

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 419 257

CS 509 840

AUTHOR Gutenko, Gregory
TITLE Deconstructing "Teletubbies": Differences between UK and US
 College Students' Reading of the Children's Television
 Program.
PUB DATE 1998-06-00
NOTE 17p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of The Canadian
 Communication Association (Ottawa, Ontario, Canada, June
 2-5, 1998).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Audience Response; *Childrens Television; *College
 Students; Comparative Analysis; *Critical Viewing; *Cultural
 Context; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; Media
 Research; Programming (Broadcast); *Television Viewing
IDENTIFIERS Alternative Conceptions; Deconstruction; *Teletubbies;
 United Kingdom; United States

ABSTRACT

In April 1997 in the United Kingdom (UK), "Teletubbies," a television program designed for young children, debuted. Unexpectedly, it developed a cult following among college students. In April 1998 "Teletubbies" debuted in the United States (US) on PBS. A study compared alternative readings and deconstructions of "Teletubbies" between UK and US college students to see what differences might be found and how these differences might reflect shared and unshared cultural significations between program and audiences. The study has been premature--UK student following probably matured during summer 1997, while the US student audience is currently unformed. Exposure to "Teletubbies" is not equivalent--"Teletubbies" airs much more frequently in the UK. Sampling methods are also now considered unreliable and invalid. No text records have been found of in-class deconstruction exercises occurring within two months of "Teletubbies" UK debut; the US exercise conducted occurred less than one month after "Teletubbies" debut, and study participants only had videotape exposure to the program. UK students have most often related integrated readings that deconstruct "Teletubbies" as either a "premier drug inducement program" or a portrayal of life after nuclear Armageddon wherein the Tubbies are mutants. In the US, 21 students in a culture/media studies class received guidelines regarding the conduct of deconstructive strategies. Six students read "Teletubbies" as being drug oriented, while a "comforting, mindless return to the womb" was noted by five students. The dominating influence of technology was apprehended by seven students. US students saw the Tubbies as being completely asexual in behavior, while UK students have tended to attribute sexual behaviors to the Tubbies. (Contains 25 references; program listings are attached. (NKA)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

Deconstructing Teletubbies: Differences between UK and US college students' reading of the children's television program.

Gregory Gutenko

Department of Communication Studies
University of Missouri at Kansas City

5712 West 92nd Terrace
Overland Park, Kansas 66207 USA
(816) 235-2729 (office)
(913) 341-0365 (home)
(816) 235-5539 (Fax)

e-mail: ggutenko@cctr.umkc.edu

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS
BEEN GRANTED BY

G. Gutenko

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

CS 509 840

Deconstructing Teletubbies: Differences between UK and US college students' reading of the children's television program.

In April 1997 the British Broadcasting Corporation debuted an innovative television program designed for children from one to four years of age (PBS Online; PBS News). Visually ambiguous and stimulating, Teletubbies quickly became very popular with its intended target audience. Unexpectedly, the four furry alien-like “techno-baby” Teletubbies and their surreal Tubbyland world also developed a cult following among college age young adults. (The campus activities calendar at Imperial College in London includes the airtimes and episode highlights for each show). One year later, on April 6, 1998, the Teletubbies debuted in the United States on the Public Broadcasting System. To what extent will the Tubby phenomenon repeat itself in the New World? Will college students in the US also be intrigued by Tubbymedia, and how might their readings of Tubbymythology compare to those of UK students?

TUBBY AMBIGUITIES

The visual and performance ambiguities inherent in Teletubbies have provoked more controversy and inspired more conjecture about “what are these things” than for any other childrens program previously aired in the UK. Nothing else has ever been both so unfamiliar and so unexplained.

It must be recognized that childrens television programming is designed by adults to be acceptable to both children and their parents. Parents must be at least comfortable that a particular program is appropriate for their children, if not actually entertained themselves by adult-directed asides that will make viewing with their children a tolerable rearing duty. Sesame Street is a prime example of a childrens program with integrated adult appeal (in-jokes and references). To be minimally comfortable for parents, a program requires culturally familiar and often nostalgic images and *signs*. Certainly, such images and *signs* must be at the very least recognized and understood by parents. It is not surprising then, that

most childrens programs can be very conservative, even reactionary, in their design. Rural settings, quaint lifestyles, and obsolete technologies abound in the television world, putting parents' minds at ease.

