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INTRODUCTION

Adolescence is a period of critical importance for learning. Command over abstraction, language, and metaphor is gradually gained during this time; the capacity for response toward future goals grows and is exercised; the working principles of one's life become established. Students become increasingly more capable of choosing and structuring their learning experiences independent of immediate teacher influence in these years. They become aware of, and form definitive judgments about, both themselves and the people and institutions in their environment.

As Friedenburg (1965) argues, the central developmental task of this time is self-definition: the process of differentiation from the culture. The educational question for students during this time should be, "What do they want to become?" They need situations which enable them to come into possession of their culture by establishing a definition of the relationships they wish to establish in it (Silberman, 1970).

Margaret Mead (1958) writes of the importance of new systems of learning to the progress of our culture:
When we look realistically at the world in which we are living today and become aware of what the actual problems of learning are, our concept of education changes radically.... We are no longer dealing with the vertical transmission of the tried and true by the old, mature, and experienced teachers to the young, immature, and inexperienced pupil. This was a system of education developed in a stable, slowly changing culture. In a world of rapid change, vertical transmission of knowledge alone is not enough. What is needed and what we are already moving toward is the inclusion of another whole dimension of learning; the lateral transmission, to every sentient member of society, of what has just been discovered, invented, created, manufactured, or marketed.

For years, television has been an important means of distributing entertainment and information throughout society. Now the growth of cable television and the Federal Communication Commission's public access provision promises to provide this medium to anyone who wishes to use it as a forum for giving information, expressing viewpoints, or sharing artistic efforts (NCTA, 1973). This opportunity can be of great importance to adolescents in their search for themselves and their culture. They have the means of entering into a dialogue with their communities, of sharing their ideas, feelings, and questions with thousands of other people. To do so they need access to television equipment, training and practice in using it, and the will to take up the challenge of expressing themselves in new ways.

On February 23, 1974, seventy-six high school students attended a small-format television workshop at the Center
of Science and Industry. This workshop was the beginning
of an effort supported by COSI, the Ohio State University's
Academy for Contemporary Problems, the Ohio Institute of
Technology, the Center for Media Development, and the
Datagang Corporation to provide an opportunity for high
school students in Franklin County to become involved in
creating television productions. During the workshop stu-
dents met in small groups to share their ideas on the theme,
*The American City: Where Do We Go From Here?* Each of the
groups planned their afternoon program from a number of op-
tions and prepared a brief production for shooting with the
equipment. The options included hands-on experience with
several television setups—COSI's studio, OIT's color
studio, and four portable videotape recorder and camera
units—as well as the chance to consult with professionals
from the television industry and view videotapes previously
produced by other groups.

Following the workshop, the groups had the opportunity
of entering a television production contest running to
May 20, 1974. Twelve groups entered at the end of the work-
shop, and four more entered in the following month. In
almost every case, the members of the groups organized and
entered the contest on their own initiative, over half of
them without advisors from their schools assisting them.
Each of the groups had access to the studios of the Center
of Science and Industry and the Ohio Institute of Technology
as well as the portable video equipment from COSI and Datagang.

This study is concerned with the struggle of four of the groups to organize their ideas and activities effectively in order to create a television production. Such a task can be difficult for high school students, for schools rarely teach them to fashion their own goals and enter into associations with peers of their choosing to learn the skills and engage in the activities necessary for the attainment of those goals.

Hopefully this study will contribute to our understanding of the conditions under which groups of adolescents gain autonomy, motivation, and effectiveness in working toward common goals involving creative self-expression. From their difficulties and failures we might gain insight into the kinds of support they need; from their successes we might learn the ways in which they can already begin to take the reigns into their own hands in exploring new avenues of communication with their communities.
CHAPTER ONE

PROBLEMS, CONSTRUCTS, AND OBJECTIVES

OF THE INVESTIGATION

I. The Central Problems

In situations in which individuals form a group to reach a common goal, there is a relationship between the nature of the task and the involvement of the group members in achieving it. The goal of the groups in the television production contest was the production of a videotape on the theme, The American City: Where Do We Go From Here? This inquiry is concerned with the relationship between the television production process and the involvement of the groups in it.

The following central questions set the direction and range of the investigation:

QUESTION #1 - Can groups of high-school students, on their own, effectively plan and produce videotape programs on social issues?
QUESTION #2 - What are some conditions under which these groups are motivated and become autonomous in their production activity?

QUESTION #3 - Is a one-day television production workshop sufficient preparation for the planning and production activities of the groups?

QUESTION #4 - What is the nature and distribution of the leadership functions in these fledgling groups?

QUESTION #5 - What is the relationship between the involvement of these groups in their productions, and the creative composition of their scripts?

Valid and reliable descriptive answers to these problems can be approached best through the use of a descriptive construct, or model, of the involvement of a group in the production process.

II. A Model of the Production Process

The following generalized descriptive sequence presents the model which directs the organization and analysis of the data.

1) One or more members of the group attempts to elicit ideas and guidance from the other members in the selection and development of a topic for the production.
2) Through discussion, the members express and evaluate various ideas for the production.

3) An individual member functions as scriptwriter, processing the group's ideas and guidance into a sequence of scenes.

4) With script in hand, the members assume the roles necessary for shooting the production, and the program is created.

Schematically, the model of the production process can be shown:

![Diagram of the production process]

The words under each of the phases labels the lines along which analytic questions are generated.

III. Analytic Questions Generated from the Model

The questions used for analysis of the data are as follows:
1. What procedures were used to elicit guidance from group members for the formation of the script?

2. Who applied these procedures? (the discussion leaders)

3. What was the nature and extent of each member's participation in discussions guiding the formation of the script?

4. Who wrote the script?

5. To what extent did the discussion leaders become involved in the sequencing and writing of the script?

6. To what degree were the ideas of the members incorporated in the script?

7. What responsibilities were assumed by members in the implementation of the script and other production tasks?

The involvement of the four groups is compared in terms of their beginning circumstances, their methods of generating and developing ideas, their organization of ideas into a sequence of scenes, and their implementation of the script. In addition, the influence of the investigator on the four groups is detailed.

IV. Overview of Data-Gathering Procedures

The meetings of the four groups were observed and tape-recorded from the middle of April, 1974, to the television festival on the following May 25. Two three-minute samples of each of the discussions were taken with Bales Interaction Process Analysis. In addition, members were periodically asked to respond to a form asking for their conceptions of
the production's theme and scenes.

Transcription of the bulk of the tape-recordings yielded the anecdotal transcripts, the most comprehensive source of data for the investigation. Tallies made of the number of comments of each member recorded in the anecdotal transcripts and Bales yielded the proportion of each member's contribution to the discussions.

The four production scripts and several other writings from group members were collected for analysis, and copies of the four videotape productions were retained.
CHAPTER TWO

A REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

I. Studies of Group Dynamics

There is a tremendous volume and variety of literature on group structure, psychology, and interaction. In attempting to review the research on group structure, Collins and Raven (1969) complain of the lack of a system of codification with which the studies might be ordered and related in a whole. The present chapter considers the properties of groups and generalizations which have been made about their development, then focuses on the qualities of effective problem-solving behavior. Various approaches to identifying and describing leadership are considered. Finally, reports of groups involved in media production are examined.

The small group is in a strategic position for bringing about changes, for it links persons with larger social systems (Bennis, et al., 1961). The primary task of the group can be that of changing the members, as in therapy or training groups, or it can be planning and effecting changes in a wider social sphere. Homans (1950) uses the distinction
between a group and its external environment to build a process-oriented model of group structure. Defining the elements of social behavior as activity (of individual members), interaction (including both interpersonal communication and interdependent acts), and sentiment (positive and negative feelings of members for each other), Homans distinguishes behavior directed to the solution of environmental problems (the "external system") from behavior prompted by problems in the group's own structure (the "internal system"). Bales (1955) suggests that development of a successful strategy for solving environmental problems involves differentiation, a process which easily threatens the group's internal integration and range of member involvement. As Collins and Raven (1969) point out, the main benefits of the process models are in revealing the extent to which intergroup states affect task accomplishment and the fact that individuals in groups face intergroup problems as well as task problems.

A confusing variety of terms are used to delineate the properties of groups. Bany and Johnson (1964) list: interaction, stratified structure, cohesiveness, sharing of common motives and goals, adherence to norms, and (as an "umbrella" property) group personality. In Collins and Raven's (1969) review of empirical studies of group structure, group properties are considered as "dimensions of interpersonal relations," and include: cohesiveness,
interdependence, communication, power, prestige, role structure, leadership, and locomotion.

Cohesiveness is defined as "the attractiveness of belonging to the group" (Horwitz, 1953) or, with more precision, as "the resultant of all the forces acting on all the members to remain in the group" (Cartwright and Zander, 1960). Before citing studies which positively correlate cohesiveness with morale, communication, interpersonal influence, task performance, and learning, Collins and Raven (1969) summarize Homans' (1950) view of the induction and function of cohesiveness as a structural characteristic:

...An individual may find himself in a position where he cannot obtain his outcomes without participating in group interactions. If the group's efforts are a success, his participation in the group is a reinforcing experience and his attractions to the group are increased. In the meantime, his task-oriented activities have generated new friendships in the group and these friendships... (also) increase his attraction to the group. Now that he values the interaction with his newfound friends, he is more likely to turn to the group as a means to solve his next objective problem, which in turn leads to more interaction—and so on.

Festinger (1950) proposes cohesiveness as a prerequisite for the imposition of group norms on the members. Horwitz (1953) cites one's position in the power structure and the presence of group goals involving cooperative relationships as conditions which increase cohesiveness, while poor task performance, failure of other members to accept the group
goals, and barriers to communication lessen cohesiveness.

Cartwright and Lippitt (1957) conclude their article, "Group Dynamics and the Individual," with a series of statements supported in the literature:

Strong groups do exert strong influences on members toward conformity. These conformity pressures, however, may be directed toward uniformity of thinking and behavior, or they may foster heterogeneity.

Acceptance of these conformity pressures...may satisfy the emotional needs of some members and frustrate others. Similarly, it may support the potential creativity of some members and inhibit that of others.

From their experiences of multiple membership and their personal synthesis of these experiences, individuals do have opportunities to achieve significant bases of individuality.

Because each group is made up of members who are...(in) other groups and who have unique individual interests, each group must continuously cope with deviant tendencies of the members...(which) may represent a source of creative improvement in the life of the group or a source of destructive disruption.

The resolution of these conflicting interests...(seems to be in) a strengthening of both by qualitative improvements in the nature of interdependence between integrated individuals and cohesive groups.

The goals of the group are important determinants of the ways in which the individual interests of members are reconciled and channeled. Schachter (1951) showed that the more relevant standards are to the group's goals and activities, the more strongly are these standards enforced. When
members fail to be steered by group goals, the locomotion of the group is slower and more tangential (Deutsch, 1949), and members become frustrated (Maier, 1956).

Interaction theory centers around the idea that the nature of the group goal creates a "market" for particular qualities, and the perceived possession of these qualities by the members determines the relative role each of them assumes in the group (Sherif, 1948, p. 456). Role differentiation results in some members influencing the actions of others toward the group goal; such influence is leadership. Rather than attempting to define leadership as a set of qualities residing within an individual, interaction theory takes a more functional approach, as Gibb (1969, p. 270) indicates:

Leadership, like any other role behavior, is a function of personal attributes and social system in dynamic interaction. Both leadership structure and individual leader behavior are determined in large part by the nature of the organization in which they occur. Leadership structure is relative, also...to the attitudes and needs of the followers.

Leaders are much more dependent on the dynamics of their groups than they are able to influence these dynamics. As Gibb (1969, p. 269) points out,

...It is one function of a leader to embody and to give expression to the needs and wishes of the group, and to contribute to the
satisfaction of those needs. To the extent that he does this, he may remain the leader; when he fails to perform this function he tends to be superseded—and he fails as soon as the followers perceive his needs and his goal to be divergent from their own.

According to Lippitt (1955, p. 556), studies show a higher morale and greater productivity in groups where leadership functions are distributed. Groups in which leaders involve the other members in the process of solving problems take longer to reach decisions, but implement decisions more rapidly than groups in which leaders make the decisions themselves (Lippitt, 1955, p. 557).

II. Reports on Student Group Productions

There are many accounts in the literature describing the involvement of groups of students—almost always classroom groups—in the production of a film or videotape as a class project. None of them attempt any analysis of the nature of group involvement in the production task, however. Anderson (1973), for example, reported on a project in which educationally disadvantaged students were trained in the use of portable half-inch video equipment, then given the chance to plan and produce videotapes. Although she told of the steps the group took, she did not touch on the dynamics of the groups. The same is true of a report of a school-wide project in Edinburg, Scotland (Beal, 1969). Students and teachers from a variety of academic departments cooperated
in the production of dramatic fiction films. Students wrote the scripts, prepared the sets, costumes, properties, artwork, and credits, took responsibility for lighting, acting, camerawork, sound effects, and editing, and arranged publicity.

In North Reading, Massachusetts, a screen education curriculum was set up in the junior and senior high school English and social studies departments (Hodgkinson, 1970). The courses were:

1) "Screen Fundamentals" (9th grade) - an exploration of visual perceptions and the language of visual and aural media, geared to the development of skills in understanding and using media;

2) "Communications" (11th grade) - a study of the uses of modern media, with practical emphasis on student production of films and videotape;

3) "Screen and Society" (12th grade) - current and recurrent problems of society and their relation to students, treated by viewing and discussion of exemplary feature films, integrated with the social studies curriculum.

The courses were evaluated with student questionnaires, interviews, and a self-knowledge scale as well as classroom observation. Some of the findings were:

...Screen education has the greatest impact on creativity in communications with students in lower grade levels. The factor of "sophistication" in older students appears as an identifiable deterrent to the necessarily simplified exercises....
Films can be an effective starting point for profitable discussion and action. The (Screen and Society) course would increase its success and effectiveness in direct relation to the increase of student involvement....

Successful work in film can be done with a minimal amount of equipment... (a) media workshop is essential....

Only after the student has achieved a good understanding and experience of the skills and structural processes of the media can other areas and disciplines be related.... (Hodgkinson, 1970, pp. 9-27).

Although the North Reading screen education courses were well planned and evaluated as successful, Hodgkinson quotes William Kuhns' warning about overly specific and rigid goals:

...The problem with orientation of goals in film study is not that there are none; quite the opposite— there are almost too many possible goals from which to choose....it may be that film study will flourish when the teacher is not dominated by too clear, too emphatic an approach. Highly defined goals have a way of inhibiting the more creative approaches taken to achieve them....A goal...is important, but more as a starting point than as an expected result. (Hodgkinson, 1970, p. 29)

As a member of the Teachers and Writers Collaborative team in New York City P.S. 90, Phillip Lopate introduced fifth and sixth graders to videotape production:

Videotape proved to be vastly more engrossing and popular than I had anticipated, and I spent the rest of the year doing nothing else with Denise Loftin's class. My whole
mode of operating in the classroom and my re-
lations with the kids changed after the intro-
duction of the machinery, which pushed me into
working with smaller groups on independent,
longer-range projects (Lopate, 1975, p. 92).

He describes the origination, scripting, rehearsals, and
shooting of a number of dramatic productions by the stu-
dents, including The Gangsters and the Girls, The Double
Daters, and Murder Story. Comparing his experiences in
student film production with the videotape efforts, he says:

In contrast (to film), videotape seems a
shockingly sophisticated medium which delivers
more information than its users intended or
bargained for. In the Super-8 films we laughed
more with the kids, as creators; in the Murder
videotape we laugh more at them (Lopate, 1975,
p. 99).

As the students gained experience with the equipment and
began to prepare their productions more carefully, the pro-
ductions increased in complexity, with a rendition of West
Side Story as the apex. They also videotaped a series of
"portraits," or interviews with teachers and administrators,
and a documentary on the school lunchroom. The problem of
how to display the videotapes was solved when a local cable-
television station gave P.S. 90 a half-hour slot each week
for broadcast of their productions (Lopate, 1975, p. 115).

It makes a great deal more sense to engage in videotape
production if the results can be viewed by a larger audience
than the participants. The National Cable Television
Association's booklet, *Cable Television and Education: A Report from the Field* (1973) cites a number of situations in which students have planned and produced videotapes for local cable distribution. One example is the experiment in Amberst, Massachusetts:

In late 1970, John LeBaron and several colleagues at the University of Massachusetts Media Center began a project called "Kideo Video" to put half-inch video equipment at the disposal of fifth and sixth graders. The purpose of the project was to allow the children to produce their own programming with as little adult supervision as possible....

Originally aired as part of the morning show of a local TV station, the children's production moved to cable as the *Children's Video Theater*, where they could stand on their own without interruption (NCTA, 1973, p. 21).

Most of the productions described in the NCTA booklet were documentaries. In Poughkeepsie, N. Y., middle school students produced *Poughkeepsie: Change Over the Years*, in which they interviewed community officials and leaders on the city's past and present. The tape was shown via cable. Students in Reading, Pennsylvania taped a program at a center for the mentally retarded which focussed on the needs of the institution and the ways in which interested viewers could help (NCTA, 1973, p. 22). Teenagers in Newburgh, New York, went to the town jail to tape a program which was shown over the Newburgh cable system's local
Accounts of videotape productions by students (Lopate, 1975; Anderson, 1973; NCTA, 1973) reveal the necessity of a period of training in the use of the equipment and basic production techniques, but thereafter additional external help, while useful, is apparently not essential to the groups' growth in skill. The experience of the production activities themselves appears to be the prime and sufficient motivator and learning experience for these groups. Of course, there are many ways in which teachers and advisors can and should help catalyze the growth of student production groups in sophistication. Once the members of a group learn the basic skills involved in videotape production, however, they seem to develop an autonomy in future production activities.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

The problem of this investigation is the nature of the involvement of adolescent groups in the task of producing videotape programs. The present chapter describes the procedures used to conduct the inquiry. They include the arrangement of a television workshop and production contest, selection of groups for observation, the gathering of data, and preparation of the data for analysis by questions generated by the model.

I. The Production Workshop and Contest

In order to catalyze the formation of autonomous production groups, a television workshop and a television production contest were organized with the cooperation of the Center of Science and Industry, Center for Media Development, Ohio State University's Academy for Contemporary Problems, Ohio Institute of Technology, and Datagang Corporation. Brochures explaining the workshop and contest were sent to nearly all the city, county, and private junior and senior high schools in Franklin County.
The workshop was held at the Center of Science and Industry on Saturday, February 23, 1974, and was attended by seventy-six students and twelve teachers from seventeen schools. The contest theme, The American City: Where Do We Go From Here? was explained and participants met in small groups for production planning in the morning. In the afternoon the participants had opportunities to use both portable and studio half-inch videotape equipment and discuss their plans with television professionals. At the end of the day twelve groups entered the television production contest; four more groups would enter in the weeks to come. No prizes were specified, although the groups were told that the videotapes would be judged on the basis of originality, appropriateness to the theme, and impact on the viewer. May 20, 1974, was set as the deadline for submission of videotapes.

II. Selection of Groups for Investigation

The activity of the production groups was monitored through contacts with members or advisors during the month of March, 1974. Few groups held regular meetings for planning their productions until April, however. Groups were selected for investigation by the following criteria:
1) the likelihood that the group would complete a videotape by the May 20 deadline;
2) the members of the group were self-selected and self-directed in their production activities;
3) the group had between four and ten members;
4) the group had regular meetings which could be observed.

The groups chosen are designated in this study as the Alpha group, the Beta group, the Gamma group, and the Delta group. All met the selection criteria.

III. Data-Gathering Procedures

In his first meeting with each of the groups, the investigator asked and received permission from the members to observe and tape-record their discussions. He offered to advise them on technical matters in return, but asked them not to involve him in their discussions otherwise. His influence on the groups is detailed in Section V of Chapter Four.

The discussion meetings of the four groups were tape-recorded; their shooting sessions were not. Two three-minute samples of member participation were taken from each discussion meeting, using Bales Interaction Process Analysis form. Members were periodically asked to complete a form Where Are We Now?, containing the questions:
1. What do you want to say? (Put it in 3 simple sentences)

2. What pictures will you use to express these ideas?

3. What sounds will you use to express these ideas?

4. What is the most important thing the group must do next?

It was administered with the instruction, "Write down what you want your production to express, as clearly as you can." Members usually took between five and eight minutes to complete it. On occasions when time was short, members were instructed to skip the last question. In several of the groups, members discussed their responses on the form as a means of clarifying and coming to consensus on the ideas they wanted their production to contain. Samples of completed Where Are We Now? forms are in the rear of Appendix B.

The four scripts and several other writings produced by members of the groups were collected, and are reproduced in Appendix C. A 3/4 inch cassette dub was made of the four completed half-inch videotape productions, and retained.

IV. Preparation of the Data for Analysis

Anecdotal transcripts were prepared from the tape-recordings of the meetings. By "anecdotal transcript" is meant the verbatim account of conversations illustrating the general thrust of the meeting, the leadership functions
performed, and the nature of the interaction, typed chronologically and linked with appropriate descriptive comment. Representative transcripts are in Appendix B. Tallys were made of the direct and attributed comments of each of the members recorded in the transcripts. Percentages were calculated to show the proportion of each member's participation in the discussions. These were then compared with the proportion of member comments in the Bales Interaction Process Analysis samplings.

The representation of members ideas in the script was found by comparing the themes and scenes contained in the script with the previous occurrence of those themes and scenes in the anecdotal transcripts and in the responses of the Where Are We Now? form.

Information on the four Gamma group meetings which were not observed was gathered in interviews with two of the members and the adviser. One of the members, subsequently identified by analysis as the primary leader, wrote a description of the early activities and background of the Gamma group at the investigator's request.

