' to the spectator addressed.²³

In the sequence I singled out, attractiveness derives at least in part from the more or less isolated use of a spectacular filmic 'trick'. In the early 1960s (the time of the film's release), moving image technology in general, and this type of optical manipulation in particular, was of course no longer a novelty – not in an entertainment context, but not in an educational one either. Early film scholars have argued that the spectatorial appeal of the cinema of attractions is due in part to its demonstration of an unprecedented technical potential.²⁴ This observation, of course, does not apply here. Even so, the visual pleasure which the above sequence seeks to generate clearly does have an 'apparatical' basis. Both the repetition of the optical procedure of image acceleration, which is entirely unnecessary for a better understanding of the film's argument, and its isolation from the rest of the narrative indicate that what is driven at is a reaction of amazement at the 'magical' effects of a visualisation practice that is specific to the medium deployed here.²⁵

Defamiliarisation

If, by 'spectacularisation', I meant to indicate the tactic of motivating viewers *purely* by providing them an opportunity of visual enjoyment, then this strategy would of course belong in the second half of this overview – the part that deals with the appeal of the viewing process itself. The reason why I discuss it here is that I do not believe that the above is applicable in this case. In the sequence from *Het bos in de bergen*, after all, the magical quality of the representational method used does not just draw attention to itself, but also reflects on *that which it depicts*.

In a piece on the attraction of slow motion in contemporary martial arts films, Vivian Sobchack analyses the effect of this technique as one of 'disorientation', which in turn results from a distantiating from that which (we think) we already know. She writes:

Confronted with the uncanny cinematic vision of forces and energies that intimately affect us but which, technologically unaided, we cannot see [...], we are wounded in our 'sore spot' twice over: first, by an acute recognition of the gap in our perception that technology both reveals and fills; and second, by technology's sudden revelation [...] of [...] the self-generating nature of 'nature' that exceeds and escapes both our anthropological and technological grasp [...].²⁶

The experience which such images generate, in other words, is not just one of admiration for the intricacy of natural life. It is one of alienation, estrangement – sentiments that result in turn from an inability to understand, or fathom, the phenomena or processes that are

shown. In cases such as these, optical manipulation no longer serves the purpose of providing access. Rather, it confronts the viewer with the fundamental *inaccessibility* of an object or phenomenon, and its inherent *unintelligibility*. The spectator, here, no longer gets to feel privileged. In the process of watching, he loses his grip of those aspects of a physical process (or, as in the case of *Het bos in de bergen*, a biological one) that he used to know (at least) *in theory*. The procedure's effect, then, is not one of revealing the unfamiliar, but rather of de-familiarising it even more – that which the Russian Formalists used to refer to as *ostranenie*.²⁷

As I said earlier, the difference between the two strategies discussed so far is a subtle one; the point of transition between them therefore is not so easy to locate. Essentially, however, the distinctive factor is a sequence's embedding: the establishment – or not – of a relation between the 'unfamiliar' fragment and the film's wider (informative) argument.²⁸

Compare for instance the fast motion sections in *In de bruine boon* * and *Het bos in de bergen*. In the first film, the various growing plant sequences are inserted into live-action scenes in which beans are dropped into/planted in the soil, get rained over, and subsequently blossom and grow pods. Here, in other words, they have a definite clarifying function: they basically constitute speeded up versions of that which took place in the period in between. In *Het bos in the bergen*, in contrast, this is not the case. What happens in the manipulated sequence here is not in any way announced by anything that comes before, nor does it constitute a visualisation of the process which the commentator talks about at that point in time. The only way in which it ties in with what happens on the auditory level of the text is that it constitutes an illustration of the sublime, almost divine – yet therefore also fundamentally *incomprehensible* – character of the Swiss nature, which is highlighted by both the film's narration and its (mostly dramatic) musical accompaniment.²⁹

Focus: Comprehensibility

If the strategy discussed above derives its motivational potential from the fact that it foregrounds the inherent inscrutability of the subjects dealt with, the second cluster of procedures I shall examine do precisely the opposite. In the examples I consider next, matter is presented as fundamentally intelligible, comprehensible. The films or sequences examined here command their viewers' attention by implicitly arguing that watching them is likely to 'pay off'. If willing to stay tuned, they suggest, the spectator may actually gain insight into a phenomenon or process that was unclear to him before.

In what follows, I shall discuss three sample strategies. Although I deal with them here successively, I would like to emphasise in advance that they often also occur in combination; when they do so, they tend to reinforce each other. First, I shall consider textual ingredients that appear to help simplify the matter dealt with; then, procedures for argumentative structuring; and finally, some of the ways in which the shorts under scrutiny explicate (aspects of) meaning.

As a last preliminary remark, I would like to add that the examples I shall discuss next more often contain signs of orientation towards a specifically *school-age* audience than the ones I dealt with before. In what precedes, I described some scenes and sequences that would not be out of place in films that target a more general audience; for instance, the type that were shown as part of the supporting shorts sections of entertainment screenings. In what

follows, the situation will be different. Here, I shall often be dealing with levels of simplification/structuring/explication that are only warranted – and that can only fulfil a motivational function – in items that address a spectatorship that is quite young.

Strategy: Simplification

As a rule, foregrounding the comprehensibility of the matter dealt with involves some form of simplification. The means to this end, however, are extremely varied. Many of the procedures dealt with above, for instance, can serve this purpose as well. Optical manipulation can help make something (visually) accessible, but it can also make it seem less complex, and therefore, easier to understand – as in the case of *In de bruine boon* *. The same also applies to staging, or the use of (extreme) close shots. By excluding or condensing non-elementary parts or stages of objects or processes, or by focusing on or drawing out more crucial ones, teaching films seem to allow their viewers not only to observe, but also to *understand* what they do, how they function, or how they fit together.

Schematisation

Another procedure that immediately comes to mind in this context is the schematic (re) representation of the things, actions or concepts that are central to a film's argument. Despite NOF's (initial) aversion to so-called filmic 'tricks', many of its products contain at least some form of schematisation. In shorts released in the institute's early years, the diagrams and models tend to be (productionally) simple; in later ones, they are usually more sophisticated, and often also animated.³⁰

In classroom films, the types of schema used vary according to the subjects dealt with. Economic geography titles, for instance, often contain cross-section drawings representing (stages of) the production processes which they illustrate. Sometimes, such profile sketches have moving parts, as in *Turf: Laagveen* (1944, Peat: The low fens), *Polderland* (1947, Polder land) or *Walvisvaart* ([ca. 1956], Whale fishing). In many cases, they recur throughout the film (*Suikerfabriek*, or *Houtskoolbranden*, 1942, Charcoal burning). Items dealing with geological processes tend to use such drawings as well: the shorts *Het ontstaan van ijsbergen aan de kust van Groenland* ([ca. 1946], The development of icebergs on the coast of Greenland), the first part of *De kust van Nederland*, and *Eeuwig verandert de kust* (1959, The coast forever changes) contain a good amount of them. Astronomy titles, in contrast, make use of more elaborate graphics (for instance, *Johannes Kepler*); sometimes they also feature three-dimensional models (*Sterren en sterrensystemen*). Arguably, the lack of live-action footage available for the phenomena such films deal with explains this pattern. The (cross-section) drawings that are used in the above geology films, after all, are more suitable for the representation of processes that have already been shown in an earlier live-action sequence or shot.

Another subject cluster that makes for a good deal of schematisation is that which NOF itself designated as *civics*. As a rule, films in this category exploit a much wider range of figurative options than those dealing with geography topics. For instance, the shorts *Goed bewaren – geld besparen* and *Van tuin naar tafel* ([ca. 1953], From garden to table) combine large quantities of elaborate cross-section drawings, filmed from various angles and distances, with animated stills, increasingly complex diagrams and colourful maps. One reason for this

schematic 'overload', I would say, is that such titles not only serve the purpose of passing on a certain body of knowledge, but are also designed to bring about a behavioural change. In addition to a series of facts and figures, they also need to convey a message, which is not made explicit so easily with only live-action shots.

Comprehensibility as Reassurance

As the above cases demonstrate, schematisation tends to involve a certain degree of 'insistence' on the intelligibility of the matter dealt with. Compare for instance the zoology shorts *Het eekhoortje* (1956, The squirrel), *De hamster* (1960, The hamster) and *Het paard*². The first two consist almost entirely of 'observational' shots of rodents gathering food, nesting, and feeding their young.³¹ Here, the viewer is given the impression that the task of figuring out what the animals' actions 'mean' is left to him entirely. In *Het paard*², in contrast, this is not the case. The short, which consists for the most part of animated images, also uses still photographs, maps, charts, diagrams and real-life models (sometimes embedded in the diegesis) to create an added comprehensibility effect. Every time one of those schemas appears, a facet of or a stage in the development of the species dealt with is singled out – and often also frozen, slowed down or enlarged. This way, the film's overall argument is given an appearance of digestibility.

Yet even if a short does opt for a representational technique that reduces the complexity of a (real-life) given to its most 'essential' parts, this does not necessarily imply that the matter it deals with therefore *actually* becomes easier to understand. After all, schematisation relies on a logic of its own; therefore, it also requires a certain competence on the part of the viewer. In some cases, the interpretational skills that are needed to decode diagrams or models are quite high. In the abovementioned *Van tuin naar tafel*, for instance, (animated) graphic representations follow each other at such a speed, and in such variety, that even an extremely attentive viewer may have some trouble figuring out how everything connects.

Yet the question is whether this actually detracts from the procedure's rhetorical potential. The strategy of simplification of which such schemas form part, after all, does not derive its capacity to motivate from the *actual* intelligibility of the matter addressed, but from the impression of 'fathomability' which it seeks to convey. In the examples given above, models and diagrams help create a semblance, an appearance, of logic and transparency. What may keep a viewer tuned, in other words, is not the experience of understanding itself, but the *reassurance* he is given that what is dealt with can (easily) be understood. Of course, I do not wish to deny here that a shot's or sequence's actual comprehensibility may generate such an effect as well. However, the rhetorical mechanism that I am trying to pinpoint here does not *require* this.³² Consider once more the example of *Van tuin naar tafel*. In this short, a voice-over narrator tells the viewer exactly what he should take away from the screening. The ingenious system of interconnecting schemas which dominates the visuals, meanwhile, does not exactly clarify much; considered in isolation, it is actually quite confusing. In combination with the audio, however, it does underscore the film's *overall* appearance of intelligibility.³³

Strategy: Structuring

Among the tools that can help increase the appearance of comprehensibility of filmic matter,

schematisation is by far the most easily noticeable one. However, the range of available techniques is much wider, and also includes procedures that are far less conspicuous. In one way or another, every aspect of textual structuring that creates an effect of transparency in the way a subject is dealt with can serve this purpose. In what follows, I shall give some examples.

Montage

One of the most common methods of organising content, of course, is to edit shots and sequences in a (chrono)logical way. Like many 'informational' types of film, NOF's shorts make use of this procedure rather intensively. Again, economic geography titles constitute a good example. In many cases, such shorts follow a series of foods or appliances from raw material to finished product. In doing so, they stick to a strictly time-based logic – as in *Kaas **, *Glas, Het boekbinden* ([ca. 1947], Bookbinding), *Strokarton* ([ca. 1946], Strawboard), or the aforementioned *Auto's aan de lopende band* (the only one in this series which documents an industrial process, rather than a traditional handicraft).³⁴ In most cases, manufacturing procedures are not shown in all their details; instead, essential stages are singled out and cut together. Much like the so-called 'process films' of the cinema's early years, many of these shorts have a temporal logic that is 'rounded off' with a shot or sequence featuring the final product – either simply displayed (sometimes literally, as in *Aardewerk*, [ca. 1949], Pottery; here it is placed on a rotating platform) or sold, bought or consumed (in *Van koren tot brood; Kaas **; *Spinnen en weven*, 1947, Spinning and weaving; *Groenten voor de grote stad*, [ca. 1947], Vegetables for the big city; *Oesterteelt*, [ca. 1952], Oyster culture).³⁵

Occasionally, a chronological system is applied so strictly that the film acquires some sort of chapter lay-out. This practice is noticeable in particular when intertitles are used for additional emphasis, as in *Koerien op stal* (1942, Cows in the shed). Here, the (agricultural) process dealt with stretches across three seasons; the textual inserts indicate a lapse of time. The same also applies in the case of *Paasfeest in Twente* (1952, Easter celebrations in Twente), in which titles are used to identify the days leading up to the main festival event, a bonfire. Another common editing pattern is that of the biology shorts *De kieviet*, *De kapmeeuw*, *De spreeuw* and *Van ei tot kraanvogel* (1961, From egg to crane). Here, montage reflects the chronology of the life cycles of the bird varieties dealt with (in the 'stock' order of nesting, laying and hatching eggs, and raising the young). The second and last film in the series also use one or more intertitles to make explicit the temporal logic on which they rely.

Structural 'Accentuation'

Earlier on I pointed out that NOF, in its various publications, heavily stressed the value of a tight textual organisation.³⁶ Also the items it distributed stand out for their emphatic construction. In the films the institute supplied, an appearance of structure – or perhaps more accurately: 'structured-ness' – derives not only from a transparent logic in the succession of shots and sequences, but also from the use of all kinds of textual 'punctuation', such as fades and dissolves. NOF deployed such means rather intensively, not only in its own productions (extreme examples are *Turf: Laagveen*, *Strokarton* and *Wij bouwen woningen*, 1949, We build houses) but also in adaptations of films acquired from elsewhere (for instance, *Een Japans gezin **, 1959, A Japanese family).³⁷

Another way in which the shorts discussed underscore their own (temporal) structure is by inserting shots of visual time indicators; for instance, clocks or watches, as in *Twentse textielindustrie ** (1949, Textile industry in Twente), *Een wens verhoord binnen 24 uur: de post* (1953, A wish granted within 24 hours: The mail), *Verkiezingen voor de Tweede Kamer, Het dorp* (1956, The village) and *Een natte broek in Waterland*. Others instead use shots of (church) bells (*Giethoorn **) or (factory) alarms or whistles (*Papierbereiding: Oudhollands papier*, 1942, Paper manufacture: Old Dutch paper; *Twentse textielindustrie **). Even in items produced as late as 1960 (for instance, the sound remake of the film *Kaas*) such ingredients can be found – in spite of the fact that they are strongly reminiscent of pre-war, mostly *silent* filmic conventions.³⁸ In those instances, they are used as additional signs of the films' structural transparency.

Another set of textual elements that sometimes serve the purpose of accentuating a film's organisation – in this case, a *spatio*-temporal one – are recurring shots of maps. Such visual 'motifs' most often turn up in films that use a journey or expedition structure (and which, in the process, draw again on a much older, silent tradition).³⁹ In the regional geography films *Oerwoudverkenner in Suriname* ([ca. 1950], Jungle explorers in Surinam), *Venetië* ([ca. 1952], Venice) and *Thailand* (1960), animated sketches of the areas under scrutiny, inserted before the opening shots of every new sequence, indicate the routes followed and specify where subsequent sections are to take place. In most of these cases, the journey threads that structure the shorts are entirely supplemental. The titles mentioned each document a (distant) region's landscape and/or the ways of life of its inhabitants; the patterns applied, therefore, primarily serve the purpose of connecting otherwise unrelated episodes. Yet even so, their motivational potential is made to stand out. By showing maps at every transition point, the films focus their viewers' attention on their own tight structure – and by the same token, on the texts', but also their contents', 'inherent' comprehensibility.

Profilmic Organisation

In the above examples, textual organisation essentially derives from the ways in which shots and sequences are combined. In many of NOF's films, however, the impression of structuredness that is conveyed *also* relates to what happens before the camera lens. On those occasions, structure is visibly embedded in the *mise en scène*.

Few of the productions which NOF released seem to be concerned primarily with the recreation of a 'natural' course of events. Instead, they aim for an impression of procedural logic and transparency – a goal which often seems to justify some kind of staging. Films that document a manufacturing process, for instance, tend to bear signs of a certain degree of profilmic intervention. In *Kaas **, *Twentse textielindustrie **, *Het boekbinden* and *Hout* (1957/1962, Wood), routine actions have clearly been cut short, slowed down or 'performed' (again) in front of the camera.⁴⁰ Zoology films are often shot in artificial environments; for instance, replicas of the animals' real-life habitats. *Het bittervoortje en de mossel* ([ca. 1947], The bitterling and the mussel), for instance, is filmed through the glass of an aquarium: the container's edges cast their shadows onto the bottom, which is visible through whipped up sand. In *De hamster*, footage of rodents in the wild is combined with shots of a congener and its young moving about in a model of a subterranean burrow (a cross-section version of the real thing). In none of these cases, much effort is taken to hide from the viewer that the profilmic has somehow

been 'tampered with'.

The role of staging, here, is that of bringing order into a situation that might otherwise seem too disorganised to comprehend. By manipulating the *mise en scène*, the films mentioned eliminate those aspects of a situation or process that are expected to 'muddle' the picture that is sketched. In my view, their motivational potential derives from the fact that they do so very emphatically. In these films, it does not matter all that much if the represented scenes look somewhat artificial; after all, what is sought after is not an impression of life-likeness, but one of comprehensibility. Signs of staging may actually *contribute* to this effect.

Structural Patterning

Examples such as the above implicitly demonstrate the importance of recognisability in the process of textual motivation. In order for a strategy to be effective, the means by which it works need to be sufficiently identifiable. For the procedure dealt with here, this means in practice that a viewer can only take for granted a certain matter's comprehensibility, if the organising elements that highlight it can actually be recognised. The chance that this happens is the higher, the more a text makes use of well-known, easily discernible structural patterns.

The shorts *Na 10 jaren arbeid* * ([ca. 1944], After 10 years of labour) and *Marker vissers* (1947, Fishermen in Marken) exemplify this principle.⁴¹ Both of these films chronicle 'a day in the life' of the people shown – farmers in one case, fishermen in the other. Arguably, most viewers will only need a minute to recognise this pattern, and to predict how the films' narratives will continue to unfold. In either case, then, the instantaneous familiarity of a basic ordering principle necessarily preconditions the spectators' experience of those sequences which they have not yet seen. In the process, the upcoming confrontation with new content is made less 'daunting'. By couching unknown subject matter in a recognisable form, both of these films give their audiences reason to believe that they will understand what is argued, and therefore, that they are likely to find continued viewing agreeable.

Another factor which may contribute to the rhetorical functioning of the above texts is the fact that the use of familiar patterns somehow always constitutes a challenge to the viewers' intellect. In an article which assesses the concept of the cinema of attractions as a conceptual tool, Charles Musser has underlined the importance of recognisable ingredients in (early) films. The author's main argument here is that items from before 1903 constituted a "reworking of the familiar" as much as being instruments of astonishment and surprise. With Musser, I am convinced that also those elements should be seen as signs of spectatorial acknowledgement – just as much as the representation of various cinematic 'tricks' (the 'attractions' discussed by Gunning). The difference between the two lies in the type of experience that the items in which they turn up seek to induce. Films that draw on the appeal of familiar structures do not aim for the kind of pleasure that goes with a perception of shock, but for the sense of satisfaction that can be derived from picking up on a given reference.⁴²

Strategy: Verbal Explication

Simplification and structuring are two strategies that can help foreground the inherent comprehensibility of the matter dealt with. Another tactic that fulfils this rhetorical function is the explication of filmic sense through words. In teaching films, verbal elucidation either takes

the form of written texts – sometimes inserted in between shots, but often also embedded in the *mise en scène* – or spoken ones. If the chosen means of explication is speech, it most commonly appears as a voice-over commentary.⁴³

Again, the motivational potential of such tools lies in the fact that they can help reassure the viewer of the fundamental comprehensibility of the matter dealt with. Verbal communication, it seems, has a semblance of precision; it is not ‘tainted’ with the ambiguity that is commonly associated with the purely visual. In addition to this, spoken or written words are often used to *narrow down* the range of denotational possibilities which moving images hold.⁴⁴ In the case of teaching films, they carry the implicit message that the audience addressed does not need to face the task of decoding a filmic text on its own, but will be assisted in its interpretation of what is shown.⁴⁵

Earlier on I pointed out that the films which NOF distributed stand out precisely for their rather sparing use of words. Materials from the first fifteen years in particular (the institute’s ‘mute period’) are surprisingly *un-verbose*. Intertitles are quite rare, even in shorts that follow on from a tradition of silents that did feature them. Also, in films that do use title cards, they tend to figure only sporadically and do not seem to form part of a systematic strategy to increase comprehensibility; consider for instance *Zoetwatervisserij* (1942, Freshwater fishing), *Kersen* (1943, Cherries), *Glas*, *De kapmeeuw* or *Aardewerk*.⁴⁶ In spite of this, films from the period generally do explicate textual meaning – albeit perhaps in more ‘subtle’ ways. However, this does not preclude that the motivational potential of the devices used is often quite evident.

Profilmic Captions

One way in which NOF circumvented its own rule against the insertion of explanatory intertitles was by incorporating texts into the image itself. In some cases, such captions are visualised as if they were ‘naturally’ part of the *mise en scène*. Classic examples are inscriptions on all types of containers and machineries, identifying either their contents (for instance, raw materials in *Kaas **, *Glas* and *Aardewerk*; a finished product in *Kersen*; various types of laundry in *Wasserij*) or their functions (measuring instruments in *De Bilt verwacht... 1959*, *De Bilt forecasts...*).⁴⁷ Other captions serve the purpose of naming the bodies and authorities featured or specifying the duties of those who work for them (for example, the signs on facades, doors and windows in *Na 10 jaren arbeid **, *Polderland*, *Haven en handel*, *Verkiezingen voor de Tweede Kamer* and the second part of *De bruine rat*, 1955, *The brown rat*).⁴⁸ In some films, profilmic signposts and labels are used to identify locations (*Oesterteelt*; *De stad, hart van de ommelanden*, 1959, *The city, heart of its environs*) and directions (the destination of products and parcels in *Een klipvisdrogerij op IJsland*, [ca. 1946], *A cod drying workshop on Iceland*; *Twentse textielindustrie **; *Een wens verhoord binnen 24 uur*; *Vrachtvervoer over de weg*, [ca. 1953], *Freight traffic by road*) or to specify temporal relations (consider for instance the clues on forms, posters, and newspapers in *Verkiezingen voor de Tweede Kamer*).

Sometimes, lengthier ‘embedded’ texts are used to explicate a film’s course of events or to summarise its overall message. Compare for instance *Haven en handel* or *Het dorp* with *Alle water is geen drinkwater ** (1955, *Not all water is drinkable*). In the first two shorts, cable notices and letters serve the same purposes as in the films mentioned above: they help identify the activities that take place in the professional/social contexts depicted. In the third, in contrast,

texts contain information that is more vital to the viewers' interpretation of what is shown. Here, shots of newspaper headings specify the circumstances of the film's story and explicate the links between its various parts. In *Niek zoekt werk op kantoor* ([ca. 1947], Nick applies for an office job), *Helpers in nood* and *De schoolreis* (1949, The school trip), writing in letters, on blackboards and in programme leaflets also contributes to narrative development, and actually even propels it. Something similar is the case with the texts on posters in *Polderland* and *Een tijdperk ging voorbij* (1959, An era went by), which function as full-fledged alternatives for more traditional intertitles.

In all of the above examples, inscriptions form a more or less integral part of the objects or processes shown, and even fulfil some sort of a role in the story that is told. Yet even so, their motivational potential is often quite evident. The reason is that in nearly all of these cases, the presence of written texts is actively brought to the viewer's attention – either through a camera (or focusing) movement, or by means of editing. In some films, 'relevant' sections of a text are even literally 'lit up' (*Polderland*, *Een tijdperk ging voorbij*). This way, their clarifying potential is visually underscored.

Of course, the above situation does not always apply. In some films, labels or signs look quite 'foreign' to the rest of the *mise en scène*. In *Van koren tot brood* or *Vlasbewerking* (1950, Flax processing), identifying tags and explanatory notices figure in places where they would not ordinarily be, for if they did, they might actually interfere with the production activities that take place.⁴⁹ Again, however, such signs of profilmic intervention need not detract from the motivational potential considered here; after all, they merely attest to the texts' preparedness to 'meet the viewer halfway'. In fact, they all function as traces of a deliberate explicative act by an (invisible, inaudible, but nevertheless very helpful) narrative agent.

Written Elements in Schemas

Another way of explicating textual meaning without using actual intertitles is to integrate verbal elements into schematic representations. More often than not, profile drawings, diagrams and animated models contain some form of written text – either structurally, or as an added feature (for instance, as part of an animated overlay, as in *Turf: Laagveen*, *Polderland*, *Walvisvaart*, *Hoogovens* or *Hout*).

Again, a good deal of variation occurs in the amount of information such verbal elements add. In some cases, they do little more than to identify (the components of) an object or action shown. *Suikerfabriek*, for instance, features a number of animated cross-sections, each of which follows a live-action shot of the same step in the manufacturing process dealt with; words, which are linked by arrows to various parts of the diagrams, are used to name the materials and equipment involved. The same principle is also applied in *Turf: Laagveen*, *Polderland* and *Hoogovens*, and in the profile drawing of a purification plant in *Alle water is geen drinkwater* *.⁵⁰ Elsewhere, the content which verbal elements contribute is more weighty, and often also more complex. Writing can be used to explicate a film's chronology, narrative structure, or even its main argument. In *Haven en handel*, the live-action footage that forms the bulk of the film is 'framed' by two animated diagrams which outline the basic mechanisms of the coffee trade, and the function of harbours in this process. The role of texts here is to introduce and sum up the main steps in the economic activity discussed. In addition to this, words serve the

purpose of specifying the precise locations of the events shown – facts that cannot always be derived from the images themselves. In exceptional cases (such as *Steenkool vervoer*, [ca. 1951]) inscribed schemas even seem to constitute the main steps in the film’s development; live-action sequences then merely illustrate the arguments which they make.

In my view, the textual function of writing in schemas is quite similar to that of intertitles. Unlike the profilmic captions mentioned earlier, the texts on charts, maps and diagrams in the above films are always literally ‘cut off’ from the images that surround them. Annotated schemas usually do bear a clear visual relation to the shots that precede or follow (in most cases, because they re-represent them graphically); in spite of this, they are fully self-contained. In cases like these, however, the *rhetorical* function of textual separation, in combination with visual repetition, is similar to that of (literally) highlighting explicative elements in the *mise en scène*.⁵¹

Spoken Commentaries

From the later 1950s onwards, textual explication in NOF’s films more and more often took the form of speech – and especially, voice-over commentaries. Like written words, spoken texts usually fulfil several functions at the same time. On the one hand, they serve the purpose of introducing relevant terminology: words and phrases which the pupils need in order to be able to talk (or write, or fill out tests) about the subjects concerned. On the other hand, they always also provide clues as to how the films in which they turn up should be interpreted. In the current chapter, it is the latter function that I am more interested in.⁵²

In her seminal study on teaching films, Jacquinot observes that the main role of speech in such items is that of ‘anchoring’ (*ancrage*, a term borrowed from Roland Barthes) textual meaning. In most of these shorts, she argues, the sole purpose of speech is to ensure the unambiguousness of the audio-visual communication, and to control the viewer’s interpretation of what is shown. She writes:

Whatever the case may be, the various sound elements, in pedagogical films, are used most often to guarantee the univocal character of the message. Everything is done to exercise control over that which is most likely to elude the sender: noise reinforces the analogical function of the image, speech anchors the meaning of the image, and images anchor the meaning of the music.

By way of explanation, she refers to the fact that teaching films are indebted to a long tradition of pedagogical interaction, which is geared entirely towards optimising – read: disambiguating – all forms of didactic exchange.⁵³

While I do not share the author’s view that (narrated) teaching films therefore constitute a highly ‘closed’ type of text (if only because I think that this conclusion is based on too narrow a conception of the ways in which textual meaning takes shape), I do believe that she makes some valuable observations here. While such films may not actually ‘control’ their readers’ interpretation of what is shown, they clearly *announce* themselves as highly univocal. By suggesting how the range of denotational possibilities for a given set of visuals can be reduced, they allow the viewers to anticipate the manageability of their upcoming interpretive task. In this process, they put them at ease, and thus, encourage them to stay tuned.⁵⁴

Another aspect of Jacquinot’s exposition which interests me is the relation which she

establishes between the texts under scrutiny and the pedagogical traditions on which they build. While I have argued earlier that the actual conditions of the films' production are of lesser importance to me here, I do think it is worth considering how educational practice is referenced on the level of the text. Within a pedagogical framework, after all, the analogy between the speech of a commentator and that of an actual teacher is sheer inescapable. The fact that a classroom audience will take a film's matter to be comprehensible, then, must partly also derive from – or at the very least, be reinforced by – its association with the voice of an educator whose primary task it is to make his pupils (the viewers) understand the matter that is passed on. For a further elaboration of how this rhetorical process operates, I refer to chapter 5.

Focus: Practical Feasibility

In terms of its motivational potential, the third and last cluster of strategies that I would like to consider in the first half of this paragraph closely relates to the one I just discussed. In what follows, I shall talk about textual procedures of which the spectatorial appeal derives from the fact that they help to represent filmic matter not as comprehensible (in an abstract sense) but as feasible, as *practically* doable. The viewer is lured into watching a film with the implicit promise that what is done by the people on screen is also achievable for him – as long as he stays focused.

Earlier on in this chapter, I gave some examples of items that motivate their spectators by allowing them to observe things, or activities, which they do not normally have access to. In many cases, I added, these objects or actions are likely to command the audience's admiration. Viewers are confronted with processes or worlds, previously unseen, that turn out to be highly intricate, or craftily organised. The procedures that are shown are solid-looking, and often involve actors – inanimate, animate, or human; here, I focus on the latter – who are experts at what they do. Therefore, they warrant the audience's veneration. In the films I deal with in what follows, similar activities are represented. The rhetorical effect which is aimed for, however, is different. In those instances, the goal is not to induce in the viewer an experience of (visual) privilege, but rather a sense of ambition: a desire – and ideally, a determination – to perform the actions shown as well as they are done on screen.

In the examples I deal with here, in other words, the envisaged motivational process consists of two, perhaps even three stages, which can either take place simultaneously, or follow each other closely in time. Before all else, the texts discussed seek to compel in their viewers a certain amount of respect: a sense of appreciation for what the filmed people do – and above all, *how* they do it (so well). This experience in turn should provoke a degree of envy: a desire to be able to perform the actions that are carried out so expertly on screen. The final stage in the process is to get viewers to actually *resolve* themselves to acquiring the competence shown, and therefore, to be willing to pick up on any reference in the film that might help them achieve their goal. In order for the latter to be possible, however, the operations shown must look not only impressive, but also feasible, practically doable. They should be represented in such a way that the audience can be convinced that the act of watching itself increases its chances of success. Manageability, in other words, is the ultimate motivational focus of these films.

Strategy: Facilitating Imitation

In the examples I shall discuss next, the rhetorical strategy that can be inferred is that of facilitating imitation. In those films and sequences, actions – or sometimes, behaviours – are represented in such a way that viewers are led to believe that they will be able to reproduce them after the screening, if only they pay sufficient attention. On the one hand, the operations shown are carried out exactly as they should be: those who execute them do not make any mistakes. On the other hand, actions and procedures are visualised very *clearly*: they are made so easily observable – but also: memorisable – that audiences can be confident that they will be able to re-enact them later on.

The textual means that can serve the above rhetorical purposes have for the most part already been covered. The kit of available tools includes staging and shooting techniques that allow the spectator a (very) close look at the actions performed, the (chrono)logical ordering of mutually dependent operations, and the isolation of crucial stages in a manoeuvre or process (for instance, through schematic re-representation). In addition to this, also speed and repetition fulfil an important motivational role. In what follows, I shall not discuss these procedures again. Instead, I shall give some examples of films in which the features mentioned very clearly function as part of the strategy dealt with here.

Whether or not a represented action or procedure stands out as ‘doable’, of course, depends to a considerable extent on the (educational) background of a particular audience. For instance, many of the abovementioned films that document manufacturing processes (*Hoogovens*, *Haven en handel*, *Auto’s aan de lopende band*) may very well have served some sort of a ‘model’ function for pupils in vocational schools.⁵⁵ For them, in other words, these shorts may have fulfilled a multiple motivational role – even if the particular skills represented are not identical to the ones they were commonly taught in class. In what follows, however, I shall concentrate on examples of which the imitability must have been obvious to a much wider audience.

In the next few pages, I shall focus on two types of film. First, I shall discuss some examples from a category that I would like to call ‘skill films’: shorts that were meant to serve as aids to the teaching of some of the more practical subjects on the school curriculum, such as handicraft, or gymnastics. Also films for specialist (technical) education are part of this cluster. Second, I shall elaborate a little on the topic of social guidance films – already touched upon in chapter 1.⁵⁶ In these shorts, what is driven at is not the imitation of a series of (physical) operations, but the adoption of a socially desirable behaviour, an ‘appropriate’ conduct. The textual means which these films employ are quite different from the ones mentioned above.

Skill Films

The strategy dealt with here is by far the most prominent in films that are meant to teach their viewers a skill – i.e. the ability to perform a succession of actions that lead towards a very concrete result. Such shorts, one could say, are highly ‘instrumental’. Serving as surrogates for actual (in class) demonstrations of the same operations, they facilitate a didactic process of ‘mirroring’.⁵⁷ The physical education films *Schoolzwemmen* (1953, *Swimming in school*) and *S.L.O.* (1957, *Sports day in school*), for instance, contain sequences in which children perform, respectively, swimming movements (breast stroke, back stroke, water treading and diving) and

gymnastics exercises (ball throwing, running, high and long jumping and general dexterity drills).⁵⁸ In *Aardig knutselwerk* ([ca. 1950], Decent handicraft) young boys show how to make a scale model of an animal farm out of waste materials. In *Ruwe planken* ([ca. 1947], *Timber*), a film targeting pupils in technical schools, adolescent men execute the various actions involved in the process of turning trees into planks of wood. By setting an example, all these shorts provide their viewers with a direct opportunity to reach a clear curriculum target. In order to be (pedagogically) successful, the films' non-explicit argumentation goes, the spectators merely need to do as shown.⁵⁹

In practice, of course, faithful imitation is only possible on the condition of continued concentrated viewing. In order for a film to stimulate this, a genuine desire must be appealed to; after all, the schoolchildren targeted cannot be expected to work up the effort of attentiveness out of a sheer sense of educational duty. In the shorts dealt with here, this is done primarily by foregrounding the practical feasibility of the task at hand. Textual features that help to incite awe may insure that the skills represented look challenging enough to make them enviable; a disproportionate emphasis on procedural intricacy and speed, however, can only have a discouraging effect. Purpose-produced films such as the above therefore visualise the processes they deal with as consisting of a manageable number of steps, each of which in turn is shown from close enough and at a sufficiently low rate to guarantee that it will stick in the minds of the viewers addressed.

The example of *Aardig knutselwerk* can help me illustrate my point. One of the most striking features of this film, in my view, is that humans hardly ever appear on screen recognisably. In most cases, shots have been made at such close range that only arms and hands are visible. At the beginning of the film, where a classroom situation is depicted – presumably, as a demonstration of the educational relevance of the skill to be performed – some of the children's faces are in view. Elsewhere, however, one only gets to see those body parts that are instrumental in the task that is carried out. They are shot from very nearby; in addition to this, the entire area surrounding the children's workspace is shrouded in an impenetrable darkness. One consequence of this approach is that the humans pictured are wholly interchangeable; identification of individual pupils simply is not possible. More importantly, however, it entails that there can be no doubt in a viewer's mind as to what he should pay attention to: it is the handiwork that he should concentrate on.

In any other context, technical choices that restrict the audience's perspective in this way might be expected to dampen rather than to stimulate its willingness to keep watching. In the above case, however, they clearly do hold motivational potential. In *Aardig knutselwerk*, it is precisely because of the way in which the viewer's gaze is directed to the task at hand that he can see so clearly which types of material are used, and how (small) fingers manage to glue together the various parts of models and puppets. Also the logic and rhythm of the film's montage further an appearance of procedural transparency. As a rule, the genesis of an item is rendered in real-time; consequently, the spectator has every opportunity to observe the process dealt with. Meanwhile, each creative step is shown only once. Whenever an operation is repeated, a jump-cut is made to a point further on in the process. The result of this is that the audience is always shown something new, and thus, prevented from getting bored. At the same time, discouragement is precluded. The fabrication of each component

of the farm is represented in a limited amount of time; the entire undertaking, therefore, does not look quite as hefty as it might.⁶⁰

Last but not least, also the film's basic chronological ordering principle plays a definite motivational role. The succession of shots and sequences in *Aardig knutselwerk* lends to the process under scrutiny a semblance of result-orientedness. Thanks to the film's construction, the viewer can rest assured that the actions demonstrated actually lead somewhere – even if the final outcome of the process has not yet been shown. This element of textual arrangement, I believe, not only affects the appeal of the matter dealt with, but also plays a part on a text-internal level. Apart from implicitly postulating the usefulness of every operation shown, it also whets the viewer's curiosity for what is to come. As such, chronological arrangement constitutes another encouragement to stay tuned.⁶¹

Social Guidance Films

In chapter 1, I mentioned that NOF not only distributed films that were meant to serve as aids to the teaching of knowledge and skills (as identified by the school curricula) but also items that had to help improve the pupils' general behaviour. The availability of such shorts needs to be considered against the background of the 'No More War' spirit that took root in the post-1945 period. In educational circles at the time, there was a growing body of opinion that formal education had a task to fulfil in the preparation of individuals for 'societal membership'; the 'new' media were considered to hold a great deal of promise in this respect. As I pointed out earlier, NOF's first ventures into this domain came rather late. In the beginning, it tended to work its behavioural advice into items with academically more 'relevant' subjects; after 1950, it also began to distribute them as so-called *civics* films.⁶²

In terms of their textual features, these shorts, or sequences, bear very little resemblance to the ones I discussed above. Unlike skill films, they do not aim primarily for an impression of *physical* (motoric) imitability; elements that facilitate a step-for-step copying of the task concerned therefore are not so prominent here. The most outstanding characteristic of these films, as a matter of fact, is that they rely rather heavily on dramatic and characterisation techniques – procedures which I shall discuss in more detail in the subsequent paragraph. In the films dealt with here, their function is to induce sentiments of envy: ambition, this time, of the social, or *societal*, kind. The situations they represent involve characters that display, or convert to, an (adult-approved) 'model' behaviour, and seem to get happier in the process. The implicit assumption here is that spectators, driven by a profound desire to fit in – a deep-rooted, universal wish for social acceptance – will want to act accordingly, and therefore, stay tuned.⁶³

The principle of motivation adhered to here hinges once again on the idea that viewing in itself is a first step towards the achievement of a film's objective. The main difference with the skill films mentioned above is the additional requirement of identifiable characters. In *Aardig knutselwerk*, I pointed out, the on-screen presence of youngsters merely serves the purpose of demonstrating to the viewers the educational relevance of the matter dealt with. In social guidance films, in contrast, their involvement is a much more crucial cogwheel in the mechanism of motivation. In order to feel tackled on their own conducts, spectators need to be given the chance to relate in some way to the people portrayed. The humans featured

therefore tend to be actual characters rather than anonymous, interchangeable figures. In most cases, they also have roughly the same ages as the spectators addressed, and share their interests and concerns (as in *Niek zoekt werk op kantoor* and *Helpers in nood*, two early language education titles dating from before the time of the *civics* films).⁶⁴

Another difference with the skill films discussed above is that social guidance shorts sometimes also exploit the educative potential of negative examples. In some instances, the child or children portrayed are not rewarded for their good conduct, but punished for an undesirable one – often with social isolation as a result. The stories told, in this case, are meant to function as deterrents. In situations like these, I believe, the potential for behavioural ‘mirroring’ remains implicit, because some sort of mental ‘inversion’ needs to take place before imitation on the viewers’ part can come about. Moreover, such films also require that the audience targeted *already* knows what the better alternative is. In NOF’s titles, this assumption is not always made; films that use negative showcases therefore tend to depict the ‘proper’, socially accepted, conduct as well.⁶⁵

4.1.2 Viewing Made Appealing

In the process of motivation, I have argued, social guidance films tend to rely quite heavily on representational techniques that can get viewers to relate to what is shown; for instance, the use of recognisable characters. In the films mentioned, these procedures can be said to serve a ‘secondary’ purpose. In those shorts, they form part of a larger strategy (facilitating imitation) of which the purpose is to make the matter films deal with (in this particular instance: issues pertaining to the spectators’ role in society) more attractive to pay attention to. In most cases, however, they (also) hold the potential of motivating their audience in a more direct way. By allowing viewers to make the connection between what they see, and their own, personal lives, they basically make more appealing the act of *viewing itself*.

In the introduction to this chapter, I announced that I would divide the motivational strategies I deal with into two groups. The assumption I made in this process is that a film’s rhetorical appeal does not always derive primarily from the way in which it (re)presents – and in the process, makes more alluring – the topics it addresses. In some cases, I said, the chosen mode of presentation has motivational value *in itself*. Filmic form, of course, is always a matter of moulding, or shaping, subject matter; formulation therefore can never be disconnected from *what* is said. The position I am taking here, however, is that some strategies do not motivate the audience by focusing its attention on features that are represented as ‘inherent’ to the matter dealt with, but rely on textual elements that make viewing the films more attractive *regardless of* what their topics are. It is those elements that I shall focus on here.

In what follows, I shall discuss three clusters of strategies. The first covers all procedures that foreground what I shall refer to hereafter as ‘textual purposiveness’. In this section, I am concerned with those aspects of filmic construction which, one way or another, help convince the viewers that the text progresses towards some sort of a (narrative) ‘end’. By raising expectations as to what comes next, they can cause anticipation or curiosity, and thus, encourage the spectators to stay tuned. The second series consists of those strategies which focus the audience’s attention on the correspondences between that which a film represents,

and its own, personal experience. One way in which the shorts under scrutiny do this is by staging recognisable characters and/or focusing on familiar (dramatic) situations; another option they exploit is to appeal to their presumed personal interests. Finally, I shall give some examples of shorts in which filmic form itself seems to constitute the main audience attraction.

Focus: Textual Purposiveness

Earlier on, I mentioned that motivational strategies somehow always contribute to the potentially 'self-perpetuating' character of audience attention. The use of the textual elements which I single out is based on the underlying assumption that if they do help to draw a viewer's attention, the latter will very likely crave for more – and therefore, will want to stay tuned. This mechanism, I believe, is particularly relevant to the strategies that I shall deal with next: those which capitalise on a text's inherent 'purposiveness', i.e. its fundamental orientation towards a certain (narrative) 'goal'.

In his 1984 publication *Reading for the Plot: Design and Intention in Narrative*, literary theorist Peter Brooks characterises (fictional) plots as "intentional structures, goal-oriented and forward-moving". If narrative is to be conceived of as discourse that "develops its propositions [...] through temporal sequence and progression", he writes, 'plot' is its constructive aspect, its "dynamic shaping force". It is what makes stories 'move forward', and in the process, 'propels' their readers, makes them read on.⁶⁶

Brooks' work should be seen as an attempt to provide an alternative to the analytical models advanced by formalist narratology, which are conceived of by the author as excessively static. In Brooks' view, structuralist critics have been focusing exclusively on the identification of minimal narrative units and paradigmatic structures. In doing so, they have neglected the temporal dynamics that shape stories: the textual 'motor forces', as he calls them, that drive forward their constitutive elements. Brooks instead emphasises that narrative depends on "meanings delayed, partially filled in, stretched out" "over temporal succession". Interested primarily in what those textual forces do for *us*, readers, the author makes mention of some kind of a narrative 'desire': a *passion du sens* (in the words of Barthes) that runs parallel to the protagonists' own ambitions. Drawing on the insights of psychoanalysis, he argues that this desire comes down to a yearning for the stories' "shaping ends" which contain the promise of meaning. It is due, in other words, to the prospect of significance of the narrative elements that lead up to them.⁶⁷

Of course, the reading of texts should not be seen as an *entirely* unidirectional movement. In 'working through' a narrative – whether written, or filmic – one does not just look ahead, but also backwards; for instance, in the process of retrospectively filling what Iser calls textual 'gaps' or 'blanks' (*Leerstellen*). Also Brooks' work, although not dealing with it explicitly, leaves room for such readerly activity. The author's main argument, however, is that every beginning *presupposes* an end, and that it is precisely this fact which triggers the "desire in time that makes us turn pages". What motivates us to read on, in other words, is the "*anticipation of retrospection*": the fact that we interpret "incidents of narration as 'promises and annuities' of final coherence".⁶⁸ In my view, the same also holds true for viewers of film. Hence, my choice for the expression 'textual purposiveness'.⁶⁹

Strategy: Narrative Patterning

If it is true, as Brooks suggests, that narrative discourse is largely a matter of temporal development – both on the level of the story, and in terms of its reading – then it logically follows that some form of ‘narrativity’ is characteristic of all time-based texts, including films. As André Gaudreault has argued, even the smallest audio-visual unit always constitutes a temporally ordered chain of photographic images; therefore, cinematic forms *necessarily* have a narrative aspect.⁷⁰

In practice, however, there is a great deal of variation in terms of how, or to what degree, films exploit, develop, or ‘expand on’ this elemental quality – and in the process, accentuate or foreground it. By analogy with Prince, the literary theorist mentioned in chapter 3, I would argue that also audio-visual texts differ as to whether or not they “[underline] features that are specific to or characteristic of narrative”; for instance, in terms of whether, or how much, they capitalise on what the author refers to as a story’s ‘teleological determination’ (a notion comparable to Brooks’ ‘goal-orientedness’).⁷¹ Earlier on, I defended the position that every textual beginning inevitably suggest that there will be an ending, and therefore, some form of ‘closure’ in terms of meaning. However, films, like novels, can also choose to *emphasise* this intratextual logic; for example, through the use of (known) narrative patterns. By thus specifying, or announcing, which route they will follow to help viewers make overall sense of what is said, they can actively focus their attention on their own fundamental purposiveness. In my view, it is at this point that narrative structuring becomes part of a rhetorical strategy of which the purpose is to encourage *continued* attention.⁷²

To what extent the use of a specific narrative pattern highlights or accentuates a text’s purposiveness, of course, depends again on how easily it can be identified by the viewers targeted. As Brooks points out, one of the driving forces of narrative desire is the “armature of plot which the reader *recognizes*”, and which, in his view, “constitutes the very ‘readability’ of the narrative text”. Recognisability, in turn, is a matter of the reader’s ‘competence’: his knowledge of the conventions of textual organisation.⁷³

In focusing on that which is already present in the reader’s experience, Brooks takes up some ideas previously formulated by Barthes. In *S/Z*, his analysis of a story by Honoré de Balzac, the French semiotician introduces his model of narrative ‘codes’, the ‘perspectives of quotations’ that together form the (‘readerly’) text’s network of meaning. The two codes (out of five) that Brooks finds the most relevant to his own project are the so-called ‘irreversible’ ones: the kind which have to be deciphered successively, moving in one direction. The reason he gives is that the combination of those two – the ‘proairetic’, and the ‘hermeneutic’ code – approximates the notion of ‘plot’ which he advocates.⁷⁴

Looking at Barthes’ own formulation, I would argue that of those two irreversible codes, the ‘proairetic’ one most pointedly embodies the aspect of recognisability referred to above. This sequence, which pertains to the logic of the characters’ actions and behaviour, is said to follow “the cadence of familiar gestures”. In fact, Barthes states, it has “no other logic than that of the *already-seen, already-read, already-done*: that of empirics and culture”. Through the proairetic code, in other words, a text draws on the reader’s foreknowledge. On the one hand, via the intratextual logic of reference and repetition – the succession of elements which

makes actions and behaviour meaningful. And on the other hand, through appeals to the reader's cultural background, which ranges from the "practical reservoir of trivial everyday acts" to a "written corpus of novelistic models" (i.e., all the texts he has previously read).⁷⁵

One of the factors that allows a reader to trace and 'piece together' the constituents of the proairetic code is, once again, what Brooks refers to as 'goal-orientedness' in the succession of actions: "how their completion can be derived from their initiation".⁷⁶ Or as Barthes himself puts it:

the nature of [a] phenomenon established by the notation is capped by a *conclusion* and consequently seems to be subject to some logic [...]. Writing 'the end' (a phrase which is [...] both temporal and logical) thus posits everything that has been written as having been a tension which 'naturally' requires resolution, a consequence, an end, i.e., something like a *crisis*.

In Barthes' view, this textual orientation towards the end is an important clue for the reader; he even goes so far as to say that the logico-temporal order of proairetic sequences entails that they "constitute the strongest armature of the readerly" (the latter term designating that which a reader 'makes' of a text). For Brooks, this fact in turn entails that it should be seen as one of the main driving forces behind narrative desire.⁷⁷

'Promising' Structures

Reformulating the above ideas in filmic terms, I would say that the motivational potential of narrative patterning, in the most general sense, lies in the fact that the viewer, who is invited to anticipate, simultaneously gets the reassurance that his curiosity will actually be satisfied – as long as he continues to pay attention. An inherent feature of any kind of textual purposiveness, after all, is that it holds the promise of some kind of a 'resolution': by creating an expectation, the suggestion is automatically made that it will also be met. More specifically, the text guarantees its reader that at the end of the film or sequence, all narrative threads will come together, and that in the process, whatever precedes will acquire maximum significance.⁷⁸

One category of texts that very clearly underscore their own purposiveness through narrative patterning are those which represent processes of production. In my section on structuring, I briefly discussed the use of this technique in teaching films as an aid to textual comprehensibility. But in addition to this, narrative threads and story lines can also serve a different purpose – one that has less to do with the presentation of filmic matter than with the internal dynamics of a text.⁷⁹ The (chrono-)logic which these shorts follow has for an effect that their various semantic 'units' become part of an intricate network in which all constitutive elements, implicitly or explicitly, refer back and forth to one another. One of the results is, that viewers can immediately make some basic inferences as to their ultimate (narrative, argumentative) 'goals'.

To a lesser degree, the same also applies to films that document the life cycle of a (mammal, bird or reptile) species. In those shorts as well, the actions or phenomena shown at the outset create expectations as to how they will develop next. In my view, the recognisability of such basic textual structures not only helps foreground the comprehensibility of the matter dealt with, but also makes viewing more attractive, because it inevitably suggests that the audience's curiosity will eventually be satisfied. As a motivational strategy, this tactic is based on a

combination of two, perhaps three, series of assumptions. First, it draws on preconceptions as to what viewers are most eager to see (an abundance of brand new products; the species' young, cute and fluffy); images which, therefore, turn up towards the end. Second, it seems to presuppose that spectators always crave for some kind of 'closure', and consequently, will want to stay tuned, *even* if they roughly know what to expect. A third, additional factor that may also contribute to the appeal of such structures is that they allow the audience to figure out at any given time during a screening where in a film's development it is at, and therefore, how much longer the sit will last. This prospect, also a reminder of the film's finiteness, can help the spectators work up the courage to persevere.⁸⁰

However, the motivational potential of textual purposiveness stands out much more in titles that make use of what I would like to call narrative 'embedding'. In the examples referred to above, the suggestion is made that the films' structure basically corresponds to that of the processes which they represent, and by implication, that the chosen organisational format is pretty much unavoidable. In other shorts, narrative patterning does not reflect an 'inherent', matter-related sequence, but functions instead as some sort of representational framework. Quite apart from the fact that such films much more emphatically draw on the textual potential dealt with here – their structure is clearly the result of a discursive *choice*, rather than a mere necessity – they often also bear *additional* marks of narrativity.

One such feature is the presence of characters who act in purposeful ways. In the work referenced above, Prince points out that the accentuation of a text's narrative character is not only an effect of the logico-temporal ordering of actions and events, but also of their specificity and 'individualisation': the extent to which they make sense in terms of a human project, and are motivated by a person's (or several people's) intentions and desires. In other words, it is also a matter of the characterial agency which propels or directs the narrative development.⁸¹

Consider for instance the 1953 short *Een wens verhoord binnen 24 uur: de post*. In this film, the central argument (once again, an account of a chronological process: the collecting, sorting and distributing of the mail) is embedded in the more 'personalised' story of a small-town teacher who orders, and later on receives and screens, an NOF-distributed film. The central part of the short features only the most basic form of narrativity, in the sense that the events dealt with are presented in an order that corresponds to their temporal succession 'in real life'. Its first and last few minutes, however, contain elements that turn the film as a whole into a much tighter, and above all, much more goal-oriented structure. Because of the fact that the process depicted in the embedded sequences is associated with the highly motivated actions of an identifiable character, its representation becomes more purposive in itself. Audiences know that most likely, the short will end with a scene in which the rented film is received, and subsequently projected, by the on-screen teacher. Arguably, it is the promise of this final section, which, although not dealing with the 'core' matter of the film, is clearly much more relevant to the lives of the viewers addressed, that is most likely to keep their attention focused.⁸²

In a much smaller number of cases, such personalised events do not constitute a mere textual framework, but actually structure the film as a whole. Most items that show this pattern

deal with humanities subjects, such as history (*Vondel, het leven van een groot Nederlander*), language (*Départ de grandes vacances*², 1959, Departure for the summer holidays) or general education topics (*Niek zoekt werk op kantoor* or *Helpers in nood*).⁸³ In those shorts, the central story events are closely bound up with the lives of one or more well-delineated characters, who have their own, clear objectives. This way, the motives and intentions behind the actions that unfold are emphasised *throughout*.⁸⁴

Enigma and Suspense

The above films, but the last two in particular, in addition to this also contain elements of what Barthes refers to as ‘enigma’. This concept, crucial to his exposition on the so-called ‘hermeneutic code’, is used to pinpoint what happens at those points in a story where questions are raised, either explicitly or implicitly, that cause in the reader the need for some form of explanation. In the course of their development, narratives may create indeterminacies, ambiguities, and ‘double understandings’ – all of which can contribute to a certain sense of mystery. This way, the textual addressee is held in suspense, and stirred up in his desire to discover, once again, “what is *at the end* of expectation”.⁸⁵

In distinguishing between the two irreversible codes, Barthes states that the hermeneutic one articulates the ‘voice of truth’ (as opposed to the proairetic, which gives expression to the ‘voice of empirics’). The ultimate goal of narrative is to reveal what *really* happened, or what events or situations *actually* meant. However, on the way towards disclosure, truth is often circumvented: it is delayed by means of “obstacles, stoppages, deviations [...] in the flow of the discourse”. Barthes here makes mention of a somewhat paradoxical logic in the dynamics of narrative texts: while “the sentences quicken the story’s ‘unfolding’ and cannot help but move the story along, the hermeneutic code performs an opposite action” and tries to “maintain the enigma at the initial void of its answer”. With respect to the creation of suspense, this delay (which the author also refers to as the ‘dilatatory space’; in Brooks’ words, the “space of retard, postponement, error, and partial revelation” which the reader needs to work through) is a discursive necessity; without it, expectation of and desire for the mystery’s (re)solution cannot not be raised.⁸⁶

A film which illustrates the above observations particularly well is the language title *Hansje en de Madurodammers*² (1958, *Johnny and the Tiny People of Madurodam*). The short tells the story of a young boy, Hansje, who loses his birthday gift, a magnifying glass, during a trip to the theme park Madurodam (a miniature city, made out of scale models of Dutch-style houses and national landmarks). In a dream sequence, which takes up most of the filmic time, the boy goes back to the park, where he gets resized to a fraction of his normal length after drinking a bottle of ‘magic’ milk. In a montage of shots (made alternately in Madurodam and on the locations which it represents to scale) he gets pursued by a ‘giant’: the caretaker of the park, a man with human dimensions. The chase leads him through the city’s various streets and buildings, and into the locomotive and cockpit of a train and plane. At the end of the film, immediately after having located the loupe, the boy wakes up from his dream. He asks his mother to accompany him back to the theme park, where he recovers the missing item. On that occasion, the park’s supervisor also turns out to be a good deal more benevolent than he seemed before (in his role of ‘giant’).

In this particular short, of course, suspense is fuelled by the fact that for the most part of the film, the main character is trying to escape from a highly dangerous situation. In Brooks' conception, the effect this may provoke in the reader (or as in my case, viewer) is that of apprehension of an imminent 'short-circuit': a premature ending to the story, which also entails a 'wrong death': an improper, because undesirable, conclusion to the narrative.⁸⁷ What keeps the viewer on the *qui vive*, in other words, is not just the prospect of the terrible things that might happen to the protagonist, but also the lasting chance of an 'unsatisfactory' ending. I would like to add, however, that in titles such as *Hansje*, this possibility is highly theoretical, as the implied viewer is supposed to know that (fictional) narratives like these do not normally end in this way. In this case, then, it is once more the anticipation of the highly predictable – and happy – events that conclude the adventure that provides the viewer with a powerful incentive to stay tuned.⁸⁸

Strategy: Audience Interrogation

Another strategy that can be associated with the foregrounding of textual purposiveness is that which I would like to term 'audience interrogation'. In his book on rhetoric in nature documentaries for television, León argues that one of the factors that keeps viewers of such programmes attentive is that they are based on a question-and-answer structure. A problem is posed, which then needs to be resolved. In the instances he quotes, this observation can be taken quite literally, in the sense that the programmes he deals with often *explicitly* formulate a scientific 'enigma'. However, even in such cases, the problem structure primarily serves as a means to organise the discourse (much like a Barthesian hermeneutic pattern) rather than as a way to encourage viewers to find answers for themselves.⁸⁹ In the shorts that I shall deal with next, the situation is different. Here, audience interrogation seems to be part of a strategy to make the audience *actively* take part in an audio-visual exchange.

One of the more extreme examples of this procedure is NOF's title *Solliciteren* (Applying for a job), released around 1942. It is an instruction film, made in two versions (one for boys, and one for girls) which discusses the particularities of job application.⁹⁰ The short, lasting about fifteen minutes, is made up of two parts. The first half of the film, covering about two thirds of the filmic time, consists of a fully staged narrative dealing with the vicissitudes of a highly unprepared young job applicant. The boy/girl makes one mistake after the other: first, by wasting precious time playing or chatting to friends; then by arriving late, acting impolite, and failing a typing test. Therefore, he/she is rejected. The live-action narrative is followed by an intertitle which indicates that the viewers should now be given ten minutes to think about the following question: "Why did Jan Geesen/Marie van Beuningen get turned down?"⁹¹ The teachers' notes specify that the second part of the film, a shorter montage of fragments accompanied by textual inserts showing the various possible answers, should be screened *after* this break. This way, passive waiting for the outcome of the enquiry can be discouraged, and the audience can be challenged to solve the problem on its own.

Involvement of the viewer, however, can also take more subtle forms. In many cases, voice-over commentators in sound films explicate the problems that are (or will be) dealt with. Sometimes, they phrase them as rhetorical questions; if so, narration functions as a mere structuring tool. At other times, however, such queries constitute a direct audience address.

A possible indication here is the use of punctuation. The speaker in *Goed bewaren – geld besparen*, for instance, occasionally leaves a pause after formulating a question; this way, he allows the spectators the time to formulate answers for themselves. Also deictic terms, such as personal pronouns, fulfil an important role in encouraging participation. The film *Van ei tot kraanvogel*, for example, addresses its viewers as ‘you’; this way, it establishes right away for whom its questions are intended.⁹²

Again, the rhetorical potential of the above strategy derives from the fact that it helps to underline a text’s fundamental goal-orientedness – thus also encouraging the audience to stay tuned. However, an important difference with the strategy discussed previously is that the above films do not seem to assume that textual structure in itself is sufficient to ‘lure’ spectators into paying attention. Instead, they address them more directly. In the process, they literally ‘talk to’ them about, or tackle them on, their duties as pupils.⁹³ In addition to this, the above shorts also motivate their spectators by appealing to their intellectual sense of pride. By asking them questions, they challenge them to formulate their own answers; subsequently, after a short moment of ‘suspension’, they tell them whether or not what they came up with was also correct.⁹⁴

Focus: Experiential Correspondence

A second cluster of strategies that need to be dealt with here are those which focus the audience’s attention on the fact that what is shown or said closely relates to its personal experience. More specifically, their aim is to cause in the viewers a sense of correspondence between that which is represented, or an aspect thereof, and what they know from their own, daily lives. In the book referred to above, León argues that in order for texts to be rhetorically successful, they must take into account the so-called ‘spatial factor’: the necessity of a certain “cultural or mental proximity” between the facts or events related and the audience addressed.⁹⁵ This spectatorial ‘closeness’ between film and viewers (or rather, the latter’s experience thereof) can be stimulated in a number of ways; in what follows, I shall discuss two. The first tactic is to introduce characters or situations that the spectators can easily recognise. The second is to directly address their (presumed) topical interests or affinities.

Although my distinction between two sets of ‘foci’ may get somewhat blurry here, I do believe that the strategies which I discuss next are instrumental above all in making more appealing the *viewing process itself*. In the examples I shall deal with, motivational potential derives not so much from the attractive (re)presentation of what I would like to designate as ‘core’ matter (the biological, geographical, or historical facts which a film relates) but rather from the *addition* of elements which, even if they do sometimes affect – or in very exceptional cases, constitute – the argumentative tenor of the text as such, *primarily* fulfil the strategic function mentioned above.⁹⁶ However, the more these elements are interwoven with what a film is actually ‘about’, the more the audience will be encouraged to relate the two, and therefore, to find its ‘core’ matter alluring as well.

Strategy: Enabling Recognition

One text which visibly pursues this goal is the 1959 short *Een Japans gezin* *. The film, part of a (rather extensive) category of pseudo-ethnographic accounts of the lives and works of

'distant' peoples, chronicles the daily activities of an extended family in a Japanese village.⁹⁷ Opening with a series of shots of two young children on their way home from school, the short subsequently shows the same youngsters greeting their parents, having dinner, making their homework, and preparing for bed. Edited in between those sequences are shots of family members engaged in their daily business: the weaving and selling of hand-made fabrics, and kitchen chores and other household duties. In the second half of the film, the viewer is shown a montage of week-end events (excursions to a temple and a theatre, outside play and board games, tea drinking with visitors) and folkloric activities (the offering of food on the occasion of New Year's Day – or so the intertitles claim).

The point of the short, clearly, is to acquaint the audience with 'things foreign': appliances, habits, and general 'ways of life' that are common in another, distant part of the world. The strategy pursued here, however, is not that of *Boerenarbeid in Tirol*, or any of the films with similar subjects that I mentioned earlier, in my section on 'providing access'. Here, the text does not appeal (exclusively) to the viewers' fascination with things unknown or exotic. Of course, it does contain elements of this. The people portrayed use sticks to eat with, draw pictures when they write, and sleep on the floor – habits that necessarily distance them from the audience addressed. Yet even so, all of the things they do immediately 'make sense'. The reason is that the activities depicted are collectively embedded into a larger structure which is very much *recognisable*, simply because it resembles that of the viewers' own lives. The motivational assumption behind this rhetorical strategy is that because of this similarity, viewers will perceive the argument made as relevant, meaningful – and therefore, will want to keep tuned.

In *Een Japans gezin* *, the fundamental correspondences between that which is represented and the audience's own experience is foregrounded in two ways. On the one hand, the short makes use of recognisable characters: children of the viewers' own age, who are part of similar social networks (those of family, friends and neighbours), fulfil similar duties (going to school, making homework) and pursue similar interests (games and excursions). Also the people that are less central to the film's narrative take on highly familiar (gender) roles (father leads the business; mother cooks). On the other hand, the short represents well-known situations (scenes of school, home and family life) in a highly recognisable order (first work, then play). Presumably, even those activities that have no equivalent in the spectators' own culture (for instance, the 'feeding' of the gods) are not *entirely* meaningless: they are likely to correspond to some of the pupils' most basic assumptions – read: stereotypes – about religious worship 'elsewhere'.⁹⁸ First, let me take a closer look at the use of familiar characters.

Recognisable Characters

In my previous section, I briefly touched upon the role of characterisation with respect to a film's orientation towards a certain textual goal. Yet the representation of human, or *humanised*, narrative agents can serve another rhetorical purpose as well. Characters can also help bring out the fundamental correspondences between that which is depicted and the viewers' own experience. In order to do so, however, they need to be sufficiently recognisable, or socio-culturally meaningful, to the audience addressed.⁹⁹

Consider for instance the short *Veilig fietsen*. In this film, narrative development revolves

entirely around the actions of a young boy, Gijs van Beek.¹⁰⁰ Gijs acts irresponsibly while riding his bike, and is subsequently sent on a traffic exam – the pretext for an exposition on road safety. More so even than the two siblings in *Een Japans gezin **, the protagonist here is an example of a typical, ‘modern’ child. In the beginning of the film, he is shown playing around with another boy, clearly a good friend; later on, he runs an errand for his mother. On both occasions, he blatantly ignores traffic rules. His uncle, a policeman, tells him off for not having the right bicycle gear (his bell and mudguard are missing) and sits him down to read a rule book. At the end of the film, Gijs obtains a ‘rider’s license’, which obviously pleases him a great deal – despite his earlier conduct. In all phases of the story, then, he shows himself as an equal of the demographic group which the film targets: that of primary/early secondary school children. His social relations, interests, and general ‘ways’ are bound to be meaningful to them – either because they share them, or because they have observed them from very nearby.¹⁰¹

The relevance of this fact becomes particularly obvious when the above film is compared to some of the character-driven narratives mentioned earlier: *Maarten Luther*, for instance, or *Vondel, het leven van een groot Nederlander*. The human figures which these films feature, while clearly instrumental in propelling their respective plots, are far from recognisable. Living their grown-up lives in a distant past (the sixteenth/seventeenth century) and an entirely different ideological context (both stories focus on the centrality of religion to their protagonists’ lives, both in the spiritual sense, and as a source of social unrest), the characters Martin Luther and Joost van den Vondel offer the audience very little to relate to. Like *Veilig fietsen* or *Een Japans gezin **, the shorts in which they turn up actively draw on the motivational potential of textual purposiveness. As opposed to those films, however, they do not insist on the analogies between the people they represent and the viewers which they address.

Familiar Situations

Yet even so, I believe, both these titles do in some way exploit the rhetorical possibilities of experiential correspondence. While neither of the protagonists mentioned above offers any *concrete* points of contact (for instance, in terms of their professional activities, interests, or objectives) the shorts in which they feature do contain some elements that may be familiar to the audience targeted. Consider for instance the case of *Vondel*. In the opening sequence of the film, the viewer is presented with a brief succession of shots of locations in the centre of Amsterdam: the sites of statues, plaques and institutions that commemorate the life and work of the author dealt with. The spoken commentary that accompanies these images clearly appeals to the spectators’ prior experience: it stimulates them to search their memories for recollections of visits, individually or in school context, which may have led to some of the places shown. This way, the film immediately establishes the relation between its (historically) distant subject and a series of more familiar, physically tangible ‘remains’, thus implicitly arguing that what it talks about may not be quite as ‘foreign’ to the viewers as they might think.

However, the film also foregrounds the above potential in a much more obvious way. With regular intervals, it focuses on situations which, despite the historical ‘remoteness’ of the characters they feature, are highly recognisable for the audience addressed. While the main purpose of the short is to acquaint its viewers with the protagonist’s literary output (plays

and poetry that constitute an important part of the Dutch canon) it occasionally also deals with aspects of his private life.¹⁰² For instance, in the section of the film which discusses the realisation of two of his most well-known pieces, the poems “Kinderlijck” (Children’s body) and “Uitvaart van mijn dochterken” (Funeral of my little daughter), both of which were written on the occasion of the death of one of his children, the camera focuses, respectively, on an empty highchair, and on a group of mourners seated around a small girl’s bed. The purpose of these sequences is to relate the protagonist, known primarily in his capacity of author (seated behind his desk, as in most parts of the film) to the much more recognisable circumstances of life as part of a family, and the emotional distress which this may involve.

In such scenes, I believe, an appeal is made to the audience’s basic ‘human interest’. Apart from rousing the viewers’ curiosity for what comes next, the film also relies on their affinity with the sort of feelings, deriving from all manner of conflictual situations, psychological or otherwise, that are common to people of all ages, places and times. The film presents a dramatic situation, which is recognisable because of the (universal) emotions with which it coincides.

Dramatic Elements

Of course, this tactic is common primarily in films that make use of well-delineated characters. More occasionally, however, it also occurs in shorts that do *not* feature those. A good example here is the 1960 short *Van ei tot kraanvogel*, an account of the life cycle of the crane. Despite the fact that the film is shot inside an animal park (Artis, the Amsterdam zoo), it clearly attempts to create the illusion of an entirely bird-centred world. The cranes shown are filmed at very close range, so that their bodies nearly always fill the screen. The consequence is that spectators are made aware, almost physically, of their hustle and bustle, and therefore, of the conflictive nature of their interaction with the surrounding world. A scene in which this becomes particularly tangible is that which shows a newborn young chased by its caretakers for a vitamin injection – one of those rare moments when people are seen to interact with the animals concerned. The birds’ reaction is clearly one of fear – a very ‘human’, and therefore, recognisable, response to the danger which they perceive.

Throughout the film, dramatic elements like these are ‘accentuated’ by additional audio-visual means. The most prominent of those is a highly suggestive voice-over commentary. In this short, the narrator not only discusses basic biological facts, but also interprets the animals’ actions. In doing so, he implicitly relates natural processes and instinctive reactions to specifically human motives and considerations. In rendering the birds’ perception of the events that take place, he endows them with feelings that are inevitably familiar to the audience addressed. Other means of dramatic accentuation are interpretive drawings in between the sequences (for instance, that of a newborn ‘baby’ crane happily cheering in its cot) and a highly evocative musical score (the rising and fading of the sounds of African instruments, underscoring moments of suspense, but also emotion). Considered in relation to what the narrator says, they both function as ways of emphasising the many correspondences between the experience of the animals shown, and that of the viewers addressed.¹⁰³

While the above film clearly represents the species it deals with in an anthropomorphic way, it does not turn the cranes portrayed into actual characters. Unlike the humans depicted in *Vondel* or *Veilig fietsen*, after all, the animals here do not in any way propel the plot that

unfolds.¹⁰⁴ In this short, narrative development is modelled entirely after the natural cycle of procreation which all living creatures are subject to – not the mutual conflicts between the birds that are shown, or even their struggle for survival in a hostile world. (As a matter of fact, it could even be inferred that the audience of the film is not *actually* expected to take for granted the claims which the speaker makes about the animals' 'inner lives'; evidence of this fact is his ever so slightly mocking tone.) Because of this, the textual elements that contribute to the short's dramatic effect are not in any way related to its main story line. In this film, then, they can be considered to function *primarily* as means to create an impression of relevance in the audience addressed.¹⁰⁵

Strategy: Addressing Interests and Affinities

In what precedes, I gave some examples of texts that foreground aspects of experiential correspondence by making use of recognisable characters and/or situations. Another way in which teaching films do this is by directly addressing presumed topical interests or affinities. The motivational potential of the shorts I shall discuss next derives from the fact that they reference or address phenomena, issues or themes which are familiar to the viewers – not because they are 'naturally' part of their existence, but because children tend to actively 'seek them out'. The topics dealt with are the kind which the addressees *like* to hear about, read up on, or see images of, also in their personal, extra-curricular lives. Again, I consider this strategy to be aimed primarily at making the viewing process more attractive; its *method*, however, is one of selectivity in terms of the *matter* addressed. Some examples should help me illustrate what I mean.

Appealing Examples

The 1959 short *Het kasteel* (The castle) takes its audience on a virtual tour of the Muider slot, a fortress in the Dutch town of Muiden dating from 1280 (but known primarily for its role as a meeting point for the literary elite in the first half of the seventeenth century). In the two newsletter articles that accompanied the film's release, the authors suggest that its main purpose is to teach the viewers a lesson about life in medieval times. Discussing this topic can be done in a variety of ways; by far the most sensible approach, however, is to 'zero in' on those aspects of it that are bound to interest children the most. When thinking of the historical period under scrutiny, pupils are likely to make the association with castles, minstrels or knights – those buildings and people that also fill the pages of their picture books, and occupy a prominent place in the world of their imagination. A film that recognises this, the authors imply, is more likely to be (rhetorically) successful. Tying in with the spectators' thematic predilections, the underlying reasoning goes, can help stimulate the children to stay tuned.¹⁰⁶

In the above short, the castle theme, despite its proclaimed 'illustrative' function, determines to a considerable extent the argumentative direction of the text as a whole. In virtually transporting its audience to a sturdy fort, the (mute) film necessarily focuses on a highly privileged form of medieval life, exemplified by the luxurious furniture, high quality utensils and splendid weaponry displayed. By the same token, it pays no attention at all to the more 'humble' living conditions of the non-ruling classes. In this particular example, then, the topical choices made impose considerable restrictions in terms of the text's argument.

However, this is not always the case. Consider for instance *Jonge ooievaars op het nest* ([ca. 1946], Young storks in their nests). In this film, the argument made closely resembles that of other shorts which document the life cycle (the stages of birth, growth and procreation) of a given animal species. The storks that are shown here do exactly the same things as the lapwings in *De kieviet*, or the gulls in *De kapmeeuw*. Yet even so, the film is more likely to appeal to the audience addressed. As a newsletter from that time observes, the children's affinity with this particular bird variety will probably be greater – if only because of its various popular associations, and its relation to the folk tales and fables that they enjoy listening to (and that the film's screening will inevitably remind them of). In this short, in other words, motivational potential derives not only from the matter's 'inherent' comprehensibility (which is underscored by the text's temporal structure) but also from the fact that the choice of species dealt with, in all likelihood, is in tune with the audience's ornithic taste.¹⁰⁷

Known Fictional Content

A much more extreme example of compliance with the children's topical preferences is the use, or recycling, of (known) fictional content. I am thinking here specifically of NOF's collection of fairy tale films: titles such as *Doornroosje* (1952, *Sleeping Beauty*), *De wolf en de zeven geitjes* (1955, *The Wolf and the Seven Little Goats*) and *De gelaarsde kat* (1957, *Puss in Boots*). Making use of mostly hand-made puppets and settings, these shorts represent 'highlights' from the children's stories by the same names.¹⁰⁸ In doing so, they actively exploit the audience's prior knowledge of, but also affinity with, the matter that is addressed. While the films clearly capitalise on the appeal of an elaborate narrative structure, thus foregrounding aspects of textual purposiveness, they also attest to a keen awareness of what particularly fascinates the audience addressed.¹⁰⁹

Of all the examples that I have touched upon so far, fairy tale films are definitely the most obviously motivational. In *Het kasteel* or *Jonge ooievaars*, I repeat, the topical choices made are part of an attempt to illustrate a (wider) historical/biological point. In the abovementioned cases, the situation is different. As the accompanying teachers' notes point out, these shorts were not meant to pass on any kind of knowledge. Like other films with fantastic plots (for instance, *Hansje en de Madurodammers* *) they were distributed by NOF as language films, and had to help children practice their expressive skills, functioning in this process as a source of inspiration. In a didactic sense, then, the argumentative points which these shorts make are entirely 'irrelevant'; the matter they deal with is no more than a *means* to an ulterior, primarily *motivational*, end. (Re)using content that is sure to appeal, in this case, is merely a way of making the audience enjoy the experience of viewing itself, thus, ideally, whetting their appetite for the activity that comes next.¹¹⁰

Focus: Formal Attractiveness

All of the strategies that I have dealt with so far in one way or another draw their viewers' attention to *what* a text says – whether by making more appealing the matter addressed, by taking into account what kids know and/or like, or by inciting their curiosity for what comes next. The last series of tactics that I want to discuss direct them instead towards the *way* things are put. In the examples I give here, in other words, the motivational focus is on the films' *formal* attractiveness.¹¹¹

Strategy: Stimulating Sensorial Indulgence

The first strategy that I would like to address is the integration of textual elements that can stimulate the audience to enjoy an item's viewing as a purely sensory experience. In what follows, I shall deal with the ways in which teaching films visually and/or aurally 'gratify' their spectators. My assumption here is that by presenting them with a spectacle that is pleasing to eye and/or ear, films encourage their viewers to stay tuned (and thus, prolong the satisfaction they get).

As a rule, of course, the formal choices which a filmic text makes can be seen as representationally, or even argumentationally, 'functional': they help picture something in a specific way, or give direction or tone to a proposition or point. However, this is not *always* the case. To clarify what I mean, I would like to introduce Kristin Thompson's concept of 'cinematic excess'.

(The Appeal of) Cinematic Excess

In an article written in the late 1970s, Thompson uses this phrase to indicate "those aspects of [a] work which are not contained by its unifying forces": the elements or features of a text that are "uneconomical or unjustified" within its wider compositional logic. By way of illustration, she quotes examples of camera work, editing and/or *mise en scène* that do not serve a clear purpose – whether it be in terms of a text's narrative development, characterisation, or even as a way of subscribing to a specific stylistic 'law'. Such textual features, she concludes, have "no function beyond offering [themselves] for perceptual play".¹¹²

The sort of elements that I consider here have an aspect of this 'excessiveness'. In most cases, they go above and beyond what a given text 'needs' to make sufficient representational or argumentative sense. However, this does not entail that they are therefore entirely superfluous. In my view, such ingredients serve a rhetorical purpose of their own.

In her article, Thompson argues that cinematic excess always coincides with "a gap or lag in motivation". She explains this by saying that the use of specific filmic devices – or otherwise, the number of times they are repeated, or the amount of time they are audible/visible – becomes excessive when it is no longer 'justified' in terms of a text's tendency towards narrative/compositional significance. In making this claim, she basically implies that structural economy (as she calls it herself) is necessarily the main focus of textual motivation. (The term 'motivation', in her piece, is used in a text-internal sense, but with inevitable consequences in terms of a film's orientedness towards an ensemble of viewers.) As the set-up of this chapter demonstrates, I do not believe that this is the case; at least, not in the corpus I concentrate on. In teaching films, therefore, also narratively 'redundant' or extravagant techniques can often be seen as part of more or less purposive textual strategies.¹¹³

Again, I would like to illustrate this with some examples from NOF's collection of process films. In shorts that belong to this category, I explained, camera positioning and montage often serve the purpose of creating an appearance of comprehensibility (and in some cases, imitability) of the manufacturing procedures at hand. Visual closeness, temporal continuity and a sufficiently slow pace are of crucial importance here. Some titles, however, deflect from this rule. The film *Van koren tot brood*, for instance, is striking precisely for its extreme variety in camera angles and distances and swift editing rhythm – features which, in this

case, do not make for an impression of intelligibility of the operations concerned. The same also applies to *Hoe ontstaat een filmscène*. This short, which primarily seeks to document the successive stages in the making of a film, occasionally digresses into a demonstration of all sorts of cinematic ‘tricks’. In my view, such textual elements or features should not be branded as ‘unjustified’. While not contributing to the films’ *dominant* motivational strategy (in both cases, that of providing access to an otherwise inaccessible world), they clearly do fulfil a rhetorical function. By thus contributing to a constantly changing visual ‘landscape’, they help keep the audience sensorially ‘entertained’.

Cinematic Exhibitionism

In the second film in particular, formal attractiveness is clearly the result of what Gunning calls cinematic ‘exhibitionism’: the ‘showing off’ of the film medium’s many (technical) possibilities.¹¹⁴ Although the author uses this phrase very specifically to refer to an aspect of early film practice, it seems equally fit to describe what happens in some of the titles that I am dealing with here. In a number of cases, NOF’s shorts actually stimulate enjoyment of the very *same* kind of procedures that were foregrounded in pictures from the cinema’s first few years; for instance, optical image manipulation techniques. The 1962 film *Sterren en sterrensystemen*, for instance, relishes in the use of speeded-up images – also at times when the latter do not serve any clarifying purpose at all (as in the backdrop to the opening credits). Elsewhere, formal attractiveness is foregrounded when more conventional methods are applied in exceptionally crafty ways. *Elf-stedentocht* (1942) and *Walvisvaart*, for instance, stand out because of the ways in which they are shot: oftentimes from rather exceptional points of view. In those instances, one might argue, cinematic exhibitionism concerns the skill and professionalism of the films’ makers as much as the possibilities of the medium itself.¹¹⁵

The above observations are particularly relevant in relation to films that seek to associate themselves with a given movement or style, or a more general (audio-)visual fashion or fad. In its early years, NOF occasionally produced titles that made reference to the kinds of visual conventions that were popularised by the so-called *Filmliga* (a Dutch avant-garde collective, active in the late twenties and early thirties) and later on, by those classified retrospectively as members of a ‘Hollandse Documentaire School’ (Dutch Documentary School). *Giethoorn **, for instance, contains aesthetically pleasing images (picturesque views, or shots of glimmering water surfaces), visual echoes and anecdotal inserts that are reminiscent of the ‘poetic’ documentaries of the period; texts which, since they were often shown in the supporting shorts sections of regular cinema screenings, must have been known also to the audience addressed.¹¹⁶ In shorts from the 1960s, stylistic ‘citation’ sometimes results in sheer mannerism. For example, the films *Van tuin naar tafel* and *Een tik van de mode?* (1962, *Cracked by fashion?*) both capitalise on some of the more ‘extravagant’ aspects of visual culture in their time; the first, through its abundant use of garish colours and upbeat music, and the second, in its ‘psychedelic’ way of filming (unstable camera, extreme close-ups), editing (fast and highly repetitive montage) and its performance of various optical tricks (stop-motion effects and the ‘misting over’ of images). In most of these cases, the use of such devices constitutes an element of cinematic excess: the formal choices made do not bring out any sort of rhetorical potential other than the (visual) attractiveness of the representational method *as such*.¹¹⁷

In this respect, the above texts differ fundamentally (albeit in rather subtle ways) from the short *Het bos in de bergen*, which I discussed at some length in my section on the strategy of ‘spectacularisation’. In my view, the difference with this film lies in the fact that in the above instances, the use of representational techniques does not seem to serve the (primary) purpose of defamiliarising that which is depicted. Consider once more the case of *Van tuin naar tafel*. A few minutes into the film, the composition of a healthy diet is visualised by means of a series of tables. The first of these chart sequences starts off with a brief animation featuring a number of fruits and vegetables that perform a little ‘dance’. Subsequently, these are joined by what look like still cut-outs of live-action shots, each of which stands for a specific nutritional function, as explained by the narrator. In this particular fragment, the abundance of movement clearly does not serve the purpose of estranging the viewer from that which is depicted – if only because the motions performed do not actually ‘represent’ anything (at least, not anything that in any way relates to the points which the sequence illustrates). Therefore, they are not very likely to make spectators feel uneasy at the realisation of an (unexpected) unfamiliarity with the things that are shown. In this sequence, I would contend, their role is merely to keep the audience visually gratified.¹¹⁸

Auditory Excess

Cinematic excess not only manifests itself on the visual plane, but sometimes also takes an auditory form. The most obvious way of aurally pleasing the viewer, of course, is by means of music. Unlike spoken words or (diegetic) noise, musical sounds often do not fulfil a clear representational function; therefore, they are powerful instruments for foregrounding a film’s potential formal appeal. However, also in this case, the distinction between various motivational functions is not always easy to make. Let me return again to the example of *Van ei tot kraanvogel*.

In this film, the sound of African music fulfils several roles at the same time. When it first occurs, it does so in combination with a shot of a map on which the natural habitat of the crane variety under scrutiny is pointed out. At this point, then, it functions as an explication of a particular geo-cultural frame. Further on in the film, however, the same tune is used, this time in a sequence where said context is no longer relevant. Here, either of two interpretations is possible. On the one hand, the sound may serve a dramatic purpose; its volume, after all, tends to rise as tension builds up. On the other hand, it can be read as an alternative to mere silence: as a way of bringing variation in an otherwise rather dull ‘soundscape’. In the latter case, its function is very simply to titillate the viewers’ ears.

