SABBATICAL REPORT

Mt. San Antonio College

1987 - 1988 Academic Year

Ralph Eastman, Instructor
Speech Communication, Drama, Broadcasting Department
October 10, 1988

TABLE OF CONTENTS

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

During the 1987-88 academic year, I did practical, unpaid participant/observer research in the development of a new television series as well as research in the history and practice of American commercial television. Having a number of well-placed personal contacts within the television industry, I was in the unique position to observe the various stages of the creative and business process involved in the development of both an episode for an existing television series, "The Equalizer," and for an entire new television series, "Men."

My choice of this sabbatical project grew out of my commitment to the notion that it is the responsibility of teachers to keep current in their professional fields so as best to provide students with an accurate picture of "the real world". I think this is especially important in performing arts areas where, all too often (in my experience), teachers paint largely unrealistic pictures of the field for their students. It seems to me that, while nurturing the necessary enthusiasm and idealism to sustain a student in a performing arts area where talent, craft, and determination are more important for success than academic training, it is essential for teachers to guide students

with a realistic sense of the demands of the contemporary industry.

I also chose to undertake this particular sabbatical study because it seemed to me that, while the College has the ability to hire excellent technicians who can teach the physical elements of production, these technicians have little or no contact with the people and processes that create the program that they are employed to film. The people who have experience and insight into that process are more rare and, in most cases, far too busy with the pressures of their own work to be accessible on an on-going basis to an educational institution. Therefore, I decided to exploit my contacts to develop a base of information about high level television creative and economic decision-making to augment instruction at the college.

The bulk of my time was spent in association with Steve Brown, a television writer/producer with Universal Studios. My sabbatical year perfectly paralleled the time period within which he developed, wrote, revised, sold, and produced the pilot episode of a one-hour dramatic series entitled "Men" that will debut on ABC early in January 1989. This allowed me to be present for the writing, planning, casting, pre-and post-production meetings as well as the actual shooting of the pilot in Baltimore, Maryland. Increasingly, because of our long-standing friendship, I

served as an unpaid personal assistant to Brown, serving as a confidant and "sounding board" for ideas.

In Fall 1987, I spent time with another acquaintance, Robert Eisele, co-producer of the CBS series "The Equalizer" and accompanied him to New York City to observe the preparation and shooting of an episode. I was able at that time to spend several days at Manhattan's Museum of Broadcasting, reviewing their holdings of materials relating to the history of broadcasting as well as viewing video tapes of vintage programming.

To enhance and clarify the wealth of practical experience I received, I took classes in contemporary television programming practices through the U.C.L.A extension -- "Making a Movie for Television," "Inside Network Television," and "High Definition Television," a day long seminar. My interest in writing has grown with the increasing number of students' dramatic writing independent study projects that I supervise and I enrolled in script writing classes at both the California State University Long Beach extension and the U.C.L.A. extension Writers' Program in order to learn more about the process of dramatic writing.

I found that prolonged observation of the story writing sessions for series proposals during the fall were not enlightening beyond a certain point. While I checked in

regularly to keep abreast of developments in the process, I decided that my time would be better spent doing research in both the history of television and reading teleplays so that I could better understand the form that my associates were working to produce. The Theatre Arts library at the U.C.L.A. Research Library has substantial holdings of teleplay scripts in various genres: episodic (comedy and drama), television movies, and mini-series. Studying produced television scripts in various genres helped me to clarify and refine my concept of what makes a successful television script. I found the research so fruitful that, throughout the year on days when there weren't scheduled meetings or production activities at Universal Studios, I spent the hours proceeding my evening classes in this special collection, reading a wide variety of representative scripts. I also researched television history and issues from the years 1945 - 1955 in industry trade magazines, Variety (at U.C.L.A.) and in Billboard (at the California State University San Bernardino library). I read several major books on television history and producing practices and ordered the best volumes for the MSAC library.

SURVEY OF GENERAL FINDINGS

THE TELEVISION INDUSTRY

There are currently somewhere in the neighborhood of 88.6 million television homes in the country. In a prediction made in 1980, it was suggested that by 1990 the networks will claim only 66% of the television viewing audience; the rest will be watching independent stations, cable, or video tape. Current figures suggest that the networks only claim 75% of viewers at any given time. These numbers (ratings) are determined by an analysis of "Homes Using Televisions" (H.U.T.). This is the number of households that have a television on, regardless of what household members may be watching it.

The familiar Nielsen Ratings are becoming obsolete. Nielsen families have always recorded their viewing habits in diary form which is only reviewed once a month, causing the feedback time to be very slow. There is also an increasing feeling that these diaries are not especially reliable because people who are required to use a diary may tend to report that they have watched programming when in fact they haven't. Further, in the older Nielsen ratings system, a family who has a "Nielsen box" in the home is simply tallied as an undifferentiated household viewing a

particular program. The "People Meter" is a newer, more accurate form of monitoring which provides individual buttons for each household member to record when he/she is watching television. This allows for a better demographic breakdown of which household members watch certain programming. The major demographic groups for the networks are children, teens (12 - 17), men and women 18 - 49, and men and women 50+ and correspond to the various audiences that advertisers want to reach to promote their products. "People Meter" critics assert that people who are drawn to such "high tech" gadgetry are basically urban or urban-oriented in their world view. Therefore, they insist that rural audiences are largely ignored by these numbers. Obviously, viewing audience surveys are still an inexact science.

However, programming on the commercial networks is a business. Shows are designed and presented to attract specific audiences for advertisers. To this end, ratings and share points are crucially important to the survival of a television series. The industry has traditionally relied heavily on the Nielsen ratings and, more recently, People Meters to determine just who is watching their programs. This information is vitally important for primetime programming as it is the major source of the networks' income in that each ratings point is roughly equivalent to

880,000 viewing households of the 88.6 million television homes in the country.

Nielsen families and diaries have been the industry standard for what American households are watching on television. "People Meters" are a refinement of the Nielson methods. They allow each member of a household to record his/her viewing preferences. Where the Nielson ratings indicated that someone in the household was watching a specific program, the People Meter provides more precise demographic information as to exactly who in the household is watching a given program. Further, as they are electronic, they allow for nearly immediate feedback instead of the lag due to the narrative form employed by Nielson diaries which could only be assessed periodically.

There is a crucial distinction to make in ascertaining the success of a given program. The industry uses two ways of "rating" programming. Nielson ratings are based on the ratio of people watching a particular program to all the televisions extant in the country, while share points measure the ratio of viewers to the number of sets actually in use at any given time. With the advent of pay cable, video tape, and games, the rest of the households may be using their televisons to view some other source of programming or have turned them off. While ratings measure the hypothetical ratio of actual viewers to all potential

viewers, shares indicate the actual percentage of viewers tuned to a program. By way of example, "Tonight" with Johnny Carson has a relatively low rating by virtue of its late night scheduling, whereas it claims the major share of the market viewing network television in that time period. Hence, advertisers are most interested in the actual per centage and demographics of viewers watching a particular time slot.

The networks use the demographic data gleaned from Nielson and "People Meter" reports in conjunction with market share figures to price and sell advertising time to their clients. In the "Golden Age of Television," it was not uncommon for an advertiser to sponsor an entire program. Names like the Texaco Star Theatre, Chrysler presents Bob Hope, the Kraft Television Theatre come immediately to mind. This trend has given way due to the tremendous costs of advertising minutes or half-minutes. Advertisers also saw that their money was better spent spreading their messages across the spectrum of television, attracting other prospective buyers for their products rather than sinking the whole or bulk of their monies into a single time slot. To this end, it is essential for the networks' advertising sales staffs to have precise information reflecting the demographics that each program in their lineup attracts so that they can exact top advertising dollars for commercials.

In this context, one can see the enormous importance of the network rivalries as to which is first, second, or third as this status determines which attracts the most advertising revenue at premium prices. At this writing, NBC is first, ABC is second, and CBS has fallen to third place.

Networks are interested in providing programming that appeals to a wide variety of the nation's demographics in order to attract audiences for the advertisers' commercials. Demographics are broken down for a number of groups. Network demographic reports indicate the number of men and women in various age ranges that watch each program. These groups break into the following ranges: Children, Teens 12 - 17, Men/Women 18 years and older, Men/Women 18 - 49, Men/Women 25 - 54. This then allows advertisers to pick their target audiences for product advertising. The largest audience for television is women from 18 - 59. Market surveys suggest that they are attracted to comedy and soap opera programming (daytime or primetime). Obviously, this leaves enormous holes in demographic sample. Networks need programming that pleases the main staple of their audience as well as attracts other types of viewers.

Throughout a primetime evening, the type of programming grows in sophistication as the evening progresses, with early programming designed to attract children (family viewing) which gives way to more adult oriented programs

once it is determined that children's viewing has ended for the day. Networks try to program a full evening of shows that will flow naturally into one another, thereby encouraging the viewer to continue viewing a particular network all night. The successful flow of an evening is built around one or more hit shows that attract viewers and encourage them to take a chance on other, less well known, programming that the network might offer. If a season's hit show attracts a certain national cross section, rival networks' programmers have two choices: they can compete for the same audience or they can develop programming for audiences that are not being served in the time slot. The industry is supplied with a vast array of facts regarding the demographics of each show's viewers.

The networks put together a series of independent television stations in major cities around the country. These stations are called affiliates and agree to present that network's programming. The affiliates determine what gets on television. There are somewhere in the neighborhood of 660 television stations in the country. Those who are affiliated with one of the three major networks have to sell network products to their sponsors. It's important for them to have shows with good ratings so as to prove to the

sponsor that "X" number of people will be watching their commercial minutes or half minutes.