The data was analyzed by searching it for descriptive answers to the questions generated from the model. Table 1 on the following page lists these questions with the sources of information probed for answers. The data also provided accounts for a comparison of the four groups in terms of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANALYTIC QUESTION</th>
<th>DATA SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What procedures were used to elicit guidance from group members for the formation of the script?</td>
<td>Anecdotal transcripts of tape-recorded meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Who applied these procedures? (the discussion leaders)</td>
<td>Anecdotal transcripts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What was the nature and extent of each member's participation in discussions guiding the formation of the script?</td>
<td>Anecdotal transcripts; Tally of the proportion of each member's comments in anecdotal transcripts and Interaction Process Analysis samplings; Written responses to Where Are We Now? form questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Who wrote the script?</td>
<td>Observer's notes; Anecdotal transcripts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To what extent did the discussion leaders become involved in scriptwriting?</td>
<td>Comparison of answers to #2 and #4; Anecdotal transcripts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. To what extent were the ideas of the members incorporated in the script?</td>
<td>Comparison of script with anecdotal transcripts and Where Are We Now? responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. What responsibilities were assumed by the members in the shooting of the script and other production tasks?</td>
<td>Observer's notes; Anecdotal transcripts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
their beginning circumstances, their method of generating and developing ideas, their organization of ideas into a sequence of scenes, and their implementation of the script.
CHAPTER FOUR

AN ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

I. The Analytic Approach

A. Development of the Analytic Questions

The central and instrumental questions applied to the data were developed from different questions, formulated before the groups were observed. These early questions were:

#1 - Does a greater clarity and convergence of the group members' conceptions of their production's ideas and structure correlate with a greater distribution among the members of leadership roles and responsibility for production tasks?

#2 - Will a member whose conception of the production's ideas and structure differs from the conceptions of the other members be less involved in leadership roles and responsibility for production tasks?

#3 - Will groups which give attention to both task roles and group building roles be those with clearer and more convergent conceptions of their productions' ideas and structure than groups which neglect group building roles?

The questions were based on the following definition of the production process: the process of clarifying and
specifying ideas into a sequence of images and sounds recorded on videotape in order to communicate those ideas to others. Group involvement in the process was pictured as a progression to greater distribution of leadership functions and task responsibility among the members as their conceptions of the production grew clearer and more convergent. Attempts to apply this model to the data collected proved futile, however. Neither the anecdotal transcripts nor the Where Are We Now? form responses showed any growth in the clarity or convergence of ideas before the scripts were written, the distribution of leadership functions did not appear to increase through time, and distribution of responsibility for production tasks was limited by the number of tasks available. In each of the four groups, the emergence of a clear plan for the production was the composition of a script, a function performed by individuals in the groups rather than by the groups themselves. The model was re-formulated to place leadership and group participation in the position of aiding the scriptwriter:

1) One or more members of the group attempts to elicit ideas and guidance from the other members in the selection and development of a topic for the production.

2) Through discussion, the members express and evaluate various ideas for the production.

3) An individual member functions as scriptwriter, processing the group's ideas and guidance into a sequence of scenes.
4) With script in hand the members assume the roles necessary for shooting the production, and the program is created.

The central questions heading the model and the analytic questions generated from it were revised accordingly, orienting the present description to a more meaningful explanation of the data collected.

B. Procedures for Applying the Analytic Questions

In the first chapter the relationship between the analytic questions, the model of the production process, and the central questions of the study was considered. This relationship is schematically summarized in Table 2. The questions generated from the model and applied to the data are:

1. What procedures were used to elicit guidance from group members for the formation of the script?
2. Who applied these procedures? (the discussion leaders)
3. What was the nature and extent of each member's participation in discussions guiding the formation of the script?
4. Who wrote the script?
5. To what extent did the discussion leaders become involved in the writing of the script?
6. To what degree were the ideas of the members incorporated in the script?
7. What responsibilities were assumed by members in the implementation of the script and other production tasks?
TABLE 2: A MODEL OF THE PRODUCTION PROCESS IN STUDENT GROUPS
AND THE ANALYTIC FRAMEWORK OF THE STUDY

**PRODUCTION PROCESS**

- **DISCUSSION LEADER** applies procedures to elicit guidance from members for topic development
  - #1
  - #2

- **MEMBERS** offer and evaluate various ideas
  - #3

- **SCRIPTWRITER** processes the group's ideas into a scenic sequence
  - #4
  - #5
  - #6
  - #7

**ANALYTIC QUESTIONS**

- **SOURCES OF INFORMATION**
  - Anecdotal transcripts
  - Bales IPA
  - Where Are We Now? form responses

- **LEADERSHIP**
- **PARTICIPATION**
- **REPRESENTATION**
- **RESPONSIBILITY**

**ANALYSIS OF MEMBER INVOLVEMENT**
The background and composition of the groups is described as a context for the application of these questions. The analysis of each of the four groups follows, organized for each under the headings, Leadership, Participation, Representation, and Responsibility. The groups are then compared in terms of their beginning circumstances, their means of developing topics, the organization of their ideas into sequential scripts, and their implementation of the scripts. Finally, the influence of the investigator and the process of observation on the interaction of the groups is described.

II. The Groups Investigated

A. General Background

The Workshop. A television production workshop was held at the Center of Science and Industry on February 23, 1974. The purpose of the workshop was to provide an opportunity for high-school students in the Columbus area to become acquainted with portable and studio half-inch video equipment. Seventy-six students and twelve teachers from seventeen schools attended the workshop.

At the end of the workshop, participants were invited to form groups and enter a video production contest. The contest's theme, "The American City: Where Do We Go From Here?", was explained, and May 20 was set as the deadline for submitting videotapes.
The Production Groups. Twelve groups from eight schools entered the contest at the end of the workshop; four additional groups entered in the following weeks. Of the fifty-six students in the groups, thirty-three (59%) had attended the workshop. Seven of the sixteen groups completed videotapes. This and other data are summarized in the table on the next page.

Although a third of the students and teachers at the workshop were from junior high-schools, none of them entered the contest.

B. Membership and Activities of the Groups Investigated

The Alpha Group. A month after she attended the workshop at the Center of Science and Industry, the media teacher at Alpha High School contacted the investigator and asked for help in obtaining television equipment for a group of her students interested in producing a videotape program. The investigator visited her class with a portable half-inch videotape recorder and camera on April 5. Since none of the students had attended the workshop, they were shown how to operate the equipment and told the basic features and limitations of the equipment in producing a program. Examples of productions that might be done on the theme, The American City: Where Do We Go From Here? were also discussed.
### TABLE 3: GROUPS ENTERING THE VIDEO PRODUCTION CONTEST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP'S SCHOOL</th>
<th>COMPOSITION OF GROUP</th>
<th>NO. AT WORKSHOP</th>
<th>ADVISOR AT MEETINGS?</th>
<th>TAPE ENTERED?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bexley</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brookhaven</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastmoor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northland</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walnut Ridge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walnut Ridge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walnut Ridge</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watterson</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watterson</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whetstone</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthington</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS:**
- 16 groups
- 56 Total (79%)
- 44 Male (21%)
- 12 Female (59%)
- 33 Advisor at Meetings (38%)
- 6 Tape Entered (44%)
As a result of the April 5 meeting, 8 male and 2 female 11th and 12th grade students chose to be included in a video production group.* Their participation fulfilled a class requirement, and they met on media class time. Meetings were held in a small, rectangular room, usually twice a week. The investigator attended their meetings as an observer. His participation was normally limited to answering questions relating to the use of the equipment.

The discussions of the Alpha group gradually came to center on the housing problem and the efforts of the Columbus Metropolitan Housing Authority to provide adequate public housing. They began shooting on May 13 and completed their production on May 17, three days before the deadline. It was shown along with others at a video festival on May 25.

Table 4 lists the meetings of the Alpha group and the data gathered by the observer.

The Beta Group. The media teacher at Beta High School arranged to have the investigator meet with her class on April 8. After demonstrating the use of the portable video equipment to the entire class, the investigator met with four twelfth grade male and three eleventh grade female students who had chosen to work as a group on a TV

*One female student formally withdrew from the group after its third meeting.
### TABLE 4: OVERVIEW OF ALPHA GROUP MEETINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>MIN. LONG</th>
<th>MEMBERS PRESENT</th>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>DATA GATHERED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Use of the TV equipment is demonstrated to the media class</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/11</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Video contest is explained; members &quot;brainstorm&quot; for ideas</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>First discussion: the rise, fall, and rebirth of the city</td>
<td>TR, Bales, WAWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Public housing is proposed and chosen as the group's topic</td>
<td>TR, Bales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Images for storyboarding are discussed</td>
<td>Bales, WAWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/29</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Interview sources and questions are planned</td>
<td>TR, Bales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Calls to CMHA officials planned; apathy in the group discussed</td>
<td>TR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/3</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Members practice using TV equipment at two housing projects</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ideas for treating public housing are sequentially outlined</td>
<td>TR, Bales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>A sequential narration and accompanying shots are developed</td>
<td>TR, Bales, WAWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/13</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Opening scenes shot from rooftop and downtown street corner</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/15</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Shooting of downtown crowds, the CMHA offices, and an interview</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/17</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Shooting at three locations; narration dubbed over crowd scene</td>
<td>WAWN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data abbreviations: TR = meeting tape-recorded; Bales = two 3-minute samples of discussion taken with Bales Interaction Process Analysis; WAWN = the Where Are We Now? form is completed.
production. Their participation in the group fulfilled a class requirement for a media project.

Although five students in the class had attended the video workshop with the media teacher, only two of them were in the Beta production group. The group's leader, Ed R, was chosen by the media teacher. Meetings were held twice a week from April 22 on, either in an unused classroom or in a small office attached to the library.

From the first meetings, group discussion centered around the growth of the city and the movement of people and businesses to the suburbs. The group videotaped their production May 17, 20, and 22. It was shown at the video festival on May 25. Table 5 summarizes their meetings and the data gathered.

The Gamma Group. Two senior girls at Gamma High School persuaded three of their friends to join them in attending COSI's video workshop. The five decided to enter a videotape in the production contest, and got a teacher to agree to act as their advisor. Holding their first meeting in the home of one of the members, they appointed a camera operator and note-taker and began planning their production. Neither the advisor or investigator were present at this meeting.

The investigator arranged to join the group as an observer after their fourth meeting. The meetings were held after school in a classroom, usually with the advisor
**TABLE 5: OVERVIEW OF BETA GROUP MEETINGS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>MIN. LONG</th>
<th>MEMBERS PRESENT</th>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>DATA GATHERED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4/8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Use of video equipment is demonstrated to the media class</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/22</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Members write and discuss ideas on the growth of the city</td>
<td>TR, Bales, WAWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Subjects on the topic sheet are probed for production ideas</td>
<td>TR, Bales, WAWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Members attempt to organize their ideas and generate a title</td>
<td>TR, Bales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Topic sheet subjects are discussed and interviews planned</td>
<td>TR, Bales, WAWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/7</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Results of research and interviews are reported to the group</td>
<td>TR, Bales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/9</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Film shown; two narrative segments read; several shots planned</td>
<td>TR, Bales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/14</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>A visitor from the mayor's office tells of plans for downtown</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/17</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>First day of videotaping</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/20</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Second day of videotaping</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/22</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Third and final day of videotaping</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data abbreviations: TR = meeting tape-recorded; Bales = two 3-minute samples of discussion taken with Bales Interaction Process Analysis; WAWN = the Where Are We Now? form is completed.
TABLE 6: OVERVIEW OF GAMMA GROUP MEETINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>MIN. LONG</th>
<th>MEMBERS PRESENT</th>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>DATA GATHERED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4/25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Members relate past experiences and ask about TV equipment</td>
<td>WAWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/30</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Titling techniques and images for opening scenes are discussed</td>
<td>TR, Bales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/2</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Opening title and poem shot; taping of first scene planned</td>
<td>TR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/6</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>First four scenes with narration shot on four locations</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/14</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Nature scenes with narration shot at Bexley Park</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/19</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Videotape reviewed and timed, and audio dub made, at COSI</td>
<td>TR, WAWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/21</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Final scene with narration and credits shot at COSI</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data abbreviations: TR = meeting tape-recorded; Bales = two 3-minute samples of discussion taken with Bales Interaction Process Analysis; WAWN = the Where Are We Now? form is completed.
present. The group planned to show a commuter to the city going through his daily routine, with a voice-over narration providing commentary. They began shooting May 2 and finished May 21. Their videotape was shown at the festival on May 25. Table 6 summarizes their activities.

The Delta Group. A month before the deadline for the submission of completed videotapes, the media teacher at Delta High School arranged to have the investigator visit her class. She indicated that a group in the class was interested in producing a videotape program, although none of them had attended the video workshop two months earlier. The investigator demonstrated the use of the portable, half-inch videotape recorder and camera and explained the production contest to the Delta group on April 24, 1974. The group, made up of five eleventh and twelfth grade students and the advisor, met an average of twice a week from April 29 to May 19; a sixth member joined the group for its last two discussion meetings and one of the two shooting sessions. On May 12 and 19 they taped their production of a talk-show satire on garbage in the city. The tape was shown at the video festival on May 25. The table on the next page summarizes their activities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>MIN. LONG</th>
<th>MEMBERS PRESENT</th>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>DATA GATHERED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4/24</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Use of the portable TV equipment is demonstrated to media class</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/29</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Effects of cities on people are discussed</td>
<td>TR, Bales, WAWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Discussion ends with idea of showing a man addicted to the city</td>
<td>TR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Development of drugs-cities parallel is attempted</td>
<td>TR, Bales, WAWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ideas generated for showing parallels between cities and drugs</td>
<td>TR, Bales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Cities-drugs parallel rejected; satirical talk-show script given</td>
<td>TR, Bales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/12</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>First taping of talk-show script at the COSI studio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/20</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Second taping of several talk-show segments at COSI studio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/23</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Segments from the two tapes are assembled onto a master tape</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data abbreviations: TR = meeting tape-recorded; Bales = two 3-minute samples of discussion taken with Bales Interaction Process Analysis; WAWN = the Where Are We Now? form is completed.
III. An Analysis of the Data

A. The Alpha Group

Leadership. Discussions of the Alpha group were generally managed by Dave I and Jim F. Dave I, a student member of the school board, was the primary leader. At his direction the group narrowed a large number of their ideas to one by the end of the first discussion meeting. It should be noted, however, that only five of the nine members in attendance were participants in the discussion to narrow the topic; the others rarely made substantive contributions to the discussions. None of the Alpha leaders ever succeeded in engaging the non-contributors in serious discussion relevant to the production after the first meeting. The problem bothered Dave I, Jim F, and the other participating members, and several attempts were made to gain ideas and evaluation from the entire group.

The most direct attempt was made by Rich H at the beginning of the May 6 meeting. After a five-minute lull in the discussion,

Mike K: "How much of a schedule (time) do we have?"
Rich H: "Enough."
Mike K: "How are we going to start it off?"
Jim F: "Is anyone capable of writing a script?"
Rich H: "Well, let's start at the beginning with an introduction. Everybody involved? (Allison H
saying something unintelligible) How we gonna start off an introduction?"

Dave I: "We've got to decide what we're going to do."

Rich H: "Obviously, it's the housing problem."

Dave I: "Yeah, but we've got to decide what area we want... which direction..."

Rich H: "OK, let's put all these directions down on a piece of paper, and then go from there. We've got the directions.... (To several inattentive members) We've got to start off with an introduction. This is the introduction."

Although Rich H did not successfully involve the non-contributing members, he persuaded the active ones to outline and plan the sections of the production, an important contribution as it turned out.

The above exchange shows evidence of another problem the group faced; deciding on and developing a script around a format. In the second meeting, no attempt was made to develop the "rise, fall, and future of the downtown area" topic agreed on at the end of the first meeting. Instead, Jim F suggested treating the housing problem and the housing projects of the Columbus Metropolitan Housing Authority. Participants discussed many ideas about what could be shown on this topic—interviews with people living in public housing units, city and state officials, shots of the facilities, etc.—but did not begin to organize their ideas into a sequential script until May 6, when Rich H persuaded them to do so.
In a group without the problem of chronic quiescence, the contributions of Jim F might be described as those of an involved participant. In the context of the Alpha group, however, both the nature and the extent of his participation qualify him as a leader. The group's production topic as well as the format used to treat it were his idea, expressed midway through the April 16 meeting:

Jim F: "I did a report for history—"

Dave I: "Did what?"

Jim F: "—on Columbus Metropolitan Housing—the city gave me all this information....and so she (the woman he contacted) said like we could go around to the housing units that they have, and we could interview the girl that she talked to...."

Dave I: "Interview a few rats." (Laughter)

Jim F: "You could show the fact that they have these (housing units), put a few interviews in it, and, y'know it's only going to be thirty minutes, and you couldn't, y'know talk about the city and everything...."

Discussions after this contribution were attempts to develop and elaborate on it. As noted above, the group's discussions took the path of hammering out a script format only after Rich H's May 6 prodding.

Jim F's role in developing the CMHA idea into a production was as central as that of Dave I. In fact, serious discussion in the Alpha group after April 16 was almost always discussion between Dave I and Jim F with occasional comments from other members. It should not be concluded
that Dave I and Jim F monopolized the conversation or that they were the only members involved in it. Although the non-contributing half of the group rarely evidenced interest in the discussions, two other members usually gave signs of following the conversations and occasionally expressed their questions and ideas.

At times, Jim F's leadership role was an extension of Dave I's; in other words, he acted as Dave I's "lieutenant." In the April 29 meeting, for example, Jim F asked for volunteers from the group to conduct interviews of CMHA officials after Dave I outlined officials to be included and suggested that the same interviewers should talk to all those interviewed. A while later, Jim F asked Dave I what areas of questions might be used, what should be done if the officials on one level blame those on another level, and so on, writing down many of Dave I's ideas. At the end of the meeting, Jim F summarized those who were interviewing officials (Mike K volunteered with Dave I and Jim F himself) and the kind of questions they would ask. When Dave I became angry at one member's apparent apathy about the need to come up with ideas for pictures the production could show, Jim F quickly suggested a visual contrast between run-down commercial rental property and maintained CMHA housing.

Although Jim F came up with and helped develop the public housing idea, Dave I is the one who transformed the concepts and images discussed into a narrative script. Dave
I's role as discussion leader and script writer is shown most clearly in the May 8 meeting. Jim F suggested they start off the production with an introduction to Columbus. Dave I said it would be best to open with a shot of the city from the southwest. He then gave an idea of how the narrative might run:

Dave I: "'This is Columbus, Ohio. It is a very typical midwestern city, and, like most cities, it has grown.' ...talk about growth in size, especially."

Dave I pauses as Jim F notes his comment on the blackboard.

Dave I: "Then--the lead line would be something like, 'All this growth means more and more people in central Ohio.' (pause) That's your fade....we lead after that into an overhead downtown sidewalk view, and hopefully we can catch it as the (traffic) light turns, so we can get some people walking...."

There follows a discussion among Dave I, Jim F, and Mike K on the visuals that could be used to show the need for housing for the expanding Columbus population. Then,

Dave I: "From there we cut to the CMHA office. The lead line there'll be, 'One organization working on the problem in the central Ohio area is the Columbus Metropolitan Housing Authority,' and then what they're doing....That would be the place for (an) interview. Then we can swing into individual areas...."

Mike K suggested Bolivar Arms as a place to show housing for senior citizens. Dave I agreed. Shortly thereafter, Mike K asked Dave I about interviewing tenants to get their opinion of the CMHA. Dave I hesitated, then suggested that
the camera show as fairly as possible what the CMHA guide at a housing facility described, but said that the group didn't have the time or resources "to do an in-depth attack" on CMHA's failures, and therefore should not attempt to do so. If the CMHA officials paint too rosy a picture, Dave suggested, a pre-summary could explain that all is not perfect.

Dave I expected the whole group to participate in the narrowing and development of ideas for the production. On April 16 he complained about the group's lack of interest in the topic agreed on the day before: "Everybody wanted to do this idea, but I don't think we've mentioned downtown once." He led the April 16, 23, and 29 discussions of the public housing topic, but did not assume the task of specifying a visual and narrative sequence until the May 8 meeting. His decision to write the script may have been prompted by several influences. In the beginning of May the observer advised Jim F, Mike K, and Dave I to go ahead with the production themselves and not wait for the rest of the members to participate in developing a script. In the May 6 meeting, as noted above, Rich H impressed on the participants that they had to develop their ideas into a sequential format in order to get anywhere. Consciousness of time may well have been the main factor. On May 8, the deadline for completion of the videotape production was only twelve days away. If a script was not written right
away, there might be no production.

**Participation.** There was a great variability in the extent to which different members of the Alpha group took part in discussions. A tally of the number of comments made by each member during five of the discussion meetings shows five of the nine members—Mike M, Rob K, Dave S, Tom K, and Allison H—responsible for only 15% (Bales: 21%) of the comments, while Dave I and Jim F alone account for 63% (49%) of the comments. Table 8 shows this and other data on the participation of Alpha group members.

Although Mike K and Rich H show only 9% (7%) and 6% (17%) respectively, they usually paid attention to serious group discussion and participated in it from time to time. Rich H's greatest participation came in the May 6 meeting when he led the other active members to structure their ideas in a sequential form, a contribution which is described above in the leadership section. Mike K was less a leader but more of a participant than Rich H. Even though Mike K's verbal contributions were less frequent than those of Dave I or Jim F, he always took part in their discussions. He was the only member that attended all of the group's twelve meetings. When Jim F asked for volunteers to interview CMHA officials, Mike K was the only member besides Dave I to agree to do so. On April 16 Mike K suggested that the production on public housing show the lives
### TABLE 8: PARTICIPATION OF ALPHA GROUP MEMBERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEMBER</th>
<th>ATTENDANCE AT DISCUS'N MEETINGS</th>
<th>ATTENDANCE AT SHOOTING SESSIONS</th>
<th>PROPORTION OF COMMENTS IN TRANS(^1)</th>
<th>ROLE DURING SHOOTING SESSIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dave I</td>
<td>7/8</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>28% director, narrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim F</td>
<td>8/8</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>21% camera operator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike M</td>
<td>6/8</td>
<td>2/4</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8% -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob K</td>
<td>7/8</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4(^3) -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike K</td>
<td>8/8</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7% VTR operator, camera operator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich H</td>
<td>5/8</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>17% -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave S</td>
<td>4/8</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8% -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom K</td>
<td>5/8</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4(^3) -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allison H</td>
<td>6/8</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2(^3) -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observer</td>
<td>8/8</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>- techadvisan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

56/72 (78%) 13/36 (36%)  
\(n = 120\) \(n = 98\)

---

1. Tallied from the anecdotal transcripts of the first, second, fourth, seventh, and eighth discussion meetings.

2. Tallied from the Bales Interaction Process Analysis samplings of the first, second, third, fourth, seventh, and eighth discussion meetings.