Many parents complained because Teletubbies displaced a popular, very conventional program, Playdays, which featured comforting trappings such as hand puppets and rural settings (O'Neill; The Baby-Boy report on the Teletubbies; Controversy).

Teletubbies provoked considerable parental suspicion and complaint in the United Kingdom soon after its debut. Many of these complaints focused on the "ethics" of targeting children as young or younger than one year of age, the extreme simplicity and repetitious nature of the content, and the intentional portrayal of infantile actions and speech patterns ("dumbing down").

The learning objectives in Teletubbies are less obvious and less advanced, and are overshadowed by apparently "bad" examples of language and motor skills, eg: "eh-oh" tubbytalk, frequent spillings, falling downs, and frequent confusions over what do next (O'Neill). Also, the deliberate surreal appearance of program, designed to appeal to the 2-4 year of age audience (these children may find the real world also as surreal, as inexplicable and as magical as Tubbyland) was a radical feature (Delingpole). Many parents have been almost as disturbed by the Teletubbies extreme physical appearances, "trippy" (drug experience) set designs, and computer-generated "visions" as by the subtle educational methodologies (Lawson; Boehm).

These were all issues that could be readily discerned by adult viewers. What was also very likely disturbing, but not easily articulated, was that Teletubbies was barren of familiar references and *signs*. Negative comments regarding "weirdness", "strangeness" and "alien-like" clearly reflected great discomfort suffered by adults when contending with the ambiguities and inexplicable world of the Tubbies. By design Teletubbies does not provide

familiar childrens show conventions (rural settings, past times, idealized presents, quaint technologies, industrial-age iconography, or mellow supervisory adult figures).

The creators of Teletubbies were clearly aware that they were offering up to their primary audience a world of inexplicable phenomena. In addressing target audience members that were preliterate or even preverbal in language, there was no point in attempting explanations of phenomena or even employing familiar (to parents) imagery, icons, or cultural *signs* within the context of the program. Programs designed for older children with language skills can easily offer explanations for any hapax or never-before encountered feature. The long-running Doctor Who had an alien Time Lord with a naive earthling as a constant companion who served expositionally to ask those questions the audience needed asked about what was going on in the strange Doctor Who world.

For a two-year-old, the entire real world is essentially built of alien phenomena lacking stable history and predictability. Every *sign* that might be learned becomes undone within hours or days. Teletubbies does not have the stability expected or understood by adults. It employs instead the stabilizing features (familiar agents) recognized and sought after by two year olds. The repetition of actions, video stories, and the always predictable responses of the Tubbies to their surroundings are there for the comfort and comprehension of the children, not their parents. This makes Teletubbies a Rorschach test that two-year-olds can enjoy but that most adults cannot abide. It was not created with parental comprehension, consolation, or approval first in mind, and so this particular controversy emerged.

Aimed at preliterate, prespeech children without in-context mechanisms for the explanation of unfamiliar content (Dr. Who's "companions"), the ambiguous signifiers in Tubbyland cannot be rationalized or explained while viewed. This encouraged public speculations and explanations among adults via unofficial Web

sites such as the Mcstev Report and Teletubbies Fact File! (Labbett) that emerged long before the BBC or Ragdoll, the program's producers, mobilized their official communications about the program's intended significations. Unofficial children's sites also appeared in order to disseminate appreciations and insights in lieu of an official Web site (eg: Oliver's Teletubby Page).

Yet another Tubbycontroversy regarded the BBC Legal department's threat of action against public Web sites using scanned images and sampled sounds from the program. Over 50 sites were active at the time of notification (August 1, 1997) and the result was the self-suspension of most of these sites, including the well-regarded Mcstev Report and Teletubbies Fact File! (the latter after over 6600 visits for information). Approximately 15 UK sites are still active, with most stripped of program images and sounds (eg: Der New 'Censored' Teletubby Worship Payj). As of this writing, less than 5 are still using images and sounds illegally (eg: Teletubbies Ate My Balls).