The networks run "Sweeps" four times a year. These are the times when the networks try to attract the highest numbers of viewers so that their sales departments will the best possible numbers to present to affiliates. It is the May "Sweeps" on which the affiliates base their fall advertising rates. Network and affiliate advertising sales departments have to guarantee an certain amount of viewing audience to their sponsors. If the program doesn't deliver the promised demographics, the network/station must pay the advertisers back in audience. That means that they are forced to provide the advertisers with additional time on other programs whose time they could be selling elsewhere. This makes "Sweeps" especially important for networks. On the national level, CBS currently bills in the neighborhood of one billion dollars a year in sales while holding 2% of its current programming inventory in reserve to pay advertisers for undelivered audiences.

The agreement between networks and affiliates is essentially a barter arrangement in which the network supplies free primetime programming for the affiliates to play in return for 6 1/2 minutes of prime time advertising per hour. This is how the networks make their income. The affiliates keep to rest to sell the rest to local

advertisers. Affiliates are not required to air network programming and may shift alliances among the three networks from year to year. In certain smaller markets, a single station may present programming from more than one network. This makes programming decisions extremely important. The programs that a network feeds its affiliates must generate sufficient audience for both the network and affiliate to make money.

In the development of new series, the programming and sales departments discuss the types of projects needed to attract advertisers. These discussions are based on the projected demographics that programmers feel the program will attract and the projected needs of the sales department.

The television industry is broken roughly into two groups: sellers and buyers. Obviously, the networks have traditionally been the largest buyers, but increasingly syndication and cable have been purchasing material. The sellers are all the production companies who are involved in producing television shows for the buyers, from what remains of the old film studios, Universal and Twentieth Century Fox to smaller independent production companies.

Before one talks about what is broadcast on commercial television networks, one must first talk about money.

Depending on which side of the fence one sits in the buyer (network)/suppliers (studios, production companies), the focus may be different. The former are concerned as to how to attract a certain market share of viewers such that advertising time is valuable to merchandisers who want to sell their products to these individuals and the suppliers are concerned with producing "packages" (programs) that will appeal to various demographic cross sections. As the amount of revenues that accrue to both networks and suppliers from a successful show is so high (for networks in terms of amount of money charged for advertising minute and for suppliers when the shows are sold into syndication [repeats]), both are engaged in a high stakes game. It is important to note here at the start that the networks do not own the rights to the programs that they present. These rights are retained by the production company. The networks pay a licensing fee which generally allows them the right to show a given episode twice, once first run and a summer repeat. Then all rights revert to the production company.

The Federal Communications Commission, in attempt to foster and encourage local broadcasting, established the concept of primetime programming. Primetime programming is what the three networks send to their affiliates between 8:00 and 11:00 p.m. weekdays and Saturday and 7:30 and 11:00 p.m. on Sunday in three of the four time zones. These times

are an hour earlier in the Central Time Zone. This leaves local stations with the late afternoon and early evening hours to fill with programming. Generally, stations present some kind of local originating news programs during this time as well as the ever present "reruns" of popular series that are no longer playing in primetime. These are shows that were popular in their time and have a built-in audience appeal based on this popularity. These re-runs are the property of the production companies that originally made them and are offered to the local television stations to fill the hours when they are not receiving current network programming. Generally, they are offered in a block of all the extant episodes at a price that is determined in each individual market. A station in Des Moines will pay considerably less for the same package of episodes than larger markets like New York, Los Angeles, or Chicago because it serves a far smaller market and its potential advertising revenues are proportionately less. It is the job of a production company's sales staff to determine and negotiate the maximum price that each market can bear for a syndication package. Then individual stations arbitrarily cut another two minutes of material out of each half hour block in order to provide them with additional local advertising time and hence revenue. This explains why sometimes there seems to be missing scenes or strange

"jumps" in continuity in rerun episodes and symbolizes the foregoing discussion. This example makes the industry's concern with the priority of a program's advertising value over its dramatic content painfully clear.

Because networks are aware of the potential value to the production companies should a series become a hit and accumulate enough episodes (generally a minimum of three years) to sell into syndication, the licensing fee negotiated rarely comes close to paying the entire cost of an episode. Production companies are similarly aware of the potential for profits from a hit show, they negative finance episodes to make up the difference between the amount of money networks pay for a episode and the actual cost of the episode as a cost of doing business. This is an expensive gamble should the show be canceled (as most are) before there are enough episodes to syndicate. The decision of whether to engage in negative financing and the amount of negative financing to undertake is one that varies from year to year depending on market conditions. The year that this sabbatical study (1987-88) surveys was one in which the market for syndication of one hour dramatic series had gone "soft". There has always been a market for half hour comedies. The success of "The Cosby Show" which finally accumulated enough episodes at the end of last season to sell into syndication has allowed it to be sold for such a

staggering amount of money that industry people wonder if the stations will be able to make their money back. In short, the syndication market is currently unpredictable. This had immediate impact on decisions of production companies as to what and how to produce shows that they developed for sale to networks.

For their part, once the networks have commissioned a series, they pay the production companies a licensing fee for the rights to two showings of the episode - the primetime premiere and the summer rerun. The licensing fee that is negotiated between the production company and network's legal affairs departments is generally less than the actual cost of the episode.

Therefore, in order to insure production qualities, certain star casting, etc., the production companies must deficit finance their series -- making up any difference between the fee paid them by the network and actual cost of producing the series episode -- gambling that their shows will be successful and provide them with a valuable package to sell into syndication. Common sense would suggest that the wise company would budget each episode at the amount of the licensing fee so as not to be forced into deficit financing. However, it is not generally possible to produce an episode for the amount the network is willing to pay for licensing rights. The studios tightly hold the actual per

episode cost of producing television but it is currently in the neighborhood of a million dollars per television hour.

As the production company is sole owner of the completed film, the networks feel no obligation to shoulder the entire cost for a production in which profits they do not participate. The licensing fee is precisely what its name suggests: payment for the broadcast rights to a program, not the cost of the production company to do business. Deficit financing is the business risk that studios are in the habit of making. While the odds against any series becoming a hit are very high -- on the order of getting a program on in the first place -- the profits to be realized from the syndication sale of a program like "The Cosby Show" are so astronomical that studios are willing to take the risk.

Writing in the Los Angeles Times calendar section on Sunday, October 2, 1988, Peggy Zieger cited the figures involved in the sale of "The Cosby Show" into syndication.

> Spurred on by a masterful sales campaign by distributor Viacom Enterprises [a leading, worldwide TV syndicator], the stations paid an unprecedented $600 million for the rights to air re-runs of 100 "Cosby" episodes over 3 1/2 years. That's an average of $4.8 million per episode, nearly twice the average $2.5 million generated by ABC's "Who's the Boss," the next biggest syndication seller (Los Angeles Times 1988, 4).

> According to Viacom's annual financial statement, the company will keep 32.5% of the "Cosby" take, approximately $200 million. The remaining $400 million will be split between Bill Cosby and Carsey-Werner [the show's producers]. TV Guide estimates that Cosby would receive about $166 million (Los Angeles Times 1988, 4).

In fact, it is through the sale of profitable series that studios get the operating capital to develop new ideas and to deficit finance existing on-air series.

THE "MEN" PROJECT

The "Men" project grew out of an 1986 project that Steve Brown had conceived in order to explore male bonding. He prepared a series proposal and pilot script for a half hour comedy/drama entitled "Best of Friends." It concerned the relationship of two old friends from a small New England town. One had left to live in New York while the other remained in the town, becoming its sheriff. Eventually the New Yorker tires of the city and returns home where the friendship is revived.

When the series pilot script went unsold, studio people advised Brown that the demographics of his series wouldn't appeal to a sufficiently broad audience to warrant a network buying it. Conventional wisdom dictated a more urban based series. Universal's hope was to create a program that would attract the "Yuppie" audience with their considerable discretionary monies by providing them with characters and settings with which they identified and to which they aspired, much in the manner of "L. A. Law" and "Thirty-Something." To that end, Brown reconceived his male bonding idea with new demographics. He set it in New York and centered it around three mid-thirties professional men who had been friends since high school and a younger man whom they befriend. Now their professions include a doctor, Steven, a lawyer, Charlie, a newspaper columnist, Paul, and

a young policeman, Danny. This choice provided the show with a wide range of potential stories as each character's life and professional problems could be explored. Brown kept virtually the same dynamics in place as in the rural show -- his central concerns were still the questions and conflicts endemic to male bonding issues -- but he had repackaged the idea into a form that the studio deemed more saleable. Their instincts evidently were right as ABC bought the pilot and originally scheduled a fall premiere opposite "L. A. Law." Universal refused to make the series if ABC scheduled it opposite the impregnable "L. A. Law," reasoning that such a placement spelled certain failure for their series. ABC chose to delay its decision about a mid-season scheduling of the series pending the outcome of the long writers' strike. However, the instant that strike was tentatively resolved, they commissioned twelve episodes to begin in January.

The series is designed to be an ensemble show with no set star. The plan is to have the main ("A") story revolve around a different man every week with the supporting ("B") story involving some or all of the others and their wives, girl friends, and families.

The pilot episode, which now is the first episode, serves as an introduction to the characters and their

dilemmas. In it the audience is introduced to the group they'll be following in "Men." As Brown didn't want all the characters to be the same age, he created the character of the young policeman's older brother, Thomas, who is a contemporary of the rest of the men and the original group's emotional center. The other three members of the group have little use for Danny but reluctantly include him in their activities because of their high regard for Thomas. In the course of the first episode, Thomas is killed in a hit-and-run accident. Despite the best efforts of the surgeon, Steven, the reporter, Paul, the lawyer, Charlie, and the younger brother, Danny, Thomas' killer, although apprehended, is allowed to go unpunished. Steven fears that the loss of Thomas will destroy the entity that has sustained them for years and he tries desperately to engineer the survival of the group. Ultimately, the group rallies and invites Danny, the younger brother, who has matured through the tragedy and gained the other men's respect, to join their ritual Friday night poker game (and group) in his brother's place. The group has weathered its first critical test and the audience is prepared for the kinds of problems that they'll encounter in the future.