3. If entries in Bales category 11, which includes "withdraws out of field," are omitted, percentages for Rob K, Tom K, and Allison H are 2, 3, and 0, respectively.
and problems of the residents. He brought the idea up again in the May 8 meeting, but Dave I argued against it, saying that the group didn't have the time to adequately probe resident complaints.

Mike M frequently participated in the joking around that occurred in the Alpha meetings, but rarely was involved in serious discussions. His participation decreased after the April 29 meeting. During that meeting, the following exchange occurred:

Mike M: "What's our message?"
Dave I: "Well, I don't know; let's see where it goes."
Mike K: "We're looking for a message, but maybe that's not the way we should go about it; we should just wait and see what message is out there."

Dave I: "One possible message that I was thinking about...is, well, if everybody cares about (the importance of decent public housing), why isn't it working? And I'd like to get their reactions--"

Mike M (who had interrupted Dave I during the previous explanation): "Not enough money?"
Dave I: "Possibly. But then--"
Mike M: "Apathy. Some people--"
Dave I: "Well, I'd like to bring that out, y'know, whose fault--"
Mike M: "How many interviews do you need? I'll give you all the answers to that."

Dave I: "Oh, OK, we're done, good-bye--Why, why is there a problem? Because you're a fool. Thank you."
Dave S, Allison H, Tom K, and Rob K seldom took part in the discussions. From the anecdotal transcript of the April 23 meeting:

...Images for storyboarding were discussed, primarily by Dave I and Jim F. During the discussion Dave S was filling out some form, Mike M was reading a newspaper, and Rob K and Tom K were reading from textbooks. Near the end of the discussion, Rob K appeared to be listening to the discussion and made some comments contributing to it. (Allison H was absent.)

Another example is this entry from the May 8 meeting:

...Allison H and Rob K spoke to each other in a low tone of voice frequently during the meeting, with almost no participation in discussion of the production. (Dave S was absent.)

In the second meeting (April 15) Dave S read the ideas written down by the members and contributed to the group's discussion of those ideas. His participation dropped sharply from the next day's meeting onward, however. He volunteered to take pictures of inner-city houses for the organization of a storyboard, but never did so.

**Representation.** As noted in the leadership section above, what turned out to be the group's production topic was first suggested by Jim F. In response to the Where Are We Now? form's first question, "What do you want to say?", Jim F's April 15 answer was: "That urban housing is inadequate at the present time, and the plans for the future
and the funds for improvement are lacking." On the same form he suggested showing housing developments and conducting interviews with CMHA authorities, all of which were eventually done. His ideas were read at the April 15 meeting, but it was during the next day's meeting, when he brought them up again, that Dave I moved to accept them as the topic for the production. By the third meeting, on April 23, all the members had indicated the "problem of public housing" on their Where Are We Now? form.

In the beginning of the discussions on the public housing topic, many members expressed the desire to have the production carry a "message" or expose an injustice. In the April 16 meeting Mike M put it this way: "This sounds good—we're going to shake a few taxpayers up." In the April 23 Where Are We Now?, Rich H and Rob K suggest comparing suburban housing with run-down inner city housing. From the April 29 meeting:

Jim F... asked what if the problems (of inadequate public housing) are blamed on state and federal authorities by local people. Dave I replied that these questions could then be put to those on the state and federal levels....

Jim F: "What happens if we go to the state and they say, 'No, it's not a problem'?

Dave I: "Then we go to the residents and show all these crappy houses, and we have back and forth between this guy saying there is no problem, and then we have rats running across...proving that there is a problem, and then we fade out and go, 'Thank you'...."
Dave I then thought of the possibility that the authorities and residents might blame each other for the problem.

In the same meeting, however, Mike K and Dave I shied away from organizing the production around a preset message in favor of a more objective presentation:

Mike M: "What's our message?"

Dave I: "Well, I don't know; let's see where it goes."

Mike K: "We're looking for a message, but maybe that's not the way we should go about it, we should just wait and see what message is out there."

In the end, the production presented the work of the Columbus Metropolitan Housing Authority as an attempt to meet the city's need for adequate public housing. The production ended with the following narration:

There are problems with public housing: federal money is often hard to get, the public is sometimes hostile to the idea, even the fact that this housing exists is not widely known. The local housing agencies like the Columbus Metropolitan Housing Authority are working on the problem. So the answer to the question, "Do people still have to live like this?" is "No."

During the May 8 meeting, as noted in the leadership section, Dave I developed Jim F's idea into a sequential script. Jim F suggested the production begin with an introduction to the city of Columbus; Dave I accepted and built on the suggestion. Mike K suggested Bolivar Arms as a place to show housing for senior citizens, and Dave I again
agreed. With these exceptions, the script's narrative and visual particulars were the work of Dave I.

Responsibility. The shooting of the Alpha production was done by Dave I, as scriptwriter, director, and narrator; Jim F, as camera operator; Mike K, as videotape-recorder operator and camera operator in Jim F's absence (at one session); and the observer, as technical advisor. Mike M joined these four at the first shooting session, which was spent practicing with the equipment, and the last, in which the closing sequences and credits were shot. Although he practiced using the camera in the first session, the positions of camera operator, VTR operator, and narrator were already filled when he attended the last session, and he had nothing else to do.

B. The Beta Group

Leadership. Ed R was appointed leader of the Beta group by the media teacher at the time the group was formed. Throughout the meetings of the group he began and directed the discussions, soliciting ideas from the other members, summarizing and interpreting their comments, and keeping them to the task of developing the production.

Ed R used two devices to elicit ideas from the members: the Where Are We Now? form and the topic sheet, The American City: Where Do We Go From Here? At the group's first discussion meeting on April 22, members filled out the Where
Are We Now? form at the observers request. Ed R then read each of the member's remarks to the group, asking for interpretation from the author and comments from the other members as he went along. As a starting point for their thinking and discussion, the observer gave each of the members a copy of the topic sheet, The American City: Where Do We Go From Here? prior to the first meeting. After the group had heard and discussed their written ideas, Ed R briefly read over the topics listed on this sheet.

In the second meeting, on April 25, Ed R summarized the ideas discussed on April 22, then used the headings on the topic sheet to solicit additional ideas from the group. He gave this orientation at the beginning of the meeting:

...You talk about growth? One thing we'll have to do is, we're going to have to film to show the good and bad aspects of growth, we're going to have to decide what we mean by good and bad. And then, the growth is occurring away from the city now; cities aren't growing anymore, it's the outskirts that are growing, they're becoming more like the city. And transportation (looking at the topic sheet), that would be going under lifestyle too; what growth has done to people's lives, how it's affected them; and transportation is part of that. OK, and then, one question was brought up: What can we do to make growth help man, and not just destroy the environment?....

We have decided what the approach is gonna be like, a documentary, with a narrator or something. Kind of like the "Sixty-Minutes" pattern or something, the television show. So now we have to decide on what (we mean) when we say, "the good and bad aspects of cities'
growth," I think we have to expound on it; so if anyone has any ideas—What do you mean when you say, well, let's just take "crowding" first, to start off with.

Near the end of the meeting, the observer handed out the Where Are We Now? forms and asked the members to list their ideas again, a suggestion that met with groans from several members. Before the group began completing the form, Ed R read aloud his notes on what had been discussed so far. When they had finished writing, Ed R said, "Let's go around and read what you have; Bob, you want to start?" They then read and explained their comments, and the meeting ended.

In the first two meetings the group had discussed a variety of ideas, far too many to be treated in one production. Ed R set the task of narrowing the topic at the beginning of the third meeting (April 30). After a reminder from Al H, with whom Ed R had apparently discussed the progress of the group, Ed R pointed out:

We’re still working with too many things; what do we want to emphasize, is what we gotta figure out today; uh, what do we want to mention, but not spend a whole lot of time on, or tie it in with what we want to emphasize. Does anybody have any ideas on that?

The group responded by discussing settings that could be shot to illustrate the possibility of incorporating natural environments in suburban areas, which provided visual material for the production, but without the benefit of a
sequential conceptual framework to guide the development and placement of the visual material. Ed R attempted to guide the group to clarify what they wanted as the production's central theme:

...from what I have gathered on what we're interested in so far, my personal opinion, we seem to have talked more on the building aspect of the flight to the suburbs,...and that not only are people moving out, but business is moving out; so, does anybody else have any—if we could get a title around that? I thought of something this morning; it's not too original; "From City to Suburbs," something like that, something to, another way to state that. Or if anyone else has another idea of what they think we should emphasize more than that.

Ed reasoned that generation of their title would bring the group to a clarification of what they wanted as the focus of the production. The subsequent search for "the" title became a preoccupation instead of a help, however, as the members tried in vain to find a title that was acceptable to all. Even after Ed R identified the central theme, and another member pointed that fact out to him, he continued to orient the discussion to an attempt to come up with a clear expression of the theme in a title:

Bob H: "...moving out, the big cities dying out, ties in with everything we have down; with the crowding, and the transportation, and lifestyles, and new aspects of growth; (it) ties them together."

Ed R: "OK, so you want to consider, then, because of the dying out of the cities we've moved to the
suburbs, and it's housing and crowding in the cities; that—that's inner-city as well as the suburbs."

Marcy S: "I don't know, I think with what we've got right now, I think you can go from there, I mean everything's tied in so closely, it seems to me."

Ed R: "Right, OK; we have to come up, like I say, y'know, with a title. The title should really—I mean, if you're gonna have a title it should be one of your major theme, if you want to put it that way. It all ties together, it's true, but there's got to be one area of major importance that you're gonna center all these other things around. That could be the dying out of the cities, and all this other stuff could be a result of it; or it could be the moving to the suburbs...what caused what, really. So—That's what we want to decide, how we're gonna approach it, and then—we can go from there...."

By emphasizing the need to clarify the causal relationships among the concepts being discussed, Ed R postponed the task of defining these relationships through the development of a visual and narrative sequence. As a result, the group apparently had no means of evaluating and fitting together the concepts and images subsequently generated.

By the May 2 meeting the group had a title, "Everybody's Mountain," but Ed R continued to use the topic sheet headings in an attempt to have the group refine and connect their ideas, with the title as the organization point:

Ed R: "OK, so, everybody think of an idea that we can put in with the title, too: 'Everybody's Mountain'...."
He realized that the ideas had to be eventually expressed in a sequence of scenes. At the beginning of the meeting one of his comments was, "What we gotta do, is write a small script of some sort on the problem." The observer made the same point near the end of the meeting: "I think you should start, y'know, you need to start thinking very seriously about a concrete script, something you're going to actually do...."

Under Ed R's direction, group members accepted various information-gathering tasks during the May 2 meeting. Al H agreed to find material on the transportation of the future and offered to help "try to think of some background music"; Marcy S and Terry C would interview people in preparation for the possible use of interviews in the production's soundtrack; Ed R would do general research on cities and the flight to the suburbs. At the next meeting, May 7, Ed R reported on his readings and Terry C played a tape-recording of interviews she had conducted with residents of several suburban areas. By the May 9 meeting, Ed R and Al H had each written papers that would be used as the production's narration.

**Participation.** Ed R's direction of the Beta group discussions facilitated the participation of every member. Table 9 shows the distribution of comments tallied from the anecdotal transcripts and Bales samplings. After Ed R's
### TABLE 9: PARTICIPATION OF BETA GROUP MEMBERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEMBER</th>
<th>ATTENDANCE AT DISCUS'N MEETINGS</th>
<th>ATTENDANCE AT SHOOTING SESSIONS</th>
<th>PROPORTION OF COMMENTS IN SHOOTING SESSIONS TRANS(^1)</th>
<th>PROPORTION OF COMMENTS IN DISCUS'N MEETINGS BALES(^2)</th>
<th>ROLE DURING SHOOTING SESSIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ed R</td>
<td>7/7</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>30% 23%</td>
<td></td>
<td>director, narrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al H</td>
<td>7/7</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>11% 12%</td>
<td></td>
<td>background music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob H</td>
<td>6/7</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>13% 11%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim K</td>
<td>6/7</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>10% 14%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcy S</td>
<td>7/7</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>15% 18%</td>
<td></td>
<td>camera operator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin M</td>
<td>7/7</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>3% 4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry C</td>
<td>7/7</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>9% 17%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observer</td>
<td>7/7</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>9% ---</td>
<td></td>
<td>technical advisor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

47/49 (96%) 19/21 (90%)  
\(^1\)Tallied from the anecdotal transcripts of all the discussion meetings but the last one.  
\(^2\)Tallied from the Bales Interaction Process Analysis samplings of all the discussion meetings but the last one.
30% (Bales: 23%), five of the six other members contributed to discussions in about the same proportions: Al H with 11% (12%), Bob H with 13% (11%), Tim K with 10% (14%), March S with 15% (18%), and Terry C with 9% (17%). Part of this even proportionality was the result of bringing each member's *Where Are We Now?* ideas to the attention of the group, a technique that was used in the first and second discussion meetings. The interaction in subsequent meetings shows the same evenness, however. Group attendance at the discussion meetings was 96%, with a 90% attendance at the production sessions, as Table 9 shows.

A number of identifiable factors set the conditions for the high degree of organizational conformity visible in the Beta group. The school was privately supported, with religious instruction as part of the curriculum. There was a dress code that included a requirement of uniforms for female students. Sex and class rank separated the Beta members into two groups: the four twelfth-grade males and the three eleventh-grade females. Ed R, appointed leader of the group by the media teacher, seemed to the investigator to be respected and accepted as a capable leader by all the members. It is clear from the data that they allowed him to direct their attention to topics, make definitive summaries of their discussions, and generally structure their participation in the meetings. Although Ed took pains to insure that every member was heard, the influence of the males in
evaluating ideas and carrying out production tasks was greater than that of the females. Terry C, a female member, suggested "City Sidewalks" as the production's title. Her suggestion was rejected in favor of "Everybody's Mountain," a title conceived by Ed R and discussed and accepted by Al H, Bob H, and Ed outside the group meetings. The script was highly representative of the ideas of the members, but it was written by Ed R largely from papers he and Al H had prepared. Al H also determined the production's background music.

**Representation.** The Beta script was written by Ed R. The bulk of it first appeared as a narrative piece written by Ed R and read to the group on May 9. With few alterations, the entire piece became sections A through G of the script (see Appendix C). Al H wrote a paper that he read at the same meeting. Ed R incorporated all but the opening and closing of Al's paper as sections H and I of the script.

Two basic decisions about the production's format and content were foreshadowed by Ed R in the second meeting, April 25. Concerning the format, he said:

...We have decided what the approach is gonna be like, a documentary, with a narrator or something; kind of like the "Sixty-Minute" pattern or something, the television show....
The idea of using a documentary format was compatible with the ideas expressed in the previous meeting, but there was no discussion of what format would be used. Ed R's phrase, "We have decided" should therefore be taken to mean either an agreement reached outside the meetings by several members, or an interpretation of Ed R's that the ideas discussed in the first meeting implied the use of a documentary format. In the second meeting Ed R also made content suggestions that he later implemented in the script:

...we're going to have to decide what we mean by good and bad (aspects of growth)...OK, and then, one question was brought up (by Ed himself in the previous meeting): What can we do to make growth help man, and not just destroy the environment?...

After about twenty minutes of discussion, Ed R said:

We're gonna have to, again, I think we still gotta look at a little bit more what we mean by good and bad growth...OK, what's good about the growth, then; well like, you have to start somewhere, I mean if you want to go someplace, you've got to start with something good and try to improve on it. And--so what's happening because of growth that could be good, and we could talk about where we're gonna go from here; take a good point and try to improve on it, make everything better.

When he finally wrote the script, Ed R gave more attention to the positive aspects of growth than the negative ones. Both he and Al H indicated the idea of expanding cities eventually growing into each other on their April 25 Where
Are We Now? forms. Al alone listed the idea on the May 2 form, and he used it as the conclusion of his May 9 paper:

The business and industry on I-270 may be quiet, peaceful, natural, and pleasing to look at, but if we continue our present sprawling rate of growth, our big cities will grow together, leaving very little country left. It has been projected that by the year 2000 Cleveland, Columbus, and Cincinnati will grow into each other. To prevent this we must bring the population growth to zero, and bring a halt to building land-consuming structures, and utilize land space.

Ed R did not use this section of Al's paper in the script.

Ed gave the production a more positive ending:

So you see that to prevent our cities from dying we must make the downtown areas more vital and exciting. We must show the public that this is the place to be. We must attract them with beautiful new downtown buildings and with places like German Village. All of this is necessary if we are to keep our cities alive and kicking.

In its final form, the Beta script focussed on the flight of people away from the cities to the suburbs, with the consequent death of the cities. As the introductory narrative tells us, "The question is: why has this occurred, and how can we stop it?" This theme was expressed by four of the seven members in the first Where Are We Now? form, completed at the beginning of the April 22 meeting. Responses of these four members to the question, "What do you want to say?" were:
Ed R: 1) How can growth be harmful? Show it.
   2) Why has this growth occurred especially in suburbs
   3) What can we do to make growth help man and not just destroy the environment.

Al H: 1) Growth is away from the city
   2) We must keep growth confined (area)
   3) How do we confine growth?

Bob H: I want to show the people of the city how the city is growing so fast. Also, that the needs of the city are greater than the resources now used. And give ideas on how to solve the problems.

Robin M: 1) How the cities have grown—Good or bad.
   2) Can the people adapt to these crowded conditions
   3) Is that why there are so many suburbs?

Table 10 shows correspondences between sections of the script and the ideas recorded in the Where Are We Now? forms. Only three of the thirteen script sections, B, F, and J, are unrepresented in the Where Are We Now? responses. Ed R utilized the ideas expressed throughout the discussions for most of the narration and visuals of the script.

Responsibility. The entire Beta group attended the three production sessions, with only Bob H and Robin M absent one time each. Ed R was the director and narrator, Marcy S operated the camera, Al H played music from a cassette tape recorder under Ed's narration, and the observer served as technical advisor. Ed R and Al H usually determined the locations and shots. At one point in the second production session, Marcy S complained to the observer that
**TABLE 10: INCORPORATION OF BBTA MEMBERS' IDEAS IN THE BBTA SCRIPT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCRIPT SECTION</th>
<th>CORRESPONDENCE OF WHERE ARE WE NOW? FORM RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>APRIL 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Al H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Ed R, Robin M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Bob H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Al H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Al H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Marcy S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
she wanted to take greater care in planning the shots than the pace set by the males allowed. She felt that the males were too interested in "just getting the thing done."

Members also took responsibility for tasks before the production sessions began. Terry C and Marcy S agreed to interview people; at the May 7 meeting, Terry C played a tape-recording of her interviews with two suburban housewives. Marcy S brought two reels of super-8 film of Chicago and New York City to the May 9 meeting. The group reviewed them with the idea of possibly including some of the scenes in the videotape production. Ed R and Al H both did research on the city and wrote papers for the May 9 meeting. As mentioned, these papers were used as the first part of the script. Besides writing a paper, Al H selected and recorded music appropriate to the different moods of the narration.

C. The Gamma Group

Leadership. Both Kim C and Telford D directed the discussions of the Gamma group. During the April 30 meeting the advisor, Lew G, was the primary directing influence, but he spoke only occasionally at the other meetings.

Kim C was the primary leader. She was responsible for talking the other members into attending the video workshop at COSI and forming a production group. She asked Lew G to serve as advisor in order to secure the school's recognition
of the group. In the first meetings of the group she took notes on the ideas and preferences of the members, then wrote the first draft of the script. In subsequent meetings she, Lew G, and Telford D directed the discussion to the goal of refining and identifying visuals for her script. Kim C's personality and friendship with the other members of the group seemed to the observer to be the most obvious characteristics of her leadership style. Lew G, the advisor, characterized her by saying, "She's sort of a Lucy figure (from the Peanuts comic strip); the others follow her lead." Speaking of herself in an account of the group's first activities, written at the observer's request, Kim C said:

...Since I did much of the planning--actually I had the biggest mouth, the most determined head & will & could be the biggest bitch--I had hassles getting us together. (She describes some of the personality attractions and conflicts among the members.)...Sounds like a soap opera--huh? Kim--being most uninvolved put her foot down & everyone listened to her or else. It was the only way to get things done.

An example of Kim's "putting her foot down" is the following exchange from the May 5 meeting, as the members prepared for their first production session:

Kim C: "OK, you guys--I'm gonna count on you, you're going to have to get this organized and done, OK?"
Cindie L: "Uh-huh (yes)."
Kim C: "You guys are going to do it for me please."
Cindi R: "Yeah."
Kim C: "No more of this—shit, Cindie?"
Cindie L: "Yeah."
Kim C: (after a short laugh) "Cindie? OK? Please?"
Cindie L: "I told you I'd do it for you."
Kim C: "OK— I really appreciate it, 'cause I'm count­
ing on you people."

Kim expressed frustration several times over the group's
slowness in developing the particulars of the script as
well as their tendency to change what had already been de­
cided. From the April 30 meeting:

...Kim C reminds the group that she has writ­
ten the script in a positive vein rather than
negative, since that's the way the group had
voted (3-2). When Cindie L asks if any nega­
tive themes are going to be shown, Kim reacts
with exasperation, saying she doesn't care,
and will they please make up their minds.

Kim C: "Alright people, I will rewrite the
script on one condition: tell me what you
want. I'm sick—"

Cindi R: "Look, you guys—"

Teldord D: (wearily) "We'll tell you what we want."

Cindi R: "Kim, we are all in the fourth period,
why don't you hand us the script, and we can work
on it."
Telford D helped to lead the group primarily by his problem-solving suggestions. For example, at the April 30 meeting the group was trying to find a way of shooting the titles when he said:

Telford D: "...I think it might be more effective if we had white letters on a black background, so it would be black, and then you would just have your title from a blank."

Kim C: "It's fine."

Telford D: "And then we could stop it down, and then it could come back open to the (poem)."

Kim C: "Uh-huh, uh-huh (yes)."

The title, "Reach Out" was shot May 2 as Telford suggested. Later in the May 2 meeting, the group was considering a musical arrangement of the Lord's Prayer as the sound accompanying the title. Telford pointed out:

I think we ought to have music, but maybe that might not be so good to use the Lord's Prayer, because first...the people have to read that (the poem following the title), then they'd be hit with the verse.