CONSOLING THE PARENTS

While the Tubbies' target audience may be fully at ease with the rampant ambiguities of Tubbyworld, their parents require guidance and reassurance. This has been provided through a large number of public relations announcements, official WWW web pages, and other adult and older-child targeted publications. Through these, all ambiguities of what the Tubbies are supposed to be and what their world is all about are largely dashed away in a monosignification process. *Signs* are officially stabilized and locked in. Fortunately, younger children do not need to know that the Teletubbie residence, called "home hill" in preschool Teletubbie storybooks, is officially called the "Tubbytronic Superdome". It is made officially clear that the Teletubbies are alien toddlers whose material and educational needs are satisfied by an extensive technology base. Rather than refer back to an adult-coddling idealized past-world, Teletubbies embraces a future-world where automation and electronics serves all needs and is even integrated

physically into the body (the TV screens built into the tummies). Teletubbies celebrates technological determinism with all the verve and unbridled optimism that had been employed by AT&T in their 1993 television corporate image campaign that portrayed humans in the future wired into an all-pervasive electronic web for work, play, education, marriage, etc. The universal tag-line in these spots was “you will”.

The message implied an inexorable future. For anyone with Luddite sympathies, this was a chilling message. A number of comments circulated by e-mail and in the press have found the “techno-baby” future-world of infant aliens raised by technology, without parents, and guided by unseen public address system entities to be chilling as well. Beautifully landscaped and under pleasant-sounding authoritarian direction, Tubbyland could be the day-care center in the Village (the incarceration community in the 1967 series The Prisoner).

TUBBY TECHNOLOGICAL DETERMINISM

For the Tubbies, technology has replaced “parental units”. They are cared for by their Home Hill (Tubbytronic Superdome) technologies and advised by various unseen entities without family connection using “public address system” voice trumpets. Anne Wood’s (program creator) intent is widely reported to be to make “children comfortable with technology” and so this program is a self-acknowledged indoctrination in support of technological determinism (similar to the 1992 AT&T image campaign).

One parent’s question to PBS about the absence of Tubby parents was not answered directly: “The Teletubbies live in an imaginary world where they are playfully self-sufficient: each program features the Teletubbies in Teletubbyland, which hums with the play technology that supplies their every need” (PBS Online). Offsetting this technoimagery, however, are the video segments of “earth kids” doing simple play activities accompanied often by parents or teachers. These segments are very conventional and are the most reassuringly

normal part of the program. But are these quaint human children real or just videotape archives from the past?

ALTERNATIVE READINGS

Perhaps college students only have time to catch the program on an irregular basis and no time at all to read up on the official explanations. Perhaps they have heard the official line but have sensed the disturbing technological determinism of the program. Whatever the reason, Teletubbies became a minor cult hit with the college crowd in the UK, but not always because of its obvious features of childhood play, fun, and innocence. While these sentiments were often appreciated and defended, there was also a great deal of deconstruction of Teletubby text.

The multiple Teletubbies audiences were: the intended primary audience of 2-4 year olds (some sources say 18 months to 4 years, a few say 1 to 6) by design. Carefully researched and focus group tested, this audience is successfully addressed; the parent audience which was (in my opinion) much less considered, and has resulted in the controversies noted above. Some parents are suspicious and disturbed by the lack of familiar signs and the abundance of powerful motivated signs without clear significations while others, on the other hand, embrace and enjoy the ambiguities and “magical” stimulations of the program and the childlike experiences they can then empathize with; other adult audiences that have responded to the childhood empathy experience. Some university students have cited this simpler level of appeal as well (The Baby-Boy report on the Teletubbies) and lastly the audience of notoriety, the college-age young adults who read the Tubby video text differently and have informally deconstructed the original significations to create diegetic alternatives that are a new source of entertainment and reinforcement for their own ilk. These alternative readings have enough integrity and complexity for the evolving series content to continue supporting these alternative readings.