In television, the most important creative person is the producer. Generally he or she is the only one who is

involved with the project from beginning to end. The producer hires writers, directors, crews, and actors who each go their individual ways once their specific job is completed. It is the producer's responsibility to shepherd the project to completion. Therefore, it is the producer who oversees all the major creative decision-making and is ultimately responsible for the finished film. This is very different from theatre or film where the producer is usually a businessman who is concerned with the financing and logistics of the project who engages a director to handle the all of the creative aspects of production.

The most important people to hire for an approved pilot project are a director and a line producer. The line producer is the person who works out the costs and budgets of the production. A good line producer knows the real cost of things and he/she will be able to advise the producer as to how to utilize the budget most effectively and what changes can be made without compromising the artistic needs of the production. The studio engaged John Stevens, a seasoned executive producer whose credits begin with "Gunsmoke" and most recently include "Simon & Simon," to serve in this role for the pilot project while the project was still being planned to shoot in Los Angeles.

The pilot director has a good deal of input as to the shape of the pilot script. This work is valuable for

directors because if the pilot is bought as a series, the pilot director will receive a royalty payment from each show regardless of his involvement. Peter Werner, the academy award winning director of the short film "In The Realm of Ice," as well as several "Moonlighting" episodes and the television movie "L.B.J.: The Early Years," was the studio's first choice for pilot director. The studio felt that by hiring Werner, the project was certain to be well received by the network. Indeed, the collaboration between Werner and Brown ultimately went so well that, in buying the program, ABC requested that Werner be made a producer of the series so as to retain the original creative team intact.

Then there followed several weeks of office casting sessions in both Los Angeles and New York, trying to find actors that were acceptable not only to the director and producer but also to both the studio and the network. Ultimately two sets of actors for each of the four major roles were assembled for the network to "mix and match." Casting is based on talent and looks as well as the studio and network's combined estimation of the "bankability" of certain actors. Many times, networks owe actors from earlier series or failed pilots exposure for any of a variety of reasons. The ultimate casting choices were carefully negotiated between all the interested parties with actor's agents getting into the equation with ever

increasing demands for their clients as the field narrowed down to the final eight.

Simultaneously, Universal's business department was negotiating with the network for the highest possible licensing fee for the pilot. The licensing fee that ABC agreed to pay for the pilot of "Men" was in the neighborhood of $750,000 (these figures are also tightly held by the studio), while the actual cost to Universal for delivering the completed pilot film was slightly over one million dollars. Pilot costs tend to exceed those of individual episodes because of the start-up costs of assembling casts, crews, and writers, scouting locations, and building scenery. This cost is amortized over the run of the series because once all these elements are in place, they can be used repeatedly in the on-going filming of a series. The studio budget for individual episodes of "Men" for the first season is in the neighborhood of $900,000. This includes monies above and beyond the network licensing fee.

With the current "softness" in the syndication market for one-hour dramatic programming, Universal was very concerned about cost efficiency during the past year. Although creative people desire to set their series in dramatically exciting urban settings like New York or Los Angeles, studio heads feel that the cost of filming television in those locations is prohibitively expensive

because all filming must be done by union crews. Brown had experience in economizing by shooting Los Angeles in place of New York for "Cagney & Lacey". That simply entailed sending the cast to New York City for a couple of weeks each year to film them in recognizable city exteriors and then shooting the body of show in Los Angeles neighborhoods that "doubled" for New York. After scouting suitable locations in Los Angeles, Universal also deemed this plan prohibitively expensive. Therefore, the original New York City setting for the series had to be changed. Universal drew up a list of acceptable cities in "right-to-work" states that might provide suitable alternatives to New York -- every small city from Richmond, Virginia to Kokomo, Indiana was considered. Brown finally negotiated to set the series Baltimore, Maryland so as to retain the original flavor of an East Coast urban setting and changed local references in the script to reflect the switch of cities.

Part of the appeal of Baltimore for Universal was that they could engage Chuck Sellier, an independent film producer based there with a reputation for working cheaply, to produce the show with his non-union company, Duell-McCall. This decision effectively demoted Brown from his executive producer position in favor of Sellier and, in a bizarre maze of corporate dealings, Brown was loaned out to

Duell-McCall Productions to supervise the production of his own show.

It is ironic that once ABC bought the pilot, Universal decided that it was too expensive to shoot the series in Baltimore even though they were now tied to that city by virtue of having established that it as the setting in the first episode. Now Universal had to find a city where the show could be produced with non-union crews that "doubled" for Baltimore. They finally selected Toronto, Canada because they felt that many areas of the city looked like Baltimore!

While Duell-McCall's non-union workers lacked the technical proficiency of a union crew, they were hired for fourteen hour work shifts as opposed to the union's eight hour shift. As John Stevens, an experienced producer, told me, "This is the wave of the future." What he meant was, while this non-union crew was slower and less experienced than professionals, the amount of time that they were prepared to put into a shooting day provided the studio with virtually the same results on film. And, ultimately, it's the "look" of the film which interests the studios and networks. Whether it takes fourteen hours instead of eight is immaterial to them, provided that it is of good quality and done inexpensively.

To compound problems for Brown, the Screenwriters' Guild of America went out on what was to be the longest strike in its history in early March. As Brown is a member of the Guild, he was prohibited from continuing to rewrite and polish his script. He could only perform functions with it that legitimately related to the producer side of his hyphenated title. This opened another "can of worms" because everyone with an interest in the project who was not a member of the striking Guild began suggesting "improvements" or actually rewriting the script. While the original script was very strong, everyone concerned with the project -- both from the network and studio -- kept worrying at it, trying to find ways to make it even better. While this is normally a situation which never occurs, Brown was prohibited from writing or taking story conferences pertaining to the script as long as the union was on strike and so was unable to handle it in usual course of his responsibilities as producer. Peter Werner and the heads of dramatic programming at Universal tried their hands at rewriting the script in preparation for a late March start of shooting. I myself suggested a key element in the final scene. While all of the input may have improved the script marginally, its basic integrity remained intact. Unusual events dictated this course which, obviously, no one would advocate as a regular practice.

Film isn't shot in the sequence that the script is written and the audience ultimately sees it. The director and director of photography break each scene into smaller units and then film each from several different points of view. First they film the "master shot" which shows the entire action of the scene with all the players. Then they film various close-up and reaction shots so that it's possible for the director to "cut" the entire scene together in such a way as to convey exactly what he has in mind to the audience. Actors performances must stay consistent so that there is no observable difference between the takes when they are finally assembled. Therefore, each shooting day was spent repeatedly filming short moments from each scene, then moving the camera, lights and set pieces to a new vantage point. Should the camera move during the shot (which makes film more visually interesting), it had to be choreographed and practiced until the crew could execute the move flawlessly. The non-union crew took longer to master the moves than their more experienced union contemporaries.

Shooting requires a large crew for set-ups, tear-downs, and scenery changes. Once the stage crew has completed their job, they all stand quietly around during the filming, waiting for the next move. Even in the most intimate

moments on film, there is an enormous crew standing just out of sight of the camera.

The script only called for two technically complicated scenes, the shooting of which took several days. The first occurs early in the film and establishes the characters of all five men as they warm-up for a basketball game in a gym. The scene is written so that the men are chatting and teasing one another while they play the game. This required several complicated camera moves to follow the action of the game convincingly. The second was the long action sequence in which Thomas, and Danny, the policemen, chase a purse snatcher and, in so doing, Thomas is struck and dragged by an automobile in a hit-and-run accident. It was shot at night with stunt doubles and required carefully choreographed action both for the actors and the camera. The ultimate effect is quite effective -- shocking without being gruesome.

Werner, the director, is known as a perfectionist and he insisted on shooting plenty of "coverage." A director must see to it that the entire scene is filmed from several different vantage points so that all essential action is fully photographed ("covered"). Then, in the editing room, he has sufficient footage to provide him with several choices when it comes to assembling the final scene on film. Werner and his assistant kept records of all takes, deciding

which were the best to be printed. He might, for example, choose among many takes, searching for subtle nuances in performance, cutting back and forth at will between the speaker and the various different reaction shots of the listeners. In the hands of a skilled craftsman like Werner, these separate strands of film are woven into a complex and subtly communicative tapestry.

The ultimate sin is for a director to find that he forgot to film something or doesn't have a good take of a necessary shot. This is why daily "rushes" are essential. They are quickly developed prints of the previous day's shooting that are reviewed by the director and producers to make sure they've caught the effect they want on film and that everything is "covered." In Baltimore, these prints were transferred to video and express mailed to the coast where they were viewed by Universal executives who would telephone or fax their comments to the East. During filming, the function of the television producer is to protect the director from extraneous concerns and problems. Because, under the circumstance, Brown was unable to serve as writer, he increasingly found himself serving as mediator, protecting Werner from (well-meaning) intrusions by studio and network executives with eleventh hour suggestions for improvements.

The filming was completed early in April and Werner secreted himself with his assistant and a film editor in an editing room in Universal City to assemble a director's cut of the final film. Most directors' contracts give them the right to assemble the film to their satisfaction before delivering it to the producer. Powerful directors can insist that the producer accept and distribute their assemblage of a film. Given the extremely collaborative nature of television, this is rarely the case and the producer may order any changes in the film he so desires once he takes delivery of the Director's cut.