A few minutes later,

Cindi R: "Do 'Fluff' (the song, 'Fluff, the Magic Dragon')."

Telford D: "How long is 'Fluff'?"

Cindi R: "Oh God--you can put it on anywhere."
Telford D: "Wow! OK, 'cause then we can just put it on, and then we can just turn the sound down as we come to the first scene."

Telford was capable of dry, deadpan humor that balanced Kim C's dramatic flair. From the April 30 discussion:

Kim C: "...I also am going to have to break this to you people; this is going to be fun; please don't throw your tomatoes at me or anything: May sixth, I believe it is, and seventh--I'm not going to be here."

Telford D: "Where are you going to be?"

Kim C: "In Michigan."

Telford D: "That's OK, we can do without you."

Lew G, the group's advisor, directed most of the April 30 discussion. He tried to keep the group to the task of refining Kim's draft of the script scene by scene. Shortly after the beginning of the meeting, he said:

Would you like to walk through it, now, to get some ideas as to how we're graphically --for instance, how did you decide you were graphically gonna do titles?

He made suggestions:

Would you entertain the idea of using nature's own, like writing on the sand, or writing on the trees?

... ... ... ... ...

Or the ghetto titling technique of spray can on a building.
The response to this latter idea was,

Kim C: "Oh, I can see that now, we'd all get arrested." (general laughter)

Telford D: "No, we can go to Cindi (R)'s house, we can't get arrested on private property."

Kim agreed with Telford, amidst laughter. When Cindi R objected, Telford suggested the advisor's apartment building. They abandoned the spray-painting idea.

The advisor tried to get the group to make a decision about the titling technique they wanted to use after another semi-humorous digression later in the meeting.

Lew G: "OK, the alternatives are real objects, making letters, or to paint, the waterpaint thing on building things; or a continuous pan across a graffiti."

When the group did not settle on a technique after several minutes discussion, he again suggested they "walk through" some more segments of the script in order to "get an idea of how you all feel" about them, "so we can get some sort of finalization."

Participation. The Gamma group discussions were characterized by copious and spontaneous interaction, frequently punctuated with humor. The following exchange, from the April 30 meeting, illustrates the interaction:
Telford suggested the group next think of a title.

Kim C: "That's a good idea, why don't WE figure out a title. (she laughs)"

Group: "Ummmm..."

Lew G: "Should it be symbolic?" Someone answers with a suppressed "M-huh (yes)." There is a pause.

Cindi R: "See this is the problem, this is what Kim's put up with, that's the reason there isn't a whole lot of script."

Cindie L: "Kim sits there, what do you think?"

Kim C: "Well, yeah (illustrating): 'How many think this? OK.' (she laughs)"

Telford D: "Our problem is, we keep saying 'Our problem is--'."

Cindi R suggested the theme of "something old, something new," except not in those words. Kim C remarked that it reminded her of something in Greek mythology. The group began joking about mythological titles, then about Andy Warhol's unconventional film techniques.

Telford D: "Getting back to the title--shall we make it simple? small words, easy to understand; or shall we toss around words like--elephant?" More joking.

Lew G: "What about: 'Our Town--Challenge and Change.'"

Telford D: "'Cowtown--Challenge and Change'...and then we can incorporate Borden's in there." Several others begin talking at once.

Kim C: "No no no, Tel no; please guys--"

Lew G: "Yeah, let's do is kinda get back to the title first, and just 'walk through' some more..."

Through all of these kinds of discussions, the group made the decisions that had to be made, and the production progressed. It must be remembered that the members formed the
group on their own initiative; they met on their own time, and their production had no connection with any of their classes or any other school organization. They had previously worked together in journalism, and had produced a film, "Bunny and Clod," the shooting of which they enthusiastically described to the observer in vivid detail.

The group had held four meetings before the observer joined them. After the production was completed, the observer asked Kim C to write an account of the group's beginning activities. Her description sheds light on their formulation of a script:

...We had a meeting ourselves at Cindi R's and formulated plans for what we wanted to say. I was elected (ha-ha) note-taker, so being in such a position, our brainstorming session consisted in throwing out ideas then nay- or yea-ing them.

From these notes I wrote the script with constant approval of the rest of the group.

I made two rough drafts of the scripts, then with some minor changes—a change from less symbolic to more simplified realism for readied understanding—we had another after-school meeting. I had not finished the script when you got together with us, but we forshadowed plans, though nothing concrete.

With consecutive meetings—some of which you attended—we planned shooting days/schedule. HA HA. We did not have: actors, storyboard, finished/polished script, (or) solid shooting location.

But, being journalism people, give us a deadline, and we'll get it done. By hook and crook we got Mr. & Mrs. R to relent and play the necessary scenes with Cindie (L) and Cindi (R) as fill-ins.
Our biggest basic problem was getting everybody together in the same place at the same time. All members of this group were either extremely active in extra-curricular activities or had a job....

A preliminary draft of the script had already been written after the first meeting, so the group was able to spend subsequent meetings refining the projected scenes and planning techniques for shooting them, rather than having to attempt to collectively create the script from scratch.

Representation. The Gamma group had met four times before the meeting in which the first *Where Are We Now?* forms were administered, April 25. Responses to the question, "What do you want to say?" show a basic agreement on the effects of the city and progress on the individual and family as the production theme:

Kim C: 1) What progress is doing to Columbus-
2) Breakup of family unit
3) Social comment on city living

Telford D: 1) The city is causing a breakdown of the family unit, on which society is based.
2) The city has designed things to appeal to the masses, thereby destroying individuality.
3) The only way to solve these problems is to recognize them and act upon them.

Cindi R: 1) That progress is a definitive reality, NOW!
2) Progress is good and progress is bad. It must be sorted out and analyzed by each person individually.
3) More people and larger cities are effecting everyone and the cities are running the community social life.
Cindie L: 1) Generally taking the family unit and showing its decay in society.
2) Second, taking an individual and how he is forced to live in society.
3) What is happening (with) progress—a circle of how we construct to destruct, birth/death.

(Pat J was absent. The advisor did not complete the form.)

Many of the scenes used in the production were also specified in the April 25 forms. Responses to the question, "What pictures will you use to express these ideas?" included the family (Kim C, Telford D, Cindi R), shown in the opening scene of the script (B); the mechanization of people at work (Kim C, Telford D), using a clerical office as an example (Cindi R, Cindie L), shown in the third scene (D); dependency on electric machinery (Cindi R), shown in (E); and busy downtown traffic (Cindie L), shown in (F).

Since Kim C wrote a preliminary draft of the script after the group's first meeting, the members had a common understanding of their production's structure by April 25. The meetings of April 30, May 2, and May 19 were spent planning how to shoot the title, making arrangements for the shooting of the first scenes, and dubbing narration over a scene. Practical considerations dictated dropping a scene showing mass production, listed by Kim C and Telford D in the April 25 Where Are We Now? Other ideas listed on April 25 but not used were: the emphasis on sex in advertising (Kim C), the destruction of nature for new roads and
buildings (Telford D, Cindie L), and the voice of a crying baby (Telford D, Cindie L).

Responsibility. Everyone in the Gamma group had a role in the shooting of the production. Kim C was director, Telford D operated the camera, Pat J read the narration, Cindi R and Cindie L appeared in the breakfast scene, and Cindi R appeared in the park scene as well. During the May 19 meeting the group reviewed the scenes they had shot (all but the last two) and dubbed narration over the office workers scene. Cindie L operated the videotape recorder while Telford timed each scene, then Kim C tailored the narrative for the office workers scene to the time length of that scene on the videotape. To preserve the sounds of typewriters and adding machines already with the scene on videotape, the observer's tape recorder was used to lift the sounds from the videotape. They were played back onto the tape as background while Pat J added the narration in an audio dub.

After some anxiety over who they could get to play the father and mother roles in the first scenes of the production, Cindi R persuaded her father and mother to help. The breakfast scene was shot in the R home on the morning of May 6. Afterward, Cindi R and Cindie L returned to school while Mr. R, Kim C, Telford D, and Pat J travelled downtown and shot the second and third scenes. Mr. R then drove the
# TABLE 11: PARTICIPATION OF GAMMA GROUP MEMBERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEMBER</th>
<th>ATTENDANCE AT DISCUS'N MEETINGS</th>
<th>PROPORTION OF COMMENTS IN SHOOTING SESSIONS</th>
<th>ROLE DURING SHOOTING SESSIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TRAN$^1$</td>
<td>BALES$^2$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim C</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindi R</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindie L</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telford D</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat J</td>
<td>2/4</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisor</td>
<td>3/4$^3$</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observer</td>
<td>4/4$^3$</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20/24       15/18     n = 203
(83%)       (83%)      

---

1Tallied from the anecdotal transcripts of all but the first discussion meeting.

2The Bales Interaction Process Analysis data was collected only at the second meeting, and is insufficient for inclusion.

3Members met four times prior to the meetings attended by the observer and advisor.
three group members back to the school, where Telford D and Kim C shot the office workers scene with the help of a business class, and the pan of modern appliances with the consent of the home economics teacher.

D. The Delta Group

Leadership. The Delta group chose Dirk N as their leader when they first formed. The first meeting, on April 29, began with:

Joel W: "We have a leader here. He's been picked as the chosen one to break up all decisions or undecided voting or whatever—however we're going to decide."

Observer: "So he's the one who takes all the responsibility of the group, huh?" (Laughter)

Joel W: "He's also the scapegoat, so if it doesn't work, we can blame him."

Dirk N: "Right. And if it does work, everybody else gets the credit...."

Dirk N began by asking each of the members to give their ideas on what the production should say. His style is suggested by the following:

Dirk N: "...Dave?"

Dave M: "Yeah."

Dirk N: "Did you think about it over the weekend, did you get any ideas?"

Dave M: "Not really."

Joel W: "Did you think about it, though?"
Dave M: "Yeah."

Dirk N: "What'd you think--about it?"

Dave M: "I really (unintelligible mumble)."

Dirk N: "Just--your mind went blank, right? (pause) Jim?"

Jim J: "I don't know. Um, I like...one of the ideas you had last Friday that you could do, like show a picture of a smaller town, and do like as it grows... (to) where we are right now as the cities grow, to where we'd be in the future."

Dirk N: "What would be the point of showing smaller towns?"

Jim J: "Where it first started--"

Dirk N: "Oh, are you saying, um, like in the past, everybody was spread out, but cities started to grow and people started to move away from the rural area?"

Jim J: "Uh-huh (yes). Moved to the city."

Dirk N: "OK. So you want to express, then, that cities are getting larger?"

Jim J: "No; I think at the end, y'know, I just said we ought to start out, but first we got to decide in our own views where the city is going, and then put that in as (an) end, with the beginning of it to start out smaller, to show where they were before to where they are right now, to where they are going to be."

Dirk N: "Would that be necessary to show where they were? I mean, doesn't everybody know that in the past...cities have just been getting large, would it be necessary to visualize that? To talk about that?"

Jim J: "Um...I think that would be better than just going, 'Zap,' y'know, 'here's what it is today.'"

Dirk N: "Why? Maybe that saying, 'Zap, here's what it is today' would be a good effect."

Jim J: "Maybe."
After hearing the ideas of Joel W and a few comments from Scott W, and the advisor, Dirk N said:

OK—um, alright, do you wanna work on what cities do to people? Like we could list some things, some effects that the cities have on people, and possibly project that to what it'll be in the future. How's that sound?

After a pause the only person to answer was Scott W, who said "Great." Jim J and Dave M were the only members present with the advisor and observer for the first half of the next meeting. They both discussed ideas with enthusiasm until Dirk N and Scott W approached. With some seriousness, Jim J and Dave M complained that "our ideas will be blown away now," a remark that the advisor, Sue R, answered by saying, "No, not necessarily."

Although she was the advisor, Sue R frequently volunteered ideas and suggestions to the discussions. The following exchange, which occurred about two-thirds through the first meeting; suggests something of the nature of the relationship between the advisor and the group:

Sue R: "Joel, what did you decide, did you decide to show what it (the city's effect on people) really is, or you gonna show the way you feel about it?"

Joel W: "The way you feel about it is your closest perception to what it really is, so whatever you know it 'really is' is only a perception of what it could be, so therefore--"

Sue R: "I'm thinking about the fact that about fifty years ago, people really liked cities; with the growth
of the nation, the city was a good place to be...so I was thinking maybe you could somehow satirize the inspiration that people had in the past, or maybe somehow tie that in, how people's feelings have changed about the city, 'cause now when you think—it depends on who's thinking about it; a person living in New York City would think it was great—"

Dirk N: "Well, we're thinking about it, so we'll probably do what we think. OK? Do you understand?"

Sue R: "Yeah. I was just—what I thought about the subject."

Dirk N: "Yeah...."

The conflict between Sue R and Dirk N was over who's ideas the production would treat. Dirk N's approach was to specify an idea and attempt to have the group understand, accept, and elaborate on it. Most of the time he directed his remarks to Joel W, whom he cast in the role of scriptwriter. From the May 6 meeting:

Dirk N: "What we were talking about, Joel, for a story line, this is what I was thinking, we follow one person, and he has to go downtown every day to get his fix of the city...and maybe we get a shot of once he gets downtown he starts taking deep breaths and looks better—you know, he's gotten his hit...so the person is finally fed up with being addicted to the city—"

Joel W: "Ah, OK, I see what you're doing."

Dirk N: "—and he wants to kick the habit, so we make up this place called the City Crisis Center, and he goes there and talks to people...."

Joel W: "So the person goes downtown to enjoy the trash...but finally it all catches up with him, and he sees it all together, the trash and everything, and finally the picture looks bad to him (throughout, Dirk N is responding, "Right, right.") so then you'll do a pun on a drug center...."
Joel found it hard to develop Dirk's ideas, however. A while later in the same meeting, he said to Dirk:

I don't know; I need something more to go on, to help add to what you're trying to do. Since you've got more of a clear-cut image of what you want to do, for ideas and that, write down what needs to be said, and ideas on how you want to approach things, and then I'll try to do that negative (unintelligible).

Participation. 60% of the comments recorded in the anecdotal transcripts (70% of the Bales entries) were made by Dirk N, Joel W, and Sue R, the advisor, with only 28% (Bales:30%) from the other four members. In the first part of the May 1 meeting, when only Jim J and Dave M were present with the advisor and observer, Jim J made three times as many comments as he averaged in the same time span of other meetings, and Dave M made twice as many comments. In the second part of the meeting, Dirk N came up with the idea of paralleling cities with drugs after Sue R's comment, "...although I don't like (the city), I need it." By the next meeting, as noted in the leadership section, Dirk N had come up with a story line to show a central character's addiction to the city, and attempted to have the group develop his idea into a sequence of scenes. Efforts of members to participate in generating ideas for the scenes were often seen by Dirk as inappropriate, however. The following excerpt from the May 8 meeting suggests the effect of Dirk's approach on the participation of other members:
Dirk N: "Ah--(trying to get the attention of the advisor, who is talking to another member)--we'll stop, we'll stop there, ah--(the advisor continues talking, then pauses) Write a news report, OK? With that stuff in it. Alright? Alright, it's got to contain, um, um, people dying of overdose of drugs, statistics on how many people are addicted to drugs; smokers and pollution, um--air tests--"

Joel W: "But we're doing overdoses of cities."

Dirk N: "Right, I know, but if you start talking about that kind of thing with drugs, it's, y'know, a subtle kind of thing, and as the film goes on we find out that what they're talking about is the addiction to cities, not drugs. That's why we have a bunch of pictures on cities (on the wall of the student's bedroom)."

Dave M: "You get a big hypodermic syringe on his dresser full of buildings and stuff, and--"

Jim J: "'Columbus police caught six people last night around a smoke tower, inhaling toxic fumes--'"

Dirk N: "Uh--the news report (in the first scene) has to be about drugs, and not cities, drugs."

Jim J: "Drugs?"

Dirk N: "Right. Um, you have how many people died of overdose of drugs....(several voices are heard at once) Yeah, stuff like that, OK. Now think about like (a scene) that would indicate directly a person being addicted to the city, just directly, OK? Um, alright, he's driving in a car, and you can have um--"

Jim J: "Dirk?"

Dirk N: (softly) "What?"

Jim J: "how about like (unintelligible) affects the air quality index?"

Dirk N: "The weather report, yeah. Alright while he's driving--"

Joel W: "OK, put him in a bus, or driving a car, or what?"

Sue R: "Leave the cars down."
Dirk N: "Yeah."

Dave M: "Not if he's hitch-hiking."

... . . . . . .

Dirk N: "He's doing a lot of smoking, a lot of smoking of cigarettes." (Several members snicker)

Ron S: "Have him pop at least one pill."

Sue R: (Laughs) "Hey, aspirin. He wakes up and takes two aspirin. Drinks some Alka-Seltzer or something."

There is a pause.

Dave M: "Why not natural stimulants, like coffee, eight cups of coffee."

Dirk N: "Because we want to direct this with, like, drugs and the city."

Sue R: "A couple of aspirins fit in, though."

Dirk N: "Yeah, OK."

Scott W: "Yeah, if we put a lot of little drugs in there, then people aren't—they might not catch the thing about getting up on the city. They might just look at it like he's a kid getting up on drugs, living in the city."

Dirk N: "OK, with the drugs, like, there's a lot of paraphernalia. We ought to think of some kind of paraphernalia with the city to go along with that, maybe like s--"

Sue R: "Parking ticket. Just a parking, a parking ticket."

Joel W: "I think I'm going to get lost in this."

The only member to express an evaluation of the ideas was Joel W, who remarked later in the meeting:
I just don't see how this is going to turn out serious. I mean---(the advisor interrupts briefly) I see it as being superfluously humorous; it's gonna be a piece of shit.

One member, Ron S, joined the group after they had already held three meetings. He tended to express himself in the imperative, and often did not explain the relevance of his ideas to the scenes being constructed. Some of his comments were:

Oh, we've got to catch some of the stock exchange. Um, "Profits for such-and-such a company soared today."

We've got to have him in a restaurant....Can you picture this: he's in a restaurant having a coke, hamburger or something; he's reading the newspaper and looking out the window, looking at this great big office building, and really getting addicted to the city--

We gotta have him going in stores, too. Especially a record store. (When, after a pause, the advisor asks why, Ron does not answer)

Attendance data and a comparison of the proportion of comments made by each member is summarized in Table 12. Note that fully half of the comments were made by either the advisor or Dirk N, the leader.

Representation. At the end of the May 8 meeting the group still had no specific sequence of scenes, much less a script, for their production. The deadline was only
### TABLE 12: PARTICIPATION OF DELTA GROUP MEMBERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEMBER</th>
<th>ATTENDANCE AT DISCUS'N MEETINGS</th>
<th>ATTENDANCE AT SHOOTING SESSIONS</th>
<th>PROPORTION OF COMMENTS IN TRANS(^1)</th>
<th>PROPORTION OF COMMENTS IN BALES(^2)</th>
<th>ROLE DURING SHOOTING SESSIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dirk N</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel W</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>talent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim J</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>camera operator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott W</td>
<td>3/5</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>background music, cue cards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave M</td>
<td>3/5</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>talent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron S</td>
<td>2/5</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>talent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue R</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observer</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>technical advisor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[\frac{27}{35} = 77\%\] \[\frac{12}{14} = 86\%\] \[n = 325\] \[n = 67\]

\(^1\) Talled from the anecdotal transcripts of all the discussion meetings but the last one.

\(^2\) Talled from the Bales Interaction Process Analysis samplings of the third, fourth, and fifth discussion meetings.
twelve days away. At the beginning of the next meeting, two days later, the advisor explained that "we've totally forgotten" the drugs-city parallel. Joel W read a script of a talk show he had written. Although it related to the problems of growing cities, none of the ideas expressed in previous discussions were incorporated. The talk show, titled "On the Road with Johnny Carcass," featured Joel W as the host (Johnny Carcass), and began with him saying:

Here we are today with a very interesting group of doctors here to discuss the changing city. Our first guest is Dr. Offal Refuse. He is very renowned for his research in eremacausis, excretory routing and garbage disposal. The doctor has just gotten back from a research tour of the Gobi Desert and the polar ice cap. The doctor was lucky enough to have an opening in his tight schedule to make an appearance here tonight. Let's have a warm welcome for Dr. Offal Refuse. (Applause)

The full text of the script is in Appendix C.

In discussions before the May 10 meeting the group never decided which format they wanted for the production. In the May 1 meeting Jim J said he'd like to see a documentary style, using a commentator and basing the narration on facts. Joel W was of a similar mind at the beginning of the May 6 meeting:

Joel W: "How about if we take this as a way of getting into the subject more, is each of us take a subject and try to research it, like, 'The city: how is it bad for people'...."
Dirk N: "Well, I don't know how much time we have to do that."

Joel W: "Go through a dictionary or an encyclopedia."

Dirk N: "Like, the effects of exhaust fumes on people?"

Joel W: "We need some statistics or something to provide the people, to prove—you just can't say they're bad."

Sue R: "Now that's back to the first theme more, I think. What are some examples—"

Joel W: "I'll do that myself, then; I think we need that."

The format that Dirk N finally—and unsuccessfully—tried to have the group follow might be called dramatic-symbolic. The idea was to have the camera follow a "city addict" from the time he wakes in the morning to his going downtown for a "fix on the city" to his rejection of the city as an unhealthy and unnecessary habit. The viewers were to hear radio reports of drug addiction in the first scene and see the connection with the character's dependency on the city by the last scene. Little attention was given to what the character would say or how the scene might be interpreted by the audience, however.

Responsibility. Few tasks were generated during the Delta group discussions. In the May 6 meeting Joel W told Dirk N, "...write down what needs to be said, and ideas on how you want to approach things, and then I'll try to do that negative (section)." A bit earlier in the same
meeting, he said he was going to do research to get facts on how cities hurt people, which is what he meant by "I'll try to do that negative" section. Neither he nor Dirk carried out any of these tasks, however.