Strategy: Addressing Formal Preferences

A second way of stimulating sensorial indulgence is to exploit the audience’s presumed formal preferences. A good deal of the films under scrutiny here make rather intensive use of representational tools that the viewers addressed can be considered to *particularly* enjoy. One of the more obvious examples is animation: a range of techniques that are known to attract an audience of young children, and that can therefore be considered a ‘safe’ motivational bet.

Although they obviously qualify too, I am not thinking here primarily of the fairy tale shorts mentioned above, or any of NOF’s other puppet films (such as *Jantje’s droom*, 1946, *Johnny’s*

Dream; Minimale modeshow, 1959, Minimal fashion show) or fictional cartoons (*De goochelaar ontgoocheld*, 1958, The magician disappointed). In items such as these, after all, formal attractiveness does not necessarily constitute the most powerful appeal; textual purposiveness and/or experiential correspondence are at least equally potent. But the collection under scrutiny also contains titles that do *not* fit this bill. The natural history short *Het paard*², for instance, deals with matter that is both more resistant to the introduction of enigma and suspense, and does not relate quite as closely to what the viewers already know. The given that it is almost entirely animated, then, carries a relatively much greater motivational weight.

In the sort of films I am referring to, the use of animation is not a matter of cinematic excess. In *Het paard*², for instance, such techniques tend to serve a representational purpose as well. Most of what the film tries to explain cannot be shown with live-action images, simply because it concerns processes that took place in a distant past; the use of some form of 'artifice', therefore, is simply inevitable. The choice of animated graphics over still sketches or models, however, is clearly made in an attempt to reckon with the preferences of the targeted audience. Another difference with the previous strategy is that addressing formal preferences does not always coincide with a fast alternation of audio-/visual impulses. Sensorial indulgence can only be stimulated if viewers do not run the risk of getting bored; excessive elements therefore often feature for short periods of time, and/or in combination with other, equally 'attractive' textual ingredients. Animation, in contrast, is less likely to lose its appeal – even if it is used ubiquitously, as in the case of *Het paard*².

The Recontextualisation of Filmic Form

Arguably, the attractiveness of the above formal features derives at least in part from the fact that they bring to mind associations with a kind of communication that does not normally take place in class. As I mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, (fully) animated shorts are normally seen in entertainment theatres – venues that children tend to visit in their spare time, and of their own free will. In those settings, the activity of viewing is not accompanied by the sort of constraints that tend to govern interactions of an educational kind. As a rule, then, such shorts – and by the same token, their textual features – are part of a different, relatively much more attractive, cinematic *dispositif*. In my view, this fact even adds to the motivational appeal of such elements when they are seen in a pedagogical environment. In the event of a form's educational recontextualisation, in other words, its rhetorical potential gets *reinforced*.

As a matter of fact, I would even argue that *any* filmic device can gain in appeal if it constitutes a reminder of a different, 'preferential' viewing situation, regardless of how well or badly it is deployed. In her contribution to the volume quoted from earlier, Sobchack emphasises that the attractational qualities of films are by nature transitory and unstable: what appeals to an audience at one moment in history may no longer do so at another point in time.¹¹⁹ I would like to broaden this statement in a synchronic sense, and posit that features that attract spectators in a given viewing context do not necessarily have the same effect in films that are seen elsewhere. In the particular instance dealt with here, this also means that textual elements that have little or no attractational value in a recreational context – say, animated sequences that are too slow or too repetitive to keep an entertainment audience tuned –

can very well acquire motivational potential when part of a programme shown in school.¹²⁰

4.2 Strategies of Motivation: Blurred Boundaries

In what precedes, I have given an overview of some of the strategies of motivation that can be inferred for NOF's teaching films. By way of identifying the various rhetorical potentials which they foreground, I have related them to six motivational cruxes, or foci. In addition to this, I have illustrated their operation with textual examples, thus also associating them with specific sets of audio-visual techniques.

In practice, of course, the relations and distinctions between said textual elements and the strategies and foci which I singled out are far from clear-cut. On the one hand, because there is no one-to-one connection between concrete textual elements and the motivational strategies which they seem to support. Many of the techniques that I discussed have been mentioned on several occasions; the reason is that I assume that they can serve various rhetorical purposes, depending on their occurrence within a given sequence or text. On the other hand, such relations are hard to establish because strategies nearly always appear in combinations. In some cases, this entails that it is almost impossible to decide which textual feature should be associated with which.

Multiple Strategic Functionality

The recurrence of (sets of) representational techniques in the course of this chapter already indicates that they often fulfil a variety of strategic roles. One of the textual devices that I have mentioned on several occasions is the introduction of a (chrono)logical sequence in the editing of shots and scenes. In process films such as *Kaas*^{*}, *Strokarton* or *Auto's aan de lopende band*, I pointed out, this feature helps convey an impression of procedural transparency, and as such, underscores the comprehensibility of the matter concerned. In the biology short *De kieviet* or the geography title *Polderland*, in contrast, it functions rather as a means of stirring the viewers' curiosity for what comes next. In those cases, then, the films' structure is primarily an instrument for foregrounding textual purposiveness. In *Niek zoekt werk op kantoor*, *Veilig fietsen* or *Départ de grandes vacances*², it also serves the purpose of characterisation, thus highlighting the possibility of experiential correspondence. The human figures staged in these films acquire personality through their agency in the stories that unfold. Because of the fact that the things they do, feel or are interested in are highly recognisable to the viewers addressed, the latter are reminded that what is said might be relevant to them as well.

So far, I have presented the various strategic functions of textual features as alternative possibilities. In practice, however, such elements can also serve multiple rhetorical purposes simultaneously. A good example here is optical manipulation. In *De kamsalamander*, for instance, enlargement techniques are used in a series of shots that show successive stages in the development of a newt. In this film, I pointed out, the technique's main benefit is that it allows the viewer to observe something that cannot normally be perceived with the naked eye. This fact in turn makes for two types of spectatorial motivation. On the one hand, it foregrounds the unfamiliarity – and by the same token, the fundamental unknown-ness – of the subject concerned. By disclosing intricate processes that take place outside the viewers' perception, the film gives its audience the chance to witness something previously unseen, and therefore, unfathomed. On the other hand, and quite paradoxically, such images also bring out the matter's inherent comprehensibility. By showing a natural process from so

nearby, and as part of a carefully selected succession of ‘crucial’ stages, the short also suggests that it *can* indeed be known. A third and last way of looking at the use of microphotography here is to consider it as an anthropomorphic tool. By giving the animals portrayed ‘human’ proportions, the film also seems to aim for an effect of experiential correspondence.

Another set of procedures that often serve various strategic functions at the same time are those which relate to the use of sound, and more specifically, voice-over narration. More often than not, a commentator’s choice of words attests to a variety of motivational concerns. In *De kruisspin* (1961, The garden spider), for instance, at least two sets of considerations can be inferred. On the one hand, the speaker’s language is marked by preciseness and unambiguousness. When specialist vocabulary is used, terms are usually self-explanatory; consider for instance the expressions ‘spinning glands’ (*spinklieren*), ‘frame’ (*raam*) or ‘capture spiral’ (*vangspiraal*). If not, they are immediately explained, as is the case with the word *kruisspin* (literally ‘cross-spider’): an insect, the commentary points out, “named after the curious white design on its back”.¹²¹ The objective here seems to be that of presenting the film’s matter as intelligible, comprehensible. On the other hand, the words used often also carry a metaphorical load. Apart from naming concrete substances and body parts, they also contribute to the image of a (bug) universe pervaded by battle and destruction (like the phrases ‘pointy palps’, *spitse kaakpoten*; ‘deadly poison’, *dodend gif*). As such, they function as instruments of dramatisation, which help foreground the correspondences between the experience of the intended viewers, and those of the (non-human) creatures shown.

Co-occurrence of Strategies

Meanwhile, the above examples also demonstrate that in most texts, several motivational strategies co-occur. In some cases, they can be distinguished from each other pretty easily; for instance, if they follow each other in time. The social guidance title *Alle water is geen drinkwater **, for example, starts off with a narrative sequence featuring a small number of characters (three family members and a doctor). The illness of a young boy sets off a mildly dramatic story, which is picked up again at the end of the film. The main motivational strategies here are narrative patterning (a tactic that highlights the text’s fundamental purposiveness) and the enabling of recognition (in turn creating the possibility of experiential correspondence). The middle part of the short, in contrast, displays the textual set-up of a process film. Here, the audience is shown two series of actions – one scientific, the other constructional – which are both organised according to their ‘natural’ temporal sequences. Although the editing logic of the earlier narrative is maintained, it no longer fulfils quite the same function. In this section of the film, I believe, the main purpose of textual structuring is not to arouse the viewers’ curiosity for what comes next, but rather to create an impression of procedural transparency – a goal that is also pursued through the use of clarifying schemas and texts. Here, the humans featured do not take on the roles of characters; spectators therefore are no longer expected to identify, let alone relate to, the individuals they see. Instead, they are encouraged to focus on the actions they perform – and in the process, be convinced of the intelligibility of the procedures shown.

In many cases, however, strategies are not divided so neatly over filmic time – a circumstance which often also entails that their respective motivational functions are inextricably intertwined.

In his 1946 manual, the American author Charles F. Hoban argues that shorts that aim at teaching their viewers a (practical) competence should develop some sort of a “*rapport* between the audience and the film”. One way of doing this, he argues, is to start from a “familiar situation” that calls for the knowledge or skills discussed; for instance, one that involves characters to whom the viewers can relate. In this type of films, therefore, “demonstration [...] dramatization and explanation” are best combined.¹²² In NOF equivalents of the kind of shorts which he refers to, the various motivational strategies are often rather difficult to disentangle. At any point in *Solliciteren*, *Niek zoekt werk op kantoor*, *Wij bouwen woningen* or *Schoolzwemmen* (all titles which fit Hoban’s bill), the youthfulness of the protagonist both enables recognition and contributes to the appearance of feasibility of the specific task at hand. Which potential is highlighted when, however, is hard to decide. The reason is that not only the functions of the various textual ‘constituents’ but also the strategies themselves overlap and intertwine.

Stock Combinations

The latter observation is particularly relevant in the case of recurring combinations of strategies. Consider for instance the example of NOF’s animated language films. Here, spectatorial appeal is nearly always due to a combination of the shorts’ formal attractiveness, (known) fantastic content and ‘purposive’ narrative structure. In most cases, it is hard to determine which of these strategies is the prominent one. As a rule, I would say, the various kinds of motivational potential mentioned take turns in getting foregrounded – the first two fulfilling a more important role at the beginning of a film, when the audience’s attention is first sought; the latter taking front stage later on, when the point is to *keep* the viewers tuned.

As the above instance shows, patterns can also be discerned in the relations between combinations of strategies, and the particular topics which films address. Telling examples here are shorts that discuss regional geography subjects, and especially, ‘foreign’ ways of life (those items which I designated above as ‘pseudo’-ethnographic). Such titles nearly always combine narrative patterning (as a way of foregrounding textual purposiveness) with strategies that highlight the possibility of experiential correspondence. Films that are situated closer to the ‘science’ pole of the curriculum – physical geography, natural history, physics and chemistry – tend to rely more heavily on techniques that capitalise on unfamiliarity (providing access, spectacularisation) and/or features that seem to contribute to a matter’s intelligibility (simplification, structuring, verbal explication). Another subject category that tends to coincide with a very specific set of motivational tactics is that of social guidance. In ‘civics’ films, the main strategy is to facilitate imitation, but techniques that enable recognition usually figure at least as prominently.¹²³

Relative Prominence

Following on from this last example, it might also be worth considering the differences in ‘salience’ of the various strategies that occur alongside one another; i.e., their relative rhetorical weight, or prominence, within a specific sequence or text. In order to explain what I mean, let me return once more to *Alle water is geen drinkwater* *. In this film, I said, tactics alternate. The short starts off with a mildly dramatic story, deploying the strategies of narrative patterning and enabling recognition; then, it moves on to a succession of sequences that show, and in the process, structure, the various stages of a number of procedures; finally,

it revisits its original plot. This description, however, amounts to a somewhat incomplete rendition of the rhetorical functioning of the text. On closer inspection, the film turns out to be more than just a series of narrative sequences with a loose (thematic) connection; it can also be interpreted as a single, integrated whole. In fact, also the middle part of the short is causally related to the protagonist's illness; the logico-temporal arch that spans the text in its entirety can therefore be considered to foreground its purposiveness as well. In the central sequences of the film, however, this function does not take front stage, but merely forms an underlying rhetorical thread.¹²⁴

The above example allows for two observations. On the one hand, it demonstrates, very simply, that motivational strategies have different levels of rhetorical prominence. On the other hand, it also shows that the relative salience of individual tactics should not be seen as a static given. Whatever happens to be the primary motivational procedure at one point in a film's development may fade to the background later on; inversely, less marked elements may gain significance in the course of time. Much like the mutual boundaries between various strategies, then, levels of rhetorical prominence seem to shift.

4.3 Textual Motivation Reconsidered: Degrees of Roundaboutness

In the first part of this chapter, I have related the strategies I discussed to six motivational foci, which I have in turn categorised into two main groups, based on whether the objective of those tactics was to increase the appeal of filmic matter, or rather that of the viewing process itself. The classification which I proposed was somewhat crude; I have therefore immediately toned down its taxonomic significance. In this process, I demonstrated that textual elements or features can serve a variety of motivational purposes, and that therefore, precise boundaries between various strategies cannot always be traced.

What I would like to do next is to suggest an alternative categorisation, which will allow me to move on from a consideration of single strategies to the rhetorical functioning of texts *in their entirety*. As opposed to the previous one, this classification will not be conceptualised as a finite series of separate (and individually defined) units, but as a number of steps on a sliding scale. Therefore, it will need less qualification.

In order to establish my point, I would like to start off with a short quote that contains my central thought in its most ‘embryonic’ form. In an NOF newsletter review of the newly acquired production *Radio ontdekt de ruimte* (1959, *Mirror in the Sky*), the film is praised in the following terms: “the short [does] exactly what can be expected of a classroom film: it provides a mixture of science, romance and human traits. [...] In a plain manner, *as if in passing*, it focuses our attention on the experimental research of natural science: how hypothesis here goes before proof.”¹²⁵ The reason why the film is applauded, in other words, is that it brings didactic matter to the viewer in an ‘unobtrusive’ way. The main scientific facts are not forced down the spectator’s throat, but proposed gently, and above all, inconspicuously. The idea here seems to be that the audience is thus ‘tricked’: that it is inadvertently made to consider ideas that it would not normally pay attention to, if it were given the choice. Another way of summarising the above piece’s point is that the film’s presentational method is conceived of as some sort of a ‘sugar coating’ – a means to ease the intake of an otherwise rather bitter pill.¹²⁶

‘Direct’ vs. ‘Roundabout’

Following on from the above, I would like to propose that a distinction can be made between more and less ‘direct’ approaches to the (re)presentation of what I would like to call ‘didactically relevant’ matter – i.e., matter that is pertinent to the pedagogical exchange of which the films under scrutiny used to form part. On the basis of what the NOF corpus contains, it is possible to construct some sort of a continuum between texts that openly focus the audience’s attention on the teaching content that had to be conveyed, and titles that operate in more ‘roundabout’ ways.¹²⁷

By definition, of course, all classroom films are means to pass on what is commonly conceived of as didactic matter; however, some of the shorts under scrutiny seem reluctant to address educationally relevant issues straightforwardly. Rather than offering such content to the viewer straight-out, they seem to ‘cover it up’ in some way. The motivational premise of texts like these seems to be that spectators are unlikely to consider classroom subjects of their own accord – and that therefore, they have to be ‘lured’ into doing so. Other titles, in contrast, approach such matter in a much more direct way. They explicitly direct the audience’s

attention to the knowledge or skills that have to be acquired.

In what precedes, I pointed out that I do not wish to conceptualise the proposed classification as a rigidly compartmentalised system, but rather as a continuum encompassing an infinite number of steps in between two (theoretical) extremes. However, in order to be able to identify the factors on which variety is based, I shall focus here on examples that can be situated closer to the scale's metaphorical 'poles'.

The Extremes (and in Between)

On one end of the 'roundaboutness' scale, I would place those shorts which do not merely 'adorn', but actually *do not reveal* which didactic content they are supposed to help acquire. In such films, any reference to the actual teaching matter, or whatever relates to it, is avoided. The most obvious examples here are NOF's essay composition films. As I said earlier, titles such as *Jantje's droom*, *De goochelaar ontgoocheld*, *Minimale modeshow* or the fairy tale films *Doornroosje*, *De wolf en de zeven geitjes* and *De gelaarsde kat* were meant to function primarily as sources of inspiration: they had to provide their viewers with material to write or talk about. The narratives they contain, then, do not constitute that which had to be learnt; as a matter of fact, what they relate must have had very little didactic significance at all, even if they were deployed as the institute prescribed. The purpose of the lessons in which they had to be embedded was simply to make pupils practise their writing/speaking skills; the relation with what was shown, therefore, could only be relevant in as far as it concerned the children's ability to put into words what they saw.

Extreme examples like these, I would argue, form a case apart; it is only in the above type of films that the connection between textual motivation and didactic objective is this unsubstantial throughout.²⁸ However, the number of instances increases considerably if one also takes into account examples that are equally 'escapist' in their choice of filmic matter, but only in specific sections of the text. I am thinking here in particular of shorts that make use of a narrative frame or insert (usually, for the combined purposes of foregrounding textual purposiveness and experiential correspondence) which does not contribute any information that is vital to the development of the film's central (didactic) argument. Consider for instance the short *De grote karekiet: nestbouw en broedverzorging* * (1948, The reed warbler: Nest-building and feeding), yet another item that deals with the life cycle of a particular type of bird. In this film, which consists for the most part of close shots of the species under scrutiny, the chronological succession of images of nesting, brooding and feeding is briefly interrupted by a short sequence featuring two young boys in a boat. Much like the opening scene of *De spreeuw*, which shows two children pick up, repair, and then return a fallen birdhouse to its tree, the fragment is motivational in a roundabout way, in the sense that it briefly draws its audience's attention to something that is likely to fascinate them *more* than the film's (main) zoological point.

A great deal closer to the directness pole of the scale are those shorts or sequences in which the didactic matter itself is the main object, or even instrument, of motivational activity. The film just mentioned, for instance, is devoted primarily to the cause of familiarising its viewers with a series of biological processes: those of procreation and survival of the species concerned. Most of the time, it does so by focusing the audience's attention on that which

should be learnt; in those instances, it is precisely this confrontation with (unseen, because physically hidden) natural phenomena that can be taken to form the text's rhetorical core.

In my overview, I differentiated between strategies that are aimed at making matter more attractive, and others that serve the purpose of increasing the appeal of the viewing process itself. This distinction, of course, is highly relevant to the type of rhetorical variation that I am trying to map out here. The procedures that I categorised in the first group, indeed, turn up much more frequently in texts which, didactically speaking, are more 'to the point'. However, motivational directness is not purely a matter of the rhetorical focus chosen. The use of elements that help increase the appeal of the objects or processes shown, for instance, does not *necessarily* make a film's rhetorical functioning less roundabout. In order to substantiate this point, I need to be a little more specific about the various (textual/didactic) statuses which subject matter may have.

Let me compare once more the sequences with microphotographic images and speeded-up close-ups of growing vegetation in the films *In de bruine boon schuilt een plantenleven* * and *Het bos in de bergen*. In both cases, the use of these techniques can be considered part of an attempt to make more appealing an aspect of filmic matter. Each of these shorts provides a (manipulated) representation of a movement, which entails either that an otherwise invisible world is made accessible (in the first title) or that one the audience *thought* it knew is spectacularised, and in the process, defamiliarised (in the second). However, I would like to argue that the subject status of the universe depicted is different in the two films. In the first one, I believe, the motions shown can actually be considered to form part of the text's central didactic given. *In de bruine boon* *, categorised, incidentally, as a 'botany' title by catalogues and instruction booklets, is a short *about* vegetal growth. Germination is the film's subject, but also the process which the viewers are supposed to acquire knowledge on. In *Het bos in de bergen*, in contrast, the situation is different. Here, the short as a whole suggests that the speeded-up images serve primarily as a visual *décor* to an entirely different argument: one that concerns the ways in which people, and more in particular, those populating the Swiss Alps, adapt their ways of life to their physical surroundings. Although the instruction sheet mentions that the film can *also* be used to make a biological point (as it contains some references to denudation and long-term geological processes), most of the text concentrates on facts that are relevant primarily in the context of a lesson in (ethno-)geography. The latter, in other words, constitute the short's *main* didactic points.

In my view, the above examples not only exemplify how subtle the distinctions between (general) 'filmic' and (more specific) 'didactic' matter may be, but also how numerous the steps are between various degrees or levels of roundaboutness. In *Het bos in de bergen*, the optical manipulation sequence cannot be conceived of as a building block to the film's central didactic point. At the same time, however, it does somehow *relate to* that which constitutes its core matter – both in the textual sense, and in a didactic one. The reason is that it visualises a process that is characteristic of some of the 'constituents' of the natural world with which the alpine people interact. In addition to this, the fragment under scrutiny can also be considered to function as a reference to titles in which biological content takes a much more central place. Vegetal growth, any classroom audience knows, is typical teaching (film) matter; therefore, the fact that it is referred to here (relatively 'unnecessarily') constitutes an obvious allusion

to the film's, or its subject's, didactic status. As such, the speeded-up sequence in *Het bos in de bergen*, although definitely more roundabout than that in *In de bruine boon* *, still works in a far less 'distractive' ways than, say, the boat scene in *De grote karekiet* *.

A Far Extreme

In what precedes, I have interpreted the concepts of 'roundaboutness' and 'directness' in terms of the relation between a film's (overall) motivational logic and the didactic matter which it is supposed to help pass on. However, there is also a category of films that do not quite fit this picture, in the sense that they clearly reside towards the directness pole of the range, but do not derive this extreme position from the way in which they treat educationally relevant *matter*. In the shorts I am thinking of here, the main (textual) argument concerns not just the chosen lesson content, but also the *process of its acquisition*.

The most obvious representatives of this category are those which I referred to earlier as 'skill films'. In such shorts, I said, audience motivation is based on the premise that the pupils addressed have a desire to acquire the competencies that the people on screen already have. In order to appeal, the task under scrutiny needs to have an appearance of manageability; otherwise, the rhetorical procedure is bound to fail. A sensible strategy, therefore, is to represent a situation in which said skill is being acquired, preferably by children of the audience's own age. In films that do so, I would contend, motivation is not at all a matter of 'luring the viewer'. Here, didactic references are not eschewed; in fact, the educational process is actively brought to the viewers' attention. Consequently, these shorts can be situated on the directness scale's *far* extreme end.¹²⁹

Knowledge vs. Skills

The relation between the above form of (extreme) directness and the representation of practical skills, of course, is not coincidental. Although I can conceive of a situation whereby the process, or even method, of knowledge acquisition is explicitly dealt with (for instance, in a classroom scene with a child answering a teacher's question), such instances are rare.¹³⁰ In addition to this, they are often also embedded in texts that feature a complex of rhetorical strategies that are more roundabout. The most direct kind of 'knowledge films' usually focus on the didactic matter itself rather than on the process of its learning. A logical explanation for this is that the acquisition of a series of facts is simply much harder to visualise than the mastering of a skill. In addition to this, the motivational potential of the latter is higher; after all, the use of watching a depiction of someone practicing a certain technique or craft – and the lure of the satisfaction that might come with possessing it – is a great deal more self-evident.

The inverse, however, is not necessarily true: while many skill films are extremely direct, not *all* of them are. The essay composition shorts which I dealt with earlier, for instance, are intended for practical purposes too; those titles, however, belong at the roundaboutness end of the scale. The rationale that can be inferred here is that in such films, the motivational factor of concrete usefulness does not need to be exploited, because the combination of their (often fantastic) content and attractive form are already sufficient to keep the targeted audience tuned.

The relation between levels of roundaboutness and the knowledge/skills distinction, then,

does not make for a very strict pattern. In spite of this, it is possible to point out some general tendencies. On the one hand, there are those films which are meant to pass on practical competencies. Such shorts are usually either extremely direct, or extremely roundabout. On the other hand, there are those which are clearly intended to convey (scientific) facts. Such items, in contrast, tend to feature closer to middle section of the roundaboutness scale. This given, however, should not be attributed to the indistinctness or ambiguousness of the strategies used, but rather to a co-occurrence of procedures with varying degrees of motivational directness. Titles that belong to this category tend to address at least part of the knowledge that has to be transferred – matter that ideally gets presented from its most attractive (unfamiliar/comprehensible) point of view.¹³¹ At the same time, however, few of them rely exclusively on the motivational potential of the subject itself; in most cases, they also detract the viewers' attention from their didactic content in some way.¹³²

Conclusions

In this chapter, I have tried to sketch a broad picture of the ways in which teaching films encourage their viewers to pay attention to what is said and/or shown. In my first, most extensive paragraph, I have identified about a dozen strategies, or motivational tactics, which such shorts utilise. I have associated them in turn with six different foci: the centres, or cruxes, around which their rhetorical operation revolves. In addition to this, I have discussed some of the representational techniques on which they commonly rely, thus establishing the relation between (implicit) strategies, and (concrete) textual features. In the second part, I have mitigated the above classification, and demonstrated how various procedures tend to co-occur and overlap. The third and last paragraph was devoted to an assessment of the films' 'overall' rhetorical functioning. Here, I have considered the relations between the shorts' general motivational logic and the didactic matter which they were meant to pass on. In the course of this chapter, I have never attempted to be exhaustive; I have merely tried to give an idea of the motivational 'range' of the films discussed.¹³³

By way of conclusion, I would like to point out that textual motivation in teaching films tends to be based on a combination of two principles. On the one hand, rhetorical strategies tie in with what is 'already there' in the viewers: shorts make use of techniques that stimulate something that is considered to be present in, or characteristic of, their implied audience. Essentially, motivational tactics are ways of responding to, or anticipating on, (presumed) interests, sensibilities or preferences. The implicit logic is that by opting for representational methods, or even subjects, that are sure to appeal, films are (more) likely to encourage their spectators to consider what is said or shown. On the other hand, shorts lure their audience by raising expectations: they create an impression as to what the treated content is *going to be like* (for instance: comprehensible, practicable, or simply fun to watch). The prospects that such qualities entail (respectively: that of a certain amount of understanding, a competence, or simply a good time) function as incentives for the viewers to stay tuned. In this respect, I would argue, the films' motivational potential depends on the *promise* of a certain property – either in the matter dealt with, or in the viewing process itself – rather than on an *actual* condition or state of affairs.¹³⁴

Another observation, which closely relates to the principles just mentioned, concerns the use in such shorts of means that are highly standardised, both in films, and in other (narrative) media texts. On the face of it, the deployment of conventional procedures is entirely logical, and even downright inevitable; without them, after all, viewers would not be able to follow a text's reasoning. Teaching films, however, seem to emphatically exploit the recognisability of established patterns in the process of motivation. To an overwhelming extent, the textual devices used derive their potential to keep an audience tuned precisely from the fact that specific combinations of images and/or sounds, over time, have acquired stock meanings or associations; for instance, an air of procedural structured-ness or transparency, or the promise of some sort of closure to an (often non-didactically relevant) framing narrative. In quite a few cases, the aspect of conventionality that is thus capitalised on goes beyond the organisation, or embellishment, of the text itself, and *also* concerns the relation of those devices to a different (i.e., non-educational) *dispositif*.

However, even in this respect, teaching films are not at all unique. With respect to the corpus I deal with here, statements on generic specificity are largely irrelevant, not only in as far as they concern specific textual 'ingredients', but also in terms of the overarching rhetorical mechanisms of which they form part. If there is anything *at all* that can be considered textually 'characteristic' of teaching films, indeed, it is to be found in the relation between aspects of motivation on the one hand, and the combined factors of (implied) audience and viewing situation, on the other.

The association between those two sets of determinants is significant in a number of ways. First, in terms of what it entails for the foregrounding of specific motivational potentials. For instance, if a film's rhetorical objective is to establish a degree of experiential correspondence, the strategies of enabling recognition and/or addressing presumed interests or affinities pose different textual requirements, depending on which audience the text targets. If it consists of a group of children viewing in a classroom setting, the introduction of young protagonists and a few fantastic elements are safe motivational bets. With a general entertainment theatre public, however, such textual ingredients are less likely to appeal. Second, the relation is relevant in terms of the relative occurrence of various strategies. In shorts that target an audience of factory employees, for instance, facilitating imitation is likely to be a prominent strategy; in this setting, after all, one of the main reasons for screening films is the training of personnel. In classrooms, in contrast, the transmission of (theoretical) knowledge tends to prevail; practical feasibility, therefore, is not quite as important a factor here. Another, more tentative conclusion would be that among films shown in class, fewer can be situated towards the (*extreme*) direct end of the roundaboutness scale.

As a final remark, I would like to emphasise once more that I have focused in this chapter on aspects of textual *motivation*; i.e., on those elements in teaching films that can be considered to *invite* the viewer to communicative interaction. In my introduction, I pointed out that this entails a definite (analytical) limitation, as not all textual features can be read in this way. In what follows, my focus will be on a different type of rhetorical elements. In practice, this means that I shall occasionally also address some of the less positively 'enticing' aspects of the texts under scrutiny.

TEXTUAL RHETORIC II: REFERENCING THE PEDAGOGICAL *DISPOSITIF*

Introduction

Earlier on I defined ‘textual rhetoric’ as those aspects of (filmic) composition that can help create a willingness in the audience to consider what is said and/or shown. In what precedes, I also demonstrated that the rhetorical process is based on a principle of implication: that it works by means of those elements that contribute to the construction of a reader-in-the-text.¹ In the examples I have given so far, these filmic ingredients always had an ‘evident’ spectatorial appeal, in the sense that their deployment was based on implicit assumptions as to what the intended viewers appreciate and/or like. The films mentioned, in other words, exploit sensibilities or propensities that are supposed to be *already present* in those watching; in doing so, they attempt to lure them into staying tuned. However, there are other ways of implicating the audience.

In what follows, I shall argue that a good deal of the shorts under scrutiny seem to actively manoeuvre their spectators into a *preferential* viewing position. I shall show that (some) teaching films do not merely try to keep their audience attentive by complying with its presumed spectatorial wishes, but also specify *which* reader role it should adopt. One of the ways in which they do this is by incorporating references to the pedagogical *dispositif*: representations of the particular tools, interpersonal relations, or communicative forms that can be associated with, and therefore, can be taken to allude to, the particular set-up of which both text and viewer (ideally) form part. This way, they explicate their most relevant interpretational framework, and by extension, the audience disposition that is most ‘befitting’ of that specific (type of) film.²

Although the ingredients or features that I shall deal with next oftentimes resemble, and sometimes even duplicate, those which I singled out in the previous chapter, my assumptions as to how they function rhetorically are different in at least two ways. First, I shall make other inferences in terms of the type of viewer roles which they imply. Strategies of motivation, I said, exploit presumed sensibilities on the part of the public. In this process, they draw on communicative, and more precisely, *cinematic* conventions. In other words, they appeal to knowledge and/or preferences which (young, school-going) spectators possess in their capacity as *film viewers*. The textual features I deal with next, in contrast, are rhetorically significant because of the relation they maintain with the audience as a *pedagogical* entity. The spectators, in other words, are addressed here in their function as *pupil-viewers*.

Second, the textual elements discussed in this chapter are also different in terms of the rhetorical effects which they seek to generate. What references to the *dispositif* do, I explained, is to help position the viewers: to steer them into adopting a very specific spectatorial stance. I would like to argue here that the rhetorical potential of such elements is *conditional upon* that of the mechanisms which I discussed before. In order to be manoeuvred into a specific reading role, after all, viewers *also* (already) need to be motivated to pay attention to what is said. In practice, this means that references to the *dispositif* often co-occur with the strategies discussed in chapter 4. Alternatively, textual features or procedures fulfil a double rhetorical role. For example, elements that enable recognition (and thus, foreground the motivational potential of experiential correspondence) can *also* constitute references to the pedagogical *dispositif* (for instance, the pupil-characters figuring in the films *De spreeuw* or *Helpers in nood*). The same also applies to the means that are used to foreground the comprehensibility of the matter dealt with, such as maps, charts, or other types or schematic representations. In the following pages, I shall concentrate in such cases on rhetorical potential of the latter kind.

A third way in which the textual elements dealt with here are distinct from the ones discussed before is that they tend to contribute to the recognisability of the corpus under scrutiny. The techniques which teaching films deploy for purposes of motivation, I have said, are common to a wide variety of filmic genres; use of those means, therefore, does not necessarily make them stand out textually. The elements I shall be discussing next, in contrast, operate by way of referencing the very specific *dispositif* within which the films function(ed); therefore, they implicitly or explicitly foreground their status as didactic tools. Consequently, these features may sometimes be read as distinguishing marks.

Yet of course, the fact that references to the *dispositif* may make teaching films generically identifiable at least to some extent does not imply that I shall treat them here as *typical*, or even necessary, textual ingredients. The rhetorical elements dealt with in this chapter do not make the shorts in which they turn up better or more 'central' examples of the category as such. Motivating their audience to stay tuned is something *all* the films in the NOF corpus do; referencing the pedagogical *dispositif*, in contrast, is not. For instance, shorts that can be situated towards the extreme 'positive' end of the roundaboutness scale that I established in the previous chapter are marked precisely by a complete lack of (audio- and/or visual) links with anything didactic, including the *dispositif* within which they were meant to be shown. This does not, however, entail that they are classroom films of an 'inferior' kind.

In this chapter, I shall first specify what exactly I mean by 'references to the pedagogical *dispositif*'. In paragraph 5.1, I shall distinguish between the various discursive practices that may generate the rhetorical effects described above. They will be divided into three groups, each of which will constitute a different 'level' of referencing. Subsequently, I shall (re)consider those same practices in terms of how self-reflexive they are: to what extent they can be considered as signs of the texts' awareness, so to speak, of their own status as teaching tools.

Next, I shall consider references to the pedagogical *dispositif* from a historical perspective. Judging by the relation between the occurrence of such textual elements and the years in which NOF made available the films in which they turn up, I am inclined to believe that they became more common over time. While early releases tend to contain very few references

to their intended screening context and/or viewing conditions, later ones do so more often. Yet although it is possible to speak of some kind of an evolution, this is neither an absolute, nor a very gradual one. Variation, it seems, occurred throughout the period I deal with; in addition to this, the increase of references appears to have followed a rather irregular pattern. In paragraph 5.2, I shall formulate some tentative explanations for those tendencies.

In the third and last section of the chapter, I shall establish the relationship between the rhetorical elements dealt with here and the issues of authority that I discussed in part I. On the face of it, the incorporation of references to the *dispositif* may seem to entail that the pedagogical framing of a film – a factor which, I pointed out, is inextricably linked to its rhetorical functioning – is shifted from outside the text to the filmic structure itself. In paragraph 5.3, I shall discuss whether or not this is the case, and if so, which are the implications of this fact for the role of teacher authority in the process of meaning production.

5.1 Referencing the *Dispositif*: Discursive Variety

In her seminal study of teaching films, Jacquinot argues that the educational institution always inscribes itself into the structure of an audio-visual message (i.e., the film text itself). In this process, it refers not to one world – as in the case of a fiction film, which restricts itself to the universe constructed by the text – but to three different ones. Apart from the ‘real’ world, which she also designates as ‘the world of everyone’ (*le monde mondain* or *le monde de tout le monde*, by which she indicates that which the film teaches about), it also references ‘the world of the specialist’ (*le monde du spécialiste*) and that of ‘the class’ (*le monde de la classe*). The former, she argues, is made up of everything that can be considered to refer to an abstraction of the concrete facts (rather than those facts themselves, which belong to the ‘real’ world). The latter in turn covers all textual elements that constitute an implication of the viewers to whom the film is addressed.³

Referential ‘Worlds’ vs. the Pedagogical *Dispositif*

In my view, the three ‘worlds’ which Jacquinot mentions cannot always be separated from each other very neatly; in most cases, they are inextricably interwoven. As a matter of fact, the author’s own reasoning already demonstrates this. For instance, she argues that one of the ways in which facts can be identified as originating from a specialist is through the presence of an interviewer. This individual acts as some sort of a ‘pupil surrogate’ – a role which places him in the world of the class. The specialist himself, on this occasion, plays a double part: in the world of the class, he also fulfils the function of teacher. The worlds of specialist and class, in other words, usually go hand in hand.⁴ In addition to this, an expert’s knowledge often also concerns the so-called ‘real’ world; for instance, in films on biology, or history. Therefore, the distinction between abstract (information) and concrete (facts) is not always easy to make.

Yet the question is whether such divisions are at all necessary. Throughout her book, Jacquinot stresses that in teaching films, a traditional model of knowledge transfer predominates: the epistemological ideal of someone who knows feeding information to someone who does not.⁵ This set-up, I believe, is evoked by both types of reference she mentions, regardless of whether they concern the knowledge that is to be passed on (thus establishing a connection with what she calls the ‘world of the specialist’) or its intended recipient (who forms part of the ‘world of the class’). In my experience, it does not matter all that much which of these two ‘spaces’, as Odin prefers to call them, is the most prominent textually, for what is called forth, directly or indirectly, is always the pedagogical *dispositif as a whole*.⁶

In addition to this, considering the referential system of teaching films in a more integrated way also shifts the attention away from separate referential ‘agents’ (the interviewer/pupil or specialist/teacher) to that which binds them together, and more specifically, to the particular power relations that are relevant to a classroom situation. Taking this conceptual step, I believe, is imperative, because it is precisely through those relations that the roles which Jacquinot refers to can be adopted. A child, after all, cannot acquire the status of a pupil unless he is part of an exchange which also involves a teacher; the latter function in turn requires the presence of someone who is being taught.

More important than the distinction between various referential worlds, I think, is the

question of how this seeping through – or to put it more actively, ‘quoting’ – of elements of the pedagogical *dispositif* takes place discursively. Jacquinet does make mention of a variety of practices in this respect; however, she does not conceptualise them systematically.⁷ One of the reasons why I choose to do so in what follows is that the differences between various discursive patterns in turn generate variation in terms of the extent to which texts actively reflect on (and as such, draw the viewer’s attention to) the films’ status as teaching tools, and therefore, to their own position within the *dispositif* to which they refer.⁸

Discursive Levels

For clarity’s sake, I shall situate the references to the *dispositif* exemplified here on three distinct discursive levels. My reason for adopting this categorisation is that by lumping together various forms of spectatorial address (i.e., treating them as variants of one and the same practice) the differences in terms of their rhetorical functioning are likely to get obscured.⁹ However, my use of the term ‘levels’ does not imply that I see the relation between those layers or stages as a hierarchical one – at least, not in as far as they concern the relative strength or conspicuousness of the references *themselves*. If it is at all possible to conceive of my classification as a ranking, it is in terms of the explicitness with which the films in which these rhetorical elements feature refer to their own status as texts, or in other words: as a measure of the shorts’ self-reflexiveness. Before I elaborate on the latter correlation, however, I shall briefly discuss, and illustrate, each of the layers I identify.

Diegetic Referencing

The first series of examples that I would like to deal with are those in which references to the *dispositif* figure on the diegetic level of the text. In the book referred to above, Jacquinet argues that in relation to teaching films, the notion of diegesis is problematic; again, because such titles refer not to one, but to *three* distinct worlds.¹⁰ In my view, this is not necessarily so. Even if classroom films may establish relations with reference points that belong to worlds *other* than the one constructed by the text itself, this does not imply that diegetic representation is not possible. Also references to the *dispositif* may occur on this textual level. In his book *De la fiction*, Odin mentions the example of a film in which a group of schoolchildren is given expert biological information during a visit to the zoo. (The situation he describes here, I would guess, is comparable to that which is established in the first few minutes of the NOF-produced short *Antoni van Leeuwenhoek*², which features a guided tour in a museum.) In this case, he points out, several of Jacquinet’s ‘worlds’ are represented in the diegesis.¹¹ The corpus I deal with, however, shows that the range of options in this respect is actually quite broad.

What I call, in the context of this chapter, ‘diegetic references’ are those elements in a film’s story world that can be considered to constitute a visual and/or auditory echo of objects or conditions that are commonly associated with the pedagogical *dispositif* (in a general sense) or the *dispositif* of classroom viewing (more in particular). The possibilities here are quite extensive. Textual elements that may take on such referential meaning vary from sounds or images of items that belong to the material framework for pedagogical interaction or articles that are reminiscent of those, to much more encompassing representations of that interaction itself. Examples therefore include both depictions of educational environments (school grounds in *Een natte broek in Waterland*, *De stad, hart van de ommelanden* and *Een*

vrolijke kadotter in huis; a primary school classroom in *Helpers in nood*; a technical workshop in *Wij bouwen woningen*; a sports ground and gym in *S.L.O.*) and tools (maps and charts in *Na 10 jaren arbeid* * and *Het Handvest van de Verenigde Naties*, 1962, The United Nations' Charter; a model in *Het ontstaan van een polder*, 1959, The genesis of a polder; a sketch or exercise book in *Wij bouwen woningen*; handicraft tools in *Aardig knutselwerk*).¹² Alternatively, they are representations of actual didactic exchanges involving relevant roles (the interaction between teachers and pupils in *De schoolreis*, *Een wens verhoord binnen 24 uur: de post*, *In de bruine boon schuilt een plantenleven* *, and some parts of *Wij bouwen woningen* and *Het dorp*) or surrogates of those roles (the farmer and area manager in *Na 10 jaren arbeid* *; the pool attendant in *Schoolzwemmen*; the tour guide in *Antoni van Leeuwenhoek* ?).

The main distinction between this level of referencing and the next one I shall discuss is that the above films feature clear-cut representations. In the examples I gave so far, references to the *dispositif* are so to speak 'locked up' in the diegesis. Because of this, the possibilities in terms of self-reflexivity are rather limited. In cases such as these, the text does indeed represent a situation that is reminiscent of the *dispositif* of which the spectators form part at the moment of watching, but in this process, it does not (explicitly) establish the connection with the status of the film itself as a didactic means (i.e. as a constituent of that *same* configuration). In order for this to happen, I shall argue further on, some other textual conditions need to be fulfilled.

Extra-diegetic Referencing

The difference between the first and the second of the discursive levels that I want to distinguish is illustrated, once again, in Odin's *De la fiction*. Following on from his example of the 'zoo film', the author describes a scene from a documentary which does not literally depict a teaching situation, as in the first instance, but presents itself as some sort of a 'magisterial lecture' (*cours magistral*) to the viewers addressed. The sequence he recounts shows a number of items and implements, all of which have something to do with the reconstitution of history by archaeological means. At one point, the film features a shot of an adult's hand, holding a stick, which directs the viewer's attention to a pro-filmic object (a skull). As Odin states, it is not clear here who this hand belongs to; its owner is never seen. The author argues that it emanates from some sort of 'interface' (or *autre champ*, in Alain Bergala's terms) between the space of the viewer and that which is constructed by the film (i.e. the story world itself).¹³ In other words, the hand and pointer do not form part of the diegesis, but emerge from a decidedly *extra*-diegetic space. This way, the impression is created that the viewer is addressed more or less directly. To clarify what I mean, let me compare two examples from the corpus dealt with here.

Extra-diegetic Inserts

The sequences that I would like to juxtapose both make use of schematic representations; however, they do so in slightly different ways. The first one, taken from the beginning of *Van ei tot kraanvogel*, is similar to Odin's example – although not identical. Here, a brief succession of images of crane varieties is followed by a fade, and subsequently, a shot of a map of the African continent. From one corner of the frame, the arm and hand of an unknown person emerge, which indicate the birds' habitat and migration routes on the map. The second one is the didactic scene at the end of *Na 10 jaren arbeid* *. In this fragment, a farmer, the film's

protagonist, is seen entering the headquarters of the Wieringermeer Estate (the administrative centre of the area of reclaimed land on which he lives and works) and shown a sketch of the region by a district manager. Then follows a series of close shots of the map with alongside it a chart, which is replaced several times with a different one by the administrator. These takes are alternated with more distant shots, which show the two men studying the documents. In the latter film, the user of the schematic representation – also the owner of the hand and arm which replace the charts – is always visually present. In *Van ei tot kraanvogel*, in contrast, Jacquinet's 'world of the class' is never represented diegetically. Here, the fragment concerned functions as some sort of extra-diegetic 'insert': a brief (visual and temporal) interruption of the story that is told by means of the surrounding live-action images.¹⁴

The effect which is generated in this process is comparable to that which Eric de Kuyper, in a piece on family film, has called the (apparent) 'annulment of technical mediation'. The author uses this phrase to describe what happens in the case of a 'direct gaze': a moment when an on-screen person looks straight into the camera, and thus, as it were, neutralises the distance – technological, but also spatial and temporal – with the viewer.¹⁵ Something similar, I would argue, takes place here. Because of the fact that the schema in *Van ei tot kraanvogel* is not anchored in the story that unfolds, the film seems to temporarily pause the diegetic development. The shot itself functions as some sort of a visual remark, an explicative aside to the attention of the implied viewer. In this process, mediation is somehow concealed: for a very brief moment, the map that fills the screen seems to operate here as an equivalent of the real-life pictures and charts that cover the walls of the classrooms in which the film is supposed to be shown. This circumstance in turn generates an impression of closeness, or immediacy, on the spectator's part.¹⁶

Voice-over Narration

The effect – or illusion – of immediacy described above is particularly strong in texts in which the viewer is literally spoken to, addressed by an audible (voice-over) narrator.¹⁷ Compare for instance the shorts *De Bilt verwacht...* and *Het paard*¹⁸. The first title contains a multitude of schematic representations that operate on a variety of levels: some as part of the diegesis, others as emerging from an extra-diegetic space, and yet another category on a textual plane somewhere in between. Maps, charts and diagrams, in this short, function both as attributes of the profilmic agents – the scientists (meteorologists) whose activities are documented – and as tools for explaining a physical process to an implied school audience. Because of this, a transition to a close shot of a schema which, a few seconds earlier, still functioned as a diegetic element can be ambiguous: it may not always be clear whether such an image continues to be part of the narrative on the daily goings-on in the weather station, or rather takes on a role which is comparable to that of a wall chart in a classroom. In many cases, *both* readings are possible at the same time.

This ambiguity, it seems, is not likely to occur in the case of *Het paard*¹⁹. Although this short uses a similarly wide range of schematic representations, it is much more obvious here on which discursive level they operate. The reason is that the film uses a spoken commentary which explicates its overall argumentation. Because of this, the text as a whole functions as addressed 'directly' to the viewer – or, as Jacquinet formulates it, "with reference to an addressee who

is absent but targeted as [if he were] present".¹⁸ Here, an impression of immediacy is created not only on those occasions when a map or chart is inserted into a live-action sequence, but as soon as the voice-over narration starts (i.e., at the very beginning of the film).

In teaching films, as a matter of fact, the use of spoken language nearly always holds this rhetorical potential at least to some extent. One reason is that speech, in these shorts, hardly ever emanates from an on-screen person and therefore rarely bears a direct relation to the diegesis of the film. In *Het paard*², for instance, we never see the one who speaks; it is nowhere suggested that the humans that figure in the few live-action sequences (an animal caretaker, some jockeys) are the source of what is said.¹⁹ Also, the voice-over commentary usually contains all sorts of additional signs of its reader-orientedness. The viewer, in films with sound, is often addressed as 'you' or with some sort of an implicative 'we' (as in the film *De kust van Nederland*): pronouns that involve the reader in, and sometimes even seem to make him share in the responsibility for, that which is said.²⁰ Variations on this practice are the use of (soft) imperatives (in expressions such as 'check out' or 'pay attention to', as in *Eeuwig verandert de kust*) and direct questions.²¹

Particularly significant in terms of the sort of references to the *dispositif* that I am trying to pinpoint here is the fact that the speaker, as a rule, takes a stance or attitude that evokes the pedagogical communication situation *in its entirety*. Speech, therefore, not only functions as a reference to the role of the educator (the one who introduces didactically relevant concepts and processes from a position of scientific, and sometimes also moral, authority), it also shows proof of an orientation towards a young, and more specifically, school-going audience. Apart from scientifically 'sound' terms (in *Het paard*²: 'dawn horse', *eo-hippus*; 'progression rate', *voortbewegingssnelheid*; 'warm- and cold-blooded', *warm- en koudbloedig*), voice-over texts often also contain more subjective (or even judgemental) expressions ('to look strange', *er vreemd uitzien*; 'humble mountain tribe', *onaanzienlijk dwergvolkje*; 'faithful helper', *trouwe helper*) and use age-specific reference points and comparisons ("the old books about Indians"; the size of *eo-hippus* as compared to that of a fox) and personifications ("the forefather of the horse"; "what nature achieved").²² Choices like the above can be seen as motivational (as they clearly foreground the possibility of experiential correspondence) but *also* as signs of the manifestation of a (surrogate) teacher figure who seems to directly address the pupil-viewer – a fact which explains Odin's association of these films with magisterial lectures.²³

The reason why I prefer to speak here of a 'concealment' of mediation – rather than 'annulment', as De Kuyper does – is that it is merely a matter of pretence, of make-belief.²⁴ The filmic speaker, of course, never *directly* addresses the actual (extratextual) viewer, but always goes via some sort of an abstraction of it. Narratologists have conceptualised this intermediary in a variety of ways. One of the most attractive ones, to me, is that of Paul Goetsch, who speaks in this context of a 'fictive reader'.²⁵ His choice of words is interesting, because it allows for the distinction with, but at the same time also connects it to, a 'fictional' one: the characterised in-story/diegetic version of the same reader (viewer) role. For Goetsch, the fictive reader is an implied reader who is addressed explicitly by the (implied) author. "Fictive readers," he argues, "may be invited to participate in a dialogue [for instance, when a question is posed], asked to read critically and use their imagination [a suggestion made quite literally in the film *Het paard*²], or challenged to formulate their own conclusions." In his view, "they can be seen as

direct or indirect references to the kind of audience the [implied] author wishes to reach.”²⁶

Meta-textual Referencing

I should immediately add, however, that in films that directly address a so-called ‘fictive’ reader, the illusion of immediacy described above is hardly ever sustained indefinitely. Most shorts in the corpus dealt with here contain at least some reference to their own status as (teaching) films – and therefore, as *mediated* representations. This way, they inevitably undermine the semblance of an immediate communication between the teacher figure implied by the text and an extratextual viewer. In this context, I am thinking not so much of the signs of indexing mentioned in chapter 3 (for instance, a leader with the logo of NOF, appearing before the beginning title in most prints, which reminded viewers of their provenance) but of more emphatic allusions to the films’ textual status. Again, the best examples of this can be found in the verbal domain.

Place Deixis vs. Discourse Deixis

The most straightforward way of clarifying the difference between extra-diegetic references and those which I shall refer to hereafter as ‘meta-textual’ ones is to contrast different uses of deictic terms in teaching films. One of the more striking characteristics of verbal explication in such shorts – spoken or written – is that it tends to contain a good deal of demonstrative pronouns. However, not all of these establish deictic relations on the same level of the discourse.

In the great majority of cases, demonstratives are used to point something out inside the image. A few minutes into the narration of *Het paard*²⁷, for instance, we hear a succession of sentences beginning with the words ‘this is...’ (the first in the series being “This, for instance, is the ancestor of today’s elephant”).²⁷ In each of those instances, the pronoun refers to one in a series of drawings of prehistoric animals that pass before the camera lens. The film also contains some adverbs that fulfil roughly the same function (for instance, the word *zo* in the sentence “Zo ziet een wild paard eruit”, which translates as “This is what a wild horse looks like”). Both terms are used to identify the image elements which the commentator is talking about at those specific points in time, and implicitly, to distinguish them from whatever came before. Linguists would consider both of these as examples of ‘place deixis’. In the film *Solliciteren*, in contrast, the demonstrative pronoun does not refer to an element in the text, but rather to *the text itself*. At the beginning of the short, an intertitle appears which explains its didactic purpose (to alert the viewer to mistakes that can be made in the course of a job interview) and how it should be deployed (the various parts of the film must be viewed separately, with a break in between). In this process, the text is explicitly referred to as such (“this film”). The use of the demonstratives, here, can be seen as an example of ‘discourse deixis’. The reference concerns the film itself; therefore, it necessarily figures on the ‘meta’ level of the text.²⁸

The opening title of *Solliciteren*, I would like to argue, constitutes some sort of ‘outing’ or foregrounding of the text, as a text – and therefore, of its place or function within a *dispositif* of viewing. The most crucial difference with the sort of references I discussed previously is that here, one way or another, the (potential) effect of immediacy, brought about by a direct address of the audience – emanating, again, from an extra-diegetic narrator – is somewhat

'unsettled'. For even if the film, because of the reference, may not actually *lose* its effect of communicational directness, this closeness is simultaneously exposed as an illusion, a mere textual *effect*. The deictic terms used in the first half of *Het paard*² divert the viewer's attention from the process of mediation by openly acknowledging his presence, in complying with his presumed need for an identification or specification of relevant image sections.²⁹ The word *deze* in *Solliciteren* constitutes a recognition of his presence as well; in this case, however, the 'courtesy' to the spectator is of an entirely different nature. Here, the audience is approached not as a collective that needs to be subjected to an illusion of communicative immediacy, but as one that is capable of seeing what a film really is: a mere text.

In *Remediation: Understanding New Media*, their well-known account of the various ways in which media refashion, or 'remediate', earlier ones, Jay David Bolter and Richard Grusin argue that in audio-visual applications of the past centuries, the apparently contradictory tendencies of 'transparent immediacy' (the use of technology that allows for a seemingly unmediated experience of what is represented) and 'hypermediacy' (the multiplication, and thereby, acknowledgement of, acts of representation/mediation) have often gone hand in hand.³⁰ The examples given above clearly illustrate this. In combination, they show that the same communicative channel that allows for the most powerful immediacy effect – that of extra-diegetic commentary – can easily be *turned into* an instrument that highlights a text's mediated-ness, and therefore, its fundamental hypermediacy. Extra-diegetic references, in other words, can easily *become* meta-textual ones. In the course of a text, both types of references often also co-occur; the viewer, in such cases, is invited to both look *at* the film (as a text) and to look *through* it (choosing at the same time to maintain the illusion of direct communication with whoever makes the filmic argument).³¹

The Text as (Teaching) Film

The meta-textual references in *Solliciteren*, of course, not only constitute a foregrounding of the text, and therefore, of the *dispositif* of viewing – or the film's place within it – but also of its function as a teaching tool, and thus, of its role within a specifically *pedagogical* set-up. By spelling out its intended use, the opening lines of the film draw attention to the short's educational nature, and by the same token, to its status as an instrument of didactic exchange. In this particular instance, the *dispositif* is explicitly specified as pedagogical; the reference, as a result, is pretty much inescapable. In the great majority of cases, however, the viewer has to take a more active role, and make his own inferences on the basis of more subtle clues. I shall illustrate this with a few examples.

Quite often, films with voice-over commentaries contain statements that concern the representational status of what is seen on screen. In *Goed bewaren – geld besparen*, for instance, the narrator points out that the image of a fungus, which follows that of a pot of food gone bad, is presented to us as seen through a microscope ("This is a microscopic shot of a fungus, 500 times larger"). In *Sterren en sterrensystemen*, we are told that all stars circle around a centre. Subsequently, an animation appears of what looks like a photographic view of a galaxy – an image which renders visible the spiral shape of its orbit. At this point, the speaker says that in reality, one such revolution takes several millions of years to complete. In the second half of *Eeuwig verandert de kust*, the commentator alerts his audience to the

fact that in the sketch that just came up the most permanent types of soil are shown in black (“Imagine that the land here is composed out of various types of rock; the most resistant ones are marked black”).³² In all of the above cases, the underlying message is that what is shown is a manipulated and/or schematised version of the real thing: a representation that is used as a means to better explain/understand what it looks like, or how it operates. By implication, this also applies to the text itself; not only those specific images, but the film as a whole functions as an aid – and more specifically, as a *didactic* aid. This deduction, however, is left to the viewer to make.

A variation on this pattern can be found in the French language film *Départ de grandes vacances*.³ Here, the reference is not purely verbal, but takes the shape of a combination of words and image. Immediately after the opening credits, a commentator’s voice speaks the line: “Nous voici encore une fois chez la famille Martin...” (“Here we are again, with the Martin family...”). At the same time, we see the silhouette of a man, front stage, who takes off his hat and sits down just outside the frame. Our first impulse is to decode this appearance as that of the (voice-over) narrator. The combination of visuals and speech, I believe, does two things. First, it makes explicit the relation between the text (the apparition of a narrator, however brief, draws our attention to the short’s textual status) and his spectator (the pronoun in the phrase *nous voici* can be read as an implication of the viewer). Second, it raises the latter’s awareness of the didactic nature of the film. Through his use of the adverb *encore*, ‘once again’, the speaker places the text within a series: a string of three didactic shorts dealing with the fortunes of the Martin family, all of which follow the same narrative pattern, use the same characters, and resemble each other visually. If the viewer is able to pick up on this reference – based on his prior experience as a pupil – he is likely to become (even) more acutely aware of the film’s place and function within classroom interaction.

The expressive value of those few seconds of introduction, I believe, can hardly be overestimated. The film’s opening words, if heard in an environment where the above references can be picked up, can easily affect the audience’s reading of everything that follows. The short’s designation as part of a series, I believe, immediately confirms its status as a French *language* film.³³ This fact in turn blocks a reading focusing on narrative events – regardless of how central these are to the text’s structure. Through those first few words, the audience is alerted to the fact that it should concentrate not so much on the incidents that take place, but on the way in which they are *told* (i.e. the vocabulary and grammar that are used in the process of narration). In addition to this, the commentator’s remark also attributes relevance, and therefore, meaning, to the otherwise inexplicable repetitions, pauses and verbal redundancies that abound in this film.

Something similar also happens in the opening minutes of *Hansje en de Madurodammers*,⁴ the Dutch language film. The short starts off with a voice-over sequence in which information is given on the theme park where its main events are set. At this point, the narrative that is to follow is literally referred to as a ‘story’ (*verhaal*).³⁴ This term, again, focuses the listener’s attention on its textual status, and by extension, on that of the film as such. However, the pronouncement also constitutes a more specific interpretational clue. In fact, the speaker here reminds his hearer that the second, main part of the short is a *fiction* – a circumstance which in turn entails that in viewing, he should observe a certain amount of distance. The

narrator basically suggests that this type of text, and the sort of reading that it normally provokes, do not 'belong' in a classroom. When watching this film, the audience therefore needs to be extra careful to adopt the most 'proper' viewing conduct: one that befits the didactic purpose of the screening.

Self-Reflexivity

In the introduction to this paragraph, I justified my classification of references onto three discursive levels on the basis of differences in the ways in which teaching films establish relations with the pedagogical *dispositif* in which they are shown. I added also that while my categorisation does not reveal much about the relative textual 'prominence' of those textual elements, it does provide some clues as to the degree of self-reflexiveness of the shorts in which they turn up. In what follows, I shall pursue this issue a little further. First, I shall try to refine my notion of (self-)reflexivity; next, I shall discuss its role in the films under scrutiny.

Referentiality vs. Reflexivity

The concept of 'reflexivity', of course, is by no means an unambiguous one. All of the films I have mentioned so far in one way or another make reference to the pedagogical *dispositif*, and by implication, to their own status or function within it. However, not *all* of them can be said to actually 'reflect' on it.

Whatever is reflexive, evidently, depends on what a reader identifies as such. Identification in turn hinges on the spectator's own contribution to a text: what he brings along to a screening, and uses in the very specific conditions of a viewing. In a piece on narration and narrativity, André Gaudreault and François Jost point out that the answer to the question whether signs of textual enunciation (for example, deictic references) even get *perceived* will differ according to the audience's prior knowledge, age, social class or historical period – and to this I would add, the institutional structure within which a film is seen.³⁵ For instance, when heard in a classroom, a voice-over commentary pointing out a particular section of the image is quite likely to be noticed, because in this setting, it constitutes an 'echo' of a real-life teacher doing something similar (with a map, or a drawing of a human body). Whether such a reference will also be taken as a reflection on some aspect of educational practice depends not only on the viewing situation, but also on the individual spectator. When analysing films, however, one has to use an abstraction of 'the' pupil, functioning within the framework of what I have defined earlier as a formal didactic situation. The question remains, then, which are my criteria for textual reflexiveness.

As a starting point for my reply I shall take the example of the phenomenon that is referred to, in art and literary theory, as *mise en abyme*: the redoubling or 'mirroring' of a text (or an aspect of it) by the text itself. As a rule, this procedure is considered to be not only a form of reference to, but also a reflection on, or a questioning of, the work or its structure.³⁶ However, not all authors who deal with the subject agree on what the *object* of mirroring may be.

Some of the more recent definitions of *mise en abyme* leave room for mirror effects whose reference point is not something *in the text*, but an element or ingredient of the (conceptual) space that 'surrounds' it. In their piece on the subject, Klaus Meyer-Minnemann and Sabine Schlickers write: "we believe that, even if the *mise en abyme* is always diegetic, it can also

reflect the extra-fictional level (the level where the implicit author and reader should be situated) or otherwise, paratexts". The example that follows demonstrates that their term 'extra-fictional' may concern not only referents outside of the diegesis, but even outside of the text itself. However, most of the cases they describe are reproductions or resemblances that are strictly *intratextual*. In practice, it seems, such redoublings are much more easily conceived of as reflections (in both senses of the word) than reworkings of elements that are not strictly part of the text.³⁷ This also seems to apply to the films under scrutiny here. A hypothetical example should help me illustrate what I mean.

Imagine a sequence in a mute film, containing either a representation of a group of pupils watching a short, or some sort of an echo thereof (for instance, a non-school audience attending a screening introduced by some kind of an educator, or otherwise, a class of children focusing on a blackboard or wall chart instead of a projected image). If we follow the logic of Meyer-Minnemann and Schlickers, we can consider this to be an example of placing 'in *abyme*' of the enunciation situation (to use the authors' terms) or the *dispositif* of viewing (in my own).³⁸ In a screening situation which closely matches the one described in my chapter 2, such a scene is very likely to cause recognition in the spectators. Quite apart from the fact that this may motivate them to stay tuned (as it foregrounds the film's potential for experiential correspondence), viewers will probably take it as a (premeditated) reference, either to the site of viewing or to the act they are currently performing. However, none of this implies that they will therefore decode the sequence as reflexive. In my opinion, a condition for this to happen is that there is a certain amount of textual 'identity'. In this particular instance, this would mean that what is being watched in the short is not only a film – as opposed to a blackboard or chart – but also *this* film: the very short in which it figures diegetically. The latter happens, for instance, in the final scene of *Een wens verhoord binnen 24 uur: de post*.³⁹

My logic here is that a text is more likely to be read as reflexive, the more it is actually concerned with *itself*, i.e. with its own status as a text.⁴⁰ On the 'highest' of my discursive levels, such is the case by definition: meta-textual references, after all, always constitute a kind of outing of the film as being precisely that. Lower down on the scale, self-reflexivity (in this context perhaps a more unequivocal term) is possible as well, but only if the reference involves some sort of 'transgression' of textual layers. An example of this is the *mise en abyme* in *Een wens verhoord binnen 24 uur*. Here, the reference to the text-as-text occurs on the lowest, or innermost level: that of the diegesis. In other words, while the reference to the *dispositif*, in this case, is part of the story that is told, the process of mirroring itself *transcends* the boundaries of that one discursive level, since its referent is the *text itself* (as well as the conditions of its viewing). A different kind of transgression occurs in the opening shot of *Départ de grandes vacances*², where the persona of the extra-diegetic narrator, while making his comment on the meta level of the text, seems to briefly 'invade' the diegesis, thus underscoring the self-reflexiveness of what the voice-over says.

In *Een wens verhoord binnen 24 uur*, the reference is pretty obvious, because the distance between the textual layers involved in the mirroring effect – the diegesis, and the meta-level of the film – is rather wide. When the (metaphorical) gap is narrower, self-reflexivity is still possible, but often also less *visible*. Compare for instance the films *Maarten Luther* and *Het paard*². Earlier on in this chapter, I pointed out that in the case of a spoken commentary, the

teacher figure that can be constructed on the basis of the speaker's voice nearly always resides in a different textual space than the diegesis about which he talks.⁴¹ However, he does not always bring this to the viewer's attention. In films such as *Maarten Luther*, the commentator restricts himself to a seemingly neutral account of historical events and their interpretation (both of which are presented here as universal truths). In this process, he completely effaces himself, and in the same movement, his 'own' textual layer. (His speech, in other words, might be conceived of as an example of what Émile Benveniste designates as *histoire*: an *énoncé* devoid of all reference to the act of enunciation.⁴²) In *Het paard*,² in contrast, this is not the case. Whenever the short's speaker explicitly identifies elements in the image for the viewer (for instance, by means of terms associated with place deixis) he inadvertently also draws attention to the discursive stratification of the film, and thus, to its being a text. In this process, the film automatically becomes *somewhat* self-reflexive.⁴³

(Self-)reflexivity as a Reading Guide

Now that I have explained which textual elements I consider to be (self-)reflexive, I need to specify which function they serve in teaching films. In my view, signs of reflexivity can best be conceived of as some sort of 'reading guides': indications to the viewer as to how a text should be interpreted. As a matter of fact, all the films I mentioned seek to make the spectator aware of the process of reading. Whether they do so by visually representing it, by referring to it in the way they address their audience, or by making explicit their own status as texts, they always focus attention on the film's – or any film's – status as an object of reading/viewing. The particular (pedagogical) *dispositif* they reference hereby functions as a directional frame: it helps to further specify the type of reading required by the text.

In a discussion of *mise en abyme* as a factor of textual interpretability, Lucien Dällenbach refers to this phenomenon as one of 'repragmatisation'. Through an effect of mirroring, he argues, the text establishes a dialogue situation and thus "presents the reader with a producer and a receiver, even [...] with the producer and the receiver of the very text he is reading". As far as I am concerned, this statement applies not only to the very specific type of textual 'artifice' that Dällenbach talks about, but even to references on the diegetic level of the text that *do not* transcend any discursive boundaries (and that therefore, I argued earlier, cannot strictly speaking be called 'reflexive').⁴⁴ For instance, Chaim Perelman points out that a speaker can use any sort of fiction – such as, fictional characters – to "insert his [implied] audience into a series of different audiences".⁴⁵ However, reading instructions are usually more noticeable, and therefore (potentially) more rhetorically *powerful*, if they take a higher position on the discursive scale, or alternatively, if they entail some form of discursive transgression.⁴⁶

Again according to Dällenbach, most novels use mirroring to remove textual ambiguity. "[I]n resorting to *mise en abyme*," he says, "texts manifest their fears about their own readability". The same, I would say, applies to self-reflexive elements in teaching films – perhaps even more pointedly so. In the text mentioned above, Meyer-Minnemann and Schlickers observe that in literary fiction, the fact that textual redoubling often goes hand in hand with a so-called *métalepse* (a transgression of the boundaries of the discourse) entails that it is not always clear who is responsible for the narrative.⁴⁷ The latter effect, I would like to emphasise, rarely occurs in teaching films. No matter which textual boundaries are 'trespassed', such shorts

nearly always make clear who, *within the bounds of the text*, takes on the responsibility for the filmic message – especially if there is spoken narration. In the great majority of cases, the impression is created that it is the owner of the commentary voice (as constructed by the reader) who takes on this role.⁴⁸

In the case of classroom films, reasons for this anxiety about textual readability can be found in primary sources. In my conclusions to chapter 1, I mentioned that even teaching film enthusiasts saw a fundamental conflict between the medium's inherent motivational potential and the requirement of seriousness and diligence in didactic situations. Producers, distributors and manual authors kept emphasising that while film's attraction to schoolchildren had to be exploited, classroom audiences should always stay aware of their whereabouts – if only so as to be able to adopt an institutionally appropriate viewer attitude.⁴⁹ In practice, it seems, this was not so self-evident.

Focusing again on literary *mise en abyme*, Meyer-Minnemann and Schlickers propose that this type of textual redoubling can be conceived of as a means to subvert the 'novelistic illusion'.⁵⁰ In teaching films as well, self-reflexive elements may cause some sort of an alienation effect: they can help prevent the reader from getting engrossed by – and consequently, losing himself in – the diegesis of the film. For instance, extra-diegetic references to elements in the image, by making visible the discursive nature of the diegesis, undermine his experience of an autonomous story world. References on the level 'above' in turn undo the illusion of direct communication with the audience that is created in this way. Through those mechanisms, I believe, spectators are constantly reminded of the fact that what should be carried away from the screening never concerns the text itself, but always the reality *outside* of the film, and even outside of the classroom in which they are gathered.⁵¹

A last remark which I would like to make before moving on to a consideration of references to the *dispositif* from a historical perspective concerns the possibility of a certain amount of 'tension' between various types of rhetoric. Whereas self-reflexivity should be considered as a means to encourage spectatorial detachment, and in this process, an awareness of the discursive (and mediated) nature of textual representation, some of the strategies that I discussed in the previous chapter do precisely the opposite. Techniques that serve the purpose of highlighting textual purposiveness or experiential correspondence, for instance, aim at pulling the viewer in, and by implication, *diverting* his attention from referential reality and its inherent complexity. However, there is no reason why such tension should be paralytic. Texts such as *Départ de grandes vacances*⁵² prove that a balance can be reached between (rather emphatic) self-reflexivity and the encouragement of (temporary) diegetic immersion.⁵²

5.2 References to the *Dispositif*: A Historical Perspective

In the introduction to this chapter, I mentioned that references to the pedagogical *dispositif*, despite the fact that they may help identify a teaching film as such, cannot be considered 'core' constituents, or features that are 'typical' of this type of short. Although many of them do, not all classroom films explicitly establish an (audio-)visual relation with the institutional framework within which they were meant to function.⁵³ However, the collection under scrutiny here shows that such references definitely became *more* common over time. If NOF, in its early days, mostly distributed films that did not in any way point to their intended screening context, such titles became much rarer later on.⁵⁴ In what follows, I shall propose a number of explanations for this development.

Interpretations

My first interpretation takes the form of an answer to the question why references to the *dispositif* can be found less often in films released in the institute's first few years. Again, I would like to make use here of work on literary rhetoric to establish my point.

In an article characterising three types of formal discourse (respectively, papal letters, state of the union addresses and congressional replies) Kathleen M. Jamieson demonstrates that antecedent genres can impose certain 'rhetorical constraints' on more recent ones. Speakers who are confronted with unprecedented circumstances, and more specifically, new communicational objectives, tend to rely on existing examples when giving shape to what they say. Sometimes, the adoption of established discursive procedures is the result of a more or less strategic choice; for instance, if the formulations concerned come with a situationally useful illocutionary force (to use Austin's terms). In other cases, the author argues, it is merely a matter of "stubborn habituation".⁵⁵ I would like to add that the selection of a specific format may also be based on the fact that a more appropriate rhetorical example or prototype is not (yet) available. This seems to be the case with early classroom teaching films.

When NOF was first set up, I explained in chapter 1, very few shorts had been made that specifically targeted an audience of schoolchildren. Makers therefore had to look for models within other filmic traditions; the most pertinent ones being 'non-curricular' educational genres such as industrial process films and travelogues. For obvious reasons, titles within those categories did not as a rule contain references to the pedagogical institution – let alone to the very particular *dispositif* of classroom viewing. The gradual incorporation of textual elements that did establish this relation, then, should be seen as part of an evolution away from the 'genre's' initial examples and towards a more purposive, audience-specific approach to the production (and selection) of such films.⁵⁶

The rhetorical constraints that impinged upon early teaching films, as a matter of fact, may have derived not only from cinematic traditions, but also from educational ones. I am thinking here in particular of the more 'uninhibited' user instructions that one can find in titles like *Solliciteren*. In the early days, such references were extremely rare. As a rule, directions as to the films' use were restricted to the accompanying teachers' notes. In my view, this fact can be related to the practice, common in formal education contexts, of hiding from the learners' view anything that pertains to the 'instruction of the instructor'.⁵⁷ Specifications on how to

integrate tools (audio-visual aids, but also mere schoolbooks) into daily classroom practice usually end up in separate leaflets, manuals, or even teachers' versions of the same objects or texts. A similar tendency manifests itself in the early output of NOF.⁵⁸

In the Dutch case in particular, the rhetorical developments sketched may have been the result of direct influence at least to some extent. The increase in references to the *dispositif* in films distributed by NOF seems to be due in part to confrontation with foreign materials that are more 'advanced' in this respect. The number of titles that contain such elements clearly grew around the time the institute began to acquire third-party productions, and more in particular, shorts made abroad.⁵⁹ Soon after that, references also became more common in NOF's own films. The relation between both trends is confirmed by former employees, who testify that film making practice at the institute was a matter of copying (or at the very least, learning from) titles produced elsewhere. Foreign items were viewed on a regular basis, not only for purposes of adaptation, but also for inspiration. Because of its relation to the institute's acquisition policy, then, the evolution towards integration of references to the *dispositif* was not a steady one, but took the form of a succession of little 'leaps'.⁶⁰

My second interpretation of this historical development is that it can be related to the introduction of film sound, and more in particular, voice-over narration. The examples I gave so far already demonstrate that referentiality, and by extension, reflexivity, are closely connected to the (spoken) word. In classroom films, I said, commentaries almost automatically function as echoes of the teacher's voice; in addition to this, they allow for the viewer to be addressed more directly in his very specific capacity of pupil-learner. Self-reflexiveness, in turn, is almost inextricably bound up with verbal explication; discourse deixis, for instance, *presupposes* the use of words. For those reasons, it is not surprising that the growth in number of teaching films with sound was accompanied by a rise in the average quantity of references to the *dispositif*.⁶¹

A third interpretation (which, as a matter of fact, simultaneously functions as an explanation for the shift towards sound mentioned above) relates the increase in referentiality to a perceived change in user attitude. Hoban, author of the 1940s manual *Movies that Teach*, observed that classroom films, as opposed to military training films, eschewed the deliberate use of teachers as characters and of classrooms as settings for action. The author saw this as a manifestation of "the scrupulous avoidance of anything in educational films that might feed the fear that films will replace the teacher" – a prejudice which, I argued in my second chapter, also informed some of NOF's positions in matters of form.⁶² Although Hoban himself considered it an unnecessary precaution, his opinion was rather exceptional for that time; 'threatening' textual elements such as he mentions did not get acceptance among colleague authors until much later on. Therefore, the increase in references, both diegetic and extra-diegetic, to tools and roles that are standard of classroom interaction, although not an indication of user attitude *as such*, can be interpreted as a sign of change in NOF's marketing strategy, and therefore, of its experience of a waning necessity for such measures to appease potential users.

Reservations

Although a tendency towards more referentiality, in my corpus, manifests itself quite clearly, I would like to emphasise that it is by no means an absolute one. First, because representations

of (surrogate) educational situations, extra-diegetic references to the *dispositif* and even meta-textual comments can be found in films dating from as early as 1943 (consider for instance *Na 10 jaren arbeid **, *Elf-studentocht*, and *Solliciteren*, respectively). Second, because later releases do not necessarily contain such elements. Some of the extreme roundabout examples which I mentioned in chapter 4 (such as, most of the story-form essay composition films) do not show any signs of their relatedness to a classroom context at all. The occurrence of such references, in other words, cannot function as a periodisation tool. In addition to this, diversity is reinforced by the incorporation into the collection of non-teaching films (for instance, the Russian-made documentary *Moskou, 1962, Moscow*) which do not contain any textual marks of their classroom status (except for an added leader or a brief introductory text).⁶³ Variation, then, not only persists, but possibly even increases in the course of time.

Another qualification I need to make here is that even if a trend towards more referentiality can be discerned, no definite conclusions can be drawn with regard to the ratios between the various discursive choices made. For instance, if a film has a certain level of self-reflexiveness, this does not necessarily entail that *all* of the references made are 'high up' on the aforementioned scale. Meta-textual elements, in this case, might very well figure alongside diegetic ones. Only two (vague) tendencies can be distinguished here. First, it can be argued that in mute films, references are usually confined to the diegesis. Although instances of 'hiding' the mediation do occur, they tend to be less obvious than in sound films, since only the latter make use of the most powerful instrument to achieve this effect: the spoken word. A second pattern is that meta-textual references do not normally show up in the earliest productions (*Solliciteren* being a notable exception). Again, the reason is language-related. In those films, the absence, or sparseness, of verbal explication tends to preclude explicit self-reflexivity.

My third and last qualification concerns a marked *deviation* from the historical tendencies I have just outlined. Meta-textual references, I implied, are more common in teaching films with spoken narration. Titles which entered the collection in the second half of the 1950s, when sound was becoming the standard, usually – although not always – contain at least *some* verbal indication of the representational status of the audio-visual aids shown on screen (for instance, a comment on the ontology, make or scale of a map, chart or model). In this process, they also foreground the films' own status as didactic tools. Later on, however, this tendency seems to have been reversed, or at the very least toned down. In films dating from the end of the period I deal with, pronouncements that thus 'out' the text (as a text) no longer seem to turn up all that frequently. Consider for instance *Johannes Keppler*, an early 1960s sound film which consists for a large part of schematic representations. When compared to other films in the NOF corpus, this short does not contain quite as many meta-textual references as items that came out a few years earlier. Unlike such films as *Goed bewaren – geld besparen* (released around 1955), which repeatedly draw their audience's attention to the discrepancies between models and diagrams and the reality which they represent, the science film restricts such remarks to a bare minimum.

Of course, none of this implies that meta-textual references, by the early 1960s, were on their way out. It should however be observed that at that time, NOF considered the viewers it targeted to be more familiar with the concept of teaching films, and more specifically, with their 'rightful' place within a pedagogical exchange. One possible explanation, therefore,

would be that the necessity of reflexivity, as a reading guide, was no longer thought to be quite as acute.

5.3 Textual References: Issues of Authority

In chapter 2, I explained that my ultimate criterion for designating a text as ‘teaching film’ is the particular framework within which it functions. A short, I said, cannot acquire this status unless it is viewed within a pedagogical *dispositif*, i.e. as part of a set-up that is marked by very specific (power) relations between those present. In order for it to qualify as such, a film needs to be deployed – and in the process, framed – by a person who, at least in theory, has a certain amount of authority over the group of people to whom it is shown (a status which, in turn, he derives from his established institutional role). Only under those circumstances is a title likely to be perceived as a didactic tool, and can it be considered to acquire meaning as a classroom film.

However, in view of what precedes, the above account in turn raises the question what happens if signs of the *dispositif*, as it were, ‘penetrate’ the text. Does this entail any kind of change in the balance among the various players, or constituents, of that particular set-up? And more specifically, what sort of consequences does it have in terms of didactic authority – after all, a crucial factor in the process of a text’s framing as a classroom film? In this respect, does a shift take place, either partial or more full-scale, from the teacher to the text? And if so, does a teaching film still need deployment – read: framing – by an (actual) instructor in order to function as such? Or does it make the text more ‘autonomous’, i.e. capable of performing more independently as a rhetorical construct?

Textual Authority

The idea that teaching films, and educational films more in general, command a good deal of textual authority, in any case, is one that pervades earlier writings on the subject. Jacquinot, for instance, holds the opinion that such texts, because of the way they reference three distinct worlds, force the viewer to follow a prescribed interpretational course. Classroom films, she argues, ensure the unambiguousness of the audio-visual communication – a practice which, I pointed out earlier, she interprets as a sign of alignment with a long-standing pedagogical tradition.⁶⁴

The Role of Speech

Particularly striking about her analysis is the fact that she keeps emphasising the role of speech in this process. In the previous chapter, I mentioned her argument that in didactic shorts, verbal explication is a matter of *ancrage*. Words, she says, do not merely add to what is shown, but also function as instruments of selection: they exclude potential meanings, while giving priority to certain others. This way, they immediately limit the range of possible interpretations.⁶⁵

Similar pronouncements can also be found in work on non-fiction films that target wider audiences. Odin, for example, says that spoken commentaries in documentaries are a means of (re)introducing homogeneity – and even foreseeability – into the reading of a text. He writes: “the compelling presence of the voice-over imposes an almost univocal reading”. Plantinga, in turn, states that in non-fictions that use a so-called ‘formal style’ “voice-over carries the authority over the meanings gleaned from the images”. Nichols, likewise, has argued that since the coming of sound, the dominant (‘argumentative’) style of documentary has been

one “in which images serve primarily as illustration for the rhetorical claims of a spoken commentary with its problem-solving bent rather than allowing the potential of images [...] to attain full force”.⁶⁶

Describing in my own words the situation which the above authors characterise, I would argue that in many – but by no means *all* – teaching films with sound, the speaker does indeed seem to assume the hierarchically highest position among those who, from *within* the text, direct the (implied) reader. In relation to shorts such as these, the distinction which Gaudreault and Jost make between ‘enunciation’ (their term for signs of what Metz, taking his clue from Albert Laffey, calls the ‘great image maker’ – an agency which is not *directly* visible or audible in the text) and various levels of ‘narration’ (a word they reserve for audio- and/or visual manifestations of a story-teller) becomes a highly theoretical one.⁶⁷ In classroom films, I would contend, the speaker most often takes on a role which actively conflates those various textual functions. In most cases, he does not seem to merely pass on the information he is fed, but rather to articulate the intentions of some kind of an implied author. An apparent conflict between several narrative agents on different levels of the text, as described by the abovementioned authors, is extremely rare.

A conviction I share with Jacquinet is that the impression of (epistemic) authority that is thus created does indeed establish a relation with – or in my analysis: a reference to – the pedagogical *dispositif* within which these shorts (used to) function. However, this does not mean that I also believe that because of this, the text *as such* takes on (extra) authority – let alone some kind of rhetorical ‘autonomy’. In order to substantiate this view, I need to lay bare two sets of assumptions that underlie the positions referred to above, and which, in my opinion, are somewhat problematic.

Underlying Assumptions

The first of these premises concerns the interpretation given to the term ‘authority’. Authors dealing with the type of films under scrutiny here seem to consider this notion largely in terms of ‘factuality’ or ‘truth’. More specifically, they use it to refer to the extent to which a text can convince its readers that what is said corresponds to (an extratextual) reality.⁶⁸ In my view, however, they somewhat overestimate the significance of this particular kind of epistemic authority in relation to the films’ rhetorical functioning.

In teaching films, I believe, what is at stake is not so much the texts’ (factual) reliability, but rather their suitability as didactic tools. First of all, not *all* titles in this category actually make the kind of truth claims that the above authors talk about. Examples of shorts that do not do so are those which I designated earlier as extremely ‘roundabout’; for instance, essay composition films that relate purely fictional events. Second, I would like to point out that it is not unthinkable that a teacher who, in the course of a classroom session, made use of a film that *does* explicitly deal with (didactically relevant) facts would have chosen to distance himself from the text, or a portion of it – just like he could do with a section of a wall chart or page in a textbook that he disagreed with. In this process, he would have actively undermined the assertion which it makes.⁶⁹ Yet none of this entails that the item shown therefore would have ceased to function as a teaching film. Of course, it cannot be denied that if an educator does not explicitly *disclaim* what is said, he implicitly confirms its factual trustworthiness;

after all, this is an inevitable consequence of the epistemic authority which derives from his institutionalised educational position. In my view, however, a short's didactic fitness, and by extension, its status – or more precisely: its *rhetorical acceptability* – as a classroom film, does not exclusively depend on this unspoken claim.