Once Werner delivered the film to the studio, his job was officially over. Given Werner's pride in his work, he elected to stay with the project throughout the rest of the post-production period. As soon as there was a completed version of the film, it was shown to James Newton Howard, the music composer, and a host of sound effect technicians who plan where and when music and sound should be introduced into the sound track.

It is during the post-production period that the film is "cleaned up" and "sweetened" for broadcast. On the set, sound is recorded separately from the film and is "synched" with the film for editing by the matching the sound and visual of the clapper board that is used at beginning of every take. For instance, while silence is imposed on the

set during shooting, occasionally background sounds interfere or actor's lines are unintelligible or muffled by other actor's line or sounds of the scene's action. Further, because scenes are shot in silence, the normal background sounds that audiences would expect to hear in the environment have to be added to the soundtrack.

The actors are assembled for "looping" session in which they stand at microphones in a darkened projection room, watching themselves on film and re-record dialogue deemed unsatisfactory by the director or producer. Once the actors finish, a "walla" group comes in. This is a group of actors trained in improvisation who simulate the background conversations that will be added to the sound mix to make the scenes sound "realistic." It's fascinating to watch a group of five or six actors creating all the conversations one might hear in a restaurant for one scene and then those of a hospital for the next.

All the sound elements are put together in ADR sessions. This is when the various soundtracks containing background music, sound effects, and voices are put together in a final mix to create the film's master soundtrack. Because the soundtracks are kept separate, it is possible simply to dub the voice track for foreign showings without disturbing the rest of the sound mix. Obviously, the editing of the film must be finalized by this time so that

technicians can accurately match each sound and music effect to its visual counterpart.

While sound technicians work on the soundtrack, the assembled negative is printed by a film processing laboratory. The producer or his assistant view the prints struck from the negative, making decisions about exposure and relative color values. The lab then makes "color corrections" in the film, lightening or darkening scenes and bringing out certain color hues. Once the color correction of the final print is approved, a magnetic strip with the finished soundtrack is added and the finished 35 mm film is delivered to the network for transfer to video for broadcast.

INTERVIEW FINDINGS

Interview subjects:

Jean Brock, wardrobe supervisor, "Men"

Steve Brown, writer-producer, Universal Studios, creator/co-producer, "Men"

Kathy Cahill, set decorator, "Men"

Bill Cornford, art director, "Men"

Robert Eisele, co-producer, "The Equalizer"

Diane Foti, production manager, "The Equalizer"

James Newton Howard, soundtrack composer, "Men"

Steve Johnson, story editor, "The Equalizer"

Gail Parent, writer-producer Universal Studios

Al Pedersen, production manager, "Men"

Ralph Phillips, independent free-lance screenwriter

Lou Rudolph, executive producer, "L.B.J.: The Early Years"

Lloyd Schwartz, executive producer, "The New Munsters"

Bill Shira, prop master, "Men"

Ralph S. Singleton, line producer, "Cagney and Lacey"

Peter Sterne, vice president in charge of programming affairs, C.B.S. Television

John Stevens, executive producer "Simon & Simon"

Jeffrey Sweet, story editor "The Clinic" (since renamed)

Ed Waters, co-executive producer, "The Equalizer"

Peter Werner, director "L.B.J.: The Early Years" and "Men" pilot/Executive Producer, "Men"

Scott Whited, key grip, "Men"

Summary of interviews with producers:

One of the areas that fascinated me before undertaking this study was the question of how values are determined in programming that is shown in millions of American homes nightly. While each network has a Standards and Practices office that reads each script for language, situations, or ideas that might not be proper for public consumption on television, what emerged from the interview questions that I developed as part of my sabbatical proposal is that virtually everyone in the top creative positions that I interviewed felt that their own personal values were good and proper for the American public. They understood that they were dealing in a popular, commercial medium and they each seemed to feel that they had the gauge of what was appropriate within that context for audiences. However, there is no one person or office that deals with questions of public morality or values.

Many producers with whom I spoke felt that the Standards and Practices departments of the networks were staffed with executives who were largely untrained and unprepared for their responsibilities. They feel that the networks see this department as providing entry level positions which will qualify young executives for more important jobs within the network hierarchy. Many times

these executives read the script with complete literalness, counting the number of potentially objectionable words, many times entirely missing the point of the line or scene, sometimes even reading in double meanings where none existed.

I have included with the documents an example of a report from ABC's Standards and Practices office that Brown received in response to an early draft of "Men". He tells me that it is indicative of the kind of concerns and objections that are routinely raised by such offices.

Many of the producers and writers with whom I spoke and/or observed were extremely busy with the business of producing twenty two episodes per television season. If the average length of a motion picture is two hours, then television producers working on hour length episodes turn out the equivalent of eleven full length motion pictures a year -- a feat that few major motion picture studios attempt. In short, with the possible exception of a strong star-producer like Bill Cosby, there is no concerted effort made to work out an educational thrust for programming. If indeed, the major rationale for art in general has long been its ability to teach and delight, television has overbalanced teaching with its ability to delight.

Television tends to be a relatively conservative medium by virtue of its vast audience. Because it is freely

invited into American homes by individual viewers, it does not dare to risk being offensive. While all art is dependent on reflecting the contemporary views and opinions of the day, television is especially so by virtue of its "invited" status. Its audience is free to tune out without penalty whereas movie or theatre audiences have already paid their money to gain admission.

One of the major explanations given for the conservatism given by industry defenders is that audiences have certain expectations when they tune in their televisions. They are conditioned by the cumulative effects of their years of television viewing and there is range of expectations they bring with them whenever they turn on their set. If these expectations are not rewarded, they will tune out. What this means in real terms is that every program presented on television will be like other successful programs that audiences have seen before. Innovation comes slowly. In that way, "The Cosby Show" is very closely related in spirit to such successful family oriented shows as "Father Knows Best," "Leave It to Beaver," and "My Three Sons."

During this past television season, there have been inroads in the area of "dramedy" which is a combination of drama and comedy which tries to show a less sugar coated version of life. "The Slap Maxwell Show", "Frank's Place",

and "Hooperman" have generally been critical rather than popular successes. Despite CBS' pledge to find a place in the fall season for "Frank's Place", "Hooperman" is the only "dramedy" with a assigned slot in the upcoming season. These new programs that find success with critics and industry people may reflect the desires of people intimately involved in the business to shake the traditional ways television tells its stories but the home viewing audience has failed to embrace the new styles and their ratings and shares have been poor.

As I said elsewhere, the market in many ways controls the nature of what is presented on television. Every eye ultimately is on the marketplace as represented by Nielsen ratings and "People Meters" and it is very powerful. For instance, when CBS wanted to cancel "Cagney and Lacey," the producer orchestrated its fans in a letter writing campaign to the network to protest its cancellation. For the first time in history, a program that the network had announced for cancellation was revived and ran for an additional three years. On the other hand, the same network was passionately committed to "Frank's Place." CBS vowed to keep the program on the air until it found its audience. They moved it to different time slots and aggressively promoted it. Despite this support, it never gained appreciably in the ratings and it was finally cancelled this month. Simply put, the

networks are incapable of dictating subject matter to audiences and audiences will not be coerced or seduced into watching "good" programs that don't interest them. "Frank's Place" finally succumbed to monetary pressures. The half-hour spot that it occupied was valuable and could be used more profitably with another program in its place. This is, I suggest, the ultimate reason for its cancellation. Sadly though, television people tend to draw the wrong conclusions from these decisions. People in the industry see a cancellation like this as being the death-knell to experimentation and return to the safety of the familiar. This then makes for television programs that seem very much like other television programs.

On the other hand, Steve Brown is proud of the Emmy award winning work he did on "Cagney and Lacey". As co-producer, he was responsible for the development of story ideas and script assignments for that series. He points to the number of issue orientated episodes that he and his partner, Terry Louise Fisher (later co-creator of "L. A. Law" and "Hooperman") produced after they steered the show away from a routine police procedural format. Indeed, he claims that they were among the first to present issues like date rape, breast cancer, spousal abuse, and alcoholism within a medium that had habitually shied away from anything that smacked of controversy. They convinced their executive

producer of the wisdom of their tactics by virtue of the loyal (and large) audiences that the show attracted. Simply put, the messages that they were putting out worked in the marketplace. Whether or not the values they espoused were transcendental or merely happened to reflect the tenor of the times is impossible to say. What is clear is that the series captured the market that they were attempting to reach. Repeatedly, I found either directly or by inference in my interviews/observation that the marketplace is the final arbiter of moral and educational values. People will simply turn off a message that they're not interested in hearing. Without audiences, television programs wither and die.

Summary of interviews with writers:

Many times writers expressed a desire to include a meaningful or thoughtful message within their television scripts. However, this is not always possible for individual writers.

The image that most people have of writers is someone who sits down alone at a lonely typewriter or word processor and creates a solo masterpiece which then is bourne off to a publisher or film studio. While some lonely novelists may create in this fashion, film and television are a collaboratively creative art. Stories are developed step-

by-step until a finished script is commissioned. Professional television writers do not write "for fun". It's a job and they may be responsible for the creation of as many as twenty two episodes a year. Script ideas are developed in story conferences in which the producer and the writing staff discuss premises for potential episodes. After selecting the most promising ideas, they begin to line out stories that meet the requirements of the series. For example, Edward Woodward, star of "The Equalizer", suffered a heart attack during the summer of 1987 and, by doctor's orders, was unavailable for filming more than two days a week of a seven-day episode shooting schedule. Scripts that had been prepared for Woodward had to be discarded. The writers and producers of the series had to create new characters and give a considerably different face to a series when the star was incapacitated.

