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INTRODUCTION

Shortly after the writer had first met the decision-maker who is the focus of this study and had clarified for him what his intentions for the study were, the decision-maker himself expressed his thoughts on the study by saying:

I hope it would be an objective study of the decision-making process which would not really be affected by personalities or impingement of people's ideas about what they think the media should be doing. And I really think that it has to be a study that talks about what it (media) really can do, what it does well and what it doesn't do well. The parameters of its operation have to be clearly spelled out. Then I think it can be an objective, a profitable study.

And I would want it to be a study which told young people who are coming along, the real world of media, rather than some dream world that is all mixed up with stars and big salaries. That's what we're after.

The researcher does not think he could have expressed more succinctly what his own intentions for the study were. His hopes and his best efforts have been to achieve these purposes.
Chapter 1

THE PROBLEM OF EMPHASIS IN RESEARCH ON TELEVISION

Virtually all inhabited parts of the United States are now within reception range of a TV signal, and 96% of all homes have a TV set. Over 175,000,000 TV sets have been sold in the United States alone. Neilsen reports that television sets are on in the average television household for six hours per day. Further, children from two to eleven years old watch television on the average 3½ to 4½ hours each day. In 1970, TV advertisers spent $3.66 billion for air time.¹

The numbers involved in the current state of television broadcasting are impressive. Few question that television has had an impact on American culture. Rather, since television's beginnings, researchers have been attempting to assess the nature of this impact.

Most efforts to date have concentrated on analyzing the audience for and the content of mass communications. For example, the question of who is watching at what time has been a major source

of concern for advertisers. Similarly, how the content of television, such as its frequent portrayal of violence, affects viewers is another example of the type of question that researchers have been trying to answer. Yet few studies in the growing body of research literature have been focused on the mass media communicator.

A research review readily documents the general lack of studies of these mass communicators and the systems in which they function, compared to the amount of research devoted to the analysis of content and audience.

Leo Bogart, in the 1972 edition of his *The Age of Television*, asserts the continuing lack of research in this area:

> Much is known about the audiences for various types of television programs, but remarkably little is known about the broadcasters themselves. . . . Social scientists have not yet looked seriously at the social structure of the industry, and the relationship among its corresponding parts: the creative personnel—performers and writers, the network program and production people, the local station owners, the advertisers and advertising agencies. This is an industry that calls upon the services of many types of specialists with differing interests and very differing conceptions of the objectives of television itself. Few systematic studies have described the way in which various elements of the industry think of the audience and its wants.2

---


It is interesting to note that in his revision of his Appendix, "The Status of Research," the only change in this direct quote from the 1958 Edition is in the last sentence. "Few systematic studies have described" replaces "No one has yet systematically...." In fourteen years little progress has been made in studying the television industry itself.
J. D. Halloran further stresses the need for research in this area by pointing out that there have been "few systematic attempts to study the mass communicator as one who occupies a sensitive central position in a social network, rejecting and selecting information in response to a variety of pressures all within a given social system."³

The British Television Research Committee, charged with wide ranging research responsibilities, sums up the mass communication research situation by emphasizing that both communicator and recipient should be studied in terms of their group relationships and affiliations:

Often in the past, mass communication research has missed both the vital individual ongoing psychological processes and the vital ongoing processes of social interaction.

Both communicator and recipient must be studied in terms of their group relationships and affiliations. Attempts must be made to locate both the communicator and the recipient within the social structure and to examine the alignment of the reference groups, as well as their relationship to each other and their relationship to the whole. In addition to the reference group approach, small group theory and organizational theory also have contributions to make....

In short, the communication process . . . must be studied within its full social context.⁴


A modest body of studies of gatekeepers and decision-makers in the news media exists. MacLean, for example, reviews several typical gatekeeper studies from the news media area. But even here the problem is that studies have been confined, on the whole, to the lower levels of mass media operations. The higher levels of economic planning and policy-making remain practically uncharted.

What seems to emerge from the gatekeeping studies MacLean reviews is that it is at the higher rather than the lower levels that crucial decisions are made controlling what reaches the mass audience. MacLean found that by the time decisions reach the individual media outlets, in this case newspapers, choice of content and form were already severely limited by choices higher up the line.

As in most other industries, broadcasters are understandably reluctant to let themselves be studied on a top managerial level. Each company feels that competitively valuable information will be disclosed or embarrassing situations revealed.

---


In addition, theories of mass communication which take into account sociological realities have only recently become available.\(^9\) For example, a major contribution of Quarantelli's\(^{10}\) model of mass communication is to make explicit that the "mass communicator" is in reality a system of interrelated decision-makers who each contribute in some large or small way to the content of what is finally communicated. Whereas a book may have only one author, who is essentially responsible for its content, a television show can have literally dozens of people (producer, writer, director, cameraman--to name just four) who make substantial contributions to the shape of the final product. In mass communication it is often difficult to determine the extent of the contributions made by the various people involved in a specific production. Studying the personal and institutional influences on a key decision-maker in this system could shed considerable light on the program decision-making process.

There is a further urgency for studies that address themselves to exploring the systems surrounding the mass communicator because mass communication generally is seen to be the product of fewer and fewer corporate systems, and therefore fewer and fewer groups of decision-makers, having unprecedented access to huge audiences.\(^{11}\)

---

\(^{9}\) Halloran, p. 6.

\(^{10}\) Enrico Quarantelli, "Unpublished Lecture Notes," Recorded Spring Quarter, 1974, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.

For example in 1959, 45% of television stations were controlled by larger entities. In 1967, 75% were controlled by larger entities. There is even consolidation of control across media. In 1973, 25% of all television stations were owned by newspapers. This is another reason why it is increasingly important to understand how institutional and personal factors influence the convictions and choices of key program decision-makers, especially at the upper levels of commercial network hierarchy.

I. The Purpose

This study attempts to make a contribution to the much needed research on the mass media communicator and decision-maker by assessing and making explicit what personal and institutional factors influence a commercial television network vice-president and executive producer in the selection and development of children's programming.

Children's television has been a special source of interest and controversy in recent years because it has been the focus of much concern by the Federal Communications Commission, public interest groups such as Action for Children's Television from outside the industry, and from the National Association of Broadcasters from within the industry.

---

12 Enrico Quarantelli, Unpublished Lecture Notes.
In a 1975 New York Times article, John Schneider, president of the CBS broadcast group, outlined the impact from the networks' point of view by asserting that children's television has become a "marginal undertaking" for CBS. Profits from this programming at CBS have declined 69% between 1972 and 1975 for three major reasons. First, industry codes reduced ads from 16 minutes per hour to 9½ for the 1975 fall season. Second, ad guidelines have limited or excluded completely the advertising of some products, such as vitamins, forcing the rejection of some ads. And third, some advertisers have withdrawn from children's shows "because they don't wish to take the heat from the various groups that oppose some, or all, advertising when children are watching."

In addition, Mr. Schneider contends that the networks have been responsive to public pressure to virtually eliminate all unmotivated violence, the use of animation "featuring unreal characters," and to move toward programming which tries to communicate information or pro-social values in an entertainment context. In short, children's television is of particular interest at this time because it continues to be a source of attention and concern to both the industry and the public.

---


An in-depth study of the personal and institutional influences on the decision making of an upper-level commercial network children's programming decision-maker has potential to suggest what may be taking place with other decision-makers and shed light on the social system within which such executives work.

Paul Lazarsfield attests to the usefulness of this approach:

. . . A whole series of studies is required to give a rounded picture (of institutions like broadcasting). However, ingenious ways to cut into the system can surely be devised.

In the study of most organizations, one can find such critical points, and once they are understood, the other parts of the system are illuminated as well.15

Grounded in a tradition of gatekeeper studies in the news media, Malcolm MacLean strongly advocates the analysis of the single case within the media organizational context. This study uses such an approach to find a critical point in the system which hopefully will provide more general illumination.

Although it is hazardous to generalize from an in-depth study of a single program decision-maker, such a study could enhance understanding of:

1. the personal and institutional factors which influence the selection of children's television and other general programming.

2. the influences and predicaments that mass media program
decision-makers can anticipate.

3. the effects of the commercial marketplace on the
   educational values in commercial children's programming.

4. the factors in the structure of commercial broadcasting
   which can be expected to influence programming decisions.

5. how future and currently working program decision-makers
   can be more effective in their decision-making roles.

II. Assumptions Underlying the Study

The following assumptions are made explicit in order to place
the study in context. The assumptions should also enable a more
accurate assessment of its generalizability and impact.

First, the study is built on the assumption that research on
the mass communicator is necessary and important. The small number
of TV broadcast systems in relationship to the mass audience, as well
as the expressed concern of responsible researchers substantiates
this assumption.

Second, it is assumed that the study of the single gatekeeper
is a valid way to explore seriously the inner workings of mass
communication systems and how key decision-makers affect programming.
The research of MacLean and the body of journalism gatekeeper studies
supports this approach. It is necessary to point out that while one
study can be informative and rich in implications, that a series of
studies will need to be made to provide a basis for accurate comparisons and generalizations.

Third, this study assumes that research at the higher levels of the television network hierarchy is an area of special need in the research on mass communicators. Bogart and Halloran asserted this need. And it is presumed that a network vice-president, who has been a producer and executive-producer of children's programs since their inception on television, is a key decision-maker and a member of a network hierarchy.

Fourth, it is assumed that this investigation can serve as the basis for some tentative generalizations about the factors that affect all mass media decision-makers, perhaps through comparisons with the few studies that have already been done.

Fifth, it is assumed that during the time the researcher is observing the decision-maker, the decision maker will be engaged in activities and processes that typify his functioning as a decision-maker. The time of observation is necessarily brief because of the researcher's financial limitations, distance, and the sheer lack of availability of an executive who spends as much time traveling as he does working in his network office. The research will have to rely on the reports of the decision-maker and his associates concerning whether the sample of the subject's activities is representative.

Sixth, it is assumed that the presence of the observer in the setting does not substantially disrupt the normal flow of activities and conversations.
III. Statement of the Problem

In general terms this study seeks to examine the factors that influence a key children's program decision-maker in a national television network. Some of the specific questions the study hopes to address are the following:

1. How do relationships in the network hierarchy and social structure affect the decision-making of a specific decision-maker in that system?
2. Over what specific elements of programming does a network vice-president and executive-producer have final authority?
3. How important are the audience ratings in determining the content and form of children's programming?
4. What influence does the Federal Government bring to bear on commercial networks and upon children's programming?
5. What influence does the general public have upon network decision-making in the area of children's programming?
6. How does the educational community affect commercial children's programming and affect one key children's programmer in particular?
7. Does public recognition such as awards and critical praise affect the quality of commercial children's programming?
8. Does educational programming on public television affect children's programming on commercial television?

9. How does a key program decision-maker affect the development of a specific program from idea through production?

10. How do the personality and personal values of a key decision-maker affect children's programming?

11. How do the day to day actions and decisions of a program decision-maker affect children's programs.

12. How does an important network executive affect the forces that surround and impinge upon him?

13. What factors contribute to surviving and succeeding in a commercial network?

IV. The Researcher in the Setting

A description and account of the origin and process of the research activities may help clarify the nature of the data collected and permit some assessment of the validity of the analysis. Because the decision-maker foresaw misunderstanding by his colleagues of the study's purposes, he wished to remain anonymous. Hereafter he will be referred to as Mr. Decision-Maker or Mr. D-M.

In its broadest sense the idea for the project arose out of the researcher's interest in anthropological and sociological approaches to the study of problems in education and in communications. He believes that much more needs to be known about the social dynamics
of educational and communications institutions in order better to understand how they affect the public they serve and how the public in turn affects them. In addition, the researcher is convinced of the power of Q-sort approaches for examining the single case.

Arrangements for Meeting the Decision-Maker

The idea for this particular study first arose when the researcher heard the decision-maker speak before a university class. Without benefit of an introduction, he approached the decision-maker and asked in a general way if the decision-maker might consider permitting the researcher to spend some time with him observing him in his work setting in order to explore how the decision-making at the upper levels of management affects children's television programming.

Mr. D-M reacted favorably and the researcher suggested that he might make further contact with him through the instructor for the class. In the summer of 1974, the researcher approached the instructor, who later became an advisor to the study, to initiate a contact. At the time Mr. D-M was executive producer of a major special for his network that had shooting locations on three continents. Because of this, it was difficult even to get in touch with him. It took two months to make the first contact. Mr. D-M expressed interest in participating in the project and suggested that the researcher and he talk personally in November, 1974, when he would again be on campus to speak before the professor's classes.
When the researcher met him, Mr. D-M was guarded about making a commitment to being involved in the study. His major concern was to assure himself that the study would not jeopardize his position in the network and that the study would be a useful and important one. To this end he wished to explore the purposes of the study and the background and capabilities of the researcher. He was particularly critical of a doctoral dissertation that had focused on a previous children's television show he had produced. He felt that the study in question did not address critical issues in television broadcasting.

He said that he felt this study would be profitable if it would be an objective study of the decision-making process, not "one which went on about what the media should be doing." He said that it had to be a study that talks about what the media really can do, what it does well and what it doesn't do well. And he wanted it to be a study which told young people coming along about the real world of the media, rather than about some dream world that is all mixed up with stars and big salaries. The researcher could hardly have been more pleased with such a statement of purposes.

Mr. D-M also seemed assured by the age and on-the-job teaching experience of the researcher. He said that if the researcher could apply some of his practical eleven years of "beating his head against the wall in the real world of classroom teaching," he might come out with something more introspective and practical than statements about how decision-making should be done. If the researcher could do this, the study would have merit for him and be more than just a nice, tidy paper.
These statements were made at the opening of what turned out to be the first focused interview with Mr. D-M. This initial contact with him produced approximately four hours of tape recorded transcripts, the bulk of which covered conversations in the classes of the professor who had invited Mr. D-M to the campus. Discussions centered around a children's series currently running on the air and the plans for the coming year's series. It also produced two sorts on the New-Program Concept Q-Instrument.16

Data from this Q-sort instrument would eventually be used to supplement data gathered by observation and interviews. Mr. D-M also promised to call within two months to set up a time for the researcher to spend a week with him in New York.

Largely because of difficulties surrounding the major special he was working on, and because he was currently responsible for 23 individual television shows, the week's observation took five months to arrange instead of the expected two. In the meantime work went into firming up the field-study approach, writing interview guides for Mr. D-M and his associates, and establishing the rationale for the administration of two Q-sort instruments.

The researcher used a Program Evaluation and Review Technique (PERT) model adapted from the work of Desmond Cook in organizing the research effort. See Appendix I for the model used for this study.

One week before the actual observation, while in New York City for another purpose, the researcher met briefly with the decision-maker's secretary to explain to her more specifically what his expectations would be. While not indispensible, this meeting was important in making his entry into the setting a smooth one. The decision-maker's secretary turned out to be an "informant" in the field study sense of the term. She provided invaluable assistance during the actual observation period in sorting out who did what among the many people interacting with Mr. D-M, and in helping the researcher find his way around the large office building and the city. She is also one of six of Mr. D-M's associates with whom the researcher was able to arrange formal interviews.

Observation in the Setting

From the moment of his arrival, the researcher was denied almost nothing in terms of being able to observe Mr. D-M's interactions with his associates and to have access to the office files, daily correspondence, and office memo traffic. In fact, Mr. D-M began
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to go over the mail with the researcher almost immediately. He was solicitous in explaining a little of the background of each letter, the nature of the "bundle" of news releases his network sends around each day, and so on. The researcher was permitted to keep "the bundle," and other published mail and could review and take notes on personal correspondence. When limited time permitted, a review was made of the copies of correspondence from the previous 30 days. Mr. D-M knew, the researcher is sure, that in these office letters was one totally personal and moving letter to a relative. The researcher took the fact that he was permitted to see this letter, as well as the others in the file, as an indication of Mr. D-M's willingness to be open with the researcher about himself and his concerns. Seeing and being able to take notes on these letters was valuable in clarifying events of the five-day observation period.

Later in the day, Mr. D-M pointed out the files on the two children's series he currently had in production. The files contained scripts, background materials, directions to writers, etc. An effort was made to concentrate on individual shows in immediate production, i.e. shows which had staff members presently in the building. Access to these files was open, with the restriction that nothing be taken from the office without expressed permission. One particularly valuable item able to be taken from the file was a copy of Mr. D-M's personal guidelines to be followed by script writers for one series. Access was also provided to phone logs for the week, so that notes on phone calls heard in the office could be checked against the complete list of calls for each day.
The decision-maker's office was divided by furniture arrangement into two general areas. The researcher was invited to sit and work in the meeting area, while Mr. D-M worked either at his circular glass desk or his typewriter. Since the researcher had access to correspondence and files relating to shows on which Mr. D-M was working, he could review materials while Mr. D-M was attending to desk work such as answering the phone or answering mail. The modest separation of the meeting area from the desk area made it possible covertly to jot notes in a small notebook to aid remembering events and conversations about which full field notes were made each evening.

When Mr. D-M introduced the researcher to his associates in his office or in other settings, he sometimes opened humorously by saying that the researcher was from the F.B.I., which usually brought smiles, before he went on to explain that the researcher was studying the decision-making process. To those who knew the professor who made the initial contact, Mr. D-M would say that the professor had sent the researcher to study how decisions were made at the network. This latter introduction almost invariably elicited comments such as, "When you find out, let us know." Mr. D-M had provided a desk in a small office-storage room for the researcher to work at when not in the decision-maker's office.

In any case, Mr. D-M always make it clear that the researcher would not be offended to be asked to leave the office or setting if those interacting with Mr. D-M wished him to leave. If the interaction in the office took place at Mr. D-M's desk, the researcher
tried to remain as unobtrusive as possible in the meeting area. Sometimes covert jottings could be made. When the participants were situated in the meeting area, jottings were made at the first opportunity after the meeting—sometimes when Mr. D-M was working at his typewriter, sometimes at lunch alone, sometimes taking a few extra moments in the rest room.

Once, after the researcher was a little too obtrusively jotting notes during a meeting, Mr. D-M told him afterwards that the other party might find it offensive. The researcher was more careful to be unobtrusive from that point on.

The effect of the presence of the researcher on the interactions seemed to be minimal. For example, once when Mr. D-M left the room to check on something in the midst of a loud and animated interchange among four participants concerning who would have the right to package a show (and therefore stand to gain several thousand dollars), one of the participants whom the researcher had just met said to him, "I guess this is more (excitement) than you expected." In general, participants accepted the researcher with little suspicion. A few were guarded; several offered information and help. To those who inquired about the nature of the study, the researcher indicated that he was practicing researcher skills. Relatively few of the decision-maker's close associates learned the full scope and nature of the study.

Mr. D-M had explained to the researcher that since he teaches one class for a local university, he often has students in and out of
his office, so there was a precedent for the researcher's being there as far as others in the setting were concerned.

Across the entire week, there were only four daytime meetings that Mr. D-M attended at which the researcher was not present. Only two of these took place in his office. Mr. D-M said that the researcher's presence would be too difficult to explain to the people in other areas who would be present at the meetings. However, he was always willing to explain in a general way who was involved and what happened at the meetings. For example, the researcher was not invited to sit in on a meeting to discuss whether the network would buy a new children's series developed by a producer from the midwest. Since the meeting was during the first day of observation, the only person of several the researcher would have known at the meeting was Mr. D-M. Since the decision-maker was making a case to his bosses for the network to buy the show, any suspicion caused by the researcher's presence could have harmed his efforts.

The first two days moved at a very brisk pace with constant meetings and phone calls. It was reassuring to the researcher when Mr. D-M commented spontaneously as he was leaving the office at day's end, "That's the way things go around here. This has been a typical day." The days were exhausting. Once the researcher had to record his field notes on tape, because he had attended an evening meeting with the decision-maker and arrived at his hotel past midnight.
Relationship With the Decision-Maker

Rapport between Mr. D-M and the researcher improved as the week progressed. On the first day Mr. D-M suggested where the researcher could eat lunch while he ran some necessary errands for his wife. Later in the week the researcher was invited to supper with the decision-maker and his wife; to travel to Philadelphia with the decision-maker and one of his writer-directors to meet an orchestra conductor who was to be the focus of a children's special; and finally, the researcher was invited to join Mr. D-M a week later while he worked with one of his crews on location. The researcher feels that this was in part an effort by Mr. D-M to see that the researcher was "denied nothing" in his observation of the television decision-making process.

Other participants in the setting referred to the decision-maker as Mr. D-M or by his first name indiscriminately. The researcher used Mr. D-M and never felt quite comfortable addressing him or referring to him by his first name.

The informal supper and the trip to Philadelphia were the only two occasions when the researcher experienced a conflict about being in a setting and observing it at the same time. Laughter and easy talk made it seem a little incongruous that there were things to be remembered and eventually written down.
Settings Observed

In addition to Mr. D-M's office, the researcher observed other settings in the course of the study. He saw the office area of the unit currently in production on a children's series scheduled for Fall, 1975, and the editing room and sound-dub studio where work was in progress on individual shows already back from location. He attended an awards luncheon where Mr. D-M accepted a national award he had won, and another luncheon where Mr. D-M, along with two children's programming vice-presidents from other networks, talked with the editor of a national student magazine about children's programming. He accompanied Mr. D-M to the home of the writer and the music composer of the show-opening for the afternoon children's series Mr. D-M was producing. Final approval of visuals and script was made at this meeting.

Other settings were mentioned earlier: the dinner with Mr. D-M and his wife and two of their friends, the trip to Philadelphia, and the shooting location for one of the children's shows.

Informant Interviews

Informants for focused interviews were arranged for through Mr. D-M on the basis of the researcher's statement of wanting to speak with people who influenced or at least knew about the influences on Mr. D-M's decision-making. There were interviews with six different people: a man from Budget Administration, a man from Talent
Administration, the unit manager with whom Mr. D-M deals constantly during production, two individual show directors, and the decision-maker's secretary.

The researcher explained to each person the general purpose of the study and that his or her remarks would remain anonymous. (See Appendix 2 for complete interview guide.) A request was made to tape-record the interview as a memory aid for the researcher. Three of the interviews were tape recorded and later transcribed. Two were written-up from notes taken during the interviews, because the researcher and informant had to talk while walking around. One was written-up from notes because the informant preferred not to be tape recorded.

The researcher talked with none of Mr. D-M's bosses in the line of command that leads eventually to the chairman-of-the-board and he suspects this is because there may have been some difficulty explaining the presence of the researcher in the setting.

Data Not Collected

The only truly disconcerting thing for the researcher was to discover only after arriving in the setting the decision-maker's strong aversion to doing Q-sorts. Mr. D-M considered them a mere "game" compared to what the researcher could learn about decision-making by observing the interactions in the setting. Nevertheless, he was still willing to do six sorts of the New Program Concept Instrument.
It also became evident early in the observation period that there would not be time to have access to, much less analyze, a large quantity of historical documentary data in the possession of the decision-maker.

**Analysis and Writing**

Nearly all field notes, interview transcripts, and materials collected in the setting were made or transferred to spirit masters so that multiple copies could be obtained for easy filing into analytic categories.

Tentative analytic categories were jotted occasionally while making field notes. As the observation moved toward its conclusion, ideas continued to be accumulated. When the observation period was over, the field notes, interview transcripts, and documentary data were filed in chronological order according to when each item was collected. The next task was to arrange that data into a flexible storage, ordering, and retrieval format. This was facilitated by the spirit duplicated copies.

As the researcher reviewed the data, he created analytic categories on the basis of whether each category reflected or might have potential for reflecting some personal or institutional factor relating to the decision making or influence upon the decision-making of Mr. D-M. A given piece of information that had multiple or diverse analytic significance, could be filed in different analytic categories because of the multiple copies. Approximately 300
individual file folders, containing the data relating to analytic categories, were created. As the sorting was taking place and as the researcher inspected the data, he developed larger analytic categories suggested by the data. These categories were synthesized into a tentative and partial outline. Finally, a complete, yet flexible, synthetic outline was created. Writing of the final synthesis was done by selecting and using the data in the analytic file folders that fit the large synthetic outline.

The two biggest constraints on the researcher with regard to the overall study were the uncontrollables of time and money. A longer observation period would probably have allowed a few more loose ends to be tied up and a few more leads to be tracked down. However, having even brief access to an exciting social setting to which few researchers have been granted access made the risks attendant to a brief observation period worthwhile. The researcher is convinced that the amount and quality of the data gathered made the risk worth taking.

**Summary**

Television has unquestionably had a substantial impact upon American culture. Although researchers have been attempting to assess the nature of this impact, most studies have concentrated on the content and audience of mass communication. Very few studies have been made of mass media communicators at the upper levels of network hierarchies. Because of the continuing consolidation of mass
media systems fewer and fewer broadcast corporations have access to ever increasing mass audiences. Therefore, fewer decision makers are deciding what mass audiences will see and hear. For this reason, it is important to attempt a study which would describe and assess the decision-making process at the upper levels of the broadcast media hierarchy.

Through one of his advisors for this study the researcher obtained permission from a commercial network vice-president in children's programming to observe and interact with him for the purpose of exploring the decision-making process at his level in his network. The researcher arranged to observe and interact with the decision-maker in three different major settings and to interview some of his close associates.

The remainder of this study is divided into the following sections: Chapter 2 describes the procedures and instrumentation used in assessing the personal and institutional factors influencing the decision-maker. Chapter 3 presents the influences on decision-making in terms of the position of the decision-maker in the network, the types of influences that surround him, and a description of the process of decision-making during the production of a television show. Chapter 4 presents decision-making events as they occur chronologically across one day, as they are illuminated by Q-sort techniques, and as they bear upon success in the commercial network system. Chapter 5 presents a summary of the study and recommendations.
Chapter 2

PROCEDURES AND INSTRUMENTATION USED IN ASSESSING THE PERSONAL AND INSTITUTIONAL FACTORS INFLUENCING THE DECISION-MAKER

The procedures to be followed in this study can be divided into three major categories: 1. choosing the decision-maker, 2. field study, 3. Q-sort methodology.

I. Choosing the Decision-Maker

Researchers wishing to participate in social settings for the purpose of systematic observation have generally found that they must seek entry to the setting through the top levels of status, authority and prestige.¹ In addition, they have found that knowing someone who knows an important person in the setting can be a useful way of gaining entry. Using a pre-existing relationship of trust between two such
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people as a means of admission assures at least one person in the setting of the trustworthiness of the researcher.²

The solicitation of cooperation of the chosen decision-maker in this study followed this general pattern. First contact was made with him through one of the researcher's advisors on this study, who has himself achieved national status in the field of mass communications and is a personal friend of the decision-maker.

The logic behind this action is clear. Researchers are normally not members of the groups which they want to study—they are seen as an "outsider" and therefore viewed with suspicion. They must, therefore, gain the acceptance of those who hold either formal or informal leadership positions within the community so that the formal and informal channels of communication can be set to working in the researcher's favor.³

Gaining entry to this setting does not alone assure a cooperative research situation. Social systems often have more than one authority structure within them. It was necessary to assure the cooperation, or at least tolerance, of sub-groups that appeared in the setting. By doing this, the researcher avoided generating conflicts between the leaders of sub-groups and avoided an over-identification with the decision-maker which might have made it difficult to solicit the trust and cooperation of others in the setting.⁴

⁴Floyd C. Mann, p. 123.
In any case, the decision-maker who agreed to cooperate in this study was a vice-president and executive producer of children's and special programming for one of the three major American commercial broadcasting networks.

II. Field Study

The first procedure to be used in this study to analyze the factors that influence this decision-maker makes use of ethnography. The ethnographer's task is the selective recording of human behavior in order to explain that behavior in cultural terms. Therefore, the purpose of this first research procedure is to describe and analyze the patterns of activities, meanings, and relationships that surround the decision-maker as he participates in his setting.

Obviously, it was necessary to establish priorities in data-gathering. The researcher's attention was drawn primarily to the aspects of the decision-maker's participation in the setting that related to program decisions.

For this purpose, the researcher spent one week "on the job" with the decision-maker, accompanying him wherever feasible, and having access to some of his associates. The study used Zelditch's notion of

---


6 Lofland, p. 54.
"field study" which suggests three methods for the field researcher: A. Participant Observation, B. Informant Interviewing and C. Enumeration and Samples. 7

Participant Observation

In this procedure, a chronological log was kept of the events across the week spent with Mr. D-M. It was a running description of events, people, things heard and overheard, conversations among people, and conversations with people. 8 In short, it provides a detailed description of each day. It includes not only the actions observed, but also the "meanings" and explanations of the actions by the participants, realizing that these explanations must be thought of as data rather than actual explanations. 9

Lofland suggests that the field notes "record" the observer as well, that is, the observer's personal opinions of people, and his emotional responses to being an observer, and to the setting itself. This keeping track can serve at least two important functions. In being at least privately honest with himself about his feelings, the researcher may find that some of the participants also feel similar

8 Lofland, Analyzing Social Settings, p. 105.
things toward objects, events, or people in the setting, thus providing a clue for analysis. The second function is that, later and away from the setting during analysis, the consciously detached observer is able to examine his notes for obvious biases he might have had.\textsuperscript{10}

The log of events and conversations was recorded in longhand in complete and readable form. Any abbreviated notes were completed overnight before the next day's observation. After the observation was complete, entries were broken down into single "events" to facilitate sorting and organizing the data.\textsuperscript{11}

Overall, the log provided a "history" of the week. The "events" of the week were sorted and filed into analytical categories that were suggested by a review of the data. This analytical grouping of the events contained in the field notes will contribute at least one dimension to the overall picture of the factors influencing the decision-maker.\textsuperscript{12}

\textbf{The observer in the setting.} Traditionally, participant observers fall into two general categories with regard to how they observe a social system. They are either unknown, or known to the participants of the setting. Practical considerations necessitated

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{10}Lofland, pp. 106-7.
  \item \textsuperscript{11}Wolcott, "An Ethnographic Approach to the Study of School Administrators," p. 118.
  \item \textsuperscript{12}Lofland, pp. 119-23.
\end{itemize}
being a known observer in this setting. It is hard to conceive of a convert role that would have allowed this researcher to keep Mr. D-M under constant observation.