The second set of assumptions which I would like to expose concern the potential rhetorical autonomy of audio-visual texts. Writings that label educational films (or other types of shorts that tend to use what Plantinga calls a 'formal style') as 'authoritarian' thereby attest to a rather immanentist conception of how meaning gets produced – even if they do take into account some of the pragmatic aspects of the process.

In his work on argumentative conventions in the academic study of literature, Stephen Mailloux argues that this is not so surprising. In decoding textual representations of reader experiences as interpretational clues, he points out, critics that shift the attention to what users may make of a work basically take over a method practiced by the 'intrinsic' approaches which they so emphatically claim to reject. In doing so, they prove that any sort of criticism always remains at the service of a more or less authoritative text.⁷⁰ To some extent, I agree, this is unavoidable – also if one's purpose is to analyse the rhetorical mechanisms of a larger body of work. What should always be kept in mind, however, is that in this process, assumptions are made about the particular *dispositif* within which the attributed meanings come about. The latter observation, although applying strictly speaking to any form of interpretation, is particularly relevant to the sort of textual elements discussed above. The reason is that these operate precisely *by way of* reference to that particular rhetorical frame (as part of a wider *dispositif*).

The best way to illustrate this is through a 'negative' example: a situation in which a classroom film is *not* used as such. Consider for instance the title *Elf-studentocht*. This short, a visual record of an episode of an ice skating contest held in the northern-most provinces of the Netherlands, makes use of all sorts of 'tools' that a viewer might spontaneously associate with the teaching of geography. Most notably, it contains a map, inserted in between sequences, on which the skaters' route is indicated by an animated dotted line. Imagine this film shown not in a school, but as part of the supporting shorts section of a 1940s entertainment film programme; for instance, at a seasonally relevant time (e.g. a cold winter's day). In those circumstances, the graphics featured most likely would not have constituted a very strong reference to a formal didactic context at all. Here, they would merely have functioned as an informative 'aside': a factual footnote to a series of images that primarily serve the purpose of 'prepping' the audience for what is still to come. In this case, after all, the point of the film's screening would have been to create a leisurely atmosphere: to whet the viewers' appetite for one entertainment activity (watching the feature) by showing snapshots of another (taking part in a sports game, attending a match, fun on the ice). Additionally, in the event of a showing soon after the film's production, it might also have had some actuality value.⁷¹ The link with a classroom setting, however, is not very likely to have occurred to the audience at all, simply because in these particular conditions, the pedagogical *dispositif* referenced (if that word is at all appropriate here) would not have been in place.

Something similar can also be said of the so-called 'authoritative' tone that characterises

voice-over commentaries in most of NOF's sound films. Think for instance of *Van ei tot kraanvogel*. In this short, the speaker takes a more or less 'didactic' stance, feeding his viewers biological facts. In addition to this, his speech contains signs of orientation towards a young, school-going audience; for instance, an at times subjective vocabulary and metaphors taken from the realm of daily life. Yet once again, the connection between those features and the film's intended viewing context is by no means absolute. In the presence of a mixed-age or even homogeneously adult audience, such textual elements might have been considered meaningful as well, even *without* functioning as references to a specifically pedagogical *dispositif*. The short's somewhat patronising tone of voice is reminiscent not only of a particular institutional practice, but also of a certain type of film: the kind of (nature) documentaries which, at the time of the title's release, were also shown in regular movie theatres. In a non-educational setting, then, the reference might have been experienced as purely intertextual. The more 'playful' aspects of the film's language, in turn, might have functioned primarily as dramatic – thus encouraging viewers (even older ones) to focus on correspondences with their own, personal experience.

Once again, the above cases show that it depends on the way in which films are framed whether specific meanings do or do not get produced. This entails that even if texts are made with certain allusions in mind, their referential potential may get lost in the screening process. In addition to this, the relative importance of individual features can vary: elements that are central to the film's interpretation in one viewing situation (for example, an educational one) may be peripheral in certain others (e.g., recreational ones). For all of those reasons, textual features can never be considered rhetorically autonomous – no matter how unambiguous they may seem at first sight.

Authority and Framing

Even if the circumstances of the screening are such that references to the pedagogical *dispositif* do stand out, then, this cannot lead to very far-reaching conclusions as to the didactic functioning of a text. More specifically, it would be wrong to assume that films can actually incorporate any kind of (context-specific) authority. In what follows, I shall elaborate on this matter a little further. In this process, I shall try to articulate some of the more subtle aspects of the interaction between a teaching film and its most pertinent rhetorical frame.

Pedagogical Endorsement

My main reason for opposing the idea that classroom films can assume even the slightest amount of (pedagogical) authority is that whatever can be considered to be present in a text always needs to be endorsed in the process of its screening, even if only tacitly. Above I claimed that a film user has the opportunity to distance himself from a given section of a short; for instance because he thinks that it makes statements that are factually wrong. Although this does not necessarily imply that the text itself therefore ceases to function as a teaching tool – and by the same token, as a classroom film – it does entail that that portion of the short will most likely not be perceived as didactically 'fit', and that therefore, it will lose some of its rhetorical force. The latter, I believe, may also apply to the film as a whole, if its user (the educator) neglects to somehow confirm, or underscore, its didactic status. Again, a hypothetical example can help me clarify what I mean.

Consider for instance a situation whereby a short is shown not in the course of a lesson, as part of a session on a subject that relates to what is shown, but at the very end of the period. The teacher does not introduce the film's topic, but merely tells the children to watch it quietly until the class ends. While the projector is running, the master cleans his blackboard, clears away some of the books that are laying around, and sits down to grade tests – perhaps even to finish reading the day's newspaper. Meanwhile, the pupils view in silence; the man in front, after all, has the reputation of being strict. While watching, they hear the film commentator's voice, and along with it, in the background, the teacher's rummaging. What they are really focusing on, however, is the clock above the blackboard, visible in the corners of their eyes. In their minds, they are anticipating the sound of the school bell that is about to ring.

Even in circumstances like these, I would argue, textual references to the pedagogical *dispositif* are likely to be identified as such. At the same time, however, they cannot possibly generate their maximum rhetorical effect. I am thinking here in particular of the sort of interpretational clues that are communicated by means of spoken commentaries. If a film is screened as part of a lesson, a narrator's attempts to focus the reader's attention on selected areas of image and/or sound can bestow on the text some kind of a hierarchy in terms of what is most important from a didactic point of view. This ranking, however, has far less prominence in the situation sketched above. The fact that the screening, in this case, merely functions as a 'filler', a way of making the children 'sit out' their time in peace, renders the matter of which elements carry the most educational weight near-irrelevant. The viewing of the film, the circumstances suggest, will not be followed by any kind of interrogation; the pupils, therefore, are not very likely to be sanctioned for getting the hierarchy wrong. Because they know this, they do not experience a reading for such pointers as imperative. The reason is that this particular interpretation is not endorsed within the given *dispositif*.

Odin, I suspect, might characterise the above situation as a 'clash' or 'conflict' between two opposing institutional dictates – a state of affairs which, I pointed out earlier, he would consider to cause rhetorical, but also complete communicative failure.⁷² Although I do agree in principle that the fact that viewers are given somewhat contradictory interpretational clues may confuse and perhaps even hamper a film's reading, I do not share his opinion that this is *necessarily* so. In my view, such failure is always due to a certain inadequacy in terms of framing. Even if a teacher takes on only the bare minimum of authority that he is institutionally entitled to, I have claimed, he can always at least indicate how the film is *supposed* to function (i.e., whether as a didactic tool, or not). The question of whether the instructor can actually influence the children's reading accordingly, and therefore, whether the communication is rhetorically successful, is a very different one (and not one that I am concerned with here).

Another point on which our views diverge is the matter of who, in the case of classroom films, can be taken as the (real) enunciator of a text. According to Odin, the teacher, researcher or specialist whose ideas are expressed in the film – often, by a character representing this persona – can be held responsible for the cinematic discourse.⁷³ In other words, he suggests that in those cases when a teaching film *is* indeed read as such (i.e., when there is no 'framing conflict' of the abovementioned kind), the film's message is likely to be perceived as coming from an 'authority' implied by the text. Such an account of the facts, however, is inconsistent with the reasoning I follow here. The example I gave above shows that it is ultimately always

the pedagogical viewing situation – embodied by its most authoritative agent, the teacher – which enunciates the text. The *dispositif*, for me, is its abstract ‘origin’ – regardless of which other textual ‘sources’ the reader may (also) be able to construct.⁷⁴

By way of illustration, I would like to refer once more to the example of *Départ de grandes vacances*⁷⁵. Earlier on in this chapter I pointed out that a clear distinction should be made between that which the short seems to tell at first sight (the adventures of a family leaving for the summer holidays) and those aspects of the discourse that a classroom reading is likely to highlight (the way in which the story, quite literally, is *told*). If, in this case, the role of enunciator would be allocated to the *textual* narrator – or, more accurately, to the abstract persona evoked through his words – there is no guarantee whatsoever that a viewer would actually be able to discern between the two. Making the speaker responsible for what is said, after all, would reduce, or even nullify, the significance of the didactic references made at the beginning of the film. As a result, an interpretation focusing entirely on the narrative events (the kind of reading that Odin would call a ‘fictionalising’ one) might seem acceptable as well. If however one takes the stance that the pedagogical *dispositif* as a whole enunciates the text, such a reading becomes didactically irrelevant, and therefore, pointedly undesirable.

Delegation of Teacher Authority

Above I argued that classroom films cannot be considered to command pedagogical authority in or of themselves. However, they may do so by way of association. Teachers, I believe, may ‘delegate’ educational prerogatives to the tools which they deploy. One way in which they can do this is by allowing the filmic speaker to act as some sort of a vicarious enunciator – for instance, by explicitly endorsing the didactic relevance of what he is about to say. In cases like these, the commentator will seem to take over the task of formulating the ideas which an instructor wants his pupils to consider.

Rhetorical delegation, of course, is more likely to occur the more authority the text itself appears to claim. A greater presence of references to the *dispositif* gives the actual teacher the chance to frame a work in a less emphatic way. Conversely, more effort is required to dissociate oneself from a highly referential film. If an instructor who uses such a short as a didactic tool wants to distance himself from something that is said, he must state much more explicitly that the (surrogate) teacher figure summoned by the film should not be perceived of as his textual *alter ego*.

Possibilities in terms of textual delegation in part also depend on the types of reference that occur. For instance, films that represent pedagogical relations in purely visual ways cannot be expected to take on the same degree of (vicarious) authority as those that echo them through extra-diegetic speech. Diegetic representations may of course help to manoeuvre the reader in a preferred spectatorial role. This positioning, however, is rather unspecific: it concerns the addressee’s overall attitude towards a text. In the second case, in contrast, the reference’s scope is much more precise. By focusing the reader’s attention on selected areas of a filmic discourse – and thus, earmarking them as (more) didactically relevant – voice-over speakers actively specify the extent of the authority which they claim. In this process, they command such power in a much more emphatic way. If endorsed by an actual instructor, therefore, precise indications of intratextual hierarchies make for a very substantial delegation

of his professional prerogatives.

The situation is different again in the case of meta-textual references. Here, two opposing principles seem to be at work. On the one hand, such elements focus the viewer's attention on the film's status as a tool. This way, they profoundly contest the (apparent) authority status of the text: they expose the work's functional subservience to both teacher and class. On the other hand, and in the same process, they also enable a radical form of delegation. By explicating the instrumental nature of a film, they claim one of the most basic pedagogical privileges: that of explicating where authority, within the viewing situation, is actually located. If a teacher chooses to do so, then, he can basically allow the text to 'speak for itself'. Yet in doing so, he also reminds its reader that it functions as a (mere) educational tool.

Conclusions

In this chapter, I have tried to describe the rhetorical operation of the features through which teaching films establish (audio-)visual relations with the pedagogical *dispositif* in which they (used to) function. Like the strategies of motivation which I discussed earlier, these textual elements are geared towards initiating (or prolonging) a communication with the viewer; similarly, they do this by implicating him, or a surrogate version of him, into the text. However, the references I just dealt with *also* contribute to a much more specific positioning of the spectator: they help encourage him to take on a preferential, didactically ‘appropriate’, viewing attitude.

In what precedes, I have distinguished three sets of discursive elements, based on how in each case the reference gets produced. This classification in turn has served as a starting point for some observations on the ways in which classroom films actively reflect on their own status as didactic tools. I have considered which factors contribute to (more) self-reflexiveness, and which functions they serve in terms of spectatorial address.

Next, I have discussed the historical significance of references to the *dispositif*. Over time, I argued, the integration of such elements seems to have increased. NOF’s early releases show relatively few signs of ‘awareness’ of their functional context – a fact which can be explained in part as an example of so-called ‘rhetorical constraint’. Films that were brought out later generally contain more. In the course of my chapter, I have related this evolution to the introduction of sound, and more tentatively, to a perceived change in user attitude towards all sorts of ‘authority-threatening’ didactic tools.

Finally, I have briefly considered the issue of whether or not such rhetorical elements can affect the power (im)balance that characterises a (traditional) pedagogical exchange, and which serves as a condition for the didactic functioning of a text. One of the more implicit purposes of this investigation was to find confirmation for my own views on what qualifies as a teaching film, as set out in the second half of chapter 2. In my last paragraph, I argued that authors who take the position that didactic films can command rhetorical power in or of themselves misconceive of the nature of pedagogical authority as well as overstating the possibility of textual autonomy. My conclusion was that such is not possible, because any didactic reference always needs to be endorsed within the very specific circumstances of its viewing; otherwise, it simply cannot acquire such meaning. A teacher may however choose to delegate some of his own functional power to whichever authorial agency manifests itself in the text. This substitute status, however, must be actively bequeathed by the film’s user, and ceases to apply (even retroactively) as soon as any doubts about its legitimacy are raised. In the latter case, it depends on how much this in turn affects the didactic plausibility of the statements made whether or not the text still functions as a ‘teaching film’.

CONCLUSIONS

It should indeed be observed that a pupil, in his experience of a film, is very *receptive* to anything that the maker may want to communicate. In a regular cinema, this receptivity can lead to a more than normal suggestibility, so that the critical mind no longer intervenes to judge the correctness of the information given. The class situation, however, differs considerably from the theatrical situation. The factors which play a crucial role in a cinema setting (the easy cinema chair, the yearning for *divertissement*, the anonymity of the viewer, the absolute darkness and isolation of the theatre, the 'surrender' to the authority of the film-maker and the identification with the hero or heroine of the story) are largely absent in the classroom. The obfuscation of the classroom, the involuntary perceptivity to everything that can be seen on the silver screen and the realistic character of the film can make the pupil more receptive to what is shown, but in itself, this is only an advantage. Suggestibility presupposes the fading into the background of the intellectual, critical functions of the mind; receptivity in contrast does not exclude activity of imagination and reason, but rather facilitates it.¹

In my introduction, I quoted a statement by Schoevers, NOF director-to-be, in which he strongly emphasises the textual peculiarities of the teaching film. In the document I cited from, he argues that classroom films are fundamentally different from other audio-visual texts, even ('broadly') educational ones. For the author, this distinctness apparently functions as a *sine qua non*: shorts that do not contain the ingredients mentioned, in his view, simply do not deserve the label 'teaching film' (*onderwijsfilm*). In the fragment quoted above, which is excerpted from Peters' *Visueel onderwijs*, the emphasis is shifted from the films' textual characteristics to the conditions of their viewing. Although the author of the 1955 manual admits elsewhere that most of the titles his institute provides have their own distinct features, he is convinced that also the classroom situation *itself* contributes to their functioning as teaching films. The circumstances of the screening, he suggests, entail that such shorts 'affect' their spectators in different ways than films seen in cinemas.²

In fact, the central idea in this section of Peters' text forms the basis of the approach which I have adopted in this work. Like the former director, I have taken the position that the conditions of a classroom viewing impinge upon the meanings which teaching films acquire. However, instead of concentrating on the psychological (read: immersive) effects of the physical circumstances of a screening, I have focused primarily on the power relations between the parties involved. This perspective has been crucial at two stages in my research: on the one hand, in the process of delineating and defining my object; on the other, in determining

my analytical approach. Arguably, the logic I have followed on both these occasions also constitutes the main difference between my own *modus operandi* and that of the authors who have studied similar corpora in the past.

In what follows, I would like to take a closer look at what my endeavours in these pages have contributed to the theory and practice of media studies. In my introduction, I explained that the teaching film, in this work, has the status of an analytical 'case': a corpus, and by extension, a textual category, that allows me to develop and test out a particular methodology. In the next few pages, I shall expound the merits of my approach – both in the conceptual sense, and in a more practical, analytical one.

But first, by way of recapitulation, I shall give a brief overview of the various contradictions (or *seeming* contradictions) that run through both halves of this text. In many cases, those discrepancies can be associated with the double function which both the suppliers and the enthusiastic users of classroom films attributed to the medium: on the one hand, that of instrument of motivation, and on the other, that of means to pass on didactic content. Historically speaking, this duality of purpose can provide an explanation for the reluctant acceptance of film in education, as well as for the variety of usage modes in daily practice. Rhetorically speaking, it reveals itself in two related – but distinct – forms of audience implication.

Finally, I shall mention some issues, or research options, which I have not explored here but which my project might in turn lead to or open up. In the process of formulating my own findings, I have raised new questions, both implicitly and explicitly. Some of those musings concerned the sort of films dealt with here; others shifted the attention to *other* texts or media types that were also designed to attain didactic objectives. At the end of this section, I shall briefly discuss a selection of them.

Film(s) for Teaching: Opposing Tendencies

My purpose in the first half of this work was to position my object, both in a historical sense and in a theoretical one. In this part, I have worked towards finding an answer to the question 'what is a teaching film?'; or, as Dirk Eitzen might prefer to phrase it: '*when* is a teaching film?'³ In this process, I have dealt with three sets of conflicting, or at the very least contrasting, ideas, ideals and practices.

The first opposition, reflected in the structure of the first half of chapter 1, is that between the convictions of early proponents of the use of film as an educational tool (very often, people who were not active in primary or secondary education themselves) and those of potential users, or their spokesmen. As it turns out, the same possibilities of the medium that the former group held in favour of its use constituted a reason for reticence among the latter.

After the first euphoric claims about the film medium's educational potential (among others, assertions concerning aspects of classroom efficiency) had proven somewhat unrealistic, proponents tended to concentrate their efforts on extolling its virtue as a *motivational* tool. Children, they argued, take a 'natural' interest in film; therefore, the medium can be exploited to stir their curiosity about subjects taught in school, or to exact a willingness to cooperate in class. Meanwhile, however, the teachers themselves, even the more enthusiastic ones, were

fearful precisely of the dangers which film's 'inherent' attractiveness entailed. Officially, their misgivings concerned the medium's association with theatrical entertainment – pastimes, in other words, that lacked the seriousness that any educational endeavour supposedly required. Most likely, however, the risk of loss of classroom authority was a more fundamental concern. Educational historians point out that teachers may have been worried that the introduction of new audio-visual tools would pose a threat to existing classroom relations and to the power prerogatives which they had acquired over time. Whichever was the main reason, specialised producers and distributors eventually did feel the need to take into account those (perceived) objections. Evidence of this can be found in the advice which they gave (very often, tips as to how the teachers could best reduce the dangers involved in using the medium) but also some of the productional decisions taken. In NOF's case, such choices primarily concerned restrictions on the use of film sound.

The second conflict, which closely relates to the first one, is that between the ideals of educational reformists, active in the period when the supply of film for education was gradually turning into a specialised business, and the users' demand for classroom tools that could fit as seamlessly as possible into long-established educational structures. Early enthusiasts, and at a later stage, film entrepreneurs, capitalised on the contemporary vogue of educational progressiveness, and 'sold' the medium as a means to transform the process of learning itself. Among the targeted users, however, the will to radically change the structures and conventions of *teaching* – after all, a necessary condition for the above transformation to take place – seemed to be limited. In the post-war years, classroom personnel had grown tired of pleas for educational reform; as a result, the medium's association with such calls only caused extra suspicion.⁴ In order for film to become even remotely acceptable as a classroom aid, then, users had to be reassured that it could function like any other (traditional) tool.

The third and last opposition that I would like to single out is that between the manual authors' claims that film in education can only generate a desirable effect if it is used more or less intensively, and the exceptional status of the medium in most primary and secondary classrooms. One of the principles which all NOF's user guides seem to defend is that children should be made to conceive of the teaching film as an 'ordinary' didactic tool. One of the ways in which they argue this can be achieved is by embedding its use into the everyday course of classroom proceedings, and by the same token, the framework of the formal curriculum. Another tactic mentioned is to simply screen films often enough. The manuals suggest that if only instructors use the medium regularly, they can help it lose its hue of entertainment tool and allow it to become a 'regular' teaching aid – although, quite paradoxically, a particularly *attractive*, and therefore, effective one. In practice, however, most of the people who saw films in school have memories of occasional screenings in which part, or even all, of the institute's user advice was simply ignored.

In spite of this, I have chosen at the end of part I to take my methodological cue precisely from instances of more intensive use. The argument I advanced in this context is that shorts that were deployed as part of what I designated as 'occasional' screenings simply could not have functioned as classroom tools, and therefore, cannot be conceived of as actual *teaching* films. Yet even if this entails that the meanings I inferred may not always have 'materialised' in practice – although I would like to emphasise again that the primary sources do not suggest

that this would have been *overwhelmingly* so – I believe that this is due primarily to the relative uncommonness of the teaching film phenomenon *as such*.⁵ In other words, it does not reduce the validity of the interpretations which I made.

Also in the second half of this work, two opposing tendencies can be traced. Again, each of those separately can be related to one of the main educational functions which primary sources attribute to the film medium.

In chapter 4, I dealt with the ways in which teaching films seek to motivate their viewers to stay tuned – either by making attractive the matter dealt with, or by making more appealing the process of watching/listening. The strategies which I inferred were all based on assumptions as to the targeted audience's preferences as *film viewers*. I claimed, in other words, that they derive their rhetorical force from the fact that they help underline, accentuate, or foreground what spectators (already) find attractive about the medium itself. In this context, my 'roundaboutness' scale should be seen as a measure of how, in this process of motivation, the didactically relevant matter – the metaphorical 'pill' – is oftentimes concealed, or 'sugar-coated'. In one way or another, all the films I have dealt with draw on conventions which the pupils knew from their experience as spectators; knowledge which, indeed, they must have acquired for the most part *outside* of their classrooms, and as part of their leisure activities (by definition, activities more attractive than those performed in school). Rhetorically speaking, then, all of these shorts somehow embrace the 'sweetness' or 'sugary taste' of the film medium itself. The difference between them lies in the extent to which, in this process, they seem to actively *deflect* the audience's attention from the didactic matter that had to be passed on.

In chapter 5, I have concentrated instead on the signs of 'didacticity' – or to resume my pharmacological analogy: the 'medicinal qualities' – of the material under scrutiny. References to some aspect or feature of the pedagogical *dispositif* directly or indirectly remind the audience of the tool status of the material shown. In what precedes, I have argued that also this type of textual elements can be read as means to bring about or prolong the communication with the viewers, albeit in this case by alerting them to their educational duties rather than to capitalise on the more 'seductive' qualities of the medium itself.

Rhetorical Analysis: Tools, Perspectives, Scope

The analytical method which I tried out in this work rests on two conceptual 'pillars'; notions developed, respectively, in the course of chapters 2 and 3. The first is the idea that film texts function, and therefore, acquire meaning, as part of a wider set-up: the configuration referred to earlier as a/the (pedagogical) *dispositif*. The second is the principle of textual implication. In my analytical chapters, I have worked on the assumption that the rhetorical functioning of films is always (also) a matter of 'implicating' the audience – with an expression that can be interpreted both as meaning 'involving it in', as in the case of a crime (the rhetorical *objective*), and as referring to the fact that in this process of addressing, the viewers are being placed, as it were, 'inside the text' (the rhetorical *means*).

Textual Analysis and the *Dispositif*

My main contribution to current debates in media studies, I believe, is that I turned the

dispositif notion (which, in recent years, has been widely explored as a theoretical concept; among others, in my own department in Utrecht) into a practical, *analytical* tool. In this work, I demonstrated how it can be used to specify the particular set-up in which readings take place. Within the framework of current thought on how textual meaning takes shape, it is no longer possible to ignore in the process of interpretation the conditions in which media are presented and consumed. For practical reasons, however, one does need to make abstraction of those conditions – especially if one’s interpretive activity concerns texts that came about, and were read, in a non-retrievable past. In what precedes, I have shown that both requirements can be reconciled: that it is very well possible to take one’s inspiration from evidence of historical practices, while also making (well-founded) choices among the variety encountered, and to take those preferences as analytical parameters or reference points.

By the same token, I also hope to have given an impetus to a reevaluation of textual analysis within the field of media studies. The close reading of audio-visual texts is a practice which, in recent years, has been somewhat marginalised. Possibly, this fact can be associated with a current preoccupation with all sorts of transformations in the media landscape – developments which, in recent decades, have been experienced as particularly acute, and which seem to have provoked an urge among scholars to map out the features of ‘old’ and ‘newer’ media (or, more and more often, the mutual connections between them). However, the relevance of such endeavours to the researchers concerned (as well as to a rather broad non-specialist public) does not entail that questions concerning textual meaning are no longer legitimate. In my view, a thorough understanding of our media culture will inevitably require that similar issues are also raised with respect to the ‘texts’ associated with, or generated by, those newer media.⁶

Another possible reason for the lesser popularity of textual analysis is the negative associations which this practice brings to mind; relations for instance with essentialist methods (among others, geared towards the identification of signs of generic specificity) or overly structuralist ones (which, in turn, are blemished with the stain of immanentism). Answering questions concerning textual meaning, of course, requires a very different approach. But by the same token, it also demands an entirely different view of what ‘textuality’ involves. In my view, a text should be conceived of not as something which is, to all eternity, fixated on paper or film stock or captured in travelling code, but as something that is inextricably bound up with, and to some extent even *incorporates*, a specific – although variable – *dispositif*.⁷

Using the notion in this way, I believe, prevents one from focusing exclusively on that which is traditionally seen as ‘the text’ (for instance, in earlier studies of audio-visual rhetoric, which drew on mathematical models of communication) and to consider instead how it acquires meaning *in relation to* a socially distinct audience, watching within an equally specific institutional framework.⁸ In the course of my own analysis, for instance, I have repeatedly stressed the importance of the relational aspect of a pedagogical *dispositif*, and more specifically, the significance within such a constellation of the power relations between pupils (the viewers) and a teacher (the film’s deployer). Compared to a ‘regular’ cinema set-up, this configuration incorporates an ‘extra’ human agent; i.e., one that does *not* belong to the group of people that make up the film’s primary audience (in traditional communicative terms: the message’s ‘receivers’ or ‘addressees’). This other party, however, cannot be reduced

to a mere circumstantial factor, an aspect of the communicational *décor* that can help ease, or alternatively, hamper (as a producer of so-called ‘noise’) the transmission of what is said and/or shown. For after all, the teacher’s decisions ultimately also determine whether the title screened can indeed function as a classroom film. At the same time, his actions can only have such consequences when considered within *this* specific framework and viewer group – hence also my refusal to consider him the (sole) ‘enunciator’ (or in communicative terms: ‘transmitter’, or ‘addresser’) of the filmic ‘message’.⁹ The merits of a perspective that thus emphasises the interactions between the various constituents of a *dispositif* far exceed the limits of the corpus dealt with here.

Audience Implication

A second advantage of widening the scope of one’s notion of textuality is that it counteracts any inclination to go search for genre-specific characteristics. Within the approach I have proposed here, what is ‘particular’ about a corpus of films is not just what one sees and/or hears when viewing them – for after all, few of those elements, if any, can be considered unique to a given genre – but rather the ways in which, within a given social/institutional framework, they generate what Jean-Pierre Esquenazi calls a (situation-specific) ‘effect’ (for instance, a ‘family/classroom film effect’).¹⁰ Very useful, in this respect, is the second conceptual pillar which I mentioned above: that of textual implication.

The phrase ‘implied audience’, I explained, derives from a literary concept, developed in the 1960s and 1970s. The version of the notion that I am using here is different in a number of ways from its narratological example; most notably, in terms of its flexibility. Within a media studies context, after all, a concept is required that accommodates for a much larger variety of reading/user modes than a study of literary texts (which may often presuppose a single, highly concentrated reader). This way, its bounds and parameters can be (re)defined on every occasion, for every particular corpus.¹¹

For instance, the implied audience which I constructed in this work is an institutionally defined collective rather than a loose combination of individual readers/viewers. As opposed to authors who have studied similar corpora in the past, I do not conceive of this entity as a mere pedagogical one, but as one that *also* draws on its experience as a film audience (in the broadest sense of that term).¹² However, even such a category of addressees is still too broad to be useful in analytical practice. As I said, the strategies which I identified derive their rhetorical potential from the fact that they can function as elements of spectatorial ‘appeal’. Whether or not they do so, however, also depends on the viewing attitude which a given audience is likely to adopt within a specific *dispositif*. As I explained in chapter 4, this observation is relevant in particular to those textual elements that *gain* in attractiveness because of the fact that the activity of film viewing itself is one that does not normally take place in class.¹³

Another benefit of using the notion of an implied audience is that it can prevent one from considering films that seem to address their viewers in a very ‘direct’ way as *forcing* certain readings upon their spectators. (And I am thinking here in particular of sound titles, the category which earlier studies of educational corpora tended to concentrate on.) Ultimately, textual interpretation is always about the detection of ‘potentials’: rhetorical possibilities that come to activation in *some* performative situations, but may get blocked in certain others. Even

items that appear to claim a good deal of (rhetorical) authority, then, cannot be considered to unilaterally 'control' their own reading in any way.

***Dispositif*, Implication, and the 'Unfinished' Text**

One of the main advantages of my analytical approach, in other words, is that it can help suppress one's inclination to make pronouncements about textual meaning as an overly immanent (and static) given. In principle, of course, an awareness of the instability of signification is beneficial to the close reading of any sort of corpus, audio-visual or otherwise. However, I do suspect that my approach may be *particularly* suited to the study of what I have designated in chapter 3 as 'unfinished' media texts.

In this work, I basically suggested that any title that is considered in isolation – i.e., without reference to its relevant *dispositif* – is in a sense 'incomplete', or 'amputated'. The term 'unfinished', however, has been used more specifically with reference to corpora, often of a kind that would fit the 'utility' bill (a notion discussed in the introduction) that seem rhetorically 'underdetermined'.¹⁴ My argument on the matter was that such texts are *particularly* dependent on the situations in which they are 'performed', if only because of the fact that when seen (or studied) elsewhere, they seem to present all sorts of interpretational problems. (Evidence of this are the many studies which retrospectively denunciate representatives of such corpora, but by extension entire genres, as stylistically 'backward' – in my view, signs of incomprehension rather than enlightening characterisations of the material concerned.¹⁵) The approach which I have taken here may help solve, or at the very least mitigate, some of these interpretive difficulties.

Possibly, the analysis of *other* 'unfinished' text types may even draw on some of the categories which I developed here. At the same time, however, it opens up, and perhaps even necessitates, the construction of new ones, which allow for different emphases. For instance, it may not be useful, for every corpus, to differentiate between the two kinds of rhetoric which I have concentrated on. While the motivational strategies which I identified are common to a wide variety of texts, this does not apply to the various references to the *dispositif*. Such elements, after all, precisely foreground that which sets classroom films apart: their status as tools in a pedagogical exchange. Although it is very well possible that similar references (to other *dispositifs*) occur in *non*-teaching films as well, these necessarily have to be conceptualised in different ways. In other corpora, moreover, the positioning of the viewer which such elements help attain does not necessarily establish, or exploit, a relation to a *cinematic*, or even televisual, *dispositif*. For instance, also advertising films place their viewers in well-delineated roles (such as, that of housekeeper in the case of a cleaning product commercial; that of *bon vivant* in a luxury holiday advert); however, the functions they reference are not always those that spectators fulfil at the (exact) time of watching.

Using the same example to hypothesise a little further, I would like to postulate that another distinction which I made, that between 'direct' and 'roundabout', may be applicable more widely. At the end of my first analytical chapter, I have asked the question of how, in the process of motivation, teaching films approach the didactic matter which they are meant to help pass on. In doing so, I have discriminated between the argument which a short makes (and which can very well be didactically 'irrelevant', as most of the language titles mentioned

demonstrate) and that which constitutes the educational 'point' of the exchange that takes place. Again, this distinction is significant primarily in films that have a clear instrumental function. In the case of advertising films, for instance, the notion of roundaboutness can be used to discuss how directly they deal with the features – the use, the practicality, the 'good taste' – of the product which they are supposed to help sell. Extreme 'roundabout' examples, here, would be those texts that do not even mention (or visualise) a particular good or brand, but count instead on the viewers' ability, or willingness, to make the association for themselves (for example, on the basis of the recognisability of the text as part of a campaign that extends over a longer period of time).¹⁶

In addition to this, my roundaboutness scale might also fulfil a comparative function. In my view, it can help make, or sharpen, the distinction between texts that need to be associated with different rhetorical frames. Take for instance the wildlife television documentaries studied by León. It is my expectation that such titles would be *less* roundabout than the ones I have discussed. The reason is that they do not normally form part of a wider didactic exchange, in which at least *some* of the matter that needs to be taught can be conveyed by the deploying instructor rather than by the film, or programme, itself. When it comes to the making of an educational argument, then, such texts are basically 'left to their own devices'.¹⁷ Therefore, while they do make use of strategies that are geared towards making the viewing experience itself more attractive (as León's work confirms), they cannot rely on such tactics *exclusively*, like some of the films dealt with here (for instance, those intended for language teaching). In addition to this, wildlife documentaries tend to serve a double rhetorical purpose. Apart from passing on certain biological/natural historical facts, León points out, they also seek to make more attractive the practice of science itself. Again, this seems to necessitate a more intensive use of strategies that foreground the appeal of the matter dealt with. Only a more extensive comparison, however, can establish whether such films therefore also motivate their viewers in more direct ways.¹⁸

Educational Media: Uncovered Ground

In what precedes, I have discussed some of the insights which I think my research has contributed to current debates in media studies, both in a (film) historical sense and in a conceptual and methodological one. To finish off, I would like to mention a few issues, or areas of research, which I have touched upon, but could not discuss in detail because of the research scope which I delineated at the outset. I shall focus here on questions that concern either my own object (teaching films) or pragmatically 'related' ones (educational media in the broadest sense of the term).

Corpora

The first point which I would like to make is that my own study of rhetorical devices in classroom films can be extended in a number of directions. In this work, I have focused on a very specific corpus – a choice which immediately resulted in a number of restrictions. On the one hand, of course, in terms of periodisation, because of the time frame which I adopted; on the other, in the spatial sense, due to the geographical range of NOF's distribution activities. Both of these restrictions have also had their advantages; for instance, the fact that I could

deal with a manageable batch of films, without having to compromise in my analysis in terms of textual variety – a variety which, I believe, must have been relevant to the then audience at least to some extent. Meanwhile, however, it also raised a number of (new) questions, that can only be answered through confrontation with other corpuses.

One possibility here is a comparison with foreign collections. A query which I still have at this point is to what extent the observations I made are nationally-specific. As I said, the collection I focused on is remarkably diverse – a consequence of the fact that it was administered by a sizeable body, which, after its first decade or so, closely cooperated with producers and distributors elsewhere. At the same time, however, NOF also held views that were rather exceptional in an international context, and that have affected the composition of the collection accordingly; for example, in terms of the ratio between films with/without sound. Some of the conclusions I have formulated here are closely bound up with such aspects of institutional policy. (I am thinking for instance of my statements on a historical evolution towards more references to the pedagogical *dispositif*.) One can wonder therefore whether those observations are valid only for the teaching film in the Netherlands, or applicable more generally.¹⁹

Another, related series of questions that an international comparison might answer emerges from a consideration of the historical conditions for the proliferation and institutionalisation of classroom films. Although I tried, in the beginning of my first chapter, to keep my horizon as broad as possible, I have gradually zoomed in on the very specific events that led up to the foundation of a (state-supervised) distribution agency in the Netherlands. Research conducted elsewhere suggests that in other parts of Europe, those events, as well as the dynamics between the interest groups involved, are different in subtle ways, even if the parties themselves seem to represent roughly the same (social, professional) categories. It might be worth finding out, therefore, which national patterns are distinguishable here, and especially, in the light of my own interest in classroom film rhetoric, which are the relations between those patterns and the institutional ‘preferences’ referred to above.²⁰

A second cluster of issues that have preoccupied me but require more intensive study of other corpora concern the various relations between the films I have discussed here and other audio-visual media deployed for didactic purposes, both at the time (slides, filmstrips, school radio) and later on (for instance, various combinations of computer hard- and software). With reference to the first category, a concrete question would be whether, rhetorically speaking, they revolve around the same motivational foci and/or if they make use of the same types of strategies as teaching films. For instance, does textual purposiveness also play a role in filmstrips or (series/successions of) slides? How prominent is the strategy of providing access in auditory texts; do educational radio broadcasts, for instance, make use of it as well? Or alternatively, do the latter, by analogy with visual texts, exploit the formal attractiveness of certain sound elements? The second category of media, in turn, could be the object of a diachronic study that tries to answer the question which strategies become more/less prominent over time. It seems likely, for instance, that those procedures which underscore a matter’s comprehensibility or open up the possibility of experiential correspondence (techniques that are very common also in titles that target a wider audience of non-specialists) still play an important part in contemporary didactic audio-visual texts. At the same time, one might

presume that (narrative) purposiveness is foregrounded less, especially in items that work on the basis of a principle of ‘random access’, and do not present their users with a (chronological) sequence of facts or events.²¹

Another series of rhetorical questions which a comparison of educational media might help answer concerns the occurrence of references to the *dispositif*. Again, a study focusing on such textual markers might either concentrate exclusively on tools available in the immediate post-war decades, or establish the relation with more contemporary ones. In the first case, the hypothesis could be advanced that school radio broadcasts, because of the centrality of a surrogate teacher’s voice, contain quite a few. Slides, in contrast, probably feature less. In more recent media texts, one might expect varying degrees of self-reflexiveness – much like in the titles dealt with here.

Configurations

It is to be expected that many of the differences that would surface as part of such a comparison might be traced back to shifts in the mutual relations between the constituents of a pedagogical *dispositif*. The particular configuration which I have worked with here, of course, is specific to a teaching *film* situation. In a constellation that involves a different apparatus, the relations between the various ‘players’ within that set-up are necessarily different – a given which in turn affects the interpretation of the texts that are the object of scrutiny. In my introduction, I summed up some of the discrepancies between the *dispositifs* that can be associated with, respectively, the use of film and (school) television broadcasts. An analogue distinction could also be made, for instance, between the shorts discussed here and educational slides, which much more emphatically ask for verbal accompaniment by a teacher, and therefore, are *less* likely to stimulate what I referred to in chapter 5 as a ‘delegation’ of teacher authority. A confrontation of films and radio broadcasts, in contrast, might lead to the opposite conclusion.²²

Equally intriguing is the question of which differences might come to light in a confrontation of texts that can be associated with more and less participatory *dispositifs*; for instance, the items under scrutiny here as compared to some of the so-called ‘interactive’ media of recent decades. Deployment of the latter, even as part of a more or less ‘traditional’ classroom set-up (as in the ‘computer labs’ of the 1980s and 1990s) necessarily entails a shift both in the relations between teacher and pupils (if only because it is the *latter* who are the ‘users’ of the medium here) and in terms of what constitutes the didactic ‘text’ – a question which, if it can be answered at all, might get different replies in each child’s case.²³

Following on from this last observation, one can also wonder if such media, *even* if they are used for ‘standard’ classroom purposes, can be conceptualised in analogue ways. In a recent article, I made the suggestion that most of the films dealt with in this work should be conceived of as *teaching* tools (means, in other words, to pass something ‘down’ from an instructor to a pupil or student) rather than as *learning* tools (i.e., resources for helping viewers to acquire certain knowledge or skills). This conclusion was based on a combination of pronouncements made in primary sources, such as instruction booklets and guides, and the findings of educational historians on how those aids were put to use.²⁴ The question is whether the same can also be said of software for PCs, for instance, or online applications.

Of course, the latter as well might take on the role of mere ‘transporters’ of content that is commonly considered relevant to formal education. However, some of the conditions of their use – and most notably, the fact that the hardware they work with needs to be operated by the pupils rather than their teachers – inevitably makes them into tools for *learners* at least to some extent. In addition to this, one might also argue that the fact that it is the students themselves who ‘generate’ a ‘text’ foregrounds the meaning of the aid in the process of teaching/acquiring a certain audio-visual competence, and thus, the possibility of a shift in terms of what I designated earlier as the ‘didactic matter’. The question which occupies me here is how specific media texts (the particular programmes, or applications, deployed) play along with this ‘new’ reality.

Competencies

A last series of research questions that this work raises and that I would like to briefly mention here tie in with this last issue, and concern the subject of media literacy or media competence: the ability of users/viewers to interpret, deploy, or (co)produce audio-visual texts. The one point in this work where I have dealt with this matter explicitly is in the context of my analysis of historical discourse on the educational role of the film medium. Among others, I referred to sources quoted by NOF itself, which discuss the ways in which (young) viewers ‘read’ audio-visual media, and what they can – and above all, *cannot* – interpret or understand. One of the questions that I have not yet asked is what the films themselves, once more, can tell us here. What sort of readerly abilities (i.e., knowledge of principles or conventions of representation or mediation) do they exploit, and by the same token, presuppose, in their addressees?²⁵ Also, which transformations do texts show over time, in terms of those ‘implied’ competencies? A review of my corpus from this perspective – or for that matter, of *any* corpus, whether explicitly educational, or not – seems useful in particular as part of a comparative endeavour, which also includes other text or media types.

Such a comparison, moreover, can also help shed more light on the (shifting) role which media themselves play in the process of developing – stimulating, activating – this literacy. Above I made the remark that didactic tools which demand more initiative from the pupils inevitably foreground their own role in the development of their users’ media skills. In practice, of course, *all* texts do this to some extent, also the kind which I have concentrated on.²⁶ A question that still occupies me here is how this role of stimulant relates to the particular medial ‘constellation’ of given period, and how it developed in the course of time. For instance, I would imagine that in a present-day context, as a consequence of the logic of what Henry Jenkins and others have called ‘media convergence’, the stimulation of such competencies takes a more inter- or transmedial form than in the decades I covered. In other words, familiarity with the conventions of one medium or application, these days, is probably more likely to lead to insights into the operation of, or the ability to work with, a series of others.²⁷ In order to be able to state this with more confidence, however, I would have to dig into the matter quite a bit deeper – another possible endeavour for the future.

NOTES

Introduction

1. "Indien een film een onderwerp in zijn geheel naar het leven behandelt, b.v. een bedrijf, een landstreek, het leven of de lotgevallen van mensen, dieren, planten, enz. dan behoort ze, daar de speelfilms hier buiten beschouwing blijven [sic] tot de categorie der Onderwijsfilms, der Propaganda (Opvoedkundige) films of der Culturele films. [...] De Onderwijsfilms moeten [...] echter aan de volgende eisen voldoen, waardoor ze zich [...] sterk onderscheiden van Opvoedkundige en Culturele films. [...] 1. Ze geven een stukje werkelijkheid, waarbij onderwerpen te pas komen, welke in het leerplan van alle lagere scholen passen. [...] 2. Het leven moet op zodanige wijze weergegeven worden, dat bij de leerlingen de suggestie gewekt wordt, alsof ze het gebeuren in werkelijkheid beleven. [...] 3. Er moet een minimum aan aanschouwelijkheid geboden worden [...]. Overbodige details moeten dus weggelaten of op de achtergrond gehouden worden [...]. [...] 4. De gebeurtenissen moeten zodanig opgenomen zijn en zo geregeld op elkaar volgen, dat de samenhang geen te grote moeilijkheden oplevert." "Keuze van films voor het onderwijs," n.d., Nationaal Archief (henceforth abbreviated as 'NA'), The Hague, archive of the 'Stichting Nederlandse Onderwijs Film' (hereafter 'NOF'), access number 2.19.042.55, inventory number 6, pp. 1-2. (For a remark on the notation of my references to this collection, see the bibliography at the end of this work.)

2. For examples and references, see chapter 1.

3. Again, I refer to chapter 1 for examples.

4. The author is most likely A. A. Schoevers; his project will be discussed in chapter 1. For the above arguments, compare for instance his "Projekt einer Schulfilmorganisation in Holland," [1940], NA, NOF, 2.19.042.55, inv. no. 2, p. 1 (a document that does credit him).

5. Accurately translating a term like *onderwijsfilm* is a difficult, perhaps even impossible, task. *Onderwijs*, in Dutch, means 'education', but also 'teaching'. Because of the original's connotation with formal, compulsory schooling, I shall stick in what follows to the English terms 'classroom film' and 'teaching film'. Although both of these phrases are somewhat less common than the more widely used 'educational film' (especially in the US), they do turn up in primary sources from the period I deal with; consider for instance Andrew Buchanan, *The Film in Education* (London: Phoenix House, 1951), a post-war survey of British educational film production and use, including that of so-called 'classroom films'; and PEP (Political and Economic Planning), *The Factual Film: A Survey sponsored by the Dartington Hall Trustees* (London: Oxford University Press, on behalf of The Arts Enquiry, 1947), an official report from around the same time, which also speaks of 'teaching films'. The reason why I prefer them in this text is that I shall focus on a very specific category of items (the boundaries of which shall be delineated further on) which both of these terms render more fully. In either case, the qualifier used – 'classroom'/'teaching' – contains an aspect of meaning that is also present in the Dutch one (in one case, the location/institution within which the films were meant to be shown; in the other, the practice they were supposed to support). A combination of both, as in the main title of this work, therefore, is the most evocative. For convenience's sake, however, I shall tend to use either one, or the other.

6. Most pressure groups which advocated the establishment of similar bodies, such as the Nederlandse Vereniging voor Culturele film, more often used the term *leerfilm* ('learning film'); see for instance "Plan voor een leerfilmorganisatie in Nederland," *Lichtbeeld en Cultuur* 18, no. 4 (1941): 50-59. Compare also J. J. van der Meulen's series of articles for the teachers' union magazine *Christelijk Schoolblad*, entitled "De Film op School," published between October 1931 and March 1932 (respectively, on 29 October, 26 November and 31 December 1931, and 14 January and 3 March 1932; most of these items are signed 'v.d.M.', but their authorship can be established with near-certainty).

7. Compare for instance [J. J.] v[an] d[er] M[eulen], "Paedagoog en cineast," *Christelijk Schoolblad*, 5 February 1942, 3, which uses it in a more generic sense, and "De onderwijsfilm," *Christelijk Schoolblad*, 17 January 1946, 1-2, a piece by the same author which talks about the recently established institute. In the early 1930s, the articles' writer mostly still used the term *leerfilm*; see previous note.

8. Here, but also elsewhere in this text, I am using the term 'foregrounding' in the most general sense: as designating a (figuratively) 'placing in the foreground'. I am not using it in the much more restricted sense specified by the Russian Formalists (and in particular, the Czech structuralist Jan Mukařovský, who further developed their ideas), and later on, in the arena of film studies, by David Bordwell (as in *Narration in the Fiction Film* (London: Methuen, 1985); a definition and an example can be found on pp. 152-53).

9. Like its (prospective) Dutch counterpart, the official German classroom film institute (Reichsanstalt für Film und Bild in Wissenschaft und Unterricht, dealt more at length in chapter 1) was very particular about the terminology it used to refer to its product; see Malte Ewert, *Die Reichsanstalt für Film und Bild in Wissenschaft und Unterricht (1934-1945)* (Hamburg: Verlag Dr. Kovac, 1998), 197-98.

10. Again, I refer to chapter 1 for examples that illustrate the statements I make here.

Of course, the naming principle discussed in this paragraph applies not only to teaching films in the strict sense, but also to other titles which served a more 'utilitarian' purpose, so to speak, than either the *divertissement*, or the 'educational entertainment' ("leerend vermaken", as a Flemish commentator once put it) of a general audience (see J. M. de Keuster, of *Vlaamsch Opvoedkundig Tijdschrift*, as quoted in "De onderwijsfilm in het buitenland," *Mededelingen van de NOF*, February 1947, 1). Consider for instance such labels as 'research film', 'army training film', or 'commercial film' – all phrases used in English-language publications of the late 1940s and early 1950s. See, respectively, Buchanan, *The Film in Education*, 17; Charles F. Hoban, *Movies That Teach* (New York: Dryden, 1946), 103; F. Dean McClusky, "The Nature of the Educational Film," in *Film and Education: A Symposium on the Role of the Film in the Field of Education*, ed. Godfrey M. Elliott (New York: Philosophical Library, 1948), 24. (McClusky here references an earlier source, from 1923.)

11. I shall elucidate this point in chapter 2, paragraph 2.1.

'Utility film' is a translation of the German *Gebrauchsfilm*, the term used to refer to the object of two consecutive issues of the journal *montage/AV: Zeitschrift für Theorie & Geschichte audiovisueller Kommunikation* (vols. 14, no. 2 and 15, no. 1), edited by Vinzenz Hediger. (For a rough definition, see his "Editorial," *montage/AV* 14, no. 2 (2005): 4.) Hediger himself used the English translation 'utility film' during the International Industrial Film Workshop (Ruhr-Universität Bochum, Germany, on 9 and 10 December 2004). In their introduction to a recent issue of *Film History: An International Journal*, editors Dan Streible, Martina Roepke and Anke Mebold translate the German original as 'useful film'; see "Introduction: Nontheatrical Film," *Film History* 19, no. 4 (2007): 339. Of course, the term is somewhat problematic, since it presupposes that films shown for purposes of entertainment cannot be considered 'utilitarian'. However, also many of its alternatives are based on unjustifiable generalisations; for instance, 'non-theatrical film', as used in the title of the *Film History* issue mentioned above (a deployment which is criticised in a review by Nico de Klerk, "Onvolkomen definities van amateurfilm en bioscoop," *Skriften* 40, no. 4 (2008): 60).

As an exhaustive overview of recent work in what might be called 'utility film studies' would lead me too far, I shall restrict myself here to some references to projects that focus on materials made, or used, for educational purposes. For research carried out in France, a valuable source of information is Béatrice de Pastre-Robert, Monique Dubost and Françoise Massit-Folléa, eds., *Cinéma pédagogique et scientifique: À la redécouverte des archives* (Paris: ENS Éditions, 2004), the proceedings of a 1999 colloquium entitled "Archives du cinéma pédagogique et scientifique à l'heure du multimédia," held in Fontenay-Saint-Cloud. See for instance pp. 9-10 (for the names of research centres, publications and other symposia), pp. 18-19 (where mention is made of a *regain d'intérêt*) and p. 56 (where the authors refer to another recently held workshop). Between 2002 and 2006, the University of Zurich hosted the project "Views and Perspectives: Studies on the History of Non-Fiction Film in Switzerland to 1964"; one of the researchers involved, Anita Gertiser, focused in her study on teaching films. For more information, see http://www.film.unizh.ch/forschung/projekte/troehler_ansichten.html. In the US, a major occasion for educational film scholars to present their work was the 2006 Orphan Film Symposium (entitled: "Orphans 5: Science, Industry and Education," held from 26 to 29 March of that year at the University of South-Carolina, Columbia, SC). Presentations of the participants, with references to their respective projects, can be accessed through http://www.sc.edu/filmsymposium/Orphans_Sound/orphans.htm. Recent volumes containing articles on the sort of subjects dealt with in those projects are *montage/AV* 15, no. 1 (2006) (one of the theme issues on *Gebrauchsfilme*) and *Film History* 19, no. 4 (2007) (an issue on 'non-theatrical film').

13. As far as I am aware, the phrase 'ephemeral film' was first used in a descriptive manner by Rick Prelinger, who referred with it to the material contained in his Prelinger Archive collection, now (partially) online at the Internet Archive website (<http://www.archive.org>). For a very succinct definition, see <http://www.archive.org/details/ephemera>.

In his contribution to the 2004 French volume mentioned in the previous note, Jacques Perriault, speaking here specifically of research into 'documentaries and scientific and pedagogical films', attributes the lack of interest in such material in past decades to two main factors. On the one hand, he relates it to a dearth of platforms for the study of such films, due in part to the fact that both researchers and the public at large have

long associated 'the birth of cinema' exclusively with its exhibition in entertainment venues. On the other hand, an insufficiently strong tradition of theoretical reflection when it comes to the study of (the evolution of) projected images. Massit-Folléa, in the same collection, adds to Perriault's points that the fast succession and/or replacement of (educational) audio-visual media, as a result of a combination of technical obsolescence, a permanent need for the 'actualisation' of contents, and policy changes, simply does not leave much time for scientific reflection. See, respectively, Perriault, "L'apport des archives du film pédagogique et scientifique aux sciences de l'homme et de la société," and Massit-Folléa, "Une nouvelle vie pour les archives," both in Pastre-Robert, Dubost and Massit-Folléa, *Cinéma pédagogique et scientifique*, 8-11 and 11-14, and 131, respectively.

14. The link between archive practice and research is established, among others, in Massit-Folléa, "Nouvelle vie pour les archives," 131. The term 'orphan film' is the medium-specific equivalent of 'orphan work', commonly employed to identify artefacts of which the copyright status is (or has become) unclear. In the film archive world, it is often used in a broader sense to refer to all moving images that do not have interested 'caregivers': people who, usually out of some sort of a financial interest, make sure that they are preserved, and subsequently, shown and/or studied (again). In circles of media scholars, the label gained more widespread use after being adopted by the organisers of the first Orphan Film Symposium (1999). However, it had already been introduced to circles of preservationists before that time (compare for instance the links at <http://www.sc.edu/filmsymposium/orphanfilm.html>).

15. In this context, Perriault speaks of the preponderance of "the chronology of events and technical/technological histories" ("la chronologie événementielle et l'histoire technique"); see Perriault, "Apport des archives du film," 18; compare also p. 11 of the same piece. An example of this tendency is Anthony Slide's *Before Video: A History of the Non-Theatrical Film* (New York: Greenwood, 1992). Also most of the presentations that were part of the session entitled "Modernizing Mass Instruction: Film and Institutions of American Visual Education" at the 2005 Society for Cinema and Media Studies (SCMS) conference (London, UK, 3 April) can be considered to fit this bill. The one article that was ever written about the collection I study here, Bert Hogenkamp's "'De onderwijlsfilm is geen Duitse uitvinding': A. A. Schoevers, Ph. A. Kohnstamm en de Nederlandse Onderwijs Film, 1941-1949," in *Stichting Film en Wetenschap – Audiovisueel Archief Jaarboek 1996* (Amsterdam: Stichting Film en Wetenschap / Nederlands Audiovisueel Archief, 1997), 55-90, deals primarily with aspects of *institutional* history.

16. An example mentioned further down this text is Larry Cuban, *Teachers and Machines: The Classroom Use of Technology Since 1920* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1986). Also Paul Saettler, *The Evolution of American Educational Technology*, 2nd ed. (Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing, 1990) contains a good deal of references to publications of this type. A focus on the optimisation of current production also marks some of the research that has been carried out within a media studies context; for instance, Geneviève Jacquinet's *Image et pédagogie: Analyse sémiologique du film à intention didactique* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1977), a book I shall consider more closely in the next few pages.

The kind of work I refer to here can be considered an extension of research on contemporary didactic media, which has abounded ever since the 'beginnings' of moving image use in education, and is still being carried out. A major publication in this area is *Audio-visual Communication Review* (published by the American National Education Association since 1953, and continued after 1977 as *Educational Communication and Technology*).

17. Consider for instance the list put together by Rick Prelinger, in his book *The Field Guide to Sponsored Films* (San Francisco: National Film Preservation Foundation, 2006), x.

18. For an elucidation of the principles of the latter type of research practice, see for instance the editor's introduction to Mieke Bal, ed., *The Practice of Cultural Analysis: Exposing Interdisciplinary Interpretation* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999), 1-14.

19. In subsequent writings, Jacquinet would shift her attention to contemporary teaching tools such as television and, later on, interactive media. Examples are *L'école devant les écrans* (Paris: ESF, 1985); *Les genres télévisuels dans l'enseignement*, co-edited with Gérard Leblanc (Paris: Centre national de documentation pédagogique, 1996); and the edited volume *Les jeunes et les médias: Perspectives de la recherche dans le monde* (Marly-le-Roi: INJEP / Paris: L'Harmattan, 2002). In the years before her superannuation, Jacquinet was head of the Groupe de Recherche sur les Apprentissages, les Médias et l'Éducation (GRAMÉ) at the University of Paris VIII (Vincennes-Saint-Denis), which conducts a variety of research on the interface between pedagogy, and information and communication science (see <http://com-media.univ-paris8.fr/commun/recherche.htm>).

20. See Jacquinet, *Image et Pédagogie*, passim. For a remark on the sort of insights her research should eventually lead to (compare also n. 16), see pp. 21-22; for her final conclusions, see pp. 113-14. The author's main sources are Christian Metz' *Essais sur la signification au cinéma*, vol. 1 (Paris: Klincksieck, 1968) and *Langage et Cinéma* (Paris: Larousse, 1971).

21. The term 'formulaic', with reference to classroom films, was used by Streible, organiser of the aforementioned Orphan Film Symposia, during a lecture in Amsterdam (Universiteit van Amsterdam, the Netherlands, 4 April 2005). More indirectly, evaluations to this effect have been made in Roger Odin, "Film documentaire Lecture

documentarisante," in *Cinémas et Réalités*, ed. Jean-Jacques Lyant and Roger Odin (Saint-Étienne: CIEREC, 1984), 272 (where the author refers to 'pedagogical films' as an example of a so-called documentary 'sub-entity': a body of films which, by virtue of their stylistic recognisability, stimulate their viewers to adopt a so-called 'documentarising reading'; see chapter 2, paragraph 2.2 for a further discussion of these terms) and Anita Gertiser, "Domestizierung des bewegten Bildes: Vom dokumentarischen Film zum Lehrmedium," *montage/AV* 15, no. 1 (2006): 68-69. (The example which Gertiser gives in the pages following her statements on the subject are conceived of as an exception to a more general rule.) Both of these publications, I need to add, in turn refer to Jacquinot.

22. For Jacquinot's formulation, see Jacquinot, *Image et Pédagogie*, 29.

23. In some cases, of course, the problem is rather that the boundaries of the corpus are not determined at all; in other words, that the assumption is made that the extent of the category is clear from the outset.

24. See Eef Masson, "Didaktik vs. Pädagogik: Ein kontextueller Ansatz für die Untersuchung von Unterrichtsfilmen," *montage/AV* 15, no. 1 (2006): 12-16.

25. For the notion of 'family resemblance', see for instance Ludwig Wittgenstein, *Philosophical Investigations* (1953; New York: Macmillan, 1973), 31-32 and 65-67. My judgements here are made on the basis of both the preliminary viewings that I carried out for the present study, and an earlier project dealing with educational collections in the UK. For results of the latter, see Eef Masson, "Educational Films in Britain: EFA's Norfolk collection as an aid to the historiography of a genre" (master's thesis, University of East Anglia, 2000) and my article "Of Pits and Vaults: The Historiographic Value of Educational Collections in Great Britain," *The Moving Image: Journal of the Association of Moving Image Archivists* 2, no. 1 (2002): 47-72.

26. 'Rhetorical strategies' is the term I use in my analysis in the second half of this work; its precise scope will be determined in chapter 3.

27. Compare Masson, "Didaktik vs. Pädagogik," 13. I also addressed this issue during my presentation, with Claudy Op den Kamp, for the 2006 Orphan Film Symposium ("How Teaching Films Teach: Strategies of Motivation in Dutch Classroom Films of the 1940s and 50s," held at the University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC, on 25 March of that year). Audio is accessible online, through the relevant link at http://www.sc.edu/filmsymposium/Orphans_Sound/orphans.htm.

28. I would like to add here that in the case of Jacquinot, this immanentism is by no means absolute. Despite her focus on 'textual ingredients', the author has always stressed the significance of what happens in the process of what one might call a film's 'actualisation'. (For the meaning of this term, compare chapter 3, p. 110.) Consider for instance Jacquinot, *Image et Pédagogie*, 134 (where she talks about the circumstances in which a title is seen, and the competencies a viewer needs in order to be able to 'decode' it). In her first book, however, the author does not develop this point any further, nor does she integrate it into her own analysis. In later work, she more often considers educational media *in relation* to their respective *dispositifs* (a concept I shall discuss later). See for example her paper "Les NTIC: écrans du savoir ou écrans au savoir" (presented during a colloquium in Lille, France, in 1996; see <http://edutice.archives-ouvertes.fr/docs/00/00/16/03/PDF/Jacquino.pdf>). Indications of this new direction in her work can also be found in writings produced in the intervening years; for instance, her articles "Le documentaire pédagogique?" in *Cinémas et Réalités*, ed. Roger Odin and Jean-Charles Lyant (Saint-Étienne: CIEREC / Université de Saint-Étienne, 1984), 193, and "Une théorie pour une province marginale du cinéma," *Iris: Revue de théorie de l'image et du son / A Journal of Theory on Image and Sound*, no. 10 (1990): 162-63.

29. Again, I should point out here that Jacquinot as well takes into consideration the ways in which the addressee of a teaching film is 'implicated' by the text itself; see for instance Jacquinot, *Image et Pédagogie*, 67-70. However, a crucial difference between her approach and my own is that I consider implication to be a basic textual function – not one that is unique to, or characteristic of, (some) teaching films. For a more elaborate discussion of this mechanism, see chapter 3.

30. The phrase 'audio-visual (AV) media' first took root in the English-speaking countries; later on, it was also adopted in the Netherlands. NOF, the distributor whose collection I deal with here, first began to use it on a more regular basis in the later 1950s, at a time when the institute was in the process of reformulating its own objectives. Consider for instance H. J. L. Jongbloed's foreword to the September 1958 issue of *Mededelingen van de NOF*, 3.

31. On a much smaller scale, such an increase also occurred during and immediately after the First World War – although perhaps in Germany primarily so. See for instance Uli Jung's and Wolfgang Mühl-Benninghaus' article on the relation between war-time (propaganda) policies and the proliferation of all sorts of 'educational' screening practices: "Die Kulturfilmdiskussion von 1914 bis 1920: Die politische und ideologische Dynamik der Ufa-Gründung," in *Geschichte des dokumentarischen Films in Deutschland*, vol. 1, *Kaiserreich 1895-1918*, ed. Uli Jung and Martin Loiperdinger (Stuttgart: Reclam, 2005), 480-86.

32. The lesser interest in teaching films became apparent, among others, at the 2006 edition of the Orphan Film Symposium, which dealt specifically with 'films of science, industry and education', but featured relatively few presentations on the third category, and especially, items used in 'formal' education. Of those contributions that

did focus on films that somehow fit the 'educational' bill, few concerned the period *after*, roughly, the later 1930s. Most of the projects/publications (that I know of) that do consider corpora similar to my own shall be mentioned at some point in this work. For a short overview of publications in the domain of amateur/family film studies, see Alexandra Schneider, "Home movie-making and Swiss expatriate identities in the 1920s and 1930s," *Film History*, no. 2 (2003): 175 n. 3. The work of Utrecht colleague Martina Roepke, *Privat-Vorstellung: Heimkino in Deutschland vor 1945* (Hildesheim: Olms Verlag, 2006), is particularly relevant here because it considers a series of texts as part of a specific film *practice* – a goal which I also set myself. For a bibliography of work on industrial films, see Anna Heymer and Patrick Vonderau, "Industrial Films: An Analytical Bibliography," in *Films that Work: Industrial Film and the Productivity of Media*, ed. Vinzenz Hediger and Patrick Vonderau (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2009), 405-61 (which contains both primary and secondary sources). For a discussion of the problems one might have with the term 'industrial', I refer to my shared contribution, with Frank Kessler, to the above volume: "Layers of Cheese: Generic Overlap in Early Non-Fiction Films on Production Processes," in Hediger and Vonderau, *Films that Work*, 75-84.

33. I borrow the term 'filiation' from David Perkins, *Is Literary History Possible?* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992), 77-78 (who uses it to refer to the ways in which texts can be 'related' to one another through extratextual links or ties).

34. Examples of the first category would be *De l'orge à la bière: introduction à la technique de la malterie* (1972, From barley to beer: Introduction to the technique of malting, commissioned by the French Centre technique brasserie malterie Française de L'ENSAIA) and *Hygiene in der Lebensmittel-Verarbeitung* (1984, Hygiene in food processing, commissioned in Germany by the Henkel company). (Mark here that this category was non-existent in the case of NOF, the institute which distributed the films that I shall analyse in what follows.) Examples of the second group are *Het meest getapt* (1953, Pulled the most often, Ytzen Brusse for Heineken Brouwerijen B.V.), *Dit is Heineken* (1963, *This is Heineken*, commissioned by Heineken International) and *Just checking* (1988, commissioned by Heineken Brouwerijen B.V.). Many thanks to Catherine Cormon of the Heineken Collection for the references, also in subsequent notes.

35. Among the films screened to audiences inside the company, one can distinguish, for instance, between titles such as *Je weet niet wat je hoort* ([1980], You won't believe your ears, commissioned by Heineken Brouwerijen B.V.; a short warning bottling-line workers against the health risks of working in noisy environments) or *Think or Sink: Professional Team Decision Thinking* (1991, produced in the UK by Video Arts Ltd. and Heirs Associate International, for Heineken [International]; a film instructing managers on the topic of cooperative decision making) and *In beider belang: een film over de arbeidsomstandighedenwet* ([1980s], In both parties' interest: A film about the law on working conditions, commissioned by the Dutch organisations of employers and employees and the Ministry of Social Affairs) or the company newsreel *Kijkglas* (Looking glass, produced from the 1980s onwards). The last two films in this series were shown to all Heineken employees. Among the films screened off company premises, one can make the distinction between the advertising and promotional films mentioned in the previous note, and items such as *Stappen met IJf Blokker* (1985, Going on a binge with IJf Blokker, commissioned by Heineken Brouwerijen B.V.) and *Uw bier is best, maar...* ([1960s], Your beer is alright, but..., commissioned by the Dutch Centraal Brouwerij Kantoor), both of which instruct bar owners on how to pull beer.

36. The institute's annual reports confirm that in the period I deal with, it never catered to other groups or organisations than primary and secondary schools.

Note here that in this paragraph, I am, very consciously, considering variation only in terms of the institutions in which/audiences for whom the films were exhibited – *not* the purposes which they served *within* those institutions. If, instead, I would look at the collection under scrutiny here in terms of its users' objectives, the conclusion would have to be that it is almost as diverse as my corporate example. For more on the way in which teaching films were deployed in (Dutch) schools, see chapter 2, paragraph 2.1.

37. Examples of works in which these terms (or any variations thereof) are used, are, in that order: Saettler, *Evolution of American Educational Technology*; Jacquinot, *Image et Pédagogie*; Odin, "Film documentaire Lecture documentarisante"; Jirí Horníček, "The institutionalization of classroom films in Czechoslovakia between the wars," *Film History* 19, no. 4 (2007): 384-91; Masson, "Of Pits and Vaults"; and once more, Saettler, *Evolution of American Educational Technology* (as in his designation 'instructional technology').

38. Again, I would like to refer in this context to the article I which wrote with Kessler, "Layers of Cheese," which addresses similar issues with respect to (all kinds of) 'industrial' films. Nanna Verhoeff has considered such matters in her book on early Westerns, *The West in Early Cinema: After the Beginning* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2006); among others, in the sections A, pp. 11-21; B, pp. 25-44; G, pp. 108-26; Q, pp. 270-81.

39. In this respect, said distribution agency takes up a rather unique position among comparable bodies internationally. The British National Audio-Visual Aids Library, for instance, supplied films not only to schools, but also to youth clubs and community centres; see Educational Foundation for Visual Aids, *16mm Films in the National*

Audio-Visual Aids Library: A Subject Catalogue (London: EFVA, 1976), iii and vii. The Dutch foundation's policy seems to have been inspired by that of its German counterpart, the RWU. (See chapter 1, paragraph 1.2 for more on the relation between the two.)

40. Nederlands Instituut voor Beeld en Geluid is the Dutch central broadcast archive. The transfer took place in 1994 (see Hogenkamp, "Onderwijsfilm is geen Duitse uitvinding," 56). Not all of the films that were once distributed by this *médiathèque* ended up in the archive collection – presumably, because in the course of time, titles that have been removed from the catalogue were either disposed of, or got lost, and therefore could not be handed over. However, the majority of the films which the institute released are indeed part of the Beeld and Geluid collection – at least, for the period I concentrate on. In this respect as well, the corpus under scrutiny is pretty exceptional; in many other countries (for instance, Britain) distribution collections have been preserved more fragmentarily (compare Masson, "Of Pits and Vaults," 61-67).

41. As far as I can tell at this point in time, around 450 films were released in the period I focus on (i.e., the 1940s, 1950s and early 1960s; see the "Scope" section of this introduction). This number excludes titles in NOF's '2000' and 'A' series (which were not included in the institute's official catalogues – either because they were not considered fully appropriate for teaching, or because they could be used only in very specialised schools). A more precise estimate cannot be made, because the available sources do not allow for it. In some cases, for instance, archival documents do not provide sufficiently reliable information on the time of the films' release in order for me to decide if they should, or should not, be part of my corpus.

As I shall not consider all of the items for which membership of the corpus can indeed be established, I need to make explicit which logic I shall follow instead, in choosing films for viewing. To some degree, my choices are made for me: for archive-technical reasons, not all the titles that form part of the collection are available for examination. (Most likely, this situation will soon change, because at least part of the NOF lot will be digitised as part of the nation-wise preservation project "Beelden voor de Toekomst". My research, however, cannot yet benefit from this endeavour.) Another argument for watching certain films rather than others is that in the process, patterns are likely to emerge. On the basis of what I saw in the preliminary stages of my research, I can already predict that certain schemes, or tactics, will recur – tactics which I can therefore infer for unseen titles (for instance, on the basis of catalogue descriptions). In addition to this, I shall also let myself be inspired in my viewing choices by the various questions that I want to find answers to; for instance, queries concerning the potential relations between the aforementioned patterns and the subjects treated (as revealed by the classifications according to lesson topic made in teachers' notes and catalogues) or shifts and transformations over time (to which end I shall have to compare the films' release dates).

42. More information on the circumstances of the institute's establishment, and more specifically, its coincidence with the German occupation, will follow in chapter 1. For the sake of consistency, I shall abbreviate the foundation's name according to the (English language) rules which I follow in the rest of this text – even though the body itself, in its early decades, most often used the spelling 'N.O.F.'. The same abbreviation will also appear in the shortened version of the title of the institute's newsletter (*Mededelingen van de NOF*, see earlier notes).

43. In this paragraph, I make an (inevitably somewhat unsatisfactory) attempt at translating concepts relating to a by now superseded Dutch school system, based on indications in NOF newsletters and catalogues. Many thanks to Ed van Berkel for his help with the interpretation of abbreviations used in those documents.

It may also be worth mentioning here that in the year of its establishment, the NOF expressed the intention to also make, and distribute, films for higher education (see for instance "Stichting Nederlandsche Onderwijs Film Opgericht 6 Mei 1941," 1941, NA, NOF, 2.19.042.55, inv. no. 1, p.1). In practice, however, it never did – except for a few titles on the use of AV-media in education, targeting students in teacher training colleges.

44. The sixteen to eighteen age bracket was included from the second half of the 1940s onwards; children in the first few years of lower school were catered to as of 1953. I should add the remark, however, that title lists in newsletters and catalogues show that films were often considered to be 'fit' for several age groups at a time – as the submenus of the "Opleidingsniveau/Educational Level" sections on the DVDs appended to this work illustrate. (Note however that on the discs, I am considerably reducing the variation in terms of educational levels and age groups mentioned above. Also the terminology I use on the DVDs is the result of simplification and compromise.)

45. The section "Wat kost u het gebruik van films en/of filmstrips?" of *Mededelingen van de NOF*, [Spring] 1955 (no. 2), 3 shows that in that year, the 4,000th member school was registered. (After the middle of the decade, a stagnation occurred in film rental, for reasons that I shall briefly speculate on at the beginning of chapter 1, paragraph 1.2). Between September 1955 and September 1956, Holland had a school population of about 1,930,600 – a figure covering pupils in what I have referred to above as 'primary' and 'extended primary education'. See Statline, the online database of Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek, <http://statline.cbs.nl/StatWeb/default.aspx> (object name "Historie onderwijs; leerlingen-studenten en geslaagden, 1950/'51-2007/'08"; accessed 1 August 2009). Of course, there is no reason to assume that all of these children actually saw films in school; after all, institutions that

employed very few teachers who made use of the institute's services would also have been included in this list. For more on the subject of teaching film use, see also chapter 2, paragraph 2.1.

46. Facts about the institute's public image and the target audience's familiarity with its services are mentioned in Cor Ottenheim, *50 jaar NOF/NIAM: Van stomme film naar interactieve media* (The Hague: Nederlands Instituut voor Audio-Visuele Media, 1991), 32. Conclusions about the distribution in terms of users can be derived from the questionnaire results published in "Het enquête-formulier," *Mededelingen van de NOF*, March 1950, 1-3.

47. I use the word 'mute' here to refer to films without sound, produced at a time when 'silent' films were no longer the standard. (In an archival context, the term is most often used for sound film elements that carry no picture information; i.e., elements that have a 'blank' sound track area. In the prints which NOF distributed, this was not always the case.)

48. Filmstrips were produced as early as 1890; at that time, however, lantern slides made of glass were still the standard. According to Rick Prelinger, the subsequent success of slidefilms (as they were called in the early years) was due to the fact that they were inexpensive to make, convenient to use and easily portable; see Prelinger, *Field Guide to Sponsored Films*, vii.

49. For more information on the introduction of those formats, see Ottenheim, *50 jaar NOF/NIAM*, 49-50 and 55-63. Please note that in the chapters that follow, I shall use the pronouns 'he' and 'his' as gender-neutral ones.

51. For convenience's sake, I shall restrict myself in the following chapters to using the terms 'primary' and 'secondary' education; however, I shall take them to refer to the entire range of levels and age groups which NOF catered for.

52. Bert Hogenkamp and Jan Pet, conversation with author, 2 February 2004.

53. As I have said, NOF provided a range of video formats; most schools, however, used the VCR-system. See Ottenheim, *50 jaar NOF/NIAM*, 49.

54. In the case of the NOF collection, such a comparison could even be based on the *same* titles, because in the institute's early video years, a good amount of films were transferred to tape, and re-released in the new format.

55. I have not attempted to find out if, in the period *after* the one I deal with, there was a second peak in terms of the medium's use – for instance, at a time when distributors began to concentrate more closely on the production of video, but did not yet have many titles available, and therefore, perhaps, lowered their rental rates for film. Additional research would have to reveal whether or not this was the case.

56. For more on this subject, I refer to the beginning of paragraph 1.2.

57. The first experimental school television broadcasts took place on 22 and 29 October 1963, respectively. NOT provided the scripts; NTS (Nederlandse Televisie Stichting, the first Dutch broadcast organisation) made the programmes and sent them into the ether. Between November 1963 and 1964, 16 more programmes followed. See D. A. de Korte, *Televisie bij onderwijs en opleiding: Van toverlantaarn tot televisie-ontvanger; Een overzicht van de ontwikkeling en toepassingsmogelijkheden van televisie* (Amsterdam: Agon / Brussel: Elsevier, 1964), 98-99. Although it was a separate foundation, NOT was closely affiliated with NOF. Not only did the school television institute have the same (founding) director, it also shared most of its board members; see Ottenheim, *50 jaar NOF/NIAM*, 37.

Another fact that seems worth pointing out in this context is that in the years prior to NOT's establishment, NOF released its own newsreel series – presumably, because it felt the need for a higher degree of topicality than the teaching film could offer (and which the television medium could provide as well). See H. J. L. Jongbloed, "Actualiteiten in de school," *Mededelingen van de NOF*, November 1959, 12-13.

58. However, articles written by NOF's proponents in the years *prior* to NOT's establishment (pieces that were generally dismissive of the possibility of the medium's introduction in schools) suggest that they were at least a little worried that this might happen. Consider for instance "Heeft school-t.v. een toekomst?" and "The show must go on!!" in *Mededelingen van de NOF*, December 1958, 5-6 and 6 respectively, and "Heeft school-t.v. een toekomst? – II" in *Mededelingen van de NOF*, April 1959, 26-27. Their later involvement with the network, therefore, should probably be seen as an attempt to forestall an overly 'liberal' development of the television medium for classroom use, at the expense of NOF's own product (or its popularity).

59. According to an article on the topic, between 40 and 45% of Dutch households owned a television by 1963; about 5 years later, this figure had risen to just over 70%. In the late 1950s, the number of families that could watch television at home was still pretty low; in 1959, it had risen to just over 10%. See Jan Bank, "Televisie verenigt en verdeelt Nederland," in *Omroep in Nederland: Vijfenzeventig jaar medium en maatschappij, 1919-1994*, ed. Huub Wijffjes (Zwolle: Waanders, 1994), 77-103 (figures derived from the chart on p. 94).

That the audience's growing familiarity with the television medium did leave its mark on teaching film production is obvious – even if one considers only those films that were released within the time frame that I have demarcated. For instance, the short *Een tik van de mode?* (Cracked by fashion?, released in the Netherlands in 1962) seems to refer in an intertextual way to the quick and 'mobile' style of television reportage. Generalising claims to this effect, however, would have to be substantiated on the basis of more systematic comparison.

60. I need to stress here that although my end date is a very precise one, it shall function in this study as a mere guideline. On the one hand, because the abovementioned arguments make strict adherence to my time limit unnecessary; after all, the coincidence of film and television use in schools probably was not a common occurrence until much later. And on the other hand, because it is quite simply impossible, as the films' release dates cannot always be reconstructed.

As a final note on the delineation of my time frame, I should perhaps add here that in *Evolution of American Educational Technology*, Saettler's book on the history of educational technology in the US, the year 1963 is considered to be one of transition between two paradigms in educationists' reflection on the role of audio-visual media in schools (see for instance pp. 8-9). However, even regardless of the fact that this date may not be significant in the same way to pedagogy within a European, let alone a specifically Dutch framework, Saettler's observation is also of limited value to me here. The reason is that in the course of textual analysis, I shall pay very little attention to this type of theorising – if only because I am convinced (as I shall argue later on) that its outcomes were of greater relevance to policy makers than to the users and viewers of those media themselves.

61. I am thinking here specifically of the difficulties that are involved in the practice of what Robert C. Allen calls "the direct study of [...] audiences"; see his article "From exhibition to reception: reflections on the audience in film history," *Screen* 31, no. 4 (1990): 351.

62. *Ibid.*, 354.

63. Apart from Jacquinet's *Image et Pédagogie* (and especially, the introductory and concluding chapters of this work), I am thinking here of Roger Odin, "A Semio-Pragmatic Approach of the Documentary Film," in *Image – Reality – Spectator: Essays on Documentary Film and Television*, ed. Willem De Greef and Willem Hesling (Leuven: Acco, 1989), 96, and Gertiser, "Domestizierung des bewegten Bildes," 68 (both pieces by authors who, I already pointed out, in turn refer to Jacquinet).

64. This applies, in any case, to the work of Jacquinet (her 1977 study as well as later publications). Also Bienvenido León, author of several pieces on rhetoric in popular wildlife documentaries (referenced, among others, in chapter 4) pursues this goal; see for instance León, *Science on Television: The Narrative of Scientific Documentary*, trans. Alicia Otano and María López (Luton, UK: Pantaneto Press, 2007); in particular, his 'To the Reader' (no page number), introduction (pp. 1-2) and conclusions (pp. 141-49).

As a matter of fact, the first problem I mentioned (that of a lack of criteria for measuring effectivity) also seems to affect empirical research on the educational benefits of contemporary media texts. A recent lecture in Utrecht (Maïke Tibus' paper on "Inference Processes in Expository Film Comprehension," presented at Universiteit Utrecht, the Netherlands, 25 November 2008) also showed that the experiments that such studies involve are sometimes far removed from concrete teaching situations, and therefore run the risk of having little direct bearing on the actual learning processes of pupils or students. (For some more on Tibus' project, see <http://www.vgk.de/projects/tibus/index.html>)

65. One piece of work that addresses such issues is Ed Tan's "Film als emotiemachine: De affectstructuur van de traditionele speelfilm; Een psychologische studie" (PhD dissertation, Universiteit van Amsterdam, 1991), which deals with the emotional effects of rhetorical devices in audio-visual media. Although it focuses specifically on (mainstream) feature films, his book is of particular interest to me here, as it asks some of the questions that I pose as well – albeit from a different perspective. One of the interesting links between our respective projects is that we both look at what Tan calls the text's structure of 'appeal' (*appèl*) and use the notion of (textual) 'motivation'. The main differences between our endeavours is that I do not, like Tan, aim to draw any conclusions as to how films *actually* impinge on their viewers, and also, that I see textual motivation as a *rhetorical* function, rather than as a psychological one (i.e., as a factor in the fulfilment of cognitive or affective needs). (See the notes to chapter 3 for some more on this subject.) However, none of this precludes that at least some of Tan's conclusions might also be applicable to the material I deal with here. See also further notes for the similarities and differences between our respective notions and classifications.

66. In past years, authors dealing with aspects of (audio-visual) rhetoric have expressed the need for a method that allows for a consideration of factors *outside* of the text (in the strictest sense); for instance, Willem Hesling, in "Documentary Film and Rhetorical Analysis," in De Greef and Hesling, *Image – Reality – Spectator*, 101-31, and Carl R. Plantinga, in *Rhetoric and Representation in Nonfiction Film* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 1. (Both of these authors make a case for a rhetorical study with a pragmatic slant.) In his contribution to the International Industrial Film Workshop (Bochum, Germany, 10 December 2004), Thomas Elsaesser proposed to discuss 'utility films' in terms of the 'events' of which they form part, rather than as (mere) texts.

67. The observations I make in this work are based on viewings of about 145 (10/15- to 50-minute) films – a figure which amounts to between 30 and 35% of the total number for the period under scrutiny. The filmography at the end of this work covers only the titles that I mention in subsequent chapters (124 titles altogether).

68. In his work on wildlife television documentaries, León as well analyses his object in terms of what one could

designate, on the basis of the definition which I use in this text, as 'rhetorical strategies'. See Bienvenido León, "Science popularisation through television documentary: A study of the work of British wildlife filmmaker David Attenborough," *The Pantaneto Forum*, no. 15 (2004), <http://www.pantaneto.co.uk/issue15/leon.htm>; also León, *Science on Television*. The main difference between his approach and my own is that he makes assumptions about the textual specificity of such programmes (just like Jacquinet and others do). Although I second some of the observations which he makes in this process, I do not agree with his more general conclusions.

69. Careful readers may have noticed that in the course of this introduction, I have consistently been using the adjective 'pedagogical' (rather than 'didactic') when referring to the wider, *institutional* framework in which classroom screenings take place. In *Image et Pédagogie*, Jacquinet, basing her argument on research done by Pierre Greco, points out that this term (*pédagogique*) is most often used to refer to the entire process of upbringing, whereas 'didactic' (*didactique*) tends to concern primarily the techniques that are available to further this process – and more in particular, procedures regarding the presentation of pedagogical content (see pp. 36-37; hence also her designation of teaching films as 'didactic'). In what follows, I shall roughly adhere to this distinction. In practice, this means that I shall reserve the word 'didactic' for those occasions when I deal with the more concrete, methodological aspects of classroom teaching. In the phrase 'didactic matter', I use it to avoid confusion; 'pedagogical matter', after all, might seem to refer to the object of pedagogy – the branch of science – rather than to the knowledge or skills that are passed on in the course of a pedagogical *process*.