This study's objective was to compare alternative readings and deconstructions between UK and USA students to see what differences might be found and how these differences might reflect shared and unshared cultural significations between program and audiences. It was also expected that US responses would be less expansive or detailed due to some of the cultural iconography (eg: widely used public address systems, custard) used in Teletubbies.

WHAT HAS CONFOUNDED THIS STUDY

The conduct of this study has been premature. The UK student following most likely matured during early summer to midsummer 1997 (based on the maximum number of Web sites launched). The US student audience (whatever it will ultimately be) is still unformed as of this writing.

Exposure to Teletubbies is not equivalent between the UK and US. Teletubbies aired in the UK twice a day and once on weekends over BBC2, a major, high viewership network. Airtimes continue to be at 7:15 and 10:00 am. UK student viewing habits reported that the 7:15 airtime was the most watched because it was before most first classes of the day and also reputedly at the ideal time to fall asleep after all-night partying. Students could watch this early showing to either wake up or fall asleep. In the US Teletubbies airs at various times (eg: 10:00 am in Kansas City, 2:00 pm in Nevada) but is unlikely to be shown earlier because local PBS affiliates did not want to displace the more popular childrens programs which have established themselves in the ideal earlier slots (avoiding a repeat of the Playdays uproar in the UK). Also, it airs on PBS, a network most college students do not seek out. There are also many cable channels (Nickelodeon, Cartoon Network) vying for the "kiddy-show for college" audience. Teletubbies, to date, has not developed a college cult following in the US anywhere near comparable to that in the UK.

Sampling methods are also now considered unreliable and invalid. No text records have been found of in-class deconstruction exercises taking place within

two months of the debut of Teletubbies in the UK. The US exercise conducted for this study took place less than one month after USA debut, and the only exposure to program for all the participants in this survey was through videotape screenings of Teletubbies in class.

Therefore, the results noted here show some difference in readings between UK and US students, but this must principally be attributed to the problems noted above.

RESULTS

The UK student readings have been drawn from commentary maintained on Web sites both self-maintained and provided through universities. These UK students have most often related integrated readings that consistently deconstruct Teletubbies as either a “premier drug inducement program”(Time For Teletubbies, Time for Teletubbies: Class A drugs; A Beginners Guide to Teletubbies; The Mystery of the Windmill; Here follows a small mention about the program) or a portrayal of life after nuclear Armageddon wherein the Tubbies are mutant human offspring maintained by the remnants of self-evolving war technologies (Moose Industries 2000; Phil; Arm-Riding).

The former reading was reportedly the most prevalent (Randall; Loaded) and less developed textually. The latter was less commonly held but was the most intertextually elaborated, with perhaps the most complex reading being offered by Moose Industries 2000: Tubbyland is H. G. Well’s future of The Time Machine, with the Tubbies being the docile Eloi foodsource species for the underground-dwelling Morlocks (who maintain the Tubbytechnology and manage the Eloi-tubbies via the voice trumpets). Both the Eloi and Morlocks are the mutant offspring of TeleTroopers, a combat engineered human derivative that survived the last war on earth.

(Also a number of unique readings: 1) the Pockett guide to: CHELTENHAM offers “evidence” that the Tubbies are based on the lives of

actual students, 2) Teletubbies Herald New Revolution (Appleyard) “reveals” that the program is a Communist plot, 3) Teletubbies - The True Story (Chapman) “discovers” that the Teletubbies are a naturally occurring animal species that was filmed by the BBC Natural History production unit for a program hosted by David Attenborough, but this documentary was mistakenly aired during children’s programming time, and 4) A Recombo DNA Lab Analysis “details” the genetic engineering of the Tubbies)

The US student readings were done as part of a voluntary course activity. Twenty-one students were enrolled in a culture and media studies class, and they were given specific guidelines regarding the conduct of deconstructive strategies. In this regard, they were probably over-informed about the process and much less naturalistic than many of their UK counterparts. It is also problematic that their exposure to cultural theory and examples may have sensitized them to particular “look for this” readings (Freudian, Marxist, Feminist, etc.) rather than their own group or personal cultures.