The script of the talk show, "On the Road with Johnny Carcass," written by Joel between May 8 and May 10, had roles for everybody but the advisor. Joel himself took the part of the talk show star, Johnny Carcass. The director was Dirk N. Jim J and a friend of his (not a member of the group) operated the cameras. Scott W watched the audio levels and played tape-recorded music for parts of the talk show. Ron S played "Dr. Vile Institute" and Dave M "Norman Normal," two guests on the show. Three other guests, "Dr. Offal Refuse" "Duty Doer" and "Impetus Perfectus" were played by the other friends of the members. The group appeared to enjoy the humor of Joel's slapstick scatological satire. It permitted some of them to ham it up before the cameras, and involved all of them in a way the discussions had not.

The Center of Science and Industry's studio equipment was used for the taping of the production, which took place on May 12 and May 20. With the production on different sections of two videotapes, Joel W and Dirk N met with the observer at the Datagang Video Corp. headquarters to assemble the best sections from each tape onto a master. The process was time-consuming. Using two 3650 Sony videotape recorders,
they spent three and a half hours on the task.

IV. The Groups Compared

A. Beginning Circumstances

The members of all four groups joined on their own initiative. Members of the Alpha, Beta, and Delta groups were under an obligation to complete some sort of media project for their media classes. Only the Gamma group formed and committed themselves to the production of a videotape on their own initiative, with no obligation other than their agreement with each other to complete the task. Although they had an advisor at some of their meetings, he attended at their request and did not represent an authority to whom they were responsible. The Alpha and Beta groups did not have their advisors in attendance at any of their meetings. The Delta advisor, however, not only attended the meetings of the group, but took an active role as participant and frequently attempted to guide the discussions.

All of the groups received the topic sheet, *The American City: Where Do We Go From Here?* either before or at their first meeting. Members of the Alpha, Gamma, and Delta groups seldom referred back to the sheets during the time they were under observation. The Beta group used the sheets extensively as a means of generating ideas for their production, however. Not only did the systematic listing of topics on the sheets fit with the orderly style of Ed R's
leadership, but their discussion kept the momentum of the group from deteriorating before the group was able to decide what they wanted their production to express.

Ed R also relied more heavily on member responses to the Where Are We Now? form questions as a discussion device than did the leaders of the other three groups. The Alpha group used the form in the discussions of their first meeting, but not thereafter. The Gamma group completed the form, but had little need of it in their discussions, since they already had a preliminary script when the investigator began observing their meetings. The Delta group completed the form, but Dirk N, the leader, never used it.

Neither the Alpha nor the Delta groups had members in attendance at the television workshop in February of 1974. Although the investigator taught the members of both groups how to operate the equipment, both groups experienced difficulty in finding an effective way of involving their members in the conceptualizations of their productions. The Delta group had the greatest difficulty of all in expressing their ideas in a sequence of practicable scenes. Although Dirk N called the production he attempted to plan a documentary, it might have been more properly called a dramatic allegory. Joel W's talk-show script, which the group finally produced, was also dramatic rather than documentary. The productions of the other groups followed a documentary format with on-location shooting and voice-over narration.
B. Development of Ideas

Note-taking occurred in the Alpha, Beta, and Gamma groups. Dave I made some personal notes in the first meetings of the Alpha group, but did not use them to review and evaluate ideas until Rich H persuaded him and Jim F to begin organizing ideas in some sort of sequence. Most of the note-taking thereafter was done by Jim F. Ed R kept notes throughout Beta's meetings and frequently referred to them in summarizing and relating ideas for the group. Kim C took notes on the first discussion of the Gamma group, prepared a preliminary script from her notes, and used the script to summarize and focus the ideas of members in subsequent meetings. No notes were taken in any of the Delta group's meetings.

The Alpha, Beta, and Delta groups all spent at least two meetings attempting to narrow and clarify the ideas they wanted their productions to contain. For all three the attempt involved some frustration. The Alpha group settled on the housing topic at the beginning of their second meeting. Further narrowing was hindered by uncertainty about what aspects of the housing issue they wanted to treat as well as by the lack of a sequential ordering of discussed ideas. The Beta group, under Ed R's direction, attempted to narrow and clarify their ideas by identifying a central theme which would tie everything together. They apparently were somewhat hindered by Ed's insistence that the central
theme be expressed in a title. Dirk N attempted to narrow and clarify the ideas discussed by the Delta group by having the members develop an idea he had come up with. The attempt failed, however. Dirk's idea appeared to serve as a point of departure for the expression of divergent ideas rather than as a point around which ideas could converge. Kim C had prepared a rough script after the first discussions of the Gamma group. The only narrowing that took place was the elimination of a scene which the members later decided was impractical to shoot.

Each of the groups faced the question of whether to give their production a negative or positive emphasis. Both the Alpha and Beta groups began with negative themes and shifted to a more positive emphasis as their ideas became more specific. The Gamma group discussed the possibilities of each emphasis, then voted three to two to give their production a hopeful ending. The desire of the Delta members was clearly to show the harmful effects of the city on people, and their discussions never moved from this emphasis.

C. Sequential Organization of Ideas

The Gamma group, whose members had experience working together in journalism and film making, was the only group to sequence their ideas in the first meetings. Part of Kim C's account of the group's early meetings bears repeating:
We had a meeting ourselves at Cindi R's and formulated plans for what we wanted to say. I was elected (ha-ha) note-taker, so being in such a position, our brainstorming session consisted of throwing out ideas, then nay or yea-ing them. From these notes I wrote the script with the constant approval of the rest of the group.

I made two rough drafts of the scripts, then with some minor changes—a change from less symbolic to more simplified realism for readied understanding—we had another after-school meeting....

It was not until their eighth meeting that the Alpha group began to arrange their ideas into a sequence, an action urged by Rich H in exasperation of the group's lack of progress in developing a topic. In the ninth and last meeting, the Alpha participants were able to focus on the development of the production scene by scene. Dave I verbally generated a narrative line for each of the shots while Jim F took notes. After the meeting Dave I wrote up a complete narration for the scenes from his and Jim's notes. Using his script, the participants began shooting the production five days later.

The organization of ideas into a sequence was also delayed in the Beta group. In the sixth meeting Ed R and Al H read papers they had written on the city. These papers became the basis of the script which, after only one more discussion meeting, the group began shooting.

Dirk N attempted to have the Delta group develop his idea for showing the analogy between life in the city and
addiction to drugs, spending the third and fourth meetings on the task. As noted above, the attempt was abortive. The group forgot the city-drugs parallel in the fifth meeting and prepared to implement Joel W's talk show script.

The table below shows the centralization of discussion leader, scriptwriter, and shooting director roles in three of the four groups:

**TABLE 13: DISTRIBUTION OF CONTROLLING ROLES IN THE FOUR GROUPS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>DISCUSSION LEADER</th>
<th>SCRIPTWRITER</th>
<th>DIRECTOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alpha</td>
<td>Dave I</td>
<td>Dave I</td>
<td>Dave I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>Ed R</td>
<td>Ed R</td>
<td>Ed R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gamma</td>
<td>Kim C</td>
<td>Kim C</td>
<td>Kim C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta</td>
<td>Dirk N</td>
<td>Joel W</td>
<td>Dirk N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only in the Delta group were the discussion leader and scriptwriter roles taken by different members, and the Delta script was the only one written without regard to the ideas generated during the bulk of the discussion meetings. The Alpha script contained ideas from three of the four participating members. The ideas scripted by Kim C
were those of the Gamma members, and the members all took part in the revision process that transformed the Gamma script into a definite and producable sequence of scenes. The greatest representation of member ideas was found in the Beta script. Ten of its thirteen sections used concepts and scenes suggested by members other than the leader-script-writer Ed R.

D. Implementation of the Script

The table below compares the distribution of various roles in the shooting of the four productions.

**TABLE 14: THE DISTRIBUTION OF ROLES DURING THE SHOOTING OF THE PRODUCTIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>DIRECTOR</th>
<th>NARRATOR</th>
<th>CAMERAPERSON</th>
<th>AUDIO</th>
<th>TALENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alpha</td>
<td>Dave I</td>
<td>Dave I</td>
<td>Jim F, Mike K</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>Ed R</td>
<td>Ed R</td>
<td>Marcy S</td>
<td>Al H</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gamma</td>
<td>Kim C</td>
<td>Pat J</td>
<td>Telford D</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Cindi R, Cindie L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta</td>
<td>Dirk N</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Jim J</td>
<td>Scot W</td>
<td>Dave M, Ron S, Joel W</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only the Gamma and Delta productions had shooting roles for all the members. Three of the four participating members
of the Alpha group took part in the videotaping of their production. All of the Beta members attended the group's shooting sessions, although four of the seven had little to do.

V. The Influence of the Investigator

A. Position of the Investigator

The investigator attended the meetings of the four groups as an observer. As such, he tape-recorded the discussions and periodically asked the members to complete the *Where Are We Now?* form. The investigator pointed out to all four groups that they could use their responses on the *Where Are We Now?* form as a means of focussing the discussions. As was shown previously, the Alpha and especially the Beta group used the form in this way.

In addition to his observer role, as a representative of COSI the investigator advised the groups on both the requirements of the production contest and the operation of the video equipment. Each of the groups was given the topic sheet, *The American City: Where Do We Go From Here?* The Beta group used the sheet in a number of their discussions, while none of the other groups discussed it beyond their first meeting. Members of the groups asked the investigator a number of questions about the potentials of the half-inch television equipment. He advised them of the necessity of shooting their productions in sequence, since editing was
extremely difficult. He explained the use of the audio dub for adding music or narration after a scene had been shot, but advised them to avoid its use because of difficulties in timing and the loss of background noises. The investigator brought the video equipment and accompanied the groups on all of their shooting sessions, advising the camera operators on basic movements and techniques, but never indicating a preference for what should be shot. After a short period of orientation and practice, the groups used the equipment on their own; the investigator was seldom consulted about its operation during most of the shooting sessions.

B. The Investigator as Participant

Even as an observer, the investigator was a participant in the sense that his presence and data-gathering had some influence on the discussions of the groups. Beyond his observer role and technical advisor role, however, the investigator participated in the discussion of the groups to varying degrees. Much of his interaction with the members was of a humorous or tension-releasing nature, serving to make them comfortable in his presence. He usually avoided any participation in substantive discussions. The exceptions to this rule are noted below.
Investigator Participation in the Alpha Group. The investigator accounts for 9% of the comments recorded in the transcripts. In the April 16 meeting he cautioned the group to plan the point they wanted to make and not leave their message to chance. In the April 29 meeting he asked what questions they were planning to use for the interviews being set up. Near the end of the meeting he suggested the members go through their record collections at home for possible music for the production. On May 1, only two of the members showed up for the meeting. The investigator suggested they call the Tenant Union for information on housing needs. He urged them to begin writing down the elements of the production. When one of them complained of the apathy in the larger group, the investigator suggested they (Jim F, Mike K, and Dave I) write a script themselves, since "the production belongs to those who take action to do it." The investigator suggested the group get out and use the video-tape equipment as a means of possibly overcoming the seeming inertia of the discussion meetings. On May 3, the investigator brought the equipment and went with the Alpha group to a public housing apartment and a southeast Columbus public housing complex. He showed them how to use the camera in a planned way—by being conscious of the angle, length of pan, focus, etc.—and had them walk around the buildings to consider the various perspectives available.
Investigator Participation in the Beta Group. 9% of the comments in the anecdotal transcripts of the Beta meetings were made by the investigator. More than half his comments were related to the administration of the Where Are We Now? form and possible ways of using the equipment. Near the end of the April 30 meeting, spent in a fruitless search for a title, the investigator suggested using a brainstorming technique as a means of solving the problem. The idea was not implemented by the group. On May 2, eighteen days before the deadline for the production, the investigator told them:

I think you should start—y'know, you need to start thinking very seriously about a concrete script, something you're going to actually do, because since you can't edit, there'll be times invariably where you'll do something, you want to shoot it again; but you can't snip little parts out of the middle and everything, it either goes or it doesn't, so you might decide to do it again, and you need time to do that.

On May 7, he suggested that the interviews the group was planning be conducted in a flowing, conversational style rather than by firing off a list of prepared questions. During the May 9 meeting he put a calendar on the blackboard for scheduling what had to be done before the deadline (it was not used), and then proposed that the group develop the visuals and narration in a sequence on the blackboard (which was not done either).
Investigator Participation in the Gamma Group. The transcripts show the observer responsible for 11% of the comments in the Gamma meetings. He was the center of attention during the first meeting he attended, as the members enthusiastically related their past accomplishments to him. The investigator participated in more humorous exchanges in the Gamma group than in any other, partially because there were more of such exchanges in the Gamma meetings, and partially because he enjoyed the greater cohesiveness and spontaneity of the group. The Gamma members asked about and the investigator advised them on audio dubbing. He suggested the trick of lifting traffic noises from the videotape with his cassette tape recorder, then playing them back as background for the narration as it is dubbed in, a technique which they used. His substantive participation, however, was less in the Gamma group than in any other.

Investigator Participation in the Delta Group. 11% of the recorded comments in the Delta meetings were made by the observer. His substantive participation in their meetings was greater than in the meetings of the other groups. In the May 1 meeting he discouraged placing the time frame of the production in the future and urged the group to narrow and focus their ideas:
It's hard to show a futuristic thing, 'cause you need a lot of props, for one thing. I guess to me it would boil down to saying, what is it that you feel most deeply should be told to people about the city that you feel deeply and that you don't think other people feel; in other words, what is it most urgent and most personal for you to communicate; because if you get a hold on that, then the sky's the limit....

Shortly thereafter in the meeting he expressed enthusiasm for Dick N's idea of paralleling drug addiction with "addiction" to the city, and joined in a discussion of the ways in which drugs and cities might be metaphorically related. His support for the idea, which continued through the May 6 meeting, was most significant in light of the fact that the idea ultimately proved unworkable for the group. In the May 8 meeting he attempted to bring the group's attention to problems in the way the analogy was being developed:

It seems to me that you need somehow a--in showing this, to show it in a context in which it's seen as a drug; now: by "seen as a drug" you could mean, you could concentrate, I guess, on the bad, on the things that would be negative, or (on the) positive, or both. He gets high on the city, but he also gets addicted, or something. But all these scenes (currently being discussed by the group), like he's going downtown and he breathes in the air, having him stand there taking a great big breath, people won't necessarily know that you're comparing it with the drugs. I see that as a difficulty. Now they might see, like if you show an exhaust pipe and that, y'know, pollution as such as a problem, yeah, but not in the context (of what you are currently discussing).
Although the investigator's comments were not helpful in relieving the atmosphere of confusion and frustration in the discussions of the drugs-cities topic, they may have contributed to the eleventh-hour abandonment of that topic in favor of Joel W's talk show satire. In any case, although the investigator initially expressed enthusiasm for the drugs-cities topic, the idea was Dirk N's, and Dirk N guided the Delta group's abortive attempt to develop the topic. The investigator's participation did not involve him in the leadership conflicts between Dirk N, Sue R, and Joel W, and at no time did the investigator direct the discussions.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

I. A Summary of the Study

This study examines the involvement of four groups of high school students in the production of videotape programs on the theme, The American City: Where Do We Go From Here? The purpose of the study is to shed light on some of the conditions under which such groups gain motivation, autonomy, and effectiveness, in working toward common goals which involve creative self-expression.

The production efforts and the study began with a small-format television workshop at the Center of Science and Industry on February 23, 1974. Seventy-six students and twelve teachers from seventeen schools throughout Franklin County, Ohio, attended. Following the workshop, sixteen production groups formed. The four groups investigated were among seven who completed videotapes for display at the Ohio State University on May 25, 1974.

Groups were chosen for the study on the basis of their likelihood of success in completing their productions. Their meetings were attended by an observer and
tape-recorded, and members were periodically surveyed on their conceptions of the ideas and images the production should contain.

The involvement of the members of each group in the development of their production is analyzed by questions generated from a model of the production process in groups, along four lines: (1) the leadership functions performed; (2) the nature and extent of group participation; (3) the degree to which the production represented the members' ideas; and (4) the distribution of responsibility for production tasks. The groups are then compared in terms of their beginning circumstances, their methods of generating and developing ideas, their organization of ideas into a sequence of scenes, and their implementation of the script.

II. Conclusions of the Study

A. Tentative Answers to the Central Questions

In the first chapter, five questions are asked about the involvement of high-school students in the production process. Each of these questions will be considered in light of the findings.

QUESTION #1 - Can groups of high-school students, on their own, effectively plan and produce videotape programs on social issues?
The findings of this study, in line with those of studies reviewed in the second part of Chapter II, confirm that high-school students can engage effectively in videotape production activities. The four groups selected for the investigation were autonomous in the sense that their members were self-selected and self-directed in their work. Since these four groups were joined by only three others in completing videotapes, out of sixteen groups setting out to do so, the conditions bearing on their success deserve further scrutiny.

**QUESTION #2 - What are some conditions under which these groups are motivated and become autonomous in their production activity?**

The four groups all conducted their production meetings within the physical context of their schools, but their autonomy from the school varied. A substantial part of the motive and opportunity for the members of the Alpha, Beta, and Delta groups was their commitment to the production of a program to fulfill a class requirement, and the availability of media class time for the scheduling of regular meetings which all could attend. The Gamma group, whose members were under no school requirement to produce a videotape, had the lack of a common, regular meeting time as a constant problem. Their success as a more autonomous group was apparently due to their greater cohesiveness--members of the Gamma group were close friends and had worked
together previously, which was not the case with the members of the other groups.

QUESTION #3 - Is a one-day television production workshop sufficient preparation for the planning and production activities of the groups?

The findings indicate that the television production workshop was useful in catalyzing the formation of production groups. Almost all the groups that formed after the workshop had members who were taking, or who had taken, a media course at their school, however. The presence of the investigator as technical advisor, as well as the fact that they were under observation, undoubtably increased the likelihood that the investigated groups would complete their productions. It may be concluded, therefore, that although a production workshop may be necessary for beginning production groups, the presence of an interested advisor and/or connection with an academic course in the school may provide indispensable support for the formation and perseverance of such groups.

QUESTION #4 - What is the nature and distribution of the leadership functions in these beginning groups?

The original model for the study pictured the increase in the distribution of leadership functions as a correlate of an increase in the convergence and clarity of the members' conceptions. The data supports neither the progressive flow
of members' conceptions nor the increase in distribution of leadership functions, however. The groups each had a primary leader who emerged as a discussion director in the first meetings. Besides functioning as the bearer and expresser of pressure to successfully complete the production, each leader attempted to elicit ideas and guidance from the other members for the formation of the script. In the Gamma group, the script was drafted after the first meeting, and subsequent discussions were spent refining and planning to shoot the script. The leaders of the Alpha and Beta groups attempted to have the members generate, develop, and agree on their production's concepts, and the task of transforming the concepts into a sequence was delayed. In contrast, the leader of the Delta group generated a framework of a dramatic script and directed the other members to fill it in. Since the leader's idea had neither the understanding nor the consensus of the group, it served as a point of departure for the generation of divergent and conflicting ideas more than it helped organize and develop the ideas into a feasible script. If the term, "distribution of leadership functions," is taken to mean the involvement of the members in the generation and evaluation of the production's concepts, these findings support Lippitt's (1955) generalization that groups in which the leaders involve the members in the problem-solving processes take longer to reach decisions, but implement decisions more rapidly than
do groups whose leaders make the decisions themselves.

QUESTION #5 - What is the relationship between the involvement of these groups in their productions, and the creative composition of their scripts?

While the Alpha and Beta groups effectively used discussion as a means of generating and developing individual ideas, they were unsuccessful, as was the Delta group, in attempts to compose a script through group discussion. The creative composition of a script was an individual function in all four of the groups investigated. Moreover, in three of the four groups the scriptwriter was the discussion leader. The task of the discussion leader/scriptwriter was to solicit and note the ideas of the members, write a sequence of scenes which coherently expressed their ideas, and revise the script as the group and practicality dictated. The leadership of the Beta group accomplished this task most smoothly and completely, judging from the results of the discussion methods employed and the high representation of members' ideas in the script. The Alpha leader accomplished the task, but falteringly, and with the participation of only half the members of the group. The Gamma group began their meetings with prior production experience and close bonds of friendship. Their leader/scriptwriter was therefore able to get a consensus on the production's topic and format and express that consensus in an early preliminary script. In subsequent meetings, the preliminary script was
of great help to the group in developing and making their production practical. The discussion leader of the Delta group failed in his attempt to have the members develop his idea into a script through discussion. The script was written at the last minute by a member other than the discussion leader, and included none of the ideas previously discussed by the group.

B. Relation of the Findings to the Literature

The collection and analysis of data on the dynamics of group involvement in production activities was directed by the five central questions just considered, through seven specific questions generated from a model of the production process. The findings may also be interpreted in light of the studies reviewed in the first part of Chapter II.

Homans' (1950) distinction between behavior directed to the accomplishment of an exterior task and behavior prompted by problems in the group's internal structure, as well as Collins and Raven's (1969) indication that process models correctly emphasize the importance of intergroup states on task involvement, appears to be confirmed by the findings of this investigation. The fact that half the members of the Alpha group would not become active contributors to the discussions threatened the group with failure in their production task. The production was saved only when three of the participating members adapted to the lack of contributions
by completing the planning, scripting, and shooting themselves. The internal system of the Beta group was, like the approach of its leader, orderly and deliberate, with systematic review of each member's ideas. Both the Beta group's internal system and the cohesive, spontaneous internal system of the Gamma group promoted the effective engagement of the groups in their production tasks. Only the Delta group, with poor internal communications and several conflicting struggles for control over the group discussions, failed to accomplish the task of production planning through the group discussions, a finding which supports Bales' (1955) contention that the differentiation required for the development of a successful task strategy can easily threaten the group's internal integration and the range of member involvement.

The findings and generalizations on group cohesiveness reviewed in Chapter II are all supported by the findings in this study. In particular, Horowitz's (1953) conditions which increase cohesiveness— involvement in the group power structure and the presence of group goals fostering cooperative relationships—and his conditions which decrease cohesiveness—poor task performance, failure of some members to accept the group goals, and communication barriers—are all illustrated by patterns in the four groups investigated. The most cohesive group, Gamma, was also the most interactive and had the least formal leadership style, the greatest
participation of the members in the development of their production, and the highest degree of member involvement in the cooperative implementation of the script. The inability of the Alpha group to involve half its members in contributing to the discussions had roots in the difficulties the group had in organizing a topic, including a lack of consensus on the goals of the production and a lack of feedback on ideas offered. Poor task performance, failure of some members to accept the goals of the leader, and communication barriers were all present in Delta, the least cohesive of the four groups. Both the Delta and the Alpha groups illustrate the findings that failure to be steered by group goals is accompanied by slower and more tangential locomotion (Deutsch, 1949) and an atmosphere of frustration among the members (Maier, 1956).