Something else I would like to make explicit at this point is that for the type of analysis I want to conduct, the films' status as *teaching* tools, and therefore, that of the object of communication itself as *teaching matter*, is of greater significance than their status as aids to *learning*. In the course of this introduction, I have stressed on several occasions that I attach great importance to matters of film deployment: the ways in which films are integrated (or not) into an educational interaction. As a rule, decisions on such matters are taken by teachers – rather than pupils – and in function of the goals which *they* have in mind. Even if my aim is to find out how these texts address an audience of *learners*, then, I shall consider them in their capacity of 'didactic containers' (i.e., instruments to *pass something on*). Further on in this work, I shall refer to a piece in which I argue that also the films themselves are best conceptualised as teaching tools (see p. 214 of my conclusions); the arguments I make there, however, are not yet relevant at this point.

1 • Film for Education: Debates, Idea(l)s and Practices

1. Matters pertaining to the teaching film came within the area of responsibility of a Departement Opvoeding, Wetenschap en Cultuurbescherming (Department of Education, Science and Culture Protection), a war-time subsection of the Ministerie voor Onderwijs, Kunsten en Wetenschappen. NOF's charter of foundation spells its full name as 'Nederlandsche Onderwijs Film'; see "Stichtingsbrief," 1941, NA, NOF, 2.19.042.55, inv. no. 2, pp. 1-2. Some of the first references in newspapers and magazines, however, already have the modern spelling, which I am using here.
2. See A. A. Schoevers, "Nederlandsche Onderwijs Film," 1946, NA, NOF, 2.19.042.55, inv. no. 6, pp. 5 and 11 (in which the author speaks of the state of affairs at the end of the German occupation) and *Mededelingen van de NOF*, [November 1945] (no. 7), 1.
3. See for instance [C. Schreuder], *Het paedagogisch en didactisch gebruik van de film bij het lager onderwijs: Leidraad voor kwekelingen*, rev. ed. (The Hague: Stichting Nederlandse Onderwijs Film, 1948), 6-10 (p. 8 in particular).
4. For more on the 'school cinema' system, see paragraph 1.2.1.
5. In doing so, I shall concentrate on the debates that unfolded in the West (i.e., Europe and the US) – if only because of the wider availability of sources for those parts of the world.
6. Virginia Church, "Antiquated," in *Teachers Are People, Being the Lyrics of Agatha Brown, Sometime Teacher in the Hilldale High School* (Hollywood: Fischer, 1925), as quoted in Cuban, *Teachers and Machines*, 4-5. See also "Education: Schoolhouse Fauna," *TIME Magazine*, 16 December 1929, <http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,881882,00.html>.
7. The names I am thinking of here are those of scientists like Eugène-Louis Doyen (surgeon, France), Osvaldo Polimanti (physiologist, Italy), Ludwig Münch (mathematician, Germany) or Arthur Van Gehuchten (neurologist, Belgium), all of whom used film to instruct their students from the late 1890s or early 1900s onwards. See for instance Vergilio Tosi, *Cinema before Cinema: The Origins of Scientific Cinematography* (1984; London: British Universities Film and Video Council, 2005), 165-68, 172, 185 and 187, respectively. Some authors also mention (less-known) secondary school teachers who used the medium from almost as early on; for instance, G.-Michel Coissac in *Le Cinémathographe et l'Enseignement* (Paris: Larousse / Éditions du Cinéopse, 1926), 3.
8. The first 'specialist' educational catalogue, edited by the British-born Charles Urban, appeared in 1908. References to this work will follow in subsequent pages.

9. Anne Raynal, for instance, quotes (Henri Langlois' rendition of) a pronouncement made by Thomas Hooman Du Mont, Henry Cook and Louis Arthur Ducos du Hauron, who, in 1860, predicted that "L'invention [the invention of moving images] permettra un enseignement universel"; see Raynal, "Le docteur Thévenard, scientifique et cinéaste," in *Le Cinéma et la Science*, ed. Alexis Martinet (Paris: CNRS Editions, 1994), 98. (Most likely, this is a compilation of pronouncements made by the three men separately, and Du Mont in particular. For an 'original' citation, see for instance Laurent Mannoni, *Le grand art de la lumière et de l'ombre: archéologie du cinéma* (Paris: Nathan, 1995), 239. Thanks also to Thierry Lecointe for help with identification of the primary authors.) About five years later, also František Rieger (inventor of the Kinesiskop, a 'perfected' version of the Stroboscope) saw the possibility of educating vast audiences with such a machine; see Tosi, *Cinema before Cinema*, 32.

10. More than half a century on, the same was also true for television (see for instance Saettler, *Evolution of American Educational Technology*, 468), video (Cuban, *Teachers and Machines*, 37) and IT applications (Cuban, *Teachers and Machines*, 72-75). Compare also Perriault, "Apport des archives du film," 16.

11. The first quote appeared in the *New York Dramatic Mirror* of 9 July 1913, and is reprinted, among others, in Saettler, *Evolution of American Educational Technology*, 98. The second pronouncement was first cited in a piece by Hugh Weir, entitled "The Story of the Motion Picture," in the November 1922 issue of *McClure's Magazine* (precise page unknown), and is reprinted in Harry Arthur Wise, *Motion Pictures As an Aid In Teaching American History* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1939), 1. Three years later, Edison rephrased his statement as follows: "I believe that in the next ten years visual education – the imparting of extant information through the motion picture camera – will be a matter of course in all of our schools. The printed lesson will be largely supplemental – not paramount." See Slide, *Before Video*, 2.

12. Or, in his own words: "un procédé d'enseignement singulièrement efficace"; see Boleslas Matuszewski "Une Nouvelle Source de l'Histoire (Création d'un Dépôt de Cinématographie Historique)," in *Écrits cinématographiques*, ed. Magdalena Mazaraki (Paris: AFRHC / La Cinémathèque française, 2006), p. 7 of the facsimile. The English translation used here is by Julia Bloch Frey, as in the online version available from <http://www.latrobe.edu.au/screeningthepast/classics/clasjul/mat.html>.

13. "Le Cinématographe sera le théâtre, le journal et l'école de demain." Charles Pathé, "De Pathé Frères à Pathé Cinéma," *Premier Plan*, n.d. (no. 55), 37, quoted in Thierry Lefebvre, "Scientia: le cinéma de vulgarisation scientifique au début des années dix," *Cinémathèque: Revue semestrielle d'esthétique et d'histoire du cinéma*, no. 4 (1993): 86; see also Thierry Lefebvre, "The Scientia Production (1911-1914): Scientific Popularization Through Pictures," *Griffithiana: Journal of Film History* 16, no. 47 (1993): 145.

14. The first is a pronouncement by the Frenchman L. Jalabert, made in his piece "Le cinéma éducateur," *Les études*, 20 January 1924, 153, quoted in Christophe Gauthier, "Au risque du spectacle: Les projections cinématographiques en milieu scolaire dans les années 1920," in Pastre-Robert, Dubost and Massit-Folléa, *Cinéma pédagogique et scientifique*, 91 ("le maître de l'avenir"). The second sentence was spoken by an (unnamed) American college professor cited in "Films beat books," says Edison," *The Mentor*, 1 July 1921, 34, quoted in Wise, *Motion Pictures As an Aid*, 2.

An example of a similar pronouncement made more recently with reference to contemporary 'new' media is Edwin van Huis' claim, in his introduction to the "Sustainable Images for the Future" session of the international working conference on "Economies of the Commons" (Amsterdam, the Netherlands, 11 April 2008), that the moving image digitisation project in which his institution currently takes part ("Beelden voor de toekomst") has "the replacement of books" (designated in his speech as "old-fashioned") as one of its objectives. Jay David Bolter and Richard Grusin make mention of similar pronouncements among early 'cyberenthusiasts'; see Bolter and Grusin, *Remediation: Understanding New Media* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1999), 60.

15. The financial aspect is mentioned explicitly in D. Charles Ottley, *The Cinema in Education* (London: Routledge, 1935), ix.

16. Cuban, *Teachers and Machines*, 3.

17. See Ottley, *The Cinema in Education*; the quotations are taken, respectively, from pp. 32, 18-19, and 29-30.

18. For ideas of the former, see Eugène-Louis Doyen, "Le Cinématographe et l'enseignement de la chirurgie," *Revue critique de médecine et de chirurgie* 1 (1899), 4, quoted in Thierry Lefebvre, "Dr. Eugène-Louis Doyen und die Anfänge des Chirurgie-Films," *montage/AV* 14, no. 2 (2005): 71. (Here Doyen in fact reasons the other way round, arguing that film can help avoid 'overpopulation' of operation rooms.) For pronouncements by the latter, see Jean Painlevé, "Le cinéma au service de la science," *Revue des Vivants*, October 1931 (pages unknown), reprinted in Marcel L'Herbier, *Intelligence du cinématographe* (Paris: Éditions Corrèa, 1946), 403-8 (quote from pp. 403-4).

19. Tosi, in this context, speaks of a "myth of the machine as an instrument of progress"; see Tosi, *Cinema before Cinema*, 29.

20. With respect to the relation between film and scientific inquiry, Scott Curtis concludes that at the time, the medium was taken to be more than just a *means*, an instrument. In his view, it functioned as an intellectual 'soul

mate' (*Geistesverwandt*) for researchers, because of the way in which it represented time, space and life: a manner that corresponded exceptionally well to their own views of the world. See Scott Curtis, "Die Kinematographische Methode: Das 'Bewegte Bild' und die Brownsche Bewegung," *montage/AV* 14, no. 2 (2005): 40. For more on the topic of rationalisation, see for instance Florian Hoof's article on labour management films: "The One Best Way': Bildgebende Verfahren der Ökonomie und die Innovation der Managementtheorie nach 1860," *montage/AV* 15, no. 1 (2006): 123-38.

21. Consider for instance Paula Amad's assessment of the ideology behind Albert Kahn's project to put together a 'planetary' archive (his "Archives de la Planète", which will be mentioned again further in this chapter); see Amad, "Cinema's 'sanctuary': From pre-documentary to documentary film in Albert Kahn's *Archives de la Planète* (1908-1931)," *Film History* 13, no. 2 (2001): 138-59 (and p. 142 in particular). For more references, see also Robert Stam, *Film Theory: An Introduction* (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2000), 25.

22. The citations are from Jerome Lachenbruch, "The Silent Teacher," *Scientific American*, 29 June 1920, 702, and Lawrence Augustus Averill, "Educational Possibilities of the Motion Picture," *Educational Review*, 50 (1915) (precise pages unknown), both quoted in Wise, *Motion Pictures As an Aid*, 2-3.

23. The original French text reads: "L'intérêt du spectacle sollicite l'attention des élèves, de ceux mêmes dont l'imagination est paresseuse"; see Hugues Besson, "L'Éducation et l'Instruction par le Cinématographe," from a *Rapport général sur l'emploi du Cinématographe dans les différentes branches de l'enseignement* (Paris, 1920) (pages unknown), as reprinted in L'Herbier, *Intelligence du cinématographe*, 400. For Ottley's pronouncement, see *The Cinema in Education*, 13.

24. G.-Michel Coissac, *Histoire du Cinématographe: De ses origines jusqu'à nos jours* (Paris: Éditions du Cinéopse / Gauthier-Villars, 1925), 259, or W. H. George, *The Cinema in School* (London: Isaac Pitman, 1935), 59-60.

25. Ottley, *The Cinema in Education*, 23 and 22 respectively.

26. See Brian Winston, "The Documentary Film as Scientific Inscription," in *Theorizing Documentary*, ed. Michael Renov (New York: Routledge, 1993): 37-57. Compare also Noël Carroll, "From Real to Reel: Entangled in Nonfiction Film," in *Theorizing the Moving Image* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 240, and Roland Cosandey, "Some thoughts on 'early documentary,'" in *Uncharted Territory. Essays on early nonfiction film*, ed. Daan Hertogs and Nico de Klerk (Amsterdam: Nederlands Filmmuseum, 1997), 40. (The latter of these works, like Winston's, argues that the notion actually predates the animated photographic image.)

27. For Matuszewski's views, see "Une Nouvelle Source de l'Histoire," p. 9 of the facsimile. The idea of the 'trace' in early discourses on film is also discussed in Mary Ann Doane, *The Emergence of Cinematic Time: Modernity, Contingency, the Archive* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002), especially the chapters 2 (pp. 33-68) and 3 (pp. 69-107). For Kahn's "Archives", see for instance William Routt's "Introduction" to the online English translation of Matuszewski's "Une Nouvelle Source de l'Histoire," <http://www.latrobe.edu.au/screeningthepast/classics/clasjul/matintro.html>, or Amad, "Cinema's 'sanctuary'". For more information on the Paris institutions, see for example Béatrice de Pastre-Robert, "Enfer, amnésie, rédemption: une histoire du fonds de la cinémathèque scolaire Robert-Lynen," in Pastre-Robert, Dubost and Massit-Folléa, *Cinéma pédagogique et scientifique* (which relates the history of the Cinémathèque Robert-Lynen de la Ville de Paris, sometimes also called the *cinémathèque scolaire*) and Gauthier, "Au risque du spectacle" (which talks about both institutions).

28. For Walter Benjamin's ideas, see for instance his "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction," in *Illuminations* (1955; London, Pimlico, 1999), 228-30. The ideas of Epstein, Dulac and Delluc are discussed in Viva Paci, "The Attraction of the Intelligent Eye: Obsessions with the Vision Machine in Early Film Theories," in *The Cinema of Attractions Reloaded*, ed. Wanda Strauven (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2006), 129-31 (and pp. 134-35 n. 12). For Siegfried Kracauer, see his *magnum opus Theory of Film: The Redemption of Physical Reality* (1960; Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1997); for example, chapter 2, on "Basic Concepts", pp. 27-40. I should point out however that in the 1920s, Kracauer (among others) had also criticised photography and film for capturing only the *outside* of things, and obscuring their true meanings; see his piece "Photography," in *The Mass Ornament: Weimar Essays* (1963; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1995), pp. 53-57 in particular. On the same issue, see also Doane, *Emergence of Cinematic Time*, for instance pp. 11-12 and 33-35.

In *Essais sur la signification*, 193, Metz speaks of the 'cosmophanic potential' (*pouvoir cosmophanique*), or aptitude for all sorts of revelation, which has been attributed to the cinema since its 'birth'. For more on the relation between *cosmophanie* and the use of (optical) manipulation devices, consider the presentations by Scott Curtis ("On Magnification") and Oliver Gaycken ("A History of Violence: Recurring Motifs in Popular Science Films") at the fifth Orphan Film Symposium (University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC, 23 March 2006), to be played back through the relevant links at http://www.sc.edu/filmsymposium/Orphans_Sound/orphans.htm.

29. See also Saettler, *Evolution of American Educational Technology*, 114.

30. In his own words: "Il [= le cinématographe] est la vie" (my italics). Besson, in L'Herbier's *Intelligence du cinématographe*, 400.

31. Ottley, *The Cinema in Education*; for the quotes, see, respectively, pp. 9, 23 and 11. According to others, however, the same quality entailed that the film also posed certain dangers to a youthful audience, which had not yet acquired the skill of moral discrimination. See for instance the treatise *Kind und Film* (Stuttgart: Ernst Klett, 1955) by Martin and Margarete Keilhacker, as quoted in Janneke Langelaan, "Het debat rondom het gebruik van film als onderwijshulpmiddel, 1912-1960" (master's thesis, Universiteit Utrecht, 2005), 15. For more on the relation between film's revelatory powers and the magical/the human unconscious, see Paci, "Attraction of the Intelligent Eye," 121-37.
32. See for instance P. Th. F. M. Boekholt, *Het ongeregelde verleden: Over eenheid en verscheidenheid in het Nederlandse onderwijs* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1998), 11 (on the situation in the Netherlands) or Valérie Vignaux, *Jean Benoit-Lévy ou le corps comme utopie: une histoire du cinéma éducateur dans l'entre-deux-guerres en France* (Paris: Association française de recherche sur l'histoire du cinéma, 2007), 24 and 123 (concerning France).
33. F. P. Gout and A. Metz, *Waarde luisteraars! De RVU en haar plaats in twee eeuwen volwassenenvorming en maatschappijgeschiedenis* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1985), 8, 9, 12 and 17.
34. In the UK, where industrialisation began earlier than elsewhere in Europe and the US, adult education was already on the agenda in the 1820s (see *ibid.*, 6 and 16).
35. For the Dutch situation, see *ibid.*, 20, and Karel Dibbets, "Het taboe van de Nederlandse filmcultuur: neutraal in een verzuild land," *Tijdschrift voor Mediageschiedenis* 9, no. 2 (2006): 47-48. For American examples, see Saettler, *Evolution of American Educational Technology*, 123-24.
36. This institute was located in Amsterdam; see Kees van der Haak, "'Mededeelingen van leerzamen aard': Taferelen uit de geschiedenis van de educatieve omroep," in Wijffes, *Omroep in Nederland*, 174-75. In Britain, again, such initiatives were taken earlier on; the Scottish Mechanics Institute, for instance, offered instruction to industrial labourers as of 1823. In its official form, however, university extension began in the 1890s (once more, in the UK; in Oxford, to be precise). See Gout and Metz, *Waarde luisteraars!*, 16-17.
37. Saettler, *Evolution of American Educational Technology*, 124-25. In her recent book on the work of Jean Benoit-Lévy, Vignaux establishes the same link; see *Jean Benoit-Lévy ou le corps*, for instance p. 45.
38. Marcel Lapiere, *Les cent visages du cinéma* (Paris: Grasset, 1948), 305-6.
39. A Dutch source is R. Miedema, "Bioscoop en Volksontwikkeling," *Volksontwikkeling* 3, no. 3 (1921): 130. The author here specifically talks about the so-called *nutsinstituten*: local branches of the national Maatschappij tot Nut van 't Algemeen (the main instigator of adult education in the Netherlands; see Gout and Metz, *Waarde luisteraars!*, 11-29 for more background information). German initiatives to this effect are mentioned in Yvonne Zimmermann, "Vom Lichtbild zum Film: Anmerkungen zur Entstehung des Industriefilms," *montage/AV* 15, no. 1 (2006): 84.
40. León, *Science on Television*, 8-10.
41. Saettler, *Evolution of American Educational Technology*, 124.
42. Tom Gunning, "The world as object lesson: Cinema audiences, visual culture and the St. Louis world's fair, 1904," *Film History* 6, no. 4 (1994): 425. An (early) mixture between museum and fair/exhibition centre was the Royal Polytechnic Institution in London, founded in 1938, which provided a combination of scientific exhibits and lectures, and sensationalist attractions ('rational entertainment'). The institution was known in particular for its spectacular magic lantern shows. As Jemery Brooker argues, presentations and performances often emphasised the magical aspects of scientific principles or implements. See his article "The Polytechnic Ghost: Pepper's Ghost, Metempsychosis and the Magic Lantern at the Royal Polytechnic Institution," *Early Popular Visual Culture* 5, no. 2 (2007): 189-206.
43. See for instance Saettler, *Evolution of American Educational Technology*, 125.
44. Valérie Vignaux, "Eine *Encyclopédie* der Leinwand: Der institutionelle Diskurs des Kinos im Frankreich des Zwischenkriegszeit und die Filme von Jean Benoit-Lévy (1922-1939)," *montage/AV* 15, no. 1 (2006): 18; compare also p. 40.
45. See for instance Jean Comandon, "Le Cinématographe et les Sciences de la Nature," in L'Herbier, *Intelligence du cinématographe*, 414, a piece based on an original contribution to *Le Cinéma des Origines à nos Jours*, ed. Henri Fescourt (Paris: Éditions du Cygne, 1932), 313-22. See also Vignaux, *Jean Benoit-Lévy ou le corps*, 25 (which mentions a pronouncement by Julien Luçhaire, recorded in a 1924 report on the activities of a French commission on the relation between cinematography and intellectual life, which I will mention further on). In the same publication, Vignaux argues that the decline of the *cinéma éducateur* (the kind targeting adults who were past their school-age, usually presented during evening classes and public lectures) began in the later years of the interbellum; see pp. 64 and 219 in particular.
46. "Quand je pense que l'on en est encore dans les écoles (aussi bien au lycée que dans l'enseignement primaire) à annoncer la géographie dans les manuels où les descriptions succèdent au nomenclatures! On y trouve sans doute un peu plus d'illustrations qu'autrefois; mais avec quelle indifférence ou quel espiègle dédain l'enfant qui sort du cinéma d'en face considère ces images d'un autre âge, l'âge des diligences et des voyages autour du monde illustrés en taille douce!" Lucien Descaves, "Le Cinéma scolaire," *Le Journal*, 1912 (precise date unknown), reprinted

in L'Herbier, *Intelligence du cinématographe*, 392. For his designation of cinema as *le theatre du peuple*, see *ibid.*, 391. In recent years, of course, similar pronouncements have been made with respect to the use of (among others) digital teaching tools; compare for instance Th. J. Bastiaans, "Onderwijskundige innovatie: Down to Earth; Over realistische elektronische ondersteuning bij leren en instructie" (inaugural lecture, Open Universiteit Nederland, 2007), http://www.ou.nl/Docs/Expertise/RdMC/Publicaties%202007/oratie_Theo_Bastiaens_web.pdf, p. 37 of the pdf-document, which makes the (more balanced) argument that the present generation of pupils simply expect the use of ICT in teaching or learning.

47. Saettler, *Evolution of American Educational Technology*, 126 and 28; Slide, *Before Video*, 61-62. Slide even goes so far as to say that the "use of audiovisual aids in education [in the US] has its origins in the 1904 St. Louis World's Fair" (p. 61).

48. For the Musée Pédagogique, see Vignaux, "Encyclopédie der Leinwand," 29. For the Cinémathèque, see Gauthier, "Au risque du spectacle," 81. Pastre-Robert even argues that the latter institution never considered itself a 'museum': see "Enfer, amnésie, rédemption," 51.

49. See for instance Ken Smith, *Mental Hygiene: Classroom Films, 1945-1970* (New York: Blast Books, 1999), 19, or, for a citation in a primary source: H. Zanen, "Filmleerstof in verband met het leerplan van onze lagere scholen," *Lichtbeeld en Cultuur* 15, no. 10 (1938): 137-41 (which points out the need for "geestelijke en morele herbewapening"; see p. 140).

50. The final report of a French commission investigating the potential application of cinematography in schools observed that the objective of education was to "speed up and increase the intellectual and moral development of the country" ("hâter et [...] accroître le développement intellectuel et moral du pays"); see the reprint of this piece, which was drawn up in 1920, in L'Herbier, *Intelligence du cinématographe*, 389. Compare also Antoine Prost, *Histoire de l'enseignement en France, 1800-1967*, 2nd ed. (Paris: Colin, 1968), which demonstrates that in late nineteenth century France, this sense of civic duty was seen before all else as a dedication to the country and its people. See for instance his chapter XIV, paragraph 2 ("Institution scolaire et unité nationale," pp. 335-340), which discusses the then tendency to put education, and geography and history teaching in particular, to the service of promoting patriotic sentiments, and thus, unifying the nation. For Gauthier's observation, see "Au risque du spectacle," 97-98.

51. Symptomatic in this respect is the fact that in Germany, the production companies' so-called Kulturfilmabteilungen, which made films that were considered to serve the very general purpose of *Volksaufklärung*, often referred to their output as *Lehrfilme* (teaching films); for instance, in Oskar Kalbus, "Der Steinachfilm," *montage/AV* 14, no. 1 (2005): 101-5. See also Bugoslaw Drewniak, *Der Deutsche Film 1938-1945: ein Gesamtüberblick* (Düsseldorf: Droste Verlag, 1987), 52-53.

52. See, respectively, Slide, *Before Video*, 7, and Saettler, *Evolution of American Educational Technology*, 31. The latter author adds that in fact, illustrated textbooks already existed before Comenius' time.

53. Saettler, *Evolution of American Educational Technology*, 37, 39 and 43.

54. The phrase 'New Education' is widely used in present-day educational history. In Holland, the designation *Nieuwe Schoolbeweging* has also been common for a while; see for instance Q. L. Th. van der Meer and H. A. Bergman, eds., *Onderwijskundigen van de twintigste eeuw* (Amsterdam: Intermediair / Groningen: Wolters-Noordhoff, 1975). The science of paedology derived its insights mostly from child psychology, and postulated that children are not to be considered smaller versions of adults but rather beings with their own characteristic mental functions.

55. See for instance J. F. M. C. Aarts, *Uit de school der historie: Leerboek der historische paedagogiek voor hoofdacte-candidaten* ('s Hertogenbosch: Malmberg, 1948), a contemporary manual of pedagogical history targeted at an audience of trainee teachers; consider pp. 35-36 and 242 in particular.

56. See for instance Ewert, *Reichsanstalt für Film und Bild*, 41. Also Saettler, *Evolution of American Educational Technology*, 44-46 deals with the principles of Herbartianism.

57. Of all those people, Montessori was the most sense-oriented; in institutions working with her ideas (usually primary and nursery schools), sensory discrimination formed the corner-stone of classroom activity – at least, at that point in time. See Saettler, *Evolution of American Educational Technology*, 62. Dewey, Boeke and Kerschensteiner set up schools in which learning revolved around manual work (the first two had pupils take part in a range of jobs, usually of a domestic nature; in Kerschensteiner's case, children performed tasks of their own choosing). Parkhurst laid the foundations of the Dalton Plan, a system based on individual (written) tasks, that could be applied in single years or course units. Key was famous mostly for her book *Barnets århundrade* (1900, *The Century of the Child*); her ideal learning environment, however, was criticised for being too utopian.

58. See for instance [J. J.] v[an] d[er] M[eulen], "Oud en nieuw," *Christelijk Schoolblad*, 18 September 1941, 10. (This article is one in a series which summarises the issues at stake and assesses the penetration of reformist ideas in Dutch education.)

59. Consider for instance the early 1920s publications of school cinema proponent David van Staveren, such as "De bioscoop in dienst van het onderwijs en de volksoontwikkeling," *Volksoontwikkeling* 2, no. 10 (1921): 458-72 (see pp.

458 and 459 in particular). As Malte Ewert has pointed out, few of the ideas entertained by the abovementioned reformist 'schools' were reconcilable with the educational use of film; see Ewert, *Reichsanstalt für Film und Bild*, 41. The German concept of *Aanschauungspädagogik* is dealt with in Uli Jung, "Kinoreformer: Nicht-fiktionale Filme für Bildungszwecke," in Jung and Loiperdinger, *Geschichte des dokumentarischen Films in Deutschland*, vol. 1, 339-40. For an idea of the semantic scope of the term *aanschouwelijk onderwijs*, see for instance Th. L. M. B., "Het principe der aanschouwelijkheid," *Christelijk Schoolblad*, 9 April 1942, 3-4.

60. Ph. A. Kohnstamm, "Het bioscoopgevaar: Een teleurstellend rapport," *Volksontwikkeling* 2, [no. 6] (1921): 282. Foreign colleagues of Kohnstamm's shared this view. In France, for instance, similar objections were voiced by professor Henri Arnould; see Annie Renonciat, "Vue fixe et/ou cinéma dans l'enseignement: naissance d'une polémique (1916-1922)," in Pastre-Robert, Dubost and Massit-Folléa *Cinéma pédagogique et scientifique*, 63. German reform pedagogues, for their part, argued that the process of film viewing conflicted with both the ideal of activity and that of personal experience; see Ursula von Keitz, "Wissen als Film: Zur Entwicklung des Lehr- und Unterrichtsfilms," in *Geschichte des dokumentarischen Films in Deutschland*, vol. 2, *Weimarer Republik 1918-1933*, ed. Klaus Kreimeier, Antje Ehmman and Jeanpaul Goergen (Stuttgart: Reclam, 2005), 137. Despite his initial objections to the use of film in teaching, Kohnstamm would defend its potential didactic benefits later on in life, and would even briefly function as director of NOF. More on Kohnstamm's views and accomplishments will follow further on in this chapter.

61. See for instance D. van Staveren, "De film voor cultuur en onderwijs," *Lichtbeeld en Cultuur* 13, no. 2 (1935): 17-25 (in which the author references a range of 'great' philosophers and pedagogues, from Immanuel Kant over John Stuart Mill to the inevitable Pestalozzi), and H. Zanen, "De didactische waarde van de film – I," *Lichtbeeld en Cultuur* 14, no. 1 (1937): 5-7 (an article referring to the pronouncements of a number of local pedagogues, among whom Jan Ligthart).

62. According to Kenneth P. King, this line was also used later, at the time of the introduction of school television: see King, "One Hundred Percent Efficiency: The Use of Technology in Science Education Since 1900," *Journal of the Association for History and Computing* 2, no. 2 (1999), <http://mcel.pacificu.edu/jahc/1999/issue2/articles/king/>, under "Scientific Literacy" (under .02).

63. Ottley, *The Cinema in Education*, xi. For earlier examples, see for instance the introduction to William G. Bagley, *Visual Education* (Meadville, PA: Keystone View, 1906), ix-x, as quoted in Saettler, *Evolution of American Educational Technology*, 140, or G. Sevrette's article "Le cinéma et l'éducation nouvelle," *Le Petit Journal*, 24 November 1927, quoted in Gauthier, "Au risque du spectacle," 93. (The second piece refers very specifically to the particular mindset of 'today's' children.)

64. Saettler, *Evolution of American Educational Technology*, 8 and 167-68.

65. The specific 'order of merit' referred to here is that of one John Adams (author of the book *Exposition and Illustration in Teaching*, published in 1910), discussed in *ibid.*, 140-43. On the subject of object teaching (and its relation to the use of film), see for instance Gunning, "World as object lesson," 425.

66. The original sentence I am summarising here reads: "En dan haar levensadem: beweging, waardoor zij zo na komt te staan aan de werkelijkheid, zo dicht aan de psyche van het kind." See Zanen, "Filmleerstof in verband met het leerplan," 138. Compare also V[an] d[er] M[eulen], "Film op School – II," *Christelijk Schoolblad*, 26 November 1931, 1-2; the same ideas were later repeated in a manual written by the same author: *Film en lichtbeeld bij het onderwijs: Een praktisch-didactische handleiding* (Baarn: Bosch en Keuning, [1951]), 31.

67. In his article "'Scientia'" Lefebvre relates that in the early 1910s, Éclair, distributor of popularising science films, promoted its products as "'leçons de choses' cinématographiques" (p. 85). Also Van Staveren (in "Bioscoop in dienst van het onderwijs," 458) and Coissac (*Histoire du Cinématographe*, 544) make this reference. See also Vignaux, *Jean Benoit-Lévy ou le corps*, for instance p. 187.

68. Ottley, *The Cinema in Education*, 8-9.

69. See for instance Miedema, "Bioscoop en Volksontwikkeling," 128-31, where the author implicitly refers to this possibility.

70. Later on, compilers of visual instruction manuals would stress this point even more. The 1955 handbook by the Dutchman Jan Marie L. Peters, *Visueel onderwijs: Over de grondslagen van het gebruik van de film en de filmstrip in het onderwijs*, 2nd ed. (Purmerend: Muusses, 1955), states on p. 20: "How unique the possibilities of film language are becomes all the more apparent when we observe that film and filmstrip (but the first in particular) can provide experiences which a direct perception of reality cannot offer." ("Hoe uniek de mogelijkheden der beeldtaal eigenlijk wel zijn, blijkt eens te meer als we constateren dat film en filmstrip (maar vooral de eerste) ervaringen kunnen verschaffen die de directe beleving van de werkelijkheid zelf niet kan bieden.")

71. Gunning, "World as object lesson," 425.

72. For Jacques Wallet's pronouncement, see his article "Partis pris filmiques et pédagogiques pour l'enseignement de la géographie: approche historique," in Pastre-Robert, Dubost and Massit-Folléa, *Cinéma pédagogique et*

scientifique, 100 (“ouvrir au réel et découvrir le monde”). The author here specifically refers to the situation in France in the 1920s. The idea of film providing unmediated access to the world would become less prominent later on. In the 1950s and 1960s, proponents of the use of film in education would point out to their readers that the perception of the filmic as ‘real’ is a mere psychological effect, which can be related both to the medium’s ‘inherent’ technological characteristics and to the way in which it is conventionally used. See for instance Peters, *Visueel onderwijs*, 12, 18, 23 and *passim*.

73. See, respectively, Besson, in L’Herbier’s *Intelligence du cinématographe*, 400 (“‘Voir, c’est presque savoir’ écrit [...] notre [...] collègue M. Roux”) and George Brown Goode, as quoted in Gunning, “World as object lesson,” 425.

74. For contemporary evaluations, see for instance Kohnstamm, “Bioscoopgevaar,” 280-82, and another piece by the same author, “Bioscoop en Volksontwikkeling,” *Volksontwikkeling* 3, no. 11/12 (1922): 457-92. A retrospective account is given in Cuban, *Teachers and Machines*, 13-14 (a section of his book that is concerned primarily with effectivity tests). Charles Tepperman made an observation to this effect in his presentation “Mechanical Brains?” for the 2005 SCMS conference (3 April of that year, in London, UK).

75. Cuban, *Teachers and Machines*, 14.

76. Luke McKernan, “Education,” in *Encyclopedia of Early Cinema*, ed. Richard Abel (London: Routledge, 2005), 214.

77. On the promotional function of early distribution catalogues, see for instance Marta Braun and Charlie Keil, “As pleasing as it is incomprehensible’: film catalogues as paratext,” in *Networks of Entertainment: Early Film Distribution, 1895-1915*, ed. Frank Kessler and Nanna Verhoeff (Eastleigh, UK: Libbey, 2007): 218-22.

78. Information on the contents of the catalogue was obtained from John P. Welle, “Avoid giving wine to children’: George Kleine’s correspondence with Cines and the discourse of uplift,” in Kessler and Verhoeff, *Networks of Entertainment*, 26.

79. The quote is taken from a pamphlet entitled *The Cinematograph in Science, Education, and Matters of State*, which Urban published a year earlier, and which is excerpted in Saettler, *Evolution of American Educational Technology*, 98. According to Luke McKernan’s web page on the entrepreneur, a contribution to the site Who’s Who of Victorian Cinema (<http://www.victorian-cinema.net/urban.htm>), *Urbanora* was published in 1908; elsewhere, he speaks of 1909 (see McKernan, “Education,” 214). The second date, however, may refer to the second version of the same catalogue (also mentioned in Saettler, *Evolution of American Educational Technology*, 98). The argument that the educational rubrication of the films should be seen as a commercial move was made by Jennifer Lynn Peterson in her presentation entitled “Beasts Fair and Foul: Locating Wildlife in Early Nature Films” for the 2006 Orphan Film Symposium (University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC, 23 March 2006), which can be played back from the appropriate link at http://www.sc.edu/filmsymposium/Orphans_Sound/orphans.htm. For more on the authorship of the films in Urban’s shows, see the “Biographies” section of McKernan’s website Charles Urban, Motion Picture Engineer: Science, education and discovery in the early years of cinema, <http://www.charlesurban.com/biog.htm>.

80. McKernan, “Education,” 124. The mission statement (“pour répondre aux besoins d’information et de culture du public catholique”) is taken from a brief history of the Groupe Bayard (as the publishing company is presently called) on the Bibliopoche website: see <http://www.bibliopoche.com/editeur/Bayard/23.html>. The projection service referred to actually predates the film era: Vignaux mentions that Coissac, author of the educational film treatises mentioned above, was involved with the activities of the Bonne Presse, and first organised the provision of stills in 1894; see *Jean Benoit-Lévy ou le corps*, 16-17. For more on the subject, see also Pierre Véronneau, “Le Fascinateur et la Bonne Presse: des médias catholiques pour publics francophones,” 1895: *Revue d’histoire du cinéma*, no. 40 (2003), 24-35 in particular.

81. Zimmermann, “Vom Lichtbild zum Film,” 80-82. As Vignaux demonstrates, this practice, also common in France, continued into the 1930s; see *Jean Benoit-Lévy ou le corps*, 189-90.

82. Peterson, “Beasts Fair and Foul”.

83. See for instance Lefebvre, “Scientia Production,” 145-46. Early popular science films were often marketed in combination with the appropriate projection apparatus; Éclair, for instance, advertised Kinéclair projectors from late 1913 onwards, in answer to Pathé’s marketing of Pathé Kok (since 1912). See *ibid*.

84. George Kleine, *Catalogue of Educational Motion Pictures* (New York: George Kleine Company, 1910), 1, as quoted in Saettler, *Evolution of American Educational Technology*, 97.

85. For instance, Lefebvre mentions that the popular science films distributed by Éclair (the so-called *Scientia* series) were variously tagged *vulgarisation*, *éducatif*, *instructif*, *scientifique* and *documentaire*, or labelled according to a range of more specific subject categories (such as, *astronomie*, *biologie*, *zoologie*, etc.). See “Scientia,” 85.

86. See for instance *ibid.*, 84-85 and 193; the quote (“la diffusion sociale d’un savoir”) is taken from p. 84. Examples of companies that produced such vernacular science films are Pathé-Frères, Gaumont, Éclair and Éclipse. Of course, the production of this type of material was not the *raison d’être* of all these firms. For instance, Pathé-Frères and Gaumont, already active in production, each took to marketing such a series, but continued to make films on other topics as well. With regard to producers outside of France, one might think of the Charles Urban Company,

according to Gaycken "the earliest [...] to produce a coherent and sustained popular science film catalogue" (quote taken from his presentation "A History of Violence", see n. 28).

87. The phrase *cinéastes scientifiques* is used, among others, in Richard Millet, "Jean Painlevé cinéaste," in Martinet, *Cinéma et la Science*, 86-94; see pp. 89-90 for a (rough) definition. (Tosi, for his part, uses the term also to refer to film-makers who worked around the turn of the century, such as the French Irishman Lucien Bull; see Tosi, *Cinema before Cinema*, 172-76.) Both Thévenard and Painlevé made films for various audiences, specialist as well as more general, until well into the 1960s (the former) or 1980s (the latter); see for instance Anne Raynal, "Le docteur Thévenard, scientifique et cinéaste," in Martinet, *Cinéma et la Science*, 95-104, and Millet, "Jean Painlevé cinéaste," respectively. Examples of series by Attenborough are *The Living Planet* (1984), *The Trials of Life* (1990) and *The Private Life of Plants* (1995), all produced by the BBC.

88. For the above statements, see León, "Science popularisation through television documentary," and León, *Science on Television*, 18. In his work, the author distinguishes between two sets of 'popularising' techniques. First, there are narrative and dramatic ones – respectively, to simplify content and bring it closer to the viewers' experience; see for instance León, *Science on Television*, 63-100. Second, he mentions 'rhetorical' or 'argumentation' techniques, which help create a so-called 'community of interest' between speaker and hearers; see León, *Science on Television*, 101-40.

I should add here that also the authors who use the first definition of the term 'vernacular' make mention of some 'characteristic' features. The textual ingredient that is referred to most often is the films' subject matter. Most of these titles, having been made in the spirit of ethnological observation, show the behaviour of animals in their natural habitats (a fact which, presumably, does not necessarily preclude staging and *in vitro* recreation); see for instance Lefebvre, "Scientia," 86-89 and "Scientia Production," 137-41; Oliver Gaycken, "A Drama Unites Them in a Fight to the Death": some remarks on the flourishing of a cinema of scientific vernacularization in France, 1909-1914," *Historical Journal of Film, Radio and Television: The Journal of The International Association for Media and History* 22, no. 3 (2002): 364; or again by Gaycken, "Das Privatleben des 'Scorpion Languedocien': Ethologie und *L'Age Dor* (1930)," *montage/AV* 14, no. 2 (2005): 45-47. In addition to this, authors also mention narratological effects such as drama, anthropomorphism and humour (Gaycken, "Drama Unites Them in a Fight" 359-60; Lefebvre, "Scientia Production," 141; Lefebvre, "Scientia," 89) and/or visual spectacle (Gaycken, "Drama Unites Them in a Fight," 366-70). 89. In the article quoted from, Lefebvre literally identifies the latter films' audience as "a company of learned people" ("une société savante"; see "Scientia," 85). He does not elaborate in his piece on potential deviations from this model.

90. According to Slide, the use of motion pictures to document the work of surgeons had become "almost commonplace" by 1908; see *Before Video*, 45. In many cases, however, the phenomena or procedures that were filmed tended to be somewhat exceptional; see for instance José van Dijck, *Het transparante lichaam: Medische visualisering in media en cultuur* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2001), chapter 2 (pp. 25-44). With respect to self-study and self-improvement, the pronouncements of Dr. Doyen have become quite famous; examples of those can be found in Coissac, *Histoire du Cinématographe*, 529, or more recent publications such as Tosi, *Cinema before Cinema*, 167, and Lefebvre, "Dr. Eugène-Louis Doyen," 71. (Sources attest that once the doctor had realised what film could do for his own practice, he ended up systematically screening recordings of surgeries for his colleagues and assistants, in addition to students and scientists further afield. See Tiago Baptista, "Il faut voir le maître: A Recent Restoration of Surgical Films by E.-L. Doyen (1859-1916)," *Journal of Film Preservation*, no. 70 (2005): 44.) With respect to the use of medical films for training purposes, the argument was once more that of efficiency. Moving images could help prepare students for real-life observation, thus significantly reducing the necessity of their presence in operation rooms (Thierry Lefebvre, "Le docteur Doyen, un précurseur," in Martinet, *Cinéma et la Science*, 72-73); in addition to this, they allowed for trainees to be taught by (only) the very best of teachers (see Tosi, *Cinema before Cinema*, 164, or Baptista, "Il faut voir le maître," 64).

91. Because of the medium's indexical qualities, which were appreciated very early on, film was attributed a good deal of evidential value (see for instance Curtis, "Kinematographische Methode," 24); this fact in turn made it attractive as a means of legitimation and promotion. Dr. Doyen, again, was one of the people who used the medium for this purpose. Supposedly, moving images helped him justify his innovative surgical methods towards the international medical world; see for instance Baptista, "Il faut voir le maître," 42-43, or Hediger, "Editorial," 6. A second example is that of the Institut Pasteur, which, according to Raynal, used Thévenard's films for the purpose of disseminating its 'brand name'; see "Thévenard, scientifique et cinéaste," 98.

92. Sometimes, titles underwent some form of transformation before they were shown to their 'secondary', popular audiences. For instance, in 1923, a year after its original release for study purposes, a film about the work of the German physiologist Eugen Steinach was re-edited in order to function as a 'popular-scientific teaching film' (*populär-wissenschaftliche Belehrungsfilm*); see Rainer Herrn and Christine N. Brinckmann, "Von Ratten und Männern: *Der Steinach-Film*," *montage/AV* 14, no. 2 (2005): 80. In an article on 17.5mm film, Martina Roepke describes

a variation on this practice: the reuse of (research-based) scientific films for screening at home; see "Tracing 17.5mm practices in Germany (1902-1908)," *Film History* 19, no. 4 (2007): 349.

93. According to Hernn and Brinckmann, the same also happened with the work of Steinach (see previous note); see "Von Ratten und Männern," 81. Doyen however was more fierce, and went to court to get the screening of his films in non-scientific contexts prohibited (see Lefebvre, "Docteur Doyen, un précurseur," 73-74, and Van Dijk, *Transparante lichaam*, 33; the trial took place *before* Éclipse re-released some of his titles in adapted form, this time *with* his permission). One of his motives for doing this may have been that the reuse of his work was highly controversial, and that this fact reflected badly on his own person, affecting his standing in (mainly French) medical circles; see Lefebvre, "Docteur Doyen, un précurseur," 74; see also p. 72.

94. See Millet, "Jean Painlevé cinéaste," 92 (ciné-clubs) and Roxane Haméry, "Kino und Unterricht. Die fabelhafte Lektion in Unehrenerbietigkeit des Jean Painlevé," *montage/AV* 15, no. 1 (2006): 50 (*avant garde* theatres). Here, one could claim, a shift took place from one type of 'specialist' use to another.

95. I use the term 'attraction' here in the sense of Tom Gunning, "The Cinema of Attraction[s]: Early Film, Its Spectator and the Avant-Garde," and André Gaudreault and Tom Gunning, "Early Cinema as a Challenge to Film History," both in Strauven, *Cinema of Attractions Reloaded*, 381-88 and 365-80, respectively. For more on the concept, see chapter 4, paragraph 4.1.1. (my section on the strategy of 'spectacularisation').

96. See José van Dijk, "Door het oog van de chirurg: Medische films en televisieprogramma's," *Tijdschrift voor Mediageschiedenis* 3, no. 1 (2000): 29-30 and 33; compare also Thierry Lefebvre's article on the same subject: "Die Trennung der Siamesischen Zwillinge Doodica und Radica durch Dr. Doyen," in *KINtop Jahrbuch zur Erforschung des frühen Films – 6: Aktualitäten*, ed. Frank Kessler, Sabine Lenk and Martin Loiperdinger (Basel: Stroemfeld / Frankfurt am Main: Roter Stern, 1997): 97-101. For more on the public appreciation of the film, see also Van Dijk, *Transparante lichaam*, 78-79. Lefebvre has written a great deal about the 'recycling' of Doyen's films in non-specialist contexts: see for instance Lefebvre, "Docteur Doyen, un précurseur," 73-75, and Lefebvre, "Dr. Eugène-Louis Doyen," 72-74.

97. Amad, "Cinema's 'sanctuary,'" 151-53 (quote from p. 151).

98. See, respectively, Raynal, "Thévenard, scientifique et cinéaste," 97 (which contains a sentence starting off with the words: "Le cinéma est par naissance scientifique") and André Drevon, "Les Travaux de Georges Demeny," in Martinet, *Cinéma et la Science*, 55 ("Au début était le 'cinéma' scientifique et d'enseignement..."): 48-61.

99. In the original: "un pionnier du cinéma pour l'école". See Drevon, "Travaux de Georges Demeny," 55.

100. Drevon says in his piece that the development of Demeny's Phonoscope (the contraption which was used to play back an animated version of chronophotographic images of a speaking person) was a result of "the scientific logic of the application of research which, as a technological spin-off, had already led to the invention of cinema [...] while at the same time remaining an instrument to analyse movement" ("la logique scientifique de l'application d'une recherche, qui elle-même avait déjà entraîné, comme retombée technologique, l'invention du film [...] tout en demeurant un moyen d'analyse de mouvement"); see *ibid.* Another author who makes this claim is Michel Frizot, a conference presentation of whom is referenced in Doane, *Emergence of Cinematic Time*, 212. Raynal does not explicitly state her position on the issue.

101. On Marey's scientific interests, see for instance Tosi, *Cinema before Cinema*, 114. Doane specifies that his appreciation for synthesis was limited to its potential as a verification mechanism; see Doane, *Emergence of Cinematic Time*, 211. For more on Edison's and the Lumières' contributions, see for instance Tosi, *Cinema before Cinema*, 111-12 (Edison) and 122-32 and 145 (the Lumières). See p. 155-56 and 160-61 of the same book for a section on the need for developments that were actually made for profit.

102. Etienne-Jules Marey, *La methode graphique dans les sciences experimetales, et principalement en physiologie et en meidecine* (Paris: Masson, 1878), p. 9, as quoted in Tosi, *Cinema before Cinema*, 83.

103. McKernan, "Education," 215. As I will explain later on, my own impression is that in most Western countries, *sustainable* forms of teaching film supply did not emerge until after (or in some cases, during) the Second World War.

104. McKernan as well mentions two conditions; the first one, however, places a slightly different emphasis. According to him, there was above all a need for "a proper theoretical understanding of the pedagogical issues involved"; see *ibid.* I for my part am not convinced that this factor was of such overwhelming importance – at least, not with respect to the creation of an educational film *demand*, the issue which I believe is at stake here. Although the matter clearly did concern those in charge of educational policy, it may not have meant all that much to primary and secondary school teachers – i.e., to the people who had to use the medium on a day-to-day basis. The issues which worried them, I shall explain in chapter 2 (paragraph 2.1.1), were of a far more concrete nature. Meanwhile, I do recognise that the principles behind visual education – or perhaps more accurately: a visual education 'ideology' – were, or was, actively used as a promotional tool.

105. See for instance [C. W. J.] N[atzi], "Een leerfilm-terugblik – II," *Lichtbeeld en Cultuur* 12, no. 6 (1934): 42 (in which the author explains the financial logic adhered to by city councils in the 1930s).

106. "La nécessité d'organiser enfin le cinématographe éducateur et d'enseignement apparaît toujours plus urgente. [...] Le manque actuel de coordination et de cohésion entre les départements ministériels intéressés, entre les divers offices régionaux, entre les œuvres d'éducation sociale, a, pour inévitable conséquence, en même temps qu'une ignorance mutuelle des résultats obtenus, une dispersion d'efforts et de doubles emplois regrettables." See Vignaux, *Jean Benoit-Lévy ou le corps*, 31.
107. See, respectively, *ibid.*, 157, and Bert Hogenkamp, "De schoolbioskoop," *Skrien*, no. 140 (1985): 42. The Belgian school cinema was in Sint-Gillis, Brussels.
108. See Hogenkamp, "De schoolbioskoop," 42, and Hogenkamp, "Onderwijsfilm is geen Duitse uitvinding," 56.
109. See for instance Hogenkamp, "De schoolbioskoop," 43. According to Gauthier, however, the discussion was not entirely 'frozen' either – at least, not in France; see "Au risque du spectacle," 75.
110. The commission, although set up in 1916, was not operational until a few years later; see Lapierre, *Les cent visages du cinéma*, 295. Its full name was: Commission extra-parlementaire chargée d'étudier les moyens de généraliser l'application du cinématographe dans les différentes branches de l'enseignement (Extra-parliamentary commission charged with the study of the means of generalising the application of the cinematograph in education). Its report was officially entitled "Rapport général par Auguste Bessou sur l'emploi du cinématographe dans les différentes branches de l'enseignement" (Paris, 1920). For more information on the contents of the text, see for instance Renonciat, "Vue fixe et/ou cinéma," 61-62, or Besson, in L'Herbier's *Intelligence du cinématographe*, 399-402. The relation between the activities of the commission and the establishment of both film services/repositories is established by Vignaux in *Jean Benoit-Lévy ou le corps*, 20.
111. See for instance [Schreuder], *Leidraad voor kwekelingen*, 6-7.
112. James Marchant, "The Cinema in Education: being the report of the psychological investigation conducted by special subcommittees appointed by the Cinema Commission of Enquiry established by the National Council of Public Morals" (London: Allen and Unwin, 1925); A. C. Cameron, "The Film in National Life: being the report of an enquiry conducted by the Commission on Educational and Cultural Films into the service which the cinema may render to education and social progress" (London: Allen and Unwin, 1932). The Cinema Commission of Inquiry itself was set up in 1917.
113. For instance, the National Academy of Visual Instruction, the Visual Instruction Association of America and the Department of Visual Instruction (DVI) of the National Education Association joined forces in 1932. See Saettler, *Evolution of American Educational Technology*, 144-45 and 47. In Holland, one of the associations that defended the cause of the teaching film at the time was the so-called Vereeniging voor Onderwijs- en Ontwikkelingsfilms (Association for Teaching and Development Films, which counted among its members, among others, Van Staveren, whose many publications I have referenced in previous notes). Many thanks to Floris Paalman for alerting me to the history of this club.
114. See Saettler, *Evolution of American Educational Technology*, 161-165 and 149, respectively. *Moving Picture Age* first appeared in 1919 (taking over from the earlier *Reel and Slide*), *Visual Education* in 1920, *The Educational Screen* in 1921; later on they all joined forces. By 1924, *The Educational Screen* had become the main visual instruction journal. The first visual instruction courses in the US were organised as early as 1918.
115. Vignaux, *Jean Benoit-Lévy ou le corps*, 24-28. The 1926 congress is also mentioned in Gertiser, "Domestizierung des bewegten Bildes," 60.
116. See, respectively, D. van Staveren, "Het internationaal Congres te Rome – I," *Lichtbeeld en Cultuur* 12, no. 1 (1934): 4, and "La convention pour faciliter la Circulation Internationale des films ayant un Caractère Éducatif," *Lichtbeeld en Cultuur* 16, no. 9 (1939): 90. The institute was closed by Benito Mussolini in 1937; after that date, its tasks were referred once more to the Committee on Intellectual Cooperation (see for instance "Convention pour faciliter la Circulation," 90).
117. For examples of such post-war boards, see among others Renonciat, "Vue fixe et/ou cinéma," 62-63 (which deals very specifically with the situation in France). As Saettler's overview shows, the results of the tests carried out at the time were often of a quantitative nature. For instance, they provided answers to the question how much more likely children were to retain factual information if films were being used (thus, it could be argued, *going against* the reformist tendency of valuing other, less easily measurable types of knowledge) or whether they could help raise the pupils' interest in a given lesson subject. Another research purpose was to find the optimal teaching film 'format' (as in the case of the so-called 'Eastman experiment', which I will deal with further on). See Saettler, *Evolution of American Educational Technology*, 223-28.
118. See for instance Charles H. Judd, *Report of the Committee on Visual Education and Cooperation with the Motion Picture Producers and Distributors, Inc., to the National Education Association* (Washington, DC: NEA, 1923), also known as the report of the 'Judd Committee', as quoted in Saettler, *Evolution of American Educational Technology*, 146, or the conclusions drawn by the relevant sub-commission at the 1926 Paris conference of Committee for Intellectual Cooperation, referred to above, as mentioned in Vignaux, *Jean Benoit-Lévy ou le corps*, 29.

119. This was the case right from the start; see Bert Hogenkamp, *De Nederlandse documentaire film 1920-1940* (Amsterdam: Van Genneep / Utrecht: Stichting Film en Wetenschap, 1988), 26-27. For more on Polygoon's educational ambitions and its projection service, see also B. D. Ochse, *De Film ten dienste van Onderwijs en Volksontwikkeling* (Haarlem: Filmfabriek Polygoon, [1926]), 7-8, and Hogenkamp, *Nederlandse documentaire film 1920-1940*, 29-30 and 32. The first of these publications, a pamphlet brought out by the company's director, also states that "Polygoon [was] set up with the sole purpose of producing good teaching films" ("Polygoon [werd] opgericht met geen ander doel dan de vervaardiging van de goede onderwijsfilm"; see pp. 7-8).
120. Hogenkamp, *Nederlandse documentaire film 1920-1940*, 44.
121. Buchanan, *The Film in Education*, 65-69. For the differences between both series, compare pp. 65-66 and 69 of the same book. For more on G-BI, see also Rachael Low, *The History of the British Film 1929-1939*, vol. 6, *Documentary and Educational Films of the 1930s* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1979), 17-18 and 20-33. British Instructional Films, first an independent company headed by H. Bruce Woolfe, was later incorporated by G-BI.
122. See for instance Buchanan, *The Film in Education*, 71, where the author points out that "production costs [for the making of classroom films] could not be regained without obtaining additional revenue by releasing 'popularized' versions of the films in cinemas".
123. For some examples, see Saettler, *Evolution of American Educational Technology*, 99-101.
124. For the Society for Visual Education and Eastman Teaching Films, see *ibid.*, 102-3. Eastman Teaching Films was one of several Eastman Kodak subsidiaries. In 1929, it changed its name to Eastman Classroom Films. The original research project was headed by Frank N. Freeman of the University of Chicago and Ben D. Wood of Columbia University. See also Slide, *Before Video*, 39-41. ERPI stands for Electrical Research Products, Inc., a subsidiary of the Western Electric Company. It set up an educational division in 1929; in the same year, it also made its first educational film (with sound). Encyclopaedia Britannica Films was the initiative of William Benton, who bought the EB publishing company (known primarily for its standard reference work) and subsequently, the ERPI collection of classroom films (1943) and the old (silent) productions of Eastman Teaching Films (1944). Together, the latter two acquisitions formed the basis of the Britannica catalogue. In the 1940s alone, 373 new productions were added to this list. See Slide, *Before Video*, 92-93, and Smith, *Mental Hygiene*, 99-100.
125. Saettler makes mention of such complaints in *Evolution of American Educational Technology*, 115. Proof of the American system's (relative) efficiency is the ubiquity of distribution points for suitable films. In a chapter on the subject, Slide states that by the end of the 1930s, "most libraries [in the US] created audiovisual and film departments, making educational [...] films available to their patrons"; see *Before Video*, 60. In addition to this, there were a variety of other institutions, both town- and state-funded, which provided such material. According to Prelinger, some of these distribution points were already in place in the mid-nineteen tens: see Prelinger, *Field Guide to Sponsored Films*, ix.
126. The first, Saettler points out, provided an important impetus to the growth of educational film libraries in extension divisions of colleges and universities, state departments of education, normal schools, and public museums; see Saettler, *Evolution of American Educational Technology*, 111. The second was a body which furthered access to materials among member institutions. It did so by compiling catalogues and commissioning titles, and by building up stocks in areas where means from other sources were not (yet) available. See for instance [C. W. J.] N[atzijl], "Hier... en over de grenzen: De culturele film en de leerfilm in de verenigde Staten – IV: The Association of School Film Libraries, Inc.," *Lichtbeeld en Cultuur* 16, no. 9 (1939): 143-44.
127. For instance, Tania Munz relates that the scientific films of Karl von Frisch and Konrad Lorenz (1920s and 1930s onwards) were first used during specialist lectures and conferences, but later ended up in the catalogues of the Reichsstelle für den Unterrichtsfilm (RfdU, see introduction). See Tania Munz, "Die Ethologie des wissenschaftlichen Cineasten: Karl von Frisch, Konrad Lorenz und das Verhalten der Tiere im Film," *montage/AV* 14, no. 2 (2005): 52. Horníček writes about the educational reuse of so-called 'cultural films' in pre-1930s Czechoslovakia: see "Institutionalization of classroom films in Czechoslovakia," 384. (The concept of 'cultural films' is dealt with in n. 211.)
128. See, respectively, Buchanan, *The Film in Education*, 65-66; Gertiser, "Domestizierung des bewegten Bildes," 58-60; Vignaux, *Jean Benoit-Lévy ou le corps*, 186.
129. Details concerning the production history for a good deal of those films can be found in Hogenkamp's Polygoon chapter in his *Nederlandse documentaire film 1920-1940* (chapter 2, pp. 25-44). One title that was definitely intended for a more general audience is *Neerland's Volksleven in de Lente* (Holland's folk life in spring time); see *ibid.*, 27-28.
130. Hogenkamp dates *De bijenwereld 1927*, which is *after* the Ochse booklet came out; presumably, then, this film was not yet finished at the time of printing. The striking predominance of geography films in collections available for classroom use has also been observed in Wallet, "Partis pris filmiques et pédagogiques," 99, and Uli Jung, "Lehr- und Unterrichtsfilme für Schulen und Hochschulen," in Jung and Loiperdinger, *Geschichte des dokumentarischen Films in Deutschland*, vol. 1, 349.

131. Gauthier, dealing specifically with the situation in France, gives an overview of the range of non-theatrical 'educational' screenings that were common in the 1920s; see "Au risque du spectacle," 97.
132. For the various categories mentioned here, see Alison Griffiths, "Ethnographic films," in Abel, *Encyclopedia of Early Cinema*, 221, and Tom Gunning, "Before Documentary: Early nonfiction films and the 'view' aesthetic," in Hertogs and De Klerk, *Uncharted Territory*, 17, respectively. For the designation 'Eastern types' (*Oostersche menschentypen*), see Ochse, *Film ten dienste van Onderwijs en Volksonwikkeling*, 11.
133. See, respectively, Wallet, "Partis pris filmiques et pédagogiques," 102 ("Rien ne sépare un documentaire pour les écoles d'un documentaire 'grand public'"; the author also demonstrates in his piece that such was the case until well into the 1950s) and Pierre-Emmanuel Jaques, "Werben, zeigen oder verbergen? Zum Tourismusfilm in der Schweiz," *montage/AV* 15, no. 1 (2006): 104-5 (on p. 105, Jaques literally speaks of "einer relativen Geschlossenheit des dokumentarischen Gebrauchsfilms"; also his observations cover the period from film's early days, up to the 1950s).
134. My focus here will be on France; however, other countries exemplify this situation as well. One that has been discussed in some detail is Czechoslovakia: see Horníček, "Institutionalization of classroom films in Czechoslovakia" (on p. 386 of his article, the author literally attributes the failure of an attempt to set up an educational film distribution system to a lack of state support; on p. 389, also the nation's deficiency of purpose-produced material is explained in this way) and Lucie Česálková, "Film před tabulí: Idea školního filmu v prvorepublikovém Československu" [Blackboard film: The idea of school film in the First Czechoslovak Republic] (PhD dissertation, Masarykova univerzita, 2009) (especially, chapter 6, "Školní film po r. 1936: učební pomůcka diskutabilních metodických kvalit" [The School Film after 1936: Teaching tool of controversial methodic features], pp. 192-208).
135. Examples of ministries that financially supported such film services were the Ministère de l'Instruction publique (Ministry of Public Education), which funded the film service of the Musée pédagogique and the Cinémathèque centrale de l'Enseignement professionnel (the latter catering specifically to those in vocational schools), and the Ministère d'Agriculture (Ministry of Agriculture), which installed its own *cinémathèque*, providing for students in agricultural schools. See Vignaux, *Jean Benoit-Lévy ou le corps*, 37-38. For more on the fortunes of the Office national du cinématographe, see Vignaux, *Jean Benoit-Lévy ou le corps*, 36, 124-31 and 157-61.
136. Gauthier here mentions the example of the Musée pédagogique (which, at some point, was also deprived of its funding, and therefore could not renew its collections). See Gauthier, "Au risque du spectacle," 87.
137. See Streible, Roepke and Mebold, "Introduction," 340-41. See also Buchanan, *The Film in Education*, 80; Masson, "Of Pits and Vaults," 51-52 (the latter two dealing specifically with the situation in the UK); Saettler, *Evolution of American Educational Technology*, 178-96 (US). (The last of these publications focuses on the use of film for purposes of industrial and military training.)
138. For purposes of illustration, see my comparative list of small-gauge film providers in Britain in 1940 and 1945 in Masson, "Educational Films in Britain," 53 (appendix A). Jan-Christopher Horak claims that the upward tendency continued in the period after the war; see his article "Archiving, Preserving, Screening 16mm," *Cinema Journal: The Journal of the Society of Cinema and Media Studies* 45, no. 3 (2006): 114-15.
- 16mm film, introduced by Kodak in 1923, got accepted as an official (SMPE) standard in 1932. Its advantages over the 'regular', theatrical gauge (35mm) were portability and safety. (The latter quality was due to the fact that it was made of a non-flammable film stock rather than combustible cellulose nitrate.) As opposed to its small-gauge alternatives (such as 9.5mm, whose manufacturers also boasted those same two assets) it also had a rather wide image surface, and used a relatively cheap reversal stock (which meant that the production process did not involve a negative stage, and therefore was less costly). For more details, see for instance Horak, "Archiving, Preserving, Screening 16mm," 113-14, and Slide, *Before Video*, xi-xii.
139. This conclusion is applicable, among others, to France, Britain (albeit with some delay) and the US; see, respectively, Michelle Aubert, Patrice Delavie, Pierrette Lemoigne and Robert Poupard, "Les collections des films pédagogiques et scientifiques des premiers temps (1910-1955)," in Pastre-Robert, Dubost and Massit-Folléa, *Cinéma pédagogique et scientifique*, 27; Masson, "Educational Films in Britain," 14-16 and "Of Pits and Vaults," 51-52; Saettler, *Evolution of American Educational Technology*, 114-15, and Smith, *Mental Hygiene*, 26. For the practical benefits, see also Prelinger, *Field Guide to Sponsored Films*, vii.
140. In 1939, just before the outbreak of the Second World War, the name of the institution was changed to Reichsanstalt für Film und Bild in Wissenschaft und Unterricht (RWU). After the war, the body was temporarily dissolved. From 1950 onwards, it continued as FWU (Institut für Film und Bild in Wissenschaft und Unterricht), servicing Western Germany (the Federal Republic); the East was provided by a Zentralinstitut für Film und Bild in Unterricht, Erziehung und Wissenschaft (ZFB).
141. Only films for higher education were made in-house; productions for primary and secondary schools were ordered from private companies. The films' subjects and treatments, however, were always determined by the institute itself. See for instance Ewert, *Reichsanstalt für Film und Bild*, 93, 99 and 102.

142. Ewert largely attributes this situation to the person of Kurt Zierold, one of the 'founding fathers' of RfdU, who took advantage of the mutual aversion between the ministers Rust (education) and Goebbels (propaganda) to forge an organisation that could function with as little government interference as possible, while at the same time benefiting from its 'official' status as a state institution (*Reichsanstalt*). See *ibid.*, 64-67 and 81-86. For more details on the various activities of the *Bildstellen*, see also pp. 201-13; for more on RfdU's financial situation, see pp. 75-76, or Ursula von Keitz' "Die Kinematographie in der Schule: Zur politischen Pädagogik des Unterrichtsfilms von RfdU und RWU," in *Geschichte des dokumentarischen Films in Deutschland*, vol. 3, 'Drittes Reich' 1933-1945, ed. Yvonne Zimmermann and Kay Hoffmann (Stuttgart: Reclam, 2005), 465-66. Pp. 191-96 of Ewert's book deal with the organisation's attitude towards the screening of propaganda films.

143. See Ewert, *Reichsanstalt für Film und Bild*, 155-6. However, there are other commentators who are convinced that the institute was an instrument of pure Nazi propaganda; for instance, Knut Hickethier, in several publications, as referenced in Ewert, *Reichsanstalt für Film und Bild*, 179-89.

144. The *Bilderbühnenbund* was an association with a membership of towns that set up communal film theatres (so-called *Musterlichtspielbühnen*) which could hire 'culturally sound' films at discounted rates. The movement had begun in the city of Stettin, which had erected the first such cinema in 1914. Apart from screenings targeted at a general audience, this venue also organised special *Lehrfilm*-programmes for schools. See Jung and Mühl-Benninghaus, "Kulturfilmdiskussion," 483, and Ewert, *Reichsanstalt für Film und Bild*, 42-43. A factor that contributed to this development was a ban on cinema-going for children, accomplished by the *Kinoreformbewegung* in the early 1910s; see Jung, "Kinoreformer," 333 and "Lehr- und Unterrichtsfilme," 351.

145. The government had a share in Ufa until 1921, when it was sold to the Deutsche Bank (Von Keitz, "Wissen als Film," 127). The core of the Ufa-Lehrfilmarchiv was formed by a selection of the holdings of the former BuFA, the Bild- und Filmamt (Photo and Film Office) of the German Army, which was dissolved in 1919. For more on this subject, see Garth Montgomery, "'Realistic' War Films in Weimar Germany: entertainment as education," *Historical Journal of Film, Radio and Television* 9, no. 2 (1989): 117-19. In addition to this, the Kulturabteilung itself produced about 400 films for use in primary and secondary schools and higher education in the period until 1923; see Klaus Kreimeier, "Ein deutsches Paradigma: Die Kulturabteilung der Ufa," in Kreimeier, Ehmman and Goergen *Geschichte des dokumentarischen Films in Deutschland*, vol. 2, 83. The Zentralinstitut für Erziehung und Unterricht was established in 1915 to further the production and distribution of non-fiction films – especially the kind that could serve the purposes of formal education. Supposedly, it was set up as a reaction against the disproportionate amount of French educational films that were available on the German market (compare Von Keitz, "Wissen als Film," 121, with Ewert, *Reichsanstalt für Film und Bild*, 37). From 1919 onwards, it took on the task of rating titles. Films that were considered fit subsequently ended up in a special teaching film archive (*Bildstelle* beim Zentralinstitut; see Von Keitz, "Wissen als Film," 126 and Ewert, *Reichsanstalt für Film und Bild*, 46). According to Ewert, the institute can be considered as RfdU's predecessor – not only in terms of what it did, but also because of who it employed; see *Reichsanstalt für Film und Bild*, 256.

146. See Von Keitz, "Kinematographie in der Schule," 470-71, and Ewert, *Reichsanstalt für Film und Bild*, 201.

147. Hogenkamp, "Onderwijsfilm is geen Duitse uitvinding," 59-60. In Holland, Hogenkamp argues, the most substantial objection to the workings of RfdU was actually of a confessional nature: the Dutch Catholics, it seems, opposed to the perceived 'neutrality' of the German teaching film institute. (See also my section on the so-called *verzuijing* of public life in the Netherlands, in paragraph 1.2.1.) For the pedagogical argument, see also Van Staveren, "Film voor cultuur en onderwijs," 21 (see n. 61).

148. Speaking of the situation in the 1920s, Ewert argues that the majority of educators doubted between reticence and open rejection; see Ewert, *Reichsanstalt für Film und Bild*, 49. A Dutch article written at the time speaks of a rather extensive group of 'neutral' and 'cautious' people (*onverschilligen* and *bedachtzamen*): J. Faber, "De Bioscoop in dienst van het Onderwijs," *Volksonwikkeling* 2, no. 8 (1921): 378. In early 1920s France, the national association of trade unions of teachers in public schools even officially *opposed* the use of film in class; see Renonciat, "Vue fixe et/ou cinéma," 68.

149. See for instance Cuban, *Teachers and Machines*, 17-18, or Hans-Ulrich Grunder, "Die Verteufelung des Bildes in der Geschichte der Pädagogik," *Paedagogica Historica: International Journal of the History of Education*, n. s., 36, no. 1 (2000): 61.

150. See for instance Kohnstamm, "Bioscoopgevaar," 282 (see n. 60).

151. Renonciat, "Vue fixe et/ou cinéma," 71. For more on standards for visual representations, see also Reinhard Stach, "Wandbilder als Didaktische Segmente der Realität," *Paedagogica Historica*, n. s., 36, no. 1 (2000): 207-9. With respect to older students, perceptual constraints seem to have been less of an issue. Incidentally, openness to the use of film in higher education was also much greater among professionals involved with this audience group. See Van Staveren, "Film voor cultuur en onderwijs," 18 for a related comment.

152. For the first argument, see Renonciat, "Vue fixe et/ou cinéma," 66-67 and 71; contemporary sources are

Kohnstamm, "Bioscoopgevaar," 282, and G. Révész and J. F. Hazewinkel, "Over de didactische waarde van de projectielantaarn en de bioscoop," *Paedagogische Studiën: Driemaandelijksch tijdschrift voor paedagogiek en methodiek* 4, [no. 2] (1923): 37 and 39-41. For the second, see Renonciat, "Vue fixe et/ou cinéma," 69, and Kohnstamm, "Bioscoop en Volksontwikkeling," 482. I should add here that the authors quoted by Renonciat also blamed some of the technical aspects of cinematography (at that point in time) for the 'imprecision' of the mental images which children retained; see p. 69 of her article.

153. Renonciat, "Vue fixe et/ou cinéma," 66; see also Kohnstamm, "Bioscoopgevaar," 482-3, and Miedema, "Bioscoop en Volksontwikkeling," 128-9 (see n. 39).

154. Kohnstamm, "Bioscoop en Volksontwikkeling," 458-9. See also Kohnstamm, "Bioscoopgevaar," 282.

Philip Abraham Kohnstamm (1875-1951) started off his career as a physicist and philosopher, and turned to the study of pedagogy in the late 1910s, when he became one of first academics in Holland to hold a chair in educational science. In 1919, he founded the Nutsseminarium voor Paedagogiek, a centre for experimental educational research at the University of Amsterdam. In the next few decades, he would remain one of the country's most solicited educational experts (alongside such prominent as J. H. Gunning, Rommert Casimir and Jan Waterink.) In spite of his earlier objections to the use of film in school (see Hogenkamp, "Onderwijsfilm is geen Duitse uitvinding," 58), he became director of NOF in 1946, after his official retirement from academia. For more biographical information, see M. J. Langeveld, "Philip Kohnstamm," in Van der Meer en Bregman, *Onderwijskundigen van de twintigste eeuw*, 87-93, and *Biografisch Woordenboek van Nederland*, s.v. "Kohnstamm, Philipp Abraham (1875-1951)" (by G. J. van de Poll), <http://www.inghist.nl/Onderzoek/Projecten/BWN/lemmata/bwn1/kohnstamm> (accessed 1 August 2009).

155. Renonciat, "Vue fixe et/ou cinéma," 64 (both quotations). In the original text, the first phrase reads: "le pouvoir quasi hallucinatoire de l'image cinématographique". The longer passage goes as follows: "le spectateur du film, peu à peu, ne voit plus devant lui des images mobiles mais des êtres réels; l'obscurité dans laquelle il est plongé renforce son illusion. Les enseignants rationalistes les plus intransigeants répugnent à asseoir les processus cognitifs de l'élève sur les vertus d'un simulacre dont le ressort procède d'un faire croire plus qu'un faire penser."

156. See for instance the pronouncements of inspector of schools Édouard Petit in "L'École et le cinéma," *Film-Revue*, 15 December 1913, 1-2, as quoted in Lefebvre, "Scientia," 90-91. See also Kohnstamm, "Bioscoopgevaar," 282 (which attributes the problem very specifically to the flickering effect).

157. Cuban, *Teachers and Machines*, 60-61. An article in a trade union magazine from the early 1960s hints at similar reservations about the use of (school) television: see P. H. M. G., "Schooltelevisie," *Katholieke Schoolblad*, 24 September 1960, 908. In a piece on the use of computers for teaching, Todd Openheimer quotes from a psychological study which argues that children may miss out on "emotional nurturance" due to overexposure to "unproven technologies"; see "The Computer Delusion," *The Atlantic Monthly*, July 1997, <http://www.tnellen.com/ted/tc/computer.htm>.

As a matter of fact, those same sources also show evidence of the permanence of some of the other psychosocial concerns dealt with above – for instance, doubts about whether media can engage children in 'proper' observation (due to fears of 'over-stimulation') and suppositions about mental 'passivity'; see G., "Schooltelevisie," 907 (which deals with the first topic), and Oppenheimer, "The Computer Delusion" (on both issues). Cuban, in turn, shares his predecessors' worries about the potential effects on pupils of repeated confrontation with a surrogate reality (in his case, as shown on a computer screen); see *Teachers and Machines*, 92.

158. See for instance Georges Duhamel's 1932 article for *l'École Libératrice* (precise date and pages unknown), as quoted in Lapierre, *Les cent visages du cinéma*, 295.

159. When both sets of reservations – psychosocial and practical – co-occur in one text, the latter seem to be emphasised less heavily. Some sources, however, deal with practical considerations only.

160. Cuban, *Teachers and Machines*, 18.

161. See F. Dean McClusky, *Motion Pictures for the Schools* (unpublished report presented to the Rockefeller Foundation, 1937), as quoted in Saettler, *Evolution of American Educational Technology*, 107.

162. See for instance N[atzi]j, "Leerfilm-terugblik – II," 43 (see n. 105; on availability) or Van Staveren, "Film voor cultuur en onderwijs," 18 and 22 (on the issue of relevant film topics).

163. See for instance Faber, "Bioscoop in dienst van het Onderwijs," 378-80. For accounts in secondary sources, see also Cuban, *Teachers and Machines*, 52-53, and Von Keitz, "Wissen als Film," 137-38. In the latter publication, the author suggests that also lack of preparation time (due to the fact that films remained in schools for such a short period of time) might have been an issue.

164. See for instance Van Staveren, "Film voor cultuur en onderwijs," 22, or H. Zanen, "Leerfilmorganisatie en filmpaedagogen," *Lichtbeeld en Cultuur* 15, no. 5 (1938): 76. Very telling in this respect is the phrasing used by Van Staveren, who, among others, tries to subvert the assumption that in using film, "[t]oo much teaching time is lost" ("Er gaat te veel tijd van het onderwijs verloren"; see "Film voor cultuur en onderwijs," 22). This line suggests that

teachers at the time thought that what was done with the help of classroom films could not (yet) qualify as actual, proper 'teaching'.

165. Kohnstamm, "Bioscoop en Volksontwikkeling," 488.

166. This is the case, for instance, in Zanen, "Leerfilmorganisatie en filmpaedagogie," 76.

167. For Cuban's observation, see for instance his publication *How Teachers Taught: Constancy and Change in American Classrooms, 1880-1990*, 2nd ed. (New York: Teachers College Press, 1993), 265 and following; more precise references to this work will follow in paragraph 2.1.1. Another argument in favour of this conclusion is that the practical arguments mentioned above also tend to re-emerge in the course of time – regardless of the more specific characteristics of the 'new' medium concerned. In his article on the use of computers, for instance, Oppenheimer mentions such problems as lack of (suitable) material, time loss and cost; see "The Computer Delusion".

168. The issue is dealt with, among others, in H. Zanen, "Schema voor een leerfilmorganisatie ten dienste van ons lager onderwijs – I," *Lichtbeeld en Cultuur* 14, no. 8 (1937): 118; see also Gauthier, "Au risque du spectacle," 83. Grunder points out that the 'cultural pessimists' who incited such fears were often intellectuals ('Gebildeten'); see Grunder, "Verteufelung des Bildes," 62.

169. For the first set of arguments, see for instance D. van Staveren, "Culturele, opbouwende filmarbeid," *Lichtbeeld en Cultuur* 12, no. 9 (1935): 65-67, or Jean Painlevé, "Préface," in *Le Cinéma scientifique français*, ed. P. Thévenard and G. Tassel (Paris: La Jeune Parque, 1948), viii (on lack of seriousness or cultural value); J. W. Smeelen, *De Schoolbioscoop onmisbaar??*, Opvoedkundige Brochurenreeks (Tilburg: Drukkerij van Het RK Jongensweeshuis, 1928), 58 (on general perversity). For the second series, see for instance, Jung, "Kinoreformer," 333 (which quotes an early source mentioning late drinking bouts); Smeelen, *De Schoolbioscoop onmisbaar??*, 28 (in which the author wonders what viewers do with their arms and legs while they are watching in the dark); or, for more on the relation between the frequenting of cinemas and criminality, particularly among the young: [D. van] S[taveren], "Film en jeugd-criminaliteit: Nog een getuigenis," *Lichtbeeld en Cultuur* 16, no. 1 (1939): 5; D. v[an] S[taveren], "Baldadigheid, Opvoeding en Onderwijshervorming," *Lichtbeeld en Cultuur* 17, no. 3 (1939): 40-45; Gauthier, "Au risque du spectacle," 90. For comparisons with other genres of popular culture, see Ewert, *Reichsanstalt für Film und Bild*, 35; Grunder, "Verteufelung des Bildes," 62; Jung, "Kinoreformer," 333.

170. For instance, Miedema, "Bioscoop en Volksontwikkeling," 128-29. John Hartley shows that similar complaints were made about television later on; see Hartley, *The Uses of Television* (London: Routledge, 1999), 144.

171. See for example Kohnstamm, "Bioscoop en Volksontwikkeling," 460-74; [D. van] S[taveren], "Over film en misdaad: Een belangrijke mededeling," *Lichtbeeld en Cultuur* 15, no. 8 (1938): 118-19; Smeelen, *De Schoolbioscoop onmisbaar??*, 28-29 (the latter dealing more explicitly with the relation between such antagonism and the commentators' religious convictions). In Holland, Protestants in particular were opposed to cinema-going; see "De film en de kerk," *Lichtbeeld en Cultuur* 14, no. 7 (1937): 97-99. Elsewhere, it was primarily Catholics; see for instance Gauthier, "Au risque du spectacle," 90, and Germain Lacasse, "The Lecturer and the Attraction," in Strauven, *Cinema of Attractions Reloaded*, 188.

172. As a matter of fact, regulation took place quite early on. In Holland, for instance, a Comité ter Bestrijding van het Bioscoopkwaad (Committee for the Suppression of Cinema Evil) was set up in 1912. One of the activities it engaged in was the publication of all sort of reports; for instance, Simon B. Stokvis' *Het Amsterdamsche schoolkind en de bioscoop* (Amsterdam: Elsevier, 1913). For an idea of the sorts of measures that were proposed (also in parliament), see for instance Kohnstamm, "Bioscoopgevaar," 280-82.

173. See for instance Van Staveren, "Culturele, opbouwende filmarbeid," 65-68; or, for opinions from later dates, Besson, in L'Herbier's *Intelligence du cinématographe*, 399, and Godfrey M. Elliott, "The Genesis of the Educational Film," in *Film and Education: A Symposium on the Role of the Film in the Field of Education* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1948): 3-10. The articles by D. v[an] S[taveren], "De culturele film in Nederland," *Lichtbeeld en Cultuur*, 2nd ser., 13, no. 1 (1936): 82-86 (p. 84 in particular) and "De bioscoop een nationaal gevaar?," *Lichtbeeld en Cultuur* 15, no. 6 (1938): 81-85 (especially p. 85) make pleas for 'positive' action. Examples of groups dedicated to this cause are the Nederlandse Vereniging voor Culturele films (see for instance Van Staveren, "Culturele, opbouwende filmarbeid," 65-68; [J. H.] v[an] Zw[ijndrecht], "Wat wil de Nederlandsche Vereeniging voor Culturele Films!," *Lichtbeeld en Cultuur*, 2nd ser., 13, no. 1 (1936): 103-4; "De Cultuurfilmcentrale bestaat tien jaar," *Lichtbeeld en Cultuur* 18, no. 2 (1941): 17-19), the French *réseaux du 'Bon Cinéma'* (Gauthier, "Au risque du spectacle," 89) and the German *Kinoreformer* (Jung, "Kinoreformer"; or, dealing more specifically with the type of films which they promoted: Jung and Mühl-Benninghaus, "Kulturfilmdiskussion," 480-81 in particular). Pronouncements on the subject of the medium's 'original' mission can be found, once more, in Gauthier, "Au risque du spectacle," 91 and 94.

As a matter of fact, positive action was also the idea behind the establishment of all sorts of courses in film education, which taught interested individuals how to distinguish between 'good' and 'bad' films. For more on this phenomenon (and its integration into the formal school programme later on), see paragraph 1.2.2.

174. See for instance "Gaan er te veel kinderen naar de bioscoop? Een enquête," *Lichtbeeld en Cultuur* 14, no. 11

(1937): 161-65, and V[an] S[taveren], "Bioscoop een nationaal gevaar?" 81-85; more Dutch sources are mentioned in Langelaan, "Debat rondom het gebruik van film," 15. Also George's early British manual, *The Cinema in School*, devotes a few pages to the subject (chapter 2, pp. 20-23).

Cinema attendance among children, I should add, was an issue that occupied the minds of pedagogues until well after the Second World War. For some of the more widely known publications on the subject, I refer once more to Langelaan, "Debat rondom het gebruik van film," 15; for purposes of comparison, see also the articles "Jeugd en film," *Onderwijs en opvoeding*, 29 January 1949, 12, and "Film en bioscoop in het leven van onze kinderen – I," *Schoolblad*, 3 December 1955, 732.

175. In Holland, this danger was often related to the school cinema system, which required that children actually left their classrooms and went to some sort of theatre. See for instance Faber, "Bioscoop in dienst van het Onderwijs," 379 (which demonstrates that even moderate supporters of didactic film use were aware of this risk). The issue is also dealt with retrospectively in Van der Meulen, *Film en lichtbeeld bij het onderwijs*, 26.

176. Grunder, in this context, uses the term *unmündig* (incapable of self-governance; see Grunder, "Verteufelung des Bildes," 66). In my view, however, the problem was perceived as much more profound, and ties in with the development of what Van der Meulen, in the late 1940s, called "het oordeel des onderscheids"; see his article "Wat doen we met de film? Onze houding ten opzichte van film en bioscoop," *Christelijk Schoolblad*, 4 March 1948, 2.