Writers then produce an "outline" of the script which is a relatively short prose version of the story elements. These outlines, or "treatments" as they are also called, are further discussed and refined by the group so that when the story is finally approved to go to script, everyone has a clear idea of what the resultant script will contain. This "story meeting" approach to script writing is designed to allow for maximum creative input in the design and structure of a story by allowing the plot to remain flexible for as

long as possible. It becomes increasingly difficult to change material once it has been finalized in script form by virtue of the amount of work writers have put in by that point.

Film and television writing is unique in that the writer is required to create by committee and doesn't have final say as to the ultimate result of his/her work. Many times the series commissions a script from a free-lance writer and buys the final version outright. Producers then have the right to make any changes they consider necessary once the writer has submitted the script. Obviously, producers don't want to spend extra time and money fixing scripts they've already paid for, so they insist on the development process in order best to insure the results that they want.

Changes can be made for a seemingly endless number of arbitrary reasons, from Woodward's heart attack, to the fact that it was raining on a particular shooting day, necessitating a sudden change of locale and situation. Because of the enormous costs of producing television, producers have to plan for every contingency and try to get the desired results on film the first time in order to stay within the budget.

As the teleplay and/or screenplay story is shaped by committee and, as the producer buys the finished draft

outright, he may make whatever changes in the final script he deems necessary. One can see that this collaborative quality of the creative process requires that all parties be in virtual agreement about a particular message or theme as well as the story in a given episode. Obviously too, the genre of a particular show (sit-com, action-adventure, or dramatic) does a lot to determine the type and depth of potential messages.

Another consideration affecting writers is that they are broken into two distinct groups in the studio hierarchy. There are staff writers who are responsible for writing or collaborating in the writing of the several scripts required during a production season and there are free-lance writers who are hired to write a single script and may conceivably write for several different series during the course of a year. The free-lance writer delivers his final script after completing the contracted number of revisions and has nothing more to do with the process, while the staff writers may make lesser or greater changes in the submitted draft, shaping it to the producer's requirements. These final changes most likely reflect additional comments and suggestions from studio and network executives.

Therefore, as the staff writers are on-going employees of the production company, it is they who have the greatest likelihood of having their messages approved and retained in

the finished program. It is because they are on-premises to promote and protect their ideas. Generally, draft versions of scripts pass among all levels of management in the course of their creation. Virtually every element has been approved on every level before the cameras roll. In this way, the system provides a system of checks and balances in terms of messages that appear on television.

Summary of interviews with production people:

In inquiring what colleges and universities could do to prepare students for jobs in the television industry, I found that the same long standing rivalry between academia and practice that I have experienced in theatre also exists in television and film. In Los Angeles and New York, technicians and production people, those "below the line" (a term that separates any television production company into two groups: the top producers, stars, and writers who are responsible for creating scripts or acting in the show and everyone else [no matter how important] who is involved in the physical production of the series) are unionized. Television and film, like theatre, are fields where the supply of willing workers exceeds the demand. Therefore, there are both formal and informal apprenticeship arrangements for qualifying for the various technical production jobs. Generally, people break into the film

industry by taking low-level jobs as production assistants, mail room workers, and messengers serving as "go-fers" to learn the business and "prove" themselves as they make contacts for future jobs. The purpose of this informal apprenticeship period in the industry is two-fold. First, the individual learns the "nuts and bolts" of that particular side of the industry and also, and equally importantly, people in the industry meet and evaluate the individual, assessing his/her abilities and liabilities. The individual learns to network with these contacts and this is the source of future jobs and job contacts. In that way it is a very inbred industry, but one that can be cracked by people with talent, determination, and patience.

I spoke to production people with and without academic training in film and found them to be openly skeptical of the real value of academic training for the potential professional television technician. They felt that, while schools helped familiarize a person with the workings of a film production team, they also tended to leave their graduates with an inflated and unrealistic view of their immediate worth to the industry. They suggested that this made degree holders less willing to take the requisite low-level entry jobs in the industry. In short, the industry has its own entrance requirements and graduates who aren't wunderkind like Steven Spielberg or George Lucas have to

fulfill them regardless of how many degrees they have accumulated.

The very high cost of doing television production seems to the reenforce the "good ole boy" method of hiring. With union technicians, there was the clear understanding that everyone associated with the project was vitally important to its success. They understood that over-sight or incompetence would slow down the forward momentum of production. The schedule for shooting days is carefully worked out by the line producer or production manager with an eye toward what is realistic to expect to get on film in a given shift. This is especially important because costs escalate markedly for union technicians and actors who are kept after their contracted working hours. Therefore, any oversight which causes delays or additional "takes" of scenes that slow down the progress of production are potentially very costly.

Everyone has his/her eye on the bottom line because of the expense. Therefore, it is not uncommon for crew chiefs, when asked for recommendations as to whom to hire frequently suggest people with whom they've already worked. They know these people's work and further know that they can be depended upon to get things right in the shortest amount of time. Any delay on the part of an employee reflects badly on the person who hired that person. It is a business, not

an Art form, and for that reason people involved tend to make safe choices.

With Duell-McCall productions, the non-union technicians were recruited from the film program at Brigham Young University in Salt Lake, Utah. Generally speaking, the crew was roughly college-aged, younger than most union crews and the bulk of their experience was with this single production company. While people were assigned to specific duties in the production crew, they could be pressed into service in other areas as the need arose. On union shoots, technicians are employed to handle specific tasks and other crew members may not assist them in their duties. This was not the case in Baltimore. Chuck Sellier had purposely structured his company so as to avoid being so hamstrung. He would often be first among the crews loading or unloading equipment from trucks, modeling a co-operation unheard of on union shoots. Additionally, a small number of more specialized technicians were union members working (illegally) in this non-union company.

This "all-for-one, one-for-all" attitude was off-putting to seasoned Hollywood producers as they saw much inefficiency occasioned by the method. They felt that Boyle's law affected the work habits of the crew: they knew that their call was for fourteen hours and the length of time necessary to accomplish the various tasks simply

expanded to fit the available time. However, the bulk of the technicians were working for two hundred dollars a week and a room at the downtown Baltimore Holiday Inn that Duell-McCall had taken over as its production headquarters. They could eat from the catering truck that supplied food for the crew on days they were shooting. Many of these young technicians didn't yet have the necessary skills to work professionally in Hollywood. However, they could accumulate experience in Baltimore and were paid and housed weekly, regardless of whether or not the company had a film in production. This gave them the edge over most Hollywood technicians who, while far better paid, only work from assignment to assignment and at that time were just beginning to feel the first effects of the industry work slow-down occasioned by the Writers' Guild strike.

In this fashion, Duell-McCall and companies like them are able to lure business away from the traditional centers of Hollywood filming by virtue of their greatly reduced overhead. As I mentioned elsewhere in this document, there is the clear sense on the part of studio people that this type of non-union production company will be the wave of the future in both film and television production, that the traditional technical unions have priced themselves out of the existence.

CONCLUSIONS

I had extraordinary luck in associating myself with Steve Brown during a year in which one of his (many) ideas was finally bought and shot as well as in being able to accompany Bob Eisele to New York. In both cases, my friends provided me with access to data, people, and processes that few outside the industry ever have the opportunity to experience.

During my time with both productions, I collected documents that could best help me to synthesize in the classroom all of the phases in the creative and business decision-making process that a television program or series pilot go through from conception to airing. I have the complete draft proposals and scripts for each program I observed, as well as a host of scheduling and budgetary information relating to "Men". I have video tape copies of the producer's cut from "The Equalizer" episode. This is the roughly edited assemblage of the completed episode minus the music sound track, special sound effects, and occasional missing dialogue. This is the first time the film has been edited into a rough approximation of what the episode will look like and this is what the producer and the post-production staff refine and "sweeten" before the final film is delivered to the network for broadcast. I have the tape of the episode as it aired with all of the post-production

work completed. Viewing the two back-to-back is an education in television production in itself.

I have considerably more material documenting the development of "Men." In the new series development process, the three networks narrow the number of potential series through a winnowing process. They commission a number of scripts based on production company's verbal presentations ("pitches") of promising series proposals. These scripts are the result of collaborative process among several members of a production company in addition to the titular creator of the series idea. The network's series development departments review and critique the purchased scripts, giving notes to the production companies as to desired revisions. One can easily see that an enormous amount of collaboration goes into creating a television series and there truly is no one sole creator.

A production company generally allots more time and money to production of a pilot episode as it must be indicative of the spirit and "feel" of the potential program and include a wide variety of the hoped-for production values. This is essential because networks base their decision to buy a series on the basis of the success of the completed pilot episode. With "Men", I was lucky enough to get two versions of early working director's cuts (precedes the producer's cut) as well as the completed pilot film (now

the first episode) that was delivered to ABC for the premiere showing in January 1989. Scenes are reedited, repositioned, and entirely omitted among the three versions. Further, I have a number of daily "rushes" -- raw footage of all the takes of a given scene shot from various vantage points from which the director and editor assemble the final scene. These provide a fine way to illustrate for students the means and choices that a director has at his/her disposal in the creation of a final film scene.

I'm involved in discussions with Rita Gurnee as to how best to enter the documents I collected throughout all these stages of production into the College library's general collection for reference and use by interested faculty, students and community members. I have arranged with Mr. Brown to get copies of scripts for the first thirteen episodes of the series for future inclusion in this collection. Should the series became a success, the College will possess important seminal materials. In any event, the materials will serve as valuable instructional materials.