The data from the study can be interpreted by the literature on interaction theory as well. The dependency of leadership structure on the attitudes and needs of the followers (Gibb, 1969) is illustrated by the inability of any of the participating members of the Alpha group to engage all the members in discussion, and by the Delta leader's failure to control and direct the discussions when he prematurely decided on a story line for the production. As previously noted, Lippitt's (1955) findings that groups with distributed leadership functions have higher morale and are more productive, are confirmed by the behavior of the Gamma
group. In functional terms, the task of the leaders of the investigated groups was to engage the members in the generation and evaluation of ideas for the production, then create a script including and expressing these ideas. The Gamma group leadership was the most functional, according to this definition, followed by that of the Beta group, the Alpha group, and—the least functional of the four—the Delta group.

III. Implications and Potentials for the Future

Student production activities will be educationally and socially significant only if they become continuously available to interested students, preferably through incorporation of group production activities as options in the high school curriculum. The present study is limited to a description of the beginning involvement of students in four production groups. Comparison of the data from the Gamma group, whose members had prior experience making a film together, with the data from the other groups shows a quicker consensus on the format and topic, earlier preliminary script drafting, more time on script revision, and more elaborate pre-production planning with the experienced group. The establishment of a support structure for ongoing student production groups would enable studies to be done of leadership and membership changes, the elaboration of production functions through time, patterns of group
inception, growth, and decline, patterns of involvement of the groups in their communities, the individual and collective influence of the group productions on their audiences, and the evolution of subject matter and production techniques used by the groups.

The following conditions would seem to be required for the successful formation and perseverance of student production groups:

1) the availability of a preliminary television workshop to give interested students familiarity with the equipment and to show the basic formats and procedures of television production;

2) convenient access to the necessary television equipment;

3) the availability of advisors with production experience;

4) provision of space for regular meetings during the school day and academic credit for production groups; and

5) the means of showing the group productions to peer and local community audiences.

These conditions might best be provided through the cooperation of several organizations working together, including at least the school system and a local cable station.

The inability of the groups in this study to effectively edit their videotapes is an unfortunate limitation shared by all who presently work with the half-inch helical scan format. Besides depriving such groups access to an important creative and controlling phase of the production
process, lack of editing capabilities requires them to shoot in program sequence. Although a segment in the middle of the production can be retaped, it must be the exact time length of the original segment, and there is almost always a breakup of the picture at the head and tail of such re-takes. At this writing there is no half-inch editing equipment capable of providing clean, accurately controlled cuts.

There is a considerable improvement in editing quality and control with the 3/4 inch cassette machines, made possible in large part by devices such as Sony's "control box" for the Sony 2850 cassette editor. The box automatically backs up the tapes on both the editor and slave machines five seconds from the edit point, ending most of the guess-work associated with having to back up the tapes separately. Tapes shot on half-inch equipment can be transferred to the 3/4 inch format through a time-base correcter. It is the judgment of this investigator that although portable black and white half-inch equipment should be available for beginning production groups, portable 3/4 inch color recorders and cameras provide a quality commensurate with the 3/4 inch editors and acceptable for cablecast or even broadcast. Since the 3/4 inch format is rapidly becoming a standard in industry and education, an increase in the quality and a decrease in the cost and weight of 3/4 inch equipment may be optimistically expected in the next few years.
When commercial television first appeared, glowing predictions were made of the educational effects the new medium would have on the public. Similar predictions are being made today about the potentials of cable and the public-access provision to revolutionize community interaction and education. Whether or not group video production activities will be increasingly supported by the schools and taken advantage of by students is difficult to predict. This study and those in the second part of Chapter Two, however, suggest a number of probable benefits of group production involvement:

1) the development of cooperative problem-solving skills by group members;
2) the clarification and testing of ideas, feelings, and values in the process of generating and achieving consensus on how they should be expressed on videotape;
3) the acquisition of understanding and skill in using the television medium as a means of self-expression;
4) the production of a large number of programs of interest and value to peer and community audiences;
5) an increase in community awareness of the attitudes and concerns of the coming generation; and
6) an increase in the understanding that the members of such groups have of the topics they explore in their productions.

In the larger context of the role of education in the future progress of our society, student television
production could be a potentially valuable tool in bringing about the transformations described by Margaret Mead in *Culture and Commitment* (1970):

Today, as we are coming to understand better the circular processes through which culture is developed and transmitted, we recognize that man's most human characteristic is not his ability to learn, which he shares with many other species, but his ability to teach and store what others have developed and taught him. Learning, which is based on human dependency, is relatively simple. But human capacities for creating elaborate teachable systems, for understanding and utilizing the resources of the natural world, and for governing society and creating imaginary worlds, all these are very complex. In the past, men relied on the least elaborate part of the circular system, the dependent learning by children, for continuity of transmission and for the embodiment of the new. Now, with our greater understanding of the process, we must cultivate the most flexible and complex part of the system—the behavior of adults. We must, in fact, teach ourselves how to alter adult behavior so that we can give up postfigurative upbringing, with its tolerated configurative components, and discover prefigurative ways of teaching and learning that will keep the future open. We must create new models for adults who can teach their children not what to learn, but how to learn and not what they should be committed to, but the value of commitment....

...the freeing of men's imagination from the past depends, I believe, on the development of a new kind of communication with those who are most deeply involved with the future—the young who were born into the new world. That is, it depends on the direct participation of those who, up to now, have not had access to power and whose nature those in power cannot fully imagine...and whose nature those in power cannot fully imagine...Now, as I see it,
the development of prefigurational cultures will depend on the existence of a continuing dialogue in which the young, free to act on their own initiative, can lead their elders in the direction of the unknown.

If proper support is given to students interested in expressing themselves on videotape, a powerful means of shaping the future will have been put into the hands of the coming generation.
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APPENDIX A

Materials from the Television Production Workshop
Announcing

AN OPPORTUNITY

...to learn how to use small-format video equipment;
...to become involved with the people and events in your community;
...to learn from professionals in the television industry;
...to use the television medium to communicate your feelings and ideas;
...to plan and create your own television production.

SPONSORED BY:
The Center of Science and Industry
The Academy for Contemporary Problems
The Ohio Institute of Technology
Datagang Corporation

in cooperation with the high schools in Franklin County and professionals in the television industry.

COSI a television workshop and production contest, on the future of a city.
APPLICATION FORM

I wish to only attend the workshop.
I wish to only enter the contest.
I wish to only attend the workshop and enter the contest.
I wish to attend the workshop and enter the contest.

Check if you wish to attend the workshop or only enter the contest.

Have you taken a class on video production, or been involved in drama? Explain:

The cost is $5 for the workshop or $10 for the contest.

I will pay when I register at the workshop.

APPLICATION FORM (DETACH)

SCHOOL

FILL IN HOME ADDRESS

PHONE

MAIL TO:

COLUMBUS, OH 43215

COLUMBUS, OH 43215

260 E. Broad St.

COLUMBUS, O. 43215

260 E. Broad St.

COLUMBUS, O. 43215
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TELEVISION WORKSHOP SCHEDULE
Saturday, February 23, 9-4

9:00 REGISTRATION
9:45 INTRODUCTION
10:00 The possibilities of television - present and future
10:20 Using the television medium to explore "The Future of the American City" --- What you might do and what you need
11:00 GROUPS - Meet in school groups with advisors to discuss ideas for a production and to select a set of program options for the afternoon.
11:30 through Lunch: Sign up for afternoon programs
11:45 LUNCH - in groups - while you sketch out a little "instant production" you can use in the afternoon.
12:30 AFTERNOON OPTIONS

1) COSI's TV Studio (20 max. each time) at 12:30, 1:30, 2:30
   - What you can do with it and how to use it
   - A chance to videotape your "instant production"

2) OIT's Color TV Studio (25 max.) leave COSI back by
   - How to use it
   - Videotape your "instant production"
     12:15........2:00
     1:15........3:00
     2:15........4:00

3) Discussion with professionals from the television industry on production planning, camera work, lighting, sound, the future of cable TV, etc. You pick the topic.

4) Some Models - examples for your imagination, on film and videotape.

5) The Portapack - how to operate and explore with a portable half-inch videotape recorder and camera. At 12:30, 1:00, 1:30, 2:00, 2:30, 3:00 (1 group per unit each time)

3:30 DISCUSSION - and the contest begins!
The enclosed brochure describes an opportunity which might be of interest to you and your students: a television workshop for beginners, emphasizing hands-on experiences with video equipment, followed by a production contest in which students will have a chance to plan and shoot a videotape.

No previous experience with film or video production is necessary; anyone can learn to operate small-format TV equipment rather easily, and with a little practice the user becomes aware of new ways of expressing an idea, telling a story, or setting a mood.

As you see from the workshop schedule (enclosed), students will plan a quick production and attend the afternoon programs of their choice in small groups (5-8 to a group). You are invited to attend free of charge as an advisor for a group of your students. If you cannot, a member of the Ohio Institute of Technology's Television Careers Club will be their advisor.

Students may wish to attend the workshop and postpone deciding on whether or not to enter the contest; this is perfectly acceptable. Note that the workshop is on Saturday, February 23—a week from this coming Saturday. I regret not bringing it to your attention sooner. Although originally intended for senior high students, my own experience with junior highs has convinced me that many would be eager for this kind of opportunity; once fired up, junior high students display an energy and enthusiasm unequaled by other groups.

Would you help by announcing the workshop to your students? The third enclosure is a group application form; if a number of students are definitely interested, they can enter as a group. If so, please mail to me by early next week. If you have any questions, or if I can be of help to you in any way, call me at 228-6361.

Sincerely,

Gerard Glassmeyer
Coordinator
TELEVISION PRODUCTION CONTEST GROUP ENTRY FORM

SCHOOL

ADVISOR (or spokesman)

ADDRESS

GROUP MEMBERS:

1) 

2) 

3) 

4) 

5) 

6) 

Will you have class time at school to plan your video production? ☐ no ☐ yes

Does your school have video or sound equipment which you can use in your production?

☐ no ☐ yes: explains

Checks: ☐ The school will supply our group with videotape. ☐ We request the loan of a videotape from the Academy for Contemporary Problems.

Check if you will be requesting the use of:

☐ a portable videotape recorder and camera

☐ Columbus Public School's TV studio

☐ COSI's TV studio (280 E. Broad St.)

☐ OIT's Color TV studio (1350 Alum Creek Drive)

Any questions?

MAIL TO: Gerry Glassmeyer, COSI, 280 E. Broad St., Columbus, O, 43215
THE AMERICAN CITY: WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

The future of America is in its cities. Americans are a metropolitan people, 70% of the population lives in metropolitan areas and by the year 2000, 129 million more people will be living in urbanized areas. The shift from a primarily rural society to an increasingly urban one presents us with problems we have never faced before. Where are we going to put these millions of people? How and where will they live? Will our present institutions be able to meet their needs?

All of the problems of the city are interrelated—each has an immeasurable effect on the others. As you are thinking about where we might go from here, these are some topics you might want to explore. How can the effects of these problems be seen today?

**GROWTH**—How can we control it? How do we grow without destroying our environment? How is it now occurring?

**SUBURBS**—How does the flight to the suburbs affect the rest of the city? Can we continue to allow sprawling suburban developments that consume a great deal of land and make us rely on the automobile?

**TRANSPORTATION**—Will we become more dependent on public transportation systems? What is the future of the car and how will this change our lifestyle?

**SCHOOLS**—How are we educated to prepare for the future? Will our present institutions meet the needs of the future?

**CROWDING**—What are the effects of being forced together? How will we deal with an increasing number of people competing for a fixed amount of space?

**HOUSING**—How can we house our growing population? Housing costs are rising forcing many people who would like to buy houses to live in apartments and mobile homes. What impact will this have on future patterns of development?
INNER CITY - As the upper income people move to the suburbs they are leaving behind a reservation of poor people and minorities, in a decaying environment. What can we do?

WELFARE - Those who are jobless in the city are forced into a cycle of poverty and are put on welfare.

LAWS - How do our laws need to be changed to cope with the future?

THE MEDIA - What is the impact, and what will be the impact, or TV, Cable TV, radio, newspapers, etc.?

PLANNING - What are the political problems involved in planning for the development and future of a city? Can we even plan at all?

GOVERNMENT - How can we manage and control an expanding and complex metropolis?

LIFESTYLE - How will our lifestyles be altered by a metropolitan society? What new lifestyles are emerging?
APPENDIX B

Representative Samples of the Anecdotal Transcripts and Completed Where Are We Now? Forms
Setting: Rm 111, described before.

This meeting began and continued with much more joking and laughter than yesterday's meeting, usually initiated by Mike M. There were frequent instances of several people talking at once. About 10 minutes into the meeting, Dave I. said, "Everybody wanted to do this idea, but I don't think we've mentioned downtown once."

Jim F: "I did a report for history..." Dave I.: "Did what?"
Jim F: "...on Columbus Metropolitan Housing—the city gave me all this information...and so she (the woman he contacted) said like we could go around to the housing units that they have, and we could interview the girl that she talked to..."
Dave I: "Interview a few rats." Laughter.
Jim F: "You could show the fact that they have these (housing units), put a few interviews in it, and, y'know its only going to be 30 minutes, and you couldn't, y'know talk about the city and everything..."

One member mentioned the Bolivar Arms project in response to Jim's suggestion; the other members did not question, approve, object, or respond in other ways to the new idea.
Mike M: "Well, what are we gonna do now?"
Another member: "Anyone else have any ideas?" Pause.
Observer: "One thing I noticed now is that you seem—people are used to being led in a school situation; you're addicted to a teacher, and you're experiencing withdrawal symptoms because you don't have a teacher to tell you what to do. The question is how to organize to get done what needs to be done."

A member: "Somebody write something down." No one volunteered.

Dave I: "Do we scratch the other thing?"

Mike M: "This sounds good—we're going to shake a few taxpayers up."

Jim F: "The lady I talked to said they're going to have to cut down—it's a big, it's a lot of red tape...." Many members talking at the same time, with much joking and laughing. Mike M. made a joke of taking a vote on the topic. Members that had been participating in the discussion seemed agreed to the housing topic; silent members (Allison H, Rob K, Tom K) voiced neither agreement nor disagreement.

Jim F: "Some of the buildings for the elderly are nice, with elevators...."

Mike K: "I think we ought to, y'know, look at people living in them, too; like, y'know, show what kind of problems they have, what kind of lives they lead."

Tom K: "There's people who might not—who might have a job, but with fourteen kids." Laughter. Pause.

I asked the members if they wanted to complete another "Where Are We Now" form, as they did yesterday; they didn't, pointing out that it wouldn't be much different than yesterday's. I suggested they define the point they wanted to make, and on this basis select the images for the videotape. I told them not to leave the message
to chance, lest it not be communicated, but to plan and organize what they wanted to say. Judging, I explained, would be on the basis of the appropriateness of the production to the theme, "The American City: Where Do We Go From Here?" on originality, and on the impact of the presentation. Questions were asked about doing a sound dub, which I explained; I also described the storyboard and suggested they do one.

END.
Setting: Since the classroom down the hall from the group’s media class was not available, the meeting was held in a small, rectangular room adjoining the library. The seating arrangement was more awkward for writing and equal interaction here than in the previous place, but the atmosphere was less formal. The meeting began with more than usual friendly interaction and joking around.

Ed R begins the meeting with a summary of the discussions of the previous meeting, on 4/25. With a reminder from Al H, Ed points out that: "We're still working with too many things; what do we want to emphasize? Is what we gotta figure out today; uh, what do we want to mention, but not spend a whole lot of time on, or tie it in with what we want to emphasize. Does anybody have any ideas on that?"

Bob H asks Ed R to go over some of the topics again. He does so. As Ed R is going over them, Terry C asks something about apartments in the suburbs; no one responds to her. Ed R goes on. With another reminder from Al H, Ed mentions the Anheiser Busch park. Tim K: "If we did that, how could we (get pictures of the animals those without getting into the facility)?"

Al H: "Well, not only nature, but just different--"

Tim K: "Landscaping?"

Al H: "Landscaping. Like I know a lot of-- you know a place called Wilson Bridge Road? You know where it turns before it hits that fishing access, that curve?--"

Bob H: "Yeah."
Al H: "— you know that new building and parking lot, with all that grass—"

Bob H: "Yeah, they left the trees where they were and just built the parking lot around it; there's trees in the parking lot."

Terry C: "Where is this?"

Bob H: "500 Wilson Bridge Road."

Ed R: "OK, well like— we could probably help—"

Al H: "We wouldn't be able to see the cars from the road; just all the big grounds with green grass and trees; y'know, the building just (unintelligible)."

Bob H: "Yeah. It's set back. It's going to be a doctors' condominium."

Ed R: "OK, so now, on that, from what I have gathered on what we're interested in so far, my personal opinion, we seem to have talked more on the building aspect of the flight to the suburbs, is what we seem to have talked most about, and that's what seems to be emphasized most in our discussions so far; and that not only are people moving out, but business is moving out; so, does anybody else have any, if we could get a title around that? I thought of something this morning; it's not too original, 'From City to Suburbs,' something like that, something to, another way to state that. Or if anyone else has another idea of what they think we should emphasize more than that."

Terry C: "Does anybody know, uh, this is kind of off, but like, if anybody knows a song that would fit this, I think (unintelligible) with the title."

(Male group member): "A what?" (Someone snickers.)

Terry C: "A song that would fit what we're talking about."
Tim K: "We have to figure out what we can do first as far as topic before we can incorporate a song."

Ed R: "All she's trying to say, if any of you can think of a song, it might help you, it might help us decide-"

Tim K: "What are we gonna have a song about?"

The discussion pauses as members try to think of a title.

Ed R: "We just gotta figure out now how we want to approach this, what major area do we want to cover, and our discussion of growth; y'know, how is it a problem, and where do we go from here. We've talked about a lot of stuff, and we've got some ideas, but we really haven't got a main idea of what we want to build around; and I just brought up that the flight to the suburbs, and the dying out of the cities, and all the new building in the suburbs and all that, seems to have been-- especially in our last talk, that was what our last talk was centered around."

Bob H: "I think the big city title means everything; y'know moving out, the big city's dying out, ties in with everything we have down; with the crowding, and the transportation and lifestyles and new aspects of growth; ties them together."

Ed R: "OK, so you want to consider then, because of the dying out of the cities, we've moved to the suburbs, and it's housing and crowding in the cities; that- that's inner-city as well as the suburbs."

Marcy S: "I don't know, I think what we've got right now, I think you can go from there, I mean everything's tied in so closely, it seems to me."
Ed R: "Right, OK; we have to come up, like I say y'know, with a title. The title should really, I mean, if you're gonna have a title it should be one of your major theme, if you want to put it that way; it all ties together, it's true, but there's got to be one area of major importance that you're gonna center all these other things around. That could be the dying out of the cities, and all this other stuff could be a result of it; or it could be the moving to the suburbs. . . . what caused what, really. So- That's what we want to decide, how we're gonna approach it, and then- we can go from there. OK, does anybody have any preference or, OK, why do you think that the big city has died out?"

Marcy S: "It's crowded."

Ed R again asks which is due to which.

Marcy S: "Well, the crowding, then the suburbs, and then the result of that was the dying of the city." (Several others agree.)

Al H: "To a certain degree the city has always had slums and that, but when all these people got a little more money, and enough money to move out to the suburbs, that's when the city started to (degenerate)." (Pause.)

Terry C: "I just thought of a title, I don't know if anyone's gonna like it, but I do: City Sidewalks. (Pause) It sounds sick, yes, I know, but no, 'City Sidewalks,' and then, because like, y'know, crowding and stuff?"

Tim K: "We could play old Christmas songs." (Brief laugh.)

Terry C: "Not play the song, but just use the title." (Pause.)

Tim K: "We could play part of the song." (Pause)
Robin M: "...if people are moving out of the city, and if you're saying why are the cities still developing, why is there still so much building going on inside the city."

Ed R: "...it's been a gradual process, it hasn't just started in the last ten years or so, but—my parents used to live close to Cincinnati; now in Cincinnati there was a lot of living right in the city, and if you go there, there's a lot of homes right up against the walls in the city. Now a lot of that now— they used to be beautiful homes. Now they're your shack (?) for the people who can't afford to move out into a nicer area, are living there now. And there has been a change as far as the city, like someone mentioned before, I think it was Al; people who could afford to get out, and didn't like the crowding, could have got out, which mainly left the poor class of people in the city itself. That's true— we went to Atlanta, too; and that's especially true in Atlanta, there's a lot of—"

Robin M: "I was just thinking—"

Marcy S: "In Chicago, though, at least, they've got, the real rich live within the city within these real nice apartments."

Tim K: "They've just started that."

Marcy S: "Yeah; they build up."

Robin M: "Yeah, that's what I was going to say, because like in New York and Chicago, their big thing... there's just a lot more people coming into the city, but they're building all these high-rise... they're just building on top of each other."

Terry C: "I think that it's a good thing that we could mention, but we can't, y'know, draw on it any."
Ed R: "Yeah; OK, I see what you mean."

Al H: "Remember when we read 'Boss,' they talked about how Dally was concerned about the people leaving the city, so what he did was he built these things within the city, and made it, y'know, appear that this is where the rich should live, so the people— a lot of them stayed within the city on the lakefront."

Ed R: "Yeah, again, that's true, but that's basically your rich, right?

Three and four members comment at the same time about the apartments. Bob H points out that there are slum areas in New York and Chicago as well as here in Columbus. Terry C notes that some of the high-rise apartments in these cities are for poor people rather than the rich. Marcy S says that all this might be mentioned, but not gone into; Ed R and the others agree.

Terry C: "Does anybody else have any ideas on titles?"

Ed R: "Yeah (agreeing that this should be considered)."

Al H: "Well, what are we actually doing?"