177. See also Jung, "Kinoreformer," 333. In many countries, therefore, pleas were held for special measures to regulate the film viewing behaviour of children. Once more, the requested restrictions concerned both the films shown (to be enforced through separate censorship systems, as proposed in D. van Staveren, "Het internationaal Congres te Rome – III," *Lichtbeeld en Cultuur* 12, no. 3 (1934): 18; "Kind, Bioscoop, Volkenbond," *Lichtbeeld en Cultuur* 16, no. 1 (1939): 2-3; "Paedagogische normen en paedagogisch inzicht: Filmkeuring voor de jeugd," *Lichtbeeld en Cultuur* 16, no. 5 (1939): 65-68) and the circumstances in which they were shown (segregated, supervised screenings, as suggested in Kohnstamm, "Bioscoopgevaar," 280-81). See also n. 144.

Apparently, also the above arguments are timeless. According to Grunder, the idea that cinema attendance might lead kids astray is as old as the medium (see Grunder, "Verteufelung des Bildes," 61); more recent pieces show that they have also been formulated by those criticising media of later decades, such as television and the Internet (see Hartley, *The Uses of Television*, 186, and Oppenheimer, "The Computer Delusion"). Even the Dutch organisation Kennisnet (a public body which calls itself a 'centre of expertise' concerning the use of ICT in education) sees the need, in a recent publication on games in teaching, to devote an entire section to the relation between gaming and violence: Jetske Beeksma with Arno van der Hulst, *Games – Meer dan spelen: ICT verkenningen voor het onderwijs* (Zoetermeer: Stichting Kennisnet, 2005), http://corporate.kennisnet.nl/attachments/session=cloud_mmdbase+328863/Publicatie_Games_web.pdf (especially chapter 4, "Is het computerspel gevaarlijk?," pp. 39-48).

178. Grunder attributes the greater threat posed by (visual) images to the fact that they are more ambiguous than (written or spoken) texts. He characterises the difference as follows: "Reading we have to do word by word. The meaning [of a text] reveals itself on the basis of a serially established understanding of each unit separately. An image we experience in a more complete, perhaps also a more totalitarian, intrusive, 'finished' way. Totality, however, is uncontrollable, anarchistic, and therefore, for pedagogues [more in particular], unverseeable and not to be made 'didactic'. Images haul us in (cf. 'virtual reality'). They make us accessories. Words in contrast keep us at a distance." ("Lesen müssen wir Wort für Wort. Der Sinn ergibt sich aufgrund der seriell gestalteten Einzelerkenntnis. Ein Bild erfahren wir totaler, vielleicht auch totalitärer, aufdringlicher, ganzheitlicher. Totalität aber ist unkontrollierbar, anarchistisch und damit für die Pädagogen nicht überschaubar und nicht didaktisierbar. Bilder vereinnahmen uns (vgl. die 'virtual reality'). Sie machen uns zu ihren Komplizen. Das Wort dagegen hält uns auf Distanz." See Grunder, "Verteufelung des Bildes," 58.) Further on in his text, he summarises the problem by saying that there is no such thing as a dictionary for images (see p. 60).

179. Cuban, *Teachers and Machines*, 61; Saettler, *Evolution of American Educational Technology*, 106. The same explanation has also been proposed with respect to the slow institutional recognition of film in medical circles. (In n. 93, I briefly touched upon such issues in referring to the activities of the French doctor Doyen; others have discussed them in relation to the works and lives of Demeny, Steinach and Painlevé: see, respectively, Tosi, *Cinema before Cinema*, 162; Hernn and Brinckmann, "Von Ratten und Männern," 80 and 97-98; Millet, "Jean Painlevé cinéaste," 87 and 90.)

180. Grunder here speaks of "the fear of adults for the image consumption of those growing up, the pedagogues' lack of power over the reception of 'living photographs'" ("die Angst der Erwachsenen vor dem Bilderkonsum der Heranwachsenden, die Ohnmacht der Pädagogen gegenüber der Rezeption der 'lebenden Photographien'"); see "Die Verteufelung des Bildes in der Geschichte der Pädagogik," 68. On the same subject, see also Marc Depaepe and Bregt Henkens, "The History of Education and the Challenge of the Visual," *Paedagogica Historica*, n. s., 36, no. 1 (2000): 14.

181. This fear is captured particularly well in the phrase "Mechanical Brains?," the title of Tepperman's presentation

at the 2005 SCMS conference (see n. 74).

182. Philip W. Jackson, *The Teacher and the Machine* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1968), 2 and 65 (among others). As a matter of fact, Jackson's lecture can be said to exemplify such claims in the 'primary' sense; after all, the tenor of his argument in part III of the essay (pp. 65-90) is that this ideology should be prevented from permeating all pedagogical thought.

183. "Meermaals is de vrees geuit, dat de film, eenmaal in de school toegelaten, de allures zal vertonen van een koekoeksjong; en al moge het hem niet gelukken den onderwijzer over boord te werpen, hij zal trachten met Hollywoodse behendigheit hem in 't overbekende hoekje te duwen. Men kent de macht van de film en vreest haar heerschappij. Men ziet haar al te dikwijls tronen als een tweede koningin der aarde." See Zanen, "Filmleerstof in verband met het leerplan," 137 (see n. 49). Equally telling is a pronouncement made in France, a few years earlier: "They killed the musician, will they also kill the teacher?" ("On a tué le musicien, va-t-on tuer le professeur?" See Lapiere, *Les cent visages du cinéma*, 295.)

184. Saettler, *Evolution of American Educational Technology*, 106. Later on, producers and distributors radically changed their tactics, and promoted their products with arguments that appealed to the teachers much more. For more on this subject, see the section entitled "Formalisation and Appropriation" further down this paragraph; an analysis will follow in the first half of chapter 2.

185. See for instance, [C. W. J.] N[atzi], "Een leerfilm-terugblik," *Lichtbeeld en Cultuur* 12, no. 5 (1934): 35, and an article by the same author, "Hoe moet de leerfilm den onderwijzer aangeboden worden?," *Lichtbeeld en Cultuur* 18, no. 4 (1941): 60 (where Natzi complains that it is teachers, not pupils, who see the most obstacles 'on the road towards film use').

Also concerns about mechanisation, it seems, re-emerged with the introduction of every new classroom tool. See for instance Van der Haak, "Mededeelingen van leerzamen aard," 279 (which mentions similar pronouncements on the topic of school radio), Ton Smits, "De film in het onderwijs," *Katholieke Schoolblad*, 10 September 1960, 865 (a primary source, on school television) and Ottenheim, *50 jaar NOF/NIAM*, 55 (on the use of ICT).

186. Cuban, *Teachers and Machines*, 90. See also Saettler, *Evolution of American Educational Technology*, 403.

187. Once again, see paragraph 2.1.1. See also Grunder, "Verteufelung des Bildes," 59 (which more specifically emphasises the relation between automation and the loss of *intellectual* classroom control).

188. Some of the problems with 'adult films' that articles and brochures singled out were fast pace, thematic overload and sensationalism; see Coissac, *Histoire du Cinématographe*, 518; Zanen, "Didactische waarde van de film," 6 (see n. 61); Zanen, "Filmleerstof in verband met het leerplan," 139; Von Keitz, "Kinematographie in der Schule," 468 (the latter dealing with pronouncements made by sources close to the German RfdU). Compare also Saettler, *Evolution of American Educational Technology*, 113, and Von Keitz, "Wissen als Film," 130. Because of the children's mental 'peculiarities', commentators asked for purpose-made materials; for instance, in Kleinstra, "Schoolfilms," *Lichtbeeld en Cultuur* 15, no. 9 (1938): 136.

189. As Prelinger points out, these benchmarks were sometimes also used to evaluate and/or purge already existing titles or libraries (for instance, corporate ones); see his *Field Guide to Sponsored Films*, ix.

190. According to Saettler, the first book(let)s that dealt exclusively with this subject appeared in the 1920s; see *Evolution of American Educational Technology*, 113.

191. See for instance G. H. Wanink, "De schoolbioscoop – I," *Bode*, 13 May 1921, 2; Van Staveren, "Film voor cultuur en onderwijs," 21 (see n. 61); Zanen, "Filmleerstof in verband met het leerplan," 137-38; Léon Moussinac, *Naissance du cinéma* (Paris: J. Povolozky, 1925), 167. See also Gauthier, "Au risque du spectacle," 94; Renonciat, "Vue fixe et/ou cinéma," 65 and 66; McKernan, "Education," 215. Some texts stress the instrumental nature of the tool by qualifying its function as either 'illustrative' (most often) or 'explanatory'/'documentary'; see for instance Renonciat, "Vue fixe et/ou cinéma," 66, and Horníček, "Institutionalization of classroom films in Czechoslovakia," 389.

Once again, I need to point out that the same was said of other audio-visual tools later on; for instance, school radio. See W. Visser, "De school en de moderne techniek," *Onderwijs en opvoeding*, 17 July 1948, 95; A. S. Keuning, "De school en de moderne techniek," *Onderwijs en opvoeding*, 25 September 1948, 115; Denijs M., "Schoolradio: wanneer wij?," *Schoolblad*, 25 February 1950, 116. (Of course, the threat to the teacher's authority may have been even more direct in this case, as it does indeed seem quite difficult to reduce what a radio voice says to the status of a mere 'illustration'. See chapter 2, paragraph 2.1.1 for more on this issue.)

192. Such a plea is held, among others, in Wanink, "De schoolbioscoop – I," 2-3; G. H. Wanink, "De schoolbioscoop – II," *Bode*, 20 May 1921, 2-3; V[an] d[er] M[eulen], "Film op School – II," 2 (see n. 66); [J. J.] v[an] d[er] M[eulen], "De Film op School – V," *Christelijk Schoolblad*, 3 March 1932, 5. See also the references in Von Keitz, "Wissen als Film," 122, and Gertiser, "Domestizierung des bewegten Bildes," 62.

193. This observation even applies in the case of non-profit institutions, which also had to convince (prospective) users of the value of their product in order to survive.

194. An example of a manual which predates this period is Coissac, *Cinémathographe et Enseignement*. (This publication, however, is still very much drawn up in the future tense, and also contains advice that is not aimed at users, but administrators.) The British publications by George, *The Cinema in School*, and Ottley, *The Cinema in Education*, came out about a decade later, but well before the first (semi-)official teaching film institutes in the UK had been set up.

195. Commercial or heavily subsidised parties, however, had the advantage that they could publicise new titles in whichever bulletins they brought out. Examples of institutional guides are for instance [Schreuder], *Leidraad voor kwekelingen* (the official NOF manual) and the publications mentioned in Ewert, *Reichsanstalt für Film und Bild*, 151-52. Manuals by independent authors are Wise, *Motion Pictures As an Aid*, and Hoban, *Movies That Teach*.

196. The French sometimes also use the phrase *fiches pédagogiques*; see for instance Jacquinot, *Image et Pédagogie*. In Holland, shorter versions of those booklets (consisting of one two-sided print only) tend to be called *instructiebladen*.

197. As of the spring of 1949, NOF's newsletter reminds its readers that new films cannot be hired unless teachers have received the relevant notes. This indicates that users were expected to consult them *prior* to choosing and ordering the material. See for instance "Nieuwe films," *Mededelingen van de NOF*, April 1949, 3.

198. For instance, wall charts and slides – first glass, then film – often came with written user instructions as well. (Many thanks to Lenja Crins for pointing me to examples of those in the collection of Nationaal Onderwijsmuseum in Rotterdam.) In addition to this, the booklets and sheets are also reminiscent of teachers' versions of textbooks, which are used to this day.

For completeness' sake, I should point out here that teachers' notes as well were produced long before the classroom film got institutionalised. Saettler, for instance, mentions examples from the first half of the 1920s (see *Evolution of American Educational Technology*, 101 and 39); Langelaan points out that the school cinema in The Hague provided them as early as 1918 ("Debat rondom het gebruik van film", 54). In fact, the practice of instructing users can even be traced back all the way to Dr. Doyen, who had the habit of providing written explanatory texts with the release versions of his recordings of surgical interventions; see Baptista, "Il faut voir le maître," 46-47. However, instruction booklets in the strict sense did not become 'standard' until specialist teaching film production became more or less profitable – in most countries, from the 1940s on. According to Cuban, they continued to play a role within some school television systems; see *Teachers and Machines*, 31-32.

199. At the most fundamental level, Anita Gertiser argues, this guidance was of a purely interpretational nature: it came down to a reduction (*disziplinieren*) of the 'semantic excess' (*semantische Überschüsse*) of the cinematic image: see "Domestizierung des bewegten Bildes," 60. This remark ties in with Grunder's observations about the (uncontrollable) ambiguity of the visual (see n. 178).

200. The 'official' publication I am referring to is *Leidraad voor kwekelingen*, written by NOF deputy director C. Schreuder. The second in the series is *Film en lichtbeeld bij het onderwijs*, authored by J.J. van der Meulen, headmaster of a primary school in Rotterdam. From 1951 onwards, he acted as a member of NOF's board of governors; the manual, however, was written before that time. (The ideas he voices, moreover, date back to the early 1930s; see for instance his 1931-1932 series entitled "De Film op School" for *Christelijk Schoolblad*, referenced in earlier notes.) In an inlay in the March 1951 issue of the *Mededelingen van de NOF* (signed by Schreuder), the publication is praised for its accuracy and readability. The third publication I shall focus on is *Visueel onderwijs*, written by the then director Jan Marie L. Peters. Information on the disagreement among NOF-colleges regarding its contents was obtained from Kees van Langeraad and, more indirectly, from Peters himself, both in interviews with the author, conducted on 1 and 22 July 2005, respectively.

201. Van der Meulen, in his book, devotes an entire chapter to the activities of NOF (see *Film en lichtbeeld bij het onderwijs*, 38-42). My hypothesis would be that his interest in the survival of the institute was due very simply to the fact that it offered him the cheapest way of obtaining films for his own use (as a teacher/headmaster). Peters, for his part, most likely saw the foundation as a platform for the dissemination of his ideas on film education; see chapter 1.2 for more on this subject.

202. Among others, I am thinking here of the countries mentioned in n. 139 (France, Britain and the US). Elsewhere, for instance in Germany and Switzerland, the activities of existing bodies were continued or expanded. Monopolisation of production and distribution took place, among others, in Holland (at least, in NOF's early years; see paragraph 1.2.1).

203. For instance, in the UK; see Masson, "Educational Films in Britain", 14-15. As Saettler observes, contemporary administrators in the US came to the same conclusion – despite the early successes mentioned in the first half of this chapter; see *Evolution of American Educational Technology*, 116. By way of explanation, Buchanan points out that the material requirements were not the same in war time and peace, which meant that procedures had to be adapted and materials replaced. See *The Film in Education*, 160.

204. On those topics, few precise data are available. For more general observations on (the supply of) films, see

Saettler, *Evolution of American Educational Technology*, 166 (on the situation in the US), and Masson, "Educational Films in Britain", 15-16 (UK). On the availability of projection equipment, see also Masson, "Educational Films in Britain", 16 (UK). In Holland, the increase in projector ownership became particularly noticeable after 1954, when NOF began with the distribution of sound films. For figures, see R. H. Hakkert, "Stom en geluid in de onderwijsfilm," *Mededelingen van de NOF*, June 1959, 13.

205. I am thinking here, for instance, of school television (with first broadcast dates ranging from 1950 in France, 1953 in the US, 1957 in the UK, and 1963 in Holland, to 1964 in Germany) and early information technologies (used in class on an experimental basis from the 1960s onward).

206. Hogenkamp, "Onderwijsfilm is geen Duitse uitvinding". (More precise references will follow later on.) In May 1945, the institute briefly got disbanded, but after a hearing on the personnel's war-time activities, it was continued in roughly the same form. See also Ottenheim, *50 jaar NOF/NIAM*, 11.

207. For more on NOF's contribution system, see "Rondom de Stichting 'N.O.F.," *Schoolblad*, 17 September 1949, 413; see also paragraph 1.2.1. RWU, the German teaching film institute which the Dutch took as their model, already had such a system in place during the war (see earlier references and Hogenkamp, "Onderwijsfilm is geen Duitse uitvinding," 60).

208. The first Dutch school cinema was the one in The Hague; it was modelled after a Belgian prototype (the *cinéma scolaire* in Brussels, referred to in the first half of this chapter; see also Langelaan, "Debat rondom het gebruik van film," 12). Other such theatres were located in Amsterdam, Rotterdam, Leyden, Arnhem, Zutphen and a few smaller towns; see Smeelen, *De Schoolbioscoop onmisbaar??*, 7. The school cinema in The Hague was part of the local school museum; in Zutphen, Leyden and Krommenie, screenings took place in regular film theatres. For more on this topic, see Hogenkamp, "De schoolbioscoop," 43-44. For more on similar institutions elsewhere, see Gauthier, "Au risque du spectacle," 78 (France). The daytime use of entertainment theatres for school audiences also occurred in Germany (Jung, "Lehr- und Unterrichtsfilme," 351-54) and France (Lefebvre, "Scientia Production").

209. See for instance the 1922 report of the Education Council (mentioned above), as quoted in [Schreuder], *Leidraad voor kwekelingen*, 7, or Smeelen, *De Schoolbioscoop onmisbaar??*, 43. See also "Nederlandse Onderwijs Film' Dir. Prof. Dr. Ph. Kohnstamm," [1947], NA, NOF, 2.19.042.55, inv. no. 9, p. 2 (which discusses the irreconcilability of a cinema 'atmosphere' and the objectives of formal education). One source that voices the latter objection in a particularly colourful way is Smeelen's brochure *De schoolbioscoop onmisbaar??* (which translates as 'School Cinemas – Indispensable'), which I mentioned in earlier notes; see for instance pp. 28-29. For similar objections abroad, see, among others, Gauthier, "Au risque du spectacle," 83 (France) and Gertiser, "Domestizierung des bewegten Bildes," 62 and 66 (Switzerland). For more on the (perceived) relation between cinema visits and immorality, I refer back to my section "Cinema and Moral Decline" in the first half of this chapter.

210. See Hogenkamp, "De schoolbioscoop," 43; the relation is established by Wanink, in "De schoolbioscoop – I," 3.

211. See, respectively, [Schreuder], *Leidraad voor kwekelingen*, 7; Faber, "Bioscoop in dienst van het Onderwijs," 378 (see n. 148), and Smeelen, *De Schoolbioscoop onmisbaar??*, 20 and 31-35; [Schreuder], *Leidraad voor kwekelingen*, 6-7. The films shown in school cinemas were often designated as *cultuurfilms* or 'cultural films' (retrospectively, for instance, by Van der Meulen in "Onderwijsfilm," 1). For more on the use of this (generic) label, and its relation to what was considered fit for school audiences, see my article "Celluloid teaching tools: classroom films in the Netherlands (1941-1953)," *Film History* 19, no. 4 (2007): 394; compare also Streible, Roepke and Mebold, "Introduction," 341; Horníček, "Institutionalization of classroom films in Czechoslovakia," 385; Von Keitz, "Kinematographie in der Schule," 474; Gertiser, "Domestizierung des bewegten Bildes," 59. A few examples exist of films that were made specifically for screening in such venues (for instance, those produced by A. M. van der Wel, director of the *schoolbioscoop* in Rotterdam; see Hogenkamp, "Onderwijsfilm is geen Duitse uitvinding," 58); however, most of the titles screened had previously been shown elsewhere. Remarks on the ineptness of film lecturers were also made abroad; compare for instance Ewert, *Reichsanstalt für Film und Bild*, 39 (Germany).

212. At least, in the view of Van Staveren, director of the school cinema in The Hague: see [D. van] [Staveren], "De schoolbioscoop – I," *Bode*, 8 July 1921, 2-3; see also N[atzijl], "Leerfilm-terugblik – II," 41 (see n. 105). For similar pleas abroad, compare Gertiser, "Domestizierung des bewegten Bildes," 62 (Germany) or Gauthier, "Au risque du spectacle," 83 (France).

213. Considered retrospectively, the timing of NOF's creation was extremely fortunate, in the sense that it may actually have accounted for the smoothness with which the process of its establishment was conducted. In occupied Holland, after all, there was little room for objection to the creation of an 'official' educational institute – whether for didactic reasons or political ones. Although NOF was later branded as a product of collaboration (see Hogenkamp, "Onderwijsfilm is geen Duitse uitvinding," 73), it managed to vindicate itself without too many difficulties. After the war, the archive documents show, a few replacements in the management and board of directors could ensure continued support from the state. Apparently, a set-up which, in the immediate post-war era, would have been considered far too ambitious or costly to initiate, was considered sufficiently valuable not to

be put to waste.

214. Adriaan Adolf Schoevers (more widely known by his initials 'A. A.') was the director of a company that organised secretarial courses; in this capacity, he had produced a few instructional films. For more information on the man's background, see Hogenkamp, "Onderwijsfilm is geen Duitse uitvinding" 62. Proof of his familiarity with the German system can be found in many of the reports which he compiled just before and at the beginning of the war; for instance, "Exposé über die verschiedenen Möglichkeiten, das Unterrichtsfilmwesen in einem Lande zu organisieren," [1941], NA, NOF, 2.19.042.55, inv. no. 1.

215. Two of the people Schoevers met with are Kurt Zierold, responsible for Rfdu/RWU at the German Ministry of Education, and Kurt Gauger, president of the institute. (He visited them in January 1941; see "De strijd tegen de invoering van Duitse Nazi-films op de Nederlandsche scholen," n.d., NA, NOF, 2.19.042.55, inv. no. 6, pp. 20-21, and Schoevers' report of the same trip: "Invoering van de Onderwijsfilm in Nederland," 1941, NA, NOF, 2.19.042.55, inv. no. 2). On home ground, his main contact was Heinrich Schwartz, responsible for educational matters in occupied Holland. His patron at the Dutch Ministry of Education was professor Jan van Dam, Secretary-General of the Department of Education, Science and Culture Protection, and a known sympathiser of the Nazis. For a more structured account of the cooperation between NOF's founders and the German occupier, see Hogenkamp, "Onderwijsfilm is geen Duitse uitvinding".

216. Secretary-General Van Dam acted as the president of NOF's board of governors. As such, he could veto decisions taken by the foundation's director as well as his own fellow-governors. See for instance "Stichtingsbrief," 1 (see n. 1). For evidence as to the institute's monopoly, see "Bespreking ten huize van Dr. J. Smit, oud rector Chr. Lyceum en tegenwoordig wethouder van onderwijs in Amsterdam op donderdag 22 mei 1941," 1941, NA, NOF, 2.19.042.55, inv. no. 6. The claim this document makes is confirmed by [M. R.] T[eijssen], "Beeld-onderwijs," *Katholieke Schoolblad*, 26 June 1941, 769.

217. J. J. van der Meulen, "Nederlandse Onderwijsfilm – III: Coördinatie?," *Christelijk Schoolblad*, 17 October 1946, 1, explicitly refers to this situation. The first attempt at centralising the distribution of filmstrips was made in 1947, when a Centraal Projectie Instituut (CPI) was set up. However, other distributors remained active as well. In 1953, also NOF joined their ranks.

Of course, NOF's monopoly in terms of film distribution – first actual, then virtual – caused a good deal of complaints. One of the organisations's fiercer opponents was H. Reys, director of Nederlandse Schoolbioscoop, an Amsterdam-based private film distribution company founded in 1934. (Despite its name, it had no link to the aforementioned *schoolbioscopen*.) After vain attempts to undo what he considered to be an unfair advantage (which, moreover, had come about under suspicious circumstances) he reverted to an article campaign in a number of trade union magazines. See Reys' letter to the editor in *Schoolblad*, 10 December 1949, 562 (in the section "Rondom de N.O.F.") and "Schoolfilmrecht," *Katholieke Schoolblad*, 22 October 1949, 227-28. Incidentally, also Schoevers, the institute's founder, was convinced that NOF should eventually become self-supporting (see the report "Bespreking met de Heeren van Bruggen en Van der Sluijs ten Departemente op 21 Mei 1946," n.d., NA, NOF, 2.19.042.55, inv. no. 6, p. 1). Supposedly, his voluntary resignation in 1949 was a direct result of the fact that his calls for pro-activeness in this matter had not been heard (see Kohnstamm's address, "Toespraak," to his personnel, d.d. 1949, NA, NOF, 2.19.042.55, inv. no. 9, p. 2). The result was that in spite of the antagonism, funding for NOF continued until the early 90s. (Only in the year 1958, the subsidy flow was temporarily interrupted; see Stichting Nederlandse Onderwijs Film, *Jaarverslag 1958* (The Hague: NOF, 1959), 3, or Ottenheim, *50 jaar NOF/NIAM*, 67.) In 1993, the institute was fully privatised (Ed van Berkel, e-mail message to author, 8 May 2008). According to ex-director H. J. L. Jongbloed (interview with author, 8 July 2005) business began to go downhill after that.

218. As the name of these offices indicates, the original idea was that district borders would more or less coincide with those of the Dutch provinces (at the time, 11); in the end, however, NOF started off with just 5 of them. In 1949, film dispatch was centralised in a single location in the town of Utrecht. See Ottenheim, *50 jaar NOF/NIAM*, 12 and 66.

219. At least, this is what Schoevers had in mind; see his notes made in preparation for a meeting with the Ministry, n.d., NA, NOF, 2.19.042.55, inv. no. 1 (the first page of the pile).

220. See "Nederlandse Onderwijs Film," 2. As more and more schools acquired their own projectors, the tasks of the Local Offices changed accordingly.

221. Kohnstamm (who, in the later 1940s, briefly acted as NOF's director) even stated that without government support, the film medium should be abandoned as a classroom aid; see Ph. A. Kohnstamm, "De Film en het Lager Onderwijs – III," *Onderwijs en opvoeding*, 29 January 1949, 9. Another source on NOF's position in the matter is A. A. Schoevers, the section "Leerfilm-organisatie" in: "Eerste project, 24 oktober 1940 ingediend bij Mr. Reynink," 1940, NA, NOF, 2.19.042.55, inv. no. 2, p. 1. For completeness' sake, I should add here that after the war, when NOF's employees had to appear in front of a commission of inquiry (*zuiveringscommissie*), Schoevers pointed out that the latter argument also served the purpose of hiding from the Germans his efforts to ban RWU films, which might be

considered products of the enemy's propaganda machine, from Dutch schools. Once again, I refer to Hogenkamp's article for more on this issue: "Onderwijsfilm is geen Duitse uitvinding," 62.

222. See for instance "Buitenlandse films," *Mededelingen van de NOF*, November 1948, [1]. In fact, NOF occasionally did distribute titles that had been made by third parties; however, it never credited the producers. On those occasions, it usually concerned items that did not, strictly speaking, belong to the institute's area of expertise (such as, the puppet films mentioned in Hogenkamp, "Onderwijsfilm is geen Duitse uitvinding," 81).

223. The term *Distributieafdeling* is first mentioned in a brochure which dates from around 1947 ("Nederlandse Onderwijs Film," 1-2); the word *Opnamedienst* in a document written in 1945 ("Bespreking met den heer Mariouw Smit op 5 december 1945," NA, NOF, 2.19.042.55, inv. no. 6). The three-part structure remained in place until the early 1950s, when the Educational and Recording Sections were replaced by a single Production Department (*Productieafdeling*, first mentioned in *Mededelingen van de NOF*, [Spring] 1954 (no. 1), 2). The merger seems to have coincided with the appointment of Peters, the then director of the foundation, who did not share his predecessors' take on what constituted a good teaching film, and therefore had a different view on how production could best be organised (Van Langeraad, interview with author). More on the role which Peters played in the development of NOF's activities will follow further on this chapter.

224. Compare for instance "Nederlandse Onderwijs Film," 2, with Van der Meulen, *Film en lichtbeeld bij het onderwijs*, 39. This situation seems to correspond to what Van der Meulen considers to be the optimal conditions for the production of teaching films. "A good teaching film," he writes, "must be the result of intense cooperation between film-maker and didactician. The didactician needs to work up the subject of the film and find out how the instructional element can come out best. The cameraman judges the technical and artistic potential of the shoot, meanwhile taking into account as much as possible the requirements of good didactics. This way, and this way only, a film can be created which is both didactically and cinematically solid." ("De goede onderwijsfilm moet ontstaan door innige samenwerking van cineast en didacticus. De didacticus heeft zich in het te verfilmen onderwerp grondig in te werken en dient na te gaan, op welke wijze het instructieve element tot zijn volle recht kan komen. De cameraman beoordeelt de technische en artistieke mogelijkheden van de opname, zo nauw mogelijk rekening houdend met de eisen van een goede didactiek. Slechts op deze wijze, en op deze wijze alléén, kan een film ontstaan, die zowel didactisch als filmisch verantwoord is." See *Film en lichtbeeld bij het onderwijs*, 35.)

For completeness' sake, I should add here that testimonies by ex-employees suggest that technical staff may actually have had a little more influence on the production process than the documents claim – if only because of practical reasons, such as unforeseen circumstances during shooting. Later on, when more third-party material was acquired and had to be adapted for a Dutch audience, production personnel were given even more freedom. (See for instance Van Langeraad, interview with author.) In spite of this, however, NOF's Educational Section always took the final responsibility for the titles that were released.

225. See "Stichting Nederlandsche Onderwijs Film N.O.F.," n.d., NA, NOF, 2.19.042.55, inv. no. 2, [p. 1]. Van Langeraad's testimony suggests that this plan was indeed executed. In addition to this, the interviewee also mentions that in the 1940s and 50s, the Netherlands did not have a formal training course for film-makers, and most people therefore learnt the particulars of production on the job. At NOF as well, many of the technicians hired had merely expressed a wish to go into the film business, and built up their experience in the course of time.

226. See, respectively, "Stichting Nederlandsche Onderwijs Film N.O.F.," [1], and "De Nederlandsche Onderwijs Film II," n.d., NA, NOF, 2.19.042.55, inv. no. 7, p. 7. The man in question, deputy director Schreuder, kept his position after the war (as opposed to director Schoevers, who had to take a step back).

227. See "Stichting Nederlandsche Onderwijs Film N.O.F.," which spells out that the job should be done by someone "volkomen op de hoogte [...] van de filmerij en alles wat daarmee verband houdt" [p. 1]. The first head of the department was F. W. Weber. As opposed to Schreuder, he did not stay with NOF very long. (In fact, Weber already quit his job during the war – according to Schoevers, because his activities as an informant of the Germans took up too much of his time; see for instance "Verdwijning Hoofd Technische Dienst" and Schreuder's "Rapport over den heer W. Weber," both n.d., NA, NOF, 2.19.042.55, inv. no. 6, as well as various other documents in the same file).

228. For first-hand recollections of NOF's aversion from cinematic artistry, consider for instance my interviews with Van Langeraad and Jongbloed. The validity of the institute's position is confirmed by Van der Meulen, *Film en lichtbeeld bij het onderwijs*, 36, and a film review by the same author, "De Vondelfilm," *Christelijk Schoolblad*, 21 October 1954, 2. Also the way in which wages were distributed among the foundation's personnel can be taken as proof for the relatively greater value which it attached to the activities of pedagogues: people with teaching degrees, it seems, tended to be paid more (see Ottenheim, *50 jaar NOF/NIAM*, 12). Equally significant in this context is the fact that the head of the Educational Section also acted as the director's deputy; see for instance "Stichting Nederlandsche Onderwijs Film Opgericht 6 Mei 1941," p.1. Yet in spite of all this, the early documents show that Schoevers himself did value artistic talent at least to some extent; see for instance "Stichting Nederlandsche Onderwijs Film N.O.F.," [1].

229. Compare also my argumentation in chapter 2, paragraph 2.1.1. Another initiative that served this purpose was the establishment in 1952 of a so-called Pedagogical Advice Committee (*Paedagogische Advies-Commissie*), the first of which brought together three pedagogical professors (H. Nieuwenhuis, Th. Rutten en G. Wielenga; see “Nieuws van de N.O.F.,” *Mededelingen van de NOF*, [Spring] 1954 (no. 1), 11). According to Peters, the body mainly fulfilled a ceremonial function: its members’ association with NOF was widely advertised, but their role as advisors was very limited (see interview with author).

Once again, I need to specify here that during Peters’ own directorship of NOF, this situation slowly began to change. The reason was that he saw teaching films not as mere didactic tools, but as objects of cinematic communication, which should therefore display a reasonable amount of (formal) craftsmanship – a view which he also communicated in his publications. In the early 1950s, then, the separation in terms of conceptual and executive responsibilities became somewhat less strict. Yet even so, the ‘didactic’ lobby inside the institute always remained a powerful one – at least, according to Van Langeraad (interview with author) and Ed van Berkel (interview with author, 25 May 2005).

230. Although socialists and liberals also had their networks, they were not organised the way Catholics or Protestants were; after the war, they no longer even constituted a ‘pillar’ in the strict sense. See for instance Staf Hellemans, “Zuilen en verzuiling in Europa,” in *Nederlandse politiek in historisch en vergelijkend perspectief*, ed. Uwe Becker (Amsterdam: Het Spinhuis, 1993), 125 and 142. Those who did not wish to attend confessional schools or get their information through Catholic or Protestant channels therefore had to make do with ‘neutral’ institutions.

231. Hogenkamp, “Onderwijsfilm is geen Duitse uitvinding,” 77 and 83. Although the existence of a neutral institution in a ‘pillarised’ society had caused protest before, it was J. J. Gielen (minister of Education, Arts and Science from 1946 to 1948) who opposed to the foundation’s neutrality so vehemently that he wanted its status changed; see *ibid.*, 60 and 76–77. In 1952, the institute ceased to be a departmental dependency, and became a foundation in its own right. The vital decisions were taken by its three sub-foundations: the Catholic Stichting Katholieke Onderwijsfilm (KOF), the Protestant Stichting Protestants-Christelijke Onderwijsfilm (PCOF), and the neutral Stichting Onderwijsfilm voor de Openbare en Neutraal Bijzondere Scholen (ONOF). See Ottenheim, *50 jaar NOF/NIAM*, 30.

232. The only practical difference for schools was that they now had to subscribe with the sub-foundation of their own denomination. The films themselves, however, still came from the same source. As far as the complexity of internal processes is concerned, ex-director Jongbloed has mentioned that in the more than thirty years he worked for the NOF, there was a serious conflict only once. At the time of the release of the film *Maarten Luther* (1959; a German, shortened version of a then-known feature film made by the American Irving Pichel), acquired at the request of the Protestant lobby, a board member for KOF argued that the film was disrespectful of Catholics, and that it therefore should not be released by the institute. After consultation with an ‘independent’ counsellor (a priest), the title was brought out anyway. See Ed van Berkel, interview with author, 17 July 2008.

233. “Rondom de Stichting ‘N.O.F.’” 413. For the period I deal with, the great majority of subscribers were primary schools; the rest of the membership was made up of institutions of ‘extended’ primary education (see my introduction for a clarification of this term) and (some) secondary schools. Compare for instance Stichting Nederlandse Onderwijs Film, *Jaarverslag 1947* (The Hague: NOF, 1947) and *Jaarverslag 1958* (The Hague: NOF, 1959); the latter of these shows that by the late 1950s, the percentage of primary schools had risen to about 75.

234. The first issues of the newsletter were entitled *Mededeling van de stichting “Nederlandsche Onderwijs Film” te ‘s Gravenhage, ten behoeve van hen, die gebruik maken van onze projectoren en films* (or a variation thereof); later, this title was changed to *Mededelingen van de stichting Nederlandse Onderwijs Film*. In 1960, the newsletter was replaced by the magazine *Toonbeeld* (first published in 1958). NOF’s catalogues, in the early years, were published in book-form; later on, they appeared as folders with replaceable sheets (*instructiebladen*).

235. I have not been able to find precise information on when NOF ceased to issue user permits. Although former director Jongbloed cannot recall that the *gebruiksvergunning* was still around after the first decade or so (Jongbloed, interview with author), evidence exists that certificates of ‘didactic competence’ were handed out as late as 1957; consider for instance J. N. Schoonderbeek, interview with Ed van Berkel, 22 September 2007. In addition to this, the institute sometimes also required proof of the teachers’ technical (i.e. projection) skills; see “De Organisatie van de Nederlandse Onderwijs-Film,” *Mededelingen van de NOF*, [Spring] 1954 (no. 1), 3. One ex-NOF-user testifies that he obtained some kind of a permit as late as 1967; see Theo Faasen, interview with Ed van Berkel, 22 September 2007.

236. See Jongbloed, interview with author; compare also Ottenheim, *50 jaar NOF/NIAM*, 15. For more on the subject of film education, and the coincidence of this evolution with Peters’ directorship of NOF, see paragraph 1.2.2.

237. Ottenheim, *50 jaar NOF/NIAM*, 44.

238. The first manual was written by deputy director Schreuder (see Jan Marie L. Peters, “Naar een didactiek van het ‘film-onderwijs’” *Mededelingen van de NOF*, [Autumn] 1955 (no. 2), 10); however, the book itself does not credit him. I am using a later version (1948, fourth impression), in which a few minor changes are made. The second handbook

is Van der Meulen's *Film en lichtbeeld bij het onderwijs*; it will be considered more closely further on in this chapter. Compare also my notes at the end of paragraph 1.1.

239. In some cases, the institute also hired independent (pedagogical) 'experts' to write short articles.

240. A same tendency, it seems, also manifests itself in similar publications abroad – especially those related to institutions with a more or less 'official' status, such as RfdU/RWU; see for instance Von Keitz, "Kinematographie in der Schule," 471-77 in particular.

241. An example of a survey is that which was held in 1950, and which resulted in the publication of a selection of results in five consecutive issues of the institute's newsletter. See *Mededelingen van de NOF*, March 1950 to [March 1951] (nos. 24-28). According to Ottenheim, the institute's test programme really set off in the mid-1940s, when Ph. A. Kohnstamm, a practitioner of experimental pedagogy himself, was appointed as director: see Ottenheim, *50 jaar NOF/NIAM*, 21. See also n. 154 for more on Kohnstamm's background and expertise). *Leidraad voor kwekelingen* says more about which tests were carried out routinely. In the mid-1940s, it claims, each film was shown to approximately 1,000 pupils (or 30 classes) before distribution. After each screening, the children were asked to fill in questionnaires. See [Schreuder], *Leidraad voor kwekelingen*, 19-20.

242. N. Crama, "Montage," *Mededelingen van de NOF*, September 1958, 13.

243. See for instance [Schreuder], *Leidraad voor kwekelingen*, 3 (the introduction to the 1946 edition of the manual). Like the visual education enthusiasts of previous decades, the institute's (early) publicists were not afraid to turn to their own advantage the ideas of pedagogues who in fact did *not* approve of the use of films, such as the later director Kohnstamm.

244. In 1955, Peters pointed out that teachers as well considered this the main criterion for deciding whether or not they would make use of films in class; see Jan Marie L. Peters, "Wat onthouden de leerlingen van een onderwijsfilm," *Mededelingen van de NOF*, [Spring] 1955 (no. 1), 13. It is remarkable that this even applied in the case of language films – films which, after all, were often designed primarily to stimulate the children's imagination (see my discussion of this subject further on). Just like other films, they were valued in terms of comprehensibility, and test screenings were meant to help anticipate interpretations which did not correspond to the ones intended. For evidence of this, see for instance the results of an experiment with the film *Kabouters en elfjes* (1948, Goblins and elves), as reported in "Kabouters en elfjes," *Mededelingen van de NOF*, April 1948, 1-2.

NOF's preference for this type of research, incidentally, was shared by similar institutions elsewhere. A cursory reading of Saettler's *The Evolution of American Educational Technology* reveals that it may actually have been, and perhaps still is, a universal tendency in the study of audio-visual teaching aids. From as early as 1919, surveys were carried out to determine the effect of such tools. See Saettler, *Evolution of American Educational Technology*, 223, 26 and 44. Although in some cases the films' value as motivational tools was measured as well, the information such research produced was mostly of a quantitative nature: tests were designed to find out how much factual knowledge spectators could obtain, and how much time could be saved if films were used (see *ibid.*, 227). Once newer media such as instructional and school television were introduced, their effects were gauged in similar ways (compare p. 374). Programmed and computer-assisted instruction (i.e., the so-called 'teaching machines' of the 1960s and 1970s; see for instance Korte, *Televisie bij onderwijs en opleiding*, 148-71) in many cases even had built-in test-functions to (help) evaluate the students' progress according to such criteria.

245. It is Jongbloed who first drew my attention to the political nature of NOF's claims to educational progressivism. In chapter 2, I shall argue that this aspect of the institute's promotional strategy actually may not have been the most appropriate one, considering the particular concerns of the people that had to put the films to use.

246. The DVDs appended to this work can serve as a means of illustration here.

247. "[...] dat er geen beter middel te vinden is [dan film] om de gezichtskring van [sic] de leerlingen te verruimen en de ramen van het klaslokaal, figuurlijk gesproken, wijd open te zetten voor de veelvormige rijkdom van het leven dat zich buiten de muren van het schoolgebouw afspeelt". See "Nieuwe films," *Mededelingen van de NOF*, [Autumn] 1955 (no. 2), p. 6.

248. See also Ph. A. Kohnstamm, "De Film en het Lager Onderwijs – II," *Onderwijs en opvoeding*, 15 January 1949, 1.

249. [Schreuder], *Leidraad voor kwekelingen*, 22 (the exact phrasing is: "natuur- en kunstproducten"). Similar points had been made earlier in the report of the Dutch Education Council, quoted in *ibid.*, 6; articles in the magazines *Volksontwikkeling* (Van Staveren, "Bioscoop in dienst van het onderwijs," 458-59 (see n. 59); Miedema, "Bioscoop en Volksontwikkeling," 128 (see n. 39)) and *Lichtbeeld en cultuur* (Zanen, "Filmleerstof in verband met het leerplan," 140 (see n. 49)) also add subject specifications. Striking about these recommendations is that they show roughly the same thematic focus as many of the (audio-visual) tools that already existed at the time – for instance, wall charts. (Some examples of those can be spotted in the backgrounds of the "Lesonderwerp/Lesson Subject" menus of the DVDs appended.) For more on the concept of object teaching (*zaakonderwijs*), I refer back to p. 30.

250. The full title of the second film in this list is *Veluwe I: Zand en heide* (Veluwe I: Sand and heath). An additional reason for the predominance of geography and biology titles in the collection at the time may have been that

those were the two subjects of which Schoevers had been able to convince the Germans that they needed to be purpose-produced – i.e., made by Dutch people, for Dutch people (and covering ‘typically’ Dutch topics); see Hogenkamp, “Onderwijsfilm is geen Duitse uitvinding,” 81. Yet even so, primary documents also indicate that the institute’s founders really did attach particular value to those areas of the curriculum.

251. [Schreuder], *Leidraad voor kwekelingen*, 23-24.

252. *Ibid.*, 25. The manual also points out that the few titles that might fit this bill (for instance, the aforementioned *Glas*, which shows how well the physical characteristics of this type of material are suited to the production of receptacles) are much more useful as geography teaching tools.

253. *Ibid.*, 26.

254. See for instance Stichting Nederlandse Onderwijs Film, *Nederlandse Onderwijs-Film Catalogus* (The Hague: NOF, 1953); compare also the institute’s annual report for 1958 (*Jaarverslag 1958*).

255. In the original text, the phrase reads as follows: “een algemeen vormend inzicht [...] in de sociale, economische en culturele structuur van de maatschappij”. See J. Pilger, “De stad, hart van de ommelanden,” *Mededelingen van de NOF*, April 1959, 9. Compare also Ton Smits, “De film als pedagogisch middel,” *Katholieke Schoolblad*, 31 December 1960, 1193-94.

256. For the difference in meaning which I attach to the notation of dates with and without brackets, and with and without ‘ca,’ see the introductory notes to the filmography at the end of this work.

257. A remark about the moral lessons in language films is made in “Onderwijsfilms voor de lagere school,” *Mededelingen van de NOF*, [September 1950] (no. 26), 2.

258. For more on the concept of ‘social hygiene,’ see Smith, *Mental Hygiene*. In the US, ‘new’ media in general seem to have been used much earlier – and also, much more frequently – to address social subjects than in the Netherlands. American educational radio, for instance, already dealt with health, government and economics topics in the late 1920s and early 1930s; see Saettler, *Evolution of American Educational Technology*, 199 and 208. In the Netherlands (where interest in school radio was generally limited, see V., “Schoolradio,” *Christelijk Schoolblad*, 20 February 1947, [2]), the medium was considered suitable mainly for art education (i.e., music, theatre, or poetry); see “De school en de moderne techniek,” *Onderwijs en opvoeding*, 5 June 1948, 69-70, and Visser, “School en de moderne techniek,” 95 (see n. 191). Also American school television emphasised ‘social science’ at an early stage; see Saettler, *Evolution of American Educational Technology*, 368. In Holland, by contrast, the main criterion for a topic’s selection was its relevance to the regular school curriculum; see for instance “Heeft school-t.v. een toekomst?,” 5-6 (see introduction, n. 58).

For completeness’ sake, I should add here that *plans* for the production of civics films already existed prior to NOF’s set-up. In a document dating from the late 1940s, Schoevers voices the intention to make films on subjects which do not explicitly figure on the school programme, such as character building (*karaktervorming*), traffic regulation (*verkeersvoorschriften*) and life problems (*levensproblemen*); see “Leerfilm-organisatie,” 2 (see n. 221). Considering the pre-war tendency towards moralisation in so-called ‘educational films’ (a trend which I identified on p. 28), this is not so surprising. In the end, however, it lasted until 1953 until such subjects were treated systematically. At first, this was done by means of filmstrips.

259. In practice, of course, there were exceptions to this rule. In his presentation for the conference “Cinema in Context” (Universiteit van Amsterdam, the Netherlands, 20 April 2006) Karel Dibbets gave an example of this. In the year 1940, the film that was screened the most often in Dutch theatres was one dealing with proper sexual conduct – a subject, in other words, that did not, strictly speaking, belong to the remit of the (non-pillarised) film exhibition sector. For more on the relation between the cinema business and the so-called *verzuiling*, see Dibbets, “Taboe van de Nederlandse filmcultuur”.

260. For instance, ex-NOF-employee Jongbloed recalls discussions among the Catholic, Protestant and ‘neutral’ board members on films with subjects such as, again, sex education (Jongbloed, interview with author). However, there was only one area of teaching that required the distribution of separate films for each denomination: religious education. Mission films such as *De Paaswake* (1954, Easter wake) or *De Bisschopswijding* (ca. 1955, The ordination of a bishop) were intended specifically for Catholics; *Maarten Luther* (1959), by contrast, targeted a Protestant audience. See announcements for these films in *Mededelingen van de NOF*, [Spring] 1955 (no. 1), 3, and June 1959, 6 (under “Onze nieuwe films”), respectively.

261. As a matter of fact, pronouncements to this effect were made until the late 1940s; see for instance Kohnstamm, “Film en het Lager Onderwijs – II,” 1, or an article by the same author, “De Film en het Lager Onderwijs,” *Schoolblad*, 12 November 1949, 509. At the time, however, the institute already distributed third-party and foreign productions – albeit more sporadically. This is also the reason why I stuck to a pre-war/post-war classification of films in the DVDs appended (see the “Justification” page on either disc for more details).

262. NOF’s 1954 annual report mentions a ratio of 13 own productions vs. 15 films acquired from elsewhere. Another 12 were given in consignment by the United States Information Service (which presumably meant that they could

be borrowed through NOF, but were not distributed under its own label). See Stichting Nederlandse Onderwijs Film, *Jaarverslag 1954* (The Hague: NOF, 1955), 7-9, and the institute's *Jaarverslag 1954*, 7-9. The membership figures for ICEF vary slightly: from 15 in a NOF-newsletter brought out in the late 1950s (see H. J. L. Jongbloed, foreword to special issue, *Mededelingen van de NOF*, June 1958, 3) to 19 in a trade union journal issue dating from two years later (H. J. W[itters], "N.O.F.-plannen voor 1960," *Katholieke Schoolblad*, 2 January 1960, 4-6). Ottenheim, for his part, writes that 17 countries were involved (see *50 jaar NOF/NIAM*, 38). The organisation was set up in 1950. It was partly funded by the European Council; the rest of its money came from member states (*ibid.*, 38-39).

263. Consider for instance Van Langeraad's account of the various specialisms of the institute's production staff at the time (interview with author). The first more 'ambitious' animated film NOF produced was *Transmutatie der atomen* ([ca. 1948], The transmutation of atoms), also mentioned in Hogenkamp, "Onderwijsfilm is geen Duitse uitvinding," 82. This title, however, was an exception at the time.

264. For the full names of RWU's successors, see n. 140. Because of the fact that I consider the NOF collection here as a *user corpus*, I shall always mention Dutch *release* dates in the case of foreign-made films. For production dates, see the filmography at the back of this work.

265. The series consisted of three films: *Le retour de Madeleine* (The return of Madeleine) and *Départ de grandes vacances* ² (Departure for the summer holidays), both acquired by NOF in 1959, and *Histoire de poissons* (A story about fish), acquired in 1961.

266. Ottenheim, *50 jaar NOF/NIAM*, 38-39; Jongbloed, interview with author; W[itters], "N.O.F.-plannen voor 1960," 4-5. The full title of the first of these films is *Antoni van Leeuwenhoek: een film over de ontwikkeling van de microscopie* ² (Antoni van Leeuwenhoek: A film about the development of microscopy). (Most likely, both these items, since they were part of a larger ICEF-series, also had an 'official' English title; however, I have not been able to find them in the available sources.)

267. See for instance [Schreuder], *Leidraad voor kwekelingen*, 3, and 13, and Ph. A. Kohnstamm, "De Film en het Lager Onderwijs," *Onderwijs en opvoeding*, 18 December 1948, 157.

268. "Ons inziens is het [...] belangrijker, dat men rekening houdt met de wijze waarop het kind een bepaalde leerstof opneemt en verwerkt, dan dat men er zorg voor draagt dat de te gebruiken films en strips aansluiten bij de leerstof die volgens het leerprogramma aan de orde is. Een der eerste eisen voor de systematische toepassing van visuele leermiddelen is dan ook, dat men de leerlingen met deze middelen vertrouwd maakt." See Peters, *Visueel onderwijs*, 46. The book was first published in 1954; my research, however, is based on the second edition, brought out in 1955, which adds an introduction and bibliography.

269. Peters' immediate predecessors were Ph. A. Kohnstamm (the educational scientist) and C. Schreuder (formerly the director of a teacher training college in the Dutch East Indies).

Jan Marie Lambert Peters (1920-2008) began his academic career as a student of Dutch. Subsequently, he briefly taught language and psychology in a secondary school and a management college. In 1950, he obtained his doctoral degree with a dissertation entitled "De taal van de film: Een linguïstisch-psychologisch onderzoek naar de aard en de betekenis van het expressiemiddel film" [The language of film: A linguistic-psychological study of the nature and meaning of film as a means of expression] (PhD dissertation, Katholieke Universiteit Nijmegen, 1950). After that, he acted, among others, as the editor of a film magazine (*Filmforum*) and as the president of a number of associations and foundations that promoted and organised film education (among others, Nederlands Film Instituut). In 1958, he was one of the founders of the Amsterdam Film Academy, where he also taught courses. At the same time, he lectured in Film Studies (*Filmkunde*) at University of Amsterdam, where he got a more permanent position in 1967. A year later, he also accepted a professorship in Film and Audio-Visual Communication Studies (*Filmkunde en de Leer der Audiovisuele Communicatiemediën*) at the Catholic University of Leuven (Belgium). Peters, interview with author, and http://www.filmacademie.nl/nfta/nieuws/bericht/080709_peters.shtml (an obituary on the film academy website, accessed 11 March 2009; page now discontinued).

270. The tenet of his argument is summarised in an article for a pedagogical journal which he published soon after his appointment at NOF: Jan Marie L. Peters, "De dubbele betekenis van de film voor het onderwijs: De noodzaak van een didactiek van het zien," *Paedagogische Studiën* 31, [no. 6] (1954); see pp. 169-70 and 178-79 in particular.

271. Compare Jan Marie L. Peters, "Het beeld gaat een taal spreken," *Mededelingen van de NOF*, [Spring] 1953 (no. 1), 2, or his manual *Visueel onderwijs*, 53, and pp. 7, 23-24 and 26 of the same book.

272. Ph. A. Kohnstamm, "Aanschouwing en abstractie als momenten van 'leren denken,'" in *Keur uit het didactisch werk van Prof. Dr. Ph. Kohnstamm* (Groningen: Wolters, 1948), 35-37, and Kohnstamm, "Film en het Lager Onderwijs," (1948 version), 157-58.

Considering the fact that in earlier years, Kohnstamm had been radically opposed to the use of teaching films, his appointment as NOF director was rather remarkable. By that time, of course, he had mitigated his position, and admitted that NOF did indeed manage to compensate for the educationally less favourable aspects of the reproduction process. (See for instance Kohnstamm, "Film en het Lager Onderwijs," (1948 version), 157-58; for a

retrospective account see also Hogenkamp, "Onderwijsfilm is geen Duitse uitvinding," 58 and 75-76.) At the time he was hired, the institute had been threatened in its survival by plans for subsidy cuts. The decision to appoint a well-known educational scientist can therefore be seen as an attempt to convince the government of its pedagogical benefits to society – and therefore, of the necessity of continued funding. See Ottenheim, *50 jaar NOF/NIAM*, 20.

273. Peters, *Visueel onderwijs*, 54.

274. On the necessity of adapting one's choice of material to the age of the target audience, see *ibid.*, 24-26; compare also Peters, "Dubbele betekenis van de film," 179-80. On the topic of teaching people to discern between good and bad quality and its potential beneficial effects on film culture as such, see "Dubbele betekenis van de film," 182, and Peters, *Visueel onderwijs*, 54. The second argument was further developed in articles written by Peters' successors; for instance, Nico Crama's, "Onderwijs over de film," *Mededelingen van de NOF*, April 1959, 16-20.

275. KFA was established in 1937, and set itself the goal of promoting films with 'philosophical depth' (*levensbeschouwelijke diepgang*, a phrase used by the organisation to this day: see <http://www.kfa-filmbeschouwing.nl/kfa.htm>). At first, it was mainly concerned with film censorship; later on, it became an institute for information and education on film-related topics. The association edited two magazines, one called *Het witte doek* and the other *Filmfront* (which were later merged into one, *Katholiek Filmfront*). In addition to this, it brought out the so-called "Projectareeks", a series of publications on subjects relating to film education (some of the better-known issues being B. J. Bertina, *De film een gevaar? Een pleidooi voor film-onderwijs op de school en voor het vertonen van speelfilms in de klas*, vol. 6, *Projectareeks*, and Jac. Dirkse, *Opvoeding tot de film: een beknopte oriëntatie voor opvoeders*, vol. 10, *Projectareeks* (The Hague: Landelijk Bureau van de Katholieke Film Actie, 1956 and [1960], respectively)). Instituut voor Film en Jeugd, established about a decade later, was an organisation which promoted research into the influence of film on (the behaviour of) youngsters, and which advised other institutions on related issues; see [H. G.] de B[oe], "Om de jeugdfilm," *Katholieke Schoolblad*, 24 September 1948, 137. Its magazine *Documentatie Film en Jeugd* was later renamed *Beeldcultuur en opvoeding*. For more on the connection between the Dutch Catholics and film education, see also Bert Hogenkamp, *De documentaire film 1945-1965: De bloei van een filmgenre in Nederland* (Rotterdam: Uitgeverij 010, 2003), 144, and G. Meulenbeld, "Geknipt voor katholieken: Een onderzoek naar de historische ontwikkeling van de houding van de Nederlandse katholieken tegenover film vanaf zijn ontstaan (1894) tot 1970" (master's thesis, Universiteit van Tilburg, 1990). CEFA, the Protestant counterpart of KFA, was set up in 1948; its periodical was called *CEFA filmgids* (later *CEFA contact*).

276. In the post-war period, teachers' organisations tended to think of cinema attendance among children as a major social problem; magazines therefore often reported on the results of relevant questionnaires. See for instance [M. R.] T[eijssen], "Om de jeugdfilm" and "Het witte doek en de jeugd," *Katholieke Schoolblad*, 24 September 1948, 137-38 and 16 July 1949, 39-40, respectively; "Jeugd en film," 12 (see n. 174); "Film en bioscoop in het leven," 732. Compare also my section entitled "Cinema and Moral Decline" in the first half of this chapter. Grunder, "Verteufeling des Bildes," 64, mentions that schools were assigned a similar 'reparatory' task in the era of television.

277. That children were usually more familiar with the medium than their elders was emphasised in the many articles on the topic that were published at the time. The tenor of those pieces was one of condemnation of – or at the very least, anxiety about – the children's intense viewing habits. See for instance "Filmwaardering als een schoolvak" (based on a 1948 text by Stanley Reed, for the British Film Institute) and "De plaats van de film in onze moderne samenleving" (after an original piece by Peters), in the issues 5/6 and 8/9 of *Documentatie Film en Jeugd* 5 (1953), 1-7 and 1-3, respectively. As far as activities for teachers are concerned, it was especially the conferences and trainings organised by Instituut Film en Jeugd which drew large numbers of attendees; see for instance [H. G.] de B[oe], "Film en rijpere jeugd," *Katholieke Schoolblad*, 5 February 1949, 38. Other institutions that were active in the field were Nederlands Filmmuseum and the pedagogical institute (Nutsseminarium voor Pedagogiek) of the University of Amsterdam. A list of relevant organisations and their activities is given in Crama, "Onderwijs over de film," 20.

278. For evidence of NOF's own efforts (for instance, in the form of articles and reviews), see issues of *Mededelingen van de NOF* in the years 1958-1959 and 1959-1960. References to its courses are made in C. J. M. H. Souren, "De film in het onderwijs," *Mededelingen van de NOF*, September 1959, 13-14, and Ottenheim, *50 jaar NOF/NIAM*, 34 (which quotes attendance figures for 1961).

279. The editorial of an NOF newsletter from 1958 explicitly states that film education ("filmvorming") is now part of the institute's objectives (see the September issue of that year, p. 1). See also Crama's article "Onderwijs over de film". That Peters' influence was still noticeable long after he had left was suggested to me by Van Langeraad (interview with author).

280. A few years earlier, the institute had already released a filmstrip dealing with roughly the same subject(s): *Techniek van de filmkunst* (The technique of film art), first mentioned in *Mededelingen van de NOF*, [Spring] 1954 (no. 1), 12.

281. See N. Crama, "Drie Nederlandse documentaires," *Mededelingen van de NOF*, September 1958, 4-6; "het

aankweken van het begrip ‘film als expressiemiddel’” is mentioned on p. 6. In an article for the June 2009 issue of *Lessen*, the quarterly magazine of the Nationaal Onderwijsmuseum in Rotterdam (which came out in the closing months of the museum’s teaching film exhibition, just before the manuscript of this work was printed), Hogenkamp suggests that after Peters had left NOF, Crama, author of the article just mentioned, took a leading role in the institute’s film education project. Among others, he took the initiative for a series of course units on film appreciation and film making taught at the Haags Montessori Lyceum, a project school in The Hague. See Bert Hogenkamp, “Om scherp te stellen: Veranderingen bij de Nederlandse Onderwijs Film, 1958-1963,” *Lessen: Periodiek van het Nationaal Onderwijsmuseum en de Vereniging van Vrienden*, June 2009, 11-12.

282. See for instance Smeelen, *De Schoolbioscoop onmisbaar??*, 43.

283. The original text for the first quote reads: “De film voor het onderwijs moet een samenhangend geheel geven, een serie van handelingen, gedragingen of bewegingen, welke tot een bepaald doel of resultaat voeren en waarbij alles er op gezet is om het verband tussen deel en geheel zo duidelijk mogelijk te laten uitkomen.” See [Schreuder], *Leidraad voor kwekelingen*, 9. Compare also Von Keitz, “Kinematographie in der Schule,” 474 (for pronouncements to this effect in Germany). The second goes as follows: “Over het algemeen zijn leerlingen der lagere school toch niet in staat om gebeurtenissen, waarvan de samenhang niet uit de beelden volgt, tot logische geheelen te verwerken, ook al worden zij daarbij geholpen [...] door commentaren.” [Schreuder], *Leidraad voor kwekelingen*, 14.

284. “Keuze van films voor het onderwijs,” 2 (see introduction, n. 1).

285. See “Nieuwe films,” *Mededelingen van de NOF*, May 1946, [2]. For its justification, the institute referred to the findings of Kohnstamm, who had argued in his early years that the film medium was fundamentally unfit as a teaching tool, because photographic representation did not allow for any kind of selection. Compare [Schreuder], *Leidraad voor kwekelingen*, 13-14, and Kohnstamm, “Bioscoop en Volksontwikkeling,” 482 (see n. 74). See also Gertiser, “Domestizierung des bewegten Bildes,” 66 (for similar statements made in Switzerland).

286. “[...] alles er op gericht is de aandacht van de leerling sterk op een bepaald onderwerp te concentreren en alle bijkomstigheden op de achtergrond te houden of zelfs af te snijden. Alleen op die wijze is het [...] mogelijk de geestelijke activiteit geheel in de gewenste richting te dwingen, en daardoor gezonde belangstelling te wekken [...]” [Schreuder], *Leidraad voor kwekelingen*, 13. Compare again Gertiser, “Domestizierung des bewegten Bildes,” 66.

287. Van der Meulen, *Film en lichtbeeld bij het onderwijs*, 34. For the (inferred) date of Van der Meulen’s book, I refer to its endorsement in the inlay sheet in *Mededelingen van de NOF*, March 1951 (p. 1). Also references in the text suggest that the work was published in that year.

288. For the preferred length of films, see for instance [Schreuder], *Leidraad voor kwekelingen*, 9. Compare also Von Keitz, “Kinematographie in der Schule,” 475 (Germany), or Hoban, *Movies That Teach*, 92-95 (US). For remarks on speed and repetition, see Van der Meulen, *Film en lichtbeeld bij het onderwijs*, 34.

289. See for instance [Schreuder], *Leidraad voor kwekelingen*, 22.

290. See Aarts, *Uit de school der historie*, 251, and Marc Depaepe, Frank Simon and Angelo Van Gorp, “The Canonization of Ovide Decroly as a ‘Saint’ of the New Education,” *History of Education Quarterly* 43, no. 2 (2003): 224.

Jean-Ovide Decroly (1871-1932) studied medicine in Ghent, specialising in pathological anatomy. During short stays at the University of Berlin and a Paris hospital, he developed an interest in the mentally disturbed. At first, his concerns were purely medical, but later on he also got involved in psychology and pedagogy. After his marriage he converted his own house into an institute for mentally handicapped children, which functioned at the same time as a laboratory. In his point of view, contact with the disturbed and retarded could generate insights into the behaviour of healthy children. From the 1920s onwards, Decroly taught his pedagogical principles at the Free University of Brussels. For more biographical information see H. C. de Wolf, “Ovide Decroly,” in Van der Meer en Bergman, *Onderwijskundigen van de twintigste eeuw*, 73-85, or Francine Dubreucq, “Jean-Ovide Decroly (1871-1932),” *Prospects: Quarterly Review of Comparative Education* 23, no. 1/2 (1993). Especially in the years after his death, Decroly’s ideas met with a lot of response – mostly in the French-speaking parts of Europe, but also in the Netherlands. According to Depaepe, Simon and Van Gorp, the excessive admiration for Decroly was slightly undeserved. In their article on the subject, they conclude that although he was good at synthesising, compiling and combining scientific concepts that were ‘in the air’ at the time, he was not an original thinker (Depaepe, Simon and Van Gorp, “Canonization of Ovide Decroly”). One of the more influential ideas of Decroly (and many of his fellow-reformists) was that the segmentation into lesson subjects which (traditionalist) curricula prescribed, should be eliminated.

291. Van der Meulen, *Film en lichtbeeld bij het onderwijs*, 49-50.

292. For a summary of these ideas, see “Orde in de chaos,” *Mededelingen van de NOF*, [March 1951] (no. 28), 2. Their implications for the production of teaching films are made explicit in [Schreuder], *Leidraad voor kwekelingen*, 22-23.

293. Depaepe, Simon and Van Gorp, “Canonization of Ovide Decroly,” 224.

294. Hogenkamp, “Onderwijsfilm is geen Duitse uitvinding,” 66. In 1942 and 1943, NOF produced a couple of foundation films: two dealing with the Veluwe (an area of woodlands, heath, lakes and drift sand in the east of the Netherlands; one of them has been mentioned above) and another on the grasslands of Friesland (the northern-

most province of the country). They were followed up with a number of titles showing characteristic crafts (Veluwe), farming activities and typical fauna (Friesland). Compare also Ottenheim, *50 jaar NOF/NIAM*, 16. For the recycling of those ideas in later years, see for instance Peters' pronouncements on this issue in *Visueel onderwijs*, 31 and 41-44.

It might be argued here that the way in which NOF moulded the principle of globality to suit its own purposes did not quite match the spirit of Decroly's ideas. Educational journals from the 1940s occasionally voice the complaint that reformist ideas – which, as a rule, stress the importance of (a child's own) initiative in the learning process – threaten to lose their value through systematisation into ready-made methods and textbooks (see for instance "Het Belgisch leerplan – I," *Bode*, 3 November 1939, 572, on the 'modification' of Decroly's ideas, or "Levende vernieuwing," *Onderwijs en opvoeding*, 8 May 1948, 54, on what happened to the insights of the Dutch pedagogue Jan Ligthart). The same could be said of NOF's foundation films, which basically forced the idea of the spheres of interest into the straightjacket of scripts (which, in turn, were interpreted for the users in the pages of accompanying instruction booklets).

295. Peters, *Visueel onderwijs*; compare pp. 41 with 39-40. In the institute's publications, the globality concept was mentioned as late as 1958; see for instance J. A. van Sambeek, "Onderwijsfilms bij het L.O.: een persoonlijke beleving van de leerling," *Mededelingen van de NOF*, June 1958, 4-5. A few years before Peters, Van der Meulen as well had suggested that classroom films might be suitable for other purposes than just those of global teaching. In his manual, he argues that in principle, they can also be used as a means of instruction (*leerfilms*) or illustration (*illustratieve films*). He adds however that in practice, the production of such material is not yet feasible (*leerfilms*) or has not yet been tried out by NOF (*illustratieve films*). See Van der Meulen, *Film en lichtbeeld bij het onderwijs*, 49-51.

296. See "Globale leerplanfilms voor de lagere school," *Mededelingen van de NOF*, September 1947, [3]; [Schreuder], *Leidraad voor kwekelingen*, 22; Van der Meulen, *Film en lichtbeeld bij het onderwijs*, 48. Compare also "Keuze van films voor het onderwijs," 1. The need for verisimilitude is emphasised in Van der Meulen, *Film en lichtbeeld bij het onderwijs*, 342.

297. My analysis here is based on what Peters says in *Visueel onderwijs*, 36. Compare also p. 10, where he reiterates the claim, by then several decades old, that "The world lets itself be captured in images and thus can be brought into the classroom." ("De wereld laat zich vangen in het beeld en kan aldus in het klaslokaal worden binnengebracht.")

298. *Ibid.*, 36.

299. For completeness' sake, I should make explicit here that adherence to its rules may actually not have been the department's primary concern. As Van Langeraad recalls, the first sets of rules that the institute formulated were thought up 'after the facts' (i.e., after its first generation of films had already been brought out; see interview with author). Once again, this confirms my view that NOF's benchmarks should be considered before all else as attempts to justify its own activities – much rather than as concrete guidelines for production. However, this does not mean that rules and regulations did not have an impact on the procedures for making films. Ex-employees testify that members of the so-called Technical Service were indeed pressurised to live up to the standards which the Educational Section imposed (Van Langeraad en Peters, interviews with author).

300. See for instance Van der Meulen, *Film en lichtbeeld bij het onderwijs*, 27-28.

301. In the 1950s, as more and more third party materials were being acquired, NOF seems to have become more permissive about the structural standards which it had formulated in the decade before (and as I will argue later, about formal requirements more in general).

302. Compare Jongbloed, interview with author. Of course, another reason may be advanced as well; see n. 299.

303. [Schreuder], *Leidraad voor kwekelingen*, 14, or Van der Meulen, *Film en lichtbeeld bij het onderwijs*, 52.

304. Most likely, the few titles which, according to the institute's rules, could possibly have benefited from the inclusion of background noise simply did not warrant the necessary investment in equipment for its reproduction. The institute's financial concerns with respect to the introduction of film sound are addressed, among others, in "Ja, ik heb 't gezien," *Mededelingen van de NOF*, April 1949, [2], and Van der Meulen, *Film en lichtbeeld bij het onderwijs*, 51.

305. See [Schreuder], *Leidraad voor kwekelingen*, 13-14, and Van der Meulen, *Film en lichtbeeld bij het onderwijs*, 35. For the link with the results of educational research, compare Kohnstamm, "Film en het Lager Onderwijs," (1948 version, see n. 267), 257-58 (which in turn draws on views expressed in Kohnstamm, "Bioscoop en Volksontwikkeling," 465-66). See also "'Sprekende' of 'zwingende' films op de L.S.," *Mededelingen van de NOF*, January 1948, 1-2.

306. See for instance "Onderwijsfilm met geluid?" *Mededelingen van de NOF*, May 1946, [1]. The argument that teachers should not be deprived of their responsibilities is dealt with more indirectly in [Schreuder], *Leidraad voor kwekelingen*, 13.

307. See "Plan voor een leerfilmorganisatie," 51 (see introduction, n. 6). The association's activities should be seen as part of an international movement against (the excrescences of) commercial film exploitation which I discussed in the first half of this chapter, as well as earlier on in this section. Nederlandse Vereniging voor Culturele films published the monthly magazine *Lichtbeeld en Cultuur*, which I quoted from on several occasions. One of its best-known members was Van Staveren, founder of the first Dutch school cinema and author of a booklet on the

subject: *De Bioscoop en het Onderwijs* (Leiden: Slijthoff, 1919).

308. RWU representatives tended to highlight the position of the teacher (who should not be deprived of his magisterial responsibilities). Supposedly, the only critics of the German standpoint were the British, who, at the time, were already distributing sound films to schools. See Ewert, *Reichsanstalt für Film und Bild*, 170. For completeness' sake, I should add here that it has also been argued that RWU's (actual) motives may have been political. As Ewert points out, post-war inspectors observed that the choice for mute films relieved the institute from supervision by the Propaganda Ministry, and have suggested that it might therefore be seen as an attempt at opposition to the country's fascist regime. See Ewert, *Reichsanstalt für Film und Bild*, 169-71.

309. The influential American journal *Educational Screen*, for instance, praised NOF's perseverance in the matter. Meanwhile, it could only recognise that many independent producers back home had already switched to the production of films with sound. See "Een Amerikaans oordeel," *Mededelingen van de NOF*, June 1947, [1-2] (which quotes from the original piece).

310. Peters, *Visueel onderwijs*, 41; see also p. 14 n. It may be worth pointing out that at that point in time, Peters still opposed the use of spoken commentaries – even if by then, he had already written the script for his prestigious *Vondel, het leven van een groot Nederlander* (1955, Vondel, the life of a great Dutchman) in which the images are accompanied throughout by a voice-over text.

I should also add here that although developments in terms of production took place quite suddenly, the path towards acceptance of sound films had already been paved in previous years. *Film en lichtbeeld bij het onderwijs*, for instance, was less categorical in its dismissal of such material than NOF's own manual, released almost a decade earlier. Van der Meulen writes: "I am convinced that when a good, well-compiled, educational sound film is used, the spoken word can be a great support to the understanding of on-screen action. Not every film necessarily has to be a global film!" ("Ik ben er van overtuigd, dat in menig geval bij gebruik van een goede, weloverwogen samengestelde geluidsfilm voor het onderwijs, het gesproken woord een grote steun kan zijn tot het begrijpen van de handeling op het doek. Niet iedere film moet noodzakelijk een globale film zijn!") However, he admits that this view is based purely on intuition, and that it first needs to be confirmed by experiments. See Van der Meulen, *Film en lichtbeeld bij het onderwijs*, 52-53 (the quote is taken from p. 52).

311. See Hakkert, "Stom en geluid in de onderwijsfilm," 12-13 (see n. 204). (On p. 12, the text literally reads: "In zijn hart is vrijwel iedere leerkracht er inmiddels van overtuigd, dat de geluidsfilm de strijd zal gaan winnen") A few years earlier, Van Langeraad had made this point in a more implicit manner: see his piece "Geluid in de klas," *Mededelingen van de NOF*, October 1957, 4.

312. In previous years, the institute had found to its cost that teachers were prepared to go look for such films elsewhere. A newsletter issue from the late 1940s points out that the market is slowly getting flooded with sound productions, but warns its users that they should resist the 'lure' of that type of material – a fact which indicates that they did not necessarily do so in reality. See "Filmmanie," *Mededelingen van de NOF*, August 1948, 1-2. Examples of private companies that provided so-called 'educational' films, and therefore, competed with NOF, are Nederlandse Schoolbioscoop, Uitenbroek-Film, Filmbureau Niestadt, Contact-Film and Benelux Films (all of which advertised in issues of *Het Katholieke Schoolblad* between the years 1955 and 1960).

313. For a reference to the termination of memberships, see Ottenheim, *50 jaar NOF/NIAM*, 47 and 68. (As a matter of fact, the institute was threatened with bankruptcy because of this.) For NOF's own take on the matter, see Van Langeraad, "Geluid in de klas," 4.

314. How long exactly this situation lasted I have not been able to establish. Fact is, however, that in the early 1960s, many films were still produced in two versions – one with sound, and one without.

315. See Van Langeraad, "Geluid in de klas," 5, and Hakkert, "Stom en geluid in de onderwijsfilm," 13.

316. Compare for instance the teachers' notes to the mute version of *De bruine rat* (1955, The brown rat; a film in two parts) with the commentary to the sound version of the same title (1958; here both instalments are merged into one). Other examples are those films that were released in sound and mute versions simultaneously; for instance, *De kruisspin* (1960, The garden spider).

317. See Kohnstamm, "Film en het Lager Onderwijs" (1948 version), 257-58, and Stichting Nederlandse Onderwijs Film, *Jaarverslag 1947*, for the first set of arguments; [Schreuder], *Leidraad voor kwekelingen*, 13 for the second. The latter point was also made by the representatives of RWU: see Von Keitz, "Kinematographie in der Schule," 472. Elsewhere, however, teaching film proponents were far less tenacious. Hoban, in *Movies That Teach*, for instance, does not seem to mind intertitles at all.

318. For NOF's official standpoint, see [Schreuder], *Leidraad voor kwekelingen*, 13, or "Onderwijsfilm met geluid?" [1]; for its staff's actual motives, I am drawing on information provided by Jongbloed (interview with author). Although the term *truc* (or *trucage*) may have had a negative connotation at first (since it referred to a procedure which was not approved of), it seems to have been the most common word at the time for whatever we would now refer to as a 'special effect'.

319. For instance, in an article on "Animation" (*Mededelingen van de NOF*, June 1958, 14-16), N. Crama only considers the technique's explanatory potential – not its psychological limitations.

320. *Elf-stedentocht* is the first part in a series called *Het Friese Weidegebied* (The grasslands of Friesland). The title refers to a skating race on natural ice, leading through eleven towns in the province of Friesland, in the north of the Netherlands. *Steenkool vervoer* is part I in the series *Onze grote rivieren* (Our major rivers).

321. "Films en lichtbeelden voor het onderwijs behoren in het gewone, dagelijkse klasselokaal thuis. [...] Daarvoor gaan we niet op stap. Zeker niet buiten het schoolgebouw, en bij voorkeur ook niet buiten de klas. Een lichtbeeldenles is wel iets prettigs, maar niet iets buitengewoons, iets sensationeels." Van der Meulen, *Film en lichtbeeld bij het onderwijs*, 99; see also pp. 23 and 36.

322. Compare [Schreuder], *Leidraad voor kwekelingen*, 6-7, with Van der Meulen, *Film en lichtbeeld bij het onderwijs*, 4 and 6.

323. See for instance Van der Meulen, *Film en lichtbeeld bij het onderwijs*, 4, or Crama, "Drie Nederlandse documentaires," 4. For similar arguments in foreign works, see for instance Auguste Bessou, "Le Cinématographe et l'Enseignement Primaire," in *Hommage à Louis Lumière*, ed. A. Bruneau (Paris: Musée Galliera, 1935) (no page numbers) (for pronouncements made in France) and Board of Education, *Handbook of Suggestions for the consideration of teachers and others concerned in the work of public elementary schools* (London: HMSO, 1937), 51 (UK; both of these publications predate those initiated by NOF).

324. "Men hoede er zich [...] voor, lichtbeeld en film als de steen der didactische wijsheid te beschouwen! Beide kunnen de taak van de onderwijzer, die onder alle omstandigheden de man blijft, wel verlichten, maar niet overnemen. [...] Film en lichtbeeld zijn slechts hulpmiddelen, zij het ook zeer aantrekkelijke en doeltreffende." Van der Meulen, *Film en lichtbeeld bij het onderwijs*, 4.

325. See for instance [Schreuder], *Leidraad voor kwekelingen*, 10-11 and 15, and Van der Meulen, *Film en lichtbeeld bij het onderwijs*, 5, 27-29 and 95; on the need of real-life experience, see Peters, *Visueel onderwijs*, 50. The requirement that various tools be combined, again, predates the establishment of NOF; see for instance Jung, "Kinoreformer," 340 (for early pronouncements to this effect in Germany) and Gauthier, "Au risque du spectacle," 95 and Renonciat, "Vue fixe et/ou cinéma," 68 (France).

326. For warnings against the interruption or early termination of film screenings, see Van der Meulen, *Film en lichtbeeld bij het onderwijs*, 28; "Het stilzetten van de projector," *Mededelingen van de NOF*, [December 1951] (no. 30), 2-4; Peters, *Visueel onderwijs*, 49. The newsletter article mentions the possibility of wear and burning due to projector heat; Van der Meulen adds that the still image such practice generates is usually of an inferior (presumably, blurry) quality. Peters in turn thinks that it prevents the film from speaking 'its own language', and thus, sabotages the pupils' efforts to master cinematic codes. In addition, all of these sources also argue that pausing a film is wrong from a didactic point of view, because it interferes with the children's perception, and therefore creates a faulty impression of 'how the world turns'. For texts that urge the users to restrict the number of verbal interventions, see [Schreuder], *Leidraad voor kwekelingen*, 14 and 16-18; Kohnstamm, "Film en het Lager Onderwijs," (1948 version), 158; Peters, *Visueel onderwijs*, 47-48.

I should point out here that NOF's attitude in such matters differs considerably from that of teaching film proponents in earlier decades. In the 1920s in particular, interested parties argued that teachers should be allowed to freeze images (Gauthier, "Au risque du spectacle," 95) or even structurally adapt a film (for instance, by cutting in it; a practice mentioned in Gertiser, "Domestizierung des bewegten Bildes," 62-63). Also in Holland, this was still considered a possibility at the time (see Van Staveren, "Bioscoop in dienst van het onderwijs," 460 (see n. 59); compare also [J. J.] v[an] d[er] M[eu]len, "De Film op School – IV," *Christelijk Schoolblad*, 14 January 1932, 5, which still sees pausing the projection as an option).

327. See Wolf, "Ovide Decroly," 75. Given this fact, it is quite remarkable that the viewing order which NOF prescribed closely matches that of distributors elsewhere – distributors who, incidentally, did *not* refer to Decroly's ideas; compare for instance the sources mentioned in Saettler, *Evolution of American Educational Technology*, 113-14; Von Keitz, "Kinematographie in der Schule," 475; Hornicek, "Institutionalization of classroom films in Czechoslovakia," 389. Once again, this seems to confirm Van Langeraad's observation that the scientific explanation which the institute advanced was a justification much rather than an actual *inspiration* for the procedures concerned.

328. See [Schreuder], *Leidraad voor kwekelingen*, 16-18 (the quote, "het ruimtelijk, tijdelijk en geestelijk verband der werkelijkheid," is taken from p. 17). Instruction booklets from the same era, which often also contain an overview of the stages just mentioned, tend to add that during the second screening, teachers are allowed to make a remark or two if the need is felt.

329. Once again, see Peters, *Visueel onderwijs*, 47-48. I should perhaps point out here that this position is somewhat in contradiction with another concern expressed by NOF, which I briefly mention further on. In some of its publications, the institute also suggests that the children, during a screening, should never be allowed to 'forget where they are': they should not get so absorbed by the film's events, that they are no longer aware that they are

sitting in a classroom – an environment meant for *learning* (under the supervision of a teacher). See chapter 2, n. 22.

330. The formulation of rules and requirements seems to be a common procedure whenever a new technology enters the domain of formal education. For instance, about a decade after NOF started its activities, school radio became a ‘hot topic’. Again, producers and other advocates claimed that radio broadcasts could only serve a purpose for classroom teaching if they were made and used properly. Articles written by the interested parties therefore established benchmarks, both formal and topical, and gave advice on the role of the teacher who had to put the programmes to use. See for instance V., “Schoolradio,” [2] (see n. 258) and M., “Schoolradio: wanneer wij?,” 115-16. Similar demands were made later on, when school television was introduced: compare for instance “Heeft school-t.v. een toekomst?,” 26-27 (see introduction, n. 58).

331. Again, I need to point out that in the wider context of how the medium was propagated, this is somewhat surprising, since film was also characterised as a particularly modern instrument. Educational reformists, after all, radically *opposed* the separation between school and other areas of life, and the mutual boundaries between the various lesson subjects of traditional education, which were considered artificial. See for instance, V[an] d[er] M[eu]len], “Oud en nieuw,” 1-2 (see n. 58); P. F. v. Overbeeke, “Organisch onderwijs,” *Onderwijs en opvoeding*, 12 March 1949, 33-36; or, for a Catholic interpretation of the same principles, the report of a 1939 educational reform commission published in *Het Katholieke Schoolblad*, 6 April 1939 (see pp. 814 and 819 in particular).

332. For references to such qualifications made at the time, see for instance “Het enquête-formulier,” *Mededelingen van de NOF*, June 1950, 1, or “Bedenklijke voorlichting over onderwijsfilms,” *Schoolblad*, 23 April 1960, 296; hints to such pronouncements are also dropped in Van der Meulen, “Onderwijsfilm,” 2 (see introduction, n. 7), and Kohnstamm, “Film en het Lager Onderwijs – II,” 1 (see n. 248). (Meanwhile, however, there were also users who *appreciated* NOF’s films for their exceptional aesthetic qualities; see for instance a letter by J. J. Derks, most likely to the board of governors of NOF, dated 4 December 1945, NA, NOF, 2.19.042.55, inv. no. 6, pp. 5-8.) For more recent statements to this effect, see for instance Hogenkamp, “Onderwijsfilm is geen Deutsche uitvinding,” 66-69, where the author argues that NOF’s films did carry on from pre-war traditions, however without the formal sophistication of the so-called Filmliga-style; therefore, he designates them as “naïve” (p. 66) or “primitive” (p. 66, 69). Compare also Zimmermann, “Vom Lichtbild zum Film,” 84 (who uses the term ‘conservative’ in talking about the look of industrial films).

For completeness’ sake, I should add that the perceived outmodedness of the institute’s output probably should not be associated exclusively with the formal restrictions which it imposed. Considering the fact that the production of audio-visual aids was a state-subsidised undertaking, it necessarily had to be subject to financial restrictions; therefore, there must have been limits to the standards that could be achieved. Until the mid-1950s, when NOF became part of a network of international cooperation, technical up-to-dateness simply was not an option. In addition to this, I should also stress that the titles which the institute distributed often remained in the collection for a very long period of time; in practice, then, children saw films that were years or even decades old. (For instance, I can derive from entries on a rental slip that accompanied a print of the film *Glas*, produced around 1943, that it was available to schools until at least 1970.)