I also observed and collected drafts of an aborted comedy project that Steven Spielberg's Amblin Productions tried to develop for Universal. The project was originally entitled "Maids in America" and was conceived of as being

the "Downstairs" half of the popular PBS series "Upstairs/Downstairs" transported to contemporary America. It was to deal with three separate households in which a maid served as the parental figure, raising the children in place of career people too busy to do it themselves. The comic hook was the ways in which the maids each became the dominant figure in the household and the mischief the three got into along with the kids.

As Brown was involved with a number of projects while waiting for one to sell, Universal assigned the project to him and another writer/producer, Gail Parent, whose credits include "Mary Hartman, Mary Hartman", several successful novels, and a stint on Broadway as author of the musical "Loreli". Naturally Brown leapt at the chance of working with Parent to develop a series for Spielberg. It seemed like a "sure thing" with the talent package that Universal had assembled. They became involved in a series of meetings and revisions that were supervised by the heads of comedy development at Universal. Spielberg's people saw various drafts which they returned with comments. This project went through a number of rewrites and revisions throughout most of the fall before it was dropped by Universal as impractical. So much for the "sure thing".

This process is far more indicative of the odds against a network actually buying a series idea and developing it

for the fall season or as a mid-season replacement, as in the case with "Men." The working formula is that 2500 series ideas are submitted (in one form or another) to networks for each one that actually makes it into the schedule. This has much to do with the vagaries of the market for any particular season. While "Men" is a fine dramatic premise for a series, it is not qualitatively better or different from other ideas that Brown had developed in the past that went unsold.

I also have full materials on another comedy/mystery project, "The Best of Enemies," that Brown co-developed with Scott Shepherd, a story editor with "The Equilizer." When it seemed a "sure thing" that Peter Falk would return to television to do a limited number of new episodes of "Columbo," the search was on at Universal for other one-hour mystery series that could be used to fill out the anticipated episode order. Supporting the notion that successful television is derivative, this series premise was based on the old "Perry Mason" show in which Mason always reversed the District Attorney, Hamilton Burger. In this case, the antagonism was between a chief of police and a private eye in Scottsdale, Arizona and, at the end of each episode, one neatly surprised the other. The idea was to keep the audience guessing who would win each time. Once

again, I have a collection of clever and intelligent drafts of a script that looked like a "sure thing" until the network "passed" on it.

I am presenting an overview of my sabbatical research to my department members during the October meeting and I have arranged to speak to the current television production classes.

I am presently overseeing three students working on screenplay writing through my independent study section and have already counseled department students who are interested in working professionally in the television and film industry.

I am now qualified to teach the department's offerings in "Acting for the Camera."

APPENDIX A

THE PROPOSAL

Through interviews, on-site observation, and independent study at Universal City Studios, Inc. in Universal City, California, I propose to study the year long process by which a new television series comes into existence for the home screen. I plan (1) to collect a representative selection of early story treatments, outlines, various draft scripts, memos and correspondence pertaining to its presentation and sale to a network, creative and tactical production of a series, as well as the design and execution of any advertising or promotional campaigns on the program's behalf, and (2) during the Spring semester to observe the daily functioning of the series pilot production team and conduct interviews with key staff personnel. I would undertake this proposed study with an eye toward developing a curriculum for MSAC closely geared to the present needs of the profession, as well as to be able to better serve the larger needs of the College in the area of television broadcasting.

Steven Brown, a colleague of mine from UCLA Drama School is currently working as a writer/producer in charge of developing dramatic television series for MCA at Universal City Studios. Before taking this assignment, he was a two-time Emmy Award winning producer of "Cagney and

Lacey." He has graciously consented to assist me in studying the process, both by allowing me complete access to his projects and by offering to facilitate my observation of other series in development and/or production at the studio. I've enclosed a copy of his letter confirming this offer. My relationship to the studio's production process will be as an independent observer/researcher with no remuneration by the studio.

SCHEDULE FOR INTERVIEWS AND OBSERVATION:

(These dates are approximate)

Early September - October 31, 1987: Universal City Studios, Inc. makes presentations of the various ideas for series to the three major networks. The three networks commission as many as 100 scripts each for possible development as television series for Fall 1988. During this period, the networks commission scripts to be developed from the series idea/concept that they've bought. The standard contract calls for an original script and two revisions of that script. The script and revisions must be approved by the studio and then by the network. The studio and network legal departments negotiate the fees for writing the pilot script as well as production credits for the creative people

if the script goes to series. Studio contacts possible leading actors for the various project.

During this period, I will review treatment ideas and early drafts of scripts, attending planning and development conferences, specifically focusing of the project Mr. Brown has under development.

November 25, 1987: Completed, revised pilot scripts must be ready for presentation to the network buyers by this date.

I will read and familiarize myself with the final drafts of scripts, discuss studio presentation and sales strategies to the networks with Executive Producers.

December 14, 1987 - January 29, 1988: The networks advise the studio which completed scripts they want to commission for development into pilot films. Of 100 scripts commissioned, the network usually orders around 20 to be taken to pilot film level.

February 1, 1988 - April 22, 1988: Production companies are formed, actors cast, crews hired, and the pilot script is filmed for presentation to the network. Production costs are calculated for presentation to the network.

During this time I will interview and observe the daily working functions of the Writing Producer(s) and the Line Producer/Production Manager(s). Additionally, I will observe and interview people in charge of the various production activities in the actual filming of the pilot project. The average one hour dramatic television series program is scheduled in three phases: (1) seven working days of PREPRODUCTION (in which the Casting Director selects the cast for the episode, the Location Manager scouts possible shooting locations for the Director's approval and takes care of all logistical problems relating to the company's accommodation there, the Set Designer designs and oversees construction or modification of location scenery, the Costumer outfits the company, the Property Master finds or builds whatever props are necessary, and the Caterer plans and prepares meals for the company throughout the shooting of the episode.) (2) seven working days of PRODUCTION (in which the Director of Photography assists the Director in the filming of the episode, the Soundman records all dialogue, and the Best Boy and Grips are responsible for the set-up and arranging of lighting and set pieces.) (3) three weeks to a month of POST PRODUCTION (in which the Associate Producer/Post Production Supervisor oversees the finishing of the filmed episode by the Film Editors, Optical Co-

ordinator, Music Conductor, the Special Effects and Film Laboratory Employees.

Early May 1988 - The executives of each of the three networks meet at their respective corporate headquarters in New York City to decide which, if any, of the pilot projects they've ordered be put into production for the fall 1988 season. At this point, thirteen episodes are order from the studio.

May 16, 1988: The production companies go immediately to work creating scripts, casting the shows, and handling the logistics necessary for the production of thirteen episodes. Networks develop advertising and promotional campaigns for their fall seasons.

As time permits, I will monitor at least the early stages of these processes.

SAMPLE INTERVIEW TOPICS FOR PERSONS SURVEYED:

1. Subjects description and perception of his/her functions within the production company.

2. Description of any special training/preparation necessary or advisable for a person's being hired and functioning effectively within subject's position.

3. Description of subject's unique resume/path to particular position.

4. Description of essential skills/philosophy of work essential to the successful execution of subject's job function.

5. Subject's suggestions for training curriculum to prepare serious students for similar positions.

6. Description of the subject's sense of job satisfaction/amount of control over final screened product.

7. Where pertinent, the subject's sense of the future in terms of job openings/possibilities in his/her particular field.

I will use this raw data as a basis in developing curriculum and professional guidelines for students.

BENEFITS TO THE COLLEGE:

As the Speech Communication, Drama, Broadcasting Department is expanding its course offerings into the area of television broadcasting by virtue of the new studio facilities, Mr. Brown's offer is an invaluable asset in the development of our program. It will provide me with a broad range of information/experience in television that none of the full time contracted Department faculty currently possess. I will be able to gain practical, firsthand information/experience in both the creative and business

elements of professional television at a high level with the industry. I could then serve as a knowledgeable resource in the guidance of this facet of the Department's programs. I can use the fruit of this sabbatical study to develop new course offerings, such as teleplay/screenplay writing and television production planning as well as supplement the existing hands-on TV production classes with information about the business aspects of television production, to teach existing classes in acting for the camera, and to develop realistic career guidelines for students interested in entering the television industry. The College will have copies of representative television scripts in various stages of development as a resource to allow students to have 'first hand' experience in examining how creative and business factors determine the ultimate result of what is presented on television. Further, I will be a valuable asset in staff development training for television production in conjunction with the Audio/Visual Department and I will have additional professionally oriented experience that will permit me to function more effectively as a member of the Cable Television Committee.

ADDENDUM: MODIFICATIONS TO SABBATICAL LEAVE APPLICATION

1. I will keep a written journal of observations and findings as may contain information of practical value and assistance to students in the field of television broadcasting.

2. Central to my project is a planned series of interviews based on a close association with Mr. Brown throughout the course of the nine month period. I plan to profile his concerns on a "nuts and bolts" working basis, focusing specifically at first on criteria for concepts, scripts, revisions and then on techniques for producing an entire project once a pilot script has been purchased by the network. These interviews will include material elicited by the following questions but are intended to be more wide ranging with additional questions generated as the specifics of the situation warrant. Further, I will conduct a minimum of nine shorter interviews with other people in the production chain with at least one with another writing producer to obtain a different viewpoint on executive and creative concerns at a decision-making level within the television industry.

Sample questions for Writing Producers:

1. Given the enormous impact of the media on today's youth, do you see your role as partially that of a potential educator?

2. Assuming that there is an inherently educational function to television virtually by definition, does television have a responsibility to disseminate "good" values? Is this an area of corporate concern? If so, how and by whom are these values determined?