There are definite advantages to assuming the known observer role. Trice, who refers to this approach as assuming the role of the "outsider," cites three: (1) It reduces the amount of time necessary to develop acceptance by others in a given social setting. This is especially crucial in the time frame in which the researcher is working. (2) "Outsideness" seems to stimulate more uninhibited response from data-bearers, since the inside threat of transmittal to others in the organization is less with an outsider. (3) Using the outsider role allows for a maintenance of objectivity that would become weakened if maximum rapport were developed with participants in the social setting. 13

In becoming a known observer the researcher enjoys the advantages of being able to move about, observe, and ask questions unrestricted by the duties and social restraints of an existing role in the setting. He is, of course, restricted by common standards of decorum and tact. 14


14 Lofland, pp. 95-6.
Informant Interviewing

In field studies, an informant is a member of the social setting who has relatively regularized and personally developed contacts with the researcher. Characteristically informants volunteer information and are more than usually concerned with one's work going properly. Because they can extend the range of personal observations, informant relations are generally considered valuable to cultivate.\footnote{Lofland, p. 111.}

In the context of a short term field study, interviews are essential to round out the picture of factors influencing the decision-maker. Mr. D-M naturally serves as a primary informant, since he is not only the focus of the research, but also a partner in the fieldwork.\footnote{Wolcott, p. 120.} As would be expected of a television producer who must argue for and defend his ideas in an intensely competitive environment, Mr. D-M is articulate in stating his personal feelings and philosophy as they relate to specific programming.

Conversations which juxtapose ideal statements with actual behavior should provide an excellent means for describing and analyzing a cultural system, because it helps point out the satisfactions, the strains, the paradoxes between real and ideal behavior.\footnote{Wolcott, pp. 119-20.}

Much of the interviewing of Mr. D-M took place as the researcher moved about with him, but three interviews were formally
structured and tape recorded. Each of these interviews lasted about an hour and allowed Mr. D-M the opportunity to relate specific accounts of: (1) His personal and career history as a decision-maker. (2) His description of status, role, and power structure in children's programming at his network. (3) A biographical account of how one of his programs moved from idea to production. Interview guides were constructed to insure that all areas were covered. (See Appendix 3).

In addition, the researcher had access to six of Mr. D-M's associates, who were interviewed according to interview guides developed specifically to elicit information and feelings about what factors influence programming decisions of Mr. D-M. (See Appendix 2).

Transcripts of these interviews uncovered the range of perceptions that these informants have about how persons and events influence the decision-maker in this setting. They also were analyzed for the extent of the affective content expressed by Mr. D-M's associates regarding their work and the people with whom they are associated professionally. Collectively, the interviews provided a basis for content analysis in terms of what people talked about and how strongly they felt about it (e.g., positive vs. negative responses about some factor in the setting). Of further importance, they provide illustrative materials about those whose lives are enmeshed personally or professionally with the decision-maker. 18

---

18 Wolcott, pp. 118-19.
Enumeration and Samples

Various sorts of numerical or potentially numerical data are normally available in the decision-maker's office and surrounding setting. This type of information was divided into two major categories.

First, a collection was made of copies of all memos and correspondence that crossed Mr. D-M's desk within the period of observation. Such data made possible frequency counts of the kind and content of messages and interactions that the decision-maker has with his colleagues. Taken in context, such data provided clues concerning who influences the decision-maker and whom he influences. Documents that indicated the formal structure of the lines of authority were also collected.

The second quantitative aspect of the fieldwork included mapping the decision-maker's social setting. In addition to orienting the researcher to the setting, these data provided clues to how physical location may affect interaction and influence the social setting.¹⁹

Limitations of the Field Study Approach in this Study

While a week's observation is very brief as field studies go, there are factors which will hopefully minimize the disadvantage of

¹⁹ Wolcott, p. 117.
spending but one week with Mr. D-M. To begin with the week was devoted exclusively to data gathering. The researcher had no other responsibilities for the week and an intensive effort was mounted. Also two different methods of field research were focused on the specific question of what factors influence Mr. D-M's decision-making processes.

A field study with broader purposes could not hope to gather sufficient data in just one week. However, the careful focus of observations, interviews and quantitative data gathering on one aspect of one member of a social setting should be able to generate a substantial amount of significant information. In addition, the qualitative field work dimension of this study was balanced by the administration of a Q-sort instrument. In sum, while a one-week observation period may seem short for a field study, the data gathered were substantial, especially when enhanced by the other data-gathering procedure.

III. Q-Methodology

The second procedure which was used to examine the factors influencing Mr. D-M's decision-making processes is Q-methodology, originated by William Stephenson, who himself asserts its usefulness in providing a rich source of hypotheses and support for conclusions arrived at through field study techniques such as intensive interviewing.
Referring to a study by Krech and Crutchfield who relied solely on open-ended, intensive interviews, Stephenson asserts that subjecting the conclusions of their study to operations along Q-technique lines:

...offers at once a way of summarizing the study as a whole and of yielding, on its own accounts, a salutary testing and proving ground for the researcher's conclusions.\(^{20}\)

Stephenson explains succinctly the nature of Q-method and Q-sorting in his *The Play Theory of Mass Communication*:

Fundamentally it is a method by which an individual can model for himself what his attitude of mind is about complicated topics, issues, or situations. Its primary concern, therefore, is with a person's subjectivity as he describes it, not as we (psychologists or onlookers) infer it. All measurements in Q are central to the person—the scales, so to speak are in the person's own mind. The method begins with data for a single case and then proceeds by comparing it with data from others. It begins with what one person models about himself and compares this with models provided by others.\(^{21}\)

The models a person provides about himself come from his sorting of decks of cards called Q-sorts and in the correlation among the responses the individual provides under different sets of instructions. Correlations may also be made among the responses of
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different individuals to the Q-sorts. The process of correlating the responses and analyzing them falls under the general rubric of factor analysis.

It will be a useful introduction to the three Q-sort instruments to be used in this study to explain some of the important assumptions, characteristics and procedures surrounding Q-methodology.

A central assumption upon which the whole of Q-methodology rests is that

...what is subjective, such as thinking, and what is observable to others such as playing golf, are in no way distinguishable for scientific purposes. Dreaming is as much behavior as...dashing a hundred yards. All is a matter of interacting with this or that situation. Inner experience and behavior are thus alike. Both are matters for objective, operational distinction and study.22

Stephenson continues:

For me, it is fallacious to seek to distinguish a region of consciousness which is outside the framework of systematic scientific observation. To do so is apt to make us overlook everything a person can observe and say about himself.23

Stephenson argues the case for the inclusion of man's subjective behavior in the behavior available to scientific investigation. Again, in The Study of Behavior:

Certainly (man) thinks, feels, imagines, muses, dreams, and all else. All such is behavior, every bit as certainly as is his purposeful walking from

one place to another or his toying with a ball. In so far as this subjective behavior can be made amenable to reliable operations, scientific method is at issue and, in that sense, objective procedures. This is precisely our position in Q-methodology. Along Q-lines all subjective behavior, hitherto regarded as in esse arbitrary and unscientific, is capable of study with full scientific sanction, satisfying every rule and procedure of scientific method.\textsuperscript{24}

Rejected is the notion that self-descriptions are unworthy of scientific regard because they are biased and therefore unreliable. On the contrary, Q-technique deals directly with the difference between the manifest and latent content of a subject's statements, that is, the difference between the way the subject says he is and the way he really is.\textsuperscript{25} It is assumed that the study of a Q-sort based on self-descriptions, for instance, will reveal the subject in the act of rationalizing, defending himself, identifying himself with others and much else. In a social setting, imitation, negativism and similar findings can be reached by factor analysis of these innocent-looking cards containing self-descriptions.\textsuperscript{26}

For researchers in the social sciences who believe that a person's "yearnings, wishes, ruminations, reflections, wantings, inclinations, fantasies, dreams, remembrances, and a thousand other 'inner' forms of behavior are of crucial importance," Q-methodology

\textsuperscript{24}Stephenson, \textit{The Study of Behavior}, p. 98.

\textsuperscript{25}Durkheim asserts that all social sciences are concerned with the latent meaning manifest in overt behavior.

\textsuperscript{26}Stephenson, \textit{The Study of Behavior}, p. 270.
is assumed to be able to bring most of these matters to testable propositional form. For Stephenson, they can be dealt with as objectively as any psychologist ever dealt with a rat.27

A second important assumption and characteristic of Q-methodology is its focus on the single case. "I am confident," Stephenson asserts, "that the intrapersonal is the most fundamental level upon which to make a beginning in social and psychological science in general and in communication theory in particular."28 With Q, any person, in principle can be made the subject of detailed factor and variance analysis.29

Kerlinger cites this ability of Q-methodology to focus on the individual as one of its principal strengths:

With Q we have a methodology peculiarly suited to intensive study of the individual. One individual can be given two, three, or more related Q-sorts. One individual can sort a Q many times. The data of such sortings can be analyzed quite objectively without entirely sacrificing the richness of the usual clinical and much less objective methods.30

A third important assumption and characteristic of Q is its affinity to theory. "We are to work," Stephenson says, "with a
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27Stephenson, The Study of Behavior, p. 100.


single person, at the call of a theory." In Q, one tests theories on small sets of individuals carefully chosen for their known or presumed possession of some significant characteristic or characteristics. Q-technique is useful for experimenting on the consequences of theories for any person made the subject of a scientific inquiry, or any interacting group of such persons. In other words, Q is especially useful for testing theories or of conceiving of individuals in relationship to theories.

A fourth assumption and characteristic of Q-methodology is that it lends itself to the systematic study of persons as such, in all their uniqueness and distinctiveness. Novelists and biographers, at their best display people with wisdom and penetration. At its best Q-methodology should inform the researcher and those interested in his findings about the qualities of the men and women he studies with equal wisdom and penetration. Perhaps much can be learned about the human condition from a careful explanation of a few really interesting people.

The New Program Concept Instrument

With this general introduction to Q-methodology providing a context, each of the specific Q-instruments proposed for use in this

31Stephenson, The Study of Behavior, pp. 4-5.
study can be discussed in turn. Both instruments are structured Q sorts, that is, a theory or a set of hypotheses are built into the set of items to be sorted along Fisherian experimental and analysis of variance design principles.

"The New Program Concept Instrument" developed by Robert Monaghan required the decision-maker to sort 36 hypothetical programs developed by Monaghan from 10 facet elements of the content and style of television. The facets used to derive the 36 specific programs were 10 kinds of content and style hypothesized to appeal to mass audiences. Each of the notions of content and style was given an operational definition and coded for convenience.

The ten factors which were derived from interviews, introspection, analytical observation of current programs, and so on, are as follows:

**Reality:**

- A<sub>1</sub> **Factual-Informational.** The presentation of events as they actually are, or were; persons being presented as themselves. Reflects expected cultural patterns, given the circumstances.
- A<sub>2</sub> **Fictional-Representational.** Actors play roles of characters other than themselves, but portray "possible" persons in "possible" circumstances.
- A<sub>3</sub> **Fictional-Non-Representational.** Presents improbable fantastic, or cartoon characters in "believable" circumstances; or "believable" characters in unlikely situations; or a combination of both "unreal" conditions.

---


Value:

$B_1$ Moral. Those programs where moral values are intellectualized—where all is not white or black, but there are shades of grey. Differing views of morality are presented in conflict, sometimes violently. A resolution is not necessarily involved.

$B_2$ Moral-Sentimental. In these programs there are clearly "good" guys and "bad" guys and a singular "right" that triumphs. The good guys are often friendly and polite; the bad guys are often crude and unsociable. It is kind of "cliche morality."

$B_3$ In these programs moral issues are not considered.

Complexity:

$C_1$ High. Given a flow of circumstances, it is difficult to predict subsequent events or final outcomes.

$C_2$ Low. The so-called formula programs.

Seriousness:

$D_1$ Comedy. These are comedy, light entertainment, and even musical shows, usually self-designated by the program format.

$D_2$ Non-Comedy. Serious programs, also indicated by the format or in the introduction of the show.

Next, Monaghan created a block matrix so that all possible combinations of these ten facets would be represented in providing these basics for developing a potential television show.

In the block design below, therefore, show 1 would be Factual-Informational ($A_1$), Moral ($B_1$), High in Complexity ($C_1$), and contain Comedy ($D_1$).

The show Monaghan describes to fit this combination of facets is:
A_1, B_1, C_1, D_1, l. BAEZ AND BALLADS--features the singing and sayings of Joan Baez. Built around a semi-interview, semi-documentary format, the program is about the singer and her relationship to folk singing as an art. She sings a few humorous folk songs and is backed up by dancers.

**BLOCK DESIGN OF TELEVISION PROGRAM TYPES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C_1</th>
<th></th>
<th>C_2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B_1</td>
<td>A_1 1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>A_1 3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B_2</td>
<td>A_2 13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>A_2 15</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B_3</td>
<td>A_3 25</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>A_3 27</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C_1</th>
<th></th>
<th>C_2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B_1</td>
<td>A_1 2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>A_1 4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B_2</td>
<td>A_2 14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>A_2 16</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B_3</td>
<td>A_3 26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>A_3 28</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(For the remaining facet combinations and representative program ideas that form the items of this Q-sort, see Appendix 4).

Mr. D-M was given all 36 coded program descriptions typed on shuffled 3x5 cards. Using several variables which hypothetically influence him (such as "what the boss wants," "what is in the public
interest," "what the audience wants,...") the decision-maker was asked to sort the program descriptions by arranging them according to those most likely to be scheduled first and those most likely to be scheduled last.

One of the decision-maker's colleagues was asked to sort the programs as he felt they most closely represented the decision-maker's ideal schedule choices. (For Sample Instruction Directions see Appendix 5.)

The variables were then intercorrelated along with the "on the air" program schedule to produce a correlation-matrix which can be examined for clustering according to McQuitty's\(^{35}\) elementary linkage analysis. The clusters can then be analyzed according to the variables that cluster together, the strength of the clustering and the differences among clusters. The hypothetical programs which best represent each cluster can then be subjected to a form of facet analysis to provide insight into the elements of content and style operating in each cluster. Such an analysis would delineate what personally held content and style values Mr. D-M uses in making decisions about children's programming.

Professional Role Items

Because of objections raised by the decision-maker which are described elsewhere in this study, this Q-sort instrument was not able to be administered. The description of it is retained here in order to illustrate its potential for use in studies of this type.

This second Q-instrument is likewise a structured Q-sort. Items were composed with reference to a body of literature which explores the Gratification and Aspiration dimensions of mass media usage and also with reference to the "Four Systems" of O. J. Harvey.37

The Gratification and Aspiration dimensions of mass media usage are analytic terms for the traditional descriptions of program content as either being "entertaining" or "educational."

Media usage for "gratification" implies, for instance, that a child watches a television program as an end in itself. The choice of a program provides for some present, immediate use, but promises nothing beyond that.

36Kerlinger, pp. 592-93.

"Aspiration" fulfillment implies that a child, for instance, plans to use what he is learning, although he may also happen to enjoy the experience as well.  

There is a body of research literature which relates the Gratification-Aspiration, Entertainment-Education concepts theoretically related to Stephenson's Play theory and also to Freud's pleasure and reality principles, Schram's immediate and delayed rewards, Mowrer's two-factor learning theory, Westley and MacLean's need satisfaction and problem solutions, and Festinger's consummatory and instrumental communication.

---


The key idea, for the purposes of this study is that these theorists and most play theorists distinguish play and leisure from work. Leisure time is our free time, to be used for recreation, hobbies or self-cultivation. Work deals with reality, with earning a living, with production. Play, on the other hand, is considered largely "unproductive" except for the self-satisfaction it provides.

In line with this distinction, mass communication serves both to inform and entertain, but for theoretical purposes it is helpful to distinguish that part of mass communication dealing with work, i.e., with reality concerns such as the weather, farm information, shipping news, educational projects, etc., as opposed to that part concerned with leisure time pursuits. The rather developed work of communication and play theorists need not be considered in detail, as long as one recognizes the general distinction between the gratification and aspiration purposes and usage of mass communication.

Gratification. In fact, many studies have produced evidence of media usage for one or the other of these purposes. Maccoby considers television fantasy as a childhood experience which is free from real life controls, an escape, and as a wish fulfillment.


Waples, et al., report that reading reduces anxiety or boredom by taking the reader from real life into a fantasy world of vicarious aggression, thus providing him with a release from tension, or perhaps fear. Even the selection of practical information at times serves a need for reduction of anxiety and brings a feeling of physical, social, emotional, or economic security. Anxiety is also associated with news-seeking behavior discussed by Kay, which relates to the Law of Pragnanz, a Gestalt form of the so-called "balance" theories. Berelson found newspaper reading provided a respite from personal worries by taking the reader outside his immediate world. Hollywood Western movies have been described by Elkin as an escape from actual life. The viewer can live in a fantasy world which allows him to identify with a strong hero and, thereby become superior to others. Comics were also reported to have a tranquilizing effect on some readers. Even adults have been reported


by Bogart\textsuperscript{51} to identify, in a sense, with comic characters. He reports that the comics also provide analogies for the events of daily life and serve as vehicles for fantasy.

**Aspiration.** A significant portion of that research evidence which is available regarding media use also suggests that a person's selection patterns and the meanings he has for messages may represent aspirations toward the fulfillment of social goals. Klapper\textsuperscript{52} summarized studies which indicated that reticent persons sometimes select informative, high-level material with social motives in mind; he also reports that this can lead to liking the material for its own sake. This is supported by Krugman and Hartley in their research on the learning of tastes and preferences.\textsuperscript{53} Waples\textsuperscript{54} says that reading involves the reader in relations with others; it can provide the reader with social prestige if he selects books which are the latest titles, highly recommended, or difficult reading. Berelson\textsuperscript{55} found newspaper reading enabled readers to appear informed at social


gatherings. Herzog discovered that radio listening helped listeners solve everyday problems, including social problems, and provided advice regarding socially acceptable and socially unacceptable forms of behavior. Elkin's analysis of the Western movie emphasizes how the films articulate socially desirable moral values and how they illustrate both desirable and undesirable personality characteristics.

Using a form of the Thematic Apperception Test, Warner and Henry found that the Big Sister radio program helped listeners solve interpersonal problems. It gave listeners a feeling that it was "educational" for this reason. Big Sister also provided listeners with a feeling of significance and importance in their domestic roles.

Bogart's interviews disclosed that the comics provided the adult with noncontroversial or "safe" topics of conversation. Mendelsohn found that the radio provided adults with information which can be discussed with others.

56 H. Herzog, "What Do We Really Know About Day-Time Serial Listeners?" In Paul F. Lazarsfeld and Frank Stanton (Eds.), Radio Research, 1942-43 (New York: Duel, Sloan, and Pierce, pp. 3-33).


In summary, research has supported the analytic distinction between the use of mass media for entertainment and educational purposes.

O. J. Harvey's Four Systems. Since he considered it to be important to understand the manner or style with which people communicate, Monaghan combined his notions of the entertainment-educational use of mass communication with O. J. Harvey's Four Basic Systems of Conceptual Functioning in his construction of the Professional Role Items Q-Instrument. 61 The Four Systems are belief systems thought to arise from differences in personal psychological development and to be manifested in different patterns of behavior and attitudes. This theory of personality organization was originally described by Harvey, Hunt, and Schroder in 1961 62 and a large number of studies 63 have been carried out subsequently on cognitive and behavioral differences among representatives of these four belief systems as they exist and function at the time of assessment.

A belief system represents a set of predispositions within an individual to construe or interpret highly ego-involving stimuli and events in a consistent way. As such, it operates as a kind of

63 See studies listed under O. J. Harvey in the bibliography of this study.
psychological filter that renders the individual selective in his sensitivity to available cues and consequently in how he interprets, feels toward, and responds to them.

Each of the four systems of conceptual functioning or belief systems used as part of the theoretical framework for the construction of the Professional Role Items Q-Sort, differ both in content and in structure. By content is meant the referents or social objects of greatest affective and ego-involving importance to the individual. For example, the content or referents for an individual in Harvey's System 1 would typically include external authority, such as God, the norms of society, institutionalized authority, tradition, etc. A System 1 individual would consistently take external authority factors into account when making decisions in highly ego-involving areas of his life.

Structurally, Harvey has focused on the molar construct of concreteness--abstractness, a quality of how the individual articulates and organizes his concepts of the ego-involving domains of his environment. Variation in Concreteness--Abstractness rests upon differences in patterning and organization of response to ego-involving stimuli from his environment.

---

At a behavioral level concreteness is manifested in a high stimulus-response requiredness. This means that the individual's response to stimulus situations is marked by rigidity and lack of flexibility. More abstract functioning is characterized by the ability to interpret stimuli in a variety of ways and thus show less rigidity and inflexibility in response. 65

A wide variety of studies have shown that concreteness is manifested in numerous ways, such as those described below, while greater abstractness has been found to accompany reversed qualities on these dimensions:

1. A simpler cognitive structure, comprised of fewer differentiations and more incomplete integrations within domains of high ego-involvement. (Harvey, 1966; Harvey, Reich & Wyer, 1968; White, Alter & Rardin, 1965; White & Harvey, 1965).

2. A greater tendency toward more evaluative, more extreme and more polarized judgments (Adams, Harvey, & Heslin, 1966; Ware & Harvey, 1967; White & Harvey, 1965).

3. A greater dependence on social cues relating to role, status and formal authority as guidelines to judgments (Harvey, 1964; Harvey, 1966; Harvey & Ware, 1968; Kritzberg, 1965; Tiemann, 1965).

4. A greater intolerance of ambiguity, expressed in higher scores on such measures as the California F Scale and Rokeach's Dogmatism Scale and in the tendency to form judgments of novel situations more quickly (Harvey, 1966; Reich, 1966; Ware & Harvey, 1967).

5. A greater need for or tendency toward cognitive consistency and a greater arousal and subsequent change from the experience of cognitive dissonce (Harvey, 1965; Harvey, 1967; Ware & Harvey, 1967).

6. A greater inability to change set and hence greater stereotype in the solution of more complex and changing problems of high involvement (Felknor & Harvey, 1963; Harvey, 1966; Reich, 1966).

7. A poorer delineation between means and ends for ability to think subordinately and thus a paucity of methods of solving a problem or achieving a goal (Harvey, 1966).

8. A greater insensitivity to subtle and minimal cues and hence a greater susceptibility to false but obtrusive cues (Harvey, 1966).

9. A poorer capacity to "act as if," to assume the role of the other or to think and act in terms of a hypothetical situation (Harvey, 1963; Harvey & Kline, 1965).

10. The holding of opinions with greater strength and certainty that the opinions will not change with time (Hoffmeister, 1965).

11. A higher score on the factor of dictatorialness as reflected in such behavior as high need for structure, low flexibility, high rule orientation, high dictation of procedures, high frequency of the usage of unexplained rules, low diversity of activities and low encouragement of individual responsibility and originality (Harvey, White, Prather, Alter & Hoffmeister, 1966; Harvey, Prather, White & Hoffmeister, 1967; Coates, Harvey & White, 1969).

12. A greater tendency toward trite and normative behavior and thus a lower tendency toward innovative and creative responses (Harvey, 1966; Brown & Harvey, 1968).

13. A greater tendency to form and generalize impressions of other people from highly incomplete information (Ware & Harvey, 1967).

See Appendix 6 for a description of each of O. J. Harvey's descriptions of each of the four systems.
The Development of the Instrument

The theoretical framework for this structured Q-sort has now been described. The following scheme was used by Monaghan to combine Harvey's four systems with notions of gratification and aspiration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System 1</th>
<th>System 2</th>
<th>System 3</th>
<th>System 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gratification</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aspiration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This model provided a structured way of generating 64 professional role Q-sort items by a method similar to that used for The New Program Concept Instrument described above. The items are descriptive of possible professional role orientations of the professional person as he functions in his role of facilitator or chooser of the media materials for the child. See Appendix 7 for a list of the 64 role items.

Administration of the Instruments

The researcher planned to administer the two Q-sort instruments during the week of observation spent with Mr. D-M. The New

Program Concept Instrument was sorted into the following frequency distributions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of cards per stack</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pile no.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Professional Role Items would be sorted into the following frequency distribution:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of cards per stack</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pile no.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Several conditions of instruction were planned for each. At the beginning the administered Q-sort, the items were handed to Mr. D-M or his associate with the appropriate instructions. The items were sorted into the distribution provided in terms of the instructions for the particular sorting of the cards.

After all data was collected, all of the sorts in the New Program Concept Instrument were correlated with each other and subjected to factor analysis.
It was expected that analysis of the program choice items and the professional role communication assessment procedures would identify clusters of internal and external factors that influence the decision-making of Mr. D-M and provide insights regarding the nature and strengths of these patterns. Once patterns of use are systematically identified it should then be possible to use these patterns in the establishing of a generally complete understanding of the factors influencing the children's programming decisions of Mr. D-M.

IV. Summary

The procedures to be used in assessing the personal and institutional factors influencing the decision-maker can be considered under three major categories:

1. Choosing the Decision Maker. In field studies it is often necessary to gain access to a setting by arranging entry through someone who knows an important person in the setting. The solicitation of cooperation of the chosen decision-maker in this study followed this general pattern.

2. Field Study Methodology. The field study procedures for data gathering in this study included participant-observation, informant interviewing and the collection of various sorts of numerical or potentially numerical data.
3. Q-Methodology. Two Q-instruments were planned for administration to Mr. D-M: The New Program Concept Instrument and The Professional Role Items. Only a partial administration of the New Program Concept Instrument was possible because of the attitude of the decision-maker toward the sorting of Q-cards.
Chapter 3

PRESENTATION OF DECISION MAKING EVENTS
ANALYZED BY POSITION, INFLUENCES, AND PRODUCTION ACTIVITY

I. What It Means to Be a Vice-President in a Television Network

There are between 50 and 60 vice-presidents of Mr. D-M's network and he was quick to point out that his title, therefore, does not indicate that he is heir-apparent to be President of the company. First of all, the title is an indication that someone is trusted with responsibility in the network and is expected to understand how to deal with that responsibility. Further, he said, "it is a device to give you membership in a fraternity which gives you a certain amount of privileges. Most all your peers are vice-presidents. If they're not, they're directors and that means they're potential vice-presidents." Outside the cards and stationary, and once someone gets over the ego-trip of being a vice-president, what the title really helps with, is the public relations aspects with those outside the network. "People look at you as vice-president and that gives you a certain stature and a certain meaning."

There is a uniqueness in Mr. D-M's position as vice-president in that he is an executive-producer as well. Only about 10% of
network programming is produced by the networks themselves. The other 90% is bought from outside suppliers. There is one other vice-president of children's programming in this network and he buys everything from outside suppliers. The network may shape and control to some degree the formulation of the idea for these shows, but all the money paid out for research and development is paid to an outside supplier. This is necessary from an antitrust point of view. Every time a network produces a show of its own, outside suppliers lose a chance to sell some of their product to the large network.

Mr. D-M said that many network people feel that a certain percentage of shows should be "hand-hewn, made in our shop, produced under us and done by us." Mr. D-M is one of the few people trained by his network to do precisely that: to create ideas and build them and put them on the air from within the network. He mentioned that people kid him by calling him the "producer-vice-president," and tell him that if he were really honest with himself, he would see that he was not really a vice-president, but rather a producer. He does have, however, and does exercise the right to buy shows from outside producers.

Mr. D-M confided that the secret of producer vice-presidents is the ability to staff their organization with producers and directors to work on in-house productions. The problem is, he said, that every time these men get good an independent producer buys them away.
The executive-producer dimension of Mr. D-M's job means that he has control over the idea, script, and final cutting of shows he produces for his network in a much more total way than vice-presidents who buy shows from outside producers. One of his close associates stated specifically in an interview that Mr. D-M worked very hard on the scripts to get them the way he wanted them and that some of his major concerns related to the content and the programming values of the shows. An important concern as a show moves through production is to see that the individual show is faithful to the show idea and the script. He demands that he be involved in cutting and sound mixing so that his producers and directors don't change his ideas or what he wants each particular script to say. The close associate cited a case, in one of the series in production at the time, in which a director took out a scene that Mr. D-M considered crucial. He made the director put it back in.

II. The Influences Surrounding the Decision-Maker

In order to clarify further the role and function of this decision-maker it will be useful to place him in his social system and in relationship to those people and forces that can influence him and who he in turn can influence. These influences will be considered under 12 major headings:
1. Network Influences
   A. Lines of Authority Above the Decision-Maker within the Network
   B. Lines of Authority and Influence in Relation to Decisions about Program Selection
   C. Lines of Authority and Influence for the Production of Individual Shows
   D. Standards and Practices
2. The Influence of Ratings and Advertisers
3. Influences from the Public Sector
   A. The Federal Communications Commission
   B. The Federal Trade Commission
   C. Citizen's Groups--Action for Children's Television
   D. The Press
   E. Letters from viewers
4. The National Association of Broadcasters
5. Awards--The Peabody et. al.
6. Local Broadcasters
7. The Child--Taking the Prime Audience Into Account
8. The Educational Community
   A. Distributing 16mm Film Versions of his Shows
   B. Preparation and Distribution of Study Guides for his Bicentennial Series
   C. Use of a University Consultant for Program and Research Matters
   D. College Teaching
9. Public Television and Sesame Street
Mr. D-M can be seen to hold a central and sensitive position in a network of decision-makers and influences upon the decision-maker in the national television network.

1. Within the Network
   A. Line of Authority
   B. Program Selection
   C. Production Unit
   D. Standards & Practices

12. Wife

11. Public Service Groups

10. The General Public

9. Public Television (Sesame Street)

8. The Educational Community
   A. Ed. Film Versions of Shows
   B. Study Guide Distribution
   C. University Research Consultant
   D. College Teaching

7. "The Child"

6. Local Broadcasters

2. Rating and Advertisers

3. The Public Sector
   A. FCC
   B. FTC
   C. Citizen's Group
   D. The Press
   E. Letters from Viewers

4. NAB

5. Awards
Network Influences

The analysis of the influences that affect the decision-maker begins with those that surround him in the network for which he works. It is his position as a network vice-president and executive producer that gives him the power to make decisions that affect children's programming.

Lines of authority above the decision-maker in the network.

