

Johnson's article "Watching TV Makes You Smarter" is arguing ^{the} truth of the urban culture in connection to television. Television is in fact a useful tool of cognitive learning amongst the youth. There are channels like the Noggin channel that is referred ^{to} as being like kindergarten on television. Little ones watch and learn as simple as that. On the contrary there are other kinds of channels that play other genres such as drama and reality shows. ^{There is though} ~~though there is~~ one genre that is becoming increasingly popular. That genre is the soap opera?

The reason why is because "soap opera[s] structure made it one of the most complicated narratives on television..." (52). The reason why people are attracted to this genre is said in Johnson's article. The average person's mind is lured towards complex plots and a medium that makes one think.

Johnson's conclusion is an accurate description of how children and young adults do learn from television. Being a young adult and being a complex individual, enjoying things like mysteries and shows with complex plots, one learns a great deal from television. Johnson, in his article explains the changes of television for the past 30 years. He articulates on page 53 "... [T]he mind ... likes to be challenged; there's real pleasure to be found in solving puzzles, detecting patterns or unpacking a complex narrative system" (53). Johnson argues television is good for young adults because it is good for the mind. One can interpret his conclusion to argue television is what the mind needs to grow in cognitive training. Another perspective

claims his inference to be against parental control of what the children watch. But this article discusses the contrary.

In this article Johnson clearly affirms the audiences his reasoning behind what he is suggesting the parents to do. Johnson requests parents to oversee the media children take in he just wants parents to understand there is a difference between bad television and television that trains one cognitively. Johnson states evidently for those believers on page 53 his intentions. He declares "What I am arguing for is a change in the criteria we use to determine what really is cognitive junk food and what is genuinely nourishing. Instead of a show's violent or tawdry content, instead of wardrobe malfunctions of the f-word, the true test [to determine good television for young adults and children] should be whether a given show engages or sedates the mind." (53). Here Johnson wants the parents to know that assessing television for their children should be based on whether the show on television engages the child's mind ,where they are learning by solving problems and making inferences, or tranquilizes the child's mind where they are not active in the show mentally.

Therefore television in its entirety is not as bad as most people believe. It is possible to learn for a show that has some violence with purpose instead of one thread of a plot and no sense of challenging the mind. How one makes the decision on whether a show is suitable for a child should be determined through how much of a cognitive learning comes as a reaction from the content of the show. Television should entice one's mind and ^{should be} ~~is possible to be~~ viewed as a educational thing.