Ed R: "OK, we've mentioned that a crowding of the city has caused a move to the suburbs by those who could afford to, and as time went on this caused the death of the city..." In the recent past some cities have made attempts to rebuild the inner-city by making it more attractive. Ed again asks for ideas.

Al H: "OK, so we can incorporate a lot of these things that we've been talking about in it."

Ed R: "Oh, yeah..."

Bob H: "I think our title should be kind of catchy—"

Ed R agrees, says that "City Sidewalks" is catchy, but "how related it
is, that's another question."

"I think you need something like that, though..."

"...some of the titles that they have (on television shows) like the last one they showed on marijuana, the title was, 'The Grass is Getting Greener.' Now see that's really catchy, (Ed R agrees) I mean, something like that, something (that has a different meaning than the usual one)."

The group pauses.

Terry C: "Does anybody know what would be good as just the phrase of a song, a popular song?"

Al H: "I was thinking, this isn't really catchy, but the way to present this title would be like, uh, 'Going to the Suburbs,' now we'd show some guy being hustled and hustled and bumped around through town and attacked- (Laughter) - and go to an airport and ask for a ticket... to the suburbs. (Groans) Back to 'City Sidewalks.'"

The group and observer talk and joke about the situations that occur in shooting a production in a public place. Al H suggests a way in which mannequins could be used to dramatize the production:

Al H: "If you want to get into that, you could have a guy going through the city, you can tell he can't stand it, he goes up to a window, and you could show a dummy falling, and then go out to the suburbs, like and have-- as it's falling, then you kind of cut it, and then show them laying underneath the trees in the suburbs."

Bob H: "All bloody--"

Marcy S: "Hey that would be great, it would, that would be good for the ending."

Robin M and Terry C also express approval and enthusiasm for the idea.
Marcy S: "Hey we should really get into something that will shock people, or show what good film techniques we can use, y'know?"

Bob H: "Lost in space."

Al H: "Y'know, I was thinking--"

Bd R: "'The Rise and Fall of the American City.'" (Laughter by the females)*

Al H: "--from going from country to city, have somebody dive into the water in a country pond, and come up in a city pool, or something like that."

Bob H: "I'm not buying a ticket to the pool to do that."

(suppressed laughter)

Members joke and consider the possibility of gaining access to a pool; the observer says this would be easy to arrange. There is a pause.

Ed R: "OK, so--"

Marcy S: "Yeah, we'd better think of some--"

(male member): "A title!"

Ed R: "A title--really." (Laughter.)

_______: "But those are still good ideas."

There is a pause, then the members consider other situations they might set up and videotape. They freely joke and laugh, with the females most active. There is another pause.

Ed R asks the observer how titles are superimposed on a scene in movies. The observer explains how this can be done using the two camera system in the Center of Science and Industry's studio.

Terry C, following up a comment of Marcy S, tells of previously filming the burning of a dollar bill.
Ed R: "We're running out of time, we gotta get a title."

Bob H: "'City Sidewalk-' 'Downtown,' we could use that song."

The observer suggests they use the brainstorming technique to find a title. Bob H suggests "Country Roads."

Al H: "We don't have to have a song, (but) there's a song by Crosby, Stills, Nash, and Young that-- they say a lot, 'Where do we go from here'. . .(he suggests using the music as the title is shown); If we can get the title included in the song, fine, but otherwise just as long as they're not-- completely--"

Marcy S: "OK; want to brainstorm?"

The members pause again. Several more ideas for titles are thrown out, but none are accepted. The meeting ends without a title being chosen.

END.
The meeting began very informally. Kim C explained how the credits would fit with another proposed scene, that of a baby crying.

Lou G (advisor): "Would you like to walk through it, now, to get some ideas as to how we're graphically---for instance, how did you decide you were graphically gonna do titles?"

Kim C: "We cannot do it the way Telford wants to do it--I wish--"

Cindy R: "You know when you said you wish we could put the, y'know, like they do on TV?"

Telford D: "Super, on slides--"

Cindy R: "Yeah"

Telford D: "But since we only have one--(camera)"

Cindy R: "That's it---I wish we could do it, but we can't."

The group paused, then Lou G (the advisor) asked me if I had any facilities for title lay-ons, like those used for ball-scores on commercial television. No, I replied, but told them it was possible to superimpose white titles over another picture, but that this procedure would have to be done with (the COSI) studio cameras. Kim C, asked if the group had access to COSI's studio. Yes, I answered, but warned that there might be compatibility problems between the portapack VTR and studio VTR.

Lou G: "Would you entertain the idea of using nature's own, like writing on the sand, or writing on the trees/?"
Cindy L: "That's what I was thinking."
Kim C: "That's about the only other thing we could do."
Telford D: "Remember the last time we tried to put signs on trees?"
(Explosive general laughter.)
Lou G: "Or the ghetto titling technique of spray can on a building."
Kim C: "Oh, I can see that now, we'd all get arrested."
(Laughter.)
Telford D: "No, we can go to Cindy's house, we can't get arrested on private property."
Kim C agreed with Telford, amidst laughter. When Cindy R objected, Telford suggested the advisor's house. They abandoned the spray painting idea.

The group joked and discussed other means of doing titles. When Lou G (the advisor) suggested using building materials, Cindy R suggested bricks, but Kim C vetoed the idea: "I'm talking about credits, now, for instance, if you want to put 'D. Telford Dennison' in bricks--" (Laughter.)
Lou G: "Write it on poster paper, or on the surface of a building, just wash it off."
Kim C: "Yeah, that's what we have to do..."
Lou G: "Do you think, would that look like West Side Story? Is that a clique?"
Kim C: "No, I don't think so, not if we change it around, then---"
Cindy R: "If we could use a graffiti board...and then switch right to that thing (the title)--"
Cindy L: "Aah (understanding)?"

Telford D: "We could do it right here... at Borden Burger (High & Woodruff),
cause nobody says anything there; and that would look great..."

(comments overlapping)

Kim C: "Couldn't you---alright, hold on a second---"

Cindy R: "We'd have to change the whole beginning with the kid
crying then."

Kim C: "... the bulletin board, and tack on like uh--- 'writer'
so-and-so, OK and you focus in on that and you move over a little
bit and focus in to another thing, something like that; that way
you could read it all on the same board, and you wouldn't have to
(unintelligible)."

Lou G: "Just pan?"

Telford D: "Yeah, then you can see all the other stuff they have out
there like, y'know, GAA, and all the other..."

Lou G: "Alright, now, would that give us the mood of our urban concern,
that we want?"

After a short pause, both Cindy L and Kim C begin talking simultaneously,
joking about the problem.

Telford D: "I think that would be interesting.... I like it better if
we could do it at Borden Burger, because it looks more degrading."

Cindy L: "It does, it looks more degrading writing on a wall than
just putting up a sign."

Telford D: "And then we could stick things in between there, like all
over campus there's signs that say like uh, 'smash racism and
imperialism and nazism and---"
Kim C: "I really don't care what you people do, it's just that I--"

Telford D: "What do you mean, 'us people,' you're in this too.

Kim C: "Well, no no no, I know, but what I mean is, do you remember
the last movie we made, and Andy was carrying around a harmless,
little rifle that wasn't loaded, it was broken--"

Telford D: "Why do we have to carry around a rifle?"

Kim C: "We don't have to, What I'm trying to tell you is, painting
on a nice little wall--(laughter)"

Telford D: "No no no no no, I don't mean we'll be painting on the wall--"

Cindy L: "We're going to put someone up to it; Mr. Gray?"

Kim C: "Maybe we could do it in water colors or something, I don't know."

Pause.

Lou G: "OK, the alternatives are real objects, making letters, or to
paint, the waterpaint thing on building things; or a continuous pan
across a grafitti."

The group briefly discussed and discarded the idea of titling on glass,
an idea of Kim C. Lou G suggested they "walk through" some segments,
to get an idea of how they all feel about them "so we can get some
sort of finalization." Cindy R agreed. Kim C stated that she
hadn't gotten a lot of help in writing the script.

Cindy L: "You guys, at least let's work on the first few areas of it
if we are going to get a portapak Thursday."

Kim C: "Alright, with 'em."

Cindy L: "And that means credits first."

Telford D: "Why don't we just have a title first and do credits last?"

Kim C: "That's what I was saying."

Cindy L: "OK just title, then."
Cindy R: "We're going to have to cut the bit with the baby crying then."

Telford D: "Why? No, we don't have to. We could have white letters on a black background--"

Lou G: "Have you ever thought of tying in your baby crying with some spelled out play letters across the crib?"

Kim C: "How about with blocks?"

Lou G: "Or blocks?"

Kim C: "Building blocks, little baby Shawn building blocks."

Laughter. They discuss who Shawn is.

Lou G: "What about the first segment?" (Pause)

Telford D: "...I think it might be more effective if we had white letters on a black background, so it would be black, and then you would just have your title from a blank."

Kim C: "It's fine."

Telford D: "And then we could stop it down, and then it could come back open to the (unintelligible)."

Kim C: "Uh huh, uh huh." Pause. "I didn't know that would work on a portapack, so--. I was the only one here, I think, that didn't go to the workshop; I was taking my ACT. I also am going to have to break this to you people; this is going to be fun; please don't throw your tomatoes at me or anything. May sixth, I believe it is, and seventh-- I'm not going to be here."

Telford D: "Where are you going to be?"

Kim C: "In Michigan."

Telford D: "That's OK, we can do without you."
Telford suggested the group next think of a title.

Kim C: "That's a good idea, why don't WE figure out a title (laugh)."

Group: "Ummmm..."

Lou G: "Should it be symbolic?" Someone answers, "M huh (yes)."

Pause.

Cindy R: "See this is the problem, this is what Kim's put up with, that's the reason there isn't a whole lot of script."

Cindy L: "Kim sits there, what do you think?"

Kim C: "Well, yeah: 'How many think this? OK' (laugh)."

Telford D: "Our problem is, we keep saying, 'Our problem is--'."

Cindy R suggested the theme of 'something old, something new,' but not in those words. Kim C remarked that it reminded her of something in Greek mythology. The group began joking about mythological titles, then about Andy Warhol's unconventional film techniques.

Telford D: "Getting back to the title-- shall we make it simple, small words, easy to understand, or shall we toss around words like-- elephant?" More joking.

Lou G: "What about-- 'Our town: Challenge and Change.'"

Telford D: "Cowtown: Challenge and Change,'...and then we can incorporate Borden's in there." Several people talking.

Kim C: "No no no, Tel no, please guys--"

Lou G: "Yeah, let's do is kinda get back to the title first, and just 'walk through' some more..."

Cindy R agreed, wanting to read the script. Kim C said no, let Telford read it because he's doing a good job. Telford D reads the script.
After a few scenes have been read, Kim C points out an area that has to be changed. She, Cindy R and Telford D discuss it, offering images. Kim clarifies her objection: the inability to do quick cuts with the portapak. Lou G suggested the only way to do it was by using super-8 for the flash cuts, then videotaping them.

Observer: "If the cuts that you're going to do that are fast, if it would be desirable, and I think it might be, would you want a surrealistic effect to this section? Because the way you're doing it you'll pick up a lot of contrast anyway, because it's second generation, and because of that-- you could accentuate that pretty easily; and what you might want to do is have it more stark during the section where you have the fast cuts. On the other hand, you might want to try to minimize that so it looks as much as possible like the rest of the videotape. But it's an option that you can fool around with."

Kim C asked if film editing equipment was available at the school. Telford D said it was, but questioned whether it was worth the effort, or if the group had time to do it. Lou G suggested flipping through pictures, and I pointed out that it would have to be done in "real time" to avoid the stopping of the VTR each time. They discarded the idea with Telford D's agreement with Cindy R's opinion that it would be better to avoid the quick cuts and use a series of vignettes.

Cindy R: "It doesn't have to be real quick, just let it sink in more: hand plugging in the taster, and then putting down the bread... putting a TV dinner into the oven, and then pushing the thing...something that relates to breakfast..."
Lou G: "And subliminally show that there's no food value. In fact, 'The Great American Dream Machine' once had a chemical analysis of a Morton frozen pie that had no food value at all; it was all chemical, no food value."

Cindy R: "Yeah, pop-tarts..."

Telford D: "That's awful... The National Lampoon had a thing on that..."

Lou G: "OK, well, let's move on then to uh, we're now in the office building somewhere."

They talk of getting some footage downtown, and recall the incident of being followed by a group of men when they were last downtown sizing up pictures.

Telford D: "Anyway, OK, this is going to be tough, cause we've got three major quotes in here... here's where there's going to be big break: 'Emphasis on mechanization of society;' impersonalization, I suppose, is (unintelligible). 'How sex permeates our society;' emphasis is put on love, on sex, on being sexy; she's of everything from toothpaste to pornography that, y'know, say that this is love."

Cindy R recalls a picture of the Little Art Theatre, and the group gets into a discussion of X-theatres, plastic mannikins (Lou G), and the truck painted on the front of the Moonshop Coop Bar.

With interpretative help from Kim C, Telford D goes over more of the script. Suggested wording, images, approaches are given by Cindy R, Lou G, and Kim C. Kim C reminded the group that she had written the script in a positive vein rather than negative, since that's the way the group had voted (3-2). When Cindy R asked if any negative themes were going to be shown, Kim C reacted with exasperation, saying she
didn't care, and would they please make up their minds.

Kim C: "Alright people, I will rewrite the script on one condition:

tell me what you want. I'm sick--"

Cindy R: "Look, you guys--"

Telford D: "We'll tell you what we want." (spoken wearily)

Cindy R: "Kim, we are all in the fourth period, why don't you hand

us the script, and we can work on it."

The rest of the meeting was spent discussing when they could all get
together to hammer out more of the script.

END.
Setting: The meeting was held in a high-ceilinged classroom, as before.

The meeting began with Dirk N going through the beginning of the production describing the "city addict" getting up in the morning "really burned out," with pictures of his addiction (the city) on the walls of his bedroom. The group considers the actions of this student once he is out of bed. Jim J enthusiastically suggests some images. Dave M makes several image suggestions. The advisor, Sue R, elaborates on showing pollution, smoking, etc.

Dirk N: "Ah- (trying to get the attention of the advisor, still talking to another member) we'll stop, we'll stop there, ah- (the advisor continues talking) . . . (there is a pause) Write a news report, OK? With that stuff in it. Alright? (Pause; other members are talking in the background) Alright, it's got to contain, um, um, people dying of overdose of drugs, statistics on how many people are addicted to drugs, smokers, and pollution, um air tests-"  

Joel W: "But we're doing overdoses of cities."

Dirk N: "Right, I know, but if you, but if you start talking about that kind of thing with drugs, um, it's, y'know, a subtle kind of thing, and as the film goes on, we find out that what they're talking about is the addiction to cities, not drugs. That's why we have a bunch of pictures (on the bedroom wall) on cities."

Dave M: "You get a big hypodermic syringe on his dresser full of buildings and stuff, and-"
Jim J: "Columbus police caught six people last night around a smoke tower, inhaling toxic fumes."

Dirk N: "Uh, the news report has to be about drugs, and not cities; drugs."

Jim J: "Drugs?"

Dirk N: "Right. Um, you have, um, how many people died of overdose of drugs, how many people are addicted to drugs; um, also, air pollution index, (the advisor, Sue R, is heard in the background talking to another group member, with whom she is planning the radio report)

Uh, people buying—(several voices are heard at once)—yeah, stuff like that, OK. Now think about like (a scene) that would indicate directly a person being addicted to the city, just directly, OK?

Um, alright, he's driving in a car, and you can have um—"

Jim J: "Dirk?"

Dirk N: "(softly) What?"

Jim J: "How about like (unintelligible) affects the air quality index?"

Dirk N: "The weather report, yeah. Alright, while he's driving—"

Joel W: "OK, put him in a bus, or driving a car, or what?"

Sue R: "Leave the cars down."

Dirk N: "Yeah."

Dave M: "Not if he's hitch-hiking."

Dirk N: "Yeah. Plus uh—(he pauses as the advisor makes a side comment)

Then we could play the monster song during that; 'cause that's what thirteen minutes long?"

Scott W: "Yeah. It's got, like, a couple of parts to it."

Several members make comments to others quietly, with some joking:

Sue R, Joel W, Scott W, and Dirk N.
Dirk N: "Um-
Sue R: "What else is different about (unintelligible)?"
Dirk N: "He's doing a lot of smoking, a lot of smoking of cigarettes."
Several group members snicker.
Ron S: "Have him pop at least one pill."
The advisor, Sue R, laughs, then says: "Hey, aspirin. He wakes up and
takes two aspirin. Drinks some Alka-Seltzer or something."
Pause.
Dave M: "Why not natural stimulants, like coffee, eight cups of coffee."
Dirk N: "Because we want to direct this with, like, drugs and the city."
Sue R (advisor): "A couple of aspirins fit in, though."
Dirk N: "Yeah, OK."
Scott W: "Yeah, if we put a lot of little drugs in there, then people
aren't- they might not catch the thing about getting up on the city.
They might just look at it like he's a kid getting up on drugs
living in the city."
Dirk N: "OK, with the drugs, like, there's a lot of paraphernalia. We
ought to think of some kind of paraphernalia with the city to go
along with that, maybe like a-
Sue R: "Parking ticket. Just a parking, a parking ticket."
Joel W: "I think I'm going to get lost in this."
Dirk N: "Like maybe the signs they have downtown, like 'No Left Turn,'
every street is a no left turn.
Jim J mumbles something about streets being one-way.
Sue R: "Like road construction along the way, (Pause) the, the unh-
degradation of the landscape by asphalt; we have acres of asphalt."
Jim J: "Wow! Eight o'clock on the freeway, during rush-hour traffic, you know? And once he's there—"

Sue R: "That's right."

Jim J: "No, like, you know, he finally gets down there, and everything keeps slowing down (unintelligible) busses..."

The advisor relates the difficulty of getting out of the driveway of her apartment complex at eight-o'clock in the morning.

Joel W asks the advisor if she is willing to act. She asks him to repeat his question, as she didn't understand what he said. When he does, she says, "Oh, I wouldn't. Not me." Several members laugh; others don't.

Dirk N: "OK, uh- Should we do the parking thing? the big high-rise parking thing?" Sue R says she thinks it's a good idea.

One member is speaking to another student who stops at the door of the meeting room. Their conversation is interfering with the group's discussion. Dirk N tells him: "Just get up and talk to him and come back," with some annoyance in his voice.

Ron S: "What about the guy goes to a bank and cashes a check; and the bank's in the city."

Dirk N: "What for?"

Ron S: "Well, I mean-- Your topic's the city and how people relate to the city, how people's lives depend on it--"

Sue R: (as Ron S continues speaking) "But how that he's addicted, how we're addicted to the city,"

Joel W: "When he goes down there, what's he trying to get once he gets down there?" (Pause)

Sue R: "He's trying to get drug- he's trying to get the city, just the enjoyment of, he's high now, he's really high. (Several others
try to speak, but the advisor continues.) We have to show, we have
to have him a little lethargic in the beginning."

Dirk N: "Yeah. Uh, and once he gets to the city, like he's just high
and walking around show all sorts of, y'know, garbage and just masses
of people, and uh, we have to do this on a weekday."

Joel W: "I just don't see how this is going to turn out serious; I
mean- (the advisor says something) I see it as being superfluous
humourous; it's gonna be a piece of shit."

Sue R: "It's going to be humorous, 'cause we have-"

Dirk N: "You mean it's got to be humorous?

Sue R: "Well--"

Joel W: "I think we ought to think it is-"

Sue R: "You have to remember that people that are going to be there
(at the video festival) are not just Worthington people."

There is a pause.

Dirk N: "Oh, like when he's driving, he could reach into the glove
compartment, like, to get a pack of cigarettes or something, and
a bunch of pamphlets on cities come flying out."

Several members laugh, especially the advisor.

Ron S, the advisor, and another member comment on the contents of these
pamphlets. Dirk N explains that the man gets downtown, goes to the top
of the Lazarus parking garage, and is seen inhaling the polluted city
air as the camera zooms back to show the city around him. Ron S begins
to describe a scene in which the man enters an elevator in his best
suit. Dirk N cuts him off with the objection that a student would not
be dressed that way.
Observer: "It seems to me that you need somehow to show it in a context in which it's seen as a drug, now: by 'seen as a drug' you could mean, you could concentrate, I guess, on the bad, on the things that would be negative, or positive, or both; he gets high on the city, but he also gets addicted, or something; but all these scenes, like he's going downtown and he breathes in the air, having him stand there taking a great big breath, people won't necessarily know that you're comparing it with the drugs. I see that as a difficulty. Now they might see, like, if you show an exhaust pipe and that, you know, pollution as such as a problem, yeah, but not in the context-"

Sue R: "If an adult's going to have a change in attitude and stuff as he drives toward the city, I think it's gonna be- you know, kind of non-apathetic."

Joel W, Dirk N, Dave M, Dirk N again, then the observer, comment on the progression from the waking-up scene to the entrance into the city. After a recap of the proposed opening scenes by Dirk N, the observer, in response to a question by the advisor, suggests that the connection between the city and drugs should be made early in the program, so the audience can follow the allusions depicted. One way, the observer suggests, is to show the student being arrested for some abuse of the city. Jim J attempts a humorous elaboration on this idea. Both Sue R and Dave M support the idea of using newspaper or magazine headlines to establish a connection between the city and drugs. The observer suggests the connection might be established through the title.

There is a pause.
Dirk N and Sue R, then several other members, give scattered ideas, but in a lower voice and more faltering than before. There is a long pause.

Sue R: "OK so, where are we now? He arrives downtown- (Pause) Do we want to think of more things that this person uses...? I wish we could think of more-"

Ron S: "Oh, we've got to catch some of the stock exchange. Um, 'Profits for such-and-such a company soared today.'"

The advisor makes an unintelligible comment.

Dave M: "Go take a stroll through the city dump; like go down to a big trash can, dig through and pull out the morning newspaper or something-"

Sue R: "Hey, that's an idea."

Joel W: "You could go skipping through the city dump..."

Dave M: "Build a trash castle."

Ron S: "We've got to have him in a restaurant."

A member volunteers to play the part of the student.

Dirk N: "You're it. There's our star."

Sue R: "Here's the star. You don't talk, though. We'll probably have somebody else talk."