In an interview, the decision-maker said that he was five slots down from the top of the organizational chart. He had two immediate bosses, the vice-president in charge of East Coast programming and the head of all programming, who was based on the West Coast. These men report to the President of the Television Network. The president in turn reports to the President of all the divisions of this communications corporation. At the top of the chart is the chairman of the board. (See Diagram 2.)

Interestingly, when Mr. D-M was explaining this organizational line chart to the researcher, he repeatedly prefaced his statement of who held which position by saying the head of all programming "at this moment is" ... and so on. He went on to
DIAGRAM 2

DIAGRAM OF THE LINE OF AUTHORITY FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD TO THE DECISION-MAKER
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explain that there often is rapid turnover. "This is a king of the hill kind of world. You live on a great deal of bravado and I guess 'bravado' is a carefully chosen word against more descriptive words. I think there is a degree of stability at the upper levels, but at the lower levels where you have program chiefs, they rise and fall upon the success of the product that they put out. In some networks which pay more money, the risk is very high and when you fall, you're through. Some other networks pay less money, and when you fall, you're not necessarily through, you're used to advantage somewhere else."

Most of Mr. D-M's dealings with those in line above him are with the East Coast Vice-President, who has approximately 7 or 8 Vice-presidents subordinate to him. Including Mr. D-M, they make up his "team."

The researcher did not directly observe business related interactions between Mr. D-M and his bosses, except for brief encounters in the hallways. However, in conversations with the decision-maker and by reading correspondence and memos, at least some of the types of interaction that take place between the decision-maker and his superiors became clear. Each week there is a formal meeting of 22 vice-presidents with the president of the company. Mr. D-M said that there was no way that he could have explained the researcher's presence at that meeting. Apparently its function is to keep all of the vice-presidents up to date on issues of concern to them and to the network.
On day to day matters the influence between Mr. D-M and his superiors flows both ways. From the top down, the decision-maker's superiors may pass on to him their desires for changes in children's programming which may in turn have resulted from pressures from citizen's groups or the Federal Communications Commission. Aware of these pressures on his bosses, Mr. D-M may propose and try to sell them on a program idea that he feels is responsive to these pressures. This kind of attempt occurred during the week of observation when Mr. D-M met with his bosses to urge them to buy a children's program from an outside producer that he considered not only to be excellent in itself, but also to be the type of show people outside the industry were urging networks to broadcast. Personal conversations and a memo Mr. D-M had written to the president of the company a month before the researcher's observation indicated Mr. D-M had been trying to sell this idea to his superiors over a long period of time.

In another instance, a memo from the president urged those personnel in the network concerned with dramatic series to script stories that were truly appealing to viewers, that made them care about what is happening. The memo said both outside critics and the network's own program department had noted this weakness in the shows being aired by the network. The researcher found this memo in Mr. D-M's file on the dramatic series he currently had in production and considered this as an indication Mr. D-M took the memo into account when approving scripts for the series.
The decision-maker's main concern with his immediate superior during the week of observation concerned a difference in understanding about the number of shows in one of Mr. D-M's series that would be done by the production people on the West Coast. A series of memos and conversations across the week seemed to clarify the matter.

One of the small routine interactions with his superiors came up when Mr. D-M had to check with one of them for permission to attend the interview luncheon with two vice-presidents for children's programming from the other two major networks. He needed permission to speak on-the-record as a network representative.

In addition to his dealing with those in the line of authority above him, Mr. D-M has day to day dealings with other vice-presidents. He had bitter words about one vice-president because he said the man apparently never communicated openly with him. In a second instance, he mentioned that the Vice-President for Station Relations, whom he rarely sees, came by to ask to see the tape of a controversial show he was doing, to be sure it would not cause problems with the local stations.

Commenting on the general idea of relations with superiors, Mr. D-M said he never liked it when the network changed bosses. "Even when I have a boss that I don't care for," he said, "I'd rather have him if I knew all his problems and all his faults, than have a new one every two years. You have to go through finding out where his weaknesses are, where his strengths are, where he's going to give me a problem or whatever. That's just normal."
Lines of authority and influence in relation to decisions about program selection. To spell out precisely who contributed what to any network television series or show is tricky business at best, because, as one of Mr. D-M's associates pointed out, the truth tends to get confused because people's memory becomes inexact. Quite naturally, people tend to exaggerate their own contribution to the final product. With this warning, the following scenario attempts to lay out a general pattern for show development from idea to final commitment to go into production, in order to spell out the influences of those people involved in the process.

Mr. D-M may start with an idea that he has personally created or an idea that he may buy from an independent producer or writer. In formal and informal meetings he has to sell the idea to his bosses and win their approval for the idea. A key factor here is to understand that Mr. D-M has "selection of show," that is, it is up to him to come up with ideas and control the scripting for the shows. To this end, for example, his bosses recently permitted him to spend one month away from his other responsibilities to research and develop the controlling idea for Action-The Bicentennial, one of the series the researcher observed in production.

Once the idea is approved, and before any scripting is done, a preliminary production meeting is held. Present with Mr. D-M are

---

1The names of shows mentioned in this study are changed in order to respect the decision-maker's wish for anonymity.
representatives of the Engineering Department, Budget Administration, Talent and Program Administration, and the Associate Producer or Unit Manager. Mr. D-M spells out the type of show and goes over the general format. In the course of the meeting the specific dimensions and limits of the show are spelled out. Questions addressed include the calibre of the talent. Should there be one lead or two? Will there be a recognized star? How many extras? If it is an in-house production, Program and Talent Administration will negotiate contracts with directors and actors. If the show will be bought from an outside packager, they will negotiate with the packager's agent.

Other questions deal with technical and engineering problems. Can the camera be taken underwater? Will weather cause equipment problems? How many days to shoot each show? How far to travel? The unit manager may contribute his ideas based upon his own experience and insights. Overshadowing all of the discussion is the question of money for the show. Budget Administration must come up with an ample, but realistic budget. One of Mr. D-M's associates who must be responsible for budget matters explained that no one wants a "schlock" show. But if it is a question of whether to take an extra shooting day to make a "good" show into an "excellent" show, the choice may often have to be for a "good" show. He agreed that in many people's eyes he "wears the black hat" when it comes to controlling costs. He did point out
that both of Mr. D-M's children's series then in production were at a prime-time level of budgeting.

In the allocation of money, Mr. D-M maintained real power once the total budget had been approved. He allocated the sum of money to be spent on each show from the total budget. The researcher observed Mr. D-M making shifts in the amount of money to be spent on specific shows in his series because of four reasons: 1) when the story or script values called for a more elaborate treatment, 2) when there were high technical costs, such as for special effects, 3) when there were unexpected production cost increases, and 4) when shows approved for production were halted or eliminated because of script, technical, or management problems.

Once the details of a series or a single show are worked out and budgeted, Mr. D-M proceeds with scripting. In the case of Action-The Bicentennial, the researcher was able to obtain a copy of the decision-maker's guidelines for script-writers. It contained an explicit statement of the show rationale and program values and also details about such things as length, the use of a narrator, and the maximum number of actors that could be used. It insisted upon fast moving action stories and the use of visuals appropriate to the television medium. Unmotivated violence was specifically excluded.

While the shows are moving through production, the producer and unit manager for the series and the representatives from Talent and Program Administration and Budget Administration are in regular
contact with Mr. D-M about the allocation of money, budget over-runs in specific areas, production successes and problems, and a wide range of matters that demand Mr. D-M's approval or decision. A substantial part of the decision-maker's time while the researcher was with him was spent attending to these matters. Evidence of this exists not only in the researcher's field notes, but also on the phone log indicating calls from these people. Back correspondence file contained letters to out of state producers detailing how scripts should be changed to reflect the value position built into the series better and to meet story and artistic requirements for the television medium.

In one instance, Mr. D-M spent thirty minutes in his office talking with a young director who doubted whether he could build the learning lesson designed for a children's series into the specific show he was doing. The decision-maker was reassuring, but insistent that the director could include the educational values in the show.

On another occasion he called a person from Budget Administration into his office to get a clarification on money allocations for some of the shows currently in production. At one point he showed the researcher a computer print-out sheet showing substantial cost over-runs in the production area and expressed concern about keeping costs in line with the budget.

From the production area, the unit manager sent word that two difficult equipment problems had been solved. These types of
information were in turn communicated in a memo by Mr. D-M to his superiors so that they could stay appraised of the progress of the series as it moved through production.

**Lines of authority and influence for the production of individual shows.** When considering individual productions, it is important to realize that everyone hired for the specific production is on "run of show," that is, they are hired specifically for the duration of the production of a series or a specific show. Mr. D-M indicated that he must plan ahead in order to keep his talented people or they will move somewhere else or go into business for themselves.

For a series like *Action-The Bicentennial*, two groups of employees can be identified, all of whom are subordinate to Mr. D-M in line of command. The first group are members of the Action! Unit, who are employed by the network for the duration of the series. This unit's members are responsible to the series producer and unit production manager who, while subordinate to Mr. D-M, has a different line of authority than Mr. D-M into the network hierarchy. He is responsible to the Executive Vice-President of the Television Network who appointed him to work with Mr. D-M. Neither Mr. D-M nor the unit manager at first wanted to work with the other. Although their association has been successful by a variety of criteria, including awards won and ratings earned,
their personal relationship remains strained. This unit manager oversees the specifics of production for each show. His staff handles the mobile unit, unions, casting, special effects, costumes, and generally whatever a specific show director needs to achieve a successful production.

The second group of employees concerned with each specific show are those who, like the director are employed for one show at a time. These are properties people, music composers, script girls, actors, and so on. In terms of their influence over the final product, most people feel like the Action: Unit casting lady who said of her job, "I propose, they dispose." In terms of decision-making and the final product, these people are significant because of a remark that Mr. D-M made one day in his office: "I sometimes think a lot about all those people working over there on my ideas adding their 10%.

Standards and Practices. All scripts approved by Mr. D-M for his shows must be sent to the network's Standards and Practices office to be reviewed for objectionable content. During his week-long observation period in the decision-maker's office, the investigator was able to review a memo and a script from Standards and Practices and note Mr. D-M's reaction.

There was an objection to the use of "God" as an expletive in the "Westward Wagons" episode of the Action-The Bicentennial series. The memo continued by saying that the use of the word
"God" to be acceptable should be used in supplication and not in an exclamatory manner. They contrasted acceptable examples of the use of "God" from the "Revolutionary Heroine" episode from the same series with one from the "Westward Wagons" episode which they excluded. For example, "... if God is willing ..." is acceptable, whereas "... in the name of God!," is not.

The decision-maker interpreted the memo for the investigator. He said that by including the acceptable examples they were saying to him, "John, don't call us up, it's OK to use 'God' in a script, but not as an expletive." He asked the researcher to go to the file drawer and find the show script and then matter of factly attached the Standards and Practices memo to it.

Later in the day, Mr. D-M said that he had argued with the Standards and Practices people on other occasions and that was why they included the positive examples from his other scripts so that he would not hassle them about their objection. He added, in reply to a question by the researcher, that over the past few years Standards and Practices had become "more stringent, more uptight, more anxious."

Influences of the Ratings and the Advertisers

Mr. D-M was quite clear on the importance of ratings by stating that if he understood "the name of what we're supposed to be doing here, the idea is to get the greatest number of viewers
to watch our particular network." He proceeded immediately to qualify this statement by saying that there are "certain restrictions and bounds and moral feelings" for himself, but he insisted repeatedly in a variety of contexts throughout the period of observation that this is an absolute which sets one of the limits within which he must work. Further, he stated that "our business is made up of advertisers because we are designed to make a profit."

He insisted often that he is in the "entertainment business, the storytelling business, and the information business." He cannot try to "educate and stay in the business he is in." He must "entertain first" and communicate any learning lesson or value position by "innuendo." What he is trying to do is "blend entertainment and information, not go into the education world." He would rather create an entertaining show that gets the large acceptable audience that meets the ratings criteria of his company and at the same time delivers a modest informational message, than deliver a full and complex message to a small audience. A small audience would be, for example, a 10% share of those watching television in a given time slot. Although this share might mean eight or nine million viewers, the show would almost certainly be cut from the schedule as unsuccessful for a mass audience.

One of Mr. D-M's children's shows was cut from the network schedule for this very reason as part of the complex of events that Mr. D-M openly refers to as his "failure" as vice-president for all children's programming for his network. He said that he learned
the hard way by being replaced in that position because of the "rating disasters" he put his network through, that he must be in the entertainment business first. Mr. D-M's consciousness of the ratings is indicated by the fact that he often had at his fingertips the share earned by a given show he produced. For example, he stated that he had doubled his ratings from the previous year on one of his series, because the shows were crisper, simpler and more entertaining. He said that he must be satisfied with communicating a minimal learning lesson within this entertainment format. He also noted with pride his network's strong showing generally in the ratings for its Saturday morning children's programming.

Although advertisers generally prefer to place advertisements with shows drawing the largest audience, they have been subject recently to increasing constraints and pressures for change. Satisfied to some degree with network response to pressures to improve children's programming, citizen's groups such as Action for Children's Television, have been bringing pressure on advertisers. An example of the kind of change this pressure has produced can be seen in the guidelines for advertising on children's television recently published by the National Association of Broadcasters. For example, advertising time on Saturday morning children's programs has been mandated to be reduced from 16 per hour to 9½ by January 1, 1976. Further, networks may no longer accept certain advertisements that were once acceptable. Advertisements for vitamins, for example,
are specifically excluded. Finally, some advertisers have withdrawn from children's shows because they do not wish to take the heat from the various groups that oppose some, or all, advertising when children are watching without adult supervision.  

Although it is not part of Mr. D-M's job to make the actual sales to advertisers, he is personally acquainted with the advertising executives of at least some of the companies that have purchased time on his shows. In fact he even mentioned one man by name in his acceptance speech at the Peabody awards dinner he attended while the researcher was with him. Afterwards, he said that the man and his counterparts in different companies deserve mention, because they make the shows possible. He said further that this particular executive occasionally calls him to get his recommendation about which shows should receive his company's advertising money. Sometimes, he said, the company could spend its money better in terms of audience size, but places its money to support educational programming.

Mr. D-M speculated in conversations with the researcher that the pressures brought to bear on advertisers may affect the nature of children's programming. There is a feeling that Saturday morning children's programming is not shared or watched by adults.

---

An advertiser, wanting to avoid any criticism, for example, the Federal Trade Commission investigating the sugar content of breakfast foods, may place his money where a parent and child are supposed to be able to share a program. They could choose, as one possibility, the late afternoon children's specials that two networks are currently producing. This would diminish the money available for Saturday morning and lead to changes in Saturday morning scheduling. The networks may diminish the number of hours they broadcast on Saturday morning. Or one network might completely eliminate children's programming and go for a different Saturday morning audience, simply because the money flow will move to other areas where there is a chance for the parent and child to share something together.

In any event, Mr. D-M is conscious of how the advertising sales for his shows stand. He told the researcher and others across the week of observation that the advertising space for his Afternoon Special series had already been completely sold.

Influences from the Public Sector

In addition to corporate influences, Mr. D-M gave evidence of being aware of and influenced by groups and individuals from the public that the mass communications seek to serve.

The Federal Communications Commission. When asked about the relationship between the networks and the Federal Communications
Commission (FCC), Mr. D-M warned that to answer the question ade­quately would take about two and one-half days of discussion. His ensuing comments and references across the week of observation seem to indicate that FCC influences upon the networks and upon himself can be considered from two major perspectives: 1) Mr. D-M's general professional concern about FCC actions in relation to broadcasters and 2) how the FCC has affected his personal programming and his decision-making.

Mr. D-M sees the FCC relationship to broadcasters as one of checks and balances. The networks and local stations have funded the National Association of Broadcasters (NAB) to, among other things, represent and protect their interests vis-a-vis the FCC and the government in Washington. One NAB function is to serve as a lobby for broadcast interests. Another function is to serve as a watchdog on government actions which might jeopardize First Amendment rights.

Mr. D-M expressed concern about a case currently moving its way through the courts in which a citizen's group was contesting a fine levied by the FCC against a station in Oak Park, Illinois, for broadcasting obscenity over the air on a sexually oriented talk show. Quoting from a newspaper, he said, "the U.S. Court of Appeals . . . last week upheld the right of the FCC to determine whether broadcasters are programming obscene materials and to fine
them accordingly." Reacting, he said, "In my 25 years (in broadcasting) that is brand new." The case was expected to go to the Supreme Court.

More often, the FCC tries to influence broadcasters by using what Mr. D-M referred to as "jawboning," which means to unofficially and off the record to sit down and discuss a matter of concern. If the FCC feels that this is not working, it may issue a policy statement such as its 1974 statement on children's television which reported the findings of an investigation into children's programming it initiated at the request of the citizen's group, Action for Children's Television. The policy statement called for a reduction in the portrayal of violence and the inclusion of more informational and educational values in children's programming. It also suggested that the networks consider placing children's programming at times other than Saturday morning.

Stressing the polarity of opinions regarding FCC influence, Mr. D-M indicated that while some people feel "that broadcasters run around in fear and trembling of the FCC, there are a lot of . . . lobbyists who think that the FCC is in the vest pocket of the broadcasters." But to sum up his position on the relationship of broadcasters to the FCC, Mr. D-M said that "as I get older and less volatile and look at this, I begin to see that it really becomes a series of checks and balances, and the pendulum . . . swings back and forth. That is healthy. I would be terrified if any group of people were to decide . . . what we will watch."
More specifically, Mr. D-M indicated that his network, at least, seems to be responding to the FCC policy statement on children's programming. He has been asked to develop some after-school specials for young people. His children's programming counterparts on the West Coast are being asked to look into some specials, too. And a reflective news program for children that Mr. D-M has been trying to move into production for more than two years will probably get at least to a pilot because of the FCC policy statement about children's programming.

Twice across the week, Mr. D-M made reference to the FCC while making decisions about a specific program. One of the reasons he gave to a producer for excluding the portrayal of violence from a show was that he had to take into account "the critics, public feeling, and the FCC."

The NAB also responded to FCC pressure by forming a Children's Program Committee, of which Mr. D-M is a member. In the Spring of 1975, the committee sponsored a convention for general managers and program managers of local stations. The purpose was to demonstrate in workshops some of the best things being done in local children's programming across the country so that local program managers could see what other people are doing with their same financial capabilities. It was a move, Mr. D-M said, to help local stations to broaden and improve their local children's programming through the week as well as on Saturday, and at the same time take a positive look at the things that are being done, and done well,
across the country. He said that quality local children's programming rarely comes to the attention of people generally.

The Federal Trade Commission. While the Federal Trade Commission has little if any direct influence on the day to day decisions of Mr. D-M, the ramifications of its power and influence have potential to influence Mr. D-M profoundly. One major area of potential influence has already been explored in the section, Advertisers and Ratings. According to Mr. D-M, one of the reasons advertisers are shifting their advertising money to weekday afternoon television is to avoid criticism and controversy surrounding products they advertise when the viewing audience is considered to be children watching without their parents. If an advertiser does not want to be involved in a controversy surrounding an FTC investigation of the sugar content of his product and withdraws or re-locates his advertising, it affects the amount of revenue available for children's programming and ultimately must touch Mr. D-M in some way.

A second major way the FTC affects Mr. D-M is in its jurisdiction over anti-trust matters. It is largely because of the FTC's anti-trust stance that networks are required to buy most of their programs from outside producers. According to Mr. D-M's estimate, networks produce only 10% of their own shows. This is what makes Mr. D-M one of the relatively few people trained by his network to create ideas and put them on the air from within the network.
Action for Children's Television (ACT) is a citizen's group centered in Boston, Massachusetts. Mr. D-M indicated that this group has brought much pressure to bear on the networks and the FCC to improve children's programming. He said that he has participated in a series of meetings with the ACT people and that the last two meetings were more positive. His view is that ACT is constantly accusing the networks of doing nothing and challenging them to do more, whereas he and the network representatives are looking for ways to share experiences they have had in a positive way. He further noted that the ACT people have indicated that the networks are making good efforts now, and have turned their attention to criticism of advertisers.

Mr. D-M is conscious of the kind of influence that a group like ACT can have on programming. He mentioned ACT by name in a memo designed to sell the idea for a music-centered program for his Afternoon Special series, saying, "the largest criticism we are receiving from the likes of ACT people and others today, is the network's lack of doing something with music for young people."

Another citizen's group, the Media Action Research Center, published a research report to coincide with the June, 1975, NAB conference on local children's programming mentioned above. It accused both the FCC and the networks of failing to take serious action to eliminate acts of violence and aggression from children's programming.
The Press. The researcher observed the press to influence Mr. D-M in three ways: as a source of information, as a means of publicizing his shows, and as an important medium critics use to review his shows. Mr. D-M regularly reads two trade journals, Broadcasting and Variety. Somewhat facetiously he said that he reads Broadcasting for the facts and Variety for the rumors. In addition, he reads the New York Times and other recognized news sources. During two of the three periods of time the observer spent with the decision-maker, he was carrying clippings relating to children's programming from either Variety or the New York Times which he showed to the people he met or to his bosses in order to make them aware of trends in the industry.

Part of the standard procedure of introducing any new television series is to call a press conference. This procedure is taken quite seriously by the networks. During the full week the researcher spent with Mr. D-M, one item that demanded his attention was preparation for a rehearsal for a press conference to be called to introduce the Afternoon Special series to the press.

Finally, when Mr. D-M was attending to the scripts for his series, his comments indicated that he was conscious of what critical reaction might be. When discussing a show that would feature the precise mathematical planning that stuntmen have to engage in, in order to insure their safety during their spectacular stunts, he said to the director that he could not have the New York Times and other critics saying it was just a stunt show with no educational
value. He said he needed more than just spectacular stunts. He needed awards, attention, and ratings in order to be able to continue what he was doing.

He expressed annoyance with one critic who told him in person how great his shows were, yet never wrote about them. And in his files the researcher found a few clippings from newspapers reviewing Mr. D-M's shows. One, from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, complimented the entertainment-education mix that communicated a subtle learning lesson. The researcher found out later that Mr. D-M had met the critic the previous year and that the critic had since been supportive of his efforts.

Letters from viewers. About the only way the average viewer has to communicate his opinion about a program to a broadcaster is to write him a letter. Mr. D-M said that "it used to be that when a letter came in to a sponsor or a station everybody went into a whirlwind. That doesn't happen anymore, now that we've had it pointed out to us that one letter out of ten thousand (or a million) viewers is not really too significant. The people who make the rating studies don't care about the letters. But the people who do the broadcasting care about the letters, particularly the producers and the directors. We learn a great deal by reading the letters and we do answer all the letters." This view was shared by the two vice-presidents for children's programming from the other two major networks who attended a luncheon interview with Mr. D-M.
During two of the three periods of observation, Mr. D-M was carrying with him letters from viewers and shared them with the observer and with others in the various settings. Two letters in particular were especially memorable. The first he had to paraphrase, because he was having it duplicated and did not have it with him. It was in response to a show on the birth process that ran on Saturday morning. The lead into the show suggested that the children invite their parents to share the show with them.

My little child, my daughter came to me and asked me in the middle of a busy Saturday morning when I was very, very busy elsewhere in my house, to sit down and watch this program. I was a little taken back and somewhat irritated that I should have to give up that time I had planned to do something else with. But as the program unfolded my daughter watched without a word the birth of all the animals and I saw the evolution of Spring and the birth of the animals. When Katy Ann, the baby, was born, my daughter walked across the room, never said anything to me, but put her arms around me and kissed me. It was the first time that there was any communication between my daughter and myself which was meaningful and important.

Mr. D-M said that the letter was a "tear jerker," and many people responded to it that way and that he did too. But it was letters like this that were coming in at that time that made it all worthwhile.

Another letter of the type that seemed to make it all worthwhile came from a young viewer. Mr. D-M indicated that he had hoped to read it as part of an award acceptance speech.³

³The name of the girl and all other names in the study have been changed in order to provide anonymity to those people involved.
I really enjoy your show and I'm going to...wach (sic) your next show. My name is Ann Trainer, age 10. I wish I could make your show longer and I wish I was part of your Action team. I wish I could get to know the Action team better.

Your friend,
Ann Trainer

Some letters find their way to the Chairman of the Board. He forwarded them to Mr. D-M with a letter that said, "I've been going to write you about Saturday morning for a long time. Bravo, Bravo, Bravo. The show is the best thing for children on TV."

He also shared some negative letters and commented upon each. He was especially pleased with two letters he received from a station manager in Oklahoma which indicated that the local manager had defended one of Mr. D-M's potentially controversial Action! shows. The manager had answered two critical letters personally before forwarding them to Mr. D-M.

The National Association of Broadcasters. The National Association of Broadcasters has already been mentioned in the section on the FCC and as a sponsor of a national workshop designed to help local broadcasters improve children's programming. Its ways of influencing the decision-maker were most noticeable in these two areas during the period of observation, but the group deserves attention because it is the lobby in Washington for the industry and it has the power to set policy for stations affiliated with it in the industry, as well as perform public relations and other functions.
It was the NAB, for example, that issued industry-wide guidelines for improving children's programming.

Awards--The Peabody et al.

Mr. D-M has in his office three shelves literally filled with awards and certificates of recognition for outstanding programming. He has won Emmies, the Brotherhood Award of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, the Christopher Award, and more Peabody Awards (6) than any living broadcaster. He is especially proud of the Peabodys. He said he considered the Emmy prestigious in the eyes of the public, but the Peabody the most prestigious of all, the "creme de la creme." The researcher saw Mr. D-M receive a Peabody for the Action! series during the week of observation and learned that another show he was executive producer for had been nominated for, but did not win, an Emmy.

It became clear to the investigator that the awards made an important contribution to the establishment of Mr. D-M's considerable reputation and status as a children's programmer. It was obvious in his tone of voice when speaking about the Peabody he had just won, that the winning of it was a source of personal satisfaction for him.

He made it a point, however, in his acceptance speech to mention not only the Action! production unit, but also his three immediate bosses and one of the advertisers for the show who was present for the ceremony.
An interesting sidelight to the ceremony was that Mr. D-M's acceptance speech was the hit of the event. Even as he was moving to the podium to accept the award there were small ripples of laughter and the audience found his speech to be quite humorous and enjoyable. After the ceremony, on the street and in the halls of his building, literally twenty or more people stopped him to say, "John, you were terrific," or "John, we really loved it." Their comments seemed very genuine. An interesting thing was that Mr. D-M said that he did not intend his speech to be funny and that he was puzzled by the laughter. An indication of how seriously he took receiving the award is that he referred to his speech several times over the next two and one-half days the researcher spent with him. He wondered about the laughter, tried to explain it, and talked about things he wished he had or could have included in the speech.

But in commercial broadcasting, awards must be put in perspective. While they are important for maintaining personal credibility and status, and therefore permit an executive to do things in programming he might otherwise be unable to do, they are clearly secondary to the ratings and the making of money. Mr. D-M himself put the awards ceremony in perspective while he and the observer walked to the hotel where the Peabody would be given. He said, "There will be an awful lot of backslapping and people saying 'Wow, John, you did a wonderful job and you're the greatest guy in the world!' Then the next day the pressure's going to be back on with questions like: 'Why isn't the show on time? How come your costs are running over? What are the ratings going to look like?'"
To the researcher, the ceremony was like being in the eye of a hurricane--a pause for half a day--and then the pressure starts up again. Mr. D-M was part of this himself with regard to the Action! unit. At the ceremony he complimented the unit on its fine work and kidded with them about never having seen them wear a tie or be dressed up. The very next morning at 10:00 A.M. he was in the Action! unit offices with a list of pointed questions about problems that had come up in the production of the series for the coming Fall.

Mr. D-M himself perhaps best sums up the place of awards in broadcasting with a comment he made during an appearance he made on a nationally televised talk show. He said, "I've always been lucky enough to win awards, but along with that I've learned to be a commercial broadcaster."

Local Broadcasters

The major way that local broadcasters can exercise power in relation to the networks is by refusing to carry programs. The Nixon administration, for example had been accused of urging local stations to exercise this power as a way of countering the network establishment, which it saw as being too liberal in orientation and overly critical of administration policies. Mr. D-M, while clearly recognizing the right of local station managers to refuse to carry a show locally, was sometimes critical of their exercise of that right. In one instance he cited a station manager in the South who objected to a re-run of a movie which contained an inter-racial
marriage. In another, he referred to a manager in New York State who refused to carry a network news special series "because it was run by Jews." Mr. D-M pointed out that the ironic twist to the racial slur was that the producer of the show was not Jewish.

Local broadcasters can exert indirect pressure by going to the FCC. Mr. D-M showed the researcher a clipping from Variety that stated local broadcasters were a major influence in bringing pressure on the FCC to confront the networks about an alleged increase in the frequency of explicitness of sex and violence on television.

A local station's decision not to carry a specific program touches Mr. D-M directly when that program is one that he has produced. When only 35 of 290 affiliates decided to carry a children's show he created three years ago, it meant certain cancellation for the program. Even his currently successful Peabody Award winning Action! show, which has pulled down a healthy 22 share against stiff competition would fare better if the 34 affiliates who carry it on a delayed basis, would run it during its nationally scheduled time slot.

The decision-maker mentions that he has personally contacted local station managers who have decided not to carry his show to urge them to re-consider. In other instances he has had to arrange for local managers to preview shows they were skeptical about. This was the case with the birth of a baby show. He was pleased that all but one of his regular affiliates supported and carried the show.
That affiliate carried the show on a delayed basis on Sunday morning and did not wish to run it adjacent to its regular local religious programming.

The Child--Taking the Prime Audience into Account

First of all, who is the child? When asked this question at the interview luncheon the researcher attended with the three network children's programming vice-presidents, the three men generally divided the young viewing audience into pre and post reading groups. Mr. D-M grouped children in two categories, ages 1 to 7 and 8 to 14. The shows he currently has in production are aimed at the 8 to 14 year age group.

When asked how they knew what kids are like, the vice-presidents said they judged by "gut feeling." They referred to having children of their own and to their years of experience as programmers. Across the time spent observing Mr. D-M it was possible to identify some of the factors that contribute to these experience-based intuitive judgments about what the child is like and about the kinds of programs that must be created for him.