333. I should specify here that in most cases, no reason was given at all. For instance, NOF’s requirement that teaching films should always be short was never withdrawn officially; in spite of this, the films which the institute released gradually became longer. Also the pace of its films increased without much explanation.

334. Advert for a film about the 1948 royal jubilee, for instance, extol its technical virtues (such as colour and sound) and/or narrative traits (action and suspense); see issues of *Christelijk Schoolblad* and *Het Katholieke Schoolblad* of that year.

335. See for instance “Vernieuwing in de onderwijsfilm,” *Mededelingen van de NOF*, December 1958, 17 (the transcript of a lecture by R. Lefranc, head of the Services Audiovisuels of the French Institut Pédagogique National, held in Utrecht, the Netherlands, in the same year). Symptomatic for this change in attitude is a series of articles for one of the main union magazines for teachers, written by Roelof Kiers, a student at an Amsterdam teacher training college, who would later become a well-known maker of television documentaries. In these texts he elaborates on Peters’ ideas about film education. See Roelof Kiers, “School en film – I,” *Schoolblad*, 25 June 1960, 477; Roelof Kiers, “Opvoeden met film [School en film – II],” *Schoolblad*, 2 July 1960, 495-96; Roelof Kiers, “Opvoeden tot de film [School en film – III],” *Schoolblad*, 16 July 1960, 533 (the first and third addressing the aforementioned issues most directly). For more on Kiers’ career, see Wim Voeten, “Geëngageerd door nieuwsgierigheid: Roelof Kiers en de ontwikkeling van de directe documentaire vorm in Nederland” (master’s thesis, Katholieke Universiteit Nijmegen, 1999).

336. During Peters’ directorship, the institute began to function as a breeding ground for those who envisaged careers in the film trade (Van Langeraad, interview with author). Several people who later gained fame in the feature film and/or documentary industries had started off at NOF. Examples are the aforementioned Crama (who became a producer/director of short fiction films, documentaries and animation films), Rob Mariouw-Smit (cameraman/director of documentary films) and Van Langeraad (television director). The first film to give a full

overview of the cast and crew involved in its making was *Vondel, het leven van een groot Nederlander*. Although in smaller productions the list of credits was usually less elaborate, most films did mention the name of a 'director' (a term which was not used before, because it was considered a sign of 'inappropriate' artistic pretence; Van Langeraad and Jongbloed, interviews with author).

337. See for instance Van der Meulen, *Film en lichtbeeld bij het onderwijs*, 7. Although the 'inherent' motivational potential of film continued to be mentioned (for instance, on p. 31 of the same guide) it did not function as an actual production principle.

338. Peters, *Visueel onderwijs*, 30-31. (Peters' reasoning in this section is that films that appeal visually encourage emotional engagement, and therefore, have a captivating effect.) In his article for the magazine of the Nationaal Onderwijsmuseum, Hogenkamp also mentions the publication of a 'colourful brochure' on NOF's services (designed by animation film-maker Rupert van der Linden, also responsible for the NOF film *De goochelaar ontgoocheld*, The magician disappointed, released in 1958). The leaflet, in his view, is symptomatic of the abovementioned attitude shift. As opposed to the manuals and brochures of earlier years, it seems to convey the message that it is actually permissible that children enjoy watching NOF's films. See Hogenkamp, "Om scherp te stellen," 7.

2 • Teaching Film Use and the Pedagogical *Dispositif*

1. Once again, I would argue that the reason for this may have been that concerns for the children's own well-fare were considered more 'obviously' relevant or legitimate – especially at a time when the most horrifying doom scenarios that were imagined in the early years (such as, those involving the 'denaturation' of education and the replacement of teachers by machines) had lost much of their plausibility. (The term 'denaturation' is used here as in David Thorburn and Henry Jenkins, "Introduction: Toward an Aesthetics of Transition," in *Rethinking Media Change: The Aesthetics of Transition*, ed. David Thorburn and Henry Jenkins (Cambridge, MA: MIT, 2004), 1.)

2. For figures, see p. 8 (also n. 45) of my general introduction.

3. See [Schreuder], *Leidraad voor kwekelingen*, 12; Van der Meulen, *Film en lichtbeeld bij het onderwijs*, 6. The institute here reiterates arguments made by members of the educational reform movement, who also emphasised the personality of the teacher, and claimed that true innovation never results from the application of methods or guidelines but depends on what one invests of oneself. Compare for instance "Levende vernieuwing," 54 (see chapter 1, n. 294).

4. For references to texts that substantiate this claim, see various notes to my section entitled "Reservations" in chapter 1 (paragraph 1.1.2).

5. Compare also Renonciat, "Vue fixe et/ou cinéma," 71. For completeness' sake, I should add here that considerations of this type do not constitute the *only* valid explanation for the (Dutch) teachers' unwillingness to accept film as a classroom aid. Ottenheim, for instance, suggests that confessional motives may have played a role as well. According to the author, Reformist Protestants (*gereformeerden*) considered the medium to be 'the devil's picture book' (*des duivels prentenboek*) and therefore radically banned it from their schools. See Ottenheim, *50 jaar NOF/NIAM*, 28. However, I would like to stress that such arguments – which may at times also have constituted a facade for the aforementioned concerns – were made only in isolated parts of the country.

6. See Cuban, *How Teachers Taught* (pp. 248-49 in particular) or John I. Goodlad, *A Place Called School: Prospects for the Future* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1983). Both of these works focus on the situation in North America, and trace this tendency until the 'present' of the books' publication. For a more local account, see I. van der Velde, "Wie droegen in de periode 1900-1940 in Nederland de onderwijsvernieuwing," in *Vernieuwingsstreven binnen het Nederlandse onderwijs in de periode 1910-1940*, ed. J. W. van Hulst, I. van der Velde, and G. Th. M. Verhaak (Groningen: Wolters-Noordhoff, 1970).

7. My choice of words here is inspired by Jacquinot's; compare *Image et Pédagogie*, 113-14.

8. Cuban, *How Teachers Taught*; see the next few notes for more specific references. I should point out here that also my phrasing in the header to this section is based on Cuban's observations. The term 'work setting' is used in his publication from 1986, *Teachers and Machines* (pp. 56-59 in particular); the idea behind it is dealt with more extensively in *How Teachers Taught*, the book I focus on here (for instance, in chapter 8, pp. 243-71).

9. Cuban, *How Teachers Taught*, 260, 252-53 and 249-50, in that order. Similar observations are also made in some of my primary sources, especially with respect to the first set of constraints which Cuban mentions. Compare for instance for instance [J. J.] v[an] d[er] M[eulen], "Leerstof-bezwaren," *Christelijk Schoolblad*, 2 October 1941, 1-2 (an article in his series on educational reform for the union magazine he contributed to).

10. Cuban, *How Teachers Taught*, 260-63. (The phrase 'situationally constrained' is used from p. 260 onwards.)

11. For Cuban's views on classroom order, see *ibid.*, 268. A similar point is made by Jacquinot, who says that it is the educator's task to 'master' the conditions ("maîtriser [les] contraintes") in which learning can take place; see *Image et Pédagogie*, 33-34.

12. Cuban, *How Teachers Taught*, 262-71.

13. The relation between the institute's specifications and the creation of an 'appropriate' classroom atmosphere is established, among others, in "'Nederlandse Onderwijs Film,'" 2 (see chapter 1, n. 209). For evidence of concerns regarding power relations in class, see Zanen, "Leerfilmorganisatie en filmpaedagogen," 76 (chapter 1, n. 164).

14. This point is made quite literally in [J. J.] v[an] d[er] M[eulen], "Geen revolutie, wel restauratie," *Christelijk Schoolblad*, 9 October 1941, 2. As far as the technical side of the problem is concerned, the same author also suggests that during a screening, the operation of projection equipment be delegated to "a boy" ("de bediening van de projectielantaarn [kan] heel goed door een jongen geschieden"). This way, the teacher can concentrate on maintaining control, rather than being distracted by the quirks of the machinery. (See *Film en lichtbeeld bij het onderwijs*, 25.) Earlier on, also Zanen had argued that teachers who were not particularly confident about their technical skills should not be asked to project films, as this might cause their lessons to fail ("Leerfilmorganisatie en filmpaedagogen," 77). With respect to the teachers' experience of the medium more in general (i.e. as viewers), Peters' manual suggests that this constituted a 'problem' especially with the older generation (see *Visueel onderwijs*, 28).

15. Jackson, *Teacher and Machine*, 5-8. Note that in my general introduction, I have already qualified this statement for some of the media which Jackson mentions (film and television).

16. *Ibid.*, 14-22, and Cuban, *Teachers and Machines*, 3-5. In this context, it is worth mentioning that both Cuban and Saettler make the distinction between two types of educational progressivism. On the one hand, there is the kind which is practiced by those who primarily seek to make schools more time and cost effective, and focus therefore on the means by which already established goals are achieved. On the other hand, there is the strand which stems from a dissatisfaction with the objectives of the educational system itself, and is performed by people who aim at changing the ways in which knowledge is acquired (in other words, those who I associated in what precedes with the New Education). For Cuban's formulation, see *Teachers and Machines*, 10-11; for Saettler's, compare pp. 5-6 and his sections on the Visual Instruction Movement (chapter 5) and the Progressive Education Association (chapter 3) of *Evolution of American Educational Technology*. The devising and promotion of new technologies, it seems, was primarily a task of those associated with the former category – even if they often exploited the latter's arguments.

17. See Cuban, *Teachers and Machines*, 5-6, and Cuban, *How Teachers Taught*, 244-45 and 51-52. Compare also Oppenheimer, "The Computer Delusion" (which discusses such problems with reference to computerised instruction). For primary references to the cliché of the teaching profession as a particularly conservative one, I refer back to chapter 1.

18. Examples of early (Dutch) reports on the issue are "Wetenschap en praktijk," *Bode*, 10 February 1939, 82-83, and "En nu... vooruit!," *Schoolblad*, 15 February 1946, 22-23. One particularly interesting piece is J. J. Dijk, "Moderne didactische hulpmiddelen," *Christelijk Schoolblad*, 12 May 1955, 1, where the author makes the distinction between those aids which, supposedly, entered schools in response to a call for a different, more visual kind of education (19th century tools such as wall charts and maps) and those that were the result of technological innovations that had nothing to do with education as such (radio, film, television). The author seems to think that the latter type's more limited appeal to teachers is somehow connected to its status of 'alien' (*vreemdeling*) to the business of schools.

19. Brian Winston, for instance, has argued in several publications that (non-fiction) films are generally taken to be inescapably 'evidential' – a fact which he attributes to the historical interdependence of science and what he calls 'instruments of inscription'. See Winston, "Documentary Film as Scientific Inscription" or Brian Winston, *Claiming the Real: The Documentary Film Revisited* (London: British Film Institute, 1995), 131-37. (For clarity's sake, I should perhaps add here that the author considers this to be a cultural, rather than an ontological fact; and therefore, an idea that we, the community that maintains it, could collectively relinquish, if we were prepared to do so.)

20. My use of the word 'mastery' here is inspired by Jacquinet's terminology; compare n. 11.

21. See for instance Hakkert, "Stomme film en geluidsfilm," 12, which claims that it voices objections made 'in teaching circles'. Compare Zanen, "Filmleerstof in verband met het leerplan" (see chapter 1, n. 49) literally the uses phrase "een te autoritair karakter" (p. 137), and D. v[an] S[taveren], "Het internationaal Congres te Rome – II," *Lichtbeeld en Cultuur* 12, no. 2 (1934): 9-10.

22. Another concern that might be worth mentioning in this context, and that I have barely touched upon so far, is that during classroom screenings, pupils should be kept from getting too absorbed by, or immersed in, the activity of viewing. In most cases, the reason the relevant sources give is that children can only learn from what is shown if they are prevented from getting (emotionally) overwhelmed by the events a film portrays, and are encouraged instead to consider with sufficient critical distance the arguments that are made. See [Schreuder], *Leidraad voor kwekelingen*, 21, or Peters, *Visueel onderwijs*, 36 and 48 (which gives tips of a more variegated kind). For more contemporary pronouncements to this effect, compare also Joost Raessens' article on educational video games, "The gaming *dispositif*: An analysis of serious games from a humanities perspective," in *Serious Games*:

Mechanisms and Effects, ed. Ute Ritterfeld, Michael Cody and Peter Vorderer (New York: Routledge, 2009); see p. 495 in particular. In view of the above findings, however, it can be argued that also in this context, what was at stake, beside the actual learning objectives, was the teachers' own status as the source of the knowledge conveyed.

23. Compare Grunder, "Verteufelung des Bildes," 59.

24. See for instance Van der Meulen, *Film en lichtbeeld bij het onderwijs*, 4. In this respect, I see a difference with, for instance, (Dutch) medical films, which were often also mute – even in the immediate post-war period (see Van Dijk, "Door het oog van de chirurg," 79–80). As opposed to classroom films, registrations of operations aimed at specialist audiences probably took this form for the more practical reason that it allowed lecturers to decide what they would focus on – much rather than because they wanted to preserve their (functional) authority over their addressees.

Another comparison that forces itself here is that with school radio. Concerns about the classroom position of teachers were also expressed in (older) debates on the educational use of wireless technique (as referred to, among others, in Van der Haak, "Mededeelingen van leerzamen aard," 279). In the case of radio, sound was the *only* possible channel of information transfer; for the target users, worries about the retention of a more or less 'authoritative voice' therefore must have been even more acute. In my experience, this probably explains why the medium became unpopular so rapidly among (Dutch) teaching staff (as shown, for instance, in V., "Schoolradio," [2] (see chapter 1, n. 258)).

25. Of course, the conclusions which I attach in this paragraph to NOF's objections to sound are also applicable to its early rules on the use of intertitles, or even non-verbal explanatory 'signs' (for instance, those that are part of schematic representations).

Another remark which I would like to make in this context is that my reasoning here differs slightly from that of Gertiser, in her study of early Swiss teaching films. In "Domestizierung des bewegten Bildes," the author discusses the ways in which such items have been 'modified' in order to fit the didactic structures and culture of formal education – a process which she designates as a 'domestication' (*Domestizierung*) of the medium by pedagogues. Although I have made some observations that are similar to hers, I choose to make a sharper distinction between the people who produced and/or distributed films (and who, in many cases, also made up the rules for their use) and the teachers themselves, whose demands had to be met ('pedagogues' in the most basic sense of the term). For me, in other words, the 'domestication' of film for teaching should be seen not as a direct outcome of the users' own efforts, but as an attempt by entrepreneurs to get the medium accepted by the professionals it targeted.

26. See introduction, p. 8. That few schools made use of NOF's films on a regular basis can be derived from the ratio between the number of institutions registered to the amount of film requests made per year. For instance, in a review of the foundation's results for 1953, a newsletter points out that the average number of film copies borrowed per school per year was 23. In some schools, however, the figures were as low as 8 to 10 (covering rentals by *all* interested teachers in *all* classes in that particular institution). See "De distributie van N.O.F.-films in 1953," *Mededelingen van de NOF*, [Autumn], 1954 (no. 2), 2. Compare also Cuban, who shows on the basis of similar figures that the use of teaching films in American schools has always been "infrequent": see *Teachers and Machines*, 17.

27. The primary sources that I shall rely on in this chapter are primarily interviews with former teachers and pupils, conducted by Ed van Berkel in preparation for an exhibition on teaching films, held at Nationaal Onderwijsmuseum (National Education Museum) in Rotterdam, between December 2008 and September 2009. Furthermore, I shall make use of the information I personally obtained during conversations with some of NOF's ex-employees, and a few informal chats with people who were school-age in the period I deal with.

28. "Voor wie werd dit boekje geschreven? Niet voor hen, die menen, dat het nieuwe niet goed is, omdat het nieuw is, en ook niet voor hen, die naar het lichtbeeld vragen, omdat 'men alle films van de N.O.F. al gezien heeft!' (historisch! [*sic*]) Wèl voor hen, die projectie bij hun onderwijs begeren, maar voor wie de grote verscheidenheid en de vele mogelijkheden verwarrend zijn." Van der Meulen, *Film en lichtbeeld bij het onderwijs*, 103.

29. Of course, verification of this hypothesis would require more systematic (empirical) research.

30. Kiers, "School en film," 477 (see chapter 1, n. 335); compare Van der Meulen, *Film en lichtbeeld bij het onderwijs*, 26. For more information (and references) on Kiers' activities, see my references in chapter 1 (same note).

31. Screening locations are mentioned in Peter, "Van koren tot brood," *Christelijk Schoolblad*, 10 January 1946, 2–3; Gerrit Lansink, e-mail message to author, 7 August 2005; D. v. d. Reijden, interview with Ed van Berkel, 27 January 2007. Ole Schepp, in an interview with the author, 9 May 2005, and Hans Volmer, in an interview with Van Berkel, 27 January 2007, testify that screenings were attended by entire school populations at a time. Marjolein de Zwaan, an ex-employee of NOF, relates that the same also happened in the early years of school television. At the time, the situation even occurred that children from neighbouring schools were brought in to watch. Interview with author, 22 May 2008.

32. V. d. Reijden, Volmer and Cees van Bree, in interviews with Van Berkel (Van Bree on 22 September 2007). Thomas

Dres, in an interview with the same person (22 September 2007), gives voice to such recollections of the later 1960s. In his school in Zeist, Volmer specifies, the children were even given lemonade (*ranja*) and sweets during the rewinding of the reels.

33. Consider, respectively, Henk Hidding's e-mail message to Nationaal Onderwijsmuseum, 15 November 2005, and Volmer's interview with Van Berkel (both reporting on screenings for *Sinterklaas*, celebrated in Holland on 5 December); V. d. Reijden's and Volmer's interviews with the same person (birthdays); the article "Iets naders over de groeps-indeling van de scholen," *Mededelingen van de NOF*, [Spring] 1955 (no. 1), 5 (among others, the weeks before various holidays). Dres (later 1960s) also mentions a concentration of screenings at the end of the school week. (According to Hidding, the *Sinterklaas* screenings organised for his school actually took place in a local bar.)

34. Compare also Hoban, *Movies That Teach*, 107-8.

35. Ed van Berkel, e-mail message to author, 5 April 2007; Trix Ginhoven, interview with Van Berkel, 27 January 2007. For the term *seizoensfilms*, see "Van de Centrale Buitendienst," *Mededelingen van de NOF*, 1957 (no. 1), 9. Two examples of such films that still have some notoriety are Albert Lamorisse's 1956 production *Le Ballon Rouge* (*The Red Balloon*, distributed by the institute from about 1960 onwards as *De rode ballon*, but not included in NOF's official catalogue; see the filmography in the back matter for reasons) and *Piccolo, Saxo en Compagnie* (*Piccolo, Saxo and Company*, an advertising film for the Philips company produced by Joop Geesink/Dollywood in 1960, re-released by NOF a few years later).

36. In holiday periods, teachers' magazines published announcements to warn users that titles were slowly getting booked up. (An example, placed by Nederlandse Schoolbioscoop, can be found in the adverts pages of *Christelijk Schoolblad*, 4 November 1948.) Topical films as well were often more popular in specific months or years. Titles dealing with the Dutch royal family, for instance, were particularly sought after in mid-1948, at the time of Queen Wilhelmina's 50th jubilee. (See for instance adverts for Filmbureau Niestad in *Christelijk Schoolblad* and *Katholieke Schoolblad* of the relevant year.)

37. Dres, in his interview with Van Berkel, talks about his recollections of those. For such titles in the NOF collection, see chapter 1 (in the notes to my section on the 'pillarisation' of the post-war Dutch society).

38. See also Volmer's interview with Van Berkel (in which he mentions that in his school, screenings were held twice a year) or Schepp, interview with author (once a year).

39. The claim that only regular screenings can be educationally effective is made explicitly in the item "Renteloze leningen voor aanschaf eigen projectoren," *Mededelingen van de NOF*, September 1959, 4.

40. Consider for instance the testimonies of Wiebe Dijkstra and J. Rijnsent, in interviews with Van Berkel on 29 January 2007 and 22 September 2007, respectively. For recollections of such screenings later on in time, in the 1960s and early 1970s, see, respectively, Ginhoven and M. van Nijnatten, and Henk van der Sluis and Volmer, in interviews with the same person (Van Nijnatten on 22 September 2007; Van der Sluis on 27 January 2007). (Volmer's recollections, on this occasion, concern his experience as a primary school teacher.) Compare, among others, Gerrit Lansink and Ole Schepp, interviews with author, 21 and 22 December 2005, respectively. Volmer and Ginhoven (the latter, this time, talking about the 1950s, when she was still a pupil) both make mention of viewing sessions in which several films were shown successively. Again, this practice went against NOF's user advice, which said that teachers should only ever show *one* film at a time; see for instance J. A. van Sambeek, "Onderwijsfilms bij het L.O.: een persoonlijke beleving van de leerling," *Mededelingen van de NOF*, June 1958, 5. Practical constraints could be that the children's own classrooms were difficult to darken (see Van der Meulen, *Film en lichtbeeld bij het onderwijs*, 23), that there was no wall or screen fit for projection, or that visibility was impaired due to the arrangement of desks and chairs (as seems to have been the case in Ginhoven's school).

41. See for instance Peter, "Van koren tot brood," 3; Filmgebruiker [pseud.], "Nederlandse Onderwijsfilm," *Onderwijs en opvoeding*, 12 February 1949, 21; S. J. Nijdam's letter to the editor (in the section "Rondom de N.O.F."), *Schoolblad*, 10 December 1949, p. 561-2. (Occasional) deviations from NOF's rules are mentioned, respectively, in Van Bree, interview with Van Berkel; Jos. Detony, "Geslaagde Nederlandse Jeugdfilm," *Katholieke Schoolblad*, 9 April 1950, 635; [H. G.] de B[oe]er, "Een nieuwe film voor de scholen," *Katholieke Schoolblad*, 8 October 1955, 653. Even Van der Meulen, although very loyal to the institute's objectives, was not exactly a bigot when it came to rules and regulations. In his article series on educational reform for *Christelijk Schoolblad*, he actually condemns teachers who follow manuals and methods too rigorously (see M[eu]len, "Geen revolutie, wel restauratie," 1-2 (see n. 14) and [J. J.] v[an] d[er] M[eu]len, "Wat dan?," *Christelijk Schoolblad*, 16 October 1941, 1-2, in particular). Also his 1931-1932 series on teaching film for the same magazine, entitled "De Film op School" (which contains many of the ideas that he would later develop in his handbook) shows evidence of his open-mindedness in such matters – and by the same token, of his fundamental progressiveness. Yet of course, there were also users who *were* quite strict about NOF's instructions; consider for instance the experiences of Rijnsent and Van Nijnatten, as related in their interviews with Van Berkel.

42. Ole Schepp, interview with author, 19 January 2006. *Koninginnedag* is a national holiday, held on 30 April (at the time Schepp speaks of, the queen's actual birthday).

43. Van Bree, interview with Van Berkel. On the whole, regular screenings seem to have taken place most often in the higher years of primary school. One reason for this may have been that NOF distributed relatively few films for younger children. Hidding's experience constitutes an exception to this rule.
44. For accounts of screenings organised by teachers who were highly enthusiastic about the medium, see for instance Hidding's e-mail to Nationaal Onderwijsmuseum and the subsequent interview with teacher Hagenauw (whose screening practice is mentioned in Hidding's message) conducted by Van Berkel on 23 May 2007; compare also Van Bree's and Dres' interviews. (A remarkable exception to this rule is the sixth-form teacher referred to by Schepp, who seems to have organised viewings as a matter of habit rather than out of a personal interest (interview with author, 22 December 2005). Indirect evidence of amateur film activities among teachers is provided in the pages of small-gauge magazines. The journal *Het veerwerk*, for instance, occasionally published adverts for educational and classroom films, but also articles which indicate that it did indeed count pedagogues among its readers (consider for instance M. Bronkhorst, "Film en jeugd," *Veerwerk* 17, no. 1 (1950): 6-7). Also Van der Meulen, in his manual chapter on projection equipment, appeals to teachers with a rather detailed knowledge of small-gauge technology (see Van der Meulen, *Film en lichtbeeld bij het onderwijs*, chapter 7, pp. 43-47). The author here seems to specifically address a group of people that use the medium more intensively.
45. The first term actually comes from Harry Wolcott, as quoted in Cuban, *Teachers and Machines*, 62. The second is my own adaptation of Cuban's 'computer buff' (Cuban, *Teachers and Machines*, 99), which he uses to refer to those teachers on a school's staff who experiment with PCs at home and are subsequently called upon to continue to do so in class (compare p. 76). It may be worth adding here that not only those who were enthusiastic about (teaching) films and computers, but also early users of school television seem to have been attracted to the medium primarily out of a fascination for the technology; see Van der Haak, "Mededeelingen van leerzamen aard," 284.
46. See for instance Jacquinot, *Image et Pédagogie*, 143, and Renonciat, "Vue fixe et/ou cinéma," 71. For Cuban's pronouncement, see *Teachers and Machines*, 49. (In the sentence I refer to here, the author happens to speak of school television, but what he says is fully in agreement with his conclusions on the application of audio-visual aids more in general.)
47. V. d. Reijden, Volmer, Ginhoven, Van der Sluis, Van Bree, Rijnsent and Gérard Bosch, interviews with Van Berkel (Bosch on 29 January 2007).
48. Consider for instance the figures quoted by Cuban in *Teachers and Machines*, 16. For Holland, I have no precise data, but I can personally testify that most of the people (of the appropriate age) whom I informally questioned did not remember watching films in school at all.
49. V. d. Reijden, Van Bree, Rijnsent and Dres, in their interviews with Van Berkel, report on such viewing circumstances.
50. Examples of texts that support this claim are Filmgebruiker [pseud.], "Nederlandse Onderwijsfilm," 21; "Wij hebben alle films al gezien," *Mededeelingen van de NOF*, [September 1951] (no. 29), 1-2; Van der Meulen, "Vondelfilm," 2 (see chapter 1, n. 228).
51. I may need to specify here that while these 'film-buffs' did not (necessarily) disapprove of the entertainment connotation which the film medium evoked, I argue that they probably did not want it to be 'carried over' into their classrooms – if only because of the potential (unforeseeable) effects on the pupils' conduct.
52. This point is formulated most eloquently by Van der Meulen; see *Film en lichtbeeld bij het onderwijs*, 99.
53. Renonciat indirectly confirms my view. In her piece on the early decades of teaching film in France, she argues that not only opponents of the medium's educational use, but also supporters and enthusiastic users sought to protect the standards and frameworks of classroom teaching ("les normes et les cadres de l'enseignement magistral"). She bases this conclusion on a consideration of the ways in which these proponents deployed the medium in their own schools. See Renonciat, "Vue fixe et/ou cinéma"; the quote is taken from p. 71.
54. See Van der Meulen, *Film en lichtbeeld bij het onderwijs*; compare pp. 7, 23, 95 and 103. As a matter of fact, the author of the 1951 manual seems to consider the pleasure which children derive from watching a film to be the main argument in favour of its educational use – because it is what motivates them to pay attention to what is taught. Consider for instance what he says on p. 31 of the same publication. In addition to this, he does not share the idea of the institute's early representatives that all films have to be viewed 'globally' (see pp. 49-50), and also his position on the use of speech during projection is more relaxed (p. 52).
55. Frank Kessler, "Notes on *dispositif*," unpublished paper, Utrecht Media Research Seminar, <http://www.let.uu.nl/~Frank.Kessler/personal/Dispositif%20Notes11-2007.pdf> (last modified November 2007); see pp. 7-9 and 12-16. Compare also Jean-Louis Baudry, "The Apparatus: Metapsychological Approaches to the Impression of Reality in Cinema," in *Film Theory and Criticism: Introductory Readings*, ed. Leo Braudy and Marshall Cohen (1975; New York: Oxford University Press, 1999).
56. Kessler, "Notes on *dispositif*," 15-16.
57. The term 'framings' is used by Kessler (see *ibid.*, 15).

58. See, respectively, Roger Odin, "Du spectateur fictionnalisant au nouveau spectateur: approche sémiopragmatique," *Iris: Revue de théorie de l'image et du son / A Journal of Theory on Image and Sound*, no. 8 (1988): 91, and by the same author, "Sémio-pragmatique du cinéma et de l'audiovisuel: Modes et institutions," in *Towards a Pragmatics of the Audiovisual: Theory and History*, vol. 1, ed. Jürgen Müller (Münster: Nodus, 1994), 41. For more on the pressures exerted by the entertainment sector, see Odin, "Film documentaire Lecture documentarisante," 271, and Odin, "Du spectateur fictionnalisant," 96. Also his piece "Pour une sémio-pragmatique du cinéma," *Iris* 1, no. 1 (1983) deals with the role of institutional constraints.

59. I should add however that use of the concept does not imply that in the course of analysis, all three players in the aforementioned constellation should necessarily always be given equal weight. In conclusion to the 2006 series of the Utrecht Media Research Seminar, which had the *dispositif* notion as its theme, the remark was made that it should be taken as a theoretical model in which each component can be either foregrounded or de-emphasised. (Compare also Kessler, "Notes on *dispositif*," 17.) In fact, this is precisely what I shall be doing in the following chapters: I shall be focusing less on technological 'hardware', and more on text and viewing position within the pedagogical *dispositif*. In what precedes, I merely meant to stress the entirely reciprocal nature of the interaction that takes place within such a set-up.

60. As a matter of fact, a certain degree of normativity may be inevitable here. As Hughes Peeters and Philippe Charlier point out, the *dispositif* is necessarily a 'situated' notion: one that is connected to a certain view of the world, which functions as an ideal, a model; see Peeters and Charlier, "Contributions à une théorie du dispositif," in *Le Dispositif: Entre usage et concept*, ed. Geneviève Jacquinet-Delaunay and Laurence Monnoyer (Paris: CNRS Editions, 1999), 20. In what follows, it will become clear that this is true also for the concept as I use it. However, at this point in my argumentation (see main text), the term 'normative' means 'standardised', or 'as enforced by means of rules or guidelines'.

61. "Dans le champ de la pédagogie, le terme 'dispositif' est souvent utilisé de façon banale pour désigner un ensemble de moyens organisés, définis et stables, qui sont le cadre d'actions réitérables, conduites pour répondre à un problème récurrent. On dira ainsi que parmi les dispositifs de formation, l'alternance est un dispositif qui diffère du 'dispositif classique' organisé autour de cours théoriques." Anne-Marie Chartier, "Un dispositif sans auteur: cahiers et classeurs à l'école primaire," in Jacquinet-Delaunay and Monnoyer, *Dispositif*, 207.

62. *Ibid.*, 208, 210 and 207 respectively. The original of the quoted section reads: "l'idée technicienne qu'il s'agit de machineries institutionnalisées et finalisées, conçues par des décideurs cherchant à être efficaces". In her piece on the activities of the *cinémathèque scolaire* in Paris (referenced in chapter 1), Pastre-Robert claims to use the phrase "dispositif pédagogique" to refer to a historical practice, rather than merely a set of instructional norms. However, even in this case, the suggestion is made that some sort of 'standard' is set off from its variants (which are *not* taken into consideration). See Pastre-Robert, "Enfer, amnésie, rédemption," 56.

63. The pieces which I am referring to are Daniel Peraya, "Médiation et médiatisation: le campus virtuel," and Fabienne Thomas, "Dispositifs narratif et argumentatif: Quel intérêt pour la médiation des savoirs?," both in Jacquinet-Delaunay and Monnoyer, *Dispositif*, 155-67 and 219-32 respectively; see pp. 159 and 222 ("l'effectuation du dispositif") for the quotes. The two *dispositifs* which Thomas compares come down to a 'narrative' and an 'argumentative' textual form.

64. Jacquinet, *Image et Pédagogie*, 33-34; compare also n. 11.

65. In chapter 5, I shall further elaborate some of the claims made here. At this point, I would merely like to add that the fact that teachers did not even have to *make explicit* their approval of a film's contents may actually have contributed to their reluctance to deploy it in class. If the mere fact that they used an item indicated that they endorsed what it said, they may have experienced this as (yet) a(nother) restriction of their intellectual freedom as educators – or at the very least, as an obstacle in the process of exercising it.

66. See Mieke Bal, *Travelling Concepts in the Humanities: A Rough Guide* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002), 135-37; compare also Jonathan D. Culler, *Framing the Sign: Criticism and Its Institutions* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1988), ix. The term 'frame', in this respect, has different connotations than the word 'context', which is often used to refer to a much more static ensemble of 'data'.

67. See Max Weber, *Basic Concepts in Sociology* (1922; London: Owen, 1962), 52 and following, or H. P. Secher's introduction to the same volume (pp. 14-15 in particular).

68. See for instance Odin, "Film documentaire Lecture documentarisante," 264-68 and 72-73. In those particular cases, the constraints the author thinks of are at least partly textual (the confining 'institutions' then being those of film history/film style itself).

69. For clarity's sake, I should add here that although the *dispositif* concept which I use does impose certain limitations in terms of the configurations of technology, text and viewing position that I shall consider, this does not imply that I exclude all variation in terms of the more specific characteristics of that particular set-up, or any of its constituents. For instance, if I say that I shall look at texts in their capacity of *didactic tools*, this still allows for a whole

series of alternative deployment modes on the teachers' part (such as, more and less interactive ones). However, I do choose to ignore any 'regime' that changes the features of the text itself. For instance, I would not consider a situation in which a sound film is projected with the volume turned down completely and/or accompanied by the teachers' own commentary (a practice mentioned by Germain Lacasse at the colloquium "Pratiques Orales du Cinéma," Université de Montréal, Canada, 24 October 2007).

70. Odin, "Semio-Pragmatic Approach," 96-97.

71. *Ibid.* (In fact, Odin says in his piece that both reading orders are perceived as emanating from the *teacher*; however, the fact that the first comes across at all is primarily the result of the pupils' own experience with film viewing in a different, entertainment context.) Mark here the striking resemblance between Odin's analysis, and that of some of the early protractors of teaching film use, who also believed that the association with cinema going would cause films to 'miss their marks' as educational tools.

I might also add here that in a 2005 session of the Utrecht Media Research Seminar, Eggo Müller took the even more extreme position that the screening of (teaching) films in class *by definition* leads to an undermining, or deconstruction, of the pedagogical 'ideology' that governs the educational institution within which they are presented. Of course, I do not share this view either.

72. See *ibid.*, 97.

73. Once again, I would like to emphasise that the position I take here is not a purely theoretical one. Although I have not done any systematic research into the matter, first-hand reports seem to confirm that at least some of the pupils who regularly saw films in class did indeed perceive of them as aids to a decidedly *didactic* exchange. A particularly evocative example is that of F. Kole, who, in an interview with Van Berkel (conducted 29 January 2007) recalls that as a child, he would read the focus sign in the logo at the beginning of each NOF print – intended in fact to help *teachers* remove any blurriness in the image – as a reminder that the children should focalise, or 'sharpen', their minds to the task at hand. Another witness states that he saw classroom screenings as an occasion to acquire knowledge about 'the world out there' (V. d. Reijden, interview with Van Berkel). Of course, neither of these reports precludes that for other viewers, the same screenings might have functioned primarily as pretexts for some 'unorthodox' excitement.

Another remark I should make here is that precisely because of the fact that I base my assumptions on a (historically, but also nationally) specific situation, it may be somewhat unfair to dismiss Odin's conclusions out of hand. After all, *his* observations may rest on experiences of a rather different kind. In his text, however, he does not make this explicit; therefore, I treat his claims in this paragraph as generalisations.

74. See for instance Smith, *Mental Hygiene*, 31. Jacquinet as well seems to consider (most) teaching films to be pedagogically ineffective; however, I would argue that she primarily attributes this to the supersededness of the pedagogical system which they were designed to support (see Jacquinet, *Image et Pédagogie*, especially her introductory and concluding chapters).

75. Again, I would like to point out that this element of what Odin might call 'constraint' derives primarily from the (institutionalised) relationship between the pupils and teachers present – not merely from the physical characteristics of the space in which they are gathered (as Peters seems to suggest; see *Visueel onderwijs*, 24, a section quoted at length in the epigraph to my conclusions). However, I do acknowledge that the latter may underline – and thereby, make more powerful – the interpersonal aspects of the pedagogical *dispositif*.

Returning briefly to what I said earlier about the relation which some authors see between the pedagogical effectiveness of teaching films and their stylistic sobriety (a characteristic denounced, in some retrospective accounts, as 'backwardness'), I would like to add also that the same observation applies here. In my view, the lack of formal 'up-to-dateness' which many of these films display connects them to other didactic texts. After all, very few schools work with state-of-the-art tools or aids. By implication, then, such features can be considered to remind the audience of the pedagogical nature of the occasion, and by the same token, of the films' situationally most 'appropriate' reading.

3 • Rhetoric: Text & Frame

1. Prelinger, *Field Guide to Sponsored Films*, x.

2. For an example of NOF's categorisation principles, see Sticing Nederlandse Onderwijs Film, *Nederlandse Onderwijs-Film Catalogus* (which, I said, also inspired the somewhat simplified system which I use in the DVDs appended to this work). For the second type of classification, consider for instance the 1963 short *Choosing a Classroom Film*, a moving image version (produced by the Centron company) of a paper prospectus commissioned by the American educational producer McGraw-Hill (to be viewed online at the Internet Archive website: see <http://www.archive.org/details/Choosing1963>). The film uses a combination of the two principles mentioned; on the one hand, it groups them by teaching aim ('information films', 'attitude films', 'skill films'); on the other hand, by

didactic method ('documenting', 'raising questions', etc.). An example of the third kind is McClusky's article "Nature of the Educational Film," 27-35, which distinguishes between 12 'functional' types of film. The classification adhered to in this piece is based on criteria pertaining, alternately, to an item's pedagogical aims (as in the case of the 'incentive film'), its didactic method (the 'problematic film'), the audio-visual techniques used (the 'rhythmic film', "characterized by the use of moving patterns of color, light and shade, geometrical design and pictorial effects") and features that can be associated with specific genres (the 'dramatic film').

3. Jacquinot, *Image et Pédagogie*, 110-11; the term *bavard* is used on p. 89.

4. One reason for the discrepancy between our respective observations, of course, is that hers are based to a large extent on what happens on the auditory level of a text – a level which, in the case of my own corpus, is often simply absent, since many of the films that form part of it are mute. However, even in those instances where voice-over narration is used, I cannot conclude that it 'directs' the readers unilaterally in their interpretation of what is shown. Compare also chapter 4, paragraph 4.1.1, my section on the strategy of 'verbal explication'.

5. Odin might argue that the problem I identify here is common to *all* (generic) classifications that are based on what he calls 'internal figures' (*figures internes*); see Roger Odin, "Rhétorique du film de famille," *Revue d'Esthétique*, no. 1-2 (1979): 353-54.

6. For Jacquinot's pronouncements, see *Image et Pédagogie*, 17-18. In this context, she speaks of an "encounter" ("*rencontre*") of a "didactic intent" ("*intention didactique*") and a "filmic mode of expression" ("*mode d'expression filmique*") (p. 39). For more on the situation in Holland, see chapter 1, paragraph 1.2.1 (and more specifically, my section on NOF's organisational structure).

Perhaps, it would be useful here to conceptualise the sort of intermedial relations which Jacquinot refers to as part of what Thomas Elsaesser has called a *Medienverbund*: a network of competing, but also mutually dependent and complementary media or media practices, linked to a specific location or initiative (see Thomas Elsaesser, "Archives and Archaeologies: The Place of Non-Fiction Film in Contemporary Media," in Hediger and Vonderau, *Films that Work*, 22).

7. For the first pronouncement, see Bill Nichols, *Representing Reality: Issues and Concepts in Documentary* (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1991), 20; compare also his book *Introduction to Documentary* (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2001); for instance, pp. 16, 39-41, 68-69 and 94-98. Plantinga's statement is quoted from *Rhetoric and Representation*, 38. For the attempts of the latter author, see Willem Hesling, "Retorica en film: een onderzoek naar de structuur en functie van klassieke overtuigingsstrategieën in fictionele audiovisuele teksten" (PhD dissertation, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, 1985); Willem Hesling and Jan Marie L. Peters, *Audiovisuele retoriek* (Leuven: Centrum voor Communicatiewetenschappen KU Leuven, 1985), part 1 ("Filmische argumentatiestrategieën," pp. 7-141); Hesling, "Documentary Film and Rhetorical Analysis".

8. The full title of Winston's book is: *Claiming the Real: The Documentary Film Revisited* (see earlier notes). For Carroll's view, see "From Real to Reel," 230-31. Although the author himself thinks that objectivity and truth are not synonymous, he argues that they are related, in the sense that the former is commonly considered to be the best method for obtaining the latter. As opposed to many post-modern thinkers, he also believes that films *can* indeed be 'objective' (see p. 232). For Plantinga's statement, see *Rhetoric and Representation*, 18; for his thoughts on narrational authority, see chapters 6 to 8 of the same book (pp. 101-170).

9. The quote is taken from Sonja K. Foss, Karen A. Foss and Robert Trapp, introduction to *Contemporary Perspectives on Rhetoric*, 3rd ed. (Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland, 2002), 1; compare also the rest of this section, which shows that the statement corresponds to many of the (recent) theories which the book discusses. Seymour Chatman, for his part, says that "[a] total rhetoric would address all aspects of textual construction, global as well as local." See his book *Coming to Terms: The Rhetoric of Narrative in Fiction and Film* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1990), 185.

10. This point has been made, among others, in Hesling, "Documentary Film and Rhetorical Analysis," 104, and Laurence Behrens, "The Argument in Film: Applying Rhetorical Theory to Film Criticism," *Journal of the University Film Association* 31, no. 3 (1979): 3. Also Nanna Verhoeff and Eva Warth, in "Rhetoric of Space: Cityscape/Landscape," *Historical Journal of Film, Radio and Television* 22, no. 3 (2002): 245-51, seem to interpret the concept in this way – however without establishing the link with textual persuasion.

11. Chatman, *Coming to Terms*, 184-203.

12. See for instance the work of I. A. Richards, Chaïm Perelman, Stephen Toulmin or Kenneth Burke, as discussed in Foss, Foss and Trapp, *Contemporary Perspectives on Rhetoric*, 19-49, 81-115, 117-53 and 187-232, respectively.

13. See Chatman, *Coming to Terms*, 186, 190-91 (quotes from pp. 186 and 191).

14. See Hesling, "Documentary Film and Rhetorical Analysis," 107 (quote) and Hesling and Peters, *Audiovisuele retoriek*, 19 and 50. Hesling himself calls this function a 'text-immanent' one (p. 19); for me, however, this adjective carries too many structuralist overtones.

15. This thought came up during a discussion with one of my supervisors, Nanna Verhoeff, to whom I owe my thanks.

16. Behrens, "Argument in Film," 3. I should add here that the author (still) associates rhetoric with the persuasion of an audience of certain 'values' or 'truths'. At some points in his text, however, he demonstrates that he interprets the concept more broadly than some of the non-fiction theorists mentioned above. (On the same page, for instance, he also uses the formulation "that the world [of the text] is somehow worth taking seriously", which strongly resembles Chatman's.)
17. For Booth's statement, see Chatman, *Coming to Terms*, 195. Derrida's views are recorded in Gary A. Olson, "Jacques Derrida on Rhetoric and Composition: A Conversation," *Journal of Advanced Composition* 10, no. 1 (1990), http://www.jacweb.org/Archived_volumes/Text_articles/V10_1_1_OlsonDerrida.htm. Decades earlier, Burke as well had stressed the role of non-verbal elements and non-symbolic conditions in the rhetorical process; see for instance Kenneth Burke, *A Grammar of Motives, and A Rhetoric of Motives* (Cleveland: World Publishing Company, 1962), 684-85 and 695-97, or Foss, Foss and Trapp, *Contemporary Perspectives on Rhetoric*, 194.
18. Umberto Eco, *The Role of the Reader: Explorations in the Semiotics of Texts* (Bloomington, IN: University of Indiana Press, 1979), 11. (Eco uses the term in a context which defines texts as 'macro-speech acts' – a theoretical link which I shall elaborate shortly.) I prefer the term 'activation' to 'concretisation' (the one used by structuralist reception theorists in relation to the signifying potential of aesthetic objects; see for instance Hans Robert Jauss, *Toward an Aesthetic of Reception*, trans. Timothy Bahti (Brighton: Harvester, 1982), 72-73) because the process I refer to encompasses much more than just the readerly activity of those viewing.
19. See Olson, "Jacques Derrida on Rhetoric". As Bal points out, Derrida himself is one of the authors who have been responsible for an extension of the concept of the performative from the domain of language (in the narrow sense) to a field that includes a much wider array of cultural phenomena. See Bal, *Travelling Concepts in the Humanities*, 178. Two standard works in the field of speech act theory are J. L. Austin, *How to Do Things with Words: The William James Lectures delivered at Harvard University in 1955* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962) and John Searle, *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969).
20. See for instance Searle, *Speech Acts*, chapter 3 in particular. Interest in the social conventions that guarantee the validity of speech acts has increased throughout the 1980s and 1990s. Again, see Bal, *Travelling Concepts in the Humanities*, 178. For Habermas' term, see for instance Foss, Foss and Trapp, *Contemporary Perspectives on Rhetoric*, 246-48.
21. Bal, *Travelling Concepts in the Humanities*, 178-79. This emphasis on convention and iterability, again, can be related to the shift mentioned in n. 19, achieved by Derrida; for Austin, the accent was (still) on the speaker's intention, and therefore, the here-and-now of the speech act's occurrence (compare pp. 176, 178 and 180). I should add however that Bal also points out that in recent years, the two notions have lost some of their conceptual 'neatness', as they have begun to 'travel' across disciplinary borders – the very phenomenon that her book is concerned with. See p.180 and following for more on this topic.
22. *Ibid.*, 182 and following. Please note that I concentrate in what follows on just one of the (many) links between the notions of 'memory' and 'performance'/'performativity' that Bal discusses in her book.
23. In the example which Bal uses to make her point, the 'viewer' referred to is the visitor of an exhibition (a person watching the slide installation she discusses).
24. Compare Bal, *Travelling Concepts in the Humanities*, 186. Bal's example also shows that in this process, the viewer can take on a highly active role: in this particular case, it is he who, on the basis of what he knows (his memory), 'acts out' the performative potential of the work. See pp. 207-9; compare also Peter Brooks, *Reading for the Plot: Design and Intention in Narrative* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1984), 37.
25. In this sense, then, 'framing rhetoric', the phrase which I use in the title of this section, is to be read as a combination of a verb (non-finite form) and a noun. However, the first word ('framing') could also be interpreted as an adjective (attributive adjunct). While Derrida and Burke, in the texts referred to earlier, argue that non-verbal contributors to the rhetorical process should not *in themselves* be seen as rhetorical (see Olson, "Jacques Derrida on Rhetoric" and Foss, Foss and Trapp, *Contemporary Perspectives on Rhetoric*, 194) I find this stance quite hard to maintain. As I shall argue further on, the extratextual elements that constitute a work's frame often *also* have features that can be considered 'rhetorical'.
26. In this context, it might be worth taking up again Bal's reference to Derrida, who speaks of the frame as 'parergon': an element which neither forms part of the work, nor is entirely extrinsic to it. If the parergon would be taken away, a 'lack' would appear in the 'ergon', the work itself. See Bal, *Travelling Concepts in the Humanities*, 140; compare also Jacques Derrida, *The Truth in Painting*, trans. Geoff Bennington and Ian McLeod (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987), 59-60 and 54-55. Issues pertaining to the framing of art works are discussed, among others, in Paul Duro, ed., *The Rhetoric of the Frame: Essays on the Boundaries of the Artwork* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).
27. Note on the translation of the second title: the word *kadotter* is a regional name for (a young of) the bird species more commonly known as *spreeuw* (starling); at the time of the film's release, however, it may also have been used

as an informal term for a small child.

28. The first film is set in Broek in Waterland, a village in the Dutch polders. The film's title is a pun on this toponym.
 29. The teachers' notes accompanying these two films indicate that they could also be used in preparation for essay writing activities (i.e., as aids to the children's imagination; see chapter 4 for more on this production principle). When deployed as such, of course, the activation of the films' rhetoric most likely would *not* have depended on their acceptability as factual statements. On occasion, then, also NOF itself left room for a certain measure of variety in terms of its texts' rhetorical functioning.

Another remark that I should make here is that also those aspects of the filmic statement which, in the scenario I sketched in my main text, would *not* have been accentuated by the films' pedagogical framing – i.e., those elements which help constitute the imaginary universe represented – would also have served a powerful rhetorical function. For a further elaboration of this point, however, I refer to chapter 4, paragraph 4.3 (and more in particular, my section on 'roundabout' motivation of the pupil-viewer).

30. Kessler, "Notes on *dispositif*," 2.

31. It might be worth pointing out here that even if the object of communication is accepted as educationally 'appropriate', and thus takes on the status of didactic/lesson content, this does not necessarily entail that the children are also prepared to *learn* (i.e. memorise, or practise) what is said. It merely implies that they *open themselves up* to the possibilities of the exchange.

32. Carroll uses the term 'indexing' to refer to the ways in which 'creators', producers or distributors label their productions when sending them out into the world; see Carroll, "From Real to Reel," 232.

33. It is important to realise here that if a film functions as a tool in a didactic process, this does not mean that (all of) its content automatically takes on the status of 'lesson subject'. Teaching matter is what is designated as such in the course of a given educational exchange; whether or not content takes on this status, therefore, varies from instance to instance. As a result, it is also imaginable that teaching matter is passed on *with the help* of a film which, in itself, does not uncover a great deal of didactically relevant facts. Compare also my argument in chapter 4, paragraph 4.3.

34. See Austin, *How to Do Things with Words*, lectures I-III (pp. 1-38) in particular. 'Appropriateness' is the term used by Jonathan D. Culler in "Philosophy and Literature: The Fortunes of the Performative," *Poetics Today* 21, no. 3 (2000): 504.

35. As I mentioned earlier in this chapter, Jacquinet claims that such 'force' is established primarily through the use of sound, and more specifically, via spoken commentaries. Again, I would like to stress that for *me*, rhetorical 'authority', in the case of teaching films, is not so much about convincing the viewer that what is shown corresponds to an extratextual reality (the 'truth') but about whether or not what it says is *didactically* acceptable – although the former can definitely *contribute* to the latter. For more on the relation between various kinds of authority (epistemic and didactic), see chapter 5.

36. My use of the term 'want to', here, refers to the fact that educators, in the process of showing a film, may also choose to temporarily 'loosen the reins' of their teachership (a possibility I mentioned in chapter 2, paragraph 2.2). As I explained, however, items that are used in this way do not qualify for me as 'teaching films'.

Another remark I should make is that a similar 'prominence' of the rhetorical qualities of the communicative exchange to that which I posit here could also be inferred for certain other environments; for instance, judicial ones. As William Uricchio pointed out after a presentation of my research (Utrecht Media Studies Seminar, Universiteit Utrecht, the Netherlands, 26 January 2007), matters of acceptability are also at stake in courtrooms; for example, the credibility of a statement or object as 'evidence', or the legal validity of an ensuing verdict. By analogy with the classroom teacher, the judge's role – and authority – is of crucial importance here.

37. Here I take a position which, again, runs counter to that of Jacquinet, who describes the teaching film as an interpretationally very *closed* type of text, which does not yield much power to external factors when it comes to the production of meaning. See Jacquinet, *Image et Pédagogie*.

38. Most likely, Odin would argue that this is the result of the fact that in our society (or 'social space'), a 'fictionalising reading' is the 'default' one; see for instance his article "Semio-Pragmatic Approach," 91-92.

39. Whether the screening is accompanied by a teacher (as in the case of the school gym), one or more parents (at home) or no adults at all (for instance, in the event of an unaccompanied cinema visit) the viewing itself will nearly always be experienced as recreational – unless it is *emphatically* framed otherwise.

40. Vinzenz Hediger and Patrick Vonderau, "Images as Tools, Films at Work. Perspectives for a European Research Network on the industrial film, post-1945," paper held during the International Industrial Film Workshop (Ruhr-Universität Bochum, Germany, 10 December 2004).

41. See Zimmermann, "Vom Lichtbild zum Film," 84. On the same page, the author also argues that this 'dominance of function over form' explains the films' *Langlebigkeit* (the fact that they could be used for so long – even at a time when they no longer looked 'up-to-date'). For comparable characterisations of family films, see for instance

Roger Odin, ed., *Le film de famille: usage privé, usage public* (Paris: Méridiens Klincksieck, 1995), most notably the contributions by Jean-Pierre Esquenazi ("L'effet 'film de famille'", 207-24) and Odin himself ("Le film de famille dans l'institution familiale," 27-41). The latter article even suggests that a more dominant textual structure might hamper the reading process that an 'appropriate' decoding of such films requires (see p. 35). A similar point is also made in Odin, "Rhétorique du film de famille," 359.

42. Odin, "Rhétorique du film de famille"; see, successively, pp. 355-57, 361-64, 365 and again p. 364.

43. Odin himself speaks of an *institution familiale* (see for instance *ibid.*, 369).

44. As a side-remark, I would like to add here that even within the *dispositif* which Odin proposes, the role of memory may not always be exactly as he postulates. The reason is that the audience of a domestic screening often also includes people who were not (consciously) part of what happened at the time of a film's shooting – even though, at the moment of its screening, they do belong to the family concerned, and therefore take a genuine interest in what is shown. Examples would be the partners of viewers who are shown as children.

45. An example of a situation in which cooperation on the pupils' part was enforced is related in one of the interviews conducted by Van Berkel. Hidding remembers that in his school, introductory titles had to be read out loud (by the entire class) during the screening.

46. Note here that my concept of 'openness' is very different from that which Plantinga uses in his writings on textual rhetoric in non-fiction films. Plantinga speaks of an 'open' and a 'formal voice' to distinguish between the various degrees of (narrational) authority which, in his view, can be assumed by a text; see Plantinga, *Rhetoric and Representation*, 106.

47. Examples of films that are likely to, at the very least, have provoked in their readers the *desire* to construct a fictional diegesis, even when seen in a school context, are *Een natte broek in Waterland* en *Een vrolijke kadotter in huis*, both mentioned earlier on in this chapter.

48. Kessler, "Notes on *dispositif*," 15.

49. Also Carolyn R. Miller, in a piece on rhetoric and genre, speaks of "the nature of rhetoric as 'addressed'": see her article "Rhetorical Community: The Cultural Basis of Genre," in *Genre and the New Rhetoric*, ed. Aviva Freedman and Peter Medway (London: Taylor and Francis, 1994), 71.

50. The term was first used in Wayne C. Booth, *The Rhetoric of Fiction* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961). Iser, of course, integrated it in the title of his 1972 publication *Der implizite Leser: Kommunikationsformen des Romans von Bunyan bis Beckett*, translated into English as *The Implied Reader: Patterns of Communication in Prose Fiction from Bunyan to Beckett* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1974). Another relevant publication by Iser is *The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978). For Ingarden's approach, see for instance *The Literary Work of Art: An Investigation on the Borderlines of Ontology, Logic, and Theory of Literature* (1931; Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1973).

51. Susan R. Suleiman, "Introduction: Varieties of Audience-Oriented Criticism," in *The Reader in the Text: Essays on Audience and Interpretation*, ed. Susan R. Suleiman and Inge Crosman (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980), 8-9.

52. Booth, *Rhetoric of Fiction*, 70-71. Booth himself has borrowed the term 'second self' from Kathleen Tillotson.

53. See Chatman, *Coming to Terms*, 81. Of course, one could argue that the same also applies to Jacquinet's work on teaching films. In her 1977 book, I pointed out, the author establishes the link between the authoritative voice that she considers to be 'characteristic' of teaching films, and the involvement of pedagogues in the process of making them. See Jacquinet, *Image et Pédagogie*.

54. Peter J. Rabinowitz, *Before Reading: Narrative Conventions and the Politics of Interpretation*, 2nd ed. (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1998); see pp. 22-26 for an explanation of the concept. (On p. 25 Rabinowitz literally says that "the structure of a work is designed with the authorial audience in mind"; further down, he adds that "actual readers must come to share its characteristics as they read if they are to experience the text as the author wished.") In a chapter on the subject, Stephen Mailloux observes that the tendency identified here has become pretty much generalised: in the writings of reader-oriented critics, he argues, the author tends to be represented as "a *manipulator* of readers, with his or her techniques guiding the reader to the intended response". See his book *Rhetorical Power* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1989), 35.

55. Bal, *Travelling Concepts in the Humanities*, 271. Examples of texts by rhetorical theorists who do this are Brian T. Cowlshaw, "The reader's role in Ring Lardner's rhetoric," *Studies in Short Fiction* 31, no. 2 (1994), and Behrens, "Argument in Film" (the former, an article on a series of literary texts; the latter, an early contribution to the field of film studies).

56. Bal, *Travelling Concepts in the Humanities*, 268.

57. See Suleiman, "Introduction," 14; for more on the so-called 'structuralist and semiotic variety' of audience-oriented criticism, see pp. 12-21. For Genette's and Prince's ideas, see, respectively, Gérard Genette, *Figures*, vols. 1-3 (Paris: Seuil, 1966-1970), and Gerald Prince, "Introduction to the Study of the Narratee," in *Reader-Response Criticism*:

From Formalism to Post-Structuralism, edited by Jane P. Tompkins (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1980), 7-25, or his article "The Narratee Revisited," *Style* 19, no. 3 (1985). For convenience's sake, I shall stick here to the phrase 'implied reader'. I do so, primarily, because it is the most widely used term, but also because it is the one favoured by Paul Goetsch, whose distinctions between various reader figures I shall draw on in chapter 5.

58. See Miller, "Rhetorical Community"; the quote is taken from p. 73. The phrases 'relational' and 'taxonomic collectives' (introduced on the same page) are borrowed from Rom Harré. One of the points which Miller's piece eventually leads to is that rhetorical processes, in addition to allowing the individual users of a language to communicate, also function as "centripetal forces", which keep (virtual) communities from "flying apart" (see p. 74).
59. In the text on industrial films which I referred to above, Zimmermann leaves room for the conclusion that this reasoning could also be reversed: that it is actually *because of* the rhetorically 'compelling' nature of the films' institutional framing that they can be so textually diverse and/or (seemingly) indeterminate. Compare "Vom Lichtbild zum Film".

60. The term 'addressivity', according to Miller, was introduced by Mikhail Bakhtin; see "Rhetorical Community," 72. The notion is also comparable to what Tan calls a text's '(structure of) appeal' (*appel*); see his "Film als emotiemachine," *passim*.

61. For completeness' sake, I should add here that also Jacquinet, in her study of teaching films, claims to look for the 'code of implication' (*code d'implication*) by which texts reference some sort of a virtual addressee ("un interlocuteur absent mais visé comme présent"; see Jacquinet, *Image et Pédagogie*, 69). In the course of her analysis, however, it becomes clear that she takes this notion rather literally, in that she uses it with respect to those sections in her sample texts where a pupil figure is represented by an interviewer (compare p. 51 and following). Although I shall consider such instances of 'visible' implication as well (see chapter 5), I tend to use the concept in a much wider sense.

62. Mark here that I conceive of the motivational function of rhetorical elements as much more encompassing than some of the authors whose approach is strongly rooted in communication studies, such as for instance Peters (the former NOF director, who later became a professor of Film and Audio-Visual Communication). For instance, many of the textual ingredients which he designates as 'predisposing operators' (*predisponerende operatoren*, see Jan Marie L. Peters, *Retoriek van de communicatie: communicatiemiddelen, communicatievormen, communicatietechnieken* (Groningen: Tjeenk Willink, 1973), 47-52) will also be dealt with here under the rubric 'motivational'.

Another difference in approach that I should underscore here is that between my own analytical endeavour, and the project of the aforementioned Tan, author of "Film als emotiemachine". In the notes to my main introduction I already emphasised that unlike he, I do not conceive of textual motivation as a psychological function, but as a purely rhetorical one. A first consequence of this decision, mentioned before, is that I am not concerned with the question of whether or not the motivational strategies which I identify can be related to the intended viewers' cognitive or affective needs. Another implication, at least equally relevant in the context of this chapter, is that I shall not deal with what *actually* keeps (or kept) those viewers tuned, but with what *the texts themselves* suggest about how this goal can be attained – regardless of whether or not said views correspond to a historical reality. However, none of this precludes that some of the strategies which Tan discusses (albeit in his case with respect to mainstream entertainment films) will also be mentioned here.

4 • Textual Rhetoric I: Motivational Devices

1. For convenience's sake, I shall drop the predicate 'implied' in the remainder of this chapter – except of course in those cases when it is precisely the property of implied-ness that I wish to draw attention to. Meanwhile, it should always be understood as present.

2. The term 'situated' is used here as in Robert C. Allen, "The place of space in film historiography," *Tijdschrift voor Mediageschiedenis* 9, no. 2 (2006): 17.

3. A further elaboration of the motivational strategy of 'enabling recognition' will follow in paragraph 4.1.2.

4. This is also the reason why the introduction of pupil-characters will be mentioned again in chapter 5 – this time as an example of what I shall call a 'reference to the pedagogical *dispositif*'.

5. Remarks on the (presumed) lack of formal appeal of NOF's films have been made, among others, by Hogenkamp (who designates some of their features as 'entirely implausible'; see his article "Onderwijsfilm is geen Duitse uitvinding," 66-69). Although observations of this type are rather unproductive *in themselves* – for indeed, what is the point of branding an entire corpus as technically 'inadequate', since clearly this fact did not prevent the films from being used, and therefore, 'read'? – I do believe that they can, in turn, stimulate reflection on the texts' rhetorical functioning. An example of a piece which demonstrates this is Zimmermann's article on industrial films, which explains the (audio-)visual 'conservatism' of such titles as a consequence of a 'dominance of function over form' ("Dominanz der Funktion über die Form") that she considers characteristic of screenings of this type of

material; see Zimmermann, "Vom Lichtbild zum Film," 84.

Perhaps I should also point out that none of the films on the DVDs appended to this work that feature graphic animations can confirm the observation which I make here. *Het paard*², a German film released by NOF around 1959 that is almost fully animated, actually looks rather professionally made, even from a present-day standpoint. *Alle water is geen drinkwater* * (Not all water is drinkable, 1955) contains some 'functional' cross-sections of a purification plant, but they do not allow for such a conclusion either.

6. An example that proves my point would be *Walvisvaart* (Whale fishing), a short released by NOF around 1956, but composed of fragments that are considerably older. The animated sections in this film seem to stylistically 'predate' the time of its release. (A rather playfully animated section is that which features a map with references to the stereotypical images of far-away countries which the audience may entertain.) The point about the implication of a historically situated group of viewers is elaborated, among others, by Gunning, who insists that "each period [in film history] constructs its spectator in a new way"; see his article "The Cinema of Attraction[s]," 387.

7. The reasons for this choice are elaborated in my main introduction. Another remark I would like to add here is that in some cases, it is possible to further break down the implied audience which I identify – for instance, in terms of older and younger children, or boys and girls. Some examples of this will be mentioned further down this chapter.

8. Van der Meulen, *Film en lichtbeeld bij het onderwijs*, 31.

9. The fact that I take this distinction between the appeal of matter and the appeal of viewing as my starting point for analysis necessarily entails that my approach to the rhetorical functioning of the films under scrutiny will be fundamentally different from that of many of the authors who I quoted in chapter 1, in my section on so-called 'vernacular' or 'popular' science films. In the conception of many of these scholars, textual features such as visual spectacle (here, part of the strategy that I shall call 'spectacularisation'), drama (for me, a means of 'enabling recognition') and antropomorfism (itself a dramatisation tool) are all manifestations of the same motivational principle. In their view, what these films do is to arouse curiosity about the subjects they deal with by making them interesting for the particular audience they target (instead of scientifically accurate, as in the case of films that address specialists). See for instance Gaycken, "Drama Unites Them in a Fight"; Lefebvre, "Scientia Production"; Munz, "Ethologie des wissenschaftlichen Cineasten"; compare also León, "Science popularisation through television documentary" and León, *Science on Television*. In the overview that follows, I shall not adhere to this logic. In my experience, educational films *may* indeed motivate their viewers by presenting matter as (inherently) interesting; however, they do not *always* follow this rhetorical logic.

At this point, I also want to emphasise once more the difference between my own approach, and that of Tan. In his "Film als emotiemachine", the author, like I do, makes a distinction between two textual 'levels' on which the motivational potential of (feature) films may be situated. In his case, however, this classification is based on what he identifies as the two possible sources of 'proximal satisfaction' (*proximale satisfactie*, the fulfilment of needs that can only be achieved in the process of watching audio-visual fictions). On the one hand, there is that which he designates as the 'fictional world' that is represented in a film, and which invites the viewer to a certain degree of 'involvement' (*geïnvolveerdheid*; for instance, empathy, identification, or some other form of psychological 'immersion'). On the other hand, there is the level of a film's 'formal attributes' (*formele attributen*), a category which covers both aspects of plot structure (which involve the viewer in a game of completing his overview of or insight in the action that unfolds) and formal elements that can cause some sort of an aesthetic experience. (See pp. 76-81.) These two levels, in turn, correspond to two different types of emotions: *artefactemoties*, or 'A' emotions, and *fictiemoties*, or 'F' emotions (pp. 132-35). In what I do here, I place a different emphasis; once more, because I conduct a rhetorical, rather than psychological analysis. One implication of our difference in approach is, that strategies that can be related to Tan's first set of motives (those that aim at fulfilling a need, or desire, for a certain degree of 'involvement' – a logical focus within a *psychological inquiry*) will not be the object of scrutiny here. (Compare also the notes to my section on 'experiential correspondencé', in which I elaborate on this point a little further.) A few of the procedures which Tan brings together under the label 'formal attributes' *will* be dealt with; for instance, in my paragraphs revolving around the foci 'textual purposiveness' and 'formal attractiveness'. However, those strategies will be considered in terms of what they may contribute to the appeal of the *viewing* process, rather than that of the appreciation of the 'artefact' as such, as in Tan's case.

10. Here, my sources on the films' classification in terms of lesson subject are the accompanying instruction sheets; elsewhere, however, I shall mostly be using the institute's 1953 catalogue (*Nederlandse Onderwijs-Film Catalogus*). Another remark I need to make here is that in what follows, dates and translations of films and titles that have been mentioned in previous chapters shall not be repeated. I refer to the filmography at the end of this work for a complete overview.

11. The full title of the first of these films is *Goed bewaren – geld besparen: een film over het bewaren van levensmiddelen* (Preserve well – save money: A film about the preservation of foods); *De kust van Nederland* is the first in a series,

and has a subtitle: *De duinen* (The dunes). The latter item, in fact, is also listed as a biology film.

12. For professional scientists, it might for instance be based on the fact that it induces an experience of satisfaction of their scientific curiosity – and thus, encourages them to stay tuned (so that they can find out more).

13. I here use the term 'virtual' as referring to the visual/aural experience of what Martin Lister, Jon Dovey, Seth Giddings, Iain Grant and Kieran Kelly call the "metaphorical 'places' and 'spaces' created by communications networks", "in a situation where the senses [...] are felt to be in one place (the virtual environment or world) while the corporeal body of the user is in another, the physical and material world". See their book *New Media: A Critical Introduction* (London: Routledge, 2003), 35 and 36.

14. For more on the possibilities for virtual 'transportation' provided by (audio-visual, but also print) media in both present and past, see for instance Erkki Huhtamo, "Armchair Traveller on the Ford of Jordan. The Home, the Stereoscope and the Virtual Voyager," *Mediamatic Magazine* 8, no. 2/3 (1995): 13-24. In the film *De bergstroom* (1952, The mountain stream) excerpts from the same film are cut together in a new, faster montage, and many of the visually less spectacular phases of the procedures dealt with are left out. In this process, the rhetorical potential of unfamiliarity which it draws on is foregrounded even more.

15. In the early years in particular, NOF distributed a good amount of geography films that focused on trades, or industries, that were considered 'typical' of Holland. (Hence also the fact that titles often refer to both an activity, and a region or town; consider for instance *Marker vissers*, 1947, Fishermen in Marken; *Twentse textielindustrie **, 1949, Textile industry in Twente; *Ontginning in de Peel*, [ca. 1951], Development in the Peel.) A 1946 newsletter explains the rationale behind this principle: since the institute caters for Dutch children, it should also call attention to products that 'belong to Dutch life' ("behoren bij het Nederlandse leven"). See "Nieuwe films," *Mededelingen van de NOF*, May 1946, [3].

16. The full title of the latter film is: *Haven en Handel: een film over de functie van de Amsterdamse haven in het international goederenverkeer* (Harbour and trade: A film about the function of the Amsterdam harbour in international freight traffic).

17. A combination of those two principles, one might argue, can be observed in more recent films or television programmes that show what goes on inside the human body. Such texts tend to both transport their viewers to otherwise inaccessible locations, and optically transform what they give them access to (for instance, through enlargements). For more on this subject, see for instance Craig Hight, "Primetime digital documentary animation: the photographic and graphic within play," *Studies in Documentary Film* 2, no. 1 (2008): 19-22 (his section entitled "Invasive surveillance mode").

18. As its instruction sheet points out, *Johannes Kepler*, like *Antoni van Leeuwenhoek*², was intended for both geography (in this case, cosmography) and history teaching.

19. An NOF newsletter article dealing with the short *Antoni van Leeuwenhoek*² emphasises precisely this point: it says that a historical film can only ever show an *approximation* of what once took place. See J. Kramer, "Doel en opzet van de film *Antoni van Leeuwenhoek*," *Mededelingen van de NOF*, April 1959, 11. For examples of the writings mentioned above, see, respectively, Munz, "Ethologie des wissenschaftlichen Cineasten," 53; Hernn and Brinckmann, "Von Ratten und Männern," 84-85 (a text which actually states that the film-makers here function as invisible 'surrogate eyewitnesses', substituting for their audiences); Lefebvre, "Scientia," 89-90 (which talks about the function of veridiction).

20. For a statement to the effect that what a film shows can be even better (for teaching purposes) than actual reality, see for instance "Met gespannen aandacht," *Mededelingen van de NOF*, December 1949, 3. Scholars of early film have pointed out that such staging often also takes place in titles that deal with plant or animal life. Again, see Munz, "Ethologie des wissenschaftlichen Cineasten" (for example, pp. 58-65) or Lefebvre, "Scientia" (for instance, p. 88, where he makes the distinction between *in vivo* and *in vitro* representation of animal conduct). For examples in my own corpus, see my section on 'comprehensibility' (and more in particular, the strategy which I designate as 'structuring').

21. The two foundational texts on the concept are Gunning, "The Cinema of Attraction[s]" (a text first published in 1986; the version used here also includes the revised sections) and Gaudreault and Gunning, "Early Cinema as a Challenge to Film History" (which first came out in 1989). My second quote is taken from the Gunning article (p. 384); the first from his "Cinema of attractions" entry in Abel's *Encyclopedia of Early Cinema*, 124. As a matter of fact, the two 'seminal' texts quote different end dates for the type of cinematic practice they deal with. In his first piece, Gunning draws the line around 1906/7; in his joint text with Gaudreault, he writes that the 'system of monstrative attractions' lasted until 1908 (see pp. 373-4). The term 'display' is used, among others, in Frank Kessler, "The Cinema of Attractions as *Dispositif*," in Strauven, *The Cinema of Attractions Reloaded*, 59. For a brief overview of the ways in which the term has been 'recycled' in the course of the last few decades, see Strauven's "Introduction to an Attractive Concept" in the same volume.

22. Gunning, "The Cinema of Attraction[s]," 384. For the quote, see Tom Gunning, "Attractions: How They Came

into the World," in Strauven, *The Cinema of Attractions Reloaded*, 37; compare also Kessler, "Cinema of Attractions as *Dispositif*," 58 in particular. (Of course, this configuration is only non-standard – or as Gunning puts it: "different" – if narrative form is taken to be the norm.)

23. I should add here that in a much broader sense, 'attractability' is the textual feature that I focus on throughout this chapter, in *all* the texts that I discuss. Motivation, I said, is a matter of 'luring', or 'attracting', the viewer with the help of textual ingredients that are likely to appeal. For clarity's sake, however, I shall continue to use the term here in the more narrow sense, in relation to textual examples of what I refer to as 'spectacularity'.

In his article on the history of NOF before 1949, Hogenkamp as well mentions the concept of the cinema of attractions. However, the author here uses it in a somewhat less specific sense, and primarily to account for that which he perceives of as signs of the films' 'primitivity'. See "'Onderwijsfilm is geen Duitse uitvinding,'" 66-69.

24. See for instance Gunning, "The Cinema of Attraction[s]," 383-84.

25. For references to pieces that establish the relation between the use of optical manipulation techniques and notions of the magical, see also the notes to my section "Grand Visions, High Expectations" in chapter 1, paragraph 1.1.1. In fact, the inference that seems to be made here about the technique's spectatorial appeal is not at all unreasonable – even from a contemporary point of view. Common experience teaches that for an audience which has seen it done a dozen times or more, the slowing down, speeding up or reversing of any live-action image may still have its own powerful allure.

26. Vivian Sobchack, "'Cutting to the Quick': *Techne*, *Physis*, and *Poiesis* and the Attractions of Slow Motion," in Strauven, *The Cinema of Attractions Reloaded*, 344-49; the quote is taken from pp. 344-45. Other authors have made similar points. In the same volume, for instance, Scott Bukatman argues that the spectacle which attractions rely on often not only foregrounds the unusual side of a phenomenon, but also makes it disturbing (see his article "Spectacle, Attractions and Visual Pleasure," in Strauven, *The Cinema of Attractions Reloaded*, 81).

27. For a thorough exploration of the 'original' notion of *ostranenie* (later also adopted by neo-formalist authors, such as Kristin Thompson), see Frank Kessler, "Ostranenie: Zum Verfremdungsbegriff von Formalismus und Neoformalismus," *montage/AV* 5, no. 2 (1996). Films such as *Het bos in de bergen*, as a matter of fact, not only speculate on the audience's prior theoretical knowledge of the process shown, but also on the fact that it has had visual ('virtual') access to it before – i.e., that it has previously seen films like *In de bruine boon* *.

28. Of course, another important factor is the film's rhetorical framing, as discussed in chapter 3. In a classroom of easily distracted children, I would imagine, optically manipulated sequences are more likely to function as visual 'attractions' than in certain other contexts. However, whether or not they also generate the effect of defamiliarisation which I imply here depends to a considerable extent on how a teacher deploys a film, and which information and/or features of the text (magical or otherwise) he emphasises/ignores in the course of his account.

29. Again, it is primarily *early* film scholars who have dealt with the cosmic, quasi-religious dimensions of natural processes which optical image manipulation techniques underscore. Consider for instance the presentations by Scott Curtis ("On Magnification") and Paula Amad ("Time is invention: Jean Comandon's Time-lapse Cinematography, Bergsonian History, and Early French Film Theory") at the fifth Orphan Film Symposium (University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC, 23 March 2006). Both of these papers dealt with the 'magnifying' qualities – in the figurative sense – of microphotography. See http://www.sc.edu/filmsymposium/Orphans_Sound/orphans.htm for links to audio recordings.

30. For some (hypothetical) explanations of this development, I refer back to chapter 1, paragraph 1.2.2 (my "Benchmarks" section).

31. The term 'observational', here, is deployed as in Nichols, *Representing Reality*, 38-56, or Nichols, *Introduction to Documentary*, 109-15 (where it is used to refer to a specific 'mode' of documentary film making).

32. In this respect, my views differ fundamentally from those of León, who, in his section on simplification, does not make the distinction between comprehensibility and the appearance thereof. See León, *Science on Television*, 73-79. Examples of films that rely on the motivational potential dealt with here, and which, in the process, *actually* make things simpler, and therefore, easier to understand, are those in which schematisation is part of a pattern of repetition – a pattern which often also includes live-action versions of that which is represented graphically (as in *Suikerfabriek*, *Turf: Laagveen*, *Polderland*, and most of the geology films mentioned earlier).

33. In this particular instance, I believe, the visuals also have a purely *formal* appeal. I shall deal with this aspect of the film's rhetorical functioning later on, in my section on 'formal attractiveness'.

34. *Het boekbinden* is the second film in a series of two, called *Het boek* (The book).

35. For a more elaborate discussion of this feature in the film *Kaas* *, see also Kessler and Masson, "Layers of Cheese," 81. The term 'process film' was introduced by Gunning, in his article "Before Documentary" (see pp. 13 and 16-18 in particular).

36. See chapter 1, paragraph 1.2.2 (the "Formal Requirements" segment of my "Benchmarks" section).

37. In the case of *Een Japans gezin* *, it is the markings on a work print held by the Nederlands Instituut voor Beeld

en Geluid which lead me to the conclusion that such alterations were made. Most of these changes, however, seem to have been made at the printing stage; therefore, the version that features on the DVD appended to this work (copied from a duplicate *negative* of the original) does not contain all of them.

38. The 1960 version of *Kaas* is an actual *remake*; it does not use any footage from the first short by that name. Even so, it resembles the earlier one in many ways. First, because the script is almost identical. Second, because the sound track is minimal: the 1960 version only has some background noise – no music, no voice-over commentary. The voices of characters can sometimes be heard, but it is not possible to understand what they say.

39. In essence, this tradition goes back to the ‘views’ of the late 1900s and early 1910s, as discussed in Gunning, “Before Documentary,” 14-16.

40. For the film *Hout*, two dates are given, because in 1962, a new, shortened version of the film was released, which also contained an extra sequence. In *Twentse textielindustrie* *, close iris shots of the basic operations that are carried out during spinning and weaving clearly do not represent the automated processes that are shown in the rest of the film, but rather their traditional, manual alternatives. The reason, I assume, is that the latter are more easily accessible to a film camera. At the same time, the choice of image content here may also serve the purpose of simplification: the manual versions of these processes, although essentially the same, unroll at a much lower speed; therefore, they are easier to understand.

41. The full title of the first film is *Zuiderzeepolders VI: Na 10 jaren arbeid* * (Zuyder Zee polders VI: After 10 years of labour).

42. For Charles Musser’s pronouncements on the topic, see his article “A Cinema of Contemplation, A Cinema of Discernment: Spectatorship, Intertextuality and Attractions in the 1890s,” in Strauven, *The Cinema of Attractions Reloaded*, 176. Of course, the above applies not only in the case of intertextual ‘mirroring’, but also where patterns are repeated within the confines of a single film.

43. In the period I deal with, the use of profilmic sound was extremely rare. Two of the four sound films on the DVD in attachment feature the characters’ own speech (albeit of course post-synchronised); this ratio, however, does not reflect the situation in the NOF-collection as a whole. In this respect, then, my selection deviates from the principles mentioned in the introductory note to the appendix on pp. 287-89.

44. See for instance Roland Barthes, “Retorique de l’image,” *Communications*, no. 4 (1964): 44-45. The author also states that the visual by definition resists meaning (p. 40) and, and further on, that every image is polysemic (“toute image est polysémique”, p. 44).

45. Elsewhere, I have pointed out that the explication of textual meaning, therefore, not only makes the *matter* a film deals with more attractive to pay attention to, but also entails that the *viewing process itself* becomes more pleasant, and therefore, more alluring. See my article “De pil vergulden – of toch niet? Retorische strategieën in naoorlogse onderwijsfilms (1941-1963),” in *Jaarboek voor de geschiedenis van opvoeding en onderwijs 2010*, ed. Nelleke Bakker, Sjaak Braster, Marjoke Rietveld-Van Wingerden and Angelo Van Gorp (Assen: Van Gorcum, forthcoming). (Under “‘Directe’ versus ‘indirecte’ motivatie”, I argue that the spectator of my sample film, *Na 10 jaren arbeid*, is saved some interpretational effort, and thus, made the promise of a more or less easy ‘ride’ in terms of reading.)

46. In the examples mentioned, they rather seem to compensate for a certain textual ‘deficiency’: a lack of clarity, or self-explanatory power, of the images shown. A notable exception to the early tendency of using intertitles sparingly is the job application series *Solliciteren* ([1942], Applying for a job), which will be dealt with later on.

47. ‘De Bilt’ is the location of the royal Dutch meteorological institute (KNMI); it is often used metonymically, as in the title of this film.

48. The full title of this instalment is: *De bruine rat II: op het platteland* (The brown rat II: In the countryside). In this film, the inscription takes the form of a sticker on the back window of a doctor’s car; a close shot here serves the purpose of identifying the profession of the man who drives the vehicle – and in the same movement, the character’s narrative function.

49. A rather curious example of such an ‘implausible’ caption can be found in the film *Een Japans gezin* *, where one in a series of profilmic texts in Japanese (the one containing a New Year’s wish) has been replaced with its Dutch translation.

50. I should add here that sometimes, iconic symbols or numerals fulfil a similar function. In *Walvisvaart*, for instance, a drawing of a clog stands for ‘Holland’, a camel means ‘North-Africa’, etc. In *Het ontstaan van ijsbergen aan de kust van Groenland*, numbers are used to indicate the heights of ice caps and floes.

51. Of course, also maps, charts and models can be part of a film’s *mise en scène*. In *Na 10 jaren arbeid* * and *De Bilt verwacht...*, for instance, they are handled by the people whose activities are portrayed. For more on the textual (and rhetorical) functioning of such profilmic elements, I refer to chapter 5.

52. Of course, the most obvious examples of films in which commentaries serve the purpose of introducing relevant vocabulary are those intended for foreign language teaching. Like textual explication, also the introduction of terminology can be seen as a way to keep viewers focused. By providing them with the necessary tools to talk

about the matter discussed, films that use this strategy make their spectators a (conditional) promise of increased communicational involvement – thus also encouraging them to stay tuned. However, I believe that in most of the shorts under scrutiny, the textual function of ‘naming’ much more emphatically derives rhetorical potential from the fact that it constitutes a reference to the pedagogical *dispositif*. Therefore, I shall discuss it in chapter 5.

53. The original text of the quoted section reads as follows: “Quoi qu’il en soit, les différents éléments sonores sont utilisés dans les films pédagogiques, le plus souvent, pour assurer le caractère univoque du message. Tout est fait pour contrôler ce qui risque le plus d’échapper à l’émetteur: les bruitages renforcent la fonction analogique de l’image, les paroles accentuent le sens de l’image, l’image ancre le sens de la musique.” Jacquinot, *Image et Pédagogie*, 110-11. For Barthes’ distinction between *ancrage* (anchorage) and *relais* (relay), see Barthes, “Rétorique de l’image,” 44-45.

54. For Jacquinot’s qualification of the teaching film as ‘closed’ (*fermé*), see Jacquinot, *Image et Pédagogie*, 145 and following. For my own views on the process of meaning production in such texts, I refer back to chapters 2.2 and 3.2.

55. While the instruction booklets accompanying these films do not restrict their target audience to pupils in vocational education, entries for the relevant titles in the 1953 catalogue do point out that they can, among others, be used in technical schools (aiming at a male public: “nijverheidsonderwijs – jongens”) and/or commercial/trade education.

56. See the “Civics” segment of the “Benchmarks” section of paragraph 1.2.2.

57. In his 1948 classification, McClusky designates such items as ‘emulative’: see his article “Nature of the Educational Film,” 32. Perhaps I should add at this point that it is imaginable *in theory* that a similar strategy would be applied in shorts that are intended primarily for the transmission of (theoretical) knowledge. (Jacquinot, for instance, mentions an on-screen ‘interrogation’ on the facts a film is meant to pass on; see *Image et Pédagogie*, 73.) However, I have not found any such examples in the corpus dealt with here.