Ron S: "Now that we know who our star is, um-""

Sue R: "I like the idea of pulling a newspaper out of the garbage..."

Ron S: "OK (several other voices interrupt) Can you picture this: he's in a restaurant having a coke, hamburger or something; he's reading the newspaper and looking out the window, looking at this great big office building, and really getting addicted to the city--"
After a pause, Dave M: "Just standing on a street corner (leaning against a lamp-post), just watching the cars go by and taking a wiff every once in a while...with a really busy intersection, just standing there and watching, staring at all this stuff—"

Dirk N: "Yeah, like High Street just before you get to Broad."

Dave M: "Yeah; someplace where it's pretty busy, y'know, he's just standing there, and can't get enough of these cars and people and things."

Ron S: "We have to have a little respect for (unintelligible)."

The advisor laughs weakly.

Observer: "Would you want to show him in the midst of this avoiding someone enforcing prohibition against cities?

Dirk N: "Yeah, we could (show) an ecologist or something."

Joel W: "Yeah, we should have him walk through a crowd of people holding signs saying, 'Down With Cities.'"

Sue R: "He could attend a debate or something; (unintelligible)-"

While the advisor is talking, Joel W jokes with Dirk N and another member. This goes on for 20 seconds. The observer suggests showing an informer telling the police about the central character's use of the city.

Dave M proposes a scene in which the central character is confronted by his mother. Ron S comments; the advisor laughs. Joel W suggests showing the central character arrested by the police when he comes home; Dirk N says the charge is "abuse of cities." Dave M also comments, followed by Joel W, the advisor, the observer, and Ron S, then the advisor again.

Ron S: "We gotta have him going in stores, too. Especially a record store."

After a pause, the advisor asks: "Why?"
Ron 5 does not answer.

Dave M: "Have him looking through the sound-effect albums..."

Several members are heard talking and joking.

Ron S: "Don't forget the banks and (unintelligible)."

There is a pause.

Sue R: "Where are we? OK, so the truant officer calls, now the kid's on his way in the car, and we talked about all the problems he has getting downtown-

Dirk N: "What did you say again?"

The advisor repeats and elaborates on the scenes in which the student arrives in the city.

Dirk N: "Is it a possibility to have the main...story line (be that) his whole purpose is just to get downtown, and we could end it where we're zooming away with him, you know where he's on top of the parking building, and we have-"

Sue R: "Will we make fifteen minutes out of that? We got-

Dirk N: "(softly) Yeah, I think so."

Sue R: "(softly) Yeah, I think so too."

Dirk N: "What do we have (unintelligible)?"

Observer: "As much as you want, really. A half-an-hour is a lot to do, especially in the time we have left, which is, I think, 9 days?"

Dirk N: "Uh, so, how about that?

Joel W: "We're gonna start tomorrow."

Sue R: "Yeah."

There is a pause.

Observer: "You need a- I would think you'd need a script first."
Dirk N: "Yeah."
Observer: "A written script, lining up the visuals and sound."
The advisor makes a comment. Several members then begin talking at once: Scott W, Dave M, the advisor, Jim J, Dirk N.
Scott W: "I've got a friend who can schedule all the muggings (we want); and I could stand there and watch one."
Someone laughs. The advisor says, "That's good."
Observer: "There are some things that you've got to watch, because the analogy is unbelievably weak in some ways, but in other ways it's strong."
Scott W suggests showing the student's entry into the city as occurring at a time when the dangers of city addiction are known, and authorities don't know what to do; "It's just where they're starting to realize the problem, but they haven't really made it illegal, or they're running around arresting archetects or anything like that..."
Ron S suggests the central character be an archetecture student.
After a few more comments, the meeting ends.

END.
SURVEY: WHERE ARE WE NOW? DATE 1/31/74 GROUP GAMMA

NAME

1. What do you want to say? (Put it in 3 simple sentences)
   a. What progress is being done to Columbus?
   b. Breakup of family unit
   c. Social comment on city living

2. What pictures will you use to express these ideas? List:
   a. Scenes of:
      Family units
   b. Mass production
      - People being mechanized
      - Jobs being...!
   c. Scenes of city life
      - Emphasis on "new"
      - Advertising medium
      - Changing attitudes of one
      - Switch back to
      - Family breakup
      - Hope
      - Why
      - Columbus can change

3. What sounds will you use to express these ideas? List:
   a. Background music
   b. Narration
   c. Traffic and other urban sounds
   d. 
   e. 
   f. 
   g. 
   h. 
   i. 
   j. 
1. What do you want to say? (Put it in 3 simple sentences)
   A. The city is causing a breakdown of the family unit on which society is based.
   B. The city has designed things to appeal to the masses, thereby destroying individuality.
   C. The only way to solve these problems is to recognize them and act upon them.

2. What pictures will you use to express these ideas? List:
   A. Showing scenes of massive production-1930's of look-aikes.
   B. Look-alike people lined up like little soldiers.
   C. Destruction of nature, sex building and roads.
   D. A typical family unit.
   E. Different kinds of people-but all with the type of problems.

3. What sounds will you use to express these ideas? List:
   A. Symbolism using a lullaby.
   B. Caught in the mad, mad, mad, mad world.
   C. Sound sounds like traffic, typing-the sounds of industry.
   D. Narration.
   E. Sound of home life.
1. What do you want to say? (Put it in 3 simple sentences)

A. Our progress is a definite reality.

B. Liberty was real and so was the war.

C. More people now live in cities, cities, cities, and the cities are becoming the community centers of the nation.

2. What pictures will you use to express these ideas? List:

A. The 'twisted' society
   (people using everything electric)

B. The town home structure
   expressions of 'bad buildings'

C. Identical, wrong-looking identical cars, identical offices
   all with a type of uniformity

D. Typical family

3. What sounds will you use to express these ideas? List:

a. Building noises and music

b. Music with meaningful lyrics

c. Typing on the constant drumming noise

d.
1. What do you want to say? (Put it in 3 simple sentences)
   A. ____________________________
   B. ____________________________
   C. ____________________________

2. What pictures will you use to express these ideas? List:
   A. Character: Scout
      Accessories: hat, scarf, boots
   B. ____________________________
   C. ____________________________

3. What sounds will you use to express these ideas? List:
   a. ____________________________
   b. ____________________________
   c. ____________________________
   d. ____________________________
   e. ____________________________
   f. ____________________________
APPENDIX C

Scripts of the Four Productions
This is Columbus, Ohio, a place with the growing pains which plague almost all cities, regardless of size. And Columbus is growing. In the past twenty years, Ohio's capitol city has annexed over one-hundred square miles, an increase of over two-hundred percent, to make it first in the state area-wise.

And more area means more people. The population rate of Columbus has been growing faster than that of Ohio, the east-north central states, even faster than that of the United States. Now ranking twenty-first among U.S. cities, Columbus has grown by fourteen and a half percent, and central Ohio has increased by twenty-one percent, to give metropolitan Columbus over one million people. So what does it all mean?

Just that people need safe, decent, and sanitary housing. And all this rapid growth often means that there are simply not enough houses to go around. As cities sprawl more and more outward, the inner-city decays until living space becomes blighted, and eventually a slum.
And, as less attention is paid these areas through social and governmental services, conditions grow worse daily. All sorts of studies have come to the same conclusion: that cramped, unsafe, unsanitary living conditions are a basic cause for everything from an increased infant death rate to a major fire risk zone. No one benefits from sub-standard housing. The residents obviously don't, and neither does the city government. Bad housing costs more to provide basic services by returning less tax revenues than any other area. Business suffers as less people come downtown to shop, leaving it, and the economy, lifeless.

So the question that comes up again and again is a simple one: Why do people still have to live like this?

Some people feel they shouldn't have to, and are doing something about it. This is the Columbus Metropolitan Housing Authority. Their goal, as the local housing authority, is not only to eliminate slums and provide housing for low-income families at rents they can afford, but also to improve the community, physically and socially, and to involve the residents in meaningful activities.
Mr. Patrick Feeney, in his office

We asked Patrick J. Feeney, executive director of the housing authority, about this.

(Mr. Feeney explains the general purpose and methods of the CMHA.)

CU of the sign, "Poindexter" at a housing site

The original housing offered by the CMHA was the project-type, like Poindexter Village.

We talked with Mr. Bernard Cheary, the manager of Poindexter, about project housing.

MS of Mr. Cheary with the buildings of Poindexter in the background

(Mr. Cheary points out the facilities offered in Poindexter Village.)

MS of Mr. Cull in the Jenkins Terrace lobby

Some housing is exclusively for the elderly.

Mr. Edward Cull is manager of Jenkins Terrace.

Mr. Cull by the recreation area

(Mr. Cull comments on the facilities offered at Jenkins Terrace.)

Mr. Cull at auditorium

Mr. Cull by lunchroom

MS Mrs. Joel Pennington in her office, with a map of Columbus on the wall behind her

One relatively new type of housing is the scattered-site concept. Mrs. Joel Pennington explains it.

(CU of the map

(Mrs. Pennington comments on the advantages of the scattered-site program.)
There are problems with public housing: federal money is often hard to get, the public is sometimes hostile to the idea, even the fact that this housing exists is not widely known.

The local housing agencies like the Columbus Metropolitan Housing Authority are working on the problem. So the answer to the question, "Do people still have to live like this?" is "No."
BBTA GROUP SCRIPT

"Everybody's Mountain" written by Edward R May, 1974

VISUALS

(A) SLOW PAN of the river and trees along the bank

NARRATION

In the words of Eugene Ruskin, Assistant Professor of Architecture at Columbia University, "it doesn't take 20-20 vision to see that our big cities are not merely in a state of crisis. They are dying." It has come to a point where the city doesn't offer anything that the public can't get somewhere else that is more convenient. It has nothing to offer to keep the people inside. As a result, our cities have become unworkable, crime-ridden, garbage-strewn, polluted, and torn by racial conflicts. They are centers for welfare, unemployment, and despair. The question is: why has this occurred, and how can we stop it?

ZOOM IN on the title, "Everybody's Mountain" painted on a rock

(B) City National building; water fountain; up flag pole

(MUSIC: "You and Me," Moody Blues)

Cities were first conceived as centers for defense, commerce, and excitement. Today, in an era of intercontinental missiles, the idea of defense is ridiculous. Big cities would be prime targets in case of any nuclear attack. The most unsafe place to be would be in a large city.
Office buildings

As far as commerce is concerned, it is a well-known fact that businesses have started to move out of the cities and into the suburbs to meet the public demand. Downtown has become a center for office buildings. Then comes excitement.

Today it seems that the only excitement that the city has to offer is getting home at night without being mugged. Many of the entertainment centers have died out or moved out of the city.

This has occurred for the same reason as business's flight to the suburbs: to become more accessible to the public.

Olentangy River Road for entertainment

From this we can see that the city has become obsolete. It can no longer provide the citizens with the kind of life they want, so as a result the people have moved out of the city and into the suburbs.

(Scott's Inn)

(C) Jefferson Ave.

There are several other reasons why people have moved out of the city and into the new industrial parks, resort farms, and young idea towns. One reason is a search for space and open air.

(D) Sinclair Road

A father would much rather see his wife and kids live in the clean and orderly environment of the suburbs as compared to the crowded and dirty downtown areas.

Neighborhood streets
In the suburban areas his kids are exposed to public parks and recreation facilities, while in the downtown areas they would meet crowded housing, traffic jams, and polluted air.

Another reason for the flight to the suburbs is convenience. With the exodus of business away from the downtown areas, many jobholders not only find it more refreshing to live in the suburbs, but also more convenient.

In the past couple of years it has also been more economical to live in the suburbs. While rents have gotten very high in the downtown areas, property values in the suburbs have also skyrocketted.

Buying a home in the suburbs is now a good investment.

Because of this many people have now been given an incentive to move out. And the city has been left behind to die.

A recent Gallup Poll, taken in August of 1972, shows that the trend throughout the country is to live anywhere but in the city.

Of all the people polled, 31% said that they would prefer to live in the suburbs. 32% said
that small towns were their preference.

23% preferred farm life, and the remaining 14% said they would like to live in the city.

This 14% is down 23% from 1966 and 18% from 1968.

In view of these facts, it is evident that the public opinion of the city and city living is steadily decreasing. The question is, how can we make the cities more appealing to the general public? How can we stop the decaying process that is now (sic) taking place in the cities? Another cause for the slow and painful death of the American city is the exodus of business to the suburbs.

(There are several reasons for this exodus. In the past, the city was the big manufacturing center because it supplied an enormous amount of cheap labor. Immigrants were the main source of this labor.)

(Today, however, there is no market for cheap labor in this country. All of it has gone, and is in places like Puerto Rico and Hong Kong.)

As a result their advantage, that business enjoyed in the past is no longer a reality.
Businesses have also moved out of the city for the same reasons that people have. First, the want of more room. People would much rather shop in a large and open area as opposed to a small and congested one.

Second, it has become not only economical for companies to move into the suburbs, but also more fashionable.

Now shopping centers which are located in suburbia are spacious, comfortable, and have a cheerful atmosphere.

Because of this who wants to fight downtown. You don't need it anymore.

(In the past two or three years the Columbus area has experienced a big building boom. Much of the development has been going on away from the downtown area.) One of the main factors in the construction away from the city was the opening of I-270, the outerbelt. This freeway has opened up the countryside adjacent to the city. I-270 has provided business with the opportunity to construct their offices, factories, labs, and condominiums away from the noise, crowding, and traffic of the city without sacrificing the
availability of it. Big corporations are now building with the intent of making their structure an advertisement for their product.

They don't put up big flashing fluorescent lights bearing the name of the company or product, but rather they design their buildings to be unusual, imaginative, and pleasing to the eye. When most people see this type of building, the first thing they want to know is, "What is it?" Once they find out they seldom forget.

(There are many such buildings along the outerbelt. The mirror-like appearance of the west wall makes the Ashland Oil Job Building (sic) an eye-catching advertisement. The setting at Mid-Ohio Volkswagen as well as the modern building design functions as an eye-catcher to passersby.)

A. Busch grounds

The actual structure of Anheuser (sic) Busch isn't especially attractive, but the wildlife area next to the brewery is able to give the company a favorable public image.

Downtown is the heart of the city and in order for anything to survive it must have a strong heart. This is especially true when we talk about the city. If the downtown area isn't lively and productive, then the city will die.
Columbus has realized this and has continued to try and keep the downtown area alive. Private investment has continually been advocated by Columbus leaders and as a result many new buildings have appeared in the last several years. Some of the newest are the Ohio Bell Building and the Bordon Building, which is still under construction. (Old building has been torn down for new, and the downtown skyline has changed drastically in the last couple years. Many new projects are also in the planning stage. For example, a new Convention Center will soon stand in the place of the old train station.)

Columbus isn't only interested in tearing down the old buildings and putting up new ones. The city and its people are also interested in revitalizing the older sections of town. German Village is a prime example of this. People equipped with a little enthusiasm and a little money have brought back part of the past for all to enjoy.

So you can see that to prevent our cities from dying we must make the downtown areas more vital and exciting. We must show the public that this is the place to be. We must attract them with
beautiful new downtown buildings and with places like German Village. All of this is necessary if we are to keep our cities alive and kicking.
VISUALS

White/black backing for title
Fade out-
Focus in on 3 lines of Kim’s "Hope" poem
Fade back to blackness

NARRATION

Silence—or appropriate music (dub in)

This is the typical American family. They are middle-class, have 2-3 children, and are happily average. The father will rise (briefcase in hand) and commute from this secure niche to his place of employment in the center of town.

(Sounds of car starting- then moving-traffic sounds in background.)

What is a commuter? What makes him special? Nothing. He has become one member of a faceless mass moving numbly to and from a job. He sees identical housing complexes—but he probably lives in one—so they don’t register in his mind. He sees slum area districts, but they’re in all cities, so why should he worry? He notices the crowds & the emphasis on all that is new, but he doesn’t mind. This is progress! The forging ahead of society—ring out the old and ring in the new!
Man enters glittery new building. Move him into as far as possible down a silent hall.

Next shots of girls doing identical jobs—pushing buttons, typing, adding, etc.

Emphasis on pushing buttons (background—"whatever" until typing/office sounds)

This is this man’s place of employment. It is a busy, growing business, and he is justifiably proud of it.

(Typing/office sounds in background)

To tie in with (D), the next shots are to be of varied mechanical items used in the home. Toasters, can-openers, ranges, washers, dryers, etc.

We seem to be in an age of mechanization.

Progress has smothered our individualism. It has segregated the family members from each other.

We are dependent on machines to warm us, teach us, entertain us and sustain us.

Why do we seek the shelter and quiet of a simple park? Is it man’s instinctive yearning to identify with nature? In the midst of mass confusion, many of us seek escape through the solitude of a running stream, a shade tree, or a wildflower. Reflect a moment upon society’s restlessness—and see how soothing nature becomes—like the healing balm over the wounds of progress.

Yet these quiet pools of thought are few and far between, for society and progress demand our major attention.

Society is fast-moving, time flies swiftly in a hurried city. There is so much input into our minds we cannot cope with the pressure.
(Gamma Script) p. 3

Shot of a tree branch in focus against a tall building background. Before this, however, continue panning across (in diff location) as in (G).

What is this doing to us? Is this the major cause of apathy? And is this indirectly a cause of mechanization?

The future of the American City is based on a question--What do we search for? At its present growth rate it is doubtful we can search, mainly because there never seems to be enough time. But if we did--what would it be? The search for truth & beauty--or science & progress?

Credits.
Johnny Carcass

Show intro - Discreet - Rebuttal

NAR. — Here we are today with a very interesting group of Dr’s here to discuss the changing city. Our first guest is Dr Offal refuse. He is very renowned for his research in cremacausis, excretory routing, garbage disposal. The Dr has just gotten back from a Research tour of the Gobi Desert and Eskimo Alley on the polar ice cap. The Dr was lucky enough to have an opening in his tight schedule to make an appearance here tonight. Let’s have a warm welcome for Dr Offal refuse. (Applause)

OFFAL — Thank you. It’s good to be here.

NAR. That’s right — you have a very tight schedule.

OFFAL — Yes — yes. I have a speech to give. Right here. This is to the society of lady for lawn and garden trash. Bae disposal. Wonderful ladies...
NAR: WITH ALL YOU TRAVELS AND RESEARCH WHAT DO YOU DO FOR ENJOYMENT?
OFFAL: YOU MEAN SEXUALLY?
NAR: NO! I MEAN FUN AND GAMES?
OFFAL: OH WELL I ENJOY DECAYED ANIMALS BY THE WAY EREMACEUS MEANS THE STUDY OF PUTTNG CARCHES WHICH IS A VERY UNEXPLORED SCIENTIFIC FIELD—
SAY ARE THERE ANY AMATURE EREMACEUS OBSERVERS IN THE AUDIENCE? YES! WELL COOL THIS FIELD OF SCIENCE IS ON THE ROAD NOW—HA GET THE PUN ON THE ROAD—
NAR: DR....IN YOUR RESEARCH TRAVEL WHAT HAVE YOU LEARNED FROM THE GOBI OR POLAR ICE CAP ABOUT GARBAGE DISPOSAL?
OFFAL: YES—IN THE GOBI I OBSERVED THE CAMEL. THEY DIG HOLES WITH THEIR HIND LEGS AND EXCRETE AFTER WHICH THEN THEY BURY IT WITH THE SAND..... AND IN THE POLAR ICE CAP I OBSERVE THE FREEZING METHOD
NAR. THANK YOU, HOW CAN YOU RELATE THIS TO WASTE DISPOSAL IN THE CITY OR?
OFFAL - TO RELATE THIS TO THE CITY WE MUST FIRST TAKE ALL THE PROBLEMS AND WEIGHT FACTORS INVOLVED. WASTE, SEWER, MUST BE ROUTED EFFICIENTLY AND GATHERED COLLECTIVELY, NEXT WE MUST APPLY THE METHODS TO THE PROBLEM. WE DESIRE SMELLELESS, TASTELESS, COMPACT AND ATTRACTIVE GARAGE ....
NAR - THANK YOU. OUR NEXT GUEST IS A HIGHLY CONSCIENTIOUS WORKER. HE IS COLUMBUS'S MATTIE FACE RESEARCH MAN. A WARM WELCOME FOR DR DUTY DOER....
DUTY: THANK YOU.
NAR - DUTY. WHAT IS INVOLVED IN MATENENCE RESEARCH?
DUTY: WELL, I PROD INTO LOTS OF TOXIC ALL OF WHICH ARE TO FIND A MORE EFFICIENT WAY TO MAINTAIN THE CITY. THIS IS A CONSTANT JOB WITH NO RESPECT.
NAR - WHY DO YOU SAY THAT DUTY YOUR JOB IS RESPECTABLE.
DUTY - OH YEA - EVERYTIME I PUT UP A STOP SIGN SOME DAMN KID RIPS IT OFF I BURN MY FINGERS REPLACING LIGHT BULB AND IM SICK OF CLEANING RESTROOMS LET ALONE TO BE CONSPIRED ON. THE ENTIRE OSU COLLEGE CAMPUS RALLYS A GIANT FLUSH ONLY TO LEAVE ME WITH THE WORST O V E R FLOW IN THE HISTORY OF SEWAGE MAINTAINING NO RESPECT NO RESPECT AT ALL NAR - THATS TO BAD DUTY - ISNT IT, IF THERE WERE JUST A CITY WITHOUT PEOPLE! I COULD INVENT ALL SORTS OF HANDY DIVISES TO MAINTAIN IT NAR - THAT YOU COULD DUTY - THANK YOU - NOW WE HAVE DR. VILE INSTITUTE HERE. HE IS THE PRESIDENT OF SOCIETY OF THE PROPAGATION OF INDUSTRY. HE HAS BEEN CAMPAIGNING FOR EXPANSION OF CITY'S.
VILE - It's good to be back. I enjoy this show so much. By the way, there is going to be a rally for the removal of farmers from the city limits. My position is for the destruction of open space so many new buildings could be built. My dream is to expand cities and this nation will change its name to the United City of America. Open space is idle space; we must all expand industry and business and take over the world.

NAC - Yes, you have stated your position rather clearly, so let's have our last guest, who is just an average citizen: Normal Norman.

Norm. After hearing all these opinions on everything, I

(The remainder of the talk show was ad-libbed)