The limited time for program viewing and for reflection and response did not yield readings as thoroughly developed or as unified as would be found on a Web site. Students were instructed to write a 2 to 3 page textual analysis of the program, with particular attention to motivated signs and cultural significance. A number of general alternative themes and individual signs were as follows, with the specific readings ordered from those most in accord to least in accord with UK students.

1) Six students read Teletubbies as being drug-oriented, with three suggesting that drugs are needed for any adult to be motivated to watch the program and three offering that the evident function of the Windmill is to distribute drugs through the air to influence Tubby behavior. This is fully in accord with the most popular UK student alternative reading of the Teletubbies as being drug related.

2) A comforting, mindless, “return to the womb”, “like being a kid again” appeal was noted by five students, and is consistent with the appeal reported by one UK student source (The Baby-Boy report on the Teletubbies).

3) The voice trumpets’ omnipresence and influence on the Tubbies coupled with the Tubbies’ “Pavlovian” behaviors and the surveillance activity of the Baby Sun lead five subjects to describe Teletubbies as “Orwellian”. This was also the reaction offered by one post-graduate student at York University, UK (Arm-Riding) and is also a subtheme in the UK post-apocalyptic scenarios. I would speculate here that the prevalence of public address use is far greater in the UK, with its extensive and complex mass transit systems, than in the US, and so the role of the voice trumpets is apprehended to be much more intrusive by US students. There is less P.A. behavioral direction in the car culture of the US.

4) The dominating influence of technology was apprehended by seven students, with its vivid contrast with the natural environment of Tubbyland noticed by three of these students. The program’s producers intend that technology be seen by young children as fun and supportive; these students see technology as being less than benign. Again, this role of technology as life controlling is also part of the UK post-apocalyptic scenarios. One US student was reminded of the Jetsons, but did not identify any particular motivated sign with this connection.

5) In contrast to UK students, US students saw the Tubbies as being completely asexual in behavior but read the aeriels and voice trumpets as phallic and home hill as breast-like. UK students have widely tended to attribute sexual behaviors and relationships to the Tubbies, but this are less likely to have anything to do with deconstructed significations and are more likely forced inventive parodies inspired as a reaction against Tubby asexuality. As with the US students, UK students have also “run away” with phallic technological imagery (voice trumpets, windmill, custard machine, etc.)

6) The Baby Sun was attributed roles as the creator or the god of Tubbyland or the center of a world for babies by five US students. These readings appear to give the Baby Sun a higher level of importance than has been found in UK student sites (Moose Industries identifies the Baby Sun as the Starchild, former astronaut Dave Bowman, seen in the conclusion of 2001: A Space Odyssey) but one UK site does describe Baby Sun as “Ed, part-time sun and god” (Der New 'Censored' Teletubby Worship Payj).

DISCUSSION

Despite the study problems noted earlier which make it impossible to draw clear comparative observations regarding UK and US student deconstruction of the Teletubbies, a few conclusions can be drawn about student readings of this program in general: the program has been read as a drug culture text, as a technological determinism text, and as an “innocence-lost” text. At the hands of college students it is hard to draw a line between sincerely deconstructed text and constructed parody. However, these readings have been compiled from both UK students who have thought long about Teletubbies and US students who are still baffled from their first encounter. It remains to be seen what, if any, true cult following Teletubbies will generate in the US, and how US student Websites may refine these readings differently. It is likely, however, that any US student developing their new site will first visit and read established UK sites, and therefore the content of their pages will not evolve independently from UK influence. One consistent line of comment from the US students in this survey: it’s boring, too slow, and I’ll never watch it. This bodes ill for any repeat of Tubbymania in the US university world.

SOURCES CITED

A Beginners Guide to Teletubbies. [On-line UK website]
Available: <http://wkweb4.cableinet.co.uk/alford/intro/intro.htm>

Appleyard, Bryan. Teletubbies Herald New Revolution.
[On-line UK website] Available: <http://members.wbs.net/homepages/l/a/r/lardon/>

A Recombo DNA Lab Analysis. [On-line UK website]
Available: <http://members.wbs.net/homepages/l/a/r/lardon/>

Arm-Riding, Simon. Newsgroups: york.phys.talk. [On-line UK website]
Available: <http://www.york.ac.uk/~sar106>

Baby-Boy report on the Teletubbies. [On-line UK website].
Available: <http://www.angelfire.com/la/babyboyz/report.html>

Boehm, Erich. (August 11, 1997). Teletubbies drive Brits to distraction.
Variety, 368, 1, p. 21, 29.