Mr. D-M pointed out that because the 8 to 14 year old has watched a tremendous amount of early evening television, he is a very sophisticated viewer when he comes to watch Saturday morning or other children's programming. He is used to tremendous pace, suspense, and lots of action. He has witnessed many instances of motivated and unmotivated violence. In general, he is used to a
pretty slick kind of viewing. So children's television must use the same pacing and the same techniques to treat topics that interest young people as are used on prime time broadcasting.

Further, because of their sophistication, children must be treated as people. They cannot be talked down to. Mr. D-M said on two or three occasions that the factors that influence decisions in children's programming are the same as those in adult programming. There are no fundamental differences. A director who has done several shows for Mr. D-M considers children a tougher audience than adults. Not only are they more likely to have more immediate distractions while they are watching, but also he says that they don't carry with them the residual of a day, the hopes and anxieties adults bring with them. They come to television and say, in effect, "Entertain me," and the show has to take up from there. Mr. D-M expressed the same notion by saying that children come with the attitude, "If you show me, I'll stay. If you don't, I'll try another channel." To sum up this point, in commercial broadcasting entertainment program values and respect for the viewer are essential if the program is to draw and hold an audience and do well in the ratings.

The corollary to this is that information and educational values for young people must be communicated within this format. The young viewers have access to the television knob and are not a captive audience like they would be in a movie theatre or at school. As one of Mr. D-M's associates put it, there can be no "popcorn" scenes, i.e. a dull section in a movie when the viewer can go out and buy popcorn.
Mr. D-M and his associates did mention one factor that is important for children's television. A program must not divide picture and sound. What is happening in the picture must be reinforced by what is happening in the audio. Dividing the two risks losing the audience. An associate explained it by saying, "if you say, 'Watch Joe run,' Joe must be running and it really is that simple." Research commissioned on the Action! series, which measured the amount of time a sample children's audience spent actually watching the TV screen during specific shows, showed marked increases in attention when the narrator would say something like, "Now watch closely as...," or "Pay attention to the...." Mr. D-M considered this reaction of children to be based on their experiences in school. Viewing of several Action! programs by the researcher confirms the frequent use of this device in the script.

There is an added dimension to Mr. D-M's image of his viewer. He considers his programming to be more aimed at "ghetto kids" than the programming of one of the two other networks. The investigator observed this belief expressed on two separate occasions. When talking with the director of the stuntman show in the Afternoon Special series, he stressed repeatedly his hope that the underlying learning lesson of the value and usefulness of mathematics would be especially important for the "deprived child" who may not have the advantages of an excellent school system. His hope was that a "ghetto kid seeing the show might react by thinking that if the
stuntmen needed math to be able to be successful, that maybe he too should care about learning math."

He amplified upon his belief that his shows took into account the ghetto child in a conversation with the researcher on the same day as his meeting with the director for the stuntman show. His proof that the other network's shows were pitched to wealthy kids was in the ratings. He said their ratings are highest when the weather is bad, because wealthy kids are outside if the weather is good. Ghetto kids, he asserted, watch TV no matter if the weather is good or bad.

The educational community--a bittersweet relationship

The decision-maker's contact with the educational community has been long and varied. One would expect this of a vice-president for children's programming. He has taught courses in creativity and broadcasting at various universities over a period of twenty years. He has a university educational consultant for his programming. He has many professional contacts and friends at universities. The researcher has already explained that the opportunity to conduct this study was arranged through a university professor who is an advisor to this study. But his contacts with schools have also been colored by bitter and disappointing experiences.

In response to interview questions and in his general remarks he questioned the value of a university education in communication when it is untempered by firsthand, on the job experience.
He focused his criticism on consultants from universities hired by networks to look good on their credit lists, but who have only academic credentials. These consultants, he asserts, "can then sit on an advisory panel and pontificate to some poor program manager and tell that guy exactly what he should do." He continued by saying that there is a tendency for the academic to get carried away, and when you put the academician in a real world sometimes he does not perform "because he can't line up all the ducks." The academic can get things somewhat organized, Mr. D-M asserts, particularly if he is teaching, because he is virtually in control, "but when you're in the firing line and somebody's snipping at your heels and shooting at you and you're trying to do something unusual or different, it's a lot different than the 'this is how it's supposed to work' sense."

Although Mr. D-M did not explain further, the tone of the conversation led the researcher to believe he was speaking from firsthand experience.

The decision-maker was equally insistent on the notion of experience and outside sense as necessary concomitants of a college degree for young people just entering broadcasting. During a particularly reflective moment in the midst of a tape recorded conversation about how young people get into and succeed in broadcasting, he reflected:

And how do you tell someone how (to make good program decisions)? The worst of it is they go to school and they study all the lenses, the rules, the vocabulary, usually from someone who is very good at what they do, but really too good at times. And they don't spend their time living, learning, and understanding what the world is all about. You can teach them everything, but you can't teach them to
think. That is the difference, that is the line of difference. It makes for the difference in the show, because when the show comes out, it may be a crackerjack to look at, but it might not say anything. A show that is interesting, acceptable, that makes people reach for it, makes them understand what you're talking about doesn't come from whether it's a 50mm lens or a 10-1 zoom. It comes from something inside. It's an evaluation made on a particular sense or feel about something.

You either know it or you don't know it and it doesn't come easy.

Another segment of the educational establishment with which the decision-maker has had difficult experiences consists of the classroom teachers who teach the students at the age level his programs are designed to attract and serve. Four years ago he tried idealistically to engage these teachers in a cooperative effort to improve one of his shows by requesting from them their ideas in a national survey. The show was filled with much educational content and he solicited their comments and suggestions. He was bitterly disappointed by the response he got. Most replies were perfunctory and hurried. Many teachers said they had not seen the show or saw it rarely or could not take time to watch. Mr. D-M had tried to respond to his critics in education by creating a critically acclaimed show filled with educational content and values. The response of educators was disappointing. They did not watch it themselves, nor encourage their students to watch it, nor did they respond when given a chance to affect the content and form of the show. For these reasons and because the show could not possibly
attract a large enough audience on its entertainment values it was ultimately cancelled. This "mistake" of making his program too educationally oriented, was one factor in a chain of similar factors that led to the "rating disaster" Mr. D-M said he put his network through and which ultimately cost him his job as vice-president for all children's programming and could well have cost him his job with his network.

There are lessons that Mr. D-M says he has learned from this experience. The first, relating directly to his survey experience, is that using television to change teaching in cooperation with teachers is impossible. He criticized teachers and schooling in general for being non-creative. Another is that he is not in the teaching business and that he must leave teaching to the teachers. The most he can do is provide information that children can absorb and make value judgments about. Because he doesn't have a captive audience, like a teacher in a classroom has, he "cannot teach 2 plus 2." He said, "The kids would turn us right off." At least five times during the periods of observation, Mr. D-M used this exact expression: "I can't get into education and stay in the business I'm in. I must first be in the entertainment business."

As a result of experiences like these, Mr. D-M is guarded in his relationships with educators. When the three children's vice-presidents were asked at the interview luncheon what their biggest problem was, they replied that adults don't watch their shows. They asserted that the networks have been responsive to grassroots criticism
and have improved their programming, but that adults may not know this because they do not take the time to watch the shows.

During the time of observation the researcher noted four ways the decision-maker was systematically and actively in contact with the educational community:

A. Negotiations regarding distribution of 16mm film versions of the Action! series to schools.

B. Preparation of study guides for teachers on his upcoming series.

C. Use of a university consultant for program and research matters.

D. College teaching.

Film distribution. Correspondence reviewed and phone conversations overheard indicated that negotiations with educational film companies to distribute 16mm film versions of last season's Action! series were not going smoothly. In the past, Mr. D-M would have dealt with a distributing agency within his corporation. Now, because of an anti-trust ruling, he must distribute through outside companies. Some of the same issues that troubled Mr. D-M's dealings with educators exist here as well. He was critical of one film distributor on two grounds. With a slight derisive tone of voice, Mr. D-M said that one difficulty was that "they don't like the films because the educational purposes are not spelled out precisely." He was also critical because these people, like adults in general and some of his bosses, "do not watch the shows while they are on
the air with kids around in order to get their reactions." Rather than use this "ideal" setting to view and make judgments, they ask to borrow the video-tapes of the shows.

One point that a film distributor made in a letter to Mr. D-M points up a difference between commercial and classroom use of mass media. If a popular culture figure who narrates an Action! show is readily acceptable to children, but not equally acceptable to adults, the educational film version will not get to the kids. The basis for this is that the kids have access to the television knob and they turn on what they want and their parents don't monitor them. But an educational film has to please the educators before it gets to the kids. Children, he pointed out, don't have access to the off-on button in the educational-film business.

**Preparation of study guides.** During the week spent with Mr. D-M, he devoted some attention to finding working space for the small staff who would prepare study guides for the upcoming Action!-The Bicentennial series which was in production at the time. The study guides would be distributed to 45,000 secondary schools across the country. This is in line with his belief that within the constraints of a commercial entertainment enterprise that he can provide information upon which value judgments can be made, but that he must let the teacher do the teaching.

Here again, Mr. D-M was worried about communicating with educators. Action!-The Bicentennial is a dramatic series with
fictionalized scripts based upon stories about little known people and events of the revolution and early growth period of the United States. The decision-maker was skeptical that teachers receiving the study guides could grasp the dramatic nature of the show. He suggested in a memo that it might be necessary to print in boldface type at the top of each guide that the stories were fictional so that they would not get letters from teachers and history buffs criticizing them for not being precisely accurate historically. He said that his experience had indicated this to be necessary.

When the researcher spent time with the decision-maker on location a week later, Mr. D-M mentioned that he had watched the first three shows with the study guide staff and worked with them in writing the guides for the first three shows of the Bicentennial series.

The university research consultant. The only regularized professional university consultant Mr. D-M was using at the time of observation was a man who provided research data on the characteristics of individual shows that contribute to holding an audience. During the week of observation, Mr. D-M talked once with this man on the phone and sent a memo to Program Administration explaining what his consulting fee per show would be.

A procedure is used in which a camera records students viewing a show to be tested in the presence of a series of distractor slides. An analysis of the viewing session produces an average amount of time the children spent watching the show compared to the
amount spent viewing the distractor slides. The high and low points of attention to the show are matched to the script so that the decision-maker and his staff can find out where the production problems lie.

It was out of this research that what Mr. D-M calls the "See Jane Run Theory" was developed, which this study referred to in the section on The Child as the general necessity of not dividing picture and sound. While admitting that this explanation is over-simplified, Mr. D-M speculated on school related origins for the technique he uses successfully in his shows. First, schools tend to favor and reward placid cooperative students, as opposed to the active and boisterous child. Principals and teachers nominate these placid children for shows, when Mr. D-M asks for students. But he doesn't want this child because he is as placid on television as he is anywhere else. Second, students get a very literal experience at school. When they see a picture of Jane running, it says right underneath it, "See Jane run." Artistically sophisticated movies, for example, will sometimes divide picture and sound for dramatic effect. But this will not work for young people nor for the majority of television audiences. So the research has shown that every time that they wish to gain attention, they call attention to the literal event happening on the screen. For example, Mr. D-M explained, "The second we say 'See that man? He's an expert in . . .', or 'Look for . . .', the kids in the research setting turn right from the distractor slides to the television." In school, he says, that's what they get all day long from the teacher. "Johnny,
you watch." And they are perfectly conditioned that way when they come to television.

Another finding that emerged from this same research is that if they can hold the child for the first eight minutes of a given show, he or she will watch the rest of the show. This has led them to concentrate in scripting and production on making the first eight minutes as interesting and as exciting as possible in order to hold the audience for the entire show.

**College teaching.** Mr. D-M's final major ongoing relationship with the education establishment is as a college teacher. He has taught at four different universities for periods ranging up to eight years. Currently for each class he teaches, he takes 10 of about 50 honor student applicants. He teaches the course in his office and has them actually physically work with him on a day to day basis, in much the same way the researcher has done. But instead of primarily observing and recording, they would be actively involved in reviewing scripts, writing their own scripts, being in on analysis and evaluation of shows and so on. They are treated and are expected to act just as though they were working for Mr. D-M and not as though he were a teacher.

Here again his criticism of the education system asserted itself. He said that he had to break them of the habit of raising their hands to speak and prepare them to enter the real world from the "ivory tower" where they have been living in a system of security
and protection. He was further critical of one university he worked for, saying that he left it because of the administration's and teachers' negative attitude toward students during a student strike.

There are three major benefits Mr. D-M identified as coming from his teaching. He said that he seeks to identify the most promising among his students and has hired or found beginning jobs for many of them. Second, he says that he gets a lot of personal satisfaction from the teaching. Finally, he said that teaching forces him really to get inside of his motivational reasons for doing things. He reviews aloud his own feelings through his students and a lot of his own experiences which he may have forgotten or written off. As a result he becomes "richer and stronger."

**Public TV and Sesame Street**

The question of whether *Sesame Street* has influenced children's television is worth considering in this study for two reasons. First, the general public is curious about the influence, if any, that *Sesame Street* may have had on commercial children's programming. The editor of the national student magazine who interviewed the three network children's vice-presidents while the researcher was observing asked this very question. The vice-presidents answered that it had no big influence, but may have accelerated the trend toward the insertion of educational values in children's programming.
The second reason the question is worth considering is that Mr. D-M said that he had the chance to put *Sesame Street* on his network and passed it up. He said that he is still referred to critically by some people as the man who passed up the chance to put *Sesame Street* on commercial television.

He thinks that his decision was a valid one, because shows as good as *Sesame Street* may not perform well on a commercial network, "which by its very title says I will entertain you, I will make you laugh." *Sesame Street* certainly does that, he said, but even with that approach, *Sesame Street* may not garner the audience or the acclaim that it does on the PBS Network. This is something that he said he had to learn and he is learning it more and more. As he often stated, he has to be content with delivering a smaller message to a large audience in an entertainment format.

**The General Public--Keeping Tuesdays Open**

Mr. D-M prides himself on being accessible to the general public. Although he has not been able to do it as much recently because of his heavy production schedule, he tries to set aside his entire schedule each Tuesday to meet with people who were seeking jobs or who came with products or show ideas. Even in the pressing schedule the decision-maker had to keep during the week of observation, he met with three outsiders.
One man demonstrated two spelling games that he thought might be appropriate for use on children's television. Once again Mr. D-M stressed that he must be in the entertainment business first and that although the spelling game might be more interesting and effective than a teacher to a "captive audience" in a classroom, the kids would turn it off if it appeared on a commercial network. He promised to pass the idea on to the producer of a new show he is considering, but said he could not use it personally.

The second outside product that Mr. D-M reviewed was a film produced by a young film-maker. Significantly, he said that he had not remembered that the appointment had been set up at the recommendation of one of his bosses. He stressed that he would have been accessible even if the film-maker had called directly. Mr. D-M was impressed with the artistic quality of the film. He said it was a potential award winner. But he said it would not be good for television, because it "pulled" too much, i.e., it was not cut with enough action to hold an audience. He said he could cut the 60 minute film to 40 minutes and make it great for TV.

For the researcher the two men who talked to Mr. D-M represented two ends of an education-entertainment continuum. The spelling games had been too "educational" for the medium of television and the film had been too "artistic," moving too slowly at times to hold a TV audience. Mr. D-M said he was impressed with the film-maker and promised to remain in contact.
The third outside person that Mr. D-M interviewed was a soft-spoken young lady seeking some kind of job with or through Mr. D-M. He was cordial, yet probing. She worked for a local television station in public affairs and had been out of work for a few months. Mr. D-M asked what kind of job she was seeking and would have preferred if she could have given a definite answer. He suggested to her that she might be the victim of the "ripple effect" in the broadcasting job scene. Two months ago he was hiring, but by the time the word reached her, all the jobs were already filled. He said he had nothing now, but would send her to a couple of producers who could possibly use her.

When she left, Mr. D-M shared some of his off-the-record impressions of her. She was pretty, he said, but her soft and chopped manner of speaking could be offensive to people. He speculated that some of her comments indicated that she might be having a personal problem with trying to find herself. He said that when he asked her what she could do for him, she kept saying what he could do for her. The researcher has noted that in other instances, as well, Mr. D-M preferred that people who dealt with him be clear and precise on what they want.

There was one other instance in which Mr. D-M demonstrated his concern about his accessibility to the general public and the public relations implications of this accessibility. On one of his visits to the Action! unit's suite of offices he visited the casting lady to check with her if several actors, whom he had personally talked with and said he would call back, had indeed been called back.
He said that the people he saw can say, "By damn, I saw a network vice-president." He said that he had made a promise to each of these people and he didn't want some guy in a bar saying that the call he had been promised never came. The script lady said that about two-thirds from his list had been called to date.

An interesting sidelight on this matter of the actors is that Mr. D-M said he had warned them that his talking with them was the "kiss-of-death." He said that no one he had ever talked to about an acting job in 25 years had ever been cast. The casting lady then indicated that none of the actors from his list who had been seen, had been cast.

One of the associates whom the researcher interviewed said that there are always people like these in and out of his office. She said that if the person has some potential Mr. D-M will try to help him or her. If he cannot personally, he will recommend the person to another area. She said that he was one of the few executives who would take the time to do that and not sort of rush people in and out. When asked if she could think of anyone else in the network who had at least an image of being accessible to the public, she said, "I can't think of one."

Public Service Groups

One other dimension of Mr. D-M's life that must be mentioned with regard to influences that affect him is his extensive involvement
in areas of public service. He was currently on the board of directors of a city-wide youth group, and the national advisory committees of two scouting groups. He worked with the National Council of Churches. He has served on United States Presidential Commissions and Councils. The only group, however, the researcher personally observed Mr. D-M involved with during the course of this study, was the branch of the armed forces in which he is a reserve officer. Mr. D-M had arranged to have representatives of his network's news department meet in a closed door meeting with his fellow reserve officers so that there could be an off-the-record general airing of feelings. The meeting took place on the evening of the first day of the week-long observation period and Mr. D-M told several of his associates how loud and exciting the meeting had been. Mr. D-M said that all the stereotypes came out about the news media being out to get the military. They considered television to be especially biased in comparison with the print media.

He said that it has been the wish and hope of broadcast managers that program executives participate in community affairs. Since he has been doing this across his career, this has been no problem for him.

He considers his involvement a learning experience, because he always finds out what activities are going on. Occasionally this led to an idea for a television show he has done.
Some public relations boards, he suspects, invite his participation because of his title or the hope that they will get some publicity out of it. He supposes it is true that a person may favor what he knows about. But he asserts that he has never offered television exposure to anyone just to accommodate someone's wishes, but only because there was a need or a national public interest. He said that these are judgments he has had to make and to live with.

One group he seemed particularly interested in was the Television Academy, because there he can help television become more of an art form of its own and develop its potential as a medium distinct from radio, the stage, or movies. Nobody tells him to do it, he said. He is involved in public affairs, because he is interested and he likes it.

The Decision-Maker's Wife

It was difficult to assess what role, if any, the decision-maker's wife has on his programming decisions. She often accompanies him on his business trips and to shooting locations, but the observer saw no interactions about programming, as such. He observed only that her comments indicate that she is aware, sensitive, and active. For example, she initiated a health and exercise program at the large apartment complex in which they live. She is mentioned here, because two people who closely share each other's lives must influence each other in complex and subtle ways.
III. How Decisions Are Made, A Sense of Judgment

The influences explored here that surround the decision-maker are diverse and complex. They interact with each other as well as with the decision-maker. Simple cause-effect relationships are hard to distinguish. How then does the decision-maker go about assessing and reacting to these influences as he moves through each day? The closest that the researcher came to a serious answer to that question came from Mr. D-M's statement quoted in the Educational Community section of influences on the decision-maker. After stressing the importance of experience as opposed to strictly academic study, he said that the ability to make good programming decisions "comes from something inside. It's an evaluation made on a peculiar sense of feel about something. You either know it or you don't and it doesn't come easy."

Asked if he considered this kind of "instinct," he replied by saying no, that it was rather a "sense of judgment." He said, "I know I have the ability to develop a sense of judgment about things and people and ideas. And mostly about timing. Timing is the crucial thing in the business we're in. When is the best time to do a certain kind of program? And the tendency is always to be too far ahead." For example, if a vice-president or a producer takes a project to his superiors today that is two years ahead of its time, he kills it for two years later when its time has come. The superiors won't touch yesterday's merchandise. They say we've seen this and it wasn't right.
On the other hand, Mr. D-M referred to a cyclical phenomenon in show ideas. He recently produced a series which basically and fundamentally had the same message and same idea as a series he had done fifteen years ago. The difference was a more complicated packaging designed to appeal to more sophisticated audience expectations. The idea was repetitive and the difference came in packaging what was appropriate for the contemporary moment. Mr. D-M said that he learned this only very recently.

The following section will try to explore the dynamic flow of Mr. D-M's decision-making in relationship to the influences that surround him by tracing the origin and development of the one show in the Action! The Bicentennial series that the researcher actually observed being shot on location. Because the time span considered will cover a period of over four years, some dimensions will undoubtedly be missed and others may be a little distorted because the researcher must rely heavily upon the memories of participants as they were expressed in interviews, rather than upon complete firsthand observation. However, a reasonably accurate picture should be able to be produced. It should provide a description of the decision-maker's values in operation and demonstrate the way he functions and the kind of power and influence he can exercise.
"Incident at Concord," The History of a Television Show

This section will attempt to trace from its remote beginnings, the history of the children's television show, "Incident at Concord." The program is one episode in the Action!-The Bicentennial series which Mr. D-M had in production during the period of time the researcher spent with him.

The causes of a failure. In order to place the show in its broadest context, it will be necessary to start four years back with the situation surrounding what Mr. D-M openly refers to as his "failure" as a children's programming vice-president.

Approximately five years prior to the time of this study, Mr. D-M was appointed vice-president for all children's programming at his network. Listening to the corporate desire for change in children's programming, which in turn was responding to the first pressures from citizen's groups, educators, and the FCC, he moved to include large measures of educational content and values into his programming. He spoke in particular of one show he spent over one and one-half million dollars to create that ran five days a week for children. He delivered what he felt were important value messages of all kinds. But only 35 of 290 affiliated stations decided to carry it.

1 Both the title of the specific episode and the title of the series have been changed to respect the decision-maker's wish for anonymity. The names of the people mentioned in this section have also been changed.
He also personally produced another show which included much educational content and was an award winner. In this show he sought to involve educators and his audience in controlling and contributing to its content. He surveyed educators, including classroom teachers, seeking their criticisms and contributions to the show. The response from educators was poor, in fact, virtually non-existent. The show earned only a 10% share in the ratings. In general, all of his children's programming ran a weak third in ratings to the other two major networks.

In the soul-searching that came out of this "rating disaster" he said that he put his network through, he sought to discover where he had failed both himself and his viewers. He said that he began to realize that in the process of growing older he had become somewhat sophisticated and lost touch with reality in the sense that he did not really understand what his audiences were composed of. Through research and through thinking and viewing television on his own, he began to realize that the 8 to 14 years old person who comes to watch one of his shows on Saturday morning, comes to him having watched a tremendous amount of early evening television and consequently was a very sophisticated viewer. These young people were used to tremendous pace and tremendous action. They had seen much motivated and unmotivated violence. They were, in short, used to a pretty slick kind of programming. If the program held their interest and entertained them, they would watch. If not, they would turn the knob to another station.
Since his network is in business to make a profit through advertising revenue, and since advertising revenue is directly related to audience size, the network wanted him to attract the largest number of viewers possible. He had learned through these programming rating failures that he had to find a way to deliver an educational message within the context of a program and still get large audiences.

He summed up his "failure" by saying he had been too far ahead of his time in including educational values in his programs. Indeed, only last year the FCC in its policy statement on children's television urged broadcasters to include the kinds of educational program values that led to poor ratings for Mr. D-M three years previously. Secondly, he said that he had come out "soft" against the "crisp," slick, action oriented programming of his competitors.

This lesson he had learned came at a high price. It nearly cost him his job with the network. He said that if he had been working for another network he could name, he did not think that he would have survived the "rating disasters" that he put children's programming through on his network. Instead, he said that his company kept someone they knew and understood and whom they had worked with for a long time. If his failure to win high ratings had been because he was a little too advanced or had moved a little too fast, then why not use him in some other capacity where he could use what he learned to advantage. He said that he is the first to admit that he moved in the wrong direction too fast, but that his network showed
a great deal of tolerance and understanding in letting him keep his stature and work in areas where he could use his proven abilities.

He said that he does not resent the man who replaced him. Although he disagrees with him on some matters, he supports him. That man has brought his network to very substantial rating successes in children's programming in the competition with the other two networks, from the poor rating position Mr. D-M had left.

There is an ironic twist to the success in the recent season of Mr. D-M's network in its rating competition with the other two networks. He said that his network's children's programming success can be attributed to the "crisp," slick, entertainment orientation of his network's programs, including his own. Their major competitor came out "soft" in comparison. This is ironic because the "softness" of the competitor's programs is the result of their attempting the same types of changes Mr. D-M tried and failed with four years ago. Just as he did, they followed the advice of educational consultants. Mr. D-M referred to one of these consultants by name. He suggested that in the coming season that their competitor would be a little more guarded in following advice from educators.

**Communicating educational content on commercial television.**

Mr. D-M spoke openly and frequently about this lesson he had learned regarding the communication of educational values in commercial children's programming. He often referred to the fact that it cost him his position as vice-president for all children's programming.
He used this experience as the justification and rationale for the kind of programming he was currently producing.

One of the strongest statements of his position was made when he was speaking before a group of educators. The researcher was present at the time. Referring to his previous lack of success in the ratings, he said:

I really didn't do the job I was supposed to do which was get the largest audience possible and still continue to deliver a message. And I think if there is any learning lesson in all that we're talking about, it seems to be that it is alright to carry the cross up the hill and be a crusader. And it's okay to go ahead and shout and scream and yell about how you want to do things that are better for television. But if you're working in the commercial networks or working in a commercial station you had better be aware that the way they make their living and their profit and their money is by circulation. And you had better...learn the techniques that deliver your message and still use the entertainment method to attract the viewer. This is where I think we have a lot of problems in the educational system, particularly in the colleges that teach communications. They don't really want to recognize that and for some strange reason a lot of times...the commercial networks are the enemy.

He seemed to sense that at least one person in this same audience of educators may have wanted to cast commercial children's programmers in the "enemy" role. She suggested, in spite of his personal experiences, it might be helpful for the networks to include a few questions at the end of children's shows to help young viewers think beyond the literal experience on the screen.

The intensity in his voice as he responded, suggested the depth of his feelings.

Well, it's possible that we could except I don't think that it's our job. I do sort of think it's the teacher's job. I'm not pushing it back in your lap exactly, but I was on
the White House Conference for Children and I did the paper which I'm sure the President or anyone else never read on the lack of creativity in the American School system. But, when I went around to school systems all the teachers told me that all I had to do is teach kids value judgments and give them value judgments. I believed that. What I didn't do is listen to the administrators who wouldn't let the teacher teach value judgments. And getting right back to the heart of your question, it is possible that I could do something to assist, but I don't know that I really want to because I really don't think it's my world to do that. I think that the educational system has to sort of change to give a child a very un-literal kind of experience and a chance for creativity, a chance for something other than the absolute literal which the system demands, which the state demands, the attendance demands, the paperwork demands, and the whole system seems to demand. I can't buck city hall. It is just impossible to do it. By the time I get that child as a viewer, except for the very little ones, they're locked into a system that I can't beat. I used to think that you could beat the system, but you can't beat that system. It's pounded into them five days a week and when they come to me on television I've got to treat them the same way. They are unable to accept anything except the very literal translation.

When the same questioner suggested that he may have been catering to the situation, instead of trying to change it, he commented further by saying:

It's not my job to change it. I'm not in that business. I'm in the entertainment business. It is your job, but you want to put it off on me. I want to put it off on you because it is really your responsibility.

We are giving children learning experiences. I am giving those experiences within the literal system. I've doubled my ratings. I'm being literal, but I'm still giving them experiences which they couldn't have in school. I'm still giving them entertainment. And that's really where I've got to stay. If I start getting to the lecture stage or start to point my finger or I say here are the questions we must remember at the end, I'm in trouble. I really am.
In three different circumstances during the period of data gathering, Mr. D-M used almost the same words to summarize his position on this matter. He said, "I'm in the entertainment business, the storytelling business, the information business. I cannot get into education and stay in the business that I'm in." On one occasion he was discussing a particular script with a director and said, "I've already failed once, I must entertain first and communicate the rest by innuendo."

Even in the face of the FCC policy statement calling for more educational programming, he said that unless ordered to change, he would stay in the entertainment business, because he believed that inside that business he could provide a large audience of young persons with some information. He believed that if he could do this he would accomplish more than if he did a purely educational program and got nobody to watch it. He said that he came up a weak third in the ratings, because he got carried away with the need to do fine programming for children, but he forgot he was in the entertainment business. Now, he said, he has been trying to learn to blend entertainment and education together to do the job he feels is necessary to gain the audience he needs to get.

In trying to attract an audience, he stressed that it is important not to mix up action and pacing with violence for violence sake. He blamed Hollywood for starting the use of violence to attract an audience. There is some truth to the fact that people will watch anything that moves and sometimes watch violence and be satisfied with
it. But, he continued, there is no need to equate violence with the word "action." If someone really understands pacing and timing, he does not need violence to attract an audience. Mr. D-M stressed on different occasions that it has been his policy to exclude unmotivated violence from children's shows for which he has been responsible.

Along with "learning" that crisp pacing and action are necessary for a successful television program, Mr. D-M at times referred to another factor that must be taken into account: the "reflective" nature of television. One of the directors associated with him explained the notion by saying that it explained why a program like The Midnight Special didn't bring rock and roll to television until 1970. After Arthur Fiedler started playing the Beatles in the Boston Pops, television was ready for rock and roll. Many young people he has met have told him their great ideas about changing television. "You know," he said, "that's like trying to change the Mississippi River, because television really mirrors the culture." If they want to change it, what they should really address themselves to is interpreting the culture better so that there are no lags between where the culture is and its interpretation.