58. The full title of the second film is: *S.L.O.: een film over een schooldag voor de lichamelijke opvoeding en wat daaraan vooraf gaat* (S.P.E.: A film about a school day for physical education and what precedes it).

59. I should point out here that of all the abovementioned films, only one, *Ruwe planken*, was intended as a ‘skill film’ in the strictest sense of the word. An introductory intertitle unambiguously states that it targets pupils in (advanced level) vocational education – people, in other words, who are taught the particular techniques shown as part of their curriculum. (The accompanying instruction booklet, however, suggests that it can *also* be used in the upper years of primary school, in the context of classes on economic geography; however, this clearly is not its primary purpose.) In contrast, neither of the physical education films pretends to only want to teach its viewers a number of skills. As opposed to some of the PE titles which I have seen elsewhere (for instance, the series *Learning to Swim*, produced by the British company Boulton-Hawker in the early 1950s, part of the Norfolk collection at the East Anglian Film Archive) they both do more than just demonstrating the proper execution of a series of bodily movements. More specifically, the first also stresses the importance of personal hygiene and appropriate poolside behaviour; the second deals with issues pertaining to the usefulness of physical exercise and outlines the general course of events of a sports day in school. The instruction booklet accompanying *Aardig knutselwerk* even indicates that it is intended *primarily* to encourage children to creatively reuse discarded materials. In addition, it says, the short can also function as a source of inspiration for writing and drawing. The motivational strategy used, however, is fully in line with those of other items that I would define as ‘skill films’.

60. The latter, of course, is also a consequence of the fact that we never see what can go wrong in the process of construction. Because failure is not shown, the impression is created that the performance of the tasks shown is a metaphorical ‘flat race’.

61. The motivational potential of this aspect of construction, designated in what follows as the foregrounding of ‘textual purposiveness’, shall be dealt with in paragraph 4.1.2.

62. For the formulation ‘societal membership’ (*het meeleven in de gemeenschap*), see for instance J. J. Derks’ letter to NOF (an NA document mention in chapter 1, n. 332), 1. In this paragraph, I shall continue to use the (American) phrase ‘social guidance’ instead of *civics*, because it allows me to also address the more educative aspects of films that ‘officially’ (i.e., according to the film catalogues) functioned as aids to the teaching of other lesson subjects.

63. Compare Smith, *Mental Hygiene*, 13 and 35-40.

64. In exceptional cases, social guidance films also target more restricted audiences, diversified according to either gender (for instance, the two versions of the film *Solliciteren*, one for boys and one for girls) or age (*Een tik van de mode?*, which explicitly addresses a fad-sensitive audience of teenagers).

65. A particularly striking example of this is provided in the short *Solliciteren* (both versions). In the first half of this film, the job applicant featured behaves inappropriately, and subsequently does not get hired. In the second, shorter half, meant to be screened after a brief class discussion, the same youngster is shown in a more ‘successful’ variant of the same procedure. See my section on ‘audience interrogation’ (paragraph 4.1.2) for a more in-depth discussion of this title.

I should also add here that producers in other countries, and especially the US, made use of negative

examples more intensively than NOF, albeit primarily in driver safety films, which did not become popular until the later 1950s (see Smith, *Mental Hygiene*, 27, 73-82).

66. Brooks, *Reading for the Plot*, xi-36; the quotes are taken, in that order, from pp. 12, xi and 13. Many thanks to Ann Rigney for alerting me to this work.

67. *Ibid.*, xiii-iv; 3-36; 37-47 (the latter section for the analogies between the narrative desires of readers and characters); the quotations are from pp. 21 and 19 (the second and third). Another text which makes mention of the (need for narrative to awaken) desire is Gerald Prince, *Narratology: The Form and Functioning of Narrative* (Berlin: Mouton, 1982); for instance, on p. 160. In this work, however, narrative passion is related to the relevance of the assertions made in terms of the readers' own lives, backgrounds, and interests. In the context of my own analysis, I have chosen to associate this aspect of textual motivation more closely with another series of strategies: those that revolve around a given film's potential for 'experiential correspondence' (dealt with further down this paragraph).

68. For Iser, see *The Act of Reading*, for instance pp. 180-231 (a chapter on the various functions and mechanisms of gaps and gap filling) and p. 167 (for some more on the "readjustment" or "continual correction" of projections made earlier). For a discussion of gaps (in a somewhat narrower sense) in audio-visual texts, compare for instance Bordwell, *Narration in the Fiction Film*, 54-55. For Brooks' ideas, see *Reading for the Plot*, 3-36, 90-112 and passim; the quotes are from pp. xiii, 23 and 93 respectively (the latter in turn containing a reference to Jean-Paul Sartre). In his fourth chapter, Brooks also establishes an analogy between the readerly desire for the end of narrative and Freud's thoughts on the human longing for death.

69. Also Tan thinks that the fact that a spectator is aware that the narrative 'leads somewhere' may have a motivational effect. See "Film als Emotiemachine", 151-57; also pp. 183-84 (where an inventory is made of research on the types of expectations narratives can raise). However, as I explained earlier, the author of this work is interested primarily in the various emotional/cognitive needs which film viewing may fulfil, much rather than in the process of 'reading' itself (which Brooks, despite his psychoanalytic digressions, always keeps focusing on). For this reason, his work is less useful to me here.

70. André Gaudreault, *Du Littéraire au Filmique: Système du Récit* (Paris: Méridiens Klincksieck, 1988), 39 and 43. In his book, Gaudreault distinguishes this 'basic' type of narrativity (which he also designates as 'intrinsic', and which he considers to be the result of an act of *monstration*, or 'showing', see pp. 95-104) from a kind which is medium-independent, and which is due to the combination, or structuration, of discrete segments (for instance, shots) into larger ones (a type which he also calls 'extrinsic', and which results from an act of *narration*, or 'telling', see pp. 105-15). For my purpose, however, this distinction is less useful; for reasons, see n. 72.

As a matter of fact, the presence of a temporal (i.e. 'chrono-')logic is about the *only* defining feature of narrative that theorists seem to agree on. Many, however, make additional requirements, such as that of characterial agency or motivated action; see Bordwell, *Narration in the Fiction Film*, 54; Chatman, *Coming to Terms*, 9; Winston, *Claiming the Real*, 105; compare with Murray Smith, *Engaging Characters: Fiction, Emotion, and the Cinema* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), 18; Marie-Laure Ryan, "Narrative and the Split Condition of Digital Textuality," *Dichtung-Digital*, no. 1 (2005), <http://www.brown.edu/Research/dichtung-digital/2005/1/Ryan/index.htm>; Gunning, "Cinema of attractions," 124 (all of whom deal with narration/narrativity in motion pictures). For more on the lack of consensus among authors, see Jerzy Pelc, "On the Concept of Narration," *Semiotica: Journal of the International Association for Semiotic Studies / Revue de l'Association Internationale de Sémiotique* 2, no. 3 (1971): 1-19 (which focuses on literary theory) and Gaudreault, *Du Littéraire au Filmique* (for instance, chapter 3, pp. 37-51, which deals with narration in literature and film).

71. Prince, *Narratology*, 146 and 55-58. In Prince's case, this observation leads to the conclusion that it is possible to discern, in literary texts, various 'degrees' of narrativity – a formulation which seems to imply that it would be possible to somehow quantify this textual characteristic, and even, to attribute some sort of a hierarchy to individual items within a certain corpus. However, even regardless of the fact that I am not sure that this is at all possible (Prince, after all, does not explain how exactly narrativity should then be measured), I also do not think that it is very useful – especially within the context of my own project, which is based on the idea of textual *potentials* (which may or may not be activated).

72. I would like to emphasise again that although I argue here that the narrative qualities of filmic texts may or may not be accentuated or foregrounded, I do not wish to reproduce Gaudreault's distinction between more and less 'inherent' types of narrativity (see n. 70). In my view, the division between 'intrinsic' and 'extrinsic' which he proposes is simply too strict. One reason is that this dichotomy coincides with a categorisation in terms of the enunciative 'layers' of the filmic discourse. According to Gaudreault, 'intrinsic' narrativity is the result of what happens in the *mise en scène* and the *mise en cadre* (framing) while 'extrinsic' narrativity is the effect of a *mise en chaîne* (the sequencing of shots and larger visual units); see Gaudreault, *Du Littéraire au Filmique*, 117-31. Although in practice, I shall focus in what follows on aspects of structuration that Gaudreault would situate on the highest discursive level, I am convinced that narrative 'accentuation' may also involve the highlighting of 'lower grade'

elements, which are the result of staging or framing (for instance, in films that visualise a production process or natural phenomenon). An additional reason is that I think that Gaudreault places too much emphasis on issues of temporality. In my view, there are also other markers of narrativity; for instance, characterial agency (examples of which will follow further down this paragraph.)

73. Brooks, *Reading for the Plot*; see, among others, pp. 18-19, 37 and 39 (quotation; the italics are mine).

74. *Ibid.*, 18. For the original characterisation of the so-called 'codes', see Roland Barthes, *S/Z*, trans. Richard Miller (1973; London: Blackwell, 1992), 20; for more on the concept of the 'readerly', and its relation to irreversibility, see for instance pp. 3-6 and 105.

75. See Barthes, *S/Z*; the quotations are taken from pp. 29, 82, and 204 respectively. See also Brooks, *Reading for the Plot*, 101 and 108 (on the role of 'binding' in the facilitation of intratextual recognition).

76. Brooks, *Reading for the Plot*, 18.

77. Barthes, *S/Z*, 51-52 (quote) and 204; Brooks, *Reading for the Plot*, *passim*.

78. As a matter of fact, this is also the textual potential that I referred to at the end of my discussion of the skill film *Aardig knutselwerk*, in my section on the strategy of 'facilitating imitation' (see p. 147).

79. It might be worth pointing out here that Culler therefore argues that narrative proceeds according to a 'double logic'. He uses this phrase to explain how at certain ('problematic') moments, story elements seem to be produced by the requirements of the discourse – its needs of meaning – rather than the other way round. See Jonathan D. Culler, *The Pursuit of Signs* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1981), as paraphrased in Brooks, *Reading for the Plot*, 28. Barthes, in this context, talks about the "implacable constraint of the discourse"; see *S/Z*, 135.

80. Compare also León, *Science on Television*, 92.

81. See Prince, *Narratology*, 148-49. Barthes and Brooks might counter this last formulation by saying that "characters come second", i.e., that they are a function of the narrative events, rather than the other way round (see Brooks, *Reading for the Plot*, 11 (quote) and Barthes, *S/Z*, 18 and 62-63). However, the latter theorists' views do not conflict with the idea that I am most interested in here: that the 'individualisation' of actions foregrounds the narrative character of texts.

82. The situation is very different, for instance, in the film *De grote karekiet: nestbouw en broedverzorging* * (1948, The reed warbler: Nest-building and feeding), which I shall deal with further on. In this short, it is the 'fictional' insert in the middle where the text's purposiveness takes centre stage. Later on in the film, this rhetorical potential is somewhat lost, as it returns to its original, purely temporally ordered chain of events.

83. *Départ de grandes vacances* ² is the second episode in the *La famille Martin* series, mentioned in chapter 1.

84. As a side remark, I would like to argue here that this (very powerful) role of characterisation in the foregrounding of textual purposiveness also explains why narrativity is so often associated primarily with fiction films; for instance, in David Bordwell and Kristin Thompson, *Film Art: An Introduction*, 5th ed. (New York: McGraw Hill, 1997), 89-90. Fictional texts, after all, *nearly always* feature what Prince calls highly 'individualised' events. Rather than concentrating on a series of operations performed by anonymous and interchangeable figures – like in many of the process films mentioned earlier – they tend to include, and generally even focus on, the experience of identifiable characters whose actions and motives form the basis for the developments that take place. A remark that seems particularly relevant in this context is Odin's observation that fictionalisation also makes for "a particularly strong system of foreseeability" ("un système de prévisibilité extrêmement fort"); see Roger Odin, *De la fiction* (Brussels: De Boeck Université, 2000), 135.

85. Barthes, *S/Z*, 17-19, 75-76 (quote), 143-48 and 162-63 (and *passim*).

86. Barthes, *S/Z*, 61-63, 75-76, 92, 203-4 and 209-10 (all quotations from p. 75); Brooks, *Reading for the Plot*, 18 and 92 (quote).

87. Brooks, *Reading for the Plot*, 103-4, 109. (Brooks' use of the term 'death', of course, must be related to the psychoanalytical framework in which he embeds his observations.)

88. Compare also León, *Science on Television*, 99-100, which discusses the role of suspense as a rhetorical device in wildlife television documentaries.

89. See *ibid.*, 94. (The author here quotes Richard Attenborough, writer and presenter of the series that constitute his corpus.)

90. The full titles of these films are, respectively, *Sollicite(e)ren I: jongens* and *Sollicite(e)ren II: meisjes*. (Both spellings of this film occur in NOF's publications; the double 'e' is used especially in the earlier ones.)

91. "Waarom werd Jan Geesen/Marie van Beuningen afgewezen?"

92. A more in-depth discussion of direct address of the audience (and more specifically, of its function in referencing the pedagogical *dispositif*) will follow in chapter 5.

93. This is also the reason why I consider them again in chapter 5; see the introduction to that section of my text for more on the positioning of the audience as an ensemble of *pupil-viewers*.

94. Tan as well briefly talks about the 'challenges' (*uitdagingen*) which audio-visual narratives may pose to their

viewers; see "Film als emotiemachine", 147. However, he relates the notion to a much wider range of hermeneutic patterns (in the Barthesian sense) than I do here.

95. León, *Science on Television*, 68. León here in turn draws on terminology introduced by the author Juan R. Muñoz Torres.

96. For a clarification of the suggestion I make here that the choice of a text's *core content* might be based on rhetorical considerations, I refer to my discussion of fairy tale films further on in this paragraph (in my section on 'addressing interests and affinities').

97. Like I did in my first chapter, I use the term 'pseudo-ethnographic' here to indicate that the shorts under scrutiny do not make any claims as to their actual scholarly value. In spite of this, they clearly subscribe to a long tradition of travelogue/'scenic'/ethnographic film making, in which the boundaries between 'scientific' and 'recreational', also on a textual level, are very hazy indeed. Compare Griffiths, "Ethnographic films".

98. Quite possibly, the fact that the occasion for the ritual is identified as 'New Year's' (*Nieuwjaar*) reduces the scene's hue of unfamiliarity even more. Of course, the practice of recycling cultural clichés is not unique to classroom film making. Early travelogues, for instance, tended to rely on familiar visual tropes as well; see *ibid.*, 222. Another similarity between the above short and such early films is the fact that both avoid the depiction of social conflict – a feature mentioned in Jennifer Lynn Peterson's entry on "Travelogues" in Abel, *Encyclopedia of Early Cinema*, 642.

99. Also Tan sees a relation between textual motivation and the characters' (emotional) 'relevance' to the viewers; see for instance Tan, "Film als emotiemachine", 241-2. Yet in his work, of course, this leads to conclusions as to the films' actual (psychological) effects, rather than their (rhetorical) potential.

Authors who have dealt with the subject seem to agree that in order for a human figure, in any sort of text, to qualify as a 'character', it needs to fulfil a more or less central role in something that qualifies as a 'story'. See for example Seymour Chatman, *Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1978), 140-41 (where the author speaks of 'degrees' of 'characterhood', depending on the centrality of a human figure to the plot) or Smith, *Engaging Characters* (for instance, his chapter 1, pp. 17-39, where he associates character with fictional, and therefore narrative, agency).

100. In this respect, the film differs from *Een Japans gezin **, where the boy and girl who are introduced in the opening sequence are not responsible for propelling all of the film's 'plot'. (In fact, part of the action that takes place does not even affect them – at least, not in a direct way.) Following Chatman's logic (see previous note) one might therefore argue that they also score lower on the characterial 'scale'.

101. In a review of this film, the NOF newsletter insists that its main benefit is that the story it presents allows for some sort of a mental 'transfer' ("zichzelf als het ware verplaatst voelen") into the situation shown. See "30,000 ongelukken per jaar," *Mededelingen van de NOF*, [Spring] 1955 (no. 1), 8. Presumably, what is hinted at here is the possibility of what certain strands of film theory and criticism tend to refer to as audience 'identification'. In what follows, I shall not be using this concept. One reason for this is that it is a highly problematic notion. As several authors have pointed out, there is no single (basic) definition which all of the term's users share; in addition to this, its most 'common' deployment in film/media studies is based on a series of misconceptions about – or at the very least, simplifying interpretations of – the original, psychoanalytic concept on which it draws. See for instance Alain Bergala, "De identificatie van de filmtoeschouwer," pt. 2, *Versus*, no. 1 (1992): 82-83, 86-87 and *passim*; compare also the introduction to Smith, *Engaging Characters*, 1-13. The second, more important reason is that even those who are relatively faithful to the notion's psychoanalytic roots argue that processes of audience identification (or as Smith puts it: 'emotional viewer engagement') have more to do with the ways in which spectators are directed through purely film technical means (camera positioning, editing, etc.) than with a certain mental 'closeness' to a given character or characters – after all, the focus of my attention here. Again, both Bergala and Smith exemplify this view. (While the latter claims to criticise psychoanalytic conceptions of viewer engagement, the 'structure of sympathy' which he proposes, in my view, is actually much closer to Bergala's Freud/Lacan-inspired ideas than some of the analyses which he attacks.) A study of textual motivation that *does* use the term 'identification' is Tan's "Film als emotiemachine". Here, however, the author includes a thorough discussion of the concept (in his sixth chapter), in which he refers to a wide range of psychological theories and compares it with similar notions.

102. As a matter of fact, the film's title also predicts this: it is *Vondel, het leven van een groot Nederlander* (Vondel, the *life* of a great Dutchman), not *Vondel, het werk van een groot Nederlander* (Vondel, the *work(s)* of a great Dutchman).

103. The use of 'humanising' metaphors and the potential dramatic effects of music are also discussed in León, *Science on Television*, 137 and 116 respectively.

104. For my definition of 'character', I refer back to n. 99. NOF, I would like to emphasise, also distributed films that *did* feature animal 'characters' (for instance, the 1952 short *Langoor gaat op stap*, Long-Ears goes for a walk).

105. In this respect, the title discussed differs considerably from the television documentaries dealt with by León, and many of the wildlife films released in earlier years. In those films, a species' struggle for survival is often the main theme; therefore, it is conflict that drives the plot. Compare for instance León, *Science on Television*, 97-100;

Gaycken, "Drama Unites Them in a Fight"; Peterson, "Beasts Fair and Foul".

106. See "Onze nieuwe films," and Theo de Vries, "Het kasteel," *Mededelingen van de NOF*, April 1959, 5 and 8, respectively. Another point of appeal which one of the authors mentions is the use of animation (in a separate, inserted sequence); the motivational role of this type of technique shall be dealt with further on in this chapter.

107. For the newsletter article, see special issue, *Mededelingen van de NOF*, [1944], 8. Also NOF's zoology catalogue suggests that the stork was a particularly popular subject: towards the end of the period I deal with, another short about this species was released: *Ooievaars* (1963, Storks).

Quite possibly, also the fact that the films which the institute brought out more often dealt with animal life (in the 1953 catalogue, twenty nine titles) than with the development and pollination of plants (in that same period, a mere five) can be seen as a concession to the audience's topical preferences. (In a piece on 1920s medical films, Hernn and Brinckmann speak in this context of an appeal to a presumed 'animal interest', by analogy with the 'human interest' mentioned earlier; see Hernn and Brinckmann, "Von Ratten und Männern," 82.) If this is indeed the case, then the strategy dealt with here not only entailed restrictions in terms of the sort of arguments that were made, but may also have affected the educational use of the medium itself. Apparently, a Dutch teacher was more likely to find his pick in NOF's catalogue if he wished to deploy film as an aid in a zoology lesson, than if he wanted to screen something in a class on botany.

108. All of the films mentioned were acquired through the German educational distributor FWU, but had been produced in the 1940s by the brothers Ferdinand and Hermann Diehl, who owned what was then the country's leading puppet film studio. For more information on their activities, see Daniela Dietrich, Herbert Gehr and Christine Kopf, *Mecki, Märchen und Schnurren: Die Puppenfilme der Gebrüder Diehl* (Frankfurt am Main: Adolf und Luisa Haeuser-Stiftung für Kunst und Kulturpflege / Deutsches Filmmuseum, 1994).

109. Mark here that the above shorts were intended for the youngest members of NOF's target audience: those in early primary school.

110. Although it is quite likely that narrative puppet films were often deployed in other ways than the instruction booklets prescribe, the above type of use is the only kind I can think of that would have made these texts into actual *teaching tools*. Therefore, I take it as my starting point for analysis. For more on the rhetorical functioning of fictional language films, see also paragraph 4.2.

111. In "Film als emotiemachine," Tan as well talks about the appeal of 'formal attributes' (*formele attributen*; see pp. 78-79). In his interpretation, however, this term stands for the sort of narrative patterns that I have discussed before, and that I have chosen to attribute the potential of 'textual purposiveness'.

112. I here use a later reprint of her text: Kristin Thompson, "The Concept of Cinematic Excess," in *Film Theory and Criticism: Introductory Readings*, ed. Leo Braudy and Marshall Cohen (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), 487-98. The quotes are taken from pp. 487, 493 and 490, respectively.

113. For Thompson's pronouncements, see "Concept of Cinematic Excess," 491 (quote), 489 and 91-93, in that order.

114. See Gunning, "The Cinema of Attraction[s]," 383-84. (In this piece, the author actually uses the term 'exhibitionism' with reference to *all* sorts of cinematic attractions; on the pages I mentioned, however, he relates it more specifically to the exploitation of the possibilities of the medium as such.)

115. In *Elf-stedentocht*, skaters are filmed in 'tracking' fashion (i.e., from a vehicle moving alongside on the ice); *Walvisvaart* contains a remarkable number of high-angle shots.

116. For more on the Filmliga, see for instance Hogenkamp, *Nederlandse documentaire film 1920-1940*, 45-66, and Céline Linssen, Hans Schoots and Tom Gunning, *Het gaat om de film! Een nieuwe geschiedenis van de Nederlandsche Filmliga, 1927-1933* (Amsterdam: Lubberhuizen, 1999). For the Hollandse Documentaire School, see Hogenkamp, *Documentaire film 1945-1965*, 97-115 and *passim*.

117. In the article quoted from above, Thompson points out that a strict distinction should be made between the concepts of filmic 'style' and cinematic 'excess'; see "Concept of Cinematic Excess," 489. However, the examples I just gave demonstrate that the two can sometimes also be connected. What is particular about the shorts I mentioned is that the use of a particular stylistic form does not constitute an attempt to textually 'blend in' – i.e., *conform* to a particular (artistic) tradition – but can be seen as an act of 'setting off', of making a short formally 'stand out' (*as* a teaching film). Whether or not specific textual features can be considered 'excessive', then, is also a matter of their functioning within a given *dispositif*.

118. Of course, I do not wish to deny here that the strategy of spectacularisation and that of enabling sensorial indulgence may sometimes co-occur. In *Het bos in de Bergen*, for instance, the budding plants sequence is *also* aesthetically pleasing. One might however argue that its *primary* rhetorical function is to draw the audience's attention to the fundamental unknown-ness of the process which it depicts. In *Van tuin naar tafel*, in contrast, this is not the case.

119. Sobchack, "Cutting to the Quick," 340-44.

120. Of course, the same logic also applies to (the use of) the medium as such: because of the fact that films do not

'belong' in an educational setting, they are bound to have a greater appeal for a classroom audience. Presumably, a result of this is that the (technical) standards of this public are also lower. Evidence of this is provided by Gerard Bosch, one of the interviewees mentioned in chapter 2, who recalls that his pupils used to be fascinated by whichever film they were shown, regardless of its subject or quality – simply because viewing it in class was such an exceptional event. Compare also Gauthier, "Au risque du spectacle," 95.

121. The commentary literally says: "Kruispin heet ze, naar de eigenaardige witte tekening op de rug."

122. See Hoban, *Movies That Teach*, 98 (quote) and following. (Hoban here more specifically speaks of military training films, but he considers this genre as a model for shorts for classroom use; compare for instance pp. 100-1. Mark also that Hoban's pronouncements are highly reminiscent of León's, as quoted on p. 155.) NOF's writings as well seem to treat the co-occurrence of strategies as a quality requirement; as a matter of fact, they do so in even more general terms. A 1959 NOF newsletter, for instance, praises the film *Radio ontdekt de ruimte* (1959, *Mirror in the Sky*) for its mixture of science, romance and 'human traits' ("een mengsel van wetenschap, romantiek en menselijke trekjes", in C. van Rijsinge, "Radio ontdekt de ruimte," *Mededelingen van de NOF*, November 1959, 11; see also paragraph 4.3 for a more extensive quote). As I explained, I am not concerned here with the question of which patterns are the best or most effective from a didactic point of view; however, it is worth noting that contemporary sources do consider the coincidence of strategies to be rhetorically significant.

123. The science/humanities dichotomy which I proposed in an earlier piece on a British collection of teaching films (Masson, "Of Pits and Vaults," 56-58) now seems to me to constitute an unwarranted generalisation – at least, with respect to the corpus considered here. For instance, although my observation on the recurrence of dramatic features in humanities titles still holds, it would be inappropriate to argue that they are absent from biology, zoology or physics shorts. After all, many science films (including those featuring on the DVD appended to this work) contain at least *some* such elements. (Compare also the article "Dierenfilms", *Mededelingen van de NOF*, April 1946, 1, in which the author suggests that 'animal films' often combine the strategies which I have designated here as 'providing access' and 'enabling recognition'.)

124. In my view, it is precisely this narrative 'umbrella' which allows this short to fulfil the rhetorical function that is so specific to social guidance films: that of foregrounding the imitability of a behaviour or attitude. Through its relation with what precedes and follows, the central part of the text – which does not in itself provide much opportunity for empathy with the individuals shown – can still incite viewers to vicariously take pride in the community portrayed, and consequently, encourage them to take on an equally responsible social role.

125. "[D]e film [doet] precies wat men van een schoolfilm mag verwachten: hij geeft een mengsel van wetenschap, romantiek en menselijke trekjes. [...] Op een eenvoudige wijze, zo als het ware terloops, wordt onze aandacht gevestigd op het proefondervindelijk onderzoek van de natuurwetenschap: hoe hier de hypothese vooraf gaat aan het bewijs." C. van Rijsinge, "Radio ontdekt de ruimte," 11; the italics are my own.

126. Pronouncements to this effect, as a matter of fact, were rather common at the time. Earlier on I mentioned that primary sources attest that even the role of the film medium *itself* was often seen in this way: that it was conceived of as some sort of a 'bait', a means of making the pupils pay attention regardless of what content had to be passed on. For an example, see Van der Meulen, *Film en lichtbeeld bij het onderwijs*, 31. Compare also Raessens' "The Gaming *Dispositif*," 495-96, which mentions use of a "games-as-pain-relievers argument" in literature on the subject.

127. Of course, which aspects of a film's content should be considered didactically 'relevant' depends entirely on the way in which it is framed: the manner in which it is used in day-to-day educational practice. As I have collected few empirical data on this subject, I shall take my departure here from the specifications given in teachers' notes and manuals. These stipulations, I argued earlier, tended to be followed only by the most dedicated users of NOF's services (or 'teaching film buffs', as I called them in chapter 2). In the context of what I am doing here, however, this should not be a problem, because it is actually *their* deployment habits that can be associated the most closely with the pedagogical *dispositif* that I have chosen to concentrate on.

128. As a matter of fact, essay composition films are also the only category of shorts that seem to have *required* from their users (and in retrospect, also from archivists or researchers) that they consulted the accompanying instruction booklets in order to find out what they were for. While many items, and mute ones in particular, are not entirely clear about what children were supposed to learn from their screening, they usually do give their viewers *some* clues as to the broader curriculum area which they were relevant to.

129. I would like to add here that *because* of the fact that the educational process is so central to the representation, the above films are not very likely to have been deployed for other purposes than the ones they were intended for. In the case of these shorts, after all, any 'deviant' use might have caused some sort of a clash between a text and its pedagogical 'frame'. Essay composition films, to be situated on the extreme *other* end of the scale, in contrast, may have served any purpose imaginable – whether didactic or purely recreational.

130. The only (vague) example of this that I could find in any of the films under scrutiny is the point in *Antoni van Leeuwenhoek*² where a girl is shown taking notes. Here, the close shot of her hand writing down the year of

one of Van Leeuwenhoek's scientific endeavours can be read as a visual reminder to the viewer (an extratextual explication, in addition to the speaker's words) but also as a way of setting an example, and even of prompting him to do the same.

131. That they rarely contain *all* of it is evident from the fact that teachers' notes nearly always give instructions as to which information users should add.

132. In his description of the structure of a good skill film, Hoban suggests that those more roundabout elements then function primarily as means of providing a 'way in' for the viewer – i.e., as some sort of a 'portal' to that which the short is really about: the demonstration and explanation of the competencies that need to be acquired. In his view, then, they can be considered to fulfil a rhetorically 'subservient' role. See Hoban, *Movies That Teach*, 99. For some more examples of films analysed in terms of their positions on the direct-roundabout scale, see Masson, "De pil vergulden – of toch niet?"

133. Consequently, readers of this work may be able to think of other strategies than the ones I proposed. For instance, one tactic that I considered, but did not develop here, is that of 'concretisation'. In some of NOF's films (very often, shorts that seek to explain rather abstract phenomena, such as physical or chemical ones) the processes dealt with are explicitly related to some of their more concrete, day-to-day applications or manifestations; for instance, by means of framing narratives. An example here would be the first instalment of the film *Goed bewaren – geld besparen*, which discusses the phenomenon of fungal growth, but embeds its argument in a story about the potential effects of bad kitchen hygiene. While often combined with textual procedures that aim at enabling (characterial/situational) recognition, the main objective of this strategy is to make the process shown more tangible, and thus, to increase the spectatorial appeal of the *matter* addressed.

134. Also Tan stresses the importance of creating expectations to the process of audience motivation: see "Film als emotiemachine," for instance pp. 137 and 143. Here, however, it very specifically concerns the anticipation of emotions (on the audience's own part), rather than the further development of the text itself.

5 • Textual Rhetoric II: Referencing the Pedagogical *Dispositif*

1. I here borrow my phrasing from Suleiman and Crosman, editors of the volume *The Reader in the Text*. Compare also the title of Nick Browne's essay "The Spectator-in-the-Text: The Rhetoric of Stagecoach," in *Film Theory and Criticism: Introductory Readings*, 4th ed, ed. Gerald Mast, Marshall Cohen and Leo Braudy (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), 210-25. The main title of this dissertation is an indirect reference to those same expressions.

2. One could argue, then, that the notion of 'address,' as I use it in this chapter, is quite close to Louis Althusser's concept of 'interpellation,' which emphasises that in being spoken to (or 'hailed') the 'subject' (in my case, the reader/viewer) is also being constituted, or produced, ideologically (here: rhetorically). Compare for instance his essay "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses" in the collection *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*, trans. Ben Brewster (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1971), 127-86 (and pp. 170-86 in particular). However, I share Stuart Hall's criticism of such Marxist thinkers as Althusser that the relation between text and viewer should not be seen too deterministically. Readers, in other words, do not *have* to take on a text's preferential viewing position – or as Hall himself puts it, comply with a text's 'preferred reading' (a notion that differs from mine in that it suggests that there is only *one* such reading for each text; within my conception, in contrast, various meanings can still be associated with the viewing position which the text itself proposes). See for instance Stuart Hall, "Encoding/decoding," in *Culture, Media, Language: Working Papers in Cultural Studies, 1972-79*, ed. Stuart Hall, Dorothy Hobson, Andrew Lowe and Paul Willis (London: Hutchinson, 1980), 117-127 (especially p. 125).

3. Jacquinot, *Image et Pédagogie*; see, in that order, p. 37; pp. 47 and 60-61; pp. 63-65.

4. For the original formulation, see *ibid.*, 50-51 and 65.

5. See *ibid.*, for instance p. 113.

6. Odin objects to Jacquinot's use of the term 'world' (*monde*) because in his experience, it obscures the relation with the world constructed by the text (*le monde textuel*). He therefore suggests *espace* as an alternative. See *De la fiction*, 129.

7. At the end of her second chapter, Jacquinot distinguishes between three 'levels' on which the filmic text can acquire its 'didactic structure': "the level of the general organisation of the document" ("[le] niveau de l'organisation générale du document"), "the level of the rhetorical procedures" ("[le] niveau des procédés rhétoriques"), or otherwise, "the more specific level of the functioning of elements or 'motifs' of the image [...] and [...] its treatment" ("[le] niveau plus ponctuel de l'agencement des éléments ou 'motifs' de l'image [...] et [...] de son traitement"). See Jacquinot, *Image et Pédagogie*, 58. In the remainder of her text, however, she does not take up this distinction – at least, not in a systematic way.

8. Further on in this chapter, it will become clear that, especially in cases of obvious self-reflexivity, the *dispositif* that is referenced is often one that incorporates a very *traditional* epistemic 'ideology,' in which the film functions

as an aid to a process of 'handing down' information from teacher to pupils. Whether or not such elements can take on their full rhetorical potential, of course, depends very much on the concrete user situation within which a text functions (a point I shall elaborate in paragraph 5.3).

9. Compare for instance Joe Clark's presentation for the fifth Orphan Film Symposium ("Educating the Race: Inequality and Pedagogy in the Films of All-American News", University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC, 24 March 2006), in which the phrase 'pedagogical address' was used to refer to a very diverse range of textual motifs (see http://www.sc.edu/filmsymposium/Orphans_Sound/orphans.htm for an audio link).

10. Jacquinot, *Image et Pédagogie*, 60-61. (The author takes her cue here from Max Egly.)

11. Odin, *De la fiction*, 129.

12. *Het ontstaan van een polder* is part I in the series *Zuiderzeepolders*.

13. Odin, *De la fiction*, 129-30.

14. The interruption, here, is specifically *visual*; if one also considers what happens on the auditory level of the text, the interruption of diegetic development should be considered to begin much earlier in the film. For more on the role of sound, however, I refer to my argumentation further down this paragraph. The difference with the shot described by Odin is that here, also the map itself is extra-diegetic; the skull in his example, it seems, is not.

15. Eric de Kuyper, "Aux origines du cinéma: le film de famille," in Odin, *Le film de famille*, 16.

16. 'Immediacy' is used here as in Bolter and Grusin, *Remediation* (see for instance pp. 21-31).

17. For more on the illusory nature of this representational effect, and its (paradoxical) relation to what Bolter and Grusin designate as 'hypermediacy', see my section on "Meta-discursive referencing" (the third level of referencing which I distinguish).

18. Her text literally reads: "par référence à un interlocuteur absent mais visé comme présent". Jacquinot, *Image et Pédagogie*, 69.

19. In this respect, one might argue, the teaching films under scrutiny differ considerably from many television programmes – another type of audio-visual products which, according to Allen, "[stimulate] face-to-face encounter by directly addressing the viewer"; see Robert C. Allen, "Audience-Oriented Criticism and Television," in *Channels of Discourse, Reassembled*, 117-18. In the latter, John Fiske adds, "linguistic recognition of the viewer's presence has its visual counterpart in the way that television personalities [...] look at the camera and address it directly"; see his book *Television Culture* (London: Methuen, 1987), 53.

One exception to the situation described above is *Antoni van Leeuwenhoek*². Here, the impression is created that the voice that is heard in the middle part of the film is the same as, and even originates from, the tour guide of the framing story. (This *in spite of* the fact that what the narrator says is not perfectly in synch with the latter's lip movements.) In this respect, the film is different again from *Vondel, het leven van een groot Nederlander*, which works with two voices: one that goes with the diegesis (even though it does not emanate from it) and another that does not. The words of the second speaker, however, always function as coming from an overall narrator; the film as a whole therefore still functions as 'directly' addressed to the viewer. The same is true for *Erasmus, stem van de rede*, which adds even more voices; for instance, that of the literary persona in one of Erasmus' texts.

20. Jacquinot here speaks of a *code d'implication* (*Image et Pédagogie*, 69); León uses the expression "[rhetorical] figures facing the public" (*Science on Television*, 131). Wallet, for his part, says that the viewer is made to act as some sort of a 'witness' (*pris à témoin*; see "Partis pris filmiques et pédagogiques," 103).

My earlier example, the film *Het paard*², does use the word 'we'; however, not in the very specific way that I am thinking of here – i.e., as referring to the combination 'speaker + his audience'. In the opening sentence of the short ("In the old stories about Indians we often read [...]", or in Dutch: "In de oude Indianenverhalen lezen we vaak [...]") the pronoun seems to point to an entity that is much more encompassing. In this case, I believe, it functions as a synonym for 'one' (*men*). The same also applies to the line "We [can] find there extremely well-developed giant specimen" ("We vinden daar welig ontwikkelde reuze-exemplaren") a little further in the film. Other designations of 'we' (or the possessive version of that pronoun: 'our', *onze*) also occur; for instance, in *Sterren en sterrensystemen*. Here, the word alternately refers to 'everyone in the referential world' (as opposed to the world of the schematic representation), 'all humans' (in contrast to any creatures that might live in other planetary systems), 'all regular people' (those who are not astronomers or physicists) and a more neutral 'one'. In all of these cases, however, it can be argued that the entity alluded to *also* includes the speaker and his audience. In this sense, then, it is implicative as well. The use of a 'royal we', which Chatman adds to the list of possibilities (see *Story and Discourse*, 256) is far less common in the corpus dealt with here.

21. Examples of soft imperatives in the film mentioned are: "Pay attention to how the cliff has been scooped out at the bottom" ("Let eens op hoe het klif aan de voet is uitgehold"), "Let us follow one of these stones" ("Laten wij eens een van die stenen volgen") or "And now look what happens when the coast changes direction" ("En zie nu wat er gebeurt als de kust van richting verandert"). For examples of direct address, see my section on 'audience

interrogation' in chapter 4.

22. In the film, those last two clauses sound as follows: "de voorvader van het paard" and "wat de natuur bereikte". In the case of the reference to stories about Indians, the speaker literally uses the expression "de oude Indianenboeken". Upon doing so, he immediately (re)asserts his scientific authority by making the comment that the latter are merely the product of romance, and therefore do not give an accurate rendition of reality ("maar, zoals de meeste romantiek, is het niet helemaal waar").

23. See p. 182. Also Wallet establishes the link with "the magisterial enunciation" ("l'énonciation magistrale"; see "Partis pris filmiques et pédagogiques," 103).

24. Of course, also De Kuyper's text allows for this interpretation, since he says: "[ce regard] annule *pour ainsi dire* la médiation technique" ("Aux origines du cinéma," 16; my italics). Compare also Bolter and Grusin, *Remediation*, 30. Allen, in this context, uses an even stronger expression than De Kuyper does, and speaks of 'de-mediation' (*Channels of Discourse, Reassembled*, 125).

25. Paul Goetsch, "Reader Figures in Narrative," *Style* 38, no. 2 (2004); see pp. 189 and 190-94 in particular. An alternative here would be to make use of the notion of 'narratee', which is conceptualised, among others, by Genette and Prince, and defined by the latter as "signs of the 'you' in narrative discourse" (Prince, "The Narratee Revisited," 330; see also "Introduction to the Study of the Narratee," by the same author), or of Rabinowitz's 'narrative audience' (which he himself distinguishes from Prince's concept; see Rabinowitz, *Before Reading*, 95). I prefer not to use either of the above concepts, because I have thus far always considered *reader* roles, and would like to consider the various types of addressees in those same terms. The advantage of this is that it will give me the opportunity to conceptualise them as different 'versions' of the same given on separate textual levels. (Prince, Rabinowitz or Chatman, in contrast, focus on the presence or absence of this role on one specific level: that of the narration.)

26. Goetsch, "Reader Figures in Narrative"; quotes from pp. 190 and 191, respectively. I should also add here that Goetsch, in his text, uses the terms 'author' (or 'writer') and 'narrator' interchangeably. While I have argued earlier that I choose not to search for (the intentions of) an (implied) author (see chapter 3, paragraph 3.3) I prefer to stick with the phrase here. First, because it is a logical consequence of the conceptual choice justified in the previous note. Second, because use of the word 'narrator', in the case of films with voice-over commentaries, entails the risk of conflating this role with that of the *speaker* – an entity which, narratologically speaking, it does not necessarily match (see for instance Chatman, *Coming to Terms*, 113).

27. "Dit, bijvoorbeeld, is de voorvader van de huidige olifant".

28. The term 'meta-textual' which I use for the third type of referencing, then, is different from the adjectives in the names which I gave to the other two levels in that it not only identifies the discursive 'layer' at which the reference is made, but also specifies the 'object' of referencing: that which is referred to. My naming logic here, however, concerns the 'location' of the reference. The term 'meta-textual', in other words, is used here as in 'occurring on/situated on the meta-level of text'. For definitions of 'place' and 'discourse deixis', see Stephen C. Levinson, *Pragmatics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 79-85 and 81 (on demonstrative pronouns) and 85-89, respectively. Discourse deixis, in Levinson's definition, is "the use of expressions within some utterance to refer to some portion of the discourse that contains that utterance" (p. 85).

29. I need to point out here that this applies only to the first part of the film. Once the voice-over commentator has invited his audience to follow its imagination into the past ("Volgen wij onze verbeeldingskracht vijftig tot zestig miljoen jaren terug...") demonstratives more often tend to refer back to what has been said earlier than to a very specific profilmic element. For instance, in the sentence "Here a new world developed for the forest animals" ("Hier ontvouwde zich een nieuwe wereld voor de wouddieren"), the deictic term 'here' seems to function as a reference to what has been explained previously rather than as an indication of what part of the accompanying image section the viewer should focus on.

30. Bolter and Grusin, *Remediation*, chapter 1 (pp. 21-50) in particular. On p. 6, they call these two tendencies "mutually dependent"; on p. 53, they also characterise them as "opposite manifestations of the same desire".

31. For my formulation here, see *ibid.*, 41 (where the authors in turn use the words of Richard Lanham).

32. The original versions of the above quotes read as follows: "Dit is een microscopische opname van een schimmel, 500 maal groter" (from part I of *Goed bewaren – geld besparen*); "Eén zo'n omwenteling duurt in werkelijkheid miljoenen jaren"; "Stellen we ons voor dat het land hier is gevormd uit verschillende rotsoorten; de meest bestendige zijn zwart getint".

33. Of course, the fact that it is narrated in French – not the viewers' own language – is the first, most obvious clue here.

34. The speaker says: "This is the story of a boy, Johnny, who has seen them [the tiny people of Madurodam]" ("Dit is het verhaal van een jongetje, Hansje, die [sic] ze [de kleine mensjes van Madurodam] gezien heeft"). (This introduction, as a matter of fact, only features in the sound version of the film, which is included on the DVD

appended to this work. The mute one, brought out at the same time, opens with the second title card.)

35. André Gaudreault and François Jost, "Enunciation and Narration," in *A Companion to Film Theory*, ed. Robert Stam and Toby Miller (Oxford: Blackwell, 1999), 49.

36. See for instance the "Introduction" to Susana Onega and José Ángel Gacía Landa, eds., *Narratology* (London: Longman, 1996), 31. For definitions of the concept, see, among others, Lucien Dällenbach, *Le Récit spéculaire: essai sur la mise en abyme* (Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1977). (Although written in the 1970s, this book is still one of the main reference works on the subject. It contains a review of the variety of its uses in literary criticism at that point in time.) One of the authors who has used the concept in a discussion of *film* texts is Metz; see for instance Christian Metz, *L'énonciation impersonnelle, ou le site du film* (Paris: Méridiens Klincksieck, 1991).

37. See Klaus Meyer-Minnemann and Sabine Schlickers, "La mise en abyme en narratologie," *Vox Poetica*, <http://www.vox-poetica.com/t/menabyme.html> (the untitled introductory part of the piece). The original text for the quote reads: "nous pensons que, bien que la mise en abyme soit toujours diégétique, elle peut réfléchir aussi le niveau extrafictionnel (le niveau où se situent l'auteur et le lecteur implicites), ou encore les paratextes". In the example referred to, the object of *mise en abyme* is said to be the actual author of the text. Although I do not share their view on this occasion – for in my opinion, the mirroring effect here concerns an *abstraction* of the so-called 'real' author, a construction by the reader – the example is quite telling, because it focuses attention on the potential *correspondences* between textual and extratextual elements of, or contributors to, the meaning of a work.

With respect to the 'visibility' of textual redoublings, it may also be worth mentioning Metz' proposition to distinguish between different 'strengths' (*degrés de force*) of enunciation/reflexivity for various 'types' of *mise en abyme* (see *Énonciation impersonnelle*, 94-95 and following). (Mark however that in his work, the term 'reflexive', *réflexif*, is used in a more literal sense, and in combination with *commentatif*, which is deployed more often, although not exclusively, with reference to verbal elements.)

38. Meyer-Minnemann and Schlickers use the semantic pair *énoncé* – *énonciation* throughout their article. Although their interpretation of these categories remains somewhat hazy (for they occasionally alternate them with the terms *histoire* and *discours*) the example of a 'real' author as the object of *mise en abyme* (see previous note) suggests that their concept of enunciation may at times come close to Émile Benveniste's 'original' one, denoting the act of (linguistic) uttering itself; see his *Problèmes de linguistique générale*, vol. 1 (Paris: Gallimard, 1966). In this respect, they deviate from Dällenbach's idea, who uses the term to refer in a stricter sense to (the context of) the production/reception of the *narrative* (see *Récit spéculaire*, for instance p. 100). (For a further discussion of matters pertaining to the conceptual ambiguity surrounding these terms, particularly in relation to film, see Bordwell, *Narration in the Fiction Film*, 21-26.)

39. For my use of the term 'identity', in this context, see also Dällenbach, *Récit spéculaire*, 142. Metz here proposes the term 'meta-filmic' (as opposed to 'meta-cinematographic', with which he refers to mirror effects that do *not* involve a redoubling of the very text in which they turn up, or some part of it). The examples he gives, however, show that this notion is still applicable to a much wider range of textual elements than the kind I just mentioned, and that do not involve an actual 'duplication' of film shots of sequences. (See for instance his chapter "Film(s) dans le film," in *Énonciation impersonnelle*, 93-111.)

40. Compare, again, Metz, *Énonciation impersonnelle*, 94.

41. This situation applies even in the case of *Départ de Grandes Vacances*². Despite the fact that the narrator, in this film, briefly enters the same profilmic space as the story's agents, he always remains invisible to them – hence, the shadow – and possesses superior knowledge (consider for instance his ironic comments on the family members' actions).

42. See Benveniste, *Problèmes de linguistique générale*, 241.

43. Examples like *Het paard*², then, are perfect illustrations of the paradoxical nature of the relation between the two 'logics' of (re)mediation identified by Bolter and Grusin. Although the speaker's voice, here, functions a means to create (an impression of) the transparent immediacy, the deictic terms he uses inevitably underscore the fundamentally discursive, and by the same token, *mediated*, character of the – or *any* – film.

44. Lucien Dällenbach, "Reflexivity and Reading," *New Literary History: A Journal of Theory and Interpretation* 11, no. 3 (1980): 440. My term 'artifice' here is inspired by the author's own characterisation of *mise en abyme* as "an artificial remedy for the deferred nature of written communication".

45. Perelman as quoted in Chatman, *Story and Discourse*, 261-62.

46. For completeness' sake, I should add here that even if such elements can be seen as (more) powerful indications by the text itself of "how it would like to be read" (see Gerald Prince, "Notes on the Text as Reader," in Suleiman and Crosman, *The Reader in the Text* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980), 238), this does not imply that a viewer should therefore necessarily live up to the instructions given. Dällenbach suggests that textual reflexivity potentially constitutes a restriction of the freedom of movement permitted to the reader (Dällenbach, "Reflexivity and Reading," 436); however, I think that this view somewhat overstates the directive powers of (any

kind of) text. Quite apart from the fact that it cannot be assumed that audiences always catch on to the references made, individual viewers also have a certain amount of choice with regard to the interpretational route they take. In addition to this, the rhetorical functioning of such textual elements (as referential) also depends on their 'validation' by other players within the *dispositif* in which they acquire meaning. For an elaboration of this point, see paragraph 5.3.

47. See, respectively, Dällenbach, "Reflexivity and Reading," 441, and Meyer-Minnemann and Schlickers, "Mise en abyme en narratologie" (a definition of *métalepse* is given in the third paragraph of the introductory part of the text). Meyer-Minnemann and Schlickers use the notion in a narrower sense than Genette, who first introduced the concept to the domain of narratology.

48. Of course, the fact that the film is shown in a specific institutional context (in a school, and in the presence of an actual teacher) entails that enunciation does not stop at the borders of the text – a given which ultimately also affects the 'responsibility' for the filmic message. For more on this subject, see paragraph 5.3.

49. See for instance Van der Meulen, *Film en lichtbeeld bij het onderwijs*, 7.

50. Meyer-Minnemann and Schlickers, "Mise en abyme en narratologie" (under 1.2, the subheading "Les fonctions de la mise en abyme").

51. In my conclusions to chapter 1, I mentioned that in the first half of the 1950s, NOF began to act more relaxed about the requirement that teaching films should always look as 'frugal' as possible (so as not to detract from the seriousness of the didactic exchange of which they were supposed to be part). However, as the above examples show, this does not mean that the institute's output therefore ceased to contain signs of worriedness about what the users presumably thought film might do to the 'regular' course of classroom affairs. As I shall explain in the next paragraph, an increase is visible over time in the films' measure of self-reflexiveness – a development that clearly coincides with the use of sound (*also* introduced in the beginning of the 1950s). For this reason, it is possible to argue that more permissiveness in terms of filmic composition was actually accompanied by a multiplication of *other* marks of 'fear' about the films' readability (as Dällenbach would put it).

Something else I would like to add is that the observations I make here probably apply not only to teaching films, but also to other (related) 'genres'. Consider for instance the 1930 psychiatry film screened by Zoe Beloff during the fifth Orphan Film Symposium. Beloff herself explained during her presentation that the verbosity of these pictures can be seen as an attempt by the makers to demonstrate their scientific integrity. The intertitles, she said, help steer the viewers' interpretation of what is seen, and thus ensure the film's status as a piece of 'visual psychological documentation'. ("Dr. Clark's Projections," paper held at the University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC, 25 March 2006. Click on the appropriate link at http://www.sc.edu/filmsymposium/Orphans_Sound/orphans.htm to play back the presentation.) I would like to add that in this process, the self-referentiality that characterises these texts encourages (emotional) detachment in the spectator: by constantly interrupting the diegetic representation, they prevent him from being drawn into the dramatised scene shown, and encourage him to take an appropriate – in this case, scientific – viewing attitude.

52. In addition to this, it can probably be argued that self-reflexive elements may serve some sort of a motivational purpose. Above I posited that the insertion of such references bears witness to a film's recognition of the viewer's ability to conceive of the text *as a text*. In those instances, in other words, the spectator is addressed as a more or less sophisticated reader: one that is at least sufficiently 'literate', or media competent, to decode those remarks. This fact in itself may constitute an appeal to the viewers' intellectual sense of pride – much like the instances of 'audience interrogation' discussed in chapter 4.

53. In this respect, then, I fundamentally disagree with Jacquinot, who maintains that the educational institution *always* inscribes itself into the structure of a didactic audio-visual message (see the beginning of paragraph 5.1).

54. Mark here that only six out of the twenty eight titles that I mentioned in this chapter so far were released before 1950.

55. Kathleen M. Jamieson, "Antecedent Genre as Rhetorical Constraint," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 61, no. 4 (1975). (Her example of papal letters on pp. 408-10 can be taken to illustrate the former situation; the latter is discussed on p. 406.) For a definition of the concept of illocution, see chapter 3, p. 110.

56. Bolter and Grusin also point out that it is common for media to offer new opportunities for hypermediacy (and therefore, I would add, self-referencing and self-reflexiveness) as they 'mature' (see Bolter and Grusin, *Remediation*, 60).

57. Again, there may be a connection here with issues of authority. It is my suspicion that drawing attention to the fact that teachers as well have rules to follow – and, implicitly, superiors to answer to – may be considered to jeopardise their professional status. In the case of factual information (as found in the great majority of booklets that accompany teaching films) it might even be seen to threaten their position of *intellectual* predominance.

58. Although the teachers' notes remained in existence for as long as NOF distributed films, they became less elaborate over time, while the shorts themselves began to contain more references to their application in class. In

addition to this, general user instructions – tips as to when and how often to screen the films and which tasks to set for follow-up – gradually disappeared from such writings.

59. As I pointed out in chapter 1, it first did so (openly) in the early 1950s.

60. Information on NOF practice was obtained in this case from Van Langeraad (interview with author).

61. An exception to this rule is *Een wens verhoord binnen 24 uur*, but as I said, this example is a rather peculiar one.

62. For the quote, see Hoban, *Movies That Teach*, 103.

63. In the case of *Moskou*, this title card also contains a condemnation of the film's supposedly communist slant. It reads: "The following recordings have been [made] under the supervision of the Russian authorities [...]. The film therefore gives only a partial image of daily life in Moscow." ("De volgende opnamen zijn [vervaardigd] onder toezicht van de Russische autoriteiten [...]. De film geeft daarom slechts een eenzijdig beeld van het dagelijks leven in Moskou.")

64. See Jacquinet, *Image et Pédagogie*, 53. In this section of her text, she literally says: "the filmic text seeks to raise the pupil's interest, to 'implicate' him, in order to keep him captive and make him follow a 'signposted' road" ("le texte filmique cherche à intéresser l'élève, à l'impliquer pour le tenir captif et lui faire suivre un chemin balisé").

65. *Ibid.*, 102-3. In her article on Swiss teaching films, Gertiser endorses this view; the counterexample which she gives in her piece is conceived of as an exception to a more general rule (see "Domestizierung des bewegten Bildes," 68 and 68-70 respectively).

66. See, respectively, Odin, *De la fiction*, 136 ("la présence contraignante de la voix over impose une lecture quasiment univoque"); Plantinga, *Rhetoric and Representation*, 159; Bill Nichols, "Transformations in Film as Reality", pt. 2, "Documentary and the Coming of Sound," *Documentary Box*, no. 6 (1995), <http://www.yidff.jp/docbox/6/box6-1-e.html>.

67. See Gaudreault and Jost, "Enunciation and Narration," 56-57 in particular.

68. Jacquinet, for instance, characterises the realm of speech in teaching films as "the site of pure speech, of the discourse of truth" ("le lieu de la parole pure, du discours vérité"; see *Image et Pédagogie*, 93). Others explicitly relate the rhetorical operation of such shorts to the truth claims made by actuality genres such as newsreels or broadcast journalism. See for instance Clark, "Educating the Race", and León, *Science on Television*, 77. Mark also that in chapter 3, I made similar observations on theorists' use of the term 'rhetoric'.

69. In chapter 2, I pointed out that educational historians argue that the unpopularity of audio-visual media was due at least in part to the fact that teachers found the prospect of having to do so rather daunting. However, this does not mean that those pedagogues who *did* use the medium therefore never attempted it.

70. Mailloux, *Rhetorical Power*, 44.

71. I have to add here, however, that the text itself does not seem to encourage such a reading. The camera does not focus on individual contestants (as might be the case in a newsreel) and in addition to this, the intertitles are not very specific about the timing of the competition.

72. Compare chapter 2, p. 100 (where I actually opposed this view).

73. Odin, "Film documentaire Lecture documentarissante"; on p. 269, his formulation is "prendre comme Énonciateur réel"; elsewhere in the same article, he also speaks of "énonciateur presupposé réel" (for instance, on p. 268). The phrase "le système stylistique du sous-ensemble films pédagogiques" is used on p. 272.

Considering the variety of meanings that have been attached to the term 'enunciation' by the authors I have cited so far, it might be useful to specify which of these Odin subscribes to. In the article just referred to, he defines it as "the act of uttering itself" ("le faire énonciatif lui-même", p. 265) – a pronouncement that aligns him with Benveniste (whom he also quotes). The prefix 'real', in this context, is used to make the distinction between fictional and non-fictional texts; however, for reasons mentioned above, this qualification is of lesser importance to me here.

74. The words 'source' and 'origin' are possible translations for what Odin calls '*je-origine*' (see "Film documentaire Lecture documentarissante," 265-66). Compare also Metz' terms *foyer* and *source*, which he uses in the first chapter of *Énonciation impersonnelle* (entitled "L'Énonciation anthropoïde", pp. 11-36), in which he opposes Francesco Cassetti's consideration of filmic enunciation in purely deictic terms. (Such an approach, in his view, holds the danger of confusing the text's enunciator with one of the parties that are actually responsible for its genesis, such as a director or a production team; see pp. 25-6.) In his view, however, use of these words, as well as their counterparts *cible* and *visée* (for the 'target' or 'destination' of the enunciation) does not preclude that in concrete films, human subjects would occupy either of those positions. In such cases, also more 'personalised' (*anthropoïde*) terms can be used – as he does himself further on in the text.

At this point, I should also add that Jacquinet as well speaks of the educator in terms of "le ou les responsables du document". In her case, however, it is not clear whether she refers here to the real teacher, or the (implied) specialist whose ideas are conveyed by the film's commentary. See Jacquinet, *Image et Pédagogie*, 131.

Conclusions

1. "Wel moet worden vastgesteld, dat de leerling bij het beleven van een film zeer *ontvankelijk* kan zijn voor alles wat de maker van de film hem wil meedelen. In de gewone bioscoop kan deze ontvankelijkheid leiden tot een meer dan normale suggestibiliteit, zodat de kritiek van het verstand niet meer tussenbeide komt om het meegedeelde op zijn juistheid te toetsen. De klas-situatie verschilt echter aanmerkelijk van de bioscoop-situatie. De factoren die in de bioscoop een belangrijke rol spelen (de gemakkelijke bioscoop-fauteuil, het verlangen naar verstrooiing, de anonimiteit van de toeschouwer, de absolute donkerte en afgeslotenheid van de zaal, de 'overgave' aan de autoriteit van de filmmaker en de vereenzelving met de held of heldin van het verhaal) zijn in de klas grotendeels afwezig. De verduistering van het klaslokaal, de onwillekeurige opmerkzaamheid voor alles wat er op het witte doek te zien is en het realiteitskarakter van de film kunnen de leerling wel ontvankelijker maken voor het vertoonde, maar op zichzelf genomen is dit alleen maar een voordeel. Suggestibiliteit veronderstelt het op de achtergrond treden van de verstandelijke, kritische functies van de geest; ontvankelijkheid echter sluit de activiteit van verbeelding en verstand niet uit maar vergemakkelijkt deze juist." Peters, *Visueel onderwijs*, 24.
2. Further on in his piece, Peters also specifies how teachers can contribute to this 'classroom effect', and thus help prevent the children from watching the film as if it were a means of recreation (and in this process, 'lose' themselves completely). See *ibid.*, 47-48; for a discussion of some of the textual differences between teaching films and other types of moving images, see pp. 30-31.
3. Compare the title of Dirk Eitzen's article, "When is a Documentary?: Documentary as a Mode of Reception," *Cinema Journal* 35, no. 1 (1995), in which he claims that it is not textual features that determine whether a film is a documentary, but rather the sort of interpretational frame that an audience chooses to apply to it (among others, on the basis of situational cues).
4. According to an article in a 1949 trade union magazine, the reformist 'fatigue' among teachers was due in part to the fact that in all those years of talking, no *actual* change had been accomplished. See "De Onderwijsvernieuwing in het Parlement," *Schoolblad*, 8 January 1949, 5.
5. Compare chapter 2, in which I mention that the more 'dedicated' users of teaching films, while fewer in number, were possibly responsible for a relatively *higher* percentage of screenings (see p. 89).
6. For some of the problems associated with the use of the term 'text' in relation to newer (especially 'interactive') media, see for instance Lister et al., *New Media*, 23 and 43.
7. Of course, this characterisation of the notion of 'text'/'textuality' already betrays my own position on the semantic issues hinted at in the previous note.
8. A remarkable example in the domain of film is the work of Peters, author of the epigraph to this section. Relevant publications are: Peters, *Retoriek van de communicatie*, and the second part of Hesling and Peters, *Audiovisuele retoriek* ("De retorische structuur van audio-visuele teksten," pp. 143-220).
9. Peters, in one of his later works, has tried to overcome this problem by differentiating between a 'primary', a 'secondary', and an 'additional' (*toegevoegde*) sender; functions corresponding, respectively, to that of the 'educational institution' that 'emits' the text (presumably, an educational film producer or broadcast company), the teacher represented in the film, and the film's user (the actual teacher). See Hesling and Peters, *Audiovisuele retoriek*, 184. My problem with this representation is, first, that it does not lend enough weight to the initiative of the (real) teacher (which is subordinate here to the other two), and second, that it obscures, much rather than to clarify, the *relations* between those three types of 'sender'. For more on the structuralist terminology mentioned above, see for instance Claude E. Shannon and Warren Weaver, *The Mathematical Theory of Communication* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1949), 55-56 and 98-99 (the last two pages dealing with the concept of communicational 'noise') and Linda R. Waugh, *Roman Jakobson's Science of Language* (Lisse: De Ridder, 1976), 25 (for the terms 'addressee' and 'addresser', used in language theory).
10. I am alluding here to Esquenazi's phrase *effet 'film de famille'*, as used in his piece by the same title ("L'effet 'film de famille'").
11. In a piece on television in daily life, Hermann Bausinger argues that this variety in user modes is a reason precisely for *not* deploying such a concept in the study of media. In his view, "the open field in which communication takes place" makes the notion of an 'implied reader' unfit for this purpose. See Hermann Bausinger, "Media, technology and daily life," *Media, Culture & Society* 6, no. 4 (1984): 350. However, I think I have demonstrated in this work that this does not *have* to be the case – as long as one uses the concept in a sufficiently flexible way.
12. Compare for instance the work of Jacquinot (and in particular, *Image et Pédagogie*).
13. See the final section of paragraph 4.1.2 (entitled "The Recontextualisation of Filmic Form").
14. One possible definition of 'utility film' is: an audio-visual text that serves another purpose than just to provide the experience – pleasurable, scary, aesthetically pleasing – of watching itself.
15. For examples, see for instance chapter 4, n. 5. Possibly, evaluations of this type can be attributed at least in

part to the fact that many scholars still seem to consider the *dispositif* relevant to most entertainment films as the 'standard' one. Compare also n. 13 in the introduction.

16. As a matter of fact, this is also the principle behind the series reference at the beginning of *Départ de Grandes Vacances*², discussed in chapter 5. In television adverts, a variation of this pattern can be found in spots that consist of two parts: one in which an argument is made about a specific product, and another, shorter 'recap' fragment further on in the commercial break. In some cases, this second 'half' features only the relevant good or its logo; in others, however, it references the text itself, or an aspect thereof (a significant story line, character, or attribute). This narrative principle is briefly dealt with in Sarah Kozloff, "Narrative Theory and Television," in Allen, *Channels of Discourse, Reassembled*, 90.

17. As an exception to this rule, one might think of films or episodes that are introduced and/or followed-up by a commentator or presenter, as sometimes happens in school television broadcasts, or clusters of science programmes. However, these are not the kinds of situations which León talks about.

18. For León's observations on the matter, see for instance *Science on Television*, chapter 3 (which mentions some of the procedures that I have discussed in my sections on 'enabling recognition' and 'Narrative patterning') and p. 18 (which deals with the nature documentary's double rhetorical function). I should however repeat that the author himself does not make the distinction between more and less roundabout, or even between my two types of spectatorial appeal. For him, all procedures are means to make the *matter* itself more attractive (or 'interesting') to the intended viewers.

19. In addition to this, a comparison with other collections might also lay bare some tendencies that I have not touched upon here; for instance, patterns in terms of the ratios between various strategies. A possible research question would be whether or not the rhetorical potential of comprehensibility is a relatively more important motivational focus in corpora that contain more films with sound (seeing as speech is such a powerful means of textual explication). Jacquinot's observations, in any case, suggest that this might be the case.

20. A good point of comparison would be Lucie Česálková's study of teaching film in Czechoslovakia in the interwar period ("Film před tabulí"), which discusses the abovementioned dynamics in great detail. (Unfortunately, an English translation of this work is not yet available.)

21. For a rough definition of 'random access' in what are often called 'hypermedia', see Bolter and Grusin, *Remediation*, 31 (which, in turn, quotes the work of Bob Cotton and Richard Oliver). For an overview of writing on the structural characteristics of 'hypertexts' (and what they entail for the users' reading/experience), see Lister et al., *New Media*, 28-30.

22. Lansink, for instance, testifies that for him, school radio broadcasts functioned as complete 'recorded lessons' – unlike the teaching films which he saw as well. See Lansink, interview with author. With respect to my remark on educational slides, I have to add that the situation would be different again in the case of their combination with *taped* commentaries, that were available as well.

23. As I pointed out earlier, some find the notion of 'textuality' as such problematic in this context. (Compare n. 6.) For more on the subject of computer labs in schools, see for instance Cuban, *Teachers and Machines*, 78 (dealing very specifically with their occurrence in the US).

24. Masson, "Celluloid teaching tools," 398. Based on what I said in the previous chapter, I could add here that also the texts themselves very clearly allude to a pedagogical ideology of 'transfer', and in the process, seek to position their viewers accordingly. Compare chapter 5, n. 8.

25. What *should* have become clear in the course of the past chapters is that the sorts of abilities the texts themselves ask for do not necessarily match the primary sources' assertions about children's 'natural' abilities. One of the reasons for this must have been that NOF employees – and more in particular, those that made/selected the films – were not always convinced of the truthfulness of those claims. Again, this confirms my suspicion that the institute used them primarily as marketing tools.

26. As a matter of fact, Peters (also initiator of NOF's film education programme) already recognised this, and tried to actively exploit the medium's potential to make children more 'film-literate' – albeit of course primarily for the purpose of teaching them the distinction between 'good' quality and 'bad'.

27. For a definition of 'media convergence', see Henry Jenkins, *Convergence Culture: Where Old and New Media Collide* (New York: New York University Press, 2006), 2-3.

APPENDIX:

DVD CONTENTS AND CREDITS

Introductory Note

The DVDs appended to this work contain twelve films from the NOF collection at Nederlands Instituut voor Beeld en Geluid: eight mute titles (marked *), and four with sound (marked †). (Both discs have the same menus, but the mute films can only be played from disc 1; the sound ones are clickable on disc 2.) In addition to this, both DVDs also contain some digitised versions of accompanying instruction booklets, scripts, and other related archive materials. They were compiled in the early stages of my research, and intended primarily for purposes of presentation, and as a teaching aid. Here, they are added for reference and illustration.

In deciding which items to include, I have chosen at the time to respect as much as possible the composition of the NOF collection itself. For instance, the ratios between films with/without sound and the relative proportions in terms of lesson subjects were inspired by those of the corpus represented. In addition to this, access to the films (via four different routes: “Lesson Subject”, “Educational Level”, “Producer” and “Production Date”) is based on information available, respectively, to the collection’s primary users (teachers and school administrators of the 1940s, 1950s and 1960s, through the menu “User Options”) and those with a historical interest (present-day researchers, via “Production Information”). The categories used in headers and menus derive from those same sources. See also the “Justification” page, accessible through the copyright button (©) in the main menu, for more information on my categorisation system.

Careful readers will notice some differences between the dates used in the text of this work, and those attributed to the films on the DVDs. A first reason for this is that the discs do not mention the times of each title’s release, but their (original) production dates. A second reason is that at the time the DVDs were compiled, my information on the topic was still limited. For the most accurate dates, then, I refer to the filmography.

Title List

(See filmography for dates and production details.)

Disc 1

Alle water is geen drinkwater; Giethoorn; De grote karekiet: nestbouw en broedverzorging; In de bruine boon schuilt een plantenleven; Een Japans Gezin; Kaas; Twentse textielindustrie;

Zuiderzeepolders VI: Na 10 jaren arbeid

Disc 2

Antoni van Leeuwenhoek: een film over de ontwikkeling van de microscopie; La Famille Martin II: Départ de grandes vacances (on the disc, wrongly listed as *La Famille Martin I*); *Hansje en de Madurodammers; Het paard*

Synopses of Sound Films (with Dutch/French Commentary)

Antoni van Leeuwenhoek (Dutch voice-over)

The opening sequence of the film shows a group of secondary school pupils on a guided tour of a museum. The commentary voice, supposedly that of the tour guide, relates some facts from the history of lens making. When his story touches upon the exploits of Antoni van Leeuwenhoek, the film changes settings, and turns to a series of enacted scenes from the life of the seventeenth-century amateur-scientist and inventor of microscopic devices. The commentator highlights some of his main discoveries and personal relations, and provides background information on the then state of physical science, the British Royal Society (which the film's subject was a member of), and his international reknown. In the closing scene, the tour guide, back in the exhibition space, briefly discusses the development of microscopy in the centuries that followed Van Leeuwenhoek's death, focusing on the possibilities which it currently provides to natural science.

La Famille Martin II: Départ de grandes vacances (French voice-over)

The film relates the story of the Parisian Martin family (featuring also in parts I and III of the same series) who are leaving for the summer holidays. First, a narrator (re)introduces all the family members, who are shown while packing their belongings. In the following sequences they are seen struggling with the decision of which items to take. As the car is being loaded, it turns out that more has been packed than the vehicle can carry, and father gets angry. In the hush and consternation, the picnic basket is left behind in the street as the car pulls away. In the second half of the film, the family are shown removing a flat tire. While the men are at work, mother and daughter decide to prepare lunch, discovering on this occasion that the basket is missing. The family end up eating in a restaurant, to the merriment of all but father, who, upon reception of the bill, finds the food disappointingly expensive.

Hansje en de Madurodammers (Dutch voice-over)

The sound track of this film consists primarily of a musical score; only at the very beginning, a voice-over can be heard. The narrator here introduces the location where its story is set: Madurodam, a theme park near The Hague with miniature versions of well-known Dutch buildings and sites.

Het paard (Dutch voice-over)

Relating the development of the horse from pre-historic times to the present, the film starts off with an introduction in which so-called 'romantic notions' of 'wildness' are put into perspective. Subsequently, the narrator gives an overview of animals alive today that still

resemble wild horses (their ancestors); graphs and models are used to point out differences and similarities. Next, a long animated sequence illustrates the physical development of the horse to its present-day state and the gradual extension of its habitat throughout history. The film ends with an overview of the ways in which humans have used the animal's strength to make their own lives easier.

Credits

Production: Claudy Op den Kamp (lay-out); Open Studio, Amsterdam.

The DVD was made with the financial help of Nederlands Instituut voor Beeld en Geluid (digitisation of film material) and Utrecht University's Onderzoeksinstituut voor Geschiedenis en Cultuur (DVD production). Many thanks to Jan Pet and Karin Westerink (formerly, Nederlands Instituut voor Beeld en Geluid), Ed van Berkel and Tijs van Ruiten (Nationaal Onderwijs Museum) and Tawnya Mosier.

The films are reproduced by kind permission of Nederlands Instituut voor Beeld en Geluid; copyright remains with the institute.

FILMOGRAPHY

Introductory Note

The films mentioned in the next few pages are those referred to in the main text of this work. For each, I specify the Dutch release title (i.e., the title as it appears on the film print and/or in NOF's publications), followed, in brackets, by an English translation (in italics if I use the official English-language title); production/original release date; production company; NOF release date, if different from the original date; some relevant technical details (M for mute and S for sound; B&W for black-and-white and C for colour); and finally, the catalogue number used by Nederlands Instituut voor Beeld en Geluid (a code that incorporates the reference number introduced by NOF, which also appears in associated archive materials such as teachers' notes and treatments or scripts).

The information given is derived from film and print materials that are currently accessible at Nederlands Instituut voor Beeld en Geluid (Hilversum), Nationaal Onderwijsmuseum (Rotterdam) and Nationaal Archief (The Hague). Due to the fragmentary nature of the sources, it is incomplete. In addition to this, some of the details provided are uncertain – especially dates. In what follows, a year in square brackets usually indicates that it is copied directly from Nederlands Instituut voor Beeld en Geluid's PICA catalogue (without confirmation by any other source). A year without brackets indicates that the archive's records are confirmed by at least one other document; for instance, an NOF catalogue, instruction booklet or annual report. Dates enclosed by square brackets which are also preceded by 'ca.' are reconstructed on the basis of more circumstantial evidence (such as, a reference in a treatment or script; a citation in NOF's newsletter *Mededelingen van de NOF*, or later on, its magazine *Toonbeeld*; the year of an instruction booklet's first imprint or edition). The reason why I have chosen to include such information, even though its status may be uncertain, is that in some cases, the period of time between a film's production and its redistribution by NOF (often in adapted form) is quite extensive – a fact which readers of this work may want to be aware of.

For most of the films which NOF distributed, no crew credits were provided; therefore, they are not mentioned here. Whenever further credits *are* significant to my argument, I mention them in my main text, or in associated footnotes. In the case of children's feature films and documentaries that had a theatrical run before they were rereleased by the institute, I mention the directors' names (preceded by 'dir.') instead of the production companies'. The names of foreign producers are abbreviated as follows:

| | |
|--------|--|
| Basic | Basic Films (UK) |
| EFVA | Educational Foundation for Visual Aids (UK) |
| FWU | Institut für Film und Bild in Wissenschaft und Unterricht (Federal Republic of Germany, from 1950 onwards) |
| MLA | Modern Language Association (UK) |
| Parvis | Les Productions de Parvis (France) |
| RWU | Reichsanstalt für Film und Bild in Wissenschaft und Unterricht (Germany, until the end of the Second World War) |
| SHB | Abteilung Wissenschaftlicher Film der Bundesstaatliche Hauptstelle für Lichtbild und Bildungsfilm, a.k.a. 'Bundesstaatliche Hauptstelle' (Austria) |

Films

Aardewerk (Pottery), [ca. 1949], NOF, n.a. (= not applicable: no alternative release date), M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM066

Aardig knutselwerk (Decent handicraft), n.d. (= date could not be established), RWU, [ca. 1950], M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM530

Alle water is geen drinkwater * (Not all water is drinkable), 1955, NOF, n.a., M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM114

Antoni van Leeuwenhoek: een film over de ontwikkeling van de microscopie † (Antoni van Leeuwenhoek: A film about the development of microscopy), 1959, NOF, n.a., S, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM1019

Auto's aan de lopende band (Cars from the assembly line), [ca. 1952], NOF, n.a., M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM095

Bergstroom, De (The mountain stream), [1952], SHB, 1952, M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM526

Bisschopswijding, De (The ordination of a bishop), [1954], Parvis, [ca. 1955], S, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM1506

Bittervoortje en de mossel, Het (The bitterling and the mussel), [ca. 1947], NOF, n.a., M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM044

Bloembollenteelt (Bulb cultivation), 1943, NOF, n.a., M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM022

Boek II: Het boekbinden, Het (The book II: Bookbinding), [ca. 1947], NOF, n.a., M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM047

Boerenarbeid in Tirol (Farmers' labour in the Tyrol), [1951], FWU, 1951, M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM534

Bos in de Bergen, Het (The wood in the mountains), [1961], Schulfilmzentrale Bern (Switzerland), 1961, S, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM1541

Bruine rat I: in de stad, De (The brown rat I: In the city), 1955, NOF, n.a., M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM116A

- Bruine rat II: op het platteland, De* (The brown rat II: In the countryside), 1955, NOF, n.a., M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM116B
- Bruine rat, De* (The brown rat), 1958, NOF, n.a., S, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM1015
- De Bilt verwacht...* (De Bilt forecasts...), 1959, NOF, n.a., M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM139
- Doornroosje* (Sleeping Beauty), 1943, Gebr. Diehl-Film, 1952, M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM541
- Dorp, Het* (The village), 1956, NOF, n.a., M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM120
- Eekhoortje, Het* (The squirrel), n.d., FWU, 1956, M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM543
- Eeuwig verandert de kust* (The coast forever changes), [1958], EFVA, 1959, S, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM1521
- En de zee was niet meer* [print title; also listed in NOF's publications as: *En de zee was niet meer*] (And there was no more sea), 1955, dir. Bert Haanstra, 1958, S, C, 080NOF/NIAM3004
- Erasmus, stem van de rede* (Erasmus, the voice of reason), 1961, NOF, n.a., S, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM1027
- Familie Martin I: Le retour de Madeleine, La* (The Martin family I: The return of Madeleine), 1948, Basic (for EFVA/MLA), 1959, S, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM1523
- Familie Martin II: Départ de grandes vacances* ², *La* (The Martin family II: Departure for the summer holidays), 1950, Basic (for EFVA/MLA), 1959, S, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM1524
- Familie Martin III: Histoire de poissons, La* (The Martin family III: A story about fish), 1949, Basic (for EFVA/MLA), 1961, S, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM1539
- Filmmontage* (Film editing), [1959], FWU, 1959, S, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM1517
- Friese Weidegebied I: Elf-stedentocht, Het* (The grasslands of Friesland: Elf-stedentocht), 1942, NOF, n.a., M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM007
- Gelaarsde kat, De* (Puss in Boots), 1940, Gebr. Diehl-Film, 1957, M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM551
- Giethoorn ** (Giethoorn), 1942, NOF, n.a., M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM014
- Glas* (Glass), [1943], NOF, n.a., M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM021
- Goed bewaren – geld besparen: een film over het bewaren van levensmiddelen* (Preserve well – save money: A film about the preservation of foods), [ca. 1955], Voorlichtingsbureau van de Voedingsraad with NOF, n.a., S, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM1006
- Goochelaar ontgoocheld, De* (The magician disappointed), 1958, dir. Rupert van der Linden (for NOF), n.a., M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM130
- Groenten voor de grote stad* (Vegetables for the big city), [ca. 1947], NOF, n.a., M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM043
- Grote karekiet: nestbouw en broedverzorging **, *De* (The reed warbler: Nest-building and feeding), 1948, NOF, n.a., M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM038

Hamster, De (The hamster), [ca. 1959], FWU, 1960, M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM560

Handvest van de Verenigde Naties, Het [print title; also listed in NOF's publications as: *Het Handvest: een film van en over de Verenigde Naties*] (The United Nations' Charter), [1960], United Nations Information Service, 1962, S, C, 080NOF/NIAM1548

Hansje en de Madurodammers ² (*Johnny and the Tiny People of Madurodam*), 1958 (the spoken introduction to the sound version of the film was probably inserted at a later date), NOF, n.a., M+S (two versions), B&W, 080NOF/NIAM131 + 080NOF/NIAM1016

Haven en Handel: een film over de functie van de Amsterdamse haven in het international goederenverkeer (Harbour and trade: A film about the function of the Amsterdam harbour in international freight traffic), [ca. 1955], NOF, n.a., M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM117

Helpers in nood (Helpers in times of emergency), [ca. 1948], NOF, n.a., M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM052

Hoe ontstaat een filmscène (The genesis of a film scene), n.d., FWU, [1956], M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM547

Honingbij, De (The honey bee), [1950], Sov-film (USSR), [ca. 1951] (shortened version, complemented with Dutch footage by NOF), M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM532

Hoogovens (Blast-furnaces), [ca. 1951], NOF, n.a., M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM088

Hout (Wood) 1957/1962 (the second is the release date of a new, shortened version containing one extra sequence), NOF, n.a., S, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM1012

Houtskoolbranden (Charcoal burning), 1942, NOF, n.a., M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM004

In de bruine boon schuilt een plantenleven * (Plant life, hidden inside the brown bean), 1955, NOF, n.a., M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM119

Jantje's droom [*sic*, print title; some catalogue entries use the correct spelling, *Jantjes droom*] (*Johnny's Dream*), n.d., Machilsto, 1946 (remake, produced for NOF), M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM035

Japans gezin *, *Een* (A Japanese family), n.d., Audiovision-Belge (Belgium), 1959 (adaptation by NOF and Rijksmuseum voor Volkenkunde), M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM556

Johannes Keppler (Johannes Keppler), [1960], FWU, 1960, S, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM1529

Jonge ooievaars op het nest (Young storks in their nests), n.d., RWU, [ca. 1946], M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM503

(This title belongs to a batch that was acquired by NOF during the Second World War. Although it was first mentioned in one of the institute's 1944 newsletters, it most likely was not actually made available to users until 1946.)

Kaas * (Cheese), 1943, NOF, n.a., M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM018

Kaas (Cheese), 1960, NOF, n.a., S, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM1025

Kabouters en elfjes (Goblins and elves), [ca. 1947], Machilsto (for NOF), 1948, M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM055

Kamsalamander, De (The crested newt), 1949, NOF, n.a., M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM063

- Kapmeeuw, De* (The black-headed gull), 1947, NOF, n.a., M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM029
- Kasteel, Het* (The castle), 1959, NOF with FWU, n.a., M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM132
- Kersen* (Cherries), 1943, NOF, n.a., M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM028
- Kieviet, De* (The lapwing), 1942, NOF, n.a., M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM015
- Klipvisdrogerij op IJsland, Een* (A cod drying workshop on Iceland), [before 1943], RWU, [ca. 1946], M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM513
(This title belongs to a batch that was acquired by NOF during the Second World War. Although it was first mentioned in one of the institute's 1944 newsletters, it most likely was not actually made available to users until 1946.)
- Koeien op stal* (Cows in the shed), 1942, NOF, n.a., M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM008
- Kruisspin, De* (The garden spider), [ca. 1960], FWU, 1961, S, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM1536
- Kust van Nederland I: de duinen, De* (The coast of Holland I: The dunes), 1957, NOF, n.a., S, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM1013
- Langoor gaat op stap* (Long-Ears goes for a walk), 1952, NOF, n.a., M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM097
- Leger van gehouwen steen, Een* (An army cut in stone), 1957, dir. Theo van Haren Noman, 1958, S, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM3002
- Maarten Luther (Martin Luther)*, 1953, dir. Irving Pichel, 1959 (German, shortened version), S, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM1520
- Marker vissers* (Fishermen in Marken), 1947, NOF, n.a., M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM050
- Minimale modeshow* (Minimal fashion show), n.d., Triofilm, 1959, M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM555
- Moskou* (Moscow), [1956], FWU (adapted from a Russian original, intended for the German market), 1962, M, C, 080NOF/NIAM577
- Natte broek in Waterland, Een* (Wet trousers in Waterland), 1956, NOF, n.a., M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM122
- Niek zoekt werk op kantoor* (Nick applies for an office job), [ca. 1947], NOF, n.a., M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM039
- Oerwoudverkenners in Suriname* (Jungle explorers in Surinam), [1948] (release date of what is most likely the original, entitled *Wakaboen*), [dir. P. H. Creutzberg], [ca. 1950], M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM528
- Oesterteelt* (Oyster culture), 1950 (release date of the original, entitled *Imperialen ooooo*), dir. P. H. Creutzberg and NOF (adaptation), [ca. 1952], M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM536
- Ontginning in de Peel* (Development in the Peel), [ca. 1951], NOF, n.a., M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM083
- Ontstaan van ijsbergen aan de kust van Groenland, Het* (The development of icebergs on the coast of Greenland), [before 1943], RWU, [ca. 1946], M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM519
(This title belongs to a batch that was acquired by NOF during the Second World War. Although it was first mentioned in one of the institute's 1944 newsletters, it most likely was not actually made

available to users until 1946.)