Chapman, Chris. Teletubbies--The True Story. [On-line UK website]
Available: <http://easyweb.easynet.co.uk/~palindrome/comedy/tubby.htm>

Controversy. [On-line UK website]
Available: <http://www.curve.demon.co.uk/teletubbies/controversy.html>

Delingpole, James. (May 31, 1997). Trippy or what? Spectator, 278,
pp. 52-53

Der New 'Censored' Teletubby Worship Payj. [On-line UK website]
Available: <http://wkweb4.cableinet.co.uk/alford/tubbmain.htm>

Donachie, P.and Betro, J. Teletubbies Ate My Balls. [On-line UK website]
Available: Dazzler@betro.demon.co.uk

Eifion's Teletubby Page. [On-line UK website]
Available: <http://www.thenet.co.uk/~eifs/>

Here follows a small mention about the program. [On-line UK website]
Available: <http://www.applecrumble.demon.co.uk/students.htm>

Labbett, David. Teletubbies Fact File! [On-line UK website]
Available: <http://www.netmatters.co.uk/users/davelabbett/teletubbies/teletubbies.html>

Lawson, Nigella. (May 21 1997). Teletubbies is for the amusement of toddlers, not their parents. The Times Times Newspapers Limited

Mcstev Report. [On-line UK website]
Available: <http://www.users.globalnet.co.uk/~mcstev/letters.htm>

Moose Industries 2000. [On-line UK website]
Available: <http://moose.spesh.com/index.html/>

O'Neill, Sean. (Tuesday 20 May 1997). Mothers lead a revolt in Teletubbieland. Electronic Telegraph UK News [On-line serial], 725. Telegraph Group Limited.

PBS Online: About the show and Website. [On-line US website]
Available: <http://www.pbs.org/>

PBS News: PBS partners with Ragdoll Productions and the Itsy Bitsy Entertainment Company to air innovative preschool series "Teletubbies". [On-line US website] Available: <http://www.pbs.org/point/>

Phil. [On-line UK website]
Available: <http://www.curve.demon.co.uk/teletubbies/tubbyinfo.html>

pockett guide to CHELTENHAM: Teletubbie Information Center. [On-line UK website] Available: <http://www.teletubby.co.uk/teletubbyland.html>

Randall, Gareth. (December 3, 199). Oliver's Tubby Talkline. [On-line UK website] Available: <http://www.users.dircon.co.uk/~julia1/teletubbies/tubbies.html>

The Mystery of the Windmill. [On-line UK website]
Available: <http://wkweb4.cableinet.co.uk/alford/windmill/windmill.htm>

Time For Teletubbies, Time for Teletubbies: Class A drugs. [On-line UK website]
Available: <http://www.fortunecity.com/boozers/samsplace/6/teletubby.htm>

Basketball

The Teletubbies watch a young boy and his father playing basketball. A balloon appears in Teletubbyland and the Teletubbies follow it until it floats down.

They take turns holding the balloon before dancing a stamping and stepping dance.

06/11/1998 06/11/1998

Stone Wall

Friday Tinky Winky, Dipsy, Laa-Laa and Po watch two children help build a stone wall then a large wall appears in Teletubbyland. The Teletubbies play a hiding game behind the wall before dancing a silly dance.

06/12/1998 06/12/1998

Emily & Jester

M Tinky Winky, Dipsy, Laa-Laa and Po watch a young girl looking after her pony, then a voice trumpet tells a popular nursery rhyme. Magical animals appear and the Teletubbies tiptoe through a dance.

06/15/1998 06/15/1998

Ned's Bicycle

Tues Teletubbies love to run and do exercises. They watch a father and son riding their bicycles, then a magical flag appears in Teletubbyland.