He illustrated his point further by citing an NBC News special on which correspondent Edwin Neuman interviewed Marlon Brando. Brando asked why television did not cover the genuine problems of the Indian community in America. Neuman said that unless an issue has cultural visibility, television can't get involved in it because society just tunes it out.
The director who made the comments, said that he included the Supremes in the rock oriented music show for young people that he was currently preparing to direct. Even though the Supremes did not currently have a hit record, they were included because the network management would know the group and be more likely to approve the show.

Mr. D-M, who was present when these remarks were made, agreed with them and added that only after a person had succeeded at reflecting back what management and viewers want, and had established a name and reputation, could that person try avant garde ideas.

Developing a new production system. This necessary background clarifies Mr. D-M's programming value position at the time of the study and his position in the network. Knowing this it is possible to proceed with the development of the Action! series, and take this account a step closer to the eventual development of "Incident at Concord."

When relieved of his duties as vice-president for all of children's programming, Mr. D-M was given the title of vice-president of special children's programming. His specific assignment from his superiors was to develop a children's program using a new and untried video tape process for producing the show. Until the decision-maker received this assignment, video cameras had been used only for in-studio and live-from-location productions. All other television programs were shot and edited and sound-dubbed on film and then
transferred to video tape for broadcast. Part of the reason for this was the size and weight of commercial quality television cameras, as well as the cumbersomeness of the necessary video tape and sound equipment.

Because of the increasing sophistication and miniaturization of quality video camera systems, Mr. D-M's network committed itself to an attempt to go totally to video tape production. Mr. D-M was to assess the feasibility of this move by developing a children's program that would test out the potential and limits of a one video camera system. A man with a strong technical production background was assigned to work with Mr. D-M to handle the equipment and technical end of the operation.

The notion that an idea must be introduced at the right time related to Mr. D-M being assigned to develop video tape. He said that three years previously he had been lecturing at universities and advising that his network go to video tape production. Then three years later, almost by accident, he was assigned a tape show and the development of tape work.

One of Mr. D-M's associates outlined the hopes of the network executives who were pushing for the use of video tape. He said they wanted to locate more production for the network in New York City, to generate more network in house production, and to do these two things within a period of five years. Underlying these hopes were profit motives. It is cheaper to do series production on video tape than on film by anywhere from 22% to 45%. This difference would mean millions of dollars in profits for the company.
Mr. D-M explained that as the show went into production that there were things he saw that could have been done better on film, but they did them on tape in order to force a new system to learn how to work and be better. He also said realistically that one of the reasons they chose him to pioneer the effort was because his Saturday morning children's time slot would be easier to cover than prime time, if the system didn't work out.

The use of the video tape equipment is a fascinating part of the development of the Action! series and is worth exploring briefly. One of its main advantages is the potential for immediate playback. This lets the director see exactly what he has just shot. Shooting film, he would have to wait until the film was developed to see what each shot looked like. For example, the director of "Incident at Concord" immediately reviewed each shot and determined if it was a "buy," i.e. a good shot, or if the actors or cameraman needed some direction for another try. Once, the cameraman asked the director to check to see if the playback showed a car parked in the background of a complicated scene just shot for this story set in colonial times. The playback indicated the car was out of the picture. If the scene had been shot on film, the director would certainly have done the scene again, just to be sure. The playback had saved time and money.

The director of "Incident at Concord" did say that this reduction in the number of shots made on location meant less flexibility at the time of editing because there were fewer shots
Another advantage of the video tape system is the speed with which a show can be edited and dubbed. "Incident at Concord" was taped on both 2 inch reels and 3/4 inch cassettes simultaneously. As soon as each 20 minute tape was finished, the 3/4 inch cassette was sent immediately to the hotel where the crew was staying for a rough-cut editing of the individual shots into correct sequence. One cassette tape deck was used to play the tapes from location; a second was used to record them in sequence.

Editing is aided by time sequence numbers that flash across the bottom of the screen during recording and playback indicating minutes, seconds, tenths of seconds, and hundredths of seconds. Using a computer, a cut between shots on the final editing of the 2 inch tape can be made to the precise hundredth of a second. The computer is instructed to find the precise shot and the precise time spot to start the next shot, and to make the cut between them electronically. Using only one camera, a 25 minute show could be shot in 3 or 4 days and edited completely in 3 or 4 days. Mr. D-M asserted that doing the same thing in film would mean weeks instead of days.

He said ideas for the original Action! series were chosen so that the camera would be forced to perform in a wide variety of environmental conditions. They ran the camera on batteries and took it down a series of difficult rapids in an eleven-man raft.
They mounted it on the side of a race car and drove it around a Grand Prix race track. They took it up in a hot air balloon. They took it to the tropics and shot underwater footage for the first time with a video camera. Underwater, the camera used available light at a depth of 65 feet. While the camera was safe underwater in a special case they created for it, the video tape on the surface got moist from the atmosphere and peeled. That problem had to be solved. They took the system to the mountains in winter and the cold made the tape brittle, so they had to install heaters to keep it warm. In short, they demonstrated the mobility and versatility of the camera.

Mr. D-M's close associate in production said that it had been his commitment from the beginning to make the equipment totally mobile. Every piece of equipment could be placed in a container and flown by airplane to location. They were given a free hand by their bosses to experiment with the $250,000 worth of equipment in the ways they chose.

Along the way technical improvements continued to be made to enhance artistic quality or in response to necessity. A movie lens was fitted to the camera in some circumstances to get a certain softness and feel that contrasted with the hard crispness of the television lens. Just prior to the shooting of "Incident at Concord," final problems were worked out of a microphone system that permitted each actor to carry his own remote microphone. Each actor was then recorded on a separate sound track in synchronization with the video
Developing the show content. With this understanding of the contribution of the video camera system to the development of the show as further background, it is appropriate to discuss the assumptions and rationale underlying the content of the Action! series. Values and approaches developed and included in the Action! series would eventually carry over into the development of the Action!-The Bicentennial series and find their way into "Incident at Concord."

Mr. D-M said that he tried to develop a show which would take cognizance of the young person's sophistication in viewing that came from watching early evening television, and at the same time would counteract some of the things children saw on early evening television.

Children saw a guy riding a motorcycle all over the country doing all sorts of things with it, and having all sorts of experiences. They saw another man skilled in the martial arts taking on five men at a time and winning. They saw scuba divers taking fantastic underwater pictures. They saw rescue squads dash into burning buildings to rescue people and dozens of other characters doing exciting and the dangerous things with skill and ease. So Mr. D-M built a show that used the same pacing and the same action-oriented techniques and same things that interested young people: motorcycles, race cars,
scuba diving, rockets and so on. He used narrators that young people would recognize, such as John Denver, Paul Newman, or Jimmy Walker.

The basic conceptual message delivered in this entertainment context was: If the things these people are doing look easy, for example, driving a race car at high speed around a track, it's only because these people have done their homework and have prepared themselves. They know the problems, they know the dangers and it looks easy because they have rehearsed it. Implied, but not stated explicitly, is that life is the same way. It demands preparation, rehearsal, study, in order to be ready for its challenges. Money can buy the equipment and the trappings, but success depends on understanding and practice of what you want to do. And this often means hard work. With this approach, he could deliver a message and meet his responsibilities as children's programmer, but also take into account that he was in show business.

In its second year the **Action!** series was pulling a healthy 22% share opposite stiff competition. Mr. D-M said that he had doubled his network's viewers for that particular time period, and was still delivering a basic conceptual message about the need for preparation. It may not have been all the message he wanted to deliver, but it was what was possible with a format that must attract an audience. He said that the show was closer to where he would like to have been in children's programming than at any time in the previous five years.
A few descriptions of specific shows in the *Action!* series should help to clarify how the concept for the series was developed into specific programs. For their show on American Grand Prix auto racing they deliberately chose a brand new car and an experienced driver who was learning how to relate to that new car. They followed the car and driver as they prepared for and went through their first race. They explored the marriage of the driver to the car so that the viewer got a chance to see that auto racing was more than wild fast driving. The program tried to show that racing really took knowledge and planning and that the driver must know and care about and even love the machine he is working with. Much action footage could be included in the story. Cars were shown sliding through turns and racing around the track.

Ultimately, the car they were focusing on did not finish the race because of mechanical failure, but that did not matter because it was not the story. They had tried to show the effort, hard work, and frustration that are part of auto racing and which often do not lead to the winner's circle.

Another episode featured the martial arts. While the program was able to show throws and even a black belt instructor break boards, it did it in the context of young people learning. The show demonstrated the respect of the class for the master teacher and showed the mental discipline, concentration, and practice of simple skills necessary to learn any of the martial arts. Karate was shown to be a discipline of mind and body, not something you use to beat
up other people. Even in a general climate of public sensitivity to the showing of violence on the air, Mr. D-M said that he did not receive any mail critical of the show.

The show on "hot dog" or stunt skiing showed the mental attitude and long practice necessary for a beginner to execute a simple flip on a practice slope, as well as the dramatic execution of double flips by experts on downhill runs in open country.

Another episode illustrated the creative planning and the painstaking care that goes into the making of drawings for animated cartoons.

Some shows, like the exploration of rides at an amusement park, were done just for the fun of it and to demonstrate that the video camera was versatile enough to give the viewer a first person ride on a roller coaster. One show featured an Indian boy and a white boy sharing each other's cultures. It hoped to demonstrate that each could accept his own culture and yet choose elements of other cultures to fit his own personally determined values. One critic who acclaimed the show said that "it may have let many young-sters know for the first time that the storybook Indian is no more."

One show of which Mr. D-M is particularly proud explored the birth process, culminating in the birth of a human baby. It was the first time the topic had been treated on Saturday morning television.

By a variety of criteria, the two year run of the Action! series had been a success. The feasibility of using a video camera system for the production of a series had been demonstrated. The
series was a ratings success and praised by Mr. D-M's superiors. Citizen's groups considered it a step in the right direction. Newspaper critics praised it. Letters from viewers generally supported it. Educators responded enough so that negotiations were initiated to transfer some episodes to 16mm film for distribution to schools. And, finally, the series brought Mr. D-M the coveted Peabody.

The move to a dramatic series. From a successful base with the Action! series it was decided to move from a semi-documentary format to a dramatic format which would in some way address itself to the celebration of the American Bicentennial. Precisely how the decision was reached is probably lost forever in the corporate structure and the memories of the people involved. Part of the decision seems to have arisen from the desire of the superior in the company who originally asked Mr. D-M to experiment with the video camera, to try the new system on a dramatic series. Part of the decision seems to have come from Mr. D-M's personal desire to try a dramatic series with the equipment. Interviews and documentary evidence did not provide the researcher with a clear answer to this question.

It was clear, however, that whereas the choices of episodes in the Action! series were made in part to test out the versatility of the camera, there was now a desire to make the camera serve the purposes of a dramatic series.

Action! episodes were based on general story ideas and minimal script guidelines, and therefore it was possible to "patch and paste"
when something did not go according to what the production team had in mind. In contrast a dramatic series would have to be shot precisely to a script, line for line and word for word. *Action!*-The Bicentennial, as the new series was to be called, would be the first network attempt to use a video camera to shoot a dramatic series on location.

Mr. D-M suggested that one of the reasons he got the chance to work with tape was that his *Action!* time slot was not an important one in comparison to prime time slots and that his bosses felt that the Saturday morning time was "safe" to experiment with.

Once the decision had been made to let Mr. D-M turn *Action!* into a dramatic series in some way related to the Bicentennial celebration, the determination of the new series' format, and Mr. D-M's part in determining that format can be traced fairly clearly.

It was mentioned in a previous section that Mr. D-M has "selection of show." This means simply that he has the final responsibility for determining the show idea and the final form of each episode script.

In order to develop the idea for the *Action!*-The Bicentennial series, Mr. D-M was given permission by his bosses to isolate himself for a month at a small house he owns in the country. He read as much American history as he could. This included textbooks, history books, and diaries, anything he could get his hands on. He said that he discovered a similarity in mood between the people living immediately prior to the revolution and mood of today. People wanted independence. Protest was easy to come by. They were trying to find themselves,
yet wanting to remain anonymous. They wanted individual living and above all they did not want government interference. In fact, he said, an important function of forming the union of the thirteen colonies was to prove to France and Germany that the colonials were willing to fight and could be supported. But the predominant clue with regard to the Action!-The Bicentennial series was the sense that there was a similarity of mood between the colonials and Americans of today.

Next, he went to Washington, D.C., to talk with the national agency coordinating the Bicentennial celebration. They pleaded with him not to reproduce history, not to show just the revolution, and certainly not to do all stories about the Tea Party, The Liberty Bell, Bunker Hill, Lexington and Concord, or any of the famous people. In further reading and in conversations with educators, he discovered that beyond a few shared facts, everyone probably has different viewpoints about national figures such as George Washington or John Adams. Why, he asked, should he destroy all the cliches in the public's minds about these people? Besides, the Bicentennial Agency's computer in Washington, D.C., held records that showed most celebrations across the country would either try to re-enact the history of the revolution or attempt to de-mythologize the revolution and its heroes. Along with pleading with him not to re-enact history, the Bicentennial people urged him to do something that was pertinent to an ongoing situation in this country today.
Taking all these influences into account, Mr. D-M settled on a two word expression that would help him focus his conceptualization of the Action!-The Bicentennial series: individual determination. This focus was made in terms of his understanding of young people, 8 to 14 years old. While they are well informed because of media exposure and schooling, a huge segment of them, if not the majority, have the problem of identity, of floating a little, of trying to find themselves. This characteristic he realized often extends beyond the age of 14 years, but it was certainly true of a large segment of his audience. Further, he said that he realized that there was a great deal of pride involved in a young person finding himself, in a young person answering questions like, "Who am I? What will I be? Where will I go?" He also said he wanted to avoid mixing up the show format with any specific political ideology or with things that were solely his own personal beliefs. So, he took the notion of individual determination as the concept around which scripts would be developed. While the idea was developing and being brought into focus, Mr. D-M produced a documentary which he said was actually an attempt to experiment with the idea for the Bicentennial series. It was called Family Life in 1770.

In one of the United States national parks a log cabin has been built which is a replica of a real log cabin from the 1770's. A family lives there during the day to demonstrate the kind of lives ordinary people lived at the time of the revolution. The purpose of the television show was to contrast life in the 1770's with life in the 1970's. For example, when the man of the house broke through
the ice in the water bucket to get water for shaving, there was a brief flash-forward to a man turning on the hot water faucet in a modern home to begin his shave.

The director of this show told the researcher that the underlying purpose of the show was to take a family that no one had ever chronicled in any history book and show that these people who came to our country were the reason that the nation had a George Washington and a Thomas Jefferson. "You don't have heroes," he explained, "unless you have those individuals who struggled and in their own heroism created a climate that these larger heroes can spring from." That relates, he said, to Mr. D-M's idea of individual determination. In a larger sense, he continued, the idea relates to the literary concept of the protoganist--the determined individual--the whole notion of the classic hero.

Writing the script guidelines. When the idea for the Action!-The Bicentennial series had been developed and clarified sufficiently, Mr. D-M took it to the planning meetings with his bosses, his unit manager and associate producer, as well as representatives from Program and Talent Administration, and Budget Administration. Specifics were explained and discussed, approved or disapproved about the series idea, budget, scripting, the calibre and number of actors, the use of a narrator, and so on. These were written into script-writing guidelines by Mr. D-M to be given to writers along with his personal verbal instructions.
The specific script directions for episodes in the Action!-The Bicentennial series began by simplifying the notion of "individual determination" and stressing the continuity with the original two years of Action!:

The key conceptual words are "individual determination." The stories should be about a person who finds himself, makes a commitment and carries it out--BUT, a person who when making that decision knows that preparation, understanding and a thorough approach to the problem are vital to success.

Mr. D-M goes on to explain that the episodes will be dramatic stories based upon true incidents or facts. They would involve simple, unsung principal figures, not the traditional stars of history. In the case of a factual event or happening, the writers could invent the people. In other cases the people could be real. Writers were instructed to use dramatic license to transmute the stories into "fascinating, powerful, moving action dramas designed to compete with the best of prime time television fare." A disclaimer would be inserted at the beginning of each show explaining that the stories were dramatic in nature and not meant to be accurate historical documentaries.

Part of the guidelines reflected his commitment to be in the entertainment business first, yet include an informational message upon which value judgments could be made:

Remember, many of our 8 to 14 year old (and older) viewers come to us having viewed much early evening television and they are very aware young people. We are in the competitive, entertainment, storytelling business which, however, this does not preclude us from imparting informational material, such as the example of "individual determination."
He issued a strong caveat about the use of violence:

Action should not be confused with violence. Violence for violence sake is not permitted. Motivated violence pertinent to the story, if used, must always reveal the build-up to the situation and most certainly should be followed through so that the viewer sees the consequences of violent action. To repeat: Violence for violence sake or for the sake of holding viewer attention or increasing viewership is out.

He urged the writers to write for the medium of television, including comments on the necessity for action. He even included a reference to what his university research consultant had taught him about the importance of holding an audience for the first eight minutes:

We are anxious to have fast-moving action television shows, not movies and NOT PLAYS. Please use close-ups of faces, hands, etc., to emphasize points or punctuate a story. These are intimate stories about people. Unlike a play, we do not have a CAPTIVE audience, so that story action must take place in all acts. The first eight minutes of your show are vital.

Included were necessary details about length of the script, the number of acts, the need to use contemporary rather than period language. He concluded with a statement that reflected his image of the child and what was needed to attract and hold the young viewing audience:

Treat children as people. Remember, we are in the competitive entertainment story-telling business and if we are to reach millions of these young persons with their
natural wisdom we MUST give them powerful, moving, action-stories to deliver our message of individual determination.4

Once the guidelines were down on paper, Mr. D-M said that he still had difficulty communicating the rationale of the series to his writers. He said they had trouble grasping that the country was celebrating its 200th anniversary and not just the Revolutionary War or the defeating of the British. Although he told them in person that they could choose incidents all the way up to 1850, in order to capture some of the early movement to the West, most kept wanting to concentrate on the events of 1776. The first approved scripts do start with the revolution. Later scripts follow the westward movement all the way to the Oregon Trail.

One of the first scripts actually put into production was a dramatic story based on an incident that actually involved a family that lived in Connecticut. The story focuses on the daughter in that family who rode, Paul Revere fashion, to alert the citizens to the northern advance of the British after they had attacked and burned Hartford, Connecticut. The family and the girl actually existed and there is some evidence that the girl actually did make

4It is evident that the script guidelines for Action!-The Bicentennial, reflect many of the experiences and influences upon the decision-maker described up to this point in the study. Though not unexpected, it was significant to the researcher that he discovered this only after having written the previous sections of this report. For him, it was evidence of the validity of the data gathered through direct observation of the decision-maker and through conversations with him and with his associates.
the ride. In the file on the story that the researcher reviewed in Mr. D-M's office there was a photo which appeared in a newspaper of a bronze statue, which exists in the area, of the girl riding sidesaddle on a galloping horse to alert the countryside to the coming of the British. The accompanying article praises her courage. Also in the file was a lengthy poem in ballad form which dubs her "the female Paul Revere." Still another item asserts that the account of her ride is largely apocryphal, raising a question about whether anyone could have galloped a horse for thirty or forty miles in one night. Apparently there is good evidence that her father was commanding officer in the party that met the British and helped drive them back to the sea in disorder. This is the factual material on which the story is based.

The script takes this little-known revolutionary heroine and develops a dramatic story to illustrate personal determination. In the dramatic version, she is the daughter and oldest child of a wealthy family, who has brought her up to be a refined young lady. Her mother is very protective of her. The story opens with a galloping, exhausted rider coming to warn her father that the British are coming and that he is to get his local militia together, block the road, and delay the British a couple of hours until the main body of patriots can be organized further north for a counter-attack.

Since time is short, the girl's father must stay to supervise and organize the men as they arrive. The question then becomes, who will ride to the outlying farms to bring help, in particular to find
one farmer who has four grown sons. The girl decides she will go. Her mother strenuously objects, but her father reluctantly decides to let her go. The rest of the story is an account of her individual determination to fulfill her mission. She rides off, loses the saddle, and continues on bareback. When she gets to the farm where the men are supposed to be, they are not there. The woman of the house, not wishing to see her sons killed, lies about where they are. When the girl arrives at the wrong place and discovers the lie, she has to go across open country to make it on time. She cuts through a woods where she meets a British deserter who is drunk. She fights him off and rides on. She takes the horse across a river and almost drowns, but she makes it to the farm where she finds nearly a dozen men who are helping to erect a barn. They immediately ride to the barricade just in time to meet the British column. In a fast paced, action oriented story, the girl has provided an example of individual determination.

This story also provides an example of the type of control Mr. D-M can exercise over a script. When the researcher first read the script, he noted that an explicit rape attempt had been cut from the scene where the girl met the British soldier. When asked about this, Mr. D-M said that the writer-director of the story was a woman who in his view was on a woman's liberation campaign. He said that her "drunken, sex hungry soldier stereotype" was just as overstated as any stereotype men might have about women. He had the section revised to eliminate some of the stereotypical dimensions of the character of the soldier.
Another story in the series which the researcher saw in production is based upon the life of the only female known to have served as a soldier in the Revolutionary War. That she enlisted disguised as a boy is fact and that she was discovered only after she had been wounded is fact. In the Action!-The Bicentennial script her mother is poor and when the girl is eight years old, places her in a home to be a servant. The mother never comes to see her. Several years later when her mother does show up, it is to tell her that she has arranged a marriage for her daughter. In a moment of individual determination, she decides that rather than face still more years of housekeeping that she will join the militia. She wraps her breasts, puts on boy's clothes and joins the militia undetected. She is discovered only after being shot in the leg while trying to raid a British storehouse for food. She removes the bullet from her leg herself, but the infection in the wound causes a fever. Only when the doctor undresses her to sponge down her body is it discovered that she is a girl.

Another episode tells the story of a runaway slave. The true part of the story is that he escapes by covering his body with onions and spreading pepper on his trail so that dogs couldn't track him. When he arrives in the north, he discovers that he is a runaway slave and a "nigger." No one wants anything to do with him. The dramatic addition to the story is that he overhears that they want to take a group of militiamen into the South where he just came from. Again, in an act of individual determination, he volunteers...
to lead them and proves his ability. While in the South, he is re-captured by slaveowners. Mr. D-M said that they avoided the Hollywood style ending where two soldiers decide they like old Charley and rescue him. In the last scene he is re-escaping by himself.

"Incident at Concord." The researcher first met Bill Steiner, the writer-director for "Incident at Concord" in Mr. D-M's office on Tuesday, the second day of the week-long observation period. He was intense, yet personable in his dealing with others. Whenever the researcher was with him, Bill was friendly and spoke openly about his work. The researcher considers him an important "informant" in this field study. The discussion at the time of this first meeting focused not on "Incident at Concord," but on another script Bill was writing for the Afternoon Special series that Mr. D-M also had in production. The episode being discussed dealt with the work of the local animal protection agency. Mr. D-M explained that he wanted pathos from stories about pets children could identify with. There was a brief exchange of questions and answers. Bill communicated a sense that he knew what Mr. D-M wanted from the script and could provide it. When Bill left, Mr. D-M said, "There's a professional" and compared him favorably to another director who had been in

\[^5\text{As mentioned previously, "Bill Steiner," and all other names are fictitious.}\]
earlier in the day to talk with him. In Mr. D-M's opinion, the
director he saw earlier was too inexperienced and unsure of himself.

By the time the researcher arrived for the week of observa-
tion, the script for "Incident at Concord" had already been approved.
Bill's script was a purely fictional story that "could have happened"
involving two young boys during militia resistance at the time of the
battles of Lexington and Concord. A rider alerts the boys' father
of the imminent arrival of the British. Since he has to stay at the
road to organize the arriving minutemen, his two sons volunteer to
go to an old mill to retrieve the militia's supply of powder and
shot. The commitment of the boys is, of course, an act of individual
determination. They must complete the mission, because each militia-
man has only a limited supply of powder and shot with him. The only
thing that bothers their safe arrival at the mill is a near miss
by a hornet as they pass under a hornet's nest in a tree above the
road near the mill. The powder and shot is hidden in the wall in
the basement of the abandoned mill. The first difficulty they
encounter is the collapse of the remains of the basement ceiling.
They survive this, but do not see a British sniper who shoots and
slightly wounds the older boy in the arm as they are loading the
powder and shot on the wagon. The younger boy abandons his brother
and flees in panic crying. After he has run and hid, he determines
to return. He sees that the sniper had climbed into a tree with
the hornet's nest. He uses his slingshot which the viewer knew
earlier that he had with him, to hit the hornet's nest. The British
sniper is chased off and the boys return on time with the powder and shot. Through individual determination they have taken an important step in establishing their identities.

Once a script has been approved, it is the director's and the unit manager's responsibilities to produce an artistically pleasing drama that is faithful to the script. Although Mr. D-M will often be on location or sit in or editing and sound dubbing, he said that the major decisions have already been made and that his role is minimal at that time. For example, he arranged for the researcher, but did not do so himself, to sit in on the production planning meetings late in the week of observation where details of costuming and set for "Incident at Concord" were discussed.

Present at this meeting in addition to Bill were eight members of the Action! production unit, including the unit manager and associate producer for the series, the assistant director, the properties man, a costuming lady, a script girl to note any changes that might be made in the script. Bill Steiner had with him a detailed story board which outlined in detail the camera position and movement as well as the actor's lines for each shot. This particular meeting focused on the properties man and addressed itself to concerns of costumes and set.

Here, for example, the researcher learned that there were three fake hornet's nests prepared just in case the hitting of the hornet's nest with the slingshot would not work out on the first attempt. Bill Steiner requested that the properties man rig the
hornets' nests with a small special effects explosive charge to increase the dramatic effect of that scene. After the production meeting, Bill told the researcher that the modification of the hornet's nest was a good example of dramatic license in which dramatic story values take precedence over realism values.

Other things that the director and the Action! unit had to take care of before going on location were scheduling and checking equipment, clearing up production crew union questions, rehearsing the actors, and such details as arranging for lunch on location and renting two campers. One camper would be for the actors to change in, the other would be for the crew to find shelter if it rained or to find a soft drink, snack, or coffee during a break.

On Friday, Bill sat in, along with Mr. D-M and the researcher, on the sound mixing of the story about the female Revolutionary War soldier. Bill said that he was there, because this was the first time he had worked with the video camera system and that he needed to get the hang of things for when he would be mixing his show in two weeks. Two incidents that occurred at this mixing session bear recording because they illustrate the kinds of decisions made at this time. While Mr. D-M was present, he noted that nearly 45 seconds of a highly dramatic, but limited action sequence on the screen had no sound accompaniment. He reacted swiftly and loudly. "You'll lose your audience at that point," he told the director. "No program for children on a small screen can keep its audience when it is silent that long." The director explained that she had found no music in
score written for the show that fit that particular scene. Mr. D-M insisted that a call be made immediately for the network record librarian to come up, view the scene, and choose some music from which the director could make a final selection. The director said she thought the scene "played" without the music, but she had no objections to adding music.

The second incident took place after the music librarian had brought three choices of music for the director to review. She quickly made a selection and commented to Bill Steiner who was still there, "Isn't it nice not to have to argue with the composer about what should or should not go into a show."

The researcher sensed at this time how strongly a producer or director must feel about having the show exactly as he or she conceptualizes it. When you consider a production to be your show, your idea, your interpretation, it is easy to get annoyed with someone who is your "subordinate" and wants to do things his way. The researcher sensed this not only with this director, but also with Mr. D-M and with Bill when the show was in production.

This account so far brings the show "Incident at Concord" from its remote conceptual beginnings in the series idea through scripting and production planning. Although the researcher observed the editing and mixing of the female revolutionary solider show, his final association with the "Incident at Concord" crew came when he spent a day at the shooting location with Mr. D-M. Although the show was allotted four days for shooting, the director, actors, and
part of the production crew arrived three days early to check out the set, set up properties, and walk through the scenes with the actors.

The researcher arrived at the hotel near Philadelphia where the Action! crew was staying late the night of the first day of shooting. This was one week following his observation in New York City. Mr. D-M had arrived about four hours earlier. When the researcher called Mr. D-M's room, he was in a meeting to update him on how the shooting was going. He said that he would meet the researcher at 6:45 for breakfast the next morning. This account of the shooting day and the decision-making involved in it will generally follow the day chronologically, in order to preserve the warp and woof of the decision-making as it developed across the day.

At 6:45, the only people in the dining room were the director, Bill Steiner, and his assistant director. From them the researcher learned that shooting was running behind schedule. The previous day the shooting area was blanketed with fog which the crew had to wait for the sun to burn off. To complicate matters, when the equipment truck was opened, the fog rolled in and the dampness caused electrical problems. This morning there was a light drizzle, but this was expected to clear by late morning. Bill was discussing which shots could be cut, if necessary, to try to get back on schedule. It turned out that only one minor, but technically time-consuming scene, needed to be cut.

When Mr. D-M arrived, the researcher moved to his table, and the discussion centered on the first three completed Action!-The
Bicentennial episodes which he had reviewed with the small team writing the study guides to be mailed to secondary schools in the Fall. The lighting he said was "super," and the sound was improving with each show. This was a reference to the technical breakthroughs in the remote microphone system mentioned earlier.

He talked also about a minor decision he had made when shooting shows that required two crews. When he called them Crew One and Crew Two, no one wanted to work on Crew Two, because they thought the number designation indicated it was somehow second-rate. He solved this by designating the crews as Red Crew and Blue Crew so that people would stop worrying about which crew was better.

After breakfast there was a general scramble to hurry to location, twenty miles away on a large local farm. The location, which included a covered bridge and an abandoned iron mill, had been found a month earlier when Action! unit members were in the area to shoot a different episode in the Bicentennial series. The researcher rode to the location with Barbara, a network unit manager who was observing her first shooting with video tape, and Marvin, the properties man. An animated discussion ensued between the two about the merits of shooting with tape rather than film. Barbara's major criticism of tape was that computer editing removed the editor from the direct hands-on immediate feedback experience of editing film. Marvin disagreed, saying that in video editing, the feedback was instant enough.
At the scene there was a network unit truck housing the portable tape and sound equipment and the two campers for the crew. About 100 yards from the truck was a covered bridge with a barricade erected in front of it behind which the minute-men would stand. Crew members and actors hurried about trying to meet the 8:00 A.M. starting deadline. As the researcher walked about with Mr. D-M, he said, "This is decision-making in action. There's a lot of tension here. The general is on the field and people are trying to impress me."