3. What is the process by which an idea gets translated into an actual television program?

4. What, if any, active and significant role does network Standards and Practices Departments, by being charged with enforcing "good taste" on television, play in determining what is seen on television? Please comment on their assets and liabilities to the creative and educational processes.

5. What role does advertising play in determining actual content of television programming?

6. Is there an agenda, overt or hidden, in place at the networks as to the type of television product that they will buy from the studio? If so, please describe your impression of it.

7. Do you believe that there is a profile for television writers? If so, please describe those

attributes. Has there been any concerted, systematic effort to seek "other voices," e.g. writers representing minority and ethnic groups?

8. Have the affirmative action rulings and work of activist groups impacted the subject matter, casting, and staffing of television productions?

9. What do you see as being the effect of unionization in the television and film industries with regards the job you are hired to accomplish?

10. Does the American public have any say in what they see? Are there any other vehicles in addition to the Nielsen rating to discover what the public might wish to see?

Three interviews with writer hired to write teleplays for series projects/programs.

Sample questions for teleplay writers:

1. How were you selected by the producer to write for this particular series? What combination of your skills, talent, and experience caused you to be hired to write the teleplay?

2. From your point of view, please describe what happens in story conferences and first time meetings with television series producers.

3. How much freedom do you have in the actual creation of a script? Are there specific guidelines, written or unwritten, that you have to follow?

4. Is there a specific person or group who decides when and if a script is "finished?" If so, what is your perception of the criteria in making that decision?

5. Describe the process that you use in developing a television script.

6. Many established programs appear to have clear formats within which their stories occur. Is there a "formula" for writing for a television series? If so, please describe your understanding of it.

7. What do you feel to be the differences between teleplay writing and screen writing? Between teleplay and play writing?

8. Is your work satisfying to you?

Five interviews with members of the production staff, ideally with (1) a line producer, (2) an episode director, (3) a set designer, (4) a post-production supervisor, and (5) a film editor.

Sample questions for the production staff:

1. How did you get to your current position?

2. What specific experiences (including educational ones, e.g., classes, teachers, materials) do you feel helped to prepare you for your current job?

3. What do you see as the effects of the unionization of the television and film industries with regards the job that you were hired to do?

4. How might interested community college students plan their time such as to maximize their chances of eventually being in your position?

5. What could community colleges do to support students in their pursuit of industry jobs?

6. Is your work satisfying to you?

7. Does your position give you the flexibility to explore other job opportunities within the television industry? What might those opportunities be?

8. What do you feel are the most important individual attributes for being successful in your job?

I anticipate having considerable access to these various people and their work environments over the course of the nine months sabbatical. It is my intention to spend a minimum of a week, longer if necessary, in informal observation of each of them at work in addition to conducting interviews. It is my expectation that their

increased familiarity with me will enhance the interview setting.

3. In addition to the means I stated in my original proposal, I will dialogue with instructors in the television production and history of broadcasting classes. I will schedule a meeting to present my findings and new capabilities to my department colleagues, be available for staff development projects in the television area, and network with the audio/visual department in their planning for, and usage of, the television facilities.

4. It is my intention to acquaint myself as thoroughly as possible with the creative, business, and logistical processes involved in the making of professional commercial television in order to augment my teaching in that field. Mr. Brown has assured me that "wherever he can go, I can go." This is a rare opportunity for me to get pragmatic, hands-on, learning experience across many levels within the television industry in a way that no formalized educational program could provide. In order to give structure to this independent study, I plan to act as an unpaid observer/researcher and, where possible, a participant, to document in journal form the development of a television through its various stages from original conception to final

production, to study the structure, functioning, and backgrounds of the creative group assembled to produce the pilot project, and to record the aesthetic, creative, and economic concerns that go into the decision-making process. To that end, I anticipate spending on average 15 - 20 hours per week at Universal Studios or in production-related activities on the schedule provided in the original proposal. I expect that I will spend another ten to fifteen hours per week in preparation, traveling time, and in compiling and transcribing materials.

As Mr. Brown's background is in writing and his function at the studio is to develop new series ideas, this offers me further opportunity to enhance my knowledge of teleplay writing. To that end, I plan to look specifically at the manner in which television scripts are developed and created, spending additional time in story conferences and presentation meeting, collecting drafts and associated materials from each of the various levels of development as reference for interested MSAC students. I will also compile a bibliography of books and guides to screen and teleplay writing for inclusion in the MSAC library's permanent collection.

5. I have now included virtually all of Dr. Dominguez and Walt Collins' suggestions either in my interview documents or elsewhere in this addendum.

6. I have used Brenda Stokes' interview format as a model for the above.

APPENDIX B

TIME USE LOG FOR SABBATICAL

1987:

Monday, September 14: Orientation with Steve Brown at Universal Studios.

Tuesday, September 15: Orientation with Steve Brown at Universal Studios.

Thursday, September 17: Orientation with Robert Eisele ("The Equalizer") at Universal Studios.

Friday, September 18: Research/reading teleplay scripts at the Theatre Arts Library, U.C.L.A. Research Library.

Monday, September 21: Working writing session with Steve Brown/Gail Parent on Steven Spielberg television project "Maids in America".

Tuesday, September 22: Working writing session with Steve Brown/Gail Parent on Steven Spielberg television project "Maids in America".

Wednesday, September 23: Research/reading teleplay scripts at the Theatre Arts Library, U.C.L.A. Research Library.
Friday, September 25: Research in television history, California State University, San Bernardino.

Monday, September 28: Flight to New York City.

Tuesday, September 29 - Wednesday, October 14: Observation of the "The Equalizer" production, "An Everyday Hero"/Research at the Museum of Broadcasting.

Friday October 16 - Friday, October 23: Attendance at the College Music Association convention, New Orleans, La.

Saturday, October 24: High Definition Television seminar, U.C.L.A. extension.

Monday, October 26: Research in television history, California State University, San Bernardino.

Tuesday, October 27: Research in television history, California State University, San Bernardino.

Thursday, October 29: Research/reading teleplay scripts at the Theatre Arts Library, U.C.L.A. Research Library/Attendance at class "Producing Movies for Television", U.C.L.A. extension.

Friday, October 30: Working writing session with Steve Brown/Gail Parent on Steven Spielberg television project "Maids in America".

Monday, November 2: Research in television history, California State University, San Bernardino.

Tuesday, November 3: Interview with Lou Rudolph, TV movie producer, Hollywood.

Wednesday, November 4: Meeting with Bob Loeffler/Scott Nielsen for MSAC Little Theatre lighting system.

Thursday, November 5: Research/reading teleplay scripts at the Theatre Arts Library, U.C.L.A. Research Library/Attendance at class "Producing Movies for Television", U.C.L.A. extension.

Monday, November 9: Working writing session with Steve Brown on pilot project "Men".

Tuesday, November 10: Meeting with Terry Bales, Director of Rancho Santiago College's television program.

Wednesday, November 11: Research in television history, California State University, San Bernardino.

Thursday, November 12: Research/reading teleplay scripts at the Theatre Arts Library, U.C.L.A. Research Library/Attendance at class "Producing Movies for Television", U.C.L.A. extension.

Friday, November 13: Meeting with Scott Nielson, consultant for MSAC Little Theatre lighting system installation.

Monday, November 16: Research in television history, California State University, San Bernardino.

Tuesday, November 17: Working writing session with Steve Brown/Gail Parent on Steven Spielberg television project "Maids in America".

Wednesday, November 18: Research in television history, California State University, San Bernardino.

Thursday, November 19: Research/reading teleplay scripts at the Theatre Arts Library, U.C.L.A. Research Library/Attendance at class "Producing Movies for Television", U.C.L.A. extension.

Tuesday, November 24: Interview with Lou Rudolph, TV movie producer, Hollywood.

Wednesday, November 25: Working writing session with Steve Brown on pilot project "Men".

Monday, November 30: Research in television history, California State University, San Bernardino.

Tuesday, December 1: Working writing session with Steve Brown/Gail Parent on Steven Spielberg television project "Maids in America".

Thursday, December 3: Research/reading teleplay scripts at the Theatre Arts Library, U.C.L.A. Research Library/Attendance at class "Producing Movies for Television", U.C.L.A. extension.

Friday, December 4: Working writing session with Steve Brown on pilot project "Men".

Monday, December 7: Interview with Robert Eisele, Co-producer of the "Equalizer".

Tuesday, December 8: Research in television history, California State University, San Bernardino.

Thursday, December 10: Research/reading teleplay scripts at the Theatre Arts Library, U.C.L.A. Research Library/Attendance at class "Producing Movies for Television", U.C.L.A. extension.

Friday, December 11: Attendance "The Martian Chronicles", MSAC Little Theatre.

Monday, December 15: Research in television history, California State University, San Bernardino.

Tuesday, December 16: Working writing session/meetings with Steve Brown on pilot project "Men".

Thursday, December 17: Meeting at MSAC with Bill Eastham and Scott Nielson on Little Theatre lighting system.

Friday, December 18: Working writing session with Steve Brown on pilot project "Men"/Interview with Robert Eisele

Tuesday, December 22: Working writing session with Steve Brown on pilot project "Men".

Wednesday, December 23: ABC commissions pilot episode of "Men".

Wednesday, December 30: Meetings with Brown and heads of Universal television to plan pre production of "Men".

1988

Monday, January 4: Working rewriting session with Steve Brown on pilot project "Men"/planning meetings.

Wednesday, January 6: Working rewriting session with Steve Brown on pilot project "Men"/planning meetings/Attendance at class "Inside Network Television", U.C.L.A. extension.

Thursday, January 7: Meeting at MSAC with Bill Eastham, Scott Nielson, Bob Loeffler on Little Theatre lighting system.