06/16/1998 06/16/1998

Music With Debbie

Wed The Teletubbies watch some children joining in with Debbie's music. A butterfly appears in Teletubbyland and there's time for a dance before Tubby Bye-Bye.

06/17/1998 06/17/1998

Ice Skating

The Teletubbies love to eat Tubby Custard, but Po spills hers on the floor and Noo Noo the vacuum cleaner cleans up the mess. The Teletubbies watch some children ice skating.

06/18/1998 06/18/1998

Washing Up

Laa-Laa dances with her ball. Then the Teletubbies stop to watch Yvette wash her plastic cups and saucers. There's time for Tubby Custard before three magic ships sail through Teletubbyland.

06/19/1998 06/19/1998

Jumping

The Teletubbies are very happy and have fun jumping all over Teletubbyland before watching children doing the same in the city. A carousel flies into Teletubbyland with a surprise inside.

06/22/1998 06/22/1998

Bubbles

Tues Po has fun blowing bubbles at everything in Teletubbyland, then the Teletubbies watch some children making their own bubbles. Laa-Laa plays catch with the other Teletubbies, then they all dance a

6/23

happy dance.

06/23/1998 06/23/1998

Shadows

Tinky Winky, Dipsy, Laa-Laa and Po dance a twist then watch some children having fun making shadows. Po decides to play a hiding game and all the Teletubbies join in, one by one.

06/24/1998 06/24/1998

Guitars

The Teletubbies watch two girls meet Tito, a flamenco guitar player, who plays them a nursery rhyme. A guitar then magically appears in Teletubbyland.

06/25/1998 06/25/1998

Numbers (Two)

The Teletubbies watch some children learn about the number 2. A magic cloud with magic powers rains special magic flowers all over Teletubbyland.

06/26/1998 06/26/1998

Rolling

Tinky Winky, Dipsy, Laa-Laa and Po watch some children rolling things up and down a hill. Po starts all the Teletubbies rolling through Teletubbyland then a magical merry-go-round appears from far away.

CC, Stereo, TV-Y

Educational Taping Rights: 3 years from original broadcast

TV Listings -- Check Local Satellite

Listings 06/29/1998 06/29/1998

Music With Debbie 2

The Teletubbies watch Debbie and some children singing songs. A Voice Trumpet appears and plays a game with Po and Tinky Winky called "Two Little Teletubbies." All the Teletubbies join in and dance a happy dance.

06/30/1998 06/30/1998

|| What's On TV || Satellite Schedule || TV Schedule || Picks of the Month
|| Trivia Challenge || PBS Online ||

CS 509840



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)



REPRODUCTION RELEASE
(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Deconstructing <u>Teletubbies</u> : Differences between UK and US college students' reading of the children's television program	
Author(s): Gregory Gutenko	
Corporate Source:	Publication Date: June 2, 1998

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic/optical media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS) or other ERIC vendors. Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following options and sign the release below.



Sample sticker to be affixed to document

Sample sticker to be affixed to document



Check here

Permitting microfiche (4"x 6" film), paper copy, electronic, and optical media reproduction

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY _____ *Sample* _____ TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Level 1

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY _____ *Sample* _____ TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Level 2

or here

Permitting reproduction in other than paper copy.

Sign Here, Please

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits. If permission to reproduce is granted, but neither box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

"I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic/optical media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries."

Signature: <i>Gregory Gutenko</i>	Position: Associate Professor
Printed Name: Gregory Gutenko	Organization: University of Missouri
Address: Communication Studies, 203 RH University of Missouri at Kansas City 5100 Rockhill Road, Kansas City, MO 64110	Telephone Number: (816) 235-2729
	Date: June 11, 1998

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of this document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents which cannot be made available through EDRS).

Publisher/Distributor:	
Address:	
Price Per Copy:	Quantity Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name and address of current copyright/reproduction rights holder:
Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse: <p style="text-align: center;">ERIC Clearinghouse 030 Huntington Hall Syracuse University Syracuse, NY 13244-2340 U.S.A.</p>