He watched Bill Steiner set up the actors at the barricade for the first shot. He needled his unit manager a little about meeting the 8:00 starting time and discusses with him the new union rule that sets a maximum of 15 hours that a technical crew may work on any given day. "Every second is money here," he told the researcher, "but you can't rush." Joe Darwin, the unit manager, commented on the union rule, "Anything that adds structure here is a problem. Anything that makes the situation less flexible is a problem." The tension mentioned earlier between Mr. D-M and this production associate continued to be evident when they were talking with each other.

Many small problems cropped up, compounded by the drizzle and the wet grass. A technical crew member struggling to eliminate a short from a line he had laid to the camera said spontaneously to the researcher, "Murphy's law¹ is working overtime here this morning."

¹Murphy's Law states: If anything can go wrong, it will, and at the worst possible moment.
When the first scene was ready to be shot, Mr. D-M and the researcher moved to the equipment truck. In the truck were Bill and the script girl who would precisely record the computer access numbers off the monitor screen at the beginning and end of each shot, the script director, the unit manager, two video technicians, and one sound technician. Bill was wired to the cameraman and his assistant director out on the set. Shooting moved slowly. It was interrupted several times during the day by aircraft passing overhead. When this happened there was nothing to do but stop the tape and wait.

Mr. D-M imposed his will only once during the day's shooting. When Bill was having difficulty getting actors to move and deliver their lines in the way he wanted, Mr. D-M insisted in a way which could not be refused that Bill use the P.A. system mounted on top of the truck to communicate with people out on the set directly. He wanted Bill to do this rather than go through his assistant director to whom he was connected by wire. Bill resisted, saying he had to be careful of two "touchy" actors out there. "Use the P.A.," Mr. D-M said. "The set director is repeating only one-eighth of what you say. All the directors resist using it at first, but once they try it, they realize they can't get along without it. When you use it, you let everyone know what's happening and people get together more easily." When he saw that Mr. D-M meant to have his own way, he gave in and then used it fairly regularly across the day.

At lunch break, Joe Darwin, the unit manager and Bill Steiner talked over the shooting. Bill had used one-third of his
allotted tape and shot only one-quarter of the show. Since it takes twenty seconds to start the tape and get it up to recording speed each time it is stopped for an acting mistake, a discussion ensued about whether to stop the tape or to try to hurry the actors through the section again immediately. No final decision about this matter was reached, but a decision was made to cut one scene so that the crew can move to the abandoned mill location and get in a couple of shots before light failed in the late afternoon. Mr. D-M listened in on the conversation and later indicated that the unit manager was doing his job and that both men were trying to "impress the general."

Before lunch, Mr. D-M met privately with the technical supervisor. Later, he told the researcher it was about budget matters. On a computer print-out, he showed the researcher that his production costs are running 50% to 80% above budget. For the series, he is already $100,000 over budget and must cut costs somehow.

At lunch and throughout the day, Mr. D-M engaged in much small talk and public relations with those on the set. He told the actors how they looked on camera, asked people, including the researcher, how things were going. When asked how he was doing, he would often reply, "Nervous, but steady." He spoke critically to the researcher of the network photographer, because the man wasn't setting up the pictures he needed to get, and Mr. D-M had to set them up for him. Mr. D-M himself took photographs with a half-frame 35mm camera. He said one of his reasons for doing this was so that when he sent a tape of one of his shows for his bosses to review, he could send the
pictures along. They would then have some idea what the show was like even though they never bothered to look at the tape.

After lunch, Mr. D-M went back to the hotel to make phone calls and suggested that the researcher stay on the set and talk with Bill when he could. In the brief time during which conversations were possible as the technical crew moved to and set up at the new location, Bill said the hardest thing about directing was realizing that he never really can get the camera to record, or the actors to act precisely the way he sees a shot in his imagination.

Generally affable and considerate, the researcher saw Bill's anger flare only once. This was with a young actor who apparently was not taking a scene seriously. With just a shade of annoyance in his voice, he called the actor's name over the P.A. and asked him to try the scene again. When he closed the microphone, he said that he'd like to call that "bastard" something else besides the character's name. When asked what, he blurted out a one word obscenity. His relations with the rest of the crew were more than cordial. Bill attributed this to his having had personal experience with camera and sound work. This made it possible, he said, to understand the problems the crew faced.

The whole unit seemed to enjoy generally good rapport. When, Lon, the cameraman, who was obviously respected by everyone, executed a particularly good pan and zoom, one of the tech crew referred to him as "Golden Fingers." Bill picked it up and Lon became "Golden Fingers" for the rest of the day.
When Mr. D-M returned in the afternoon, he asked Joe Darwin why there were two campers instead of the usual one. Joe very painstakingly explained that on the basis of his experience it was better to have one for the actors and one for the tech crews. Also, two would provide shelter for all if it rained. When Mr. D-M sensed the defensive tone of the long reply, he said, "I was just asking, that's all." Although the two men respect each other's competencies, and both, on other occasions had told the researcher this, there was once again evidence of the tension that is present when they work with each other.

The atmosphere in the car on the way back to the hotel was basically one of relaxed fatigue. Joe Darwin, the unit manager, was more relaxed and animated than the researcher had ever seen him. He and Mr. D-M compared assistant-directors for two of their shows. Expressing his general sensitivity to non-verbal cues, Mr. D-M asked why Joanne, the script girl, was missing her usual sense of humor across the day. He said that today "she was deep within her eyes." Summarizing the shooting, Mr. D-M said to the researcher, "You saw lots of decision-making, but no major decisions were made today."

Back at the hotel, Mr. D-M, Joe Darwin and Bill Steiner went to the room where the rough cutting of tape from location had been going on, to review and discuss the day's shooting. In two days Bill would wrap up the shooting and within two weeks would cut and sound mix his show.
The program introduction for the Bicentennial series. The researcher observed one other instance of Mr. D-M influencing and exercising control over the concept for the Action!-The Bicentennial series. This was when he visited the writer and the composer for the introduction that would be used at the head of each show and carry the logo for all the episodes of the series. The meeting took place in an apartment of the husband and wife who did the introduction. He had written the musical score and she had done a series of slides and written the lyrics to accompany the music.

Mr. D-M said that although the stories were all set in the 1770-1850 time period, the introduction to the series featured contemporary children in order to emphasize that the series was dramatic rather than historical and to make it easier for young viewers to absorb the implied learning lesson of individual determination.

The writer-photographer of the introduction guided Mr. D-M through her storyboard which contained sketches of the individual slides. Then she moved to a light table which held the actual slides. The music and words were then played in the background and she pointed out where each of approximately 30 slides would fit, in order to fill out the 25 second introduction. Most of the conversation dealt with pacing and how the Action!-The Bicentennial logo would fit into the storyboard. The three decisions made that changed the introduction from the way the writer had originally presented it were: 1. to add one slide to step up the pace for one segment,
2. to split the TV screen into quarters so that it would hold the last four slides at the same time and 3. to run the Action! logo over the slides when it appeared. To make this last change artistically possible, Mr. D-M had to have the logo redrawn so that the visuals would show through the logo more clearly.

It took nearly two hours for Mr. D-M and the writer to decide they were satisfied with the final changes.

The slides showed a series of young people planning, doing, and accomplishing a variety of things. A boy played a clarinet, another boy made plans to be an architect. A girl was shown at graduation. A series of five slides showed a girl stepping up to bat in a little league baseball game and getting a hit off of a male pitcher. One of the lines sung with the music said, "I can see. I can do. I can be anything I want to be." The words and slides attempted to communicate the idea of individual determination.

What the researcher especially noticed in this setting was Mr. D-M's concern with action and pacing. He suggested a third slide be inserted in a two slide sequence because the brief segment "pulled," i.e. moved too slowly. Also apparent was his concern for the central idea of the series. When the writer showed him three well composed pictures of a girl shooting a basketball that were not used in the introduction, he said that he could have used only one because in that one the girl looked determined.

Mr. D-M gave his final approval only after the slides were placed in a stack-loader and projected on the wall at about the same size they would appear on a television screen.
IV. Summary

This section has traced the decisions and the influences on those decisions that ultimately led to the shaping and final shooting of "Incident at Concord," one episode of the Action!-The Bicentennial series. It began with factors that led to Mr. D-M being assigned the Action! series and how the development of the new video camera system contributed to Mr. D-M's shaping of the series. It continued by tracing the development of Action! from a semi-documentary into a dramatic series called Action!-The Bicentennial. The influences on the scripting for the series were traced, and one episode, "Incident at Concord," was followed through production. Finally, Mr. D-M's contribution to the video and sound introduction which will be used for all episodes in the series was explored.
So far this analysis has outlined the factors that affect the decision-maker and which he in turn can influence. It then attempted to follow the development of one show that the decision-maker produced from its remote beginnings through production in order to provide examples of how the decision-maker functioned in the context of these influences over a period of four years. To add to the picture, this section will follow his activities across one day of the week-long period the researcher spent with him. This should provide a picture of his influences on program decision-making as they arise on a "typical" day when he is at his office.

The researcher chose this day to record because Mr. D-M, himself, called it "typical" of the days he spends in his office. The day began at 9:15 A.M. when the researcher arrived and found Mr. D-M preparing for his 9:30 appointment. The work day runs from 9:30 to 5:30 as an accommodation to the three hour time difference
between New York and the West Coast. In this way there is as much overlap as possible in daylight work hours between the East and West Coast network offices.

As he was working at his desk, Mr. D-M told the researcher about the armed forces reserve meeting he attended the evening before. He had arranged for two network news executives and a news correspondent to come before the group to answer questions off the record from the military officers. He said that it was a real knock-down, drag-em-out session. All the stereotypes had come out. The broadcast media were accused of being biased and "out to get the military." This military reserve group was one of several public service groups that Mr. D-M gave his time to, and he was pleased to have been able to arrange the meeting. Over the next few days he told several people how exciting the meeting was.

At 9:25 Mr. D-M showed the researcher a letter inviting the decision-maker to an interview luncheon that day with children's programming vice-presidents from the other two major networks. The interviewer would be the editor of a national student magazine who planned to run the interview as a story in a Fall edition of her magazine. He said that even though he had sent a request to his superiors to attend the luncheon as a network representative two weeks previously, permission had not been granted yet. He said he would probably have to go without it.

At 9:30, Dr. Bluestern, a physician, arrived for Mr. D-M's first interview of the day. In months when he is less pressed by
production matters, Mr. D-M set aside each Tuesday to meet with anyone from outside the network who wished to see him to try to sell an idea or seek help finding a job. Today there would be only two such interviews. Dr. Bluestern explained that he has been interested a long time in developing learning games for children. He had brought two games to show Mr. D-M in hopes that he might be able to use them for television. The first game was a spelling game that uses a magnetic board with letters printed on it. Students place metal rings around letters on the board to spell words. For example, one line would have a drawing 🌠 followed by the letters K C I A D T. The magnetic circles would stick only around the letters CAT. Mr. D-M was pleasant and polite. He said the idea is fascinating and, though he cannot promise anything, would pass the game on to the producer of a children's show that he knows. The second spelling game is on 16mm film and Mr. D-M started to take Dr. Bluestern to a small projection room in order to view it.

As he was about to leave, Carol, his secretary, indicated he had a phone call from Program and Talent Administration. Mr. D-M took the call and carried on the conversation in a loud angry voice. The matter concerned some activities on the West Coast that might substantially affect his programming plans for the Afternoon Special series he was currently working on. He was angry that he found out about these changes "second-hand" from someone below him in chain of command, rather than directly and immediately from Program and Talent Administration. He demanded clarification on the matter as soon as was possible. The researcher interprets the strength of
Mr. D-M's reaction to have been based upon the decision-maker's perception that the West Coast operation was intruding on his territory and then not in a straightforward manner. It took two days and a memo from one of his bosses to clarify the matter.

Mr. D-M calmed down quickly and continued to the projection room. Dr. Bluestern's film taught general factual knowledge as well as spelling. Mr. D-M stopped the film part way through and said that the film contained a good idea, but was too educationally oriented. Mr. D-M also raised a question about the game's approach to learning. Students learned the correct answer only after they guessed at three choices. But his main point was that it was not appropriate for commercial television. He said the game would go over with a "captive audience" in a classroom because it might be better than listening to a teacher, however, "if kids had access to a TV dial, they would turn it off immediately in favor of something more exciting." He said that he knew this because it cost him three million dollars and a ratings disaster to learn it. He explained that after five days of school, children prefer escape TV on weekends. He said that he even tried soliciting the cooperation of teachers to support his own educationally oriented programming, but they didn't watch it either. He would rather teach a small lesson to a large audience, than include lots of educational content and have no one watching. He concluded by saying, "I can't use it. I'd be less than honest if I said otherwise." He would stay in contact about the magnetic board game however. When Dr. Bluestern left, he
said he was on his way to work. Cordially, Mr. D-M said, "You probably work harder than I do."

At 10:00 Mr. D-M was back in his office and called the Action! series unit manager. There was anger in Mr. D-M's voice as he asked pointed questions about episodes in the Action!-The Bicentennial series. When he did not get answers he considered satisfactory, his anger deepened. Two of the issues in question were about arrangements for obtaining a horse for one of the shows, and then setting up a viewing for Mr. D-M of the final editing of the Bicentennial series episode about the girl who joined the Revolutionary Army disguised as a boy. Mr. D-M demanded that the unit manager get moving on the matters.

After the phone call to the unit manager, Mr. D-M worked quietly at his desk on correspondence. The researcher reviewed the day's outgoing mail which Mr. D-M wrote Monday. There were seven items:

1. A letter to the woman who will head the team writing the study guide for schools on the Action!-The Bicentennial series. It told her he had located a room for her people to work in.

2. An apology to a vice-president for missing a meeting on the Bicentennial series. The reason was that he was in Europe checking on the production of one of his shows.

3. A letter to one of his bosses stating that the dates of the Afternoon Special series had been decided. Copies are indicated for a dozen people who needed to know this information.

4. A note to the organizer confirming that he has arranged for a speaker for the upcoming NAB workshop on children's programming for local broadcasting.
5. A memo to another of his bosses concerning arrangements for the commercial sound dubbing of one of his shows.

6. A note to someone in the network bureaucracy asking if it would be possible to arrange to receive an award in Chicago that was won by the Action! series the previous year.

7. A memo to Program and Talent Administration stating how much the educational research consultant would receive for each show of the Bicentennial series.

In addition, the researcher reviewed the notes that Mr. D-M made on the script of the science-fiction show for the Afternoon Special series. The show follows the adventures of two families who travel from and return to earth in a space ship that can reach the speed of light. His comments addressed themselves to two main points. He wants the science elements to be more truly informational so that students can learn something about the theory of relativity. He suggests calling in a physicist to firm up the theoretical underpinnings of the show. Why go faster than the speed of light, he asked, when present science suggests this cannot be done and when much is known about the fascinating things that happen when objects approach the speed of light. He wants the show to teach these elements in the context of the story rather than simply elicit an audience reaction of, "look, isn't this amazing."

Secondly, he wanted real character development. He asserted that more than just similarities of age and sex between the characters on the show and the people in the viewing audience would be needed to generate interest. He suggested that distinct personalities be created for the characters that interact and clash.
He suggested several elements of the story that could be used to generate these interactions.

Five phone calls interrupted his work: One concerned setting up a meeting with the programming department. The second was from the legal department checking on a matter from the previous month. The third confirmed that he would appear on the Tomorrow show. The fourth involved another angry conversation with the unit manager about the delay in setting up a time for Mr. D-M to see the final editing of the female Revolutionary War soldier story. The fifth involved getting a clarification on the length of time allotted to the "teaser" which would introduce each show of the Bicentennial series. The tone of this conversation indicates that Mr. D-M considers this man difficult to deal with. He alternately needles him and placates him.

At one point Mr. D-M sees a man outside his door whom he knows and calls out a pleasant greeting. This is typical of the pleasantries exchanged in elevators and in hallways. One time in an elevator, Mr. D-M met an old-time radio personality and TV star out of the 1950's and early 1960, introduced himself and asked if the aging star remembered that the decision-maker had been a page boy for his show 25 years before.

At 11:00 the young director of one of the Afternoon Special shows came in to discuss the script. The show was to demonstrate that math skills and careful planning were necessary for the television and movie stuntmen who created the spectacular stunts
that viewers see. The director said that he was sure he could deliver a "crackerjack stunt show," but that he wanted to share his fear that he could not deliver the math background that Mr. D-M wanted.

Mr. D-M reassured him and insisted that he could do it. He said that he needed points from the FCC and that he could not have critics saying it was just a stunt show with no educational values. While the Action! series could be satisfied with simply showing that preparation was necessary, the Specials had to go further in imparting a learning lesson. He stressed the need for kids in ghetto schools to see the need for learning and study in school in order to be able to understand or do the things they saw on the screen. He said that his previous programming failure taught him he needed to air action-packed, exciting shows, but that he still had to teach a learning lesson by innuendo.

The director still had his doubts about the math content, based on his conversation with stuntmen. Mr. D-M continued to be alternately supportive and bluntly insistent that math values be included. He cited other pressures on him. He needed at least a 21% share of the audience and he needed to get this show firmed up because of competition from the West Coast. In short, he needed a show that would attract an audience, and be a commercial success, yet he needed to communicate information and a learning lesson as well. The researcher noted that Mr. D-M brought up many of the influences upon his programming in insisting that the director create a show that met his expectations.
After the director left, Mr. D-M told the researcher, "That's why they pay me a vice-president's salary." He assessed the director to be talented, but needing more experience.

At 11:30 a.m., a friend of the decision-maker who was chairman of the board of an ad agency came in to talk briefly about some of Mr. D-M's shows he had seen. Mr. D-M told him about the reserve meeting the night before and quoted some of the military men's angry accusations to the news media.

The unit manager arrived to say that the viewing of the final editing of the show he has been arranging would be ready to show in ten minutes. He said he would be there to view it with Mr. D-M.

At 11:40 a.m., Mr. D-M went to the editing room. On the way he said that the woman who directed the show "complains a lot, but did a good show. She complained more than usual on this one." The atmosphere in the editing room is serious. This is the last chance to change any visuals before the sound is dubbed in. Mr. D-M was to give his final approval for sound dubbing to being. Because of the extra expense involved in a change, visuals in shows are rarely changed once the sound has been dubbed.

Mr. D-M said, "Let's get started before the unit manager arrives. He always messes with the buttons on the equipment when he's around." One light was left on to create a living room atmosphere and Mr. D-M sank into absorbed concentration as the tape began to roll. About four minutes into the show, the unit manager
arrived and flipped off the light. Mr. D-M exploded. He told him to leave the light on, that he was always unnecessarily toying with the equipment and that his concentration was broken. He said the show was OK and stormed out of the room. The researcher followed at a discreet distance until Mr. D-M, who once again calmed fairly quickly said, "C'mon let's go to lunch. I saw the show last week, and it will be OK."

From his conversations and observations across the week, the researcher infers four factors that contributed to the intensity of the decision-maker's anger with the unit manager across the morning and in this circumstance. First, relating to the pressure Mr. D-M had been putting on the unit manager during the morning, he told the researcher that he was trying to move the Action!-The Bicentennial production into high gear. Two weeks ago, he said that all was sweetness and light and the atmosphere in the Action! unit offices was generally relaxed. Now with the tempo of productions picking up, it was necessary to get people moving at peak efficiency. Mr. D-M's major way of doing this was to bring pressure to bear on the manager of the Action! production unit.

The second reason relates to the first, because the day before Mr. D-M by accident found his Action! unit manager in a meeting with a vice-president and production crew from another series talking about the use of the new video-tape system. He criticized his unit manager for being at that meeting when he should have been attending to Action!-The Bicentennial production matters, i.e. moving the operation into high gear. Mr. D-M made reference to this in the
morning phone conversation. Mr. D-M was also upset with the vice-

president for calling the Action! unit manager into his meeting. He

sent a note to this vice-president later in the week suggesting that

he would be happy to meet with him about the video system, so as not
to take the Action! unit manager away from production matters.

The third reason is the general tension that the researcher

noted to exist between the two men whenever they worked with each

other. The researcher suspects that Mr. D-M would have called it a
"chemistry" problem between them. By this he would mean perhaps an

unspecifiable emotional reaction based somehow on their differences

in handling people and approaching production operations.

The fourth reason for the degree of his anger was suggested

by an associate of Mr. D-M who knew he had arrived back from Europe

late in the evening on Sunday, two nights previously. She noted

that although Mr. D-M did get angry at times, the degree of his anger

that morning may have been a little unusual. She attributed it in

part to the physical after-effects of jet-lag from the trip. Mr.

D-M himself did mention that he had suffered the effects of this

phenomenon.

The unit manager, himself, told the researcher that he could

see the tension building across Monday and said that he felt some

incident would bring matters to a head. He said that he realized

that Mr. D-M got over matters like that fairly quickly. In fact,

the next day he and the director arranged to have Mr. D-M see one

scene that had been changed from the previous week, so that the
director would be sure there would be no problems with the show.
Because Mr. D-M's early departure from the editing session made him early for the luncheon interview, he and the researcher wandered around the block and visited a stereo equipment store that Mr. D-M said he browsed in from time to time. Then they went over to view the lobby of one of the other network's buildings. There, Mr. D-M greeted a vice-president from that network and told him about the meeting with the military the evening before. The vice-president said he regretted that some of their own news staff were not at the meeting to take some of the heat.

Mr. D-M met his two counterparts in children's programming from the other two networks on a corner where they were all met by a limousine to take them to the luncheon interview. The limousine was a large black Lincoln Continental. Both it and the chauffer looked as though they had been borrowed from the set of The Godfather. To add a final touch, the researcher learned that the lunch would be at one of the finer family-owned Italian restaurants in the city. Mr. D-M explained to his counterparts that the researcher was spending a week with him to practice research skills in studying the program decision-making process.

At lunch, the magazine editor who was conducting the interview asked a series of general questions about children's programming including the vice-president's conception of the nature of his job, how they chose programs, the influence of Sesame Street and so on. Some of their answers are recorded in other sections of this study. The atmosphere was friendly and cordial throughout the lunch and ride back. The following day Mr. D-M said that he considered the
discussion to be generally superficial and that it didn't get at their real problems. He said the comradery was also superficial and that the three vice-presidents would probably do unmentionable things to each other if they had the chance because of the strong competition between the networks.

When Mr. D-M arrived back at his office at 3:30, Bill Steiner, the director of "Incident at Concord," was waiting to discuss the script for an Afternoon Special episode that he was writing about the local animal protection agency. Mr. D-M gave some suggestions for making the show more appealing to young viewers. Bill replied by saying that the changes were generally easy to include. Mr. D-M expressed concern that the cheetah that would be used in the story should not harm any of the actors. Bill assured him the cheetah would be safe.

Mr. D-M then held up his next scheduled meeting until he finished answering the day's correspondence so that Carol would have time to type it. On days when he did not have meetings, Mr. D-M said that he would answer the phone for Carol while she typed, so that she could finish his typing on time.

At 4:00 there was a meeting with two partners who were packaging a show for Mr. D-M. There was a question of who had the right to package it and therefore stand to gain several thousand dollars in profits. As usual, Mr. D-M made it clear that the researcher would leave if the men wanted him to. They did not object to the researcher staying. Mr. D-M insisted that it was clear from the beginning that the two men present had that right to package the
show and that they should get rid of the men causing problems if necessary. An animated discussion developed. Mr. D-M called a man from the budget department to bring the file on the contract down to his office. When Mr. D-M left the office briefly, one of the men said, "I'm not going to contradict him, but it wasn't clear that it was the way he said." Then to the researcher he said, "I guess this is more (excitement) than you expected." Mr. D-M explained that the show might not even be used this season because of the problems. Both men seem a little relieved by this.

In typical fashion Mr. D-M came across as someone sure of himself and ready to take action immediately. He even offered to call the man in question and tell him the situation while the partners were present.

When the men left apparently satisfied, he told the researcher, "This is a tough business."

At 4:30 a young Spanish-surnamed American and a man who appeared to be his agent, entered Mr. D-M's office. The young man, Paulo, had brought a film for Mr. D-M to view for possible purchase or as a pilot for a children's series. When the agent brought up the fact that the interview had been set up through one of Mr. D-M's bosses, Mr. D-M said that he had forgotten and that he always tried to set aside time on Tuesdays to talk with anyone who wanted to see him.

The decision-maker first clarified who had the rights to the film. The State Department of Education had the right to use
the film until the end of the year and would air it on public television. He then called the executive showing room and arranged for a screening. The film tells the story of a young Puerto Rican boy whose family moves into a new apartment. The boy is harassed by older non-Puerto Rican boys who eventually take from him one of two walkie-talkie units which he received as a special gift for his birthday. By chance the boy meets a young Black man who is a Karate instructor. The boy's parents are at first fearful that learning Karate will turn their son into a gang member or a street bully. Instead he learns self-discipline and self-respect. In the confrontation that naturally follows over the return of his walkie-talkie, a simple arm hold is all that is necessary to force the older boy to return his birthday gift. In the process he earns the respect of the older boys as well.

Mr. D-M called it a "sensational film." "If I'd buy it and air it," he said, "It would win all the awards--Peabody, Emmy--all of them, but it 'pulls.' I could cut this to 40 minutes and make it great for TV." Mr. D-M's facial expression during the film seemed to indicate that he was almost physically affected by the slow pace at one or two points in the film.

The young director objected and explained the artistic values. Mr. D-M explained that he is in a reflective business, and must give the audience what it wants. And his audience wants a faster pace. He continued, "You're great. You do everything well. I've rarely seen a talent like yours. I wish my people could use a
camera that well." He implied that he would like to introduce the
director to the video camera. "You're just like one of my better
cameramen. He fought me for four years. Now he can shoot for
television." Mr. D-M let Paulo know that he could submit a script
to him for consideration. He made it clear he was not asking him
to submit one. This was to avoid the $625 fee that the network must
pay someone if it asks him to write a script, even if the script is
never used. After Paulo left, he told the researcher that the
director is indeed talented, but too in love with film technique.

The researcher noted that the two outsiders the decision-maker saw that day represent two ends of the television programming
spectrum. Dr. Bluestern's film was too crude and educationally oriented and Paulo's was too "arty" and slow paced. Commercial children's television, for Mr. D-M, must be artistically good, but fast paced. And it must communicate its educational message by innuendo.

At 5:45, Mr. D-M told the researcher that he had a final meeting with one of his producers that the researcher could not observe. The following morning Mr. D-M explained that the producer he met with was running over budget. This meant cutting her own salary. Since producers are touchy about revealing how much they make on a show, it would have been difficult for the researcher to be present.
II. Q-Sort Methodology and Results

Because of objections raised by the decision-maker, two of the three proposed Q-sort instruments were not administered. Early in the week of observation, Mr. D-M said that he hoped the researcher was not going to ask him to "play that game with the cards again." He continued by saying that sorting cards was "artificial" and that the researcher could learn much more by observing decision-making as it was happening in the setting than by anything that came out of sorting cards. The decision-maker did agree to attempt a continuation of one Q-sort instrument he had sorted twice during his first contact with the researcher. During the six sorts that Mr. D-M did make of the New Program Concept Instrument cards, it was evident that he found the experience mildly annoying and frustrating, although he did make an honest attempt to sort the cards according to the researcher's directions.

The researcher also requested one of Mr. D-M's associates with whom he must work closely on production matters to sort the cards following the same instructions with regard to ideal programming as those given to Mr. D-M, so that a comparison could be made between their perceptions of programming.

In a word, the data generated by the administration of the instrument is inconclusive, allowing only tentative analysis and conclusions. For nine variates a correlation of .58 is necessary
for significance at the .05 level. Only 5 of the 36 correlations were .40 or above, the highest being .50.

For the first two Q sorts in the setting, the researcher attempted to have the decision-maker sort the New Program Concept cards using the same instructions that had been given when Mr. D-M sorted the same cards five months previously at the Ohio State University. However, precisely the same instructions were not able to be given, because the decision-maker wished to tie his choices to a specific time of day when the programs would be aired. The researcher takes this to account for the nearly random level of correlation between sorts 1-3 and 2-4, the pairs which were intended to be sorted under identical conditions of instructions. (Table 1.) In fact, sort 1 ranks lowest in total variance of all 9 sorts.

Some tentative analysis can be made, however, of the modest correlations which emerged between the seven sorts done while the researcher was in the setting in New York City.

The highest variance occurred in sort 3, in which Mr. D-M was asked to rank the cards according to what his idea would be of an ideal program schedule, which would provide the audience with the programs that should be aired. (See Appendix 5 for complete directions for this category.)

Mr. D-M's ideal program schedule correlated at .36 or higher with four of the six remaining categories and at the near significant level with "Best for Children" and "Personal Enjoyment Categories." These correlations could suggest a consistency between Mr. D-M's personal and professional life. The programs he considered ideal
Ideal Program Schedule.  Programs that should be aired. (Sorted on campus)

Actual Program Schedule.  Programs that would be aired. (Sorted on campus)

Ideal Program Schedule.  Programs that Mr. D-M thinks his boss would enjoy watching.

Actual Program Schedule.  Programs considered best for children.

Ideal Program Schedule.  Programs Mr. D-M's closest associate in production area thinks should be aired.

Actual Program Schedule.  Programs that Mr. D-M thinks his boss would enjoy watching.