Tuesday, January 12: Preliminary casting sessions for "Men" at Universal Studios.

Wednesday, January 13: Preliminary casting sessions for "Men" at Universal Studios/Attendance at class "Inside Network Television", U.C.L.A. extension.

Thursday, January 14: Research in television history, California State University, San Bernardino.

Monday, January 18: Research in television history, California State University, San Bernardino.

Tuesday, January 19: Preliminary casting sessions for "Men" at Universal Studios.

Wednesday, January 20: Preliminary casting sessions for "Men" at Universal Studios/Attendance at class "Inside Network Television", U.C.L.A. extension.

Friday, January 22: Research in television history, California State University, San Bernardino.

Monday, January 25: Preliminary casting sessions for "Men" at Universal Studios.

Wednesday, January 27: Research/reading teleplay scripts at the Theatre Arts Library, U.C.L.A. Research Library/Attendance at class "Inside Network Television", U.C.L.A. extension.

Thursday, January 28: Attendance at class "Beginning Film Writing", California State University Long Beach extension.

Tuesday, February 2: Preliminary casting sessions for "Men" at Universal Studios.

Wednesday, February 3:Research/reading teleplay scripts at the Theatre Arts Library, U.C.L.A. Research Library/Attendance at class "Inside Network Television", U.C.L.A. extension.

Thursday, February 4: Attendance at class "Beginning Film Writing", California State University Long Beach extension.

Friday, February 5: Research in television history, California State University, San Bernardino.

Tuesday, February 9: Research in television history, California State University, San Bernardino.

Wednesday, February 10: Research/reading teleplay scripts at the Theatre Arts Library, U.C.L.A. Research Library/Attendance at class "Inside Network Television", U.C.L.A. extension.

Thursday, February 11: Attendance at class "Beginning Film Writing", California State University Long Beach extension.

Wednesday, February 17: Research/reading teleplay scripts at the Theatre Arts Library, U.C.L.A. Research Library/Attendance at class "Inside Network Television", U.C.L.A. extension.

Thursday, February 18: Attendance at class "Beginning Film Writing", California State University Long Beach extension.

Wednesday, February 24: Research/reading teleplay scripts at the Theatre Arts Library, U.C.L.A. Research Library/Attendance at class "Inside Network Television", U.C.L.A. extension.

Thursday, February 25: Attendance at class "Beginning Film Writing", California State University Long Beach extension.

Wednesday, March 2: Research/reading teleplay scripts at the Theatre Arts Library, U.C.L.A. Research Library/Attendance at class "Inside Network Television", U.C.L.A. extension.

Thursday, March 3: Attendance at class "Beginning Film Writing", California State University Long Beach extension.

Friday, March 4: Bid opening on Little Theatre lighting system, MSAC.

Saturday, March 5: Attendance, U.T.B.U., MSAC Little Theatre.

Monday, March 7: Meeting with Dean Ronnebohm about the Drama program, MSAC.

Wednesday, March 9: Research/reading teleplay scripts at the Theatre Arts Library, U.C.L.A. Research Library/Attendance at class "Inside Network Television", U.C.L.A. extension.

Thursday, March 10: Meeting with Kathy Charlton on "Rock Music History" class at the Phil Ochs Archives, Venice, Ca.

Monday, March 14: Travel to Baltimore, Md. for rehearsals and pre-production of "Men".

Tuesday, March 15 - Tuesday, March 29: Observation of rehearsals/shooting of "Men".

Monday, April 4: Meeting of "Humanities" class teaching team, MSAC.

Wednesday, April 6: Research in television history, California State University, San Bernardino.

Thursday, April 7: Research/reading teleplay scripts at the Theatre Arts Library, U.C.L.A. Research Library.

Saturday and Sunday, April 9 & 10: "Preparing A Screenplay" seminar U.C.L.A. extension.

Tuesday, April 12: Editing session of "Men", Universal City.

Thursday, April 14: Attendance of "Midsummer's Night Dream", MSAC/Speech Dept. meeting/Research/reading teleplay scripts at the Theatre Arts Library, U.C.L.A. Research Library.

Monday, April 18: Editing session of "Men", Universal City.

Tuesday, April 19: Research in television history, California State University, San Bernardino.

Thursday, April 21: Research/reading teleplay scripts at the Theatre Arts Library, U.C.L.A. Research Library/Preview House showing of rough cut of "Men".

Monday, April 25: Editing session of "Men", Universal City.

Tuesday, April 26: Music spotting meeting for "Men", Universal City.

Wednesday, April 27: Sound effects spotting for "Men", Universal City.

Friday, April 29: Editing session of "Men", Universal City.

Monday, May 2: ADR for "Men", Burbank.

Tuesday, May 3: ADR for "Men", Burbank.

Thursday, May 5: Dubbing for "Men", The Burbank Studio.

Friday, May 6: Screening of "Men" for cast and crew, Universal Studios.

Monday, May 9: Research/reading teleplay scripts at the Theatre Arts Library, U.C.L.A. Research Library.

Wednesday, May 11: Research/reading teleplay scripts at the Theatre Arts Library, U.C.L.A. Research Library.

Friday, May 13: Research in television history, California State University, San Bernardino.

Tuesday, May 17: Opening of bid for installation of lighting system, MSAC Little Theatre.

Wednesday, May 18: Research/reading teleplay scripts at the Theatre Arts Library, U.C.L.A. Research Library.

Tuesday, May 24: T.B. test, MSAC.

Wednesday, May 25: Research/reading teleplay scripts at the Theatre Arts Library, U.C.L.A. Research Library.

Thursday, May 26, T.B. test reading, MSAC

Wednesday, June 1: Research/reading teleplay scripts at the Theatre Arts Library, U.C.L.A. Research Library.

Thursday, June 2: Attendance at "Horton Foote One Acts", MSAC Little Theatre.

APPENDIX C

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Arlen, Michael J.. 1977. The view from highway 1. New York: Ballantine Books.

_____. 1982. The camera age: Essays on television. New York: Penguin Books.

Ball-Rokeach, Sandra J., Milton Rokeach, and Joel W. Grube. 1984. The great American values test: Influencing behavior and belief through television. New York: The Free Press.

Barnouw, Erik. 1975. Tube of plenty: The evolution of American television. New York: Oxford University Press.

Blum, Richard A. and Richard D. Lindheim. 1987. Primetime: Network television programming. Boston: Focal Press.

Brady, John. 1981. The craft of the screenwriter. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Brooks, Tim and Earle Marsh. 1985. The complete directory of prime time network tv shows 1946 - present, third revised edition. New York: Ballantine Books.

Brown, Les. 1971. Televi$ion: The business behind the box. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

_____. 1982. Les Brown's encyclopedia of television. New York: Zoetrope.

Castleman, Harry and Walter J. Podrazik. 1982. Watching TV: Four decades of American television. New York: McGraw Hill.

Christensen, Mark and Cameron Stauth. 1984. The sweeps: Behind the scenes in network tv. New York: William Morrow.

Egri, Lajos. 1960. The art of dramatic writing. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Field, Syd. 1982. Screenplay: The foundations of screenwriting. New York: Dell Publishing Co.

_____. 1984. The screenwriter's workbook. New York: Dell Publishing Co.

Friendly, Fred W.. 1968. Due to circumstances beyond our control . . .. New York: Vintage Books.

Gitlin, Todd, ed. 1987. Watching television. New York: Pantheon Books.

Goldman, William. 1983. Adventures in the screen trade: A personal view of Hollywood and screenwriting. New York: Warner Books, Inc.

Herman, Lewis. 1974. A practical manual of screen playwriting for theatre and television films. New York: New American Library.

Josefsberg, Milt. 1987. Comedy writing for television and Hollywood. New York: Harper and Row.

Kaminsky, Stuart M. 1988. Writing for television. New York: Dell Books.

Litwak, Mark. 1986. Reel power: The struggle for influence and success in the new Hollywood. New York: William Morrow and Co.

Mandler, Jerry. 1978. Four arguments for the elimination of television. New York: William Morrow.

McNeil, Alex. 1980. Total television: A comprehensive guide to programming from 1948 to 1980. New York: Penguin Books.

Metz, Robert. 1977. CBS: Reflections in a bloodshot eye. New York: Playboy Press.

Miller, Mark Crispin. 1988. Boxed in: The culture of tv. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.

Miller, William. 1980. Screenwriting for narrative film and television. New York: Hastings House.

Newcomb, Horace and Robert S. Alley. 1983. The producer's medium: Conversations with creators of American tv. New York: Oxford University Press.

Newcomb, Horace, ed. 1987. Television: The critical view, fourth edition. New York: Oxford University Press.

Postman, Neil. 1985. Amusing ourselves to death: Public discourse in the age of show business. New York: Penguin Books.

Root, Wells. 1979. Writing the script: A practical guide for films and television. New York: Henry Holt and Co.

Seger, Linda. 1987. Making a good script great. New York: Dodd, Mead & Co.

Shanks, Bob. 1976. The cool fire: How to make it in television. New York: W. W. Norton.

_____. 1986. The primal screen: How to write, sell, and produce movies for television. New York: W. W. Norton.

Sklar, Robert. 1980. Prime-time America: Life on and behind the television screen. New York: Oxford University Press.

Trapnell, Coles. 1974. Teleplay: An introduction to television writing, rev. ed.. New York: Hawthorn Books.

Walter, Richard. 1988. Screenwriting: The art, craft and business of film and television writing. New York: New American Library.

Winn, Marie. 1985. The plug-in drug: Television, children, and the family. New York: Penguin Books.

Williams, Martin. 1982. TV: The casual art. New York: Oxford University Press.