Onze grote rivieren I: Steenkool vervoer [*sic*, print title; teachers' notes and catalogues use the correct spelling for the subtitle: *Steenkoolvervoer*] (Our major rivers: Coal transportation), [ca. 1951], NOF, n.a., M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM091

Onze tanden (Our teeth), [ca. 1956], NOF, n.a., M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM118

Ooievaars (Storks), n.d., FWU, 1963, S, C, 080NOF/NIAM1596

Paard [†], Het (The horse), 1950, Defa-Kulturfilm, [ca. 1959], S, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM1518

Paasfeest in Twente (Easter celebrations in Twente), 1952, NOF, n.a., M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM096

Paaswake, De (Easter wake), [1954], Parvis, [ca. 1955], S, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM1503

Papierbereiding: Oudhollands papier (Paper manufacture: Old Dutch paper), 1942, NOF, n.a., M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM013

Piccolo, Saxo en Compagnie (Piccolo, Saxo and Company), 1960, Joop Geesink/Dollywood (for Philips), 1963, S, C, 080NOF/NIAM3099

Polderland (Polder land), 1947, NOF, n.a., M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM053

Radio ontdekt de ruimte (*Mirror in the Sky: The Story of Appleton and the Ionosphere*), 1956, EFVA, 1959, S, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM1525

Rembrandt, schilder van de mens (*Rembrandt, Painter of Man*), 1957, dir. Bert Haanstra, 1958, S, C, 080NOF/NIAM3003

Rode ballon, De (The Red Balloon), 1956, dir. Albert Lamorisse, [1960], S, C, 080NOF/NIAM3023 (This title, a non-teaching film, was distributed by NOF, but was not mentioned in its official catalogues, because the institute did not own very many copies. The cost of prints included a license fee, which made the film more expensive to distribute than most of the other titles it had on file; therefore, only a couple had been acquired. Information obtained from H. J. L. Jongbloed, in an interview with Ed van Berkel, conducted on 21 July 2008.)

Ruwe planken (*Timber*), [ca. 1947], NOF, n.a., M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM041

S.L.O.: een film over een schooldag voor de lichamelijke opvoeding en wat daaraan vooraf gaat (S.P.E. [Sports Day Primary Education]: A film about a school day for physical education and what precedes it; abbreviated in main text as: 'Sports day in school'), 1957, NOF, n.a., M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM124

Schoolreis, De (The school trip), 1949, NOF, n.a., M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM072

Schoolzwemmen (Swimming in school), 1953, NOF, n.a., M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM103

Sollicite(e)ren I: jongens [the spelling of the catalogue title varies according to the edition] (Applying for a job I: Boys), [ca. 1940], Schoevers Instituut, [1942], M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM030

Sollicite(e)ren II: meisjes [the spelling of the catalogue title varies according to the edition] (Applying for a job II: Girls), [ca. 1940], Schoevers Instituut, [1942], M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM031

Spinnen en weven (Spinning and weaving), 1947, NOF, n.a., M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM051

- Spreeuw, De* (The starling), 1950, NOF, n.a., M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM081
- Stad, hart van de ommelanden, De* (The city, heart of its environs), 1959, NOF, n.a., M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM133
- Sterren en Sterrensystemen (Stars and Stellar Systems)*, n.d., FWU, 1962, S, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM1545
- Strokarton* (Strawboard), [ca. 1946], NOF, n.a., M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM036
- Suikerfabriek* (Sugar factory), [ca. 1944], NOF, n.a., M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM012
- Thailand* (Thailand), n.d., Centre Audio-Visuel (country could not be established), 1960, M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM563
- Tijdperk ging voorbij, Een* (An era went by), 1959, NOF, n.a., M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM134
- Tik van de mode?, Een* (Cracked by fashion?), n.d., FWU, 1962, S, C, 080NOF/NIAM1551
- Transmutatie der atomen* (The transmutation of atoms), [ca. 1948], NOF, n.a., M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM056
- Turf: Laagveen* (Peat: The low fens), 1944, NOF, n.a., M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM017
- Twentse textielindustrie ** (Textile industry in Twente), 1949, NOF, n.a., M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM070
- Van ei tot kraanvogel* (From egg to crane), [1960], Artis, 1961, S, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM1543
- Van koren tot brood* (Corn to bread), 1942, NOF, n.a., M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM010
- Van tuin naar tafel* (From garden to table), [ca. 1953], Voorlichtingsbureau van de Voedingsraad with NOF, n.a., S, C, 080NOF/NIAM1001
- Variaties op een filmthema* (Variations on a film theme), [1959], FWU, 1959, S, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM1516
- Veilig fietsen* (Safe cycling), [ca. 1954], NOF, n.a., M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM110
- Veluwe I: Zand en Heide* (Veluwe I: Sand and heath), 1942, NOF, n.a., M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM001
- Venetië* (Venice), n.d., SHB, [ca. 1952], M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM535
- Verkiezingen voor de Tweede Kamer* (Elections for the Lower House), 1957, NOF, n.a., M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM126
- Vlasbewerking* (Flax processing), 1950, NOF, n.a., M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM076
- Vondel, het leven van een groot Nederlander* (Vondel, the life of a great Dutchman), 1955, NOF, n.a., S, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM1003 (also 080NOF/NIAM1004)
- Vrachtvervoer over de weg* (Freight traffic by road), [ca. 1953], NOF, n.a., M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM105
- Vrolijke kadotter in huis, Een* (A jolly starling in the house), 1959, NOF, n.a., M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM138
- Vuilnis van een grote stad* (Waste of a big city), 1943, NOF, n.a., M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM023
- Walvisvaart* (Whale fishing), n.d., RWU (footage shot by the Dutch company Polygoon-Profliti,

re-edited by RWU), [ca. 1956], M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM548

Wasserij (Laundry), [ca. 1951], NOF, n.a., M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM079

Wens verhoord binnen 24 uur: de post, Een (A wish granted within 24 hours: The mail), 1953, NOF, n.a., M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM100

Wij bouwen woningen (We build houses), 1949, NOF, n.a., M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM069

Wolf en de zeven geitjes, De (The Wolf and the Seven Little Goats), 1939, Gebr. Diehl-Film, 1955, M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM545

Zoetwatervisserij (Freshwater fishing), 1942, NOF, n.a., M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM011

Zuiderzeepolders I: Het ontstaan van een polder (Zuyder Zee polders I: The genesis of a polder), 1959, NOF, n.a., M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM135

*Zuiderzeepolders VI: Na 10 jaren arbeid ** (Zuyder Zee polders VI: After 10 years of labour), [ca. 1944], NOF, n.a., M, B&W, 080NOF/NIAM033

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Archival Collections

Archive of the 'Stichting Nederlandse Onderwijs Film'. Nationaal Archief [Dutch National Archives], The Hague, the Netherlands. (Foundation documents, minutes and reports, institutional memos, notes prepared for the post-war *zuiveringscommissie*, NOF-leaflets and -brochures.)

NOF archive. Nationaal Onderwijs Museum, Rotterdam, the Netherlands. (Teachers' notes, newsletters, production papers, catalogues, annual reports.)

Note on the Collection at Nationaal Archief

Most of the items in the NOF collection at Nationaal Archief that date from the period up to 1946 were drawn up by A. A. Schoevers (the foundation's first director) or one of his close collaborators. In my notes, however, I only mention his name if authorship of a document can be established on the basis of the papers themselves.

Since the time of my archival research, the collection has been reorganised. As a result, the codes with which I refer to specific documents' locations are no longer valid. In this work, I use the inventory numbers linked to the collection's former access number, 2.19.042.55. The new number by which the papers can be accessed is 2.14.69; a conversion table is available from archive personnel. In the process of reorganisation, some documents have also been removed from (the public part of) the collection, either because they were considered too brittle to handle, or because they duplicated other items (in which case they have been destroyed). As a result, not all of the documents which I reference here may be traceable. In some cases, interested parties may have to rely on different versions of the same items (versions which possibly do not contain the annotations which I used for establishing the dates of their production).

Note on Reference System

References to the NOF collection at Nationaal Archief are formatted according to the archive's own requirements. References to teachers' notes and production papers are generally very concise, as authorship and production date can rarely be established. (Variations in content in different imprints or editions are rarely relevant to my argument, and are only mentioned in exceptional cases.) For newsletters, catalogues and annual reports, see the "Newspapers and Periodicals" and "Primary Sources" sections of this bibliography.

Periodicals

NOF Magazines

Mededelingen van de Stichting Nederlandse Onderwijs Film (at first entitled *Mededeling van de stichting "Nederlandsche Onderwijs Film" te 's Gravenhage, ten behoeve van hen, die gebruik maken van onze projectoren en films*, or a variation thereof; shortened in notes as *Mededelingen van de NOF*), nos. 1-[31] ([1942]-March 1952); no. 1 ([Spring] 1953); nos. 1-2 (1954); nos. 1-2 (1955); nos. 1-2 (1956); nos. 1-2 (1957); no. 1 (September 1958); vols. 1-2 (1958-1959)

Toonbeeld: uitgave van de Stichting Nederlandse Onderwijs Film, vol. 2, nos. 3-4 (1960); vol. 3, nos. 1-4 (1960-1961); vol. 4, nos. 1-3 (1961-1962); vol. 5, nos. 1-3 (1962-1963); vol. 6, nos. 1-3 (1963-1964)

Pedagogical Journals and Teachers' (Union) Magazines

De Bode: Orgaan van de "Bond van Nederlandsche Onderwijzers" (subtitle also *Orgaan van de "Bond van Nederl. Onderwijzers"*; shortened in notes as *Bode*), vols. 32-33 (1921) and 51-54 (1939-1942)

Christelijk Schoolblad: Onze Vacatures (shortened in notes as *Christelijk Schoolblad*), vols. 14 (1920-1921), 33-40 (1939-1948), 46 (1954-1955) and 51 (1959-1960)

Het Katholieke Schoolblad: Orgaan van het K.O.V. – Katholieke Onderwijzersverbond in Nederland (shortened in notes as *Katholieke Schoolblad*), vols. 5 (1938-39), 8 (1941-1942 + 1945-1946), 11-12 (1948-1950), 18 (1955) and 23 (1960)

Onderwijs en opvoeding: uitgave Nederl. Onderwijzersvereniging (shortened in notes as *Onderwijs en Opvoeding*), vols. 1-2 (1948-1949) and 1-6 (second series, 1950-1955)

Het Schoolblad: Orgaan van de Nederlandse Onderwijzers Vereniging (subtitle also *Orgaan van de Nederlandse Onderwijzersvereniging*; shortened in notes as *Schoolblad*), vols. 1-5 (1946-1950), 10 (1955) and 15 (1960)

Volksontwikkeling: Maandblad uitgegeven door het Nutsinstituut voor Volksontwikkeling (shortened in notes as *Volksontwikkeling*), vols. 2-3 (1921-1923)

Amateur Film and Film Education Magazines

Documentatie Film en Jeugd, vol. 5 (1953)

Lichtbeeld en Cultuur: Mededeelingen van de Ned. Vereeniging voor Cultureele films (subtitle also *Maandblad van de Nederl. Vere(en)iging voor Culture(e)le films*; as of July 1935: *Officiëel orgaan van de Nederlandsche Vereeniging voor Cultureele Films*; shortened in notes as *Lichtbeeld en Cultuur*), vols. 12-13 and vols. 13 (second series)-18 (1934-1941)

Het Veerwerk: Maandblad voor smalfilmers; Officieel Orgaan der Nederlandse Smalfilmliiga (first subtitle also *Smalfilm-tijdschrift*; shortened in notes as *Veerwerk*), vols. 15-17 (1948-1950)

Other Periodicals

TIME Magazine, vol. 14 (1929)

Note on Reference System

Precise references to articles in the above periodicals appear only in the notes. NOF's newsletter (*Mededelingen van de NOF*) is normally referenced by date; if the time of its release can only be established by conjecture, an issue number is mentioned as well.

Databases

Statline (database of Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek). <http://statline.cbs.nl/StatWeb/default.aspx>.

References: Primary Sources

Aarts, J. F. M. C. *Uit de school der historie: Leerboek der historische paedagogiek voor hoofdactecandidaten*. 's Hertogenbosch: Malmberg, 1948.

Educational Foundation for Visual Aids. *16mm Films in the National Audio-Visual Aids Library: A Subject Catalogue*. London: EFVA, 1976.

Bastiaans, Th. J. "Onderwijskundige innovatie: Down to Earth; Over realistische elektronische ondersteuning bij leren en instructie." Inaugural lecture, Open Universiteit Nederland, 2007. http://www.ou.nl/Docs/Expertise/RdMC/Publicaties%202007/oratie_Theo_Bastiaens_web.pdf.

Beeksma, Jetske, with Arno van der Hulst. *Games – Meer dan spelen: ICT verkenningen voor het onderwijs*. Zoetermeer: Stichting Kennisnet, 2005. http://corporate.kennisnet.nl/attachments/session=cloud_mmbase+328863/Publicatie_Games_web.pdf.

Benjamin, Walter. "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction." In *Illuminations*. 1955. Edition by Hannah Arendt, translated by Harry Zorn, 211-235. London, Pimlico, 1999.

Bertina, B. J. *De film een gevaar? Een pleidooi voor film-onderwijs op de school en voor het vertonen van speelfilms in de klas*. Vol. 6, *Projectareeks*. The Hague: Landelijk Bureau van de Katholieke Film Actie, 1956.

Bessou, Auguste. "Le Cinématographe et l'Enseignement Primaire." In *Hommage à Louis Lumière*, edited by A. Bruneau, no page numbers. Paris: Musée Galliera, 1935.

Buchanan, Andrew. *The Film in Education*. London: Phoenix House, 1951.

Cameron, A. C. "The Film in National Life: being the report of an enquiry conducted by the Commission on Educational and Cultural Films into the service which the cinema may render to education and social progress." London: Allen and Unwin, 1932.

Coissac, G.-Michel. *Le Cinémathographe et l'Enseignement*. Paris: Larousse / Éditions du Cinéopse, 1926.

———. *Histoire du Cinématographe: De ses origines jusqu'à nos jours*. Paris: Éditions du Cinéopse / Gauthier-Villars, 1925.

Dirkse, Jac. *Opvoeding tot de film: een beknopte oriëntatie voor opvoeders*. Vol. 10, *Projectareeks*.

- The Hague: Landelijk Bureau van de Katholieke Film Actie, [1960].
- Board of Education. *Handbook of Suggestions for the consideration of teachers and others concerned in the work of public elementary schools*. London: HMSO, 1937.
- Elliott, Godfrey M. "The Genesis of the Educational Film." In *Film and Education: A Symposium on the Role of the Film in the Field of Education*, 3-19. New York: Philosophical Library, 1948.
- Stichting Nederlandse Onderwijs Film. *Catalogus*. The Hague: Stichting Nederlandse Onderwijs Film, 1953.
- . *Jaarverslag 1947*. The Hague: NOF, 1947.
- . *Jaarverslag 1954*. The Hague: NOF, 1955.
- . *Jaarverslag 1958*. The Hague: NOF, 1959.
- . *Nederlandse Onderwijs-Film Catalogus*. The Hague: NOF, 1953.
- George, W. H. *The Cinema in School*. London: Isaac Pitman, 1935.
- Hoban, Charles F. *Movies That Teach*. New York: Dryden, 1946.
- Jackson, Philip W. *The Teacher and the Machine*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1968.
- Kalbus, Oskar. "Der Steinachfilm." *montage/av: Zeitschrift für Theorie & Geschichte audiovisueller Kommunikation* 14, no. 1 (2005): 101-5. Originally published in E. Beyfuss and A. Kossowsky, ed., *Das Kulturfilmbuch* (Berlin: Chryselius and Schultz, 1924).
- Kohnstamm, Ph. A. "Aanschouwing en abstractie als momenten van 'leren denken'." In *Keur uit het didactisch werk van Prof. Dr. Ph. Kohnstamm*, 32-48. Groningen: Wolters, 1948.
- Korte, D. A. de. *Televisie bij onderwijs en opleiding: Van toverlantaarn tot televisie-ontvanger; Een overzicht van de ontwikkeling en toepassingsmogelijkheden van televisie*. Amsterdam: Agon / Brussel: Elsevier, 1964.
- Kracauer, Siegfried. "Photography." In *The Mass Ornament: Weimar Essays*. 1963. Edition prepared and translated by Thomas Y. Levin, 47-63. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1995.
- . *Theory of Film: The Redemption of Physical Reality*. 1960. Reprint edition, with an introduction by Miriam Bratu Hansen. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997.
- Lapierre, Marcel. *Les cent visages du cinéma*. Paris: Grasset, 1948.
- Marchant, James. "The Cinema in Education: being the report of the psychological investigation conducted by special subcommittees appointed by the Cinema Commission of Enquiry established by the National Council of Public Morals." London: Allen and Unwin, 1925.
- Matuszewski, Boleslas. "Une Nouvelle Source de l'Histoire (Création d'un Dépôt de Cinématographie Historique)." In *Écrits cinématographiques*, a facsimile of the first edition of two of his works, edited by Magdalena Mazaraki. Paris: AFRHC / La Cinémathèque française, 2006. Originally published in *Le Figaro*, 25 March 1898. English translation quoted, by Julia Bloch Frey, available online from <http://www>

- .latrobe.edu.au/screeningthepast/classics/clasjul/mat.html.
- McClusky, F. Dean. "The Nature of the Educational Film." In *Film and Education: A Symposium on the Role of the Film in the Field of Education*, edited by Godfrey M. Elliott. New York: Philosophical Library, 1948.
- Meulen, J. J. van der. *Film en lichtbeeld bij het onderwijs: Een praktisch-didactische handleiding*. Baarn: Bosch en Keuning, [1951].
- Moussinac, Léon. *Naissance du cinéma*. Paris: J. Povolozky, 1925.
- Ochse, B. D. *De Film ten dienste van Onderwijs en Volksontwikkeling*. Haarlem: Filmfabriek Polygoon, [1926].
- Oppenheimer, Todd. "The Computer Delusion." *The Atlantic Monthly*, July 1997, 45-62. <http://www.tnellen.com/ted/tc/computer.htm>.
- Ottley, D. Charles. *The Cinema in Education*. London: Routledge, 1935.
- Painlevé, Jean. "Préface." In *Le Cinéma scientifique français*, edited by P. Thévenard and G. Tassel, vii-ix. Paris: La Jeune Parque, 1948.
- PEP (Political and Economic Planning). *The Factual Film: A Survey sponsored by the Dartington Hall Trustees*. London: Oxford University Press on behalf of The Arts Enquiry, 1947.
- Peters, Jan Marie L. "De dubbele betekenis van de film voor het onderwijs: De noodzaak van een didactiek van het zien." *Paedagogische Studiën: Maandblad voor Onderwijs en Opvoeding* 31, no. [6] (1954): 169-83.
- . "De taal van de film: Een linguïstisch-psychologisch onderzoek naar de aard en de betekenis van het expressiemiddel film." PhD dissertation, Katholieke Universiteit Nijmegen, 1950.
- . *Visueel onderwijs: Over de grondslagen van het gebruik van de film en de filmstrip in het onderwijs*. 2nd ed. (with a new introduction and bibliography). Purmerend: Muusses, 1955.
- Révész, G., and J. F. Hazewinkel. "Over de didactische waarde van de projectielantaarn en de bioscoop." *Paedagogische Studiën: Driemaandelijksch tijdschrift voor paedagogiek en methodiek* 4, no. [2] (1923): 33-67.
- [Schreuder, C.]. *Het paedagogisch en didactisch gebruik van de film bij het lager onderwijs: Leidraad voor kwekelingen*. Rev. ed. The Hague: Stichting Nederlandse Onderwijs Film, 1948.
- Smeelen, J. W. *De Schoolbioscoop onmisbaar??* Opvoedkundige Brochurenreeks. Tilburg: Drukkerij van Het RK Jongensweeshuis, 1928.
- Staveren, David van. *De Bioscoop en het Onderwijs*. Leiden: Slijthoff, 1919.
- Stokvis, Simon B. *Het Amsterdamsche schoolkind en de bioscoop*. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 1913.
- Wise, Harry Arthur. *Motion Pictures As an Aid In Teaching American History*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1939.

References: Secondary Sources

- Allen, Robert C. "Audience-Oriented Criticism and Television." In *Channels of Discourse, Reassembled: Television and Contemporary Criticism*, 101-37. 2nd ed. London: Routledge, 1992.
- . "From exhibition to reception: reflections on the audience in film history." *Screen* 31, no. 4 (1990): 347-56.
- . "The place of space in film historiography." *Tijdschrift voor Mediageschiedenis* 9, no. 2 (2006): 15-27.
- Althusser, Louis. *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*. Translated by Ben Brewster. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1971. <http://www.marx2mao.com/Other/LPOE7oNB.html>.
- Amad, Paula. "Cinema's 'sanctuary': From pre-documentary to documentary film in Albert Kahn's *Archives de la Planète* (1908-1931)." *Film History: An International Journal* 13, no. 2 (2001): 138-59.
- Aubert, Michelle, Patrice Delavie, Pierrette Lemoigne, and Robert Poupard. "Les collections des films pédagogiques et scientifiques des premiers temps (1910-1955)." In *Cinéma pédagogique et scientifique: À la redécouverte des archives*, edited by Béatrice de Pastre-Robert, Monique Dubost and Françoise Massit-Folléa, 23-37. Paris: ENS Éditions, 2004.
- Austin, J. L. *How to Do Things with Words: The William James Lectures delivered at Harvard University in 1955*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962.
- Bal, Mieke, ed., with the assistance of Bryan Gonzales. *The Practice of Cultural Analysis: Exposing Interdisciplinary Interpretation*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999.
- . *Travelling Concepts in the Humanities: A Rough Guide*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002.
- Bank, Jan. "Televisie verenigt en verdeelt Nederland." In *Omroep in Nederland: Vijfenzeventig jaar medium en maatschappij, 1919-1994*, edited by Huub Wijfjes, 77-103. Zwolle: Waanders, 1994.
- Baptista, Tiago. "'Il faut voir le maître': A Recent Restoration of Surgical Films by E.-L. Doyen (1859-1916)." *Journal of Film Preservation*, no. 70 (2005): 42-50.
- Barthes, Roland. "Retorique de l'image." *Communications*, no. 4 (1964): 40-51.
- . *S/Z*. 1973. Edition translated by Richard Miller, with a preface by Richard Howard. London: Blackwell, 1992.
- Baudry, Jean-Louis. "The Apparatus: Metapsychological Approaches to the Impression of Reality in Cinema." In *Film Theory and Criticism: Introductory Readings*, edited by Leo Braudy and Marshall Cohen. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999. Originally published (in French) in *Communications*, no. 23 (1975).
- Bausinger, Hermann. "Media, technology and daily life." *Media, Culture & Society* 6, no. 4 (1984): 343-51.

- Behrens, Laurence. "The Argument in Film: Applying Rhetorical Theory to Film Criticism." *Journal of the University Film Association* 31, no. 3 (1979): 3-11.
- Benveniste, Émile. *Problèmes de linguistique générale*. 2 vols. Paris: Gallimard, 1966-1974.
- Bergala, Alain. "De identificatie van de filmtoeschouwer." Pt. 1. *Versus: kwartaalschrift voor film en opvoeringskunsten*, no. 1 (1992): 82-105. Section from an original contribution (in French) to Jacques Aumont, Alain Bergala, Michel Marie and Marc Vernet, *L'esthétique du film* (Paris: Nathan, 1983).
- Boekholt, P. Th. F. M. *Het ongeregelde verleden: Over eenheid en verscheidenheid in het Nederlandse onderwijs*. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1998.
- Bolter, Jay David, and Richard Grusin. *Remediation: Understanding New Media*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1999.
- Booth, Wayne C. *The Rhetoric of Fiction*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- Bordwell, David. *Narration in the Fiction Film*. London: Methuen, 1985.
- Bordwell, David, and Kristin Thompson. *Film Art: An Introduction*. 5th ed. New York: McGraw Hill, 1997.
- Braun, Marta, and Charlie Keil. "'As pleasing as it is incomprehensible': film catalogues as paratext." In *Networks of Entertainment: Early Film Distribution, 1895-1915*, edited by Frank Kessler and Nanna Verhoeff, 218-22. Eastleigh, UK: Libbey, 2007.
- Brooker, Jeremy. "The Polytechnic Ghost: Pepper's Ghost, Metempsychosis and the Magic Lantern at the Royal Polytechnic Institution." *Early Popular Visual Culture* 5, no. 2 (2007): 189-206.
- Brooks, Peter. *Reading for the Plot: Design and Intention in Narrative*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1984.
- Browne, Nick. "The Spectator-in-the-Text: The Rhetoric of Stagecoach." In *Film Theory and Criticism: Introductory Readings*. 4th ed. Edited by Gerald Mast, Marshall Cohen and Leo Braudy, 210-25. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992. Originally published in *Film Quarterly* 34, no. 2 (1975).
- Bukatman, Scott. "Spectacle, Attractions and Visual Pleasure." In *The Cinema of Attractions Reloaded*, edited by Wanda Strauven, 71-82. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2006.
- Burke, Kenneth. *A Grammar of Motives, and A Rhetoric of Motives*. Cleveland: World Publishing Company, 1962. Combined reprint edition of *A Grammar of Motives* (1945) and *A Rhetoric of Motives* (1950).
- Carroll, Noël. "From Real to Reel: Entangled in Nonfiction Film." Chapter 15 of *Theorizing the Moving Image*, 224-52. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Česálková, Lucie. "Film před tabulí: Idea školního filmu v prvorepublikovém Československu" [Blackboard film: The idea of school film in the First Czechoslovak Republic]. PhD

- dissertation, Masarykova univerzita, 2009. http://is.muni.cz/th/64587/ff_d/LC_DISERTACE_fin.pdf.
- Chartier, Anne-Marie. "Un dispositif sans auteur: cahiers et classeurs à l'école primaire." In *Le Dispositif: Entre usage et concept*, edited by Geneviève Jacquinot-Delaunay and Laurence Monnoyer, 207-18. Paris: CNRS Editions, 1999.
- Chatman, Seymour. *Coming to Terms: The Rhetoric of Narrative in Fiction and Film*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1990.
- . *Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1978.
- Cosandey, Roland. "Some thoughts on 'early documentary'." In *Uncharted Territory. Essays on early nonfiction film*, edited by Daan Hertogs and Nico de Klerk, 37-50. Amsterdam: Nederlands Filmmuseum, 1997.
- Cowlshaw, Brian T. "The reader's role in Ring Lardner's rhetoric." *Studies in Short Fiction* 31, no. 2 (1994): 207-16.
- Cuban, Larry. *How Teachers Taught: Constancy and Change in American Classrooms, 1880-1990*. 2nd ed. New York: Teachers College Press, 1993.
- . *Teachers and Machines: The Classroom Use of Technology Since 1920*. New York: Teachers College Press, 1986.
- Culler, Jonathan D. *Framing the Sign: Criticism and Its Institutions*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1988.
- . "Philosophy and Literature: The Fortunes of the Performative." *Poetics Today* 21, no. 3 (2000): 503-19.
- Curtis, Scott. "Die Kinematographische Methode: Das 'Bewegte Bild' und die Brownsche Bewegung." *montage/AV: Zeitschrift für Theorie & Geschichte audiovisueller Kommunikation* 14, no. 2 (2005): 23-43.
- Dällenbach, Lucien. *Le Récit spéculaire: essai sur la mise en abyme*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1977.
- . "Reflexivity and Reading." *New Literary History: A Journal of Theory and Interpretation* 11, no. 3 (1980): 435-49.
- Depaepe, Marc, and Bregt Henkens. "The History of Education and the Challenge of the Visual." *Paedagogica Historica: International Journal of the History of Education*, n. s., 36, no. 1 (2000): 11-17.
- Depaepe, Marc, Frank Simon, and Angelo Van Gorp. "The Canonization of Ovide Decroly as a 'Saint' of the New Education." *History of Education Quarterly* 43, no. 2 (2003): 224-49.
- Derrida, Jacques. *The Truth in Painting*. Translated by Geoff Bennington and Ian McLeod. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987.
- Dibbets, Karel. "Het taboe van de Nederlandse filmcultuur: neutraal in een verzuild land." *Tijdschrift voor Mediageschiedenis* 9, no. 2 (2006): 46-64.

- Dietrich, Daniela, Herbert Gehr, and Christine Kopf. *Mecki, Märchen und Schnurren: Die Puppenfilme der Gebrüder Diehl*. Frankfurt am Main: Adolf und Luisa Haeuser-Stiftung für Kunst und Kulturpflege / Deutsches Filmmuseum, 1994.
- Dijck, José van. "Door het oog van de chirurg: Medische films en televisieprogramma's." *Tijdschrift voor Mediageschiedenis* 3, no. 1 (2000): 73-94.
- . *Het transparante lichaam: Medische visualisering in media en cultuur*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2001.
- Doane, Mary Ann. *The Emergence of Cinematic Time: Modernity, Contingency, the Archive*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002.
- Drevon, André. "Les Travaux de Georges Demeny." In *Le Cinéma et la Science*, edited by Alexis Martinet, 48-61. Paris: CNRS Editions, 1994.
- Drewniak, Bugoslaw. *Der Deutsche Film 1938-1945: ein Gesamtüberblick*. Düsseldorf: Droste Verlag, 1987.
- Dubreucq, Francine. "Jean-Ovide Decroly (1971-1932)." *Prospects: Quarterly Review of Comparative Education* 23, no. 1/2 (1993): 249-75.
- Duro, Paul, ed. *The Rhetoric of the Frame: Essays on the Boundaries of the Artwork*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Eco, Umberto. *The Role of the Reader: Explorations in the Semiotics of Texts*. Bloomington, IN: University of Indiana Press, 1979.
- Eitzen, Dirk. "When is a Documentary?: Documentary as a Mode of Reception." *Cinema Journal: The Journal of the Society for Cinema and Media Studies* 35, no. 1 (1995): 81-102.
- Elsaesser, Thomas. "Archives and Archaeologies: The Place of Non-Fiction Film in Contemporary Media." In *Films that Work: Industrial Film and the Productivity of Media*, edited by Vinzenz Hediger and Patrick Vonderau, 19-34. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2007.
- Esquenazi, Jean-Pierre. "L'effet 'film de famille'." In *Le film de famille: usage privé, usage public*, edited by Roger Odin, 207-24. Paris: Méridiens Klincksieck, 1995.
- Ewert, Malte. *Die Reichsanstalt für Film und Bild in Wissenschaft und Unterricht (1934-1945)*. Hamburg: Verlag Dr. Kovac, 1998.
- Fiske, John. *Television Culture*. London: Methuen, 1987.
- Foss, Sonja K., Karen A. Foss, and Robert Trapp. *Contemporary Perspectives on Rhetoric*. 3rd ed. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland, 2002.
- Gaudreault, André. *Du Littéraire au Filmique: Système du Récit*. Paris: Méridiens Klincksieck, 1988.
- Gaudreault, André, and Tom Gunning. "Early Cinema as a Challenge to Film History." In *The Cinema of Attractions Reloaded*, edited by Wanda Strauven, 365-80. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2006. Originally published (in French) in Jacques Aumont, André Gaudreault and Michel Marie, ed., *Histoire du Cinéma: Nouvelles Approches*

(Paris: Sorbonne, 1989).

Gaudreault, André, and François Jost. "Enunciation and Narration." In *A Companion to Film Theory*, edited by Robert Stam and Toby Miller, 45-63. Oxford: Blackwell, 1999.

Gauthier, Christophe. "Au risque du spectacle: Les projections cinématographiques en milieu scolaire dans les années 1920." In *Cinéma pédagogique et scientifique: À la redécouverte des archives*, edited by Béatrice de Pastre-Robert, Monique Dubost and Françoise Massit-Folléa, 73-98. Paris: ENS Éditions, 2004.

Gaycken, Oliver. "'A Drama Unites Them in a Fight to the Death': some remarks on the flourishing of a cinema of scientific vernacularization in France, 1909-1914." *Historical Journal of Film, Radio and Television: The Journal of the International Association for Media and History* 22, no. 3 (2002): 353-74.

———. "Das Privatleben des 'Scorpion Languedocien': Ethologie und *L'Age D'or* (1930)." *montage/AV: Zeitschrift für Theorie & Geschichte audiovisueller Kommunikation* 14, no. 2 (2005): 44-51.

Genette, Gérard. *Figures*. 3 vols. Paris: Seuil, 1966-1970.

Gertiser, Anita. "Domestizierung des bewegten Bildes: Vom dokumentarischen Film zum Lehrmedium." *montage/AV: Zeitschrift für Theorie & Geschichte audiovisueller Kommunikation* 15, no. 1 (2006): 58-73.

Goetsch, Paul. "Reader Figures in Narrative." *Style* 38, no. 2 (2004): 188-202.

Goodlad, John I. *A Place Called School: Prospects for the Future*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1983.

Gout, F.P., and A. Metz. *Waarde luisteraars! De RVU en haar plaats in twee eeuwen volwassenenvorming en maatschappijgeschiedenis*. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1985.

Griffiths, Alison. "Ethnographic films." In *Encyclopedia of Early Cinema*, edited by Richard Abel, 221-22. London: Routledge, 2005.

Grunder, Hans-Ulrich. "Die Verteufelung des Bildes in der Geschichte der Pädagogik." *Paedagogica Historica: International Journal of the History of Education*, n. s., 36, no. 1 (2000): 53-71.

Gunning, Tom. "Attractions: How They Came into the World." In *The Cinema of Attractions Reloaded*, edited by Wanda Strauven, 31-39. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2006.

———. "Before Documentary: Early nonfiction films and the 'view' aesthetic." In *Uncharted Territory. Essays on early nonfiction film*, edited by Daan Hertogs and Nico de Klerk, 9-24. Amsterdam: Nederlands Filmmuseum, 1997.

———. "Cinema of attractions." In *Encyclopedia of Early Cinema*, edited by Richard Abel, 124-27. London: Routledge, 2005.

———. "The Cinema of Attraction[s]: Early Film, Its Spectator and the Avant-Garde." In *The Cinema of Attractions Reloaded*, edited by Wanda Strauven, 381-88. Amsterdam:

- Amsterdam University Press, 2006. Originally published in *Wide Angle* 8, nos. 3-4 (1986). The 2006 version also includes some changes made in a subsequent version, published in Thomas Elsaesser, ed., *Early Cinema: Space, Frame, Narrative* (London: British Film Institute, 1990).
- . "The world as object lesson: Cinema audiences, visual culture and the St. Louis world's fair, 1904." *Film History: An International Journal* 6, no. 4 (1994): 422-44.
- Haak, Kees van der. "'Mededeelingen van leerzamen aard': Taferelen uit de geschiedenis van de educatieve omroep." In *Omroep in Nederland: Vijfenzeventig jaar medium en maatschappij, 1919-1994*, edited by Huub Wijfjes, 273-99. Zwolle: Waanders, 1994.
- Hall, Stuart. "Encoding/decoding." In *Culture, Media, Language: Working Papers in Cultural Studies, 1972-79*, edited by Stuart Hall, Dorothy Hobson, Andrew Lowe and Paul Willis, 117-127. London: Hutchinson, 1980. Originally published as "Encoding and Decoding in Television Discourse" in *CCCS Stencilled Paper*, no. 7 (1973).
- Haméry, Roxane. "Kino und Unterricht. Die fabelhafte Lektion in Unehrebarkeit des Jean Painlevé." *montage/AV: Zeitschrift für Theorie & Geschichte audiovisueller Kommunikation* 15, no. 1 (2006): 43-57.
- Hartley, John. *The Uses of Television*. London: Routledge, 1999.
- Hediger, Vinzenz. "Editorial." *montage/AV: Zeitschrift für Theorie & Geschichte audiovisueller Kommunikation* 14, no. 2 (2005): 4-7.
- Hellemans, Staf. "Zuilen en verzuiling in Europa." In *Nederlandse politiek in historisch en vergelijkend perspectief*, edited by Uwe Becker, 121-50. Amsterdam: Het Spinhuis, 1993.
- Herrn, Rainer, and Christine N. Brinckmann. "Von Ratten und Männern: Der Steinach-Film." *montage/AV: Zeitschrift für Theorie & Geschichte audiovisueller Kommunikation* 14, no. 2 (2005): 78-100.
- Hesling, Willem. "Documentary Film and Rhetorical Analysis." In *Image – Reality – Spectator: Essays on Documentary Film and Television*, edited by Willem De Greef and Willem Hesling, 101-31. Leuven: Acco, 1989.
- . "Retorica en film: een onderzoek naar de structuur en functie van klassieke overtuigingsstrategieën in fictionele audiovisuele teksten." PhD dissertation, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, 1985.
- Hesling, Willem, and Jan Marie L. Peters. *Audiovisuele retoriek*. Leuven: Centrum voor Communicatiewetenschappen KU Leuven, 1985.
- Heymer, Anna, and Patrick Vonderau. "Industrial Films: An Analytical Bibliography." In *Films that Work: Industrial Film and the Productivity of Media*, edited by Vinzenz Hediger and Patrick Vonderau, 75-84. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2009.
- Hight, Craig. "Primetime digital documentary animation: the photographic and graphic within play." *Studies in Documentary Film* 2, no. 1 (2008): 9-31.
- Hogenkamp, Bert. *De documentaire film 1945-1965: De bloei van een filmgenre in Nederland*.

- Rotterdam: Uitgeverij 010, 2003.
- . *De Nederlandse documentaire film 1920-1940*. Amsterdam: Van Genneep / Utrecht: Stichting Film en Wetenschap, 1988.
- . "Om scherp te stellen: Veranderingen bij de Nederlandse Onderwijs Film, 1958-1963." *Lessen: Periodiek van het Nationaal Onderwijsmuseum en de Vereniging van Vrienden*, June 2009, 7-12.
- . "'De onderwijsfilm is geen Duitse uitvinding': A. A. Schoevers, Ph. A. Kohnstamm en de Nederlandse Onderwijs Film, 1941-1949." In *Stichting Film en Wetenschap – Audiovisueel Archief Jaarboek 1996*, 55-90. Amsterdam: Stichting Film en Wetenschap / Nederlands Audiovisueel Archief, 1997.
- . "De schoolbioskoop." *Skrien*, no. 140 (1985): 42-45.
- Hoof, Florian. "'The One Best Way': Bildgebende Verfahren der Ökonomie und die Innovation der Managementtheorie nach 1860." *montage/AV: Zeitschrift für Theorie & Geschichte audiovisueller Kommunikation* 15, no. 1 (2006): 123-38.
- Horak, Jan-Christopher. "Archiving, Preserving, Screening 16mm." *Cinema Journal: The Journal of the Society of Cinema and Media Studies* 45, no. 3 (2006): 112-18.
- Horníček, Jiri. "The institutionalization of classroom films in Czechoslovakia between the wars." *Film History: An International Journal* 19, no. 4 (2007): 384-91.
- Huhtamo, Erkki. "Armchair Traveller on the Ford of Jordan. The Home, the Stereoscope and the Virtual Voyager." *Mediamatic Magazine* 8, no. 2/3 (1995): 13-24.
- Ingarden, Roman. *The Literary Work of Art: An Investigation on the Borderlines of Ontology, Logic, and Theory of Literature*. 1931. Edition translated by George G. Grabowicz. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1973.
- Iser, Wolfgang. *The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response*. Translated by David Henry Wilson. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978.
- . *The Implied Reader: Patterns of Communication in Prose Fiction from Bunyan to Beckett*. 1972. Recompiled edition, translated by David Henry Wilson. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1974.
- Jacquinet, Geneviève. "Le documentaire pédagogique?" In *Cinéma et Réalités*, edited by Roger Odin and Jean-Charles Lyant, 191-97. Saint-Étienne: CIEREC / Université de Saint-Étienne, 1984.
- . *L'école devant les écrans*. Paris: ESF, 1985.
- . *Image et pédagogie: Analyse sémiologique du film à intention didactique*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1977.
- , ed. *Les jeunes et les médias: Perspectives de la recherche dans le monde*. Marly-le-Roi: INJEP / Paris: L'Harmattan, 2002.
- . "Une théorie pour une province marginale du cinéma." *Iris: Revue de théorie de l'image*

et du son / A Journal of Theory on Image and Sound, no. 10 (1990): 159-68.

- Jacquinet, Geneviève, and Gérard Leblanc, eds. *Les genres télévisuels dans l'enseignement*. Paris: Centre national de documentation pédagogique, 1996.
- Jamieson, Kathleen M. "Antecedent Genre as Rhetorical Constraint." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 61, no. 4 (1975): 406-15.
- Jaques, Pierre-Emmanuel. "Werben, zeigen oder verbergen? Zum Tourismusfilm in der Schweiz." *montage/AV: Zeitschrift für Theorie & Geschichte audiovisueller Kommunikation* 15, no. 1 (2006): 91-107.
- Jauss, Hans Robert. *Toward an Aesthetic of Reception*. Translated by Timothy Bahti. Brighton: Harvester, 1982.
- Jenkins, Henry. *Convergence Culture: Where Old and New Media Collide*. New York: New York University Press, 2006.
- Jung, Uli. "Kinoreformer: Nicht-fiktionale Filme für Bildungszwecke." In *Geschichte des dokumentarischen Films in Deutschland*, vol. 1, *Kaiserreich 1895-1918*, edited by Uli Jung and Martin Loiperdinger, 333-40. Stuttgart: Reclam, 2005.
- . "Lehr- und Unterrichtsfilm für Schulen und Hochschulen." In *Geschichte des dokumentarischen Films in Deutschland*, vol. 1, *Kaiserreich 1895-1918*, edited by Uli Jung and Martin Loiperdinger, 349-56. Stuttgart: Reclam, 2005.
- Jung, Uli and Wolfgang Mühl-Benninghaus. "Die Kulturfilmdiskussion von 1914 bis 1920: Die politische und ideologische Dynamik der Ufa-Gründung." In *Geschichte des dokumentarischen Films in Deutschland*, vol. 1, *Kaiserreich 1895-1918*, edited by Uli Jung and Martin Loiperdinger, 480-86. Stuttgart: Reclam, 2005.
- Keitz, Ursula von. "Die Kinematographie in der Schule: Zur politischen Pädagogik des Unterrichtsfilms von RfDU und RWU." In *Geschichte des dokumentarischen Films in Deutschland*, vol. 3, *'Drittes Reich' 1933-1945*, edited by Yvonne Zimmermann and Kay Hoffmann, 463-88. Stuttgart: Reclam, 2005.
- . "Wissen als Film: Zur Entwicklung des Lehr- und Unterrichtsfilms." In *Geschichte des dokumentarischen Films in Deutschland*, vol. 2, *Weimarer Republik 1918-1933*, edited by Klaus Kreimeier, Antje Ehmann and Jeanpaul Goergen, 120-42. Stuttgart: Reclam, 2005.
- Kessler, Frank. "The Cinema of Attractions as *Dispositif*." In *The Cinema of Attractions Reloaded*, edited by Wanda Strauven, 57-69. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2006.
- . "Notes on *dispositif*." Unpublished paper, Utrecht Media Research Seminar. <http://www.let.uu.nl/~Frank.Kessler/personal/Dispositif%20Notes11-2007.pdf> (last modified November 2007).
- . "Ostranenie: Zum Verfremdungsbegriff von Formalismus und Neoformalismus." *montage/AV: Zeitschrift für Theorie & Geschichte audiovisueller Kommunikation* 5, no. 2 (1996): 51-65.
- Kessler, Frank, and Eef Masson. "Layers of Cheese: Generic Overlap in Early Non-Fiction Films on

- Production Processes." In *Films that Work: Industrial Film and the Productivity of Media*, edited by Vinzenz Hediger and Patrick Vonderau, 75-84. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2009.
- King, Kenneth P. "One Hundred Percent Efficiency': The Use of Technology in Science Education Since 1900." *Journal of the Association for History and Computing* 2, no. 2 (1999). <http://mcel.pacificu.edu/jahc/1999/issue2/articles/king/>.
- Klerk, Nico de. "Onvolkomen definities van amateurfilm en bioscoop." *Skrien* 40, no. 4 (2008): 60.
- Kozloff, Sarah. "Narrative Theory and Television." In *Channels of Discourse, Reassembled: Television and Contemporary Criticism*, edited by Robert C. Allen, 67-100. London: Routledge, 1992.
- Kreimeier, Klaus. "Ein deutsches Paradigma: Die Kulturabteilung der Ufa." In *Geschichte des dokumentarischen Films in Deutschland*, vol. 2, *Weimarer Republik 1918-1933*, edited by Klaus Kreimeier, Antje Ehmann and Jeanpaul Goergen, 67-86. Stuttgart: Reclam, 2005.
- Kuyper, Eric de. "Aux origines du cinéma: le film de famille." In *Le film de famille: usage privé, usage public*, edited by Roger Odin, 11-26. Paris: Méridiens Klincksieck, 1995.
- Lacasse, Germain. "The Lecturer and the Attraction." In *The Cinema of Attractions Reloaded*, edited by Wanda Strauven, 181-91. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2006.
- Langelaan, Janneke. "Het debat rondom het gebruik van film als onderwijshulpmiddel, 1912-1960." Master's thesis, Universiteit Utrecht, 2005.
- Langeveld, M. J. "Philip Kohnstamm." In *Onderwijskundigen van de twintigste eeuw*, edited by Q. L. Th. van der Meer and H. A. Bergman, 87-93. Amsterdam: Intermediair / Groningen: Wolters-Noordhoff, 1975.
- Lefebvre, Thierry. "Le docteur Doyen, un précurseur." In *Le Cinéma et la Science*, edited by Alexis Martinet, 70-77. Paris: CNRS Editions, 1994.
- . "Dr. Eugène-Louis Doyen und die Anfänge des Chirurgie-Films." *montage/AV: Zeitschrift für Theorie & Geschichte audiovisueller Kommunikation* 14, no. 2 (2005): 69-77.
- . "'Scientia': le cinéma de vulgarisation scientifique au début des années dix." *Cinémathèque: Revue semestrielle d'esthétique et d'histoire du cinéma*, no. 4 (1993): 84-91.
- . "The Scientia Production (1911-1914): Scientific Popularization Through Pictures." *Griffithiana: Journal of Film History* 16, no. 47 (1993): 137-53.
- . "Die Trennung der Siamesischen Zwillinge Doodica und Radica durch Dr. Doyen." In *KINtop Jahrbuch zur Erforschung des frühen Films – 6: Aktualitäten*, edited by Frank Kessler, Sabine Lenk and Martin Loiperdinger, 97-101. Basel: Stroemfeld / Frankfurt am Main: Roter Stern, 1997.
- León, Bienvenido. *Science on Television: The Narrative of Scientific Documentary*. Translated by Alicia Otano and Maria López. Luton, UK: Pantaneto Press, 2007.
- . "Science popularisation through television documentary: A study of the work of

- British wildlife filmmaker David Attenborough." *The Pantaneto Forum*, no. 15 (2004).
<http://www.pantaneto.co.uk/issue15/leon.htm>.
- Levinson, Stephen C. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- Linssen, Céline, Hans Schoots, and Tom Gunning. *Het gaat om de film! Een nieuwe geschiedenis van de Nederlandsche Filmliga, 1927-1933*. Amsterdam: Lubberhuizen, 1999.
- Lister, Martin, Jon Dovey, Seth Giddings, Iain Grant, and Kieran Kelly. *New Media: A Critical Introduction*. London: Routledge, 2003.
- Low, Rachael. *The History of the British Film 1929-1939*. 7 vols. London: Allen and Unwin, 1948-1985.
- Mailloux, Steven. *Rhetorical Power*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1989.
- Mannoni, Laurent. *Le grand art de la lumière et de l'ombre: archéologie du cinéma*. Paris: Nathan, 1995.
- Massit-Folléa, Françoise. "Une nouvelle vie pour les archives." In *Cinéma pédagogique et scientifique: À la redécouverte des archives*, edited by Béatrice de Pastre-Robert, Monique Dubost and Françoise Massit-Folléa, 131-33. Paris: ENS Éditions, 2004.
- Masson, Eef. "Celluloid teaching tools: classroom films in the Netherlands (1941-1953)." *Film History: An International Journal* 19, no. 4 (2007): 392-400.
- . "Didaktik vs. Pädagogik: Ein kontextueller Ansatz für die Untersuchung von Unterrichtsfilmen." *montage/AV: Zeitschrift für Theorie & Geschichte audiovisueller Kommunikation* 15, no. 1 (2006): 10-25.
- . "Educational Films in Britain: EFA's Norfolk collection as an aid to the historiography of a genre." Master's thesis, University of East Anglia, 2000.
- . "Of Pits and Vaults: The Historiographic Value of Educational Collections in Great Britain." *The Moving Image: Journal of the Association of Moving Image Archivists* 2, no. 1 (2002): 47-72.
- . "De pil vergulden – of toch niet? Retorische strategieën in naoorlogse onderwijsfilms (1941-1963)." In *Jaarboek voor de geschiedenis van opvoeding en onderwijs 2010*, edited by Nelleke Bakker, Sjaak Braster, Marjoke Rietveld-Van Wingerden and Angelo Van Gorp. Assen: Van Gorcum, forthcoming.
- McKernan, Luke. "Education." In *Encyclopedia of Early Cinema*, edited by Richard Abel, 214-15. London: Routledge, 2005.
- Meer, Q. L. Th. van der, and H. A. Bergman, eds. *Onderwijskundigen van de twintigste eeuw*. Amsterdam: Intermediair / Groningen: Wolters-Noordhoff, 1975.
- Metz, Christian. *L'Énonciation impersonnelle, ou le site du film*. Paris: Méridiens Klincksieck, 1991.
- . *Essais sur la signification au cinéma*. 2 vols. Paris: Klincksieck, 1968-1972.
- . *Langage et Cinéma*. Paris: Larousse, 1971.
- Meulenbeld, G. "Geknipt voor katholieken: Een onderzoek naar de historische ontwikkeling

- van de houding van de Nederlandse katholieken tegenover film vanaf zijn ontstaan (1894) tot 1970." Master's thesis, Universiteit van Tilburg, 1990.
- Meyer-Minnemann, Klaus, and Sabine Schlickers. "La mise en abyme en narratologie." *Vox Poetica*. <http://www.vox-poetica.com/t/menabyme.html>.
- Miller, Carolyn R. "Rhetorical Community: The Cultural Basis of Genre." In *Genre and the New Rhetoric*, edited by Aviva Freedman and Peter Medway, 67-78. Londen: Taylor and Francis, 1994.
- Millet, Richard. "Jean Painlevé cinéaste." In *Le Cinéma et la Science*, edited by Alexis Martinet, 86-94. Paris: CNRS Editions, 1994.
- Montgomery, Garth. "'Realistic' War Films in Weimar Germany: entertainment as education." *Historical Journal of Film, Radio and Television: The Journal of the International Association for Media and History* 9, no. 2 (1989): 115-33.
- Munz, Tania. "Die Ethologie des wissenschaftlichen Cineasten: Karl von Frisch, Konrad Lorenz und das Verhalten der Tiere im Film." *montage/AV: Zeitschrift für Theorie & Geschichte audiovisueller Kommunikation* 14, no. 2 (2005): 52-68.
- Musser, Charles. "A Cinema of Contemplation, A Cinema of Discernment: Spectatorship, Intertextuality and Attractions in the 1890s." In *The Cinema of Attractions Reloaded*, edited by Wanda Strauven, 159-79. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2006.
- Nichols, Bill. *Introduction to Documentary*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2001.
- . *Representing Reality: Issues and Concepts in Documentary*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1991.
- . "Transformations in Film as Reality". Pt. 2, "Documentary and the Coming of Sound." *Documentary Box*, no. 6 (1995). <http://www.yidff.jp/docbox/6/box6-1-e.html>. Originally published (in Spanish) in Manuel Palacios and Pedro Santos, eds., *Historia General del Cine*, vol. 6, *La Transición Del Mudo Al Sonoro* (Madrid: Ediciones Cátedra, 1995).
- Odin, Roger. *De la fiction*. Brussels: De Boeck Université, 2000.
- . "Du spectateur fictionnalisant au nouveau spectateur: approche sémiopragmatique." *Iris: Revue de théorie de l'image et du son / A Journal of Theory on Image and Sound*, no. 8 (1988): 121-39.
- , ed. *Le film de famille: usage privé, usage public*. Paris: Méridiens Klincksieck, 1995.
- . "Film documentaire Lecture documentarissante." In *Cinéma et Réalités*, edited by Jean-Jacques Lyant and Roger Odin, 263-78. Saint-Étienne: CIERIEC, 1984.
- . "Pour une sémio-pragmatique du cinéma." *Iris: Revue de théorie de l'image et du son / A Journal of Theory on Image and Sound* 1, no. 1 (1983): 76-82.
- . "Rhétorique du film de famille." *Revue d'Esthétique*, no. 1-2 (1979): 340-73.
- . "A Semio-Pragmatic Approach of the Documentary Film." In *Image – Reality – Spectator:*

- Essays on Documentary Film and Television*, edited by Willem De Greef and Willem Hesling, 91-100. Leuven: Acco, 1989.
- . "Sémio-pragmatique du cinéma et de l'audiovisuel: Modes et institutions." In *Towards a Pragmatics of the Audiovisual: Theory and History*, vol. 1, edited by Jürgen Müller, 33-46. Münster: Nodus, 1994.
- Olson, Gary A. "Jacques Derrida on Rhetoric and Composition: A Conversation." *Journal of Advanced Composition* 10, no. 1 (1990): 1-21. http://www.jacweb.org/Archived_volumes/Text_articles/V10_I1_OlsonDerrida.htm.
- Omega, Susana, and José Ángel Gacía Landa, eds. *Narratology*. London: Longman, 1996.
- Ottenheim, Cor. *50 jaar NOF/NIAM: Van stomme film naar interactieve media*. The Hague: Nederlands Instituut voor Audio-Visuele Media, 1991.
- Paci, Viva. "The Attraction of the Intelligent Eye: Obsessions with the Vision Machine in Early Film Theories." In *The Cinema of Attractions Reloaded*, edited by Wanda Strauven, 121-37. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2006.
- Pastre-Robert, Béatrice de. "Enfer, amnésie, rédemption: une histoire du fonds de la cinémathèque scolaire Robert-Lynen." In *Cinéma pédagogique et scientifique: À la redécouverte des archives*, edited by Béatrice de Pastre-Robert, Monique Dubost and Françoise Massit-Folléa, 45-58. Paris: ENS Éditions, 2004.
- Pastre-Robert, Béatrice de, Monique Dubost, and Françoise Massit-Folléa, eds. *Cinéma pédagogique et scientifique: À la redécouverte des archives*. Paris: ENS Éditions, 2004.
- Peeters, Hughes, and Philippe Charlier. "Contributions à une théorie du dispositif." In *Le Dispositif: Entre usage et concept*, edited by Geneviève Jacquinot-Delaunay and Laurence Monnoyer, 15-23. Paris: CNRS Editions, 1999.
- Peters, Jan Marie L. *Retoriek van de communicatie: communicatiemiddelen, communicatievormen, communicatietechnieken*. Groningen: Tjeenk Willink, 1973.
- Pelc, Jerzy. "On the Concept of Narration." *Semiotica: Journal of the International Association for Semiotic Studies / Revue de l'Association Internationale de Sémiotique* 2, no. 3 (1971): 1-19.
- Peraya, Daniel. "Médiation et médiatisation: le campus virtuel." In *Le Dispositif: Entre usage et concept*, edited by Geneviève Jacquinot-Delaunay and Laurence Monnoyer, 155-67. Paris: CNRS Editions, 1999.
- Perkins, David. *Is Literary History Possible?* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992.
- Perriault, Jacques. "L'apport des archives du film pédagogique et scientifique aux sciences de l'homme et de la société." In *Cinéma pédagogique et scientifique: À la redécouverte des archives*, edited by Béatrice de Pastre-Robert, Francine Dubreucq and Françoise Massit-Folléa, 7-19. Paris: ENS Éditions, 2004.
- Peterson, Jennifer Lynn. "Travelogues." In *Encyclopedia of Early Cinema*, edited by Richard Abel, 640-43. London: Routledge, 2005.

- Plantinga, Carl R. *Rhetoric and Representation in Nonfiction Film*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Prelinger, Rick. *The Field Guide to Sponsored Films*. San Francisco: National Film Preservation Foundation, 2006.
- Prince, Gerald. "Introduction to the Study of the Narratee." In *Reader-Response Criticism: From Formalism to Post-Structuralism*, edited by Jane P. Tompkins, 7-25. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1980. Originally published (in French) in *Poétique* 14 (1973).
- . "The Narratee Revisited." *Style* 19, no. 3 (1985): 299-303.
- . *Narratology: The Form and Functioning of Narrative*. Berlin: Mouton, 1982.
- . "Notes on the Text as Reader." In *The Reader in the Text: Essays on Audience and Interpretation*, edited by Susan R. Suleiman and Inge Crosman, 225-40. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980.
- Prost, Antoine. *Histoire de l'enseignement en France, 1800-1967*. 2nd ed. Paris: Colin, 1968.
- Rabinowitz, Peter J. *Before Reading: Narrative Conventions and the Politics of Interpretation*. 2nd ed. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1998.
- Raessens, Joost. "The gaming *dispositif*: An analysis of serious games from a humanities perspective." In *Serious Games: Mechanisms and Effects*, edited by Ute Ritterfeld, Michael Cody and Peter Vorderer, 486-512. New York: Routledge, 2009.
- Raynal, Anne. "Le docteur Thévenard, scientifique et cinéaste." In *Le Cinéma et la Science*, edited by Alexis Martinet, 95-104. Paris: CNRS Editions, 1994.
- Renonciat, Annie. "Vue fixe et/ou cinéma dans l'enseignement: naissance d'une polémique (1916-1922)." In *Cinéma pédagogique et scientifique: À la redécouverte des archives*, edited by Béatrice de Pastre-Robert, Monique Dubost and Françoise Massit-Folléa, 61-71. Paris: ENS Éditions, 2004.
- Roepke, Martina. *Privat-Vorstellung: Heimkino in Deutschland vor 1945*. Hildesheim: Olms Verlag, 2006.
- . "Tracing 17.5mm practices in Germany (1902-1908)." *Film History: An International Journal* 19, no. 4 (2007): 344-52.
- Ryan, Marie-Laure. "Narrative and the Split Condition of Digital Textuality." *Dichtung-Digital*, no. 1 (2005). <http://www.brown.edu/Research/dichtung-digital/2005/1/Ryan/index.htm>.
- Saettler, Paul. *The Evolution of American Educational Technology*. 2nd ed. Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing, 1990.
- Schneider, Alexandra. "Home movie-making and Swiss expatriate identities in the 1920s and 1930s." *Film History: An International Journal* 15, no. 2 (2003): 166-76.
- Searle, John. *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969.

- Shannon, Claude E., and Warren Weaver. *The Mathematical Theory of Communication*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1949.
- Slide, Anthony. *Before Video: A History of the Non-Theatrical Film*. New York: Greenwood, 1992.
- Smith, Ken. *Mental Hygiene: Classroom Films, 1945-1970*. New York: Blast Books, 1999.
- Smith, Murray. *Engaging Characters: Fiction, Emotion, and the Cinema*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995.
- Sobchack, Vivian. "'Cutting to the Quick': *Techne, Physis, and Poiesis* and the Attractions of Slow Motion." In *The Cinema of Attractions Reloaded*, edited by Wanda Strauven, 337-51. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2006.
- Stach, Reinhard. "Wandbilder als Didaktische Segmente der Realität." *Paedagogica Historica: International Journal of the History of Education*, n. s., 36, no. 1 (2000): 199-221.
- Stam, Robert. *Film Theory: An Introduction*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2000.
- Strauven, Wanda. "Introduction to an Attractive Concept." In *The Cinema of Attractions Reloaded*, 11-27. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2006.
- Streible, Dan, Martina Roepke, and Anke Mebold. "Introduction: Nontheatrical Film." *Film History: An International Journal* 19, no. 4 (2007): 339-43.
- Suleiman, Susan R. "Introduction: Varieties of Audience-Oriented Criticism." In *The Reader in the Text: Essays on Audience and Interpretation*, edited by Susan R. Suleiman and Inge Crosman, 3-45. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980.
- Suleiman, Susan R., and Inge Crosman, eds. *The Reader in the Text: Essays on Audience and Interpretation*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980.
- Tan, Ed. "Film als emotiemachine: De affectstructuur van de traditionele speelfilm; Een psychologische studie." PhD dissertation, Universiteit van Amsterdam, 1991.
- Thomas, Fabienne. "Dispositifs narratif et argumentatif: Quel intérêt pour la médiation des savoirs?" In *Le Dispositif: Entre usage et concept*, edited by Geneviève Jacquinet-Delaunay and Laurence Monnoyer, 219-32. Paris: CNRS Editions, 1999.
- Thompson, Kristin. "The Concept of Cinematic Excess." In *Film Theory and Criticism: Introductory Readings*, edited by Leo Braudy and Marshall Cohen, 487-98. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999. Originally published in *Cine-Tracts* 1, no. 2 (1977).
- Thorburn, David, and Henry Jenkins. "Introduction: Toward an Aesthetics of Transition." In *Rethinking Media Change: The Aesthetics of Transition*, edited by David Thorburn and Henry Jenkins, 1-16. Cambridge, MA: MIT, 2004.
- Tosi, Vergilio. *Cinema before Cinema: The Origins of Scientific Cinematography*. 1984. Edition translated by Sergio Angelini. London: British Universities Film and Video Council, 2005.
- Velde, I. van der. "Wie droegen in de periode 1900-1940 in Nederland de onderwijsvernieuwing." In *Vernieuwingsstreven binnen het Nederlandse onderwijs in de periode 1910-1940*, edited by J. W. van Hulst, I. van der Velde and G. Th. M. Verhaak, 361-88. Groningen:

- Wolters-Noordhoff, 1970.
- Verhoeff, Nanna. *The West in Early Cinema: After the Beginning*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2006.
- Verhoeff, Nanna, and Eva Warth. "Rhetoric of Space: Cityscape/Landscape." *Historical Journal of Film, Radio and Television: The Journal of the International Association for Media and History* 22, no. 3 (2002): 245-51.
- Véronneau, Pierre. "Le Fascinateur et la Bonne Presse: des médias catholiques pour publics francophones." *1895: Revue d'histoire du cinéma*, no. 40 (2003): 24-40.
- Vignaux, Valérie. "Eine *Encyclopédie* der Leinwand: Der institutionelle Diskurs des Kinos im Frankreich des Zwischenkriegszeit und die Filme von Jean Benoit-Lévy (1922-1939)." *montage/AV: Zeitschrift für Theorie & Geschichte audiovisueller Kommunikation* 15, no. 1 (2006): 26-42.
- . *Jean Benoit-Lévy ou le corps comme utopie: une histoire du cinéma éducateur dans l'entre-deux-guerres en France*. Paris: Association française de recherche sur l'histoire du cinéma, 2007.
- Voeten, Wim. "'Geëngageerd door nieuwsgierigheid': Roelof Kiers en de ontwikkeling van de directe documentaire vorm in Nederland." Master's thesis, Katholieke Universiteit Nijmegen, 1999.
- Wallet, Jacques. "Partis pris filmiques et pédagogiques pour l'enseignement de la géographie: approche historique." In *Cinéma pédagogique et scientifique: À la redécouverte des archives*, edited by Béatrice de Pastre-Robert, Monique Dubost and Françoise Massit-Folléa, 99-106. Paris: ENS Éditions, 2004.
- Waugh, Linda R. *Roman Jakobson's Science of Language*. Lisse: De Ridder, 1976.
- Weber, Max. *Basic Concepts in Sociology*. 1922. Edition translated by H. P. Secher. London: Owen, 1962.
- Welle, John P. "'Avoid giving wine to children': George Kleine's correspondence with Cines and the discourse of uplift." In *Networks of Entertainment: Early Film Distribution 1895-1915*, edited by Frank Kessler and Nanna Verhoeff, 21-29. Eastleigh, UK: Libbey, 2007.
- Winston, Brian. *Claiming the Real: The Documentary Film Revisited*. London: British Film Institute, 1995.
- . "The Documentary Film as Scientific Inscription." In *Theorizing Documentary*, edited by Michael Renov, 37-57. New York: Routledge, 1993.
- Wittgenstein, Ludwig. *Philosophical Investigations*. 1953. 3rd edition of the translation by G. E. M. Anscombe. New York: Macmillan, 1973.
- Wolf, H. C. de. "Ovide Decroly." In *Onderwijskundigen van de twintigste eeuw*, edited by Q. L. Th. van der Meer and H. A. Bergman, 73-85. Amsterdam: Intermediair / Groningen: Wolters-Noordhoff, 1975.

Zimmermann, Yvonne. "Vom Lichtbild zum Film: Anmerkungen zur Entstehung des Industriefilms." *montage/AV: Zeitschrift für Theorie & Geschichte audiovisueller Kommunikation* 15, no. 1 (2006): 74-90.

Note on Reference System

References to lectures at conferences are mentioned only in the notes.

SAMENVATTING

De leerling in de tekst: Retorische middelen in onderwijsfilms uit de jaren veertig, vijftig en de vroege jaren zestig

In de laatste tiental jaar is er in academische kringen een toenemende aandacht merkbaar voor zogenaamde ‘gebruiksfilms’: audiovisuele teksten die niet bestemd zijn, of waren, voor de verstrooiing van een publiek, maar om het te informeren, te trainen of iets te leren, of te overtuigen van de voordelen van een dienst of product. Die aandacht is terecht, want net als de speelfilms die al langere tijd tot de filmwetenschappelijke canon behoren, vormen ze onderdeel van het collectieve geheugen van vele generaties kijkers. Ondanks de groeiende interesse van de afgelopen tijd is het verrichte onderzoek echter nog vrij eenzijdig: in de meeste gevallen betreft het de geschiedenis van productie of distributie, of vragen omtrent educatieve of zakelijke effectiviteit. Veel minder aandacht is besteed aan de verschijningsvorm van de films: de tekstuele middelen die ze hanteren bij het verdedigen van hun informatieve, educatieve of commerciële argument. Bij gebrek aan dergelijke studies overleeft het beeld van erg ‘formulaire’ genres: corpussen die geassocieerd zouden kunnen worden met een beperkt aantal audiovisuele ingrediënten, die ze bovendien van andere tekstsoorten zouden onderscheiden. De schaarse vakliteratuur over het onderwerp pleegt dat imago ook nog eens te bevestigen.

Het doel van mijn onderzoek is het hierboven geschetste beeld zo veel mogelijk te nuanceren. Daarbij ga ik uit van een collectie onderwijsfilms: titels die bedoeld waren ter ondersteuning van het lesprogramma van kinderen in lagere en vroeg-middelbare scholen. De selectie ervan gebeurt op puur pragmatische gronden, en meer bepaald op basis van het feit dat de films zijn verdeeld aan instellingen voor formeel onderwijs, en ingezet in de reguliere lespraktijk. Hierin wijk ik af van eerdere studies, die veelal selecteerden volgens tekstuele criteria, en daarom ook tot conclusies kwamen in termen van genrespecificiteit – een cirkelredenering die ikzelf tracht te vermijden. Een tweede belangrijke wijziging ten opzichte van ouder onderzoek is mijn keuze voor een retorische analyse: ik bestudeer de manier waarop onderwijsfilms hun kijkers ‘aanspreken’. Concreet betekent dit dat ik niet ga speuren naar typische, corpus-eigen kenmerken, maar naar de manieren waarop (min of meer universele) audiovisuele technieken ingezet worden bij het in de tekst ‘binnenloodsen’ van een heel specifieke kijkersgroep.

De methode die ik daarbij hanteer is gebaseerd op twee conceptuele pijlers. De eerste is de idee dat films functioneren, en dus betekenis krijgen, als onderdeel van een ruimere configuratie: de combinatie van technologie, tekst en vertoningssituatie die binnen de mediastudies wel eens aangeduid wordt met de term *dispositif*. In het specifieke geval van onderwijsfilms is de vertoning onlosmakelijk verbonden met de educatieve institutie waarbinnen die plaatsvindt;

om die reden spreek ik hier dus van een *pedagogisch dispositif*. De tweede pijler is het principe van tekstuele implicatie. In mijn analytische hoofdstukken werk ik op basis van de aanname dat het retorische functioneren van films altijd een kwestie is van het op de een of andere manier 'in de tekst plaatsen' van een publiek – een collectief van kijkers die samen zijn om een specifieke reden, en die kijken vanuit een gemeenschappelijke achtergrond en interesses, waaraan de tekst ook appelleert.

Het proefschrift dat de neerslag vormt van dit onderzoek bestaat uit tweede grote delen. Met het eerste, inleidende gedeelte stel ik me tot doel mijn object te positioneren. Ik verken het concept 'onderwijsfilm', zowel in de historische als de theoretische zin, en ga het vervolgens (opnieuw) afbakenen, in het licht van de analyse die volgt. Deel I bestaat op zijn beurt weer uit twee hoofdstukken.

Hoofdstuk 1 heeft een overwegend historische inslag. De term 'onderwijsfilm' die ik in mijn werk hanteer is nauw verbonden met een reeks van praktijken, maar ook ideeën en idealen, die betrekking hebben op het gebruik van film als educatief middel. Om die opvattingen in kaart te brengen exploreer ik het betreffende discours, voornamelijk op basis van primaire bronnen. Daarnaast behandel ik ook historische praktijken die erop gericht waren het medium beschikbaar te stellen voor didactisch gebruik. Hoewel mijn onderzoek zich toespitst op films uit de periode vanaf de Tweede Wereldoorlog (een tijdvak waarin voor het eerst sprake kon zijn van een zekere mate van institutionalisering) ga ik hier ook verder terug in de tijd. De reden daarvoor is dat veel van de ideeën die toen gangbaar waren, en die ook in aanmerking werden genomen door de producten en distributeurs van gespecialiseerd materiaal, wortels hebben in de decennia daarvoor. In het tweede gedeelte van het hoofdstuk, dat focust op de periode tijdens en na de oorlog, zal ik voornamelijk een beroep doen op teksten die gelieerd zijn aan de Stichting Nederlandse Onderwijs Film (NOF), de instelling die verantwoordelijk was voor de verdeling van de films die ik analyseer in deel II.

Vervolgens, in hoofdstuk 2, doe ik enkele uitspraken over de manier waarop de genoemde films in het onderwijs werden gebruikt. Omdat over dat onderwerp maar weinig informatie voorhanden is, zijn de observaties die ik hier maak van sterk hypothetische aard. Bij het formuleren van mijn bedenkingen maak ik gebruik van een handvol getuigenissen, maar voornamelijk van de bronnen die ik ook bespreek in hoofdstuk 1. Hoewel dat veelal geschriften zijn van normatieve aard (bijvoorbeeld, artikelen die eisen stellen voor de productie van 'goede' onderwijsfilms, of handboeken met advies voor potentiële gebruikers) geven ze toch ook enig zicht op de houding van leraars tegenover het medium (overwegend argwanend), en zelfs, over hoe ze het gebruik ervan moeten hebben ingebed in hun dagelijkse lespraktijk (in sommige gevallen: helemaal *niet*). De conclusies die ik daarover trek dienen als basis voor de keuzes die ik in het tweede deel van het hoofdstuk maak voor het afbakenen, en het invullen, van mijn eigen onderwijsfilm-concept. Bij die gelegenheid geef ik ook toelichting bij mijn notie van 'pedagogisch *dispositif*' – een notie die toelaat dat ik de teksten die ik behandel nadrukkelijk positioneer als *leermiddelen*.

Het tweede deel van het proefschrift is gewijd aan een retorische analyse van het geselecteerde corpus, en heeft als doel een antwoord te vinden op de vraag hoe onderwijsfilms hun kijkers aanspreken. De term 'retorisch', in dit verband, moet geïnterpreteerd worden in de breedst

mogelijke zin van het woord. Heel concreet betekent dat, dat ik niet op zoek ga naar de manier waarop, of de middelen waarmee, de behandelde films trachten een publiek ergens van de overtuigen, maar me veeleer afvraag hoe ze een communicatie tot stand trachten te brengen, of in stand proberen te houden, met de toeschouwersgroep waarop ze zich richten. Die focus op wat ik hier benoem als 'mode(s) of address' impliceert onvermijdelijk dat ik tekstbetekenis niet beschouw als iets wat vastligt in het werk zelf, maar als een tekstueel 'potentiaal': iets wat tot stand komt, of geactiveerd wordt, binnen een specifieke (performatieve) situatie.

Om mijn betoog te structureren ga ik uit van twee premissen. De eerste is dat onderwijsfilms – net als *alle* teksten, audiovisueel of anderszins – er retorisch gezien in hoofdzaak op gericht zijn hun geadresseerden uit te nodigen, en aan te moedigen, tot (verder) kijken. Daarbij maken ze gebruik van een heel breed arsenaal aan strategieën, die sterk van mekaar verschillen in termen van de vooronderstellingen die ze maken over wat een publiek aanspreekt. Wat ze met mekaar verbindt, is hun retorische fundament: het feit dat ze de toeschouwers altijd zoeken te motiveren door ze op de een of andere manier in de tekst te 'incorporeren'. Mijn zoektocht naar de mechanismen achter dit principe van implicatie vormt een leidraad bij het inventariseren van de verschillende retorische procédés die onderwijsfilms hanteren.

Mijn tweede aanname, of observatie, is dat in dat proces van implicatie een deel van de behandelde films in zekere mate ook de aandacht van hun publiek sturen in de richting van de specifieke (institutionele, en meerbepaald pedagogische) omstandigheden waarin de vertoning plaatsvindt, en waarin tekstbetekenis tot stand komt. In dat proces dragen ze bij tot de 'positionering' van hun kijkers: ze stimuleren ze, met andere woorden, tot de voor die film, of dat type van film, meest verkieslijke kijkhouding. Daarbij doen ze opnieuw een beroep op tekstuele middelen; sommige heel onopvallend, en in de tijd beperkt tot een enkele shot of sequens, andere prominenter, en mogelijk herhaald of uitgestrekt over de hele lengte van de film. Het uiteindelijke doel van mijn analyse is om ook die ingrediënten te identificeren, en vervolgens, om ze te classificeren volgens het discursieve niveau waarop ze zich manifesteren. Daarbij maak ik voornamelijk gebruik van concepten uit de narratologie.

Hoofdstuk 3, dat de inleiding vormt tot deel II, is van methodologische aard. In dit onderdeel bespreek ik het concept 'retoriek', en leg ik uit hoe ik het inzet in de loop van mijn analyse. Ik beargumenteer dat het beschouwd moet worden als een latent aanwezig iets, dat maar tot activering kan komen binnen een specifiek functioneel framework (in mijn geval, dat van het pedagogische *dispositif*). Daarna komt een analytisch hoofdstuk, waarin ik enkele van de strategieën bespreek waarmee onderwijsfilms hun kijkers trachten te motiveren. Eerst deel ik ze in op basis van het type retorisch potentiaal dat ze exploiteren, en vervolgens in termen van de mate van directheid waarmee de teksten waarin ze opduiken ingaan op voor de scholen relevante materie. Het vijfde en laatste hoofdstuk behandelt de manieren waarop de films hun publiek lijken te manoeuvreren in de kijkhouding die bij dat soort materiaal de voorkeur heeft: die van leerling-kijker. De tekstuele elementen die dat doel dienen worden geconceptualiseerd als verwijzingen naar het pedagogische *dispositif*. Aan het eind van dit onderdeel speculeer ik tenslotte ook nog even over de betekenis van dergelijke middelen voor de relatie van autoriteit tussen allerlei soorten leraarsfiguren (filmisch en 'echt') – een kwestie die van grote betekenis lijkt te zijn geweest voor de auteurs van de bronnen uit deel I.

Zoals uit het voorafgaande moet blijken, is het doel van mijn onderzoek in de eerste plaats *methodologisch*: ik ontwikkel een werkwijze, en een vocabularium, waarmee ik het kan hebben over de verschijningsvorm van films die andere doelen dienden dan louter het amusement van een publiek. Daarbij denk ik echter niet in genrespecifieke termen, maar ga ik uit van de premisse dat wat een corpus typeert, niet iets tekstueels is, maar datgene wat ontstaat in de confrontatie met een bepaald *dispositif*. Bij het uittesten van mijn *modus operandi* bied ik daarnaast ook een blik op een ensemble van teksten dat, wellicht mede door dat vertoningsdoel, lange tijd een hiaat vormde in allerlei filmgeschiedenissen (nationaal en internationaal). Ik schets daarbij een beeld dat niet gekenmerkt wordt door formulariteit, maar net door een uitgesproken mate van variatie.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude to a number of people, without whom the endeavour of writing this dissertation would have been much harder to accomplish – but also less instructive, and above all, gratifying.

First of all, I would like to thank my supervisors, Frank Kessler and Nanna Verhoeff. Frank stood by me from day one, and helped me in word and deed. He advised me on how to write better texts, reminded me of academic conventions, and let me pick his bibliographic mind (as well as his personal library). He exerted his influence so I could overcome bureaucratic obstacles, and took me along to lectures and conferences. In addition to this, he also eased my first steps into university teaching. Nanna has subjected my thoughts to her ever-critical mind, with great passion. I want to thank her for never ceasing to ask the question ‘why’ – especially at times when I was concerned primarily with the ‘who’, the ‘what’ or the ‘how’. And *even* in those moments when it clearly made me sweat blood. For introducing me to the tactics of academic ‘positioning’, and for her attempts to convince me that intellectual ambition is not a dirty word (not *entirely* successful, but I’m working on it!). For friendship, and for some practical life lessons – among others, the fact that rental cars, although useful for transporting archive boxes, are prone to swerving towards concrete bollards... ;-)

Also other members of the Utrecht staff have helped me in various ways. William Uricchio, who attended presentations and read draft chapters, posed insightful questions and made useful comparisons. Martina Roepke, as well as other attendees of the Media Research and Media and Performance Seminars, gave critical reactions to presentations and texts. Sjaak Braster offered some reading tips on the elementals of the New Education and alerted me to networks of educational historians. Ann Rigney sent me a few crucial tips on the principles of narrative ‘dynamics’. The staff of OGC, my research institute, and above all Simone Veld, boosted my confidence by always believing in the success of my project – even at the most frustrating times. (That Easter email really made my day!)

Outside the university, there are others who deserve my gratitude. First, at Nederlands Instituut voor Beeld en Geluid, Karin Westerink, Bert Hogenkamp, Jan Pet, Peter Klinkenberg en Hans van den Berg, for their efforts to facilitate access to the corpus which my research revolved around. Later on, also the late Henk Verheul, who actually came looking for *me* to familiarise me with the Smalfilmmuseum’s collection of NOF titles. A little later again, Sabine Lenk, who took an interest in my project as soon as she joined the team. Tom De Smet en Richard Soeter, for their buccaneer action to copy my favourite still.

At Nationaal Onderwijsmuseum, Tijs van Ruiten, for his hospitality and his generosity with the

institution's resources, and Jacques Dane, for various chances of exposure for my research. The members of the advisory committee for the exhibition "Een eeuw onderwijsfilm", and especially Marjolein de Zwaan en Floris Paalman (University of Amsterdam). Lenja Crins, and some of the museum's many unpaid volunteers, who occasionally shared their memories with me. But above all, Ed van Berkel, for the many hours he spent digging up tapes and getting U-matic players to perform, replying to my countless emails, and sharing his knowledge on subjects varying from by now superseded Dutch school systems, to the machinations of the former NOF/NIAM. For the selfless way in which he shared the results of his own surveys and research. And more in general, for the pleasant cooperation, both in the context of my own project, and in the run-up towards the exhibition.

Kees van Langeraad, Harry Jongbloed en the late Jan Marie Peters, for receiving me into their homes and sharing memories from times long before I was even born. Gerrit Lansink, for his anecdotes, and very simply, for his interest in what I do. Ole Schepp, for helping me out in the first months of my endeavour, when access to archive collections was still underway, and for giving me my only experience of what a teaching film screening must have been like. And, of course, for the many biscuits! Thierry Lecoite, for single-handedly filling the French hiatus in my corpus of primary texts. Catherine Cormon (Nederlands Filmmuseum/Heineken Collections), Leen Engelen (Catholic University of Leuven/Limburg Catholic University College), Anita Gertiser (University of Zurich), Mette Peters (NIAf) and Walter Swagemakers (Nederlands Filmmuseum), for literature tips, references, and various bits and bobs of information.

A particularly loud 'thank you' to Claudy Op den Kamp, for the many hours which she spent on making my research results more eye-friendly. Without her photographic, InDesign, and Photoshop skills, this piece of work would not have looked quite as attractive, nor as multi-medial. I want to thank her for her patience, and for fuelling my enthusiasm to carry out a crazy, 100-layered idea (to Thomas v.d. L.'s great regret). And, for being my second most faithful reader. ;-) Lots of cheers also to Tawnya Mosier, for her careful editing, and above all, for her conscientious removal of parentheses. Guy Edmonds, for his replies to *ad hoc* requests for language tips. Juan Vrijs, and once more Claudy (then at Cineco/Haghefilm), for a wide range of services and favours, both optical and digital. Karin van Es, for high-speed-googling, and transportation of various goods (legal). And of course, Bram 'MSN Me' Masson, for IT support from Ghent, Okpo, and who-knows-where-else.

In addition to the above, there are also some people who have helped me in more indirect ways with this undertaking – either by being there for me at times when life was a little harder, or by compensating with their presence the rather solitary existence of a PhD researcher. First, my colleague-*aio*'s at Muntstraat and Janskerkhof, and especially, Bregtje Lameris (my first acquaintance there), Wibo Bakker and Fransje de Jong (coffee buddies), and of course, Kristine 'Xylifresh' Steenbergh. Claudy, for the many hours, days, WEEKS she worked on my mental health (providing both advice and escapist stories). Liesbeth De Voogdt, and also Tawnya, my self-proclaimed 'cyber mom', for always *egging me on*. (T, I think I won...) Joanna Poses, for watching *De bruine rat* with me – part one *and* part two. The members of the 'Can It Get Any Worse?' Filmclub, the various Pub Quiz teams, and other distractive 'support groups'. Nanna en Lena Verhoeff, Pepita Hesselberth, Ronny Temme, Giovanna Fossati, and once more Karin, for shelter, food and/or general pampering in times of dental trouble. And of course,

my parents, for international assistance, practical and other. For always encouraging me to do what I want – without questioning my reasons. For receiving with enthusiasm anything that deals with the activities of *de grote karekiet*. And very simply for being there – even if I may not always have been myself. And last but not least: you, pup. No one ever let me into her life so quickly, so wholeheartedly...

Finally, I'd like to mention two more people who, perhaps without realising, gave me the first, but possibly crucial leg-up to start this project: Rick Prelinger and Chris Horak. Whenever I ran into them in the international circuit (first as an archivist, then as a PhD-researcher), they both, each in his own way, showed me their genuine appreciation for what I did. In the end, it was such pats on the back that encouraged me the most.

Oh and... did I mention *Claudy*!?

CURRICULUM VITAE

Eef Masson was born on 30 September 1976 in Ghent, Belgium. She studied Dutch and English language and literature at Ghent University, and film studies and film archiving at the University of East Anglia (Norwich, UK). From 2000 to 2003, she worked at Nederlands Filmmuseum, first as a film restorer, and then as a project leader in the museum's Collections Department. In 2004, she became a PhD researcher at the Research Institute of History and Culture (OGC) at Utrecht University. Since the autumn of 2008, she has been teaching at Utrecht's Department of Media and Culture Studies.