Actual Program Schedule.  Programs that should be aired. (Done in NYC)

Actual Program Schedule.  Programs that would be aired. (Done in NYC)

Actual Program Schedule.  Programs that should be aired. (Done in NYC)

Correlations for Nine Sorts of the How Program Concept Instrument with Total Variance for Each Category and Ranking of the Variance Totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Card 1</th>
<th>Card 2</th>
<th>Card 3</th>
<th>Card 4</th>
<th>Card 5</th>
<th>Card 6</th>
<th>Card 7</th>
<th>Card 8</th>
<th>Card 9</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
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<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1
also tend to be the ones he says that he enjoys most. In addition, the correlation between Mr. D-M's ideal schedule and the show he considers most salable to advertisers and those that would actually be aired could suggest a belief on his part that programs he considers ideal do have a chance to make it commercially. These conclusions seem consistent with statements made by the decision-maker. For example, in a recent appearance on NBC's "Tomorrow" show, Mr. D-M forcefully stated that he felt that he could sell the idea of quality children's programming to his bosses and that he could sell ad space for quality shows to advertisers.

Diagram 3 graphically illustrates the correlations between all of the sorts done in the setting. All five of the sorts that deal with Mr. D-M's personal perceptions about programming correlate with at least two other sorts, supporting the conclusion of a general consistency between Mr. D-M's personal and professional program values.

A .45 negative correlation exists between Mr. D-M's perceptions of his programming boss's idea of programs "Best for Children" and his own. In addition, there are slight negative correlations between his perception of his boss's programming values in the areas of "Ideal Programs," "Actual Programs," and "Saleable Programs." These correlations suggest that Mr. D-M perceives his immediate boss to have different programming values than his own, especially in the area of children's programming. This further suggests that Mr. D-M must take these differences into account in his professional relationships with his boss, that he has to be
Key: 3 = Sort Number

.50 = Relationships and correlation between two separate sorts of the instrument representing different conditions of instruction.
3. Ideal Program Schedule. Programs that should be aired. (Sorted in NYC).

4. Actual Program Schedule. Programs that would be aired. (Sorted in NYC).

5. Personal Enjoyment. Programs that Mr. D-M would personally enjoy watching.

6. Commercially Saleable. Programs easiest to sell ad space for.

7. Boss's Preference. Programs Mr. D-M thinks his boss would be most likely to air.


9. Associate Choice. Programs that Mr. D-M's closest associate chose as ideal for airing, i.e., Programs that should be aired.

Note: Sorts 1 and 2 were eliminated from analysis because of suspected effects of differing conditions of instruction from sorts 3 and 4.
conscious of "selling" his ideas to his boss. Here again these conclusions are supported by observations in the setting. While it was clear that the relationship between the two men is cordial, Mr. D-M indicated that he is sensitive to the tone of their conversations to be sure that there are no difficulties on the horizon.

Further evidence for this conclusion comes from Mr. D-M's statement that he has been trying to move one children's news show from the idea stage into production for over three years. The difficulty has been convincing those he is responsible to, including this particular programming boss, of the validity of the program idea. This observational evidence could be seen to support the Q-sort data suggesting a perceived difference in program values between Mr. D-M and his immediate boss in the network hierarchy.

The only correlation existing between Mr. D-M's sort and that of his closest associate in production is in the category of actual programming, suggesting that if they do have different programming values in other areas, they do share an understanding of what kinds of values go into programs that can actually be aired. This at least can form the basis of a working relationship. The researcher considers this finding particularly interesting, because he observed a tension in the working relationship of the two men which reflected to at least some degree differences in values, as well as in manner of handling production matters. It was not surprising that the grid indicated only one somewhat significant correlation between the sorts of these two men. The conversations
between the two that the researcher observed and recorded suggest that they are in agreement on certain basic values that must be included in children's programming.

A review of the theoretical base of the New Program Concept Instrument allows for only a few tentative conclusions about the program values of the decision-maker. A comparison was made of the program values written into the six programs chosen most often by Mr. D-M in all of the sorts as desirable and the six programs chosen most often as least desirable in all of the sorts. (See Table 2.) The various program elements associated with the general categories of Reality, Moral Value, and Seriousness appear with random frequency in all the programs chosen by Mr. D-M. However, four of the six programs preferred were high in complexity and five of the programs not preferred were low in complexity, i.e. so-called formula programs. This suggests that Mr. D-M prefers shows that are complex enough so that their outcome depend on the flow of events and are not easily predictable. It is suggested that this preference for complex programs over formula-based programs may influence his programming decisions.

Again, observational evidence may be cited to support this conclusion. In at least three instances when the researcher observed Mr. D-M dealing with programs that included plot or other dramatic elements, he noted an insistence on believable motivation for action and realistic development of characters through motivation and action that grew out of their interactions with each other. In fact, Mr. D-M had just made a trip to Europe previous to the researcher's
TABLE 2

THE DECISION-MAKER'S MOST AND LEAST CHOSEN SHOW NUMBERS ON ALL SIX SORTS OF THE
NEW PROGRAM CONCEPT INSTRUMENT WITH ACCOMPANYING
CONTENT AND STYLE CODES

(For a complete description of content and style elements and show descriptions see Appendix 4.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Show Numbers</th>
<th>Reality (Factual-Fictional)</th>
<th>Moral Value (Moral-Amoral)</th>
<th>Complexity (Complex (1)-Formula (2))</th>
<th>Seriousness (Comedy-Non-Comedy)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>D1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>D2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>B3</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>D1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>D2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>B3</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>D2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>A3</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>D2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 2 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Show Numbers</th>
<th>Reality (Factual-Fictional)</th>
<th>Moral Value (Moral-Amoral)</th>
<th>Complexity (Complex (1)-Formula (2))</th>
<th>Seriousness (Comedy-Non-Comedy)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$A_1$</td>
<td>$B_1$</td>
<td>$C_2$</td>
<td>$D_2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>$A_1$</td>
<td>$B_3$</td>
<td>$C_2$</td>
<td>$D_2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>$A_2$</td>
<td>$B_2$</td>
<td>$C_1$</td>
<td>$D_1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>$A_2$</td>
<td>$B_3$</td>
<td>$C_2$</td>
<td>$D_1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>$A_3$</td>
<td>$B_1$</td>
<td>$C_2$</td>
<td>$D_2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>$A_3$</td>
<td>$B_2$</td>
<td>$C_2$</td>
<td>$D_1$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Shows Least Often Chosen

Category A contains three different types of Factual and Fictional.
Category B contains three different types of moral values.
Category C contains two types of Complexity:
  \[ C_1 \] - High Complexity
  \[ C_2 \] - Low Complexity or "Formula" programs.
Category D contains comedy and non-comedy elements.
week-long observation period to insist that a foreign producer of one of his shows include these program values in his script.

A further suggestion of what elements of content and style may influence Mr. D-M's programming decisions may be indicated by noting the characteristics built into the show (Number 14)\(^1\) which was one of his two top choices in four of the five sorts:

a **Reality:**

a\(_2\) Fictional-Representational. Actors play roles of characters other than themselves, but portray "possible" persons in possible circumstances.

b **Value:**

b\(_1\) Moral. Those programs where moral values are intellectualized—where all is not black and white, but there are shades of grey. Differing views of morality are presented in conflict, sometimes violently. A resolution is not necessarily involved.

c **Complexity:**

c\(_1\) High. Given a flow of circumstances, it is difficult to predict subsequent events or final outcomes.

d **Seriousness:**

d\(_2\) Serious programs, also indicated by the format or in the introduction of the show.

These elements could provide a surprisingly accurate description of the characteristics of the Action!-The Bicentennial series Mr. D-M had in production during the period of observation.

\(^1\)See Appendix 4 for show description.
In contrast, one of the most frequently rejected shows (Number 31) features improbable characters, trying to affect cliche morality, humorously in a formula form. These characteristics are nearly the opposite of those found in the most frequently chosen shows of the Q-sort.

The one show in the Action!-The Bicentennial series that the researcher observed going through final picture and sound editing contained a believable lead character who made a difficult and serious personal decision with somewhat complex moral overtones. The resolution was not predictable and grew logically out of the events and action of the story. In short, it had the same elements of content and style as the Q-sort program item that Mr. D-M chose most frequently.

III. Succeeding in the System

One final question needs to be considered in order to round out this study of the factors that influence Mr. D-M's rise to the position of a programming vice-president in a national television network and to his tenure in that position. Some of these factors were clearly implied in the preceding sections of this study, others were stated in interviews with Mr. D-M and his associates. By implication, making these factors explicit could suggest what those

---

2See Appendix 4 for show description.
beginning in commercial broadcasting must take into account if they wish to survive and move up in commercial broadcasting.

When asked by the researcher specifically to provide some guidelines for a young person just getting into the business that might contribute to his success in commercial television, Mr. D-M stressed experience. He said that the aspiring broadcaster should see all the movies and plays that he can, and read all the books that he can, and do as many things as he can. He should be aware of the world around him and reflect upon it so that he can reflect the world back to the public. Only then need he start to learn the business. He warned about trying to be avant garde, saying that this is a privilege that comes, in most cases, only after the beginner has learned how to reflect back to the public what it wants. He has to establish the name, the reputation, and the background before he can be avant garde.

A summary of this, he said is called "playing in the pit."

In early vaudevillian days if you played in the orchestra you played in the pit in front of the theatre stage. You pounded on the piano or played the saxophone or whatever. You played and played. Then when you started to be a composer, you knew what it was all about. There is just no substitute for playing in the pit, no way you can start out without making a million mistakes. I don't know if that's common in other professions, but it is true in ours.

Related to the notion of the necessity for "playing in the pit," is Mr. D-M's skepticism that schooling can teach aspiring broadcasters what they need to know. One of his directors asserted that not even the networks can teach writing, producing or directing. The grammar and the vocabulary can be taught, but the best that can be
done for young people is to provide environments and opportunities to learn the almost intuitive sense of judgement necessary to be a creative and successful broadcaster.

Mr. D-M said that an executive who makes "right" decisions half of the time probably has a pretty good batting average. He believes that something a friend of his said is very true: "If this were an easy business there would be a lot more people in it." He said:

At first glance it is a very glamorous business and exciting and it is that. And you live every minute of it and you are always intrigued, you're always learning something, and you're always having new and exciting experiences. But the glamour part goes away pretty quickly, because a lot of it is hard work. It is a very specialized business and it doesn't have a great many people who can do well in it. It has a lot of people who can do all right, but you see, all right is not the answer that's drawn from the extra little plus in everybody.

Another important consideration that Mr. D-M stressed was that a person find out what he or she does best. He said that he has at times encouraged a producer or director to write or to perform or whatever. Even though they resist, they sometimes find that they are more comfortable in the new area. Their insecurities go away and they become stronger, better professionals.

At one point during the period of observation, a director pointed out to the researcher two young women who probably fit this criterion of "playing in the pit." They were two office staff workers for the Action! unit. They were secretaries, and script-girls and generally did the drudgery work that everyone else passed off to them. But the director said, in the process they were learning all
dimensions of the operation. Someday, he predicted, they would be directors or producers.

When asked how much influence knowing someone in the business had on people getting in or staying in, Mr. D-M replied:

Well, I think a tremendous amount. I've always told everybody if you know any way to get in and get started, do it and use it. If you're ruthless they'll find it out and if you're stupid they'll find it out. The big thing is getting in, and the next thing is staying in, and that is the real acid test. You say, I don't want to work for him because he's my father, or I don't want to work for him because he's my brother. Well, I have news for you. That may be the entrance, the door may open quicker than it does for someone else. It sometimes is tougher when you know the person. And after you're in, the real judgment comes on yourself. You have to look yourself in the mirror in a couple of years and see if you really made a contribution--and you're going to be the one that knows that. You might have a little more longevity than someone else, but you've got to live with yourself if you're not worth anything.

For himself, Mr. D-M spoke explicitly from time to time about some of the things that contributed to his rise from his days of "playing in the pit" at a network station in the midwest. Perseverance and a sense for how the game is played were two factors. "We live in a 'king of the hill kind of world,'" he said. "It pays well, so it's always looking for that extra super-human person who comes in and does well." When that person is you, it's fine. When that person is someone else, there is a temptation to be bitter. The way to succeed in this ebb and flow and inevitable rotation and movement of men and positions, Mr. D-M said, "is to remain flexible."

You try to sell people on your ability to do certain things and give them confidence to let you go ahead and do them. Now, that makes you a maverick sometimes and sometimes you find that you're going to have to kiss a
few people once in a while in order to get it all done. But that doesn't necessarily mean you have to sell yourself or your soul, except that you do have to sense the direction in which they're running. In most cases if you can do that, you can still do the things you want to do, but you have to do them in a different way.

This means that someone entering and wishing to stay in commercial broadcasting must accept the system as it is and try to work within it. As one of Mr. D-M's directors said earlier, changing commercial broadcasting would be like trying to change the Mississippi River. The influences found in this study to surround the decision-maker often represent long standing and powerful institutions. They cannot be ignored and they must be taken into account in order to survive and succeed in the system. The researcher found it interesting that three different people he met in the course of the study used the same saying, almost a cliche, when talking about their situation: "You can't fight city hall." The problem for a creative and aware person in commercial broadcasting becomes one of maintaining his integrity while staying within the system.

In this same line of thought, Mr. D-M said that an important thing he had learned about succeeding in the system is never to be too far ahead, too avant garde. He said that this lesson was brought home to him recently as he was sorting through cartons of papers and tapes that he had accumulated over his 25 year career. He said that he found that some ideas he had 10 years ago are really much better and ready now than they were then. There is a matter of perseverence until the time or the need catches up with what you want to do. It was mentioned early in this study that Mr. D-M had
lected and talked about the need for and advantages of his network going to video tape. All of a sudden that project came into being and, almost by accident, he was assigned to pioneer its development.

Management people, viewers, and critics, he said, are unable to take too much new thought or avant garde things. These ideas are often labeled "liberal" or "far-out" or whatever. But if there is just a degree of newness and excitement that is within people's grasp, that program has a chance of making it. Knowing this, he said, is important in program decision-making. Younger people are often eager to reach out for something new and sometimes don't see that what is right in front of them is what they should be doing. "Experience," he said, "finally teaches you that you are way ahead of a lot of other people. That's because you're reading in the field, you're thinking in the field...all the time." If the programming decision-maker in any areas of television can focus down to the more immediate future and expectations of his audience, he can still find programs that are attractive and can still deliver the message he wants. As a program example, Mr. D-M cited a show he was doing which is based on his conviction that American children are rich in information from school and television about which they don't necessarily understand the meaning or consequences. Five years ago, he had the idea for a show that would feature characters that children could relate to and who would interact with each other by reflecting upon the consequences of news items and other facts that children already know. In this way children could explore the
consequences of what they already know and put their considerable factual knowledge to use. Recent government pressures for changes in children's programming may provide Mr. D-M a chance to see this five year old idea finally developed into a series.

When the topic of the length of Mr. D-M's association with the network came up, one of his associates speculated briefly upon how Mr. D-M had made it to vice-president and had stayed in the network for as long as he had. He said that the decision-maker had "battled his way up" from a network midwest affiliate because he developed a very good programming sense along with a sense of how to do things right and get them done. In addition he had developed much political savvy and a very good sense of self-preservation. He mentioned that anyone like Mr. D-M is always in a tenuous position, because the person's personal star rises or falls with the success of his programming. Mr. D-M, he said, had managed to stay in programming areas where he could make best use of his abilities and in these areas he did excellently.

This same associate also outlined for the researcher, the conventional wisdom among his network's middle management for moving up in the system: 1. You cannot do your job so well that nobody else can do it, because the network doesn't promote people who are irreplacable. The corollary to this is that you must have or train a subordinate under you who can do your job. 2. You cannot be a threat to those people over you in any manner, either to their job or their peace of mind. 3. You cannot rock the boat. You have to
succeed without getting people upset, and often without people knowing that you are succeeding. 4. You have to please your superiors. You have to do things their way, make things succeed their way, and give them credit for it. This associate said that you have to succeed at all four things, not just a part of them. Also, people under you don't enter in. You can create as many problems for them as necessary, without too much worry about it affecting your personal promotion.

Mr. D-M told the researcher that the length of time, he had spent as a producer in his network was rather unusual. He said that most of his early associates had long since left to become independent producers.

The researcher asked some of Mr. D-M's associates why they thought he had stayed so long as a producer for the network. Their answers, almost unanimous, may provide one final factor that contributes to someone's success in a commercial network. One said, "He loves his work." Another said, "He's good at what he does, and he enjoys what he is doing."

Mr. D-M himself alluded to the increased possibilities for wealth if he had chosen to go into independent production. He also alluded to an early independent business venture prior to his joining the network that had failed through no fault of his own. But if these two factors caused any real regret in Mr. D-M regarding the decisions that led to his position as a network vice-president, the researcher saw no evidence of it. He tends to see the answers
given by Mr. D-M's associates to provide the central part of the reasons why Mr. D-M stayed with his network as long as he had.
Chapter 5

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

I. Summary of the Study

This study sought to determine what personal and institutional factors influence a key commercial television network decision-maker in the selection and development of children's programming. It was hoped that in the process of studying this question some light might be shed on such questions as the personal and institutional factors which affect commercial television programming generally, the effects of the commercial marketplace on the educational values in commercial children's programming, and the predicaments that beginning mass media program decision-makers can anticipate.

The topic was considered to be important because very few studies have ever been made of the mass media communicators at the upper levels of network hierarchies. This is because executives have been suspicious of researchers because they have felt that competitively valuable information would be disclosed or embarrassing
situations revealed. The researcher was able to find only one other study directly similar in nature and purpose to his own.\(^1\)

Through one of his advisors for this study, the researcher was able to obtain the agreement of a vice-president for children's programming at a major commercial network for the researcher to spend one week observing and interacting with him in his office setting. As it turned out, the researcher spent three data gathering periods with the decision-maker: 1. One day on The Ohio State University campus when a series of interviews were conducted, 2. the week in New York City with the decision-maker, and 3. one day on the shooting location of a show that the decision-maker was producing.

Two different, but complementary research methodologies were proposed: anthropologically oriented field study approaches and the administration of two Q-sort instruments. Because of situations that arose and are described in the body of the study, only the field study approaches were able to be implemented fully. One Q-sort instrument was able to be partially administered. However, the volume of data that was generated was still quite substantial.

The analysis of the data followed the pattern illustrated in Diagram 4. The influences surrounding the decision-maker and which

---

1. The circular "tube" represents the influences that surround the decision-maker and provide the context for his decisions about children's programming.

2. The horizontal line represents the path of development leading to the production of "Incident at Concord" from the Action!-The Bicentennial series.

2a. The solid portion of that line represents the week that the researcher spent with the decision-maker in New York City.

3. The first vertical line represents the one day recorded in this study which traces the decision-making activities across one "typical" day.

4. The second vertical line represents the day spent observing the shooting on "Incident at Concord."
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he in turn can influence were identified and described. Then the origin of the show that the researcher observed being shot was followed from its very earliest conceptual beginnings through its actual production. Finally, to complete the picture of the decision-maker's world, a "typical" day in his office was described and the factors that contribute to successful functioning in a commercial network structure were examined. A tentative analysis of the limited Q-sort data was also attempted.

II. Findings

The decision-maker was found to hold a central and sensitive position in the midst of influences from within and outside of the network structure. While he does have considerable power to control the content and form of the children's programming for which he is responsible, he can hold his position in the network and exert his power only within the limits imposed by the often powerful institutional forces that surround him.

One of the most significant findings emerging from the study is the powerful inertia of the institutional forces surrounding a program decision-maker in commercial broadcasting. This power is particularly felt in the demand to reflect back to mass audiences cultural manifestations which viewers want to see and hear, and the necessity to win in the network's rating competition.
This finding confirms the conclusions of the Monaghan and Plummer study. The Q-sort analysis in their study suggested a serious difference in the value system of their subject and the institutional values of his commercial broadcast setting. They secretly concluded that their decision-maker would probably reach a crisis because of these value differences and perhaps try to find a setting in which he could function more comfortably. A few months after their study was completed their decision-maker resigned from his commercial broadcasting job to take a similar position in public broadcasting.

The present study described how Mr. D-M tried to include his personal educational values in his commercial children's programs. His attempt proved to be "unsuccessful" because his programs did not meet the basic commercial broadcast requirements of meeting audience expectations and of winning high ratings. However, instead of leaving the network to seek another position, he adjusted his programming to meet network requirements because he felt that he could both create the kind of programs his network needed to win ratings, and still get across some of the content he felt met the educational needs of his audience.

Both men, in short, came to realize the power of the demands for successful commercial programming. The Monaghan and Plummer

---

decision-maker left commercial broadcasting for a setting which would allow fuller implementation of his values. The sheer numbers of his viewing audience would probably be less because of the diminished commercial appeal of his programs. Mr. D-M decided to continue to try to work within the commercial system, even though the educational values he could communicate would be more limited than he would like. The numbers of his viewing audience would probably continue to be large. No judgment is implied of either man. Both came up against the same commercial programming constraints, but each personally decided to come to terms with these constraints in a different way.

In addition to this similarity noted between the Monaghan and Plummer decision-maker and Mr. D-M, several conclusions can be drawn about the nature of the influences that effect Mr. D-M and about the nature of his influences on programming:

1. Mr. D-M's position in the network is tenuous in nature. This is especially true because he is in the programming and production area. His star rises and falls on the success of his programming and the opinions of his bosses. There is ample evidence in the study to support this conclusion. The most direct evidence is Mr. D-M's loss of his previous children's programming vice-presidency because of the poor ratings performance of his network children's programming.

Other evidence of the basic tenuousness of commercial network programming positions appeared throughout the study.
Mr. D-M described his setting as a "king of the hill" kind of world and was able to reflect at length on the kinds of attitudes and behaviors necessary to survive and succeed in that world. He expressed his sensitivity to the tone of his casual conversations with his immediate boss, to assure himself that matters between them were continuing on an even keel. Finally, the fact that Mr. D-M's bosses were virtually the only people in the setting to whom the researcher did not have easy access is taken as an indication of Mr. D-M's sensitivity to their opinions about his actions.

2. Mr. D-M evidenced a strong need and desire to exercise control of the show concept of his productions. One of his associates alluded to this by saying that Mr. D-M had "selection of show" in his area of children's programming. Much of the description and analysis of data in this study is devoted to how Mr. D-M went about exercising this control. His artistic control was exerted primarily through selling his ideas to his bosses and, once the ideas were approved, through control of the script for individual shows. He considered the actual writing of scripts, the directing of shows, and the details of production matters to be primarily the responsibility of specialized professionals. Although he certainly attempted to be on the scene throughout production as much as possible,
his main concerns were to insist that the final product be faithful to the concept of the show and to the approved script.

3. In his programming decisions Mr. D-M was attuned to the present. He sought to create shows that would be successful here and now in the opinion of his bosses and in terms of the readiness of his audience for a specific idea. This was based on his conviction that television is a reflective medium and that it must reflect back to the public what it wants to see and hear. Mr. D-M stayed attuned to the culture at large in a variety of ways. The researcher noted, for example, that Mr. D-M often had with him newspaper clippings that explained the current actions of the Federal Communications Commission, Action for Children's Television, competing networks, and other groups outside his network that had power to influence commercial television programming. He carried letters from viewers with him that he used to illustrate viewer reactions to his shows. He also stated that in his viewing of movies and television, he always kept an eye out for ideas and trends that might have application to his programming. Finally, his willingness to be involved in public affairs and keep his office door open to people outside the network who came with ideas was also a way for Mr. D-M to stay in touch with ideas that might be useful here and now or could be kept on the shelf.
until they might be ready for inclusion in his programming.

4. Mr. D-M decided that in order to stay in the commercial broadcasting business he must give top priority to being successful in the ratings and include educational program values in a context that would bring acceptable ratings. The analysis of the Q-data in this study suggests that Mr. D-M feels that the inclusion of entertainment values which are necessary for ratings success is compatible with the inclusion of educational values in his programming. He readily admits that he cannot include all the educational message he would like to deliver, but asserts that success in the ratings must have priority if he wishes to stay in the commercial broadcasting business.

5. The major way that children's programmers in commercial television obtain feedback about children and children's program preferences is through the ratings. Three children's programming vice-presidents were asked at the luncheon interview described in this study how they assessed program needs of children. None expressed any ongoing first-hand contact with children beyond the raising of their own. Although they said that they read and answered all letters they received from viewers, it was stressed earlier in this study that the impact of letters on the network was minimal.
when compared to the ratings. Even the university re-
searcher that Mr. D-M used as a consultant for his Action!
series was employed to give advice on how to make shows
already in production better able to hold an audience.

6. The educational community and commercial broad-
casters generally hold different opinions about what
constitutes "good" children's programming. Understanding
and cooperation between commercial broadcasters and educators
is the exception rather than the rule. Educators often
accuse commercial broadcasters of ignoring their
responsibility to provide "quality" educational programming
for children. Commercial broadcasters in their turn accuse
educators of not understanding the nature of a commercial
enterprise and of trying to pass the buck for change in
education off on the broadcaster.

7. Awards and critical recognition provided a great
deal of personal satisfaction for Mr. D-M. Success in winning
awards, however, was clearly secondary as far as the network
was concerned in influencing programming decisions. At least
one of Mr. D-M's award winning shows was cancelled because
of poor ratings. Awards did contribute to establishing the
status and credibility of Mr. D-M and allowed him chances
for programming innovations that a less widely recognized
programmer might not have had.
8. The main direct power that local broadcasters have
to influence network programming is to decide not to carry
a network offering. If enough local stations do not carry
a show, it usually means sure death for the show in question.
When these decisions seem arbitrary or unjustified, they are
a particular source of frustration for network broadcasters.

III. Relationships Among the Variables

These conclusions summarize and point up the variables
that influence Mr. D-M and by implication influence programmers at
his level in commercial network hierarchies. It may be useful to
speculate on the interrelation among these variables in order to
delineate their relative importance in influencing children's
programming.

Central to Mr. D-M's personal programming values is his
desire to communicate educational and informational messages for
children. His actually creating informational and educational
programming while vice-president for all children's programming, and
the loss of that vice-presidency in the process, provides ample
evidence that communicating educational and informational content
is important for him.

Influences from outside the network such as Action for
Children's Television, the FCC, the critics, educators, and award
committees place pressure on the networks and indirectly support
Mr. D-M's efforts. However, in order to be able to communicate
informational messages, Mr. D-M must have an acceptably large audience to be able to continue in commercial broadcasting. In concrete terms this means he must succeed in the ratings competition. The higher his ratings, the easier it is to attract advertisers and make a profit for his network. Also, commercially attractive programs are more likely to be carried by affiliates. Thus, while ACT, for example, lobbies for more and better educational programming for children, Mr. D-M often finds himself at odds with the group because he feels that it does not understand the realities of a profit-making commercial broadcast network. In any event, Mr. D-M's desire to communicate educational values could go a long way in explaining why it was important to him to remain in commercial broadcasting and seek to continue broadcasting informational messages within the programming realities of a commercial broadcast network.

In order to stay in commercial broadcasting and attract an acceptable audience he must create entertaining, crisp, and action-oriented programming. He uses his personal sense of judgement based upon years of experience to create program ideas that interpret the culture and reflect back to the culture its interests and concerns. He works with professional producers, writers, and directors who are capable of creating this kind of commercial programming. He has even hired a research consultant to advise him on how to hold audiences for his shows.

Underlying all of this, is the necessity for Mr. D-M to understand what it takes to survive and succeed in the network
bureaucracy. For example, he must know when and how to present a show idea to his superiors, when to protect his rights when it seems to him that his area of authority is being undercut or how to deal with a memo from the offices of Standards and Practices.

Stated succinctly in the form of hypotheses these interrelations could be expressed as follows:

If a commercial programmer wishes to communicate an informational message, then he must do it in a format that will be able to attract a sufficiently large audience.

If he wishes to attract a large audience, he must create entertaining, action-oriented programming.

If he wishes to communicate an informational message and stay in commercial broadcasting, then he must develop the ability to survive and function successfully in the bureaucratic system.

A variety of data sources contributed to this in-depth study of the influences on the decision-making of one of perhaps eight or nine national vice-presidents for commercial children programming.

It is suggested that this study of the influences on one of these men, suggests that similar factors may be influencing the men who hold similar positions.
IV. Recommendations for Further Study

The conclusions and hypotheses in the previous section raise as many questions as they answer. Below are suggested further studies that could be useful for exploring the decision-making process in commercial broadcasting hierarchies:

1. Because this study focused on one decision-maker in one commercial broadcast setting, generalizations based on the study must be made with caution. Several similar studies using participant observation and Q-methodology must be made if a fully valid picture of broadcast decision-making is to emerge. Especially important would be an attempt to seek subjects at even higher levels of the network hierarchy, so that a fuller understanding of network decision-making could emerge. This hope is a guarded one because decision-makers seem to be reluctant to admit researchers to their settings. Even Mr. D-M expressed fears that the purpose of this study might be misunderstood. Further, both the decision-maker in this study and the one who was the subject of the Monaghan-Plummer study had prior personal and value commitments to the educational community. Perhaps there will be difficulties for researchers to gain access to broadcasters who do not have ties to education.

2. A field study which included a participant observation period of greater length and that focused on the development of one particular show could do much to amplify
the ongoing decision-making process to which this study had access mainly through interviews and limited documentary data.

3. While it was regrettable that the power of Q-sort methodology could not be used fully to help amplify the picture of the influences on the decision-making of Mr. D-M, the tentative analysis of the limited data does suggest the potential for the use of Q-sort quantitative methodology in conjunction with field studies which focus on the single case. Studies similar to this one could profit from full use of Q-sort approaches.

4. Mr. D-M stressed the difficulties of being too avant-garde in the face of what he termed the reflective nature of television. Studies that address themselves specifically to programs that have pioneered changes in content and format would be useful for understanding how programming changes come about in commercial broadcasting.

5. This study produced evidence that a key programming decision-maker was aware of the influences on commercial programming from groups such as the Federal Communications Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, Action for Children's Television, The National Association of Broadcasters, the critics, the press, local broadcasters and others. Studies that explore how each of these groups
affects network broadcasting would be useful to further understanding of the place of mass media communication systems in the context of the larger culture.

6. The upper levels of other mass media hierarchies also need to be studied. The press, radio, and movies have pervasive influences on American culture. Studies which explore the factors which influence key decision-makers in these media are likewise necessary to provide an understanding of the influences of mass media communicators. Comparison of studies made of decision-makers in different mass media systems might help identify unique influences of each upon its audience.

7. A constant concern of Mr. D-M was the conflict between the need to create entertaining programs and yet include an educational message within the entertainment format. A study of the educational "message" being broadcast in children's programming generally would help clarify at least what educational content broadcasters are attempting to communicate.

8. The relationship between the educational community and the commercial broadcast community seems particularly ripe for study. Perhaps the exploration could begin with a case study of the influence of one prestigious consultant from education on commercial network programming.
Although it has been pointed out that awards for excellence have limited impact on programming, studying the nature of that influence might shed some light on how networks are affected by the awards they seek or receive. Another interesting study could explore the process by which awards committees arrive at their decision.

V. Conclusion

From its inception this study was seen as a way "to cut into the system"\(^3\) of commercial broadcasting, to begin mapping the territory, so to speak. This was based on the researcher's conviction that the first step necessary in understanding any setting to be examined and that may be the focus of efforts to change is to examine that setting as objectively as possible. Researchers must first describe how a situation works and the forces that play upon it, whether that setting be a commercial broadcasting network or a first grade classroom. Only when a setting has been clearly understood can people learn how to function in it and try to change it if they so desire. This approach provides the basis for dialogue and can help avoid accusations and counter-accusations based on incomplete data by parties to the setting who are interested in effecting change. If this study has outlined a basically valid picture of one

---

\(^3\) Lazarsfeld, "Afterword" in *The People Look at Television*, pp. 420-421.
dimension of the commercial television decision-making process, it has succeeded in its purpose.
Appendix 1

Summary of PERT Network for Decision-Maker Project

This study was organized using approaches suggested by the Program Evaluation and Review Technique (PERT) as explained by Desmond Cook. Contained here are the Summary PERT Network and Tabular Work Breakdown for the project.

### Tabular Work Breakdown Structure for Decision-Maker Research Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL 0</th>
<th>LEVEL 1</th>
<th>LEVEL 2</th>
<th>LEVEL 3</th>
<th>LEVEL 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decision-Maker Project</td>
<td>Problem Statement</td>
<td>Background and Importance of Problem Based on Literature Search</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Choice of Decision-Maker</td>
<td>Research Procedure</td>
<td>Participant-Observation</td>
<td>Enumeration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Participant-Observation Log</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Informant Interviewing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q-sort Methodology</td>
<td>New Program Concept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Instrument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Role Items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>Participant-Observation</td>
<td>Memo Collection</td>
<td>New Program Concept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spend Week with decision-maker</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mapping of Work Setting</td>
<td>Instrument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Make Field Notes</td>
<td>Professional Role Items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interview Decision-Maker</td>
<td>Instrument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interview Decision-Maker's Colleagues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Administer Q-sorts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New Program Concept</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Instrument</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Role Items</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Instrument</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Documentation</td>
<td>Charts and Tables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Narrative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary PERT Network for Decision-Maker Project

1. Project Start
2. Start Literature Search
3. Complete Problem Statement
4. Complete Background and Importance Statement
5. Complete Literature Search and Theoretical Framework Statement
6. Start Contacts with Decision-Maker
7. Start Formulating Research Procedure
8. Complete Participant-Observation Research Design
9. Complete Q-Sort Procedure Design
10. Finalize Plans for Visit to Decision-Maker

11. Start Data Gathering
12. Complete Participant-Observation
13. Complete Administering Q-Sort Instruments
14. Begin Analysis of Data
15. Complete Participant-Observation Analysis
16. Complete Q-Sort Analysis
17. Begin Data Synthesis
18. Complete Interpretation
19. Complete Conclusions
20. Complete Tables and Figures
21. Complete Narrative

The months above the diagram indicate a general time frame for the network sequence.
Appendix 2

Associate Interview Schedule

COVER SHEET:

Name: 
Date: 
Place: 
Relationship to Decision-Maker:

Introduction:

1. Explain that the purpose of the study is to explore the television programming decision-making process, i.e.: to explore, for example, how children's programs get on television.

I hope to find part of the answer to this question by exploring the personal and institutional factors that influence Mr. D-M, who is an important children's program decision-maker.

2. Give assurances that respondent will remain anonymous in any written reports growing out of this study, and that his responses will be treated in strictest confidence.

3. Indicate that he may find some of the questions farfetched, silly, or difficult to answer, the reason being that questions that are appropriate for one person are not always appropriate for another. Since there are no right or wrong answers, he is not to worry about these and do as best he can with them. We are only interested in his opinions and personal experiences.

1This introduction format follows closely the Fred Davis' interview guide, "Problems of the Handicapped in Everyday Social Situations," February, 1960, as found in John Lofland, Analyzing Social Settings, pp. 86-87.
4. Feel free to interrupt, ask clarification, criticize a line of questioning, etc.

5. Explain something about my background, training, and interest in the area of inquiry.

6. Ask permission to tape. Explain that in an informal and open-ended conversation like we are going to have, it would be impossible for me to remember what we talk about without a tape recorder.

7. May wish a second interview, if necessary.

Interview Questions

A. Background

Please describe in your own terms the nature and length of your association with Mr. D-M.

PROBE FOR: Differences between "organizational chart" and reality.

B. Program Values

1. Action!-The Bicentennial

Would you please explain the genesis and rationale for Action!-The Bicentennial?

How the idea originated?
Who originated it?
Any major controversy surrounding the show?
What position "won"? Why?
Who is Mr. D-M most likely to listen to? Take advice from?
What kinds of questions does Mr. D-M tend to be concerned about when he is working with someone on:
A show idea?
A script?
While shooting on location?
Cutting the final product?
Can you give an example?
How does Mr. D-M make an important decision with respect to a show? Example?
2. **Afternoon Special**
Would you please explain the genesis and rationale for Afternoon Specials?
How the idea originated?
Any major controversy surrounding the show?
What position "won"? Why?
What influence did you have?
Who is Mr. D-M likely to listen to and take advice from regarding this show? Example?
What kinds of questions does Mr. D-M tend to be concerned with when he is working with someone on?
   - A show idea?
   - A script?
   - While shooting on location?
   - Cutting the final product?
   - Example?
Which of the ten specials were eliminated and why?

C. **The Setting and Social System**

Mr. D-M once told me that most of the people he came here with have since left and are virtual millionaires. No criticism implied--why is he still here?
Who does Mr. D-M interact with most when he is in town?
PROBE FOR: Whom he spends most of his time with?
   Whom he seeks to avoid?
If this changes with each visit, what are the dynamics of the changes?
Did the recent change in programming bosses change the way things are done around here?
What factors contribute to someone keeping his job and moving up around here?
How much openness or manipulation characterize the setting?
Do you spend time with Mr. D-M off the job? Whom does he spend time with?
Are you conscious of anyone "looking over your shoulder" while a proposal is being made or the work is in progress?
What elements are generally considered to be a part of the children's programming formula?
Taboos?
What advice would you give to a young decision-maker (say a producer or director) that would contribute to his success?
Who are the people here who have the most power to influence the eventual way a program will appear on the air?
D. Personality

PROBE FOR AS APPROPRIATE:
Mr. D-M

Open to flattery and influence?
Courage to stand up to pressure groups?
Would he be jealous of another man's success?
Approachable?
Well-liked?
Stands up for his beliefs?
Is the notion of breaks and instinct important here?
Interview Guide for Mr. D-M

A. Background

A1. Awards
What is a ( ) Award?
What programs did you get the ( ) awards for?
What criteria do they use?
Why are the awards important for you?
What significance do others miss about them?
How much impact does the ( ) have on the network generally?
What other awards have you won? (Refer to trophies on his shelves.)
PROBE FOR: Influences that awards have on the decisions about programs.
  How the various awards are different. (significance, etc.)
  Refer to statement in previous tape about proving credibility in the corporate structure.

A2. Relationship with and Teaching in Schools:
Please explore the teaching aspects of your career.
  College teaching:
    (University #1)
    (University #2)
PROBE FOR: Possible source of educational values.

A3. Public Service
Please review briefly for me your involvements in "Public Service." (Specific organizations mentioned.)
What is your attitude toward being involved in these things?
How did you become involved in ( )?

A4. Please Review in Brief for me who is in the social setting surrounding you and whom I am likely to meet while I am here.

1A few of the questions have sections omitted, indicated by ( ), to preserve the anonymity of the decision-maker.
Who are you responsible to?
Who do you spend the most time with when you are in town?
Anyone you would just as soon avoid?
Who do you interact with when you are on location?
Who do you associate with off the job?

A5. What do you read?
   Variety? What else?

B. Writings and Productions

B1. Writings:
   What is the general nature of the writings you have accumulated?
   Scripts? What?
   Are there any that might be available for me to see? (Try to get as many written documents as possible.)

B2. Productions:
   Are video-tapes of some of your shows available for viewing or borrowing?

C. Program Development

C1. "Action!"--update
   Statements from our conversation on the ( ).
   "You can have fun and excitement, yes, but you must do your homework, recognize the dangers, be ready."
   "If these things look easy, it's because they have done their homework."
   "Agree to settle for less, but reach more people."
   How far back can you trace this particular view?
   How did you come to hold it?
   Is this essentially the same value orientation for (Show AA)?
   When I last talked with you, you said:
   "American youth are information rich and experience poor." Could you explain what you mean by that again?
   What other values made (Show A) a ( ) Award winner? (this year?) Pace/Timing/Speed/Feeling/etc.
   You mentioned that you had trouble getting good scripts for Action!-The Bicentennial and working with writers.
   Would you mind exploring the nature of that problem?
   Same problem with Afternoon Specials.
   Besides yourself, which people will have the biggest role in shaping the final product?
   Do you make decisions on feeling and instinct?
   How effective are the polls in determining audience tastes?
C2. Would you explain the genesis and rationale for Afternoon Specials?
   How the idea originated?
   Who originated it?
   Any major controversies surrounding the show?
   What position "won" and why?
   Which of the ( ) suggested shows was eliminated and why?
   Which is/will be the strongest show? Why?
   What things are currently at issue with regard to this series, (of specials)?
   Who are you responsible to for Afternoon Specials?
   Who do you listen to about the show?
   Wife?
   Besides yourself, what people will have the biggest part in shaping the final product? How? In what ways?
   What program values make Afternoon Specials a strong series?

C3. Would you explain the genesis and rationale for other shows you have done?
   (Show A)
   (Show B)

C4. Anything further on "show C" that we talked about?
   What is holding up the money to go ahead?

D. Miscellaneous.

   What advice would you give to a young decision-maker (say a producer or director) that would contribute to his success?
   You once told me that most of the people you came here with at $50 per week have since left and are millionaires. Surely you could have done the same. Why are you still here?
   What factors contribute to someone keeping his job and moving up around here?
Appendix 4

New Program Concept Instrument

Elements of Content and Style and the Program Descriptions that Were Sorted by the Decision-Maker

The elements of content and style to appeal to mass audiences are based upon interviews, introspection, analytical observation of current programs, discussions with colleagues, and the slowly emerging body of theory regarding what programs people like and do not like.

These notions are given as the element definitions provided below. As a practical step, it is handy to designate each element by a symbol:

Reality:

A1 Factual-Informational. The presentation of events as they actually are, or were; persons being presented as

themselves. Reflects expected cultural patterns, given the circumstances.

A<sub>2</sub> Fictional-Representational. Actors play roles of characters other than themselves, but portray "possible" persons in "possible" circumstances.

A<sub>3</sub> Fictional Non-Representational. Presents improbable, fantastic, or cartoon characters in "believable" circumstances; or "believable" characters in unlikely situations; or a combination of both "unreal" conditions.

Value:

B<sub>1</sub> Moral. Those programs where moral values are intellec-
tualized--where all is not white or black, but there are shades of grey. Differing views of morality are presented in conflict, sometimes violently. A resolution is not necessarily involved.

B<sub>2</sub> Moral-Sentimental. In these programs there are clearly "good" guys and "bad" guys, and a singular "right" that triumphs. The good guys are often crude and unsociable. It is kind of "cliche morality."

B<sub>3</sub> In these programs moral issues are not considered.

Complexity:

C<sub>1</sub> High. Given a flow of circumstances, it is difficult to predict subsequent events or final outcomes.

C<sub>2</sub> Low. The so-called formula programs.

Seriousness:

D<sub>1</sub> Comedy. These are comedy, light entertainment, and even musical shows, usually self-designated by the program format.

D<sub>2</sub> Non-comedy. Serious programs, also indicated by the format or in the introduction of the show.

By placing these elements into a block, as the one below, the total possible number of combination of combinations can be quickly generated.
In this case there are $3 \times 3 \times 2 \times 2 = 36$ element combinations, including $(A_1B_1C_1D_1)$ and $(A_1B_1C_1D_2)$ and so forth. Each set of elements represents a possible program idea. Enumeration of the various combinations provides guidelines for the entire set of program ideas. Each set of elements is a kind of recipe for a separate program idea.

The following are some examples of television program ideas which can be generated following these procedures.

**Element Combinations and Representative Program Ideas**

1. **BAEZ AND BALLADS**--features the singing and sayings of Joan Baez. Built around a semi-interview, semi-documentary format, the program is about the singer and her relationship to folk singing as an
art. She sings a few humorous folk songs and is backed up by some dancers.

2. THE WAR YEARS--stories of actual battles of World War II, with emphasis given to showing both the Allied and German viewpoints of values for the battle.

3. THIS FUNNY WORLD--humorous human interest news stories from around the world are told through a newscaster with stills and film.

4. THE EXECUTIVE--the camera follows a high ranking executive on a typical working day. The show depicts the business world and the hard and sometimes controversial decisions which must be made.

5. PARDON MY FOOT--true stories about famous and not so famous personalities of our times. The program features actual events and the heart warming and moving dilemmas which touch humanity. Photos and films as well as the actual individual involved, combine to recreate the stories that lead to hilarious and sometimes surprising conclusions. Truth is indeed stranger than fiction.

6. NIGHT CRY--true stories of policemen during their night shift in a large city. Tonight we go to New York City and travel with Car 369 on its night beat.

7. SONGS WE USED TO SING--a musical variety show featuring old favorite songs which are frequently sung by the artist who made them famous.

8. FIREFIGHTERS--true accounts of the fire departments throughout the world. The show depicts bravery above and beyond the call of duty.

9. WHAT HAPPENED?--a game show where viewers send in letters describing a humorous incident that really happened to them. Actors re-enact the incident leaving out the ending. Guest celebrities try to guess how the incident really ended.

10. THE FUTURE--a program that first looks at research on a project for the future. Then, through sketches, we see the projected finished product. Tonight, we see the Mach 3 Jet Commercial Transport Plane (its development, and its good and bad points).
11. THE WEIRD TEAMS—sports teams that are exceptionally different than the normal are featured each week. This week's show features a comedy baseball team, including a trick pitcher.

12. HOME ON THE RANGE—a cooking show with man and woman as host and chefs. Viewers send in their favorite recipes and chefs prepare the food. At the end of the program, a lavish dish is cooked and the recipe is given to all viewers.

13. RED TAPE—each week this satirical program presents sketches that constructively poke fun at our complex institutions such as education, foreign policy, etc. Typically they focus on a basic conflict in the institution which is most difficult to resolve.

14. THE NEGOTIATOR—a program about a man who goes all around the world by order of the President of the U.S. to negotiate a treaty or peace terms. Tonight, he goes to Egypt to negotiate peace between Egypt and Israel.

15. WHEN IT RAINS IT POURS—a satirical takeoff on the soap opera, complete with all of the characters in the lives of Clyde and Martha. All situations are handled with tongue-in-cheek sarcasm; the soap opera and its plots being the target for most of the action or fun.

16. THE PEACE CORPS—true stories of peace corps members re-enacted by actors. Tonight we go to Africa and a primitive village.

17. THE PLOTTERS—a program about a group of people that do only good but in an illegal way. Tonight, the scheme to quiet a false press release by using a "fight fire with fire" technique.

18. THE MISSISSIPPI—a Mississippi riverboat captain narrates the stories of his trips and times, and the troubles and involvements of his passengers while traveling up and down the river during the late 1800's.

19. GOLD RUSH—two ne'er-do-wells go north to Alaska in search of a fortune. From Nome to Fairbanks they get into funny as well as serious trouble, but always manage to dig themselves out of the situation in a humorous manner.
20. THE CORONER--tonight, the coroner is drawn into trying to break up a plot to dispose of a body of a man who was killed by his wife's lover.

21. WHO SAID THAT?--a quiz show panel tries to unravel famous quotes spoken by actors who use the scrambled quote in a "man on the street" talk with a perfect stranger. The contestant who correctly guesses the quote and the person who said it wins.

22. GREAT SCIENTISTS--each week an actor portrays a different scientist of the past in a setting of the past, explaining his scientific law or achievement and how it came to be. Tonight, the setting is England in the 17th Century with Sir Isaac Newton.

23. SAFETY FIRST--"Officer Bob" instructs children on the subject of safety at play. His points are supported through the use of animated cartoons showing dangerous habits and situations.

24. WHY IT HAPPENS--actors present material for school children prepared by experts on natural phenomena such as the northern lights, etc. Films, slides, and visual aids are used to simplify the explanation. Everything is made very easy to understand.

25. HINDSIGHT--a self designated "in group" of a cemetery community comes to life at midnight each week. This "Rat Pack" of the Six Feet Under Club sarcastically gossips about real life events of the past week. They each have a different point of view and can seldom agree on an ideal solution.

26. COMMITMENT DESTINY--tales of the world beyond. Tonight, Jim Barker's robot is involved in a question of morality with another robot whose programmed brain is not in alignment. Which is more important, man or machine?

27. GREEK TO ME--the ancient Greeks and Greek mythology is brought to the viewer through animation. The narrator of the semi-fictional programs about humorous Greek mythology is the butler of Zeus. Tonight, he tells the inside story on Diana and some of the wars between the gods.
28. HUMANS ARE CRUEL--a documentary narrated by a cartoon rabbit, covering the subjects of conservation and animal husbandry. The main point is how to help preserve natural resources.

29. GHOST WRITER--a deceased editor comes back from the dead to continue his small newspaper's editorial crusade to clean up City Hall. The episodes, while fictitious, reflect many of the problems that actually plague small towns and big cities alike. Humorous situations arise as the corrupt officials try to find out how anyone could discover all of this information.

30. THE UNKNOWN--stories of the bizarre. Tonight, the story of a renegade doctor who is involved in an illegal experiment of a human brain transplant.

31. HALO CURSE--two angels decide that man has become too evil. So they assume human form and fly down to earth in order to change man. But man considers them strange people who should mind their own business. Tonight, the angels try to cure two bank robbers of their evil ways.

32. PROJECT U (Project Universe)--a space adventure program. Tonight, our animated cartoon characters land their space ship on an uncharted planet and then begins the strange tale of human sacrifice and morbid customs of war.

33. THE IMAGE OF MUSIC--specials in color. Pictures or related images, films or stills, or animated cartoons are skilfully arranged to match the type of music played in tempo, color, subject matter. In other words, a visual interpretation of music.

34. OUTSIDE THIS WORLD--an educational program in animated cartoon form. Kal, an American space explorer, travels throughout the solar system and tells us what we know or theorize about it.

35. PASS INTO TIME--an elderly scientist takes the viewer into his time machine to go back and witness an important historical event. This scientist humorously helps to make the historical event turn out as the history books say it does.
36. HOW ABOUT THAT!--an educational program that shows some aspect of the natural sciences through an animated cartoon story. Tonight flowers come to life and we learn about how they live and grow.
Appendix 5

Sample of Complete Instructions for the New Program Concept Instrument

We each have an ideal concept of what network television programming should be like. This would consist of an ideal program schedule which would provide the audience, as we understand it, with the very best possible combination of content and style. This is an opportunity for you to select for scheduling hypothetical, but carefully constructed television shows, according to the way you wish to see television programming improved.

On these cards are possible potential programs any of which may be used as part of the ideal program schedule. I want you to look through them and think how you would like the program schedule to be ideally. Your initial reactions or first impressions are what I want. Put the cards which best describe the way you would like the program schedule to be ideally in a pile on the left. Put the cards which least describe the way you would like the program schedule to be in a pile on the right. Place into a center pile those cards which are not clear to you or you do not care strongly about one way or another.

Now, from the cards on the left, select the 2 programs which you would most ideally like to see aired and place them on card pile Number One. From the cards on the right, select the 2 which describe shows you would least like to see aired and place them on card pile Nine. Then go back to the pile on the left, select 3 cards which next best describe programs you would ideally like to see aired and place them on pile Number Two. From the cards on the right, select the 3 which next least describe shows you would like to see aired and place them on card pile Number Eight. Continue by going back to the pile on the left and the middle pile, if necessary, and select the next 4 most ideal programs and place them on pile Number Three. Then choose the next 4 least ideal and place them on pile Number Seven.

Continue to do this so that the Nine piles each has the number of cards designated below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pile Number:</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cards per Stack:</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
System 1. This mode of construing the world and relating to it fits the description of concrete functioning presented earlier. The cognitive structure remains fairly undifferentiated and poorly integrated. The representatives of this System are easily distracted by salient cues even if they are false and there is a strong tendency to make snap judgments and bifurcated evaluations. These individuals show greater dependence (relative to the other systems) on external authority, relying on external sources for their standards of conduct and criteria for evaluation. These external sources are generally extra-personal forces such as Gods, norms of society, institutionalized authority, tradition, etc. System 1 representatives prefer highly structured situations and display an intolerance for ambiguity. A poor delineation between means and ends is accompanied by a strong commitment to "the right way" to do a given task and thus search for multiple or alternative paths and the willingness to consider new information are highly limited if not prevented completely. This situation results in stereotype in approaching problems, insensitivity and resistance to environmental inputs which are not congruent with the existing cognitive organization, and low ability to change set. In addition these individuals tend to show ritualistic adherence to rules without understanding, high religiosity, high absolutism, high evaluativeness, high identification with social roles and status positions, high conventionality and high ethnocentrism (Harvey, 1966).

System 2. This style of functioning is characterized by negativism and an anti-rule, anti-authority orientation. The cognitive structure is somewhat more differentiated than in System 1, perhaps exemplified by the ability of System 2 individuals to see themselves as separate from society and to question many of the values and practices of society. However, the cognitive organization remains poorly integrated and thinking still tends to be fairly compartmentalized, as indicated by the inability of the System 2 individuals to envision the implications and possible effects of their rejection of some aspect of their environment on other aspects. Perhaps because of ambiguity, vacillation, and inconsistency that they perceive in their environment, they associate unstructuredness with distrust, loss of
security, fear of rejection, and/or a feeling of loss of control over their situation. Thus the need for structure and intolerance of ambiguity remain high but are likely to be manifested in suspiciousness and avoidance of commitment. Individuals from System 2, more than any other system, are in a psychological void, rebelling against structure and authority on the one hand and rendered fearful and anxious by the absence of authority guidelines on the other. The rebelliousness of the System 2 individual appears more manifest while the seeking of structure and the attempt to find security in stable authority is more latent. Thus outwardly the representatives of this system tend to display negative valence toward the same referents that are of high positive relevance to representatives of System 1; it is important to note, however, that both use these same external sources as points of reference. Similar to System 1 individuals, high involvement among System 2 representatives appears to eventuate in high arousal, high autonomic activity, conceptual closedness and an inability to differentiate among cognitive and behavioral alternatives (Harvey, Reich, & Wyer, 1968).

**System 3.** This mode of functioning, next to the highest level of abstractness treated by Harvey, et al., (1961) is characterized by a desire to be liked and by attempts to establish and maintain relationships that foster mutual dependency and allow for manipulation of others. In fact, System 3 representatives have come to rely upon dependency and manipulation of others as their primary technique of controlling their environment. This type of interpersonal experience results in an awareness of self as a causal agent, sometimes an exaggerated one, and facilitates the development of a conceptual organization which is more differentiated and better integrated than that found in either System 1 or 2. System 3 individuals are much less categorical in their evaluations and tend to base their decisions on the implications of effects they will have for themselves and/or other people. Because of their ability to exercise control over others, representatives of this system are less deferential toward authority than representatives of System 1, less negative than individuals of System 2, and in general less concerned with extra-personal forces and institutional authority. They are, however, very concerned with attitudes of peers, social acceptance, social responsibility and the standards of behavioral prescribed by their particular reference group. Since they do not develop clearly delineated personal standards, they are in constant need of feedback from significant people in their environment in order to regulate their behavior and attain the acceptance and mutual dependency that they need. System 3 representatives manifest the need both to be dependent on others and to have others dependent on them. Their dependency apparently is directed toward individuals of power and status while those whom they would have dependent upon them appear to be persons low in status, power and expertise possibly because such persons would be easier to manipulate under the guise of helpfulness (Ware & Harvey, 1968; Alter & Harvey, 1969). Fearful of facing a
situation alone, where success would depend on individual performance and/or personally derived criteria, System 3 individuals are extremely vulnerable to the threat of rejection, social isolation and other social conditions that might prevent the existence or use of dependency relationships.

System 4. This style of functioning, the most abstract of the four systems, is characterized by high task orientation, information seeking, exploratory behavior, risk taking, independence without negativism, internal standards of conduct, personally derived criteria of evaluation, and relativism in thought and action. The conceptual structure is more highly differentiated and integrated than the other systems. These individuals are able to consider a given concept domain from many points of view, evaluate the concept with regard to several dimensions, and to see multiple relationships both among the several aspects which they are able to articulate within a given concept and between that concept and other elements of their cognitive organization. These individuals are open to new information and capable of integrating such information into their existing cognitive organization, making appropriate modifications in that organization if necessary. In addition to being able to integrate apparently opposing characteristics of the same referent, (e.g., the same person may simultaneously possess "good" and "bad" characteristics) they are less likely than individuals from other systems to generalize impressions based on incomplete information (Ware & Harvey, 1967). In general their ideas and attitudes appear to have been derived pragmatically from direct experience of environmental feedback and are not oriented toward adhering to externally defined "truths" or conforming to inviolable social norms. They, more than representatives of any other system, work for intrinsic rather than extrinsic rewards (Harvey, Coates, White & Neva, 1969). Unlike individuals of the other systems who associate unstructuredness with uncertainty, insecurity, fear or reprisal, fear of rejection, etc., representatives of System 4 interpret these conditions as indications of trust and respect and they welcome the opportunity to exercise their independence and behave in accordance with their own inclinations. Thus System 4 individuals display a low need for structure, a relatively high tolerance for ambiguity, an ability to differentiate between means and ends, an ability to articulate several ways of attaining the same goal, a capacity to "act as if," a high ability to change set and a tendency to avoid stereotype in solving problems (Harvey, 1966).
Appendix 7

Professional Role Q-Sort Items

1
Knowing the ins and outs of institutional politics is probably necessary to keep moving in the direction you want.

5
In order to get what is really needed for the child it is often necessary to beat the bureaucratic system.

2
The ability to make quick impressions will always be useful.

6
Like most people I sometimes act friendly with my supervisors to get what I want.

3
It is sometimes in the long-range best interest of the child for me to chip away at established power structures.

7
Like having scheduled goals with the child.

4
Sometimes it is fun to "act out" to gain demands.

8
Like knowing that I can get the child to do what is best for him.

9
It is good for the child to depend on himself for realistic expectations.

10
If you want to develop the child's potential it is good to demand the most from him.

11
It's for your own good to know your political position in the institution.

12
Like taking risks in my work with children.

13
It is in the best interest of the child's development that I set an example of how to deal with power hungry authority figures.

14
Like to be treated specially by others.

15
Enjoy demanding the most from the child

16
In order to be competent, I will always need to have my supervisors keep me informed of how I am doing.

17
It is satisfying to break down established structures when you know that is the only way things can get better for the child.

18
Like to watch the child carefully to see how he reacts to me

19
like making a game of institutional politics

20
enjoy learning new things

21
Deep down, my goal is to get the child to do what is best for him.

22
feel good about making expectations absolutely clear to the child
like to depend on those "in the know"

enjoy having my superiors keep me informed of how I am doing

It will be useful to rely upon my own internal standards when dealing with the child.

have fun playing tin soldier kinds of games with the child

glad to see the child depend on himself for realistic expectations

find it exciting to try out as many things on my own as possible

It is gratifying to teach the handicapped child to stand up for himself in a world where he is different.

It is easier and more comfortable to maintain control among pre-schoolers.

I feel a lot more secure knowing my friends are there when I need them.

like to comment on things which are not right

I work hard to teach the child to stand up for himself in a power oriented system.

Sometimes it is gratifying to beat the bureaucratic system to get what you want for the child.

like snappy obedience from children

When things are not right I often tell people, including superiors, straight out.

like to know my friends are there when I need them

enjoy being a strong role model for the child to show him how to fight the system
| 39 | feels good to rely upon my own internal standards when dealing with the child |
| 40 | It is worthwhile to play around with different ways of presenting ideas to the child. |
| 41 | like to play around with different ways to present ideas to the child |
| 42 | By watching how the child reacts to you, you can more accurately help the child develop constructive behaviors. |
| 43 | In the long run it is good to make expectations absolutely clear to the child. |
| 44 | It is worthwhile to try out as many things on my own as possible. |
| 45 | To evaluate my assessments when receiving new information is always useful. |
| 46 | It is ultimately beneficial for the child to follow the same order each day. |
| 47 | To be treated specially by others will always make me feel good. |
| 48 | like working with people who cooperate with me |
| 49 | enjoy knowing my political position in the institution |
| 50 | I find pre-school children more manageable than older ones. |
| 51 | Playing tin soldier kinds of games with the child will be beneficial to him in the future. |
| 52 | It is important to know the individual uniqueness of each child. |
53 Learning new things is always challenging.

54 Maximum benefits are derived by having scheduled goals for the child.

55 Sometimes you have to depend on those "in the know" to make decisions in your best interest.

56 feel comfortable making quick assessments--but am ready to change as new information is received

57 Snappy obedience from children is a benefit to them in the long run.

58 feel comfortable with first impressions

59 I am ready to take risks in my work with children.

60 enjoy looking at the individual uniqueness of each child

61 like the child to follow the same order each day

62 I'm most efficient when I am with people who cooperate with me.

63 enjoy subtle humor that pops the big shot's authority

64 I find humor with a bite is sometimes useful to undermine crystallized power structures.
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